mihi cum dederis/t, cumulata(m) morte remittam), un *locus desperatus* où la signification du second vers semble perpétuellement se dérober. Je pencherais pour *quam mihi cum dederit, culpam tum corde remittam* (« quand il [Énée] m'aura accordé cette grâce [de retarder son départ], je pardonnerai alors sa faute [de m'abandonner] au profond de mon cœur »). Voir V.-Flac. 3.406-408 (*Celaeneus / insontes errore luit culpamque remittens / carmina turbatos uoluit placantia manes*) et un autre écho (formel, mais non plus sémantique) en Claud., *Gild.* 132-133 (*genitor iam corde remitti / coeperat et sacrum dextra sedare tumultum*). Suite à une dittographie du M de *tum*, et à l'absorption d'un C « mince » dans O, *corde* a pu dériver vers *morte*, et le glissement de *culpamtum*, écrit avec un P « mince », à *cumulatam* reste plausible (intrusion d'une moitié de A = un quart de M). Je conclurai par deux derniers exemples qui nous font sortir du corpus virgilien. Aux p. 96-97, Conte défend, avec Antonino Pittà et contre Gauthier Liberman, l'émendation *tradere es* pour *traderis* en Stat., *S.* 1.1.84-86 (*cedat equus … / … quem tradere es ausus / Pallaeo, Lysippe, duci*). Aux parallèles livrés par la préface du Livre 1 (*centum hos uersus, quos in equum maximum feci, indulgentissimo imperatori postero die quam dedicauerat opus tradere ausus sum*) et par Tibulle (1.9.53 : *at te, qui puerum donis corrumpere es ausus* ; 1.9.77 : *blanditiasque meas aliis tu uendere es ausus*), j'ajouterais, pour ma part, Prop. 1.20.51-52 (*his, o Galle, tuos monitus seruabis amores; / formosum Nymphis credere es ausus Hylan!*) où *es ausus* remplace l'ininterprétable *uisus*. Dans quatre cas, un verbe de transmission régit le datif du récepteur, et Tib. 1.9.53 évoque, à son tour, des cadeaux répétés. Aux p. 98-99, Conte note que la métrique rend des plus suspectes la version qu'un éditeur comme Enrico Flores continue d'imprimer en Man. 3.603-605 (*quaeque super signum nascens a cardine primum / tertia forma est et summo iam proxima caelo*). Lucian Müller a proposé *forma erit*, où le futur n'est guère motivé ; A. E. Housman, *sors manet*, qui heurte la vraisemblance paléographique. Je me suis prononcé ailleurs (in *Phoenix* 69, 2015, p. 170) pour *forma exstat summo* … ; voir Ov., *H.* 13.101, *Pont.* 2.10.46, *Tr.* 4.3.1-6.

Université libre de Bruxelles (ULB). Marc DOMINICY.

Charles DAVOINE, *La ville défigurée. Gestion et perception des ruines dans le monde romain (Ier siècle a.C. – IVe siècle p.C.)*, Bordeaux, Ausonius, 2021 (Scripta Antiqua, 144), 24 × 17 cm, 433 p., 25 €, ISBN 978-2-35613-366-3.

As Charles Davoine notes in the first pages of this informative book, ruins are loaded with significance in modern cultures. To a considerable extent, modern cultures have defined themselves around the ruin. Ruins allow modern cultures to explore their relationship with the remote past, with civilizational precariousness, the (un)certain future in a cycle of rise and fall, and the prospect of our individual mortality. Consequently, they have been subject to frequent and intensive academic discourse. Our understanding of the 'modern' ruin is entangled with a poetics of ruination, which becomes more resonant the higher the status of the fallen civilization: images of the ruins of Egypt, Greece and Rome have been supplemented with the invented ruins of modern cultures. This is such a prevalent aesthetic that some modern architectures have imagined their constructs with an eye on future ruination: their contemporary buildings becoming a symbolic residue of a new epoch-defining civilization. Yet, as Davoine points out, much of this aesthetic is modern and not shared by ancient poets and writers, though there are resonances in certain texts. The obsessive engagement with the ruin is unarguably not such a major feature of the Classical aesthetic and certainly not of the everyday treatment of ruination and the decay of buildings in urban contexts. Davoine does not problematise

this difference, for to so do would be to force the narrative into an extended discussion of the modern aesthetic, but focuses on the practical treatment of urban decay in ancient cities. In so doing, Davoine adopts a materialistic approach. The significant body of literary and legal texts from antiquity present considerable difficulties of interpretation, not the least being the translation of the vocabulary that could be applied to buildings in a state of decay: there are many grades of ruination and disrepair. Davoine's approach is initially philological, looking at the varying language used in different circumstances to define a broad category of 'ruin' and of actions in the repair or restoration of such 'ruins'. It is evident that there were multiple categories of disrepair of sites which, as in modern languages, demanded a varied vocabulary and that the Latin and Greek, unsurprisingly, does not map exactly onto the modern. This materialistic focus leads to a focus on consideration of legal texts and the small number of literary texts which deal with the decay and repair of urban buildings. Davoine sees a consistency of approach in these texts. Urban and imperial authorities were concerned with the disrepair of buildings. They perceived a civic interest in maintaining the appearance both public and private buildings. Consequently, they were anxious to prevent buildings become ruins and urban plots becoming vacant. Much of the legislative focus is on preventing the stripping of building materials from urban sites. We cannot know how effective such measures were or how closely administered public and private sites could be. As with other aspects of Roman law, the repetition of basic elements does not signify failure, but a desire to reassert and reinforce the principles. In such a complex area, one would expect that urban authorities would be repeatedly challenged and faced with difficult decisions. Yet even if the aims of the laws were not completely achieved and one would expect that sites fell into disrepair in Roman cities as part of the normal urban processes, Davoine shows the commitment on the part of urban authorities to maintain the urban community. Archaeology is perhaps less useful on this topic than one might initially imagine. Buildings in ancient cities must have fallen into disrepair and buildings been abandoned or repurposed over time. Over the long period of occupation of a city, one would expect sites to be redeveloped and although such redevelopments can be detected archaeologically, especially in a site like Pompeii, understanding the dynamics and the influence of such redevelopments on the cityscape is difficult. If the cultural and administrative pressure was to maintain buildings and plots in a state of good repair, the occasional failure to meet those goals is both to be expected and not necessarily of any grand significance. We have similar problems in thinking about the repurposing of buildings in the late antique city: is a repurposing symptomatic of decay or vitality? Are periods of abandonment of particular plots normal in cyclical development and redevelopment? Were the civic regulations attempts to hold back that cycle which would inevitably have failures? The legal and literary evidence is not such as to provide us with textured topographical descriptions. The archaeology for most sites is not so fine-grained in its chronology. Egyptian cities, for which the papyri provide limited guidance to topographic developments, clearly had number of abandoned sites at any one time. These were used as rubbish tips and appear to have been unremarkable. There is no *prime facie* reason to believe that Egyptian urban authorities would have been more tolerant of disrepair than elsewhere, though there was an evident magisterial concern with keeping Roman cities clean. The concerns of the legal texts were administrative, but they also illuminate the economics of building. The economics were such that a developed site in disrepair might have value for the architectural elements and building materials on the site: a building's value might be more its rubble rather than its land value. Davoine does not develop the implications of the observation. Archaeologists and economic historians are increasingly conscious of the scale of wealth that was sunk into a building, particularly given the constraints of pre-industrial building technologies. The quarry that was an existing building was, then, an asset of considerable value. This

appears to have been the case up until the nineteenth-century when the value of rubble of demolition was a major asset to be offset against the costs of the large-scale urban development of the period. In modern cities, buildings, private and public, commercial and domestic, are torn up and replaced with considerable rapidity and abandon: the grand buildings of hyper-modernity have a very short period of utility. Such different economic conditions had consequences. Roman 'prime' sites, if stripped of their existing buildings were less likely to attract rapid redevelopment and this would surely have encouraged civic authorities to intervene more readily. The administrative and political pressure and the sinking of capital into a site must have discouraged the radical and repeated redevelopment of a plot so familiar in our modern cities, and a conservatism in urban and building form. In itself, that tendency would generate a different relationship to the past in urbanism. Perhaps more surprising than this general commitment to the urban infrastructure is the willingness of the authorities to regulate the management of private property. One presumes that those sufficiently wealthy to strip away architectural elements for sale or reuse would also have had political influence, but at face value, the city was committed to forcing such individuals to maintain the private and domestic urban infrastructure. This was clearly not primarily a safety issue, but one of aesthetics and politics. The city expected its leading citizens to contribute not just through the sponsorship of public buildings and events but through the development and maintenance of their own grand residences. The city was not just its public buildings, but its private structures. A blurring of the distinctions between public and private can be seen probably as late as the sixth century with the great aristocratic houses taking on civil functions. The division so deeply written into our thinking on Roman cities and, indeed, on modern cities between *res priuata* and *res publica* seems to be more complex in the reality of urban management. Our inherited political view of ancient cities is one which emphasises public spaces and places of assembly and citizenship. But in these texts, the distinction seems more blurred. In at least some regards, *res priuata* is to be governed in the interests of the city and made to conform to the aesthetic requirements of the city. The city's need for display, both to its own citizens and to outsiders, encompassed the public buildings and the grand, and perhaps less grand houses, whose residents were evidence of the vitality and civic spirit of the community. The absence of evident disrepair was symbolic of the city's order and hence a representation of an idealised community. A field of ruins would challenge any such symbolism. On a larger scale, catastrophic events required imperial intervention. Davoine is surely correct to see such interventions as opportunities for the imperial authorities to display their commitment to the local communities affected by earthquakes and the like. Such interventions were political in generating a shared sense of community between the emperor and the community, which is reflected in the aesthetic of a functioning city. The city's successful recovery would seem to depend on imperial support and this cemented the political dependence of the local on the imperial, whether or not that recovery would anyhow have taken place over time. The 'ruin' required restoration whether it was on the small scale of the individual building or the larger scale of the city. Davoine's treatment of the complexity of urban decay and repair focuses attention on the strength of the city and city authorities. In theory at least, urban authorities sought to establish a measure of aesthetic unity and control over the city by insisting on repair. There was space for old buildings, and thus a consciousness of an urban heritage, but not evidently for ruins. That is, in my view, a core element of Davoine's contribution: cities were not museums or monuments to a past, but even as they were conscious of and displayed elements of tradition, asserted their vibrancy and success in the absence of ruins. Ruins were objects of sorrow and failure, not mechanisms for an understanding or display of the (lost) antiquity of a community. Nevertheless, I found myself wondering as the book progressed whether there was such a difference

between ancient and modern attitudes. The Romantic engagements, often of visitors, with the ruins of Rome and Athens, for example, were in often in blatant ignorance of the modern cities that surrounded the ancient. Part of the poetic was a disassociation of the ruin from the current city which, however often repeated in literary circles, was often a marginal, particular and peculiar conception. By contrast, our attitude to modern sites in ruination and disrepair are complex but not particularly poetic. In contemporary Athens, for instance, the dilapidation that followed from the financial crisis did not generate an aesthetics of ruination, but a drive for redevelopment and reclamation. We are not moved to consider our limited temporal span in comparison with historical time by visions of the bombed-out cities of Ukraine or Syria. Post-industrial landscapes might capture some of the sense of fallen civilization, but urban authorities are focused on clearance and reclamation and the return of economic productivity to such sites. The vast fields of rubble generated by the resettlement of working-class populations that I remember from my childhood were seen as symptomatic of urban failure not a poetic of ruination, and were redeveloped as quickly as possible. Evidently, cities negotiate relations with their pasts in dealing with old buildings and in architectural renewal and restoration, but the drive and aesthetic of the modern city is for functional spaces, in both economic and social terms. The relationship of Roman cities to their pasts was, evidently, different and perhaps less focused on issues of era and epoch or conscious economic and social transformation, but both modern and ancient cities are and were more machines for living than monuments to lost pasts. Even in more literary contexts, the modern engagement is not completely foreign to antiquity, as Davoine recognises. Imperial Latin poetry especially (Lucan most notably, but not exclusively) offers an aesthetic and political treatment of ruins which resonates with the modern. One wonders whether the urban authorities' concern with the decay of sites was in part a result of an anxiety that the city might be perceived to belong to the past. Nostalgia is a powerful counter to the imperial present. Davoine's contribution, then, is to focus our attention on the processes of urban renewal in the Roman cities and the battle against ruination in preservation of the city as a political and social community. It points to the very different dynamics of Classical urbanism and is suggestive of the structural differences in Roman economy and society that underpin those dynamics. As one prone to succumb to the temptations of the poetics of urbanism, I appreciate the salutary focus on the vibrant materiality of Roman cities.

Royal Holloway, University of London. Richard ALSTON.

Ginetta DE TRANE, *Scrittura e intertestualità nelle* Metamorfosi *di Apuleio. Le diverse forme del dire artistico*, Lecce – Rovato, Pensa, 2021 20,5 × 14 cm, 355 p., 38 €, ISBN 978-88-6760-815-7.

The book under review is the second, revised edition of a volume first published in 2009. As indicated in the preface, G. De Trane has taken into account the criticism of the previous version (i.e. L. Graverini, review of De Trane, in *Athenaeum* 100, 2012, p. 633-637) and aims to update the bibliography though without being exhaustive (cf. p. 9: "si citeranno, senza pretese di completezza, studi il cui ambito cronologico comprende gli anni dal 2010 a oggi"). The purpose of her book is to illustrate the intertextual engagement with previous Greek and Latin literature in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*. The volume is divided into seven chapters. Chapter 1 deals primarily with the complexity of the prologue of the *Metamorphoses*. De Trane includes an evaluation of the other two versions of the ass-story, i.e. the *Onos* ascribed to Lucian of Samosata, and Lucius of Patras' lost *Metamorphoseis*, mentioned in Photius, *Bibl.* 129. This chapter also focuses