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, 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.

Northfield, Minnesota  Christopher Brunelle


The two poems chosen by Becker – the fifth, centered on a didactic monologue on taking care of cattle, and the sixth, containing preliminaries to a song contest that never takes place – may not appear to form a coherent unity. One of Becker’s major contributions is to demonstrate the centrality of generic experimentation to both texts by highlighting the fifth eclogue’s complex relationship to didactic and the presence of epic material in the description of the stakes – a stag and a horse – in the sixth. However, her introductory claim that the theme of agriculture forms another major connection between both poems is unconvincing; in fact, the commentary would seem to demonstrate the reverse. To some extent, in her thinking about generic mixing in the poems Becker follows the framework set out by Enrico Magnelli’s excellent piece in the ‘Brill Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral’ (2006). Magnelli’s argument about Calpurnius’

effort toward the ‘bucolization’ of other generic material is overlaid with a focus on authorial intention that is likely to give some readers pause. Becker paints a picture of a Calpurnius who attempts to achieve the status of a vates sacer à la Vergil by incorporating georgic and epic features into his collection. This desire to focus on Vergil-inspired intentions is not productive in its own right and leads Becker to ignore the elegiac strand in eclogue 6, which would expand and complicate the generic picture.

The introduction is structured on the model of Fey-Wickert’s commentary. Here one expects to see a discussion of the date, subject to much scholarly back and forth since the publication of E. J. Champlin’s 1978 JRS article, which argued for a date in the reign of Alexander Severus. The Neronian date may now seem to be the settled consensus, but one would expect a commentary to engage with the stylistic arguments of Armstrong (1986) and the intertextual claims of Courtney (1987). None of the relevant works on the date are in the bibliography.

After a summary of the collection’s contents (section 1.2), and an overview of methodology (1.3), Becker locates her poems within the collection and introduces the major themes that interest her (1.4). The poems then receive separate treatment. The relationship of eclogue 5 to Vergil’s third Georgic is most usefully presented, with the analysis revealing just how different Calpurnius’ georgic material is (1.6). There follows a short, rather peculiar, section on Longus (1.7), in which Becker, on the basis of similarities among Vergil, Calpurnius, and Longus, posits the existence of an undefined catalogue of shepherdly duties. The last section devoted to eclogue 5 (1.8) traces a set of correspondences with the work of Columella; Becker leaves open the question of whether the similarities are due to the dependence of both texts on Vergil. The next section is an introduction to the sixth eclogue (1.9). In addition to Becker’s claims for the role of epic material in Calpurnius’ ambitions, we find here a defense of the poem, which used to be seen as an early and/or fragmentary attempt. Becker uses Genette to show that the poem has a complex narrative structure and then proceeds to detail its relationship to the contest poems of Vergil and Theocritus (1.10, with lengthy quotations of the Greek) and a useful overview of epic precedents for the stases (1.11).

The next section, on meter (1.12), contains a chart, modeled on Fey-Wickert’s, that shows the frequency of different shapes of the hexameter lines in Theocritus, the three works of Vergil, Ovid’s Metamorphoses, Calpurnius’ collection as a whole, and finally each of the two eclogues treated by Becker. As no statistical information is given, aside from some data on 5 and 6, the chart’s usefulness is limited. The final section presents a concordance of textual choices (1.13). Becker’s text represents something of a compromise between Korzeniewski’s and Amat’s. Only on two occasions does she select a reading not chosen by either of the earlier editors. The first is Ecl. 5.6, where Becker prints germina, the reading of N, over germina, the reading of G and V. She addsuce a good parallel from the second eclogue, but her argument is not sufficient to overcome the presence of gramina just two lines later as well as the fact that germina is the lectio difficilior. The word has something of technical prose pedigree, and is also used by Vergil at Georg. 2.76, thus making it a good fit for the georgic didactic environment of the poem. The second reading comes in 5.109, where Becker reads incursare velit against incursare velit of her two predecessors. This decision is surprising (the alternative adopted by, e.g., Keene and Duff is incursare of Ht plus Haupt’s conjecture vetet; velit is found in all the mss.) and her reasoning is difficult to evaluate since the reading is not mentioned in the commentary.

There follows the text of the poems accompanied by facing German translation and the commentary proper. The introduction promises a commentary focused on language and style, meant to serve as a tool for further research on the poems. What Becker delivers is clear and generally useful, if somewhat uneven.
The level at which her comments are pitched varies significantly, leading this reviewer to wonder about the intended audience. No knowledge of Greek is assumed (it is always translated) and some entries present very basic information (e.g., the Muses as daughters of Zeus and Mnemosyne and goddesses of the arts without a strong religious component, cf. Lares, Apollo, etc.). Likewise, lexicographical information is sometimes given on fairly straightforward words (e.g., the *TLL* definition of *hircus* as a male goat). On the other hand, both the introduction and the commentary presuppose some familiarity with at least the basic generic features of pastoral and didactic, information that would be useful in helping some readers appreciate Becker’s larger claims.

Becker is good at leading the reader through the poems’ structure: the seasonal divisions in eclogue 5 and the different stages in the ever more heated exchange of 6. Another strength is her ability to provide parallels at different levels of discourse: from vocabulary and phrasing, to syntax, *insectae*, and finally themes. In the accumulation of parallels it sometimes seems that it is Vergil’s *Eclogues* that receive less attention than they deserve: for instance, when Nyctilus is described as *candidus* at 6.14 one might expect a reference to Alexis in Verg. *Ec.* 2.16; *al* in 5.76 is noted as the only instance of an exclamation in the collection, but no reference is made to its frequency (and Neoteric coloring) in Vergil’s book; two Homeric and two Vergilian similes are quoted to demonstrate that the ancients were afraid of snakes, but there is no mention of *latet anguis in herba* (Verg. *Ec.* 3.93).

While readers will find points of disagreement, the commentary offers a useful introduction to some of the major questions and gives helpful guidance through the poems. Becker provides a basic tool that students and scholars can consult with profit as they begin their own engagement with these peculiar poems, which still have much to reveal.

Princeton


Diana Spencer’s ‘Roman Landscape’ is part of the Classical Association’s ‘Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics’ series (‘short books dedicated to key themes and concepts in the classical world’). Its first challenge is to show that landscape qualifies for inclusion in this series – that somewhere in our fragmentary image of Roman Italy, we can point to a specifically ancient sense of scoping and shaping the natural world that turns the land into a theme or concept akin to *Landschaft*. The search takes us across an expansive literary and artistic terrain in which we meet familiar figures such as Varro, Virgil and Pliny, and familiar sites such as the Villa ‘Farnesina’, Livia’s villa at Prima Porta, and Hadrian’s Villa at Tivoli, but with an intense eye on what all of these do to, and with, the world around them. And for S., the search is justification enough, for it is searching «for a Roman sense of landscape» that «illuminates and enriches understanding of their world and its differences from and similarities to (y)ours» (p. 15). Equip-