

satire. The seemingly separate projects of Horace's two books of *Satires* thus mirror one another and are interdependent, or, as S. says, are in dialogue with each other. The inversion in Book 2 accomplishes the undoing of Horace as an authoritative speaker. In a similar way, according to S., individual satires speak to each other. So, for example, the suspicions we develop in the course of *Satires* 1.2, that the speaker's confidence in his moralizing speech against adultery derives from his own taste for the practice and his acquaintance with its concomitant perils, are confirmed by his slave (with the notably Plautine name of Davus) in *Satire* 2.7. In this monologic dialogue Davus makes apt, and Bakhtinian, use of the Saturnalian reversal of hierarchy to speak *libertate Decembri* and inform his master that he ('Horace') possesses none of the virtues he advocated in the diatribe satires of Book 1, and among other specifics that he is obsessed with another man's wife. Likewise, though Horace eats a simple meal off of earthenware in *Satires* 1.6, in *Satires* 2.2 and 2.7 he is 'busted' for a fondness of gourmet food.

The Bakhtinian idea of addressivity marks the fact that a speaker always talks to someone, and no communication is outside a relationship. S. sees the poetic address to Maecenas in the *Satires* as real, not merely a conventional dedication; Maecenas is one of many addressees of the poems, but S. sees the troubling, unequal relationship with Horace as ever-present in the *Satires*. S. might have bolstered this element of her argument with further investigations into the extensive current scholarship on the poetic version of patronage, Peter White for example, but her book does us all a favour in forcing Maecenas into the picture as a live player in the *Satires*. One surely has to imagine that Horace performed these poems for an audience that included Maecenas, and that it would have been irresistible to play his audience for satiric humour. So the tasteless nudge to Maecenas 'for a raise' that Lyne and others have seen in *Satires* 1.1 when Horace moralizes against stinginess, strikes S. not as tasteless but rather a good joke, at which Horace's friends in his audience laugh, along with the ever generous Maecenas. S. acknowledges that the Bakhtinian reversals of Carnival support the power-relations of the status quo, and she makes a reasonable case for a disappointingly unsubversive Horace: there is so much he might lose.

S.'s analysis seems to me to have crucial implications for how we read the figure of Horace in these poems which have elicited such passionate autobiographical readings from their beginnings. S.'s book would have us imagine Horace as an historical figure who writes satires in which he sometimes stars, or hosts if you will, and he sometimes brings other historical figures in too, such as Maecenas. He works out real issues in life in a fictional context, and where the fiction begins or ends is anyone's guess, but it works better as art than as fact.

S. is refreshingly gentle to the critics she disagrees with, as befits a writer who believes what Bakhtin's comrade Voloshinov says, that word is a two-sided act and speaking makes a relationship with one's audience. S.'s practice as a critic is to investigate what the satires are doing rather than to evaluate their success in some undefined world (our own) and she can thus always show how the satires succeed.

University of Notre Dame  
schlegel.1@nd.edu

CATHERINE SCHLEGEL

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000756

H. H. GARDNER, *GENDERING TIME IN AUGUSTAN LOVE ELEGY*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. viii + 285. ISBN 9780199652396. £60.00.

Studies of Latin love elegy which seriously challenge the way we think about this genre are rare these days, and it is striking that the most provocative and innovative books on elegy to have been published in the last few years have been informed in some way by the critical theories of Lacanian psychoanalysis (most prominently, recent treatments by Michaela Janan and Paul Alllen Miller). Hunter Gardner's contribution to David Konstan's and Alison Sharrock's excellent series, *Oxford Studies in Classical Literature and Gender Theory*, continues this trend by judiciously drawing upon Julia Kristeva's model of 'women's time' (*le temps des femmes*) to help shed new light on both the attraction of the female elegiac beloved to her *amator* and her ultimate rejection by him — according to the traditional master plot of Augustan elegy. That master plot, as G. shows: 'posits an emphatically "young" (*iuvenis*) lover in a constant state of rejection from his nearly divine, but hopelessly fickle beloved ... [while] erotic consummation of the elegiac relationship, a relationship maintained primarily through strategies of delay, deferral and

concealment, remains ever receding from the *amator's* view' (5–6). Of course, the relationship, like the beloved quasi-immortal *puella* herself, matures over the course of time, and the eventual transformation of *puella* into *amus* prompts her lover's own 'erotic, civic, and poetic maturation' (5), marking the end of the affair (there are no happy endings in the elegiac story-world) — and his return to civic life.

In elucidating this erotic, poetic and narrative life-cycle, G. takes as the starting point for her analysis a detailed consideration of the temporality of the human life course and its milestones, treating time in the discourse and drama of elegy as an embodied concept: 'that is, time as measured by a single erotically motivated human subject, and used to organize that subject's experience in terms of a past, present, and future' (10). That subject's experience is not only gendered but grounded in a specific socio-historical context, and G. offers an exemplary overview of the asymmetrical timelines open to the elegiac poet-lover and his *puella* in a chapter on 'Coming-of-Age in Augustan Rome', in which she argues that 'the Princeps' interventions in the life cycles of his subjects prompted the concerns of time, ageing, and immortality so evident in elegiac poetry' (33). Indeed, the next three chapters go on to illustrate how the male elegiac *amator* appropriates the time-line and temporal attributes of the *puella* in order (temporarily) to resist the accelerated maturity encouraged and exemplified by the Princeps and so to realize the pleasures of an 'arrested development'. The first of these, 'Taming the *Velox Puella*', offers a nicely nuanced close reading of Propertius 1.1 (treated as 'a template for those temporal pressures felt throughout Propertian elegy' (59)), and shows how 'the performance of the elegiac lament, with all its cyclical wandering, completed through groans and prayers ..., allows the *amator* to confront his temporality' (82). The following chapter, 'Two *Senes*: Delia and Messalla' focuses predominantly upon the so-called 'Delia cycle' of the Tibullan corpus, to explore 'how the ideal of *inertia* and the static existence it implies shapes the life course and love story of the Tibullan *amator*' (86). And the final chapter in this section, 'Ovid: Elegy at the Crossroads' convincingly argues that 'Ovid uses the Callimachean *recusatio* as a delaying strategy *par excellence*: the poet-lover of the *Amores* conflates elegy's frequently recognized erotic deferrals with the generic deferrals that hinder his evolution towards writing patriotically inspired verse' (115).

The second half of the book looks more closely at the temporal qualities associated with elegy's *puellae*, here making fuller use of Kristeva's concept of 'women's time' and its Lacanian (and Platonic) foundations, to show some of the ways in which the elegiac figure of the 'abandoned beloved' (146) articulates both the *puella* and *amator's* gendered and 'genred' experiences of time: 'that is, an experience defined by repetition, cyclicity, and spatial enclosure' (146). This section offers a persuasive demonstration of the ways in which the marginalized elegiac *puella* 'offers the poet-lover a space of retreat, a suspension of the literary and political ideologies that threaten to shape the course of his life' (254). The *puer delicatus* receives some attention here (187–9), but it is noticeable that elegy's only extant female poet, Sulpicia, does not. She is marginalized to an early footnote (5 n. 12), and it does seem something of a missed opportunity to have excluded Sulpicia's poetry from this study, given the potential insights into *le temps des femmes* in Augustan Rome and Augustan love elegy that her work clearly has to show.

Nevertheless, this volume represents an innovative, persuasive and very welcome new study of Roman elegy. It includes some particularly fine close readings of individual poems (especially Propertius 1.1 and 1.3, Tibullus 1.3 and 1.4, and Ovid, *Amores* 1.8), carries its theoretical learning lightly, and should be required reading for all students of Augustan literature.

University of Bristol  
G.Liveley@bristol.ac.uk

GENEVIEVE LIVELY

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000768

E. BUCKLEY and M. T. DINTER (EDS), *A COMPANION TO THE NERONIAN AGE*. Chichester/Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013. Pp. xvi + 486, illus. ISBN 9781444332728. £120.00.

Few rulers have managed to define an era the way Nero did. If the label 'Neronian' is due partly to accidents of transmission, it is equally due to the emperor himself, who shaped and embodied the culture of his age via his various rôles: aspiring performer; lavish builder; amateur poet; sponsor