discussions of point of view; which, as e.g. Philip Hardie and Richard Thomas have demonstrated, is so crucial to what the end of the *Aeneid* might mean. She also shows clearly how her own observations supplement one another. So, for instance, she subtly and convincingly contends that, via the simile at *Aeneid* 12.921–3, 'the final duel between Aeneas and Turnus becomes, in a sense, a new siege (albeit a metaphoric one)', in which Turnus embodies the city for which he fights, and points out that 'this powerful simile . . . reinforces the connections between individual and collectivity [R. has] analyzed previously' (p. 196). Another, more general, aspect of this book that I think particularly praiseworthy is its brevity (*mega biblion, mega kakon, ktl.*). R.'s interpretative mode is suggestive and provocative rather than prolonged, and she succeeds admirably in proposing and exemplifying, with both insight and concision, new ways of interpreting Virgil's elusive epic poem. I greatly enjoyed and thoroughly recommend this book, with which R. makes a most valuable contribution to Virgilian scholarship.

Harvard University BEN TIPPING
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni286

THE *EPODES*

L. C. WATSON: *A Commentary on Horace's* Epodes. Pp. xviii + 604. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Cased, £85. ISBN: 0-19-925324-2.

It has taken thirty-three years since the publication of the first volume of R. G. M. Nisbet and Margaret Hubbard's magisterial commentary on Horace's *Odes* for a commentary of similar stature to come out on the *Epodes*. Nisbet and Hubbard sparked a spate of more interpretive books on the *Odes* in the 1980s and 1990s. In the past few decades, however, books on the *Epodes* have been rare, and the most significant critical advances have taken place in individual articles or chapters. Watson's commentary will give momentum to the exciting scholarship the *Epodes* have recently begun to attract. Graduate students and mature scholars alike will find their task much easier and more rewarding with this research tool at their fingertips.

At Don Fowler's memorial conference at Jesus College, Oxford in 2000, R. G. M. Nisbet began his talk: 'Not everyone should write a commentary.' The remark was received with laughter and consternation. The many commentary writers in the audience were each convinced he was speaking of them. W. should rest assured that he is one of those who should. There are many *desiderata* in commentaries: learning, judgement, clarity, and a willingness to make decisions, but equally important is passion. W., who has the serious virtues, also clearly enjoys his work. He gives the impression of continually saying, 'Aha!', whether it be the discovery of the size and weight of elephant penises (12.1), of just the right reference (G. Richter, *Ancient Furniture* [Oxford, 1926], 12.12), of just the right parallel (to pseudo-Quintilian on the last words of wretches seeking vengeance at 5.92; to Pliny on exogamic grafting at 16.32), or a recondite word of his own ('chalcenteric', 16.15–16). W. thanks both Nisbet and Fowler (among others) in his acknowledgements, but it is clear that his intellectual filiation tilts more toward the lion of the philological tradition than to the postmodernist.

W. excels at setting Horace's poetry in a larger cultural context, and he has

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni287 Published online by Cambridge University Press

particularly made his mark by comparing the magic in the *Epodes* to the now substantial corpus of magical texts. His analysis of Epode 5 is stunning. He amasses a wealth of evidence that 'the kinds of activity which Horace attributes to Canidia really did go on, or were widely believed to do so' (p. 176), adduces parallels to the magical arcana of the poem in the magic papyri, and shows that there was significant contemporary anxiety about magic. This background sets the poem in a serious and socially engaged light. The poem's gains, however, are not only in the political. W. also follows through with an analysis of the poem's humor and its relation to mime. This literary affiliation suggests the witches' magic is unlikely to succeed and the boy might in fact escape. Horace addresses real contemporary fears about magic, but also defuses them.

W., however, is less strong on literary self-referentiality. The efficacy of the magic represented in the poems is questioned (also at 17.81), but, given the link between magic and *epodai*, and the recently salient critical issue of the relation of power to powerlessness in the *Epodes* (begun by W. Fitzgerald, 'Power and Impotence in Horace's Epodes', *Ramus* 17 [1988], 176–910), he could do more to address the poetry's claims (or not) to effectiveness. Horace asserts his poetry has bite (Epode 6), but it is not at all clear that the addresses to the people in Epodes 7 and 16 (whatever the situation imagined for their address) are represented as persuasive (pp. 269, 484–5). These issues need to be woven together. A treatment of the collection's title (*Iambi* or *Epodoe*?) would also be useful (compare A. Cavarzere, *Il libro degli Epodi* [Venice, 1992], pp. 9–14) in this regard.

Although W. recognizes the importance to Augustan poetry books of the numbers 5 and 10, and sees Epode 11 as a 'new orientation within the book' (p. 363), he does not recognize that such places are conventional loci for poetic self-definition. He makes no suggestion that the fierce invective against Maevius in Epode 10 is programmatic for the genre. While W. recognizes elegiac coloring in Epode 11 (p. 359), and acknowledges A. Barchiesi's interpretation of the poem as a narrative about rival genres in his introduction ('Alcune difficoltà nella carriera di un poeta giambico. Giambo ed elegia nell'epodo XI', in R. Cortès Tovar, J. C. Fernández Corte [edd.], *Bimilenario de Horacio* [Salamanca, 1994], pp. 127–38), this has little effect on the commentary. W. is right to insist that *sicut antea* (11.1) indicates a 'disjunction with Horace's previous behaviour when in love', but he overlooks the significance of this statement's occurrence in a poem. The poetry's genre is as much at issue as the behavior. He wrongly objects to Barchiesi's interpretation on the grounds that there is no evidence Horace actually composed elegy (p. 15 n. 104). Horace stages a conflict between generic codes; he is not reporting on actuality. There is no lemma on *querebar* (11.12), which is virtually a technical term for elegy (D. Mankin, *Horace: Epodes* [Cambridge, 1995], ad loc.); *libera bilis* (11.16) is mentioned as a marker of iambic in his introduction (p. 15), but the point also belongs ad loc. W. notes that Inachia's name points to Io and that Lyciscus is a little wolf, without drawing the further conclusion that the names of erotic objects in Epode 11 have generic significance, as often in Horace (e.g. Lalage in *Odes* 1.22). A cowgirl surely recalls Hipponax' target Boupalus, and the wolf accords with the *Epodes*' general preoccupation with dogs and their jobs. In his treatment of the recurrent animal motifs in the *Epodes*, W. even remarks that animals are absent in this poem (p. 27).

For Horace's understanding of his genre, it would be good to have in the introduction a compilation of the later Horatian passages on iambic. W. goes over Epistle 1.19 (p. 5) briefly, but does not decide on an interpretation of the disputed

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni287 Published online by Cambridge University Press

l. 28. *Ars poetica* 79–82 should be analyzed in the same breath, and the later lyric disavowal of iambi and their *tristes . . . irae* (*Odes* 1.17.9) deserves a place here as well.

Although W. is interested in form, he tends not to integrate it fully into interpretation. This approach is partly due to the commentary format, but partly to habits of mind. His comments toward a treatment of the *Epodes'* style are valuable (pp. 30–5), as is his handling of arrangement and unity (pp. 20–30). His metrical conspectus, however, needs expansion (compare M. Rosellini's more detailed analysis in *Enciclopedia Oraziana*, edited by F. della Corte and Sc. Mariotti [Rome, 1997], Volume II, pp. 912–19), and he lets, for example, the archaic short in *uerterunt* (9.17) pass without comment. It would be nice to have Porson's bridge and the Archilochean licenses spelled out and demonstrated instead of relegated to other treatments in footnotes (p. 43 n. 257, p. 44 n. 260). W. generously quotes Holford-Strevens's illuminating note on Horace's clothing one meter in another (17.12), but there could be more such. A. Barchiesi has shown that Horace's subtle use of meter contributes to his definition of the genre and of his position in the iambic tradition ('Horace and Iambos: The Poet as Literary Historian', in A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni, A. Barchiesi (edd.), *Iambic Ideas* [Lanham, 2001], pp. 141–64), and in his piece on Epode 11, cited above, he points out that the metrical pun on *incerto pede* (11.20) correponds to the new meter at that point in the collection. Third Archilochean Asynartete consists of a combination of the iambic and elegiac elements (pp. 134–5). The generic dialectic corresponds to a metrical hybrid. No word on either the pun or the generic aspect of the meter in W., though he has a good discussion of the scholarly surprise when the Cologne Epode revealed that Archilochus actually composed in this meter (pp. 360–1). The movement of thought that correlates the small detail with some larger strategy of poetic definition would be welcome. Similarly, comments on word order are few and isolated. His appendix on neotericism in Epode 14 is symptomatic: when he puts his mind on style, he does it intensively and well, but his discussion is sufficiently important to contribute to his interpretation of the poem. He misses an acrostic on Diana, whose brother Apollo more often prohibits certain kinds of poetry, at Epode 14.6–10 (noticed by a student of Lowell Edmunds, Michael Dougherty, who has no intention of publishing). Diana is associated with magic in the *Epodes* (5.51, 17.30), so Canidia may already be afflicting the poet (symptoms worse than *mollis inertia*, 14.1, are to be found at 17.21–6).

As a textual critic, W. is lucid, conservative, and decisive. He takes seriously the commentator's job to lay out alternatives, but to make decisions (15.7 is exemplary). He frequently organizes the history of a problem, whether interpretive or textual, in decreasing order of probability (e.g. appendix on ll. 15–16 of Epode 16). Although he tends to preserve transmitted readings where a strong argument can be made (12.7), he is not loath to emend: *praui* for *parui* of the Scamander (13.13) when Shackleton Bailey (no shrinking violet) athetizes. He prefers simpler solutions (*amici* at 13.3, where he convinces me over my youthful preference for Housman's *Amici*, bibl. ad loc.). It is good to see Peerlkamp taken seriously (17.22); although his tendency to cut has fallen out of favor, he had a good eye. According to W.'s conspectus (pp. 47–9), he lines up with Shackleton Bailey about a third of the time.

There are many individual interpretations of note:

In W.'s view, the debate over the relative importance of Archilochus and Callimachus as predecessors is misguided: both were surely influential, though in different ways (pp. 4–18).

W. argues that the so-called impotence in Epodes 8 and 12 is not technically impotence at all. Unlike other poetic instances, Horace fails to get it up not in the

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni287 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/bni287 Published online by Cambridge University Press