'hamstring'. Translation and commentary are not always in step: **61** and **76** *supremum . . . honorem* are translated respectively as 'last rites' and 'last honour'; at 76 n. we are told that *supremum* has different senses, 'highest' (of the honours paid to Pallas) at 76. Separate notes can repeat or be at odds with each other: e.g. **213** and **214** on the repetition in *praediuitis . . . praecipuus*. H. can misreport others' commentaries and even his own. It is a shame that such a monument of learning and percipience is marred by such a crop of misprints and unverified references. For his *Aeneid* 3, already well underway, one gathers, H. might also note that the heavy use of bold makes it difficult to pick out line-numbers of the lemmata; the problem might be eased by indentation, and reference could be further expedited by including line-numbers in the running heads.

*Corpus Christi College, Oxford* PHILIP HARDIE
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni070

## *DULCE, SED PERICULOSUM?*

D. WEST: *Horace* Odes *III*. Dulce Periculum. Pp. xxvi + 280. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Cased, £50 (Paper, £19.99). ISBN: 0-19-872164-1 (0-19-872165-X pbk).

David West's commentary on the third book of the *Odes* follows the model of its predecessors (*Odes* I [Oxford, 1995]; *Odes* II [Oxford, 1998]) by offering a text, a parallel verse translation, and an interpretative essay, normally quite brief, on each poem. There is the usual sort of introduction, a bibliography more substantial than those of the earlier volumes, and an index of topics. An innovation is the inclusion at the end of the discussion of most poems of a section entitled 'Other Views', where W. provides gobbets from the critical work of other scholars. This move is explained in the foreword (p. v) as a response to a concern that a commentary of this type must inevitably seem dogmatic (must it?); W. wishes to assure readers that he recognizes that the *Odes* are open to a wide range of interpretative opinions, some of which he considers 'profoundly learned and just'. Yet throughout the commentary W. seems to want to close down interpretation, in a manner which has drawn criticism before; while there appears to be an awareness, then, that in the past his readings of Horace have been found too exclusionary, in fact his approach in this volume, though softened in tone (we have got beyond the broadside against theory, especially intertextual theory, found in the *Odes* II commentary, pp. 46–9), is fundamentally unchanged. Still, one must be glad of an explicit recognition that the author's own readings of the poems are not necessarily 'the answer'; and the inclusion in the 'Other Views' on 3.13 of Ralph Hexter's statement that 'For West, "you read him your way, I'll read him his" is no joke' (p. 122) even points to a sense of self-irony (though Hexter's article[1] is, curiously, omitted from the List of Works Cited).

Unlike W.'s commentaries on *Odes* I and II, this volume was not written under the influence of Nisbet and Hubbard (or Nisbet and Rudd, whose anticipated commentary on *Odes* III W. admits [p. 5] to having caused him some anxious moments). But it inevitably challenges comparison with Gordon Williams [Wms]'

[1]R. Hexter, '*O fons Bandusiae*: Blood and Water in Horace, *Odes* 3. 13', in M. Whitby, P. R. Hardie, M. Whitby (edd.), *Homo Viator. Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol, 1987), pp. 131–9 (p. 134 for passage quoted).

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni071 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pioneering commentary on the same book (Oxford, 1969), aimed at the same kind of market. An obvious point of difference lies in W.'s choice of a verse rather than a prose translation, and it is one of the volume's strengths that he has succeeded superbly in combining close fidelity to the Latin with a sharp poetic sense. The military metaphors of 3.28.3–4, for example, are excellently rendered by 'Into action [strenua], Lyde, . . . and mount an assault on the fortress of wisdom [munitae sapientiae]' (p. 239); at 3.24.10 the English neatly reflects the accentual rhythm of the Latin line (p. 195; W.'s interest in word-accent—more prominent than in the earlier volumes—is another important feature of the book); the first two stanzas of 3.19 could hardly be better done (p. 165). There are weaker moments (it cannot be right to represent 3.29.41 'ille potens sui' by 'A man will be in control of his life' [p. 247]—this is exactly what, by the logic of the thought, he will not be), and indeed places where I found myself in strong disagreement (most notably in the delaying of the translation of 'Herculis ritu' at 3.14.1 to the third line [p. 125], reducing the prominence of a striking and arguably ambivalent phrase and narrowing down its range of reference); but W. is unquestionably a gifted translator, whose versions deserve to be widely read and used.

As ever, W. is also helpful on particular linguistic points and on *Realien*. We are reminded (p. 203) that 3.24.51 'eradenda' properly bears the meaning 'erase', not 'eradicate' (so Wms), the metaphor gaining force from 'elementa' (which can denote letters of the alphabet) in the next line; our understanding of 3.29.6–10 is enhanced by the geographical information W. supplies concerning the places mentioned, as viewed by Maecenas from his *turris* in Rome (p. 250). But there is a clear tendency in the commentary to focus on certain details in a poem rather than on giving a balanced overview, and in this respect W. falls some way short of Wms, who takes far greater pains to guide the reader through each poem's flow and argument. Indeed, W. often seems more concerned to write about those things that interest him than to meet the needs of the student. On occasion this riding of hobby-horses is taken to extreme lengths, most egregiously in the extraordinary piece of speculation on pp. 256–9 concerning the provenance and vintage of the 'lene merum' put aside by Horace for Maecenas at 3.29.2: this instance of the documentary fallacy is as wild in its own way as the most unpersuasive example of the sort of criticism panned by the scholar who famously urged us to 'cast out theory'.

After thirty-five years, of course, Wms's commentary has inevitably dated; indeed, one of the core ideas it presents—that we find in the *Odes* a blend of 'real' Roman and 'literary' Greek elements—was shot to pieces by Jasper Griffin as long ago as the 1970s (*JRS* 66 [1976], 87–105). But copies of Wms do not require a health warning; for all its virtues, the same cannot be said of W.'s book, which will give the inexpert reader a view of Horace and his relationship with Augustus grievously lacking in the complexity which the tools of criticism so vehemently rejected by W. in other places have helped us to perceive. The root of the problem is W.'s insistence that Horace (or 'Horace'—W. distinguishes in the introduction [p. xii] between the unknowable 'real' Horace and 'the character presented by the words of the poems', though little or nothing is made of this distinction in the commentary itself) is unwaveringly pro-Augustan: an assumption that tends to support itself by excessive precision in the interpretation of details, and results almost inevitably in partial readings which ignore or attempt to slither past genuine difficulties. I restrict myself to a few examples, beginning with 3.1.

For W., the first Roman Ode is an essentially political poem, 'saturated with Augustan ideology' (p. 14). The Epicurean way of life which, as W. recognizes, it appears to recommend is not, in his view, an objection: Horace's personal abjuration of wealth and power can be seen in terms of the Augustan programme, while at the

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni071 Published online by Cambridge University Press

same time the apparent contradiction between the Epicureanism of this poem and the 'un-Epicurean sentiments' of those which follow is in line with Horace's assertions elsewhere of his own inconsistency ('He gloried in his own contradictions') (pp. 19–20). First of all, this is having it both ways (and implicitly saying that the Epicurean views expressed in 3.1 don't really count); secondly, though W. devotes a page to discussing the debt of this poem to the proem of Lucretius 2 (pp. 20–1), he refuses to draw the obvious conclusion that Horace is thereby challenging the traditional Roman demand for political engagement. Interpretation of 3.1 and its relation to the rest of the Roman Odes should trouble us much more than W. allows.

Picking and choosing is central to W.'s manner of criticism. On 3.7 he writes of the 'striking discrepancy between the bitter condemnation of adultery in *Odes* 3. 3, 4, and 6, and the frivolity of 3. 7' (p. 77). But this is not a problem for W., because Horace 'is a chameleon of a poet. And why not? He is writing poems, not excogitating solutions to the problems of life.' This might be fair enough, except that W. is determined (i) to see the Roman Odes as essentially free from chameleon-like change (monochrome khaki, rather); (ii) to treat the Roman Odes seriously (Horace is not simply 'writing poems' then; and one needs to ask what *is* a poem, and what it means to write one); and (iii) to regard Horace as an 'Augustan' poet whose Augustanism permits him both to support the party line on sexual morality and (in 3.7 and elsewhere) to 'emulat[e] . . . Greek social and literary culture' without worrying about sexual morality. This book could in fact serve as a proof text of what tangles a literary critic can get into when his work has no coherent (or properly examined) theoretical basis.

Another major cop-out occurs in the commentary on 3.14, where W. declares that 'unico' at line 5 ('unico gaudens mulier marito') 'must refer to [Livia's] affection for Augustus' (p. 127) ('her all-in-all' is his translation on p. 125), smoothing over the problem caused by the reminder—which W. himself regards as an inevitable consequence of the use of the word—of the murky circumstances in which they married. 'For the last sixteen years the marriage of Augustus and Livia has been rock solid' is W.'s way of reading the passage, adding, with a circularity of argument characteristic of his whole approach, that 'the accomplished panegyrist adjusts to turn the negative into a positive'. But Horace did not need to generate this reminder at all; and in a poem where the celebration of Augustus' victorious return from Spain is arguably undercut in a variety of ways, the discord produced by 'unico' should be permitted to sound fully. Remarkably, on the next page (p. 128) W. asserts that the *virgines* mentioned in line 9 ('[prodeant] virginum matres') must include Julia, who is not specifically mentioned in the poem; but if we think of Julia here, we can hardly avoid thinking too of her mother, Scribonia, whose presence in the poem will make infinitely better sense on the more subversive interpretation than on W.'s.

W.'s take on *Odes* III, then, denies this poetry, which he plainly loves, much of the complex richness which interpretation can open up. It is similar with his Augustus, who appears as almost wholly beneficent, even a kind of card-carrying liberal (see e.g. pp. 4–5, 19, 131): try telling that to the proscribed. It is striking, but not surprising, that the bibliography does not include the important essays of Duncan Kennedy and Matthew Santirocco illustrating the terminological and conceptual difficulties involved in writing about 'Augustus' and 'Augustan' poetry.[2] The great pity here is that, while W.'s learning, knowledge of Latin, and poetic feeling are profound, it will be too

[2]D. F. Kennedy, '"Augustan" and "Anti-Augustan": Reflections on Terms of Reference', in A. Powell (ed.), *Roman Poetry & Propaganda in the Age of Augustus* (London, 1992), pp. 26–58; M. S. Santirocco, 'Horace and Augustan Ideology', *Arethusa* 28 (1995), 225–43.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni071 Published online by Cambridge University Press

*periculosum* to recommend this volume wholeheartedly to those for whom it is primarily intended.

*National University of Ireland, Maynooth* J. H. D. SCOURFIELD
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni071

## *QUOT HOMINES, TOT HORATII*

A. J. WOODMAN, D. FEENEY (edd.): *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*. Pp. x + 271. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Cased, £45, US$60. ISBN: 0-521-64246-9.

This edited book on Horace is the latest in a series of volumes edited by A. J. Woodman and (severally) his colleagues (David West, Jonathan Powell, and Denis Feeney) that have appeared as an 'occasional series' at five- to ten-year intervals since 1974 and have borne elastic enough titles to encompass nearly any contribution on any aspect of Latin poetry or prose: *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry* (1974); *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (1979); *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus* (1984); *Author and Audience in Latin Literature* (1992). While each of these earlier volumes contains articles on a wide variety of authors, the book under review here is focused on the various works of only one ancient author: Horace. The choice of Horace was influenced, one supposes, by the bimillennium of his death celebrated in 1992; this occasion has been marked by several volumes, including Niall Rudd (ed.), *Horace 2000: a Celebration. Essays for the Bimillennium* (1993) and S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Homage to Horace: a Bimillenary Celebration* (1995), with a very helpful survey of twentieth-century Horatian scholarship in the introductory chapter by Harrison. There is also now the three-volume *Enciclopedia Oraziana*, ed. S. Mariotti (1996–8).

Included in the W. & F. volume are Bradshaw on the evidence for Horace's lifespan; Du Quesnay on Horace's relationship to Maecenas in *Epode* 1; Zetzel on the development of Augustan poetry and its relationship to Callimachean and Alexandrian poetry with a focus on *Serm.* 1.10; Woodman on imitation and allusion in Horace's *Odes* and Horace's relationship to Catullus and Greek lyric (in particular, Sappho); A. Griffiths on the *Odes*: how to know when a poem begins and ends; Nisbet on *Carm.* 3.21 and Horace's relationship to Messalla Corvinus; Oliensis on feminine endings and closural motifs (especially hair) in Horace's *Odes*; Barchiesi on the generic, performative, ritual and intertextual properties of the *Carmen Saeculare*; Freudenburg on Horace's defining of self and his attitude toward Maecenas in *Epistles* 1; Moles on Horace as a philosopher, poet and moralist in *Epistles* 1; Lowrie on the triangulation of Horace, Cicero and Augustus in *Epistles* 2.1; and Feeney on the interplay between poetry, princeps and the political climate in *Epistles* 2.2.

In their epilogue the editors make a masterful, almost Ovidian attempt to link the entire collection together by revealing and/or creating various commonalities among the articles: so two authors treat literary history, four authors discuss Horace's relationship to Pindar and four Horace's relationship to Cicero, two interrogate gender-related issues, four focus on the relationship of poet and *princeps*, and on the social and political backdrop to Horace's poetry, and two employ a formalist method of analysis. The contributors, however, are wildly disparate in their approach and theme, and the only real commonality is the poet Horace. In the brief prologue the editors explain their choice of contributors (but not of theme): their goals were 'to

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni071 Published online by Cambridge University Press