presence of an attractive woman, but an unattractive one. Whether or not Horace's attacks are defensive and after the fact, W. calls attention to the strangeness that in both poems Horace ends up in bed with such charmers in the first place. His discussion of the same issue in 'Horace's *Epodes*: the Impotence of *Iambos*' (in S. J. Harrison, *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration* [Oxford, 1995], pp. 188–202) sets Horace's embarrassment in a wider scope: iambic fecklessness also includes the political.

W. comes down on the side of Horace's presence along with Maecenas at Actium in Epode 9. As is endemic in Horatian studies, he brings up persona theory in the context of eroticism and the personal, but takes poems involving historical events as more transparent. His warning against biographism comes as the first footnote to Epode 11 (also on garlic, 4.4 n.28), not in the context of battle. Of course, it is not the poet's actual presence at Actium that is in question, but whether the poem represents him as present. W. puts too much weight on the literalness of *nausea* (9.35). It could mean seasickness, as he suggests, but be extended metaphorically to feelings of political discomfort sympathetically assimilated to the illness of friends on board ship. The next line explains the nausea and its antidote: it is good to dissolve care and fear for Caesar's affairs with sweet wine (9.37–8). This could be done anywhere, and it is important not to erase ambiguity.

He gives temporal priority to Eclogue 4 over Epode 16, but without strong argumentation and without summarizing the major moves. Decisive in my mind is N. Horsfall (*RFil* 119 [1991], 357): basing his comments on, among other things, a seminar given by Nisbet in 1970, he remarks that the echoes between Horace and Virgil span up to perhaps five Eclogues and are concentrated in about eight lines of the Epode. It is more likely that Horace brought the various material together than that Virgil kept thinking back to the same small set of Horatian verses.

It is heartening that after the publication of a 604-page commentary, full of valuable insight and information, Horace has by no means been shut down as a field for research. W. has rather opened up this strange and fascinating collection. My complaints are minor in proportion to the substance of the work.

New York University MICHÈLE LOWRIE
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni287

HORACE'S AUDIENCE

R. L. B. McNeill: *Horace. Image, Identity, and Audience*. Pp. xii + 188. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001. Cased, £31.50. ISBN: 0-8018-6666-9.

McNeill's *Horace: Image, Identity and Audience* is an exercise in the new historicism. M. places Horace in context, utilizing as a sometimes obtrusive theoretical key the notion of concentric rings of audience pioneered by Barbara Gold. M. demonstrates a common sense approach as he attempts to avoid the pitfalls of an excessive devotion to biography while basing his readings and interpretations on a close analysis of the text, informed by an understanding of contemporary history and literature. Where one does argue with M.'s conclusions is when one's own subjective response to the text is simply different, as where, rather than reading *ad unguem factus homo* as a compliment to Fonteius Capito at *Satires* 1.5.32–3, as does M., one reads the phrase as a sarcastic comment on the overly civilized style of Antonius'

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni288 Published online by Cambridge University Press

supporter, and as an implicit and adverse comment on Antonius and his team. Octavian's entourage is painted in favourable colours, even when their minor shortcomings are exposed for our gentle amusement.

The general critical comment can be made that, driven by his adherence to the notion of the concentric rings of audience and misled by a selective use of textual evidence drawn from different chronological periods in Horace's life and career, M.'s conclusions sometimes go beyond what the evidence might suggest. For example, one might be startled to read (p. 24) of *Epistles* 1.7.1–9 that 'One is therefore led to imagine a stern Maecenas, with a frown on his face, grimly reading these opening lines', although the further conclusion that 'Horace's presented self-image, consequently, is that of one who must tread very carefully' seems entirely reasonable. However, it is precisely the delicacy of M.'s own tightrope act, poised between biography and historicism, that makes the book a delight.

Chapter 1, 'Poet and Patron'. M. builds bulky interpretative structures on flimsy foundations. An example is his desire, in the discussion of *Satires* 2.8 (p. 21), to impute to Horace a sense of anxiety and disappointment that he was not one of the guests at the meal hosted by Nasidienus, where Maecenas and his shadows, as reported by Fundanius, play a less than dignified rôle. M. cites R. J. Baker's discussion of this poem, 'Maecenas and Horace *Satires* 2.8' (*CJ* 83 [1988], 212–32), but does not pay sufficient attention to Baker's unflattering reading of the behaviour of Maecenas. However, M. is correct in stating that 'this new approach to self-presentation is one of Horace's greatest poetic innovations' (p. 31), while the necessity for this innovation sprang from the fact that Horace's origins were relatively humble, if we accept his insistence on the fact of his being *libertino patre natus* and a survivor of the losing side in the civil war, both aspects of his life which made him useful to Maecenas and Octavian/Augustus.

Chapter 2, 'In the Public Eye'. M.'s notion of the 'concentric rings of audience' informs his discussion of Horace's works as they demonstrate the construction of different Horatian personae which speak to the different rings of audience, from the inner circle of Maecenas and Octavian/Augustus to the senatorial or equestrian élite and then the larger reading public. Interestingly, given the intense interest Horace shows in his own work and its reception, M. does not consider the effect on his own work that the *persona* of Horace *qua* audience might have on its composition. One area where Horace does act as his own audience is in his estimation of his own literary achievements. M. betrays himself as having a rather anachronistic hostility to 'overt self-glorification' as he suggests that Horace takes special measures to avoid any such charge. However, in the context of Roman society and literature, 'self-glorification' was the norm, if one takes as evidence the self-adulation of Cicero or of the *Commentaries* of Julius Caesar.

Chapter 3, 'Craft and Concern'. While it is likely that in his work Horace created different and appropriate *personae*, it seems less obvious that in his discourses on poetry he would find a similar necessity, as is suggested by M. in this chapter. There is no difficulty in believing that Horace valued his own achievements, even when he ironically disparages them (e.g. *Satires* 1.4.56–65), that he is proud of the appreciation of the *docti*, and that he is convinced of his status as *vates* and of his own immortality (*Odes* 3.30). There is no status anxiety here. Similarly, I have no difficulty in accepting that *paupertas* was responsible for Horace devoting himself to a literary career. Life decisions are frequently over-determined. The multiple personalities of M.'s reading could as easily be read as demonstrations of the poet's own awareness of the complex personalities which simultaneously inhabited his own mortal clay and were formed to

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni288 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cope with the demands of living in such a turbulent and complex time. Moral and political schizophrenia was not only endemic at the time, it was a necessity for survival.

Chapter 4, 'Worldly Affairs'. M.'s chapter on Horace's political involvement as propagandist is sensible and well informed. More of the material that appears in the end notes should have made it into the main body of the text. This is a readable and stimulating account of Horace and the interrelationships between image and identity and audience. At times the references to the 'concentric rings' seem a trifle forced, but the book challenges lovers of Horace's genius to re-engage with the major questions raised by the life of that poet in the critical period of change and renewal that was the time of Augustus.

University of Canterbury, Christchurch ROBIN BOND
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni288

NOT BY OVID?

W. LINGENBERG: *Das erste Buch der Heroidenbriefe. Echtheitskritische Untersuchungen*. (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, Neue Folge, 1. Reihe, Band 20.) Pp. 334. Paderborn, Munich, Vienna, and Zürich: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2003. Paper, €46. ISBN: 3-506-79070-6.

The claim that all of Ovid's *Heroides* are a spurious work had already been advanced by Otto Zwierlein in his bewildering book, *Die Ovid- und Vergil-Revision in Tiberischer Zeit. Band I: Prolegomena* (Berlin and New York, 1999), esp. pp. 354–400. There Zwierlein argues that a revisor of Tiberian age, whom he identifies as the very minor poet Julius Montanus, did actually write hundreds of verses of the *Aeneid*, the entire *Appendix Vergiliana*, about ten poems of Ovid's *Amores*, all the *Heroides*, the *Medicamina*, and *Ibis*, parts of *Ex Ponto*, and substantial portions of other Augustan works, including major parts of Propertius. Quite understandably, in the midst of such an apocalypse, Zwierlein's specific claim about the *Heroides* did not attract special attention from the reviewers: see esp. J. E. G. Zetzel, *Vergilius* 46 (2000), 181–91; G. K. Galinsky, *Gnomon* 74 (2002), 685–7. Now we have a massive book by a follower of Zwierlein, who argues in detail for the spuriousness of all the *Heroides*. (As L. reminds us at p. 21 n. 11, he has a predecessor in Karl Lehrs, 1863.) L. substantially accepts 'die Zwierleinische Hypothese'—and that implies that in his book we will find an enormous number of references to seemingly unobjectionable Virgilian and Ovidian lines quoted with asterisks marking their alleged spuriousness (e.g. the reference to 'Ps.-Vergil. AEN. *4,550', p. 167). As far as regards the specific authorship of *Heroides*, L. offers no names (in fact, Montanus is never named), and limits himself to saying that the author of the single *Heroides* (pp. 1–15) is a different one from the author of the double ones (p. 25). The motivations that inspired such poetic geniuses with the desire of keeping their names and personalities away from contemporary and future audiences are destined to remain an inexplicable mystery.

Claiming that all the *Heroides* are un-Ovidian means of course that we should fix the problem of Ovid's own references to them as his work (*Am*. 2.18.19–34, *Ars* 3.341–6, *Pont*. 4.16.13–6). But obviously from a Zwierlein-inspired perspective this

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni288 Published online by Cambridge University Press