review are equally the descendants both of the great masters presented here, and of past and present generations of Barcelona-based Romanists, medievalists and classicists, who include Martí de Riquer, Joan Bastardas, Josep Alsina and Miquel Dolç. To give but three examples, Carles Miralles’s research on Homer, Josep Lluís Vidal’s studies on Virgil and the Virgilian reception, and Pere Quetglas’s work for the Glossarium Mediae Latinitatis Cataloniae mirror twentieth-century interest in classical epic and in medieval Catalan texts. As well as crossing academic boundaries, Del Romanticisme al Noucentisme testifies to a rich scholarly tradition in classical and Catalan studies at Barcelona. Judging by the papers in this volume, the one-day conference at the University of Barcelona when they were read and discussed must have been a stimulating gathering, plentiful in ideas and enthusiasm. Those of us unable to attend at the time can now thank the editors for their acumen in bringing the proceedings swiftly and neatly to the press. The inclusion of an index of names and terms would have increased the usefulness of the volume. In any case, much benefit can be derived from this valuable collection.

Alejandro Coroleu
University of Nottingham
Department of Hispanic and Latin American Studies

Ovid in the Twentieth Century


The opening chapter of Ovid and the Moderns (‘The Lure of Ariadne’ [pp. 3–17]) exemplifies the strengths and weaknesses of the study. Its focus is the figure of Ariadne, and in particular her depiction in the paintings of Giorgio de Chirico and in Ariadne auf Naxos, Richard Strauss and Hugo von Hofmannsthal’s opera of 1912. For both artists, Ziolkowski argues, the Ovidian Ariadne was mediated by Nietzsche—as the consort of Dionysus she was a recurring motif in Nietzsche’s works.

This chapter, which mentions English writers only in passing, sets the tone for the volume. Whereas for most critics of Ovid’s afterlife the early twentieth-century phase is dominated by anglophone Modernists such as T.S. Eliot, James Joyce and Ezra Pound, Ziolkowski’s much broader frame of reference, his readiness to engage with the litera-

6. A student of Balcells, Dolç held no university post at Barcelona. He was, however, a member of the editorial committee of the Fundació Bernat Metge, for which he translated Virgil, Persius, Tacitus and Martial. For Dolç’s debts towards Balcells and Riba’s translation criteria see Jaume Medina Casanovas, “El Virgili de Miquel Dolç”, in: M. del C. Bosch—M.A. Fornés, eds., Homenatge a Miquel Dolç (Palma de Mallorca: Govern Balear, 1997, pp. 681–686).

7. Miralles makes that debt explicit in the preface to his Homer (Barcelona: Empúries, 2005, p. 10): “Sóc professor de grec a la Universitat de Barcelona, on foren professors de grec Lluís Segalí i Carles Riba, on l’estudi de l’èpica –grega i romànica, sobretot- ha estat una tradició, de Miïa i Fontanals a Martí de Riquer i Josep Alsina. M’he pres com un deure placent, algun cop, mirar d’aportar amb els meus estudis alguna cosa a aquesta tradició i, ara, tornar aquest Homer a la meva llengua.”
atures of several European countries as well as with the other arts, puts these more usual suspects into a fresh perspective. Indeed this is the book’s avowed purpose, as Ziolkowski explains very cogently in the Preface:

The contextualization of individual works helps us to understand that they belong to a larger tradition rather than being unique, as is sometimes assumed. It does not diminish the stature of Christoph Ransmayr’s international bestseller *The Last World* to compare it, say, to Jacek Bocheński’s *Nazo poeta* or Marin Mincu’s *Il diario di Ovidio*; but it reminds us that Ransmayr’s novel is not the only brilliant fictionalization of Ovid in recent decades. By analogy, we see Eliot’s *Waste Land* with different eyes when we reread it together with major poems by Rilke and Mandelstam from the same year. (p. xiii)

Ziolkowski’s absorption in European literature makes this book a really valuable addition to Ovidian scholarship. But as a comparatist rather than a classicist Ziolkowski sometimes overestimates the newness of modernity, and fails to acknowledge the complexity of Ovid and other classical writers. This shortcoming is in evidence in his suggestive analysis of the presence of Ariadne in the works of de Chirico. A stone figure of Ariadne is a recurrent presence in his paintings, often accompanied by a puffing train in the background, a reminder that the classical heroine has been transplanted into a modern setting. Ziolkowski notes two important sources for Ariadne’s story, Catullus’s Carmen 64 and Ovid’s *Heroides*. He observes that de Chirico, in representing her as a statue rather than a woman, may be responding to Catullus’s comparison between Ariadne and a statue, and to the Ovidian Ariadne’s fear that she is turning to stone:

The mythic and timeless Ariadne has been violently transported into the modern world of railway timetables and reduced to a stock figure in a traditional pose. The metaphor of Ovid’s poetry (*lapis ipsa fui*) has been reified through the painting. This is the shocking modernity of de Chirico’s Ariadne paintings, which sets them apart from the scores of earlier treatments of the theme. (p. 9)

But in fact the earlier treatment of Ariadne’s story, Catullus 64, is already doing something very like de Chirico. When his Ariadne is described as ‘saxea ut effigies bacchantis’, ‘like a marble figure of a bacchanal’ (61) the metaphor is already in a sense ‘reified’ for this Ariadne, though not a statue, is certainly a work of art. She is woven on a coverlet, wrenched out of her time (like de Chirico’s Ariadne), to adorn the marriage bed of Peleus and Thetis. The triptych-like structure of Catullus 64—the inset narrative of Ariadne’s desertion is framed by opening and closing movements describing the wedding of Peleus and Thetis—also invites comparison with *Ariadne auf Naxos*. In the opera too we have a frame with a more modern and realistic setting which is contrasted with the mythical inset narrative of Ariadne. Ziolkowski’s comparison between this piece and de Chirico’s Ariadne paintings is perfectly valid: ‘Both the opera and the paintings exploit a radical juxtaposition of past and present.’ (p. 15) But he overlooks the important affinities between these works and Catullus’s poem which is layered in a similarly sophisticated and self-conscious way, playfully subverting the reader’s expectations of textuality and chronology.

In the following chapter, ‘Transitions’ (pp. 18–29), Ziolkowski suggests that de Chirico and Hofmannsthal’s interest in Ovid went against the grain of the zeitgeist. Ovid’s polit-