doubt. It would be of great interest if P. would publish his views on these and related matters, on which his editions of Theon and Longinus and his study of Hermogenes show his fine knowledge of later Greek rhetoric.

I am grateful to Mervin R. Dilts for advice in composing this review; responsibility for the contents is, however, solely mine.

Fort Collins, Colorado

George A. Kennedy


In choosing the phrase *dulce periculum* from Horace’s Ode of Bacchic enthusiasm to entitle this third volume of his combined translations and commentary, West might seem to signal his two-fold aim as expressed in the two preceding volumes of the series of «stimulating young readers who have to study the poems» and adding to scholarly debate by putting forth his own views.¹ In fact these two previous volumes *Carpe Diem* and *Vatis Amici* have been widely noticed, and treated seriously by scholars. Readers acquainted with the volumes will know that the Commentary consists not in a traditional form of word or line annotation but rather in explanatory essays touching upon a variety of topics at the author’s discretion but always, in sum, comprising well designed cameo interpretations. This volume follows that same general format, with its Introduction subdivided into a brief biography, a guide to metrics and accentual stress aiming to foster oral reading, and a set of thematic essays. In this case a second, more extensive set of thematic essays directly prefaces the Roman Odes covering topics relevant to their perceived unity, but also as W. observes in a footnote, to his understanding of the book as a whole. One added challenge confronting this third volume, as he modestly observes in its preface, is the «totally different experience of working without Nisbet and Hubbard», whose guidance he had valued in the earlier books; one feature new to this volume is the inclusion under the heading ‘Other Opinions’ of extracts from previous interpretive writing intended, as W. puts it, to offset the appearance of dogmatism by giving some idea of the range of responses these poems arouse. Collectively this range extends from Bentley to Michèle Lowrie, but draws most heavily upon writings of the decades 1960–1990.

The new Introduction is by no means a mere repetition of its predecessors. Both the biographical and metrical sections have been revised and amplified while the two essays on ‘Praise’ and ‘Humor’ treat topics not previously addressed. Whereas the biography of the 1995 volume offered only a skeletal vita abstracted from ancient sources, this much fuller version incorporates a contemporary critique of those sources, reflecting the argument elaborated independently in 1995 both by G. Williams (mentioned) and W. S. Anderson (not mentioned) to the effect that Horace’s ‘freedman father’ was by no means a born or life-long slave, but rather a free citizen of Venusia taken prisoner during the So-

cial Wars but soon after liberated. Furthermore ‘poverty’ as a condition of Horace’s youthful upbringing does not make sense. In the aftermath of the Social War settlements, Horatius Pater so profited from his profession of coactor that he was able to support his son’s advanced schooling in Rome. This persuasive historical reassessment of the Suetonian vita with its credulous transmission of Horace’s programmed self-portraiture as fact has in recent years become the consensus opinion, at least among scholars whose theoretical grounding leads them to eschew literal minded biographical readings at the same time that they recognize the self-presentational mythology of the poems as an integral component of Horace’s poetics that cannot be ignored.

Like the vita, the metrical sections of W.’s Introductions have grown progressively fuller with specific reference to the poems that the student will read here. While W. has not altered the view that he cavalierly asserts in Carpe Diem, that ‘Horatian meters are easy’, he does more here than in that first volume to make them so. While carrying over explanations of Alcaic and Sapphic similar to those given in Odes II, he presents here as concise and clear an introduction of the choriambic basis of the Asclepiad meters as anyone might want. Humor, as opposed simply to verbal wit, W. defines with a Ben Jonsonian twist as stemming from «character in action», and he instructs the reader how to find it, largely in Horace’s portrayals of self. The poet, as he says «is confident of his achievement but knows not to speak too seriously about it». Immediately, however, the reader will turn the page to find another, much weightier thematic introduction preceding the Roman Odes. Here, under the heading of ‘Augustan Inventory’ we encounter a series of topics synchronized with the earlier foregrounding of ‘praise’ whose rationale W. attributes to the Res Gestae. They are Conquest, Clemency, Peace, Prosperity and Order, Italy, Moral Reforms, Exempla, The Young, Religion and Troy (seen no less as a compromised precedent than as a proud heritage). Although these matters are most frequently referenced in W.’s Roman Odes commentary, they are also the foundation for his statement that all the poems in the book are Augustan in so far as they bear a relationship to the events and beliefs of the time in which they were written. Needless to say few readers will dissent from this proposition, but the manner in which the relationship plays out can leave room for divergent opinions.

In this book as in those preceding W. sees two major roles for the Horatian persona: that of Praeceptor Amoris and that of political champion, each one involving a didactic element. The first of these roles implies detachment. Having initially been introduced with respect to 1.25 as ‘Professor of Love’ dispassionately observing the human comedy, the praecceptor speaks in a number of poems of Book 3 as «the sympathetic and amused connoisseur of the follies of the young lovers» in a series of «lighthearted poems about love» seen to pose «a cheerful counterpoint to the severities of the Roman Odes». But as Anderson pointed out in his BMCR review of the first book, W.’s borrowing of the term praecceptor from Ovid’s Ars Amatoria is somewhat inappropriate to the role assigned here. As an active proponent of subversive sexual license, Ovid’s didactic-
cist who boasts of knowledge by ‘experience’ is the very opposite of Horace’s bachelor uncle with his often cautionary advice, and becomes even more ironically opposite should we wholly accept W.’s view of Horace as the champion of Augustan moral reform. At the same time the poet’s engagement, as W. would have it, in tender emotions seems to go deeper than in previous poems. All the same, where the wisdom of the ‘praeceptor’ poems overlaps with the sentiments of the so-called ‘love’ poems, the bachelor himself may betray experience that, according to W., is not wholly confined to the past. Thus the lovers’ dialogue of 3. 9 is not just a little dramatic script resembling the transmission of an overheard interchange, but one in which the H speaker seems to be investing a degree of emotional capital in the revival of a lost affair. Comparing the tennis-court volley of recriminations that flies between the ego voice and that of Lydia with the cozy bill and cooing of Catullus’ Acme and Septimius, for no really good reason save their duovocality, W. draws a final distinction between Catullus’ «cheerful skit on the rhetoric of love and the credulity of young lovers and Horace’s contem-
plation of one aspect of its mystery».

In the amatory valedictory of Ode 3. 18, the surprise invocation to Venus to tange Chloen flagella instead of a witty afterthought becomes the directed purpose of the poem where the «cessation of serenading and night vigils...does not mean no more love». This scenario of emotional engagement comes to include two poems, 3. 11 and 3. 27, that others might at the least wish to place within the observer category, if in fact their attention to love should not be considered merely incidental to larger artistic concerns. These are the two whose greatest source of fascination lies in the oblique relationships between their framed mythological narratives and their declared subjects. Even W. with his instinct for structural logic finds the Galatea propempticon difficult, but settles for reading it as a heroic burlesque within a good-natured farewell to a mistress who has departed with a younger and more appealing lover. Similarly the ‘Persuasion Ode’, as one might call it, in which Horace invokes the enchantment of the lyre to urge a reluctant Lyde towards accepting a bridegroom is seen as a personal courtship piece although not unleavened by touches of self-mockery concerning the «absurdity of co-opting a god in a shameless attempt to persuade a young virgin to give herself to a middle-aged poet». Indeed, were seduction the point of the poem, it would certainly be absurd, but isn’t this a rather trivializing reduction to impose upon so complex an exploration of lyric potency? Among the variant opinions concerning the Galatea poem W. includes an indirect citation of Kilpatrick’s somewhat stretched interpretation of Europa’s perilous journey as that of the poetry book itself. Far more explicitly Horace’s invocation of the testudo whose powers have been proven in Hades would seem to map the territories open to poetic imagination? Finally the reader who wonders what these poems might have to do with the Augustan moment can find the answer (p. XIV) in the statement that Horace’s ambition to write lyric poetry to rank with the lyric poetry of Greece is one which «chimes with Augustus’ desire to foster a culture which could rival the Greek achievements». Again, (p. 77), he addresses the apparent moral flippancy of the Asterie Ode which might just, indirectly of course, sanction adultery, with the disclaimer: «Horace is an Augustan poet, and the Augustan settlement had many aspects and he gloried in them. One of these is reversion to the austere morality of the idealized Republic, another is emulation of Greek social and literary culture».

Given this keen eye for political relevance, it is even surprising that W.’s explanation of the Lyde poem, with its internal narrative of the Danaid crime as a mock-warning against undervaluation of marriage makes no mention of that very public exposure of the 50 brides and their husbands among the furnishings of the Palatine Apollo precinct. Surely the parallel between Danaus’ enlistment
of his daughters, Augustus’ co-optation of their sculpted bodily presence to convey some propagandistic message not wholly clear, and Horace’s co-optation of their exemplary fate, compounds the ambiguity of what W. himself calls an ambiguous piece. Or should we go even further to consider that Horace might even be using the paradigm to comment on artistic co-optation in general? Although W. does sometimes problematize the extent to which Horace, at every moment of his creative process, had Augustan implications in mind, and similarly the consistency with which his contemporaneous readers might be alert to the same, nonetheless, his concept of «oblique panegyric» and the «art of indirect flattery» finds such significations lurking behind almost every column in the Roman landscape.

So in the stanzas of 3. 1 Augustus would have welcomed Horace’s negative view of elections because he «was now proclaiming a golden age of prosperity and social order, in which such rivalry and election were to be held in check. The elective magistracies were no longer to be a route to supreme power and the source of destructive conflict (p. 17)». (But was it not actually the subversion of magisterial elections that resulted in power and conflict?). Item 4 included within W.’s Augustan Itinerary prefacing the Roman Odes is an Augustan valuation of Italy based upon two passages in the Res Gestae in which (actually) the princeps is declaring how much Italy values him, from which W. goes on to propose that he did not miss the opportunity to represent his settlement of many thousand demobilized soldiers on the land «as the rejuvenation of agriculture and the restoration of traditional rural life».

In the course of his commentary W. often remarks upon the ostensible pride with which Horace mentions Apulia as his place of origin. In fact his biographical introduction adduces testimony from ‘Satires’ and ‘Epistles’ to support that of the ‘Odes’, and also makes this pride one of the arguments for the originally Italic free status of Horace’s father. Thus one might think that this background provided sufficient reason for Horace to construct an Apulian topography for his childhood myth of divine protection without any need to understand that, «Praise of Italy is praise of Augustus in this most powerful of the Odes».

In the following poem 3. 5, a simple mention of the Marsyian tribe becomes similarly Augustan, while the sacrifice of rustic Phydyle in 3. 19 reflects not only Horace’s own feeling for traditional rituals, but also «Augustus policy of renewal and consideration for the peoples of Italy» (p. 18). W.’s appreciation of the beautiful Faunus Ode so imbued with the mystique of rural landscape comes to its conclusion with the assertion «Augustus would have approved» followed by a link to his re-institution of the Lupercalia. Finally even in the sphragis poem (whose monumentum might by some eyes be seen as surpassing a certain pretentious family mausoleum) a mention of the pyramids becomes a «glancing compliment to Augustus» conquest of Egypt while seasonal variations in the aqueous volume of the River Aufidius «carries a reminder of Augustus to readers the length and breadth of the Roman world» (p. 267).

In preparing the reader for this ideological innuendo, W. is at pains to justify Horace’s stance; in the Introductory section on ‘Praise’ he highlights the issue of ‘how to praise’ as a problem that had long exercised philosophers and cites a particular treatment in some fragments of the Epicurean disciple Philodemus drawn from an original three books on ‘Flattery’. Although W. cites no explicit definition of praise in these pieces, they would seem to characterize the difference between flattery and friendship, frankness and flattery and also to caricature
the subservience of the base flatterer in social situations. Perhaps the closest parallel may be found in some passages of Cicero’s De Amicitia treating flattery, graphically illustrated by the words of Terence’s parasite Gnatho (91–97), but while Cicero’s primarily political concern is trustworthiness, W.’s application to Horace’s more public situation shows that he means Horace’s perceived allegiance to be ‘sincere’. What W. perceives in Horace’s reflections of Augustan policy is not specious flattery, but deep dyed assimilation. He is no ironist accepting the inevitable with a resigned shrug, but an outright proselytizer who actually sees Rome with a vision identical to that of the princeps, and even anticipates his moves, as in 3.6 where the scorching condemnation of present day sexual mores anticipates the marriage laws and social reform.

It may be difficult for a Horatian to like 3.6 or 3.16 that most homiletic of the poems, but what about the Roman Odes whose poetic qualities at least equal their didactic. I confine my remarks to the centerpiece poems 3.3 and 3.4.

In treating Juno’s prohibition on the rebuilding of Troy W. takes the sane view that Augustus had no such project literally in sight, but allows that the reader cannot be content with an explanation that renders the passages wholly meaningless. Steele Commager had solved the problem by expanding the metaphorical sense of Trojan wrongdoing to «encompass the whole concept of Rome’s fallen state, one that was evidenced particularly by civil wars», wherewith he rendered Juno’s prohibition of rebuilding as a decisive statement that «the past is finished».

W.’s far more focused application of the allegory looks before and after, projecting Troy’s primary vice of sexual license backwards onto Cleopatra and anticipating Augustus’ marriage reforms. Which seems more worthy of Horace’s imaginative genius? A similar difference appears when we contrast the two scholars’ responses to 3.4. As the Muse has elected and preserved Horace, so also she counsels Augustus and the substance of the counsel has to do with the battle of gods and giants. In W.’s opinion, the Olympian victory is an outright celebration of Actium. Commager does not deny the equation, but moderates it as the basis for timely advice.

In this very Hesiodic context, certainly one benefit of the Muses election of Horace is to instil an Hesiodic voice into him, while the same Muses’ recreation of Caesar suggests the Theogonic mission of offering advice to the rulers of men. Hesiod’s counsel opposes strife, so does Horace’s line: 3.4.65: vis consili expers mole ruit suo with a meaning by no means oblique to the fact that clemency that had not previously been Augustus’ strength. So the difference of W. and Commager is not that the earlier interpreter denied contemporary significance to these political odes, but rather that he conceptualized the poet’s voice as having a greater degree of critical detachment, a position not unsimilar to that adopted in the amatory poems. W.’s Horace seldom advises Augustus (p. 61) but rather follows the practice of panegyric in praising a ruler for what he has already done; Commager’s gives a rather more subtle twist by advising the ruler on how to merit divinity by prolonging his present good conduct into the future.

This ideological coloring in W.’s interpretations would seem to have grown stronger with the progress of his career. To my mind, his great virtue as a reader, has always lain in his canny instinct for illuminating poetic structure and ability to chart a path through a series of Horatian images revealing a logic as much aesthetic as anything else. In his 1973 essay ‘Horace’s Poetic Technique in the Odes’ he offered readers a very accessible methodology based upon their identi-
fication of contrasts of word and image which within the course of a poem open out into contrasts of thought. Vestiges of this approach can be seen here, especially when W. prefaces his remarks on 3. 11 with such statements as (104) «Some see a disunity in the poem...others try to tie the poem together...we should surely try to be better». Or in such passages as the Messala ode 3. 21 where he remarks how «lines 9–21 demonstrate three characteristics of Horace’s poetry, his penchant for the collocation of opposites, the sharpness of his imagery, and the coherence of his thought, not logical patterning but a gliding from thought to thought.» Indeed the same phrasing might be taken to describe W.'s own procedure which we see at its very best when he explains for the Faunus Ode, 3. 18, the aesthetic economy of Horace’s adjectival characterizations of the Sabine rural landscape and the powerful god who crosses the boundaries between the settled and the wild. Indeed this volume contains such passages well fitted to instruct by example the young reader in using philological information and techniques with imagination and grace. W. is also on the mark in recognizing and insisting throughout that Horace’s poetic focus involves multiple roles and characters many of which are as likely to be imaginary as real. All the same, it is dismaying to see so many of these roles twisted into the service of Augustan policy. While such asseverations may provide Horatian scholars or advanced students with good springboards for debate, this potential may escape those first time readers for whom the book is ostensibly intended and who are most likely to be influenced by the opinions of the expert. For these the periculum of the title is most aptly chosen.

Bloomington

Eleanor Winsor Leach


Auf eine Einleitung (VII–XLI) folgt ein Compendiorum conspectus (XLI). Im eigentlichen Hauptteil des Bandes, der Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar umfaßt (1–412), geht der Viten ein Vorwort voraus, dem Text und Übersetzung sowie ein ausführlicher Kommentar folgen. Es entstehen so drei in sich dicht gefügigte Blöcke, nämlich zur vita Probi, zu den Viten der erwähnten vier Usurpatoren und zur vita des Carus, Carinus und Numerianus. Es folgen ein In-
