

Barthes and Augustine, K. argues, occupy opposite ends of the theological spectrum, and yet, through their engagements with narrative, both testify to the power of language to raise crucial questions about the nature of divinity. Despite being framed by insightful analyses of Ricoeur and Barthes, K.'s is neither a Ricoeurian nor a Barthesian reading of Augustine. Rather, Ricoeur, Augustine and Barthes are placed in enlightening juxtaposition with each text enriching the reading of the last. Although there is a recognition that Augustine may have influenced Ricoeur and Barthes, K. is not writing a reception history. Rather, what he produces through this collision of perspectives is the 'philosophy of ancient and modern literature' promised in his subtitle.

If theology emerges as the central thematic of the first chapter, then history and politics become the dominant themes of the second. Turning his attention to Virgil's *Aeneid*, a text which K. has analysed with great subtlety elsewhere, he shows how time and narrative are woven into the Imperial fabric of the epic. The *imperium sine fine* proclaimed by Jupiter is an effect of narrative as much as a 'representation' of worldly domination beyond the text. Again, K. finds his modern interlocutors: Derrida, Fukuyama and Hardt and Negri are prominent, but Virgil, Augustine and even Polybius are also called upon to do the work of theory in this chapter.

Chs 3 and 4 in turn deal respectively with 'Determination' and 'Self-Determination' and here Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* and Livy's *Histories* act as the key texts. K. uses Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* to explore the notions of 'open' and 'closed' time. He opens with Gary Saul Morson's assertion that while in life time is 'open' to a plurality of different outcomes, literature, with its compulsion for closure, represents time as 'closed' and predetermined. Morson worries that the temporal world-view adopted in literature can affect our experience of temporality in 'life'. As K. puts it rather more winningly: 'As you exit the theatre, can you be entirely clear that you have stepped outside the metaphysical discourses which intersect *Oedipus*?' (100). As the chapter progresses K. uses *Oedipus* to address the temporalities of interpretation. He asks whether literature, in its ability to anticipate the theories to which it gives rise, can upset the conventional chronologies of literary criticism. The fourth chapter investigates the phenomenon of counterfactual histories and the productive introduction of the question 'what if ...' into standard historical narratives. It is an indication of K.'s skill that Heidegger and Livy emerge as natural interlocutors in this exploration.

The final chapter concludes with a return to theology via the antitheology of Lucretius and Epicurus and the 'Scientific Revolution' to which they gave birth. One of the themes which reappears insistently here, as it does in the book as a whole, is that while texts exist in time they also resist their own temporal determinism and open onto unknown futures. The rich potentiality which K. locates in the texts he reads perfectly characterizes the book he writes. K.'s volume, and the series to which it belongs, boldly announce the future potential of antiquity.

University College, London  
m.leonard@ucl.ac.uk

MIRIAM LEONARD

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000896

P. R. HARDIE, *RUMOUR AND RENOWN: REPRESENTATIONS OF FAMA IN WESTERN LITERATURE*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. xii + 693, 37 illus. ISBN 9780521620888. £110.00/US\$180.00.

Impressive for the breadth of its coverage of so many authors and works across so many literary epochs, this study of representations of *Fama* in the Western tradition nevertheless combines that vastness of scale with Hardie's characteristic acuity as a close reader of text (text that extends in this case far beyond the Greco-Roman canon). While the book tells a continuous story, it is loosely divisible into two movements, the first extending down to ch. 9. After a foundational first chapter in which H. sets out his stall, complicating his subject by introducing the tensions and instabilities, 'the major duplicities and dichotomies' (6) and the order and disorder (19) that are encased or implicated in the figure of *fama*, he moves to the task of 'plotting *fama*' (cf. 43) by first dwelling (ch. 2) on aspects of κλέος in Homer and Hesiod before moving to Virgil via the latter's response in *Aeneid* 1 to the 'plot of *fama*' that H. discerns in *Iliad* 2. Chs 3–5 carry important weight in the book as a whole because of their focus on Virgil and Ovid, those hardy perennials whose influence pervades so much of the volume. Ch. 3, on Virgil's personification of *Fama* in *Aeneid* 4, skilfully relates the monstrous vision of 4.173–97 to 'structures and homologues' (78) extending over the epic as a whole; after this fundamental treatment (78–125), H. moves in a

related but somewhat unexpected direction by probing in the briefer ch. 4 (126–49) ‘the limits of rhetoric within the *Aeneid*’ (129) through the test case of the Council of Latins in *Aeneid* 11 (is the *fama* that the epic poet offers Rome and her heroes insulated from, or potentially compromised by, the fragility or potential guile of rhetoric as showcased in H.’s sensitive reading of the Council?). After *Fama* in *Aeneid* 4, *Fama* in *Metamorphoses* 12 takes centre stage in ch. 5, with questions of ‘engagement with and comment on its Virgilian predecessor’ (151) naturally central to the discussion; but H. also deftly exposes the fault-lines of Ovidian *Fama* as a construct riven by internal tension and contradiction (e.g., the appearance of this *Fama* ushers in an Ovidian epic cycle within the *Metamorphoses*, but at so momentous a narrative moment *Fama* herself appears comparatively unimportant in the plot; cf. also p. 156 for Ovid ‘keep[ing] a certain distance from the *Fama* who at the same time is a personification of the poet’s own verbal makings’).

H.’s subsequent excursion into ‘Later Imperial Epic’ (ch. 6) explores the profound Virgilian and Ovidian imprints on Lucan, Valerius Flaccus and Statius; but then a sudden leap to Nonnus’ *Dionysiaca*, and to a brief but insightful section (214–25) on the Nonnan Typhoeus as ‘an avatar of that virtual personification of the epic tradition that I wish to see in the Virgilian *Fama*’ (215). At this point the book appears to take on a different momentum, surging into two related chapters on ‘*Fama* and the Historians’ (ch. 7 on Livy, ch. 8 on Tacitus, with extension to the younger Pliny and Martial); both show a formidable control not just of the texts, but also of the larger cultural narrative in which the forms and functionings of *fama* are themselves affected by the transition from Republic to Principate. At the beginning of ch. 9, on ‘The Love of Fame and the Fame of Love’, brief recapitulation (330–1) offers a pause before a change of gear: while Ovid and especially Virgil remain key influences, in and after ch. 9 the book enters its second general movement by focusing on post-Classical representations of *Fama*. H. ranges from Spencer’s *The Faerie Queene* (ch. 10) to Renaissance Christianizing responses to the *fama* tradition in the neoclassical, epic narrative form of Jacopo Sannazaro’s *De partu Virginis*, Girolamo Vida’s *Christiad* and Milton’s *In quintum Nouembris* (ch. 11); from Petrarch’s *Trionfi* and *Africa* (ch. 12) to the early modern period, represented in ch. 13 by Shakespeare’s ‘Henriad’ (*Richard II*, *Henry IV* Parts 1 and 2, and *Henry V*) and Ben Jonson (with brief additional glances at George Chapman and Thomas Scot on pp. 537–41); and from Milton’s *Paradise Lost* and *Samson Agonistes* (ch. 14) to Chaucer’s *House of Fame* and Pope’s *Temple of Fame* (ch. 15) before H. finally samples (ch. 16) visual representations of *Fama*, in the quest for continuities and discontinuities between the visual and the textual materials.

Given the scale of H.’s undertaking, occasional summaries of the ground travelled so far in the volume offer helpful orientation, especially in the later stages (e.g., 391, 570). But despite the vastness of the enterprise and the book’s spacious dimensions, the compactness of the writing and the relentless closeness of the readings that are offered create a sense of urgency and of tight construction — an impression reinforced by the additional materials that are concisely incorporated through appendices or postscripts (so 123–5, 174–7, 270–2). The sheer array of materials is dazzling, but sudden shifts of direction can sometimes disconcert, as (e.g.) when the focus unexpectedly moves to *The Faerie Queene* (20); to Joannes Sambucus’ *Emblemata* (26–7); to Augustine and Boethius (33–4); or to Fulke Greville (36). Through fast-moving changes of scene in this fashion, H. combines deep learning with a lightness of touch, as if broaching his *fama*-theme from a synchronic rather than a diachronic perspective. In this respect, the book is not so much about the later reception(s) of a static Classical concept of *fama*, but about the dynamic evolution of a flexible, multiform idea from antiquity down to the early modern period; and H. comes to his theme not as a classicist who steps tentatively in the later literary tradition, but as a scholar of rare breadth with a totalizing grasp of the materials he covers. The book is not for the faint-hearted, and it is hard not to feel overwhelmed at moments by the sheer dimensions of the work, the uncompromising rigor of analysis and the density of exposition. But there can be no doubt about the monumental importance of this remarkable work of scholarship. The book is also beautifully produced, with ample margins, thirty-seven illustrations, thirty-six pages of bibliography and thorough indices of passages discussed and of general subjects; unfortunately, the price is in proportion to the scale of this impressive work.

Columbia University  
gdw5@columbia.edu

GARETH WILLIAMS

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000902