do justice to this tour de force. It is this kind of catalogue that takes research to a higher level, but it is almost impossible to discuss it extensively.

Nonetheless, considered from a viewpoint of 'new philology', P. could have made more use of the variant readings. For example, P. mentions the two different letters of dedication to Piero de'Medici accompanying Rinuccini's translation of *Nicias and Crassus*, and gives an edition of both, but does not discuss their differences, which are, in my opinion, very significant. In the 'official one', found in most manuscripts, the Medici are praised, but in the other one, probably not meant to be read in public, but for the eyes of Piero alone, the Greek teacher appointed by him, gets the most praise. It would have been interesting to hear P.'s view on this difference. In a new-philological approach, a discussion of the marginal note in a figure on page 120, stating that Roman and Florentine religious habits were the same, might have been illuminating with regard to 'civic humanism', and a treatment of the variant readings between manuscript 'u', 'm', and 'c' in the letter accompanying the translation of Timoleon by Pacini (10.1) might have been of some interest as well. These examples serve to show that a keener eye for variant readings could have yielded even more arguments supporting P.'s main thesis.

However, these are just some quibbles that do not detract from the value of this very important study on Plutarch in the Quattrocento. This book will be invaluable not only for readers interested in Plutarch and his fortuna, but also for those who are studying the political and cultural atmosphere of fifteenth-century Italy.¹

Nijmegen

Werner Gelderblom


In the vast sea of Virgilian bibliography there are few dedicated studies of the hero of the *Aeneid* himself. This is partly no doubt because the topic is so large as to be virtually coextensive with a study of the poem as a whole, and partly because characterization is not a currently fashionable topic. In this Habilitationsschrift submitted to the Freie Universität, Berlin, Sch(auer) sets himself the clearly delimited task of analyzing Aeneas not as a character, not as a hero, but in his role as a leader within the *Aeneid*, as that role defines itself through the actions of Aeneas and the reactions of others, in deeds and words, to Aeneas as *Anführer*; the word 'Führer' is avoided because of its obvious connotation, and also because it imports historical presuppositions, of a kind that have often attached to Augustus, and that might prejudice our estimate of Aeneas as *dux*. Discussions of Aeneas as a leader have often started with the assumption that the legendary leader of the Trojan exiles is to a greater or lesser extent a reflection of leadership models in later Roman history (for example R. G. M. Nisbet's classic article 'Aeneas imperator. Roman generalship in an epic context', in: S. J. Harrison (ed.): *Oxford readings in Vergil’s Aeneid* (Oxford 1990) 378–89), and in

¹ I thank dr. Bé Breij for correcting my English.
particular a foreshadowing or type of Augustus himself. Another kind of external point of reference for judging Aeneas as leader is the ancient literature on the good king, productively exploited by Francis Cairns, Virgil’s Augustan epic (Cambridge 1989) 1–84, acknowledged by Sch. (32 n. 57) as the closest precedent for his own inquiry. But Sch. justly points out that by imposing a pre-existing schema on the interpretation of the *Aeneid* Cairns finds only what he sets out to find.

Sch. liberates himself from the findings of previous studies in two ways. Firstly by stressing the fact that the *Aeneid* is a product of the first decade after the end of the Civil War, a time when the ideology of the *princeps* was evolving. It is therefore a mistake to plot the character and actions of Aeneas against what only later emerged as the definitive image of the *princeps*. As others have pointed out, the choice of a legendary subject for his Augustan epic allows Virgil room for manœuvre in exploring possible models for a Roman leader that an epic on recent historical events would not have. Secondly, while recognizing that the *Aeneid* is itself a part of the set of political and cultural discourses that led to the definition of the principate, Sch. insists that the part played by Virgil’s representation of Aeneas in that wider discourse can only be assessed after a detailed, «werkimmanent», analysis of that representation within the *Aeneid* itself. Where Cairns starts from an external model (Hellenistic kingship theory) and works inwards to the text, Sch. starts from a reading of the text and works outwards to possible connections in the wider cultural and historical contexts. Of course no «werkimmanent» reading of a text can be entirely innocent of the reader’s own presuppositions, which in Sch.’s case include a view of the transparency of Fate and of Jupiter’s revelation of Fate which Anglo-Saxon readers will find simplistic, and an insensitivity to the rhetorical conditioning of some of the statements about Aeneas’ qualities as a leader made by characters in the poem. But, by and large, a scrupulous sifting and analysis of what Aeneas does, the contexts in which he acts, and what is said about him and his actions, leads to a nuanced and in some degree unfamiliar picture.

A first section includes discussion of the historical scene in the 20s BC, of methodology, and of the effects of the choice of a legendary subject in relegating direct panegyric of Rome and Augustus to excursuses, and in allowing a minimal presentation of the power-structures in the society of the exiled Trojans. The second section sketches out the world of the *Aeneid*, i.e. the context within which Aeneas functions as a leader. Emphasis is placed on the transitional nature of the society of Trojan exiles, stripped of its previous political structures, and whose chief dynamic is an impulse on the part of all social orders to unite and follow Aeneas. Aeneas owes his position as leader not to succession to Priam, but to his role as guardian of the Penates. There is a strong identification of the private family of Aeneas with the Trojan people, which may have more to do with the mystification of Augustus’ power than Sch. allows. If it is difficult to distinguish between the private Penates of Aeneas and the state Penates of Troy, this is a confusion of public and private that would ultimately lead to the ‘privatization’ of the communal Vesta of the Roman state in Augustus’ house on the Palatine (see D. C. Feeney, The gods in epic (Oxford 1991) 214–16). The importance of the house of Aeneas as model for a ruling dynasty is also underestimated in the claim that Aeneas is essentially, and solely, a «Vermittlerfigur» and
Integrationsfigur, whose role is to initiate the foundation of the Roman race (Romanam condere gentem). It is not surprising that the Romans are not named 'Aeneadae'; the name that matters is Iulus, and the gens Iulia is the name of a dynasty. For an argument that the close association of the gens Iulia with the gens Romana marks a decisive break with the ideology of the plural gentes of the Roman Republic see I. Gildenhard, 'Virgil vs. Ennius, or: the undoing of the annalist', in: W. Fitzgerald and E. Gowers (eds.): Ennius perennis. The Annals and beyond (Cambridge 2007) 73–102, at 92–8. Looking to the wider world beyond the Trojans, Sch. points out that, with the exception of Carthage, Aeneas interacts with peoples with whom he is already connected by genealogy: this is not the world of total strangers within which much of Odysseus' wanderings take place. Nor are the Trojans' wanderings random, since within the still larger context they are directed by the gods and fate, so severely limiting the scope for Aeneas' independent action as leader.

The third and longest section looks in detail at Aeneas as leader. Sch. gives further good reasons for resisting any attempt to see character development in Aeneas over the course of the poem. Situation and circumstance determine both changes of behaviour (e.g. from despair to confident leadership within the space of a day at the beginning of the narrative both in the ordo artificialis in book one, from helpless passivity in the storm to acting as material and psychological provider for his men, and in the ordo naturalis in book two, from desperate fighter for a doomed city to forward-looking leader of a people headed into exile), and the alternation of different leadership roles. Aeneas is not elevated to leadership of the Trojans by public office; set apart by divine parentage and his reputation as a fighter, he has a charismatic attraction without parallel in the epic tradition. Awkward questions as to the precise mechanics of Aeneas' selection as leader are conveniently sidestepped in the gap between books two and three; but it should be remembered that we have already been prepared for Aeneas' leadership by the 'succession scene' in which the dead Hector, Priam's heir, gives the dreaming Aeneas the mission of finding a new city for the Penates of Troy.

Sch. strikingly shows how minimalist is the description of the social and political structures of the Trojan exiles. The old Trojan aristocracy is not given a privileged role. The effect is that of a tabula rasa, a canvas for a new kind of leadership. Aeneas himself presents himself as a Trojan, not the noble son of a noble father (contrast Odysseus' announcement of himself as Laertiades), and his interest is in securing a regnum for his people, not to be rex himself. Within the heroic world he is of course perceived as rex, but the Roman narrator's most common title for him is pater. In general Aeneas is not distinguished by the insignia and clothing of a king, unlike other rulers in the epic, but rather by his personal beauty and commanding presence, by the lofty positions (but not a throne) from which he speaks, and by the large retinue that habitually accompanies him. When he bursts forth from the cloud at Aen. 1.588–93, beautified by Venus, he shines with the purple, ivory, silver and gold of a figurative kingship. It is only later in Carthage, once sidetracked from his true mission, that he appears, uniquely, in the actual luxurious robes of royalty.

Sch. then checks off the various duties of a leader whose mission is to bear the Penates from Troy, travel to Italy, found a city, and fight a war to establish a throne for Ascanius. As commander of a fleet Aeneas is exceptional among epic
heroes in his knowledge of steersmanship and in his ability to take over himself at the helm when Palinurus is lost. The true leader knows how to steer the ship of state. As city-founder in Thrace, Crete, Acosta, and prospectively Latium, Aeneas takes for himself the role of institutor of religion, leaving political power in the hands of others. As general Aeneas rarely shows himself in the role of strategist (in contrast to the strategic discussions on the Italian side), whereas he is very active in single combat, when motivated by favor and ira. This is an interesting qualification of Nisbet’s image of ‘Aeneas imperator’. Sch. makes the fair point that in his religious role Aeneas does not actually have the office of a priest, but this does not diminish the figurative importance of ‘Aeneas pontifex’, the title of an essay by H. J. Rose (London 1948) (not in Sch.’s bibliography). In discussing Aeneas’ ‘Führungsstil’ Sch. puts to one side Cairns’ elaborate charts of the virtues of the Hellenistic ‘good king’, and finds that, very much a dux sui generis, Aeneas is characterized above all by the following: Sorge, cura, in the sense both of concern for his people and consuming anxiety; a sense of pity that sometimes interferes with the requirements of good leadership, and is quite distinct from the imperial virtue of clementia; and a concern to give his (or her) due to every member of his people, both high and low (‘Jeder zählt’). This collegiality and approachability, which goes considerably further than the imperial virtue of civilitas, is manifested in exemplary form in Sicily in book 5, both in the games and in the episode of the mutiny of the Trojan women. Like others, Sch. sees the Sicilian episode as a laboratory for the exploration of the relationship between a leader and his people.

In the short fourth section Sch. asks how the, in many ways surprisingly new, picture of Aeneas as leader that emerges from an unbiased reading of the text relates to the image of Octavian/Augustus in the 20s BC. As a charismatic ‘Integrationsfigur’ who enjoys the support of all ranks Aeneas maps easily enough on to the young dux who appealed to consensus uniuersorum, and whose power rested on auctoritas rather than more formal offices. Is Aeneas as ‘Interimsfigur’, guiding his people through a period of transition but ultimately self-effacing, ambitious not for himself but only for his people, a useful screen for the true ambitions of Octavian? Sch. raises these possibilities, but shows tact in not attempting to define too rigid a set of equations between Augustus and his legendary ancestor. Sch. suggests that the vagueness and lack of institutional definition that characterize both the society of the Trojans and many of the roles of their leader Aeneas are deliberate, allowing later readers to project their own image of Augustus back into the Aeneid. How capacious the text is of different readings can be demonstrated yet again from a book published shortly after Schauer’s, Anton Powell’s ‘Virgil the partisan. A study in the re-integration of Classics’ (Swansea 2008), which also argues for the necessity of reading the Aeneid within the context of the 20s, but, unlike Sch. who denies that the poem is in the business of panegyric or criticism of the princeps at the start of his rule, argues for a politically partisan Virgil concerned to counter the negative image that clung to Octavian as a result of his failings against Sextus Pompeius in 42–36 BC. Quot lectores, tot Marones.  

Cambridge Philip Hardie