EMPOWERING THE READER

L. EDMUNDS: *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry.* Pp. xx +201. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001. Cased. £32.50. ISBN: 0-8018-6511-5.

This book might more accurately have been titled *The Reading of Roman Poetry and Intertextuality*, in that its treatment of intertextuality forms an intermittent part of a more general theoretical discussion of reading, with particular reference to Roman poetry. Widening out the application of literary theory to the ancient texts exemplified in his earlier book *From a Sabine Jar. Reading Horace, Odes 1.9* (Chapel Hill and London, 1992), Edmunds now seeks to reinforce his adherence in that book to a reading practice based on Jaussian hermeneutics (of which further Tibullan and Ovidian samples are here offered) by means of an extensive consideration and critique of other theoretical positions. The width of his reading is impressive, and one of the book's uses might be as a virtual anthology of literary theory for students of Latin poetry, if at times the procession of theorists troops past the reader rather breathlessly.

Chapters 1–3 work in sequence through the eternal triangle of text–author–reader. The attack on the old philological notion of the text-in-itself is aimed at what is now for most a straw man, although the good point is made, following Zetzel, that the beginning of textual criticism in Alexandria is inseparable from the new production of an intensely intertextually aware body of literature. A clear account is given of the meaning of 'intertextuality' for its coiner, Kristeva, in the course of a sharp separation of E.'s aestheticist position from Kristeva's *marxisant* reduction of texts to the level of social process. The chapter on 'Poet' is devoted largely to an attack on intentionalism, including within its sights not just a Hirschian appeal to the 'external' intention of the author, but also Knapp and Michaels' 'internal' account of the intentionality of speech acts. To counter the latter E. resorts to a historical construction of a difference between oral and literate poetry, the first of several versions of a history of transition from performance to textuality, public to private, the fullest of which is presented in Chapter 7, 'Reading in Rome'. But E.'s history of reading hesitates as to the exact moment of the fall from the 'golden age' of poems as speech acts; at one point it is Rome in the first century B.C., but a few pages later it has already happened in third-century Alexandria. E. is still trapped in that 'necessary fiction of a lost idyll', of an age of performance and community, that the late Don Fowler deconstructs in his forthcoming book *Unrolling the Text.* Thirdly comes 'Reader', for E. the true source of the production of meaning, including intertextuality, but a source 'constrained' both by the Jaussian hermeneutic sequence of readings and by a rather abrupt appeal to Fish's notion of interpretive communities. E. also speaks (p. 61) of the creation of the 'text-object' through the 'interaction of text and reader', although the ontological status of 'text' here is not clear.

Three somewhat divagatory chapters, 4–6, follow. In 'Persona' E. displaces the activation of intertextuality from the discredited author onto the speaker within a poem, but in the terms of E.'s own argument I do not understand how a 'persona' can have an originating power of this kind. The metapoetic reading of the Picus and Canens story in Ovid *Met.* 14 (pp. 76–9) is one of the best passages in the book, but the thrust of the reading reinstates Ovid (or at least 'Ovid') as the source of the episode's intertextualities, rather than the speaker within the text, the anonymous nymph. The next chapter, 'Addressee', is cutely cast in the form of a dialogue between E., Mario

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.296 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Citroni, and (marginally) Richard Heinze, in order to launch a critique of Citroni's historicist argument, in *Poesia e lettori in Roma antica* (Rome, 1995), about the rôle of the addressee in Latin poetry. Some fair points are scored, but Plato was well aware of the power wielded by an author who grants an opponent the 'freedom' to speak within a literary dialogue. In the next chapter E. suggests that in order to construct fully the 'Possible worlds' offered up by poems to their readers, we are called upon to use our 'intertextual encyclopedia' in order to supplement the gaps in the texts. E. distinguishes sharply between fictional (absolutely non-real) worlds and the 'possible worlds', in the sense of counterfactual versions of the actual world, of Latin poetry, but this would imply that all Latin poetry was resolutely realist: the world of pastoral shepherds comes closer to a 'fictional world' than does the world of the love elegist.

In the more systematic account of intertextuality in the final Chapter 8, the reader is now firmly made the locus of intertextual meaning. Intertextuality is characterized, defined even, by the uncertainty which arises from the fact that the reader alone is the authority for the boundaries of allusion. The absence of unequivocal markers of intertextuality leads E. to reject the Contean analysis of allusion as structured like metaphor (since a metaphor always declares itself as such), but, granted a reader's initial construction of an intertextuality, what is there to stop its further analysis according to the structure of a trope?

E. had almost completed his book when Stephen Hinds's *Allusion and Intertext* (Cambridge, 1998) came into his hands. To establish distance, E. is forced to an almost parodic summary of Hinds's subtle incorporation of an author-function into the reader's own construction of the meaning of a poetic text. Nor does E.'s charge that classicists are still too much in thrall to the presence of the author ring true to my perception of the prevalence of reader-oriented criticism, at least among Don Fowler's 'New Latinists'.

New Hall, Cambridge PHILIP HARDIE

EPIC DREAMS

J. BOUQUET: *Le songe dans l'épopée latine d'Ennius à Claudien.* (Collection Latomus, 260.) Pp. 204. Brussels: Éditions Latomus, 2001. Paper. ISBN: 2-87031-201-6.

In recent years the interest in dreams of antiquity and their interpretation has increased considerably. This holds true not only for different genres of sources and texts but also for a number of specific questions, e.g. concerning patterns of interpretation or the utilization of dreams for political purposes. Such studies are welcome insofar as, on the one hand, they are directed against the long-prevailing tendency towards a strong psychologization, thus making clear that dreams, dream images, and their interpretation in antiquity have to be seen within their own autonomous framework. On the other hand, such studies are also necessary for an adequate understanding of the wide range of facets and the various levels of discourse in antiquity itself.

The study under review focuses on an exactly demarcated section, i.e. Latin epics from Ennius to Claudian. The basic question refers to the relation to Homer as the 'archegetes' of dream and epic: was the Latin literary treatment of the dream-motif (influenced by Homer) rigid and static, or was there a further creative development as compared with Greek literature? It is the declared aim of the analysis 'peut-être

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.296 Published online by Cambridge University Press