

*EXEGI MONUMENTUM: A NEW COMMENTARY
ON HORACE, ODES III**

With the appearance of A.J. Woodman's commentary on *Odes* 3, the Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics series (informally known as the Green and Yellows) completes its coverage of the works of Horace, which began in 1989 with Niall Rudd's commentary on the literary epistles. Over the years the Green and Yellow commentaries in general have tended to become longer and more advanced, and this commentary of Woodman (hereafter W.) continues that trend. At 304 pages, it is by some distance the fullest commentary of the set; for comparison, in 2012 Roland Mayer dispatched *Odes* 1 in a trim 176 pages. In its level of detail W.'s work approaches, though without equaling, the standard reference commentary of R.G.M. Nisbet and Niall Rudd, published in 2004 (hereafter referred to as N-R).

It is W.'s great merit to have approached these familiar poems with a fresh eye and to have confronted their many interpretative challenges in an independent spirit. Not every divergence from received opinion commands assent, but one must admire W.'s willingness to swim against the tide.

A substantial introduction (pp. 1-42) deals with a wide range of topics relating to *Odes* 3 and the *Odes* in general: "Politics and Poetry," "Book 3," "Vocabulary," "Models and Metres," "Artiste de Sons," "Scholarship," and "The Text." I select a few noteworthy items for comment.

W. has ingeniously detected an asclepiad line in the famous inscription recording Horace's composition of the *Carmen Saeculare*: CARMEN COMPOSUIT QVINTVS HORATIVS [FLACCVS] (cf. *CQ* 69, 2019, 911-12). As he notes, "In identifying the author of the *Carmen Saeculare*, the sentence also acknowledges the collection of poems which won him the commission."

The question of H.'s attitude toward Augustus is treated by W. as a matter of etiquette and dismissed in a sentence. Speaking of H.'s praise of Maecenas (and presumably of Augustus as well), W. writes: "modern attempts to suggest ... that Horace is somehow subversive and that his praise of such great men is not to be taken at face value—are based on a mistaken view of Roman social conventions and the reciprocity expected between friends" (p. 8). W.'s view of H. as a full-throated supporter of Augustus informs some of his more debatable interpretative choices, such as his treatment of the final stanza of 3.6 (on which see below).

W. rejects the title "Roman Odes" for 3.1-6. In his characteristic style, he writes that "the title is absurd: it implies that the other eighty-two odes in Books 1-3, even though written in the language of the Romans by a Roman poet who lived and worked

* A.J. WOODMAN, *Horace: Odes Book III*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021, xiii+398 pp., €29.17, ISBN 978-1-108-74054-8 (paperback).

in Rome and its immediate vicinity, are somehow *not* Roman” (p. 12). That argument seems highly contrived: as W. knows, the justification for the title “Roman Odes” is that these six poems reflect on the current state and direction of Rome, and on the meaning of being Roman, in a sustained way that is unique in the collection. (The fact that the final ode in the sequence is addressed to an unnamed “Roman” may also have played a part.) In support of his claim that the title “Roman Odes” stems from the belief that H. is really a Greek poet who happened to write in Latin, W. adduces several comments from N-R that call attention to the Roman setting or situation of a given ode. That is a mere distraction. The odes differ widely in the degree to which they refer to specifically Roman surroundings and customs, and it is entirely within a commentator’s brief to note the presence or absence of such markers. In any case, I doubt that W.’s preferred designation, “Alcaic Hexad,” will supplant “Roman Odes” in common usage.

W. also rejects the idea that 1-6 form a single long poem, and here he seems to me to be on solid ground. His counterargument attempts to rebut the axiom that “poems change when the meter changes” by pointing to places where the meter *seems* not to change when a new poem begins (e.g., where successive poems are in different Asclepiad forms, and the change is not apparent until the second or third line of the new poem).

On the issue of arrangement of poems, W. acknowledges small-scale patterns but declines to follow (e.g.) Matthew Santirocco in discerning more elaborate forms of arrangement.

A discussion of poems that imply a dramatic situation (including provocative accounts of 3.19 and 3.26) segues into the question of whether the first-person in such dramatized poems is to be identified as H. W.’s conclusion is judicious: “although it is natural and convenient to assume that in most of the odes, for most of the time, the speaker is Horace himself, the demonstrable exceptions show that the assumption of roles is an aspect of his lyric *uarietas*” (p. 21).

On the matter of word order W. argues (against Nisbet) that mimetic word order is “in fact ... very common” (p. 26, with examples). H.’s facility with words is said to be the key to his memorable *sententiae* (although one may doubt that an example such as *uis consili expers mole ruit sua* is really “in common parlance today,” p. 26).

W.’s discussion of intertextuality focuses on an alleged “mismatch” between H.’s references to Sappho and Alcaeus as models and his limited verbal allusions to their poetry. W. suggests that H. saw his debt to them primarily in metrical terms. One might wish to modify his argument by noting that more verbal allusions to Sappho and Alcaeus would probably be recognizable if we had more of their poetry, as is suggested by the example of Sappho’s “Brothers Poem” alluded to in 1.9. The question could also be considered more comprehensively by noting H.’s allusions to the larger canon of Greek lyric (as in Michèle Lowrie’s detection of a “second parade” of lyric models in *Odes* 1.12-18 (*Phoenix* 49, 1995, 33-49), and Michael Sullivan’s 2021 *JRS* article on 1.1).

Also on H.’s relationship to Sappho and Alcaeus, W. disputes Nisbet’s view that H. saw Alcaeus as the primary member of the pair. W. sees both as equally important, and their equivalence as a response to the gender dualism of Catullus.

On meter, W. observes that if 3.12 is arranged as four four-line stanzas, the number of lines in poems 1-6 is exactly half the total of lines in the remaining 24 poems (336 to 672), which he argues is not likely to be a coincidence. Hence any attempt to bracket lines as interpolated (and specifically 3.11.17-20) is to be rejected. (See also below on 3.12.)

The section headed “Artiste de sons” produces examples of assonance, alliteration, and soundplay (again *contra* Nisbet). W. briefly considers the question of performance, firmly rejecting the idea.

W.’s brief survey of scholarship concentrates on commentaries in English (plus Syndikus), with pride of place given to Nisbet and Hubbard and N-R. W. gestures in the general direction of other critical writing (“their quantity is such that it is almost impossible even to keep track of them, let alone read and study them,” p. 38).

W.’s treatment of manuscripts and text is generous in comparison with that of other Horatian commentaries in the series, but makes no claim to a full discussion. So, for example, he lists six manuscripts that are accessible digitally, but does not mention several others of equal importance to editors that do not currently have digital access. He says nothing about relationships among the manuscripts. (It would be useful for readers to at least be told that the transmission is sufficiently contaminated as to rule out the application of stemmatic methods.) He briefly cites the textual articles of Charles Brink, George Goold’s privately printed edition, the Teubners of Istvan Borszák and D.R. Shackleton Bailey, both reviewed by Nisbet, and Nisbet’s own conjectures. (Since W. expresses interest in how Nisbet’s conjectures will fare in the new OCT edition that I am preparing, I may say that, while I admire the fertility of mind that produced them, only a few are likely to be cited in the critical apparatus.)

W. includes an abbreviated critical apparatus that does not refer to individual manuscripts but simply distinguishes between manuscript readings and conjectures. Where the manuscripts disagree, only their readings are cited (e.g., on 3.12 the apparatus reads “bibet] bibit”). This procedure seems well suited to the needs of the series’ readers.

The introduction concludes with a brief discussion of problems of presentation (upper- vs. lower-case, marking direct speech with quotation marks).

In contrast to the practice of the other Horace commentaries in the series, W.’s text is notably innovative. He has printed eight of his own conjectures and accepted several others that had not appeared in the most recent critical editions. The results are mixed: some of W.’s proposals deserve consideration and merit at least mention in a future critical apparatus, while others will probably encounter strong resistance. (All references in the following list are to poems in Book 3.)

- 4.10 W. accepts Bentley’s *sedulae*, arguing that “the domestic detail [in the transmitted *Pulliae*] seems quite out of place.” But the obscure local place names in the following stanza have a similar feel to them, and it seems unlikely that an uncommon but genuine proper name would have been generated through scribal error.

- 4.46 Bentley’s *umbras*, which is almost certainly correct (it is printed by SB and endorsed by N-R), is noted in W.’s apparatus but receives no comment.

- 6.11 W. adopts Bentley's *nostrorum*, taking it with *praedam* to produce the "surreal" image of the Parthian wearing the captured Roman as a prize. The concrete character of *adiecisse ... torquibus exiguis* tells against this interpretation.

- 11.17-20 In this much-discussed passage W. offers another replacement for the transmitted *eius atque*, namely, *atque agatur*. This seems rather colorless compared to Bentley's *exeatque* or Cunningham's *aestuatque*, as well as being farther removed from the paradisis. I continue to think that the stanza is an interpolation, elaborating the reference to Cerberus as *immanis ... ianitor aulae* in lines 15-16.

- 11.52 W. mounts a vigorous defense of the variant *sculpe* against the commonly accepted *scalpe*: it anagrammatizes *sepulcro*, and *sculpta* is used "in a related sense" in Ov. *her.* 14.128 ("it seems reasonable to infer that Ovid is taking his cue from H.").

- 14.11 W. (following Quinn) accepts J. Gow's *expectate* for *expertae* and renders *uirum expectate* as "await the hero" (i.e., Augustus). Gow's conjecture is probably among the "other interpretations, some quite implausible" referred to by N-R; on it Nisbet had earlier remarked that "after *puellae* this would naturally mean 'await your husband'" (*PLLS* 4, 1983, 119, n. 17).

- 14.20 W. conjectures *testis*, of which the transmitted *testa* would be an easy corruption, but the sense is perhaps less obvious than he allows (it is not immediately clear that the *testis* is the *cadus* of line 18).

- 18.10 As W. notes, the description raises some problems if the date is early December (e.g., the grassy plain, *herboso ... campo* 9). He admits that his proposal (*Apriles* for *Decembres*) is "radical"; the suggestion that a scribe altered *Apriles* to *Decembres* because of a misunderstanding of *pleno ... anno* (5) is also bold. He does not mention Andrea Cucchiarelli's even more radical suggestion of deleting 9-16 (*MD* 68, 2012, 203-21). On closer inspection the lines do look like a jumble of oddly assorted details (why the Golden Age *adynaton* of 13, for example?).

- 20.8 W. conjectures *an magis* for the transmitted *maior an*; this gives straightforward sense, and he is right to say that attempts to explain the transmitted text (or to emend it, as with Peerlkamp's *illa* for *illi*) have not been persuasive.

- 24.4 N-R write "it is absurd to alter the transmitted and characteristically specific *Tyrrhenum* in order to support the variant *publicum*" (which is exactly what W. does).

- 24.37 W.'s *inculta* is well worth considering.

- 24.54 No mention of Bentley's almost certainly correct *firmandae* for *formandae* or of Cornelissen's *rudi* for *rudis* (adopted by N-R).

- 25.12 W. reads *quam* for *ut*; an unlikely corruption, and *quam* (as W. admits) causes ambiguity with the preceding *lustratam Rhodopen*.

- 26.7 W.'s *acutos* merits consideration, partly because it is not far from the transmitted *et arcus*. Giangrande's *aduncos* has a similar attraction; it is called "fort. recte" by SB.

- 27.13 In another much-emended passage W. proposes *si licet* for *sis licet*; he glosses this as "(i.e., by the gods)," but that idea is not easily supplied, and it weakens H.'s wish for Galatea to introduce the notion of divine permission.

- 27.41 W. accepts Sanadon's *quam*, which is probably right ("note should be taken" N-R, "fort. recte" SB).

- 29.33 W. prefers R's *ferentur*, which he calls "much more natural" than the more widely attested *feruntur*.

- 30.2 W. has saved his most provocative new suggestion for the final poem: he proposes *aptius* instead of the transmitted *altius*. Of W.'s three objections to *altius*, only the first seems persuasive, i.e., that *situs* does not mean "decay." The second, that *situs* in the sense of "site" is inappropriate because the site of the Pyramids was not conspicuously high, looks like nitpicking, while the third, that "lofty" is an inappropriate description of a collection that includes invitations to drinking and sex, is too literal-minded. W.'s invocation of Pindar (*Pythian* 6.7-14) in support of *aptius* involves some sleight-of-hand: because Pindar uses a word that means "ready," "there must be a strong likelihood that H. described his *monumentum* of odes as *aptius*, which regularly means 'ready'"—although it does *not* mean "ready" here! W. does not offer a translation of the whole line with *aptius*; doing so shows that the sense is not obvious ("a monument better suited than the royal site of the Pyramids"—"better suited" for what?) and also that W. has not solved the problem of *situs*, since what H. is asserting is surely not that his monument is "better suited" than the site of the Pyramids, but "better suited" than the Pyramids themselves. W. does not discuss the idea that *situs* means "resting place," which N-R consider possible: "taller than the resting place of the Pyramids" would mean "taller than the resting place that the Pyramids make up," i.e., "taller than the Pyramids."

- 30.13-14 W. accepts the inversion of the adjectives proposed by Fuss and revived by Kovacs, *Aeolios carmen ad Italum / deduxisse modos* in place of *Aeolium carmen ad Italos / deduxisse modos*; that is worth considering, and the framing word order is another attraction. On the other hand, one hesitates to replace a difficult phrase with one so straightforward.

The commentary is organized in the form now standard for commentaries on the *Odes*, an introductory essay that in this case ranges in length from a single paragraph to several pages, followed by the lemmatized notes.

In the Preface to his commentary on *Odes* 2, Stephen Harrison wrote that "a commentary on Horace's *Odes* must lean especially heavily on Nisbet and Hubbard's classic work of a generation ago" (p. vii). W. too draws liberally on N-H: he cites them some 140 times, mostly for documentation of conventional themes and language. His treatment of N-R is very different: he has exerted considerable effort to remain independent of them and of what he calls their "authoritativeness" (p. 37), not allowing himself to consult them until a first draft of his own commentary had been completed. When he cites them, it is more often to express criticism or disagreement, sometimes in sharp terms (e.g., 1.14-15 "quite irrelevant to the ode," 1.36-7 "pointless and perverse," 14.22 "limp in the extreme ... mistaken the point," 19 intro n. 98 "desperately artificial," n. 99 "unfortunately misunderstood," 26 intro "feeble ... contradicted by details in the poem itself," 27.13 "completely implausible," 30.13-14 "completely counter-intuitive"). A reader whose knowledge of N-R was derived exclusively from W.'s references would form the impression that their commentary consisted largely of misguided conjectures and interpretations, and would be puzzled by W.'s reference to their "authoritativeness."

W. is on the whole sparing with the sort of evaluative judgments on poems that characterize N-H and N-R. Exceptions include 7: “the ode . . . in its wit, eroticism and concern for human relationships shows H. at his most characteristic—and his best” (p. 179); 9 “the ode is a dazzling example of Horatian humour and wit” (p. 200); 10 “a witty and self-deprecating vehicle for the celebration of wifely fidelity” (p. 207), 30 “the brilliance of this final ode” (p. 372). On 29 W. pulls out the stops, quoting laudatory comments from other critics (e.g., from N-R on the “breadth and majesty of its scope,” which he echoes in his own reference to its “majestic sweep”).

W. is also sparing with references to secondary critical literature. One does not get the sense of a commentator regularly in dialogue with other interpreters. Exceptions include Ian Du Quesnay and Francis Cairns, who are cited often and always with respect. On the other hand, references to historical and other non-literary scholarship are frequent and admirably up to date.

Out of a much larger number of noteworthy comments I have chosen the following for discussion. In the manner of reviews, the selection tends toward places where I am not persuaded by W.’s arguments. (Poem numbers appear in parentheses.)

(1) W. takes *musarum sacerdos* (3) literally, and treats 1-40 as a “priestly utterance” distinct from 41-8, which are a “personal statement” in H.’s own voice. (He pondered whether to set 1-40 off within quotation marks (p. 42), but opted not to do so.) So sharp a distinction between voices risks suggesting that the thoughts expressed in the final stanzas have no relevance to the audience of 1-40, which is not the case.

Non prius audita (2-3) is understood as “not previously listened to, heeded” on the questionable grounds that poems extolling the virtues H. extols could not be described as “not previously heard.”

In 14-16 *Necessitas* is taken to refer to Fate, and the point is that “inequalities are an inexorable fact of life.” How does this square with *aequa lege*? W.’s answer is that Fate’s lottery is fair, since everyone has an equal chance of emerging as high or low. The more common interpretation, that *Necessitas* = death, is said to produce a point “quite irrelevant to the ode.” But it seems hard not to connect the *urna* of 16 with that of 2.3.26, which clearly refers to judgment passed on the dead. (W. does not note the parallel.)

W. rejects Nisbet’s *Sidone* for *sidere* (42) for three reasons: the sense is poor, the prosody irregular, and a Homeric comparison is eliminated. Nisbet had anticipated and rebutted the first two.

(4) W. disputes Fraenkel’s notion that the ode is heavily influenced by Pindar’s first Pythian, substituting Hesiod’s *Theogony* as the main Greek source of influence. But on 11 W. notes “it is striking that similar details are told about Pindar,” and the n. on 18-19 notes another parallel with lore surrounding Pindar. N-R’s introductory section adduces considerably more evidence of Pindaric influence than W.’s statements would suggest.

W. refers to “this difficult and controversial ode” (p. 124), but his general comment makes no reference to difficult or controversial elements (excluding the issue of Pindaric influence).

W. takes lines 42 to 64 as spoken by the Muses: “one of those places in Latin poetry where direct speech has no formal introduction but has to be inferred from the

context.” (A 2008 discussion by Alex Hardie, cited by W., also begins a speech by the Muses at this point.)

W. renders *in maius* (67) as “all the more”; with *prouehunt* one expects some reference to movement (“to greater heights” G. Williams and Rudd).

On 5.26-7 W. nicely comments “*additis damnum* is typically Horatian: one would expect a loss to be subtracted, not added.” W. is throughout sensitive to such details of phrasing, as on 5.36 *sensit iners* (“another of H.’s pointed juxtapositions”).

(6) The introductory discussion sets out W.’s approach to the apparent contradiction between the opening and closing stanzas: *Romane* is Augustus, *lues* means “expiate,” and since therefore “we can be confident that he will complete the restoration successfully,” lines 46-8 should be read as a question to which the implied answer is negative. “Rome’s traditional ability to deal with foreign threats ... will return, unimpeded by any moral decline.” This ignores the obvious direction of much of the ode, which graphically depicts Rome’s current degraded moral condition and pointedly contrasts it with the virtuous past. In other words, the decline of the present vis-à-vis the past is, according to H., an inescapable fact. If the only question is whether the future will be worse than the present, H. would be saying “yes, Rome has sadly declined from its heyday, but thanks to Augustus, at least the next generation won’t be worse than the present one.” Also, the implied answer to 45 (*damnosa quid non imminuit dies?*) is surely *nil*, which makes it hard to look for an exception in the following lines. (On 45, W. writes “Nevertheless the very fact that H. has expressed himself in the form of a question means that he has left open the possibility of a different answer; in this case the answer would be ‘time will not impair the future generation,’ *provided* the restoration of the temples and statues” etc.)

(7) W. suggests that the mythological *exempla* in 13-20 were not uttered by the go-between, but made up by H. to reassure Asterie, since they are palpably unlikely. He does not note that N-R came to a similar conclusion: “highly implausible ... perhaps it is best taken as a lighthearted fiction.”

(8) On 5 *docte sermones utriusque linguae* W. ties himself in knots by taking *sermones* as referring to Maecenas’ dialogues. N-R more gracefully allow for the possibility of a reference.

(9) It is surprising that more is not made of a comparison with Catullus 45. On line 18 (*diductosque iugo cogit aeneo*) one misses a reference to the less positive image in C. 1.33.10-12 *Veneri, cui placet impares / formas atque animas sub iuga aenea / saeuo mittere cum ioco*. (An observer of this scene might conclude that “Horace” and Lydia are also *impares animi*.) Peerlkamp’s *reiectoque* in 20 is rightly resisted, but not for the strongest reason, that it would put the blame for the breakup on Lydia, whereas the man has a much better chance of gaining his objective if he admits (or pretends to admit) that he was at fault.

(10) On 11 *difficilem* one might wish for a reference to the same adjective in 3.7.32, with the opposite advice (Asterie is urged to remain *difficilis*). I am not persuaded that in 13 ff. H. is depicting Lyce as a divinity; the only evidence that might point in that direction is *parcas* in 17, and while that appeal *can* be addressed to a divinity, it is hardly restricted to such use. (It is found in the very next ode of Hypermetra’s sparing her husband Lynceus, 3.11.46.)

(11) W. rightly sees the importance of Hypermestra's speech and of Hypermestra as a "standard-bearer for marriage"; but he threatens to undermine his interpretation by adopting Cairns's invocation of *charis* as covering a range of "para-serious" effects from the funny to the macabre. If that is a good description of the speech, why should Lyde be persuaded by it?

Dic in 6 seems problematic. If addressed to the lyre alone (so N-R), the opening vocative to Mercury is left hanging, but can *dic* be addressed to two entities (W., following Cairns)?

(12) W.'s treatment is revisionist in two ways. He arranges the lines in four-line stanzas (with Goold and Quinn, but against most editors). The resulting division of metra (2–2–4–2) strikes me as ungainly and unbalanced in comparison with the 4–4–2 arrangement adopted by SB and N-R. He also (following Cairns) rejects the widespread view that H. is imitating a poem of Alcaeus that is spoken by a young woman, Neobule; instead he takes it as addressed by H. to Neobule. His rhetoric on this second point is distinctly hectoring: "this scholarly edifice collapses," "not the slightest resemblance," "rid ourselves of the misconception," "no evidence whatsoever," Cairns's analysis "is exactly right." One would not infer from his discussion that the same view had been taken (in more measured terms) by N-R, who also note that Cairns was far from alone in his understanding of the poem.

W. takes N-R to task for nowhere mentioning the possibility of setting the poem in four-line stanzas. They do note that Heinze proposed to present it as a single four-line stanza of ten metra per line.

(13) It seems slightly odd that W.'s introductory section does not mention the last stanza, which might be thought to contain the *raison d'être* of the poem, although his notes on it duly cover the relevant points. He might have mentioned N-R's attractive suggestion that H. gave the spring near his Sabine estate the name of a landmark near his birthplace.

Incidentally, the little anthology of absurdities relating to the *fons Bandusiae* at the end of N-R's introduction is not to be missed (although one wishes that they had resisted the temptation to say that these notions "muddy the waters").

(14) W.'s interpretation of the opening stanza is correct, but his punctuation (with dashes setting off *modo* — *laurum*) seems unnecessarily fussy. On 5 *unico* W. is uncharacteristically noncommittal ("scholars disagree"); for discussion see my *Horace's Odes* (2020), 139–40.

(15) The idea that *fige modum* suggests that Chloris should put up a poster announcing her retirement from prostitution strains belief. W. rejects the idea that *ludere* in 5 refers to choral dances, but the phrasing (and the following line) requires some group activity, not just individual promiscuity.

(16) No mention of Bentley's *risisset* (7), which SB called "fort. recte" and N-R thought "may well be right." (W. is elsewhere quick to note H.'s use of the singular with more than one subject.)

W. assumes that line 8 means that Danae herself was bribed by Jupiter, and weaves a fanciful scenario of how this might have happened; N-R more plausibly take it as referring to bribing Danae's guards.

(17) It is not clear why the fact that there was more than one Lamus obviates the objection to *ducis* in 5. Nothing in H.'s text supports the notion that he is alluding to a multiplicity of Lami.

W. again follows Cairns, who interprets the poem as marking Lamia's birthday. N-R think this is ruled out because "the repetition of *cras* shows that the festivity is caused by the bad weather." That particular argument may not be persuasive, but the emphasis on the weather does seem significant. If H. meant us to think of the next day as Lamia's birthday, why not say so?

(19) W. understands the entire poem as taking place during a nocturnal *commisatio*; given the alternative explanations, this is at least worth considering. W. also thinks that the opening lines are addressed to Telephus, although the "nerdy" (W.'s word) figure of 1-4 does not seem to have much in common with the Adonis of 25-6. (Cf. N-R on 26: "this glittering young man cannot be the boring antiquarian of the opening stanza.")

11-12 are taken as a question, which does not seem to me to solve the problems of this difficult passage. (I must confess that much about this poem continues to puzzle me.)

(20) W. oddly calls this "one of the most challenging of all H.'s odes." One problem that W. unnecessarily creates is whether Pyrrhus has already stolen away Nearchus or is only considering doing so: the poem does not say clearly one way or the other, which suggests that the answer to the question is not important. W. himself opts for the first possibility (referring to Pyrrhus' "success in stealing Nearchus," n. on 3-5), without argument.

(21) W. takes *pia* (4) to mean "devoted," i.e., to its "twin," Horace. That seems strained, and less likely than N-R's "kindly, caring," said of a divinity.

W. ingeniously suggests that *quocumque nomine* in 5 plays on the blanket clause of hymns but uses *nomen* in a different sense ("purpose," as in *OLD* 26a). That removes the difficulty alleged by N-R and any need for emendation.

(22) W. takes *quam* (6) to refer to Diana herself, but that makes the reference to the dedication of the pine tree pointless. He does not see particular significance in the emphasis on assisting women in childbirth in 2-3 (unlike N-R, who indulge in atypical speculation about an illegitimate child of H. himself).

(23) On 18, after remarking that "there are almost as many different interpretations of this controversial line as there are interpreters," W. offers only one—his own. It is, however, a good one: "though not more persuasive by reason of an expensive victim." N-R translate the stanza as though 18 were postponed to the end.

(24) On 19-20, W. punctuates after *uirum*, separating *dotata* from *coniunx*; this seems very unnatural, and does not significantly alter the sense. Nisbet's *fallit* is very attractive (*fallit* altered to *fidit* after *nitido*); one wonders why he abandoned it (it is not mentioned in N-R).

On 27-8, W. argues forcefully against taking *pater urbium* together (i.e., against N-R, who in fact do not understand *pater urbium* as a title, but as a compressed way of referring to numerous inscriptions each of which names Augustus as *pater urbis* (+ specific city)).

(26) For this poem W. has produced a strikingly original scenario. The speaker (probably not to be identified as H.) is a komast heading toward Chloe's door; anticipating resistance, he has brought along crowbars. Then he stops in his tracks [at this point the poem begins] and reflects that he is too old for this sort of game. Catching sight of a shrine of Maritime Venus, he thinks it is a suitable site at which to dedicate the tools of his erotic career. But then he has second thoughts: perhaps a prayer to Venus will soften Chloe for one final encounter. He resumes his journey with renewed hope.

W. rejects the idea that the final line and a half unexpectedly undoes the earlier protestations of being done with love as "feeble"; it is not clear why. On this reading 3.26 would be a forerunner of 4.1, where H. similarly alleges that he has put love behind him only to have his resolve overwhelmed by longing for Ligurinus. In 3.26 the effect of the sudden turnaround would be comic, in 4.1 poignant.

C.P. Jones has suggested that the final lines are a wish that Chloe suffer unrequited love for another man, an attractive reading that N-R are inclined to accept. W. thinks that *semel* is "problematic" for this interpretation. Why would it not be equally problematic for his own? If by the end of the poem H. has hope that Chloe will be receptive, why should he limit his hope to one encounter? N-R take *semel* to imply that a single blow from Venus' whip will do the job (which could apply either to W.'s or to Jones's reading).

(27) W. ties the mythological narrative to the opening propempticon by suggesting that the happy ending to Europa's story actualizes the happiness that H. had wished for Galatea (i.e., H. ends up resigned to Galatea's leaving and wishes her well—although W. thinks that H. must have hoped for Galatea to reconsider after reading the ode). He also suggests, though tentatively, that the stress on the naming of Europe may have had Augustan connotations post-Actium.

W. probably goes too far in saying that Galatea belongs among the *impii* because she is leaving H.; that would be more than a "complication" for the logic of the opening section.

It is not likely (given *laceranda*) that *cornua* in 72 = "penis."

W. takes 73 as a question, thinking that the act of revelation is "much more effective if made explicitly." It may be a problem that Europa patently does not know that she is the wife of Jupiter.

(28) In this case W.'s employment of the term "mimetic" does not produce any startling results. But if the feast of Neptune being celebrated really was held on December 8th, as in the Athenian calendar (as W. thinks possible), H. would hardly have failed to note that this was also his birthday.

W. places an exclamation mark after 8; he does not discuss the alternative of taking the lines as a question (so N-R and Klingner).

(29) Lines 43 ff. are a rare case where W. accepts the *communis opinio* and I am inclined to depart from it. The great majority of eds. and comms. treat *uixi* as a one-word statement, but I am fully persuaded by SB's extension of the quotation to the end of the following stanza (48). (That possibility is not discussed by W., who refers only to Vollmer's clearly untenable idea that the quotation continues until the end of the poem.) The language of 44-8 (especially the imperative *occupato*) seems of a piece

with the assertive *uixi*, and the contents of the lines are almost a gloss on its meaning. Gordon Williams interestingly remarks that “the poet pretty well takes over this character as his own”—a conjunction that in my view is effectively expressed by having the character speak for H. At 49 the focus alters with the introduction of *Fortuna* and the tone also changes to a less lofty register.

In 53 W. flirts with the possibility that *celeris* is nom. modifying *Fortuna*, not acc. with *pennas*; that seems unlikely. His argument that “the point is not the speed at which Fortune flies but the suddenness with which she can take off” verges on hair-splitting, and does not reckon with the common phenomenon of transferred epithet.

The volume concludes with a Select Bibliography, an ample General Index, and an Index of Latin Words.

Slips are extremely rare. The note on 3.16.33-4 should probably be headed 33-44, and in the note on 3.15.5 “Chloe” should be “Chloris.”

As the foregoing pages have shown, this commentary is brimful of novel ideas and interpretations. I find a number of them unconvincing, but others may react more sympathetically; whatever view one takes, engaging with Tony Woodman’s innovative thoughts is always an invigorating experience, and one that anyone interested in Horace will want to have.

R.J. TARRANT
Harvard University
tarrant@fas.harvard.edu

