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Readers will turn to this book to appreciate Roman elegy’s role in the burgeoning field of emotion studies and to learn a new way of understanding the genre, and in both areas they will not be disappointed. For jealousy, C. persuasively argues, is the emotional core of elegy (4). Not only does jealousy provide much of the energy that drives the lovers’ narrative, it also provides a psychological explanation for poetic structure; the thematic repetition that characterizes nearly every poem mirrors the jealous lover’s obsessive fixation on a relationship’s crucial details (158). Likewise, to attack Propertius, Tibullus, and especially Ovid for writing declamatory exercises is to misunderstand the jealous narrator, who assumes many different roles not simply to display his rhetorical education but to imaginatively reenact the erotic narrative from many points of view (158–9). C. moves nimbly among wide-ranging contexts, from poetry to culture to psychology. In the debate whether emotions are culturally determined or transhistorically universal, C. manages to have her cake and eat it too: her text focuses on Augustan Rome, but her footnotes include dozens of suggestive comparisons to jealousy in literature of the last several centuries.

C. acknowledges (49) that her work is a collection of case studies rather than a complete catalogue, and Propertius, more absorbed than Ovid or Tibullus in the workings of jealousy (113), takes precedence throughout. The lucid conclusions about genre with which she ends each chapter thus tend to overstate her case, applying to all three authors what is only occasionally true of one or two. Smaller points also overgeneralize; Catullus’ noteworthy denial of infidelity in the Lesbia and Juventius poems (156) is at odds with his acknowledgment of a wide-ranging sex life (C. 32; 61; 110). Following some of Kaster’s methods1, C. engages not simply in lexicography, as if emotions were easily mapped onto specific words, but in analyzing the intricate stories of which jealousy is only a part. Kaster’s useful classification of emotional scripts, however, is mentioned only in passing (51n13). Moreover, like other scholars of the emotions, from Aristotle (Nic.Eth. 2,7) onwards, C. admits that not everyone agrees on what emotion is actually being represented in any particular text, and she sees jealousy where others have seen other emotions. It is also simply baffling for her to claim that Latin elegic poets do not use the Greek term zelotupia (11). Her emphasis on emotional development through poetic narrative pays gratifying attention to the

shape of individual poems, but it comes at the cost of ignoring their placement within the poetic book. Hence C.’s analysis (59–61) of Corinna’s paranoia in Ov. Am. 2,7 bypasses Ov.’s recent justification of her fears in 2,4 and 2,5. C.’s final chapters, however, are more attuned to the context of the *libellus*.

The first chapter (21–47) is expanded from her article in CJ 2006, some of the material from which now appears, with updated bibliography, in her introduction. The chapter deals not with jealousy but with love, seen by philosophers and elegiac poets alike as an illness in need of a cure. But, C. argues, unlike Lucretius and Cicero with their exhortations to emotional self-control, Tibullus and Propertius acknowledge and accept the illness as a chronic condition, to be relieved if not removed by the writing of love poetry. C.’s conclusion overstates the case; «for elegiac narrators, writing poetry provides the antidote» (45) ignores Ovid, who from Am. 1,1 onward consistently sees love poetry as a symptom rather than a treatment of love. Still, C. offers a useful explanation (27–9) of elegy’s response to philosophy’s critique: Eros is unavoidable, and those who mock lovers for their foolish behavior will soon become lovers themselves. The ancient anecdote of Lucretius’ death from a love potion thus plays out in *ben trovato* form the repeated warnings of Propertius & Co.: Love conquers all, especially those who mock it. C. misleadingly connects (28–9) this motif, however, to Ovid’s repeated warnings that those who pretend to be in love will soon truly be in love. Though Ovid may claim that fakers become real lovers, he also undermines the idea of real love by an insistence on its status as a performance rather than an honest emotion.

Ch. 2 (49–75) offers a typology of elegiac jealousy through the three salient characteristics that any jealous lover exhibits: «a belief in one’s expectations of special attentions, a belief that these claims are threatened, and a desire to reassert them» (74). There is an emotional contradiction in jealousy: in oneself it is a sign of love, but in one’s lover it is an annoying imperfection. From this contradiction C. derives two fundamental qualities about the elegiac genre. First, we often criticize in others what we forgive in ourselves, so the conflict betokens elegy’s «psychological realism» (62); second, the beloved’s jealousy is a form of self-advertisement, because it shows how attractive the lover is to others. Jealousy thus proves the supremacy of erotic love, which «surpasses any legal or nominal claims to possession, including a philosophical understanding of the emotions» (74). For C., then, the love triangle in Latin elegy is not merely an outgrowth of the standard mime narrative, in which the cuckolded husband is duped by his wife and her lover; the inattentive elegiac husband is less humiliated than scorned for failing to uphold the emotional foundations of marriage, including jealousy. Accordingly, Ovid’s playful condemnation of the inattentive husband in Am. 2,19 is also a serious proof that jealousy is, so to speak, the bedrock of love (69–70). C.’s analysis shows how the elegists both copy and yet subvert Augustan marriage laws: poet and emperor alike criticize complaisant husbands, but poets do so in order to prove that «true feeling should stand *above* marital love» (74). All these good connections, however, could be stronger. C.’s discussion of jealousy in *Ars* 2 (64–5) ignores the lengthier account of the topic at *Ars* 3,577–610. Here Ovid addresses both men and women—and then launches his most direct attack on the *leges Iuliae* (3,611–6), which is absent from C.’s brief account.
C.’s interpretation of the lover’s gaze in Ch. 3 (77–92) inverts the standard view: viewing the beloved is not so much a reflection of desire as an indication of suspicions and fear (78). C. emphasizes the importance of gender; jealous women tend to be wary of visual and other signs of infidelity (Ov. Her. 5 and 6; Prop. 4,3; add Clytemestra in Ars 2,399–408), but paranoid men rush to judgment (Ov. Am. 2,5; Prop. 1,15; 2,32). On the model of the scripta puella, jealousy can be a sign of poetic success, as the poet’s fear for his beloved’s notoriety is also his delight in his poetry’s popularity—yet elegiac poets tend to emphasize their own vulnerability more than their confidence (91). C.’s lucid conclusions again overstate the case for Ovid; against the analysis of Am. 3,1 should be placed the poet’s boasts of immortality, his rejection of lover, and his joining of form and content at Rem. 357–96. The metaphorical triggers of jealousy lead to the natural result: physical violence. Ch. 4 (93–112) again differentiates men from women; jealous women respond with physical violence (Tib. 1,6; Prop. 3,8, 4,8; Ov. Ars 2,451–62), while men tend to counter with verbal attacks (Tib. 1,13; Prop. 2,8) and interpret the women’s violence as yet another sign of male desirability.

C.’s final two chapters are particularly engrossing. Ch. 5 (113–39) begins with an analysis of Propertius 1,5 and 2,34, in which the narrator, intertwining poetic and erotic rivalry, displays a remarkable transition from hostility (against his rivals) to sympathy. Against earlier scholars, who claimed that jealousy was trumped by men’s alliances, C. persuasively argues that homosocial bonds in fact thrive on competition; jealousy is the necessary catalyst for (in these cases) male bonding. Jealousy is also the metaphorical bond between ourselves and the elegiac narrators; we readers are like jealous lovers, yearning for a faithful partner in between the sheets of the text yet worrying whether we can trust our author to tell us the truth. C. relies heavily on a parallelism of visualization, connecting the visual clues and narratives through which the poet-lover exhibits his jealousy with the visual narratives that we readers create. On the other hand, C. wrongly claims that Ovid’s accounts of Procris and Cephalus in Ars 3 and Met. 7 provoke no readerly sympathy (136–8). Rather, Ovid’s apostrophe to his characters and his self-definition as elegiac lover (Ars 3,736 me miserum!) enact exactly the same narrative slide from external narrator to sympathetic fellow sufferer that C. had earlier argued typifies the response of the reader.

In Ch. 6 (141–56) C. sets elegiac fides in its Roman context. Jealousy constantly worries about trust, and the instability of Roman fides defines not just love but religion, politics, and society at large. Propertius outdoes his rivals in showing (1,21; 1,22; 2,6; 3,13) how the flawed elements of private passion describe and condemn the entire Roman world. C.’s argument would have gained all the more from engaging in a dialogue with Miller, who shows how elegy’s use of such ‘semiotic slippage’ marks the genre as a seismograph of the disruptions of the sense of self that shook Rome in the transition from republic to empire. Moreover, elegists are hardly alone in bemoaning the unstoppable spread of moral corruption, as Hor. (C. 3,6) agrees.

Other bibliographic updates would have added nuance. «Recent work on the Roman family» (142n7) on the role of familial affection cites nothing after 1991;

add Reydams-Schils on the Roman Stoics’ approval of emotional bonds with loved ones.¹ James’ compelling analysis of elegiac female speech² recasts jealousy as genre in a way that complements C.’s analysis; what the ‘women’ in Latin love elegy express is not any individual (much less historical) truth but simply the conventions of the genre itself. Literary envy links the reader and the writer beyond the bounds of elegy, as Anderson’s work on Martial, himself a close reader of the elegists, shows.³ The book itself is handsomely produced; the dozen or so typos are all minor, and an index locorum forms part of the general index.

The humorist Roz Chast once published a cartoon illustrating the Seven Deadly Sins: Envy, Envy, Envy, Envy, Envy, Envy, and Envy. C.’s promotion of Jealousy as the central emotion of Roman elegy is less outrageous but just as appealing. She writes engagingly, with a blend of scholarship and opinion that offers a new and true appreciation of the forces at work in these complicated and fascinating poems.
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