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In the foreword of her new book, *Cleopatra and Egypt*, Sally-Ann Ashton (hereafter A.) acknowledges her original aim was to find the ‘real’ Cleopatra. What the author came to realize in her project is that reality, much like beauty, lies in the eyes of the beholder. Every culture and every era fashions its own Cleopatra. And this is no less true for academics and biographers than for artists, playwrights and movie producers. A. identifies herself as a Classical art historian/archaeologist and Egyptologist, and she brings her expertise in these areas to bear in offering an alternative portrait of the legendary queen. As she asserts, ‘The aim of this present book is to place Cleopatra within an Egyptian context and to consider her as a ruler of Egypt, not as a Greek monarch’ (p. 1). The book succeeds in this respect; it is a valuable contribution to our cultural understanding of Ptolemaic Egypt and an important corrective that challenges our presumptions and prejudices in viewing Cleopatra as Macedonian Greek or Hellenistic queen. Nonetheless, the study is much more useful for the informed reader, who can benefit from this revisionist approach, than for the beginner. The book’s nine chapters, each segmented into multiple topics, are diffuse and richly but overly documented. In the end, the book fails to offer a general introduction to the queen or a focused biography of her life and political ambitions in a Greco-Roman world. As the book jacket announces, it will be an invaluable resource but all the more so when coupled with a more traditional biography.

The first chapter begins with the two most commonly asked questions regarding the Egyptian queen today: ‘Was she beautiful?’ and ‘Was she black?’ A. weighs the arguments on each side for Cleopatra’s identification as an ‘African Icon’. She concludes that ethnicity is always a matter of choice, and Cleopatra must be viewed as an ‘Egyptian’ who ‘embraced her native culture’. And yet did not all Ptolemaic rulers embrace Egyptian culture, exploit the traditions and rites of the ancient land, and portray themselves as pharaohs and living gods? How Cleopatra differed from her royal predecessors is not a consequence of her ethnicity (even if her mother was Egyptian, as recently argued) or skin tone. Gender distinguished Cleopatra’s rule. There were powerful Ptolemaic queens before Cleopatra but none who ruled alone, for so long, and exerted such dominance in Egypt and abroad. As A. astutely observes (p. 72), the Romans (not the Egyptians) took issue with a female ruler.

Chapter 2 (‘Sources’) is a missed opportunity. A. offers a rapid but profitable survey of recent scholarship on Cleopatra (the bibliography is excellent, but one should now add S. Burstein *The Reign of Cleopatra* [2008] and P. Jones *Cleopatra: Life & Times* [2006]). The review of the ancient sources, however, is cursory and at times inaccurate (Valerius Maximus is not a historian; Lucan is a Neronian poet). A. distinguishes some sources by chronology, others as ‘African’. Even if Appian should be read as an Alexandrian historian who spares his fellow citizens the typical Roman hostility and cultural stereotypes, his...
treatment of Cleopatra is not profoundly different from that of other authors. Might we not see gender prejudice trump ethnic bias? It is more difficult to see how later writers like Athenaeus, Florus, and Aurelius Victor should be understood as ‘African’. The last section (2.5 ‘Alternatives to the Literary and Historical Sources’), barely a page in length, would have benefited from a more detailed and explanatory survey of the nature of Egyptian textual evidence (notably, papyri), stelae, and temple dedications. It would then have served as a better introduction to the abundant material that follows.

The book’s central chapters (3–6) explore Cleopatra’s representations as an Egyptian ruler. In particular, the fourth chapter provides a careful review of the Egyptian names and titles, statues, and the temples (architecture and dedications) associated with the queen. The fifth chapter reminds us that the city of Alexandria had expanded during Cleopatra’s rule and includes discussions of the Caesareum (temple dedicated to Julius Caesar), Pompey’s tomb (rebuilt by Hadrian), the royal palaces along the seafront (A. cautions against believing the television claims of their discovery and associations with Cleopatra), and the mausoleum of Cleopatra. The sixth chapter explains Cleopatra’s status as a goddess and her divine titles in Egypt.

Chapter 7 (‘Cleopatra, Mark Antony and the East’) is the most disappointing. Readers unfamiliar with Roman politics following Caesar’s assassination will not be helped by the author’s curt narrative. Following the victory at Philippi, Antony demanded to meet the Egyptian queen at Tarsus not to answer for raising money for Gabinius (one of several historical errors of Roman names and dates throughout the book), but for the conspirator Cassius. A. also follows Appian’s narrative (4.82) too faithfully when she asserts that Cleopatra’s fleet had been damaged in a storm and that she returned to Egypt in distress. More likely, the queen calculated it was in her best interest not to send her fleet to assist either the conspirators or the Caesarians. What if she supported the losing side? Bad weather and illness were excuses that not even Antony believed. A. also confuses or slight key players. M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus (whom A. identifies simply as Messalla) was not Antony’s ‘lover’. Antony’s wife, Fulvia, is merely described as a woman who had been ‘politically active’ in Italy and who later ‘had lost her life, fighting for Antony’s cause’. A. is better when she raises questions about the queen’s alleged marriage with Antony and what this meant to her status as ruler in Egypt and the legitimacy of her children. Regarding Caesarion (or Ptolemy XV Caesar), A. assumes a greater controversy over his birth (pp. 57–58, 106–107) than the evidence warrants. It is much more likely that he was 17 at the time of his death (not 13 or 15). And if Cicero’s letters hint at a pregnancy, it would not be the birth of Caesarion, as A. allows the possibility, but the orator’s fears of a second ‘little Caesar’.

The last chapter looks at the legacy of Cleopatra. The triumphal ceremonies in Rome were in August (not ‘the autumn’), and the coinage that celebrated Octavian’s victory was far more extensive than the two very different ‘crocodile’ issues cited. A. omits any mention of the impressive ‘CAESAR DIVI F’ and ‘IMP CAESAR’ series. The coin from Gaul was actually issued by the Roman colony of Nemausus, modern Nîmes, founded by Augustus and
settled by veterans of his Egyptian campaign, or legions of Antony. Another section considers the fashion of ‘Egyptomania’ in Rome but asserts that it doesn’t take hold until the reign of Domitian, despite the popularity (and suppression) of the cult of Isis in Augustan Rome. The study ends with the murder of Cleopatra’s last descendant, the son of Cleopatra Selene, who had been given in marriage to the king of Mauretania. Named after the royal dynasty of Egypt and garbed in a purple cloak, the young Ptolemy won the applause of a raucous theatre crowd when Caligula invited him to Rome. He was not a ‘political threat’ (even to a madman emperor), but Ptolemy’s reception in Rome may be evidence of Cleopatra’s transformation from a despised foreign enemy to a popular cultural icon. Caligula, however, was no fan.

ROBERT GURVAL
University of California, Los Angeles


In Philosophy and Exegesis in Simplicius: The Methodology of a Commentator, Han Baltussen (B.) offers a careful and comprehensive reconstruction of the ways in which Simplicius of Cilicia (c. 480–540 CE) framed and executed his extensive Aristotelian commentaries. If Simplicius is known at all to Classicists, it is for two things. First, his commentaries provide many of the most extensive fragments of the writings of Presocratic philosophers. Second, he was one of the seven Platonic philosophers who chose to leave the Roman Empire for Persia after the emperor Justinian in 531 restricted their ability to teach and live as they saw fit. Despite these notable features and the over 3000 pages of his writing that survive, Simplicius has not received sufficient scholarly attention. When read in its own right, his work has often been dismissed as derivative and uninspired. And yet, as B. ably shows, Simplicius was an extremely productive and sophisticated thinker who saw his commentaries as works that could move forward a specific intellectual agenda. B.’s Simplicius is a refreshingly three-dimensional figure motivated by philosophical, spiritual, and political concerns particular to the 520s and 530s CE.

B. argues that the way to understand Simplicius’ commentaries is to read them with an awareness of their author’s scholarly approach and larger objectives. B. devotes much of the study to showing how the particular intellectual context in which Simplicius wrote shaped his use of the ideas of both earlier philosophers and his own commentaries. Like Plotinus, Iamblichus, and Proclus, Simplicius presented a broadly integrative Platonism that incorporated Aristotelian, Stoic, and Pythagorean ideas. Nevertheless, B. argues, Simplicius went beyond his predecessors in seeking to harmonize all Greek philosophy. In so doing, he aimed to counteract the common Christian rhetorical strategy of attacking pagan philosophy by pinpointing disagreements between individual thinkers. B. further suggests that Simplicius’ own experi-
ence of living through Justinian's prohibition of teaching in Athens contributed to a sense that Platonism was profoundly threatened (188). Simplicius may then have envisioned his commentaries as a sort of textbook (206) from which this comprehensive version of Greek philosophy could be learned even if no teacher was available to present it.

B. organizes the study around Simplicius' treatment of other authors, but he succeeds in ensuring that these discussions originate from within Simplicius' own texts. He divides the book into two sections of three chapters apiece, organized chronologically. The first three chapters detail how Simplicius responds to and makes use of early Greek philosophy. In Chapter One, B. provides a useful introduction to Simplicius' historical context and offers an extended discussion of Simplicius' intellectual approach. Of particular importance is B.'s careful framing of late Platonism as the enterprise of a person with "deeply religious motives as well as certain technical skills of a scholarly nature" (21). Although not a controversial point, B. does well to raise it at the outset of his study and further develop it as his argument progresses. Chapter Two examines Simplicius' engagement with Presocratic thought. It argues that Simplicius reinterprets Presocratic philosophy as a premonition of Platonic thought on which he can impose his own views. Chapter Three looks at Simplicius' engagement with Peripatetic ideas. B. describes how Simplicius situated Aristotle and his students Theophrastus and Eudemus within the larger Platonic family and drew comfortably upon the most suitable of their ideas.

The book's next three chapters examine Simplicius' engagement with earlier and contemporary commentators in order to show stylistic antecedents and trace the development of the commentary genre. Chapter Four focuses upon Alexander of Aphrodisias and shows how easily Peripatetic commentary could influence Platonism. B. argues that Simplicius made extensive use of Alexander because his work offered a good base commentary from which his own analysis could begin. In this, Simplicius seems to build upon the example of Syrianus, a fifth-century predecessor who commented on Aristotle by writing a work apparently designed to serve only as a supplement to the existing work of Alexander. Simplicius did not use Alexander uncritically, however. Instead, Simplicius seems to have engaged in a constant assessment of how well Alexander's arguments held up. When merited, he even offered strong criticism of Alexander's ideas. Chapter Five examines the significant Platonist commentators who preceded Simplicius. B. begins by considering the origins of the Platonist commentary tradition, beginning with the Anonymous Commentary on the Theaetetus and proceeding through the work of Simplicius' own teachers Ammonius and Damascius. One particular strength of this rich chapter is the concise but well-considered call to appreciate the degree to which late Platonic thought joined spirituality and religion with rational philosophy. Chapter Six rounds out the section by discussing the polemics that Simplicius leveled against the Christian Platonist John Philoponus. These passages are notable both for the ideas they contain and for the ad hominem attacks that they press against Philoponus. B. suggest that the intensity of Simplicius' assaults come from his fear that, as a former stu-
dent of Ammonius, Philoponus may have possessed both the pedigree and skill to make cogent Christian criticisms of Platonism. The work then concludes with a short epilogue that restates and expands B.’s main conclusions.

B. has produced a sound and stimulating portrait of Simplicius’ methods and intellectual context. His conclusions are generally sound and his arguments largely compelling. Indeed, in most cases, B. has probed and prodded his evidence as far as it can go. One exception to this is B.’s assertion that the political threat Christianity posed to Platonism may have helped to motivate Simplicius’ project. While this idea seems quite plausible, the Aristotelian commentaries do not provide much in the way of hard evidence that Simplicius saw contemporary political events as a threat to his philosophical enterprises. Simplicius’ commentary on Epictetus’ Handbook, however, makes this concern explicit in its (justly famous) description of the role of a philosopher in an irredeemably corrupt polity. This evidence would have enhanced B.’s intriguing argument about Simplicius’ particular concerns. This small quibble aside, B. has offered readers both an impressive introduction to Simplicius and a new model for how scholarship on the late antique commentary tradition can be done.

Edward Watts
Indiana University


Claudia Baracchi’s Aristotle’s Ethics as First Philosophy is an insightful and intelligent book that, in opposition to the Western traditional view of the separation between practical and theoretical wisdom, argues that these two modes of thought are indissolubly intertwined. This is the case for two fundamental reasons. First, logos in all its forms (epistêmê and dianoia) is endowed with meaning and relevance only to the extent that it is attuned to its non discursive boundaries: sensible experience and shared practices on the one hand, and intuitive first principles on the other. Second, knowledge of the first principles itself is “phenomenologically and […] experientially grounded” and rests on “living—in-action” (p. 2). On these grounds Baracchi argues that ethics, as the most comprehensive discourse that studies the conditions of all thought, is first philosophy.

In the first chapter, devoted to Metaphysics A and Posterior Analytics B.19, Baracchi shows that even the most speculative inquiries are grounded in the primordial phenomenon of desire and have a strong link with sensibility and doxa. Not only is sensation the beginning of knowledge. The indemonstrable principles of all sciences are themselves attained through epagôgê, which starts from perception as well as from commonly held beliefs.

Chapter two focuses on the first six books of the Nicomachean Ethics, which, according to Baracchi, “clarifies and further develops the insight regarding ground and conditions already announced in the ‘metaphysical’ discussions,” and for his reason enjoys a privileged status and can be regarded as first philosophy (p. 170).
Given that all human activities are directed to the attainment of the highest good, politics is the most architectonic and authoritative science that orients and guides them all. Indeed, only in the context of the *polis* can human beings actualize their nature as “animals having *logos*” and cultivate the intellectual virtues, the development of which is itself a “historical-genealogical phenomenon” (p.120). Moreover, the ethical discourse is the only one that becomes fully aware of itself as thoroughly dialectical and as grounded in communal practices, which are the very conditions of its possibility. For Aristotle stresses that ethical teachings can be fruitfully received only by those who, besides being experienced, have already been habituated to act well and are thus able to see the ends of all actions, which are at the same time the in-demonstrable starting points of practical philosophy. Furthermore, Aristotle’s thesis of the mutual implication of virtues of character and *phronēsis* shows in a paradigmatic way the interconnection between actions and desires on the one hand, and thought on the other.

The chapter closes with a discussion of the intellectual virtues and the defense of the unity of *sophia* and *phronēsis*. The latter “includes a genuinely contemplative, indeed, ‘theoretical’ dimension” (in the broad sense of *theōria*) (p. 208), and the former never loses touch with the phenomenal and the ethical.

The last point is further elaborated in the third chapter, which offers an excellent discussion of the principle of non-contradiction. The capacity to recognize this *archē* as the highest principle of being and thought rests, on the one hand, on our openness to the phenomena, which impose themselves upon us in their determinacy, and on the other, on our reliance on *praxis* broadly understood. Aristotle defends the principle against those who deny its validity by showing that even they live and think in accordance with it. First, they systematically choose one determinate course of action over another. Second, they engage in dialogue, and the very deed of speaking meaningfully is the concrete expression of the constitutive role of the principle for the possibility of *logos*.

The final chapter points to the unity of our approach to the human and what surpasses it through an interesting discussion of friendship. Perfect friendship between equals is reciprocal love animated by the common desire for the good, and thus reveals human nature as “an open structure of receptivity […] inhabited by, and striving towards, that which is irreducible to oneself” (p. 269). Our relation to nature and the divine may in turn be understood in terms of *philia* among unequals: contemplation of the highest being and order is driven by love and enables us to understand the human in its proper position within the whole that constitutes its origin and highest end.

Baracchi’s book brims with insightful remarks on a number of topics, and succeeds in arguing for the unity of the various modes of human cognition without blurring their differences. Correspondingly, the author successfully draws a complex but unified picture of human nature as capable of self-transcendence and yet always in touch with the sensible and phenomenal world. The attempt to move from the thesis of the unity of practical and theoretical philosophy to the view of ethics as first philosophy produces mixed
results. Is ethics first in the order of knowledge? While the author makes a good case for the importance of the reflections on ethical discourse to illuminate all forms of cognition, the idea of the primacy of ethics is in tension with the Aristotelian understanding of human beings as capable of being informed by the structure of reality as it appears. This is a universal human capacity that is essential for the apprehension of first principles and that seem to be minimally affected by the nature of the particular ethical formations in which human beings happen to flourish.

Is ethics first in the order of being? Baracchi’s views on this point are not always linear. At times she suggests that because ethics is first in the order of knowledge, it is also first in the order of being (e.g., p. 170), but does not explain how primacy in one order translates into primacy in the other. For the most part, however, she persuasively defends the more plausible position according to which, while the eternal bodies and the divine are first in the order of being, our apprehension of them is never severed from desire and from the phenomenal world.

SILVIA CARLI
Xavier University


Roger Beck’s concise introduction to Greco-Roman astrology, as he freely admits, suffers from titular problems (xi–xii). “Ancient” refers only to the classical world, as in accordance with the other titles of this Blackwell series (those interested in Babylonian astrology need to look elsewhere). Beck (B.) also rejects the possibility of writing a history of astrology, maintaining that the undertaking was essentially static in classical antiquity. Thus, this work is an introduction to the theory and practice of astrology in the classical world.

The first two chapters consider the theory, definition, and origin of astrology. B. emphasizes the tight relationship between astrology and astronomy in antiquity, rightly noting that modern science history’s focus on astronomy and distaste for astrology has led to a number of problems for our understanding of the latter. Science historians have often rejected astrology, separating it from astronomy, even though they were considered two facets of the same prognostic undertaking. Even so, the author points out that Ptolemy himself distinguished between the two, while considering them both predictive: astronomy allows one to foretell the future positions of the stars and planets; astrology is, in Ptolemy’s words, “prognostication through astronomy” (7; Tét 1.1). B. goes on to describe the varieties of astrology, including catarchic, interrogatory, omen astrology and, most importantly, genethliology. Genethliology was undoubtedly the most common type of astrological practice in classical antiquity and, thus, is the primary subject of the subsequent chapters. B. finishes Chapter 2 with a brief discussion of the origin of classical astrology in Mesopotamia and Egypt.
Chapters 3–6 present the semantic system of astrology and its operative principles. Here, the author outlines the basic layout of a horoscope. He also presents the apparent movement of the planets within the signs and discusses fundamental concepts such as the important points on the ecliptic, signs of the zodiac, angular relationships, and, just as importantly, their respective semantic loads that enabled the astrologer to assign meaning to the sky. Though the discussion in these chapters is mostly descriptive, the author still manages to contextualize the practice within a broader intellectual framework, even if only briefly. For example, he observes how astrological semantics are tied into larger conceptual systems in antiquity (e.g., odd numbers, hot, male = positive; even numbers, cold, female = negative). More widely, he points out that the popularity of horoscopes and the correlative awareness of the surrounding heavens naturally led to the ability to map celestial features and to reconstruct and predict celestial phenomena. Negative observations on these chapters are few: Chapter 3 closes with a section entitled “An Example of a Simple Ancient Horoscope – and How to Replicate it with an Astronomical Program on a Home Computer.” Here B. offers an ancient horoscope but does not actually inform his readers on how to replicate it on their home computers!

In Chapters 7 and 8, B. describes how the astronomical data were actually interpreted by means of the astrological hermeneutic. In Chapter 7, he introduces the primary sources for his discussion, i.e., papyri and astrological handbooks. But both are problematic for reconstructing practice since horoscopes preserved on papyrus do not supply an interpretation while the handful of surviving handbooks are not really how-to guides for the would-be practitioner. Rather they serve to showcase the sagacity of the master who composed them. Furthermore, the principles in the handbooks, if applied consistently to any individual’s horoscope, would present a horde of incongruous interpretations; a horoscope really represents the spectrum of possible products of an individual’s life. It is the skill of a good astrologer to be able to pick out which of the possibilities are the most likely to be fulfilled. Thus, horoscopes of the dead provided a retrospective control for astrologers and also afforded them the opportunity to showcase their sophistication by discerning the “true” causes of a person’s life events. B. focuses on these readings offered post mortem, since they offer plenary examples of the astrologer’s art and since, more importantly, we simply have very few (if any) horoscopes that actually attempt to predict events of a person’s life. The author provides the example of Firmicus Maternus’ post mortem horoscope of Ceionius Rufius Albinus, which sufficiently highlights the complex grabbag of devices that the expert could use to generate meaningful cause-effect relationships between celestial configurations and the events in a person’s life. B. also offers an exercise created by Vettius Valens in which that astrologer compared the horoscopes of six men who found themselves nearly shipwrecked and pursued by pirates in 154 CE in an effort to demonstrate that the horoscopes of each of these individuals, though born in different times and places, pointed to a crisis in the same year. B. is right in highlighting this text as a gesture toward finding some empirical evidence for astrology’s
predictive value. The author also includes a fascinating discussion of the last of the Greek horoscopes, one analyzing the birth of Islam written in 775 ca. 150 years after the fact.

Chapter 8 examines the legal predicaments that were posed to a profession that, at least in theory, could offer answers to questions such as the length of person’s life and the identity of the next ruler. Though in Rome it was generally illegal for an astrologer to predict a death, the extant manuals say a great deal about how to do so and B. gives a couple of examples, including one for the emperor Hadrian (composed safely after his death). Despite these legal constrictions, emperors too relied on the advice of astrologers, and the author discusses cases from the reigns of Claudius and Domitian.

B. summarizes his own take on the importance of astrology to modern scholarship in the final chapter, recognizing that although the idea that the stars physically affect a person’s life is bunk, that the ancients believed so is itself profoundly important. He also argues that genethliological astrology is a “natural language” (or at least was considered one by the ancients), more than simply a semantic system. The semantic system is known and understood by the users of the language, i.e., the astrologers and the stars themselves (or the gods who arranged them). B. considers this assertion controversial. Perhaps; but I am not sure what affixing the label of “language” to astrology provides us that describing it as simply “a very sophisticated semantic system” does not.

B. writes with great wit and clarity. This work is a well conceived and organized introduction to classical astrology. It will serve as a popular entry-point to the subject for some time to come.

Jeffrey Cooley
Boston College


These ten essays, which first appeared from 1980 to 1996, work from a simple but perplexing question: “Why call a stream of words a connection of threads?” (2). Unthinkingly as we speak of a “web of words” and derive text from textus, weaving and speech differ markedly in respect to spatial versus temporal organization, the material versus the immaterial, and, in antiquity, female weavers and the male authors who represented them. To analyze the relationship of gender and language in archaic epos, Plato, and Aristophanes, B. brings to bear structuralist / poststructuralist theory, deconstruction, psychoanalysis, and, most intriguingly, architectural theory. The collection modulates from webs to other structures, including architecture, on which B. speaks knowledgeably, having earned a Master of Architecture as well as a Ph.D. in Classical Philology.

A lively band of tricksters courses through these essays: Mêtis, Helen, Penelope, Hesiod’s Muses, Pandora, Aphrodite, Hermes, and Aristophanes’ Praxagora. Despite the fading charms of deconstruction and psychoanalysis,
these interpretations remain fresh because of B.’s acumen as a reader and stylist and her singular gift for explaining the spatial dimensions of narrative meaning. The volume’s cover presents Dora Wheeler’s tapestry of Penelope as she unravels her web, which B. uses to explain the progression of arguments in the essays (1–9). She provides an index locorum (393–409), an index of terms in Greek (411–417), and an exemplary register of names and concepts (e.g., “analogy / polarity,” “architecture, anthropocentrism in,” “marked vs. unmarked categories / meanings”) (371–392). She introduces her theoretical tools lucidly in each essay, with some unavoidable repetition across the collection. The essays have been revised but do not address scholarly work since their first publication.

As the subtitle makes clear, these readings address “the female in Greek thought,” not ancient Greek women. The “female” includes not only women and goddesses as represented by male authors but also the structurally “female” function of the architect / dēmiourgos. B.’s gender analyses owe most to Lévi-Strauss and his followers, as well as Freud, and do not engage directly with the theories of Second Wave Feminism. B. offers accessible and nuanced investigations of how gender works in various texts rather than recruiting the texts to support a master theory.

The introduction, “Language and the Female in Early Greek Thought” (ch. 1), focuses on Hesiod’s Muses and Helen (in Homer, Stesichorus, and Gorgias) as paradigms of females’ ability to speak both truth and the deceptive semblance of truth. The following essays proceed in three thematically organized triads.

The first section, “Weaving in Narrative: Textures of Space and Time,” addresses the Homeric poems. “Helen’s Web: Time and Tableau in the Iliad” (ch. 2) takes Helen’s weaving as a key to the temporality of the epic, arguing that the contradictions of historical sequence, especially in Iliad 11–15, are not flaws but create “unperishing fame” by introducing universality and timelessness into the narrative: “The art of the Iliad is the art of the tableau” (46). The third chapter, “Similes and Symbol in Odyssey V,” finds a progression across similes that presents a symbolic rebirth of the hero. “Odyssean Temporality: Many (Re)Turns” (ch. 4) analyzes the temporal “interweaving” of the chronological structures of retrospect and prophecy in Odyssey 11–12.

The second triad, “Weaving pseudea homoia etumoisin ‘false things like to real things,’” quotes Hesiod’s teasingly ambiguous Muses to introduce three studies of the binaries that underlie archaic thought. “Helen’s ‘Good Drug’” (ch. 5) explores Helen’s pharmakon, with its powers of good and ill, as a symbol of the Odyssey’s own ambiguous authority in telling the truth and as an epitome of the workings of polarity and analogy in Homeric thought. Chapter 6, “Sacred Apostrophe: Re-Presentation and Imitation in Homeric Hymn to Apollo and Homeric Hymn to Hermes,” reads Hermes as a doubling and undoing of Apollo in a relation analogous to writing and speech in Derrida’s analysis of Plato’s Phaedrus. Chapter 7, “Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: Tradition and Rhetoric, Praise and Blame,” addresses gendered discourse in the erotic power reversals of divine female and mortal male.
The final triad of later essays (1992–1996), “Weaving in Architecture: The Truth of Building,” moves to structures that are less concrete and securely gendered than is weaving, in particular to an “architecture of signs” (220) encompassing gender and marriage. These essays offer venturesome and often insightful interpretations, having appeared both in classics and architectural venues (of the latter, e.g., the collections The Sex of Architecture and Strategies in Architectural Thinking). “The (Re)Marriage of Penelope and Odysseus” (ch. 8) investigates the “architectural partnership” (7) of Odysseus the bedbuilder and Penelope the weaver of threads and words. The reader willing to posit discourses avant la lettre (“an Odyssean architectural theory,” 215) can gain new insight into much-analyzed passages. “Architecture Gender Philosophy” (ch. 9), uses an ambitious gender analysis of khôra (“space,” “place”) in Plato’s Timaeus and Laws to intervene in a 1987 exchange between Jacques Derrida and the architect Peter Eisenman over the comparative standings of philosophy and architecture in deconstruction. In this essay, B.’s phrasing for once becomes ponderous: “The architecturalization of philosophy is its deconstruction” (262). Chapter 10, “Female Fetish Urban Form,” offers a heady mix, with illustrations, of architectural theory, Xenophon’s Oeconomicus, and Freud on fetishes to interpret the female takeover in Aristophanes’ Ecclesiastaezusae. Some readers may find Freud’s theories more outlandish than Aristophanes’. Theory makes strange bedfellows—and to good effect, for B. offers a fresh and suggestive reading of the play.

Like any worthy collection, this volume is more than the sum of its parts, for B.’s larger project—more an architecture than an argument—demonstrates how rich and various, and endlessly entangled in assumptions about gender, are the non-linear structures of narrative. The volume itself, in being well summarized and indexed and clear about its arguments, invites the reader to navigate in ways now natural to Web users and thereby demonstrates how much we have already changed our assumptions about the linearity of the “web of words.”

FREDERICK GRIFFITHS
Amherst College


Joanne Berry’s The Complete Pompeii offers a textbook introduction to Pompeii for a non-scholarly audience, supplementing other recent approaches to Pompeii (e.g., A. Cooley and M. G. L. Cooley, Pompeii: A Sourcebook [Routledge 2004]; J. J. Dobbins and P. W. Foss, eds., The World of Pompeii [Routledge 2008]; M. Beard, Fires of Vesuvius: Pompeii Lost and Found [Belknap 2008]). As with other volumes in Thames & Hudson’s “Complete” series, this book is abundantly illustrated, with 318 illustrations, 275 of which are in color.

After a brief Introduction, Berry (hereafter B.) begins Chapter 1 with the eruption of Vesuvius. She notes what the ancients thought of Vesuvius and includes Pliny’s descriptions of the eruption as well as modern scientific analysis. Particularly important is B.’s explanation of why Pompeii is not, in fact,
a “time capsule,” but rather a reflection of the processes of sporadic abandonment, destruction by Vesuvius, looting, and harmful excavation techniques.

Chapter 2 offers a chronological catalogue of the excavation of Pompeii and Herculaneum, including main personages, the political climate, and changing excavation techniques. At its best this chapter provides vivid glimpses into the connections between politics and archaeology, although sometimes the text veers into lengthy descriptions of which parts of the towns were excavated when.

B. clearly and thoroughly explains the complex origins and growth of Pompeii in Chapter 3, which stands out as the most nuanced chapter. She begins with ancient literary sources, explains modern theories of the development of Pompeii, and proceeds with a tight analysis of the Greek, Etruscan, Samnite, and Roman influences evident in the archaeological material.

The people of Pompeii are examined in Chapter 4, which includes a synopsis of Pompeii’s social structure, followed by examination of how tombs provide evidence of Pompeii’s social composition and an individual’s status and aspirations. An excellent plan of the Herculaneum Gate Necropolis incorporates translated epitaphs (pp. 100–101). Also included are sections on graffiti and literacy, sex and erotica, and women. The former two sections are helpfully broad in scope. The discussion of status in this chapter would benefit from more subtlety, as it currently gives short shrift to slavery.

In Chapter 5, B. presents the political structure of Pompeii and the different buildings (including civic structures, theaters, the amphitheater, and baths) and forms of entertainment commissioned by those with political ambitions. There are entertaining artists’ reconstructions of the Forum (pp. 126–127) and Stabian Baths (pp. 150–151), and samples of translated electoral programmata (p. 131). Nevertheless, B. glosses over the seeming lack of competition for the office of duovir, and her narrow focus on the use of buildings and games by political elites leaves this reader yearning for discussion of the moral status of gladiators, evidence for mixed-sex bathing, and the multiple functions of baths and bathing.

B. tackles Pompeian houses in Chapter 6, concentrating on their decoration and the relationship between decoration and social status. Included in this chapter are descriptions of some of the more famous houses of Pompeii, and an especially lucid section on the difficulties and rewards of analyzing household artifacts.

Turning to gods, temples, and cults in Chapter 7, B. describes temples of the pre-Roman and Roman period (including the Imperial cult and foreign cults) and their relationship to displaying or advancing social standing. She also discusses neighborhood and household shrines and ritual activities. This chapter would be aided by more attention to religious activities and rituals more generally, and B.’s portrayal of the roles of freedmen in cults would benefit from more nuance, such as that provided by L. Hackworth Petersen’s The Freedman in Roman Art and Art History (Cambridge 2006).

Chapter 8 concerns Pompeii’s economy, covering agriculture in Pompeii’s hinterland and in town, the local production and sale of craft goods, and bars and inns. B.’s description is supplemented by excellent textboxes
and visual materials, such as a textbox on the various types of occupations at Pompeii (p. 221); an artist’s reconstruction of the Fullery of Stephanus (p. 222); and a textbox and diagram offering an informative explanation of different scholars’ reconstructions of Pompeii’s ancient coastline (p. 224). B. ends with a short chapter on the aftermath of the earthquake (dated by B. to 63 CE), skillfully countering theories of “elite flight” during this period with the complexities of the archaeological evidence.

The end materials include a section on visiting Pompeii, further readings, and an index. The further readings begin with a reference to Garcia and Garcia’s bibliography on Pompeii, then list chronologically major excavation reports, followed by general sources and reference works, and chapter-by-chapter bibliography. A thematic organization for these latter sections, however, might prove more useful than the current alphabetical arrangement. B. includes an admirable number of foreign-language works and articles on specific buildings, although the general reader might have benefited from a stronger focus on English-language introductory texts (such as overviews on bathing or religion, for example). Some works are conspicuously absent from the further readings, such as S. R. Joshel, Work, Identity, and Legal Status at Rome: A Study of the Occupational Inscriptions (Oklahoma 1992); W. V. Harris, Ancient Literacy (Harvard 1989); and J. R. Clarke, Looking at Lovemaking: Constructions of Sexuality in Roman Art 100 B.C.–A.D. 250 (Berkeley 1998), among others.

As a whole, the tightness, clarity, and subtlety of the text vary. In addition, the sporadic mention of Herculaneum sometimes fleshes out a discussion but sometimes may distract a reader. Numerous terms, authors, and place names are left undefined, which might hamper a general reader’s progress through the text. In this respect, more in-text glosses or a glossary at the end of the book would have provided useful assistance. Occasional factual peccadillos might sidetrack those familiar with the material, although none that I noticed would significantly alter a general reader’s comprehension. In sum, the format of the book, with clearly marked headings and subheadings, numerous textboxes, and a true wealth of images, makes it easy to consult for teaching purposes. This book provides a valuable resource for those teaching courses on Pompeii, Classical Archaeology, and Roman Social History.

Sarah Levin-Richardson
Stanford University


This book is the third in a series that explores the relationship between Platonism and other prominent philosophical movements of the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial periods. The series is a product of the Diatribai annual conference on ancient philosophy, and the majority of the papers
in this volume were first presented at the colloquium on *Stoicismo e platonismo in età ellenistica e imperiale* in April of 2006.

In their introduction to the book, the editors contend that “it is wrong and it would be impossible to reduce the Stoic-Platonist relationship to a simple formula” (p. xv). While the two schools were often engaged in forceful argument against each other, each school also borrowed terms and ideas from the other. Therefore the interactions between Platonism and Stoicism were varied and complex. The book’s articles demonstrate this thesis through a careful examination of a wide variety of Stoic-Platonic interactions.

The book’s first article is “Le débat entre platonisme et stoïcisme sur la vie scolastique: Chrysippe, la Nouvelle Académie et Antiochus” by Thomas Bénatouïl. The author examines the scholastic life (as promoted by Plato and Aristotle), contrasting Chrysippus’ criticism of it with the defense it received from the New Academy and Antiochus of Ascalon. Next is Francesca Alesse’s “Alcuni esempi della relazione tra l’etica stoica e Platone” which looks at the influence of Plato’s works on Stoic ethics. She finds that, whereas the early Stoics were interested in borrowing ideas from the Platonic dialogues, the later Stoics primarily used Plato’s works to argue against the Skeptics and contemporary Platonists. This article is followed by “La lecture stoïcienne du laconisme à travers le filtre de Platon” by Sophie Aubert. Aubert shows that Platonic dialogues, such as *Protagoras* and *Phaedrus*, inspired the Stoics to create a philosophical style of writing, based on laconism (brevity). This way of expressing philosophy celebrated the use of “brief and memorable words” and “words rich in logos” (p. 46).

In “L’Érôs pédagogique chez Platon et les Stoïciens,” Valéry Laurand discusses the Stoic understanding of eros, focusing on passages in Epictetus. The Stoic treatment of eros seems to have been strongly influenced by Platonic dialogues, especially the *Symposium*, but also to be at odds with those same dialogues. The next article is unique, in that its subject is a poetic rather than philosophical work. John Stevens’ “Platonism and Stoicism in Vergil’s *Aeneid*” examines the *Aeneid* as emblematic of a time when “some began to think of the two philosophies as a single set of great ideas” (p. 87). For example, Vergil reflects the Platonic tripartite soul in the three realms of the underworld, but also incorporates the Stoic belief in fate throughout the *Aeneid*. Next, Mauro Bonazzi’s “Eudorus’ psychology and Stoic ethics” explores the apparently strong influence of Stoicism on Eudorus. Eudorus uses a lot of Stoic terminology, but his rejection of psychological monism makes it clear that he is a Platonist. Bonazzi argues that Eudorus adopts Stoic vocabulary in order to strengthen his polemic against the Stoics and to subordinate their thought to his own Platonism.

In “Onomastic Reference in Seneca. The Case of Plato and the Platonists,” Teun Tieleman analyzes Seneca’s references to Plato and others, showing that Seneca generally restricts these references to cases in which they support Stoic teachings. Continuing the discussion of Seneca, Brad Inwood’s “Seneca, Plato and Platonism: the case of Letter 65” discusses Seneca’s understanding of causes. According to Seneca, reason is the only cause and Plato and Aristotle erred in identifying additional types of cause. Inwood also
discusses the extent to which philosophy in Seneca’s time was bookish and
academic (as in the middle ages) and the extent to which it was still an oral
activity (as in ancient Greece). Next, Robert Sharples examines the influence
of Stoicism on the understanding of fate among the Middle Platonists (es-
pecially pseudo-Plutarch) in “The Stoic Background to the Middle Platonist
discussion of Fate.” Sharples argues that the Middle Platonists did not see
themselves as importing Stoic ideas so much as correcting them.

In “Marcus Aurelius’ Meditations: How Stoic and How Platonic?” Chris-
topher Gill argues that while the emperor appropriates Platonic language, his
thought is solidly Stoic. Specifically, Gill argues that, despite appearances,
Marcus never embraces a Platonic mind/body dualism. Then in “Platonismo
e Teoria della Conoscenza stoica tra II e III secolo d.C.,” Riccardo Chiara-
donna explores the varied ways in which the Stoic concept of koinai ennoiai
was treated by Alcinous, Galen, Porphyry and Plotinus. He argues that this
is “not only the story of a refutation, but also (and principally) the story of
an integration” (p. 209) in which each writer modified the concept to fit his
own philosophical outlook. The final article of the book is “Calcidius on God”
by Gretchen Reydams-Schils. Here, she argues that while Calcidius’ view of
God is primarily derived from the three Platonic levels of divinity, he is also
strongly influenced by Stoic thought.

This book will be appreciated primarily by classicists and specialists in
ancient philosophy; but a few of the articles may also hold some appeal for
the broader philosophical community, since they raise philosophical issues
that go beyond mere analysis of the sources. Inwood’s discussion of causes
and Sharples’ examination of the meaning of “conditional fate” are especially
intriguing. And anyone who has ever enjoyed reading the Aeneid will be in-
terested in the insights into its philosophical themes offered by Stevens.

Those who read the book as a whole will find that it covers a wide
range of topics, offers up many insights, and impressively supports the edi-
tors’ thesis that the interactions between Platonism and Stoicism cannot be
reduced to any simple formula.

ANDREW R. HILL
Xavier University

David J. Breeze, Roman Frontiers of Britain. Classical World Series. London:

The “Classical World Series” aims to produce reliable introductions to
a wide range of topics, for students and non-professionals as well as
for professional classicists in need of a quick review of a specific area
of knowledge. Breeze (B.), currently the Head of the Special Heritage Proj-
ects, Historic Scotland, author of over a dozen books on the historic physical
remains of Britain and Scotland, and longtime excavator on both Hadrian’s
Wall and the Antonine Wall, has here written a well-organized, diachronic
account of the Roman occupation and the physical frontiers of Britain and
Scotland. The book introduces non-specialists to a wide variety of topics re-
lated to the Roman frontiers in Britain. These include the nature of the pri-
mary sources, the history of scholarship, the construction and purpose of the frontiers, and the nature, organization, and daily routine of the Roman army.

Historians once readily cited *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* 11.2 as referring to the frontier as something “qui barbaros Romanosque dividet.” Almost two thousand years later, however, the frontiers that were once meant to divide cultures are now bringing people together. Hadrian’s Wall obtained the status of a World Heritage Site in 1987, followed by the Antonine Wall in July 2008. Additionally, and perhaps more importantly, the two frontiers are major components of both British and Scottish cultural identities and testaments to the complicated historical traditions associated with both monuments, since both modern British and Scottish cultures identify themselves with both Roman and ancient native populations. As a result, Hadrian’s Wall and the Antonine Wall symbolize the syntheses of these two cultural influences.

The first chapter “The Sources” (11–21) and the second chapter “The Roman Army” (22–28) offer essential background information. To B.’s credit, the author critically examines the primary sources that surround the subject at hand (literary sources, inscriptions, the Vindolanda writing tablets, and numismatic evidence), an important addition for those interested in teaching the modern craft of ancient history and stressing the limitation of all ancient primary sources. Additionally, B. includes a welcome, albeit brief, history of archaeology associated with the Romano-British frontiers. This account starts with sixteenth-century antiquarians and leads up to the geophysical surveys and other tools used by twenty-first century archaeologists. His account of the Roman army in the second chapter offers no new ideas; it is, rather, a quick account of Roman military organization and the layout of most Roman forts.

The third chapter “Before the Walls” (29–36), the fourth “Hadrian’s Wall” (37–50), and the fifth “The Antonine Wall” (51–63) are the core of the book. B., incorporating new discoveries and theories from the Roman Gask project, states that a Roman military campaign, followed by fort construction projects, occurred north of the Forth-Clyde line early in the Roman occupation, but was abandoned sometime between A.D. 86 and 103. Next, B. focuses on Hadrian’s Wall by detailing its general features, building processes, and general layout. He stresses the experimental nature of the Roman endeavor, in their use of a defined, linear barrier as a frontier, and proceeds to reinforce the idea that the Hadrianic and Antonine Walls were both always “works in progress.” B. believes that the purpose of the Romano-British frontiers was to divide the barbarians from the Romans. The linear barriers enabled the Roman army to prevent attacks by brigands, to facilitate strict control into and out of the Roman territory, and to create a staging area for security patrols and larger campaigns into the north, if the need ever arose. In B.’s framework, the degree of separation between Roman and barbarian in Britain was much more stark and dramatic than on other imperial frontiers in the Empire (North Africa, for example), where physical boundaries were much more permeable. Although B. offers a number of theories as to why the Romans pushed north after Hadrian’s death in 138 and began work on the Antonine Wall, he favors the idea that the emperor Antoninus needed a military operation that would
give him military prestige. Once again, B. adeptly discusses the physical nature, building program, and overall layout of this frontier barrier.

B. concludes his book with the sixth chapter “Hadrian’s Wall Reoccupied” (64–73), the seventh chapter “Life on the Frontier” (74–85), a brief section discussing everyday life on the frontier during Roman occupation, and a small series of sections consisting of an epilogue, a list of sites to visit, a list of Roman emperors, and suggestions for further study and reading.

B.’s work is one of the most efficient presentations of the Roman frontiers in Britain. In the short space of ninety-nine pages the author does an exceptional job of introducing the major topics, areas of research, and debates surrounding this subject. B.’s prose is readable and his narrative flows well. Furthermore, the book is organized with many sub-headings within its chapters, allowing the pace of the book to move at an appropriate rate. The book contains numerous maps, drawings, and photographs. Unfortunately, while B. cites literary sources to support his arguments, most of the time he does not cite the actual primary sources. The Historia Augusta is an exception. This is a minor criticism for an excellent book.

JOSEPH LEMAK
Elmira College
Mansfield University


We know that the female roles in Athenian tragedy were played by male actors, but do the male characters become female, conceptually at least? Cawthorn (C.) argues that they do through their suffering, and that once transformed, their masculinity is not recovered. Her topic is tragedy’s treatment of the male body, and how its Dionysian forces of disguise and dissolution render that body feminine. In the Introduction C. sets forth her approaches to bodies and to gender. In tragedy, she argues, concepts of the body are destabilized, and the theatrical body (both in text and performance) particularly exposes the ways in which ideas of sex and gender are expressed through the body. What she sees in Classical Athenian culture in general and even more so in tragedy is that masculinity is always a state of “becoming” rather than “being”—manhood has to be repeatedly proven and is never securely achieved.

In the six chapters that follow, C. examines both Classical ideas about the body and specific examples from tragedy. Chapter 1 investigates the relationship between words and the body in tragic performance. Chapters 2 and 3 detail further what the Classical Greek ideas about the female body and male body were, and how the associations of the female body with both suffering and mimesis are particularly important for tragedy, as it stages representations of the suffering male body. Chapters 4 and 5 then apply these concepts particularly to Heracles in Sophocles’ Trachiniae, bringing in for comparison Euripides’ Pentheus, Hippolytus, and Heracles, and, to a lesser
extent, Aeschylus’ Agamemnon and Sophocles’ Ajax. Chapter 4 details the ways in which the male body is subjected to feminizing suffering and is thus represented as becoming female. Chapter 5 considers whether, as several critics have argued, the male character is restored to manhood at the drama’s end, and masculinity is revalorized. The concluding Chapter 6 argues further against closure in tragedy and the return to masculinity closure might provide; it then considers briefly whether the audience also becomes female through its own experience in the theater. I noticed only one significant typo/mistake: a confusion of Circe for Calypso on p. 117 (C. says Odysseus “famously weeps by the shore of Circe’s island”).

C.’s claims about tragedy as a genre and her discussions of individual plays are heavily dependent on scholarship focused on gender in tragedy that was produced in the 1980s and 1990s, especially that of Zeitlin, Loraux, and Bassi (whom she acknowledges on p. 11 as influences), as well as others like Segal and Padel (see pp. vii–viii). Her reliance on their work has the effect of making many of her statements about tragedy uncontroversial, but also unremarkable now more than a decade later. So although such points are made repeatedly (often overly so), I’d like to focus here on one aspect of C.’s arguments that offers the potential for new insights and interpretations: the interaction of word and body in tragedy.

In the first chapter, C. argues that, contrary to the common focus on logos (words/text), logos and soma are inseparable in tragedy, because, among other factors, “the actor’s voice, the medium of logos, is embodied” (32). C. also demonstrates, against even recent discussions of what is allowed to be shown, that there is a great deal of representation of physical pain on stage in Athenian tragedy. An important corollary that C. argues here is that a distinction between physical and mental pain or suffering does not apply in Athenian tragedy (34). Understanding the relationship between mental and physical suffering could dismantle overused distinctions that obfuscate rather than illuminate what tragedy is all about. C. also sees a similar connection in how the audience of tragedy is affected in both mental and physical ways, and in how the senses of seeing and hearing work in tandem (37–38). These insights could again prevent us from pursuing misleading dichotomies. Finally, attention to nonverbal elements, such as cries or interjections (which may appear in the texts) and gestures (a part of performance we can only conjecture about), reveals just how “embodied” the words of the drama are. Both sounds and gestures convey and affect emotions in conjunction with the words.

A more vigorous application of these insights to her discussions of individual tragedies would have strengthened her arguments. For example, when Sophocles’ Heracles is on stage in pain, wearing the poisoned peplos, how might the masculinity of the actor’s voice (imagine if it were deep and booming) and body send signals to the audience that could counter or complicate the femininity of his suffering or the words he speaks? What physical gestures or postures might reinforce one or the other gendered impression? In her arguments against the re-masculinization of Heracles in the Trachiniae, C. asserts that “[t]he last image the audience has is presumably of Heracles’ body remaining racked by suffering dealt by the hand of his wife” (106). But
she tells us no more than that about what the audience might have seen on stage (in other words, what does Heracles’ racked body look like?), even though she is arguing that it is the sight that causes the feminization of Heracles to remain. Although C. rightly notes that any conjectures about sounds and sights of the original performance are wholly speculative (and throughout she qualifies any such statements, as exemplified by “presumably” here), nevertheless the act of speculating in this way could open up new possibilities for interpreting the physical nature of theatrical performance that C. so fittingly emphasizes in her first chapter. Similarly, only in the last five pages of the book does C. return to the intriguing idea from Chapter 1 that the audience could be affected bodily through watching—here adding that the audience would thus be feminized as well—but much more could be done with this question. C. argues in her Introduction that “attention to somatics might open up a different discourse on tragedy” (2–3), but C. herself has not achieved that in her subsequent chapters.

**Mary Ebbott**
College of the Holy Cross


Near the beginning of this slim new volume an ominous statement appears: “one never knows what a book is about until after writing it (sometimes not even then).” Fortunately, this sentiment proves primarily to be part of Cuomo’s tacit admission that the sweeping title of her book and its implied generalist appeal is a bit misleading, since the book is in fact a collection of disparate and narrowly focused case studies, one per chapter, each an experiment with a different type of technology, time period, and methodology. This is not necessarily a bad thing, and Cuomo (C.) uses the case studies together to make an impassioned plea to other historians of ancient technology (and to the next generation of scholars, the real audience for this book), to expand the parameters of the field to encompass aspects of social and intellectual history, to take a nuanced look at the evidence (“problematising” the discussions, in her terminology), and to mine often overlooked material culture and epigraphic sources.

C.’s attempt to broaden the field from a narrow focus on engineering is particularly admirable, but she casts her net too wide by embracing all that the ancient terms *techne* and *ars* can imply, and ultimately the work suffers from such a loose definition. When the term can embrace virtually any form of learning or knowledge, it ceases to have real meaning as a unifying subject for a book, and C. veers even within individual chapters from a narrow definition, close to what we understand today by the term technology, to a much broader concept, including virtually any kind of knowledge or ability.

Although the “semblance of unity” that Cuomo attempts to impose on what are essentially separate articles thus often feels contrived, there is a consistent focus throughout not on technology *per se*, but on how society viewed
ancient technicians and how they the technicians viewed themselves. C.’s main conclusion is arguably that ancient technicians, “so often described as marginal to ancient society, were, if anything, often marginal-ized” by ancient and modern authors alike. In these studies, C. shows to the contrary that the ancients did realize the necessity of technology and with it the indispensability of technicians; moreover, the features that characterize ancient discussions of *techne* in general include its great usefulness, its moral ambiguity, and its strong political resonance.

Her most convincing argument to this effect comes toward the end of chapter one (“The trouble with *techne*”), where she demonstrates that sources for 5th-century Athens display a fear and distrust of technology and technicians precisely because they were both necessary to the polis but morally ambiguous, because *techne* is acquired rather than innate, and because *techne* brings with it the possibility of change and social mobility. It is worth pointing out more forcefully than C. does that the sources in which this “sense of menace” is most evident deal primarily with only a very specific aspect of *techne*, where knowing a *techne* is equated with engaging in a trade. The social mobility that this subset of *techne* offered resulted from the potential for wealth through trade, and in this context C.’s stated decision not to explore the relationship between technology and economics explicitly is keenly felt.

C. next jumps forward to the Hellenistic military revolution to argue against a linear model of technological innovation. Her arguments here for a significant sense of moral ambiguity and unease expressed toward technology are less convincing, in large part because the primary texts involved are mostly biographies. These tend to moralize about their subjects, but not necessarily about the technology they were using. Does the fact that Plutarch tells us that Demetrios Poliorkeites was wounded by one of his own catapults really tell us much about the contemporary view of technology?

C. uses the next case study to demonstrate that craftsmen expressed their own activities in a positive light (despite the often assumed strong bias against technicians) by looking at representations of carpenter’s squares on funerary monuments of the 1st and early 2nd centuries A.D. She makes an appealing suggestion that the symbol also purposely suggests a more socially threatening message—that death is the great leveler—but neither of the two clear cases of carpenter’s equipment being used in such a visual message (because they include further iconographic cues such as a skull or butterfly) comes from a funerary context.

In chapter four, C. examines inscriptions about boundary disputes between communities in the Roman Empire during the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian. The connection here to ancient technology is tenuous at best, since for the most part land surveyors, if involved at all, were usually “expert witnesses” and not the judges, and the real authority in all cases was political. I see no reason to assume that “many disputes between private individuals were likely to use surveyors as adjudicators,” so that “what has survived may give a biased, diminished reflection of their actual role.” The material itself, however, is intriguing, and C. explores in detail the various mechanisms of trust and the layers of authority employed by the adjudicators of the cases.
In the final chapter, C. at last sees the trend to marginalize technicians reversed as she explores how the position and perception of architects changed in late antiquity. She logically concludes that the Christian image of God himself as a demiurge ushered in a more prestigious, even more spiritualized, public persona for architects, making it not surprising that patrons would want to take on the mantle of technical expert along with that of fìnancer of a structure.

In all, there is much to praise: clear organization, beautiful writing, an impressive command of a vast body of wide-ranging material, and in particular, the introduction of bodies of evidence that have received little or no attention. This material is itself one of the best things about the book, and so it would perhaps be petty to observe that in many cases the material presented in greatest detail and at greatest length turns out to be the least important or convincing for the conclusions that C. draws.

Jeanette Marchand
Wright State University


Like all the volumes in the Phoenix Presocratics Series, the study of Anaxagoras by Patricia Curd (C.) “aims to make Anaxagoras and his ideas accessible to modern readers through translations of the ancient Greek and Latin texts and by providing explanatory notes and interpretive essays” (3). Indeed, the book is well structured as a way into the mind of Anaxagoras. After brief acknowledgments and a guide to abbreviations, C. begins with a succinct introduction that makes clear her intentions and the means by which she will carry them out. To this she appends a few pages that prepare the reader for some of the more technical vocabulary, after which the reader is left on his or her own to explore the remains of the Anaxagorean corpus: original fragments, in Greek and in context, each mirrored by C.’s facing-page translations into English, and translated testimonia of later commentators.

C.’s laissez faire approach stands in contrast to the obvious alternative, namely, a lengthy introductory discussion of thematic material designed to equip the student for the gnomic fragments that follow. Inwood prefers this arrangement in his fine volume on Empedocles, also in the Phoenix Presocratics Series, and perhaps he is right to do so. The poetic language and copious content (at least relative to what we have left of Anaxagoras’ writings) demand considerable background and preparation. But Anaxagoras, though roughly contemporary with Empedocles, does not have the same “poetry problem”: his fragments are remarkable for their sober, unembellished prose, a clear rejection of the epic pretensions of some of his philosophical forebears, especially Parmenides, whose injunction against “thinking what is not” weighed heavily on Anaxagoras’ intellectual conscience.
C.’s own artless prose is stylistically continuous with Anaxagoras. In the exegetical essays following the fragments and testimonia, her habit of illustrating points by way of such mundane (and presumably personal) examples as “Kate the dog” (172) and chunky chicken soup (159) might strike some as pedestrian and thus unfit for the discussion of such lofty subjects, but this would be to misunderstand the spirit of Anaxagoras. The philosopher, who was tried in Athens on charges of impiety for writing that the Sun was no god but a hot rock, would surely have welcomed the profane pooch into his pantheon of physically explicable phenomena. That much is clear from C.’s first essay, which addresses primarily the life of Anaxagoras, who appears to have had no taste for politics or other diversions of the landed gentry. Originally from a family of considerable means in Clazomenae, he was said by some to have given away his estate before relocating to Athens, where he spent his time philosophizing. When asked why he paid no attention to political affairs, Anaxagoras reportedly pointed skyward and replied: “hush, I am very concerned about my country” (DK 59 A1). If this anti-political sentiment sounds vaguely Socratic, that’s because it is Socratic, at least in the sense that, as C. emphasizes, Anaxagoras set a standard for intellectual integrity that clearly made an impression on Socrates and Plato, among others.

Less congenial to the Socratic conception of philosophy, however, was Anaxagoras’ commitment to working out a detailed cosmology, to which C. dedicates most of the remaining four essays. Her treatment of the interpretive issues swirling around the fragments is admirable for its accessibility. Students will be grateful for her self-discipline with respect to esoteric scholarly disputes and technical minutiae. C. consistently confines her discussion of such matters to footnotes, a practice that prevents them from disrupting her description of Anaxagorean theory. This is true especially of her “Notes on the Fragments,” which divides the original fragments from the translated testimonia. As in the case of fragment B14, C. often compares the interpretation based on her printed text with those suggested by plausible variants, but rarely do the arguments in support of one reading or another trespass into the body of her exegesis. When she does engage with an academic controversy, it is usually with an eye to its heuristic value for the student reader. C. regularly presents her own interpretations of Anaxagoras by way of contrast with prominent alternatives. In one of her first forays into Anaxagorean physics, she introduces Cornford’s version of the principle of homoiomerity (“a natural substance such as a piece of gold consists solely of parts which are like the whole and are like one another—every one of them and nothing else”) only to criticize and ultimately reject it in favor of the view that Aristotle is mistaken in his understanding of Anaxagoras (147–150).

C.’s argument about homoiomerity is perspicuous and probably sound. In any case, it appears to be the view of most contemporary scholars. But on occasion C.’s sensitivity to the heuristic value of such controversies runs the risk of simplifying and distorting their nature and importance. In the longest and most important of the interpretive essays, “The Original Mix and Seeds,” C. takes up a central problem of Presocratic interpretation, namely, the question of what counts as a fundamental entity in Anaxagorean ontology. She
advocates a “moderate” view, which she distinguishes from the “expansive” and the “austere” (154). “On the expansive view,” she writes, “everything that is in the world as we now perceive it (or which has emerged earlier or will emerge later) is in the original mixture” (ibid.). This would include both natural and artificial “stuffs” (e.g., water and cheese) as well as natural and artificial objects (e.g., cats and chairs). The austere view “limits the fundamental things to opposites” (ibid.). Proponents of the austere view include, by her account, Tannery, Burnet, Cornford, Vlastos, Inwood, and Schofield (164 n. 21), the last of whom is quoted at some length in C.’s reconstruction of the view (165–166). Curiously, she appears to qualify her location of Schofield’s within the circle of austere interpreters, conceding that his view “differs from that of Vlastos, in that Schofield ultimately recognizes two levels of ingredients: fundamental ingredients (the opposites) and further ingredients (‘air, earth, water, and seeds’) which are derived from the fundamental ones. These further, secondary ingredients then combine to produce things in the natural world” (166 n. 26). The complexity of the issue calls for nuanced distinctions between different ways of being a fundamental entity. Something could be ontologically fundamental (prior with respect to its being or reality), physically fundamental (causally prior), or cosmogonically fundamental (prior in the temporal order of development), and it’s not obvious that what is fundamental in one sense must be fundamental in others. Schofield’s feel for such nuances makes him difficult to pigeonhole, and C. comes off as somewhat dismissive in the attempt. Indeed, the shifting focus of C.’s criticisms (from Vlastos to Schofield and others) leads one to wonder who, if anyone, actually adopts the austere view as C. lays it out, raising worries that its only champion is a straw man.

Nonetheless, one might think it best to err on the side of simplicity, even if it means violating the subtler nuances. After all, some nuances are worth more than others. I am inclined to sympathize with C., partly because I, too, regard many or most members of the austere family of interpretations as untenable, though not necessarily for the same reasons. My sympathy is tested, however, when C.’s attention turns to the so-called expansive interpretations, for it is there that C. seems especially eager to exaggerate the distance between her moderate position and a diversity of very plausible views. In particular, she tags Daniel Graham in one footnote as a proponent of “modified expansionism” (254 n. 3) while in the very next note she uses a quotation from Graham’s work as a “representative statement of the expansive ontology” (254 n. 4). A bit later, she relates in yet another footnote that Graham believes all mass nouns denote an Anaxagorean stuff, even if that stuff is artificial (e.g., cheese). The original mixture contains all these stuffs, though it does not contain artificial objects such as chairs (158 n. 12). Without getting deep into philosophical detail, I must say, first, that Graham’s view seems very near to C.’s in many respects, and, second, that on the major point of disagreement (the status of artificial stuffs), Graham’s interpretation is just as, if not more, convincing. But even if Graham is wrong and C. is right, surely she has not shown this simply by labeling his view expansive and then refuting
a version to which he does not subscribe. Much less has she shown that her view is uniquely moderate.

Still, all this is forgivable given the value C.’s study has for both student and professional scholar. As many are no doubt aware, she has worked diligently for some years to piece together a coherent and persuasive picture of Anaxagoras’ philosophy. C. has, on the whole, succeeded, and in a way that makes her many virtues the beneficiaries of her few vices. Her expertise in, and unconcealed enthusiasm for the puzzles of, Presocratic physics and metaphysics more than make up for the rather short shrift given his epistemology, especially the oracular and provocative B21a: “appearances are a sight of the unseen.” Likewise, the charm of her unpretentious prose excuses, almost justifies, the book’s many typographical errors. Whether C. truly knows the mind of this preeminent Presocratic we cannot be certain; that she has captured his spirit is difficult to doubt.

Joel E. Mann
St. Norbert College


Interest in ancient ethnicity has steadily been gaining momentum over the past decade, with work by Jonathan Hall and Emma Dench, among others, leading the charge. In Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome, Gary D. Farney (F.) focuses on the role of ethnic identity claims in the political culture of the Roman republic.

F. argues that “ethnic identity formed an important element in aristocratic family identity.” (22) He goes on to demonstrate that Roman political families made frequent and effective use of their ethnic background, showcasing and advertising it through the use of nomenclature, coinage, and the adoption of particular behaviors, manners of speech or sartorial choices. One of the more welcome results of this argument, as the book makes clear, is a more individuated conception of Roman views of Italic ethnic identity. The results are very much in line with the image of a multicultural peninsula increasingly favored by scholars today.

F. divides his material by ethnic group, with a chapter each devoted to Latins, Sabines, Etruscans, and the municipalities of Italians, referred to collectively by F. as ‘Italics’, translating the Latin Italici (179 n. 2). There is an epilogue surveying the cohesion of Roman and Italian identities as the empire expanded under the principate. The chapters all follow a similar format: a brief overview of the ethnic group’s history and involvement with Rome, followed by a survey of some key features of the ethnic stereotype and its presentation. Thus F. takes us through the intricacies of Latin descent (Latium vetus vs. adiectum); the Sabine prisa virtus and its development from earlier stereotypes of Sabine arrogance; Etruscan softness and cruelty, along with their use of the disciplina Etrusca to compensate for their negative perception in Roman eyes; the attempts of the Italian nobility to advertise municipal
identity; and the final cohesion of Italic identity in the face of pressures on the franchise from abroad. The argument moves from center to periphery, looking first at the earliest and most entrenched group, the Latins, and moving finally to the Etruscans and Italians, whose acceptance into the franchise came late and with some hardship.

F.’s focus on particular cases rather than on abstractions is both cautious and commendable, especially since, as he himself admits, the evidence is often precarious at best (cf. 25–26, with a sober account of the methodological difficulties at 34–38). F.’s attention to the broad spectrum of media in which ethnicity was manifested and manipulated is therefore especially welcome. Particularly notable is F’s treatment of numismatic evidence, not only for making profitable use of a still underutilized body of data, but also for demonstrating in an accessible format the use of coins in Roman cultural history. Epigraphy forms the bulk of the evidence, but it is the analysis of coins that often takes center stage. It is therefore a shame that the detailed Catalogue of Coins does not contain images; only a select few receive illustration in the text.

The wealth of detail in this book, it is to be hoped, will pave the way for many further enquiries, for example, on the issue of Rome itself and the construction of Roman identity. F. frequently uses Romans as a foil against which ethnic assimilation and differentiation occur (e.g., 53: “All in all, there is a very conservative and assimilating ideology here, seeking acceptance and, more elusively, the confidence and support of the Roman people. They [i.e. coin types] speak to a pluralistic society, too, but from men whose studied parochial ties are proof of their “Romanness” and desire to belong”). F.’s own work destabilizes some of the ethnic sureties on which our concept of Romanness relies; but room remains for a fuller discussion of the ethnic dimension of Roman identity. F. points the way with his attention to the viability of Latin and Sabine cultures within Rome. If ethnic identity was a fluid commodity in Rome, as F. demonstrates, is Roman ethnic identity at all a useful construct? And if it is not, what might have replaced it? F.’s fourth chapter and his epilogue direct further attention to the intersection of ethnicity and citizenship, and to the difficulties of bifurcating ethnic and legal identities.

Developed from the author’s doctoral dissertation, the book still shows occasional infelicity in diction and repetitiousness. Readers may also wonder at the considerable volume taken up by Chapter 4 on the Etruscans, a people F. himself admits had little political presence under the Republic beyond their control of the disciplina Etrusca. More pervasive is the problem of recovering ancient thought-patterns; for example, on pp. 112–114, F. suggests that the self-restraint shown by Aemilius Paulus and Scipio Aemilianus in conquest, as well as their reputation for bravery in battle and modest funerals, were recognized as markers of Sabine identity. But bravery, self-restraint, and frugality were also claimed as quintessentially Roman qualities, and we have little chance of ascertaining whether or not individual audiences would have indeed interpreted them as ethnic characteristics. Audience responses to cognomina and coin types, too, are difficult to ascertain without explicit evidence, though these, at least, are more talkative media than personal characteristics
alone. Still, the overall argument is convincing, and many illuminating findings arise along the way.

The bibliography is impressively up-to-date, with recent works appearing frequently in both the footnotes and main discussions. The book also features four maps (xvii–xx); the middle two might be made lighter in future reprints.

Ethnic Identity is, all in all, a well-produced and fertile contribution to the study of ethnicity and political posturing in Republican Rome. It will be of interest and value to students and scholars of Republican politics, the fashioning of Roman identity, and of Rome’s interaction with the peoples who surrounded her.

Ayelet Haimson Lushkov
Yale University and Dartmouth College


Aulus Gellius, who for generations dwelt on the margins of *Altertumswissenschaft*, has lately become an attractive target for post-structuralist and new historicist critics. In his latest book, Erik Gunderson (G.) opens Foucault’s toolbox to examine the *Noctes Atticae*, incidentally raising broader questions about contemporary philology and the “future of the past.”

G.’s study playfully imitates the form of P. K. Marshall’s edition of the *Noctes* (Oxford 1990). After no less than three praefationes, the reader encounters two “volumes” consisting of several “books” and a concluding “appendix”; these are further divided into capita in the Gellian mode. Each chapter possesses its own, often humorous Latin title (e.g., *Quod Holford-Streuens auctor Noctium Atticarum sit*, p. 270). One also finds an *Index Rerum Potiorum*, located after the first “volume” and printed in Oxonian type, and a series of *Fragmenta Adespota*, including one-word items such as “gallimaufry” and “googlewhack.” Apart from its power to amuse (which readers may judge for themselves), this jeu d’esprit serves to underscore the point that Gellian scholars inevitably morph into their subject, and thus enter into a continuous loop of philological commentary. *Quot grammatici, tot Gellii* (p. 279).

The third praefatio (pp. 18–44) furnishes a commentary on the preface to the *Noctes Atticae*, which G. reads as a bid for immortality analogous to Scheherazade’s “1001 deferrals of death” in the *Arabian Nights*. The work is less a compendium of knowledge than an invitation to “become Gellius” in a never-ending romp through the Library of All Antiquity. G.’s first three “books” (pp. 55–165) are devoted to the basic categories of Gellian literary criticism: auctoritas, ratio, and usus. Among other things, he shows how these three in fact run together: in formulating his arguments, Gellius uses authoritative ratio (especially when it comes from the mouth of Caesar), rational auctoritas (through the accumulation of definitive citations), and rational and authoritative usus (e.g., what sounds natural to the ears of Cicero and Ver-
gil—and they should know). This circular argumentation is symptomatic of the recursive logic of antiquarianism as practiced by Gellius and his contemporaries. It resembles an artfully concealed game in which “some profit, others lose; knowledge circulates according to rules-that-are-not-rules” (p. 131). The pages devoted to usus raise the broader question of the uses to which the Noctes were intended to be put (pp. 132–165). Gellian utility, it turns out, is what conduces to success in a kind of competitive performance art, which is practiced on fellow method-actors at table, in libraries, and in the forum. The fourth “book,” misleadingly entitled Index Nominum vel Dramatis Personae (pp. 166–201), considers the characters in the Noctes. Unlike previous writers on this subject, G. has less to say about the celebrities who grace Gellius’ anecdotes than about spectral figures such as Varro, Tullius Tiro, and Gellius himself. We are reminded of the often blurred distinction between Gellius the character in his own stories, Gellius the reader of texts, and Gellius the author and narrator of the Noctes. He is analogous to Diego Velázquez, the painter of a painting about painting in Foucault’s famous discussion.

The second “volume” opens with two “books” entitled Libri Librorum (pp. 225–251) and Auctoris Auctores (pp. 252–286). Here G. plays on the ambiguity of the genitive case to reflect on the way that antiquarian research re-shapes the authoritative texts by which it has been shaped: “Antiquarians are all children of the book: even as they give birth to books, books also give birth to them” (p. 251). It is possible, then, to sketch a family tree of commentary from (e.g.) Ennius, himself an antiquarian, to Gellius, his latter-day “Servile Twin” (cf. Geminus Servilius in NA 12.4.1), and from Gellius to Macrobius, who, like Frankenstein, sutured fragments of the Noctes into his new “body” of knowledge. Nor does the “begetting” stop there. G. proceeds to an interesting, albeit curiously selective and out-of-date, critique of modern Gellian scholarship (pp. 270–286), noting among other things the contrast between the pretended distance and objectivity of contemporary philology and Gellius’ embrace of personal and continually circulating authority. The author of the Noctes, it seems, was a postmodern archaeologist manqué (cf. p. 16).

G.’s major theme, then, is the infinite regress and progress of antiquarian scholarship. As Derrida observed, “[T]he archivist produces more archive, and that is why the archive is never closed” (cited on p. 297 from Archive Fever: a Freudian Impression [Chicago 1998], p. 68). These reflections generate a great deal of recursive prose, of which the following is a typical example: “Reading generates a self that is thoroughly authored by the authors thereby consumed and digested. But this reading is always also a misreading that both self-authors and reauthors the authors ostensibly consumed and digested” (p. 252). If they succeed in digesting pronouncements such as this, academic readers may have a bit of soul-searching to do. Are they constrained, however, to choose between the Wolfian model of linear progress in totius antiquitatis cognitio and the tight spiral of postmodern criticism? Gellius’ researches resemble the flight of the honeybee (cf. Honeycomb, one of the rejected but disconcertingly appropriate titles mentioned at NA praef. 6). Although his progress and logic are far from linear, Gellius is still going somewhere and
gathering *something*, which, he trusts, will provide both pleasure and genuine nourishment. Latter-day Gellii may hope to do the same.

**Stephen M. Beall**

Marquette University


Like any good crime story, *Law and Crime in the Roman World*, by Jill Harries (H.) has its share of villains and victims as well as legal procedures, surprises, and a sure-handed detective to guide the reader through the evidence. Though *Law and Crime* is not a murder mystery, it nevertheless charts an investigation of crime as a complex phenomenon in Roman society. H., our detective, has a sure grasp of the evidence, legal and otherwise, and a winning method of exposition.

*Law and Crime* is more than an overview of Roman criminal law and procedure, as it examines “how the Romans thought about and discussed offences against the community, who formulated the rules and conventions about crime and how they worked” (ix). Since crime is a vast topic, H. organizes her study around three themes: (1) the impact of legal tradition, (2) the role of litigants and court decisions, and (3) social and moral perspectives in addition to the views of legal experts. The best part of this book is H.’s style of presentation because it conveys a wealth of information while at the same time modeling methods of legal analysis so that the reader learns not just the law itself but more importantly the relationships between legal technicalities and the larger issues that shaped Roman responses to crime. Thus H. accurately represents law as a dynamic process rather than a simple set of rules.

The first chapter introduces sources and methodological issues. Next come two chapters on legal procedure, first in public trials and then *cognition*. Six more chapters follow on different topics (e.g., theft, extortion, sexual crimes, murder). Though the book is organized thematically, H. follows a chronological arc in individual chapters to explain the development of legal concepts and procedures. The historical scope is generous, from Romulus’s laws about wives who poisoned their children through problems in Justinian’s compilation, with good attention to the influence of Christianity. Within this historical framework, H. investigates key issues in legal studies, including the interpretation of statutes, the impact of procedure on fairness, and the complex relationship between social morality, political interests, and legal practice. More attention to the economic aspects of crime would have been welcome.

H.’s focus on morality and politics enables her to draw amply on Roman literature to assess the aims and limitations of criminal law. Particularly effective is her treatment of rhetoric, both in the context of legal trials and more broadly in social discourses. H. probes difficulties in the legal definition of murder, for example, through an analysis of a murder trial as represented in Apuleius’s *Apology*. Her careful reading of the speech highlights both legal
procedure and rhetorical tactics. When she turns to cultural discourses, for example, the rhetoric of *incestum*, H. offers a theoretically sensitive discussion of the cult of the Vestals that relates the legal questions to a broad range of literary sources (90–95). Contextualizing the law with Roman literature also makes the book more accessible to one of H.’s target audiences, students.

*Law and Crime*, a Key Themes in Ancient History book, fulfills the series’ aim of providing “readable, informed and original” studies for students, instructors, and scholars in related disciplines. It will work well as a textbook not least because there is much of contemporary relevance. Topical issues include accountability in the legal process, the use of state terror including torture, and limits (or not) on the powers of the executive (e.g., 28–42, 57, 80–83). On the Roman side, H. illustrates legal issues with persons and events from Roman history that will (or should!) be familiar to undergraduates. Her discussions offer new perspectives on Caesar, Cicero, and Pliny the Elder, while introducing students to some less well frequently taught authors, e.g., Apuleius and Aulus Gellius. H. provides an impeccable model of how to deal with sources, assessing their nature and value as evidence for the law, for example, in her discussion of Aulus Gellius’s reported debate about the definition of theft (50–54).

Throughout *Law and Crime* H. presents her arguments in a clear, compelling way. Chapter titles are clever and informative (e.g., “The Thief in the Night,” “Sex in the City”). Chapters tend to begin *in medias res*, with thought-provoking assertions (e.g., “Killing people was not always wrong”—118) or anecdotes. The chapter on *cognitio*, for example, opens with alarming examples of a governor’s abuse of power, the crucifixion of a citizen or condemnation to the mines, to highlight the serious impact that problems with procedure could cause. Similarly, the chapter on violence, opens with self-help traditions, to motivate the subsequent analysis of legal remedies for violence. This makes for good reading, but some students may lose their way without a clear outline at the start of each chapter. The chapter conclusions, however, draw together the strands of the discussion in a helpful summaries. Instructors will want to preview legal concepts and vocabulary before students tackle the material on their own because H.’s in-depth analysis depends on familiarity with Roman law. This is not so much a criticism of *Law and Crime*, for students should be challenged to master new and difficult ideas, rather it is a reminder to have some good references on Roman law at hand, as suggested in H.’s useful bibliographical essay.

*Law and Crime* should be on the shelf of anyone interested in crime or the Romans. H. engages readers with well-chosen examples and adept argumentation, as she investigates both controversial questions and what might in other hands be dreary legal details. Her book offers compelling perspectives on crime and society through a meticulous analysis of Roman law, both substantive and procedural.

**Cynthia Jordan Bannon**

**Indiana University**

2007 was a good year for Aristophanes. Nigel Wilson published his OCT edition, along with a supplementary collection of textual criticism aptly dubbed *Aristophanea.* Douglas Olson released his *Broken Laughter,* a translation and commentary of select comic fragments. And, as the subject of this review, Jeffery Henderson has produced a long overdue edition and translation of Aristophanes’ fragments. The very textual foundation upon which we construct our literary interpretations has thus received a much-welcomed reexamination. Undoubtedly, much like a good vintage, these scholastic drops will be savored for a long time to come.

Simply put, Henderson is a keen practitioner of the modern Loeb. He offers the best text to date: the magisterial edition of Rudolph Kassel and Colin Austin. Yet, like any respective Loeb editor, an occasional apparatus criticus illustrates seminal manuscript variations and emendations. Notably, this text also includes the complete testimonia, unattributed, and dubiously attributed fragments for Aristophanes. For such a comprehensive endeavor, the presentation is tidy and lucent. Each play is concisely introduced; we learn of rudimentary plots and dates of production, whether known or conjectured. And even for the unattributed and dubiously attributed fragments, Henderson documents their traditional, albeit tenuous, ascription. Though disconnected, the reader never loses sight, or chronological sense, of how all this text pertains to the Aristophanic corpus. More importantly, Henderson retains Kassel and Austin’s numbering of the fragments, thus eliminating any future confusion amongst students and scholars. Textually speaking, this Loeb is an ideally strong, concise rendering of a text that is not encumbered by textual criticism and comment.

As for translation, Henderson’s previous reviewers have rightly noted the innate difficulty of translating comedy. Should it be versified or prosaic, textually accurate or explicitly modern in idiom and vulgarity? While Henderson is known for his modern, North American, and appropriately vulgar translations, here he produces an excellent balance between textual accuracy and the rendering of Athenian jokes and innuendo with contemporary English vigor. The text is accessible to every level of Classicist. One can easily parallel the Greek with his prosaic English. But where the translation departs idiomatically, an explanatory note follows. Consequently the reader is never confused about Henderson’s choice of words.

Be that as it may, should any contentions emerge, they will only constitute minor, if not insignificant, quibbles. For example, I can conjecture a few possibilities: “arsehole” for *prvktñw* (24) and “pussy shellys” for *dorûallow* (382b) are too tame for their obscene intent; “tankarding” for *petaxnñomai* (301b) does not seem to carry the sense of luxuriousness (*trufÇsin*) that Pho-tius notes; and the use of “looky” to convey the dialect of onic -kvw resembles the problematic archaisms of older Loebs. Nevertheless, such comments could not mar the superb quality of Henderson’s work.
Now, there are a few noteworthy problems regarding the structural integrity of the printing. To note a few: an occasional preposition suffers dittoigraphy, a superfluous acute accompanies the correct one, some smooth breathings have incorrectly replaced rough ones, and the translation of fragment 510 is missing. The footnotes are also occasionally sloppy, e.g., a footnote introduced on page 349 is not found till page 355. Regardless, the vast majority of the printing is sound. Minor annoyances, yes. But the reader can logically adjust and move forward. Even in the case of incorrect breathings, for those that know Greek, the mistake can be simply brushed aside. And printing here is the key word. These problems are undoubtedly the fault of the press, not the editor.

In the end, Henderson has tremendously favored the students and scholars of Aristophanes. Finally, the translation of his fragments is complete. Finally, whether it be an undergraduate survey or a graduate seminar, a lengthy, fruitful, and timely discussion of these abandoned works as a whole can occur. Furthermore, although these fragments appear to be the cultural debris of Athens’ heyday, we should not lose sight of their provenance. Pol-lux, Athenaeus, the Antiatticist, Moeris, Aelian, Plutarch, Harpocratio, Sto-baeus, and Photius—to name a few—reminds us that we are dealing with the reception of Aristophanes and Old Comedy. Yes, it would be wonderful to have these plays in their entirety, to historicize them explicitly in the context of fifth-century Athens. But as Glen Bowersock and Ewen Bowie have generally conjectured, Imperial authors know more about Aristophanes and Old Comedy than heretofore assumed. Menander may have been the paideutic favorite, but many later works, the novel included, have far more in common with Old Comedy and its theater. Henderson’s Loeb should not only instigate further discussion about Aristophanes as a fifth-century comedian, but also about his reception and use in the Imperial period and beyond.

2007 was indeed a good year for Aristophanes. We should all look forward to the ideas that will hopefully emanate.

James Brusuelas
TLG Project, University of California at Irvine


The fragmented nature of our sources for Hellenistic philosophy makes edited collections essential tools for the scholar and teacher alike. In English there are two main collections: A. A. Long and David Sedley’s The Hellenistic Philosophers, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1987) and Brad Inwood and Lloyd Gerson’s Hellenistic Philosophy: Introductory Readings, 2nd edition (Hackett, 1997). The Epicurean selections from Inwood and Gerson (IG) have long been available in a separate volume, The Epicurean Reader (Hackett, 1994), with a brief, but insightful introduction by D. S. Hutchinson. The Stoic Reader is the long-awaited companion. The new volume reproduces all the major
texts on Stoic logic, physics, and ethics. It also includes some skeptical selections relevant to the Stoic-Academic debate and a “sampler” of texts from the Roman Stoics (Musonius Rufus, Seneca, and Epictetus, but not Marcus Aurelius).

A major advantage of IG’s editorial approach is the preference given to continuous selections. Key texts such as Diogenes Laertius’ and Stobaeus’ summaries of Stoic ethics are included in their entirety. Longer texts such as Cato’s speech in *De finibus* and Balbus’ speech in *De natura deorum* are significantly edited, but still give some sense of the original. These longer selections provide the framework for each of IG’s topical divisions, with shorter fragments and testimonia providing important supplements. Inevitably specialists will regret that some important passages from von Arnim’s *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* that are not included (e.g., SVF 2.81 = Aetius Plac. 4.9.13).

The editors’ intention is clearly to offer a representative collection rather than a complete compilation. Even so, it is somewhat surprising that the collection only includes a total of eleven passages from Plutarch’s *De Stoicorum repugnantibus* and *De communibus notitiis adversus Stoicos*. In only a few instances are questionable texts included. Text 24 (= Sextus Empiricus M 8.56–8) is one such case. Although the original context makes it clear that Sextus is speaking *in propria persona*, the selection makes the claim that “every thought comes from sense-perception or not without sense-perception” look like the report of a Stoic doctrine. The editors are apparently sensitive to this problem and cite texts 7.53 (= Diogenes Laertius 7.53) and text 135 (= Seneca Ep. 120.3–14 selections) as parallels. But neither of these passages justifies attributing to the Stoics the strict empiricism suggested by text 24. I mention this not so much as a criticism of the editors as a warning to the reader. In many cases, the value of what is said within a given selection can only be determined by carefully considering its original context and source. By its very nature an edited collection of this sort removes passages from their original context and gives them the appearance of objective “evidence.” The preference given to continuous selections in this volume mitigates this disadvantage to some degree; but one must still be wary of the outcomes of editorial decisions.

The present volume includes several features that will help the reader gain a better appreciation of the selected passages. There is a helpful list of “Philosophers and Philosophical Sources” with approximate dates and brief descriptions. The list includes several names not included in the 1997 volume (e.g., Nemesius and Tertullian), although it is still not quite comprehensive. For example, Alexinus (c. 240–c. 270), the dialectician whose criticism of Zeno is recorded in text 22.108–10 (= Sextus Empiricus M 9.108–10), is not included. The volume also includes an excellent glossary of translations with brief descriptions of important concepts. Again the few omissions (e.g., “basic grasp” for *prolepsis* and *prolambanô*) do not significantly detract from the usefulness of this tool. The volume includes both an index (terms and names together) and index locorum. Texts are numbered continuously from 1 to 150, but the standard internal section numbers are retained. So, for example, the reference to the *daimôn* at Diogenes Laertius 7.88 appears in the index as “101.88.” The navigation of this volume is greatly improved over the 1997 edition by
the inclusion of text and section numbers in the header of each page. Finally, the translations themselves show equal concern for readability and accuracy. The editors frequently fill out the highly compressed and elliptical Greek of our sources, but their clarifications are scrupulously contained within square brackets (differentiating them from editorial additions to the manuscripts in angle brackets).

Perhaps the only major disadvantage to this volume is the extremely modest introduction. The introduction concisely situates the Stoics within the “Socratic tradition” and explains the Stoics’ position vis-à-vis that of the other major schools. Nevertheless, comments such as “[the Stoics’] version of the history of the cosmos and its relation to the divine is closer to Plato’s vision in the Timaeus than to Aristotle’s theory” will only be helpful to readers with some background in ancient philosophy. This means that many teachers will probably want to supplement The Stoic Reader with some additional introduction to Stoic philosophy. Then again, many readers will regard this lack of scholarly interpretation as an advantage. The Stoic Reader presents a relatively clean slate of basic texts upon which an interpretation may be built.

Henry Dyson
University of Michigan


Reading Herodotus combines two recent trends in classical scholarship—the popularity of the edited volume and revived scholarly interest in Herodotus’ Histories. Consisting of an introduction and 12 essays, this volume examines the logoi of Book 5, in which Herodotus narrates events in and around the Mediterranean that culminate in the Ionian Revolt. For the reader of Herodotus, Book 5’s dizzying array of seemingly arbitrary material and its mix of ethnographic and historical narrative can result in a somewhat disorienting experience. Reading Herodotus seeks to shed light on these peculiarities by analyzing the logoi sequentially and within the larger context of the Histories’ narrative themes and patterns. Each chapter, to varying degrees, argues for Book 5’s structural and thematic coherence and contributes to the volume’s overarching thesis, that Herodotus thematizes ambiguity and ambivalence in a way that reflects and comments upon the state of contemporary historical and cultural affairs.

The sophisticated and thorough introduction falls into two parts. The editors first outline the goals, methods, and parameters of the collection, clearly delineating their reasons for approaching Book 5 in terms of logoi and prioritizing the chronological experience of reading. In the process they provide a helpful introduction to different literary-critical approaches as well as an overview of the specific challenges faced by any reader and interpreter of Herodotus’ work. The second half of the introduction distinguishes the present volume from the plethora of recently published work on Herodotus.
The editors identify their book as a hybrid of different scholarly genres: a combination of the monograph (it is univocal in that each chapter focuses on a specific topic), the edited volume (it contains multiple interpretations and approaches), and a commentary (it focuses on one book and analyses it chronologically). This self-reflexive approach usefully frames the volume in Herodotean terms and provides an ideal format for modeling Herodotus’ own approach to historiography—gathering multiple voices and approaches and unifying them under one narrative umbrella.

Elizabeth Irwin provides an auspicious start with an insightful chapter analyzing two seemingly inconsequential logoi: a historical anecdote about the Paionians followed by an ethnographic account of the Thracians. Building on this approach, Robin Osborne argues persuasively for the narrative and thematic significance of two, again, seemingly unconnected logoi (historical then ethnographic) about two Paionian tribes. David Fearn explores the ways in which Alexander I and the Macedonians are portrayed as pro-Greek though their cultural and political credentials are undermined by the narrative. The logos of Darius’ bridge over the Hellespont provides Emily Greenwood with the perfect opportunity to examine the geographical, cultural, and textual implications of the bridge metaphor. In her excellent and engagingly written chapter, Rosaria Munson argues that Herodotus absorbs and transcends competing oral traditions surrounding the Ionian revolt, often undercutting the political motivations that gave rise to them. Simon Hornblower examines the ways in which the Dorieus episode dramatizes the interconnectedness of events in and around the Mediterranean. Christopher Pelling analyzes the use of the words diaballein and eupetees in Aristagoras’ bid to garner support for the Ionian Revolt and concludes that Aristagoras’ ability to “put one over” on the “pushover” Athenians raises questions about the validity of Athenian and Spartan national stereotypes. Vivienne Gray argues that Herodotus’ digressions about the ancestry of prominent figures in Athenian history (Harmodius, Aristogeiton, and Cleisthenes) casts the relationship between Athens and Ionia in ambivalent terms and reflects the ideological tension contained in different attitudes to Ionianism at the time. Johannes Haubold expands Gray’s political and cross-genre approach by mapping the digression on the beginning of Athenian-Aeginetan hostilities onto early poetic models of historical change—from divine to human agency, from sacred aetiologies to cultural politics. In his chapter on Socles’ speech against tyranny, John Moles first addresses the questions of whether the speech is any good (it is) and whether it was appropriate for the occasion (it was). He then argues that through this speech Herodotus asserts the value of democratic ideals and the necessity of striving to live up to them despite the Athenians’ own frequent failures to do so. Anastasia Serghidou’s nuanced and stimulating chapter examines how Herodotus exploits Cyprus’ own ambivalent representations of its identity in relation to Hellenicity and Persian rule.

Like the Histories itself, each of these essays investigates the seemingly insignificant in connection with larger historical and narrative patterns and reflects upon the ambiguity and the shifting nature of the lessons of the past. As such, they act as an object lesson in Herodotus’ goals and methods. It is
all the more fitting, then, that the volume concludes with John Henderson’s essay, which, written in his inimitable style, races through the themes and logoi of the preceding chapters at breakneck speed like a messenger bearing urgent news charging ahead on the Royal Road through an exciting and ever-changing landscape.

The volume contains only a few minor typographical errors with the unfortunate exception of the bibliography, which suffers from a large number of formatting inconsistencies and the occasional omission of cited works. For example, Christopher Pelling, “Educating Croesus” CIAntiq 25.1 (2006) 141-177 is missing page numbers and should be listed as “2006a”. Entries for H. Yunis’ Written Texts (Cambridge 2003) and M. Clarke et al.’s Epic Interactions (Oxford 2006) are missing entirely. The index is also less thorough than it could be. This is a missed opportunity to provide the reader with a ready point of entry into the various stimulating dialogues in which these essays engage.

Ultimately, however, this book is greater than the sum of its already valuable parts. Careful cross-referencing and the development of themes from one chapter to the next result in an impressively cohesive volume. Thanks in large part to the editors’ vision, Reading Herodotus does more than contribute to our understanding of Book 5 of the Histories. It invites us to reflect on our own processes of reading and writing and demonstrates how much Herodotus still has to teach us about the process of historical change and the nature of scholarly inquiry itself.

YURIE HONG
Gustavus Adolphus College


What qualities would make an excellent English translation of Horace’s Odes for the college student and the common reader in the early twenty-first century? The poems are notoriously difficult to transpose. There is what Nietzsche described as Horace’s mosaic of words. There are the metrical virtuosity and the music, what Horace himself seems to have been most proud of (Epist. i.19.21–33). There are the wit and the irony. There is the startling effect that J. V. Cunningham has described as “a kind of imagic shift or transformation image which, like a train through a tunnel, brings one to a new prospect on the other side of the divide.” There is the rich lyric tradition of which the Odes form a piece, and the fact that the poems make more sense, and are more meaningful the more one knows about the world in which Horace lived. And everywhere in the poems there is the thoroughly engaging Horatian persona.

There are lovely lines in Jeffrey Kaimowitz’s verse translation of Horace’s Odes. For example, the opening lines of ii.9 follow the Latin closely, employ iambic rhythm to nice effect, and give the reader a sense of how Horatian callida iunctura works: “Not always do the rains pour down upon / bedraggled fields or fitful storms harass / unceasingly the Caspian sea”
(Non semper imbres nubibus hispidos / manant in agros aut mare Caspium / vexant inaequales procellae/ usque...). Here “bedraggled” (hispidos) fits perfectly its soaking-wet context and tips the reader off to the pathetic fallacy that colors this ode. K. claims that “translators of poetry should at least provide something approaching poetry,” and these lines and many other passages show his skill in doing just that.

One of the challenges translators face is giving the English reader some sense of the metrical artistry and variety in the Odes. R. states that “metrics have a central role” in his translations (p. xi). He employs iambic and trochaic patterns, together with approximations of the English syllable and line counts to the Latin, to produce what he terms metrical “reminiscences” of the Horatian meters. While some lines can be scanned to produce what might be called “reminiscences” of the original rhythm (e.g., “Lydia, say, by all the / gods, I beg you, why you hasten Sybaris through love to / ruin, why he shuns the / sunny Field of Mars, he who bore dust and heat” [i.8.1–4] does resemble the beat of the Greater Sapphic), generally speaking, the two regular meters R. employs (iambics for Horace’s Asclepiad meters and Alcaics, and trochaics for all the rest, including the fourth line of the Alcaic strophe) cannot convey the musical range within an Horatian ode, nor give the reader much sense of the metrical variety within the four books. Within the individual odes, there are variations in the metrical scheme from stanza to stanza.

Perhaps the most striking feature of R.’s translations is how he handles line-end. To some ears the enjambments will impart a certain lurching movement to the verse. Ode iv.2, for example, closes with: “Ten bulls and as many cows will free you, / me a tender calf, who after he has / left his mother, grows on ample grass to / satisfy my vows, // imitating with a mark of snowy / white upon his brow curved fires of the / moon on its third rising, all the rest of / him being tawny.” If one does not pause at line end, the lines read like prose; if one does pause, the enjambments sound awkward. There are ninety-six instances where “the” is in final position, and many instances where a line ends in “of,” “a,” “with,” or “to.” There are syntactic affectations that may confuse rather than delight a college reader: e.g., “there are some men who pleasure find to swirl / Olympic dust in chariots...” (i.1.3–4). Fairly frequently, R. follows the Latin closely in reproducing long, paratactic sentences: e.g., “Now enough ill-omened snow and hail has / Jove, our father, poured on earth and, hurling / with right hand aglow against our sacred / citadel, frightened // Rome, frightened nations lest the painful / times that Pyrrha mourned return, the / strange events, when Proteus forced his seals to / visit high mountains // and the fish clung fast to the elm’s top branches, / which had been the dwelling of the doves, while / fearful deer were swimming mid the inund-ating flood currents” (i.2.1–12).

R. adds a liberal dash of old-fashioned words in his translation recipe (e.g. “lest,” “alas,” “perchance,” “prates,” “prattling,” “wanton,” “whence,” “comely,” “maiden,” “harlot,” “fair of brow”). There are many examples of unusual word choice (e.g., “Cyrus will inflict his reckless / hands on you” at i.17.25–26, “I was brained to death” at ii.17.27–28, “till he firmed the wavering senators” at iii.5.45–46). Some phrases might trigger unintended laughter:
“heedless of herbage” at i.15.30 or “riding / on his nickering horse through fires” in iv.14.23–24.

Ronnie Acona provides a clear overview of Horace’s life and work in a fifteen-page introduction that assumes no knowledge of the Roman world in the reader. She presents Horace as one who maintained “a certain wariness about the price of that peace” the Augustan regime established. She nicely illustrates with several examples how highly quotable Horatian tags are far more complicated and interesting when read in context.

R. follows Klingner’s text, with some alternate readings from Shackleton Bailey’s edition. The Latin text is not printed. There are no line numbers. At the bottom of the page, R. identifies the meter of each ode and in footnotes provides information to help the reader make sense of names and contexts. The overall format of the book is attractive. I noted one typo (“crys” for “cries” on p. 6); the Latinless reader probably will not recognize “Volcan” as “Vulcan” on p. 98.

K. deserves the last word. Here is his fine rendering of i.11: “Don’t ask, you cannot know, what end for me or you / the gods have set, Leucōnē. Don’t look into / the stars. Much better to submit to what will be, / whether Jove bestows more winters or makes this / the last which pummels now the Tuscan sea against / a rocky shore. Be wise, decant your wine, prune back / long growth of hope. As we speak, begrudging time / has fled. Seize the day—and trust tomorrow least.”

John O. Svarlien
Transylvania University


Xenophon’s account in the Anabasis of the march into and out of Persia by a Greek mercenary army (a group Lee collectively refers to as the Cyreans throughout his book) is one of the great adventure/war stories of antiquity. Xenophon’s personal involvement in the events that he describes has sparked the interest of many modern military historians. The detailed nature of Xenophon’s account has become particularly relevant to scholars who have embraced John Keegan’s revolutionary method of studying military history by analyzing the personal experience of the soldier on the battlefield. Lee’s objective, however, is to discuss the daily life of the Cyreans away from the battlefield. To do this, Lee proposes to examine the army on the march, their logistics, and personal relationships. Another important point Lee makes throughout his book is that, although the army as a whole was a mobile community, it also essentially consisted of many smaller communities, the members of which depended on each other for their survival and success on and off the battlefield.

Chapters 2 and 3 discuss the broader context of the march of the Cyreans. In chapter 2, Lee reconstructs the route the army takes, while emphasizing aspects that would potentially create difficulties for the soldier on the
march: terrain, weather, availability of supplies, proximity to water, and the hostility of native peoples. He then turns in chapter 3 to the various contingents that made up the army and how the exigencies of their situation transformed the Cyreans from a diverse group of soldiers with a variety of backgrounds and experiences into a close-knit, relatively homogenous army.

The topic of chapter 4 is army’s organization. The main tactical unit in the army was the _lochos_ composed of 100 men under the command of a _lochagos_. The men of the _lochos_ fought, marched, camped and foraged together. On the more intimate level, each soldier belonged to a _suskenia_, a group of 10–15 comrades. While he only briefly discusses the function of the _lochos_ and _suskenia_ in battle, Lee focuses more in depth on how these units served as social communities that jointly accomplished relatively mundane, everyday tasks such as food preparation.

Chapter 5 documents the evidence for the armor, weapons, cooking gear, tools, camp gear, and plundered goods of the mercenary hoplites. Lee hypothesizes on the weight of all of this gear and discusses the realities of marching while carrying such heavy equipment. He then investigates containers and pack animals as methods of transport.

With chapter 6, the emphasis of the book shifts to the daily life of the soldier. Lee reconstructs a typical marching day by examining the marching order, distance traveled per day, and how the decision was made to stop and camp for the evening. Most of these activities took place at the _lochos_ level. It was the task of the _lochagoi_ to assemble their _lochoi_ at the start of the marching day and get the men moving in the appropriate direction at the appointed starting time and at a suitably fast pace.

Resting and the camp are the subjects of chapter 7. As in other aspects of military life, camping was done according to _lochos_. Each _lochos_ bivouacked in a specific location and was separated from other _lochoi_ by open spaces through which men and animals could walk. Similarly, each _suskenia_ within the _lochos_ had its own spot in the camp where the men could eat and sleep as a unit.

In chapter 8, Lee discusses the collection and eating of food. Cyrus’ army had no central mess hall, so it fell to the individual soldiers, usually working together as a _suskenia_, to collect and prepare their own food.

In chapter 9, Lee collects the evidence for a soldier’s well-being: his nutrition, sleep, sanitation, and hygiene. In his discussion of sanitation, Lee calculates the volume of waste the army of Cyrus would theoretically have produced, bringing home the point that the production and removal of human and animal waste would have been a daily concern for the army.

In chapter 10, Lee corrects the common misconception that a large number of servants and non-combatants followed the army of Cyrus. While this may have been true in other Greek armies, as a general rule the Cyreans had to perform for themselves those tasks that they might otherwise have delegated to servants. In many cases, members of the _suskeniai_ shared these duties. The Cyreans did, however, pick up captives along the way, some of whom were kept for sale on the slave market while others seem to have become companions and shared in the duties of the _suskenia_.


In his conclusion, chapter 11 at p. 276, Lee sums up well the importance of his book’s scope: “Reconstructing what it might have been like to march in *lochos* column or set up a *suskenia* encampment enables us to imagine the physical and spatial dimensions of ordinary soldiers’ worlds. In doing so we comprehend the range of challenges they endured and the kinds of decisions they had to make.” In studying the Cyreans’ struggle for survival, Lee has revealed a great deal about what it meant to be a soldier in a context greater than the traditional focus of the soldier on the battlefield. As Lee points out, however, that focus is taken for granted by Xenophon who did not feel it necessary to outline the day-to-day experience of the soldiers with whom he marched out of Persia. Instead, those important details “emerge from careful interrogation of the text” (280). It is through such an interrogation that Lee has reconstructed the daily life of the Cyreans. His approach and attention to detail are convincing and his book provides an excellent contribution not only to the study of Xenophon’s *Anabasis* but also to the field of Greek military history.

**Brian K. Harvey**

Kent State University


This book will serve as a wonderful memorial to an author who is no longer with us. Steven Lowenstam (1945–2003) was a professor of Classics at the University of Oregon. We are grateful to T. H. Carpenter for seeing this project through to publication and to the publisher for producing this stunning volume.

There are many books on the Trojan War in Greek art but this one not only differs in its focus on Achilles and Odysseus but in its sensitive approach on issues relating to iconography and style. It begins with a comparison of four vase paintings showing the blinding of Polyphemos and produced nearly simultaneously in four different parts of Greece and Italy at ca. 650 BCE. The reader is thus introduced to the beginning of pictorial art in Greece and Etruria. The period under consideration ends at ca. 300 BCE.

After a short introduction on the role of poetry and its connection to art, the book contains three major chapters on Greece, South Italy, and Etruria. Each of these contains seven to ten subheadings on artists or themes. There are 86 black-and-white illustrations, and fifty pages of very useful notes, bibliography, and index. The writing is uniformly excellent, even seductive, as the author was passionately enamored with the task of conveying to us the combined effect of stories and images. Lowenstam had a talent for discovering masterpieces and discussing known ones in new ways.

It takes only four pages of tightly woven text to explain the richly decorated François Vase but Lowenstam devotes equal attention to one challenging image, the marriage of Paris and Helen on the krater by the Detroit Painter at the Metropolitan. Helen and Troilos are obviously very important to the
Trojan War and are discussed several times in different contexts. The four pages on the great painter Exekias focus on one of his best works, the amphora in the Vatican with Achilles and Ajax gaming. Lowenstam gently but authoritatively disagrees with the usual interpretation and proposes instead to connect the image to *Iliad* 2.768–769 where Achilles is called the greatest.

The chapter on Greece includes equally fascinating discussions of the Sirens, the Ransom of Hektor, fifth-century portraits of Achilles and Odysseus, and ends with a neglected group of vases from the sanctuary of the Kabiroi near Thebes. Images of Kirke and Odysseus, the Judgment of Paris, the Sack of Troy, and a few others are shown as examples of this strange and wonderful Boiotian style that anticipated in scope the caricatures of the great French artist Honoré Daumier (1808–1879). It is not only refreshing to have these images in the middle of the book; their presence here also acknowledges their status as artistic masterpieces. It is to the author’s credit that he illustrated both sides of the charming skyphos at the University of Mississippi at Oxford, an object that was *not* chosen for the important exhibition *Greek Vases From Southern Collections* (New Orleans 1981).

The chapter on South Italian art begins with a magnificent volute-krater by the De Schulthess Painter from the Shelby White and Leon Levy Collection at the Metropolitan that shows the rearming of Achilles. Although the full-page photograph is excellent, a color plate would have been desirable here. This object is not included in the recent spectacular catalogue (2007), but the Metropolitan may have to reconsider as a consequence of this book: Lowenstam selected a second work by the De Schulthess Painter (Geneva, Musée de l’Art et d’Histoire) because of this artist’s unique interpretations of the myths.

The chapter on South Italy also includes masterpieces by the Darius Painter, the Dolon Painter, and a few others. Helen and Trojan topics dominate the art of South Italy, along with Odysseus and Aineias, but the author managed to find unusual topics and interesting images, like the Ambush of Dolon, the Slaughter of Lykaon, and devotes an entire section to the mysterious Thersites. In the past, it was not uncommon to find South Italian vases dismissed as imitations of Athenian art, but thanks to the work of A. D. Trendall, A. Cambitoglou and many others it is now possible to appreciate them in their own context. Our author takes advantage of these advances and presents us with a vibrant South Italian artistic tradition that not only developed independently but exploited these stories, familiar to the Greeks, in new, mostly funerary contexts. Chapter 2 ends by noting that “a wondrous, wise beauty rises from the tombs of South Italy.”

The Etruscan material in Chapter 3 is much more diverse in that it includes metalwork, tomb frescoes, stone and ivory carving. Once more the discussion begins with an amazing work, the Monteleone di Spoleto bronze chariot at the Metropolitan, shown in beautiful drawings by P. Bollo. The interpretation of the three main panels is anything but obvious and even Lowenstam stumbles over the meaning of the side panels, questioning the identity of the heroes in the duel and the meaning of the hero driving a chariot over a woman. Those wishing to tackle the problem will find a good, eight-page foundation in this book. The rest of the chapter is
devoted to the ivory pyxis in Florence, the Ambush of Troilos, a selection of fifth-century mirrors, and Achilles Sacrificing Trojan Youths. The Torre San Severo sarcophagus concludes the book. Here, I would agree with D. von Bothmer that this object does not belong among ancient works of art.

This is one of the best books on Greek art. Amazingly, Lowenstam was trained as a philologist with a particular interest in Homer, while scholars who write about art typically come from an archaeological or museum background. Lowenstam demonstrated that as long as there is passion for work, it is possible to arrive at the truth from a different direction. He will be sorely missed.

Sarantis Symeonoglou
Washington University, St. Louis


Ancient Rome and Modern America will almost certainly become the definitive work on the reception of ancient Rome in modern America. Weaving together the information contained in Malamud’s impressive collection of essays and articles regarding Roman influence on twentieth-century America with some new research on the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it is a fascinating study that details how a rich variety of Americans, male and female, black and white, political and artistic, sophisticated and low-brow, have interpreted Roman history and culture from the American Revolution to the present.

Not surprisingly given Malamud’s use of the word “modern” in the book’s title (though she never defines the adjective), she devotes only three chapters to America before the Civil War. Her discussion of the founders is very brief but competent, emphasizing their devotion to the Roman republic as a model of government and to its martyrs, Cato, Cicero, and Brutus. Her chapter on the equally well-worn subject of “Rome and the Politics of Slavery” is similarly unoriginal but competent. She demonstrates that while southerners viewed slavery as the source of Roman intellectual, cultural, and political achievement, abolitionists identified it as the principal reason for the fall of the revered republic. In another chapter she shows that antebellum workers who felt oppressed by the new industrial capitalists compared them to Roman aristocrats who exploited the plebeians. Both Jacksonian Democrats and agrarian reformers praised the champions of the plebeians, such as the Gracchi and Marius, and even slave rebels like Spartacus. Meanwhile, the Whigs denounced Andrew Jackson as a latter-day Caesar.

The largest, most original, and most valuable part of the book are the last six chapters, which explore the reception of Rome from postbellum America to the twenty-first century. Among the dazzling variety of topics Malamud explores with clarity and concision are the rise of corporations and radical reformers, the mass marketing of circuses and other so-called Roman pleasures, 1930s screwball comedies, Cold War novels and films, Caesar’s Palace in Las Vegas, and opposition to George W. Bush. Labor reformers, socialists,
progressives identified the “robber barons” of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as the new Caesars. In the same era novels portrayed the Romans as persecutors of virtuous Christians and Jews. In the wake of the Spanish-American War traditional pejorative references to the decadence and imperialism of ancient Rome were replaced by a celebratory linkage with the United States’ new imperial might. Entertainment vendors like P. T. Barnum offered common citizens the guilty pleasure of a thoroughly Americanized version of the Roman circus, which had formerly been despised as a form of debilitating luxury. In the 1930s Hollywood distracted moviegoers suffering through the Great Depression with parodies linking the corrupt officials and greed of ancient Rome with those of contemporary America. During the Cold War, while Howard Fast’s *Spartacus* presented the declining Roman republic as the forerunner of a modern United States marred by class divisions, the more conservative “sword and sandals” movies reestablished the nineteenth-century novelists’ practice of distancing the United States from pagan Rome by emphasizing the latter’s persecution of Christians. By contrast, the builders of the casino-resort Caesar’s Palace, far from castigating the decadent luxury of imperial Rome, surpassed Barnum in inviting ordinary Americans to share in it. Finally, twenty-first-century critics of George W. Bush such as Senator Robert Byrd revived the Whig trope of portraying themselves as latter-day Ciceros seeking to rein in an imperial presidency.

While Malamud’s fascinating survey identifies recurring themes in Americans’ use of Rome, it also depicts a decline in the depth of American knowledge concerning Roman classics, history, and culture. Despite the continuing appearance of Rome in the nation’s most popular films even as late as 2000 (*Gladiator*), Malamud rightly concludes, “Knowledge of Roman history declined over the course of the twentieth century and Americans know much less about ancient Rome than did their forebears” (253). For instance, the classical knowledge of even many ordinary Americans during the antebellum period greatly exceeded that of the vast majority of Americans today. Malamud’s book is a sad record of the decline of American classicism from the sophisticated political and historical debates of the founders to the shallow and stereotypical trappings of a casino. Malamud is admirably understated on this point, generally allowing the evidence to speak for itself. As the book proceeds, the reader cannot help noticing the increasing frivolousness of the uses to which Rome is put. What began as a fairly deep literary knowledge that provided valuable tools for substantive discussions of crucial issues concerning public policy and social practice has ended in a collection of superficial symbols and clichés about gladiators. If Byrd’s thoughtful (though obviously debatable) use of the Romans to advance the power of Congress against the presidency constitutes a throwback to the founders’ use of the Roman classics, it is the exception that proves the rule.

A relatively brief book that covers two centuries naturally opens itself to the criticism that many important topics are covered only in passing or neglected entirely. For instance, I would have liked to have seen more information about the educational system that once served as the foundation for American classicism, about that system’s decline in the late nineteenth cen-
tury, and about the crucial role of the Latin classics in the Romantics’ creation of the United States’ first national literature.

But such quibbles cannot overshadow the virtues of Malamud’s work. It is rare to find a scholar capable of treating so vast a subject in so engaging a manner. In the process she identifies both enduring themes and radical shifts in American perceptions of ancient Rome in both its republican and imperial phases. Cultural and intellectual history at its best, *Ancient Rome and Modern America* seems destined to surpass William Vance’s *America’s Rome* (Yale University Press, 1989) as the definitive work on the subject.

**CARL J. RICHARD**
University of Louisiana at Lafayette


Most classicists consider our ancient texts foundational in the Western tradition and relevant into the contemporary period; but in his study of Paul’s letter to the Philippians, Joseph Marchal (M.) foregrounds some problematic implications of these premises that should concern classicists as well as New Testament scholars. M.’s study grows out of his apprehension that Paul’s letters and their interpretation have been repeatedly appropriated to authorize social structures of subordination and domination: “it is hard to ignore the influence and impact of biblical materials in some of the most startlingly dehumanizing practices of humans” (120). He examines how Paul’s rhetoric lends itself to imperialist, colonialist, and sexist agendas. To counteract such appropriations of Paul, M. advocates for a feminist postcolonial approach that empowers readings of the Epistles that no longer “sanctify domination or oppression” (122), but enable counternarratives challenging repression. Some ancient historians may hesitate to introduce seemingly anachronistic categories like racism, sexism, and colonialism into the study of the ancient world, but as our texts continue to have impact, we may need to attend to the messages they impart and develop strategies to open up their interpretation to the reality of global asymmetries and inequalities. M. ably introduces such strategies and their theoretical underpinnings while supplying a sophisticated overview of current feminist postcolonial work. Two recent collections focusing more specifically on the intersection of Classics and postcolonialism may also be of interest: Barbara Goff (ed.), *Classics and Colonialism* (London 2005), and Lorna Hardwick, Carol Gillespie (ed.), *Classics in Post-Colonial Worlds* (Oxford 2007).

*The Politics of Heaven* consists of an introduction and five chapters. In the introduction, M. explains why he uses both feminist and postcolonial methodologies for reading Paul: neither alone could adequately address the text’s “intersecting dynamics of gender, sexuality, ethnicity, and empire” (3). At the heart of M.’s critical method is this awareness of the multiplicity of interlocking power dynamics in societies. This perspective also informs his choice of *kyriarchy* as a central concept in his analysis. Elizabeth Schüssler Fi-
renza created this neologism to replace “patriarchy,” which suggests a simple binary of power, with a term that conveys the interlocking “pyramidal relations” of oppression and domination in societies (6).

In the first chapter, M. distinguishes himself from other biblical scholars using postcolonial or “People’s History” methodologies and then explains his reliance on the work of feminist postcolonial theorists, particularly biblical scholars Kwok Pui-lan and Musa Dube (21–23). Four questions posed by Dube guide M.’s evaluation of Paul’s rhetoric: “1) Does the text have a clear stance against the political imperialism of its time? 2) Does the text encourage travel to distant and inhabited lands, and how does it justify itself? 3) How does the text construct difference: is there dialogue and liberating interdependence or condemnation of all that is foreign? 4) Does this text employ gender and divine representations to construct relationships of subordination and domination?” (23).

In chapter 2, M. demonstrates how easily Paul’s rhetoric in Philippians can “be re-assimilated or co-opted to an imperialist or colonialist agenda” (54). M. first reviews commentators who interpret Philippians as anti-imperialist and resistant to the Roman Empire because it usurps imperialist language to project Christ as a superior kyrios and a heavenly commonwealth opposed to Rome (Phil. 2.6–11; 3.18–21). Situating Paul’s language in the context of Dube’s questions, M. shows how little Philippians advances an anti-imperialist agenda. Answering Dube’s third question reveals Paul’s aversion to difference. When Paul refers to “opponents” (1.28), he forecasts their destruction. He describes those who disagree with him as “dogs,” “evil workers” (3.2), and “enemies” doomed to destruction (3.18–19). Paul employs the model of Christ’s obedience to urge the Philippians to obey him with “fear and trembling” (2.12) and “without grumbling and questioning” (dialogismôn 2.14). Paul gives priority to his own authority and dismisses equal interchange. M. argues that Paul’s rhetoric in Philippians replicates an imperial stance.

The third chapter, on imitation, foregrounds a major strength of the book: M.’s inclusion of a wider range of postcolonial theorists than the “usual suspects,” Edward Said, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, and Homi Bhabha (9). This effort enlarges the reader’s perspective on “imitation,” a foundational concept for both Paul’s rhetoric and historical colonialisms. Throughout Philippians, Paul emphasizes his status as model. He urges the community, “Be co-imitators of me” (symmimêtai mou 3.17). He exhorts them to be with him in the “same fight” (1.30) and to think the “same thing” as he does (2.2). And he describes as “mature” (teleioi) only those who share his thinking (3.15). Since an imperative for the colonized to imitate imperial culture also underwrites colonialism, mimesis has been a central focus in postcolonial studies (69). In this context, a view often invoked is Bhabha’s suggestion that mimicry functions to destabilize the model’s authority: because colonizers’ authority rests on their difference from the colonized, the ability to become like the colonizer destabilizes “this hierarchical dynamic” (70). The hybridity of colonized “mimic men” thus opens a space for the resistance and agency of the colonized (72). M. turns to feminist postcolonialist commentators to establish the multiform nature of mimicry and the difficulties in reading mimicry as
essentially resistant and Paul as anti-imperialist (79). He adduces instances where mimicry may be read to validate rather than destabilize imperialism. His theoretical review of the competing dynamics of mimicry for postcolonialist analysis provides a valuable resource for appreciating the complexities of the topic.

In the fourth chapter, M. considers Paul’s “co-workers,” Euodia and Syntyche, and Paul’s direction that they “think the same thing” (Phil. 4.2–3) in the context of Dube’s second question. He rejects the “malestream” consensus that these women are in conflict with each other. He argues that their differences are with Paul, who advises them to conform to his thinking. M. foregrounds this reference to difference and suggests it destabilizes Paul’s claim to authority and demonstrates an inherent divergence of thinking among the Philippian community (108). M. returns to this divergence in the fifth chapter, where he argues that scholars must “not begin and end with Paul’s perspective” if they wish to avoid reinscribing his kyriarchal suppositions (115). They should rather attend to the possibilities offered by feminist postcolonial theory and move marginal perspectives to the center of interpretation (122).

M. makes a valuable contribution to ancient studies. He compels us to face the mixed heritage of our texts and offers a wide-ranging introduction to theorists whose interpretative methodologies recognize and attempt to defuse the asymmetrical orders of domination and subordination inscribing our literature. I hope terms like “malestream” will not put off readers, because The Politics of Heaven will richly repay a close reading.

JUDITH PERKINS
Saint Joseph College


Marks (M.) has two principal goals in this slim but thorough volume. First, he shows that, like the Iliad, the Odyssey has a plot essentially arising from a plan of Zeus, a Dios boulê, with Athena as well as Poseidon pictured as ancillary deities who pick up on Zeus’s lead. Moreover, the plan of Zeus operates as an important structural device in oral composition. Second, he looks at the plot, characterizations, and narrative decisions of Homer’s epic in relation to other versions of Odysseus’ tale that were likely arising concurrently in various locales and connects the centrality of Zeus to the Panhellenic nature of Homer’s poem.

The “plan of Zeus” argument is a controversial interpretation that should provoke the reader toward intrigued acceptance or thoughtful rejection. I fall into the latter category, but nonetheless appreciate M.’s arguments and cannot simply shake my head in blanket dismissal. His analysis of the Dios boulê, while faulty in my eyes, raises significant insights into both the narrative structure of the epic and the involvement of the deities in Odysseus’ story.

According to M.’s argument, the opening Olympian scene establishes Zeus’s hegemony in constructing the plot of the whole Odyssey. Zeus gets the
ball rolling with his Oresteia, in which he sets up theodicy as a major theme and implies a correspondence between the families of Agamemnon and Odysseus that will be exploited throughout—both standard observations, though I would say Homer, not Zeus, makes the connection. M. deviates in his claim that “Zeus’s speech prompts Athene to raise the subject of Odysseus” (21) and “to propose the plan that she does for Odysseus’ return” (23). M.’s discussion of the Oresteia/Odyssey parallels in Chapter One is interesting and includes non-Homeric versions and cult rituals. My interpretation of this divine council, however, places Zeus on the periphery in an Athene-driven plot. Rather than prompting Athene to bring up Odysseus, Zeus’s speech shows no indication that Odysseus is remotely on his mind. Athene, far from picking up on his cue, artificially manufactures a segue that forces Odysseus into a conversation that would otherwise avoid that topic altogether. Once she nudges him in that direction, Zeus authorizes her plot decisions: her visit to Ithaka and Hermes’ journey to Ogygia. Chapter Two contends that Zeus is in charge of the second Olympian council in Book 5 and gives Hermes his orders, with Athene powerless to take action. In fact, Athene, as M. acknowledges, “initiates the ‘second’ discussion of Odysseus by expressing despair that the hero remains on Ogygia” (38), but he contends that she has been forgetful and that Zeus has to remind her of her previous plan. I see it the other way around. Zeus has the authority whereas Athene has the interest in Odysseus’ story. M. construes authority falsely as plot-control and discounts too easily Athene’s responsibility in keeping the plot on track. The author is at his most convincing in the third chapter, where he analyzes the deities’ involvement in bringing the narrative to an abrupt end. I very much like his discussion of revenge and vendetta, a cycle of violence that can be stopped only by divine intervention and an erasure of memory commanded by Zeus. The assertion that Athene’s plan reaches only as far as the slaughter of the suitors is well made. It takes Zeus to supply the supernatural solution that can bring satisfactory closure to the plot. Still, his contribution to the plot comes at the end; from the opening until just before the close, Athene makes the plot decisions and checks in with the main characters to keep the story going correctly.

M. confuses Zeus’s plan with fate. Zeus, when prompted, recalls what Odysseus’ fate is and can present it in prophetic, table-of-contents fashion, as he does in 5.30–42. “Zeus downplays his own role in the formulation of a workable plan” and “enacts his own plan as it were under the aegis of Athene” (39). The author points out that Zeus’s timetable incorporates Odysseus’ delay when the sea-god smashes his raft, arguing that Poseidon, like Athene, is thereby an aide in Zeus’s carefully laid-out plan. Narrative plotting is not the same as knowing ahead of time what is going to happen after Athene gets things under way. As Cedric Whitman often said in class, “Fate is the way the story goes.” Zeus knows how the story goes and tells it here.

Most of the book’s second half brings in evidence of non-Homeric versions of Odysseus’ story and related Nostoi, largely brought in to bolster two main points: 1) Homer’s version is both aware of conflicting versions (mainly but not solely in western Greece) and interested in “de-authorizing” them by providing what was intended to be the definitive details of Odysseus’ legend;
2) unlike several other deities, Zeus is not connected with specific towns and is therefore a good candidate for chief deity in a Panhellenic (as opposed to epichoric) epic, hence the significance of Zeus and the Dios boulê in both Homeric epics. The three chapters that develop these points make interesting reading in an area outside the mainstream, and I learned a great deal from them. I did, however, find much of the argument speculative in a way that did not enhance my reading of Homer. It is likely true that conflicting details we know from later written sources showed up in songs concurrent with Homer, but it seems too much to claim that de-authorizing them was a motive or concern in the composition of the Odyssey.

Despite my inability to accept M.’s central points, I nevertheless found this book interesting and often compelling reading; at times I was ready to concede Athene’s role as prime narrative-mover to her father—but not quite. The prose is clear and readable, the organization is excellent, and the scholarship is extensive and well deployed.

Scott Richardson
St. John’s University, Minnesota


In Widows and Patriarchy, McGinn offers a compact, but rigorous exploration of the status and roles of widows in several patriarchal societies. He acknowledges that patriarchy has varied from one society to another and that it has not been equally advantageous to all men, nor equally disadvantageous to all women in a society. He maintains, nonetheless, that one element common to most patriarchal societies has been the belief that widows constitute a category problematic for men. Because marriage in which the wife is dependent on her husband has traditionally been considered the most appropriate situation for adult women, widows have frequently been the focus of male anxiety. McGinn discusses two contrasting—though both negative—stereotypes that have developed. The first is the stereotype of the vulnerable widow, in need of protection and resources, who becomes a burden to her family and community. The second stereotype, that of the lusty widow, is more frightening to men, because she engages in behavior condoned in men but not women and therefore prompts fears of an inversion of the gender hierarchy. A sexually experienced woman, now free of the control of a husband, she may seem to engage in inappropriate behavior, such as sexual promiscuity or, if she is wealthy, the squandering of her resources. Of course, these stereotypes were developed by men, and, as McGinn points out, widows’ own thoughts on patriarchy are largely beyond recovery. Literary works, almost all of them composed by men, are generally didactic or prescriptive in nature. From them, we learn only how men wanted widows to behave. McGinn traces, for example, iterations of the Widow of Ephesus story from ancient to modern times. Unfortunately, we are rarely, especially for the ancient world, privy to the reality of widows’ lived experiences. From the perspective of widows, the reality was often bleak. Because the identity
of an adult woman was defined through her relationship to her husband, the loss of her husband meant a loss of social identity, restrictions on social interactions, and consequent isolation. Moreover, for most women, widowhood meant a dwindling of financial resources. For the widow, whether weak or strong, remarriage might have appeared to be the only practical means of avoiding destitution and/or aspersions on her moral character; but the quest for a new husband might in itself raise criticisms of predatory and sexually avid behavior. For older (and poor) women, moreover, particularly those past child-bearing years, it might be impossible to find a new husband.

McGinn discusses the different ways that cultures have addressed the problems raised by a woman’s loss of her husband by examining the cultures of three historical periods: ancient Athens and Rome (a section that concludes with references to New Testament teachings and Jerome’s influential construct of celibate widowhood), late medieval and early modern England and Germany (with particular emphasis on the consequences to women of Christian charity, the Black Death and the Reformation), and nineteenth- and early twentieth-century England and the United States (which saw the erosion of male privilege at law and the introduction of meaningful social assistance legislation). McGinn’s aim is not to produce an exhaustive study, but rather to develop a methodology that will facilitate a broad comparison of gender hierarchy in different historical contexts. He admits that comparative evidence in itself proves nothing, but can perhaps provide illumination to areas where evidence is limited or unavailable. His work will be particularly useful to Classicists, for whom sources of information about the lives of women are so meager.

McGinn begins each of his analyses of the three time periods with a summary of demographic information, including an estimation of the number of widows in the society, the mortality rates for both men and women, and the age gap between spouses at first marriage. In societies such as ancient Athens and Rome, where females married at a much younger age than males, and where wars were frequent, young widows were common. When these widows had young children, as most would, the prospect of remarriage was often clouded by the difficulty of attracting a man who was willing to assume the role of stepfather, or by issues of custody, since in many cultures, the children legally belonged to the family of the dead husband. To achieve facility of comparison, McGinn organizes each analysis around four topics. First, he discusses widows’ rights at private law, exploring whether women could own, inherit and manage property, and thus legally possess their own resources. Second, he investigates economic privilege, ascertaining what opportunities widows had to find employment, and whether remarriage might be their only option to escape poverty. Third, he looks at freedom of movement and the impact of the social marginalization that resulted from the death of one’s husband. If widows had to curtail their activities or risk charges of immoral behavior, perhaps remarriage was the only way that they could elude social isolation. Ironically, they might experience more freedom under the control of a husband than as widows. Fourth, McGinn discusses whether widows were
entitled to choose to remarry and to choose their spouses, or were forced into new marriages.

One point that McGinn stresses for each of his three time periods is that the experience of widowhood for women in wealthy families was much less challenging than that for women in poor families. Because the information that Classicists have available is almost exclusively about upper-class women, and often focuses on such merry widows as Clodia Metelli and Ummidia Quadratilla, we may fail to comprehend the desperation of lower-class widows, some of whom were reduced to begging and/or prostitution to survive. McGinn’s comparative approach provides a valuable tool, enabling readers to understand how precarious the lives of most widows were. Readers will also appreciate McGinn’s extensive bibliography on issues of gender hierarchy and social status from the ancient to the modern world.

Jo-Ann Shelton
University of California
Santa Barbara


In this volume, McHardy (hereafter M.) takes a new approach to a topic, vengeance, which has received much attention from classical scholars for the last several years. M.’s main aim is “focusing on motivations for revenge across a range of Greek sources and attempting to explain why revenge is taken in one situation, but not in another” (p. 1).

The main point of M.’s argumentation is that Athenians in the classical period did not take revenge for slights according to some behavioral code, but instead engaged in a rational cost-benefit analysis before taking action. As a result, M. finds that under certain sets of circumstances—for instance, when an injured party was of inferior social standing—violent revenge was not always a beneficial course of action, and people could attempt other forms of compensation. She argues that because of such calculations, the classical Athenians were more likely to take revenge in situations of sexual misconduct or property disputes than they were in cases of homicide or insult. Evolutionary psychology, according to M., explains this difference, as men tried to protect their access to women’s reproductive resources and ensure the survival of their genetic line, goals that would be endangered by sexual “poaching” or loss of status due to a failure to protect one’s property.

Overall, I am convinced by M.’s arguments regarding the idea that the ancient Athenians did not seek revenge blindly, but calculated the potential costs and benefits of the various courses of action before proceeding. I also found her reading of the differing motivations of Orestes and Elektra in Homer and tragedy compelling. Nevertheless, I confess that in many other ways, I find this book to be frustrating.

As noted above, M. takes a cross-genre approach to her sources, which mainly consist of Herodotos, tragedy, the orators, and Homer. M. herself
notes that this approach can be problematical if the sources are used uncritically (p. 1), yet she treads dangerously close to that line. Throughout the book, examples from Homeric epic are used in such a way that they appear to have the same evidentiary value for the behavior of classical Athenians as do contemporary sources. While there is no doubt that Greeks of the classical period were influenced by Homer, I can’t help but wonder if that influence was as pervasive as M. would like it to be.

There are also instances of doubtful interpretations of the sources. Lysias 1, On the Murder of Eratosthenes, obviously gets a great deal of attention in the chapter on the response to issues of seduction, rape, and adultery, and necessarily forms part of M.’s contention that such crimes are more likely to inspire violent forms of revenge than others. Nevertheless, my sense of this oration has always been that Euphiletos was brought to trial for killing Eratosthenes precisely because killing adulterers was such an unusual course of action in classical Athens.

M. also claims that Herodotos’ portrayal of Artemisia’s actions during the battle of Salamis, in which she rammed another Persian ship in order to save her own, demonstrates the “general expectation that women are not only weak and cowardly, but also exceptionally devious” (p. 90). Yet, interestingly, she fails to address the role of revenge in this tale, as Herodotos explicitly tells us that she had an earlier quarrel with the king of Kalynda, whose ship she rams to effect her own escape. This is all the more significant for M.’s argumentation as Munson notes that Herodotos clearly devalues the idea of revenge as a motivating factor in Artemisia’s actions (R. Munson, “Artemisia in Herodotus,” ClAnt 7.1 [1988] 102), yet one of M.’s main points is that women are more likely than men to take violent revenge without regard for the consequences. Additionally, I have always felt that this story is as much of a commentary on Xerxes as it is on Artemisia: while Artemisia fights, Xerxes is so clearly lacking in the masculine quality of andreia that he not only watches the battle from shore instead of leading his troops, but is such an inept commander that he is unable to tell his own ships from those of the Greeks.

But it is with the theoretical basis of the book, its dependence upon evolutionary psychology as an explanatory model, that I have the greatest issues. For example, M. argues on pages 112–117 that evidence, both mythical and historical, describes the “tendency of ruling families to fight among themselves over power and to kill one another to seize control” (p. 112). For M., evolutionary psychology explains such behaviors: access to power and property gives men greater access to women, ensuring the continuation of their genetic line. Yet it seems to me that if the sources indicated that men protected the lives of their kin despite detrimental effects to power and property, evolutionary psychology could explain that behavior as well.

M. seeks to problematize oversimplified theories concerning revenge in ancient Athens, yet throughout her discussion of the sources lacks nuance. This is particularly evident in her use of tragedy; for although she acknowledges the potential difficulties of using tragic sources, she often argues that tragic plotlines provide important evidence for how the Athenians viewed revenge in various situations. We have, however, little indication of how much
these tragic representations may or may not have influenced actual behaviors in classical Athens.

Overall, I found this book to be disappointing. While M. makes several good points concerning the nature of revenge in classical Athens, these are frequently overshadowed by difficulties of interpretation. As a result, the book was not as persuasive as it could have been if the sources had been subjected to more rigorous analysis, particularly with regard to the context and goals of each selection. M. concludes with the hope that her arguments will inspire further discussion, a hope with which I heartily concur.

Danielle L. Kellogg
Brooklyn College


Niall McKeown has produced a useful and provocative book on the historiography of slavery in the ancient Roman world. The book belongs to the Duckworth Classical Essays series, which, according to the jacket of this particular book, “unsettles received wisdom” while provoking “debate and controversy both within and beyond Classics.”

In that sense, the book does not disappoint. In a series of seven chapters devoted either to specific authors or to broader conceptual approaches to slavery, McKeown develops a multi-pronged argument about methodology in the study of ancient slavery. In his view, much of the evidence for slavery in antiquity is ambiguous and susceptible to multiple interpretations. As a consequence of this basic problem, historians have constructed narratives of slavery that are plausible, but ultimately not readily amenable to either proof or falsification. Thus, in the end, most narratives of ancient slavery are not only highly sensitive to the initial assumptions of the historians who create them, but also not so nearly as well-founded as their authors and their readers would like to believe.

McKeown devotes a considerable amount of attention to a recent strand of scholarship that emphasizes both the adversarial nature of relationships between master and slaves and the ways in which slaves sought to resist their masters’ authority. In Chapter Four he engages with the work of Keith Bradley, a leading figure in the effort to rescue the voice of the ancient slave from elite literary sources that suppress it beneath their own slaveholding ideology. For Bradley, efforts on the part of slaves to resist their oppression were inevitably misconstrued by slaveholders as evidence of slaves’ inherent criminality and moral turpitude. In his view, the historian can only reconstruct the reality of slavery in ancient Rome by reading past such evidence; when this approach is adopted it reveals a reality in which most slaves resisted the authority of their masters, whether actively or passively. While McKeown nowhere denies that this is a perfectly plausible interpretation of the ancient evidence, he does stress the ambiguity of the source material on
which Bradley constructs his case. So, whereas Bradley interprets comments by the jurists concerning crimes and delicts committed by slaves as evidence of widespread servile resistance, McKeown points out that they need not be read as generalizations concerning typical behavior on the part of slaves. Instead, they may simply reflect recognition on the part of the jurists that, in a society in which slaves permeated social and economic life, slaves could and did become implicated in illegal behavior, just as did the freeborn (pp. 80–90).

Resistance to slavery is likewise the focal point of Chapter Five, in which McKeown discusses recent literary analyses of Roman slavery. Here, he argues that scholars are increasingly likely to accept the narrative of servile resistance as a given, and that this assumption necessarily colors their efforts to reinterpret a range of classical texts. Thus, he suggests that scholars of Plautus in particular are inclined to think that Plautine comedy sought, among other things, to help slaveholders deal with their fear of their own slaves. Once again, McKeown acknowledges that such readings are eminently plausible, but stresses that the nature of the evidence can easily give rise to other plausible and countervailing interpretations (pp. 109–121).

McKeown does not limit himself to a critique of the narrative of servile resistance, but instead casts a critical gaze on a number of other aspects of twentieth-century historiography on ancient slavery. In Chapter One, he discusses the changing priorities of historians who have sought to mine Roman epitaphs for evidence of slavery. Chapters Two and Three focus on selected pieces of non-Anglophone scholarship, including Fridolf Kudlien’s analysis of both structural aspects of slavery and affective relationships between master and slave, as well as the Marxist approach of Shtaerman and Trofimova. In Chapter Six, McKeown discusses recent work inspired by broader trends in the social sciences (such as demography), and in a final chapter he draws comparisons between the ways in which scholars of Roman slavery and scholars of ancient Greek slavery approach their subjects.

While McKeown is certainly correct to stress the ambiguity of the ancient evidence and the problems that this ambiguity poses for historians of ancient slavery, readers expecting him to offer solutions to these problems in the text will find themselves somewhat frustrated. McKeown does make one sensible suggestion: in Chapter Six, he argues that authors who orient their work toward the social sciences tend to be more up-front about the limitations of the evidence and about the kinds of conclusions that the evidence can support, and he suggests that other scholars who focus on slavery should adopt comparable rhetorical strategies (p. 140). But in other respects, his recommendations remain underdeveloped. Thus, while it is clear that he has reflected on the advantages and pitfalls of comparative evidence (pp. 91–96), he does not engage in a sustained discussion of whether nor not historians can use comparative approaches to produce narratives that are not just plausible, but also more plausible than alternative interpretations. Arguably, the comparative method makes progress of this sort possible, inasmuch as it ideally encourages its practitioners to make specific predictions about the relationships we should expect to see between clusters of individual variables (for
a good example, see Walter Scheidel in Enrico Dal Lago, ed., *Slave Systems: Ancient and Modern* [Cambridge 2008]).

This one weakness aside, McKeown has written a stimulating book that will challenge its readers to reflect on the difficulties inherent in writing the history of ancient slavery. Scholars who specialize in ancient slavery will inevitably disagree with some of McKeown’s interpretations of both the ancient evidence and modern scholarship, but will still benefit from his critical orientation. Arguably, the book will be of most use to those who teach classes on ancient slavery, for it will force students to deal head-on with questions of methodology that are central to any effort to reconstruct the past.

Cameron Hawkins
The University of Chicago


Theocritus’ bucolic poems are curiously self-contained literary artifacts that modern readers have found both highly attractive and difficult to come to terms with. Taking this experience as his starting-point, Payne (P.) discovers in Theocritus’ bucolic poetry “the first fully fictional world in Western literature” (1). P. has produced an account of ‘fictionality’ and reading fiction that could serve as introduction to the topic by itself (thus rescuing theory of fiction from its current Cinderella status). As opposed to mimetic literature that, according to P., provides tools for understanding reality, fully fictional worlds can only appear as alternatives to reality (7). P. sets for himself the task of explaining the workings and the attractiveness of such alternatives. He succeeds admirably, by constantly discussing Theocritus’ poems in comparison with ancient Greek and Roman poetry and criticism, including scholia, and with classical modern fiction, such as Proust’s or Pessoa’s. P.’s work could easily serve as a model study for such double approaches.

Chapters 1 and 2 focus on the power of Theocritus’ fictional world to seduce its readers through representations of story-telling and by various means of producing presence (Idylls 3, 11, and 13); chapters 3 and 4 investigate the workings of mimetic desire, that is, different acts of imitation, and its therapeutics (Idylls 3, 1, 7, 6, and 12). The conclusion follows up the main lines of argument regarding Virgil’s eclogues and early modern bucolic fiction. I can only single out a few highlights:

By examining the different representational modes in Idyll 1 (dialogue, ecphrasis, song) P. demonstrates how these actually work as “mise en abyme” for readers’ responses to fiction. While we seek to go beyond this response, by making sense of deictic markers and by filling in gaps, our response to the ecphrasis resembles the fictional character’s response to the wooden drinking-cup described (39). Theocritus thus places the reader in the gap between representation and performance (48). The focus on reader response and fictional allure naturally leads to a discussion of how Theocritus produces presence. P. compares Theocritus, drama, and Callimachus’ mimetic hymns in their re-
spective ways of using ‘deixis’, that is, pointing towards fictional contexts, as means of constructing fictional worlds (53). He adds thoughts on “presence effects” in Hellenistic poets (58) and “modistics,” informed by critics from Plato to Genette.

In a fully fictional world, what does it mean to be a bucolic character? P. answers this crucial question with characteristic elegance: it means to be shaped by one’s relations to the fictional world of bucolics, as P. demonstrates with a list of characters who are what they are by emulating other bucolic characters. P. chooses the rarely discussed Idyll 12 in order to flesh out the approach of imaginative role play. Bucolic characters imagine themselves in a fictive identity in order to achieve freedom from suffering. Moreover, this is how P. seems to understand the actual motivation to read Theocritus (though one wonders whether there are other, perhaps less therapeutic ways of reading him). Theocritus, according to P. who contrasts what Plato has to say on fiction and its effects on the soul, offers an option of self-development that is not based on philosophical self-knowledge but on literary self-projection: “If there is a message here, it would seem to be that the pleasures of bucolic song and bucolic impersonation are their own reward” (99–100).

Although there is much to choose from, my favorite chapter is the last (“From fiction to metafiction”). Taking his cues from Hermesianax’s wonderfully insane poetic pseudo-biographies that blur the boundaries between reality and fiction, P. re-reads the much-discussed Idyll 7. In short, he understands the idyll along the lines of modern literary (which means here “half-fictional”) autobiographies, because the idyll both invites and rebuffs autobiographical readings (138). Theocritus gives independent life to a creation of his own: Simichidas, an alter ego, meets Lycidas, a fictional goatherd, who then teaches his inventor. (P. finds an exact parallel in Pessoa’s heteronymic fictions, esp. 143.) P. calls this phenomenon “metafiction” (21). The overall “message” of these texts, according to P., would then be “that we change by identifying with the products of our imagination” (145, influenced by Girard’s “mimetic desire”).

In conclusion, after an ironic reading of Callimachus’ epigrammatic mourning of Heraclitus, P. follows up on his major themes in, mainly, the Lament of Bion and Virgil’s Eclogues, along with a reappraisal of biographical readings insofar as they are invited by these texts.

Within its well-confined pomerium, P.’s book does not leave much room for quibbles. I have only three, which are mostly concerned with the boundaries of this space: (1) I am not sure that the label “wholly fictional world” makes sense in Theocritus’ case: are herdsmen ever “wholly fictional”? One wonders whether there were no herdsmen in Theocritus’ world—since every one, according to P., refers back to the Odyssey. Or if there were, would then, say, the fable with its foxes and sheep not also belong to a genre that is wholly fictional? In the end, the claim that Theocritus “invented fiction” might thus go a little too far. (2) P. has split Theocritus, at least, in two. Besides the bucolic fiction, there is Theocritus’ Hellenistic world that is described in no less artistic, but non-fictional ways in, e.g., Idylls 15, 16, or 17. Moreover, there are not fully fictional fictions among his works, e.g., Idylls 18, 22, or 24. How
do these all fit together? (3) P. makes Theocritus and his readers appear very bookish. His constant quoting from modern classics (the only one I am missing is Nabokov, especially Ada or Ardor) implies, however, a statement that P. never makes explicitly, nor does he have to, because it is broadly shared: that Theocritus is, in certain respects, like these modern literates. For P., he is part of a timeless universe of literary criticism that ranges from Plato to Iser, from Aristotle to Genette, and from Homer to Robbe-Grillet. I wonder whether such a reading at least partly begs the question. At the least, it would be beneficial to spell out the affinities: e.g., will the same feature in Theocritus’ text have the same effect on every reader, regardless of time and place?

These are big questions, and one should not blame P. for having avoided them. Obviously, P. has thought hard about the texts he writes about. He shows superior command of ancient texts, modern literature and critical theory. His extraordinary book throws fresh light on every idyll and every problem it discusses. Whether or not one agrees with him, he lifts the discourse on bucolic poetry to an entirely new level of sophistication. Thus, for anybody who is interested in fiction in ancient Greek and Roman literature, bucolic fiction through the ages, and reader response to fictional writing, P. has produced an indispensable study.

Markus Asper
New York University


Part of the Blackwell series of Introductions to the Classical World, Rabinowitz’s contribution on Greek Tragedy is a truly excellent piece of work. She covers an extensive amount of material in an impressively concise fashion, combining factual information with judicious analysis throughout. A particular strength of this book is its thematic structure, which allows the author to develop major issues in a cumulative fashion without being repetitive and without producing the kind of disparate chapters one often finds in companions or introductory volumes. It is clear that much thought went into the planning and execution of this book. Connections are made throughout to issues raised in previous chapters, giving the reader a feeling of sustained guidance through many complex issues. Equally admirable is the even-handed way in which Rabinowitz treats and refers to scholarship on the plays themselves and on contextual historical and social issues. A further quality of this book is the way in which Rabinowitz is able to crystallize the essence of the tragedies she discusses without being reductive in any way. She makes the material accessible to the non-specialist but simultaneously emphasizes the complexities and ambiguities inherent in Greek tragedy.

The Introduction emphasizes the Attic origin of Greek tragedy and guides the reader through different approaches to the genre—philology, new criticism, structuralism, psychology, post-structuralism. Part I offers three chapters on the Athenian context of tragedy, each of which is extremely well
synthesized. The comprehensive treatment of historical and social context is another strength of this book. Chapter 1 ‘What Was Tragedy?’ discusses the origins of tragedy, how they were performed, and how they were analyzed by Aristotle and Plato, pointing out some common misunderstandings that have arisen from the Poetics, especially. Chapter 2 “Tragedy and the Polis” draws connections between tragedy and democracy and discusses Athens’ development into an imperial power. The context of oratory is discussed as is the anachronistic ideology of democracy that features in Greek tragedy. Chapter 3 “Tragedy and Greek Religion” discusses the festivals of Dionysus, stressing the connection between the religious and the civic that was so important in ancient Athens. Ritual practices that feature in Greek tragedy are also discussed and the chapter concludes with an analysis of Euripides’ Bacchae. Part II analyzes a representative sample of Greek tragedies through four major themes: Chapter 4 “War and Empire” (Aeschylus’ Persians and Oresteia, Euripides’ Iphigenia in Aulis), Chapter 5 “Family Romance and Revenge in the House of Atreus” (the Electra plays of Euripides and Sophocles), Chapter 6 “Victims and Victimizers” (Euripides Trojan Women, Hekabe and Medea) and Chapter 7 “The King and I” (Sophocles’ Antigone and Oedipus the King).

Rabinowitz carefully avoids turgid plot summaries, but rather interweaves explanations of crucial plot lines with insightful analysis. In addition, she consistently reminds the reader of the importance of the Chorus in Greek tragedy by referring to their contributions to theme-development in the plays she discusses. Indeed, although, in many cases, Rabinowitz was covering well-trodden material, her analyses felt fresh, perspicacious and comprehensive. For example, in her treatment of Oedipus Tyrannos she draws attention to the combination of ritual and political dimensions in the play, she discusses the context of the Athenian plague, the relationship between free will, fate and hamartia, the crucial choral activity of dancing, the virtues and errors of Oedipus, the practice of ostracism and scapegoating, the issue of Athens vs. Thebes, the analyses of Freud and Lévi-Strauss, the question of Oedipus standing for ‘the universal man’, and modern feminist approaches to the play that show that Oedipus’ confidence is gendered rather than generically human. Rabinowitz herself is known for her feminist reading of Greek tragedy especially in Anxiety Veiled: Euripides and the Traffic in Women (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), but one never gets the sense that she prioritizes one particular reading over another. Rather she is dedicated to drawing attention to the ambiguities of the plays that leave them open to a multiplicity of interpretations.

Throughout the book, Rabinowitz reminds us of the continuing relevance of Greek tragedies as ways of thinking about morally ambiguous issues in society, throwing in modern analogies and parallels, and engaging the reader with open-ended questions related to the tragedies under discussion, all of which culminates in a final chapter on Modern Performances (written with Sue Blundell). This chapter explores how productions of Greek tragedy in Japan, Europe (including Ireland, Britain, France, Germany, Greece), Africa, the Caribbean and the U.S. have fruitfully explored the themes of war,
grief, gender relations, dysfunctional families, race, and post-colonialism which Greek tragedies offer.

The book is written without footnotes or endnotes, doubtless a requirement of the series, but suggestions for further reading appear at the end of several chapters and a full bibliography is included, as is a comprehensive index. There is very little indeed one can criticize in this book. Given the amount of bibliography on Greek tragedy, it did seem a little odd to have one short section of suggestions for further reading at the end of Part II (to cover four chapters on different tragedies) when each chapter in Part I received its own suggestions for further reading. Admittedly this may not have been in the author’s control. One minor inconsistency seemed unfortunate. Having judiciously noted (p. 15) that the term *hamartia* means ‘error’ and not ‘flaw’, Rabinowitz then refers to the term as an ‘error or flaw’ on p. 172. That being said, these minor issues do not detract in any way from the quality of this book. It will be an excellent resource for students and teachers alike.

Isabelle Torrance
University of Notre Dame


With the recent discovery of the Lupercal cave on the southwest corner of the Palatine Hill, scholarly attention has once again returned to the veracity of the legendary foundations of the city of Rome and public perception of Rome’s own mythology. In the timely *Legendary Rome*, Jennifer Rea analyzes the Palatine and Capitoline hills during the early reign of Augustus applying both topographical and literary analysis. Through this interdisciplinary approach, Rea attempts to capture the epic unfolding of a new order in the city of Rome after Actium through the manipulation of the archaic past. The first two chapters of the book are devoted to understanding the topographical developments of the two oldest occupied hills of Rome. Next, Rea analyzes the role of visual culture in the existing social framework of the city. The final two chapters discuss how the architectural modifications of the hill are completed under Augustus. A brief conclusion follows.

Chapter 1, “The Palatine: The Casa Romuli and the Domus Augustus,” addresses the development of the Palatine Hill and the role it played in the mythology of Rome’s founding. Rea considers the topography of the hill in relationship to Augustus’ architectural development of the space. The emperor’s manipulation of the space encouraged the Roman audience to understand that the emperor’s complex was the logical development from Romulus’ hut and the nexus of power atop the Palatine. This architectural dialogue created Augustus in the image of humble leader whose tasks included redefining the importance of Rome’s religious and political development under his own leadership and that of his prestigious predecessors.
In Chapter 2, “The Capitoline: Jupiter Tonans Restores the Past,” Rea addresses the role that the Capitoline and Jupiter played in the early foundation legends. She discusses Augustus’ restoration of Rome’s connection to the gods and the city’s prestigious destiny by restoring the prestige of Jupiter’s sanctuary as well as constructing a second hut of Romulus within the Capitoline sanctuary.

Chapter 3, “Thinking in Images: Preserving the Past for the Present,” bridges the gap between the material remains and the literary discussion of them by presenting modern theories about visual culture and social dynamics and applying those theories to the transition crafted by Augustus between Republic and Empire. The dialogue created by the poets and Augustus conveyed the vision of the archaic foundation of Rome and its subsequent regeneration under the first emperor. By articulating the visual culture of Rome, both the poets and the emperor are contributing to the dialogue between a city and its inhabitants.

Rea next examines the work of three poets. In “Urbs Aeterna: Reinventing Rome in Aeneid 8 and Tibullus 2.5,” Rea analyzes the references to Rome’s pastoral beginnings as depicted by Vergil and Tibullus. Each poet manipulates proto-Roman landscape to convey the promise of Rome’s future success. In “Maxima Roma: Refounding Rome in Propertius 4.1, 4.4, and 4.9,” Rea analyzes the poetry of Propertius as it relates to his more pastoral contemporaries. Propertius approaches the foundations of the city from a more military standpoint, and in essence, creates his Rome as the antithesis to the pastoral foundations of Vergil. By creating this dichotomy and emphasizing the violence of the past, Propertius is asserting that a violent foundation can create a stable and prosperous city. This message of future prosperity would particularly resonate with the contemporary Roman audience who had recently survived the violent ending of the Republic and the Roman defeat of one of its own at Actium. These Romans too would see success stem from instability just as the Rome of Romulus became the urbs aeterna.

Rea’s concise discussion of archaic monuments in the Augustan age and the meaning of the texts that refer to their humble origins concludes with a discussion of Ovid and his approach to the foundation legends of Rome. Introducing analysis of a new author in the conclusion diverts attention from the more developed analyses of Propertius, Tibullus, and Vergil in the preceding chapters, although it is interesting to see the directions in which other Augustan authors develop the notion of the archaic past following the final, unstable years of the Republic. In the end, Rea concludes that Rome as a city is ultimately successful because of the tradition of assimilation versus subjugation. This same tradition exists in the poetic presentation of the various foundation legends of the city. Thus, archaic Rome existing alongside Augustan Rome highlights the historical trajectory of the city as well as its presumably successful future as a result of the even-handed leadership of Augustus.

Missing were images to complement the descriptions of the hills and the building programs of Augustus. Only three figures, all line drawings, are included in the book: a simple reconstruction of the hut of Romulus and basic plans of the Palatine and Capitoline hills. Increasing the number of images
to include plans of Rome under Augustus and in the Iron Age as well as reconstructions of the structures in question would have greatly added to the reader’s appreciation for the topographical developments Rea describes.

Interdisciplinary approaches to the classical world have long been lauded as a means of fully comprehending a particular time and place. Rea’s book, an easy read for classicists in all disciplines, integrates both literary and archaeological evidence to form a balanced base from which to analyze the works of Augustus and his contemporaries in a manner not dissimilar to the emperor’s own approach to recreating cultural identity, a parallelism welcome both as a reflection of the ancient world and modern scholarship. Rea avoids discussing the manipulation of archaic Rome in the era of Augustus in terms of propaganda, which distinguishes her from many contemporary approaches to Augustan Rome. By maintaining a narrow focus on three poets and two hills, Rea provides the reader with a digestible and synthetic approach to the use of archaic Rome in Augustan propaganda. Furthermore, by combining literary and material cultural evidence, Rea creates a more complete picture of the Rome intentionally crafted by Augustus and taken up by the poets.

RYAN RICCIARDI
Bowdoin College


In his Preface to Virgil’s Aeneid: A Reader’s Guide, David O. Ross (R.) states that his model (hence the title) for his book is the good tour guide, “who is not compelled to reel off, exhaustively, all the dates, facts, and points of interest about an object or site, but who can illuminate what is essential, providing a way of seeing and putting together certain selected pieces in a meaningful and suggestive manner” (p. viii). In this R. succeeds, but the reader looking for a unified, clear exegesis of the poem will be disappointed. The book is better described as a collection of thematic essays by a scholar who has clearly spent many years studying and teaching the poem. Due to its sophistication and some significant idiosyncrasies, I would recommend this book only to very mature students or teachers of the Aeneid in Latin who seek some good examples of ways to enter the text. For this select group, R.’s elegantly written little book provides some interesting questions and approaches to think about.

The chapters are arranged thematically. In Chapter 1, “Virgil’s Hero,” R. draws attention to the complexity of Aeneas’ character and those aspects that are particularly human: his reaction to crises, his reaction to loss, his relationships with Dido, Anchises, and Ascanius, and his aristeia on the battlefield. Chapter 2, “The Victims,” is a collection of meditations on Virgil’s depiction of other characters: Dido, Nisus and Euryalus, Pallas and Lausus, Turnus, Camilla, and Italy herself. In Chapter 3, “Fate and the Gods,” R. attempts to help modern readers grapple with the explicit omnipresence of the supernatural in the poem. Chapter 4, “Virgil’s Troy,” is a study of Virgil’s use
of the image of Troy through the first half of the epic. Chapter 5, “Rome, the rerum imago,” is similarly a study of the image of Rome in the epic. The final chapter, “Virgil, His Life and Works,” is an attempt to show the unity of Virgil’s poetry and the degree to which the Eclogues and Georgics illuminate the Aeneid. There is an Appendix on Latin hexameter that attempts to guide the reader to an awareness of ictus, accent, and the relevance of the placement of caesura in Virgil’s hexameters.

Space limitations allow only general criticism and praise. R. avoids overtly contentious positions, but he tends clearly toward a darker, more complex, pessimistic reading of the Aeneid, and his book succeeds as a tonic to oversimplified readings of the epic. In the character chapters and throughout he makes his reader explicitly aware of the cost in suffering and death of Rome’s success. About the gods in the Aeneid, R. brings out human isolation from and ignorance of the divine. R.’s general methodological approach is to collect and examine some passages that he feels particularly illuminate the question at hand, drawing out the structures, words, themes, and allusions that support his claims. For example, Chapter 6, “Rome, the rerum imago,” is built on the exploration of three passages: Jupiter’s revelation in Book I, Anchises’ speech in Book VI, and the shield ekphrasis in Book VIII. The unity and clarity of the chapters vary. Some (e.g., Chapter 5) read as cogent argument and others more as mishmashes of observations. R. himself hints at the latter with the apropos title of a subsection in Chapter 2: “Some aspects of Turnus.”

One choice that I believe limits the book’s usefulness is the lack of any bibliography or footnotes. R. notes (p. viii) that the decision to eliminate references to secondary scholarship was conscious in order to avoid a potentially limitless amount of bibliography. However, for any reader lacking mastery in Virgilian scholarship (R.’s intended readership), the all-but-infinite mass of Virgilian scholarship is precisely the problem. Readers indeed have no trouble finding articles and readings on the Aeneid; finding readings of quality pertinent to the questions that R. raises is the challenge, and I for one would have preferred a few selected recommendations for further reading at the end of each chapter.

Latin-less readers will no doubt find R.’s book daunting, also limiting its readership. All analysis and argument in the book are supported with copious references to the Latin text. It is a model, in fact, of proper citation. Almost all Latin cited is translated, but even a very sophisticated reader would have trouble correlating a standard Aeneid translation with R.’s translations of words and phrases without some knowledge of Latin. Furthermore, not all relevant passages are quoted in their entirety (for example, the three passages examined in Ch. 6), so any reader not thoroughly versed in the Aeneid should have a Latin text at hand to get full use of R.’s book.

The book is almost entirely free of typos and mistakes. I only noted some inconsistencies in the marking of ictus and accent in the Appendix (pp. 148–150) and the stating of Virgil’s birthday as March 15 rather than October 15 (p. 120). R.’s style throughout is elegant and aimed at a very sophisticated reader; there are learned allusions to other classical authors and mythology,
and technical terms (e.g., “ascending tricolon,” p. 96) are relatively common. Nevertheless, R. maintains a delightfully conversational tone throughout. The text is peppered by questions that R. rarely fully answers, and the teacher of Virgil would be smart to borrow for productive class conversations, for example (about Aeneas): “Is he good or bad? Is he cold, wooden, and even inhuman . . . or is he thoroughly human? Is he a paragon of the heroic ideal . . .?” (p. 30). The result is that the book often reads as a collection of polished lecture notes. For all these reasons, I would have a hard time recommending this book as a first stop to someone looking for guidance in how to approach the Aeneid; but for the student or teacher of Virgil interested in the idiosyncratic but learned observations of a respected and experienced scholar of Latin poetry, R.’s book is worth a look.

Richard H. Davis Jr.
The Hotchkiss School


This volume of essays by the late Professor Segvic has been edited in memoriam as an act of piety by her husband Myles Burnyeat. Acts of piety are acts of virtue and I altogether commend Myles Burnyeat on choosing one so appropriate for his late wife.

But, alas, the task of the reviewer is to review, and so, after paying my respects to the deceased (whom, however, I never had the fortune to meet), I must set aside piety and embrace another of the species of justice, honesty, and report my opinions on the book to the reader.

The book contains eight essays (Professor Segvic did not live to write the large-scale work she wished). Two are slight, a book review and an online entry; the rest are substantial articles. The first of these, on Protagoras’s political art, is little more than reportage, though accurate reportage, of part of Plato’s dialogue of that name. The remaining essays are substantial and controversial. In his introduction Charles Brittain (a friend of Segvic’s) says of them, or rather of the two on Socratic Intellectualism and on Aristotelian Deliberation, that they are brilliant and original. I will not begrudge the enthusiasm of endorsement which is no doubt born of pious sorrow. The essays are provocative but I cannot speak to their brilliance. I intend no disrespect hereby to the late Professor Segvic. Brilliance is hard to gauge. Better leave judgment on that to the passage of time.

The essay on Socratic Intellectualism maintains that Socrates’ paradoxical thesis about no one erring willingly is less paradoxical than it appears and than tradition has considered. Segvic says that Socrates included an element of will in knowledge and that he intended knowledge in action to be certain and correct and not have the doubtfulness of opinion. The volitional element in knowledge explains how he who knows must act as he knows, for his knowing is already a commitment to act. The element of certainty and
correctness explains how people do not act as they think they should, for their thinking is opinion and not knowledge. Hence the thesis that no one errs willingly reduces to the thesis that no one who knows acts against his knowledge and that he who knows acts on his knowledge. Aristotle remarked that an appeal to opinion as weaker than knowledge does not resolve the puzzle, since some people hold their opinions with the firmness of knowledge. Segvic’s original move of inserting will into knowledge obviates that objection but at the cost of defining away the puzzle. He who knows but does not act did not know, for to know is to will and if he did not act he did not will. Clever, perhaps, but unconvincing. It destroys the puzzle; it does not solve it.

The essays on Aristotle (on the Varieties of Goodness, on the Metaphysics of Action, and on Deliberation and Choice) attribute to him, as others too have done, the very modern thesis of pluralism about values. Segvic’s originality is to suggest that Aristotle is indebted to Protagoras for the thesis. The suggestion is provocative and misleading. Aristotle opposed the monolith of a Platonic Idea of the Good in favor of many goods, but the *Nicomachean Ethics* still notoriously reduces the good for man to the one good of wisdom. Protagoras had many goods because the many men have many opinions and every opinion is right to him who has it. Aristotle had many good actions because the many circumstances have many differences and every difference is matter for prudence. To say that good action is relative to times and persons and places as discerned by prudence is very different from saying that good is relative to opinion. The former relativism says that for every person and time and place there is a right act which prudence discerns; the latter says that for any time and place and person there are as many right acts as there are opinions. Whole worlds turn on the distinction.

Segvic seeks to dissolve this distinction in Aristotle’s case. Her originality is her cleverness in teasing Protagoras into Aristotle. Her fortune was to have found John McDowell (she was his colleague for a time at Pittsburgh). Aristotle’s prudence becomes, in her hands, McDowell’s space of reasons. Segvic never uses that phrase, but I could not myself help seeing it everywhere. Consider: “The human good is not a naturally functioning entity but—in a certain sense—a product of practical reason, a life lived under its guidance” (p.106). “…our finding and considering things good is in part what makes them good” (p.105). “Since an end is identified through the conception the agent has when he aims at it … the virtuous and the vicious will be distinguished as much by their goals as by their distinctive vision of the world” (p.136).

Is this McDowell? Is it Protagoras? Is it Aristotle? I think one could, at a pinch, make it fit them all, but only by adding the necessary qualifications: the space of reasons for McDowell, opinion for Protagoras, prudence for Aristotle. Where does Segvic fit? Maybe with a Protagorean Aristotle suitably McDowelled for the modern reader. Consider too that someone who interprets Aristotle into the McDowelled Protagoreanism of “an end is identified through the conception the agent has when he aims at it” cannot be akratic. His knowing, his “conception,” has his will, his “aiming,” built into it. He
must always do what he conceives, for his conceiving is his aiming. We come round full circle, and we can add Socrates to Segvic’s triumvirate.

Actually I prefer Segvic’s Homer. She has a wonderful interpretation of how, through apt allusions, Plato in the Protagoras is making Socrates like Odysseus confronting Circe and descending to the Underworld when he goes to meet Protagoras at Callias’ house. This is Segvic reading James Joyce into Plato. More fun and more true than reading McDowell into Aristotle.

Peter Simpson
City University of New York


Virgil Aldrich’s remarks about “[t]he ambiguity of ‘what is mirrored’ by a mirror” [1] may serve as an incipit in a review of Rabun Taylor’s The Moral Mirror of Roman Art (henceforth Mirror). The book is something of a departure from the author’s previous Roman Builders, a gripping work on the achievements and flaws of Roman large-scale architecture. Mirror accomplishes exactly what the book intends: an exploration of the role of mirrors and reflections in Roman visual culture. Taylor investigates a complicated and diverse body of media (from drawings of now lost Pompeian paintings to cameos) seeking to order the available evidence thematically and thereby produce taxonomies of reflections. Voyeuristic, magical, self-absorptive, and performative contexts are but a few among the many delineated by Taylor. Some of these images are utterly unambiguous, as in the case of a painting from the Villa Arianna in Stabiae that depicts a young girl gazing at herself in the mirror. Others may be less so, for they engender metaphors and meanings that are difficult to read: the engraving of a now lost fresco from the House of Queen Margherita in Pompeii brings this problem to the fore. To compound the picture, some images also might lend themselves to multiple interpretations and to subjective charges that may not be in harmony with the artist’s intentions. In spite of these difficulties, Taylor identifies ways to navigate this complicated body of images. The support of literary sources, in particular, provides the analysis with an important corollary: the texts of Seneca, Torquato Tasso, Umberto Eco, among others, frame questions about images, reflections, and their rationales writ large. In addition, the author draws heavily from the scholarship on the subject. Topical studies on mirrors in antiquity like Cameron and Dunbabin’s work on North African mosaics figure prominently alongside the more theoretical approaches of Frontisi-Ducroux and by Vernant. Although the latter are largely confined to the Greek world, they form the foundation for the type of inquiries that Taylor seeks to explore through the intricate nature of reflections in Roman visual culture. To that end, the author establishes two work protocols. First, he postulates that reflections in Roman art were never haphazard in character: laden with sexual, magical, and religious symbolism, reflections in classical visual culture were never “innocent.” We, the viewers, are thus enticed to codify the message
that each image conveys directly or through reflections. A second criterion, a byproduct of the first, lies in the moral character of reflected images and their existence as metaphors of processes and/or events that affect the actor(s) represented. In this context, the title of the book may almost sound like a disclaimer about non-metaphorical reflections and images.

With this in mind, the reader is presented with an ample selection of images that cover thematically and geographically the Roman world. Although the emphasis is on Campanian visual culture, mosaics from Zeugma and stone altars from Vindolanda situate the analysis away from excessive regionalism. Taylor comes to terms with this variegated body of evidence in proposing a two-tiered classification: first, images carry meaning towards the self and society; second, images inform a dialectic between the self and the Other. The sequence of the chapters follows this armature systematically. The first two sections of the book illustrate true reflections that problematize gender, identity, and sexuality. Each carrying their own visual conventions and metaphors, these images demand the presence of a viewer. (S)he will then evaluate the visual discourse, thus becoming accomplice to the moral process embedded in the reflection. The various representations of Narcissus and his drama, as presented by Taylor, well illustrate this dynamic relationship.

Chapter 3, “The Mirror of Dionysus,” moves away from the essentially realistic reflections hitherto considered and engages with the religious and magical qualities traditionally associated with mirrors and reflections. Dionysus and his cult receive particular attention insofar as they interface with Orphism and other mystic rituals. While the discussion of the myth of death and rebirth of Dionysus could benefit from a more rounded discussion of its archaeological facet [2], the focus on reflected images opens new vistas on the allegories of initiation rites and afterlife anxieties. Of particular interest is the discussion of the lamination of mirrors with elements of the typical Bacchic repertoire like the tympanum and phiale, which introduces new foci to the already complicated idiom of these representations.

Chapter 4 follows by introducing one of the book’s pivotal points: the role of mirrored shields as vectors of metamorphoses and internal transformations. The episode of Achilles on Skyros in its various representations illustrates the lamination of the mirror with the shield as well as the metaphors that it elicits. Taylor situates the visual implications of this theme within a larger analysis of shields in the textual sources and in classical visual culture: this spans from Aeschylus’ Seven against Thebes—thus expanding Froma Zeitlin’s angle [3]—to the fallen Persian warrior in the Alexander Mosaic. Chapter 5 brings the argument to its conclusion by elaborating on the myth of Medusa, where the reflective mirror no longer produces effects on the referent but instead acts as a catalyst in the unfolding of the scene. Finally, the appendix, “Medusa and the Evil Eye,” hints at the possibility of moving beyond the canonical interpretation of the gorgon as an apotropaic device.

Overall, Mirrors is a very fascinating book; though navigating a vast body of data, it follows its avenues of research methodically. The only quibble may stem from the quality of the illustrations (not as crisp as one would like). In short, the publication of this study is very much welcomed for the novel
approaches it suggests and the type of thought-provoking inquiries it instills in the readership.


Classicists often serve as mercenaries for other disciplines, expanding their topics of instruction well beyond the classical world to serve departments of history, religion, government, etc. Wallace’s (*W.*) *Cambridge Introduction to Tragedy* provides analysis of a range of works, theories, and issues that would be useful for classicists to employ if called upon to serve their institutions’ English or theater departments in a course on tragedy through the ages. It portrays tragedy as a genre unified throughout all of its manifestations across time, space, and performance environment by its “capacity to elicit the audience’s response,” to “stir emotion” in reaction to a range of types of human experience, suffering among them (3). One of the chief merits of this book is the nuanced way in which it explores this sense of tragedy as something that the theater communicates well, but which can be seen just as powerfully across disciplines and media.

After a chapter laying out the book’s approach to the subject, *W.* spends 107 pages on a succinct overview of a broad range of chief works, prominent themes, and social contexts of authors whose work for the stage has conventionally been recognized as tragic. *W.* starts with Greece, laying out a host of civic concerns influencing the production of Athenian tragedy: competition in all aspects of Athenian life, the gods, shame, democracy, Athenians’ concept of pity, and perceptions of the plays’ setting. She then pairs Seneca and Racine, based on their similar use of Athenian models “to represent the more general pressure of the past upon the present and its implications for tragedy” and their attention to “the competing demands of reason and passion” (31).

*W.*’s section on Shakespeare focuses on the lack of uniformity in his tragedies. Political change and religious skepticism at the time he was writing contribute to his variable approach, as does his drawing upon both comedy and three distinct medieval and Renaissance tragic traditions. The main tie binding his tragedies is conclusions that, despite appearances, leave little hope for a satisfying resolution beyond the scope of the play. In the next section, “Romantic Tragedy,” *W.* examines the way in which Ibsen, Strindberg, and Chekhov adapt the Romantic legacy to their late nineteenth-century
contexts, applying the broad dichotomy between society and the individual alienated by it to parochial social situations. Concerning American tragedy, W. focuses on the tendency of Eugene O’Neill, Edward Albee, Arthur Miller, Tennessee Williams, August Wilson, and Tony Kushner to make the primary locus of drama families, which show viscerally the impact of immigration, slavery’s fallout, and other twentieth-century societal developments.

W. then handles various non-Western approaches to tragedy, looking first at tensions between European models and native African traditions in the works of Wole Soyinka and Athol Fugard. Next is the Noh theatre, which, independent of tragedy’s influence, achieves a tragic impact through its focus on memories of trauma. W. covers Samuel Beckett last, emphasizing the tragic effect he achieves through his characters’ confrontations with emptiness. Finally, in two case studies concluding the chapter, she studies tragedies’ use of graphic violence to provoke audience response, and ways in which tragedies reveal the traumatic potential of language, yet show simultaneous awareness of the ambiguity of silence.

Chapter 3 provides a compendious account of influential theories of tragedy introduced by intellectuals from Classical Athens to twentieth-century France, each of whose ideas W. portrays as incomplete but mutually complementary. Aristotle emphasizes the cathartic effect of identifying with the suffering of tragic characters. Hegel sees classical tragedy as a genre that acts out and rationalizes civic conflicts. Nietzsche attends to the emotional pleasure that classical tragedy provides. Kierkegaard stresses the isolation of the individual who is “left at the mercy of an absurd universe” (130). Camus and Sartre envision tragedy as playing out individual responses to a nihilistic world. Girard, focusing entirely on classical tragedy, contends that tragedy represents the ritual sacrifice of a prominent figure as a scapegoat, then dramatizes the perversion of that sacrifice when distinctions and order break down. W. applies these different theoretical approaches in three case studies, of fate, politics, and gender.

W. helpfully steps outside of typical approaches to the topic in her chapter on non-dramatic tragedy. She there lays out steps that several nineteenth-century novelists and twentieth-century filmmakers have taken to create tragic effects in genres not naturally suited to such effects. She also explains how static visual art can be tragic in capturing images that imply a tale leading to suffering. More unexpected are W.’s examinations of tragic elements in psychoanalysis and theology. The therapeutic approach of the former is like tragedy in that it tries to gain control of trauma by facing it in a controlled environment. And the mystery and uncertainty of faith lend a tragic aspect to the latter. Finally, a brief concluding chapter addresses the cathartic impact of certain sites where widespread suffering occurred.

Overall, W.’s Cambridge Introduction to Tragedy is a valuable resource for someone teaching tragedy across time, cultures, and media, or for undergraduates assigned to do research on tragedy’s evolution over time. While the grand scope of W.’s project in a volume that is labeled an “introduction” requires brevity in approaching each of its many subjects, W. succeeds in raising a great number of ideas on which an interested reader can then expand by
engaging the concise bibliography provided for each of the book’s sections. W.’s approach nicely complements that in Bushnell’s recent *Tragedy: A Short Introduction* (Blackwell 2008), which lays out tragedy through the millennia in a much more nuts-and-bolts way, with chapters that treat theaters, form and language, plots, and heroes in different tragic traditions. With *The Cambridge Introduction to Tragedy* employed for ideas and approaches that go beyond the classicist’s typical canon and the Blackwell volume for transparently comparative information on different manifestations of tragic theatre through time, a teacher in our field would have firm ground on which to begin structuring a course that begins in our comfort zone but soon moves beyond it.

ROBERT HOLSCUH SIMMONS
University of North Carolina, Greensboro


Both the title of Wiseman’s book and its beautiful cover immediately catch our attention and make us question our assumptions about ancient Rome. Virgil had wryly assured us that the Romans were far too serious to pay much attention to myths and art and poetry, so we are intrigued by the thought that someone could devote an entire book to the myths of Rome. The cover-illustration, Tiepolo’s *Triumph of Flora*, also challenges our image of ancient Rome. We imagine the Romans as being puritanic militarists under the Republic, before they collapse into decadent inertia under the emperors, yet here we have a depiction of a Roman myth that is neither puritanic nor decadent. Flora is sexually provocative in her triumph, but she is being worshipped by a soldier and citizen of the Republic. Her triumph came when such ordinary Romans forced their aristocratic Senate to accept the wild Games of Flora as an annual festival of the Republic.

Wiseman urges us to pay less attention to the mansions of the aristocracy and the palaces of the emperors, and he introduces us instead to the unfamiliar, everyday Romans. Far from being xenophobic puritans, these neglected Romans are creative and pleasure-loving, and they delight in combining elements from many cultures into their world-view. They were the first people to write something down in Greek (13), and they welcomed Demeter, Dionysus, and Kore as the gods of their own bread, wine, and liberty (68). The assassination of their leader, Tiberius Gracchus, in their Temple of Ceres was therefore a sacrilegious insult to the Roman People (192). These Romans were quick to see the parallels between the progress of Athenian democracy and their own struggles for liberty, so they naturally raised a statue to Alcibiades (70) and loved the Greek myth that told how Dionysus had freed Marsyas from Apollo (68–69).

If we want to meet the very “un-Roman” people who truly made up the population of ancient Rome, we have to follow Wiseman into the less well-known parts of the Roman world. We have to pay attention to little details of Roman history where their voice may be heard. It is easy to find out
that in 73 BC Licinius Macer helped the people win back their rights after the dictatorship of Sulla. Wiseman reminds us, however, that in addition to being a Tribune of the Plebs, Licinius was also “the People’s Historian” (199). In his version of Roman history, Romulus had been the victim of a conspiracy by the aristocratic Senators, just as Gracchus was murdered by them centuries later. To create a tradition for his own radicalism, Licinius dubiously claims that the first champions of civil rights in Rome had been members of his own family. So the first Tribune of the Plebs was a Licinius, and the first Plebeian to be elected Consul was also a Licinius (199–20). Wiseman is an expert in this transformation of “invented legend” into “acceptable history” (181), and he interprets countless stories like this throughout his book.

His other area of expertise is Roman art, and his fortunate readers are presented with over 100 black-and-white photographs and 16 color plates of less well-known artefacts from the Roman world. Most of these works were produced by “foreign” artists —Greeks, Etruscans, and Italians—but they were enjoyed by Romans, and Wiseman helps us to understand their significance. He invites us to look closely at everyday things like mirrors and boxes and coins. He devotes a chapter to the work of Novius—an Italian artist working with Greek and Etruscan themes for customers in Rome (87–118). After exploring the diverse world of Novius, Wiseman concludes: “I imagine he didn’t think of Amykos and Ajax as particularly Greek, any more than we think of Cinderella as Italian or Snow White as German; they were simply characters in stories everybody knew” (114). This simple but powerful comparison shows how absurd nineteenth-century xenophobia was, and how seriously it has distorted our vision of the ancient world. It has left us with a host of false preconceptions about what counts as truly Roman.

In this work, Wiseman introduces us to everyday artefacts and popular stories, and through them he brings back to us the lost voice of the Roman people. He also reminds us that this voice was never completely silenced, in spite of the powerful Senatorial tradition that dominated Roman culture and our own interpretation of the Roman world. George Washington responded to the populist tradition of ancient Rome (155–157), and so did Patrick Henry (294). It spoke out in the French Revolution (294–295), and in Stanley Kubrick’s Spartacus (201, 305). If we see the Romans as puritanic imperialists, we are silencing a part of ourselves.

The scope of this book is encyclopaedic, and it is quite daunting in its detail, for it is not just a book about the myths of Rome. Wiseman is presenting us with nothing less than a new Roman world, a world that is far wider and more complex and more exciting than the traditional Rome of the scholars. Culturally diverse, pleasure-seeking, fighting for their rights, these Romans are not so ancient after all, and our own complex world has far deeper roots than we ever imagined.

Henry John Walker
Bates College

In this clearly written and carefully argued book, Worman (henceforth W.) focuses on “abuse in classical Athenian literature that centers on the mouth and its activities: especially talking, eating, drinking, and sexual practices” (1). She seeks to demonstrate that during the classical period “public mockery of professional speakers forges an iambic discourse that isolates the intemperate mouth as a visible emblem of behaviors pilloried in the democratic arena” (1). Oral activities were central to the public spaces of the democratic city (courts, assembly) where citizens made decisions affecting Athens’ welfare as well as to the agora and symposia. Given this, it is unsurprising that among other body parts “the mouth emerges as a dominant metonymy for behaviors and attitudes that menace the well-being of Athens” (2) and encapsulates social and political styles often associated with gender and class. The polysemic mouth is “a site for the convergence of appetites” (14) and serves to convey type.

W. traces the development of abusive public speech from archaic epic through comedy and satyr plays, philosophy (Plato and Aristotle), oratory (Demosthenes and Aeschines), and Theophrastus’ *Characters*, arguing that “the demagogue, the sophist, and the female serve as negative reference points for constituting praiseworthy male behaviors and their attendant discourses” (13). Her analysis is informed by theoretical work on the body (Bakhtin, Bourdieu) as well as literary texts ranging from Catullus’ poems to Rabelais’ *Gargantua and Pantagruel* to Philip Roth’s *Portnoy’s Complaint*, which use body parts in insulting and obscene ways as imagery of excess. In classical texts, such excess indicates that those exhibiting it should be excluded from public office or private symposia. Throughout, W. is good about summarizing previous scholarship and signposting where her study innovates.

In chapter 1, “The mouth and its abuses in epic, lyric, and tragedy,” W. presents archaic poets’ ideas about balance and fair exchange expressed in insulting discourse centered on the mouth, located in rituals such as dining, and in various spoken interactions arising from both high-status and hungry, low-class outsider figures. Homeric epic, W. asserts, originates “images associating the voracious mouth or belly with insults, curses, and crafty devices” (29). Her discussion focuses on figures such as Odysseus, who represents the rude body in his guise as outsider-beggar, both giving and receiving abuse. Types she analyzes include “the cannibalistic warrior” (Achilles), “the appetitive guest” (Irus, the suitors), and the “hungry ‘outsider’” (iambic poet personae). W. also examines Pindar’s use of abusive talk in portraying “the rapacious, sophistic politician” (48) and the way fifth-century tragedians build on this link between consumption and speech in presenting “poisonous politicians” like Odysseus in *Philoctetes* and dangerous “female” speech in *Antigone*.

In chapter 2, “Open mouths and abusive talk in Aristophanes,” W. looks at loud, unrestrained talkers who also voraciously consume goods: food, wine, money, land, and sex. Unlike the cannibal warriors of epic, loudmouthed, voracious comic cannibals, “embodied especially by the dema-
gogue Cleon in *Knights* and *Wasps,* consume edibles and “citizens’ lifeblood” (62), acting as “flashpoints for anxieties about how appetite and democratic practice converge” (63). In them, we can discern how Athenian attitudes regarding citizen behavior and the potentially dangerous influences of sophists and demagogues on it change over time. Further, the abusive language in these plays influences prose depictions of professional speakers in the fourth century. W. employs Barthes’ ideas about literary figuration to outline patterns of tropes that are used and reconfigured “to serve elite didactic purposes” (69). Comic types are characterized by excessive appetites associated with women, providing negative paradigms to help regulate male behavior.

Before turning to the development of these types in oratory, rhetorical theory, and Platonic dialogues, W. considers “Gluttonous speechifying in Euripides’ *Cyclops*” in chapter 3. Arguing that this play supplements the iambic tradition, she studies the trope of the *mageiros,* or public butcher, that arises out of the comic cannibal type and serves to mock and demean sophists.

Chapter 4, “Crude talk and fancy fare in Plato,” is one of the book’s most. Here W. shows how Plato used comic abusive vocabulary to “dramatize Socrates’ outsider status and lampoon the conceits of the sophists” (22) in quasi-private narrative settings. Pointing out that these dialogues are set in the years in which Athens lost its empire and was rocked by crises often involving the philosopher’s family and friends, W. notes that they “clearly take up the challenge of exploring how this degradation of Athens’ power and control came about” (156). Plato employs oral imagery in his assessment of the sophists and their techniques; he fashions his main character, Socrates, as an “iambic contender.” Socrates uses comic invective in his arguments with sophists, but as the embodiment of a type seen in the beggar Odysseus and in comedic and prose “vulgar heroes,” he also “configures the reaction against effete, grandiose speakers in his very body” (159). His “debased body and low talk” give lie to the elite *kaloskagathos* (166). W. notes that Plato’s imagery “frames an iambic stance and passes defaming judgment on oral excesses” (160), excesses that she proceeds to illustrate especially well in Plato’s depiction of the disturbing deportment of Thrasymachus in *Republic* I. Comedy made this kind of iambic discourse popular and Plato adopted it for prose; his dialogues, with their historical references and iambic vocabulary, forge a link between late-fifth century drama and the forensic oratory of the 440s and 430s.

W. examines “Defamation and oral excesses in Aeschines and Demosthenes” in chapter 5. The orators clash during the years of growing Macedonian threat, differing in their approaches to the political problem and accusing each other of having acted in ways unfit for an Athenian citizen. In particular, W. focuses on their disputes over their behavior in the embassy to Philip and over the crown voted Demosthenes for civic benefactions. In their speeches, “both orators make use of a discursive pattern of vocabulary and type-casting that aims at the extreme alienation of one’s opponent from the mass of Athenians” (216). Each portrays the other as indulging in unacceptable appetitive behaviors as a way to paint what comes out of his mouth (his counsel) as dangerous and immoral, focusing on paralinguistics (“booming
and babbling”). Such direct deployment of iambic vocabulary and discourse in the political arena seems to have been unprecedented in Athens.

Finally, in chapter 6, W. studies “The intemperate mouth in Aristotle and Theophrastus,” extending her analysis into rhetorical theory. W. prefaces her discussion of the Characters with a brief look at Aristotle’s writings on character and style, which focus on iambic discourse as a oratorical tool. Further, W. argues that Aristotle’s work provides a link between professional orators and Theophrastus’ ordinary citizens, in that it “tends to disparage the ways in which character, the appetites, and speech performance intersect for both orator and audience” (282). The philosopher dismisses the importance of delivery and style as theatrical, in that both influence only the ignorant. In contrast, Theophrastus’ sketches elaborate on character types developed in earlier genres, including nonverbal behaviors such as deportment, para-linguistics, and facial expressions. The theorist, however, appropriates and adjusts the oral excesses of professional speakers to fit the lives of ordinary, private citizens, making their consequences less dangerous for Athens and allowing us a glimpse of typical lower-class behaviors.

In sum, this is a valuable contribution to studies of abusive speech in literary and political discourse, constructions of the body, and nonverbal behavior; it shows the connections between genres incorporating iambic features. W. can be repetitive, but this ensures that her readers never lose the thread of her analysis as she moves between genres. The general public as well as scholars will find W.’s book interesting and relevant; her work is discussed in detail in the introductory chapter of David Denby’s History of Snark. The book is largely error-free; I noted a typo on p. 270 (replusive for repulsive) and a few problems in footnotes. For example, I wondered if note 26 on p. 161 could be correct (it refers to p. 15 of chapter 7 in Leslie Kurke’s forthcoming book). Two errors, strangely enough, concern references to the same author, I. Vasiliou. Footnote 44 on p. 166 refers to Vasiliou 2002b and note 77 on p. 177 refers to Vasiliou 2008, but neither of these appears in the bibliography as such.

Christina A. Clark
Creighton University


This erudite, lucid and well-written small book, the latest in the series “Classical Presences” edited by Lorna Hardwick and James Porter and published by Oxford University Press, by a distinguished scholar of German and comparative literature, examines some of the oldest and most widespread myths of antiquity and their revival in the early 20th century. The modernist appropriation of Cretan myths in both literature and art coincided with the remarkable discoveries of Sir Arthur Evans at the site originally known as “Tou Tseleve he Kephala” and slightly later as “Ta Pitharia,” before Evans presented it to the world as the “Palace of Minos at Knossos.” Evans’
excavations at Knossos, initiated in 1900, did much to breathe new life into the myths that were to inspire some of the great artists, authors, and thinkers of the 20th century, not least Pablo Picasso, W. H. Auden, James Joyce, and Sigmund Freud.

Ziolkowski’s self-proclaimed aims of the book are to explore “first, how Cretan myth was used during the early decades of the twentieth century as a mirror for modern history, society, and the psyche; and, second, how this new perception of myth permeated all the arts simulaneously, including literature, painting, sculpture, prints, opera, ballet, and the theater, as well as popular culture” (p. ix). At the core of this undertaking is the underlying conviction “that the transfiguration of classical myth in general constitutes one of the principal characteristics of classical modernism, without a grasp of which that period of twentieth-century culture cannot be fully appreciated” (p. ix). In keeping with these aims, the focus is very much in the cultural world of modernism and, as such, iconic earlier work portraying the Cretan cycle, such as Rembrandt’s *Rape of Europa*, does not enter the discussion. As for the title, the book is not about Minos per se but the legendary king as a binding figure connecting the various Cretan myths: Minos as the son of Europa and Zeus, husband of Pasiphaë, stepfather of the Minotaur, father of Ariadne and Phaedra, patron of Daedalus and Icarus.

The book begins with an introduction that lays out the modernization of myth. Following a brief few paragraphs on Crete in history, there is a fuller section, still succinct, on Crete in myth, which hits all the high notes from Homer and Hesiod to the lost plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, and from Ovid and Virgil to the handbooks of Apollodorus and Hyginus, before Ziolkowski turns to the resurgence of Crete and its myths. There is then a discussion of the intellectual precursors of modernism: Karl Marx, Friedrich Nietzsche (who died the very year Evans began digging at Knossos), Sigmund Freud, and Sir James Frazer. From there Ziolkowski contextualizes the modern turn to antiquity in the period—and associated fears—before and after World War I. The discussion moves seamlessly from the work of Oswald Spengler, H.G. Wells, and T.S. Eliot to that of Wilfred Owen, Le Corbusier, and Horace, to mention only a few. In the final section there is an important discussion of André Siganos’ distinction between “mythanalyse” and “mythocritique,” i.e., between “primary” myth, secondary or “literary” myth, and “poeticized” “ironized” myth (“myth littérarisé”). The discussion incorporates the work of Thomas Mann, Karl Kerényi, Nikos Kazantzakis, Henry Miller, Patrick Leigh Fermor, and Jack Lindsay, again to mention only a few!

In Chapter 2 (“Europa and the Bull: Sex, Society, and Politics”) Ziolkowski cuts to the chase: the story of Europa and the bull is laid bare, as is the polyvalence of myth. This is the first of ostensibly three Cretan myths that form the crux of the book. The story begins with Europa and the sexual awakening in the work of early 20th-century *Jugendstil* artists (illustrated with works by Felix Valloton, Heinrich Vogeler, and Lovis Corinth), before moving to Europa in the 1920s. Here we glimpse, not for first time, Ziolkowski’s learning: as the theme of sexuality gives way to social criticism, we enter the very different yet intimately connected worlds of poets like Osip Mandelstam
and Rolfe Humphries, writers and journalists like Claire Goll and William Plomer, artists like Werner Peiner (whose *Europa* graces the dust-jacket of the book), and the operas of Darius Milhaud and Stephan Wolpe. The three final headings of Chapter 2 deal respectively with “Europa in the Public Sphere,” “Europa Politicized,” and “Surrealist Europa.”

In Chapter 3 (“The Minotaur: The Beast Within and Threat Outside”) Ziolkowski not only moves on to the second of the Cretan myths, but to the dark cultural landscape of European fascism and war of the 1930s. The first section, “The Minotaur and His Labyrinth,” overviews the cultural landscape; the remainder of the chapter is neatly compartmentalized into what may be termed five arenas. The first concerns the journal *Minotaure*, published in Paris between 1933 and 1939 by Albert Skira and Efstrathios Eleftheriades (aka E. Tériade); the second focuses on Picasso and the Minotaur; the third turns to poetry and the Minotaur among the poets; the fourth deals with the Minotaur in fiction; the fifth with the Minotaur on stage. To list the work of a generation of creative talent that Ziolkowski touches upon in this chapter would be beyond the word limit of any book review.

The penultimate Chapter 4 is entitled “The Other Cretans: Alienation, Invention, Liberation.” This chapter provides something of a closure by completing the mythic cycle: Minos and Pasiphaë, Ariadne and Phaedra, Daedalus and Icarus. Here the discussion focuses on art and literature from the earlier 20th century to the 1930s and beyond. Pride of place belongs to the father and son duo, and the chapter is subsequently sub-divided into the following headings: “Daedalus the Scientist and Artisan”; “The Resurgence of Icarus”; “Daedalus and Icarus At Odds”; “Life Imitates Art: Lauro de Bosis” (and his 1927 play *Icaro*); “Daedalus and Icarus in the 1930s and Beyond.”

The final chapter provides a brief “Conclusion: The Modernity of Myth.” In just over three pages Ziolkowski returns to the economic, aesthetic, psychological, and anthropological revisions of Marx, Nietzsche, Freud, and Frazer, and how they revitalized ancient myth, thus allowing it to be taken up as a mirror of modern consciousness. The adaptations of these myths in so many different forms and genres by many of the most talented and representative creative artists of the early 20th century is a story that can only be told by a master scholar and creative artist. Ziolkowski’s *Minos and the Moderns* is both elegant and engaging, not only because it focuses on wonderful, erotically charged and violent myths, but because it shows how these ancient myths functioned as foundational narratives of modernism.

John K. Papadopoulos
University of California, Los Angeles

By concentrating on the biblical Book of Job, reflections of Primo Levi, and testimonies gathered from his research at Yale’s Fortunoff Video Archives for Holocaust Testimonials, Alford masterfully constructs an intricate quilt that comforts his readers as he takes them into the daily, unsettling world of some Holocaust survivors. By delicately weaving together Judaic ideology, modern psychoanalysis, and a plethora of questions posited with enormous intuition and insight, the author manages to enlighten his readers with a mosaic of moral revelations.

We see the Book of Job as a series of tumultuous and confusing lessons that can be troubling to those who prefer direction on how to confront the existence of evil in the world. To assist his readers, Alford brilliantly introduces Levi’s take on Job’s Black Holes as a way to pose significant questions, and even plausible answers to how victims handled the cruel wager between Satan and God. This remarkable correlation is the most intriguing and ingenious offering in this important book, as we travel, with eyes wide open, down the treacherous and perplexing road where Job and Primo Levi met spiritually. In an almost storytelling form, Alford allows us to experience the pain of the unfathomable suffering found on this dangerous road, and brings his audience back safely to the present.

Alford keeps the voices of Job and Levi calm, confident, and credible throughout the reader’s journey. However, while Alford clearly points to the strength garnered by both Job and Levi from the ways God defended them at supreme moments, the reader is forced to wonder: How has the litany of Holocaust Survivors whose testimonials we sadly absorb been defended or even remotely protected by God?

Because of this question, it is somewhat blurred how the survivors, through their poignant narratives, demonstrated the relationship between abjection and affliction, or, more specifically, the connection between loss of oneself and meaningful suffering. In short, as we read the rawness in the narratives conveyed by survivors, the notion of meaningful suffering seems to remain an oxymoron for the reader and, perhaps, for the survivors. Whatever the case, a discussion raised about the justification of human suffering is accessible to us.

Alford positions the testimonials of survivors at a place in this weighty piece that compels us to ponder the distress of the human soul. We cry, sometimes laugh, and feel grateful that life, in some productive capacity, is lived by those who still struggle with ways to find meaning in their collective suffering. We are forced to ask, “How do survivors go on?” Then, with little comfort, we realize that the metamorphoses of those afflicted with unsparing pain into people with lessons learned and forgotten are as fantastic as those of a fairy tale.
Because it balances the semiotic aspect of religion with the morally incomprehensible decisions and patterns promoted by a very large portion of the human condition, C. Fred Alford’s After the Holocaust: The Book of Job, Primo Levi, and the Path to Affliction is certain to be a book to be rhetorically reckoned with. It is heartening to read about the unthinkable from a scholar who is equally equipped to promote awareness and intellect in our lives as well as banish passiveness from our souls—and our hearts.

HENRY L. ROUBECEK
The University of Houston-Downtown


In this innovative and extensively researched study, Peter Bang (B.) challenges the prevailing notion, that Roman economic activities resembled those of early modern Europeans, by suggesting that the consequences of Roman rule created markets and trade strikingly similar to those of other large, pre-colonial empires such as the Ottoman, Mughal and the Ming/Ch’ing. By focusing particularly on Mughal India, Bang attempts to redirect debate surrounding the Roman economy beyond “East vs West” and ground it within wider discussions of world history.

The main goal of the book is to challenge intellectual barriers, to take away a sense of the familiar by providing a different, non-modern (or early modern) European context in which to understand market trade within the Roman Empire. B. wants to shift discussion about the Roman economy away from the battle between “modernists” and primitivists” over quantities of trade. He argues that the aristocratic and tributary needs of the Romans living under the Principate promoted distinct commercial patterns that differed profoundly from the evolving capitalism of early modern Europe. These patterns best fit what B. calls the “bazaar.” Following the foundational work of anthropologist of Clifford Geertz, B. demonstrates that a bazaar is distinguished by high uncertainty of information and relative unpredictability of supply and demand. Consequently, the prices of commodities in a bazaar are fairly volatile and the integration of markets is often low and fragmentary. Traders do not have enough information about other markets or goods to integrate them with their “home” networks. From a modern perspective, where the objective is to overcome such information obstacles and thereby create a predictable and transparent environment, the bazaar can seem chaotic at best and idiosyncratic and “bizarre” at worst. This is intentional. B. suggests that most merchants operating in the bazaar are small and household-based and aim not to limit uncertainly but to perpetuate and exploit it through localized knowledge and personal relationships, such as clientage and membership in a religious group. Only by understanding such personal ties can sense be made of the chaos, and profitable exchanges transacted.
Although the book shows its origins as the author’s doctoral dissertation, the reader will find B.’s insightful and thorough review of literature worth the effort. Particularly for those wishing to master the historiography of Roman economics, The Roman Bazaar has much to offer. The book is organized into two sections: Part I (chapters 1–2), “The Roman Empire and the comparative study of pre-industrial society,” and Part II (chapters 3–5), “Imperial Bazaar.” Chapter 1 focuses on why Roman and Ottoman, Ch’ing, and Mughal comparisons fit. Here, B. demonstrates that a shift in comparative models away from the contrasting economies of industrializing early modern Europe and toward the complementary Asian agrarian empires allows for a better understanding of the relationships between market systems and tributary empires. Chapter 2 explores the character of economic integration within the Roman world by analyzing the concept of tributary empires, or political systems that prioritize tribute extraction over other activities. This focus on tribute directs attention away from markets as the organizing force in the economy to the process of tribute extraction and mobilization of peasant surplus production by both elites and governments. Perhaps the most surprising conclusion, to my mind, was that market formation was driven by politically determined consumption rather than economic competition. Hence, economic development was the result of political exploitation, not its victim, as has so often been assumed. Chapter 3 analyzes market integration and argues that Roman merchants would generally have been less able to integrate markets than their early modern European colleagues. “The world of the Roman trader was an uneven, rough and heterogeneous place … It was a high-risk, high transaction-cost environment” (195). “Instead of integrating markets closely, the approach of the bazaar would often have been more opportunistic or speculative, with the merchant constantly seeking to bring himself in a situation where he could benefit from a market imbalance” (200). Chapter 4 examines protection and customs duties in the Roman and Mughal empires, in order to determine the influence of imperial “protection.” B. concludes that the interests of the imperial state were more closely aligned with the tax collectors than the merchants. Consequently, trade was more regularly tapped for the sake of revenue rather than protected for the sake of individual profit. Chapter 5 looks at communal, religious organizations and the role of the household in supplying capital. B. concludes that these personal contacts helped shelter traders in the rough, quixotic world of the bazaar. As a result, trade was conducted within relatively proscribed circles, following known and proven relationships.

As the concluding chapter of the book, B. offers an “Epilegomena” that not only summarizes and emphases what has been set out but also grounds the ephemeral discussion of models and markets. At this point, after working through B.’s painstaking analysis of Roman market behavior, the conclusion that elite consumption underpins consumer practices is not surprising. Indeed, it is perhaps comforting that B.’s comparative research proves the Roman Empire is not significantly different from other ancient societies in terms of consumer demand. Just as scholars like Lin Foxhall have shown for Classical and Hellenistic Greece (Olive Cultivation in Ancient Greece. Seeking
the Ancient Economy, Oxford 2007), B. argues that Roman consumption and market activity during the Principate inherently revolved around individual, usually elite, desire for luxury goods.

In the end, B. offers a compelling model for Roman economic activity that shows, perhaps inevitably, that Rome was not unique among pre-modern societies. The uncertain, at times contradictory, world of the Roman bazaar shared fundamental similarities with economic systems in other agrarian, tribute-oriented empires. While this book’s sophisticated, often highly theoretical analysis of Roman and Indian economic activity will not appeal to all audiences, its advice that we integrate political, social and economic goals, rather than attempt to isolate them, is most welcome.

**Timothy Howe**
Saint Olaf College


This book is an amazingly good read. Mary Beard has taken a subject that has been studied and written about so much that one would think another book might be redundant. Not this book. By putting together the historical, literary, and archaeological evidence, tempered with a healthy dose of skepticism, Beard has given a refreshingly new look at the people, their occupations, and everyday life in ancient Pompeii. She repeatedly asks herself such questions as “What do we know,” “What don’t we know,” and “What happened where,” thereby cutting through unsubstantiated conclusions made by others. She also discusses the different reasons for the continuing destruction of the evidence, including major damage caused by Allied bombing in 1943. All in all, this is a rich and accessible book that is so graphic and earthy that one can hardly put it down.

Beard’s clever use of language is constantly in evidence, even in the titles of her chapters, such as “Earning a Living: Baker, Banker and Garum Maker.” (She describes *garum*, which is usually translated euphemistically as “fish sauce,” as “that characteristically Roman concoction of decomposing marine life.”) Frequent allusions to English ditties and songs pepper the text, and amusing takes on images, such as a naked Venus painted in a bakery that she compares to a pin-up girl (pp. 171–172), enliven the book. Even the graffiti (in Oscan as well as Latin and Greek) help to give a sense of instant access to individuals. Other chapter titles give a sense of immediacy: “Living in an Old City,” “Street Life,” and “Painting and Decorating,” where we are given a description of painters who hastily left their paint pots on the scaffolding as they rushed off to try to escape impending disaster. “Fun and Games” is about leisure activities and entertainment, from dice to gladiators. “The Pleasures of the Body: Food, Wine, Sex and Baths” is intriguingly tied to the modern world. Her portrayal of bars and barmaids, brothels and brothel visitors, is vivid as well as amusing.
On the one hand, we are given a picture of a small provincial city in southern Italy where more than 2500 election posters were found painted on the walls (p. 188), and where everyone knew everyone else, so that it would have been difficult for slaves or foreigners to sneak in to vote when they were not eligible to do so. On the other hand, we see how Pompeii is a microcosm of the city of Rome or other large urban areas. Beard ties in historical facts, showing for instance how Pompeii had a connection with the assassination of Julius Caesar (through one of its citizens); and how paintings of Aeneas and Romulus in Pompeii, “copies of copies,” are our best evidence for the appearance of lost statues of those two men in the Forum of Augustus in Rome (p. 52).

The author paints a lively picture of the people who lived in the houses, worked in the shops, and played in the baths and brothels. Individuals like Aemilius Celer, a sign painter who seems to have cornered the market in the area near his home (p. 189), come to life. Beard often catches the flavor of the low-class speech of the inhabitants, showing how graffiti range from the vulgar to the poetic (p. 183). Prominent among ancient writers cited are Petronius, Pliny, Martial, and Juvenal. Of modern authors, Beard makes frequent reference to Edward Bulwer-Lytton’s Last Days of Pompeii (1834), and to the impressions of the early Grand Tourists.

The effect of the volcano is brought to life from the very beginning, when the scene of individuals escaping from the fumes and carrying a few precious possessions is vividly portrayed. Throughout the book we are reminded of the catastrophe, sometimes in poignant ways, such as in a bakery with eighty-one loaves of bread left in the oven, almost 2000 years overcooked (p. 172). The dilapidated state of some of the houses, even grand ones, is explained not only by the well-documented earthquake that occurred in AD 62, but also by the presumed tremors that must have preceded the eruption of August 79. Remarkably, the finds included the skeletons of two cows within the magnificent House of the Faun (p. 162), only one example of animals living within the confines of people’s homes.

A statue of one of Pompeii’s most illustrious citizens, Marcus Holconi-us Rufus, is probably a recut head of Caligula (pp. 207–208). Here one wishes that the author had specific references to studies of recut heads in her section, “Further Reading.” (Her annotated reading list is extremely helpful, but not as complete as it might be.) This is not a book about ancient art, even though a treatment of more of the artistic remains would have added materially to the picture of the city. The author does cleverly use many 18th and 19th century engravings and line drawings to illustrate her points, and in general the illustrations are lively and illuminating. Sometimes one wishes for more color or larger images, but the price is reasonable, presumably because of the limited number of color plates. Cross-referencing backwards and forwards, both to text pages and to images, enables the reader to keep checking small points discussed elsewhere.

The same book was published in the UK under the title Pompeii: The Life of a Roman Town. In a way, that is a better title, because that truly is what the book is about. Whatever the title, this is a superb study of the city and its
people, and will be essential reading for all students, laypersons, and travelers interested in Roman antiquity.

Nancy H. Ramage
Ithaca College


This is a fascinating book and a valuable demonstration. A selection of the author’s previously-published essays and reviews from 1977 to 2007, it shows his abiding interest in the continuous influence of classical studies, in particular classical history, historiography, biography, bibliography, and archaeology. Gibbon’s Decline and Fall serves as a thread through most of the following articles. The choice of subjects seems idiosyncratic, connected only accidentally. But it is not so. They are deliberately chosen to demonstrate the range of classical influence on scholars, artists, musicians, historians, and poets, all in such a way as to prove B.’s central point: the broad and enduring power of the Classics in Western humanistic endeavor.

The articles are arranged in three parts, from the 18th through the 20th centuries. The first four concern Gibbon and his Decline and Fall directly, while the fifth and sixth serve as a bridge. The first, “Gibbon’s Historical Imagination,” provides biographical information about Gibbon’s choice of subject and the philosophical and literary influences working upon him early in his life. It also helps to appreciate Gibbon not as an exacting scholar, careful of details, but as a man of extraordinary intellectual and imaginative grasp. B.’s own sharp scholarship reveals Gibbon’s reliance on other scholars’ interpretations rather than on direct and critical reference to original sources. It was his organizing and vivifying power, not scholarly exactitude, that made the Decline and Fall so successful. This chapter is thus programmatic for the collection. It poses a troubling thought to all who labor in our vineyard: critical and scholarly acumen, so necessary for us, is not what makes our discipline meaningful to a wider and interested audience. Iggy Pop, godfather of punk rock, seems to agree (“Caesar Lives,” Classics Ireland 2 [1995]) http://www.ucd.ie/cai/classics-ireland/1995/Pop95.html).

Chapters Two through Four add rich and copious details to our understanding of Gibbon’s personality and ambitions, his library and working methods, his contacts with the illuminati of his age, and the political crises, especially in France, that bore heavily on the Decline and Fall. A careful assessment of Gibbon’s versions of his autobiography provides a transition to the fifth chapter, a close examination of the increasing influence of Suetonius and classical biography in the 18th century, particularly in France. Anyone wanting the full and correct story of the discoveries and excavations of Pompeii and Herculaneum and an accurate assessment of their effect on 18th and early 19th century tastes and fashions (as well as on the young Gibbon and, in the next century, on Mommsen) will read the final chapter.
Herculaneum is the link to the first article of Part II, a review, really, of a 2000 edition by Adam Kendon of Andrea de Jorio’s 1832 study of Neapolitan hand gestures, *La mimica degli antichi investigata nel gestire napoletano*. Most of B.’s observations concern de Jorio’s enthusiastic but undisciplined attempt to connect the hand gestures of Naples of his day to those known from ancient literature and art. Both opera fans and teachers of Vergil will appreciate the lecture “Berlioz, Virgil, and Rome,” in which Berlioz’s close and careful use of the Latin original in composing his libretto for *Les Troyens* is expertly displayed. B.’s extensive knowledge of the ancient Middle East and Arabia are on display in the next chapter, on “Edward Lear in Petra,” which parallels that on Herculaneum and Pompeii. For it is a document of educated Europeans’ interest in and travel to this remote and rose-red city. Plates of Lear’s illustrations enliven the text. A fine article on Jacob Burckhardt’s two principal works is a return to the central problem: obsession with philological niceties for academic bibliocrats or a grand and broad vision, essentially correct but not without flaws, for a wider audience.

Part III begins with a review of C. Winterer’s *The Culture of Classicism* (2002). As many another reviewer, B. takes Winterer to task for her simplistic periodic schema of Classics in America and for her premature obituary of the Classics in this country. Here again it is the breathtaking panorama of classical influence that matters most. Like many (I suppose), I know only the “Ithaca” of C. P. Cavafy. B.’s three articles on this modern Alexandrian Greek poet’s abiding concern with Greek life in the later Empire motivate me to read more. The relationship between Gibbon and Cavafy seems profound. In particular, it is the latter’s absolute insistence on critical and historical accuracy in his poems on late imperial topics that places him in some tension with the former. And I’m certain that B.’s masterful treatment of Cavafy’s tortuous relationship with the ascetic pagan Julian will inspire many to read or re-read that emperor’s own works and the works of others like Ammianus. Cavafy’s personal resolution of classical paganism and Christianity are revealed in chapters on Apollonios of Tyana and on the poet’s unfinished and/or unpublished works. Exacting scholarship together with breadth of vision: such was the life and work of A. D. Momigliano. B. gives us a eulogy of a personal friend, yes; but more than that, an example of a passionate life spent in this discipline and his *Nachleben*. The relationship between biography and antiquarianism to history was a continuing concern for Momigliano. Like Cavafy, he, too, was drawn into the nexus of paganism, Judaism, and Christianity in the late Empire, the work of his later life.

I wish I could say that I had heard of the Polish journalist Ryszard Kapuściński before, but I cannot. Now that I have, I certainly intend to read him. If his name seems out of place in this collection, this objection is soon dismissed. For B. here again shows the power of classical historiography, Herodotus in particular, upon Kapuściński and his work, which, like that of Gibbon, might fail the exacting standards of classical scholarship or at times even of journalism; but which conveys truth even so. The book closes with a commentary on Auden’s essay “The Fall of Rome” and poem of the same name. It is a fitting conclusion. It knots together all the strands that
run through this complex tapestry: concern with the sense and style of historiography; pagan and Christian in late antiquity; the role of archaeology in understanding classical antiquity; and not least, Gibbon himself.

PETER COHEE
Schola Latina Bostoniensis


This valuable collection is the first book to tackle the Philostratean corpus as a whole since Alain Billaut’s L’Univers de Philostrate (Latomus, 2000). Elsner’s introductory essay takes aim at two common approaches to the Second Sophistic: a narrow concentration on its rhetorical and political dimensions, privileging VS at the expense of Philostratus’ other work, and an image of sophistic authors as clever but shallow dilettantes. Against both, this volume makes a convincing case for the thematic coherence of the corpus, whose protean diversity offers a composite portrait of imperial Hellenism. Certain themes, which owe much to Ewen Bowie’s work, recur throughout: generic playfulness; religious revival; the relative value of word, image, and experience; the best vehicles for transmitting sophia and paideia; and above all, issues of identity, especially the relation of elite Greeks to their cultural past. Philostratus is shown to articulate a range of relationships between past and present, asserting both the recoverability, even the living presence, of the heroic past and its elusiveness, the need for creative reinterpretation, and the superiority of present achievements to past models. This review will be organized around these thematic connections.

Bowie’s biographical sketch (Chapter 2) locates Philostratus professionally among Greek sophists active in Athens and Rome, and seeks parallels for his diverse literary output, above all in Lucian. (Latin authors, notably Apuleius, are largely missing.) A useful overview of Philostratus’ works, summarizing current consensus on the dates and authenticity of each, concludes the chapter.

Philostratus’ approach to religion blends conservatism with creativity. For Simon Swain (Chapter 3), the corpus advocates revival of an older, purer Hellenism more in accord with nature, in response to challenges posed not only by Roman power, but also by Christianity. Yet as Ian Rutherford demonstrates (Chapter 11), the atypical Thessalian theôria to the tomb of Achilles described in Heroicus is probably fictional, modeled on “interrituals” including the myth of Theseus. Likewise, Verity Platt (Chapter 7) shows that Philostratus’ Apollonius harmonizes philosophy and popular religion through an approach to viewing images centered on phantasia—a complex synthesis of visual perception with mental concepts that bypasses the limitations of mimesis to constitute a direct approach to the divine itself. Thus Apollonius reconciles conventional oppositions between artistic and literary (or mental) representations of the divine and between traditional cult and philosophical
critique. So too he himself unites and perfects all of Hellenism, recapitulating and surpassing all predecessors—including Pythagoras and Odysseus, as Jaap-Jan Flinterman (Chapter 8) and Gert-Jan van Dijk (Chapter 9) illustrate. Flinterman’s essay also addresses recent challenges to the divinity of the theios anēr through a nuanced reading of VA. Caught between praising Apollonius and acquitting him of mageia, VA veers between naturalistic explanations for his abilities and crediting him with superhuman status and achievements similar (but superior) to those of Pythagoras. Hence Apollonius, like Pythagoras, was indeed regarded as supernatural in some (if not all) quarters in the second century.

Like Platt, Zahra Newby (Chapter 15) investigates the relation between word and image, tracing the shifting balance in Imagines between absorption in images and detached viewings that subordinate the visual to verbal exegesis. This tension between immersing oneself in a painted fantasy Greek past and using painting as a springboard for prestigious display of paideia mirrors the educated elite’s relationship to Greek culture in general. Art historian Stephan Bann (Chapter 16) connects Caravaggio’s Narcissus with Imagines, as a test case for establishing links between classical texts and Renaissance paintings.

Sandrine Dubel (Chapter 14) and Jason König (Chapter 12) explore the relationship between rhetoric and other branches of paideia, finding Philostratean parallels between sophistic activity, painting, and gymnastikē. For König, the juxtaposition of history and physiognomy in Gymnasticus, usually dismissed as incoherent, is thus central to the work’s argument. Further, the prestige of gymnastikē within Greek paideia makes it a vehicle for broader concerns about how to engage with the Greek past. Crucially, both athletic training and rhetoric require creative, flexible, morally directed reinterpretation and reshaping (of body and past). Such parallels only go so far, though. Cataloguing the characteristic dress, behavior, and speech of sophists and philosophers in imperial texts and portrait sculpture, Harry Sidebottom (Chapter 5) argues that the two roles were not compatible, but defined in opposition to each other, representing two poles within Greek elite identity: the sophistic urban insider versus the rustic philosophical outsider. He suggests that these roles were created as supra-polis agents whose embodiment of Greek paideia gave them the symbolic capital necessary to operate on the level of Roman power.

Identity construction also occurs through funerary practice and text. Joseph Rife (Chapter 6) shows that sophists’ burials advertised their membership in the Greek urban elite but distinguished them only slightly from non-sophists. He accordingly disputes the social importance of sophists: comparison between VS and archaeological remains shows that Philostratus exaggerates their status. Thomas Schmitz’s narratological reading of VS (Chapter 4) explores how Philostratus establishes his narrator’s authority as a sophistic insider and invites—or intimidates—readers into accepting his judgments. Similarly, Simon Goldhill (Chapter 13) reads the Letters—an anomalous collection whose performative value lies closer to lyric poetry
than to epistolography—as a handbook of the rhetorical self-presentation of
the cultured Greek lover.

These themes converge in Tim Whitmarsh’s wide-ranging reading
of Heroicus as a text that engages readers in (re)creating themselves as mem-
bors of the Greek urban elite, while problematizing that identity (Chapter 10).
Heroicus presents the Greek past as vividly, even seductively, present in the
contemporary Greek landscape and through reading. Ultimately, however,
re-embodying the past seems impossible: neither landscape nor art nor text
can fully close the gap—a parable for “the ambiguous position of third-centu-
ry Greeks in relation to their cultural traditions” (229).

This collection is pitched at scholars, and at times its breadth makes
one wonder who its imagined reader is. (For this philologist, Dubel’s and
Bann’s discursive, technical essays proved difficult to follow, and in several
chapters clearer sign-posting of the argument would have been welcome.)
Yet although most readers will inevitably select the chapters most relevant to
their interests, the collection—like Philostratus himself—does repay reading
as a whole.

KENDRA ESHELEMAN
Boston College

Susanna Braund, Seneca: De Clementia. New York: Oxford University Press,
2009. xiiI + 459. ISBN: 978-0-19-924036-4. $150.00

Although de Clementia is important to scholars in fields ranging from
philosophy to Roman history to Renaissance politics, until now it
lacked a modern scholarly edition in English. Susanna Braund’s new
volume fills that void nobly. Braund (hereafter B.) calls it her magnum opus
(viii), and indeed it is a masterpiece of scholarship. The project of several
decades, the book reveals her deep knowledge of de Clementia and long devel-
oped thoughts on the various issues involved. To read this commentary is to
read de Clementia with a learned and generous advisor. On matters philologi-
ical, philosophical, grammatical, rhetorical, literary, and historical, B. provides
solutions and parallels in abundance.

The book falls into the standard divisions: lengthy introduction (91
pages), text with facing translation, and commentary with appendices. Both
introduction and commentary are accessible to scholars and advanced stu-
dents. All Greek and most Latin quotations are translated, opening the door
for those in fields outside Classics.

The introduction offers biographical information on Seneca and histori-
cal details on Nero’s accession, culminating in a discussion of the work’s date
and genre. This leads naturally into a discussion of the de Clementia’s literary
predecessors. Although stating that Hellenistic kingship treatises seem to be
the main ancestor for Seneca, B. quotes more extensively from Plato and Aris-
totle. She also provides a structure of the de Clementia as it survives, a helpful
four-page outline of the work’s divisions and themes. Here she also gives a
section on “Seneca as Communicator,” which she says would normally be
called “prose style.” The change in label is helpful and makes a usually dry
topic interesting and accessible. The *de Clementia*’s Nachleben from *Octavia* to Renaissance political philosophy is presented well. Finally, she discusses the state of the text and previous scholarship on it, including her relationship to previous editions. On the question of the text’s completion, publication, and intended scope, B. presents all views on the subject. She remains neutral on the former, but comes down firmly in support of the view that three books were planned, analogous to *de Ira*.

B.’s text presents a judiciously bold interpretation of the manuscripts. Her apparatus criticus is reasonably comprehensive; disputed readings are noted and discussed in the commentary. Her apparatus and textual notes, however, pale in comparison to Malaspina’s edition (Turin 2001), which boasts an exhaustive (and often exhausting) analysis of textual issues. B. states her debt to Malaspina (91), cites him often in the commentary, points readers to him when greater discussion would be redundancy, and, in general, maintains great integrity as editor and scholar. Unless strictly interested in paleographical quandaries, Anglophone readers will likely find B.’s edition all they need.

B.’s translation successfully conveys Seneca’s ideas in beautiful English. The commentary complements the translation and cites countless parallels for almost every phrase. In concert with the indices, it is straightforward to use and has an attractive layout easy on tired scholarly eyes. Readers less familiar with Stoicism or more obscure ancient philosophy (such as neo-Pythagorean kingship texts) will find all explained in a clear fashion, and more philosophically minded readers will find the information and bibliography they need.

My one objection to B.’s approach lies in the area of politics and the *de Clementia*’s contemporary readership, where B. focuses almost exclusively on Nero with little attention to other possible audiences. For whom was the *de Clementia* written? It is addressed to Nero, certainly, but since Leach’s 1989 article “The Implied Reader and the Political Argument in Seneca’s *Apocolocyntosis* and *de Clementia*” (*Arethusa* 22:197–230), no one can deny a broader readership and Seneca’s attention to them. Although B. calls this article “essential reading” (56), she rarely mentions it or invokes its conclusion, that *de Clementia* was largely intended to convey to the Roman elite the emperor’s absolute power, their own helplessness, and their personal stake in the emperor’s safety as a guarantee of stability. Instead, B. focuses almost exclusively on Nero as the audience of the work, pointing out not merely when he is flattered, but the effects this is presumed to have. When B. does notice wider audiences like the Roman elite (e.g., 214–215, the argument is essentially Leach’s, although she is not cited here), Nero tends to fade away. A sentence later, however, he is back and the elite are gone, although Leach discussed this passage in terms of the wider audience as well. It is as if *de Clementia* could operate only on one level of meaning. For example, at 1.7.3, Seneca explains that private individuals may pursue vendettas because they have been hurt and can be hurt again, but a figure as great as the emperor can never be injured and therefore never requires vengeance. B. states that his aim here “must be to persuade Nero that the display of clementia is a strength and not a weakness” (243).
For Leach, however, the security and invulnerability of the emperor are a key part of Seneca’s message to the elite about complete power and the futility of opposition. Given Nero’s existing policy of clemency, these lines make sense as a warning to the elite not to misinterpret clemency as weakness or view Nero as a peer.

B. generally accepts the ancient sources’ portrayal of Nero as a monster who needed constant reminding not to kill everyone. In recent decades, however, scholarship has more thoroughly interrogated these biased, unrealistic sources and moved towards a portrait of a more competent, less cruel Nero (e.g., Champlin’s *Nero* [Cambridge, MA 2003] and Elsner and Masters’ *Reflections of Nero* [Chapel Hill, NC 1994]). B.’s traditional Nero produces in tow a more traditional reading of *de Clementia*. It is, however, not the principal function of a commentary to innovate and interpret, but to provide a clear framework for others to create their own readings. In this respect, B.’s *de Clementia* is outstanding and shows her attention to detail and understanding of Senecan prose style. I am sure it will be the standard work on this important text for a long time.

Jennifer E. Thomas  
Oberlin College


Intertextuality was introduced into the Classics mainly by scholars of Latin literature. In recent years, however, this concept has become increasingly appealing to Homerists. Exploring the intertextual dynamics of a fluid oral tradition might seem challenging, and examining the interconnectedness of the Homeric epics with the vast but lost number of pre-Homeric poems is not an easy task. Yet Jonathan Burgess accepts the challenge of tracing and interpreting the multitiered interaction between the Homeric epics and non-Homeric traditions. Burgess (B.) follows in the footsteps of neoanalysis, but he refines and often revises the methods and arguments of the neoanalysts. “Weak” intertextuality, or *Quellensforschung*, gives place to an audience-oriented interpretation of Homeric allusions to mythological events that lie beyond the narrative scope of the *Iliad*, while the neoanalysts’ attempts to reconstruct lost epic poems is replaced with an attempt to reconstruct a *fabula* in narratological terms, a set of recurring fundamental motifs that regularly unfolded in a certain sequence within a traditional tale.

B. reconstructs the pre-Homeric myth of the life, death, and afterlife of Achilles, by combining evidence from various media (epic, lyric poetry, iconography), and examines how the *fabula* of Achilles is reflected in the Homeric epics. Chapter 1 draws on iconographical evidence, to establish that Achilles’ biography was understood as a unity in antiquity. Although there is no evidence of an early “Achilleis” and Achilles was just a hero in the Trojan

Myth in surviving early Greek epic, B. focuses on non-literary material and argues that myth often covers the life story of a central hero. Just like Herakles and Theseus, B. contends, a coherent biography of Achilles is suggested by early Greek art. B. offers intriguing suggestions, such as that the wound in Achilles’ heel was related to his swiftness—it slowed down the hero before he was finished off by other wounds (interestingly the movie Troy follows a similar interpretation).

Chapter 2 reconstructs the fabula of Achilles’ death. B. argues convincingly that Memnon, a hero with Hephaistian armor, is pre-Homeric and that the second armor of Achilles in the Iliad is a Homeric invention. Thus, the motif of two heroes with divine armor battling each other is transferred from the fabula (Achilles-Memnon) to the narrative framework of the Iliad (Achilles-Hektor). Chapter 3 examines how the Iliad conceives of Achilles’ imminent death, and considers the poetic effect of the Iliad’s allusions to Achilles’ destiny. According to B., Achilles’ assertion in Iliad 9.410–6 that he will either die young at Troy or return home and live a long life must not be taken at face value. Achilles knows that he will die and his pretense that he can still choose to live is a rhetorical manoeuvre. Overall, B. suggests that the Iliad’s inconsistencies about the fate of Achilles deepen the hero’s characterization.

The intriguing relationship between intertextuality and oral epic is explored in Chapter 4. B. enriches the text-oriented studies of neoanalysis with oralist theory. Unlike neoanalysts, B. focuses on reception, not composition. Motif transference, that is the transposition of specific mythological motifs to the context of Homeric poetry, invites the audience to recognize the interplay between Homeric and extra-Homeric material.

Having sketched out the fabula of Achilles in Chapter 2, B. goes on to examine the transference of the myth of Achilles’ death to the Iliad (Chapter 5). B. argues convincingly that Patroklos is Achilles’ altera persona and that Hektor’s duel with Achilles is a reworking of Memnon’s battle with Achilles. Motif transference contributes to the sense of collapsed time—the future lurks behind the surface of the presence. Less convincing is B.’s attempt to refute Patroklos’ similarities with Antilochos. B. argues that Patroklos cannot be an altera persona of both Achilles and Antilochos in an oral poem, assuming that oral intertextuality cannot be as sophisticated as literate poetics (p. 79–80). I think that the argument that an audience cannot follow the intertextual threads between Patroklos and both Achilles and Antilochos deprives oral intertextuality of its depth, and undermines B.’s otherwise sophisticated analyses.

Chapter 6 argues that the transferred motifs of Achilles’ death occur in extended narrative patterns. Thus, the Iliad tells the story of Achilles’ anger on a first level, but on another level it outlines the narrative of Achilles’ death. Chapter 7 examines Achilles’ mortal fate in the Homeric epics vis-à-vis the hero’s apotheosis in non-Homeric traditions. B. sheds new light on this issue, arguing that a hero’s immortality is not inherently contradictory to his burial since apotheosis results from the division of mortal and immortal parts through the agency of fire. The book concludes with a survey of the tombs and cults of Achilles from ancient to modern times (Chapter 8).
Overall, the book is an insightful contribution to Homeric studies. It offers many innovative ideas and, although some of the arguments are inevitably speculative, B.’s suggestions are by and large convincing as he supports them with a wealth of literary and non-literary material. The book is written in a lucid style and its structure is well organized. B. manages to argue clearly about complex ideas, synthesizing Homeric scholarship with modern literary theories, art history, and archaeology.

The main difficulty I have with the book is that, although one of B.’s main claims is that he focuses on reception and not composition, there is not much emphasis on the effect of allusions on the audience. B. mentions that the audience appreciates the intertextuality of motif transference (p. 70) or that it is jarred into thinking of the fabula of the death of Achilles (p. 83), but these statements strike me as limited interpretations of Homeric allusions. In general, long reconstructions of mythological events are followed by brief references to the audience. Thus, the book seems to offer an oralist version of neoanalysis rather than an audience-response approach of intertextuality. This, however, must not distract us from the merits of this admirable study. B. offers a systematic exploration of the interaction between Homeric and non-Homeric material, and I hope that his book will inspire new studies in the fascinating field of oral intertextuality.

Ioannis Ziegas
Cornell University


Much scholarly attention has been paid to A.E. Housman’s poetry and personal biography. There has been less interest, however, in his contributions to classical scholarship and this is an imbalance which Butterfield and Stray’s book seeks to correct through a selection of essays examining Housman’s critical editions as well as his place in the larger scholarly environment of the early twentieth century.

Stray begins the book with an introduction that sketches some of the complications inherent in assessing Housman. He was a classical scholar as well as a poet; his reviews of and comments on fellow scholars are famously scathing; and he was a skilled textual critic and emendator who was not interested in the larger cultural currents (ancient and medieval) which produced the texts he edited so well. Stray’s essay sets the tone for the rest of the book: it seeks to be a fair appraisal of Housman, praising his strengths, pointing out his failings, and avoiding hero-worship along the way.

The remaining essays fall into three sections, the first of which, “Housman the Scholar,” examines Housman’s work as an editor of classical texts. S.J. Heyworth, E. Courtney, R.G.M. Nisbet, S.P. Oakley, and G.D. Williams each portray Housman as a skilled emendator of Propertius, Manilius, Juvenal, Lucan, and Ovid’s Ibis whose conjectures were creative (even if not always convincing or correct). They each also highlight Housman’s uncon-
cern with the manuscript tradition of the authors he edited. M.D. Reeve’s chapter deals specifically with this subject. He shows that for Housman, editing texts meant repairing places where the text made no sense, not examining manuscripts to understand how those corruptions came about. Still, Reeve notes that Housman’s critical editions have largely stood the test of time and so his editorial method works on some level. Oakley and Williams also contrast Housman with other scholars of his time. Oakley gives us a selection of correspondence between Housman and Fraenkel. These letters and the review show that Housman was a great textual critic, but Fraenkel was better at “bring[ing] ancient authors to life” (p. 86). The heart of Williams’ chapter is the contrast between Housman and Robinson Ellis, a slightly older scholar who had published on the Ibis in the 1870s. Williams portrays Ellis as representing an older, artistic/humanistic brand of scholarship which Housman fought against through his “scientific” scholarship. The contrasts with Fraenkel and Ellis provide a nice lead-in to the second section. Butterfield’s contribution (dealing with Housman’s writings on meter) deals with a more general aspect of his work and it argues that while Housman was not “a great proponent of metrical theory” (p. 131), he should be regarded as one of the most knowledgeable twentieth-century metrical scholars.

The second section of the book highlights the differences between Housman and contemporary scholars. Some differences are certainly due to Housman’s unique personality, but many mark him as a prototypical twentieth-century classicist. Stray’s chapter examines the scholarly debate between Housman and R.C. Jebb over the meter and restoration of a newly-discovered papyrus of Bacchylides, a conflict which Stray believes is emblematic of the growing divide between old-style “gentlemen scholars” (Jebb) and newer professional scholars (Housman). N. Hopkinson finds that J.P. Postgate more than held his own against Housman in their published disagreements but that Postgate (like Jebb) represented a different kind of scholar. Postgate sought to defend the utility of classics to a wide, general audience while Housman was concerned with details that were important mainly to other scholars. Butterfield’s second essay contrasts Housman with W.M. Lindsay. Lindsay believed that when editing a text, only conjectures based on good palaeographical evidence should be made, a practice at variance with Housman’s. In his contribution here, L. Lehnus publishes several newly discovered letters from Housman to A.S. Hunt regarding Hunt’s restoration and publication of a portion of Callimachus from the Oxyrhynchus papyri. These letters demonstrate that Housman was just as skilled at emending Greek texts as Latin ones. J.H.C. Leach’s essay looks at “Classical Scholarship in Housman’s Correspondence” and determines that Housman mainly discussed scholarship in his letters when responding to queries about emendations, ancient orthography, or meter. Still, Leach concludes “that Housman’s correspondence yields rather little about the scholar that is not new” (p. 241).

The final three chapters comprise section three, “Housman’s Legacy.” This section is less cohesive than the first two. G. Luck’s chapter points out that several recent editions of Propertius accept some of Housman’s conjectures, indicating Housman’s worth as an emender. E.J. Kenney’s essay is
a modified version of a speech he delivered in 1976 at the Housman Society dinner in Cambridge. This brief chapter is thus largely an encomium of Housman, praising his exact scholarship and lamenting that Housman’s editorial work has frequently been ignored by later editors. In the last chapter, J. Diggle relates how he acquired both a cap and pen owned by Housman. This chapter adds a more human dimension to Housman, although it (and the entire final section) has a tendency to drift towards the hero-worship deplored by Stray in the introduction.

In short, this is well-produced book (which is free, for the most part, of typographical errors, although a medial sigma is often used in Greek quotations where a final sigma is required) and it presents a balanced assessment of Housman the scholar. He possessed a wide-ranging intellect; his conjectures were often brilliant (even if not always correct); he had little regard for the history of manuscript tradition; and he in many ways symbolized the changes taking place in the field of classics as it professionalized in the early twentieth century. Butterfield, Stray, et al. have done an excellent job of restoring Housman to his proper place in the history of classical scholarship and of reminding us that there is more to Housman than his poetry.

Aaron Wenzel
Beloit College


This is a revised and expanded translation of the Greek original published in 2001. The editor was the late Anastassios-Fivos Christidis, Professor of Linguistics at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. In its far-reaching scope, it begins with a General Introduction on histories of the Greek language and is then divided into nine parts, each followed by a full bibliography: I: The Language Phenomenon; II: The Greek Language: Language and History; III: The Ancient Greek Dialects; IV: Ancient Greek: Structure and Change; V: Greek in Contact with Other Languages; VI: Translation Practices in Antiquity; VII: Language and Civilization; VIII: The Ancient Greeks and Language; and IX: The Fortunes of Ancient Greek. The individual chapters within each part are written by eighty distinguished scholars, evenly divided between those from Greece and other nations and including not only philologists but also historians and archeologists.

Part I presents language as a general phenomenon of human experience, with chapters on the nature of language, units of linguistic analysis, the relationship of language to the brain and to thought, the origin and acquisition of language, and language change. Part II treats the development of the Greek language from proto-Indo-European through the Roman period. It includes chapters on the Indo-European language family, civilization, and culture, the genesis of Greek and its early written forms, the development of
writing, literacy and orality in the classical and Hellenistic periods, and the rise of the Koine. Part III describes the ancient Greek dialects, their classification, the relationship of Mycenaean Greek to the dialects of later periods, and the grammatical characteristics of individual dialects.

Part IV deals with the development of Greek phonology, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary from classical Attic Greek to Koine Greek, Jewish Greek, and the Greek of the New Testament. Part V discusses the contact between Greek and other ancient languages, including Thracian, Illyrian, Phrygian, Carian, Lycian, Lydian, Iranian, Etruscan, Latin, Hebrew, Egyptian and Coptic, Syrian, Celtic, the Indian languages, and Arabic. Part VI discusses translation practices and bilingualism in antiquity, with individual chapters on the Septuagint, the Greek of Roman texts, Phoenician bilingualism, and Greek translation of Lycian and Syriac.

Part VII on language and culture is subdivided into three sections: language and literature; specialized vocabularies of slavery, democracy, religion, law, philosophy, medicine, and philosophy; and cultural meanings and their transformations. Part VIII briefly describes education in antiquity, ancient grammarians, and Atticism from the Hellenistic period on. Part IX on the fortunes of ancient Greek surveys its development into Medieval and Modern Greek.

There are also three informative appendices. The first includes analyses of accentuation and punctuation. The second discusses proverbs, maxims and riddles, magical papyri, prophetic discourse, the language of the gods in Homer, obscene language, child talk, non-verbal communication, and music. The third studies phonetic, syntactic, and semantic change in ancient Greek. These are followed by a list of editions and translations of ancient texts, a glossary, and an analysis of the Greek phonetic system. There are also comprehensive indices of proper names, languages and dialects, words in Greek and other languages, and terms and subjects, as well as 121 black and white illustrations, 13 maps, and 23 tables.

This ambitious and well-organized tome provides an encyclopedic account of the history of the Greek language. The articles are written to be understood even by non-specialists. Many of the chapters, ranging from three to thirty-nine pages, are exciting to read and provide sample texts illustrating the material covered. This book will serve as a very helpful reference work for anyone interested in the Greek language.

FRANCIS T. GIGNAC
The Catholic University of America


Jo-Marie Claassen (C.) is well known in the field of Ovidian scholarship for her many published works on Ovid’s exilic poetry. She has been a pioneer in interpreting the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto as literature instead of
as sources for historical material, and unwavering in her resolve that these works represent a “literary … culmination of [Ovid’s] … *oeuvre*” (ix) comparable in style and quality to his earlier poetry. *Ovid Revisited* is intended to make available in a single monograph many of C.’s previously published work on the exilic poetry, revised, rearranged, and assembled into chapters; the monograph also includes material previously unpublished.

This volume contains an introduction, six chapters, an ‘excursus’ on recent Ovidian studies on the exilic poetry, two appendices, a table of specialized vocabulary, myth tables, and a general index. Each chapter is further divided into sections that alert the reader to the main idea under discussion. The introduction provides important background information on the details of Ovid’s exile, the poetic arrangement and chronology of the books of exilic poems, and the prevailing view of 20th-century critics that the exilic poems were of inferior literary merit and that their worth was largely as “historical source material” (1). The introduction also presents ideas to be treated in greater detail in later chapters.

Chapter One considers Ovid’s feelings toward the emperor and his family after Augustus relegated him to Tomis. In C.’s view the poet’s treatment of Augustus and his household, who often are identified as gods, is consistently “ironical,” “irreverent,” or “negative.” This chapter also explores Ovid’s effective use of personification of the “non-human” and depersonification of himself “to convey his psychological reactions to exile” (42).

In Chapter Two C. defends the exilic poems from the criticism of “monotony” by pointing to the linear structuring of the poems through which Ovid varied addressee, tone, and theme. She dispels the notion that the poems are “monotonous” by examining the sequence of *Epistulae ex Ponto* 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4. In addition to revealing a careful ordering of the three poems with different content, her analysis illustrates how reading the poems sequentially enables a “more nuanced reading” of each.

Chapter Three begins with a discussion of Ovid’s ambivalent attitude toward his poetry, which he portrays in negative terms as ruinous and in positive terms as therapeutic and capable of conferring immortality. C. then examines the interplay between meter and emotion and meter and content in order to demonstrate the continued high quality of the exilic poetry. She concludes this chapter by examining figures of speech (such as alliteration, assonance, and onomatopoeia) and various types of rhyme that contribute to sound play, which, she argues, complements meaning.

Chapter Four is largely concerned with “the specialized vocabulary of exile.” C. begins her discussion of Ovid’s use of language by supporting an idea suggested many years ago by Betty Rose Nagle. Nagle proposed that Ovid, seeing his situation as *poeta relegatus* as similar to that of the lover shut out of his beloved’s house (*exclusus amator*), appropriated the language of Roman elegy to describe his circumstances as an exile. In addition to making an inventory of the language of love that recurs in the exilic poems, C. identifies categories of key vocabulary, which she lists and in some instances defines, that includes the following spheres: language pertaining to politics, to “private friendship,” to the legal system, to religion, and to Augustus “as
imperial deity.” C.’s generalizations regarding language that occurs both in the exilic poems and in the earlier works, and shifts in the meanings of this language, are intended to enable a more nuanced reading of the poetry. For example, *ingenium* ("inborn talent" or “natural ability”), which in his earlier poetry generally had positive connotations, in the exilic poetry has negative connotations—Ovid’s inborn talent has been “lost” or has “harmed him” (131–132). She summarizes the main point of her discussion of language as follows: “Much of the exilic poetry may be palinodic, in the sense that it draws attention to the poet’s earlier elegies and redraws the alignment of some of the sentiments there expressed, particularly by the new directions in which familiar words are sent” (134–135).

Large sections of Chapters Three and Four are technical in nature and do not permit easy comprehension by the non-specialist. C. herself suggests that the non-specialist may choose to skip these parts of the two chapters (ix).

Chapter Five investigates Ovid’s use of mythological figures in an “exilic context.” For instance, Ovid chooses to identify himself with figures who wander or are persecuted (Aeneas, Hercules, Ulysses-Odysseus, and Actaeon, to name a few). Augustus not only is “thundering Jupiter,” but Juno (tormentor of Aeneas and Hercules), Neptune (tormentor of Ulysses-Odysseus, and Diana-Artemis (tormentor of Actaeon) (176). C. offers many examples of Ovid’s skill in exploiting and adapting myth to his exilic situation.

In Chapter Six C. compares and contrasts the “exilic literature” of the modern South African poet Breyten Breytenbach and other South African writers and that of Ovid. Her purpose is to offer a better understanding of the motivation for these literary creations written in difficult political circumstances and to identify central themes and metaphors common to the literature of alienation and isolation thereby contextualizing Ovid’s highly original achievement.

This volume concludes with an overview of largely recent scholarship on the exilic poems, divided into two major parts. The first part is concerned with secondary literature on topics of “historical interest”; “theories of Ovid’s relegation” exemplifies one issue discussed in this section. The second part largely is devoted to a review of recently published literary studies, texts, and commentaries on Ovid’s works of exile.

C.’s passion and enthusiasm for her subject seem indefatigable. In this book she has collected in one place a wide range of interesting and important topics that will appeal to anyone interested in Ovid’s exilic poems in particular or in exilic literature in general.

HELENA DETTMER
University of Iowa

Despite the vast ideological distance between nineteenth-century classicists and twentieth-century feminists, their assessments of ancient women are remarkably similar. According to these well known assessments, which have dominated scholarly discussions of gender until relatively recently, all women in the ancient Greek world were unambiguously disempowered, subordinate, and mute, and their lived experience was almost exclusively confined to the domestic sphere. Joan Breton Connelly opposes these long-standing views by arguing that women who held religious office in ancient Greek culture were active agents who operated at the center of public power. Connelly’s configuration of Greek priestesses as highly visible civic leaders who made important contributions to the polis is grounded in recent attempts to rethink the rigidity of sacred/secular binaries in ancient Greek culture, most notably Robert Parker’s contention that the Greeks did not distinguish between sacred and secular law. “If things religious were not considered separate from things secular,” Connelly reasons, “then the positions of leadership held by priestly women were primary, not peripheral, to the centers of power and influence” (p. 5).

Connelly’s evaluation of female religious officeholders as empowered figures of civic authority challenges traditional—though by no means universal—understandings of Greek women as passive, subservient, and publically invisible beings confined to the performance of childbearing and housekeeping duties within the domestic sphere. To substantiate her thesis, Connelly evaluates extensive archaeological, epigraphic, and literary evidence over a broad chronological and geographical scope. Source material includes documentation for priesthoods from the Archaic through the Roman Imperial periods and ranges from South Italy to Asia Minor. The book examines prominent priesthoods (Athena Polias at Athens, Demeter and Kore at Eleusis, Hera at Argos, and the Pythia at Delphi) and surveys disparate fragmentary evidence of female priesthoods from across the Mediterranean basin. Connelly uses this broad scope of evidence to illuminate the contributions of more than 150 women.

Following Pierre Bourdieu, Connelly argues that the priestesses of the Greek world were empowered by significant social, cultural, and symbolic capital. These forms of capital were based on pedigree and wealth, which functioned as the basic requirements for acquiring religious office. The early chapters examine the numerous opportunities for female sacred service from childhood through late adult life. Subsequent chapters argue that female agency and even civic leadership were cultural norms for this elite group of women. In the course of examining evidence for votive statuary, priestly costume, ritual duties, community authority, and funerary memorials, Connelly convincingly establishes the priestesses as prominent figures who led prayers, spoke before public assemblies, initiated sacrifices, led public processions, and maintained possession of the temple keys.

Connelly’s generously illustrated study represents a laudable attempt to address the fluid complexities of what have often been treated as rigidly simplistic binary constructs: sacred/profane, visible/invisible, public/private. The introductory chapter cites Theodor Adorno’s model of constellation
as a primary framework within which to understand the complex relationships of priestesses as actors within structures of bureaucratic organization (pp6–25). In establishing this framework Connelly binds together the private and public spheres by positing an analogy between the rituals of the domestic sphere and those of the temple and argues that the correlation between house and temple provided the critical foundation of female agency. She deftly calls into question the possibility of a fixed distinction between the public and private spheres by equating the agency that enabled female officeholders to circulate between house and temple with the larger circulation of power within the polis. The fluidity of movement between house and temple reflected the fluidity of religious office and by extension the fluidity of priestly identity. Although some religious offices offered a permanent status, the priesthood was predominantly comprised of temporary offices held by women at varying stages of the female life cycle. Consequently, the elite women who made up the female priestly caste circulated in and out of the spheres of house and temple, thereby preventing fixed distinctions between priestly and nonpriestly identity.

Connelly utilizes a multi-methodological approach to accommodate the diversity of source material. Although the introductory chapter establishes a promising outline of independent methods of inquiry, there is not a strong connection between the discrete theoretical frameworks established in the introduction and the various analyses presented in subsequent chapters. The analysis of female agency is weakened by the lack of an in-depth analysis of the complex interplay between agency and structure. Since the implications of Adorno’s idea of constellation as a critical practice are not addressed, the relation of female agency to the larger social structures in which it was practiced is unclear. Although Connelly rightly notes that “consideration of the circulation of power within the bureaucracies of the cult, the polis, and the culture industry” (p. 22) is central to her investigation, the complexities of this circulation of power are not discussed. The lack of in-depth analysis is an inevitable result of Connelly’s decision to adopt a long chronological and broad geographical scope. While there are many advantages to the long and broad view (which Connelly cogently enumerates), there are also disadvantages, particularly when such a view is adopted within a theoretical framework that attempts to move beyond the analysis of power as an essentially binary structure toward the examination of power as a complex system of mediation and circulation.

The book has many strengths. In addition to presenting a sustained analysis of the temple key as the most prominent signifier of female priesthood, Connelly makes a formidable case for the public visibility of priestesses. Her examination of inscriptions on statue bases, funerary monuments, and votive offerings, as well as dedications in temples and marketplaces, establishes that priestesses were a constant presence in civic life. As a result of the public contributions to the cities in which they lived, the priestesses were publically honored in both life and death. This is an important book that will work toward a final silencing of generalizing views of female invisibility in
the ancient Greek world. Connelly’s wide-ranging study will be of great interest to scholars across disciplines and historical periods.

TAMMIS THOMAS
University of Houston-Downtown


*Roman Women* consists of four chapters entitled “Gender and Status” (pp. 1–43), “Marriage and the Family” (pp. 45–91), “Women’s Work” (pp. 93–140), and “Public Life” (pp. 141–180). A glossary of terms (pp. 181–188), a list of Roman authors (pp. 185–188), and a bibliography (pp. 189–194) round off the book. Its illustrations are well chosen, well catalogued, and well reproduced; they include some unusual and revealing items. The author’s summaries of important issues and time periods provide good general introductions to the respective topics. The Cambridge Introduction to Roman Civilization series has as its intended audience “students who have no prior knowledge of or familiarity with Roman antiquity” (frontispiece). The author seeks to demonstrate how ancient sources serve as objects of social analysis, even imagining how individual works may have operated in specific performance settings.

At the very start, D’Ambra describes her preference for the “plebeian and anti-classical” and observes: “Attention is paid to the ordinary and everyday aspects of life rather than to the spectacular and cinematic scenery of ancient Rome” (p. xvii). Thus, D’Ambra’s approach is in sympathy with methodological trends in feminism, art history, and archaeology in the late twentieth century. The first chapter is divided into four sections. In the first, “Sources,” D’Ambra discusses her use and interpretation of literary and non-literary texts, material culture, and the fine arts. For example, she notes as problematic the use of funerary inscriptions and satire as sources for common attitudes about actual women in antiquity. Each genre is intended to evoke specific emotions and each appeals to a different audience (p. 9). In the second section, “Marriage by Capture,” D’Ambra describes the rape of the Sabine women as a “founding myth” and as the “blueprint for Roman attitudes toward women, marriage, and the imperial mission of conquest” (p. 10). In the third section, “Gender and Power,” she turns to the male-dominated hierarchical structure of ancient Roman society and examines how social status determined power or lack thereof. She describes the taming of young women’s sexual power through the institution of marriage and “medical practices that advised women of childbearing age to be kept pregnant for optimal health (Soranus, *Gynecology* 1.11.42, arguing against the conventional wisdom)” (p. 12).

Early on, D’Ambra states that it was preferable for respectable women to be “depicted with masculine characteristics in literary and visual repre-
sentations to demonstrate that only exceptional women could acquire the dignity, discipline, and high-mindedness of the male ideal” (p. 13). Here and elsewhere (e.g., p. 4), D’Ambra creates the impression that the ideal for respectable Roman women was a grim, quasi-masculine, and shadowy existence. While she acknowledges (p. 7) that archaeological evidence like perfume jars and cosmetic containers suggests that Roman women carefully crafted their looks, she omits pointing out that modes of self-presentation available to women are likely to have varied according to specific contexts (e.g., public or private) and time periods. In discussing negative attitudes toward older women, she relies on satire, a genre she had earlier described as problematic. Indeed, her use of satire as a source for male attitudes is unqualified throughout the book (see especially pp. 13–14).

In the first section of chapter 2, “Moralizing Exempla,” D’Ambra describes male expectations for a Roman wife’s behavior as essentially misogynistic (pp. 46–50). She adduces the negative stereotypes of women found in satire as proofs of common attitudes (pp. 47–49). On page 48, D’Ambra writes “the poet Juvenal wrote his sixth Satire, long considered the bible of invective against women; yet its target is adulterous wives and by extension, marriage.” This is precisely the argument advanced by Susanna H. Braund in her article, “Juvenal – Misogynist or Misogamist?” (JRS 82 [1992]: 71–86). There is no footnote to identify Braund as the author of this idea here, although Braund’s article does appear in the Bibliography. The decision to leave out references to modern scholars in the text may have been an editorial one. However, it might have been helpful to list relevant sources after each chapter, or at least organize the bibliography by theme, so as to further engage curious students in modern scholarship.

The second section, “Moral Reform,” describes Augustus’ legal attempts to regulate behavior but does not tell us that he failed. Under the next heading, “Mistresses and Love Poetry,” D’Ambra discusses the illicit and troubled love affairs alluded to by Roman elegists. Considering the genre as male dominated, she mentions Sulpicia only to dismiss her (p. 53). She provides no significant details about Sulpicia or her work until p. 71, when she quotes several lines from one of her poems. The mores of the Roman banquet are discussed within the context of the world of elites that Roman writers describe. Although “professional women,” i.e., prostitutes or courtesans, are mentioned briefly on p. 56, no discussion of their role in Roman society is provided here or in Chapter 3, “Women’s Work,” where one might expect it.

“Honor and Shame,” the third section of Chapter 2, evokes the exemplum of Lucretia only to conclude that “the Roman discourse on marriage cast... every matron as a potential source for scandal – after all, it was both Lucretia’s virtuous woolwork and her beauty that aroused the Etruscan prince” (pp. 58–59). The fourth section, “Passages and Protocols,” outlines the activities of young girls: their informal education with an emphasis on domestic skills, woolworking, and playing with dolls (pp. 59–61). Here D’Ambra speculates: “In their play with dolls, girls may have restaged the daily dramas of the household through an imagined household persona” (p. 60). Section five, “Puellae Doctae” mentions a few instances of elite girls who received a more
than rudimentary education (pp. 62–65). “Dying Before Their Time,” the sixth section of Chapter 2, is a poignant discussion of the evidence provided by funerary monuments dedicated to the memory of young daughters (pp. 65–70). The remaining sections of this chapter, “Matchmaking,” “Weddings,” “Husbands and Wives,” “Motherhood,” and “Mothers and Daughters” briefly consider these aspects of society within the context of a discussion of funerary art, epitaphs, and literary sources.

In the introduction to the third Chapter, “Women’s Work,” D’Ambra enumerates the sorts of work which women engaged in, the activities from which they were excluded, and elite men’s disdain of women’s typical occupations. She concludes that elite women occupied their time by doing little more than supervising their staff of slaves, although doing so was a task far more demanding than we might readily assume (p. 94). Such women appear to be wrapped up in the concerns of the domestic sphere to the exclusion of any other activities. It is not until p. 135 that D’Ambra mentions that some elite women, matronae doctae, took pleasure in intellectual pursuits like writing poetry or discussing philosophy, although they were mocked for this by satirists. Under the heading “The Arts of Cultivation,” D’Ambra gives a more nuanced account of the societal responsibilities expected from the same matronae who had appeared so dour in earlier chapters. There is also a very good discussion of grooming and women’s use of cosmetics in ancient Rome, as well as photographs of items (wigs, comb, hairpin, etc.) employed in the lady’s toilette. Illustrations also afford some idea of domestic space, especially a 2nd century C.E. sarcophagus, which displays along its interior sides bas-reliefs of domestic furniture (p. 103, fig. 49). This is helpful, as the houses and villas on the bay of Naples are today seen and published without their furniture.

In the fourth chapter, D’Ambra turns to the lives of imperial women and those whose extraordinary vice or virtue merited mention in ancient literary sources. In earlier chapters D’Ambra details the range of negative descriptions of women found in ancient Roman writers, but she does not provide any historical descriptions of the sort of woman the Romans celebrated as an exemplary matrona until her final chapter. Here, the author defines positively, and from a variety of sources, what the expectations for such a woman were at this time. This chapter is the strongest in the book in terms of interpreting sources within their social and historical context. In the remarkable life and in the honors granted to Cornelia, the mother of the Gracchi, we have an example of the education, influence, and public role which a respectable woman was capable of achieving in the late Republic. D’Ambra acknowledges that the public agency and visibility of women like Cornelia in the Republic and of women of the ruling families during the empire may have influenced the activities and the modes of self-representation of upwardly mobile women. Earlier, she avoids making this connection (e.g. on p. 18), instead hinting that, no matter what choices women made, they would be criticized by their male counterparts. At points, in this chapter and elsewhere in the book, D’Ambra’s interpretation of the primary literary sources is misleading. She denies that ancient male authors could write with any degree of nuance about their fe-
male subjects, and she establishes a false dichotomy in such authors’ descriptions of women as being either wholly evil or above reproach (p. 143).

Roman Women could be a useful text, in combination with other sources, in an introductory course on sex and gender in antiquity or in a survey art history class. One may evaluate this textbook as an artistic complement to the literary material in Lefkowitz and Fant’s Women’s Life in Greece and Rome. A Source Book in Translation, now in its third edition. For whatever course D’Ambra’s textbook is considered, however, the teacher might consider that reading sources fruitfully requires knowledge of the context in which they emerged. And even for those who have no prior experience in the discipline of classical studies, a certain amount of challenge may be welcome. One need not necessarily simplify or gloss over complexities or pre-digest material to make it more palatable to the uninitiated. Among numerous and seemingly endless possibilities on the topic of women’s role in Roman society, Hemelrijk’s Matrona Docta, Kleiner and Matheson’s I, Claudia, volumes I and II, and Skinner’s Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture may provide the student with more of an opportunity to consider ancient sources within the richness of their socio-historical backgrounds, and to ponder what they mean.

Mary R. McHugh
Gustavus Adolphus College


With its complex dramatic action, its setting in a determinate cultural and historical context, its demanding and sustained argumentation, and its linguistic virtuosity, the Protagoras cries out for a commentary of rare excellence: one capable of representing the ironies and subtleties of the action, of informing the reader of both the content and significance of historical and cultural allusions, of analyzing and evaluating the logic, and of explicating nuances of the Greek often or even necessarily lost in translation. Fortunately, that is precisely the kind of introduction and commentary that Nicholas Denyer (D.) offers us. Any student or scholar of this dialogue will profit greatly from this edition and indeed find it indispensable. On every page one finds the erudition, insight and balance that this exceptionally complex and controversial dialogue demands in a commentary and until now has not received. It is not possible in the context of a brief review to capture fully the character and usefulness of this edition; I will therefore limit myself to providing a representative sample of its valuable contributions.

In a very sensible introduction D. is sensitive to the great care Plato takes “to thwart the lazy inference from ‘This is what Plato has Socrates say’ to ‘This is what we are to believe, on the authority of Plato’” (9). The point is not that the dialogue in no way offers us Plato’s views, but that getting at these views will require much more work, and a much more holistic reading,
than a mere elucidation of what the character Socrates argues. Furthermore, D. in his commentary recognizes that, given not only Socrates’ notorious irony but also the complexity of the rhetorical situation, one has to be careful about identifying what Socrates argues with even what Socrates is supposed to think. This caution is especially important in the case of Socrates’ defense of hedonism. In exposing its serious shortcomings, D. allows the possibility that Socrates is either not committed to this hedonism at all or only to a more ‘high-minded’ version of it than the one he gets the masses to accept (186). This caution is reflected even in D.’s editing of the text, since at 357a7 he prints the scribal correction υμὑν instead of the υμὑν found in all the manuscripts, so that Socrates is made to say that the right choice of pains and pleasures has appeared, not to ‘us’, but to ‘you’ (the many) to be the salvation of human life (193). D. also uses the contrast with a passage from the Laws 689a–b, which rejects both hedonism and the view that knowledge is weak, to show that “we might, without accepting the hedonism into which the masses have been argued, accept the conclusion into which Socrates hopes to argue the masses on the basis of that hedonism, the conclusion that we always do a thing if we know it to be the best thing in our power” (194).

Yet we must careful even in attributing the conclusion to Socrates since, as Denyer rightly notes, Socrates’ rejection of the view that knowledge can be overcome by pleasure does not necessarily commit him to the view that knowledge as commonly understood is all-powerful; he instead could have believed that “knowledge of good and bad demands something like the long and intense schooling of appetite, emotion, and intellect that the Republic prescribes for those who are to rule an ideal society” (181). He also importantly notes, in commenting on 352e5-353a1, that Socrates is not denying that people have the experience of being forced by pleasure to act against their better judgment but is only challenging their description of this experience (182–183). Socrates can therefore be regularly portrayed in both Plato and Xenophon as assuming that there is such a thing as akrasia (183).

What Protagoras says in the dialogue is no more straightforward, since, as D. shows, intentional ambiguity and misrepresentation are essential to his rhetorical strategy. His very choice of telling a muthos in his great speech is described by D. as a way of avoiding commitment on sensitive issues, such as the existence of the gods (100). Also noted are Protagoras’ guarded silence in the speech regarding the virtue of courage (107, 117, 124) and the beneficial ambiguity of his claim at 323a2–3, which can mean either that there can be no cities unless everyone is just or that there can be no cities unless it is everyone’s duty to be just (109); later the meaning slips even further into the weaker suggestion that it is in everyone’s interest to be thought just (110). If Protagoras in addition fails to distinguish between practicing, caring for, and being-taught virtue, it is with the purpose of conflating the claim that we can improve ourselves with the claim that we must submit to instruction by the sophists (111). D. also suggests that Protagoras’ later speech on the relativity of the good, by which he derails the discussion of the unity of the virtues, is intended as a means of avoiding the embarrassment that would be caused
by having Socrates ask ‘about who is benefitted and who harmed by whose justice and by whose injustice’ (134).

D. repeatedly draws attention to the way in which literary details contribute to the message of the dialogue. A good example is what these details show us regarding the failure of dialogue itself within the dialogue. It is noted that before Socrates’ arrival the sophists were not conversing with one another at all (140) and that it is only Socrates who brings about such a conversation (142). This exposes the solipsistic consequences of Kallias’ suggestion that each converse as he likes, as well as the vacuity of Hippias’ idea of a community of the wise. Socrates’ description, at the beginning as well as the end of the dialogue (310a1, 362a3), of his exchange with Protagoras as a ‘speaking and listening’ (language that could describe a fair trial, a series of speeches at a symposium, or even an exchange of insults!) suggests that in his estimation it did not merit being described as a genuine case of dialegesthai (204).

D.’s commentary also illustrates an important general feature of Plato’s literary composition in repeatedly drawing attention to the ways in which themes that will become of central concern later in the dialogue are anticipated earlier, often in the very action, characterization and setting. For example, the later focus on courage is anticipated both by the opening discussion between Socrates and Hippocrates (69, 72) and by Protagoras’ concern throughout the earlier part of the dialogue with risks and precautions (87); also, Socrates’ self-serving misquotation of Homer at the start of the dialogue anticipates his perverse reading of Simonides in the second half (66). To become aware of this literary device is also to have a grasp of the unity of the dialogue and especially of the unity between its argument and its action.

These examples can give only a very partial indication of what the reader stands to gain from this extraordinarily thorough and perceptive commentary on an extraordinarily rich and rewarding dialogue. It is no exaggeration to say that it could have saved much previous scholarship from some simple errors and hasty assumptions. Future scholars of the dialogue are therefore lucky to have it now in their toolkit.

F R A N C I S C O J. G O N Z A L E Z
University of Ottawa


I n spite of its title, Daniel Dombrowski’s Contemporary Athletics and Ancient Greek Ideals does not deal with the ancient world in any great detail. Authors such as Plato simply provide a convenient framework to analyze modern theories concerning athletics and the value of competition. D.’s study does hint at some new ways we might think about the competitive urge of Greek athletes but in the end it does not greatly advance our understanding of the Classical world, particularly in dealing with Jacob Burckhardt’s influential view about the innate hyper-competitiveness of the Greeks.
D.’s first chapter provides an overview of ancient athletics with a focus on terms that figured in their careers.

Stephen Brunet
University of New Hampshire


This new translation of Sophocles’ Oedipus the King (OT), Oedipus at Colonus (OC) and Antigone (Ant.) represents the fifth entry in the Johns Hopkins University Press’s young series New Translations from Antiquity. The series’ first excursion into tragedy, the volume under consideration follows the approach taken in Oxford’s Greek Tragedy in New Translations series: it pairs a classicist, Robert J. Littman, with a professional poet, Ruth Fainlight, to produce a translation both aesthetically beautiful and historically accurate. (The book nowhere distinguishes the contributors’ work, nor shall I.) In these twin goals, the translators have succeeded admirably. These versions will reward close reading in the classroom and will provide excellent scripts for actors. My one not insignificant caveat concerns the introduction and notes.

Fainlight and Littman have given us loosely iambic English poems of varying line lengths. The verse uses a relatively prosaic register of language for the episodes—as Sophocles himself often does—and a slightly higher register for lyric verse, always to good effect. The translators repeatedly show that they have a good feel for tragic emotions. I cite just one of many possible examples. In Ant., Teiresias describes the effect of Creon’s autocratic rule. The translation reads, “The cities are seething with hatred against you | as the torn flesh of their dead sons | with its unholy carrion stench | is brought by savage dogs and raptor birds back to their hearths” (1080–1083). The horrific imagery is emphasized by the spondaic, almost staccato rhythm of 1081–1083a sandwiched between the far quicker iambic and dactylic rhythms of 1080 and 1083b. We can viscerally feel the vultures turning their beaks from Polyneices’ corpse to Creon’s living carcass.

The translations, except for lyric passages, bring over Sophocles’ Greek line for line, but never word for word. While never letting go of Sophocles’ imagery, the translators go for the concept in each line rather than a slavishly literal rendering. Their judgment is almost invariably sound. A good example is Theseus’s reassurance to Oedipus: “my name will be your shield” (OC 667). The line, the last in the twelve-line speech, condenses Sophocles’ τοὑμὑν φυλάξει σ’ὑνομα μὑ πάσχειν κακὑς. The translation forcefully concludes Theseus’s pledge by placing heavy accents on “name” and “shield,” the words that correspond to the Greek words standing at the line’s principal caesurae.

A second aspect of the translators’ approach is to translate keywords according to their context rather than to render them consistently with the same English word. For example, in Oedipus’s speech at OC 960–1013, there are
several instances of the Greek *akōn*. It is translated variously as “unwillingly,” “unwilled, unknowing action” and “reluctantly.” In each case, the translation precisely captures the central force of this complex Greek word in its context. Greekless readers and audience will admittedly miss that Sophocles uses a keyword here. (A note to this effect would have been useful.) With a teacher’s guidance, though, the accumulation of translations, far from causing problems of understanding, gives the reader an impression of the full range of the word. The translation enables interpretation by opening up the semantic field in a way that a wholly consistent translation would inhibit.

There are times when the translation loses too much of the original sense, but these instances are far rarer. In the early scenes of *OT*, we miss the irony when Oedipus tells the Chorus, τὴν δὲ δρὴν τὸν οὐδὲν θύρη (293): literally, “no one sees the doer.” The verb is an historical present. When the translation, however, uses a true past tense—“no one saw who did it”—we lose the essential point that the Chorus and audience (in the present) do see the man who killed Laius. In the same episode, the Greekless reader or audience member might get the false impression that revenge is a strong motivational force for Oedipus. To be sure, the idea of vengeance is explicitly mentioned in 107 and 136. At 258, however, the translation has Oedipus say “we must seek out the cause and avenge it,” where “and avenge it” is not in the original. At 312–313, Oedipus begs Teiresias to save the city “from the pollution of unavenged murder.” Again, “unavenged” is imported into the text. Translation is necessarily an act of interpretation, but this reader at least felt that this case crossed into interpolation. Fortunately, as I said, such moments are infrequent.

The volume’s introduction and notes, in contrast, are problematic. I would be reluctant to assign this reading to undergraduates. The introduction strongly emphasizes the religious nature of Athenian tragedy. While Dionysiac ritual deserves emphasis, it is not helpful to read statements such as: tragic myths “were believed in, much in the same way that Christian society believes in Jesus” (xiv). The attempt to make the foreign world of Greek myth comprehensible to students is admirable, but the analogy to Christian faith is misleading. The authors also show a lack of understanding of ancient theatrical conventions. For example, in a note on *Ant.* 528–530, where the Chorus describes Ismene’s “flushed face” and tears, the authors comment, “The chorus is commenting on Ismene’s expression, which would not show under the mask” (204). The idea that Ismene’s true expression is “under the mask” mistakes how masks work in a performance setting. The note reinforces the introduction’s already weak description of masks: “The masks remained fixed, so that facial expressions were not possible” (xviii). Though literally true, the remark neglects how expressive a skilled masked actor can be with a poignant tilt of the head or an elated opening of the palm. We come away from such remarks with the sense that tragedy was deficient in its ability to be performed.

Unfortunately, there are many such interpretive and factual miscues in both the introduction and notes. Fortunately, these shortcomings have not invaded the translation itself. It is generally free from both creative interpolation and mistranslation. The plays read, both silently and aloud, as the mas-
terpieces they are. The complexity of Sophocles’ themes and imagery comes through the prism of some very fine English poetry. These translations deserve theatrical production and classroom study.

John Given
East Carolina University


In this slim but jam-packed volume Gloria Ferrari draws together diverse fields—archaic poetry, pottery, astrology, cosmology, performance ritual, literary criticism, Spartan society—to provide a new and provocative interpretation of Alcman’s *Partheneion*, our earliest (late 7th century BCE) surviving piece of lyric poetry.

The book consists of an introduction, three chapters (in the middle of which are sixteen pages of artistic images relevant to the discussion), and a postscript followed by the text and translation of the poem, a list of abbreviations, a bibliography, and three indexes (sources, monuments and general).

In the introduction F. sets out clearly her approach. Her overall concern is with trying to visualize the performance of Alcman’s poem as a means of understanding its meaning. She is going to argue that the *Partheneion* chorus represents the stars, celebrates the cycle of seasons and is fundamentally about *kosmos*, of the *polis* and of the universe (p. 17). In situating her work, she acknowledges her debt to Claude Calame, *Les choeurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque* (Rome 1977) but notes quite rightly that there are many points of interpretation of the poem’s content which are still hotly debated.

Chapter 1, “The Myths,” deals primarily with the first surviving 35 lines. Despite their fragmentary nature it is generally agreed that one of the topics is the feud between the Tyndarids and Hippocoontids (p. 21), though the significance of this within the context of the whole poem is the subject of much debate. F. argues that the version herein concerned the aetiology of the dual kingship in Sparta and the dangers inherent in deviating from the hereditary succession (i.e. Hippocoon, as *nothos*, had to be removed from power and the rightful chain of succession restored). F. then argues that the fragmented moralizing in lines 13–19 refers to the myth of Phaethon. Much is necessarily conjecture here (Phaethon is not named) but the resources F. draws on to establish her reading of the text are legion. The resulting interpretation has *poros* (line 14) refer to the path of the heavenly bodies, *aisa* (line 15) as the ordering principle of the path of the heavenly bodies, and Phaethon exemplifying the chaos which would erupt should the measured course of the heavenly bodies be disrupted. It is he to whom lines 15–16 refer (in F.’s restored version): “[Let no] mortal fly to the sky/ [nor flee from] marrying Aphrodite”.

Chapter 2 “The Chorus” takes a critical look at lines 39–110 in which the chorus sings about itself. There is much disagreement on many points of
interpretation in these lines and F. is careful always to point out alternative explanations and explain where she departs from these and why. In essence her interpretation is that the named characters are not historical/mortal as is frequently argued but mythical and represent the cosmic configuration which heralds the onset of winter when Sirius and the Pleiades are both present in the sky (lines 60–63). It is at this time of year that the Hyades also appear in the night sky and it is they whom the chorus represents. Thus Agido is the Dawn who summons the sun (lines 41–42) and who releases the chorus from their travail (i.e. allows the Hyades to set after their night’s work). Hagesiumora is the Moon, whose overshadowing brightness the setting Hyades escape with the coming of dawn. Aenesimbrota is the Night to whose house astral figures retire. The horse imagery is read as referring to color and brightness rather than speed, and the named characters (lines 70–72) are individual Hyades. F. argues that this cosmic setting further supports the suggestion that the myth of Phaethon (whose father, the sun, attempted to guide him through the starry racecourse) is evident in the earlier lines.

Chapter 3 (“Ritual in Performance”) is primarily concerned with examining the self-referentiality of the performance. F. argues that the chorus plays a dual role as the dancing Hyades and as “ritual agent in a cultic setting” (e.g., as the former they cannot allocate praise or blame, lines 39–46, but as the latter they do, lines 2, 12). There is, thus, a contrast between ocular deixis and fictional deixis. The language points to a performance taking place before dawn; the chorus points out the night, the moon and the Pleiades, which the audience would likewise be viewing, but at the same time configures these astral phenomena “as objects and actions [e.g. dancing stars], which the spectators are asked to imagine” (p. 115). In playing the role of performers of rituals and characters in a drama, they embody the harmony of the heavens in their dramatic role and the harmony of the state in their choral role. F. also here suggests that there is a theme of lament running through the poem and asks us to rethink the traditional view that the combination of lament and paian is a new development in tragic lyric (p. 121).

In a postscript F. deals with the question of the festival at which this cosmic dance was performed. She carefully interrogates the limited evidence for the timing of the Spartan Karneia and argues that it can be placed at the turn of the season from autumn to winter (pp. 131–135). Then she returns to visual evidence and proposes that the so-called kalathiskos dance so frequently and widely portrayed in art represents the dance of the stars, the celebration of which is by no means confined to Sparta.

The above does not do justice to F.’s dense and scholarly (but always clear) argumentation in which no point of conjecture is presented without some corroborating evidence. Some points are less convincing on their own than others and will assuredly provoke debate, but her achievement in arriving at a coherent theory to account for many of the most problematic features of the poem is significant and will prove a new and important point of departure for further work on the poem. To the current reviewer it seems a much more satisfactory interpretation than those currently on offer.

After John Winkler’s magisterial study on the comic or at least highly ambiguous meaning of book 11 of the *Metamorphoses* (*Auctor and Actor. A Narratological Reading of Apuleius’s Golden Ass*, Berkeley/Los Angeles [1985]), Frangoulidis is one of the few authors to have argued for a serious reading of Lucius’ conversion to the cult of Isis in book 11 of the *Metamorphoses*. His method is intratextual, i.e. F. proposes close readings of passages and constructs a web of comparisons between them. The book contains an introduction, nine chapters, and an appendix. The first chapter compares Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* to the Greek *Onos* and convincingly suggests that all Apuleian additions to the Greek predecessor ultimately prepare the way for the serious message of book 11. Chapter two compares Socrates and Aristomenes, both victims of magic, to Lucius. The latter comes off better than the former in his encounter with magic because he only had contact with the apprentice-witch Photis. The ensuing comparison between the charlatan Diophanes and Asinius Marcellus demonstrates that magic is unreliable, whereas true religion is trustworthy. Chapter four provides a compelling comparison between Lucius and Thelyphron, which enhances the results of chapter two. The next chapter is dedicated to the tale of Cupid and Psyche as a mythic variant of the novel. In the following chapter (6) magic is equated with sex, war, and violence, and thus characterized as a negative force in the novel. Chapter seven explains why Apuleius preferred the ass figure to other narrative possibilities (unbridled sexual appetite, mobile beast of burden, stupidity, stubbornness, fable motifs, animal of Seth-Typhon, hated by Isis). Chapter eight pulls the strings together. The first ten books of the *Golden Ass* are interpreted as preparations for the Isis book. The dichotomies F. unfolds are persuasive: Lucius’ encounter with religion (Isis) is in stark contrast to his dabbling with magic. The final festival of Isis mirrors the festival of Laughter. The respective initiations into the Isiac rites and the ‘initiation’ into magic are juxtaposed. Lucius’ final journey to Rome where he wins fame and glory is in many ways the opposite of his previous wandering in books 1–10. F. concludes the book with a discussion of how Apuleius played with the genre of the Greek ideal romance. An appendix reinterprets the embarking of Isis’ ship during the Ploiaphesia festival as a metaphor for Lucius’ entrance into a new life. F.’s competent overviews of previous research at the beginning of each chapter are very useful.

F.’s intratextual approach, however, causes problems. The book is devoid of any contemporaneous background so that Apuleius’ work and the magic therein stand in odd isolation. Strangely enough, F. never refers to Apuleius’ speech in his self-defense against the charges of magic, which could have corroborated his theses. Self-imposed restraint to the text also makes F. overlook (e.g.) the fact that Asinius Marcellus was a historically attested
member of the upper classes (CIL XIV 4447), a circumstance that could have strengthened his argument (198).

More importantly, F. never ventures to define how he understands and employs the term “magic” in the context of his book. Modern scholars of religion have become reluctant to draw a clear-cut line between magic and religion. While this clear divide might work from an orthodox Christian standpoint, it was certainly alien to Apuleius. And because things were in a state of flux in antiquity, Plato, as much as he criticizes charlatans (66), still bases his worldview partly on magical assumptions, as shown by D. Collins and others. Hence, the stark contrast that F. constructs between base and harmful magic on the one hand and superior and benign religion on the other becomes too apodictic. Better are the passages in which F. speaks about the positive/benevolent magic of Isis (e.g. 168, 171, 179). This heightened awareness of the intricacies of the divide between magic and religion which F. occasionally shows does not prevent him, however, from suggesting a very positive reading of Lucius’ initiation into the cult of Isis and his subsequent life as a celibate pastophor. The question arises of whether Lucius has really learned something and has changed, as suggested time and again by F. (e.g. 43, 124, 125). I still have my doubts that this is a Bildungsroman. Does Lucius perhaps run away from the amphitheater not because he wants to renounce sex forever, but because he does not want to copulate in public and fears being torn apart by ferocious animals after the sex act? How positive can the conversion experience be if even Lucius, whose perspective F. consistently employs, doubts the necessity of the triple initiation (Met. 11.26.4–27.1; 11.29.1–3) and complains about the high costs involved (Met. 11.28.1–4)? And how free is Lucius as an initiate (cf. 187) if he is not allowed to have family and must work to pay for his multiple initiations?

In addition, one wonders if everything can be compared to everything else with the consequence that some similarities seem far-fetched (e.g. Apollo’s oracle as compared to Demeas’ letter: 110–111; the wind that carries Psyche is compared to the tavern keeper in Hypata: 111). Overinterpretations are at times the result. On 144, e.g., I fail to see how Lucius’ involvement with Photis is violent. Moreover, many comparisons are obvious and do not take us beyond what we already know. This is not to say, however, that the comparative method does not at times yield good results: F. sometimes succeeds in making valuable observations (e.g. 27, 87, 98, 175, 179, 183, 184, 192, 196, 200, 209, 214, 215).

A more general problem is F.’s tendency to indulge in plot rehearsals. While this is necessary the first time a passage is interpreted, many repetitions could have been avoided (e.g. 30; on 168 the same half sentence appears twice within one paragraph). I conclude with some minor quibbles. On 80 on chance, a brief discussion of the concept of tyche would have been appropriate. On 169–171 in his discussion of Lucius’ asinine form, F. could have mentioned that Jesus was represented on a mock-crucifix as an ass-headed person.

The strength of this book does not lie in its new findings or bold claims, but in its astute intratextual observations which are more or less plausible.
The book is a welcome addition to Apuleian studies and will be much appreciated by those scholars who, pace Winkler, have opted for a serious reading of the *Golden Ass*.

WERNER RIESS
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill


Goff’s attractively produced interpretation of Euripides’ troubling play provides a basic overview of the work’s political context in fifth-century Athens, its characters, and the most important attempts to re-fashion it in the late twentieth century. As part of the Duckworth Companions to Greek and Roman Tragedy series it is intended to guide students in engaging with basic problems posed by the text. The book breaks no new scholarly ground—as it should not—and it is wisely unencumbered by superfluous references, but in a clear, accessible text it sets forth some of the fundamental background issues needed to grasp Euripides’s difficult work.

The overall tripartite structure of the book is clear. Goff (G.) first describes her basic views of the play, disagreeing with those who see the play as a long and static lament, or as a passive anti-war cry that is devoid of plot development, tragic flaws and heroes. Goff maintains that Euripides has written a play with resounding self-conscious energy and a dynamic structure, which creates new images of itself as it has been performed over time. Its popularity over centuries is the main evidence for this dynamism; evidence within the play will for the moment have to wait, as G. turns to issues of context in the fifth-century performance.

The primary issues of context here are Athens as a mature democracy, and its war with Sparta. The first question is whether the play is an anti-war statement, and to this the answer is rightly no. It is one example of the discourse over the fate of doomed cities, a “thinkable element of public policy in fifth-century Athens” (19) that is contextualized in the highly stylized, non-naturalistic forms of “mature” tragedy. G. suggests a reconstruction of the trilogy to which it might have belonged, which would have situated the lament in a broader scope of action. But it is the massacre of Melos in 416 that is most enticing to us as a point of reference. G. challenges the comparison, and the anti-war implications that follow from it, noting that Hekabe’s responsibility for the war blurs the notions of guilt and innocence, while Kassandra dreams of vengeance, and Hekabe imagines what Astyanax might have been as lord of Asia. In the end, G. writes, the Melos interpretation is “compelling but questionable,” given the complicity of the victims in the war, and the pity for the victors over their own eventual fate.

In the second part G. analyzes the play itself. Her promise at the outset (16) was to reveal the power of the play “by a continuous close reading rather than a thematic analysis, countering the charge of static immobility with an emphasis on the pace and dynamism of the play as it unfolds.” Thus it was somewhat disappointing to see that the analysis is not a continuous close
reading, but rather a discussion of the characters (including the gods and the chorus) and their implications, and not on the play as it unfolds. G. force-fully counters the charges of static immobility—the play’s emotional power is beyond doubt—but the promised structure of the analysis is not fulfilled. This is revealing, because it is true that there is little to no plot development in the play, and the character analysis is appropriate to such an experimental, unorthodox work. But a few words of explanation for this would have been welcome.

The gods—the first of the characters discussed—begin in a special way, with a second god, Athena, interjecting herself into Poseidon’s prologue, and demonstrating the inequalities of power between men and gods, as well as the awful fate that awaits the Greeks. The discussion becomes precisely the thematic analysis that was disavowed up front. The same follows for the other characters. Hekabe’s job, for instance, is to engage with the other characters, to give emotional expression to the fall of Troy, to punctuate the action with the rise and fall of her body, and to occupy the center discursively. Similarly brief discussions follow for the chorus, Talthybios, Kassandra, Andromache, Helen, and Astyanax. With the last, whose body is brought in on a shield, G. illustrates the emotional power of the play through two objects that will outlast the young boy: his imaginary epitaph, and the shield, which serves not only as memory of his death, but also of the missing Hektor.

The final third of this companion considers ten major theatre and film versions of the play, as performed in the second half of the 20th century. These works are all conditioned, G. reminds us, by the ever-widening capacity for war, as well as the willingness to target civilians. These receptions began in the early part of the century, after critics of the previous century had condemned the play as incompetent. They were often used to illustrate specific political causes. Gilbert Murray’s translation, for instance, was closely associated with protests against the Boer War, and the sufferings of the play were aligned with those of the victims of the Great War. Sartre’s Les Troyennes buttressed his own anti-colonial agenda, and his addition of a deus ex machina not only particularized the play to his own pet conflict, but also collapsed the colonial wars into a condemnation of all wars. Such interactions between the universal and the particular appear repeatedly in the various 20th-century receptions of the play. Brendan Kennelly’s The Trojan Women, for instance, may be read as a commentary on Irish conditions, or on oppression more broadly conceived, or perhaps as anti-male rather than anti-war.

G. has provided a useful guide to the play, its performance contexts, and its 20th-century productions. A guide to recommended reading, and a seven-page bibliography add to its value for students. Teachers should find it helpful, although the price will make it unfortunately difficult to use as a required text. It should find a rightful place as a recommended text in a library setting.

John Lewis
Duke University
Histories of ancient Israel have long been written in a predicable way. The central narrative of the Hebrew Bible (Old Testament)—stripped of all supernatural (thus, historically suspect) elements—is employed as the primary historical data. Thus, one finds a heavy concentration on political and military history, often with brief discussions of cultural issues (e.g., religion). When social history is undertaken, the interest is primarily in the most famous residents of ancient Israel—the Israelites. This approach has undergone significant refinement over the years, most prominently with regard to (1) a fuller integration of the wealth of available archaeological data; (2) a more suspect approach to the historicity of portions of the biblical narrative. Notwithstanding these significant advances, such works remain histories of ancient biblical Israel.

This book is the most ambitious attempt to write a history of ancient Israel that does not take the biblical narrative as its starting point. The major goal of this work is to offer a history of the region of ancient Israel from the ground up—to narrate the story of the land and its peoples from the Chalcolithic period through the Iron Age as guided by archaeological evidence and ancient (i.e., contemporaneous) literary sources. This goal is already apparent in the title. This work is not a history of Israel alone. Rather, the inclusion of “Canaan” in the title is a recognition that the region that the Israelites would later inhabit had already been home to the vibrant civilization of the Canaanites (notwithstanding their universal denigration in the Hebrew Bible).

The book is divided into three sections. The introduction (Part I) is a general overview of the cultural history of the southern Levant (the term commonly employed rather than Israel, Canaan, or Palestine) followed by a “summary of resources” (lists of the most relevant scholarly journals and publishers; major museum and library collections; and museum and university research programs). The overview is of limited help since most readers have not been introduced to many of the key issues and terminology. Similarly, the value of the list of resources is not clear and likely would be better placed at the end of the volume. Accordingly, the book lacks a true introduction outlining the major goals of the volume and its methods.

The nine chapters in Part II—“Canaanite and Israelite Civilization”—are the heart of the book. Chapter 2 is a general overview of the ecology of the region that draws upon both ancient sources and modern evidence. Chapter 3 (“historical and chronological setting”) presents the basic historical chronology for the southern Levant (and ancient Near East) and introduces the primary sets of data available to historians. The core of this chapter is a lively survey of the long history of archaeological exploration in the region. In particular, Golden unpacks many of the ideological assumptions of his cast of characters, thereby shedding light on the longstanding intersection of biblical studies and archaeology. There is also a too brief discussion of the historical difficulties involved in the biblical text. In the chapters that follow, Golden treats various aspects related to the cultural history of ancient Canaan and Is-
rael: (ch. 4) origins, growth, and decline of Levantine cultures; (ch. 5) economics; (ch. 6) social organization; (ch. 7) politics; (ch. 8) religion and ideology; (ch. 9) material culture; (ch. 10) intellectual accomplishments. Each chapter is divided into chronological sections on the topic in the Chalcolithic, Bronze, and Iron Ages (the latter two further divided into sub-periods). This broad chronological setting opens up the narrative to include treatments not just of the Israelites, but also the Canaanites and Philistines. Throughout, Golden turns first to the archaeological evidence and then presents literary evidence (biblical and non-biblical) where it is deemed relevant. Golden does a commendable job sifting through the evidence in order to offer this balanced presentation of the civilizations of the Canaanites, Israelites, and Philistines.

Part III (“Current Assessments”) consists of one chapter on “major controversies and future directions.” Here, Golden treats a few issues from the Chalcolithic Period and Bronze Age, but spends most of the time on the Iron Age and the historicity of several aspects of the biblical narrative (e.g., the conquest of Canaan, the figure of David). In addition to an extensive subject index, the book closes with two very useful tools: a thorough glossary and an annotated bibliography.

In many ways, the disengagement with biblical studies hinders the volume. Golden never really systematically explores the central questions relating to the historical reliability of the Hebrew Bible. Rather, he relies upon general assessments—e.g., that the biblical description of the Divided Monarchy is generally deemed more reliable (pp. 68, 161, 270-75)—or often remarks that some specific issue is a matter of great controversy among scholars. For the former, he doesn’t draw out the implications of how this evidence can therefore be employed responsibly; for the latter, non-specialists in biblical studies remain in the dark. The attempt to engage some of these issues in the final chapter is all too brief and ultimately is of little value since its limited results are only episodically integrated into the main portions of the book. At times, Golden himself seems to slip into old habits; for example, when he takes for granted the historicity of many events from the United Monarchy of Saul, David, and Solomon (e.g., pp. 66-68, 168, 194), with too little methodological discussion of the merits of such claims (a major issue among both archaeologists and biblical scholars that receives only a cursory treatment at the very end of the book—pp. 170-175).

This book is an impressive accomplishment and certainly fills a longstanding desideratum of many archaeologists, historians, and even a few biblical scholars. Notwithstanding the stated reservations, the merits of this book are many and it represents an important resource for students and scholars interested in ancient Israel and Canaan and the ancient Near East more generally.

Alex P. Jassen
University of Minnesota

In the last several years, Mark Golden (G.) has made a number of significant contributions to the study of ancient Greek athletics. Most important has been his 1998 *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece*, in which he postulated that sport provided a “discourse of difference” that served to create and reinforce divisions among various key groups in society (e.g., wealthy participants vs. poor, men vs. boys, male vs. female, Hellene vs. barbarian). Though the phrase, discourse of difference, is not mentioned in his latest book, *Greek Sport and Social Status*, the theory still informs much of G.’s take on Greek athletics. This book derives from his Fordyce W. Mitchell Memorial Lectures delivered at the University of Missouri at Columbia (in 2000) and retains much of the lively wit of the original lectures. The book is accessible to the average reader, especially because G. is so adept at providing modern analogies and parallels: we can see a wonderful teacher alongside the scholar. Despite that fact that the lectures were written and delivered nearly a decade ago, the research and bibliography are extensive and up-to-date. The book is a welcome addition to the growing library of work on ancient sport.

The discourse of difference is most evident in the first two chapters: “Helpers, Horses, and Heroes: Contests over Victory in Ancient Greece” and “Slaves in Ancient Greek Sport.” In the first, G. explores the attempts by elite male athletes to downplay or deny outright the claims of others who helped or participated in their victories, such as jockeys, and charioteers in equestrian events, and trainers and coaches in athletics. Victory especially (or exclusively) belongs to the elite. In this, G. understands Greek society more broadly than most scholars of ancient sport: where most limit their studies to the archaic and classical periods of Greek history, here he expands his investigation to the evidence-rich Hellenistic and Roman periods. For example, he discusses the newly published (2001) papyrus from the late third century BC, generally attributed to Posidippus, and finds that jockeys and charioteers still get no respect. It is curious that Roman appreciation of charioteers made little impact in the Greek world, as A. Cameron (*Circus Factions*, 207–210) observed. Tiberius and Germanicus, for example, may have won equestrian victories at Olympia without riding themselves just as Greek elites always had. But Nero soon showed up at Olympia and drove his own ten-horse chariot—with predictably disastrous results. He did, however, win the crown in spite of his great crash-up. The long period of Roman domination was certainly influential on Greek culture and eventually the (Roman style) circus, with it emphasis on the star charioteers and even horses, came to dominate the political culture of key eastern cities in the Byzantine period.

Chapter two examines another key social difference accentuated by sport: free vs. slave. A survey of the evidence for slave competitors turns up little to support the possibility that slaves in the Greek world could compete against free men. This is different from other slave-owning societies, such as the United States in the 19th century, which G. investigates for parallels. There we do find limited evidence for slaves competing in various sports. The Greek exclusion of slaves from competition marks the athlete as a free man and as a citizen of a polis. G. also tackles the difficult question of why athletes were whipped for breaking the rules, since such punishment was
properly servile. Building on the work of Crowther and Frass, he suggests that by taking his punishment in silence and not crying out (as a slave was expected to), the elite competitor could recover his status. He demonstrated that he deserved his free status.

In chapter three (“Greek Games and Gladiators”), G. explores the similarities between gladiators and athletes in the Greek world and concludes that there is good reason to include gladiatorial combats under the heading of “sport.” Certainly, it seems that the gladiators themselves wanted to be included, and it might be best to listen to them. We have a corpus of epitaphs, many quite lengthy, written by or for deceased gladiators in which they often make claims similar to those made by athletes. In the past, however, most scholars have refused to include gladiatorial combat in their discussions of ancient sports, usually on the grounds that the gladiators were slaves compelled to fight or homicidal maniacs who did it for the pleasure. But the gladiators’ claims invite us to reconsider our definition of sport, and this G. does with a survey of what other historians of sport have said. The question is crucial, since our concept of sport is so rooted in our own culture. In most cases, it appears that gladiatorial combats have been defined out of sport by scholars for their own reasons: gladiators were slaves (or if free had to swear a servile oath); gladiators fought because they were compelled to, not because the wanted to; gladiators (sometimes) killed their opponents; gladiators more properly belong to showy “spectacle” than to competitive “sport”; gladiators were Roman, athletes were Greek. G. brings the two sides together and does so not just by showing how Greek gladiators had assimilated athletic ideals, but also by showing how Greek athletes were not as pure and unbloodied as we have long thought.

The final chapter (“Olive-Tinted Spectacles: Myths in the Histories of the Ancient and Modern Olympics”) picks up the theme of questioning assumptions (“myths”) about sport, ancient and modern. G. highlights twelve differences between the ancient Olympics and what he calls the IOC Olympics. The “Olympic Truce” as it is being formulated by the Greek government and the IOC (to cease hostilities during the Olympic games) purports to be a renewal of an ancient truce. But as G. observes, this truce as it has come to be understood never existed. It is another example of the ancient games being appropriated for modern objectives. But we should be getting used to that by now.

Michael Carter
Brock University


This collection begins with the emergence of dialogue as a literary genre in classical Athens and ranges far afield from there, touching on many aspects of classical and late antique life and literature, yet all the while it circles somewhat uneasily around the question of Christianity’s role in sti-
fling, smothering, diverting or possibly re-energizing dialogue. While the essays, which derive from a 2006 colloquium at Cambridge, naturally differ in style, scope and overall impact, most are reliably interesting. Thus the book’s appeal does not depend on a coherent discussion of dialogue and its rumored end. This is fortunate, since, while the volume is successful in fleshing out dialogue’s broad cultural context, there are competing versions of this context and little agreement on how to assess its effects on “dialogue.” It would be a rare classicist, literary theorist, or cultural historian who did not discover both new approaches and new information in the course of an intensive skim. The book is more fun—and more useful—in its impressive diversity than in its rather strained unity.

The eleven essays, prefaced by Simon Goldhill’s introduction, are divided into five sections: the classical Greek dialogue, its Roman-era descendants, Augustine’s influence, other Christian contexts, and the effect of all of this on Jewish texts. Although some of these essays could easily have been trimmed, the volume is in general very well edited. Most chapters begin with a renewed struggle to define dialogue, which, while it can become tiresome, is often a necessary irritation given the sprawling nature of the topic. Much more welcome are the uniform conclusions: each chapter ends with a paragraph or two that generally help both to clarify the foregoing chapter and re-knit the book’s fabric.

Goldhill’s introduction lays out ambitious goals for the book, and is perhaps best treated as an unusually challenging example of those increasingly ubiquitous end matter “discussion guides” than as a traditional introduction. In other words, his hope that these studies of ancient dialogue will have implications for “modern thinking” (p. 1) relies more on reader response than on the generally careful and academically-targeted arguments of the contributors. But that’s the idea—Goldhill’s explicit hope is to provide a “foundation to explore [such] questions,” including doozies such as “[w]hat is it about the expression of conversation in the form of dialogue that makes it integral to democracy and difficult for early Christianity?” (8)

Goldhill also lays out three “frames” which have recurring relevance. One of these is the application of Bakhtin’s theories of dialogism, which are much deployed by Emily Greenwood in her chapter on dialogue in Thucydidides. Noting significant “interference” deriving from the different lexical and generic meanings of “dialogue,” Greenwood examines the ironies of the Melian dialogue as well as “the power of the dialogue form” itself (24), finding a multiplicity of views and possible meanings. Full appreciation of this essay may depend on a firm grasp of the intricacies of Bakhtin and of certain terms of art such as “interference,” which both opens the essay and serves as the last word, but is not clearly explained. Nevertheless, Greenwood amply demonstrates that Thucydidides both stands at the beginning of dialogue’s role as a “politico-literary compound form” and foreshadows the retreat of (literary) words from the arena of political power in Plato’s dialogues. Goldhill’s second “frame” is the political and social context of dialogue, particularly in its Athenian origins, and Andrew Ford provides an accessible and well-reasoned survey of the rhetorical struggle between the followers of Socrates and
the sophists. Alex Long’s contribution focuses on Plato, emphasizing his use of a number of different models of dialectic, each fitted to Socrates’ interlocutors in a particular dialogue. He suggests that Plato remained uncommitted, perhaps even preferring internal conversation to dialogue proper and warns that there is no “short cut from the history of genres to the history of ideas” (59). It could be added that the genre of the literary dialogue is so dominated by Plato that the history of genres—so promising a field when there is all epic or the many forms of the novel to be considered—is, in the case of dialogue, a bit of a dead end. Plato is first (more or less) and best, and his use of the form is so varied that in fixing his approach “we seem doomed to buying generality at the price of substance, or vice versa” (48).

Malcolm Schofield opens the book’s second section with a chapter that, despite his best efforts to rescue the reputation of Cicero’s dialogues, will be best appreciated by confirmed Ciceronians or those interested in the parsing of genres—an explanation of Cicero’s use of the “dialogue-treatise” form only made this non-specialist yearn for Plato. Jason König then introduces the third “frame” (which dominates the rest of the book), namely the influence of Christian religious authority, declared by Goldhill to be the “sea-change” that is “a crucial template for understanding why dialogue matters so much” (2). König narrows his sights, producing an engagingly loose discussion of Methodius, Athenaeus, and Macrobius. But strong conclusions on multiple authors can rarely be drawn in a short essay, and it takes some squinting to see the difference between “diluted interest in” earlier forms of dialogue and “engaging with those traditions intricately” (113). König’s style of argumentation makes notably heavy use of rhetorical questions, perhaps demonstrating the inevitable influence of the scholar’s subject on his prose.

The first of two chapters on Augustine is Gillian Clark’s apologetic look at his rejection of dialogue. The argument that Christianity “prompted newly challenging forms of dialogue” (120) is not very persuasive, given the evidence presented here that Augustine abandoned dialogue because shouting down his enemies was more effective. Clark’s treatment of Augustine is even-handed, yet intractable problems of interpretation are reflected in her special pleading that, given his episcopal responsibility to protect the souls of his flock, Augustine “needed to win” (126). Richard Miles produces a compelling exposé of Augustine’s brilliant transformation of epistolary argument from a sort of long-distance intra-Christian dialogue into a deadly tool of what we might call media domination. Augustine uses underhanded tactics and political power to silence his weaker opponents, but when seeking to out-influence such formidable competitors as Pelagius and Jerome, he writes a letter (to a Roman noblewoman, in a fascinating example explored here at length) that first boxes them out and then boxes them in, feeding his correspondent her initial “lines,” and thus, by essentially writing both “parts” of the dialogue, forcing the debate within the parameters of his own definitions of orthodoxy.

Richard Lim’s chapter places Christian dialogue in a broader cultural context, although the jargon-heavy exposition serves more to break down the definition of dialogue than to expand it. Kate Cooper and Matthew Del Santo attempt a similar widening of the way, bringing in Boethius and Gregory the
Great, but their writings seem to represent at best a repurposing of the remnants of the dialogic tradition and not the assumption-reversing “new impetus” that Cooper and Del Santo hope for (189).

The two final chapters add both diversity and interest. Seth Schwartz writes on the *Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira* and the Palestinian Talmud, examining the Jewish use of, and response to, the symposium. The discussion is placed firmly in a social historical context, and demonstrates how Jewish adaptation of symptic practice (sometimes rather eccentric—*Ben Sira* recommends keeping silent at a symposium) became a proving ground in the negotiation of the tension between social models based on group solidarity (the Jews, in theory and tradition) and on institutionalized reciprocity (which the symposium imports). Finally, Daniel Boyarin argues that the Babylonian Talmud “is best understood as part of the shockwaves running throughout the cultural area and... represents... the same move away from logic and rational thinking” that are evident in Christian apologetic and Byzantine documents (226). Rather than try to save dialogue, then, Boyarin extends the critique, finding fideism and apophasis where we had once been content to praise the rabbis of the Talmud for their rationalist dialectic. Nevertheless, he has the Talmudic tales to back this up, and thus the chapter achieves the rare feat of satisfying the reader while further muddying the waters. So, although there is much to be learned and even more to be argued over, the twin questions of dialogue’s nature and its end remain unanswered. Consequently, there is little here to boost that leap from antique academic expertise to modern interfaith and cross-cultural “dialogue” —the scare quotes must remain.

**Josh Levithan**

Kenyon College

---


May 2010

Hi Jon,

Got your *Pol. ‘n’ Pol.* to review for *CB* but sat on it for ages, *mea culpa*—you know how it is in our line of work, always something more urgent to attend to than reading books (‘Reading books! What are we paying you for?’ the fools’d say if they read this). Not to say I wasn’t looking forward to it—quite the opposite in fact, given your good name in Cicero circles and the mad rush of interest in Latin letters since the late 90s or so, but try as I might I just couldn’t free up the time. It didn’t disappoint and has got me thinking in new ways—what more can I say? When I finish the wretched review, I hope *CB*’ll push it through press quickly enough. Anyway, I thought I’d drop you this line to say sorry, it’s going to be a while yet.

It’s great to see a full book dedicated to the *Letters*, and something other than editions, commentaries, letters as sources for political history and so on—not to knock the unknockable Tyrrell or Shackleton-Bailey or even
Hutchinson’s more literary take, of course, monumental works of their kind, but yours is kind of different. The early-doors promise of dollops of the psychology of socio-linguistics seems pretty daunting when you think from the title you’re likely to get some trad. cultural history, but you make the sociology stuff sound utterly familiar and win me over. ‘Face’ is fundamental you say, whether it’s ‘losing’ or ‘saving’ or ‘threatening’ (one’s own or other people’s), through carefully managed and recognisable linguistic and rhetorical shiftiness. Your bibliography shows it’s clearly going on in other fields, so why not our own, and I bet it’s only a matter of time before people start ‘Halling’ Pliny and Fronto and Symmachus and so on, if they haven’t already. You don’t know what you’ve started (!) but it’ll be a tough act to follow; identifying linguistic markers of thanks, promises, joy, congratulations, goodwill (a big one that!), esteem, categorising each occurrence in its context, counting them and so on (Appendix One) but basing your chapters on them throughout (1, ‘Doing Aristocratic Business’; 2, ‘From Polite Fictions to Hypocrisy’; 3, ‘Redressive Politeness’; 4, ‘Politeness in Epistolary Conflict’; 5, ‘Politeness and Political Negotiation’). You ‘show your working’ this way and get your philology and sociology working together as best mates, but it can’t be as easy as you make it look—teasing out the live register of all this dead stuff is much of what we do, but you talk about it too.

If I get you right, ‘politeness of respect’ is what you use to keep the appropriate social distance between you and your addressee; your ‘affiliative politeness’ is what you say to them to narrow that distance, to get closer for whatever reason; and your ‘redressive politeness’ makes sure your addressee knows their ‘face’ is not under threat from you, despite the circs. You give these definitions early with helpful examples (3–29) and they then underlie the five chapters that follow. Cicero had lots of friends and opponents, of course, but lots of acquaintances who could be reckoned either at various times, and you show how he used different politeness strategies to try to get them where he wanted. Your closing chapter on letters after the Ides of March 44 BC shows as much as anything how tense it could all be, and I liked how your Pol. ‘n’ Pol. is out-alliterated by your ‘military muscle’ (190), although I doubt Cicero would have found it entertaining. He must have known the sword (even a small one) was mightier than a pen (even a polite one). Do you think he knew about his politeness categories and strategies (and refined them, practised them, sought to improve them, learned from them), or do you reckon the ‘choices’ and ‘discernment’ of your conclusion were more subconsciously acquired and exercised? Is such a fine gradation of politeness something you know without being taught? And assuming it’s perfectly possible for an apparently courteous formula to be so tired or ironic it lacks any force other than sinister contempt (?), how can we be sure it’s not happening on the lifeless page? Another thought: you say these strategies of courtesy probably endured for a while into the imperial period (194). I guess the proof of that might be in a future study, beyond the scope of Pol ‘n.’ Pol. and fair enough, but it highlights the socio-historical specificity of the whole enterprise. If anything is, politeness is acculturated; without a sense of how other cultures or periods did politeness, it’s difficult to get a sense of how in-
novative or idiosyncratic Cicero and his pen pals were, if at all. I’m sure your conc. undersells itself.

Well-produced, easy on the eye, but eighty-five US dollars is going to be beyond the pockets of most individual readers. All serious libraries should have a Hall, but can’t you get onto OUP to run a paperback edition? Undergrads should read this, not just the old pros.

Anyway, I need to dash—CB needs hard copy as well as e-copy and I haven’t even started it yet. Just wanted to let you know I’m on the case.

All the best,

ROGER REES
St. Andrews University


This study is a slightly revised version of the author’s dissertation, which was defended at the University of Helsinki in January 2008. Halla-Aho (hereafter H.) investigates the language of the non-literary letters from Vindolanda and Egypt (with some reference also to the North African texts outside of Egypt, and the poorly preserved letters from Vindonissa in modern Switzerland). As indicated in the title, the focus is on the syntax and pragmatics of the letters; in particular, opening and closing salutations; sentence connection; “syntactic incoherence”; and word order (all of which are further described below). Although the corpora under investigation are fairly small, and their texts often fragmentary, they are of exceptional value linguistically, in as much as they offer a unique portrait of Latin. H.’s book contains several interesting and insightful (though very cautious) discussions, but its success is ultimately limited by two problems. The first is that the arguments and claims of the book are not always clearly expressed; the second is that treatment of the issues is at times superficial. The work is comprised of seven chapters, which are followed by a short excursus on anaphoric pronouns; bibliography; an appendix detailing the corpus; and subject index. Below I sketch each of the chapters and offer brief evaluative remarks.

Chapter one, “Introduction,” begins with a description of the aims of the work, and is followed by a very helpful and informative description of the corpora of non-literary Latin letters; the relationship between the non-literary letters and Latin more broadly; and then a short section on scribal context. Chapter two, “Setting the Context: Variation and Change in Latin,” sets the stage for the rest of the study by discussing some of the broader issues that the non-literary letters raise, such as the notion of Vulgar Latin; language standardization; substandard written language; and the differences between written and spoken language. (On this last topic, one can add J. Miller and R. Weinert, *Spontaneous Spoken Language: Syntax and Discourse* [Oxford 1998], among many other works, to the list on p. 37 n. 50.) These two chapters do
a good job of introducing the corpora and giving a broad overview of the issues involved in studying these texts. It would, however, have been helpful to have a more detailed presentation of the theoretical framework. There is a short paragraph to this effect on p. 22, in which H. situates her work within S. Dik’s Functional Grammar, but there is no overall description of the pragmatic framework and concomitant assumptions (we are instead given this piecemeal as the book unfolds). An explicit summary of the claims to be made in the subsequent chapters, as well some description of how the individual chapters form a bigger picture, would also have been an improvement.

With chapter three, “Letter Phraseology,” we enter into the core of the work. Here H. investigates the formulas that are used to open and close letters, and concludes (p. 62) that variation in salutation is geographically conditioned (at Vindolanda, usage is generally sparse, while in Egypt it is far more extensive, and this because of Greek influence); by contrast, social status and rank appear not to have had much effect on salutation. Chapter four takes up the issue of sentence connection, and the question of the relationship between parataxis and spoken language. H. concludes (p. 88) that the use of *et* to connect sentences in narratives is a feature of the spoken language, as are its topic-changing and presentational functions. In investigating the alternation between *rogo mittas* and *rogo ut mittas*, she claims (p. 89) that the presence of *ut* is not conditioned by register (i.e., formality) or a written/oral divide: she suggests instead that the complexity of the construction (including the distance between the matrix and embedded verbs) is relevant. Chapter five, “Syntactic Incoherence in the Letters,” investigates a small handful of constructions that includes anacoluthon, contamination, and accusatives absolute. The meaning of the term “incoherence” is thus (unusually) broad here, and does not necessarily refer to constructions that cannot be parsed (be it semantically or morpho-syntactically). Indeed, the notion of “incoherence” is a complicated one, and it is dismaying that H.’s analyses at points veer off into psycholinguistic and cognitive territory without laying the necessary groundwork: e.g. p. 97, where H. tries to explain the form of a clause by claiming that its author “simply had too many things on his mind.” The advantage of examining the various constructions in this chapter together was not clear to me, and in my view it would have been more helpful to have integrated the section on “thematic constituents” (pp. 106–118) with the pragmatic discussion in the following chapter.

Chapter six, “Word Order,” takes up a central issue of classical scholarship: why do words show up in the order that they do, and how does the meaning (broadly construed) of a clause change if that sequence is altered? This issue is so important because it goes to the heart of our ability to read texts closely. After making some salutary remarks on the problem of using typological evidence to interpret Latin word order, H. investigates the relative ordering of verbs and objects in her corpus, and what role pragmatics plays therein. The discussion of information structure (pp. 139–153) is at times confusing, e.g. when H. uses the term *topic* to refer to two different categories, namely what she calls a “topic” and a “new topic”; in a similar vein, the terms “neutral focus” (p. 147) and “weak focus” (p. 153) are used
to refer to the same category, although neither is precisely defined. It would have been helpful if H. had made explicit exactly how she arrived at her pragmatic judgments of the sentences, as well as provided more context for the examples that she discusses (or even just included the preceding and following sentences in her quotations). The study of pragmatics and word order has witnessed significant strides over the past two decades; a good deal of this work is overlooked by H., e.g. that of Ellen Prince, Gregory Ward, Nomi Erteschik-Shir, and Devine and Stephens (their 2006 book is cited, but not discussed in any detail), as well as the recent Ph.D. dissertation of K.M. Hanna, *Basic Word Order in De Agricultura* (University of Auckland 2004). It is hard to know what to make of H.’s conclusion (pp. 153–154) that Latin word order “cannot be reduced either to syntactic or pragmatic factors.” Does this mean that a theory of Latin word order will need to make reference to both pragmatics and syntax? If so, then her analysis is ultimately aligned with those in the generative-syntax tradition. For one starts out with an assumed base configuration (the syntax part), which then gets reorganized, or “scrambled” (the pragmatics part). Or does it mean that reference to both components is necessary but not sufficient? If so, then what other explanatory mechanisms do we need to account for the observed patterns?

D.M. Goldstein

Thesaurus linguae Latinae


Extensively documented and subtly argued, Halliwell’s *Greek Laughter* examines the varied faces of laughter, ridicule, and mirth among ancient Greeks. Ranging the millennium between Homer’s laughing gods and stern “agelastic” church fathers, the book fills a tall order, in ten densely footnoted chapters and two appendices. A difficult work to summarize, therefore, but one might start by saying that in laughter H. pinpoints a locus of critical inquiry that runs the gamut of social settings and speech-act genres, from symposia to public religious cult, from comedy to philosophy, from unbridled literary satire to full-throated condemnation of all laughter by Christian moralists.

Chapter 1 lays a nuanced theoretical basis. H. insists that “comprehensive theories of laughter...are radically misconceived” (10), and rejects the three “canonical” theories of laughter—superiority, incongruity, and release—opting instead for indeterminacy, thick historical-cultural contextualization, and scrupulous attention to emic terms and understandings. A laugh is apparently never just a laugh: “An irreducible complexity...inheres in Greek attitudes to what takes place when human beings themselves engage in laughter” (16). Laughter is dialectical, between hidden affects and bodily signs, play and seriousness, laughers and laughed-at. The latter dimension points to the social micro-dynamics of shame and shaming, and perhaps most
provocative is the study’s many close readings of how derision serves ends of group aggressions and can be “a vehicle of victimisation” (33). (Rene Girard on the screening mechanisms of violence deserved citation here.) No surprise, then, that Greeks anxiously evaluated when, how, at whom, and what sort of laughter was appropriate, and so the work examines how attempts to control laughter map onto its roles in chastening society along lines of class, gender, status, and social prestige.

Homer’s gods laugh more than, but never at, his mortal heroes, whose grim lives are no laughing matter. They may share tender, tearful laughs (Hector and Andromache) or cackle with bloodlust (Odysseus about Dolon), but unlike the gods their laughter is never pure, “unquenchable” mirth—except for Penelope’s suitors, whose divine retribution takes this form and who, in a foreshadowing metaphor on their reaction to Odysseus’ pummeling Irus, “die with laughter.” Homeric scholars should find these dense fifty pages rich with insights.

Chapter 3 turns to sympotic mirth, examining its psychology and ethics. Drawing on passages in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes, the Odyssey, Theognis and others, it identifies laughter as a key ingredient in the symposiasts’ shared “dream of immortality,” a space-time set apart by its relative freedom to laugh and be laughed at, while remaining mindful that a “tough realism” (121) is required outside the symposium. H. also traces his themes here through Euripides’ Cyclops and Alcestis, and offers a close reading of the symposium’s “serio-ludic ideal” in the loaded exchanges between Socrates and the other party-goers in Xenophon’s Symposium.

The thorough examination of the thorny topic of “ritual laughter” in Chapter 4 will demand attention from all Greek religion specialists. It presents a full dossier of relevant cult contexts and extant texts, and then subjects each to extensive, often withering scrutiny. Because of the important cults involved—e.g., Eleusis, Thesmophoria, Dionysia—the prominence of women in them, and the complicating history of ritual theory, this chapter’s positions and conclusions will rouse more fresh debate than it lays to rest. Bakhtin’s theory of carnivalesque gets some play here, though suspicion of all explanatory theories of ritual runs high. (The claim that Greek ritual laughter “was rarely if ever at odds” with politico-religious authority [205] overstates an argument from silence.) A related question treated is whether Old Comedy constitutes ritual laughter: “the dull truth is that we can hardly decide,” because the evidence for the latter turns out to be so thin (214). Chapter 5 widens the focus to aischrologia, “shame(ful) speech,” and zeroes in on Old Comedy’s licit shamelessness as a test case for issues of parrhesia in democratic Athens, since its flagrantly irresponsible speech challenges all authority, even that of the demos. Here H. takes pains to show, first, that Plato does not really blame Aristophanes in the Apology, and second, how the Knights transmutes the smuttiest street-slang into sophisticated theatrical artifice.

How sophoi and philosophoi laugh and/or do not laugh is analyzed in Chapters 6 and 7, treating, respectively, “the ethics of ridicule” and existential absurdity. Archaic anxieties about laughter, including Pythagorean antipathies toward it, lead into lengthy discussions of Socratic irony, Stoic
“compromises” on laughter, and Aristotle’s acceptance of it, with his virtuous eutrapelia (“wittiness”) as a mean between the buffoon and the boor at EN 4.8, and his biology of human laughter in Parts of Animals. Modern expressions of nihilistic absurdity help open the question of how Greeks might “laugh at life”; Chapter 7 then unpacks the traditions about laughing Democritus and weeping Heraclitus, and the notorious mockeries of the Cynics, aimed at life and death.

Chapter 8 directs its gaze at Menander and his notoriously unfunny New Comedy, reading the (fragmentary) plays for their “complex…fluctuation in the level and tone of comedy” (400), where laughter and tears, the ludicrous and serious, play back and forth, craftily manipulating audience response. Chapter 9 homes in on Lucian and his philosophic tomfoolery, tracing specifically the theme of existential laughter of life and death in several of the satirist’s kaleidoscopic texts.

Chapter 10 concludes with the New Testament—the mocking of Christ—and early church fathers, Clement, Basil, and John Chrysostom, drawing intriguing parallels between their stern rejections of laughter on moral grounds and earlier ethical treatments of laughter (especially Plato), and highlighting the emphatic rejection of bodily pleasures that tended to underwrite early Christian attempts to banish laughter from human life.

The appendices add notes on (1) the language of laughter and (2) “gelastic faces” in visual art, including the archaic smile, gorgons, masks, satyrs, and portraits. Overall, Greek Laughter is both a big book and a magnum opus, a richly varied banquet where specialist scholars from many fields will find noteworthy insights and challenges to other current opinions and interpretations.

Matthew Fox
Rutgers University


Although Galen’s is the largest surviving oeuvre of any ancient author (xv), Hankinson plausibly asserts that compared with Plato, Aristotle, Ptolemy, and Archimedes, “Galen is nowadays by far the least well known, even among the generally educated” (xvii). So this most recent Cambridge Companion—the seventy-eighth in the series—aims to remedy this relative neglect with fourteen essays on this most prolific physician, scientist, philosopher, and scholar.

Hankinson sketches “The man and his work” in Chapter One. We learn inter alia of Galen’s origins in Pergamum, his poor opinion of women, his low opinion of sexual activity, his surgical stint at a gladiatorial school, his meteoric professional and social rise at Rome, his considerable skills at rhetoric, persuasion, and self-aggrandizement, his emphasis on virtue, and his lack of physical courage. Hankinson believes Galen saw himself “as a man on a
heroic mission to rescue medicine, and science in general, from their degenerate decrepitude” (24).

Next, G. E. R. Lloyd offers an overview of “Galen and his contemporaries”. The brief second chapter adds little to the first, repeats a number of its points, and is somewhat internally redundant. Lloyd’s thesis seems to be that rivalry and polemic characterized Galen and his medical colleagues. Moreover, Galen believed that the best doctor is also a philosopher because the doctor needs logic to reason well, he needs physics to understand the fundamental nature of physical objects, and he needs ethics to know virtue and to be good.

In the third chapter, Teun Tieleman outlines Galen’s methodology, arguing that he “implemented his version of the rational method by drawing on the philosophical tradition” (50). Tieleman judges Galen to have been a remarkable and often original intellectual in the second century CE because of this interplay between philosophical concepts and medical problems.

Ben Morison authors two chapters. In one (4, “Logic”), he contends that Galen’s insistence that logic is to be studied only insofar as it facilitates constructing demonstrations of medical truths leads him to criticize the approaches of other ancient logicians. In the other (5, “Language”), he argues that a coherent view concerning the correctness of language can be found in Galen’s works on that subject. Galen believes that while etymology reveals nothing about the nature of the world, terminological abuse undermines successful communication.

In the chapter on epistemology (6), Hankinson sees Galen as neither a skeptic nor an epistemological optimist. Galen thinks the limits of human knowledge allow the diligent doctor to learn all he needs to know.

In Chapter Seven (“Psychology”), Hankinson translates Pierluigi Donini’s Italian into English, preserving its periphrastic, long-winded, somewhat overblown style. Donini reports that Galen repeatedly declares that he has no knowledge of the nature (phusis) or essence (ousia) of the soul, yet claims to know that it is tripartite and that each part is seated in a particular bodily organ.

In Chapter Eight Hankinson surveys Galen’s philosophy of nature, providing a neat summary of Galen’s thoughts on elements, qualities, bodies, temperaments, imbalances, the humors, the ‘natural faculties,’ causes and teleology, causation and necessity, and divine providence. Hankinson explains that “Galen’s natural philosophy, like his philosophical psychology, is framed with the needs of the medical practitioner in mind” (211).

In a pleasantly lucid chapter (9), Julius Rocca suggests that for Galen, use of anatomy both defined the true worth of a practicing physician and disclosed his investigations into the nature of the living organism. With Galen, anatomical science in antiquity reached its apogee, and he remained the authority for centuries.

In the chapter on physiology (10), the translation from Armelle Debru’s French by Hankinson is rather rough in spots. Vivisection Galen saw as vital for discovering animal functions. But given the scattered texts on physiological functions and their frequently polemical contexts, Debru finds Galen’s
physiology to be slippery. Nonetheless, insights are offered on Galen’s accounts of digestion, respiration, and embryology.

Philip J. van der Eijk provides a clear and tidy overview of Galen’s theory of therapeutics (chapter 11)—a complicated subject, to be sure. Van der Eijk notes that therapeia means ‘care’ as much as ‘cure’, and so concerned both sick and healthy bodies and minds (298). He finds that in its systematicity, comprehensiveness, conceptual sophistication, adaptability to individual circumstances, and its ability to conjoin theory and practice, Galen’s therapeutics is both medically and philosophically impressive (300).

In chapter 12, Sabine Vogt explains how Galen advanced the ancients’ ‘drug-lore’ by constructing one of the first true ‘pharmacologies,’ that is, a systematized classification of 440 different plants and 250 other substances consumed as remedies, including how they are obtained, stored, used, and applied. ‘Qualified experience,’ as Galen terms it, proves to be a better guide than pure theory for the physician prescribing drugs.

In a learned chapter (13) written in a tiresomely halting style Rebecca Flemming argues that in Galen’s milieu, textual commentary “played a key role in the development of ideas and understanding, in their articulation and elaboration, and in their transmission and dispersal” (347). She locates Galen within existing, vibrant medical and philosophical commentary traditions while stressing that he re-figured and extended exegetical patterns by emphasizing logical demonstrations in his commentaries. Though he can be fairly faulted for relentless self-promotion and other shortcomings as an exegete, Flemming admires Galen’s drive to systematize everything, despite the fact that this drive is undermined by his efforts to display his erudition as well as enact his methodological rigor.

The final chapter (14) is terrific. Vivian Nutton explores “The fortunes of Galen” by sketching the geographical spread and types of influence of Galenism; key figures in its survival; the editions of Galen published; and the history of Galen and his corpus through the centuries down to the present day. To offer just one sample of Galen’s importance: a woodcut accompanying a 1516 medico-philosophical treatise depicts Galen with, but more prominently than, Hippocrates, Plato, and Aristotle. “A guide to the editions and abbreviations of the Galenic corpus,” a handy table of English titles and modern translations of Galen’s works, an extensive bibliography, and a good index complete the volume. If you love Galen, you’ll want this book.

Scholarly works on the life and reign of Alexander the Great abound. Yet, this volume of essays by some of the leading scholars in the field is a useful addition to any library because of its incorporation of “a wide range of scholars” (1) and its “new approach” to some of the subject matter, hence the subtitle “A New History.” Heckel and Tritle have put together a useful handbook of sorts that covers nearly every aspect of Alexander’s reign spanning from the ancient Macedonian background to modern interpretations of the king’s reign.

The first three chapters of the work are insightful historical summaries of the Macedonians before Alexander (pp. 7–25), Alexander’s conquest of Asia (pp. 26–52), and the period immediately after Alexander’s death (pp. 53–68). These broad overviews give the reader the timeline of these periods and prepare the reader for the more detailed discussions that follow.

In Chapter 4, Heckel treats the relationship between the king and his army (pp. 69–82) and discusses the nature of Alexander’s leadership. He suggests that Alexander had an uncanny ability to understand his men and keep their loyalty. Gregor Weber, in Chapter 5 (pp. 83–98), treats Alexander’s court, which was a mix of inherited Macedonian customs and Persian customs. Granted, for the majority of his reign Alexander’s court was a mobile military camp, but it still provided the king with the “organizational framework for the exercise of power” (90).

In the next thematic section, Elisabetta Poddighe and Lawrence Tritle both discuss Alexander and his relationship with the Greeks. Poddighe focuses her discussion on the Corinthian League and Alexander’s manipulation of the idea of “Greek Freedom” (pp. 99–120). Her approach stems from close examination of the sources, focusing in particular on the inscriptive evidence. Tritle attempts to ascertain why some Greeks supported Alexander while others did not, concluding that many Greeks saw Alexander as a way to prosperity and as the harbinger of a new age (pp. 121–140).

The most innovative inclusion in the volume is the section on Alexander and Achaemenid Persia by Pierre Briant that begins with the historiographical problems associated with studying the Persian Empire (pp. 141–170). He also discusses the Persian administration of the empire as well as the transition from Achaemenid rule to Macedonian. His second essay (“Alexander and the Persian Empire, between ‘Decline’ and ‘Renovation’,” pp. 171–188) argues against the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century view that the Achaemenid Empire was in decline and that Alexander’s conquest ushered in a period of “economic regeneration” (172). This view was a product of the anti-Persian bias in Greek authors who insisted on viewing the Persians as decadent and weak at the same time.

The fourth section of the volume focuses on Alexander as a man and begins with Elizabeth Carney’s treatment of the relationship between Alexander and his mother, Olympias (pp. 189–202). Carney effectively follows the evidence for Olympias to show her as not only a strong woman in her own right but as a woman devoted to her children. Daniel Ogden follows Carney’s treatment with a discussion of Alexander’s sex life which has been a hot button issue and a frequent topic of conversation on the internet (pp.
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203–217). He traces the historiography of the subject in modern authors such as Tarn and Dover before discussing the issue as it is expressed in the ancient literary tradition. A large portion of the essay pertains to Curtius’s depiction of Alexander’s relationship with the eunuch Bagoas, but he does deal with others, particularly the women Barsine, Roxane, Stateira, and Parysatis, and the king’s closest friend Hephaestion. He concludes that “a continent, strictly heterosexual and non-“promiscuous” Alexander is ultimately harder to understand and explain in historical context than the opposite” (217). Boris Dreyer’s treatment of the cults for Alexander (and those closest to him) and the issue of his supposed divinity end this section (pp. 218–234). He discusses briefly the major events that have contributed to the belief that Alexander wanted to be a god (the visit to the oracle at Siwah, proskynesis, and the king’s relationship with Dionysus) before tracing the establishment of various cults to Alexander. Most of these cults can be traced to shortly before the king’s death or thereafter.

The volume concludes with a section about the reception of Alexander in ancient and modern times. Alexander Meeus talks about the king’s image under the Successors and concludes that it is here that his image began the transformation that would lead to his legendary status in later generations (pp. 235–250). In her essay, Diana Spencer discusses the Roman view of the Macedonian king (pp. 251–274), which is a much-condensed version of her 2002 book The Roman Alexander: Reading a Cultural Myth (Exeter). She suggests that Alexander “is implicitly and explicitly embedded” in the Roman cultural fabric to such a degree that he becomes almost central to Roman epistemology and identity (272). Also included in this section is a discussion of the portraiture of Alexander by Catie Mihalopoulos (pp. 275–293) who suggests that “the artistic development that occurred during and after Alexander shaped a new ideal in the material culture of the Greek mainland and the Mediterranean world” (293). Finally, Elizabeth Baynham’s “Power, Passion, and Patrons: Alexander, Charles LeBrun, and Oliver Stone” (pp. 294–310) is a discussion of how Alexander has been “perceived in western culture” (294). Her particular focus is on Charles LeBrun’s series of Alexander paintings produced some time between 1660 and 1668–1673 in France and on Oliver Stone’s 2004 Alexander film. She points out the similarities between the two (e.g., their heroic portrayal of the king) as well as their manipulation of the ancient historical tradition.

The volume as a whole contains a thorough timeline, a map, images, and an index that would be useful for a survey course. Of more use to scholars, however, are the copious source citations and the extensive 38-page bibliography. Overall, it is a cleverly concise approach to the study of Alexander, useful for undergraduates and professional scholars alike.

Dawn L. Gilley
Northwest Missouri State University

In the annals of Propertian scholarship the first decade of the twenty-first century will be a truly memorable one for its voluminous and industrious productivity, which includes a monumental commentary on book two (Fedeli 2005), a similarly monumental textual commentary on the whole corpus by the editor of the present work (Cynthia 2007), a massive interpretive study of the poet (Cairns 2006), and, most notably, the publication of three major critical editions (Giardina 2005, Viarre 2005, Heyworth 2007), which differ widely in their reconstructions, based on the manuscript evidence, of what Propertius wrote. (I have not seen Propercio, Elegías edited by F. Moya del Baño and A. Ruiz De Elvira 2001.) In fact, these editions, in their cumulative impact, have hammered so many nails into the coffin lid of hopes for a new vulgate text of the poems acceptable to the majority of readers that those hopes may stay buried for a very long time to come. And that’s a good thing. Not since the closing decades of the nineteenth century when Baehrens 1880, Palmer 1880, and Postgate 1894 published their editions have readers of the poems been challenged so forcefully to confront the manifold disquieting uncertainties of what is commonly referred to as the text of Propertius. The poet’s reputation is secure; the text of his elegies, readers of this edition will conclude, is still very much a work in progress.

S. J. Heyworth’s edition of Propertius and its mate, Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius (2007), not under review here, begin a new chapter in the history of the transmission of the poems. Although technically not an editio princeps, since its publication comes over five hundred and thirty years after the elegies first appeared in print, this edition, nonetheless, delivers a new Propertius in a new package that gives one the sense that a revolutionary change has taken place. This is the third edition to appear in the OCT series, preceded by those of J. S. Phillimore (1901, 1907) and E. A. Barber (1953, 1960). It differs from its predecessors in every way, from the standard features of the OCT volumes to the treatment of the text: the collection is titled elegi rather than carmina; the apparatus criticus, which serves up very generous portions of manuscript readings and conjectures, is by no means a breuis adnotatio, the series’ traditional phrase for what is printed at the foot of the page; the editor’s activity is described as edidit, rather than the usual recognuit, presumably to prepare the reader for the complete textual overhaul that lies within; and the long and detailed preface (pp. vii–lxv) is written in English, continuing the new tradition inaugurated for Latin texts in the series by Green’s edition of Ausonius (1999). Even in the presentation of the text there are noteworthy differences from the standard format of Latin texts in OCTs: poem numbers are given in the right hand margin opposite the first line; this, coupled with the use of a modified version of the astericus as a coro nis (x within a circle) to indicate the end of a poem, makes it immediately clear, without any break in visual continuity, when the editor has altered the division of elegies; for example, 1.5.1–2 added to the end of 4, or elegies 2.31 and 2.32 combined into one poem. The coronis has an important function, especially in Book 2, as a result of two editorial procedures: first, verses judged to be spurious are deleted from their contexts and are printed in brackets after the ends of their respective poems (here the coronis sets up a clear boundary...
between the genuine and the spurious); second, when the editor identifies fragments of poems, signaled by three dots at the beginning of the first line (p. lxiii), a *coronis* printed at the end of a fragment represents the editor’s judgment that whatever else may be missing in the fragmentary poem, it does have an ending. To give an example, in Barber’s edition 2.18 is divided into three poems: 18 A (1–4), 18 B (5–22), which begins with a lacuna, and 18 C (23–38). Heyworth presents 2.18 as a series of six fragments: fragment 1, 18.1–4; fragment 2, 18.5–20, which preserves the poem’s ending, as indicated by the *coronis* at line 20; fragment 3, 18.21–22; fragment 4, 18.23–26–<31–32>–27–30–<***>–35–36; fragment 5, 18.33–34; and fragment 6, 18.37–38. It is clear that 18.5–20 is to be regarded as the remnant of a once complete poem. The status, however, of the other fragments in this group, all introduced with three dots and lacking a *coronis*, is problematic: they could be lines dislocated from different poems elsewhere in the collection; they could be fragments belonging to the same poem, though that seems an unlikely possibility; or they could be the only extant lines of lost poems. Whatever the case may be, the editor’s use of the adjective *alienus* in the *apparatus* to indicate that these fragments are out of place does not answer to the difficulties that arise when one inquires into the possible origins of the fragments and seeks plausible explanations for how these fragments came to be combined into the single elegy labelled 2.18; *alienus* begs the question of what lines, in a series of six fragments, have a claim to being in their rightful place.

The *praefatio*, which is built on the foundations laid by Butrica’s *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius* (1984) and the editor’s own investigation of the tradition in his Cambridge thesis (1986), gives a full and detailed account of the transmission. The most important conclusion about the value of the manuscripts is that in addition to the primary manuscripts N and A, there is a third independent stream of transmission, labeled L, which is to be identified with the lost manuscript of Propertius sent by Poggio Bracciolini to Niccolo Niccoli and which, according to Heyworth and Butrica, became the parent of the 15th century Italian tradition (pp. xxviii–xlix). The chief difficulty in this reconstruction of the manuscript transmission is that an examination of the readings attributed to L or its descendants strongly suggests that the symbol L represents not a manuscript but rather collective editorial activity to emend the text of Propertius, using the evidence provided by the N and A traditions. At 4.10.18 where N and P (Petrarch’s lost copy of A) have a *porco*, corrected by Jacob to a *parco*, L gives itself away, in my judgment, as an emended text by substituting a seemingly less peculiar, but still nonsensical, reading, *aprico*. One example of L’s independence that the editor finds especially probative is the reading *plaustra Bootes* (3.5.35), or something close to it, given by representatives of L; here N has *flamma boon* and P *flamma plaustra* (pp. l–li). The reading *plaustra Bootes* strikes me as an outstanding conjecture based on knowledge of the readings in N and P, and an understanding of the astronomical context, which in turn led to the recovery of the true reading from passages in Latin poetry where Bootes and his *plaustra* are found (Germanicus, *Aratea* 139; Ovid, *Met.* 2.176–177, 10.447; Lucan 2.722; and others). Overall, L’s chief distinguishing characteristic is its avoidance of the kinds of errors that would
identify it as an independent carrier of the tradition. What especially arouses suspicions about L’s independence is that if N omits something, then L gives us what is found in P (3.1.27, 3.11.58, 4.3.7); if A or P omits something, then L gives us what is found in N (1.6.15, 1.8.4, 1.14.19, 2.21.5 and 7). It is a coincidence too good to be true that L fills in the blanks when N or A(P) is guilty of omission and at the same time avoids making its own distinctive errors that would separate it from N and A. In my view, whatever textual improvements L has to offer that are independent of N and A can be explained as the product of editorial activity on the part of learned scribes and readers whose knowledge of Propertius’s poetry and Latin poetry in general allowed them to emend the text. The impressive results achieved by the humanist correctors of Catullus’s text provide an excellent parallel to the quality of the work done by these early Propertians. In short, there are, in my judgment, only two independent witnesses to the poems of Propertius, N and A (and A’s descendants after 2.1.63). These two manuscripts, together with the evidence provided by the indirect tradition, are all that connect us to the art and genius of one Rome’s greatest and most learned poets.

Heyworth’s edition is not for the faint of heart and certainly not for readers who were hoping for an updated version of Barber’s OCT, the most widely used text. Those who are familiar with George Goold’s Loeb 1990, 1999 will know what to expect. In the praefatio (p. lxiv) the editor announces that he does not use the obelus in his text. True to his word, he presents readable texts of all the elegies, despite doubts and reservations about the probability of some conjectures and transpositions, and in so doing is guided by the ancient critical judgment that the Umbrian poet expressed himself neatly and elegantly, not obscurely and bizarrely. Of necessity, then, numerous conjectures are printed in the text, a good number of which belong to the editor. Although the poor quality of the transmitted text does not license the unrestrained use of the scalpel and the saw, it does require constant probing and the application of those instruments by a skilled and trustworthy editor wherever he diagnoses a problem. It is no exaggeration to say that every page in this edition will arrest the reader’s attention with alterations of the text. To illustrate with a single phrase, in current texts of 1.4.13–14 (Barber, Camps, Richardson, Fedeli, Viarrre), where Propertius says that Cynthia’s charms are not limited to physical beauty, the MS tradition gives as one of her attractions multis decus artibus: in Heyworth’s edition we find a different quality, motis (Goold) decor (recentiores) artubus (Marcilius). In the former version Cynthia’s charms include artistic abilities; in the latter, like Herrick’s Julia, she captures the eye with the movement of her limbs. This is as good a test-case as any among the hundreds that present themselves to the reader because it is indicative of editorial procedure throughout the book: not only in places where the transmitted text is manifestly corrupt or highly suspect but also in places where the reading of the manuscripts has been judged to be sound, as in this instance, Heyworth offers the reader what he regards as the best reconstruction of the poet’s wording that Propertian textual scholarship has to offer. In the editor’s judgment motis decor artubus, has a better chance of being what Propertius wrote than the reference to her artistic talents as given
by the MS tradition. To argue that not one of those three words, *motis decor artubus* is found in the manuscripts is no argument at all since the evidence of the manuscripts is so poor, a frightening but inescapable truth that is hard to accept in the case of so brilliant an author. What is called conservative criticism in the elegies of Propertius is really nothing more than a low grade of conjectural criticism with which readers have become comfortable because it corrects what is demonstrably corrupt and tolerates what is passable as Latin poetry in deference to manuscript authority: the smaller the wager, the smaller the risk. The uncomfortable reality, as this edition demonstrates beyond any doubt, is that what has been sanctioned by the passage of time, the printed page and inertia is no substitute for a thoroughgoing critical revision of the whole text. And that is what we have in Heyworth’s edition.

A look at the first elegy of Book 1 will give the reader a good idea of what to expect in this new Propertius. In 1.2 *Cupidinibus* has a capital *c* contrary to editorial practice since Lachmann (1816) who argues that the personification is inept because of *Amor* in line 5. In 1.5 we find *Puellas* with a capital *p* to indicate the Muses, although this appears to contradict the editor’s statement in his textual companion that he prints *puellas* (p. 6). Rossberg’s *ei* at the beginning of 1.7, in place of *et*, weakens the force of the line by turning the emphatic *mihi*, with *deficit*, into a mere interjection; the impact of *furor* on the poet and the idea that he is a helpless victim is clearly expressed in the transmitted text; *ei mihi* turns the poet’s torment into a sound effect. In the absence of an adverb answering to *modo* in 1.11 the editor, following Housman, posits a lacuna of two lines after line 11. This or Courtney’s conjecture, recorded in the *apparatus*, seems the best solution to a long recognized problem. In 1.12 the editor prints *ferire*, conjectured by Heinsius and also found in the *recentiores*, in place of *uidere* given by N and A. This is a good example of the life cycle of an attractive conjecture. After Heinsius proposed it, *ferire* became a regular fixture in the eighteenth-century vulgate text of Propertius and was energetically defended by Burman (1780). Lachmann (1816) banished *ferire* from the text on the grounds of manuscript authority and sense, and it has remained in exile until now; in view of the explanations of *uidere* that have been given (facing danger rather than a good day’s hunting) the transmitted reading should be given the benefit of the doubt. The adoption of *umbras* in 1.23 for *amnis* of the manuscripts seems to me a trivialization of the text. Propertius is not being specific about any particular manifestation of the witches’ power, commonly described as the ability to stop rivers or make them reverse their course, and to draw down celestial bodies from the sky or make them reverse their course, but rather professes himself willing, if his request is granted, to acknowledge their power to direct the course of two natural phenomena, stars and rivers. And that is sufficient acknowledgement of their supernatural power. How exactly the witches exercise that power is not of interest to the lover. Moreover, stars and rivers seem to form a pair in such contexts (cf. Vergil, *Aeneid* 4.489 and Tibullus 1.2.43–44). In 33 Heyworth’s conjecture *nam for in* removes the difficulty of having *noctes* as the object of *exercet* and provides a clearly expressed logical connection, if logical connection is needed, with
the thought of 31–32, as the poet offers his own unpleasant experience as a reason for others to continue in relationships where love is mutual.

These are highlights from just one poem. It would take a monograph to do justice to the whole book and it will be years before Propertian scholarship has fully absorbed and digested all that this innovative reconstruction of the text has to offer. My disagreements with the editor’s choice of reading (and there are many more) are not to be taken as a final judgment on the quality of the edition, which is truly outstanding, but as an indication that it demands attentive and alert readers who are willing to take a fresh look at old problems and consider a wealth of new and exciting proposals for the improvement of the text. Some readers will be furious, some will applaud, and some will despair. But all students of Latin poetry must count themselves lucky that they can walk in this luxuriant garden of poetry, guided by the editor’s masterly survey of textual scholarship in the praeferatio and apparatus criticus. Toward the end of his preface (p. xxviii) Lachmann 1816 wrote, “Sed jam tu, his nugis omissis, Propertium ipsum, quam nostra et aliorum commentaria, diligentius lege.” If the reader will grant that “Propertius himself” is not always to be identified with what is transmitted in his manuscripts, then Heyworth’s edition is the place to begin.

D. Mark Possanza
University of Pittsburgh


This completes Simon Hornblower’s three-volume commentary on Thucydides, focusing on books five (chapter 25) through eight or the second half of the History. Hornblower’s procedure is that employed in the preceding volumes. A general introduction identifies and considers overarching themes. As the commentary tracks the text, particular sections and subsections are thematically introduced. These are followed by detailed commentaries on individual lemmata. Hornblower (H.) provides translations of these passages, working from Jowett’s version but substantially revising or replacing it when necessary. A sustained concern is to position the History with respect to its classical predecessors, contemporaries and successors, with a strong emphasis on intersections with Herodotus (433–453, 654–670; see also vol. 2, 19–38). This volume also includes valuable references to and assessments of recent scholarship. Like its companion volumes, this one deserves continued revisiting by students and scholars engaged with Thucydides, regardless of field.

Treating the final four books in a single volume is demanded by the structure of the History. Thucydides’ most sustained and continuous narrative, the story of the failed Sicilian invasion told in books seven and eight, is bracketed by two books (five and eight) that have often been read as dispersed or unfinished. The impression conveyed by such readings is that the History is an assemblage of pieces varying markedly in finish. This limits ef-
forts to identify developed themes within the work generally. H. largely challenges these views, dissenting particularly from Andrewes, who (in his *Historical Commentary on Thucydidès*, vol.5) reads book eight as a jumble in need of serious revision (886, 946, 964). H. finds instead a complex narrative that is internally cohesive (1) and intertextually linked with books six and seven (1048) and with the *History* as a whole (946).

This judgment parallels those of scholars such as Connor and Rood who emphasize the literary character of Thucydidès’ work and who read anomalies and disjunctures as significant contributions to the narrative. H.’s literary Thucydidès encourages a polyinterpretability that fosters multivocality, ambiguity and provisionality (1036). Yet H. cautions that even the most insightful literary approaches cannot solve all textual puzzles and he convincingly points to difficulties that seem intractable (82, 91, 196, 620, 886). So, H. takes the perspectives of both Andrewes and Connor seriously (215, 886).

Though H. often proceeds atomistically (his term, vol. 2, 2–3), he offers his own thematic assessment of the significance of the final four books, read together. Book five’s overarching themes are autonomy and rule over others (211). The Sicilian narrative of six and seven points to dynamics of colonization that both draw upon and distort kinship relations (657), a theme that informs the Melian dialogue that ends book five (221, 225). Eight’s treatment of Athens’ domestic political turmoil closes the circle on autonomy and rule as the democracy succumbs to the oligarchy of the Four Hundred after becoming accustomed to imperial hegemony (937). Reflections on the relation between freedom and rule (for Plato’s Gorgias, the most important human goods) thus structure the Thucydidæan treatment of Athenian practice generally.

The commentary on book eight also brings the *History*’s concern with domestic politics and regime character into sharper focus. H. resists seeing Thucydidès’ criticisms of Athenian democracy (30) as signaling an attachment to oligarchy, for the criticisms of the Four Hundred are more scathing (364, 406, 950, 962). H. offers a more complex treatment of the rule of the Five Thousand that should encourage those interested in the political theory of Thucydidès to engage in deeper reflections on the significance of that “moderately blended” regime. It is represented as the best Athenian governance of Thucydidès’ lifetime, thus challenging what many read as Thucydidès’ veneration of Pericles (1023). Yet the regime also originates from suspect motives (1011) and its practices and policies when in place are opaque (952–953).

There are questions as well. H.’s goal of making Thucydidès accessible to students having little or no Greek (vol. 1, Preface) is complicated by the sophisticated nature of the analysis. The commentary unavoidably demonstrates the necessity of engaging Thucydidès’ own language in a text whose substance is often controversial (919, 1001). More avoidable are occasional digressions on rivalries among eminent classicists that may create the misleading impression that this is a work only for classical scholars. Substantively, there are occasions on which H.’s own synoptic insights complicate particular readings. Thucydidès’ polyinterpretability could be read as a stylistic endorsement of the cultural characteristics of democracy over those of regimes.
(such as Archidamos’ Sparta) with more uniform public narratives. In this light, what appears as appreciation of Spartan sōphrosyn (1036) may also have a deeply critical edge. One consequence of this polyinterpretability is that democratic writing or speech potentially becomes a critical resource revealing the limits or hazards of the political power that enables it. Thucydides’ narration of the complex impression that the powerful Athenian fleet creates when it sails for Sicily may (pace H., 389) be connected with the assessment in 1.10 of the distorting image created by Athens’ physical magnificence. Precisely because Athens’ naval power may be a more accurate indicator of strength than architectural achievements, its display may also remind the onlookers of how much can be lost in a defeat. Likewise, Thucydides’ diagnosis (in 8.64.5) of the “pretence” of the good order offered to the subject cities by the Athenians may indict not only the rhetoric of the Athenian oligarchs but also the broader deficiencies of the empire generally. Here, pretence would be detected not only in comparison with a less hegemonic Spartan alignment (942–943) but also in light of the Athenians’ own claim in 1.76 that they behave more justly than their power requires.

While some of these questions complicate the letter of particular readings, they are consistent with the spirit of H.’s approach. Though its historical, philological and literary contributions are estimable, this book’s most fundamental virtue is that it stimulates and rewards endless curiosity about and engagement with Thucydides.

Gerald Mara
Georgetown University


This helpful little book mainly consists of useful summaries of characters’ speeches, placed in the full richness of their proper literary, historical, social, and theoretical context, thus broadening the reader’s understanding of the text. Hunter’s additional references to reception work in modern popular culture also helps demonstrate the continuing relevance of the issues discussed by Socrates and others, thus offering the non-classically minded a motive for reading the original. In sum, the volume serves as a practical introduction to Plato’s Symposium aimed at the general reader who has recently read, or is thinking of reading, the text for the first time, most probably in translation.

It is, by contrast, less useful for anybody interested in the philosophy of love, or indeed in any of the dialogue’s philosophical ideas. Indeed it more or less manages to avoid the discussion of any ideas whatsoever, an achievement facilitated by the book’s focus on the speeches, as opposed to the dialogue, of the Symposium. True, this is primarily intended as a work of literary criticism (not philosophy), published as part of Kathleen Coleman and Richard
Rutherford’s *Oxford Approaches to Classical Literature Series*, so in a sense it does just what it says on the tin. But the merits of divorcing the literary criticism of philosophical dialogue entirely from the work’s philosophical content are slight.

Philosophy is, of course, mentioned here and there, but it is only ever discussed in its relation to madness and ecstasy (as opposed to reason), perhaps betraying the author’s own attitude towards it. On those few occasions when a philosophical distinction is alluded to, it is done *en passant* to revealing some psychological fact about a character. We are told, for example, of Socrates’ contrast between “truth” and “appearance” (p. 107, the scare quotes are Hunter’s) without so much as one line about what this contrast actually amounts to in Socrates’ mouth, or the slightest indication of the reasoning behind it. The focus, instead, is on why Alcibiades misinterprets Socrates’ distinction between the ‘truly beautiful’ and that which merely appears beautiful (218e2–6) as a refusal of the opportunity for sex. Unfortunately it is impossible to understand even *this much* without some grip of (a) Socrates’ general distinction and (b) its application here to the case of beauty. Both are missing from Hunter’s account of the Alcibiades’ psychology. This is a shame, not least because the question of the character’s psychological journey throughout the evening is of genuine interest and Hunter has an original take on it that deserves to be taken seriously (an honor he does not seem keen to bestow upon himself).

Contrary to what the blurb on the dust jacket promises, then, Hunter’s book does not ‘survey and explain’ the *arguments* of the dialogue, described as ‘one of Plato’s most sophisticated meditations on the practice of philosophy’. If it shows anything at all about the Plato’s arguments it is that an elucidation of the book’s literary and historical context cannot alone help to clarify, let alone evaluate, them. This is not to say that facts about, for example, the concept of *Eros* in Greek society are irrelevant to the argument, far from it. But their relevance can only be revealed through a philosophical engagement with the text, and this is exactly what Hunter’s book leaves out. As a result the book serves best as an *appendix* to philosophical commentaries or, at best, a minor study-case in Greek Society.

**Constantine Sandis**

Oxford Brookes University and NYU in London


*Pindaric Metre: The “Other Half”* is a well-researched, thoughtful, and informative monograph on Pindar’s odes—about half of the corpus—that are not in dactylo-epitrite (D/e) meter. It is no mere synthesis of previous scholarship, but combines novel theoretical discussion with commentary on each of the odes discussed, and Itsumi (I.) sets forth a compelling interpretation of Pindar’s metrical phrases.

I. argues that the odes traditionally considered to be in aeolic meter can and should be divided further into aeolic and what he calls “freer D/e.” This
results in three main metrical categories of odes: aeolic, freer D/e, and D/e. I. does not discuss the D/e odes in detail because of their supposed metrical clarity, but analyzes the poems composed in aeolic and freer D/e meters. In fact, he separates these two categories into three classes: odes that are aeolic, odes that are freer D/e, and odes that are composed in an amalgam of aeolic and freer D/e. Thus, in I.’s terms, the odes can be grouped into four metrical categories: D/e, freer D/e, aeolic, and an amalgam of freer D/e and aeolic.

I.’s book is divided into three parts. Part I discusses the shape and phrases of 18 ‘major epinikia.’ Part II provides detailed metrical commentary on all the non-D/e odes. Part III is a section of miscellanea on Pindaric meter: e.g., I. has sections on the characteristics of D/e, verbal assonance, and bridges and caesurae here. In general, Part I may be viewed as the introductory material, Part II as the substantial individual commentaries, and Part III as appendices.

After listing eight rules for the division of phrases, I. turns to consider the odes’ structure conceptually. His argument for constructing the category freer D/e is compelling. The basic differences between D/e and freer D/e are: 1) freer D/e has $D$ (ὑὑὑὑὑὑὑ) not $d$ (ὑὑὑὑ) (following essentially P. Maas’s terminology) as the basic phrase of double-short movement; 2) phrases less commonly used in D/e are more frequently used in freer D/e; 3) linkanceps is not used as frequently in freer D/e; 4) verses in freer D/e are generally much shorter than D/e phrases. I.’s introduction of the category freer D/e represents the most novel feature of this monograph.

In Part II I.’s analyses of individual odes include a line-by-line schema metrorum; a list of verses/periods in the respective odes with hiatus or brevis in longo (recognized since A. Boeckh’s 1811 edition of Pindar as clear markers of verse ends); a sample of Greek text from each ode (for a triadic ode, for example, I. prints the first strophe and first epode); general remarks; a metrical analysis of strophe and epode; a discussion of textual problems; and, a discussion of individual verses. This Part is the most useful resource for readers interested in the metrical characteristics of individual odes.

Using O. 1 as a case study, I provide the reader here with an example of Part II’s metrical commentary on an individual ode. I. classifies O. 1 as an amalgam of aeolic and freer D/e. The ode provides a good test of I.’s theory for freer D/e and, more specifically, amalgamated freer D/e and aeolic. The verses of strophe and epode are secured in all but one place thanks to hiatus and brevis in longo. Reading through the text and schema alongside I.’s symbolic description of the verses, one realizes that I.’s argument for freer D/e and the composite amalgam is compelling. There is nothing awkward about how I. breaks up verses, and his analysis allows the reader to get a strong feel for the metrical development of the ode. In his general remarks section, I. thoughtfully points out that O. 1’s opening verse, the priapean dicolon (glyconic + pherecratean), has encouraged people to think of the ode as purely aeolic, but this is too simplistic, since many of the ode’s periods are not composed of immediately recognizable aeolic cola. I.’s general remarks on all the odes are well worth reading because they allow the reader to understand quickly what the important metrical irregularities are in the odes and how the
odes relate to one another metrically. In the analysis of the strophes and epo-
theses, I. always breaks them into further sections. This is an admirable practice
because it encourages the reader to be more aware of the period-by-period
movement within the stanzas. For example, by breaking the stanzas of O.
1 into smaller units, the reader clearly recognizes the movement in the ode
between aeolic and freer D/e phrases and can also see how Pindar regularly
modulates between shorter and longer verses. In his section on textual prob-
lems, I. discusses problems in the MSS and offers emendations that have been
widely accepted; alternatively, he discusses, as necessary, passages that re-
main particularly problematic. In his section on individual verses, I. examines
the verses of the individual odes one by one and refers the reader frequently
to passages in part I that are relevant to the individual verses discussed. I.’s
detailed cross-referencing between Part II and Part I allows the book to be
consulted as a user-friendly reference work on individual odes.

In his introduction, I. suggests that M. L. West’s dynamic analysis of
odes (example of this method may be found in West’s 1982 Greek Meter) has
its limitations. I. asserts that the interpretation of odes in terms of variation
on themes allows for interpretive looseness that may be counterproductive
for properly understanding the phrases of the odes statically. By static I mean
a description of the odes into their composite periods. By dynamic I mean
the manner in which the periods follow one after another. Although static
description of odes should not be given up for the sake of dynamic interpreta-
tion, more dynamic analysis by I. on the odes would have been appreciated.
The interpretation of stanzas depends on dynamic analysis. One may teach a
student to recognize phrases within an ode, but the student will only grasp
the movement and development of an ode with dynamic analysis and an
understanding of Pindar’s variations on preceding phrases: the manner in
which Pindar uses repetition, addition, subtraction, internal expansion, com-
pression, inversion, and modulation to develop an ode thematically. A dy-
namic analysis at the end of each ode’s commentary in section II, for instance,
would have been attractive.

A few quibbles and comments: I.’s neologism freer D/e was not a par-
ticularly good choice. It suggests that freer D/e is a less strict form of D/e.
But according to I.’s analyses, freer D/e is not freer than D/e; it is simply dif-
f erent. A term such as D/e II would have been better. The metrical term ‘pen-
dant’ is misspelled ‘pendent’ passim. A definition of choriambic nucleus for
the non-initiated in the key to terminology would have been useful. Interest-
ingly, I. questions West’s assertion that link anceps is a problematic concept
(p. 5). In West’s memorable words: “Greek poets compose with cola and need
no mortar to join them” (GM 70). I., however, considers Maas’s link anceps
a “revolution in metrical study” that elucidated “the structural simplicity of
[D/e]” (p. 5). It is humbling to remember that although scholars have made
great headway in explaining Greek meter, some of our most basic concepts,
such as link anceps, are still highly contested and in need of further research.
The reader of this book is left wondering, for example, how freer D/e may be
used to interpret lyric odes by poets other than Pindar. This admirable book
should motivate further research on Greek lyric meters.
In recent years classicists employing various methodologies and focusing on different regions and eras of the ancient world have made significant inroads in the subject of cognitive and cultural ramifications of literacy. Yet there has been no single volume that highlights the complexity and wealth of Greco-Roman literacy studies. *Ancient Literacies* partially fills this gap. I say partially because even though the thematic and chronological scope is wide, most contributions focus on certain recurring themes (e.g., the role of writing; books; reading and performance of literature) during the late republican and imperial Roman periods. This is not due to the lack of scholarship on earlier or a more diverse range of Greek and Roman literacy practices; it possibly reflects the scholarly predilections of the editors. Be that as it may, these limitations take nothing away from the scholarly value of the volume per se.

An objective of the collection (see Introduction) is to readily and consciously demonstrate the multivalence of ancient literacy practices and the plurality of scholarly opinions on the subject. A strong emphasis on a contextual approach as well as a tendency to move away from literacy as a set of skills to literacy as a series of practices and events are evident in most essays. Along these lines the opening essay by R. Thomas is a convincing case-study of a locally-situated practices approach to ancient literacy. She programmatically proclaims that a “multitude of literacies needs to be recognized” (p. 13) and then proceeds to illustrate aspects of the multiplicity and complexity of specific “literacies” in democratic Athens, with special emphasis on writing practices in contexts of banking, commerce, and citizen participation in the political and legal system. Following Thomas’ essay, G. Woolf surveys evidence for various uses of writing in the Roman world in connection with the economic, territorial and administrative growth of the Roman state. But contrary to the approach adopted by Thomas, he believes that the model of contextual analysis of an array of micro-literacies is not applicable to Rome because Roman literacies were much more “joined up” (e.g., pp. 47, 52, 61, 64).

Other papers explore literacy and the importance of writing from different standpoints and methodological angles. In her paper B. Burrell examines instances of monumental writing and its reception in Roman Ephesus. She stresses the intermingling of Greek and Roman elements, prompted by elite patrons, that resulted in the creation of a bi-cultural architectural environment. T. Habinek’s essay is divided into two distinctive parts. Approaching the issue of writing from a historical perspective, he associates early instances of Roman writing with the changing matrix of social relations and obligations and identifies it as a token of status. In the second half of the essay through an analysis of graphic word games he explores some of the cognitive functions
of writing in the Roman world and illustrates some ways “in which writing exists and operates independent of speech” (p. 136). K. Milner’s essay examines aspects of “literary literacy” (i.e., the reading and writing of canonical literature) as revealed by Virgilian quotations in Pompeian graffiti. Contrary to some other modes of interaction with literature, graffiti underscore the act of writing and often create their own narratives, i.e., they articulate meanings that go beyond those intended by the original author (in this case Virgil) of the quotations.

Another set of essays deals with the materiality and symbolic significance of books in the Roman empire. F. Dupont explores the fragility of books, their function as gifts and literary containers, and their role in establishing a canonical literary status of authors. J. Farrell dissects the ambiguities of the image of books in the works of Catullus and other Roman poets, especially in relation to their immediate and posthumous reception. In a tightly argued essay H. Parker highlights the central importance of reading (in contrast to recitation) in the process of dissemination of Roman poetry. G. Houston reviews in an informative manner papyrological evidence for book collections and libraries, especially in late Roman Egypt. Most of the collections were privately owned and their tentatively reconstructed contents suggest a great deal about the collectors’ literary interests as well as some possibilities about the purpose of some of these book assemblages. To be sure, private collectors depended mainly on bookstores in order to enrich their collections. In his essay P. White examines aspects of the commercial activities of bookshops in ancient Rome, but also views them as sites of social interaction and literary performance among the scholars and the clientele who frequented these establishments.

Finally, two other essays explore the connection between literature, its performance, and literacy. Using the literary anecdote as an entry point S. Goldhill examines aspects of literacy and oral performance of cultural exempla among the Second Sophistic literati. In his essay W. Johnson takes Gellius’ Attic Nights as a starting point to examine the literary image of scholarly reading communities and the way texts are represented as central in the self-validation of such groups.

W. Johnson’s introduction can be read in conjunction with D. Olson’s Epilogue. The former summarizes the content of the papers whereas the latter reviews scholarly developments on literacy studies and presents some interesting reflections on the cognitive consequences of literacy. It is unfortunate that Olson, an author of thought-provoking work on literacy, does not engage directly with the essays of the volume. The collection also contains a very useful bibliographical essay by S. Werner focusing on literacy studies in classics during the last twenty years.

Overall, this is a well-produced volume that deserves scholarly attention. It is a collection of solid and often high-quality scholarship as well as a welcome addition to the growing literature on ancient literacy.

ZINON PAPAKONSTANTINOU
University of Washington
English translations of the *Thebaid* have become unexpectedly widespread in recent years. Following Melville’s (Oxford 1992), the last decade has seen the arrival of the prose renderings of Hall (Newcastle 2007-2008—not consulted for this review) and Shackleton Bailey’s Loeb (2003), Ross’s free verse translation (Baltimore 2004), and now the work of Joyce, artfully rendered via a six-beat line. Melville still proves serviceable, and Shackleton Bailey provides a characteristically rich guide to the Latin text, but Joyce is likely to become indispensable for a wider audience that has, until now, lacked a well-rounded English *Thebaid*. For the readability of this translation (Joyce is a poet in her own right) and the quantity of exegetical support make it uniquely ideal, particularly for those teaching and studying the *Thebaid* at a more advanced, but potentially Latin-less, undergraduate level. Since Statius’ epic constitutes a unique synopsis of the entire Theban saga (as opposed to its treatment in tragedies both Greek and Latin), I expect that this volume will facilitate the broader attention the poem warrants.

The *Thebaid* is no easy read, and courses in classical mythology understandably avoid it in favor of more canonical texts (as also in surveys of Roman culture or literature, where Statius is overshadowed by Vergil and Ovid in the arena of epic poetry). Since few are likely to stumble upon the *Thebaid* and digest it unaided, Joyce’s translation provides a solid foundation for interpretation and analysis: the introduction offers a clear background to the period, the poet and the poem, and is amply enhanced by references to major works of scholarship in English; each book is prefaced by a structural summary and interpretive introduction; the text itself is supplemented by footnotes on individual pages; and at the volume’s conclusion come an illuminating literary commentary, glossary, and bibliography. Joyce’s insights into thematic and literary matters are consistently learned, and both her commentary and interpretive introductions are richly intratextual, looking forward and backward at both episodes and similes to treat the *Thebaid* first and foremost as a literary object on its own terms. These exegetical aids make the book ideal for a college-level curriculum, particularly at a more advanced level.

As the exegetical apparatus surrounding the translation is helpful, so too is Joyce’s presentation of Statius’ poetry, the style of which is notoriously dense and ornate, generally excellent. Her layout of the text, for one, aims to guide its reader: changes in speaker or locale are indicated by line breaks, the verses of ekphrases are divided and marked off, and authorial comments are blocked off in italics. The translation itself is poetic yet faithful to the impetus of the original: Joyce employs a six-beat line that captures the allusion, alliteration, and violence of Statius’ hexameters in an English verse that is eminently readable. Deserving of particular note is the varied register of Joyce’s poetic vocabulary, which mixes rich, elevated (and even archaic) diction with idioms of a distinctly contemporary flavor. An impressive poetic balance is struck; only rarely does her lexicon disorient the reader unduly by employing overly contemporary slang or the outlandishly arcane (the use of ‘peons’
for vīlis [1.191], 'lackeys' for ministri [1.515], and 'minions' for famulos [1.541] were among the few choices that struck this reviewer as forced. Generally speaking, Statius’ vernacular remains palpable.

As an example of Joyce’s poetic balance, consider the following passage from Capaneus’ assault on Thebes from atop its walls (10.877-882). Notice in particular the prolepsis of the feminine possessive ‘her’ in the final line, the paradox of defensive walls producing ‘bombs’, and how the diction and dynamism of her rendering surpasses other translations:

simul insultans gressuque manuque
molibus obstantes cuneos tabulataque saevus
destruit: absiliunt pontes, tectique trementis
saxea frena labant, dissaeptoque aggere rursus
utitur et trunci rupes in templum domosque
praecipitat frangitque suis iam moenibus urbem.

Joyce
Turning at once with foot and fist
to attack the structure, he savagely wrenched away keystones
and joists; great beams collapsed, the stone corbels supporting
the roof gave way. He recycled the dismantled mass
of debris: smashing temples and homes with jagged fragments, he
used her own defensive walls to bomb the city.

Melville
At once with hand and foot
He attacked the masonry and wrenched away
Keystones and joists; the crossbeams fell apart,
The ribs of stone that held the roof gave way.
Putting dismembered fragments to fresh use,
He hurled the shattered blocks on shrines and homes
And smashed the city with its own great walls.

Ross
He shouts his insults and with hand and foot
fiercely destroys the mortar work and layers
of masonry that block him. Stone supports
slip under trembling houses. Bridges crumble.
He redeployes the pieces he dislodges,
hurls broken fragments down on homes and temples
and breaks its own high walls to wreck the city.

Shackleton Bailey
Thereupon he falls upon the blocks with foot and hand, fiercely de-
omolishing wedges and planks standing in his path. The bridges fly apart, the
stone ties of the covering roof give way, the rampart is dismantled. He uses it
again, hurling the mutilated rocks down upon temples and houses, smashing
the city with her own walls.

Criticisms of the volume are few and minor. For one, the footnotes tend
to gloss more obvious allusions, while occasionally avoiding more difficult
ones. Given Statius’ predilection for antonomasia and metonymy, this can
occasionally result in confusion and frustration. Similarly, some aspects of
the mythical tradition remain a bit nebulous despite the abundance of commentary and notes. Eriphyle’s betrayal of Amphiarasus for the necklace of Harmonia, for example, receives little comment. Also, given the variety of works on the Theban saga from which Statius undoubtedly drew, some comparison of the poet’s version with other mythological narratives would be welcome (as an apparatus of sorts). In the end, however, these are minor complaints; Joyce has produced an eminently readable and useful English *Thebaid* that will assist and stimulate scholars and students. I expect that it will enjoy many years of use in college curricula.

C. Michael Sampson
University of Michigan


This volume, the result of a most fruitful collaboration on the part of a roster of international scholars, aims to present an up-to-date synopsis and analysis of works by and about Philo of Alexandria, one of antiquity’s most prolific biblical commentators and philosophers. This collection, along with its indexes of sources and authors, will appeal to a variety of researchers and is also accessible, for the most part, to advanced undergraduate and graduate students.

The nine essays that constitute this Companion are divided into three parts: Philo’s Life and Writings, Philo’s Thought, and Philo’s Influence and Significance. There is naturally some overlap in coverage among the chapters, so that the generous indices are especially welcome for readers interested in only one or two aspects of Philo’s many-faceted writings.

The first chapter, by Daniel R. Schwartz, discusses what is known of “Philo, His Family, and His Times.” Philo is thought to have been born around 15 BCE and to have died in the mid-40s CE. Schwartz introduces and interprets the evidence for these dates, as well as for Philo’s prominence in a well-connected Hellenistic Jewish family, several of whose members are known from Roman sources. Philo is portrayed as something of an ivory-tower scholar, who nonetheless descended into the rough-and-ready world of politics, especially through his participation in a Jewish legation to the emperor Gaius Caligula following anti-Jewish attacks in Alexandria. All and all, Schwartz is effective both in filling out a portrait of Philo and in placing him within the varied contexts in which he operated.

By its nature, chapter 2, “The Works of Philo,” by James R. Royce (with the collaboration of Adam Kamesar) is more technical. As with any ancient author, so with Philo we lack the complete corpus. What we do have has been transmitted (not without modification, of course) primarily in Greek, but there are also some important texts known only (or primarily) in Armenian, as well as a few in Latin. Determining the classification, extent, and relative
chronology of this material is no easy task. Fortunately, Royce and Kamesar are skilled guides for the un- or half-initiated. In their view, most of Philo’s work was contained in three large exegetical series—the Quaestiones, the Allegorical Commentary, and the “Exposition of the Law”—all of which take as their starting point the Greek translation, or Septuagint, of the Pentateuch. In addition, there are apologetic and historical works as well as treatises devoted to philosophy.

In chapter 3, Kamesar provides a detailed presentation and analysis of “Biblical Interpretation in Philo.” He first demonstrates that Philo’s “Bible” was indeed the Septuagint, about which Philo makes the extraordinary claim that this translation was both sense-for-sense and word-for-word. Philo is certainly best known for his allegorical interpretation of Scripture, but, as Kamesar points out, Philo did not always abandon the literal interpretation for the allegorical. What he consistently sought out was the explication that was most beneficial for the progress of the human soul. In this regard, bibli-cal characters were exemplary but without fully losing their individuality as humans.

Part 2 (“Philo’s Thought”) has three chapters: Christina Termini, “Philo’s Thought within the Context of Middle Judaism”; Roberto Radice, “Philo’s Theology and Theory of Creation”; and Carlos Lévy, “Philo’s Ethics.” Termini’s discussion is divided into three main topics: theology, theory of man, and the law. Among the most stimulating insights are her views on the complex relationships among Logos, Wisdom, the powers, angels, and God; on Philo’s understanding of sin as interpreted on the basis of the first chapters of Genesis; and on how Philo creatively expounds on the dietary laws from both allegorical and literal/pragmatic perspectives.

Radice’s chapter is also divided into three primary sections: God, creation, and the nature of the powers and the Logos. He uncovers a number of ambiguities in Philo’s exposition: Platonic and Stoic thought are clearly central for Philo, but he also frequently charts his own course as he plies his central craft, namely, biblical exegesis.

Lévy treats his topic in five sections: philosophical principles, the virtues, the passions, moral progress, and politics. Perhaps the most compelling discussion in this regard is found in the third section, where Lévy finds considerable originality in Philo’s understanding that, in addition to destructive madness (widely recognized in antiquity), there was also a far more constructive form of madness that was of divine origin.

As can be seen, most topics in the first of part 2’s chapters re-appear in one or both of the subsequent chapters in this part. This is helpful for those whose primary interest is the analysis of Philo’s debt to, and independence from, Jewish and Greek thought respectively. It is less satisfying for the reader who seeks what might be termed a holistic approach to Philo’s contributions in these areas.

Part 3 provides extensive discussion and analysis of “Philo’s Influence and Significance.” The first chapter is Folker Siegert, “Philo and the New Testament,” a topic of considerable importance since it involves the earliest evidence for the Jewish philosopher’s reception within the Christian community.
Siegert methodically investigates a large swath of New Testament writings—the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Pauline corpus, 1 Corinthians (a special case), Luke and the Pauline School, and the Gospel according to John—under more than a dozen categories. It is difficult to imagine that Siegert has overlooked any relevant passages. For him, the clearest evidence of Philo’s influence, although probably indirect, is to be found in Hebrews and the Gospel of John.

At the beginning of his chapter, “Philo and the Early Christian Fathers,” David Runia observes the paradox that we are almost totally indebted to early Christians for our knowledge of Philo the Jew. As Runia painstakingly investigates material from the second to the fourth century, he seeks to explicate this paradox. He begins with Clement of Alexandria, whose work (around 200 CE) contains the first uncontested references to Philo. Alexandria continued to be one of the central influences on the positive reception of Philo, while Antioch was among the locations where the philosopher fared far less well. All of this, in Runia’s account, can be understood within the context of the development of Christian thought and exegesis.

The final chapter is David Winston, “Philo and Rabbinic Literature.” Although the authors of such literature never mention Philo by name, it is clear that many of them were familiar with major themes in Philo’s thought and with characteristic expressions of his language. In Winston’s analysis, the lack of direct engagement is due in considerable part to Philo’s complete dependence on the Septuagint version rather than the Hebrew. Among the areas to which Winston pays special attention is Philonic Halakhah.

Overall, this collection admirably succeeds in its stated goals. All researchers should have this volume as their “companion” on any journey, long or short, through the writings of Philo.

LEONARD GREENSPAN
Creighton University


This book documents the history of humans and horses, exploring what happens when humans harness the speed of the horse, that is, when “the world’s brainiest biped teams up with the world’s fastest quadruped.” Kelekna (K.) sees this union as key to most of the major developments in world history. The horse becomes the vehicle not just for the transportation of humans and their cargo, but also for religion, politics, and art. This is an epic story and K.’s book has a correspondingly wide chronological and geographical scope ranging from the pre-historic steppes to twentieth-century America. The first chapter begins 60 million years ago with the first horses.

Throughout she emphasizes the key role played by migratory horse-breeding steppe peoples in shaping events in sedentary agricultural areas. Technological innovation is spread by horseback and developed by riders to make military tactics ever more efficient. According to K., such innovations as the development of greater ship capacity and size have their roots in the
need to move horses more rapidly and effectively for warfare. Even changes such as the advent of trousers for men can be traced to the need for greater equestrian efficiency. Horses are also the subject of religious cults and, according to K., are the means of spreading religious ideas such as Zoroastrianism. K. contrasts the use of horses in the Old World with their absence in the New, contending that empires such as the Aztec and Inca could not maintain tight control over their subjects because of a lack of speedy human transport that would allow information to be rapidly disseminated. The use of horses by European conquerors in these areas was an important factor in the overthrow of the Aztec and Inca societies.

Of special interest to Classicists are K.’s discussions of Greece, Persia, Macedonian, and Rome as horse-using societies. She seems, however, to be more in control of the scholarly material for earlier societies. In any case, there are numerous errors in her discussion of Greece. For example, she calls Pegasus the snow-white horse of Eos (p. 178). But Eos drove a two-horse chariot and Pegasus was not one of the horses. She mentions that the Birth of Athena pediment on the Parthenon presages Athena’s role in the “conquest of the Tritons” (p. 181), by which I presume she means “Titans.” And she says that marble equestrian statues, “although relatively rare in archaic Greece, were positioned on the fifth-century B.C. Acropolis” (181), although by the classical period if there were equestrian statues these would have been bronze.

These problems do not, however, detract from the big picture of the role of the horse in world history that K. chronicles. In today’s era of specialization she is to be commended for taking on such a big project. The final chapter of the book strikes a somewhat jarring cautionary note. Here K. emphasizes the destruction of war and the environmental degradation brought about by the same human-horse combination so painstakingly and positively detailed in the preceding chapters.

MARY ANN EAVERLY
University of Florida


Thirty-one noted Classical scholars have contributed to this hefty volume edited by Peter Knox. It is wide-ranging (production, genre, and style are covered), with interpretive essays on the key poems as well on the all-important Ovidian Nachleben, particularly the poet’s reception in English literature. Further gracing the tome is a chronology of key literary and historical events during Ovid’s lifetime, a list of some ten textual figures, and a thirty-page bibliography and a twenty-odd page index. To orient the user, each chapter’s conclusion features a helpful “further reading” paragraph. Knox refers to the two comprehensive collections published in 2002 (Barbara Weiden Boyd’s Brill’s Companion to Ovid and Philip Hardie’s Cambridge Com-
panion to Ovid), and justifies the present undertaking as timely by recalling the “bimillenary of his exile to the shores of the Black Sea” (xiv).

In the space permitted here and to give the reader a feel for the contents, I will provide a little more detail to describe the first two sub-sections of the book, then just summarize the last three.

Part One, “Contexts,” has the opening sentence of “A Poet’s Life” (Ch. 1) that reads: “The climate for poetry in Rome during Ovid’s lifetime was electric” (3), and Knox’s brief opening survey mainly borrows Ovid’s own words to sketch out the few known biographical details. M. Citroni’s essay (“Poetry in Augustan Rome”) follows (Ch. 2), touching on matters relevant to Augustus, Maecenas, Virgil, Horace, and poetic vocations. “Rhetoric and Ovid’s Poetry” is treated by E. Fantham (Ch. 3) who analyzes the sophisticated and sometimes incantatory strategizing, especially in the speeches. The poet as priestly uates, the topics of pietas and the divine apparently counter Ovid’s flippant attitude toward religion, asserts J. D. Hejduk in “Ovid and Religion” (Ch. 4).

Part Two, “Texts,” opens with J. Booth’s “The Amores: Ovid Making Love” (Ch. 5), which studies the fifty-odd teasing poems of erotic sex, love (real? faked?), and their metapoetics. L. Fulkerson asks rhetorically “The Heroides: Female Elegy?” (Ch. 6), covering their authenticity, mythical characters, and the epistolary mode as moderns and especially feminists view the letters. The Ars Amatoria is subjected by R. K. Gibson to a survey (Ch. 7) in the context of Roman love elegy, of Roman women and the lex Julia, as well as a take on Ovid’s mocking and subversive erotodidaxis.” Contrasting the Ars with Cicero’s De Officiis, he concludes: “[...] Ovid regularly emphasizes that the lovers must play their part in the smooth running of a love affair, conduct themselves in an obliging manner, and practice personal decorum” (102). The Remedia Amoris comes next (Ch. 8), presented by B. W. Boyd, who aims, after the “Protean poet” himself, to transgress the “[...] the usual boundaries that characterize discussions of this poem” (104, 105). Discussed are the metapoetic frame, the precepts, generic and imagistic matters. “Fasti: the Poet, the Prince, and the Plebs” by G. Herbert-Brown (Ch. 9) examines the “religious ‘otherness’,” extra-textuality, and military themes of Ovid’s versified Roman calendar, a poem composed AD 3–7 but, under the “power realignment” (138; Augustus’ death), rededicated to Germanicus (after AD 14).

E. J. Kenney and G. D. Williams study Ovid’s luxurious encyclopedic epic, his “greater work,” in “The Metamorphoses: A Poet’s Poem” and “The Metamorphoses: Politics and Narrative” (Chs. 10 and 11). The former argues that it aimed at a witty contradiction, “a Callimachean epic” (143) that ended up, with its plausibly fantastic mythology, as a complex and “hero-free” “parable of the human condition” (145, 148).

Perpetual mutability, satirical or black humor, and authorial presence typify the poem for Kenney, whereas Williams scrutinizes imperial portraiture and “narratological instability” in certain episodes—a “fluid commodity” (Augustus), with a treatment at once elusive and effusive (154).

It falls to J. M. Claassen to deal with the problematic Tristia (Ch. 12), a miniature “elegiac epic” (174) along with its intertextual elements, chronol-
ogy, exilic themes and topics, as well as humor and poetics. The invective invoked for the pseudonymous *Ibis* M. Helze considers (Ch 13) exaggerated, imaginative, humorous, as well as a work that served as “self-therapy” (193). Chapter 14, “*Epistulae ex Ponto*” by L. Galasso highlights the collection’s chronology, various structures and themes, the presumed recipients, the role of the Princeps, and the transformative and creative power of poetry exhibited therein. Knox (Ch. 15) takes on the task of surveying “Lost and Spurious Works,” including, of course, the *Medea* tragedy and doubtfully attributed works like several *Heroides* and the fascinating *Consolatio ad Liviam*, among other pseudo-Ovidiana.

Part Three, “Intertexts,” contains chapters 16 through 21, with essays by J. L. Lightfoot (Hellenistic poetry), B. Acosta-Hughes (Callimachus), D. Wray (Catullus), S. J. Heyworth (Propertius), R. Maltby (Tibullus), and R. F. Thomas (Virgil). Part Four, “Critical and Scholarly Approaches” (Chs. 22–27) has contributions on editing the texts (M. Possanza), commenting on Ovid (Knox), intertextuality (S. Casali), sexuality and gender (A. Keith), generic transformations (J. Farrell), and theoretical approaches (E. Spentzou).


Considering that the Brill volume (534 pages) is now set at $337. one might say Knox’s same-sized collection at $200 is a bargain. But, given the current world economic situation, for my students I would doubtless choose Hardie’s somewhat slimmer (424 pages) paperback *Companion* at $33. Ideally, advanced undergraduate (majors) and graduate students would benefit from having all three to hand (on library reserve?), so as to compare and contrast and certainly learn much from these three delightful feasts.

RAYMOND J. CORMIER
Longwood University


*Fylo* is the final publication of a conference held in Rethymno, Crete in 2005—“Engendering Prehistoric ‘Stratigraphies’ in the Aegean and Mediterranean.” The aim of the conference, and as well the publication, was “to open discussion of our present concepts, and preconceptions, of gender and cultural identities in their Aegean and wider Mediterranean contexts” (p. ix). The 29 articles in *Fylo* address issues of gender from different perspectives. Five articles, those by Dommansnes, Kokkinidou and Niko-
laidou, Allen, D’Agata, and Tsipopoulou, consider the roles of female archaeologists in the history of Aegean archaeology. The first two authors present case studies of feminist archaeology in Norway and Greece respectively. Allen and D’Agata give fascinating historiographies of American, British, and Italian female archaeologists mainly in Crete both before and after World War I. Tsipopoulou presents the results of a recent survey of female archaeologists regarding matters of gender and career. Unfortunately, the survey was only completed by 12 participants, thus giving an insufficient base for statistical analysis.

Some articles focus on reception studies. Bradfer-Burdet’s “Phèdre ou la Goulue” offers a history of “Cretomania” in France in the early 20th century with particular focus on how bare-breasted Minoan women were understood. On a similar note, Morris’s article on the bared breast eschews the Cartesian dualisms of mother/lover. After surveying the history of the bared female breast in Western art, Morris focuses on the role of Evans in the construction of western notions of Minoan women. Goodison too argues against Cartesian dualisms and employs a more embodied approach to the study of Minoan religion. Rejecting the model of “woman as vessel” she calls for new examinations of Minoan vessel “goddesses” and offers new interpretations of physical ecstasy in baetyl cult scenes. Cadogan offers a brief, excellent historiography of the Matriarchy Myth in Crete, ending with an interesting argument regarding “meta-gender”— that the real Minoan power objects are aniconic/genderless.

Several articles deal explicitly with ungendering archaeology—reconsidering the ideas of “male” and “female” in ancient ideologies and arguing for the existence of “third” and “fourth” genders—genderless and hermaphroditic. Alexandri’s “Envisioning Gender in Aegean Prehistory” gives a theoretical introduction to this notion especially as it applies to iconography. She argues (p. 23), “[T]he decontextualisation of artifacts when trying to approach gender in the Aegean may actually mask the very thing that we are looking for: the variability of gendered identities.” Bolger’s “Beyond Male and Female” applies such theories to three case studies from Bronze Age Cyprus: Chalcolithic figurines, Plank figurines, and scenic compositions. Highly recommended for anyone working in prehistoric coroplastic studies is Marangou’s “Gendered/Sexed and Sexless Beings in Prehistory.” This study of Neolithic and Early Bronze Age figur(in)es offers an excellent theoretical approach not only to the study of engendering terracottas but how such artifacts reflect the societies that produced them. A more focused work on terracottas is Shelton’s “Who Wears the Horns?” which offers some good background on the history of Mycenaean terracottas before concentrating on the question of why that corpus is dominated by anthropomorphic females and male bulls. Her hypotheses rely heavily on fertility paradigms and certain gender stereotypes (p. 129: “females give life and sustain it through nurturing; males represent the virile power that produces life, human and agricultural, and also protects it”) which some readers might find objectionable.

More focused studies that apply feminist or (un)gender theories to Aegean art are Hitchcock’s “Knossos is Burning” and Weingarten’s “The Zakro
Master and Questions of Gender.” The first looks at third gender theories and applies them to the Minoan Genius, considering its transformation from a fully female Taweret in Egypt to a third gender Genius who mainly partakes of the male domain in Crete. The latter reconsiders the Zakro Master’s glyptic daimones with an eye to gender studies and notes specifically their Near Eastern influences and counterparts.

Another approach taken to engendering prehistoric stratigraphies involves reconsidering archaeological data in the light of feminist theories. Müller-Clemm’s excellent reanalysis of an Iron Age cemetery in Jordan shows that earlier, stereotyping theories regarding body position and grave goods vis-à-vis gender were quite inaccurate in light of both physical anthropology and careful attention to the data sets. “Neither archaeological evidence nor anthropological analysis confirm that the positioning of the body in the grave has any gender-specific meaning, and there is no convincing evidence that female burials could be identified through a specific set of artifacts” (p. 63). Vavouranakis offers a somewhat less rigorous study of a PreBA tomb at Audemon, Cyprus, in which supposedly male items (spear head, knife, whetstone) were buried with a female. He provides comparative evidence from other Bronze Age Cypriote tombs, but relies too uncritically on artifacts as emblematic of gender. Sánchez Romero in her article “Women in Bronze Age Southeast Iberian Peninsula” presents a pithy introduction to the archaeology of the Argaric peoples of Bronze Age southeastern Spain, with interesting foci on both childhood and maternity in the archaeological record. González-Mar-cén and Montón-Subías offer a shorter paper on the same Argaric community asking in particular why women’s grave goods are not analyzed in regard to continuity the way men’s are in regard to change. Awls feature prominently. McGeorge’s “Gender Meta-Analysis of LBA Skeletal Remains” is a fascinating application of physical anthropology to feminist archaeology wherein she looks at a specific group of tombs from BA Crete to analyze status.

Several articles consider life cycles and age grades in the Bronze Age Aegean. Chapin offers an update of her article “Boys will be Boys” with additional data from Crete. Younger’s admittedly lighthearted article “We Are Woman” examines three or four phases of female life in the Minoan sphere with a particular interest in the socialization of age groups. Kopaka’s article, although presented as having something to do with motherhood in the Aegean, is actually a somewhat speculative paper about menstrual rites as depicted on the walls paintings of Thera. Far better in terms of maternity in the archaeological record is Pomadère’s “Où sont les mères?” which is a brief but well-presented collection of data and theories regarding Mycenaean kourotrophoi. Audouze and Janny’s article is the one work in the book that does not concern women or feminist archaeology, but presents approaches to finding children in the Palaeolithic archaeological record.

Only two articles deal with the written word. Uchitel’s “The Minoan Linear A Sign for ‘Woman’” is self-explanatory, although I should point out that the article is highly specialized and geared exclusively to those involved in Linear A and B studies. Olsen has finally published her conference paper of the past decade on the differences between women in Knossos and Pylos as
recorded in the Linear B tablets of both sites. This article is a fine introduction to women and economics in the Linear B tablets.

The only disappointing article in the collection is Zeimbeki’s “Gender, Kinship, and Material Culture.” This paper is nothing but theory buzz-words and some speculation on finding gender in the archaeology of ritual sites, but the author provides far more data as to why such an approach is impractical rather than feasible.

Finally, we must thank John Younger for putting together three brief works-in-progress by the late Paul Rehak, so that he too might partake in a conference so clearly indebted to his work. Rehak’s mini-articles on figure-eight shield friezes, hair pins and Linear A, and the slow pace of gender studies in Aegean archaeology, offer excellent bibliography and much to think about in regard to gender in the ancient Aegean.

All in all, this book is an excellent contribution to the study of gender in the ancient Mediterranean, and the articles will no doubt become required reading in their respective fields.

L. H. Dommasnes, “Women in Archaeology in Norway: twenty years to gendered archaeological practice and some thoughts about changes to come.”


A. Alexandri, “Envisioning Gender in Aegean Prehistory.”

D. Kokkinidou and M. Nikolaidou, “Feminism and Greek Archaeology: an encounter long over-due.”

D. Bolger, “Beyond Male/Female: recent approaches to gender in Cypriot prehistory.”

G. Vavouranakis, “A ‘Speared Aphrodite’ from Bronze Age Audemou, Cyprus.”


C. Marangou, “Gendered/Sexed and Sexless Beings in Prehistory: readings of the invisible gender.”

L. Hitchcock, “Knossos is Burning: gender bending the Minoan genius.”

B. A. Olsen, “Was there Unity in Mycenaean Gender Practices? The women of Pylos and Knossos in the Linear B tablets.”

K. S. Shelton, “Who Wears the Horns? Gender choices in Mycenaean terracotta figurines”

A. Uchitel, “The Minoan Linear A Sign for ‘Woman’: a tentative identification.”

J. Weingarten, “The Zakro Master and Questions of Gender.”

M. Zeimbeki, “Gender, Kinship, and Material Culture in Aegean Bronze Age Ritual.”

F. Audouze and F. Janny, “Can we hope to Identify Children’s Activities in Upper Palaeolithic Settlements?”

A. P. Chapin, “Constructions of Male Youth and Gender in Aegean Art: the evidence from Late Bronze Age Crete and Thera.”

K. Kopaka, “Mothers in Aegean Stratigraphies? The dawn of ever-continuing engendered life cycles.”

M. Pomadère, “Où sont les mères? Représentations et réalité de la maternité dans le monde égéen protohistorique.”

J. G. Younger, “‘We Are Woman’: girl, maid, matron in Aegean art.”


G. Cadogen, “Gender Metaphors of Social Stratigraphy in pre-Linear B Crete, or Is ‘Minoan Gynaecracy’ (Still) Credible?”

L. Goodison, “Gender, Body and the Minoans: contemporary and prehistoric perceptions.”

C. Morris, “The Iconography of the Bared Breast in Aegean Bronze Age Art.”


Stephanie Lynn Budin
Rutgers University, Camden
Most classicists consider our ancient texts foundational for the Western tradition and relevant into the contemporary period. In his study of Paul’s letter to the Philippians, Joseph Marchal foregrounds some of the problematic implications of these premises that should concern classicists as well as New Testament scholars. Marchal’s study grows out of his recognition that Paul’s letters and their interpretation have been repeatedly appropriated to authorize social structures of subordination and domination: “it is hard to ignore the influence and impact of biblical materials in some of the most startlingly dehumanizing practices of humans” (120). He examines how Paul’s rhetoric has been co-opted for imperialist, colonialist, and sexist agendas. To counteract such appropriations of Paul, Marchal advocates for a feminist postcolonial approach that will empower readings of the Epistles that no longer “sanctify domination or oppression” (122), but enable counternarratives challenging repression. Some readers may hesitate to introduce seemingly anachronistic categories, like racism, sexism, and colonialism, into the study of the ancient world, but as our texts continue to have impact, we may need to attend more carefully to the messages they impart and develop strategies to open up their interpretation to the reality of global asymmetries and inequalities. Marchal ably introduces such strategies and their theoretical underpinnings while supplying a sophisticated overview of current feminist postcolonial perspectives.

The Politics of Heaven consists of an introduction and five chapters. In the introduction, Marchal explains why he utilizes both feminist and postcolonial methodologies for reading Paul: neither perspective alone could adequately address the text’s “intersecting dynamics of gender, sexuality, ethnicity, and empire” (3). At the heart of Marchal’s critical method is this awareness of the multiplicity of interlocking power dynamics in societies. This perspective also informs his choice of _kyriarchy_ as a central concept in his analysis. Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza created this neologism to replace “patriarchy,” which suggests a simple binary of power, with a term that conveys the interlocking “pyramidal relations” of oppression and domination in societies (6).

In the first chapter, Marchal differentiates himself from other biblical scholars using postcolonial or “People’s History” methodologies and justifies his reliance on the work of feminist postcolonial theorists, particularly two biblical scholars, Kwok Pui-lan and Musa Dube (21–23). Four questions posed by Dube guide his evaluation of Paul’s rhetoric: “1) Does the text have a clear stance against the political imperialism of its time? 2) Does the text encourage travel to distant and inhabited lands, and how does it justify itself? 3) How does the text construct difference: is there dialogue and liberating interdependence or condemnation of all that is foreign? 4) Does this text employ gender and divine representations to construct relationships of subordination and domination?” (23).
In chapter two, Marchal demonstrates how easily Paul’s rhetoric in Philippians can “be re-assimilated or co-opted to an imperialist or colonialist agenda” (54). Marchal first reviews commentators who interpret Philippians as anti-imperialist and resistant to the Roman Empire because it usurps imperialist language to project Christ as a superior kyrios and a heavenly commonwealth opposed to Rome (Phil. 2.6–11; 3.18–21). Situating Paul’s language in the context of Dube’s questions, Marchal shows how little Philippians actually advances an anti-imperialist agenda. A response to Dube’s third question reveals Paul’s basic aversion to difference. When Paul refers to “opponents” (1.28), he forecasts their destruction. He describes those who disagree with him as “dogs,” “evil workers” (3.2), and “enemies” doomed to destruction (3.18–19). Employing the model of Christ’s obedience, Paul urges the Philippians to obey him with “fear and trembling” (2.12) and “without grumbling and questioning” (dialogismôn 2.14). Paul prioritizes his own authority and dismisses equal interchange. Marchal argues that Paul’s rhetoric in Philippians functions to replicates the imperial stance.

The third chapter, on imitation, foregrounds a major strength of the book: Marchal’s inclusion of a wider range of postcolonial theorists than the “usual suspects,” Edward Said, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, and Homi Bhabha (9). This enables him to provide a more nuanced perspective on “imitation,” a foundational concept for both Paul’s rhetoric and historical colonialisms. Throughout Philippians, Paul emphasizes his status as a model. He urges the community, “Be co-imitators of me” (symmimētai mou 3.17). He exhorts them to be with him in the “same fight” (1.30) and to think the “same thing” as he does (2.2). And he describes as “mature” (teleioi) only those who share his thinking (3.15). Since an implicit imperative for the colonized to imitate imperial culture also underwrites colonialism, mimesis has been a central focus in postcolonial studies (69). In this context, a view often invoked is Bhabha’s suggestion that mimicry functions to destabilize the model’s authority; since colonizers’ authority rests on their difference from the colonized, the ability to become like the colonizer destabilizes “this hierarchical dynamic” (70). The hybridity of colonized “mimic men” thus opens a space for the resistance and agency of the colonized (72). Marchal turns to feminist postcolonialist commentators to establish the multiform nature of mimicry and the difficulties in reading mimicry as essentially resistant and Paul as anti-imperialist (79). Marchal adduces instances where mimicry may be read to validate rather than destabilize imperialism. His theoretical review of the competing dynamics of mimicry for postcolonialist analysis provides a valuable resource for appreciating the complexities of the topic.

In the fourth chapter, Marchal considers in the context of Dube’s second question Paul’s “co-workers,” Euodia and Syntyche, and Paul’s direction that they “think the same thing” (Phil. 4.2–3). Marchal rejects the “malestream” consensus that these women are in conflict with each other. He argues that their differences are with Paul, who advises them to conform to his thinking. Marchal foregrounds this reference to difference and suggests it destabilizes Paul’s claim to authority and demonstrates the inherent divergence of thinking among the Philippian community (108). Marchal returns to
this divergence in the fifth chapter, where he argues that scholars must “not begin and end with Paul’s perspective” if they wish to avoid re-inscribing his kyriarchal suppositions (115). Feminist postcolonial theory opens possibilities for moving excluded or marginal perspectives to the center of interpretation (122). Marchal makes a valuable contribution to ancient studies. He compels us to face the mixed heritage of our texts and offers a wide-ranging introduction to theorists whose interpretative methodologies take into account and attempt to defuse the asymmetrical orders of domination and subordination inscribing our literature. The Politics of Heaven will richly repay a close reading.

Judith Perkins
Saint Joseph College


This companion aims “to assemble a variety of approaches in the study of classical historiography” (xx). This goal, per se unambitious, along with the protean nature (and booming production) of companions, suggests the question: cui prodest? The answer: the book’s 57 essays provide many profitable tools both for the teacher and the scholar.

In the introduction Marincola sets out to supply the “background to some of the issues that will arise in the contributions” (1). He sketches the main approaches of ancient historiography starting from Jacoby’s division of historical writings into five sub-genres and showing both its legacy and limits. Although, as Marincola acknowledges, Jacoby’s division applies better to Greek than to Roman historiography, this succinct (8 pages) introduction provides a frame for understanding fundamental trends of ancient historiography and modern approaches to it. Marincola also resists the temptation to write a short history of Greco-Roman historiography and reduce it to “formulas and linear progressions” (8). In this respect the companion succeeds, and the broad array of collected essays invites the readers to reflect on their questions rather than to settle on simple responses.

Part I, contexts, tries to situate some broad issues “in the contexts of the societies that produced them and the generic traditions that developed over many centuries.” Nicolai shows how we understand historiography differently from Greeks and Romans. Darbo-Peschanski explores the origin of Greek historiography and the methodological issues involved in its approaches; the meaning of historia informs Schepens’ essay, which places the birth of historiography within the Greek tradition of historical inquiry. Rhodes treats the Greek historians’ use of inscriptions and makes one regret the absence of a corresponding essay for Latin historians, although Wiseman’s original contribution about the prehistory of Roman historiography partly fills the gap. The same applies to the next two essays: in considering the relation between myth and historiography, Saïd proves that Greek historiography was born out of myth and then invented the ‘mythical’ as its foil; and
Dewald sketches the emergence of a literary and imaginative construction of meaning in Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon. Myth and literary constructions in Latin historiography, however, are not treated. Pitcher considers characterization and Marincola speeches in ancient historiography; either essay could be assigned to undergraduates and graduate students as useful introduction or overview. An essay by Woodman concludes this first part and strongly argues a simple (and most welcome) point: one cannot grasp ancient historiography through translations, but needs to read the original text to investigate historians’ work.

Part II, surveys, introduces the major genres of historiography. Ten essays concern Greek historians. They consider the war monograph (Rood); the *Hellenica* (Tuplin); the writing of universal history (Marincola); the writing of history in Athens (Harding); Magna Graecia (Vattuone), and the Near East (Dillery); and the writing of history focused on Persia (Lefant) and Alexander (Zambrini). As for later Greek historiography, Sterling provides a clear introduction into the complexity of Jewish writers in the Hellenistic and early Roman worlds, and Pelling, a useful overview of the Greek historians of Rome. Five remaining papers focus on Rome and consider its early tradition (Beck); memoir and autobiography in the Republic (Riggsby); and historiography in the Late Republic (Levene), in the Empire (Matthews) and in Late Antiquity (Banchich). The organization of the material makes the first part, on Greek historiography, more successful than the second. The essays on Latin historiography, in fact, are divided chronologically, thus concealing the development of genres in Rome.

The contributors of part III, readings, “examine individual episodes or themes while simultaneously trying to draw some larger conclusions.” These episodes include the Thermopylae episode in Simonides and Herodotus (Vannicelli); Rhampsinitos’ story in Herodotus (S. West); Thucydides’ second prooemium (Porciani); the third sacred war in Diodorus (Green); the battle of Massilia in Caesar’s *BC* (Kraus) and of Pistoia in Sallust’s *Cat.* (Feldherr); Philip’s ascension to Mt. Haemus in Livy (Jaeger); Cincinnatus’ clothing in Dionysius (Schultze); the cannibalism of Mary in Josephus’ *BJ* (Chapman); Dioxippus in Curtius Rufus (Baynham); the battle of Mons Graupius in Tacitus’ *Agr.* (Ash); Vitellius’ portrayal in Tacitus’ *Hist.* (Keitel); and Ammianus’ Roman digressions (Rohrbacher) and epilogue (Kelly). The themes comprehend *agon* in Thucydides (Lateiner); narrative strategies in Xenophon’s *Hellenica* (Grey); fortune and Aetolia in Polybius (Walbank and Champion, respectively); Sallust’s style (O’Gorman); a comparison between Quadrigarius and Livy (Forsythe); Velleius’ nostalgia for the Republic (Gowing); Alexander’s pursuit of glory in Arrian (Bosworth); the literary dimension of Appian’s *BC* 1 (Bucher); and Cassius Dio’s discomfort under Septimius Severus (Hose).

This third part, the longest in the two volumes (23 essays and 167 pages), grants what the inside jacket promises: “a series of cutting-edge articles by authoritative scholars,” which “communicates the results of recent research and demonstrates the diversity of approaches towards the past in studies of the ancient world.” The choice to include these essays in a Companion is bold, and deserves much credit. Classic *loci*, like Thucydides’ sec-
ond proemium and fortune in Polybius, are juxtaposed to new ones, like Dio-
xippus in Curtius and Ammianus’ Roman digressions. This choice not only
shows, rather than explaining, the trends of contemporary historiography; it
also provides fresh ideas for research.

The “genres that bordered on and influenced ancient historians” are the
subject of part four, neighbors. Seven essays explore the relationship between
historiography and epic (Leigh); ethnography (Dench); tragedy (Rutherford);
antiquarianism (Bravo); biography (Stadter); geography (Engels); and the
novel (Morgan). One essay constitutes part five and concludes the companion
by exploring “the continuity and change” in late antique historiography.

Almost every essay is divided into subsections and followed by es-
sential bibliographical suggestions. A table of contents, list of contributors
and abbreviations and a short preface open the two volumes, which conclude
with 60 pages of bibliography, an index locorum and a general index. The
choice to treat Greek and Roman historiography together presents obvious
advantages and a few pitfalls: more space is devoted to Greek than to Roman
historians, and the originality of Roman historiography is not always brought
forth. One might be disappointed not to find a self-contained introduction to
Thucydides or Tacitus, but this is nowhere promised. In short, this compan-
ion asks a lot of its readers, but also has lots to offer.

Luca Grillo
Amherst College


Oxford University Press has reissued, without change to the text,
Kevin McGeough’s primer on Roman civilization, which was first
published by ABC-Clio in 2004 as The Romans: New Perspectives. The
book aims to serve as a handbook on the basics of Roman civilization, and as
a starting point for more in-depth study. Indeed, it often reads as a “hand-
book to handbooks,” as throughout the work M. points the reader to more
involved treatments in standard works such as T. J. Cornell’s The Beginnings
of Rome (New York, 1995) and F. R. Cowell’s Life in Ancient Rome (New York,
1980). There is no direct engagement with primary literary sources, and little
discussion of the images printed alongside M.’s text.

The book is divided into eleven chapters, each addressing a different
theme. Chapter 1, the Introduction (pp. 3–16), addresses the prominence of
Rome in western culture and summarizes the resources available to scholars
of Rome. Chapter 2 (pp. 19–31) considers the geography and ecosystems of
the empire, a topic to which M. returns in Chapter 11 when weighing argu-
ments about Rome’s fall. In Chapter 3 (pp. 32–52) M. offers a history of the
contexts and ways in which Rome has been studied, before moving on in
Chapter 4 (pp. 53–96) to a sweeping historical overview, which takes us from
the Villanovan settlements of 900 BCE up to the Germanic king Odoacer’s as-
sumption of power at Rome in 476 CE. The overview is at times uneven (M.
commits just three sentences to Trajan’s reign [pp. 84–85], but nearly a full
page [p. 87] to Commodus and his gaggle of advisors), and at other times incorrect (on p. 73 we read that the patrician Sulla was elected to the tribunate). Chapter 5 (pp. 97–120) covers the Roman economy, while Chapter 6 (pp. 121–152) looks at social organization (with a welcome introduction to the use of surface surveys), social strata, and family life. Chapter 7 (pp. 153–177), on politics and warfare, is for the most part clear in (e.g.) sorting out the many voting comitia and discussing the development of military tactics during the Republic. Chapter 8 (pp. 178–206), on religion, is similarly successful in presenting Rome’s plethora of deities, priesthoods, and festivals; M. is sure throughout this chapter to distinguish the Roman pantheon and religious practices from the Greeks’. Chapter 9 (pp. 207–247), titled “Material Culture,” introduces Rome’s best-known monuments and distinctive artistic developments. Problematic here is that in the sections on pottery (pp. 229–233), Roman art (pp. 233–238), and objects from daily life (pp. 238–244), there is just one image (of a mosaic, on p. 235). This is an issue elsewhere in the book as well, as in the treatment of coins in Chapter 5 (pp. 108–111), which is also void of images. M. turns to “Intellectual Accomplishments” in Chapter 10 (pp. 248–284), where he focuses on Roman science, philosophy, law, and literature. This last field is given just four pages of treatment (pp. 265–268); more discouraging perhaps is that at several points M. directs readers to the introduction to Wheelock’s Latin for further reading on Latin literature, with no mention in the text or bibliography of the handbooks of G. B. Conte (Latin Literature: A History [Baltimore, 1994]) or E. Fantham (Roman Literary Culture: from Cicero to Apuleius [Baltimore, 1996]).

While the first ten chapters present themselves as “bare-bones” introductions to themes in Roman civilization, the final chapter (pp. 287–306), titled “Controversies and Future Directions,” looks in greater detail at issues such as the uncertainty of Rome’s origins and the reasons for the fall of Rome (and whether “fall” is even the appropriate term). M.’s summaries of scholarly stances on these and other matters are helpful, and make this the most interesting chapter in the book. But, for a chapter aiming to explore “future directions,” it is unfortunate that the most recent entry in the chapter’s bibliography (pp. 305–306) is from 1995. Indeed, the bibliography is an issue for the book as a whole. While the annotated list of sources for further study at pp. 339–365 is helpful, it has not been updated from the 2004 edition. The book’s only changes from that edition come in the replacement of some of the images. But the drawback remains that many of the images are not duly captioned; for example, The Emblem of Christ Appearing to Constantine on p. 91 and The Rape of the Sabines on p. 289 are oddly not credited to their painters, Rubens and Pietro da Cortona, respectively.

Problems with Latin spelling come up frequently (e.g., the singular of equites becomes equite and the singular of the Roman coin becomes quadrans), and there is a handful of dating errors (e.g., on p. 211 it is stated that Juvenal was writing two centuries after Nero). The recurrence of such problems certainly takes away from the book’s reliability. But the thorough glossary (pp. 307–332) and timeline (pp. 333–338) are valuable resources for the student of Rome; and the book as whole could serve just this function, as a glossary
writ large of Roman civilization, to be used as a companion to other, fuller resources.

Timothy Joseph
College of the Holy Cross


In a stimulating new book, Mary P. Nichols analyzes the concept of “friendship” in Plato’s middle dialogues as an activity that could bring philosophy and politics together. She does so by appeal to Søren Kierkegaard’s and Friedrich Nietzsche’s interpretations of Socrates, the legacy of which has resulted in the “alienating aspects of modern thought” (p. 2). By “alienation,” Nichols means something like the “turn to subjectivity” that, so she claims, “undermine[s] communal and hence political life” (p. 2) both for the ancients and for ourselves today. One might detect a hint of a polemical subtext directed against philosophical approaches to Plato’s writing that focus on interiority for the pursuit of happiness, or those that adopt “analytical” approaches to Socratic arguments. For Nichols, whose approach strikes a balance between philosophy (of a “continental” tenor) and literature, Plato’s writing itself cautions us against such positions (pp. 90–95).

Despite the fact that two of the five chapters (Chs. 2 and 4) contain material previously published in article format, Nichols’ study holds up reasonably well as a monograph. Those chapters of Nichols’ book not previously published (Chs. 1, 3, and 5) are generally less persuasive and less well-designed, and they feature higher instances of error in typography and citation. The framing device that ties the book together, namely the alienation of Socratic communalism by Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, is most expressly discussed in Chapters 1 and 5, which I will treat in brief, because these chapters do not warrant as much commentary as those that deal most exclusively with the Socratic dialogues (Chs. 2–4).

Chapter 1, “The Problem of Socrates: Kierkegaard and Nietzsche,” and Chapter 5, “Socratic Philosophizing,” pursue the problem of the Socratic community, which is also a problem of the self, by describing how Kierkegaard (in *Philosophical Fragments and Fear and Trembling*) and Nietzsche (in *The Birth of Tragedy and Twilight of the Idols*) present a Socrates alienated by his pursuit of universal knowledge. There is value in these chapters’ discussion of Kierkegaard, who posits two possible relationships between self-knowledge and universal (or God-) Knowledge: either they are the same (Socrates), or they exist paradoxically (Climacus/Johannes de Silentio). On Nichols’ per-

2 Typographical and citation errors I have discovered: p. 35, *Theogony* should be *Theogony*; p. 97, there is an extra space between “they” and “have”; p. 99, the citation should be *Phaedrus* 227c not 227a; p. 100, the citation “227 and b” is in error; p. 116, the citation for the stream of love rebounding like an echo should be 251c or 255c, not 254c; p. 116, n. 34, the *Lovers* is not generally regarded a work by Plato; p. 130, “eather” should be “either”; p. 136, there is an extra space before the citation of 270b; p. 184, there is an extraneous quotation mark before “Versenyi.”
tinent reading (p. 211), Kierkegaard’s mistake lies in his assumption that the truth is “absolutely other” and that the process of philosophizing with friends could not produce knowledge. Nichols is right to draw our attention to Kierkegaard’s analysis of Socrates, both for our understanding of Socrates, and for our comprehension of Kierkegaard’s philosophy.

Chapters 2–4 function most effectively as running commentaries on the Platonic dialogues (Symposium, Phaedrus, Lysis) that are treated therein. I will focus on the major themes of these chapters (friendship and its defining features) and explain my greatest point of disagreement with Nichols, namely that I do not think Plato conceives of philosophical friendship as reciprocal among equals.

Chapter 2, which examines “Love, Generation, and Political Community” in the Symposium, is Nichols’ best chapter in terms of argumentation and interpretation. Her central claim is that Socrates’ “understanding of love…rooted in both human need and resourcefulness…explains [his] piety, his philosophic life, and his connection to and even love for other human beings” (p. 30). Nichols’ treatment of the Symposium’s speeches succeeds in presenting a case for a progressive development in the notion of erotic deliberation that culminates in Socrates’ wish to practice dialectic with would-be “lover” Alcibiades. Still, Nichols cannot discover anything like reciprocal friendship among equals in the Symposium except where Diotima apparently places it on the “ladder of Love”: somewhere nearby the generation of laws and pursuits (209c; cf. 211c). That a higher relationship between friends could be unequal (which is not quite the same thing as non-reciprocal) does not present itself as a problem for Plato.

In Chapter 3, “Self-Knowledge, Love, and Rhetoric,” Nichols claims, in the Phaedrus, self-knowledge and universal knowledge are achieved jointly through reciprocal friendships between souls that are similar to one another. Thus, Nichols sees a departure from the unequal friendships that characterize the pursuit of beauty itself in the Symposium. I, for my part, see very little divergence from the Symposium’s description of philia and its place within the Platonic universe. Philia belongs below the pursuit of the objects of beauty through learning (which requires unequal relationships between lover and beloved in order to catalyze psychic ascent) but plays no direct role in universal knowledge, which is beyond an individual’s self-knowledge. After all, knowledge of the (external) thing itself is superior to, and requires, the recognition of similarities. Moreover, as in the Symposium, equal friendship belongs at the level of the political and cannot be separated from laws and lawgiving.

Nichols perhaps missteps when she goes in pursuit of the character of philia in Chapter 4, “What is a Friend?”. In this chapter, Nichols accepts the aporetic design of the Lysis, but she also imagines that it provides justification for the claim that friendship, like philosophy, is reciprocal. Her argument rests on two doubtful claims: (a) that there is a semantic distinction between unreciprocated desire (erōs) and reciprocated friendship (philia), and (b) that “possessing” a lover is an ongoing activity. These claims are contradicted by Socrates’ adherence in the dialogue (221e) and elsewhere (e.g. Smp. 200c–e) to the principle that “friendship” (philia) must be “friendship of something”
which it, consequently, “lacks.” In this sense, friendship is no different than erōs in the Symposium, but, on the contrary, it actually constitutes the technical language for pursuit of something that one does not “have.” There are many other issues worth discussing viz. this chapter, which is complex and interesting, if ultimately unsatisfying, like the Lysis itself.

Overall, Nichols has produced a provocative analysis of an understudied aspect of Platonic philosophy. Its strengths lie in the sensitive readings that Nichols elicits in her running commentaries on those Socratic dialogues that deal with friendship. While readers might be hesitant to agree with Nichols’ claim that reciprocity is equivalence in Plato’s theories of philosophical friendship, they will rejoice in following Nichols on the upward journey towards more synoptic readings of the Socratic dialogues.

PHILLIP SIDNEY HORKY
Stanford University


If the chief feature of gardens is the clearly defined boundary then the chief feature of garden literature is its seductive ability to lead author and reader to transgress generic decorum and to generate a transformation in those who read and write about them.

I begin this review with a quote (from p. 123), in part to imitate Victoria Pagán (VP), all of whose chapters start with aphorisms of Ian Hamilton Finlay, in part to support the point of aphorisms (to evade the secular, and preserve the garden’s mystery, x), and in part because this particular sentence might function as a mantra for the whole. Whatever ‘garden’ signifies (place, time, event, change, desire, society, anxiety, &c) this sententia works.

In the introduction, VP compares the highly specialized work by Wilhelmina Jashemski on Pompeii’s gardens with the broad survey of Roman gardens by Patrick Bowe (7). Despite differences, both show that the garden was “an integral feature of domestic and public architecture, and a place for work, leisure, business, and religious worship” (7). VP too shows the multiple functions of gardens, but she adds to the discussion by introducing gardens in the Roman literary imagination. She thereby makes a significant and provocative contribution to this field of study. In some sense, her work unites the poles of Jashemski and Bowe: VP thereby succeeds in her aim to reach “as wide an audience as possible” (ix).

Within the many functions of gardens, there are polarities: gardens are places of hard labor and leisure, and of inclusion and exclusion; they are defined yet they invite transgression of definition; they are natural and ordered; they are secular and spiritual; they are for reproduction as well as for change; they are physical and metaphysical. They are, in short, a way of “being in the world.” This means that literature on gardens is a way of “articulating that existence” (5). Thus VP’s big question is, “How does the garden with all of its
physical and metaphysical meaning, shape the ideological import of a work of literature?” (2) To think through this question, VP explores the garden in four Roman literary genres (technical, satiric, annalistic, autobiographical), presented by four authors (Columella, Horace, Tacitus, Augustine), over four centuries, and presented in her book in four chapters. The fifth chapter presents a modern author and an unRoman genre for further analysis of the garden in the literary imagination.

In Chapter 1, “The Garden of Empire,” VP focuses on Book X of Columella’s *On Agriculture*. This is the only one in a 12-book treatise to be written in meter; such exceptionality in presentation bespeaks a consonant exceptionality to the garden. Gardens are poetic, capable of whisking away into a state of reverie those who either experience them or write about them. VP first considers the physical and metaphysical features of Columella’s garden poem. Inasmuch as the creation of a garden entails the institution of boundaries, the establishment of such physical order is also a metaphor for society since certain members of any community will be included or excluded. The garden is also steeped in religious, mythological, and intellectual elements: it is metaphysical. Thus, Columella’s garden is both bound by space, but it exceeds those boundaries. The space within is filled with plant specimens from around the Mediterranean. Columella’s catalogue of plants reveals his underlying ideologies: the incorporation of such disparate plants from such disparate places in “a small parcel” of land presents us with a garden that “represents a terrestrial totality” (30). Thus even though the garden excludes, it also unites, and thus becomes a metaphor for (a “naturalized”) Empire (30).

The extent to which Columella was aware of the metaphorical presentation of Empire is discussed in the final part of this chapter. Given Columella’s reference to the literary request of Silvinus, to his finally having paid off his literary/social debt, as well as his allusions to Vergil, it is possible that Columella suffered a certain “anxiety of influence” and of “inspiration,” and was aware of the “transformative effect of the subject matter on the poet’s psyche” (35).

Gardens can be metaphors for society. The Roman literary genre that most readily provided poets with the means to reflect (on) society was satire. Satire was “obsessed with social hierarchy and the distasteful transgression of strictly imposed boundaries” (38). Accordingly, it is fruitful for comparison with gardens. In the second chapter, “The Garden of Politics,” VP turns to Horace’s *Satire* 1.8, where Priapus tries to protect the Garden of Maecenas from witches and necromancy. VP’s readings of this poem are political, but ‘political’ is not limited to governmental running: it refers to “a range of activities that control the distribution and flow of power in a society” (39). This flow operates between polarities (male/female, good/evil, sacred/profane, reverie/reality), and it seems to occur as the elements in each antithetical pair undergo some sort of transformation in the garden. Priapus, for instance, is male, and is the guardian of the garden. Yet he is impotent when it comes to scaring away the witches, who are female, and are violating moral and social codes by entering the garden. Priapus is in a reverie as he recollects the event; but in the end, he recalls himself to ‘reality’, and whereas his phallus failed to ward off the witches, a fart of epic proportions sends them a-scatter. These
polarities and transformations are, of course, voiced by Horace. *Satire* 1.8 can be read politically from the perspective, then, of both Priapus and Horace (41). Though obscured in a “cloud of flatulence” (50), Horace’s worries over a changing political landscape are nevertheless evident, particularly if we read 1.8 in concert with his *Epodes* and with Vergil’s *Eclogues* (55–60). But while Horace undergoes several experiences similar to Priapus (anxiety, change, reverie), he differs in one important respect: unlike the deity, Horace is able to guard against any impotence—of self or satire or the “garden of satire”—by transgressing generic decorum with the fart that may send the witches flying, but which sticks in the reader’s mind in an unsettling way (62–63). In this way, “Horace wins” (63).

From gardens in verse, VP turns to those in prose. In chapter 3, “The Garden of Representation,” VP explores murder, historiography, transgression, and male anxiety of control in Tacitus’ *Annals* 11, wherein the Gardens of Lucullus provide a setting for the expiration of Messalina. In Tacitus’ presentation we witness many of the essential ingredients of garden literature: thus, if in Horace there is an anxiety over political change, in Tacitus there is an anxiety about representing the past. Or, whereas both Columella and Priapus fall victim to the garden’s seductive power, Tacitus seems all too aware of this temptation: he “seems to steel himself against the powers of the garden to lead a rational reader astray” (72) by voicing his anxiety in a disclaimer at the start of his narrative. This act bespeaks the aforementioned anxiety of representing the past. In other ways too, the historian’s concern is apparent. Through mythological allusion (Claudius’ advisor is called Narcissus), nebulous language (*simulacrum* describes Messalina’s Bacchic revelry, and *species* is used of Claudius’ storming back to Rome), as well as a narrative that is temporally and spatially imprecise, Tacitus alerts “the reader of the potential shortcomings of representation” (76). Even the persons represented are at once specific individuals and stereotypes (68). Or, in the case of Lucullus, in whose gardens the death takes place, the eponymous Roman morphs from a successful soldier to an inglorious over-indulger in things extravagant. These persons are defined and yet they defy stasis. Tacitus seems to present in his narrative “poetic possibility” rather than “historic probability” (66, 77). Even so, poetry and history are not necessarily disjunctive: VP includes and interprets a modern poem at the end of this chapter, Forché’s ‘The Garden Shukkei-en’, which is both history and poetry (87–92), and which, like Tacitus’ narrative, shows a self-consciousness and a concern over representing the past.

If in Tacitus’ garden we witness the expiration of a woman of moral depravity, in Augustine’s Milanese garden, we are presented with the (re)birth of a morally upright Christian man. In the fourth chapter, “The Garden of Redemption,” VP again identifies bipartite structures and antithetical themes: Augustine’s experience is physiological and psychological, it rests on utterance and in writing, involves both a ‘then’ and a ‘now’ (95), and seems to unite the worlds and mythologies of pagan and Christian Rome (104). These polarities reflect the liminal life of the author. Whether stuck between poles (100) or thriving at the interstices (98), Augustine “resides on the edges, metaphorically, physically, and emotionally” (100). We see these tensions also in
his final conversation, overlooking a garden, with Monica (97), and in the pear-theft story from Augustine’s youth (101–103). In the final analysis, VP points to the similarities between gardens and autobiographies (105–106). She then points to the similarities between the representation of gardens and autobiography, seen most clearly through a comparison of Horace’s Satire 1.8 and Augustine’s Confessions (107–108). The big difference between Augustine and Horace, and Columella and even Tacitus, is that this latest author neither guards against nor recalls himself from the garden reverie; observes VP, “How striking then, to see Augustine … allow himself to be fully transported and transformed—and redeemed—in and by the garden” (108). On ‘redemption’ and the redemptive capability of the garden, VP again turns to a modern narrative, Coetzee’s Life & Times of Michael K, and provides some provocative interpretation before revisiting the ancient presentation by means of comparison (of authors, texts, and literary stylistics, 109–118).

VP begins the final chapter, “The Garden of Invention,” with a recap of what are the common features and functions of gardens. She explains why she chose to analyze the gardens that she did, as well as the literary genre in which these “out-of-the-way” places were represented (122). In part her motivation was to “put a brake on interpretations of garden literature that wax rhapsodic on themes such as regeneration, growth, life, timeless beauty, and its constant companion, truth” (123). In part she wanted to show that the garden (and garden literature) “has a powerful hold over the imagination across genres, across eras, and that authors and readers should be keenly aware of this seductive power” (123). To demonstrate this “hold” VP turns to Tom Stoppard’s Arcadia and to his Invention of Love. Amidst plot summary, VP shows that in Arcadia, Lady Croom’s garden, like those we have seen in Roman literature, is a locus of transformation. As such it is also a place where time past and present are melded. Despite these similarities, this play “resists stepping into the rhetoric of garden” (134). In addition, there is none of the self-consciousness in Stoppard’s production that we saw in Tacitus and in Augustine. We see instead several moments of metatheatre wherein Stoppard presents an awareness of the reception and review of his play (131). Stoppard too, it appears, has an anxiety of representation (134), one that is evident also in The Invention of Love. VP chooses not to dwell on (theorizing) Stoppard’s anxiety; instead, she shows that in this play the garden seems to be a metaphor for textual criticism. If so, gardens and Classics have much in common (144). VP thus ends her book in a way that is simultaneously unRoman and yet inescapably Roman, and in a way that, like the gardens and garden literature she has been writing about, succeeds in collapsing the temporal gap of ‘then’ and ‘now’. One wonders, then, if, like the Roman authors, like Forché, Coetzee, and Stoppard, VP too harbors and reveals her own self-consciousness about representation and reception. Thus to poetry, history, autobiography, and drama, we might add ‘scholarly literature’ to the list of places where gardens and their representation seduce both author and reader alike. Such speculations might be crossing the line, but isn’t that, in the end, part of the point?

GILLIAN McINTOSH
San Francisco State University

Most of the ten papers presented in this volume were first delivered in the colloquium, “The Timeless and the Temporal: The Political Implications of Art during the Peloponnesian War, 431–404 B.C.,” organized by the editor, Olga Palagia, at the annual meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America in New Orleans in 2003. In the preface, Palagia promises papers that “discuss aspects not only of the art history, but also of the history and religious attitudes of the Athenians during this critical period” (p. xv). The international contributors assembled by Palagia have, for the most part, lived up to the editor’s promise. I shall not review every one of the ten chapters of the book in detail. Instead, I provide some general comments on the value of the book and its overall quality with a brief overview of the contents of each chapter.

The long, horrible Peloponnesian War affected the artistic life of Athens to its core. The war caused significant cultural losses, such as an exodus of great artists and intellectuals, like the tragic poets Euripides and Agathon, the painter Zeuxis, and Iktinos, an architect of the Parthenon. Palagia and her contributors, however, do not focus on losses, but rather highlight the new elements introduced into Athenian art as a result of the war, which have not been well documented or discussed before. We are treated to analyses of sculptured dedications showing renewed confidence in the city’s destiny, the architectural sculptures of the Ionic temple of Athena Nike, the revival of sculptural reliefs in the period, both funerary and votive, and the invention of ‘record reliefs’, to name a few tantalizing innovations. We learn about new subjects introduced by vase painters, such as the Meidias painter, that were intimately related to developments in sculpture. We also learn about powerful new themes in art, like war, death, and resurrection, and about new archaistic trends in sculpture, perhaps associated with conservative elements in the political life of Athens. The contributions in this book, therefore, dramatically change the conceptual framework of artistic discourse in Athens during the war and offer exciting new perspectives.

Michael A. Flower’s chapter 1, “Athenian Religion and the Peloponnesian War” (pp. 1–23), opens the book with a thoughtful set of questions related to the relationship between the Athenians and their gods during and after the war. Arguing that Athenian religion operated under principles of reciprocity between gods and men, Flower convincingly shows that there was no ‘crisis’ of belief or practice in the late fifth century, as has sometimes been proposed. Rather, the Athenians faced a series of challenges that were overcome even as Athens was losing its empire (p. 1). While some members of the elite, perhaps under the influence of the sophists, had come to question the existence of the gods, the continuing performance of religious rituals at festivals in Athens strongly indicates that the majority of Athenians still held traditional beliefs about the nature of the gods and their involvement with mankind. Even though Thucydides, our most important source for this period, tends to minimize the significance of religious activity in human af-
fairs, Flower’s scrupulous research proves the power of the oracles, especially at Delphi, divination, and the overlap between politics and religious propaganda. Sculptural dedications in this period, in fact, provide verification of the reciprocal relationship between men and gods.

Chapter 2, “Archaism and the Quest for Immortality in Attic Sculpture during the Peloponnesian War” (pp. 24-51), by the editor, Olga Palagia, is a highly specialized presentation. Palagia first grapples with the emergence of archaism in freestanding sculpture, and then considers sculptural representations of the descent to and return from the Underworld as new narratives in times of crisis. In chapter 3, “The Eleusinian Sanctuary during the Peloponnesian War” (pp. 52-65), Kevin Clinton reviews the architectural history of the sanctuary through the culmination of its architectural development under Pericles in order to argue that the status of the sanctuary was clearly in flux during the war years. By showing that there was no suspension of annual celebrations of the Mysteries honoring Demeter and Kore, Clinton supports the complex religious picture established by Flower (chapter 1). Despite military setbacks and the plague, devotion to these goddesses remained and was demonstrated by sculptural dedications at the sanctuary. Carol L. Lawton further hones the argument about sanctuary sites in chapter 4, “Attic Votive Reliefs and the Peloponnesian War” (pp. 66-93), in which she discusses in detail four groups (of the approximately 40 votive reliefs from ca. 420 to 405 BCE) that represent dedications to the Eleusinians, Athena, Asklepios, and Artemis (p. 67).

The scope of the discussion changes significantly in Lisa Kallet’s chapter 5, “War, Plague, and Politics in Athens in the 420s B.C.” (pp. 94-127), which covers the military events of the period, explores attitudes held by Athenians towards the war and towards Sparta, and examines the war’s impact on the individual and on the Athenian oikos, or household. With Thucydides as her guide, Kallet shows that the hawkish continuation of the war, supported by Kleon, was not so different from Pericles’ push for Athenian aggression and expansion at the beginning of the war.

Three chapters, Peter Schultz’s chapter 6, “The North Frieze of the Temple of Athena Nike” (pp. 128-167), Hans Rupprecht Goette’s chapter 8, “Images in the Athenian ‘Demosion Sema’” (pp. 188-206), and John H. Oakley’s chapter 9, “Children in Athenian Funerary Art during the Peloponnesian War” (pp. 207-235), bring us squarely back to the artwork of the war period. Schultz shows through meticulous research that an interpretation of Block M of the north frieze of the temple of Athena Nike as the defeat of Eurystheus (cf. Herodotus 9.26-27) affords many possible connections between Kleon, his allies, their victories in the mid 420s, and the ‘visual rhetoric’ present in the north frieze. Goette attempts to understand the iconography of Athenian state burials from the monuments, how burial monuments influenced the contemporary art of Athens, and whether funerary battle scenes were historical or not. Oakley argues that the sudden increased interest in children as subjects in art (and literature) during the Peloponnesian War can be attributed quite clearly to the decline of the male population.
Brian Bosworth’s chapter 7, “Thucydides and the Unheroic Dead” (pp. 168-187), returns to close analysis of Thucydides’ narrative in order to determine why Thucydides did not dwell on details or commemorate heroic deaths. Bosworth concludes that war and death for Thucydides were a collective experience (p. 183) and that the fate of the collective rather than the individual (cf. the Homeric epics) was the main experience to record. The final chapter (10), “The Politics of Personal Style” (pp. 236-263), by H.A. Shapiro, is a compelling discussion suggesting that much of the controversy during the period over sexuality, masculinity, and excess crystallized around the figure of Alcibiades. Making the case that “style is political” (p. 236, his emphasis), Shapiro closely ties the career of Alcibiades to both literary and artistic trends.

Every chapter ends with a rich bibliography, and there are three ample indexes. Still, in a book of this kind there is inevitably some unevenness in writing style from one author to another. More troubling, though, is the fact that much of same key evidence supports different arguments. This makes for some tedious reading with the repetition from chapter to chapter of basic information about the Peloponnesian War, chief political players, and passages from Thucydides. The authors together, however, do illuminate various aspects of Athenian art, archaeology, daily life and ritual, and larger historical questions, and serious scholars of the Peloponnesian War will benefit greatly from their work.

ANN OLGA KOLOSKI-OSTROW
Brandeis University


In this book the editor and six additional contributors deviate from the more standard stylistic analysis of Archaic and Classical Greek Sculpture to examine the technical aspects that were a major contributing factor to stylistic development. Some of the essays are regional surveys while others examine the use of a particular material across regions. They reveal the important and often overlooked role material and technique played in the development of Greek sculpture and also examine the function of statues in the ancient Greek world.

John Boardman’s essay “Sources and Models” describes separate sources for the kouros and Kore. He begins with an exploration of the scanty evidence for early cult statues and connects the development of early Greek sculpture to religious needs. Korai developed from Cretan Daedalic. For the kouros, he (unlike several other contributors to the book) downplays the role of Egypt as technical inspiration, rejecting the Egyptian canon as model but agreeing that the size and material of Egyptian monuments inspired the Greeks. He also defines three distinct stylistic groups within kouroi—Cycladic, Attic, and Ionian.
Mary Sturgeon in “Archaic Athens and the Cyclades” reviews the evidence for Greek quarrying and marble sources, noting that techniques seem to come from the Southern Anatolian-north Syrian area. In discussing the function of the kouros, she suggests that the modern name ‘kouros’ has misled us and that we should recognize that this type could hold a variety of meanings. The pose of the kouros may be conditioned by the desire of the sculptor to impart stability to a potentially breakable object. She discusses the sources for marble and the use of decorative touches such as paint and added metal.

Barbara Barletta in “Archaic and Classical Magna Graecia” details the role that materials and tradition play in the sculpture of the Greek west. She presents a chronological survey of the materials used and types of monuments produced. Poor stone sources combined with a strong coroplastic tradition led to later use of stone than on the mainland and a predominance of early terracotta sculpture. Nevertheless, although freestanding stone sculpture arrived later, its sculptors are fully conversant with stone carving techniques and are not simply translating clay into stone.

Olga Palagia in “Classical Athens” points out that there are no unfinished pieces still in the quarry to help us determine techniques for this period. She points to a unique use of structural iron in attaching the Parthenon pediments. Her examination of Classical architectural sculpture discusses the great wealth of piecework, added metal, and color that is no longer well-preserved. In examining marble types she points to the ascendancy of Pentelic marble over Parian, which she suggests may be connected to the defection of Paros from the Athenian Alliance. She also shows that Eleusinian marble in statue bases is not an original trait of the sculptor Phidias but has an earlier history.

Peter Higgs in “Late Classical Asia Minor: Dynasts and Their Tombs” looks at two monuments—the Nereid Monument and the Mausoleum at Halikarnassos, which, while they have been the focus of exhaustive research, have not been studied together. He notes that both are monuments of dynasts who combine Greek and Oriental themes to appeal to eastern and western constituencies. Technically, the Nereid monument shows much more piecing of figures than the Mausoleum. Both works use more expensive marble for the most important sculptures and lesser-quality stone for less significant areas.

Carol Mattusch chronicles the history of bronze as a medium for sculpture in “Archaic and Classical Bronzes.” She points to the homogeneity among bronze statuettes of the ninth century as establishing the principle of repetition in bronze work. Egypt provided the inspiration of monumentality and also the lost-wax technique for larger-scale bronzes in the Archaic period. The properties of bronze are not, however, fully exploited in early pieces, since they are bound by the style and typology of stone sculpture. Full exploitation of bronze occurs in the Classical period when the major statue type shifts to athletes, often in motion. She also notes that previous methods of cleaning bronzes have caused loss of the ancient patina, but that newer methods will
now allow us to preserve the original surface and thus gain a clearer idea of
the visual impression bronze statues made in antiquity.

Olga Palagia in “Marble Carving Techniques” discusses the mechanical
aspects of copying. She rejects Sheila Adam’s idea that direct point-by-point
copying was used. Instead, her review of the evidence shows, models were
used or a caliper system involving triangulation but not the pointing machine
traditionally advocated by scholars. She suggests that the fact that ancient
sculptors worked in a variety of media indicates that they provided models in
clay or plaster, rather than directly creating the sculptures attributed to them.

Norman Herz in “Greek and Roman White Marble: Geology and De-
termination of Provenance” explains the kinds of information that geological
analysis can now provide. He describes the Marble Data Base that contains
isotopic data for all major Classical Greek and Roman marble sources. He out-
lines the various important questions these data can be used to answer. For
example, marble provenance can be established. Reconstruction can be aided
when pieces can be associated or disassociated from a monument based on
the isotopic rates of the marbles used. The authenticity of a piece can also be
established. This technology is also being extended to limestone.

While much of the material has been presented elsewhere, this book
provides a valuable resource by bringing the contributions of these scholars
together in one place. It is copiously illustrated with photos, drawings, and
charts. I do, however, have a caveat. After one reading, the pages of the pa-
perback edition began to fall out. A more durable binding is clearly needed.

Mary Ann Eaverly
University of Florida

Miriam R. Pelikan Pittenger, Contested Triumphs: Politics, Pageantry,
and Performance in Livy’s Republican Rome. The Joan Palevsky Imprint
in Classical Literature. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of

In this well conceived and well executed monograph, Pittenger (hereaf-
ter P.) undertakes a thorough examination of the evidence for triumph
debates during the period 218–167 B.C. found in books 21–45 of Livy’s
history of Rome ab urbe condita. As such, the book joins a recent spate of publi-
cations on the Roman triumph and related topics. Unfortunately, however, as
P. explains in her preface (pp. xi–xiii), she was prevented from engaging with
much of this important work in detail because of extenuating circumstances
surrounding the final revision of the manuscript. While the title under review
has suffered no grave detriment from this situation, it is to be hoped that P.
(and other scholars) will continue the study of this material in light of this
other work. In the introduction (“Livy’s Republican Rome,” pp. 1–24), P. ar-
ticulates the theoretical framework of the investigation and provides an out-
line of the argument. She clarifies how, in her analysis of Livy’s speeches, she
will integrate various historical and historiographical perspectives through a
focus on rhetoric and performance. The core of the book is then divided into two central parts.

In the first part (“Setting standards: Imperio auspicio ductu felicitate,” pp. 25–125), P. addresses the fundamental question of who triumphed (or not) and why they did so (or not). In particular, she analyzes the meaning and significance of the basic qualifications enshrined in the four-fold ritual formula imperio auspicio ductu felicitate (cf. Liv. 40.52.5), and she highlights the productive tension between tradition and originality in the mos maiorum. Chapter 1 (“Triumphal decision making and the SPQR,” pp. 33–53) introduces the key players (the Senatus, the populus Romanus, and the imperatores themselves in search of a triumph), as well as the different levels of celebration (the triumph, the triumph in monte Albano, and the ovatio). Chapter 2 (“Consular tribunes and privati cum imperio: Magistracy and triumph,” pp. 54–66) considers two classes of exceptions to the standard rule that the would-be triumphator had to have been consul, dictator, or praetor. Chapter 3 (“Crossing provincial boundaries: Joint campaigns and overlapping jurisdictions,” pp. 67–83) examines various procedural difficulties. Chapter 4 (“The importance of closure,” pp. 84–103) ponders the issue of when a bellum could be said to be debellatum, and the consequent effect on both the awarding of a triumphus to an imperator and the ratification of his acta. Chapter 5 (“Body counts; or, Who killed whom?” pp. 104–114) evaluates the reliability (or, rather, lack thereof) of ancient casualty statistics, as well as the validity of the “law” cited in Val. Max. 2.8.1 that required that the would-be triumphator had killed more than 5000 of the enemy in a single battle. Chapter 6 (“Patterns of success,” pp. 115–125) reviews the mass of data provided by Livy in books 21–45 and concludes with the salient reminder that, even despite missing requests, outright rejections, and celebrations of ovationes and triumphs in monte Albano, a clear majority of the requests made during this period did ultimately result in a full triumph (cf. pp. 299–307).


In the conclusion ("Triumphs and Roman values," pp. 275–298), P. "attempt[s] a decoding of the triumph as religious ritual, political display, and cultural pageant" (p. 275). The main text is complemented by two useful appendices (pp. 299–307), an ample bibliography (pp. 309–328), and three indispensable indices (pp. 329–365). Part two contains some (likely inevitable) repetition of the material in part one, and P. perhaps overuses certain terms and concepts (e.g., “symbolic value”). The text is relatively free from typographical errors. All in all, because of its laudably balanced approach, this book should appeal to scholars interested in Livy as both historian and historiographer.

JOHN JACOBS
LOYOLA COLLEGE IN MARYLAND


David Potter has written a compact, provocative, attractive, and thoroughly enjoyable history of Rome, a text certain to spark discussion among ancient historians and one which will lend itself to lively debate in any classroom where it is used. Organizing the narrative into seven chapters covering the years 800 BCE to 642 CE, Potter seeks to explain how the community of Romans developed, how they themselves understood this development, and whether their own notions of community changed over time. In answering these questions, Potter offers a sober and carefully reasoned analysis of the historical sources and produces a narrative that elevates social forces over personalities and evolution over revolution.

Potter’s periodization highlights his argument. Chapter one covers the period from 800 to 350 BCE, and emphasizes community formation and consensus building rather than conflict and struggle. Thus he gives the Servian reforms more serious consideration while suggesting that first century civil strife may have exaggerated our understanding of a less divisive Struggle of the Orders. Chapter two discusses the traditional (i.e. chronological) growth of empire; Potter again and again emphasizes fides as the key to understanding both domestic and foreign policy at Rome. He thereby implicitly
explains why the Romans were so infuriated with Carthage in 202 (though they themselves had not been as self-critical in 237). While Potter discusses the “failure” of the Republic in the ensuing chapter, he argues that it evolved rather than died. In his eyes the state failed to secure the loyalty of those who were dependent upon it. This especially explains the Social War which he clearly thinks a watershed or defining moment. Like the Italians, Romans thereafter turned to individuals who would satisfy their needs or demands. The fourth chapter explores the transition to the principate, which, for him, began in 59 and concluded only with the Year of the Four Emperors. During these years, at first dictators and later the principes became the guarantors of popular sovereignty over against the Senate. These leaders guaranteed their power with standing armies, and ensured their tenure by stationing those forces on the frontier. By 69, even the four usurpers saw their powers ratified in traditional assemblies.

At Augustus’ death, as Potter notes, the Roman Empire was more powerful and its population far greater than any of its potential enemies. For nearly two hundred years thereafter there was peace and stability, marked by a professional government, expanding economy, and growing population. This period occupies chapter five which concludes with the Severans whose governance, Potter argues, marked a dangerous departure: Severus and succeeding emperors became more dependent on the armies which they now led in person. In the succeeding chapter he proceeds to explain the transformation of the Roman world. Threats from without increased; the Roman armies suffered significant defeats, probably born of outmoded equipment and strategies. Separatist tendencies began to show themselves within. Because the post-Constantinian emperors were incapable of securing personal loyalty, they could not control or enforce imperial policy; the consequent in-fighting was destructive. And thus we reach the end, which is the subject of chapter seven. Potter turns to the question of when the Empire fell—a question, he suggests, that is much more complex than it might appear. He does, nevertheless, believe that the quest is valuable because it ultimately forces us to acknowledge that the fall was progressive. He distinguishes causes and dates for the decline in the West and East, the latter holding on until the death of Heraclius and the Arab occupation of Alexandria in 642, when “…the court could no longer convince its subjects that it was better off with Constantinople than without.”

This tale, told in a style accessible to any interested reader, provides insights and interpretations that merit the attention and consideration of any historian of Rome. Potter’s thesis, enunciated in his introduction, threads its way through the entire narrative such that Roman history is explained organically (not episodically); there is thus a flow to his argument that facilitates comprehension of the Roman achievement over fifteen hundred years. He well demonstrates that Rome flourished when it promoted and provided for the community of its people and that it failed (on more than one occasion) when it did not—all of this in a narrative of little more than 300 pages.

The format of the text also merits comment. Each of the seven chapters opens with a time line; if the text is interpretative, these are “data
central.” And each concludes with several brief paragraphs on the central themes explored. Within each chapter frequent excerpts of primary sources head a page or fill its margins. More important, Potter actually refers to these passages in his narrative; rather than filler or extras, they are essential evidence for his argument. Illustrations also abound, and, as we might expect of Thames and Hudson, these are judiciously chosen and well presented, often in color. The highlight is the multitude of coins which Potter, a master of Roman numismatics, employs to put faces to the names or to illustrate political programs and propaganda. The text concludes with a seven-page glossary, some suggestions for further reading, and a five-page index.

In reading I noted only three slips. On pages 66 & 79 Potter refers to Catulus’ naval victory in the Lipari Islands rather than the Aegates. Likewise on page 136 he would have Caesar prosecuting a Roscius rather than the aged Rabirius. Finally the transition from page 205 to 206 garbles the relationship, correctly explained on page 204, between Trajan and Vespasian.

To conclude on a positive note: Potter has written an engaging and substantive text that provides critical detail and data as well as a clear and persuasive argument. It could serve well as the core text for a semester-long course in Roman civilization. The clarity of its prose, the coherence of its argument, and the quality of its illustrations all serve to demonstrate how an introductory text should be constructed. An admirable effort!

David W. Madsen
Seattle University


Having read Joel Relihan’s edition of Cupid and Psyche, I am delighted to say that it is an important addition to the corpus of Apuleian scholarship. Just as Apuleius took a story and modified it to reveal elements of the human mystery, so Relihan (R.) has modified the typical way in which the average scholar or student approaches the story of Cupid and Psyche. The entire structure of his text is designed to get the reader, novice or scholar, to peer beyond a simple folktale and to relish the story in perspectives (perhaps) not previously encountered. R. does this through three ways: providing an atypical introduction that attempts to help the modern reader “get into” the ancient mindset, offering us a consistent translation to highlight Apuleian style and diction, and supplying a concluding discussion complete with an intriguing interpretation and useful appendices.

R. begins by admitting that he will postpone a normal introductory discussion by giving his readers a background that will help them approach the story from the perspective of an ancient reader in order to understand the text better (xvi). He gives a brief history of what the ancients would have expected to read in the Golden Ass, followed by a brief outline and series of questions
on the iconography and history of Cupid and Psyche, ending with a series of four Platonic passages (three from *Phaedrus*, one from *Symposium*) concerned with love and the soul.

The history of the *Golden Ass* and the discussion of the iconography of Cupid and Psyche cause the reader to consider if Apuleius is an original thinker in his rendition of the story. The Platonic passages identify and reinforce the idea that Apuleius had a reputation that earned him the nickname *Platonicus*. They, furthermore, serve to provide part of the philosophical context present to the mind of the ancient reader. As R. notes, “*Cupid and Psyche* exists at the intersection of Platonic philosophy, folktale, and popular religion” (xix).

Relihan offers ten pertinent questions throughout the discussion that act as a guide and a bridge between the history, art, and passages and the story itself (xvii-xix). These questions help the reader discern whether or not Apuleius is drawing upon artistic images and the Platonic tradition, and, if not or if so, why Apuleius does this. R. does not offer any conclusions in this “introduction,” but he will address these questions in his conclusion. Although he is aware the ancient audience would have read *Cupid and Psyche* within the context of the *Golden Ass*, R. wants his modern audience to approach the story without the gravitas and temptation to connect it immediately with the story of Lucius and Isis.

R.’s translation is organized and consistent throughout. He uses the same diction in order to mimic Apuleian style. For example, all forms of *curiosa* are translated “sticking one’s nose in” and forms of *saevus* are translated “sadistic.” He divides the text according to critical editions, keeping passage numbers the same, while adding his own subtitles. One unique aspect of his translation is that he gives the context of the story by including scenes in which the storyteller (in this case, the old woman) appears. When one reads this text, then, one does not begin with *there once was a king and queen* . . . , but rather with the old woman attempting to soothe and to comfort the kidnapped bride, Charite. Likewise, the finale does not end with Voluptas being born but rather with the demise of the storyteller. R. does not touch upon his decision to do this, only commenting that every story must have a storyteller and an audience; nevertheless, its inclusion opens up a hermeneutical door for mythologists and folklorists who are concerned with the relationship and the relevance of storyteller and listener.

R.’s concluding discussion begins with three appendices, containing passages from Apuleius’ *De deo Socratis*, Martianus Capella’s *Marriage of Philology and Mercury*, and Fulgentius’ *Mythologies*. It ends with a section that he titles “Afterthoughts,” followed by a table that is a synthesis of Freudian and Jungian psychological interpretations on *Cupid and Psyche*, taken from Gollnick’s *Love and the Soul*. R. argues that, as a typical romantic comedy, *Cupid and Psyche* combines tales from the point of view of three humorous, folktale characters (the groom, the bride, and the mother-in-law), who go through the transformation of life experience. He also demonstrates that *Cupid and Psyche* is an Empedoclean comedy—love appearing as strife, dissolving the
status quo while actually reorganizing it into a more complete fit, to the “de-light” of all.

R.’s conclusion, furthermore, offers the reader a way through the entanglements of Apuleius to a realization that portrays a modern bias—fictitious tales possess no truth. Truth, rather, whether it is in the form of philosophical unveiling or divine reality, is beyond the realm of story. The romanticized notion of truth found in Cupid and Psyche is a delusion, to use R.’s word. The story contains no hidden meaning or depth, Platonic or otherwise. It is simply an entertaining tale about growing up, set within the context of a romantic plot. Its preoccupation with sex indicates that it is nothing more than an elaborate, traditional Milesian tale. Philosophical truth and genuine salvation through the intervention of a deity cannot be found in such mythoi.

R.’s conclusion, finally, does not leave its readers hanging but rather presents them with several ideas that require further exploration and attention. R.’s text, therefore, accomplishes its task splendidly and shows its author to be an accomplished scholar and teacher as well as a man of insight and good humor. This text, therefore, is favorable for both the new and the veteran scholars of Apuleius, and I would recommend it as required reading for anyone teaching a course on Apuleius’ version of Cupid and Psyche.

JARROD LUX
Conner High School
Hebron, Kentucky


John Mark Reynolds (R.) spends much time attending to Athens but pays virtually no attention to Jerusalem: this book is therefore not an introduction to classical and Christian thought, but rather an interpretation of Plato. Some attention is given to Aristotle (pp. 186 ff.) but Paul enters the discussion six pages before the book ends (p. 239). R. seems, in any case, to be concerned to cultivate a middle ground between Greek philosophy and Christianity: “Christians must recapture the middle way of Augustine and Chrysostom. Athens and Jerusalem are not two cities, but two districts in one city: the city of God” (p. 19–20). But it is also the case that “Athens, the rational mind, does not by itself have the resources it needs to deal with the most important things. The ancient Greeks knew this, which was why so many of them were eager to embrace Christianity” (p. 20). Let me note that the “ancient Greeks” were unaware of Christianity, since it didn’t exist until half a millennium after they had passed from the scene. And let me move on without noting that to associate Athens with “the rational mind,” if, by Athens one means Plato (as R. does) is to ignore what Plato complicates in his output.

R. continues: “We are learning the same lesson again . . . postmodernism is merely the tired realization that rationalism without faith ends up destroy-
ing its own foundations (p. 20).” I’m not sure how, or why, postmodernism sneak ed in, but R.’s bibliography lists no works that represent this movement in western thought. Yet, according to R., “neither secular nor Christian culture has modern or postmodern answers (p. 20),” though he never indicates what the questions might be. Thus, “the rationalists believe that Christian doctrines are false. The postmodernists think that all doctrines have only an “inner” or personal truth. Christians are too afraid of losing to engage in the discourse, so Athens cannot hear what Jerusalem has to say (p. 21).” I must ask: too afraid of losing what? And, if we are in the twenty-first century, since R. has for the umpteenth time mentioned postmodernism, what precisely do Athens and Jerusalem represent?

The difficulty with this book is that it assumes an understanding of what is meant by Athens and Jerusalem, a fair enough proposition if the discussion remains centered in antiquity, but one that can hardly be taken for granted in the glare of postmodernity. In any case, the book proceeds as if the Introduction had never been written, with chapters that offer general readings of Plato grounded in an understanding owed not to R. but to John Cooper, upon whose translations of Plato R. relies. Chapter 1 deals with the Pre-Socratics and melds a discussion of the origins of western philosophy with a treatment of Homer, Hesiod and the function of mythology (pp. 23–32). The obvious introduction of Anaximander (pp. 32–35) and Anaximenes (pp. 35–37), leads expectedly to Xenophanes and Heraclitus (pp. 37–42), thence to Parmenides and Zeno (pp. 42–47). There follow Empedocles, Anaxagoras, and Democritus (pp. 47–51) and a brief treatment of sophistry. Chapter 2 then discusses the nature of the education Socrates offered (pp. 58–64) before attending to the specifics of the great philosopher’s death (pp. 64–68), which serve as a segue into Plato’s thought. Recollection (pp. 73–77) and the Forms (pp. 77–82) figure in an analysis of Plato in chapter three that leads to a more committed discussion of the soul (pp. 82–86) and the consequential Platonic moves involving goodness, truth, and beauty that conclude this chapter’s readings (p. 87).

Expecting further analysis of Plato’s positions, chapter 4 instead offers a discussion of the dialogic form in which Plato chose to communicate many of his views (pp. 88 ff.). Given R.’s interest in Socrates, the dialogues that come in for especial attention are the Euthyphro (pp. 90–96), the Meno (pp. 96–105), and the Phaedo (pp. 105–122). Chapter five forges ahead to the Symposium and there follows a cogent summary of Plato’s views as expressed in it (pp. 123–149). Abruptly, readers leave the Symposium to enter into the difficulties of the Republic, where R. focuses, in chapter six, on justice (pp. 150–173). After a brief treatment of the Timaeus in chapter 7 (pp. 174-184) R. is ready to “break with the master” and analyze Aristotle’s views in chapter eight (pp. 185–202), focusing on the De Anima and the Metaphysics, though the short space given to these works indicates the superficial nature of R.’s treatment, owing to his interest in Aristotle’s ethics, to which he devotes chapter 9 (pp. 203–220).

All of this is by way of preparation for Christ, who first is mentioned by R. in chapter 10, where the rise of Christianity is implicitly measured against Epicureanism and Stoicism (pp. 221–239). Paul’s introduction, how-
ever, brings the book around to its stated topic, but, coming a mere six pages before the end of the book (p. 239), it seems late, to say the least. Chapter 11, “A Postscript” (pp. 246–254) raises what seems to be the central issue of this book, viz., the relation between faith and reason. R.’s insistence that reason can be ennobled by faith in the face of postmodern cynicism and skepticism is self-evident. Yet the polemical introduction and the halting conclusion of this book make it appear as if reason and faith have something to be ashamed of. I wish R. had been braver and written a book that more clearly stated the reasons why faith and reason can and should subsist together. Instead, he has written a pedagogical accounting of Plato that can be used to teach students about the Greeks. While I can recommend this book for use in the classroom for teachers desiring a competent introduction to Greek philosophy down through Aristotle, there is something troubling about a book recommended for publication—if the blurbs are any indication—by the very people who taught the author. Had the editor of this book sent it in manuscript form to less biased readers—if the blurbs are in fact excerpts from the reports of readers—the book might well have become less a summary of classical Greek philosophy, and more a defense of the need to merge reason and faith—a mingling whose need is felt strongly in our own contemporaneity.

Joseph Pucci
Brown University


Crucial to understanding the writings of Tacitus is an understanding of Tacitus’ political thought, that is, his conception of the nature of power and representation in imperial Rome. Although much ink has been spilled on the political aspects of Tacitus’ writings, a book-length study of the question has not been published. Moreover, studies in Tacitus’ political thought inevitably, yet needlessly, get caught up in the senator’s biography, which narrowly circumscribes the critical landscape and restricts what we might otherwise say about the views expressed in the texts themselves. From such a space, Sailor has made a break by expanding what can be said about Tacitus and the political aims of his writings.

Sailor’s first chapter puts Tacitus’ writings in context with other actions, literary or otherwise, that strove to declare autonomy from the Principate. The obvious models for such actions were those by political martyrs like Thrasea Paetus and Helvidius Priscus. Sailor points out that whatever Tacitus may have thought about such men, he realized that they were striving after autonomy, and this is the direction in which he orients his historiographical writings. Thus, Tacitus’ literary aims were an attempt to claim personal autonomy by representing the past in a manner independent from the Principate’s perspective yet free from malice. To do so was nothing less than an act of libertas: taking the princeps out of the equation by writing neither to praise
in expectation of reward, nor to condemn outright, removed control of the narrative from the princeps to Tacitus.

Details and the fine points of Tacitus’ political, literary, and historiographical method are not Sailor’s interest, and this omission is a flaw of the book. But what Sailor overlooks in the minutaie, he makes up for in focusing on the big ideas. So in chapters two, three and five, Sailor focuses on the prefaces of the Agricola and the Historiae, and the so-called second preface to the Annales (4.32-33). In his discussion of the Agricola, Sailor argues that Tacitus is out to reclaim representation and set it in line with historical truth. Tacitus aims to record truthfully the military accomplishments of his father-in-law Agricola, which went underappreciated by the regime; likewise he reveals the military failures of the regime, which at the time were celebrated as victories. Moreover, if the reign of Domitian is to end, along with the suppression of free thought his regime enforced, then the new age can only begin with the expression of free thought, and neither Nerva nor Trajan can do that. Tacitus must show the way.

In chapter three, Sailor turns to the Historiae and Tacitus’ movement from the biography of a particular man and his emperor to a political society and its Principate. Sailor is refreshing in his willingness to recognize that Tacitus is not merely writing about individual principes, but rather, is wielding his perceptive intellect against the Principate as an institution, which in the Historiae has a propensity to devolve into a seemingly endless series of civil wars. One of Sailor’s most convincing points is that Tacitus views historiography under the Principate as analogous to a master and slave relationship whereby servile historians could either love or hate their master princeps. Tacitus’ great achievement is to get outside of this relationship and to write history imbued with a sense of libertas such as a free man possesses. To do this Tacitus must alienate himself from the system of reciprocity that functioned between princeps and historian. In the midst of these perspicacious arguments, Sailor’s weakness on matters of method and composition emerge, since he fails to explore Tacitus’ use of sources, such as the acta senatus or the martyrologies of dissidents, which would seem to bolster his argument that Tacitus sought to return to a Republican form of historiography free of corruption by the regime.

Sailor departs from his predominant focus on prefaces in chapter four to study the place of Rome in Tacitus’ Historiae. Sailor benefits much from studies that have explored the importance of Rome in its physical and literary monuments. Of course, in the Historiae, the destruction of the Capitolium, and its significance for both Romans and their subjects, comes to the forefront. Sailor distinguishes Tacitus’ critical perspective towards the Roman civil wars and their destruction of Rome’s most sacred space from the patriotic stance he adopts when discussing the subject peoples of the empire. Here Tacitus quiets his critical voice and projects a tone of solidarity with the regime as it puts down revolts in Gaul and Judaea.

Chapter five presents a return to the big picture when Sailor turns to book four of the Annales (4.32-38). He makes the compelling argument that Tacitus has to wrestle with the contradiction of his own success: if Tacitus is
an autonomous historian, why has he survived without persecution. To avoid
the answer that he simply is not important enough to be persecuted, Tacitus
turns to the figure of Cremutius Cordus, who showed not only that history
was an important and potentially threatening endeavor worthy of persecu-
tion, but also that the historian had to work in figured speech to survive.
At this point, Tacitus’ text has to work to convince readers that the author is
operating in an ominous milieu. The generations of readers who come away
from the text with just this image demonstrate its author’s artistry.

In closing, Sailor speculates on the death of Tacitus in a way that
many will find conspiratorial, but I would suggest is quite productive. Sure-
ly, our text of Tacitus’ Annales breaks off in mid-sentence due to the loss
of the manuscript, but Sailor leaves us with the tantalizing image of Hadrian’s
henchman seizing our author just as he is narrating the suicide of Thrasea
Paetus, stylus still in hand, his work unfinished. Even if we prefer to keep
Sailor’s speculations at arm’s length, the hypothesis nonetheless provokes the
kind of thought that is illustrative of this rather original study.

THOMAS E. STRUNK
Xavier University

Timothy Saunders, Bucolic Ecology: Virgil’s Eclogues and the Environmental
0-7156-3617-6. $33.00.

Saunders’ monograph is a welcome addition to the literature on Vergil’s
Eclogues. He encompasses a broad variety of elements under the term
‘nature’, showing how variously they can be understood in these po-
eems. Nature per se, however, is not the target in this book; the role of nature
as a powerful and accommodating vehicle for contemplating, defining, and
redefining genre and poetry is what comes to the fore as Saunders’ (hereafter
argument in short is that the Eclogues turn to the natural world throughout
in order to define their nature and place in the literary tradition and that it
is through this particular process of self-definition that they express the full
extent of their audacity and ambition’ (4).

The book’s six chapters, in the whole course of which each of the Ec-
logues is treated (though not in Vergil’s sequence), bear the names of catego-
the natural world from stars to springs to smallest atomies is saturated with
poetic and generic meaning unfolds over the course of the whole book, and
S. offers interesting minor observations along the way. Particularly compelling
are the book’s central chapters (3, 4, 5). He treats only Eclogues 10 and 1
(in that order) in these chapters, but it is here that S. revisits most usefully a
series of well-known generic and poetic tropes (Helicon, Permessus, springs,
groves, fields), and sheds new light on them by highlighting these pervasive metaphors’ base in the natural world.

In the chapters dealing with the extraterrestrial (1, 2), S. focuses closely on particular lines and images in Eclogues 3, 5, 8, 9, and returns often to the notions of ‘repetition, responson, reciprocity and exchange’ (57) as the processes whereby Vergil links bucolic poetry with aspects of the heavens and the cycle of the year. In the final chapter (6), S. traces Lucretian vocabulary in order to show that Virgil’s macroscopic bucolic world operates in ways analogous to Lucretius’ world of atoms. He looks, for example, to the verb cogor, used of ‘herding together’ both atoms in Lucretius’ De Rerum Natura and flocks in Vergil’s Eclogues, as a key link here.

While the argument as a whole is appealing, there are moments in the text where S.’ treatment of details seems rushed, or his metaphors askew. I offer two representative examples.

S. discusses Vergil’s use of the word deducere at the start of his subsection on ‘Astronomy’ (42). He emphasizes the word’s appearance in Alphesiboeus’ song in E. 8.69, carmina uel caelo possunt deducere lunam, but unfortunately fails to take into account the prominence of ‘drawing down the moon’ as a stock feature of love magic and witchcraft, even though magic is explicitly at work in this song; nor does he comment on the repetition of the uncompounded verb in the poem’s refrain, ducite ab urbe domum, mea carmina, ducite Daphnin (8.68 etc.). Both could be turned to S.’ advantage.

Later on S. calls attention (107) to Theocritus’ Idyll 1, in particular the exchange of a cup. The terminology S. uses imports a metaphor that prevents him from showing clearly how the cup’s trade history serves as an explicit statement regarding poetry’s relationship with the bucolic landscape. S. reaches for terminology of ‘finance’ and ‘currency’ – and so obscures the fact that the poem’s economy is based on barter, rather than on a currency, and that the bucolic barter system supports S.’ argument by explicitly including poetry. The cup, a functional art object, is the perfect middle term between subsistence (cheese) and transient beauty (song). By providing this valuation in terms of barter, Theocritus ensures that song is part of the system, valued in terms drawn from the bucolic world.

S. has a persistent and unsettling habit of personifying the Eclogues, attributing to the poems actions which surely were undertaken by their author (‘The Eclogues’ habit of casting themselves …’ (4); ‘the Eclogues set the coordinates …’ (30), to give but two examples; see also the quotation in paragraph 1).

Turning at last to the introduction, which focuses on theory, I am again struck by S.’ guiding metaphor, the ‘ecology’ of the title. S. follows Bonnie Maranca, a theater critic, in asserting an analogy for texts based upon an 1866 definition of ecosystems by biologist Ernst Haeckel (5-7). Although the term ‘ecology’ has significant cachet in the present time, and one that S. uses to distance himself from both Schiller and Alpers, the texts-ecosystem analogy does not prove practically useful here, and falls swiftly by the wayside. S. replaces Haeckel’s emphasis on the ‘complex interrelations’ of ecosystems, without explanation, with the simpler notion of ‘repetition and recursion’ (5).
Emphasis on repetition in a discussion of the Eclogues is appropriate in itself, and does not require the ‘ecology’ analogy as a vehicle.

The implications of S.’ study are further reaching than he suggests. What his argument shows is not that ‘ecology’ or ‘ecosystems’ can provide yet another metaphor for how texts interact with other texts, but rather that real ecosystems constitute the enabling medium of poetic discourse among Virgil’s poetic predecessors, and especially in his Eclogues. E.O. Wilson’s biophilia hypothesis (Biophilia, 1986), which posits that living things are by nature drawn to other living things, comes to mind as I close S.’ book, as does the work of Thomas Berry (e.g. The Dream of the Earth, 2nd ed. 2006), who emphasizes how crucial to human intellectual and psychological flourishing is our relationship with the natural world. S.’ work showcases the remarkable depth and variety of Virgil’s, and his poetic predecessors’, engagement with the natural world as a mysterious and bountiful fund of poetic meaning; he has laid the groundwork for further exploration of the importance of the natural world as a medium of thought in ancient literature and beyond.

MEGHAN REEDY
Dickinson College


This is a paperback reissue of the 1995 hardback edition, which was an update to Buck’s seminal but outdated *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Chicago 1933); no changes have been made to the text of the reissue. The book begins with a brief survey of the subgroups and daughter languages of Indo-European. This is followed by a substantial (ca. 320 pp.) section on historical phonology. Historical morphology is then dealt with in four parts: declension, pronouns, numerals, conjugation. Issues of historical syntax, semantics, and pragmatics are only mentioned in passing. Buck’s Grammar had a section on word formation, which Sihler (= S.) has excised on account of space.

Reviewers of the 1995 hardback expressed qualified praise and appreciation for the book (see e.g. M. Weiss, *AJPh* 117 (1996) 670–675; J. Clackson, *CR* 46 (1996) 297–301; G. A. Sheets, *CJ* 93 (1997) 88–92). On the one hand, it is a useful and necessary volume to consult because it offers an extremely rich collection of data. On the other hand, its utility is seriously undermined by the complete absence of bibliography, which extends even to citations of ancient testimonia. It is true that S. often (but not always) acknowledges others’ opinions and marks the absence of a *communis opinio* with phrases like “some scholars believe,” but still this book is not without its tacit idiosyncrasies—a situation that is far from ideal for the untutored reader. When S. airs his own analyses, the level of detail often exceeds what the typical classicist will need. The upshot is that while useful, the volume must be read with caution, and double checked against other sources.
One might question the decision of the Press to issue a paperback almost fifteen years after the original publication, and leave the text entirely unaltered. As a basic collection of data, the book retains its utility. The weakness of its reappearance now of course is that no account can be made of the developments and discoveries that have occurred since the mid-1990s. How have things changed? Space permits only the most restricted notice of developments (see further the review of the paperback reissue by Z. Simon, BMCR 2009.06.34). There have been sweeping proposals for the parent language, such as Jay Jasanoff’s magnum opus, *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb* (Oxford 2003), which presents a new account of the PIE verbal system in trying to work out the knotty problem of the Anatolian i-conjugation and its relation to the perfect and middle verbal paradigms. Our understanding of the Anatolian languages has increased dramatically, in particular that of Carian; see I. J. Adiego, *The Carian Language* (Brill 2007). Investigation into the sub-grouping of Indo-European has also intensified in recent years; the issues in this domain have attracted not only philologists and linguists, but also evolutionary biologists. Their goal has been to provide a more articulated Stammbaum of Indo-European that reflects the historical break-up of the family, as opposed to the rake-like tree models that one often encounters.

But perhaps the most striking difference between 1995 and today is to be found in resources. Back then, there was very little in English to guide the classicist into the complexities of Indo-European linguistics, or even recent historical accounts of the classical languages. Since then, a handful of useful introductions to the field have been published, including those of O. Szemerényi, *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics* (Oxford 1996); M. Meier-Brügger, *Indo-European linguistics* (Berlin/New York 2003); R. S. P. Beekes, *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia 2005); B. Fortson, *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction* (Malden, MA/Oxford 2004, a second edition of which is due in September 2009), which is the best of the lot in my opinion; J. P. Mallory and D. Q. Adams, *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World* (Oxford 2006); E. Tichy, *A Survey of Proto-Indo-European* (Hempen 2006); and J. Clackson, *Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction* (Cambridge 2007). A number of works on the history of Latin have also appeared in recent years, such as P. Baldi, *The Foundations of Latin* (Berlin/New York 1999); J. Clackson and G. Horrocks, *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language* (Malden, MA/Oxford 2007); and soon we will have another from Michael Weiss, which is to be published by Beech Stave Press. In German, there is also the work of G. Meiser, *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* (Darmstadt 1998). A new Latin etymological dictionary by M. de Vaan appeared recently as well, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages* (Leiden/Boston 2008). The history of Greek has not received the same attention, but A. Barton’s *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch* (Heidelberg 2003) appeared, and S. Colvin recently published his *A Historical Greek Reader: Mycenaean to the Koiné* (Oxford 2007). And Brill will soon publish a two-volume etymological dictionary by R.S . P. Beekes. What this amounts to is that there are now
far more places where one can (and in fact must) go for information on the historical development of Greek and Latin beside Sihler.

In a book of this type, there will inevitably be many points on which one can disagree. Minor criticisms I have placed at the end of this review. For now, I would like to call attention to two rather more serious faults. First, there is an issue of presentation and scope: the title promises more than it delivers. A handbook that bills itself as a “comparative grammar” should investigate more than historical phonology and morphology. It is true that this has been the bread and butter of Indo-European linguistics (as well as historical linguistics more broadly). It is also true that this fault is not unique to S., especially in this case where he assumed the title from Buck. It is also true that less work has been done on historical syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. But still, worthwhile claims about these issues can be made; for syntax in particular, I refer the reader to B. Fortson, “Proto-Indo-European Syntax,” in Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, 2nd ed. (Amsterdam/Boston 2006), vol. 10: 228–235.

A second problem concerns the description of verbal aspect and the PIE verbal system. If I understand his account, S. claims that verbs were classified into one of two categories, “stative” and “eventive.” The former included predicates like know, remember, am afraid. The latter by contrast marked “events,” and encompassed learn, fly, throw, etc. Morphologically, the PIE “stative” corresponds to the Greek and Sanskrit perfect tense; the other tenses (present, aorist, imperfect) fall within the “eventive” domain. What is confusing in this account is that he seems (with just a nod to exceptional situations at §410) to think that a predicate was either inflected as a “stative” or as an “eventive.” But this cannot be true, as it is possible for verbs to straddle the stative-eventive divide in different stems, e.g. perfect (= “stative”) μμμμμμ ’I remember’ vs. aorist (= “eventive”) ὑμνὑσθην ’I remembered.’ Matters would have been clearer if S. had drawn a distinction between Aktionsart (otherwise known as lexical aspect, modes d’action, or situation aspect) and grammatical aspect (otherwise known as viewpoint aspect or simply aspect): the former refers to the inherent properties of a situation, while the latter is a property of a verb form.

A further problem is that the classification of situations into classes like “stative” and “eventive” can vary across cultures and languages. Such differences emerge for instance in progressive verb forms. In some languages, particular situations are classified as states and do not appear in the progressive, while in others they are not so perceived, and can assume a progressive form. Take the verb see, for instance. In English we do not say *I am seeing, but the Portuguese equivalent of this sentence would be perfectly acceptable: see B. Comrie, Aspect (Cambridge 1976): 34–35. Thus we cannot always expect our intuitions about what is a state versus what is an event to correspond to those of Greek (or PIE) speakers; nor should we always expect the same classifications among the daughter languages.

Lastly, an issue of semantics: at various points (e.g. §407 fn. 1), S. asserts that stative predications “lack tense.” Exactly what this means is unclear throughout, and more space should have been devoted to such a complicat-
ed and important issue. S. tries (ibid.) to explain the tenselessness of stative predications with the following pair of sentences:

(1) Jane's family owns most of downtown Altoona.

(2) Jane's family owned most of downtown Altoona.

S. claims that semantically (1) “includes” the meaning of (2), but does not specify how: via implication? or presupposition? Furthermore, he claims that (2) is synonymous with the following:

(3) Jane's family no longer owns most of downtown Altoona.

One can challenge this claim with the following sentence:

(4) Jane's family owned most of downtown Altoona in those days, just as they do now.

If (2) and (3) were synonymous, one would expect the two clauses of (4) to contradict one another: for according to S. the first establishes that Jane’s family no longer owns most of downtown Altoona. We can also question the synonymy of (2) and (3) by substituting (3) into the first part of (4):

(5) ?Jane's family no longer owns most of downtown Altoona in those days, just as they do now.

The outcome in (5) is very odd (even if it can be defended as making some sense), and the clash suggests that (2) and (3) are not as synonymous as S. claims. Lastly, consider also the following two sentences:

(6) I loved her deeply.

(7) I know the answer.

The first of these need not implicate I no longer love her, nor need (7) implicate that one has always known the answer, or knew it at any point in the past; that information is simply not encoded or derivable from the sentence. S.’s account raises a further problem, which is that the tenselessness that he attributes to the perfect/stative is often held to be a feature of the aorist, specifically the gnomic aorist, which is found in Greek, Indo-Iranian, and Slavic. I dwell on this issue because S.’s description is seeping into scholars’ conceptualization of the Greek perfect. For a useful description of the semantics of the perfect, see A. Deo with C. Condoravdi, “Aspect Shifts in Indo-Aryan,” in Proceedings of International Congress of Linguists 18 (Seoul 2008). (Though the data are from Indic, the semantic descriptions apply remarkably well to Greek.)
I offer now a selection of smaller criticisms of the work. §116 Regarding Hesychius’ entry for ‘foot,’ πὑς · πὑς ὑπὑ ΥΔωριὑων, S. comments: “since there is no such word as ‘πὑς,’ the true meaning of this entry is enigmatic.” But πὑς is elsewhere attested (PMG 977); it is clear from the context of that quotation that Herodian at least construed it as a form of ποὑς. §218 S. has reservations about the change of Lat. -ny- > -nd-, and describes it as “phonetically unexpected.” But phonetically a stop could have arisen via gestural overlap if a closure were created in the glottis during the release of the tongue from n toward the palate. And after an apical nasal, d is exactly what one would expect. This type of change is known as glide fortition, and is not a rare phenomenon, e.g. PIE *y > Lydian d in Anatolian, and Holtzmann’s Law in Germanic. Farther afield, one can find parallels in Austronesian: see O. Dahl, Proto-Austronesian (Lund 1973): 46–48. §245 The discussion of the relationship between recessive verbal accentuation and its purported origin in enclisis is unclear. S. claims that εὑμὑ and φημὑ are enclitic “in all circumstances,” which is patently false; in sentence-initial position, they are not clitics, and when ἐὑμὑ means ‘it is possible,’ it is likewise tonic. S. writes further: “…it is of crucial importance that, being so short, their (unaltered) forms fell within the limits possible for enclitics, such that the obligatory accent lies on the preceding word.” He then cites cases like βασιλε ὑστι. But he neglects to mention that when βασιλε is hosted by a paroxytone, it will be accented, i.e. βασιλε ὑστι. §376.b S. labels the anaphoric pronoun ἡ a Sophoclean hapax (Fr. 471.1 Radt), but the form is also attested in the Greek grammarians, e.g. Dionysius Thrax, p. 65.1 Uhlig. S. claims that the form continues *sih₂, although he also notes that we would expect ἡ from *sih. He implies that ἡ is feminine (and the Sophoclean fragment accords with this analysis), but in Dionysius Thrax, the word is implicitly presented as masculine; see further Uhlig’s note ad loc., as well as Schwzyzer, Griechische Grammatik 1.608 (Munich 1934-1939). Is ἡ rather to be taken as a gender-unspecified indirect reflexive, and equated with Lat. and Gothic is? §408 fn. 1 The remark that “even the basic verb categories of Sumerian have resisted analysis to date” is overstated: see P. Michalowski, “Sumerian,” in The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World’s Ancient Languages (Cambridge 2004): 19–59. §414 S. writes, “In PIE itself there was no true passive, that is, a type of morphosyntax with the direct (or indirect) object as the subject of the verb, with an agent in an oblique case.” But what about *-tó- formations? S. answers this question (p. 622), and in doing so appears to contradict the sentence just quoted: “Functionally the derivative made a verbal adjective which construed with nouns that would stand in object relation to a transitive finite verb. Nouns that would have been in subject relation are either absent or are marked with some case other than nom. or acc.” See further the two classic articles of S. Jamison: “The case of the agent in Indo-European,” Sprache 25 (1979) 129–43, and “Remarks on the expression of agency with the passive in Vedic and Indo-European,” Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 93 (1979) 196–219. §493 It leaves me with misgivings to see the augment *e- projected back to PIE. This affix is attested only in Greek, Indo-Iranian, Armenian, and Phrygian; as such, it may well be a post-PIE development, as S. himself notes (p. 485). Moreover, even in Vedic
and Homeric, the development of the augment is not yet complete, as there we still find so-called injunctive forms. S. explains (ibid.) that the prestige of Greek and Indo-Iranian once fostered acceptance of the affix in the parent language. But if we know better now, why propagate ancestral errors? S.’s insistence that Skt. srutá- and Grk. ὑπός are not to be compared is odd. The former does not occur in Vedic, but in the Mahabharata it attests the meaning ‘flowing’ (S. makes an explicit claim to the contrary), which would match that of the Greek exactly.

D. M. Goldstein
Thesaurus linguae Latinae


I should preface this review with the acknowledgment that I am not an architectural historian. I do however teach introductory and advanced courses in Roman material culture, and therefore am interested in affordable and accessible books on Roman temple architecture. Issued in paperback in 2008, Stamper’s book on Roman temple architecture is very affordable (especially given the wealth of illustrations) and fairly accessible. Starting with the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in the sixth century B.C.E., Stamper traces the development of Roman temple architecture through to the second century C.E. His main argument is that the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus was a paradigmatic building in ancient Rome, and both contemporary and subsequent rulers drew power and authority from their association with this temple.

In Chapter One, Stamper gives background on the site of Rome during the period when the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus was built. He also describes the rituals associated with the foundation of the temple, and the importance of the Capitoline Triad in Rome. In the second chapter, Stamper argues against the traditional reconstruction of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. According to Stamper, the foundation walls, the size of the columns and contemporary comparative evidence all point to a smaller temple, about 1/3 smaller than conventional interpretation. This smaller size makes later emulation of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus easier to trace. In Chapter Three, Stamper describes temples constructed in the early to mid-Republic in the Forum Romanum, Forum Boarium, Largo Argentina and the Roman colonies of Paestum and Cosa. The Etrusco-Roman tradition of temple architecture is predominant during this period, and the Capitoline temple remains the primary reference. In the fourth chapter, Stamper discusses the influence of Hellenistic architecture in Rome in the second century B.C.E., highlighting the popularity of the Ionic order, the use of stone, and the closer spacing of columns (but always combined with distinctly Roman characteristics). In Chapter Five, Stamper addresses the introduction of the Corinthian order in Rome, with the Round Temple by the Tiber and the temples in the Largo Ar-
gentina serving as examples. Chapter Six focuses on the building programs of Pompey and Caesar, and the manner in which the monuments built by these men enhanced their prestige.

The transformation of the city of Rome during the Augustan period is addressed in Chapters Seven and Eight. In Chapter Seven, Stamper describes the Temples of Divus Julius and Saturn in the Forum Romanum; the temples on the Palatine, and the temples of the Circus Flaminianus. The Corinthian Order is popular at this time, but again with “distinctly Roman characteristics.” A detailed description of the Forum Augustum and the Temple of Mars Ultor is given in Chapter Eight, where Stamper argues for allusions to the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, the use of Greek and Hellenistic elements with a Roman twist, and the power of architecture to enhance the status of the ruler.

The fire of 64 C.E., followed by the ravages of the civil war in 68, gave the Flavian emperors plenty of opportunities to build in the city. In Chapter Nine, Stamper focuses on the rebuilding of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, the Templum Pacis, the Temple of Vespasian, the Temple of Minerva and the Arch of Titus. In Chapter Ten, Stamper describes the Forum of Trajan in great detail, with his discussion culminating in a description of the Temple of Divus Traianus from archaeological and numismatic evidence. The final two chapters address the building projects of Hadrian and his successor, Antoninus Pius. The structure of the Pantheon, its links to earlier temples (Temples of Jupiter Capitolinus and Mars Ultor), and its symbolism are discussed in Chapter Eleven. In Chapter Twelve, Stamper focuses on the Temple of Venus and Roma. Modeled on the Temple of Olympian Zeus in Athens and probably completed by craftsmen from Asia Minor, the Temple of Venus and Roma was a “Greek building in a Roman city” (212). The Temple of Divus Hadrianus in the Campus Martius and the Temple of Antoninus Pius and Faustina in the Forum Romanum are also described in this chapter.

Stamper’s volume is attractive because it goes beyond simple descriptions of the temples to get at the meaning and significance in their design. Whether or not you agree with his argument regarding the powerful precedent of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, Stamper’s consideration of the temples in their socio-political contexts is enlightening. In addition to the contextual information, the description of the activities that took place in these temples, for example, Hadrian’s use of the Pantheon as an audience hall, reminds us of the importance of the temple in Roman daily life. There is not much about the actual building process or construction techniques, but this was not Stamper’s purpose.

Stamper’s argument is repetitive at times, and occasionally the repetition is practically verbatim (cf. pp. 105–106 and 124–125). In addition, there are a surprising number of spelling and/or typographical errors, i.e. Cataline for Catiline (58); Marcus Anthony at one point (68), and Marcus Antony at another (106); Roman’s for Romans (twice on p. 49); Carthegenians for Carthaginians (49); Mithradates (68) vs. Mithridates (84); Aachaeans for Achaeans (69); caliculi on p.133 and elsewhere, caulis (72). Otherwise, the argument is fairly easy to follow, with clear explanations of the ancient sources and
previous scholarship on the different temples. There is not a lot of technical jargon, but it would have been useful to have a glossary defining such words as fictile revetment, *in antis*, *periptos sine postico*, *pycnostyle*, etc. Certainly, the illustrations enhance the argument and are a strong point of the book.

Maura K. Heyn
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro


In this book Andrew Stewart attempts to place Classical art firmly within its ancient cultural context. He poses and then attempts to answer the questions “What did the classical revolution achieve? and What did the classical ideal really consist of?” While acknowledging the important work of J. J. Pollitt’s *Art and Experience in Classical Greece* in assessing the Classical experience, Stewart emphasizes contextual aspects—literature, history, and social organization not foregrounded in that work. Designed to be a textbook for 21st century students who may not be as familiar with the ancient world as previous generations, the book provides stimulating discussion, copious illustrations, and enough maps, timelines, and translated literary passages to ensure that students will be engaged and informed. Throughout the book the author also provides analogies to modern events to help students see the relevance of Classics to today’s world.

The introduction “Classical, Classic and Classicism” frames the discussion. Stewart explores the factors which led to the development of an artistic style that is foundational to the Western artistic canon and also attempts to define the essence and enduring appeal of all things classical. His first - and by no means easiest step - is to define exactly “what Classical means.” For Stewart, the salient characteristics are “vitality, beauty, sensuality and soul.” He discusses each of these with reference to specific developments of the Classical period. Vitality, for example, is exemplified in the naturalism of Greek sculpture and the refinements of Greek architecture. Beauty is “appearance informed by geometry,” which can be seen in works such as the Doryphoros. Sensuality indicates the erotic in art, the male nude and the increasingly revealed female body. Soul is “a sense of personhood, or what might be called interiority.” Stewart points to Greek art as uniting mind and body.

The remainder of the book proceeds chronologically. Chapter One, “Archaic into Classical: the Greek Revolution,” examines the cultural climate in which Classical art emerged. He stresses the importance of context throughout. In this and subsequent chapters Stewart grounds the art in historical events and pulls in contemporary literature. He creates a narrative that interweaves history, politics, philosophy, religion, and drama with artistic production. For example, his discussion of the temple of Aphaia at Aegina includes the text of Pindar’s ode to the Aiginetan Pylakidas, a pankration winner.
Chapter Two showcases the changed society left in the wake of the Persian wars. Among many examples of interconnectivity Steward contrasts the Orseia, vase-painting, and the temple of Zeus at Olympia to show how each medium reflected and commented upon recent events. Chapter Three focuses upon the “Classical moment.” The Parthenon, Doryphoros, and Greek philosophy figure prominently. Chapter Four, “Interlude: City Household and Individual in Classical Greece,” further stresses the importance of context. This chapter provides a closer look at fifth-century Athenian society, examining such topics as gender relations and the ways in which the city represented itself.

Chapter Five, “The Great Convulsion,” looks at the changes brought about by the disasters of the Peloponnesian War. Stewart connects the use of perspective and other visual effects in art to the Sophists. Special visual effects are understood in light of rhetorical attempts at persuasion. In Chapter Six, “The Fourth Century: An Age of the Individual?” Stewart focuses on four major areas around which questions developed--government, religion, ethics and reality. Greeks were asking, “How best should people be governed? What is the true form of the gods and how should human beings relate to them? How does one live the best life and what is the relationship between reality and appearance?” The Final Chapter, “The Shadow of Macedonia,” highlights the connections and the differences between Macedon and Classical Athens. Macedon’s take on the Classical has a heavy emphasis on Homeric symbolism and a political system which Stewart describes as “baronial.” In this last stage of ancient Greek classicism Athens, as Stewart, says “canonizes its past.”

Stewart’s discussion is wide-ranging and stimulating. Throughout the book he offers a variety of connections and insights. While not all of these work (the choice of caryatids for the Erechtheion may indeed represent a co-opting of the kore type by the Athenians, but it is not the first example of the use of female figures as architectural supports) they provide a basis for student debate and engagement with the material. Extensive bibliographies for each topic allows students to further pursue the ideas presented here. The book is a valuable addition to our understanding of the Classical period and a useful classroom resource.

Mary Ann Eaverly
University of Florida


This is an excellent addition to Duckworth’s series of Companions to ancient drama. The *Suppliants* is, of course, not one of Euripides’ more frequently studied plays and it has not captured subsequent imaginations like plays such as *Medea* or the *Bacchae*. Storey (hereafter S.) believes that it deserves to be better known, and while I doubt that it will ever be up there in the Euripidean top ten, he ably outlines its dramatic strengths and demonstrates, mostly convincingly, that it has more to offer a modern audience.
than its description by an ancient commentator as “an encomium of Athens” might suggest.

After an introductory chapter on the mythical and historical setting of the *Suppliants*, S. offers an extended narrative commentary on its action (chapters 2–5). Chapter 6 (90–104) engages with some recent readings of the play and their handling of questions that he identifies as crucial to the play’s general interpretation: these include Theseus’ character; Adrastus’ moral and intellectual development; the tone of his funeral speech; and the Euadne scene. After a chapter on staging, the book ends with a brief account of the post-Euripidean myth. This arrangement creates a generally well-organized book, but it does lead to a degree of repetition as S. introduces specific issues in chapters 2–5 and then returns to them in chapters 6 and 7.

Chapter 1 discusses the mythical traditions that Euripides would have inherited. S. also offers well-informed summaries of important scholarship on Thebes, Argos and Athens in tragedy and useful observations about the play’s Eleusinian setting. He offers a particularly balanced discussion of how far the play might reflect contemporary issues of the Peloponnesian War: indeed, one of the hallmarks of this particular companion is its even-handedness in offering a range of critical opinions alongside its author’s own positions. Another special strength is S.’s ability to integrate general cultural information about Greece with its specific manifestation in the play. For example, chapter 2 offers a summary of supplication and suppliant drama as it is relevant to this play, while the messenger scene is discussed within an excellent general account of such scenes in tragedy.

Chapter 3 (45–61) considers Theseus’ confrontation with the Theban herald. S. offers a measured discussion of the central issues of the debate, attempting to ascertain likely audience reaction to this character. A central question in earlier treatments of this scene is how far we are meant to endorse Theseus’ claims about democracy and how far the herald’s critical view of it should be taken seriously. S. takes a middle path between critical extremes, noting that neither side really engages with the more serious points made by the other. My own opinion is that the herald must be a straw man, given that he is advising Theseus to reject Athens’ most famous traditional exploits, but in a companion of this kind, S.’s impartial approach is entirely appropriate.

Central to Chapter 4 (62–77) is a discussion of Adrastus’ epitaphios speech: given the mismatch between his noble, civic-minded heroes and the arrogant monsters of mythical tradition, commentators have wondered whether it can possibly be intended seriously or if it is a satire on the inevitable dishonesty of all rhetoric that idealizes war dead. S. is sceptical of excessively ironic readings and convincingly argues that we should read it from an Argive perspective: tradition is written by victors, so that while Thebes’ enemies are viewed unfavorably by Theban-inspired tradition, Argive tradition would have been entirely different. Similarly, S.’s Euadne is a relatively admirable character, whose function is further to humanize Kapaneus as a family man whose loss has caused devastation to a loving wife.

A chapter on staging effectively combines a general account of the Greek theatre with specific attention to the impact of visual effects on the
audience of the *Suppliants*. Particularly good are the comments on the opening scene: Aethra is at first confined to the center of the playing area by the chorus of old women, and by turning away from her at 110 to interact with Adrastus, Theseus is turning his back on this central area. This visual “wrong turn” symbolizes his mistake in initially rejecting Adrastus. He will be called back logically and visually by his mother, and at 361, when he takes her hand, we see what a powerful visual metaphor is offered by touch in this play as mother and son exemplify a harmonious relationship all too rare in the rest of the play. S. also offers some thoughtful observations on the significance of entries and exits in this play (113–115).

The last chapter discusses post-Euripidean tradition. The Athenian intervention on behalf of Adrastus itself did not greatly capture later imaginations, but S. states that it hugely influenced political propaganda, especially in 4th-century oratory. This is not untrue, but fails fully to consider that the annual *epitaphios logos* over the Athenian war dead had certainly been in existence long before Euripides’ play, all the more therefore before the 4th century, and as far as we can judge, the retrieval of the Argive dead was a standard topic in such speeches. S. gives the misleading impression that apart from Aeschylus and Euripides, this story was not told frequently at Athens. Although the Athenian intervention was of greater interest to Athenians than others, Euadne herself found long-lasting literary fame in Latin poetry, above all Statius, on whom Boccaccio draws, who in turn offers inspiration to Chaucer and others. S. summarizes all relevant details crisply, keeping Euripides firmly in central view. The final chapter focuses on four recent productions out of the mere 13 documented since 1926, ending with an account of a 2007–2008 production that inevitably brought the Iraq War into connection with Euripides. As with the other Duckworth companions, a very useful list of texts, translations and commentaries with annotated bibliography is included, along with a glossary of terms. I can happily recommend this as an excellent introduction to this relatively rarely read and seen play.

Sophie Mills
University of North Carolina at Asheville


*Platonic Patterns* is, as Thesleff (T.) puts it, “the result of a life’s scholarly work.” The three insightful books reprinted here, *Studies in the Styles of Plato* (SP) (1967), *Studies in Platonic Chronology* (PC) (1982), and *Studies in Plato’s Two-Level Model* (TM) (1999), deserve the attention of Plato scholars, as do the four included articles. In this review I will emphasize the continuity of T.’s studies and indicate a few of the things that one may learn from the works presented in this volume that may be of interest to readers unfamiliar with T.’s work.

One of the most marked aspects of recent Plato scholarship is a concern with the literary aspects of the Platonic dialogue. Most often, this concern involves how Plato uses the drama of the dialogue to display the
character of Socrates and his interlocutors and to stress the importance of character for philosophic discussion. SP is a good reminder that there is more to Plato’s literary technique than his use of dramatic characterization, for attention should be also paid to the structure and form of Plato’s writing. SP provides an analytic toolkit for mapping the styles of a Platonic dialogue. Following T.’s advice on how to pay attention to the styles of Plato will provide readers with both aesthetic and philosophic insights.

SP also makes several observations that play an important role in T.’s later studies. First, stylometry, the mechanical study of texts with a view toward establishing their chronological order, is of limited value for an author such as Plato, “who changes his style within very brief units of text” (21). Second, questions of style and chronology require an analysis of “Plato’s public relations and the part played by the Academy in propagating his doctrines and writings” (11). This focus on Plato’s intended audience receives continued treatment in PC and “Plato and His Public.” Third, T. suggests that some of the discrepancies in Platonic interpretation might be resolved by paying attention to the “patterns” that appear in his writings (21). While SP and PC employ Platonic patterns in the service of establishing tentative chronologies, TM uses recurrent patterns of thought to argue for philosophic consistency throughout the corpus. In focusing on patterns of language and thought as they reappear throughout the corpus, T. provides an important alternative tool to analytic and dramatic analysis.

Although chronology is often discussed by modern scholars, it doesn’t seem to be pursued with the same zeal as it was in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, except perhaps by a few scholars such as T., Ledger, and Brandwood. For the most part, T. argues, we now seem to be content with a vague but widely held chronological doxa, which he labels the “Lutoslawski-Raeder-Ritter thesis.” This thesis implies that the dialogues show signs of intellectual development, and that stylometry offers separate proof of ordering the dialogues in line with this development (150). PC is intended as a wake-up call to those who unconsciously adhere to this thesis. As part of this wake-up call, T. chides contemporary scholars for their relative ignorance of previous scholarship on Platonic chronology (165), for whether one sees nineteenth-century scholarship as a scrap-heap or a gold-mine, one should be aware of how its claims have shaped one’s own views.

T.’s goal in PC is to formulate a chronology of his own, one which provocatively suggests that Plato revised his works over time and that some works are semi-authentic, having been produced by Plato in conjunction with his students at the Academy. T.’s assignment of an early beginning and relatively late completion of the Republic helps, in my view, to explain that work’s over-determined and multifaceted philosophical content. T.’s claim that brevity and Socratic tone do not necessarily imply an early date is also especially worth taking seriously. Other choices will probably find dissenters, for many of these issues are difficult to evaluate. PC led me to think that answers to many such questions are always likely to be provisional, arrived at only by cautiously mixing one’s judgment with sound research. What T. shows in PC, however, is that patient attempts to answer the chronological question
provide real payoffs in our understanding of the dialogues, even if precise chronology lies beyond our reach.

TM applies the search for patterns in Plato’s texts to a study of the various forms of opposites that Plato employs throughout the corpus. TM shows that complementary opposites, such as “better and less good,” not polar opposites, such as “good or bad,” are the basis for Plato’s thinking (395). T. juxtaposes his own view of Plato’s metaphysics to that of Aristotle and many others who argue that Plato believed in two completely separate worlds (397). The goal of this work is rather general: to show by “cumulative argument” that Plato had a coherent two-level vision throughout his corpus, and that these two levels are complementary rather than polar in character (499–500). TM achieves this goal, but, perhaps because I am very much in agreement with its findings, I found it to be less provocative than other sections of Pla-tonic Patterns. While T. is right that “a universal koin nia” dominates ch rismos in Plato’s thought, we should also note that the aporia of ch rismos generates some of Plato’s most interesting investigations.

The four articles usefully revisit the themes of the longer works. I wish that Parmenides Publishing had also included T.’s essay “Platonic Chronology” (1989). This “restatement and readjustment” of PC is an important part of T.’s corpus and an important resource for students of Platonic chronol-ogy.

T. describes his own concern as primarily “historicist” rather than “modernist”: he is more concerned with “wie es eigentlich gewesen” than with reading “the dialogues in terms of, and for the benefit of, modern philos-ophy” (xii, 391). While T.’s question about “how it actually was” is of more recent origin than the concern for simply benefiting from the dialogues (cf. 147), the collection under review will prove useful to both historically-mind-ed scholars and scholars mainly interested in what Plato has to offer us today.

LEWIS TRELAWNY-CASSITY
Binghamton University


E. A. Thompson was a very important scholar who wrote prolifically on the subject of the European barbarians during the latter half of the 20th century. Marxist in orientation, his concern was largely the social history of the ancient and early medieval Germans, and his work generally attempted to disentangle their history from the worlds of Greece and Rome, viewing the barbarians as worthy of study in their own right.

This book is a posthumous second edition of Thompson’s 1966 original, a work that, while certainly dated, remains an essential point of departure for discussions of the 4th-century Goths and their later forebears. This period was of great significance to the formation of the future Visigoths, who would go on to sack Rome in 410, play a starring role in the fall of the Western Empire,
and rule a formidable Iberian kingdom until its collapse in the early 8th century. It is no accident, therefore, that the era of Ulfila, their first Arian bishop, is taken as a chronological marker. Indeed, it was during the lifetime of Ulfila (c. 311-82) that the Goths became the dominant presence along the Danube; came under increasing Roman political, cultural, and economic influence; were granted admission into the Roman Empire; began the process of Christianization; adopted the Arian creed; and, finally, began to employ the Gothic script invented by Ulfila himself, translating and disseminating the Bible in a Germanic language for the first time ever.

It should go without saying, therefore, that any interpretation of this period will have serious repercussions for our understanding of Gothic, late Roman, and early medieval history. Thompson’s own position, largely a reproduction and reworking of earlier articles, occupies six chapters, seven if the 11-page introduction (which provides a biography of Ulfila) is included. The first chapter treats political history, tracing the various migrations that led the Visigoths to the abandoned province of Dacia by the late 3rd century and their subsequent dealings with the Roman state from Constantine to Theodosius. Here Thompson emphasizes military conflict, the Goths’ growing economic dependency on the Empire, and the emperors’ ability to manipulate both to achieve multiple ends (not least peace). The second chapter focuses on material culture, trade, social organization, and tribal religion. Here Thompson supplements the limited archaeological evidence then at his disposal by appealing to numerous written sources, all of which combine to suggest that the Visigoths were a traditional Germanic society that was altering fundamentally through contact with the Roman Empire. The third chapter is complementary, providing a close reading and analysis of the Passion of St. Saba that ultimately sheds light on Gothic village life and attempts to confirm the broader generalizations of the prior chapter. The fourth chapter treats the Gothic conversion, emphasizing a link between Christianization and Romanization. It demonstrates that Christians like Ulfila had been active among the Goths for decades, but argues rather provocatively that the Goths only converted in the aftermath of their settlement in Moesia (c. 382-95) and then chose Arianism, instead of the emperor’s Nicene Christianity, as a means of maintaining a separate Gothic identity. The fifth chapter repeats these ideas, but also looks more closely at the early Gothic Church itself: its organization, its relationship with the Christian communities inside the Empire, the role and impact of Ulfila’s episcopacy, and the causes and effects of two 4th-century instances of persecution (347-48 and 369-72). Finally, the sixth chapter addresses Gothic Christianity after Ulfila, demonstrating its continued sense of otherness, despite becoming increasingly Greco-Roman in orientation. This chapter is then followed by three short appendices treating minor chronological or interpretive themes.

Not surprisingly, much has changed in the field of barbarian studies in the more than four decades since this book was originally published, and it is a testament to Thompson’s abilities as a scholar that this study remains relevant (and thus worthy of being reprinted), despite its anachronisms. The idea of a “traditional Germanic society” or even “ancient Germans” is now
often rejected; the reliability of many of Thompson’s sources, especially Jordanes, has become a serious matter of debate; migration (and its importance) is contested; questions of ethnicity, ethnogenesis, and identity now color most interpretations; new archaeological evidence has added much nuance to the society (or better societies) living within and beyond the lower Danube frontier; and, finally, the very idea of “Visigoths” in the time of Ulfila has been thoroughly rejected, not simply because the term is a later attribution, but because the Visigoths themselves are now seen as a multi-ethnic (but largely Gothic) conglomeration that emerged gradually within the Roman Empire during the late 4th and early 5th century.

Major interpretive shifts like these may suggest that Thompson’s book is too antiquated for a modern audience. Nevertheless, its general insights about the peoples residing on the barbarian side of the Danube, and especially the manifold impacts of the Roman Empire on them, remain current and have been confirmed by additional archaeological evidence. Likewise, Thompson’s reconstruction, dating, and explanation of the Gothic conversion to Arian Christianity, while certainly challenged by some, continue to have adherents. Perhaps more importantly, this second edition benefits greatly from three important additions that help to modernize Thompson’s original book. The first is a brief and very readable forward written by Michael Kulikowski, which explains the significance of Thompson’s work while also pointing out its anachronisms and current scholarly trends (the latter vital for novices). The second is a disappointingly brief (but still useful) bibliographic note, which is intended to direct readers to newer, related scholarship. And the third is a fourth appendix, which reproduces John Matthew’s translation and commentary on the Passion of St. Saba, a text of great value to Thompson’s analysis.

These additions, combined with the continued importance of Thompson’s work and a price that is much more affordable than any used copy of the original, make purchasing this second edition well worth the expense.

Jonathan J. Arnold
University of Tulsa


Giusto Traina (T.) has taken a provocative step in 428 A.D.: An Ordinary Year at the End of the Roman Empire. In his book, a 2009 Alan Cameron translation of the original 2007 Italian edition, T. intends to avoid the pitfalls of other Late Antique studies, which either overemphasize the “history of events,” or explore too extensively the “slow rhythms” of the lives of ordinary citizens, at the expense of event-driven history (xviii). To this end T. proposes to present a sort of cross-section of the history of the Mediterranean world, geographically unbounded, but tightly delimited chronologically by
the “ordinary” year of 428, a cross-section that can present big events without overlooking ordinary occurrences. It is the tight temporal boundaries, and not the apparent historicity of an event, that determine what events are treated.

Though the publishers have emphasized the idea of the ordinary year in ads, reviews, and cover design, the success of the book depends very little on this conceit, which in any case often goes unobserved (see further below). The original Italian title (428 dopo Cristo. Storia di un anno) gives a better idea of T.’s method. The true genius of T.’s approach lies in the *storia*, in his geographic unification of a large, unwieldy, and seemingly disconnected world from Britain to Palestine within a single and convincing narrative. Beginning in the first chapter in Armenia, T. takes the reader for a chapter-by-chapter tour, which wends through Constantinople, Rome and Ravenna, Gaul and Britain, Spain, Africa, and eventually back to Palestine. In each chapter T. is able to draw convincing connections between the events of one region and another seemingly unrelated one, often through the medium of Theodosius II or a member of his court. So, for example, T.’s discussion of the *foederati* serving with general Aetius in Aquitania in Chapter 7 becomes especially relevant in Chapter 8, when Bonifacius, the *comes* of Africa, revolts against the authority of the Emperor through reliance upon his own band of *foederati*. T. uses this method to great success to synthesize an impressively broad swath of knowledge and information, often drawn from obscure sources, into an engaging and easily readable narrative.

The final function of the year 428 in this method is not as significant as the cover and title would suggest. Though he uses 428 as a touchstone, T. in fact draws his material from the 420s and 430s more generally, and in some senses from the entire first half of the 5th century. The dearth of evidence demands that he extrapolate in this way. For instance, T. rightly gives attention to the Theodosian Code, but is forced to mention (43) that the process of its formation did not begin until 429. He notes, therefore, that the planning process had begun as early as 425. At the same time, T. occasionally forces an event of 428 to bear undue significance. For instance, T. appeals (34) to a law of April 21, 428 that sought to defend prostitutes from abuse by their procurers. He is in fact little interested in prostitutes or procurers, but wishes to describe an imperial “project to control social order … with the intention of safeguarding the *kòsmos.*” T. in no way invalidates his methodology either in expanding his temporal parameters or in exploiting events of 428, but the emphasis on the single year often seems unnecessary, and occasionally threatens to obscure the insightful syntheses he makes.

As mentioned above, the synthesis is truly a geographic (or at least geopolitical) one. In Chapter 1, T. begins with a discussion of the fall of Armenia and the geopolitical ramifications for the Roman Empire and Persia. T. focuses particularly on Flavius Dionysus and his embassy to the Sassanians, an event that would have received more notice in ancient sources, T. suggests, if it had been successful. With the eastern frontier of the Empire thus destabilized, T. shifts his focus in Chapter 2 to Nestorius, who in his short time as bishop of Constantinople sought (unsuccessfully) to synthesize the Christianity of the east and west through an increased episcopal austerity coupled with
a normalization of asceticism. Chapter 3 begins with Nestorius in Antioch and takes us with him to Constantinople, and gives a picture of the religious and social character of the rural communities along the way. In Chapter 4 T., having made the westward trip in the company of Nestorius, focuses on Constantinople, the Emperor Theodosius II, and the imperial court (especially Theodosius’ wife, Eudocia, and his sister, Pulcheria). T. successfully redeems Theodosius from critiques of his weak character and lack of authority by presenting him as a meticulous manager of his image and approachability. His reclusiveness and inaccessibility are convincingly described as an effort to sanctify his person, and so enable the further centralization of institutions such as education, justice, and religious orthodoxy around his capital. In Chapter 5, T. moves west to Greece and Italy. He describes how the unification of the Empire around Constantinople is reinforced by the ascension of Valentinian III to the western throne. At the same time, in spite of the new emphasis on orthodoxy, Eudocia’s influence over Theodosius leads him to tolerate a certain persistence of paganism and Neoplatonism in Athens, a sign of both the importance of Eudocia and Theodosius’ desire to curry favor with the intellectual elite. Chapter 6 details the shift of power in Italy from Rome to Ravenna, before Chapters 7 and 8 cover the Vandals and their progress into Africa. In Chapter 9, T. discusses Egyptian Christianity, which, in contrast to Nestorius’ efforts in the east, was moving towards a more rural and isolated Christianity, quick-spreading, but inevitably isolated by its use of Coptic. Chapter 10 moves the narrative through Jerusalem before returning in the final chapter to Persia and the Sassanians to whom Flavius Dionysus had led the unsuccessful embassy described in Chapter 1.

Because of its readable, highly synthetic narrative, 428 will be a valuable addition to the shelves of Late Antique scholars and in the classroom.

Daniel P. Hanchey
Baylor University


In the fateful year 1939 Sir Ronald Syme’s classic The Roman Revolution debuted, starring Octavian as “little Benito,” with a cast of thousands depicting a new ruling elite (often from Italian cities) replacing the corrupt nobiles of the Urbs. Syme’s use of “revolution” for a transition from oligarchy to monarchy displeased those restricting the term to Marxist class struggles. Accordingly, “revolutions” of 1688 in England and 1775–83 in North America are misnomers. For Wallace-Hadrill (hereafter “W-H”) Syme’s work represents a forerunner of “post-colonial history” (p. 443), as Augustus rose to power on the shoulders of Italian novi homines, the “elite-challenged” hitherto on the fringes of power, but who opened the door to prominence for later provincial elites. Syme’s unparalleled mastery of the prosopography and major
players’ personal connections has not, however, told the whole story, for the political history transpired within an age of cultural change, which did not cause the political “revolution,” but affected it. Wealth from conquests permitted the *equites* and local elites of Italian cities to challenge the power of the metropolitan elite (*nobiles*), while the “sub-elites,” especially *liberti*, converted wealth into social prestige with the emergence of new cultural forms. These “sub-elites” achieved prominence locally (e.g., *Augustales*) and at the center (Claudius’ secretariat of *liberti*); their wealth, impinging on equestrian status symbols, discomfited Pliny the Elder (pp. 350, 355) and (pace W-H) threatened social revolution. Syme ignored these “sub-elites.”

This very anthropological book, framed in that discipline’s often obfuscatory jargon and emphasizing material culture and its symbolic “language,” contrasts with Syme’s prosopography and “from-the-top-down” perspective. Nor is it the currently fashionable history “from-the-bottom-up,” as W-H’s “sub-elites” hardly qualify as the proletariat. Many of W-H’s Italian “elite” are equestrians, but W-H bizarrely avoids that term, thus creating an unnecessary disjunction with Syme’s book. W-H’s “culture” denotes not only literature, antiquarianism, art, architecture, and home furnishings, but also behavioral characteristics and values defining a group: hence the work belongs to the current mania for identity studies.

What did being Roman mean? For W-H, our view of “Roman” is an Augustan construct, the product of W-H’s “cultural revolution.” Similarly, the Social War (91–89 B.C.) was really a conflict of identities (p. 447). Chs. 1–3 usefully review recent debates about Romanization, creolization, etc., and study the dress, languages, and material culture of the Italian *socii* of the 1st–2nd cc. B.C. to facilitate understanding an Italian perspective: although the *socii* profited from Roman imperialism, Hellenization among Italians by no means came exclusively through the *Urbs*; no Roman policy imposed the Latin tongue or Roman customs on *socii* (W-H omits military organization); and much perceived as Roman (e.g., the *toga*, the *atrium*) either lacked a Roman origin or was not exclusively Roman. W-H on use of Latin and bilingualism owes much to the work of J. N. Adams (2003). Occasional exaggerations on the thorny issue of Hellenization stretch an argument too far (e.g., pp. 23–24: too strong a contrast between Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.156–157 and Ov. *Fast.* 3.101–102, whose *tradiderat* does not mean “robbed”; as a Greek, Philo of Alexandria would never have said “romanize” rather than “hellenize” barbarians: *Leg.* 147), and generalizing from Egypt the Roman army’s supposed extensive use of the Greek language in the East (p. 83) is erroneous. W-H’s concentration on an independent Italian identity leaves readers begging to know in these and later chapters a precise definition of the pre-Augustan Roman *civis*’ identity, especially as W-H believes that the *mores maiorum* were constantly reinvented in the Late Republic.

Chs. 4–6 treat literary endeavors (“structures of knowledge”). A long chapter (4) on Vitruvius (indebted to Pierre Gros’ works) demonstrates that Vitruvius created a notion of “Roman” architecture by coupling Roman and Italian concepts, inventing “traditions,” and demonstrating Greek theory’s application to Roman practice. A discussion of ancestors follows (ch. 5), in
which antiquarian studies, especially Terentius Varro’s, are shown to have exposed the nobles’ false pretensions about their ancestors. Varronian science undercut the nobles’ dubious sapientia and underlay the calendar reforms of Caesar (46 B.C.) and Augustus (9 B.C.), symbolized by his Horologium (alternatively dated 10 B.C. at p. 357)—an attempt to make time revolve around Augustus (p. 245). If calendar reforms attest that antiquarian work was sometimes read, W-H politicizes such work: antiquarianism legitimized reformer activity with superior knowledge of the real Roman traditions (pp. 236, 243). The model perhaps fits Vitruvius, but Varro, a Pompeian, hardly aimed at legitimizing Caesar. W-H’s frequent use of Varro recalls Syme’s reliance on Asinius Pollio—a fragmentary source supplying keen insight, when an argument needs it. W-H’s relatively few citations for the nobles’ inconsistencies in use of maiores and mores maiorum suggest possibly “cherry-picking” the sources (pp. 218–231). H-W curiously omits Augustus’ notable claim (RG 8.5) of reviving obsolete exempla maiorum and creating new ones, and does not observe that Rome, like the U.K., lacked a written constitution: tradition was always malleable.

Varro’s Antiquities also underlie W-H’s treatment of Augustus’ mapping, rebuilding, and reorganizing Rome as a city (ch. 6)—a consolidation of W-H’s scattered papers. As W-H demonstrates, this reorganization of neighborhoods (vici) improved city-services (fire-fighting, water supply), established intra-city cults for Augustus, permitted an accurate census, and increased control of the plebs urbana, whose riots had exploited the maze of alleys in the Republic’s last years. Comparison of Augustus’ urban renewal with Baron Haussmann’s creation of broad Parisian boulevards under Napoleon III is apropos: clear fields for cannon fire against proletariat barricades, as in 1848.

The final two chapters (7–8) focus on luxury, a consumer revolution, and Roman exports to the provinces, which stimulated local production of “Roman brands.” W-H compares Roman sumptuary laws, mainly targeting food, to similar (unsuccessful) Renaissance and Early Modern legal efforts, which perceived the prosperity of merchants and craftsmen as a threat to social stability. A parallel Roman shift in thinking is implied: from framing the problem of prosperity as luxury and morality into consumption and class. W-H posits three stages of a “wave pattern” of production, which united distinct processes of Hellenization and Romanization into a unitary cultural transformation: (1) initial import of Eastern Mediterranean products (2nd–1st cc. B.C.), (2) evolution of Italian production centers (Late Republic-Augustus), and (3) exports of Italian products throughout the Mediterranean (Augustus and post-Augustus). A detailed survey of the development of Italian pottery illustrates the process. Maecenas (a native of Arrentium) possibly had a major role in popularizing Arrentine ware by securing contracts to supply the army for his hometown friends. Indeed the army and veteran colonies became a target market for the new consumption of lesser luxury goods. An “Epilogue” (441–454) summarizes the work and emphasizes W-H’s “improvements” to Syme’s views.
This bountifully illustrated book features few typographical errors (pp. 350, 355: Plin. *H.N.* 33 repeatedly cited as *H.N.* 3). Less glossy paper would have avoided irritating glare, and CUP’s editors surprisingly condoned journalistic use of “impact” as a verb in a scholarly work. Thirty-one color plates (between pp. 210–211), duplicating some of the black-and-white figures, are not signaled in the figures’ captions. At 297 n. 88 “Neudecker (1994)” on Vespasian’s tax on urine (Suet. *Vesp.* 23.3) is missing from the bibliography.

Unfortunately, W-H’s many valuable discussions run about 200 pages too long; some lengthy surveys of material culture merited summaries and a less glossy paper would have been more readable. Further, despite many references to the Italian elite’s advance anticipating provincial elites in Roman government, W-H never discloses the process of advancement for provincials. Vast social movements still boil down to acts of individuals—Syme’s prosopography. W-H’s abstract concern for how citizenship as a social dignity replaced voting and military service as the basis of Roman identity (pp. 452–453) ignores the practical value of *civitas* in the provinces (e.g., St. Paul’s appeal to Rome after arrest) and limiting legionary service to *cives*, who could be enrolled. W-H’s *Cultural Revolution* offers a useful socio-economic supplement to Syme’s work, but by no means replaces it.

*EVERETT L. WHEELER*

*Duke University*


David Walsh’s debut book, based on his Ph.D. thesis, tackles “burlesque” images of mythological figures on Greek painted pottery, an iconographic category that can include “parody, caricature, irreverent humor, obscenity, ridicule, the grotesque, or the simply bizarre” (p. xxvii). These sorts of images have been individually discussed in earlier scholarship, but Walsh (W.) aims to bring disparate examples into a single, unified treatment. Even so, as he says, the book does not “profess to be exhaustive” (p. xxv); because of the rather daunting range of evidence, W. focuses on specific fabrics of Greek pottery and specific subjects for his analysis.

Part One introduces the reader to the types of vases to be explored, providing brief historical information for those unfamiliar with a certain fabric. Attic pottery is in the minority in this particular study; naturally the South Italian and Sicilian “phlyax” vases form the largest group, but joining them are Corinthian komos vases, Caeretan hydriai, vases from the Kabeirion Group, and the small yet arresting “Sam Wide” Group, now attributed to Corinthian painters. Typically iconographic studies limit themselves to considering a subject or genre within a single fabric, whereas W. is ambitious in casting a wide net. This can be both a good and bad thing. On the positive side, it is refreshing to read a book that ventures beyond Attic and South Ital-
ian vases to consider lesser-known fabrics and seek commonalities between them. The risk, however, is that the historical contexts that make each fabric unique can be downplayed. W. has a careful line to tread throughout the book in that regard. Part One goes on to introduce readers to the dramatic, artistic, religious, and social aspects of Greek humor, in a concise yet meaty chapter.

Part Two, the heart of W.’s discussion, includes a series of case studies as four chapters, each considering a particular theme of mythological burlesque. Chapter Three, “Strange Beginnings,” showcases early images of burlesque, for example in the Attic Black and White Style, scenes of “geranomachiae” (most notably on the François Vase), and some of the early Kabeirion vases. Chapter Four, “Violating the Sanctuary,” explores scenes in which sacred space serves as the backdrop for burlesqued myths, namely scenes of the Rape of Cassandra, the theft of the Palladion, and Herakles and Busiris. Chapter Five, “Ridiculing the Gods,” shows how specific deities are lampooned and burlesqued, among them Hephaistos, Zeus, and Apollo. Finally, Chapter Six, “Subverting the Hero,” looks at how Greek painters turned the heroic ideal on its head and recast such figures as Herakles or Odysseus as figures of fun. All four chapters consider the wide range of fabrics Walsh promises in Part One, and all include a fine mixture of well-known and lesser-known pots. The array of “Sam Wide” vases is a particular treat. The reader is referred throughout to the Catalogue that concludes the book and provides more details on specific vessels.

Part Two is laudable for its breadth and for the lively descriptions of individual vases; W.’s prose is evocative and sometimes humorous. But this part of the book betrays its heritage as a doctoral dissertation and could have benefited from further revision and restructuring. The brief introduction opening each chapter, for instance, provides only a general hint of where W. plans to go with his extended analysis. The reader is led through a series of vases, but, as one section ends and another begins, is not given much of a road map. Only in the Discussion sections closing each chapter does the reader see exactly what the author intended in the preceding pages. Indeed, W. is so careful to document the opinions of other scholars in his survey of individual vases that his own ideas seem overshadowed. This reader would have preferred to see the concluding discussions revamped into introductions, and for the author to have been more assertive in highlighting his specific contributions.

In the final chapters (Part Three), W. departs from a survey of subject matter to consider broader issues. Chapter Seven, “Distorted Bodies,” focuses on how burlesque figures alter the Greek ideal form. This theme is easily spotted in the earlier chapters, so a longer discussion here is welcome. Chapter Eight, “Distribution: Being In With the In-Crowd,” uses statistical analysis to discuss patterns of production, provenance, and the popularity of certain subjects over others as targets for burlesque. W. does well in explaining the limitations of such an analysis as well as its potential usefulness. The last part of this chapter builds on reception theory to consider the audiences for burlesque imagery. Chapter Nine, “Final Reflections: The World Reversed,” pulls outward to ponder how the Greeks’ interest in burlesque imagery re-
lates to their worldview, using recent scholarship about carnival and other ritual behaviors. W. concludes that burlesque imagery in Greek vase painting played a positive role in the community “by allowing the exploration of fantasies concerning the sacred and profane within a supportive civic structure” (p. 285) and that the Greek city itself—its institutions, its customs—provided fertile ground for its development.

W.’s book is best suited for a specialist reader, although discussions are presented in clear enough terms for student use too. The book’s quality is consistent with other Cambridge University Press volumes: a good assemblage of illustrations, nearly all clear and sharp, few typographical errors, user-friendly design. The addition of a Catalogue is a good choice, particularly given the range of subjects and fabrics treated here. Overall, this volume marks a worthy addition to the corpus of scholarship devoted to mythological iconography and, through its very ambition, provides food for thought and further conversation.

SHERAMY D. BUNDRICK
University of South Florida St. Petersburg


It might be surprising to find that a book surveying one of the most notable classical collections in the world has not already been written. Indeed there are preexisting publications, but until this 2009 book by Dyfri Williams, the most recent compilation of British Museum highlights dates from nearly twenty years ago. It was 1992 when Lucilla Burn wrote The British Museum Book of Greek and Roman Art. Two earlier surveys, one from 1970 (Fifty masterpieces of classical art in the British Museum) and one from 1976 (B.F. Cook, Greek and Roman art in the British Museum) were certainly in need of updating. One of the benefits of creating a new overview of the British Museum’s sumptuous classical collection is taking advantage of improvements in photographic reproduction. The greatest strength of Williams’ recent book is the stunningly clear full color imagery complete with well chosen details. And there is no one better to compile such a group than Williams, who has served for some time as the Museum’s Research Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities.

The book surveys artifacts produced from prehistoric Greece (c. 4500 BC) up to the Roman Empire (c. 300 AD). The book is divided into seven sections, each containing a brief history of the given period, followed by a selection of catalogue entries that provide more specific information about each object. Deciding what to include and what to leave out of such a massive collection must have taken some consideration. Williams offers little insight into his method for choosing. The pieces had to be of “real quality,” Williams tells us in his preface, or “engender a sense of wonder” (p. 7). But mostly the
objects needed to best “represent their time and place” (p. 7). Labeling any bit of visual culture a masterpiece certainly sets one up for a challenge.

Works perhaps were chosen because they best convey the historical development of classical cultures or are emblematic of relationships between civilizations. Mostly they provide evidence for the author’s fairly standard interpretation of ancient history. An early carving of the human figure (p. 11) and a comparable Cycladic nude (p. 13), for example, complement the author’s discussion about the invention of objects that are not merely functional but express human experience; the decision to include gold jewelry from Aigina (p. 23) serves as documentation of the growing trade between the Crete islands and Turkey. The historical overviews that begin each of the seven sections do not seem to force artificial connections between the subsequent catalogue entries, but instead each work is chosen to further the author’s account of the period. In the case of the early Greek world, for example, numerous vases are chosen to establish the rise of pottery workshops in the region.

The author provides a large range of object types, from traditional sculpture in relief and in the round, to decorative arts including painted and carved vases, cups, helmets, coins and jewelry. Some stand apart from others, but all are worth seeing. The geometric painted design on the Dipylon vase from Athens is particularly stunning in its vividness, despite large sections being missing (p. 41). The Griffin Jar from the 5th century BC is eye-catching for its level of preservation (p. 49). The white-ground jug by the Brygos Painter is notable for its intact white surface but also for its overall beautiful shape (p. 103). The gold ribbon diadem from Melos triggers the imagination with its delicate twisting of gold and modest jewelling (p. 180). There is also a curious red translucent Italic amber piece from Capua that is striking (p. 251). It depicts in tiny detail an intricate scene of nymphs and maenads. The silver Warren Cup, most likely crafted by a Greek artisan working in Rome, graphically depicts a lovemaking scene between a bearded man and boy while a third figure spies from behind a half-closed door (p. 289). Williams’ descriptions of objects are full and poetic, giving details about paint and surfaces not easily seen in a photographic reproduction. The author’s reference to Henry Moore’s love of the early period of Aegean art is indicative of the formalist angle the author takes.

As is often a problem in reproductions of artwork in books, a sense of scale is missing. A large Cycladic figure of nearly seventy-seven centimeters (p. 13) thus looks to be of the same height as a figure leaping over a bull, which is actually only eleven centimeters (p. 19). But the full page reproductions allow the viewer to see clearly the surfaces and details of each object.

The last section of the book provides a too brief history of how the collection was formed, followed by maps, timelines with key historical dates, and a glossary. Suggestions for further reading are also provided. The author acknowledges the 17th-century contributions of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, and those of Sir William Hamilton in the 18th century. Other key collectors were Charles Townley, of course Lord Elgin, and later Charles Newton. Little attention is given to the various controversies surrounding the amassing of a valued collection by such accused imperialists.
Overall the book is appropriate for well-informed general inquirers into the world of classical art. The book may be a unique choice for beginning academic surveys of the classical period. Experts looking for new insights into the ancient world, however, will probably not find them here. What they will observe is a substantial visual documentation of the British Museum collection.

Susan J. Baker
University of Houston-Downtown


Authorized Lives, which is William’s re-worked Ph.D. dissertation (Cambridge, 2003), is a serious yet delightful study of late antique Christian biographical writings. Excluding the gospels, acts of martyrs, hagiographies, and post-fourth-century lives of saints, Williams focuses on texts from the “fringes of the [biographical] genre,” such as panegyrics and pilgrimage narratives from various geographical locations and in various languages. In addition to providing biographical data, trustworthy or not, these texts “reveal a consistent set of attitudes and assumptions” about the world and life in the world (pp. vii–viii, 8–9). Williams investigates Eusebius’ Life of Constantine, Gregory of Nyssa’s Life of Moses and In Praise of Basil, Athanasius’ Life of Anthony, Life of Pachomius, Jerome’s Life of Paul and Life of Hilarion, The History of Monks in Egypt, and Augustine’s Confessions Book 8.

In Williams’ most impressive analysis of Eusebius’ Life of Constantine, readers are invited to observe how emperor Constantine is depicted as a liberator Moses redivivus, or even as Christ, the new Moses, in the continuously unfolding history of salvation. “Eusebius’ portrayal of Constantine took the emperor out of a conventional Roman imperial context and reinstated him in an exclusively Christian tradition” (p. 54).

In the equally illuminating juxtaposition of the Life of Moses and In Praise of Basil, Williams demonstrates how “the re-enactment of the Scripture” (passim) worked in the case of a contemporary ecclesiast. Gregory speaks of his brother as the latest but definitely not the least among the saints in the celebrated tradition of Abraham, Moses, Samuel, Elijah, John, and Paul (p. 72). Connecting the Bible with a fourth-century bishop results in a “unified sacred history” (p. 57), in a “grand Christian narrative” (p. 101), where one meets a “biblical Basil” and “late-antique Moses” (p. 87).

With his analysis of the Life of Anthony, Williams shows how the paradigm of understanding late antique figures in the light of the biblical ones is extended to the not-yet-famous characters of the fourth century. Nevertheless, one can also detect here a certain shift of focus in Williams’ analysis. The typological links between the biblical figures and monks are, in fact, a bit less suggestive than one would like. So, instead of pursuing investigation into the appropriation of the Scriptures, Williams turns his attention to the appropriation of the Life of Anthony, which seems to become a new object of interest.
Accordingly, Augustine’s *Confessions* is considered only as a unique testimony to the history of the influence of the *Life of Anthony* (Book 8). For several reasons, Augustine does not fit very well into Williams’ overall thesis, and the author is aware of that. First, Augustine speaks primarily of himself and thus, he is reserved enough not suggest a parallel between himself and Moses or Paul. Second, Augustine considers post-biblical patristic literature to be qualitatively different from the about-to-be-canonized New Testament literature. In addition to the references given, I would add *Ep. 148.4* and especially *c. Faust. 11.5:* “There is a distinct boundary line separating all productions subsequent to apostolic times from the authoritative canonical books of the Old and New Testaments.”

Despite the overall positive impression of Williams’ analysis, there are also some issues that need further consideration.

First, I am not entirely persuaded by the author’s assertion that a special characteristic of the assessed biographies is that these possessed “an authority that had otherwise been restricted to the scriptures” (p. 229). Re-enactment of the Scriptures, belief in the continuation of the sacred history, and typological interpretation of contemporary figures are valid undertakings even without the corresponding claims to a special inspiration or to being “a new New Testament” (p. 231). I wonder whether the alleged scriptural authority was a real characteristic of these biographies or whether it is merely a dubious and imaginative deduction from their elevated rhetoric. In other words, was it really only Augustine who singled out the Scriptures as having unique and unparalleled authority?

Second, because typology enables the connection of biblical figures with early Christian saints, Williams begins his book with an investigation of biography and typology, and by distinguishing typology from allegory. He sides with Daniélou and Markus, rather than with De Lubac, Clark, and others who are not so convinced that typology is necessarily something superior to allegory. The author’s brief analysis and his actual references typology (pp. 55–57, 62–63, 95, 207, 230–232) did not convince me that typology and allegory “imply radically different assumptions about the world and text” (p. 11). This is the case only when some (I believe inadequate) assumptions are accepted about typology and allegory in the first place, such as their different relation to history. Be this as it may, Williams’ point that typology continued to be the means for understanding post-biblical figures in the light of biblical figures is definitely a valid and important one for assessing early Christian biographical writings.

Third, although Williams mentions the concepts of “imitation” and “example” several times, and once even the phrase “stimulus for conversion” (p. 234), he curiously never discusses *protreptikos* as a possible genre for the texts that he considers. It’s a pity, because *protreptikos* would have enabled him to show that the late antique readers of these biographies, too, were expected to become participants in this unified sacred history. Nevertheless, since Williams takes the monastic lives as a sort of “generalized inspiration” rather than as concrete models to be imitated (p. 184, cf. 227), this neglect may be intentional. Williams contends that the point of the early Christian biographical
writings was not literal imitation (as he concedes on pp. 170–176) but rather a suggestion of a possibility of a blessed life in one’s particular circumstances (p. 183).

This monograph is recommended for scholars and students of Christian late antiquity as a fascinating and original study of Christians’ self-understanding in the post-scriptural world, without any hesitation . . . only if they can afford it.

Tarmo Toom
The Catholic University of America


This recent addition to Duckworth’s excellent Companions to Greek and Roman Tragedy series explores Euripides’ often-undervalued drama, Orestes. Highly regarded in antiquity and Byzantium the play’s popularity has suffered in modern times both in terms of its reception and in scholarship. Many classicists have offered very negative critiques of Orestes as second rate and many regard it as somehow not a ‘real’ tragedy.

Wright (W.) ably refutes such an interpretation of Orestes and mounts a vigorous defence of the merits of the play as a tragôidia (W.’s term). In his view the drama’s first audience in 408 BCE would have been in no doubt that what they were watching was a tragedy. W. argues instead that the play was written in the style of ‘late’ Euripides. He refutes Nietzsche’s accusation, made in his The Birth of Tragedy, that Euripides destroyed Greek tragedy. Instead he argues for Euripides as a tragedian who in his late dramas pushed the boundaries of the genre in interesting and challenging ways. Irony, self-consciousness and intertextuality are all characteristics this ‘late’ style and W. sees them as indicative of the strength of Orestes as a drama rather than as weaknesses.

The book is divided into six chapters. In the first chapter, aptly named ‘Setting the Scene’, W. offers his readers an introduction to the world of the play, its author and the genre of tragedy. He argues that Euripides deliberately distances his audience from the action on the stage, starting with Electra’s prologue-speech. The effect is one of deliberate ‘incongruity and strangeness’ (p. 28).

A close textual analysis of the play follows in chapter two. Wright argues that the play falls into two halves (p. 32). In the first half Orestes and Electra are helpless victims, but in the second they take matters into their own hands. They plot to kill Helen and hold her daughter Hermione hostage. Orestes is a play full of incident, with many surprises and a strange, unsatisfactory ending. Euripides, W. writes, wanted to ‘startle’ his audience (p. 33).

Chapter three explores one of the play’s main themes: the relationship between gods and mortals. Here W. argues for the importance of discussing this crucial relationship in terms of its fifth-century BCE context (p. 52) and then proceeds to offer his interpretation of the main characters of the play. He
focuses in particular on Orestes’ dilemma: if Orestes was Apollo’s agent then why did the god abandon him after he committed the matricide? This question has shaped ancient and modern audiences’ response to the character. The unsatisfying ending of the tragedy that offers no solution to this moral dilemma raises uncomfortable questions about the god’s behaviour and the question of justice in the play. For W. the conclusion of Orestes leaves a ‘bitter’ aftertaste (p. 71).

In chapter four W. explores Euripides’ ‘late’ style in more detail. He rejects the easy solution of interpreting the play as the product of a disillusioned ‘outsider’ as Euripides was presented in the biographical tradition. He argues instead for Orestes as a complex, experimental and challenging tragedy, characteristic of a great artist in old age (p. 78). For him Orestes is a ‘palimpsest’ text that is ‘almost postmodern’ in its intertextuality (p. 81). W. also points out that even with our very limited knowledge of the music of Greek tragedy enough evidence survives about the ‘New Music’ sound of the play to know that it would have added to the first audience’s perception of Orestes as new and startling.

Chapter five argues for the ‘inherently political’ nature of Greek tragedy as a whole (p. 90) and for the political engagement of Orestes in particular. W. is convinced that the play not only problematizes heroic values (p. 100), but that it also questions Athens’ continued involvement in the Peloponnesian War. In the years 411–408 the political climate in Athens was characterized by a sense of ‘unease’ (p. 102) when oligarchic factions were threatening the democracy. For W. Orestes and his supporters can be viewed as just such a ‘quasi-oligarchic faction’ (p. 103). The people of Argos, however, are also presented in a negative light. The assembly, described in the messenger’s speech, is unruly and easily swayed. Thus the play does not construct a direct parallel between the world of myth and contemporary Athenian reality. Therefore it has no political message (p. 114).

In the last chapter W. argues that Orestes is indeed Euripides’ ‘cleverest play’ as the comic poet Strattis called it in his now lost work Anthroporestes (p. 115). Its originality, its engagement with contemporary ideas of rhetoric and cosmology and the difficulty of discovering a ‘message’ in the play might at times startle and challenge us, as they probably did its first audience, but that does not mean that we should ignore it or condemn it as inferior. Orestes most assuredly does not deserve its negative reception in modern times.

W.’s book offers its readers a clear and insightful introduction to the play. Students unfamiliar with Orestes will gain valuable insights into the world of the drama and a close and interesting analysis of the themes of the play. The Companion also provides a summary of scholarly opinions about the drama and allows interested readers to pursue themes further with the help of the bibliography. Those more familiar with the tragedy will still find much to enjoy in W.’s well-written discussion. Like Euripides W. does not give us easy answers but he does raise important questions about the Orestes and our search for its elusive meaning.

ANASTASIA BAKOGIANNI
The Open University