

Dido and Amata, who arguably share the common model of Fedra, passed over in silence in this book (p. 76).

A conspicuous absence in the book's analysis throughout is the philosophical dimension of *amor* and *furor*. Stoicism, which has played such a major role in our interpretations of the book's finale, is never mentioned, and Epicureanism is present only to be rejected (p. 60); more importantly, the Empedoclean dimension of *Eros* and *Eris*, which surely must have been relevant to Virgil as he alluded simultaneously to Apollonius' *Eros* in *Argonautica* 3 and to Ennius' *Discordia* in *Annales* 7, is only referred to in passing (p. 68), while S. Clément-Tarantino's view on *amor* and *Discordia* is dismissed in a footnote without much explanation (p. 37 n. 137). One is left to wonder whether the reintroduction of Ennius into the picture as well as of a tighter interrelation between 'amour-passion' and 'amor ferri' would take B.P. to different conclusions, especially in view of the military connotations of the episode of Dido as an *aition* of the Punic Wars, and bearing in mind that her curse is also the cause of the wars in Latium (*Aen.* 4.629, *pugnent ipsique nepotesque*).

Connected to this is the more pressing issue that the distinct categories of *amor* that B.P. adopts from J. Dion (*Les passions dans l'œuvre de Virgil. Poétique et philosophie* [1993]), namely 'passionate love', 'conjugal love', 'homosexual love', 'filial love', 'love for the fatherland', 'love of arms', 'love of glory' etc. (pp. 59–61) are really too schematic and narrow to allow for a deeper interpretation of this poem, nor does it help to lock up each occurrence of *amor* in an either positive or negative compartment. While I am in full agreement with B.P. when she writes that 'la casistica virgiliana non può essere ricondotta nel letto di Procuste di un rassicurante schema binario' (p. 83), it seems to me that this binary distinction is nevertheless implied throughout the course of her analysis of those places where 'positive' *amor* turns into 'negative' *furor* or is the root of 'negative' and 'tragic' consequences for individuals and communities (p. 84). This, I suspect, runs the risk of despoiling that complexity and polysemy of the *Aeneid* that B.P. herself otherwise successfully emphasises.

University of Warwick

ELENA GIUSTI
e.giusti@warwick.ac.uk

A NEW COMMENTARY ON HORACE'S 'LITTLE' BOOK OF *ODES*

HARRISON (S.) (ed.) *Horace: Odes Book II*. Pp. x + 267. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. Paper, £20.99, US\$34.99 (Cased, £59.99, US\$99.99). ISBN: 978-1-107-60090-4 (978-1-107-01291-2 hbk). doi:10.1017/S0009840X18000677

H. brings his decades of scholarship on Horace to bear in this 'Green and Yellow' edition of the second book of *Odes*, the shortest (20 poems) and most underrated of the trio published in roughly 23 BC. The result is a substantial and informative resource for the experienced scholar and the novice graduate student alike, an up-to-date and worthy complement to the now 40-year-old Nisbet & Hubbard (1978). Small quibbles: 'Works Cited' lacks

R. Janko's *Philodemus: On Poems* (2000); the index is unhelpful without citations of ancient authors (see e.g. R. Mayer's Cambridge *Epistles* 1).

Following a general introduction, H. reviews opinions about the ordering of the poems (numerous), characterises the poet's decisions about book length, metre, addressee and poem length ('moderate') and sets out the poems' literary forebears in Greek lyric and epigram and in early Latin (abundant). A march through Horace's favourite structural elements (e.g. ring composition, the mid-poem 'turn', 'closural devices'), which are faithfully identified throughout the commentary, is followed by an innovative and effective introduction to the analysis of Horace's style: a line-by-line tutorial on the Postumus ode. I would not hesitate to assign these two thoughtful pages (pp. 18–19) to students as a model of crisp stylistic analysis.

Textual decisions are conservative, favouring readings found in the majority of manuscripts (excepting 2.2.14, 2.9.1, 2.14.25, 2.17.14, 2.19.24), and simply annotated in an abbreviated apparatus. H. refers the reader otherwise to the great Oslo database of conjectures on Horace, whose current web address requires correction (p. vii, <http://tekstlab.uio.no/horace/>). H.'s own plausible diagnostic conjectures at 1.20 (*pectus* for *vultus*), 5.13 (*Ferox* for *ferox*) and 12.9 (*tu ipse* for *tuque*) are defended but not adopted (he does print *cauda* for the very unlikely *caudam* at 19.31).

H.'s interest in the ways Horace binds the poems to their contexts both local (within the poem or book) and global (across the *Odes* and beyond) is evident in an organisational scheme for the book (pp. 6–7), which is as good a provisional starting point as any. The collection begins with the civil wars and addressees connected with them in ways great (Pollio, Dellius) and nominal (Sallust). This rather sober opening is relieved by several odes on love and friendship (2.4–9). *Odes* 2.10–20 offer advice and thoughts on mortality to those who need it, not all named (including 2.12, a *recusatio* to Maecenas, apparently still requesting poems on the campaigns of Augustus, and 2.14, the famous Postumus ode). Other types of poems appear among these, including a malediction of the nearly-fatal falling tree that conjures a marvellous jam session by Sappho and Alcaeus in the underworld (2.13, where I remain unpersuaded that Horace agrees with the *vulgus* favouring Alcaeus), a striking hymn to Bacchus with another glimpse of the underworld (2.19) and a surreal metamorphic *sphragis*.

Like others in the series, H.'s commentary is interpretative and has a point of view. He conceives *Odes* 2 on a chronological trajectory from *Odes* 1 (aspiring to lyric greatness) to *Odes* 3 (attained), although where this leaves *Odes* 2 is not directly spelled out; the catchword is 'moderation' along a path of 'internal ascent and onward movement' (p. 3). The influence of Greek and Roman writers ('literary intertexts') on Horace's poetry is a major focus; while Horace's creativity is sometimes remarked, the unmistakable final impression is of a poet deeply in debt. The commentary's great strength is its diligent attention to and discussion of these literary allusions and elements of Horatian lyric, H.'s sharp eye and ear for the subtleties of Horace's language, metre and style. He takes obvious delight in following the trails of breadcrumbs in every imaginable direction, often Greek (despite translations, the edition is not for the Greekless).

The notes are judicious (less comprehensive and more crisp than N.-H.) but admit full quotations and intricate argumentation. A few examples. On 2.3 (p. 68) clear notes on *in remoto gramine* and *per dies festos* obviate the need for the quotations of Lucretius and *Georgics*. But arguments for debts to Philodemus in 2.4 (pp. 74–6, also fully quoted in N.-H.), and Anacreon and Philodemus in 2.5 (pp. 82–6) demonstrate deep literary engagement, although Horace's modest description of Phyllis pales against the exuberant catalogue of Philodemus, *AP* 5.132.1 (*suras* the only echo, of κνήμη). Again, a pointer at 2.8.8 to Alcman's μέλημα δάμωι and Callimachus' epigram on the themes of erotic perjury

and beautiful home-wreckers would suffice, but the reader comes away with a full picture of the tradition crystallised in the Horatian ode. Horace's reprimand of C. Valgius Rufus for his sentimentality over the death of a boy (2.9) receives one of H.'s longest and most rewarding introductory essays. This poem has everything, as the essay masterfully shows: well-known literary addressee, solid date, generic engagement with elegy and epic, allusions to *Georgics* 3 and 4, dramatic (and very Horatian) deployment of geography and landscape, and a triumphal Augustus. The sceptical nod to the possibility of irony regarding encomium of the princeps (to M. Putnam 1990) is in keeping with H.'s Horace throughout, a practical middle-aged poet who knows (and does not mind) who is buttering his bread (arguably a disservice to the poet). Similar substantial attention is paid to the hymn to Bacchus (2.19), tracing its roots in Euripides' *Bacchae*, Lucretius and Hellenistic aretology, and anchoring it securely in Horace's political context. The details invite serious consideration of the ode's combination of 'whimsical visions ... paired with serious claims' (p. 224), in anticipation of *Odes* 3.

Augustan politics arise primarily in discussions of dating and biography. Substantial exceptions are 2.7, where Horace's military service at Philippi is inescapable, and 2.19, where H. discusses the Augustan implications in the 20s of the once-Antonian figure of Bacchus. In each case, H.'s Horace is apolitical, looking back at his own youthful politics from a more mature perspective; but maturity does not preclude irony. H. observes on 2.1 that the picture of civil war is not eased by the hopeful presence of a 'saviour figure', i.e. Augustus, as in *Odes* 1.2 and 1.35, but concludes that this grim vision provides Pollio's *Histories* with a 'suitably tragic subject'. In view of the 'conspicuous neutrality' of Pollio (N.-H., p. 10), one might also see implied a condemnation not only of civil wars but also of those who make them, and perhaps even some scepticism about the thundering genres that record them: notably *tractas* (2.1.7), *retractes* (2.1.38), m-alliteration (2.1.17), *perstringis* (2.1.18) and Horace's rejection of the theme for lyric in favour of *leviore plectro* (2.1.40). In 2.7 to Pompeius, the scene shifts from pre-Philippi camaraderie to Philippi (and beyond, 2.7.15–16, *te rursus in bellum resorbens*), to an Italian symposium, which 'sympotic turn' (argued fully in S. Harrison 2004) H. reads as a 'domestication' of 'the furor of civil war' (p. 110). But Horace promises to serve Pompeius Italian wine in unusual Egyptian cups (22, *ciboria*); in company with the unusual *bacchabor* and the Thracians, the imagined symposium does not suppress but rather activates imagery of Philippi (Thrace), Antony (Dionysus) and Actium (for Antony, Augustus and Bacchus see pp. 224–6 on 2.19). The symposium may mitigate, but pointedly does not erase. Similarly 2.11 turns from Quinctius' worries about the Cantabrians and Scythians to a symposium with Near Eastern elements (Lyde and *nardo*); as these current opponents have nothing to do with the Near East, perhaps Horace alludes to this now-pacified region to allay his friend's anxiety, a lesson for the present from the difficult recent past.

This said, H. takes every opportunity to provide full and welcome background on all of the major interpretative questions in these *Odes*. It is a learned and useful edition, bringing insightful commentary together with recent pertinent scholarly discussion and discoveries in a compact and affordable format, an excellent gateway for scholars and graduate students seeking a path into and through Horace's 'little' book of *Odes*.

Boston University

PATRICIA J. JOHNSON
pjjclass@bu.edu