

Perhaps the accumulation of complexity in Virgil's allusive design is a function of long time. These days we are lured by the Siren song as much to a hasty reading as to a slow overreading.

The reader steps into the poem; its characters step out. But Juno does not wear the *palla* of a pop-up antagonist. She comes alive in F.'s analysis as a rival to the narrator himself, teeth set to wrest the story from him in the telling and ensure that it not become another *Odyssey*. The famous elision (*menē t̄ncepto*, 1.37) at the start of her first aria thus takes on new meaning. She is not merely alluding to the μῆνις of Achilles or Apollo at the beginning of the *Iliad*; she hears what she takes to be the beginning of an *Odyssey* and wishes to sing an *Iliad* instead. Thenceforth all her interventions are at once metapoetry and a foil to the cautious reader. By the end it is not only the *Aeneid* that belongs to her, but also the language in which it was written. She wanted to be a poet and ended up an editor, content to erase Teucer and the Trojan name from her song.

'But is he right?' seems by the end of the book to be a less pressing question than 'How has he transformed the way we will read this poem?' Yet we still must ask the former question. Even if I read precisely because I find the author's mind vastly more interesting than mine, when we peer into this text F. helps us to see our reflection as in a shield of inscrutable craftsmanship. And we marvel in delight perhaps at how little we have known of ourselves – *Juno's Aeneid* makes us not merely reckon with our reflection on the surface of this work but with the artistry of our hands.

It is unfortunate that, through no fault of F.'s, so many infelicities of type beleaguer such a beautiful book; these should be placed at the doorstep not of Cohen Hall but of the Scribner Building in Princeton to ensure that future editions will be scrubbed clean, because we will surely be reckoning with this book for a long time.

New York

ADAM FOLEY
adamtoddfoley@gmail.com

THE RECEPTION OF VITRUVIUS

COURRÉNT (M.) *Vitruvius Auctor. L'œuvre littéraire de Vitruve et sa réception dans la littérature antique (I^{er}–V^e siècles)*. (Scripta Antiqua 124.) Pp. 394, fig. Bordeaux: Ausonius, 2019. Paper, €25. ISBN: 978-2-35613-253-6.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X21002298

Pliny the Elder listed Vitruvius as one of the *auctoritates* employed to draw up Books 16, 35 and 36 of the *Naturalis historia*. Two decades later Frontinus (*Aq.* 25) explained that Vitruvius was the most likely candidate (the other option being Agrippa) responsible for the development of the *quinaria*-pipe in the Roman water-supply system. In the late fourth to fifth centuries CE Servius quoted Vitruvius to elucidate Virgil's *Aen.* 6.43, although he put words in his mouth that he never said in the *De architectura*. In the fifth century Sidonius mentioned Vitruvius twice (*Epist.* 4.3.5; 8.6.10), using his name as an antonomasia for 'architecture', but he seems to have made little use of his work (a plausible reminiscence in *Epist.* 2.2.5). The case of Cetus Faventinus is completely different, as he compiled a highly selective abridgment of the *De architectura* in the third to fourth centuries CE, *ad humiliora ingenia*. All-in-all, five authors mention Vitruvius between

the first and the fifth centuries, but only Pliny and Faventinus truly interact with the text of the *De architectura*. A 300-page monograph devoted to the reception of Vitruvius' work throughout this period therefore seems promising.

C., a well-known specialist in Vitruvius, is not particularly interested in Pliny or Faventinus, her main aim being to discover the silent traces of Vitruvius' treatise in the works of Greek and Roman literature that never mention it.

The book is structured into an introduction and three chapters focused, respectively, on Vitruvius' literary ambition, his lexicon and his reception in ancient literature. The volume ends with a brief conclusion, a detailed set of indexes (*inscriptionum, locorum, nominum, rerum* – mostly a useful *index verborum*) and a bibliography.

The first chapter addresses the relevance of the *De architectura* as a representative voice of the culture of transition from Republic to Principate. Based upon C. Moatti's studies on the intellectual revolution at the end of the Republic, the argumentation is solid, although A. Wallace-Hadrill's *Rome's Cultural Revolution* (2008) and certain insightful contributions made recently by A. König ('From Architect to Emperor', in L. Taub and A. Doody [edd.], *Authorial Voices in Greco-Roman Technical Writing* [2009]) and E. Romano (*Arethusa* 49 [2016]) would have proved useful to her discussion. As for the study of the cultural and literary context, and the influence that models and *auctoritates* had on Vitruvius, C. sometimes seems to underestimate Varro's role. I find it difficult to agree with her reading of Book 7, *praef.* 14–15, as a Vitruvian statement proclaiming that all his sources on architecture were Greek and there was not a single Latin author among them. What Vitruvius notes in this text is simply that the Greeks had written numerous books on architecture and the Romans very few. As Varro's work has almost entirely been lost, the statement that Vitruvius did not use Varro for any technical aspect of the *De architectura* because Varro was not an architect is speculation, especially with regard to terminology.

In her exploration of Vitruvius' literary ambition, C. provides a valuable review of prose rhythm in the *De architectura*, following the model proposed by J. Aumont (1996). Despite some 'psychological' ad hoc interpretations of rhythmic clauses, these pages pave the way for a literary interpretation of their specific significance in the more rhetorical parts of the work. Indeed, an example of prose rhythm analysis in one of the prefaces would have helped the reader to appreciate the potential value of this approach for a fuller and more comprehensive reading of Vitruvius, beyond the mere quantitative description. In this respect, it is also somehow surprising that C.'s review has not prompted her to propose any correction to the transmitted text or to prefer any textual variant for rhythmic reasons. For a correct assessment of prose rhythm and the limits of interpretation it should be recalled that, whether the writer intended or not, every Latin text always has rhythmic patterns. It is the critic who has to discern when a rhythmic clause is intentional and therefore meaningful, and when, by contrast, it is just the inescapable result of using words with long and short syllables.

The lexical study is the core of the monograph, and it is probably the most useful section, for its own merit and the possibilities it provides. The lexical research has been carried out using the *Dictionnaire des termes techniques* by Callebat–Fleury, two epigraphic databases (*EDR* and *Clauss-Slaby*) and the Database BTL, Release-4 (2006). Nevertheless, this repertoire of lexicographical tools omits many late antique and Christian works (indeed, the source for Christian writers has been the *Gaffiot*), and this is therefore a misguided decision. Surprisingly, the *TLL* has no part in this approach to the lexical issue. The following are a number of examples of the impact this choice has on C.'s lexical research. On p. 90 she says: 'Callebat et Fleury indiquent que *aeracius, crescentia, despectatio, pinsatio, replum* et *sima* sont lus depuis Vitruve, mais nous

n'avons pas trouvé d'autre mention de ces mots dans la littérature postérieure'. For the first four terms, the later 'missing' occurrences can easily be retrieved in the *TLL*, whereas *sima* is used in late antiquity to designate the lower part of the liver (Vindicianus, *Gyn.* 14). As for p. 112, *odeum* can be read not only in Ammianus, but also in Polemius Silvius (82); on p. 183 *phellos* is said to be a Vitruvian hapax, but the *TLL* gives two more attestations (one with a different meaning, but the other is explained by Oribasius as *co(o)pertura*, fairly close to the Vitruvian use); *demolitor* (*ibid.*) is used also by Jerome (*nom. Hebr.* p. 43.11); *aeracius*, allegedly a Vitruvian hapax (p. 228), is registered in the *Notae tironianae* (101.39, a *nota* for a *semel dictum?*); *phalangarius* is found in Vitruvius, Nonius Marcellus and a fourth-century CE inscription, but also in a second- to third-century CE Tebtonis papyrus and within the Latin glossography tradition; *craticius* (p. 234) is not a hapax (cf. Festus, p. 301; Ulpianus, *Dig.* 17.2.52.13; Palladius 1.19.2; Orosius, *Hist.* 5.12.8); *aquilonalis*, *bituminosus* and *fontalis* (p. 235) are not hapax legomena (cf. *TLL*); *nitrosus* is also found in the *additamenta* to Damigeron's lapidary and Caelius Aurelianus (*Tard.* 1.169); *sulphurosus* is also in Caelius Aurelianus (*Tard.* 1.112); *congesticius* (p. 247) is found in Vitruvius and Faventinus as well as in Columella and Palladius.

In the final chapter C. studies the presence of Vitruvius in other Greek and Roman works. Caesar's *Commentarii* are the first works considered. Based on the terminology used, C. boldly ascribes to Vitruvius the writings copied by Caesar in several technical passages of both his *Commentarii*, including the description of the bridge on the Rhine. Vitruvius and the Caesarean commentaries do share certain technical terms, which are scarcely represented in the preserved Latin texts. However, using the same word for the same thing can hardly be taken as a sign of dependence. It is clear that Caesar used his engineers' drafts, but from there to directly identifying the engineer responsible for some passages in Caesar with Vitruvius may seem a leap of faith. The section on medical texts could have been improved with the *TLL*; for example, *laxatio* is said to be used only by Vitruvius and the *Mulomedicina Chironis*, but it is a term used in other medical texts (Philumenos lat., Theodorus Priscianus, Caelius Aurelianus, Oribasius lat.). The same applies to other terms; when C. finds a word only in Vitruvius and another author, she tends to interpret the match as the result of reading Vitruvius, excluding other possibilities; everything looks like a nail when you have a hammer in your hand.

The attribution of orthographical features (e.g. *enlychnia/ellychnium*; *peristylum/peristylon*) to the authors instead of the scribes is troublesome, and the repeated statement that Vitruvius is the sole ancient author to narrate Archimedes' 'Eureka' moment is puzzling. Significantly, the section about Plutarch omits the passage of *Moralia* where he tells the story (*Non posse* 1094c).

C.'s book is definitely a welcome contribution to the study of Vitruvius, his lexicon and the presence of his work, and may serve as a solid starting point for further research in this field.

Universidad de Salamanca

DAVID PANIAGUA
dav_paniagua@usal.es