

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

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