The problems posed in this book are strongly determined by modern anthropology and sociology; in this respect the author sometimes overshoots his mark. Lévi-Strauss has demonstrated that in primitive societies social and animal taxonomies were connected, but the interaction between Greek zoological taxonomy and Greek social life is not clarified. I doubt if Kuhn's theories about 'normal science' and 'paradigms' can be applied to the amalgam of Greek life sciences. And, what I most regret, L.'s treatment of the connexion between science and ideology is plainly disappointing. First of all, his concept of ideology is far too limited. What about Greek religion, theology, philosophy, teleological thinking, etc.? And, secondly, L. is inclined to overrate the influence of ideology and to underrate the influence of scientific research. The Hippocratic writers and Aristotle had the same ideas on the inequality of the sexes, they had, however, different ideas on the role of women in procreation. According to the Hippocratics men and women produce seed, Aristotle rejects this theory on biological grounds and states, that men produce the seed (the 'form') and women the menses (the 'matter'). In the following remarks on this subject L. suggests more than he can prove (p. 94): "The Hippocratic writers represent important voices against the notion of the essential disparity between the contribution of the two parents"; "Aristotle underpinned the dominant ideology"; "The grounds on which they did so were not themselves primarily ideological" (but secondarily they were?).

To sum up: a useful study of partly unknown subjects and a good counterpoise against the view, that Greek science became more and more pure, rational and free of values; but I am not convinced that our modern ideology can contribute much to the interpretation and understanding of Greek science and Greek theories.
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This is another volume in the long list of French monographs on Roman gods, this time concerning a deity whose dossier is extremely meagre. So far only one modest though valuable book had been devoted to Ops, namely P. H. N. G. Stehouwer's Mnemosyne, Vol. XXXIX, Fasc. 3-4 (1986)
dissertation\(^1\)), which confined itself to the oldest stage of the development. This time Ops is celebrated with a comprehensive study of 366 pages tracing her history down to the time of Augustus. P.'s admiration of Dumézil's "structure théologique" does not prevent him from also investigating other aspects, notably topographical data and the historical development including Greek influences; in this last he follows Bayet, Boyancé and Le Bonniec.

Ops, being "l'abondance considérée en tant que force active, productrice de richesse" and not "le produit", represents and produces the abundance of the corn harvest and is, in this quality, closely associated with the deity who presides over the barns, Consus. Two pairs of festivals in August and December testify to this partnership. Ops is at home in two different areas, separated by the brook of the Forum valley. On the 'left bank' she shares the regia, connected with the Opiconsivia of August, with Jupiter and Mars. In this tripartite constellation she represents the third function, albeit in an emphatically urbanised and 'regal' form. On the right bank she has an altar ad forum, that is in the area of Vulcanus and particularly Saturnus. In this cult, connected with the December festival, her liberty is unbridled and there is a rustic atmosphere, which in Roman symbolism is associated with Sabine origins. However, in both cults the focus is on the abundance of corn.

In the period of the second Punic war changes can be observed. The goddess becomes more and more abstract and her function broadens into the protection of the (material) prosperity and power of the city. Correspondingly she is strictly 'in the service' of Jupiter: her first temple, built, as P. argues, around the middle of the third century, was accorded a place on the Capitol. This evolution from "une richesse en quelque sorte primitive, c'est à dire de source surtout agricole," towards a "richesse mobilière" is, of course, a general characteristic of Roman society of the second and first century B.C. and Ops evolved accordingly. Her second temple, built by L. Caecilius Metellus Dalmaticus ± 115 B.C. and according to P. a reconstruction rather than a construction, has close connections with the booty of war and must be interpreted in the light of the religio-political circumstances of its time.

Of course, there were alternative traditions. Greek mythological influence created the couple Ops-Saturnus (Rhea-Kronos) and there was a—very scanty—iconographic tradition. Both preserved traces of the agricultural origins of the goddess but were not sufficient to have a decisive impact on ideological developments.