Volume III in Documents 178-486 traverses the period A.D. 453 to 534, closing with the Mandate of Justinian I on Admission to Religious Life. This final volume also contains a most useful Appendix on Persecutions — the important references to reported imperial legislation instigating persecution of Christians (pp.1179-1196); a Glossary (pp.1199-1245, in itself a veritable mine of information); and a series of Indices including Sources, Persons, Places, Subjects, supplemented by Biblical, Classical, Legal and Patristic quotations and allusions.

Altogether a super contribution to scholarship, and in its own right more than enough to place the academic world under a permanent obligation to the illustrious compiler and author.

H.R. Minn


The mounting interest in late Roman and Byzantine studies is an encouraging feature of the contemporary stirring in the academic dovecotes. The student preparing to farewell the Western Empire will find a delightful sketch of the Transition from Antiquity and the Emergence of Byzantium in the first chapter of this book where he will read a thrilling account of the chaos of the third century, of the Reforms of Diocletian and Constantine, of the darkening barbarian threat, of the crisis of the fourth and fifth centuries leading on to Justinian the Great. So enlightened, he will (as the writer fervently hopes) adjust his views on the thorny question of the 'Fall' of the Roman Empire, and be eager to get a working knowledge of its great Eastern extension, the resources of which resisted exhaustion till A.D. 1453. A visit to Istanbul will then become one of his greatest ambitions for future travel.

H.R. Minn


Gordon Williams’ edition of the third book of Horace’s Odes has been designed to appeal to the schools market and because of its attractive format and relative cheapness will, I am sure, prove very popular in this field. David West’s small critical work on Horace is aimed more towards the general reader, but since it is one of the books included in Williams’ short list for further reading it seems appropriate to treat them together.

Williams sees the users of his commentary as sixth-formers, undergraduates (the work is based on lectures to the General Humanity class at St Andrews), and those who are generally interested in poetry. It is a departure from the normal type of school edition in that the poems are each accompanied by a literal prose translation and a running commentary, in which W. seeks to guide the reader through the poem as a whole rather than to pick out individual difficulties. As a result, perhaps, of the translations being in prose and also of the prosaic quality of many of the commentaries, which tend to labour the difficulties of the transitions in poetic thought that abound in the Odes, but say little about Horace’s choice and placing of words or his use of various literary devices, this edition does not give one the feeling of being in contact with a great poet, who was able to take a basically rigid and inflexible language (even after Cicero’s efforts) and make it look easy to twist and mould it into forms that rival those of Pindar or the Alexandrian poets, writers who had a much more malleable language to work with as well as a longer tradition to draw upon. But form and artistic prowess are not greatly in demand nowadays and consequently they are not emphasised so much by modern critical writers: what are wanted are “ideas” or “involvement”,¹ and it is indicative of this trend in critical thought that in his Introduction W. feels obliged to defend Horace against the charge of some critics that his ideas are hackneyed.

The Introduction also contains an account of Horace’s life and works and sections on the political situation of 42-23BC, the poet’s place in society, and style and metre. The first two sections are adequate, though the cool reception first given to Odes I-III by the general public could have been mentioned; but the argument in the third, concerned with ancient views of poetry as “pleasurable” or “useful” and the change from the highly personal, almost egocentric poetry of the Neoterics to the political commitment that characterises the Augustan writers, could well have been filled
out more. Under Style, W. deals well with Horace’s claim to originality, and also gives a few examples of the type favoured by a more traditional form of criticism — archaisms, Greek usages and the like — to illustrate the changes of tone in Horace’s poetry. Mention is made, too, of his practice of blending Greek and Roman elements and of his especial genius in catching and involving his readers’ imagination. It seems to me that this latter is one of the marks of a successful poet and this could have been treated more fully for the benefit of W.’s third class of reader, as could his section on ornamentation. In this W. deals with word order and the use of simile and metaphor. In connection with the former, it would have been useful to mention in the footnote along with O. Skutsch’s article upon rhyme in Horace (BICS II (1964), 73-78) H. Darnley Naylor’s exhaustive work upon word order in the Odes and Epodes.² For the latter, although I think he does not intend it, W. gives the impression that there is not much use of simile and metaphor in Horace. What he means, I believe, is that there are not many full-blown similes in the Odes, long digressions prefixed by words like ceu or velut, but rather that metaphor is just hinted at and the similes pared down to the size of the poems and suggested by a word or two. This is one of the ways that Horace captures the reader, obliging him to fill out the comparison from his own observation, or knowledge of Homer or history, and for a good account of how he manages this in several poems one could refer to the other book under review here.

Finally W. says a little on structure in the Odes and the arrangement of the poems in Book III. Too little here; if anything, there has been too much critical energy expended in attempting to establish the relationship of the “Roman Odes” to each other, but this is the only place in W.’s commentary where we learn that these six poems are usually taken together by modern readers and that 111.30 is an epilogue — no mention of its importance as a σφραγί; for the whole collection. Furthermore W.’s statement (p.23) that “it is a waste of time to speculate on a matter (the order of the poems) of which the poet himself probably had no clear idea and which, in any case, has minimal literary relevance” would be rejected wholesale by many and, contrasted with the fact that he devotes a seven page appendix to giving us the Greek originals of various poems in Book III, tells us more about the editor’s own interests than about Horace.
In his text W. departs from the Oxford text in but a few places; 3.12, bibet for bibit (there seems little to choose between them; see Wickham's note ad loc.); 4.10, Pulliae for Apuliae (a fairly common name taken to be that of Horace's nurse; this lady can number Mommsen, Kiessling and Fraenkel among her distinguished supporters); 4.69, Gyges for Gyas (almost certainly correct if we are to have a proper name here — the MSS have gigas; the name occurs first in Hesiod, Theogony 149, 714, 734, and the majority of the MSS, which support Γύγης over Γύης there, now has the added support of papyrus evidence; see West's commentary on the Theogony, ad loc); 5.15, trahenti for trahentis; 6.10, inauspicatos for non auspicatos (on the grounds that Horace likes words with the privative in-; yet W. resists Bentley's inominatis at 14.11); 8.27, ac omitted at the end of the line (probably rightly; it is in only one MS and looks like an intrusion under the influence of et in the line above); 24.4, terrenum and publicum for Tyrrhenum and Apulicum (a difficult passage where W. follows Kiessling — Heinze in preferring common sense to the lectio difficilior: for full discussion see Kiessling-Heinze, ad loc.). In respect of punctuation the only important differences I noted were that W. follows Kiessling-Heinze rather than the OCT in placing a question at the end of 28.8 and in 29.43ff confining the direct speech to "vixi" (Wickham has direct speech to 48). He follows Meineke's law scrupulously throughout, dividing the poems into four-line stanzas, and consequently the Asclepiadic 24, 25 and 30 may have an odd appearance to those reared on other texts.

Everyone has his own opinions when it comes to Horace and it would be too much to hope for that they should coincide everywhere with those of the commentator. However there are several places where it seems to me that W.'s interpretation is unclear, if not incorrect, and it is worth noting these. 1.33-34 (contracta pisces aequora sentiunt / iactis in altum molibus) is, according to W., meant to be humorous and he mentions these lines elsewhere as an example of how Horace will suddenly change tone. But what Horace is talking about here is a serious matter, the reversal of the order of nature, the arrogant invasion by man of an element that does not belong to him, and as such it is meant, I am sure, to shock rather than amuse. Again at 6.21-22 (motus doceri gaudet Ionicos / matura virgo) we are meant to be shocked, but not primarily because the girl has been "corrupted from her youngest years", 56
but because she is *matura*, "ready for marriage", but is learning lewd dances instead of preparing herself for her duties as a wife and mother. Of less importance is W.'s questionable translation of *pauperis Ibyci* (15.1) as "hard-working Ibycus". As he points out, *pauper* often has moral rather than financial connotations (p.34), but here the name is surely meant to bring to mind that of the poet Ibycus, and by convention poets are poor in the monetary sense, though not always especially hard-working. Finally, in commenting upon the beginning of the great epilogue, *exegi monumentum aere perennius*, W. writes "it is a tombstone — but the word instantly evokes the usual sort of monument in the poet's mind; a brass plaque — but his is more eternal". Tombstones and brass plaques remind me more of the country "society" in Balzac's novels, the notary, the doctor and the undertaker, than of Augustan Rome, and jar accordingly. If he is using *monumentum* in a literal sense, which I doubt, Horace is thinking of the great tombs of the nobility that lined the roads out of the city, or perhaps of Augustus' Mausoleum, on which construction began in 28 BC, not of the simple tablets that marked the final resting place of the poor in the *columbaria*, which I believe, were usually of marble in any case. The bronze in question must therefore be simply a reference to the enduring qualities of that material or to bronze statuary, and the comparison is on an altogether grander and more poetic scale than W.'s note would suggest. However these are but minor quibbles and the reader who keeps his critical wits about him will learn much from W.'s book.

Mr West's book is a slight one for the price (for instance, there is a great deal of blank space between the relatively short chapters) and is little more than a collection of critical essays and notes whose common denominator is their author's interest in Horace's use of imagery and metaphor. West has made translations of all the poems or passages which he comments upon but, unlike Williams, he has preferred to try for verse and the result is not always very successful; a prose translation more closely tied to his arguments would have been more helpful both to fellow critics and to readers whose Latin is rusty. At one point West remarks that "the critic can only plod where the poet has flown" (p.42) and, although this is only too true, some of his explanations of Horatian imagery do seem to me to be laboured too much. Yet such a close reading of the text is an error on the right side, which enables the author to
expose several earlier interpretations as incorrect, and the book as a whole offers the reader some valuable insights into Horace's poetry.

West begins with a chapter on the Soracte ode, I.9; this poem has foxed more than one critic and no two writers on Horace seem to be able to agree whether the poem is set in Rome or in the countryside, whether it deals with a party, or, metaphorically, with youth and old age, besides wondering how on earth the snow-clad mountain, the training fields and the teasing girl are all going to fit into the same landscape and the same season. Steering cleverly between these various critical reefs (several of which he shows to be illusory), West offers a commonsense interpretation and does not forget, unlike some writers, that Horace wrote poetry, not seed catalogues. He then turns his attention to the Epistles and guides us through the comparison in the *envoi* to Book I (I.20) in which the book of poems is compared to a slave boy up for sale, I.13, where Vinnius is likened to a donkey, and I.1,1-19, in which Horace likens himself to a retired gladiator and then, in quick succession, to an ancient horse and a drifting ship. This is one thing that does emerge very clearly from West's studies, that Horace can switch metaphors with an audacity and ease that is unparalleled in any other ancient author. The third chapter brings in the fourth Georgic and Columella to elucidate a passage in Epistles I.3,20-29, where the young poet Iulius Florus is compared to a bee, but West shows that Horace has gone much further into detail than the traditional metaphor. Other passages that he deals with are *Epp.* I.1,28-42; I.7,10-13; I.10,14-25; I.19,41-49; II.1,13-17 and II.2,109-125 before returning to consider two of Horace's love poems, *Odes* I.11 and I.13.

Criticism of Horace's amatory poems has been particularly bedevilled by that modern desire for "involvement" and "realism" to which I referred earlier. Did Horace actually have all these love affairs or are his sighs simply the result of skilful manipulation of literary conventions — and therefore "hackneyed" and "artificial"? This form of argument, combined with an equally fashionable predilection for poetry about sex rather than about love, has led to a grave misunderstanding of many of the Odes and to the modern preference for Catullus over Horace, reached *via* innumerable tiresome and, to my mind, irrelevant comparisons between the two poets. Happily West does not belong to the "involvement" school and in his final chapter on General Principles does much to under-
mine this critical standpoint, shaky at the best of times. But we are getting ahead; with 1.11 and 1.13 he is still in hot pursuit of the imagery. In 1.11 he draws attention to the agricultural metaphors of *spatio brevi / spem longam reseces* (lines 6-7), a reference to tree pruning and the famous *carpe diem*, which he would connect with the gathering of the grapes. Could *vina liques* also be a reference to the farmer’s year? It is usually taken to refer to the straining of the wine just before drinking but the new wine also has to be strained after its primary fermentation and this is a job for the early winter. If it is true that the poet does have in mind here this type of wine straining, as well as winter pruning and fruit picking, all tasks of the autumn and early winter, then we can clearly see the transition in thought from the *winter* of line 4 and we also glimpse an implicit contrast between the neurotic existence of the city dwellers, seeking to know the future from the astrologers that abound at Rome, and the farmer who wisely attends to the present as he follows the perpetual turn of the seasons but whose every action proclaims his implicit trust in the future.

West states that “a main purpose of this book is to attempt to reclaim Odes I.13” (p.65). That he does not succeed in this is due, I feel, to an incorrect interpretation of the imagery here. He asks himself a number of questions about the physiological description of love that Horace gives in lines 4-8 and concludes, wrongly, that Horace’s liver is boiling and that the metaphor is taken from cookery. In fact, the origins of the comparison are to be sought in medicine, not cookery. Horace elsewhere refers to the liver as the site of the passions of love and anger and the swelling of the bile accompanies the rise of these emotions. This is a traditional idea that, when combined by Galen with Hippocrates’ more sensible statements about the four bodily fluids, gave rise to the theory of the four temperaments, which was to be the basis of mediaeval medicine. In this poem Horace is attacked by both love and anger. Consequently his liver swells with bile, which is a hot fluid (hence *fervens*), and this causes a change in his temperament (*mens*). His complexion grows pallid (*color*) and he begins to sweat (*umor in genas*). Although caused by love the outward symptoms are just like those of a man with a malarial fever, which, according to Hippocrates, was caused by an excess of overheated bile. It is just as irrelevant to mention cooking pots and boiling here as it would be to mention them whenever someone’s heart swells, or
brims over, with love, or whatever, in a modern romance. *Macerer* (line 8), which West makes a cornerstone of his argument, in that it is "cook's Latin", need not be a stumbling block; from the time of Plautus it is often found in a transferred sense and it would seem more natural to take it that way here.9

In the second part of his short book West turns to the analysis of several of the first nine Odes of Book I, in which Horace parades the various metres he is going to use. Here there are chapters on the first Ode, I.2 and III.21 (*O nata mecum*), I.5, I.7 and I.8 before the final section on General Principles. He draws a closer parallel in I.7 between Plancus and the legend of Teucer than other commentators are prepared to do; much depends upon how far the insinuations of fratricide levelled against Plancus by Velleius Paterculus are to be believed. In dealing with I.5 and I.8 he takes a stand against Quinn’s excessively colourful interpretations and quite rightly rejects that writer’s attempt to make the latter poem a serious satire directed against the recently revived *Lusus Troianus*, but, like so many before him, he does not succeed in catching and explaining that elusive quality, which has made the ode to Pyrrha so well loved, though he does isolate a nice Horatian curl of the lip in *gracilis.puer*. As West points out, Horace was by this time middle-aged and paunchy! In his final chapter West makes a last plea to those who would understand Horace, or any other writer for that matter; to study and respect the writer’s language (what a relief to find a statement of this kind after reading in an American classical journal not two years ago the preposterous pronouncement that “some of the best translations we have published were written by poets with no, or next to no, Greek and Latin”10), to divest ourselves as far as possible of modern prejudices that are different from the poet’s, and to get rid of our notion that a poem is only “good” if it deals with “real life”. This approach to poetry, or to art of any kind, is not an easy one, but, in the case of Horace, West has shown how rewarding it can be.

J.E.G. Whitehorne

NOTES

1. Taken as the latter by both Wickham and Kiessling-Heinze.
2. Various interpretations of the ode are summarized by C.C. Esler, CW 62(1969), 300-305.
3. iecur - Odes I.25,15; IV.1,12; Satires I.9,66; Epp.I.18,72. bilis - 
   Epode 11,16; Satires I.9,66; II.3,141; Epp.I.19,20.
4. LSJ s.v. ἃπαρ.
5. Hippocrates, Nat. Hom. IV.
6. Hippocrates, Nat. Hom. XV.
7. TLL s.v. macero.