

we might ask where our interpretative constructions align with the terms of the ancient authors and where they might impose frameworks in some ways at odds with them. While Graver's distinction between behaviours and doctrines, for instance, offers some help to us as a means of sorting out Seneca's attitudes about Epicurus, it should be said that this construal departs from the self-conception that ancient philosophy offers: behaviours could not be separated from doctrines, nor doctrines from behaviours. Those behaviours that Seneca seems to have shared with Epicurus, in other words, were grounded in disparate ways of viewing the universe and society. If, from the Stoic perspective, 'intention' (*voluntas*) determined the rightness or wrongness of a behaviour, i.e. if one's way of regarding an act determined its morality, is it strictly accurate to say that Seneca endorsed Epicurus' behaviours?

Inquiring further into the philosophical dimensions of Roman philosophical discourse – the philosophy of their philosophy – could offer a fruitful line of study for future projects.

Houston Baptist University

TIMOTHY A. BROOKINS
tbrookins@hbu.edu

THE WANDERINGS OF *FAMA*

KYRIAKIDIS (S.) (ed.) *Libera Fama. An Endless Journey*. (Pierides 6.) Pp. xii + 257, ill. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016. Cased, £52.99. ISBN: 978-1-4438-1099-9.
 doi:10.1017/S0009840X17002256

This book evolved from papers given at a conference at the University of Athens ("'*Fama scripta*": Wanderings of *fama* in Latin Literature', 17 December 2012) in response to the publication of P. Hardie's book on *fama* (*Rumour and Renown: Representations of fama in Western Literature* [2012]). As Hardie acknowledges in the 'Afterthought' to the present book (pp. 206–7), the contributors both build on his analysis (especially in the chapters on Virgil, Ovid, Juvenal and iconography) and extend its scope (to include Cicero's epic poems, Manilius and Prudentius). The volume therefore constitutes a valuable and thought-provoking addition to the proliferating scholarship and debate surrounding *fama* and related issues.

In Chapter 1, M. Garani corrects the assumption, based on the much-quoted maxim *λάθε βιώσας*, that Epicurus and his followers always recommended avoiding renown. She cites sources (Epicurus, *ΚΑ* 7; Philodemus, *De adul.* [*PHerc.* 222] col. iv, 1–12 Gargiulo; Plut. *De tranquillitate animi*, *Mor.* 465F–466A) that outline a more complex position: 'there are conditions under which an Epicurean could accept – but not hunt after – fame, provided that this process grants pleasure and can contribute to one's *ἀσφάλεια*' (p. 36). Her subsequent analysis of fame in Lucretius raises interesting questions, for example whether it is possible to harmonise the concept of eternal *fama* with the 'everlasting atomic flux' of the Epicurean universe (pp. 42–3).

In Chapter 2, E. Karamalengou explores Cicero's manipulation of *fama* in the two epic poems he wrote to celebrate the achievements of his consulship (*De consulatu suo* [60 BC] and *De temporibus suis* [post-exile]). She follows Hardie in distinguishing between *fama-gloria* (positive) and *fama-rumor* (negative), and sees Cicero's autobiographical epics as attempts to counter the latter (which dogged Cicero's career after his execution of the

Catilinarian conspirators) by advancing and emphasising the former. Cicero's striking decision to fuse the epic narrator and epic hero in his celebratory 'autofiction' has interesting consequences for *fama-gloria*: is the epic poet equally able to bestow κλέος/*gloria* on his epic hero when that hero is in fact himself? Karamalengou argues that Cicero successfully navigates this problem using a variety of subtle techniques. For example, the Muse Urania praises Cicero both for his academic/literary pursuits and for his political achievements (Cic. *De consulatu suo* 75–8): 'we realise then that the poetic *fama-gloria* and the political *fama-gloria* have a special joint function: the more the *fama-gloria* of the poet is extolled, the more the *fama-gloria* of the epic protagonist increases, to such a degree that both *famae* converge until they become interfused and identical' (p. 53).

S. Clément-Tarantino is well known for her work on *fama* in the *Aeneid* (*Fama ou la renommée du genre: recherches sur la représentation de la tradition dans l'Enéide*, Diss. Lille 3, 2006), and in Chapter 3 she presents a selection of her insights. She first considers *fama* in terms of references 'to traditions as hearsay' (p. 58) or 'Alexandrian footnotes' (*fama est, ut perhibent, fertur, dicitur* etc., following S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* [1998]). She usefully distinguishes between cases in which these introduce secondary narratives or digressions (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 4.179) and cases in which they work within the main narrative (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 4.204, 9.591, 12.735). In both instances, Clément-Tarantino offers explanations as to why, surprisingly, it often appears that there are 'no real allusions or no definite *auctor* for what is introduced in this manner' (p. 56). In addition, the distinction between primary and secondary narratives highlights that *fama* is not just involved in digressions, but is also 'a principle of narrative cohesion' (p. 61). This use of *fama* 'is not, as far as we can tell, characteristic of the epic before him' (p. 64 n. 29). Instead, Clément-Tarantino suggests that Virgil was influenced by the role of rumour in Attic tragedy (especially Euripides' *Helen*), which may explain why *fama* is overwhelmingly negative and/or tragic in the *Aeneid*: 'in this epic, *fama* is never seen to bring words of victory. She does not personify (positive, glorious) Renown' (p. 69).

In Chapter 4, E. Peraki-Kyriakidou focuses on the character Leuconoe, according to Ovid one of the three daughters of Minyas, and the story she tells of the love affairs of Sol (Ov. *Met.* 4.169–270). Peraki-Kyriakidou argues for a meta-poetic reading of the episode, according to which it highlights contrasts between Bacchic drama (= unrestrained, public and performed as spectacle), which has dominated Book 3 of the *Met.*, and learned poetry of the Hellenistic style (= disciplined, private and introspected), associated with the sisters' favoured goddess, Minerva. Peraki-Kyriakidou links the former with 'reported speech and its dissemination in an un-composed or even chaotic way' (p. 71) and contrasts this with Leuconoe's decision to suppress the speeches of the Sun and Clytie within her own intricately woven narrative (p. 84). Throughout, she uses etymological analyses of names to support her arguments (e.g. *Leuconoe* = λέύσσω + νοῦς 'she is the maiden who sees with the mind's eye', p. 80).

In Chapter 5 A. Michalopoulos turns to 'the use and role of *fama* in Ovid's exilic poetry' (p. 94). He distinguishes between (1) *fama* as reputation and fame, and (2) *fama* as news, rumour and hearsay. It is apparent from the selection of interesting passages from the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* that, though Ovid remains preoccupied by *fama* in Tomis, he displays inconsistent attitudes towards it. For example, Ovid demonstrates a combination of confidence in the eternal reputation he has achieved through his pre-exile literature (e.g. Ov. *Tr.* 3.7.50) and anxiety that his *fama* has fled Rome along with its master (e.g. *Tr.* 1.5.83–6). In addition, he emphasises the contingency and fragility of the information he receives from Rome (e.g. *Tr.* 3.12.37–44), yet also describes the appearance of a

vividly personified, winged (yet invisible) *Fama*, which passes good news to him directly (*Pont.* 4.4.11–8).

In Chapter 6 K., the editor, explains what is unique about *fama* and *gloria* in Manilius' *Astronomica*. For the Stoic Manilius, *laudes* and *fama* are 'given by fate' (p. 125; *Manil. Astr.* 3.56–60, 4.14–19), rather than/as well as being the product of human effort and skill. Because of this, and perhaps because of the real risks accompanying personal fame under the Principate (p. 127), Manilius does not explicitly aim for poetic renown in the same way that Ovid, Virgil, Horace and Lucretius do (pp. 120–1, 125–6). For example, K. demonstrates that Manilius' densely allusive personification of *Gloria* (*Astr.* 2.808–19) is born of nuanced poetic and philosophical motives (pp. 128–34) and shows that he deploys the imagery of reaching the stars in a different way from his predecessors: for Manilius, whose subject is astronomy, a journey to the heavens is not 'the reward ... for his poetic excellence', but 'is directly related to the pursuit of knowledge itself' (p. 137).

S. Papaioannou offers a close analysis of Juvenal's portrayal of the gossipy woman at *Sat.* 6.398–412. She agrees with previous scholars that this figure is a 'poetic self-projection' (O. Umurhan, *Arethusa* 44 [2011]), and that Juvenal draws on Virgil's and Ovid's descriptions of *Fama* (P. Hardie, *Rumour and Renown* [2012], pp. 176–7; L. Watson & P. Watson, *Juvenal: Satire 6* [2014], p. 208). In addition, she persuasively argues that this passage contains reflections on the fraught relationship between Augustan epic and imperial satire: the humorous transformation of epic *Fama* into an old, ugly woman who traverses Rome spreading global gossip firstly reflects the first-century AD satirist's anxiety about how his work relates to and continues the Latin epic tradition, and secondly indicates concerns about the difficulties involved in 'trying to manage ... the cultural multivocality of the empire' (p. 165).

P. Hardie's intriguing exploration of 'Glory, Memory and Envy in Prudentius' *Peristephanon*' furthers his discussion of 'Christian Conversions of *Fama*' in *Rumour and Renown* (Chapter 11, pp. 411–38) and is rich with valuable insights. For example, he notes the generic complexity of the *Peristephanon*, which combines 'lyric form with epic matter ... the martyr is both epic hero, and victorious contestant in a game or spectacle' (p. 166). Though pagan *fama* is influential (Hardie discusses Virgil and Horace in particular), it must be redefined within a Christian context: 'in the Christian version of the calculus of *kleos* the prize is not just imperishable fame and glory, but imperishable life in heaven' (p. 169). For Prudentius, *fama* exists both on earth (where it is corporeal and material) and in heaven (where it is spiritual and immaterial). In each case it is closely associated with speech and writing: Prudentius' earthly *Peristephanon* is gloriously mirrored by the everlasting 'heavenly book' in which angels record the sufferings of the martyrs (*Per.* 10.1111–35). Hardie's dense analysis of this complex text opens up exciting avenues for further research and debate.

G. Guastella, author of *Word of Mouth: Fama and its Personifications in Art and Literature from Ancient Rome to the Middle Ages* (2017), closes the collection by considering the reception of Virgilian *fama* in iconography in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. His discussion points to the heterogeneity of images of Virgil's *Fama*-rumour (p. 198), then tracks the incorporation of features of *Fama*-rumour into representations of *Fama*-renown and *Gloria Mundi*. Guastella's interesting arguments would have been aided by the inclusion of the images discussed within the chapter.

The many voices of this volume constitute a fitting and high-quality contribution to the study of the multiform concept of *fama* in Latin literature and beyond. It is perhaps the case that more could have been made of uniting these contributions within a single book. Though it was no doubt the aim of the editor to publish an open-ended work in reflection of the 'endless journey' of scholarship on *fama*, I think that a general conclusion

considering the relative merits of different approaches and drawing together discrete arguments (for example on the complex relationship between *fama* and genre) would have been a useful, if challenging, addition.

Balliol College, University of Oxford

CALYPSO NASH
calyпсо.nash@gmail.com

‘RECOVERING’ THE MEANING OF THE *AENEID*

STAHL (H. - P.) *Poetry Underpinning Power. Vergil’s Aeneid: the Epic for Emperor Augustus. A Recovery Study*. Pp. xii + 488, ill. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2016. Cased, £45. ISBN: 978-1-910589-04-5.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X17002335

Virgilian scholarship was monopolised in the second half of the twentieth century by a bitter debate over the degree of Virgil’s alleged Augustanism. The polemics have dampened since the mid-1990s, with many now either favouring ambivalent readings that see the very tension between optimism and pessimism as a major characteristic of the poem (see R. Tarrant, *Virgil Aeneid XII* [2012] – curiously absent from the present book) or else openly distrusting the appropriateness of the question when expressed in terms of a strict ‘pro’ or ‘anti’ dichotomy which is always bound to hold Augustus as an unavoidable point of reference (D. Kennedy, “‘Augustan’ and “Anti-Augustan”: Reflections on Terms of Reference’, in A. Powell [ed.], *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus* [1992], pp. 26–58, again absent from the present book). To these reactions’ insistence in going ‘beyond’ the debate, S. opposes a backward-looking approach, attempting to turn the clock back to a time before WWII and especially the Vietnam War, the two events that S. thinks are to blame for the emergence of ‘the Gentle Vergil School’ (p. 61), which reads the poem as expressing sympathy for history’s victims and concern with the human condition. The book is a response to R. Thomas’ *Vergil and the Augustan Reception* (2001), an attempt to wipe out, in the name of philological ‘objectivity’, the allegedly subjective readings that originated with V. Pöschl’s desire ‘to make amends for his Nazi past’ (p. 455) and were later fuelled by the anti-imperialist trends of American scholars ‘in opposition to America’s war in Vietnam’ (p. 234). It labels itself as a ‘recovery study’ that looks for Virgil’s ‘verifiable intention’ (p. 2) as that of a shamelessly partisan propagandist of Augustan ideology, and attempts to ‘(re-)gain . . . access’ (p. 77) to a poem that can only be considered *Menschheitsdichtung* if we ‘restrict’ *Mensch* ‘to the ruling class and its adherents’ (p. 427).

Many scholars will find it difficult to share S.’s methodological and theoretical premises. Virgil’s text always has *one* fixed and ‘valid’ (p. 359) meaning, that the author wished to be understood uncontroversially and unanimously by his implied readers. Our duty is to ‘recover’ both such authorial intention and the understanding of its ‘reader or hearer . . . the Roman boy or man who, in the new national epic, learns to admire his Emperor’s ancestor’ (p. 22). We are only allowed to achieve this with the help of ‘objective, non-literary, evidence’ (p. ix) or else with contextual evidence from the poem itself; we cannot, as the intertextuals do, ‘extend the use of Vergil’s models in the interpretation of the *Aeneid* beyond the function that they are assigned to by the Vergilian context’ (p. 96).

Inevitably, however, this ‘Roman boy’ will appear to many as nothing more than an artificial construction, an illusory foil to unrecoverable authorial intention, whose supposed