Chapter 6, 'Philology and Textual Cleansing', persuasively attacks emendation and excision of V.'s text aimed at removing moral ambiguities. This nineteenth-century sport would be wholly a straw man now were it not for its recent revival in the work of such a distinguished scholar as Otto Zwierlein (and his pupil Robert Cramer), and T. has predictable fun here with attempts to rewrite the Shield of Aeneas and the Parade of Heroes. Chapters 7 and 8 discuss the appropriation of V. by fascism (see esp. on Goebbels and the *Georgics*, pp. 228–35), and the counter-appropriation of anti-fascists such as Hermann Broch and Francesco Sforza. Chapter 9 deals with the end of the poem: T. is right to stress the openness of V.'s closure and to attack those who seek to eliminate its ambivalence in the tradition of Mapheo Vegio's reconciliatory thirteenth book, and the conflict of different types of *pietas* which T. praises as an analysis of the ethics of the *Aeneid* (pp. 110–12) is surely relevant again here (revenge for Pallas conflicts with *clementia*). But ambivalence about the killing of Turnus can coexist with a generally Augustan view of the poem, just as regret about the destruction inherent in the civil wars can coexist with acquiescence in the new Augustan order.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford S. J. HARRISON

PATRONAGE IN HORACE

P. L. BOWDITCH: *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage*. Pp. xi + 281. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 2001. Paper, £22.50. ISBN: 0-520-22603-8.

J. P. Sullivan once remarked: 'the Romans were not interested in some of the subjects that interest us or, at least, in the way they interest us. The Romans were interested in money, but not in economics; they were interested in literature, but not interested in literary criticism' ('The Politics of Elegy' *Arethusa* 5 [1972], 17). How, then, does one speak of these things? It is precisely this problem of shifting epistemic frameworks and the potential therein for anachronism that P. L. Bowditch addresses in her book. Studies of literary patronage often run afoul of literary critics and historians when insisting on the economic dimension of such delicate relations as those between Horace and Maecenas. Literary scholars denounce economic reductionism, arguing that the exquisite ironies of the text can never be a mere product of the exchange of utilitarian values. Historians cry anachronism, noting that the poets speak in terms of gifts (*munera*) and friendship (*amicitia*), not economic relations.

Of course, the fact that ancient poets do not talk about economic systems or their relation to the production of literary texts no more means that these things did not exist than does the fact that ancient physics knew nothing of subatomic particles proves that they did not exist. Nonetheless, the ancients did not perceive the relation between economics and literature, between commodity exchange and aesthetic production, in the same manner as we do. B. proposes an original solution to this problem by turning to the resources of anthropology and Marcel Mauss's notion of a gift economy. More particularly, she makes use of Karl Polanyi's distinction 'between capitalist societies that possess "an institutionally separate motivationally distinct economic sphere of exchange" and those in which "the elements of the economy are embedded in non-economic institutions" ', such as kinship systems, religious rituals, and forms of artistic patronage (p. 39). The power of B.'s use of this insight is that it turns the charges of anachronism and reductionism on their heads. The assertion that the literary cannot be reduced to the economic assumes that the two realms

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.294 Published online by Cambridge University Press

already exist as separate forms that can then be correlated with one another as base to superstructure. Yet, insofar as relations of cultural, political, and economic exchange are embedded in the same institutional structures, it becomes impossible to talk about them in isolation. Rather, it is those who believe that economic exchange can be separated from aesthetic and interpersonal relations who are engaging in anachronism and reductionism.

B. uses her understanding of the embedded nature of ancient economic relations to offer a persuasive reading of Horace's *Odes* and *Epistles*. The argument is that while *amicitia* in Rome could take on many meanings, from the mutual respect and affection outlined in Cicero's *De Amicitia* to cruder forms of patronage found in the same author's letters to Julius Caesar on behalf of Trebatius, it always rested on an ideal of reciprocal *beneficia*. 'The true gift, in so far as it does not look for a return, should stir an equally spontaneous voluntary and unconstrained gratitude' (p. 36). The ideology of gift exchange that underlay the institution of *amicitia* was such that the relation could never, and should never, be reduced to a crude calculation of mutual benefits that would be dissolved once a balance of payments had been achieved. Rather, the *officia* of *amicitia* were supposed to create lasting affective ties of mutual obligation that also entailed real material benefits.

In some cases, reciprocating benefactions would be offered directly to the original provider. In others, the debt incurred would be greater than could be repaid directly, and so would create an excess margin of *gratia* that would then result in further benefactions offered to a wider set of friends and *clientes*. The ideal result was an ever-widening web of mutual support and aid. With the consolidation of the principate and the centralization of patronage in the hands of a person to whom full reciprocation was by definition never possible, that web of mutual support came to emanate from a single center to which one was always necessarily in debt. In the *Odes* the figure of the *vates* makes 'the gift of ideology' in the form of an aestheticized sacrificial expiation of the sins of the republic. This public benefaction, which in the case of the 'Roman Odes' offers an image of the state as healed and whole, is a 'spontaneous' gift of gratitude in reciprocation for the benefits provided by Maecenas and the *princeps*, as symbolized by the Sabine farm.

This same aesthetic sublimation of the material into the ideological ideal allows the poet in the *Epistles* to transform the Sabine farm into an icon of the *locus amoenus*. In a careful reading of pastoral motifs in the *Epistles*, B. argues that this transformation permits the farm to serve as the image of Epicurean withdrawal, allowing a switch in registers from *amicitia* as an institution of patronage and mutual benefaction to that of a non-hierarchical relation between equals. Horace deploys an ambiguity in the very notion of *amicitia* to effect a change in the nature of his relationship with Maecenas as he simultaneously switches genres from hieratic lyric to philosophical epistle. Yet, as 1.14, the epistle to the bailiff of the poet's Sabine farm, reveals, the very possibility of Epicurean withdrawal, which allows the refiguring of the poet's relationship with his patron, is predicated on a hierarchy of economic relations between the poet and his servant. Thus, Horace's attempt on one level to disembed the economic from the affective, to separate personal from economic exchange, is dependent on its reinstantiation at another. The Sabine farm is the token of that which guarantees the poet's independence and signifies his never-ending entanglement in a vast and complex web of interpenetrating personal, cultural, political, and economic exchanges.

University of South Carolina PAUL ALLEN MILLER

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.294 Published online by Cambridge University Press