nel libro della Fabrizi complessivamente c’è una analisi, abbastanza buona, di alcuni blocchi, quasi frammenti statuari, degli *Annales*.

Napoli

Enrico Flores


R. G. M. Nisbet passed away in May of 2013, marking the end of a great age of scholarship in English on Horatian lyric. Nisbet’s commentaries on the first three books of Horace’s *Odes*, published between 1970 and 2004 with his collaborators, M. Hubbard and N. Rudd, constitute perhaps the most monumental achievement in the field of the past fifty years. The new Cambridge ‘Green and Yellow’ on *Odes* 1 by Roland Mayer (hereafter M.) is naturally apt to be compared to the first volume of the Oxford series (1970, hereafter N.-H.), but the goals of the two works are quite different. Moreover, M. makes use of the new resources available to him to provide genuinely original insights on a selection of poems that Nisbet and Hubbard themselves memorably described as «too familiar to be easily understood». This book represents a crucial step in the growing Cambridge catalogue on Horace; on the one hand, it supplements Thomas’ recent edition of *Odes* 4 and *Carmen saeculare* (2011) and Gowers’ of *Satires* 1 (2012), but on the other it is the first to tackle a book of the *Odes* covered by the Oxford commentaries. Mayer is an ideal choice to undertake the challenge, having already produced a commentary for Cambridge on *Epistles* 1 (1994) and written broadly on Horatian stylistics; the result is a volume that will change the way that scholars approach this cornerstone of Latin literature.

It is important to state that this is not a commentary for the neophyte; Anglophone students encountering Horace’s *Odes* as an introduction to Latin poetry are probably still best served by Garrison (1991) or Ancona (2005), or even by one of the older commentaries in the public domain such as those of Wickham or Page. M. road-tested excerpts of his commentary with Masters students (vii), and it is at this level that students will profit most from M.’s notes. The emphasis in the introduction on stylistics requires a certain amount of prior experience with the Latin language, and there is no biography or contextualization of Horace within the late Republican history at the outset. This absence is perhaps of minor importance given the prominence of the poet, the existence of an extensive biography in N.-H., and the fact that historical and prosopographical data are supplied in the commentary itself, but on the other hand it might be noted that both Thomas (2011) and Mankin on the *Epodes* (1995) contextualize the poet in their introductions, as does Mayer (1994). *Odes* 1 would normally be a student’s first contact with Horatian poetry, and, had this edition been intended specifically for transitional Latin classes, it would have been useful to have an introduction to the poet and his life.

Senior undergraduates and post-graduates will gain a great deal from using the book, the latter most profitably in conjunction with N.-H. The two commentar-
ies rarely overlap, M. noting in his preface that his own edition has been designed to contrast with the earlier one:

«As an undergraduate I had read Nisbet and Hubbard’s indispensable commentary shortly after its appearance, but in later years, using it as a university teacher, I often wondered what I can have made of it, since it was clearly not designed with me in mind. The basic aim of the present commentary is to provide the student reader with the sort of information that will facilitate the construe of the text» (vii).

While most Latin instructors will not have made prior acquaintance with the noun «construe» (a favorite of M.’s), the first sentence will ring true for many of them. Much of the space in N.-H. is taken up by the citation of Greek and Latin parallels, which are useful for the scholar but of doubtful significance to the student, and the procedure also has the effect of making quick consultation difficult. M.’s commentary is far ‘cleaner’, providing the most important passages from Greek literature (and generally translating them) while enabling students to find the key grammatical information. Evidently, the scale of the commentaries is responsible for many of the differences between them: although the word-count of each page is roughly the same, N.-H. devote 427 pages to the commentary and introductory essays on each poem while M.’s page-count comes to 177 (including essays).

The introduction itself concentrates on the novelty of Horatian lyric together with certain formal and interpretative questions.


At issue in section 1 is the difference between the Odes and Horace’s earlier satirical work – the backdrop of the Satires is clearly far removed from the inspired world of the lyric poet with its fauns, nymphs, and Muses. The adoption of this new genre presented the poet with new artistic possibilities, and the «liberating power of lyric» (1) was further augmented by the abundance of models: no two members of the canon of nine lyric poets were identical in spirit. This versatility allowed Horace to approach a range of topics that would have been out of place in his hexametrical collections. Still, Horace needed to set the largely Greek genre of lyric poetry within Roman society, and M. describes the difficulty of this task well:

«Horace had to overhaul the lyric tradition comprehensively so that it could adequately accommodate Roman experience, or more specifically Horatian experience» (2–3).

In terms of this debate, additional discussion of the intersection of the Epodes with the Odes might have been profitable: M.’s statement that the former was «unrelievedly pessimistic» must be qualified by reference to Epodes 9, at the very least. Indeed, there is much that is common to both collections in terms of imagery (see, for example, Epodes 13), and identifying some of the continuities between them would have been a fascinating exercise.

Section 2, which considers meter (A), linguistic register and style (B), and word order and placement (C) will be welcomed by anyone working on Horace.
Here we have a succinct description of the workings of Horatian lyric, and the section sets the scene for the observations made in the commentary itself. The sub-section on meter is a good example of the difference between M.’s commentary and that of N.-H.: while the latter surveyed all of the Horatian lyric meters, M. includes only those that feature in Odes 1, which results in a greater degree of concision and practicality. It is when it comes to linguistic register and word-placement, however, that M. is in his element, particularly on topics such as ‘golden-line’ syntactic patterns and juxtaposition/callida iunctura. In Section 3, M. proceeds to consider the Horatian ode as a whole, for example the progression within a given poem (A. Linear progression, B. Situation and response) and the importance of the middles and ends (C. The parts of the Ode). Section 4 focusses on the arrangement of the book itself, M. covering the evidence for the intentional placement of individual poems while remaining justifiably non-committal about the presence of any overarching pattern in the layout of the poetry book. The next section (5) offers brief comments on the dating of the book and the transmission of the text (on which, see below), and the final one (6) makes a statement about the essays (usually half a page to a page in length) appended to the commentary to each poem.

As for the commentary itself, I came away with the feeling that I had been reintroduced to Horace. In line with its aims (see above), there is a heavy emphasis on syntax and style, and this certainly plays to M.’s strengths. Greek accusatives are well covered, a help for those unacquainted with the language, and the identification of rhetorical figures, coinages, and translations from Greek is excellent; M. is also good on Greek loans (both lexical and syntactic). At times, this emphasis can become repetitive, in that certain basic elements are defined at each instance: on pages 120 and 121, for example, the phrase «the termination is the accusative singular of the Greek third declension» appears verbatim on opposing pages (and is repeated elsewhere, for example at 139). The term «antonomasia» is also perhaps overworked, and could have been dispensed with on a number of occasions. Nevertheless, M. provides a good introduction to the intricacies of Latin poetic syntax.

One small issue arises with M.’s phraseology in explicating lexical Grecisms and their relationship to poetry. M. frequently describes the connection by means of a sentence such as the following: «lyra is a loan-word from Greek and as such poetic diction (TLL vii 2.1948.79–84...)» (93). M. is right in that the word lyra is used predominantly in poetry (as we indeed learn from the TLL), but the «as such» might lead some students to suppose that all imported Greek words constitute poetic diction (compare, for example, 87 and 111, ‘so poetic diction’, and 123, «as such poetic diction»). This is of course not what M. means, as his discussion of moechos (175: «a colloquial loan-word... It finds a natural place in H.’s satires») and gazis (190: «a loan-word (not exclusively poetic, however)») show, but perhaps this way of expressing things could be modified in future editions.

One advantage that M. has over N.-H. is of course forty years of scholarship: M. puts both the Enciclopedia oraziana and TLL to effective use, and it is the
incorporation of the latter that sets M.’s commentary apart from N.-H. (the TLL was substantially less complete in 1970). To note just two instances from the first ten lines of Odes 1.1: for the entry on praeidium... decus, M. uses the TLL to demonstrate how traditional the pairing was, while on collegisse iuwait M. is able to show that the infinitive as a subject for iuwait is chiefly poetic by reference to the TLL (maxime in poesi). Other lexica and handbooks are widely cited (and sometimes corrected – see, for instance, 140 and 170). The effect of these applications is that one comes away feeling more attuned to what is specific to Horace’s style than one had been in the past.

There are one or two further issues that should be mentioned. One interesting editorial choice, perhaps made in deference to the student readership, was to do without a critical apparatus. Nor, as far as I can see, does M. specify the text that forms the basis for his edition (in his earlier Cambridge commentary on Epistles 1, M. had based his text on Wickham-Garrod and Shackleton Bailey). Although he provides a very brief discussion on the transmission of the text in his introduction, he does not comment on these absences. Although the inclusion of an apparatus is non-obligatory for editors of the Cambridge series (compare Rudd on Epistles 2 and Gowers on Satires 1), both Mankin (Epodes) and Thomas (Odes 4 and Carmen saeculare) provide basic versions at the bottom of the page, and instructors may miss the opportunity to introduce their students to textual issues. These are generally discussed in the body of the commentary, but when it comes to vexed questions such as the opening word of Odes 1.32 it would be useful to have the options laid out for quick reference.

One general problem for modern commentators is how to incorporate online resources into printed editions. Most people, I think, would be sympathetic towards M.’s reference to a Wikimedia image of the Alcaeus and Sappho barbitos from Munich’s Staatliche Antikensammlungen (62): we have developed swifter methods for accessing images than through printed media. It remains a question, however, as to how stable such online platforms are – it/when the uploader removes the item the reference will become obsolete. M. offsets this problem by providing additional bibliography in printed form, and this is ultimately a unique instance, but it is nevertheless clear that the citation of such resources has the potential to age a work like this prematurely.

These are comparatively minor issues, however, and I personally learned much from M.’s book. In sum, this is a fine new commentary, well situated between the more elementary books of Garrison and Ancona and the monumental (but sometimes frustrating) tome of Nisbet and Hubbard.

Cambridge (MA) Andreas T. Zanker


Harry M. Hine hat die Erforschung von Senecas Naturales Quaestiones, die einzelne Probleme der stoischen Physik und insbesondere der Meteorologie diskutieren, nicht nur durch seine Teubneriana von 1996 mit neuer Kollationierung der Handschriften und neuer recensio auf eine verlässliche Grundlage ge-