for the (re)evaluation of Roman literature: Greek/Roman intertextuality is a process, not a state, that is predicated on slippages between two systems; Horace, in recuperating Pindar, is influenced by the instability of his predecessor; 'genre is often used in literary criticism as a substitute for lost or weak links to society, occasion, and historical context' (p. 112). Feeney's article too is valuable in its observation that the conditions for speech evolved as the political climate changed and in showing how Horace the poet coped with the unique political environment of triumviral Rome. Feeney thus links poetry inexorably to social and political change.

As W. & F. maintain in the epilogue, 'all readers have their own "Horace" ' (p. 188). The volume stands as proof of this statement. Every scholar and critic claims to have special knowledge of his or her Horace. Many of the authors here want too much to believe in the reality of Horace and continue to speak of his 'sincere' feelings. The issue of Horace's constructedness is occasionally raised but needs to be more explicitly acknowledged, even by the more theoretically advanced among the authors; too often the authors here fall into the traps Horace sets for us. We must take care to be resisting readers, to interrogate Horace's philosophy without needing to posit a real, knowable Horace, and to eschew trying to explain events in favor of interpreting the motivations that Horace constructs. And we need to be aware that, above all else, Horace is interested in the writing of poetry and in himself as a poet.

This volume has many good articles in it, articles that make new arguments or reinvigorate older but still valuable observations. There is, however, a certain clubby atmosphere prevailing in the volume, resulting from the presence of a tight group of authors whose work is closely related and cross-referenced to the exclusion of the other contributors. For future elucidations of the nuances of this complex poet, it would be better to be more inclusive, both of contributors (rather than repeating with the same people or choosing from among a narrow group) and of approach. One thinks, for example, of recent work on the representation of women in Horace's *Odes* (see R. Ancona's *Time and the Erotic in Horace's Odes* [Durham, NC and London, 1994]; P. Rosenmeyer, 'Girls at Play in Early Greek Poetry,' *AJP* 125 [2004], 163–78, at p. 173), and work on women, the body, the gaze, and domination/power in the *Odes* by Sutherland (*AJP* 124 [2003], 57–80) and other scholars, work that ties Horace's poetry together with other ancient authors of lyric and authors of elegy. This is a topic that Oliensis and to some degree Woodman have opened up here, but which is underrepresented. Perhaps this is material for a future volume edited by W. and co.: New Directions in Latin Literary Studies.

Hamilton College BARBARA K. GOLD
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni072

PROPERTIUS IV

J. B. DeBrohun: *Roman Propertius and the Reinvention of Elegy*. Pp. xii + 263. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2003. Cased, US$54.50, £34. ISBN: 0-472-11276-7.

Propertius' fourth book has undergone a renaissance of scholarly interest in the last decade, with M. Janan's *Politics of Desire* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2001) and the body of articles on individual poems by K. O'Neill (*AJPh* 121 [2000], *Hermathena* 158 [1995], and *CJ* 94 [1998]). This interest is perhaps the result of renewed attention paid to Ovid's *Fasti*; when looking to Ovid's sources of inspiration and his

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni073 Published online by Cambridge University Press

innovations in this remarkable text, scholars have found Propertius' aetiological collection an intriguing and elusive prototype (e.g. C. Newlands, *Playing with Time* [Ithaca, 1995] and A. Barchiesi, *The Poet and the Prince* [Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1997]). With its title, DeB.'s new book grants to Propertius 4 pride of place in elegy's transition from a private enterprise to a voice appropriate to public themes: *Roman* Propertius and the *Re*invention of Elegy (my emphasis). DeB. argues that the etiological program of the fourth book creates something new by engaging with the more personal amatory concerns of Propertius' earlier work (p. 8):

> Propertius knew that his decision to increase the thematic range of his elegy with Roman aetia would create a conflict with his own earlier definition of elegy as exclusively amatory. It is my thesis that Propertius planned from the outset of Book 4 to make this conflict an integral part of his new elegiac program.

To explore this conflict, DeB. employs the critical terminology of Marjorie Garber's work on cross-dressing as a conceptual space where opposite, conflicting ideas or identities meet (M. Garber, *Vested Interests* [London, 1992]). Garber poses cross-dressing as a 'third term' that renegotiates the identities of a seemingly binary pair, in the case of cross-dressing, between male and female. DeB. proposes that various 'thirds' operate in Book 4 to mediate between Propertius' amatory and aetiological interests. These thirds are terms or themes that resonate in different ways with each of the two opposing poetic approaches. *Arma* is the first such third she treats; in Elegy 4.1 *arma* participates both in the growth of Rome from its epic/humble origins, and as a metaphor for elegiac love. As a common element it both unites Propertius' amatory poetic heritage with his new etiological program and holds them in tension against each other. Similar thirds are examined in successive chapters: *patria* in Elegy 4.1, the *limen* in 4.9 and 4.4; wardrobe in 4.9 and 4.2; and the Battle of Actium in 4.6 (in this last chapter DeB. sees a cluster of thirds, including costume, the god Apollo, the poetic/military boat, and Cleopatra). An epilogue treats death as a possible third in 4.5 and 4.11.

Her approach produces some fine close readings of the texts. DeB.'s discussion of the *limen* in Elegy 4.9 is especially nuanced and complex. In the poem on Hercules' encounter with the Bona Dea's priestess and his establishment of the Ara Maxima, the *limen* is at once an etiological threshold (of the Ara Maxima and the sanctuary of the Bona Dea) and an amatory one (of the *puella*'s door in the *paraklausithyron*). Drawing on W. S. Anderson's work on this poem (*AJPh* 85 [1964], 1–12 and in K. Galinsky, *Interpretation of Roman Poetry* [Frankfurt-am-Main, 1992]), DeB. shows that Hercules' actions *vis-à-vis* the thresholds in this poem at once establish him as founder and violator of religious traditions and boundaries, and participant and transgressor of the elegiac habit of waiting at—not breaking through—the door. The hero's entry into the sanctuary of the Bona Dea forces the reader to ask questions about what belongs inside and what outside, and what these terms themselves mean. These questions spill over onto Propertius' new elegiac project: the dangers and conflicts inherent in crossing, or indeed redefining, the *limen*, are the same dangers faced by the poet seeking to redefine the relationship between amatory and aetiological elegy, and his own relationship to each form. DeB. concludes this chapter with an abridged discussion of elegy 4.4's *limina* and some suggestions about the *limen* in 4.5, 4.7, and 4.11. As with the rest of the book, this chapter is clear, replete with gems of insight about individual verses and about larger themes that should—and now will—inform our reading of the whole collection.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni073 Published online by Cambridge University Press

DeB.'s approach raises some interesting questions. First among them is the applicability of the concept of thirds to Propertius' elegiac project: three seems to be too few variables for the topic. Put simply, etiology and amatory elegy already contain thirds (or fourths or fifths)—complex and pluralistic discourses that admit of many perspectives. In postulating these forms of discourse as opposites DeB. does a disservice to the complexities of both forms of poetry. Etiology, for example, DeB. frequently glosses as '*Roma*', generally styled as patriotic (e.g. pp. 25, 83, 149, 181). In the book's epilogue she similarly asserts that '(death and) aetiology are associated closely with "fixity" and "closure" ' (p. 242). Scholars of Hellenistic poetry and of its Augustan age adherents have demonstrated ways in which etiology is neither necessarily patriotic nor fixed (G. Zanker, *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry* [London, 1987], and C. Newlands, *Playing with Time* [Ithaca, 1995]). Amatory elegy occasionally suffers a similar simplification in DeB.'s analysis. In an otherwise excellent discussion of the blurred lines between the real battles that enabled Rome's rise and the amatory battles between lovers in Elegy 4.1 (pp.79–85), DeB. aligns the metaphor of *militia amoris* with amatory elegy (*amor*) but without discussing that this metaphor always confounds love and war, as shown in Kennedy's important discussion, present in DeB.'s bibliography but nowhere cited in this section (D. Kennedy, *The Arts of Love* [Cambridge, 1993]).

A second question that arises involves the wider cultural significance of the thirds that DeB. identifies. Though she rightly asserts that *arma*, *patria*, *limen*, costume, Actium, and death are themes of significance to Augustan Rome, with the exception of Actium these symbols emerge in her treatment as purely literary choices with literary ramifications; they could have been written at any time, given a Callimachus in the library. Even her treatment of Propertius' Actium concentrates on the poetic resonance rather than the contemporary political resonance of this poem; the absence of Gurval's work from her discussion is puzzling (R. A. Gurval, *Actium and Augustus* [Ann Arbor, 1995]). Though her readings of individual poems are invaluable to the scholar of Propertius and Roman elegy, those interested in the wider cultural discourses operating in Propertius' last work are encouraged to read DeB. alongside M. Janan's *Politics of Desire* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2001), Stahl's *Propertius 'Love' and 'War'* (Norman, OK, 1985), and P. A. Miller's *Subjecting Verses* (Princeton, 2003).

University of Kansas TARA S. WELCH
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni073

FEMININE VOICES

S. H. LINDHEIM: *Mail and Female. Epistolary Narrative and Desire in Ovid's* Heroides. Pp. x + 270. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2003. Paper, US$29.95. ISBN: 0-299-19264-4.

Recent years have seen a growing critical interest in Ovid's *Heroides*, a collection that appears to offer various forsaken women of ancient literature an opportunity to tell their stories from their own point of view. Despite the gender issues inherent in this collection, critics have focused largely on Ovid's manipulation of prior texts and generic categories. In her study, L. sets out to correct this imbalance by examining the power dynamics that lie behind Ovid's use of cross-gendered speech in the *Heroides*.

L.'s primary framework for reading the *Heroides* hinges on the notion of

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni073 Published online by Cambridge University Press