

The subsequent nine chapters are thematic: four treat both poets together (2: ‘Pessimism and Pejorism’; 3: ‘Spring and Death’; 7: ‘Questions of Integrity and Consistency’; 8: ‘Form and Content’), two Horace specifically (3: ‘Horace’s Attitude to Religion’; 6: ‘Horace and Politics’), and three Housman specifically (5: ‘Religion and Politics in Housman’; 9: ‘Housman, Literary Criticism and the Classics’; 10: ‘Housman’s Criticism of Horace’). The author-specific chapters tend to be the most rewarding, since the theoretically attractive unification of the two authors in a single discussion proves practically difficult: although G.’s introductory chapter emphasizes the importance of reading each poetic collection as a whole, the book tends to proceed via close readings of individual poems.

In ch. 2 (17–41), G. demonstrates that melancholy lurks within the traditionally jocund lyrics of Horace, commonly conveyed through natural imagery, which aligns him with the more obviously ‘pejorative’ verse of Housman. Ch. 3 (43–61) tackles a similar strain of poetic expression, the themes of springtime and death, in which *Carm.* 4.7 and 1.4 are especially well handled, although G. implausibly suggests (55–6) that the two poems could have been composed simultaneously.

Ch. 4 (63–75) makes a convincing case for doubting the sincerity — if that is not an anachronism — of Horace’s religious devotion, deflating in particular the theological importance that has often been attributed to his ‘first hymn to Mercury’ (1.10). (Ch. 5 is purely Housmannian.) Ch. 6 (91–115) treats Horace’s politics, although with less satisfactory results: the binary account of the ‘personal’ and ‘political’ (99–100) is laboured and Horace’s self-presentation is not set in sufficient context with the other ‘Augustans’; nevertheless, G. plausibly suggests (101–5) that the last poem of Horace’s *Odes* (4.15) displays ‘double irony’ and a ‘deliberate inconsistency’, a *recusatio* steered by Apollo into panegyric, closing ambiguously with Venus. Such themes lead into ch. 7 (117–45), which tackles poetic integrity. G. claims for Horace political, but not moral, sincerity: that may be, but his arguments (on *Carm.* 2.7, at 121–8) that Horace both had to mention his Republican past and do so light-heartedly fail to convince. More of the Horatian corpus here requires consideration. Ch. 8 (147–72) argues that poetic form and content are not in conflict: here G. is much stronger when treating the verbal arrangement of Horatian lyric rather than its metrical form and inheritance.

The closing section of the book, focused upon Housman, is the least successful. In ch. 9 (173–97), G. is vexed by his (in)famous separation of textual and literary criticism. Housman did indeed profess that true literary critics were vanishingly rare (and that he was not one), yet G. prefers to suppose not that Housman’s conception of ‘literary criticism’ was much more specific and rarefied than the modern term, but that he ‘has not thought’ (177) and is ‘stupid or dishonest’ (189). Yet almost any of Housman’s textual notes reveal that literary criticism (in its usual sense) went hand-in-hand with textual criticism for him as for any competent critic. Ch. 10 (199–222) directly addresses Housman’s treatment of Horace, incorporating his lecture notes preserved in Cambridge. However, the disparaging conclusions drawn are puzzling: few careful readers of Housman’s scholarship could assert that he ‘was less interested in educating his readers than in crushing them’ (203), ‘refuse[d] to have anything to do with literary criticism’ and favoured the much-maligned ‘palaeographical method’ (207).

Certainly, G. does have valuable contributions to make to understanding Horatian and Housmannian lyric (and his detailed interest in textual problems is refreshing): his close readings are often illuminating, if at times dogmatic. One wonders, however, whether a more suitable vehicle for his studies could have been found. The bibliography covers a good range but does not include the collected volume *A.E. Housman: Classical Scholar* (2009). As a note to the series editors, it is regrettable that the longer endnotes could not have been presented as footnotes.

Queens’ College, Cambridge
djb89@cam.ac.uk

DAVID BUTTERFIELD

doi:10.1017/S007543581500101X

M. T. DINTER, *ANATOMIZING CIVIL WAR: STUDIES IN LUCAN’S EPIC TECHNIQUE*.
Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012. Pp. viii + 186. ISBN 978047211850 (bound);
9780472028719 (e-book). US\$65.00 (bound).

In his Introduction, Dinter distinguishes himself from previous scholars who have ‘exclusively addressed’ issues of politics and ideology, source criticism and the influence on the poet of

'contemporary rhetorical education and practice' (1). D., by contrast, will 'take Lucan more on his own terms as a poet' and will address various features of his technique that create 'a unique poetic form and vision' (2). Some scholars of Lucan will not recognize their own work in this rather sweeping *Forschungsbericht*, but the real problem lies in the want of any clear definition of D.'s own project.

The first and longest chapter of the study concerns 'Lucan's Epic Body'. As early as the proem to the *Bellum Civile* Lucan identifies his subject as the fatherland turned against its own guts with a victorious right hand. Students of Lucan will scarcely need reminding that the ensuing ten books repeatedly draw out this image as well as depicting innumerable instances of dismemberment and bodily disintegration. D.'s contribution is to gather together a large amount of such material, to arrange it under specific headings and then to subject it to the bare minimum of useful analysis. There are some nice observations but no coherent thesis.

The remaining chapters are tied to the first by a series of bodily metaphors, some ancient, some D.'s own, but few readers will regard them as contributing to a unified thesis (for these metaphors, see, for example, 4, 9, 15). *Fama*, epitaphic motifs, *sententiae*, various forms of repetition, medieval *argumenta* and sundry Renaissance and early modern continuations of Lucan are thrown together to create a study of Lucan's 'epic body' that itself has all the bodily unity of an Arcimboldo grotesque. On occasion, this approach has more basis than on others. The section on *sententiae*, in which D. does his most effective and original work, draws well on Quintilian's view of these as the 'eyes', that is to say, the places of greatest beauty, within the body of the speech, but the threefold assertion (92–4) of their capacity for excerptability and integration into 'new textual bodies' or 'new literary bodies' smacks of an author trying too hard to hold his own text together. In other instances, the connections are distinctly more tenuous, even evanescent.

D.'s second chapter on *Fama* presents Lucan's poem as a 'textualized struggle for fame' (62). As in the first chapter, he demonstrates his ability to bring together a good deal of material relevant to the general theme, but a striking inability to do much with what he has amassed. The one strong claim regards the relationship of Lucan's Erictho to *Fama* as presented in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 12. The arguments adduced in support of this view are somewhat forced.

The account of *sententiae* sits uneasily with D.'s initial claim to break with modern concern for the influence on Lucan of the rhetorical culture in which he was raised. Yet it does draw an important distinction between context-specific pointed expressions and *sententiae* that 'display universal gnomic force' (91). There are also good remarks on the highly sententious speech of Pothinus (110–11) and a useful account of 'antiproverbs' and their place in Lucan (111–14). D.'s experimental filleting of Lucan in the manner of the excerptor of Publilius Syrus would have benefited from greater application of the distinction between the context-specific and the universalizing. He might also have asked in what sense phrases such as Luc. 7.55 *pacemque timeret* qualify as any sort of *sententia* (102 n. 73, 109 n. 126).

The final chapter presents a strange congeries of material. It begins with some hackneyed observations on the poetics of iteration in Seneca and Lucan, gestures briefly at internal verbal repetition and then collapses into wholly irrelevant paratextual material from the *argumenta* and the continuators. The central section treats the Vulteius episode as a 'case study' in Lucan's 'poetics of repetition' (122), but it offers little that is new and is vitiated by internal contradiction (127 implies that Livy's account of the Opitergini is no more than a hypothetical reconstruction while 137 indicates knowledge of its actual contents).

It was sensible of D. to avail himself of Susanna Morton Braund's translation of Lucan, and the reader is repeatedly made aware of its quality and precision. Where D. does not do so, the results can be somewhat eccentric (at 135, *praebebunt testes* is rendered as 'we have been seen'). The text is not free of errors though most of these are relatively trivial. In sum, D. is an energetic but somewhat undiscerning collector of ideas and material. Much of what finds its way into this study could profitably be removed. Much else could be subjected to more acute and effective analysis. D. is an enthusiastic anatomist, but I would not trust him as a surgeon.

St Anne's College, Oxford
matthew.leigh@st-annes.ox.ac.uk

MATTHEW LEIGH

doi:10.1017/S0075435815000222