

which he argues that creative use of the *persona* is a non-ancient device. Being a simple man, I prefer to follow the guidance of Colin Dexter. In his short story, *The Inside Story*, printed in the volume ‘Morse’s Greatest Mystery’, he illustrates the dictum enunciated by Diogenes Small in his *Reflections on Inspiration and Creativity*: teaching would-be writers how to utilise creatively the distance between the author and the *persona*, Small states, ‘it is those fictional addenda which will effect the true alchemy’. The literary device of the *persona* matters less in Horace’s *Satires* and *Epistles* where, for the most part, the author tries to reduce to nil the distance between author and *persona*, for example he wants us to believe that the ‘touchingly grateful son who attributes his education in virtue to so excellent a father’ is the writer. But the opening-up of distance between author and *persona* is of prime importance when it comes to Ovid and Ingleheart.

Her study of Horace’s presence in Ovid’s *Tristia* 2 is perhaps the meatiest and most interesting (in the eyes of this amateur reviewer) of the essays. She goes over a subject which she has treated before and which has been examined also by Barchiesi (both articles are in the bibliography). They both show that we cannot take at face value the ‘Ovid’ who addresses Augustus. In the light of the irony of Ovid’s text and of the *persona*’s apparent *faux pas* – which Ingleheart illustrates – we can see that what we have is a writer, Ovid, who creates for the *Tristia* an *alter ego* (let us call him Publius) who is in exile and pleading with Augustus for forgiveness and some degree of mitigation. But Publius’ pleas to Augustus are undermined by a third voice, whom I would call Naso (no, my friend, not Nadeau) who, as Ingleheart and Barchesi tease out, makes Publius an unconvincing character, an unreliable narrator. Publius aims to flatter Augustus and to conciliate him but Naso (also Ovid’s creation) makes us see Publius’ humility and repentance and flattery as unconvincing. In other words, it is Naso’s voice which, in Diogenes Small’s formulation, ‘effects the true alchemy’. But if Publius’ voice is that of an unreliable witness – and it seems to be agreed that it is – then where is Ovid as he writes? Is he in exile? We cannot know. This knife-edge of indecision is of the essence of our reading of the *Tristia*. If we are interested in the historical question, we may consult Bingham in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* (Brussels, 2003, pp. 376–400). But, from the purely literary viewpoint, Augustus is being mocked and Horace is made instrumental to the mockery. As Ingleheart is writing a commentary on *Tristia* 2, I offer her these uncompromising thoughts in the hope that her commentary will eschew the comforting fudge that her last paragraph about opposition and integration makes me dread.

University of Edinburgh

YVAN NADEAU
yvannadeau@btinternet.com

VIRGIL AND OCTAVIAN

POWELL (A.) *Virgil the Partisan. A Study in the Re-integration of Classics*. Pp. xii + 310, ills. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2008. Cased, £45. ISBN: 978-1-905125-21-0.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X10002192

This is a closely argued if occasionally repetitive book that covers far more issues than can be dealt with in the confines of a relatively brief review. Underlying the argument is the premise that critical studies of the Virgilian *œuvre* have largely

failed to take proper account of what P. terms the 'political intertext'. In particular this means the history of the years between Philippi and Actium, where P. highlights the unpopularity of Octavian in Rome due to proscriptions, land confiscations and his failure to deal with the threat posed to Rome's grain supply by the blockade Sextus Pompeius was imposing from his base in Sicily.

It was against this background that Virgil embarked on his poetic career with the *Eclogues*. P. contends that we should consider Virgil's whole output as a connected *œuvre*, with the *Eclogues* making an offer and the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* fulfilling it. The offer is to become the partisan that the title of P.'s book suggests; but it is a 'conditional' offer. I, Virgil, can celebrate you, Octavian, as a god and present your image and ideology in a way that will win over the intellectual elite in Rome; but it will only work if the land confiscations cease. There is plenty I can – indeed will have to – gloss over or 'spin', but as you can see from *E.* 1 and 9 (and from your own political experience), these expropriations are doing too much damage both to productivity and to your reputation.

The *Georgics* perhaps comes closer than either of the other works to fulfilling Virgil's part of this putative 'bargain'. P. maintains that its subject matter is intended to generate retrospective support for Octavian's policy of land for veterans by showing what they could achieve now that they have become farmers; still militaristic in their attitude, they productively employ their 'weapons' against the recalcitrant soil. But when we get to Book 4 the situation becomes more problematic. P., as many critics before him, argues that the bee communities are an analogue for human ones, and that their success in generating 'sweet' honey under the leadership of their 'king' supports the principle of a state governed by a monarchy. But the bee community is archetypically iron-age: there is no room for any form of love other than love of possession (*G.* 4.177) and they are completely dedicated to the work ethic. Efficient it may be; well-ordered it may be; but as the Orpheus paradigm shows, it runs contrary to human nature. The kind of society *bougonia* (seen as analogue for the bloodshed of proscriptions and civil war) produces bears too close a resemblance to the 1984 horror.

Four of the book's eight chapters are devoted to the *Aeneid*, where, P. argues, we again see Virgil the partisan at work. Through the figure of his ancestor Aeneas, certain negative aspects of Octavian's character and actions are transformed into positives: for example, Octavian's propensity to run away when military situations turned against him are recast in Aeneas' rejection of the heroic ideal in favour of one based on *pietas*; his duty to ensure the success of his mission leads him quite properly to flee from Troy rather than die in a blaze of glory, and similarly he chooses the prudent path of escape when confronted by the Cyclopes in Sicily. P. also discerns a concerted attempt to counter the negative images of Octavian put about by Sextus Pompeius and Antony. P. claims that the architecture of the poem supports the partisan viewpoint, that the trajectory of the poem passes from Juno's anger in Book 1 to the reconciliation between Jupiter and Juno in Book 12, so confirming the success of the mission and Rome's future (= present) glory under Aeneas' descendant. Regrettably in my view the architecture reveals something rather different. The division of the poem into an Odyssean half and Iliadic half, in that order (as P. himself notes), serves to highlight the fact that all Aeneas has succeeded in doing is to recreate the Trojan War in Italy, with the Trojans now playing the part of the Greeks; numerous resonances with the *Iliad* show that Aeneas has turned into an Achilles figure (and we should recall how Aeneas himself described the 'new Achilles' Pyrrhus back in Book 2); and in Book 12

we find the man for whom relating the sack of Troy was to reopen an ‘unspeakable grief’ (2.3) imposing exactly the same fate on Latinus’ city in order to attain his end (and claiming divine support in doing so). Yes, Aeneas will achieve his goal; yes, so has (the now) Augustus – but the tragedy of the *Aeneid* lies in the sort of person each of them had to become in order to win this success. The first simile of the poem, as P. notes (and devotes considerable space to), has the man of *pietas* overcoming the *furor* of a mob; but this is answered by the final simile, a nightmare one of impotence and silence (*Aen.* 12.908–12). Aeneas’ killing of Turnus, the poem’s closing act, shows that even within the self-proclaimed embodiment of *pietas*, *furor* wins out in the end. And there is nothing one can do or say, no spin one can apply, to alter this fact. That is this poet’s final response to the post-Philippi world.

On pp. 122–4 P. engages in a long polemic against those who believe that Virgil is ‘innocent’ of the kind of partisanship for which he is arguing, saying that it is ‘symptomatic of a wishfulness in the interpretation of Virgil which is widespread among critics’. This is a dangerous argument to use. Not only does it imply that all those who disagree with P.’s interpretation are guilty of imposing their own prejudices on the text, but it could also just as easily be employed by an unkind critic against P. himself. Personally I have no preconceived wish for Virgil to be anything; what I do claim is that I try to follow where the text leads. And to my mind, despite the many thought-provoking analyses that this book offers, it does not lead in the direction that its author contends.

La Trobe University, Victoria

JOHN PENWILL
j.penwill@latrobe.edu.au

AUGUSTUS AND APOLLO

MILLER (J.F.) *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*. Pp. xii + 408, ills. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Cased, £65, US\$110. ISBN: 978-0-521-51683-9.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X10002209

In the light of the appropriation of Apollo by Augustus, who claimed a special connection and increased the god’s importance in Roman religion, M.’s book announces itself as a synoptic study of this ‘Augustan’ Apollo in contemporary poetry and of the varying reactions of the poets to this ideological project. Its seven chapters are concerned with Octavian’s affiliations with Phoebus at the end of the republican period; Apollo’s supposed help in the victory over Anthony and Cleopatra at Actium; the deity’s (expanded) role in the story of Aeneas presented by Virgil; poetic responses to the temple of Apollo on the Palatine; Horace’s *Carmen Saeculare* and the *ludi saeculares* of 17 B.C.; possible allusions to ‘Augustan’ Apollo where that divinity’s musical or poetic functions are to the fore in literature; and Ovid’s handling of Phoebus in the *Metamorphoses*.

At times M.’s remarks do not seem strictly relevant to the appropriation of Apollo by the *princeps* (e.g. pp. 39–53 and much of the very long third chapter), so that this book would be better described as an investigation not just of ‘Augustan’ Apollo but of all substantial references to Phoebus in the poetry of the period. As such, it is a lengthy, well-researched and wide-ranging treatment, which takes into account minor writers (as well as the five major Augustans) and also artistic and