

we find the man for whom relating the sack of Troy was to reopen an ‘unspeakable grief’ (2.3) imposing exactly the same fate on Latinus’ city in order to attain his end (and claiming divine support in doing so). Yes, Aeneas will achieve his goal; yes, so has (the now) Augustus – but the tragedy of the *Aeneid* lies in the sort of person each of them had to become in order to win this success. The first simile of the poem, as P. notes (and devotes considerable space to), has the man of *pietas* overcoming the *furor* of a mob; but this is answered by the final simile, a nightmare one of impotence and silence (*Aen.* 12.908–12). Aeneas’ killing of Turnus, the poem’s closing act, shows that even within the self-proclaimed embodiment of *pietas*, *furor* wins out in the end. And there is nothing one can do or say, no spin one can apply, to alter this fact. That is this poet’s final response to the post-Philippi world.

On pp. 122–4 P. engages in a long polemic against those who believe that Virgil is ‘innocent’ of the kind of partisanship for which he is arguing, saying that it is ‘symptomatic of a wishfulness in the interpretation of Virgil which is widespread among critics’. This is a dangerous argument to use. Not only does it imply that all those who disagree with P.’s interpretation are guilty of imposing their own prejudices on the text, but it could also just as easily be employed by an unkind critic against P. himself. Personally I have no preconceived wish for Virgil to be anything; what I do claim is that I try to follow where the text leads. And to my mind, despite the many thought-provoking analyses that this book offers, it does not lead in the direction that its author contends.

*La Trobe University, Victoria*

JOHN PENWILL  
j.penwill@latrobe.edu.au

## AUGUSTUS AND APOLLO

MILLER (J.F.) *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*. Pp. xii + 408, ills. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Cased, £65, US\$110. ISBN: 978-0-521-51683-9.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X10002209

In the light of the appropriation of Apollo by Augustus, who claimed a special connection and increased the god’s importance in Roman religion, M.’s book announces itself as a synoptic study of this ‘Augustan’ Apollo in contemporary poetry and of the varying reactions of the poets to this ideological project. Its seven chapters are concerned with Octavian’s affiliations with Phoebus at the end of the republican period; Apollo’s supposed help in the victory over Anthony and Cleopatra at Actium; the deity’s (expanded) role in the story of Aeneas presented by Virgil; poetic responses to the temple of Apollo on the Palatine; Horace’s *Carmen Saeculare* and the *ludi saeculares* of 17 B.C.; possible allusions to ‘Augustan’ Apollo where that divinity’s musical or poetic functions are to the fore in literature; and Ovid’s handling of Phoebus in the *Metamorphoses*.

At times M.’s remarks do not seem strictly relevant to the appropriation of Apollo by the *princeps* (e.g. pp. 39–53 and much of the very long third chapter), so that this book would be better described as an investigation not just of ‘Augustan’ Apollo but of all substantial references to Phoebus in the poetry of the period. As such, it is a lengthy, well-researched and wide-ranging treatment, which takes into account minor writers (as well as the five major Augustans) and also artistic and

numismatic representations of the god. There are no big new theories here, but the critical appreciation is generally sane and sober and can be perceptive (e.g. on the *Carmen Saeculare* at pp. 276ff.). Although there must have been a temptation to see references to ‘Augustan’ Apollo everywhere, M. is properly cautious (cf. his remarks on p. 9), and he is judicious in his approach to Ovid’s shifting engagement with Augustan ideology (pp. 333–4 and 349). He is alert to intertextual aspects, although he does have a tendency to claim allusion where it seems unlikely (e.g. pp. 156, 202, 216–17). For the most part the English is free from jargon and typographical errors.

Unfortunately there are substantial problems with methodology and interpretation. Sometimes scholars’ theories are dismissed *tout court* (so on p. 221 Veyne’s idea that in *Odes* 1.31 Horace was praying to a statue of Apollo that he himself had just dedicated is simply written off as ‘mistaken’ without any argumentation at all). Although M. does pay some attention to textual issues, he can be remiss and rather cavalier in this regard, as when in his discussion of Propertius 2.31 on pp. 196ff. he ignores the fact that in the MSS there is no break between 2.31 and 2.32 and some respected modern editors (like Goold) run the poems together, something which clearly has an important bearing on the tone and thrust of the lines on Phoebus’ temple on the Palatine Hill. The analysis can be somewhat superficial too. For example, in his treatment of Propertius 4.6 (pp. 80–92) he brushes off scholarly ‘fuss’ about the question of the elegist’s sincerity in his portrayal of the engagement at Actium and maintains that the piece celebrates the battle and is a genuine compliment to the emperor, but a witty and whimsical one. This may be true. However, apart from the fact that such wit and whimsy could be distancing and even subversive, there is much that is distracting, suspicious and disturbing about this seeming celebration, most notably the placement of 4.6 between two erotic elegies and right after the frequently comical 4.5 (on the *lena* Acanthis); the injunction (at 13–14) that Jupiter himself should pay attention while Augustus is being sung of; the claim at 37–8 that Augustus was the saviour of the whole world; the twofold reference to his fear of the decoration of the enemy fleet and the (surely superfluous) reassurance that it is only painted (48, 50); the allocation of a mere two couplets (55–8) to the combat itself, especially after all the preceding build-up; the round of applause for the victory by the Nereids at 61–2; the notion that a mere woman like Cleopatra would have made for a paltry triumph (65–6); and Apollo’s sinking of ten ships with a single arrow at 67–8 (compare Postgate’s quip in his *Select Elegies of Propertius* [London, 1884] ad loc.: ‘we need not speculate ... how many arrows he had in his quiver, nor whether this was an average or an exceptional shot’). M. only touches lightly on a few of these issues, and he passes over the rest entirely.

Sometimes he grasps the point but does not take it far enough. So on p. 199 he sees that the first line of Propertius 2.31 (where his girlfriend asks why he is late) means that when he describes the Palatine shrine of Phoebus which he has been visiting he would (out of fear of a row) explain not just where he had been but also how glamorous and how tempting were the sights that detained him; but M. does not go on to observe that this scenario must call into question to some extent the elegist’s enthusiastic description of the temple dedicated by the emperor to his protecting deity. Similarly he perceives (pp. 13, 344ff.) that ‘Augustan’ Apollo is sent up in the Daphne narrative at *Metamorphoses* 1.452ff., but he does not bring out anything like the full extent of the mockery of the god there, and apparently does not spot the frivolity over the laurel’s connection with Phoebus

at 557ff. (how pleased would Daphne in her laurel form be to be in such close contact with the lover she has resolutely shunned?) and 564–5 (is being evergreen something desirable or exciting, and would Daphne want to be linked thus with her despised suitor?). So too on pp. 324ff. he sees only some of the fun that Ovid is having with Apollo's intervention at *Ars* 2.493ff., not noting that there is an elaborate build-up to make readers expect from the deity something of significance and importance, only for Phoebus to come out with some lightweight and self-evident remarks on the subject of love, or that the god, who appears solely as an advisor on casual affairs, and who shows an amusing fondness for a levity and expression very similar to Ovid's own, is used in an extensively flippant fashion in this trivial context. And there is a bigger issue here, one that has a bearing on M.'s study as a whole. He opines that there as elsewhere 'Augustan' Apollo is not alluded to, so there is no enduring hit at that Augustan symbol. However, given that the *princeps* has appropriated this divinity, surely if Phoebus in any function, guise or context is mocked or criticised in contemporary literature in Rome, then Augustus' Apollo (who is after all the same god) is also diminished, whether or not there is direct reference to him in his 'Augustan' role.

In conclusion, and so as not to end on too negative a note, if the above reservations are kept in mind, readers should find that this book is a useful treatment of Phoebus generally and in particular of 'Augustan' Apollo in contemporary verse.

McMaster University

P. MURGATROYD  
murgatro@mcmaster.ca

### THE *RES GESTAE*

COOLEY (A.E.) (ed., trans.) *Res Gestae Divi Augusti. Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Pp. xviii + 315, figs, maps. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Paper, £16.99, US\$29.99 (Cased, £45, US\$90). ISBN: 978-0-521-60128-3 (978-0-521-84152-8 hbk).

doi:10.1017/S0009840X10002210

For some 40 years, the edition of the *Res Gestae* by Brunt and Moore with its concise and informative commentary has been the most valuable resource available in English. It included only the Latin text without editorial marks or apparatus. In 2007, John Scheid's Budé edition became the new foundation for any subsequent work as it contained the critically edited Greek and Latin texts from Ankara, supplemented by the Latin and Greek fragments from, respectively, Pisidian Antioch and Apollonia, plus an up-to-date commentary of some 65 closely printed pages.

C. has taken the next step and the result is splendid. She is building on Scheid's texts; the Greek and Roman versions of the *RG* from Ankara, incorporating redactions on the basis of the other fragments, are laid out side by side with a translation for each. User friendliness continues in an attractively printed commentary of some 175 pages, which includes numerous illustrations. In addition to the usual items, such as indexes and bibliography, there is a comprehensive introduction dealing with several aspects of the *RG*, including its discovery and its treatment by Mussolini. I have no doubt that this edition, too, will have a run of several decades, especially if it is updated periodically.

As for the text, there are no surprises. C. appends a lengthy tabulation of the differences between her composite text and Scheid's. In most cases, they are the