

Review: notes

1. Translation in brackets makes for difficult reading, especially in articles like Bonner's and Thompson's/Bruère's. (The translations in Green's article work well because he has done them himself. Not a solution, however, for the first set of articles – all the authors are dead.) Also, in Rosner-Siegel and Green, it is generally only the block quotations that are translated. This makes for easier reading. Overall, the translation seems erratic, since in the Rosner-Siegel article, one-line quotations are sometimes translated, sometimes not. Also, the translation is, on occasions, inaccurate or simply clumsy.
2. Why no Fred? "The Pivot of the Pharsalia" article pretty influential?
3. Much of Dante not translated in Fraenkel's article.
4. With the exception of Conte's piece, the first batch of articles are fairly tedious (if necessary) pieces of scholarship. Perhaps the collection could have been arranged differently?
5. Thompson's and Bruère's article, while useful, is a good example of the tedious quellenforschung that was practiced prior to Hind's work on intertext.
6. Another significant omission: O'Higgin's 1988 article on the *vates*.
7. Leigh's article is interesting (as all of Leigh's stuff is), but very few of its pages actually dwell on Lucan. The episode of Caesar and the grove is important, though, and other articles have been written on it, so perhaps one of them could have been chosen?
8. This leads me to another point: there is a tension inherent in this volume that may be the fault of the series more than the compiler, namely, that a collection of the most influential articles on Lucan does not necessarily represent the most significant episodes in the poem. Caesar and the grove is an episode that has generated many articles, but it is debatable whether any single one of them could rightfully be called 'influential'.
9. The German scholars have certainly made it in to this volume. What about the Italian scholars? Narducci?
10. One section could be entitled: "Context" (or some such) and include Bonner's, Lintott's and Martindale's articles.
11. Overall, what we learn from this volume is that Lucan scholarship has a long way to go before it can stand beside the work done on his predecessors, Ovid and Vergil.
12. Paradox inherent in the ORCS project: if the article is so canonical, it is unlikely to have been published somewhere obscure. So why reprint? If it is from an obscure source, chances are it is not really that influential.
13. Helzle's article: is it really that influential? It seems an odd choice.

14. There is surprisingly little in this volume about Lucan's "poetics". Most of it is context – historical, historiographic, social, political, literary. Does this tell us something about the editor's choice or about Lucan scholarship or both?