

Although G.'s range of cultural reference is attractively broad and engagingly presented, the volume pays no formal attention to Horatian reception. This is in contrast to the great majority of recent companions (including the editor's own *Brill's Companion to Propertius* (2006)). This lack of engagement with an increasingly prominent area of classical scholarship reflects G.'s forceful — even aggressive — repudiation of what he terms 'modern theory': 'Suffice it to say that modern theory is nothing but a misapplication of half-understood philosophies (or sometimes pseudophilosophies) to literary criticism, a misapplication that substitutes the texts as objects of research by theory itself; that the advance in knowledge or understanding gained by such a procedure is virtually nil, is no wonder' (x). In fact, the book rejects not just theory but, apparently, any criticism considered tainted by theoretical concerns, and almost any suggestion of metapoetic interpretation (not a single mention, in text or bibliography, of Lowrie's *Horace's Narrative Odes* or even of Michael Putnam's *Artifices of Eternity*, to cite just two particularly egregious instances among very many possible examples). The well-informed specialist will appreciate and may even (depending on their sympathies) enjoy the pointed disregard — an almost audible silence — that surrounds a very large number of recent commentators on Horace, but this decision effectively disables the book as a useful introduction. For all G.'s earnest — and plainly sincere — admiration for Horatian versatility and range, the 'Horace' that emerges from the volume is accordingly flattened and reduced.

King's College, London
victoria.moul@kcl.ac.uk

VICTORIA MOUL

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000732

E. GOWERS (ED.), *HORACE: SATIRES BOOK I*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. xii+ 370. ISBN 9780521458511. £23.99/US\$40.00.

Since Zetzel's landmark article of 1980 ('Horace's *Liber Sermonum*: the structure of ambiguity', *Arethusa* 13), some of the biggest transformations in the way we think about what happens in a book of Latin poetry have emerged from studies of Horace's first book of *Sermones*. Despite the intense critical attention that these poems have received, commentaries of a matching high calibre have failed to materialize, and the best of the old ones (Bentley, Lejay, Orelli, Heinze *et al.*) are by now very old, and have long since ceased to tell us what scholars are actually saying. Emily Gowers' new Green and Yellow commentary does far more than bring things up to date. It innovates, and opens pathways for fresh interrogation. By combining the best of the solid philological and historical gains made by the great nineteenth- and twentieth-century commentaries in French, German and Italian, with the best of recent cultural and literary-critical scholarship (primarily in English), G. has managed to produce something that the field has not, in fact, ever seen: an impressively full and thought-provoking commentary in English on the first book of Horace's *Sermones* (Bentley's brilliant commentary of 1712 was in Latin).

Commentators have to be choosy in selecting what to emphasize and what to let readers pick up on for themselves. G.'s points of emphasis are well chosen and well balanced, with the main point of focus centering on the process of the poet's self-fashioning in the course of the book, and the relation of the self that we are made to notionalize and keep track of in the many shifting historical, cultural and stylistic contexts that we are made to consider. What G. seems to 'get' in all of this that no other commentator seems to have gotten nearly as well is how ideas tumble forward in Horace's hexameter poems from things (logically) unsaid, but (metaphorically and tangentially) implied. Playing with the ways of off-hand talk, Horace's 'Conversations' trip along from thought to thought, often landing us far from where we began, and having taken many unexpected turns along the way. And yet underneath their affable meandering is a web of implication (the traces of a loaded metaphor's being gradually unpacked, or of it secretly implying, then giving way to, the next metaphor down the line) that connects not just one thought to the next, but first to last and all thoughts in-between.

A particular highlight in teasing out how this works in the actual 'talking' of the poems is to be found in the way that G. tracks the flow of ideas from line to line in *S.* 1.4, showing how the poem's opening discussion about Old Comic freedom gives way to a quasi Old Comical/censorial scolding of Lucilius' over-free style ('an "Aristophanic" *synkrisis* between himself and his Roman satirical "father" Lucilius', 149), and from there to the question of whether satire, given its stylistic proximity to New Comedy and everyday speech, belongs in the lofty (senatorial?) company of high

Ennian poetry (*'numerus'* means both "group" and "metrical line" in this poem', 150–1). Then, from New Comic fathers scolding their sons we transition to the topic of Horace's own brand of scolding humour which, he says, he has adapted from the lessons he learned from his New Comic father ('the salient comic precedent is the severe father Demea in Terence *Adelphoe*', 176) who has a good deal of the Old Comic Lucilius about him ('the father's finger-pointing lessons are the ethical equivalent of Greek comedy's branding of criminals ... *notabant*', 176). Every step of this discussion, G. shows, finds Horace giving a polyvalent figure a slightly different turn.

G.'s note on *'numerus'*, quoted above, is itself worth the price of the book, and to it I have added a 'senatorial' question mark of my own in parenthesis, as if to show how new possibilities tend to pop into view by way of G.'s insightful line-by-line analyses: is Horace perhaps playing upon (and mocking the very idea of) his wielding the censor's *nota* by pretending in these lines to exclude certain un-worthies (such as himself) from the lofty company of 'the poets', i.e. the way a censor would sort out and specify who belongs in the senate, and who does not? I might say the same thing about the G.'s note on *illudo chartis* in line 139, where the invitation to savour the metaphor produced by *illudo* ('I gamble/fritter away on') provokes me to think that perhaps Horace is here, at the end of the poem, still playing with the idea of his being a New Comic (thus 'gambling' playboy) son of an admonishing Terentian father, i.e. still 'frittering away' his wherewithal on silly things (such as satire). And thus the entire poem seems fitted together in intricate ways that I had never managed to see before.

I could go on with further examples. Suffice it to say that the commentary does not solve every grammatical and syntactical problem that I have ever had in reading these poems: in fact there are many places where it could have stood to be more teacherly and explicit. Nor has it dispelled my every meaning-filled doubt about some of the poems' darker turns. And yet it is much to her credit that G. has not tried to try to do this. Whatever else this outstanding book does, it has the decency never to tell me what Horace 'clearly' means in poems that, as Persius (stealing Horace's own metaphor) once observed, he designed to keep us dangling (*'excusso populum suspendere naso'*, Pers. 1.118).

Yale University
kirk.freudenburg@yale.edu
doi:10.1017/S0075435814000744

KIRK FREUDENBURG

S. SHARLAND, *HORACE IN DIALOGUE: BAKHTINIAN READINGS IN THE SATIRES*. Bern/Oxford: Peter Lang, 2010. Pp. xii + 347. ISBN 303911946X. £41.00.

Suzanne Sharland has written an engaging and original book on Horace's *Satires*. She uses Bakhtin's theories of narration, carnivalesque inversions, heteroglossia and addressivity to analyse the dialogicality ('the chatter and counter-chatter') of Horace's *Satires*, so they 'may be better understood in their full artistic complexity' (7). Bakhtin's theories of dialogicality are her scaffolding, but her own careful ingenuity enlivens and mobilizes the poems.

The book begins with a long chapter introducing Bakhtin, the nature and definition of diatribe, and Horace's *Satires* as *sermo* — as conversation as well as satire; the rest of the work gives close readings of the first three satires of Book 1, the 'diatribe satires' and then of *Satires* 2, 3 and 7 in Book 2. *Sermo* is understood as always dialogue, 'a response to prior discourse and an anticipation of future discourse' (3), and the inherent dialogism in diatribe's second-person address makes *Satires* 1.1–3 an ideal place for S. to begin her discussion. Horace's opening poems of Book 1 have hardly been the favourites that appear in Latin readers (unlike *Satires* 1.9, for instance, the poem excluding the talkative wannabe that readers so enjoy — though S. would have something to say on that) and the introjected speakers of Horace's first three satires seem wooden, prone to hackneyed philosophical parody. Yet S.'s dialogical reading makes the interactive chattiness of these poems evident, as well as their humour, their liveliness and their instability, and she particularly reveals the performance of the *Satires* immanent in the text. S.'s book shows that Horace exploits the layered voices of his multiple speakers and addressees in his first book of satires to destabilize the moralizing speaker of the diatribe, known as 'Horace'.

S. sees the second book of the *Satires* as a carnivalesque inversion of Book 1 and its primary speaker. Horace becomes the primary listener in Book 2, and in dialogues that verge on monologue Horace, the moralizing/satirizing chief speaker of Book 1, becomes the object of the