help us to understand the Greek view of emotions, and of the means (especially verbal) by which emotions can be produced in an audience, evidence drawn especially from the rhetorical treatises of Aristotle and his successors. It is useful to have this evidence assembled. Indeed, I think the critical categories of the rhetorical treatises, and particularly their distinction between *ēthos* and *pathos* (or the 'ethical' and 'emotional' styles), are potentially illuminating, certainly for Hellenistic and Roman literature, and conceivably too for Greek tragedy. In these treatises, in fact, Stanford might find some justification for his project of treating emotions, and the production of emotions, in Greek tragedy as a separate subject. But I think one needs to make a rather careful study of ancient categories, in an attempt to reconstruct their critical framework, before applying these categories to ancient literature. Stanford, however, makes no real attempt to follow this procedure. He has barely started to discuss Aristotle's catalogue of emotions in Book Two of the *Rhetoric*, before he begins to apply Aristotle's terms to Greek tragedy (pp.23ff.). And in his application of these terms, he brings to bear critical judgements and a critical sensibility that go well beyond anything he claims to find in Aristotle or in other ancient sources. Both here and elsewhere in the book, one has the feeling that Stanford believes that he already knows what is emotionally powerful in Greek tragedy, and that he is writing to tell us this. 79

Now, if that is what Stanford really thinks, and what he wants to do in this book, that is fair enough. After a life-time's study of Greek literature, and other literatures, Stanford no doubt does have a clear sense of what he finds 'emotional' in Greek tragedy; and, given his enviable sensitivity to the colour and power of the Greek language, his feelings on the matter have some weight. Taken as a mosaic of intuitive responses to striking passages in Greek tragedy, presented in a clear, lively manner, this book has genuine value. Classical Studies students might find the book particularly helpful (all quotations are translated). Despite Dover's call for scholars of Greek to communicate to 'the general reader' the aesthetic appeal (and interpretative importance) of Greek style (*Proceedings of the Classical Association* 73[1976], 9-19), recent critical studies of Greek tragedy designed for a general audience have not concentrated on this aspect of the plays. As 'an introductory study', in this sense, this book is worth recommending. But for students and scholars who are interested in exploring in any depth the origins of the emotional power of Greek tragedy in general, or of particular Greek tragedies (such as the *Agamemnon*), I think this book will prove unsatisfactory and superficial.

STEPHEN HINDS(Girton College, Cambridge): cave canem: *Ovid*, Fasti 4.500
LCM 9.5(May 1984), 79

quo simul ac venit, frenatos curribus angues
iungit et aequoreas sicca pererrat aquas.
effugit et Syrtes et te, Zanclaea Charybdi,
et vos, Nisei, naufraga monstra, canes. Ovid, *Fasti* 4.497-500

Ceres' chariot ride from Sicily to Attica takes her into deeper waters than may be immediately apparent. 'There were indeed *magni poetae* who confused, or consciously contaminated, the stories of the two Scyllas [viz. the sea-monster and the daughter of Nisus]' - so R.O.A.M.Lyne's (Cambridge 1978) commentary on the well-known *Ciris* 54ff. discussion. 'Confused, or consciously contaminated': here at least (to leave for another day *Am.*3.12.21.2, *Ars* 1.331-2, *Rem.*737 and *Her.*12.123-4) Ovid, who tends to write his own commentaries, doesn't risk being denied the benefit of the doubt. His *Nisei ... canes* are a hazard to conventional marine traffic; but they are *naufraga monstra* in another sense too. The poet's progress in the task of writing the *Fasti* is repeatedly described, by a programmatic image common in Ovid and in ancient literature in general (see E.J.Kenney in *Ovidiana* ed. Herescu, Paris 1958, 205-6), in terms of the progress of a ship over the sea: *Fast.*1.3-4 *excipe ... | hoc opus et timidae derige navis iter*; also 1.466, 2.3 & 863-4, 3.790, and, in the present book, 4.18 & 729-30. This is the ship which is truly in danger of being sunk by the *Nisei ... canes*. After such a mythological howler, the envious may ask, how can a *doctus poeta* go on? But of course the *Fasti* do continue: the poetic shipwreck is a sham, with the mistake literally including in the words *naufraga monstra* an acknowledgement of its own self-consicousness. Moreover, it is arguable that a pun in the preious couplet has already given the game away. *aequoreas sicca pererrat aquas*: Ceres wanders a great deal in the course of this narrative (cf. *Fasti* 4.465, 568, 573, 575, 589); but her passage through these particular waters involves, as is about to emerge, more than one kind of *error*.