The collection ends with two papers relating in various ways to the *Nachleben* of Proclus' mathematical theory in particular. Mario Otto Helbing ('La fortune des Commentaires de Proclus sur le premier livre des *Élements* d'Euclide à l'époque de Galilée') gives an enlightening account of the influence of Proclus' commentary in the Renaissance, in the aftermath of its first edition in 1533, followed by its translation into Latin by Baroccius in 1560; and Giovanni Sommaruga ('The Nature of Mathematical Objects in Proclus and in Contemporary Philosophy of Mathematics') provides a rather less successful, but still interesting, attempt to relate Proclus' position to various modern theories, including those of Quine and Benacerraf, but mainly that of a lady mathematician unfamilar to me, Patricia Maddy.

There is inevitably a certain amount of overlapping between the papers collected here, but overall they constitute a most valuable exploration of the Neoplatonic doctrine of the rôle of mathematics in philosophy and the status of its objects.

*Trinity College, Dublin* JOHN DILLON

## VIRGIL AND THE CONSPIRACY THEORISTS

R. F. Thomas: *Virgil and the Augustan Reception.* Pp. xx + 324. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-521-78288-0.

Hot on the heels of Richard Thomas's *Reading Virgil and his Texts* (Ann Arbor, 1999), collecting two decades of his important papers (reviewed by Andrew Zissos in *CR* 51 [2000], 251–3), comes this second volume from one of the liveliest and most forceful of modern Virgilian scholars. The overall argument of the book is that the optimistic and positive 'Augustan reception' of Virgil (hereafter V.) is as much a cultural construction as the pessimistic and ambivalent reception associated with the so-called 'Harvard school', of which T. himself is a noted exponent, and also that it is an unpersuasive view. The case is made with T.'s typical zest, learning, and pugnacity, which make the book a particular pleasure to engage with, even (or especially) for those who, like me, do not wholly agree with his views. This major contribution will certainly put new fire into an old debate.

In his 'Prologue' T. lays out his eclectic methodology: 'philology, broadly defined, so as to include, for instance, narratology, reception theory, some deconstruction, and an occasional dose of New Historicism' (p. xv). This is laudable both for its transparency and its inclusivity, but it is interesting to see the omission of New Criticism, for it is by a New Critical appeal to the close interpretation of V.'s texts and their ironies and ambivalences that T. often seeks to justify his views. And though T. departs from New Criticism in laying some claim to historicism, it is perhaps through the overall cultural context of the Augustan period (Zanker, Galinsky) that his thesis can be most effectively challenged. Furthermore, the 'Augustan reception' that he attacks often seems too monolithic and undifferentiated; many, like myself, feel able to separate out, for example, the *Aeneid*'s rhetorically effective contributions to Augustan propaganda from its clearly tragic/realistic view of the price of Aeneas' political achievement. There can, I think, be a spectrum within 'Augustanism', while for T. once any ambiguity is admitted the 'Augustan' interpretation falls.

An introductory section lays out 'The Critical Landscape', and includes a typical textual argument. At 6.791–2 Augustus is associated by the speaker Anchises with the Golden Age: *aurea condet/saecula.* T. does not here use his argument (often effective

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.292 Published online by Cambridge University Press

elsewhere) that this statement is spoken in character-voice and cannot be attributed to the author, but instead claims that *condet* means 'bring to a close' and not 'found'. Though T. makes a good point of Latinity here (*condere* with *saecula* is certainly anomalous), it seems more convincing for the linguistic innovation to be explained by the ktistic context (Augustus is, of course, here out of chronological order after Romulus to justify their pairing as founding figures; cf. Suet. *Aug*. 7.2), and the attribution of the Golden Age to the Augustan period is common elsewhere (cf. e.g. K. Galinsky, *Augustan Culture* [Princeton, 1996], pp. 90–121) and (I would argue against T., pp. 50–1; cf. *PLLS* 9 [1996], 127–33) clearly expressed at *Aeneid* 1.291.

The first chapter proper, 'Virgil and Augustus', persuasively backs the bottom-up approach to Augustan poetic patronage of Peter White's 'promised verse' against Syme's top-down 'organization of opinion'. But this could be thought to shift rather than close the debate: political collusion can be a bottom-up as well as a top-down process, and the wide cultural diffusion of 'Augustan' elements evident in the work of, for example, Zanker are crucial here (though Z. is given short shrift by T.). T.'s case here for the negative aspect of the Jupiter/Augustus comparison can be countered by evidence from the Hellenistic poets which T. himself has been so effective in using in Virgilian interpretation: Callimachus *H*. 1.79–80 and Theocritus 17.1–4 surely show us the ruler/Jupiter equivalence in unambiguous encomia.

Chapter 2 traces links with Horace, Ovid, and Lucan. The case that V. is addressed somewhat casually at *Odes* 4.12 and was not so close to Horace as generally imagined is interestingly made. The obvious obstacle *Odes* 1.3 *animae dimidium meae* is treated as depreciatingly pseudo-erotic and literary, but such language can be used between close poetic friends (Catullus to Calvus in poem 50), and the honorific position of *Odes* 1.3 in the book (after Maecenas and, in effect, Augustus) is surely significant. Ovid's subversive finding of gaps and slippages in his version of the *Aeneid* in *Met.* 13–14 (see now Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext* [Cambridge, 1998], pp. 107–19) is no surprise, nor Lucan's inversion in his anti-Virgilian epic on the self-destruction of Rome.

Chapter 3 argues that the Servian commentary consistently distorts V.'s texts to glorify Aeneas. Though this is certainly a Servian purpose, the examples chosen can again be challenged: the explanation of *Aen.* 12.7 *latronis* (implied comparison with Aeneas in a simile) is surely the focalization of Turnus here (and the gloss *venatoris* may in any case not be tendentious), while at *G*. 2.498 *res Romanae perituraque regna* can look to Rome's destruction of foreign kingdoms rather than the end of the non-*regnum* Rome itself, and at *G*. 2.172 *imbellem . . . Indum* could be post-Alexander ethnography and encomiastic rather than subversive.

Chapters 4–8 spread out a rich tapestry of important Augustanizing receptions to which the limits of this review cannot do even scant justice, and which will be required reading for anyone interested in Virgilian reception. Chapters 4 and 5 give a fascinatingly contextualized account of the ideologies of Dryden's massively influential translation and of some of its successors, approaching again the old problem of Aeneas' abandonment of Dido and their 'marriage' (add here the excellent *Reading Dido* [Minneapolis and London, 1994] of Marilynn Desmond). I would argue against T. that Aeneas is subject to understandable conflicts of *pietas*, that here as elsewhere (e.g. in the loss of Creusa) even a culpable Aeneas is not an anti-Augustan Aeneas, and that it was not Augustus who in Virgil's lifetime experienced political problems through erotic entanglement with a queen from North Africa. Aeneas cannot always be a cipher for Augustus, and the literary demands of rounded and ambivalent characterization which give us a complex Aeneas differ from the demands of politics which give us a simpler Augustus.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.292 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/52.2.292 Published online by Cambridge University Press