

## REVIEWS

**D. M. MacDowell.** *Demosthenes the Orator*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Pp. xii & 457. ISBN: 9780199287192.

Those wanting to learn about Demosthenes' rhetorical style have had to make do mostly with Lionel Pearson's *The Art of Demosthenes*, now getting on in years (it was published in 1976), or the (very good but necessarily smaller scale) chapters on Demosthenes in S. Usher, *Greek Oratory: Tradition and Originality* (Oxford 1999). More recent commentaries on some of Demosthenes' speeches deal with matters of style. These include, for example, D.M. MacDowell's commentaries on Dem. 19, *On The False Embassy* (Oxford 2000), and Dem. 21, *Against Medias* (Oxford 1990), Cecil Wooten on Dem. 4, *Philippic 1*, with rhetorical analyses of the second and third *Philippics* (Oxford 2008), J. Radicke on Dem. 15, *On the Freedom of the Rhodians*, in German (Stuttgart 1995), H. Yunis on Dem. 18, *On the Crown* (Cambridge 2001), and Pearson's *Demosthenes: Six Private Speeches*, specifically those against Aphobus Onetor, Phormio, Zenothemis (Atlanta 1972). All of these books (and others) have their strengths and weaknesses, but in all cases Demosthenes' oratory is necessarily only part of the big picture. But at least we have them, for so many of Demosthenes' speeches, especially his private ones, have not received individual attention (in English anyway), thereby frustrating many who want to know more about them. Hence the need for a single work that discusses all of Demosthenes' speeches and evaluates his style, which is precisely what MacDowell in the present book has given us with his customary analytical skill and clarity. It will become the standard treatment of Demosthenes the orator.

MacDowell's contributions to the study of Demosthenes, indeed Greek oratory, make this book a fitting end to his life's work, for he died in January 2010, shortly after it was published. The book is not a biography (a relief, as I have it on good authority that a biography is due for publication in 2011-12), although MacDowell does discuss aspects of Demosthenes' life and political career where necessary – most obviously in the chapters on the political speeches. He also treats numerous matters of law, legal procedure, and other aspects of Athenian society (including religion) as they pertain to both private and public speeches. Another positive feature of the book is that he discusses the spurious speeches that survived in the Demosthenic corpus and the works found at the end of the corpus, i.e., the *Funeral Oratio* (6), *Erotic Essay* (61), *Prooimia*, and the *Letters*. The spurious speeches are woven into chapters dealing with the genuine ones, although there is an entire chapter (5) devoted to Apollodorus and his speeches (nos. 36, 45, 46, 49, 52, 53, 59).

The book's first two chapters are introductory. The first one deals with topics such as forensic and symbouleutic oratory, revision of speeches, and has brief comments on the *prooimia* (pp. 6-7). It is a pity that MacDowell deals with the *prooimia* so cursorily as they

---

are important works (though their authorship is disputed), and the bibliography he gives on them is lacking. The second chapter gives details of Demosthenes' family and personal life and ends with the *Erotic Essay* (61). This seems an odd place to have a discussion of this work, but MacDowell's rationale is that the essay is "possibly relevant to the subject of Demosthenes' sexuality" (p. 23). "Possibly" indeed, for it is hard to accept the work as Demosthenic (all MacDowell says on authorship is "if he [Demosthenes] is in fact the author," p. 23). Very useful in these earlier chapters is a chronological list of the speeches (p. 12) and a stemma of the family of Demosthenes (p. 15).

Chapters 3-14 are the heart of the book and discuss all of Demosthenes' speeches. MacDowell arranges the chapters by themes and largely in chronological order. Thus, for example, Chapter 3, "Demosthenes' Inheritance" (pp. 30-58), has the speeches *Against Aphobus* and *Against Onetor*, Chapter 6, "Liturgies and the Navy" (pp. 127-151), has the speeches *Against Polycles*, *On the Trierarchic Crown*, *Against Euergus and Mnesiboulus*, *On the Symmories*, and *Against Phainippos*, Chapter 12, "The Peace of Philocrates" (pp. 314-342), has *On the Peace*, *Philippic 2*, *On the False Embassy*, and so on. The last surviving speech of Demosthenes, *On the Crown* (18), is the subject of Chapter 14 (pp. 382-397). We then have a short chapter (15) that neatly builds on aspects of Demosthenes' style and characteristics that have been treated throughout the book and is divided into three sections: clarity and structure, emphasis, and variety (pp. 398-407). MacDowell takes his examples from *Against Meidias*, *On the False Embassy* and *On the Crown* because of their authenticity and "all belong to the middle or later part of his career, so that they may be taken as representative of his mature style" (p. 398). This survey of Demosthenes' style is likely to be reprinted in any "reader" or "introduction to" Demosthenes. The final chapter (16), "The Letters and the Final Years," obviously deals with the six letters, the Harpalus affair, and the events leading to Demosthenes' suicide in 322 (pp. 408-426).

The book ends with a decent bibliography (pp. 427-440) and a useful index of sources (pp. 441-450), but a too short index of subjects (pp. 451-457).

Each of the main chapters introduces the speeches within it with a concise discussion of the background that led to them so that readers can fully appreciate their contexts. Then follows a detailed analysis of the speeches, not merely of content but also of the effects they would have on their audience. At all times the focus is on Demosthenes' style, and MacDowell gives plenty of quotations to illustrate the points he makes. I should point out that throughout the book all quotations are in English, and that when Greek is used it is relegated to the footnotes (how nice to see foot- and not end-notes!) except in the case of the stylistic chapter (15), where its integration in the text is unavoidable, but each passage has a translation underneath it.

There is much in the book that one can take issue with, but that is to be expected, given its range and nature. For example, MacDowell believes that Demosthenes did not revise his speeches for circulation: what we have are his drafts that he kept and which were collected together after his death (pp. 7-9). The idea of drafts is hard to accept, given how “polished” are the extant speeches, and the stories that we have about Demosthenes’ unwillingness to speak unless he was properly prepared on the topic. Indeed, the consensus on a speech such as *On the Crown* (18) is that Demosthenes did revise it, as indeed did Aeschines with his *Against Ctesiphon* (3), so if he revised one it follows that he would do the same with others. Then there is MacDowell’s conclusion that the first *Philippic*, because of its style and power, “must have propelled Demosthenes immediately into the front rank of Athenian politicians” (p. 218). Not really, for the speech was unsuccessful, as was the one that followed it (*On the Freedom of the Rhodians*). It was not until 346 that Demosthenes found himself in this position, when he was elected one of the ten ambassadors to Philip II. The list can go on, but so what? Such disagreements are the nature of the academic beast, and they do not detract from the quality of this book.

MacDowell has given us the complete Demosthenes as far as his rhetorical style is concerned, and indeed in many respects he has given us a very good book on Athenian society. It is also easy to read, for MacDowell writes with his customary clarity. As examples, I refer readers to the complicated inheritance case that Demosthenes brought against his guardians when he came of age (Chapter 2), the equally complicated “balance of power” arguments put forward in *On the Megalopolitans* (Chapter 8) and the convoluted events and diplomatic negotiations that led to the Peace of Philocrates (Chapter 12), all of which are understandable on a first reading. Theophrastus was reputed to have described Demosthenes as “an orator worthy of Athens”: MacDowell has written a book that is worthy of Demosthenes.

IAN WORTHINGTON  
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

**Richard Stoneman.** *Alexander the Great: A Life in Legend*. Yale University Press, 2008. Pp. xvii + 314. ISBN: 978-0-300-11203-0.

Is there any classical scholar luckier in his subject matter than Richard Stoneman? Which of us, after being nurtured in the arid plains of philology, would not want to sojourn in a land of talking trees, magical gems, waters of immortality and naked Indian sages? And these are only a few of the myriad curiosities to be found in this delightful whirlwind tour of the Alexander legend, a tour which spans almost every corner of the world Alexander conquered and quite a few other places besides.

Only a person of exceptionally broad expertise would undertake such a book, which is perhaps the reason that nothing like it has been published in English before this.

Stoneman has spent more than twenty years researching the Alexander legend, much of which was devoted to work on his commentary on the *Alexander Romance* (forthcoming in three volumes from Fondazione Lorenzo Valla), and on his extremely useful 1994 anthology *Legends of Alexander the Great*. The *Romance* in its various recensions is like a literary reservoir into which streams flow from virtually every culture of the ancient and medieval worlds, and Stoneman has traced many of these back to their sources, showing with great clarity how the Jews, Egyptians, Zoroastrians, Persians and Arabs each contributed something distinctively their own. His research is thorough and up-to-date on these matters, despite the fact that the researchers he cites are specialists in many diverse and far-flung fields.

Of course, no treatment of the Alexander legend can ever be wholly comprehensive, and specialists will inevitably feel that one episode or another has been given short shrift. I'll raise my own cavil here, which is that Stoneman has somewhat arbitrarily excluded material from Arrian and the other Alexander historians that has already developed into legend or is headed very much in that direction. In his chapter on Alexander's death in Babylon, for example, Stoneman surveys the fantastical omens that predicted the conqueror's demise, among them talking trees and monstrous births, but omits discussion of the many similar (though less fanciful) omens found in Plutarch. Stoneman seems to have imposed a boundary between "legends" and historical sources when in fact they often closely overlap.

Stoneman uses a thematic, rather than chronologic or text-based, scheme of organization, grouping the legends he treats around core ideas and episodes. It's a Herculean labor to organize material this diverse and Stoneman's scheme occasionally doesn't work out well – for example, he treats the legends surrounding Alexander's relationship to the Egyptian Nectanebo in two different chapters, the first and tenth – but all in all it's a sensible and clear scheme which largely avoids redundancy. Scholars looking for insights into the *Alexander Romance* will be disappointed to find that text diced and spliced into half a dozen different chapters, but that is the inevitable result of a scheme which carries many benefits for the non-specialized reader. There are, however, numerous cross-references to help us put such *disiecta membra* back together again.

Scholarly readers may also find themselves disappointed in Stoneman's tendency to collect and compile stories more than to interpret or analyze them. One often wants to press him on just why certain legends became popular enough to be included in the *Romance* or other story collections, or why certain cultures preferred the versions of Alexander they did. Why did the Persians, once defeated by Alexander, adopt him as one of their own and enshrine him in glory in their *Shahnameh*? Stoneman notes the phenomenon but does not try to explain it, and perhaps it is unfair to expect him to do so, or this book would have stretched into multiple volumes. Nonetheless it is a bit of a

letdown to come to the end of this survey and find no conclusions, only a thin three-page “epilogue.”

The other side of the coin however is that Stoneman is a brilliant raconteur who takes evident delight in his material and allows himself to indulge in fascinating literary digressions. He pauses to note the origins of legends drawn on by Shakespeare and later writers, and even touches on recent literature when it invokes similar themes (a 2001 novel by Orhan Pamuk is referenced on p. 36 as a modern correlate of an ancient Alexander legend). His technique is sinuous and digressive but always interesting, like that of Herodotus. At one point (pp. 79—83) he permits himself a long discussion of how early mapmakers and church fathers dealt with the problem of the monstrosities of India, a highly compelling survey during which the reader very nearly loses sight of Alexander and his legends.

Stoneman’s witty and urbane style is well suited to his material. He livens up the many plot summaries he is forced to include here with ironical comments and *aperçus*. His is the voice of a skilled and alert folklorist who very much appreciates a surprising or clever twist in a story, but who also isn’t timid about saying so if a story lacks any such redeeming touches. Stoneman is no mere antiquarian in his approach to his legends but a tasteful and refined aficionado.

Scholarly readers and researchers will be very gratified to find, in this book’s two appendices, comprehensive guides to the literature of the Alexander legend, one in the form of a catalogue raisonné of all the major texts and the other a chronological table of the *Romance* and its derivatives. Anyone who has tried to find a path through the labyrinth of the *Romance* tradition without such guides will be grateful to Stoneman for the clarity and utility of these appendices. The bibliography is also extremely comprehensive and up to date, another invaluable resource for those doing work on the Alexander legend.

The book is unusually well designed and attractive for a scholarly monograph, with a beautiful cover, numerous illustrations, and several pages of color plates. Alexander’s legend has always been appealing to painters and illuminators, and Stoneman has reproduced here some of the finest examples of their work.

JAMES ROMM  
BARD COLLEGE

**John E. Atkinson and John C. Yardley. Curtius Rufus, Histories of Alexander the Great, Book 10.** Clarendon Ancient History Series. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Pp. 274. ISBN: 978-0-19-955763-9.

This book is another volume of John Atkinson’s thorough and invaluable commentary on Curtius’ *Histories of Alexander the Great*, a life’s work of which the first volume was

published in 1980 and the second in 1994.<sup>1</sup> Curtius' book 10, the final section of his *Histories*, covers such key issues as the last months of Alexander's reign, the events in Babylon after his death, and the author's assessment of his protagonist's career and character.

The volume consists of three main parts: an introduction, an English translation made by John Yardley for the Penguin series published in 1984 that in some passages was rephrased, and a commentary. The book also includes a short appendix on problems of chronology, a rich bibliography (pp. 249-268), and a general index.

The excellent and detailed introduction (pp. 1-47) establishes a profile of the *Histories* discussing in ten chapters Curtius' intellectual context, the complex problem of his date and identity, his sources and attitude towards Alexander, the genre, historical and literary value of his work, and the structure of book 10.

The full and well-documented commentary (pp. 75-246) covers crucial events such as the second flight of Harpalos, the Exiles decree, the Opis mutiny, Alexander's death and the arrangements in the aftermath. Also the myths of Alexander's tomb and the search for it are treated briefly.

As in the preceding volumes, Atkinson, who argues for a Claudian date of Curtius' *Histories*, focuses on its specifically Roman features stressing the Roman character. Rich in cross-references to the texts of Arrian, Plutarch, Trogus/Justin and Diodor, the commentary serves to show how Curtius reflects Roman literary and particularly historiographical tradition. Atkinson points out that the *Histories* mirror socio-political issues, rhetoric, propaganda, and even coin legends of the early Empire, echo former republican ideals, and provide standard *topoi* on Alexander.

Two minor critical comments may be made. First, in the context of the debate on Alexander's visit of Kyros' tomb, the sepulchral inscription preserved by Arrian (an. 6.29.8), Plutarch (Alex. 69.2-3), and Strabo (15.3.7), and the suggestion that the version calling Kyros the "King of Asia" was forged by the Macedonians by order of Alexander could have been mentioned.<sup>2</sup>

Secondly, regarding the Macedonian diadem, Atkinson shares the disputed traditional view that it was a part of the Persian costume taken over by Alexander in 330. However, the diadem was not the distinctive sign of the Persian great king as also the ancient Greek sources confirm. In addition, in the context of iconographical studies,

---

<sup>1</sup> J.E. Atkinson, *A commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus' Historiae Alexandri Magni, Books 3 and 4* (Amsterdam, 1980); *A commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus' Historiae Alexandri Magni, Books 5-7,2* (Amsterdam, 1994).

<sup>2</sup> See J. Heinrichs, 'Asiens König'. Die Inschriften des Kyrosgrabs und das achaimenidische Reichsverständnis', in W. Will and J. Heinrichs, eds., *Zu Alexander d. Gr.*, vol. I (Amsterdam, 1987), 487-540; D. Stronach, 'Of Cyrus, Darius and Alexander: A new look at the epitaphs of Cyrus the Great', in R. Dittmann et al., eds., *Variatio delectat: Iran und der Westen* (Münster, 2000) 681-702.

---

scholars like Calcani, Hammond and Prestigianni Giallombardo have argued that the diadem had traditionally been the sign of the Argeads long before Alexander's reign.<sup>3</sup> While Atkinson deals with Fredricksmeyer's hypothesis that the diadem was an established Macedonian convention,<sup>4</sup> their arguments are missing.

But these are peripheral objections. To sum up, Atkinson's well-argued and profound commentary is an important contribution to the scholarly debate on Curtius and a necessity for students, graduates, and scholars researching the history of Alexander.

SABINE MÜLLER  
UNIVERSITÄT KIEL

**Susan Langdon.** *Art and Identity in Dark Age Greece, 1100-700 B.C.E.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. ISBN: 978-0-521-51321-0.

Langdon's *Art and Identity* is an exciting new look at the Greek Iron Age, viewed through the prism of Geometric art. The figural scenes on Geometric pottery have traditionally been thought of as illustrations of epic or myth, or more recently as symbols of elite status and prestige. This book offers an alternative perspective. In it, Langdon focuses attention on the visual content of Geometric scenes, considering what they can tell us about social relationships and gender roles within Iron Age communities. The book is a marked departure from earlier research on the subject, opening up new avenues of research for scholars of both visual culture and Iron Age Greece.

The Introduction is brief, sketching out previous approaches to Geometric art and outlining the scheme of the book. Langdon goes on to set out her theoretical framework in the first chapter, "Art Made to Order." As in each of the following chapters, this chapter begins with a description of a well-known object, using the object and its images to introduce the specific social identities under discussion. In this first chapter, Langdon uses the British Museum "Abduction Krater" (BM 1899.2-19.1) as the starting-point for a discussion about bride abduction and its connection to marriage ritual. She then goes on to discuss the relationship between Geometric art and the societies which produced it. Imagery, she argues, has a crucial role to play in shaping the perception of social roles. She points out that the sparse Geometric style was especially suited to communicating social norms, as it represents not specific scenes and individuals, but generalized categories of people in recognizable contexts. As Langdon puts it, "the

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf. G. Calcani, 'L'immagine di Alessandro Magno nel gruppo equestre del Granico', in J. Carlsen et al., eds., *Alexander the Great. Reality and myth* (Rome 1993), 29-39; N.G.L. Hammond, 'The evidence for the identity of the royal tombs at Vergina', in W.L. Adams and E.N. Borza, eds., *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian heritage* (Washington, 1982), 111-127, see p. 117; A.M. Prestigianni Giallombardo, 'Il diadema di Vergina e l'iconografia di Filippo II', *AM* 4 (1986), 497-509, see p. 505.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. E.A. Fredricksmeyer, 'Once more the diadem and barrel-vault at Vergina', *AJA* 87 (1983), 99-102; 'The origin of Alexander's royal insignia', *TAPA* 127 (1997), 97-109.

abstractions of Geometric style offer a flexible, essentializing quality by which a viewer would associate him or herself with an idealized image, a broadly sketched social type” (p.82). Langdon also points out that imagery is especially potent when viewed at special occasions or at crucial points in an individual’s life, such as birth, coming of age, marriage, and death. It is at times such as these, she argues, that valuable pieces of decorated Geometric pottery would most often have been used. Indeed, if the “Abduction Krater” was used to carry water for a bridal bath as Langdon suggests, it would certainly have communicated a powerful message about male and female roles within marriage.

The second chapter, “Geometric Art Comes of Age,” focuses on maturation rituals for boys, taking as its central object a terracotta shield found at Tiryns depicting combat with Amazons on the front and a hunting centaur on the reverse. Langdon uses archaeological evidence to argue the concept of childhood developed over the course of the 8<sup>th</sup> century, and draws on later accounts of maturation rituals to propose that the imagery of the Tiryns shield should also be seen in this context. The portrayal of centaurs, Amazons, and monsters throughout the Iron Age is considered, and their connections to liminality and adolescence are highlighted.

From the social production of male youths, the third chapter turns to the social production of marriageable maidens and starts with an analysis of a hydria showing female dancers from the Villa Giulia. In this chapter, “Virgin Territory,” Langdon argues that the ideology of the *parthenos* also emerged in the early- to mid-8<sup>th</sup> century, and was connected to ideas of passivity, fertility and nature. This emergence, she suggests, is not only traceable in the iconography, but also in the changes in the mortuary record, where the differential treatment of young women becomes increasingly marked.

The fourth chapter, “Maiden, Interrupted,” returns to the motif of abduction, focusing on an abduction scene on a kantharos from Copenhagen (NM 727), and considering how the theme of abduction constructed both male and female roles. Langdon points out that abduction scenes are often juxtaposed with scenes of combat or competition, thus representing abduction as part of a standard set of heroic masculine activities. Geometric scenes are compared to images from later Classical pottery, as well as Bronze Age Minoan seals.

“The Domestication of the Warrior” deals with adult male social roles. The “masculinization” (p.272) of Geometric society is argued, using evidence from domestic architecture and the heightened importance for feasting as well as documented trends in iconography. This process, however, seems to have been balanced by the simultaneous socialization of the warrior, and Langdon traces subtle changes in the depiction of men including a preference for portraying individual combat rather than all-out war, and the return of a successful hunt rather than the actual killing of animals. Crucially, Langdon

---



highlights the importance of betrothal – a formalized agreement between two men which reconfirmed social norms and status – to this new definition of masculinity. An Attic vessel stand bearing an image of a betrothal ceremony is the focal point for this chapter.

The Epilogue sketches a picture of Iron Age Greece which results from the analysis of the previous chapters – as an increasingly male-dominated world where gender roles were constructed through iconography and social practice, and where women were presented as submissive and passive. However, Langdon also recognizes that images can never tell the whole story, and that “the realities of gender in early Greece were too complex to summarize as a simple picture of victimized women and domineering men.”

While the book hangs together well as a whole, there are some issues regarding the evidence Langdon uses to support her arguments. This evidence is sometimes pushed further than it can reliably be taken, and tenuous conclusions are sometimes built on shaky foundations. Taken individually, the readings of several of the objects discussed often seem to rely on overstretched and slightly questionable associations. The use of anachronistic supporting evidence, either from the Bronze Age or the historical period, is especially worrying. However, when all the various pieces of evidence are taken together, the argument is usually more convincing, and the main principles of the approach remain valid. An additional perplexing aspect is Langdon’s insistence on Geometric art as a means of expressing community (e.g. p.42 and p.296). If anything, her arguments point towards structures of differentiation within the community (male and female, mature adult and youth, elite and non-elite) rather than unity across it.

This is an impressive and original book, introducing a radical new approach to a subject which has been stuck in an intellectual rut for some time. In addition, Langdon writes engagingly, and contextualizes Geometric pottery against a backdrop of other Iron Age figurative arts as well as Homer, Hesiod, and the archaeological record. Overall, *Art and Identity* deserves to be read widely, and looks set to become an essential text in the study of early Greece.

NAOISE MAC SWEENEY  
FITZWILLIAM COLLEGE  
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

**Christopher H. Roosevelt.** *The Archaeology of Lydia, from Gyges to Alexander.* London: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Pp. xvii+314, figs. 110, tables 8.

In view of the considerable size of greater Lydia and the diversity of its landscape, the large number of sites that had to be investigated and their material inventories analyzed for their chronological, historical and cultural significance, Christopher Roosevelt has done a remarkable job of presenting a fresh and detailed picture of the Lydian civilization.

The book is divided into seven chapters including a general introduction where Roosevelt describes briefly the earlier investigations carried out at Sardis and its surrounding areas. One has to acknowledge that some of the pioneering undertakings in the field provided us with a basic understanding of the cultural and political history of Lydia. The new archaeological data presented in this book has its roots in the regional research carried out by the author to find more material yielding for his doctoral dissertation on the subject of settlement in greater Lydia. His original project was subsequently extended into the Central Lydia Archaeological Survey in 2005. The systematic and intensive field study of the CLAS project reportedly surveyed numerous sites in a ca. 350 km<sup>2</sup> area surrounding the Gygaean Lake. In terms of territory, this area defined as central Lydia is considered to be a small fraction of the estimated 22,400 km<sup>2</sup> expanse of greater Lydia (92). Parts of the material in this book were presented by Roosevelt at scientific meetings and also published in journals (see the list of his publications in “Works Cited”). His success in invigorating the archaeological databank with new material allowed him to take a fresh look at the Lydian political and cultural landscapes with the stated purpose of evaluating the impact of political changes on cultural, economic, social, and spiritual transformations in pre-Classical and Classical periods.

The second chapter (11-31) provides a concise and well-structured overview of “The cultural and historical framework” of Lydia from the pre-kingdom times in the late Bronze Age to the Hellenistic period. The so-called biological, linguistic and historical evidence of Lydian origins in LBA Anatolia is based largely on traditional views that are very difficult to corroborate archaeologically (13-22). The linguistic evidence does not take us very far. The records of Lydian language consist of a few early and mostly late inscriptions recovered from the kingdom and post-kingdom territories and their peripheries. Its affiliation to the LBA Luwian language could be explained in a number of ways. One possibility presupposes that the LBA predecessors of the Iron Age Lydians might have been one of the ethnic groups that inhabited a certain unknown area in the predominantly Luwian west-central plateau. Such a group could have spoken a local dialect of Luwian which over the centuries developed into Lydian. As for tracing “biological continuity” by comparing the Bronze Age and middle/late Iron Age human remains recovered in the territory of greater Lydia, I doubt if this exercise in physical anthropology can lead to convincing conclusions. The Hittite sources occasionally refer to this region in the context of political events, and later the Classical sources refer to the legendary ruling dynasties, but none of them guide us in defining the ethno-cultural composition of the population in clear terms. Roosevelt, in presenting his interdisciplinary evidence relevant to the discussion in his chapter, wisely refrains from jumping to hasty conclusions. His statement, “Archaeological evidence for these pre- and/or early Lydians neither confirms nor contradicts the linguistic, historical, and

---

pseudohistorical evidence. Archaeology may support the idea of a cultural rupture at the end of the late Bronze Age, but the available data are extremely limited and conclusions must remain preliminary until more evidence can be gathered” (20), makes his position on this issue quite clear. His investigations did not produce new data that could help confirm the accuracy of the pseudo-historical information provided by the Greek sources that the five-century-long early Lydian period was dominated by two consecutive legendary dynasties: the Atyad and the 22-generation-long Heraclid (12, Table 2.1). The following middle Lydian period Mermnad dynasty whose five successive kings ruled over an extended territory from the early seventh to the mid-sixth centuries BC is naturally treated as the most significant cultural and political phase in the short history of the kingdom. Despite the serious threat posed by the Cimmerian incursions in the reigns of Gyges and Ardys, the kingdom succeeded in transforming into a political power to be reckoned with. Through timely military endeavors and economic planning Lydia achieved most of its political goals in a very short time. The state income from the exploitation of its considerable resources and trade financed its military campaigns, especially during the reigns of the last three kings. This period with its impressive cultural and political highlights, and the developments that followed during the nine-generations-long Achaemenid domination of Lydia (late Lydian period) until the Hellenistic takeover is the main focus of this book. Roosevelt does not neglect to point out that “Following Cyrus’ conquest, the status of Sardis and Lydia is not clear until the time of Darius in the late sixth century”(26).

The third chapter covers the “Lydian geography and environment” (33-58). The reader is reminded that the heartland of the Mermnad Kingdom consisted of the capital city, Sardis, and surrounding areas with fertile tracts of cultivable land that extended also into the low hilly countryside situated north of the Hermus River (34-35, fig 3.1). As for greater Lydia, Roosevelt believes that it covered the territory of the Manisa province, except perhaps for the district of Soma, the Kemalpaşa, Bayındır, Tire, Ödemiş, Kiraz and Gölcük districts in the province of Izmir, and the Eşme and Güre districts in the province of Uşak (37, fig. 3.3). In the absence of clearer or sufficient markers of ethno-cultural identity, such as middle Lydian burial mounds (109, fig. 5.5), Roosevelt advises caution in fixing the northwestern and southern boundaries of greater Lydian territory with absolute certainty. As for the much larger expanse of the short-lived mid-sixth-century Lydian Empire, he does not differ from others in defining the extent of this territory in terms of Lydian spheres of cultural influence and economic and political interests.

The geographical details provided by Roosevelt in his chapter could help familiarize the reader with the relief of greater Lydia. This portion of the west-central plateau has important landmarks such as the mountain ranges of Temnos (Simav) in the north, Tmolus (Boz Dağ) and Mesogis (Aydın Dağları) in the south, together partly

surrounding a territory dissected by the Hermus (Gediz), Caicus (Küçük Menderes), and their numerous tributaries and headwaters, and marked by numerous fertile valleys and plains. In the Iron Age too, the inhabitants of this land must have enjoyed a relatively mild climate, a well-balanced annual precipitation—conditions ideal for dry farming of crops—and rich soils for viticulture, horticulture and for creating orchards. In other words, the Lydian society was most likely self-sufficient as far as its agro-pastoral production was concerned. Looking at the Lydian countryside with its rich natural resources including marble, and precious and base minerals, one can understand why this kingdom prospered economically beyond expectations under the Lydian kings, and later continued to prosper under the Achaemenid administration.

The fourth chapter of the book focuses on the “settlement and society at Sardis”(59-89). While revisiting the much publicized public, religious, and domestic urban architecture, Roosevelt successfully summarizes in an orderly fashion most of the known facts about the political history, economy, industry, and trade network of Lydia’s royal capital. He rightly remarks that by combining the few surviving archaeological remains from Sardis with information derived from textual and epigraphic sources and mortuary customs, it is possible to understand the structure and nature of Lydian society (85). The impression one gets is that in both the middle and late Lydian periods, the structured/stratified urban society of Sardis consisted of groups with various ethnic affiliations. In the middle Lydian period the cosmopolitan society consisted of five socially distinct classes: the royalty; the elite that encompassed the nobles and the high echelon religious officials; a middle class of professionals that included craftsmen, traders, and other independent professions; commoners, probably the largest class of people made up of landowning independents and landless serf-like dependents; and slaves (85-86). Distinctions in types of burials, from tumulus and elaborate chamber tombs to more modest graves, support this division of Lydian society into stratified classes (183). On closer inspection, it is quite obvious that this social stratification existed in Anatolia and the rest of the Ancient Near East at least since earlier historical periods (e.g. the Hittite society), and probably much earlier (e.g. Mesopotamia). Roosevelt agrees that under the Achaemenid administration the structure of society did not change much except for the top echelon royalty. This was a natural outcome of conquest by a foreign power. In the case of Lydia, a Persian satrap and ranking advisors and military personnel replaced the Lydian royal house and corresponding officials (88).

The fifth chapter of the book which covers the “Settlement and society in central and greater Lydia” presents conclusions derived from results of three years of intensive field surveys that followed from his previous work and the five decades of archaeological investigations by others in the immediate and distant hinterland of Sardis (93-112). Roosevelt also studied numerous archaeological collections kept in regional museums. Unlike the importance of primary evidence from secured contexts, he considers their

---

value of secondary importance as contributions to the better understanding of the nature and diversity of political, spiritual and economic activities in the middle and late Lydian periods (103). Of a total of twenty sites identified and dated to the middle and/or late Lydian period in central Lydia, eight have been classified as sites with low-density surface scatter. Roosevelt has grouped the latter as sites with less intensive occupation or human activity. As for the high-density settlement sites, five of them are situated on the southern shore of the Gygaean Lake (94, fig. 5.1). The location of these farm or village-like settlements in lakeshore and valley locations near perennial springs and fertile soils strongly indicate that their inhabitants pursued an agro-pastoral economy. The proximity of these and other villages to Sardis raises the question of landownership. The fields could have been owned by the elite class living in the capital and worked by landless farmers for a share of the crop yield. In the section dealing with “Tumulus groups in greater Lydia” (109), Roosevelt mentions the existence of between 69 and 98 distinct groups totaling more than 450 tumuli. He believes that the locations of these groups of tumuli where the prominent members of the elite class were buried, are often in the proximity of settlement sites (39 out of 71 cases), suggesting therefore, they can help identify the size of the private estates of those buried in them (109). In another important section in this chapter, “Settlement concerns,” Roosevelt discusses economic aspects of “subsistence and communication” (115-116); “territorial control” (117-121); and “resource and procurement” (121-123). In the following two sections he presents the archeological data relating to the “Sacred landscapes and cult places” (123-129) and “Lydian settlement patterns and regional interaction” (129-133). He ends this chapter with a discussion intended to guide the reader through the historical and cultural paths of the Lydian civilization.

The sixth chapter is dedicated to a meticulously documented presentation of “Burial and society” at Sardis and greater Lydia (135-183). The cultural and temporal diversity of these material records leave no doubt that the population of Lydia consisted of various ethno-cultural groups. Other than the Lydians, it included Phrygians, Mysians, Carians, Ionians and later also Persians. The sub-division of the chapter into “Regional burial types” (136-151); “Graveside markers and funerary imagery” (151-176); “Grave assemblages and funeral ceremonies” (176-182), and the following summary was a good idea considering the multitude of funerary material. One of the conclusions of this chapter is that people buried in pits, sarcophagi, and chamber tombs of diverse types were members of the affluent urban middle class, most of them living at Sardis. According to Roosevelt, a large number of rock-cut chamber tombs at Sardis became family mausoleums by the mid-sixth century BC (183). As for top echelon members of the royal house and some of the political elites and ranking dignitaries of the Lydian society, they were buried in a tumulus containing chamber tombs.

The last chapter, seven, is reserved for “Conclusions: continuity and change at Sardis and beyond” (185-203). This well-constructed synthesis highlights Roosevelt's observations and remarks concerning “Developments in the material record” (186-191) and “Material and historical synthesis: continuity and change” (191-201). He ends this chapter with “Some final conclusions and prescriptions for the future” (201-203). In the second part of the latter, he volunteers his vision for those planning field projects in Lydia. His advice, “Finer control of the chronology of ceramics and other classes of material abundant in the archaeological record of Lydia is of the outmost need” (202), should be heeded by all means.

The geographically divided “Catalogue of sites and finds in central and greater Lydia” is a very important part of this book (205-258). Each site description in this catalogue contains brief information on the exploration history and references.

Finally, I would like to congratulate Roosevelt for producing this well-researched book which is a valuable contribution to archaeologists and historians interested in Iron Age Anatolia in general and Lydia in particular.

JAK YAKAR  
SONIA AND MARCO NADLER INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY  
TEL AVIV UNIVERISTY

**Dimitra Andrianou.** *The Furniture and Furnishings of Ancient Greek Houses and Tombs.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Pp. xvi + 213; 24 b/w illustrations. ISBN: 978-0-521-76087-4.

This is a careful and considered account of ancient Greek furniture that is comprehensive up to a point. The author well describes the difficulties in studying material that, if it is recorded at all in excavation reports, is summarily published in catalogue form. She places her own study against the background of recent work on Greek houses, sagely noting the inherent interpretative problems, rejecting, for example, the claim that all the houses at Olynthus were originally identical, and noting that even Pompeii is not the pure time capsule that people once thought it was. She uses the literary and epigraphic record to good advantage, for all that the latter usually applies to temple dedications. She admits that “The leap from sacred to domestic is not straightforward” but rightly points out that “the evidence exists and should be taken into consideration in this first attempt to present the material evidence often ignored or rarely considered in publications of ancient houses.” She has divided the surviving evidence into two groups: furniture from houses, and furniture from tombs; for although the two categories overlap considerably, there are differences.

A. thus discusses in turn seats, couches and beds, tables, storage containers, cupboards and shelves: the hardware. The software section includes an overview of textiles, then accounts of bedclothes, wall hangings, rugs and mats, and furniture

---

involved in the making of cloth. There are further chapters devoted to “Sacred furniture in treasure lists,” and “Furniture, luxury and funerary symbolism in Macedonia,” and appendices culling relevant data from inventories on the Athenian Acropolis and Delos. For the reviewer, she hits all the right buttons. She believes that wall hangings figured large in the domestic scene (it used to be hard to persuade people that perhaps John Travlos had given us an over-simplified view of Greek interiors); she believes that silver plate was exhibited on the ancient equivalent of Welsh dressers; Miss Richter had denied the possibility. Not directly relevant here, but I think the point is worth making, Josephus’ account of the Temple at Jerusalem (*BJ* 5.5) includes splendid descriptions of the kind of soft furnishings with which any Greek temple would have been equipped.

There is, though, a larger picture. A. restricts herself to what she calls “the area of Greece ruled by the Macedonian kings,” roughly equivalent to the modern state of Greece. This is fine from the point of view of the doctoral thesis that lies behind the book: the material needs to be defined, and it helps if a student can have easy access to it. She steps outside this area in order to incorporate into her study a richly equipped tomb at Tekirdağ on the Sea of Marmora in European Turkey. Again, a logical step to take, since it is directly relevant to her theme; but why stop there? What follows is not intended to be unhelpfully critical, but simply to draw attention to the likelihood that there is much more relevant material elsewhere: in Italy, North Africa and Egypt, the Levant, and especially in the Black Sea area. I do not know what is in the museums at Apollonia, Istros, or Panticapaeum (not to mention the store-rooms of the Hermitage), but if I were ever to write a book about Greek furniture, I would take steps to find out. The establishment of the proposed Greek Institute of Archaeology in Odessa should do much to make the Black Sea more accessible to scholars of ancient Greece.

There is a larger picture in another sense too, for the Greek word *σκευή* embraces much more than what we, or the author, think of as “furniture.” An eastern Mediterranean example makes the case: “I ... took all the care I could of the royal furniture, to recover all that I could of what had been plundered from such as had plundered it. It consisted of Corinthian candelabra, and of royal tables, and a considerable amount of uncoined silver” (*Jos. Vit.* 68). Tables are discussed at some length by A., but lighting does not get a look in. This is all the more surprising as we learn from her (or I certainly did) that windows were a Roman development. And yet, lamps, lamp stands and candelabra on a quite a large scale are a feature of many a sympotic scene, and many survive in the archaeological record. Most recently, for example, a cache of iron and bronze “furniture” of late Hellenistic date, including craters, lamp stands, table legs, an incense-burner, and lamps on a scale matching the well-known Etruscan example at Cortona, has been found at Vani in Georgia.

*Furniture and Furnishings* is, in its way, though, an exemplary work. If the relevant remains elsewhere in the ancient Greek world were treated as thoroughly as this, our image of the domestic environment of the world would be greatly enriched.

MICHAEL VICKERS  
JESUS COLLEGE, OXFORD

**Hyun Jin Kim.** *Ethnicity and Foreigners in Ancient Greece and China*. London: Duckworth, 2009. Pp. vi + 217. ISBN: 978 0 7156 3807 1.

The flow of scholarship on Greek identity and anti-barbarian xenophobia continues unchecked: thus do contemporary preoccupations impact upon the study of antiquity. Nor is this the only modern preoccupation that marks this book, for its distinctive feature is consideration of a Chinese angle, with Greek attitudes to foreigners in the archaic and classical eras being compared to China's relations with neighbouring peoples during a period stretching from the eighth to first centuries BC and Herodotus' *Histories* compared with the *Shiji* of Sima Qian (145 or 135-86)—astrologer, Prefect of the Grand Scribes, victim of judicial castration, and father of Chinese historiography. The book is structured as a series of parallel accounts of Greek and Chinese phenomena rather than a thorough-going comparative analytic discourse, which is sensible in view of the unfamiliarity of the Chinese material to most classicists (and of classical material to any sinological readers?)—and perhaps also of the fact that the comparisons that can be usefully drawn are at a relatively high level of generality.

Kim's view is that Han Chinese and Greeks resembled each other in the breadth and variety of the prejudices that they shared. Moreover, just as the Greeks' predominantly xenophobic position was the end result of a process involving the formation of a Hellenic identity and the "invention of the barbarian," so Chinese xenophobia was something that emerged at a particular time, not something that always existed. But, despite this similarity, the book's contention is that Greeks and Chinese expressed their snobbery about foreigners in different ways and its purpose is both to illustrate and explain this fact. One of the ways it does this is through the comparison of Herodotus and Sima Qian, a comparison that is used to cast light on Herodotus' treatment of Scythia and Lydia as well as to provide an example of how Chinese attitudes to the outsider play within a specific high status and somewhat independently minded work.

Kim gives a familiar account of Greek attitudes to the outsider in Homeric and archaic literature and of the relatively belated crystallization of Hellenic identity: on the latter point he reasonably queries Hall's stress on the role of class-differentiation and Malkin's idiosyncratic views on Homer and *nostoi*. More strikingly he argues (*contra* the normal consensus) that "barbarian" acquired its resonance in the late 6th c., before the Persian invasion of Greece and in response to the Persian arrival in Anatolia. One aspect of this is that the Persians' impact came not just from the shock of conquest by a novel

---



foreign group but also from the Persians' own "ethnographic" categorization of subject-peoples and from the Greek experience of being comprehended within a multi-cultural imperial state. This brought them into a different relationship with whatever sense of the diversity of the world they had had before, and this was especially so since the conquerors classified them all simply (and disdainfully?) as Yauna. Persian conquest thus encouraged an existing inclination towards the construction of Hellenic identity, and the practical burden of Persian rule tended to encourage othering of the multi-ethnic imperial state as homogeneously "barbarian." At the same time Ionians picked up from the Persians the "pluralism and heterogeneity" that were distinguishing features of the AE (p.123). The AE viewed the cosmopolitanism of the empire as a plus, and that attitude rubbed off in Ionian pluralism and sophism—indeed it rubbed off on Herodotus. There is food for thought here, and the possibility of a late archaic origin of the barbarian is certainly one to be considered. If this (further) means that Greek xenophobia was a product of anxiety not triumphalism, then so be it, especially as the Persians were a potential occasion of anxiety until the fall of the empire. Whether the Greeks never achieved a sense of outright superiority (as Kim maintains) is another matter: the Persian overtones of the Parthenon or the Odeon are not (*pace* 46) straightforward indications in this context.<sup>5</sup>

Other aspects of the treatment of classical Greece are more open to criticism. Kim's attack on the Greek claim to military superiority has some dicey moments. The events of 480/79 cannot be called "a small triumph" simply because the numbers at Plataea were quite possibly of the same order on both sides: that does not diminish Greek entitlement to satisfaction at having won. Similarly the current perfectly understandable fashion for deconstructing the hoplite phalanx does not mean we can write off what happened at Plataea because it was achieved by greater co-operation and solidarity among the soldiers rather than superior tactics or technology. Why should justified Greek pride suffer because modern historians have misunderstood the nature of hoplite fighting? And what is wrong with co-operation and solidarity? Thucydides' observation that the Scythians had greater military potential than Greece is not merely qualified but entirely negated by the additional remark that realization of this potential was ruled out by political disunity. If it is true (as Kim believes) that Persians always won if they deployed their cavalry correctly, how do we judge their failure to fight battles they could win on various crucial occasions? The apparent claim that in retreating through Armenia the

---

<sup>5</sup> Incidentally, on Achaemenid matters, the Borsippa document from 515 BC (BRM 1.71) does not (*pace* p.25) mention Greeks, and it is not demonstrably true either (*pace* p.26) that there were Greeks in the Persepolis secretariat (the evidence supposed to show this probably does not do so: cf. J.Tavernier, *Iranica in the Achaemenid Period* [Leuven 2007], 365, s.v. \*Yauna-) or (*pace* p.53) that Xerxes left Greece in 480/79 because of a rebellion in Babylon in 479 (the only potentially authoritative evidence about Babylonian rebellions at this date puts them *before* the Greek invasion: cf. C.Waerzeggers, "The Babylonian revolts against Xerxes and the "End of Archives"", *AfO* 50 [2003/4], 150-173).

10,000 were outside the empire ignores the fact that they encountered a satrapal army there (and defeated it): the military historians of the *Anabasis* whom Kim criticizes know a bit more about the story than he allows. Can the observation that fifth century Greek naval fighters were “students of the Phoenicians” (because the trireme came thence) really render Salamis and Eurymedon empty events? Greeks indulged in much big talk about matters military (as about other things); and for much of Greco-Persian history between 479 and 334 neither side chose to test the issue on a large scale anyway. But the 21st century liberal horror at anyone *ever* being better at something than someone else really has to be kept in check.

Kim sees the fourth century as more xenophobic even than the fifth. Certainly there is more surviving anti-barbarian rhetoric, partly because the big politico-military story *was* one in which Persia had a persistent role—but partly because of the sorts of text that survive. The characteristics of 412-386 and of 386-334 differ from one another and from those of 478-412 (with or without a Peace of Callias), but Persia was always, after 480/79, a definitive point of reference (and anxiety); if the right voices survived authentically from the 460s we might hear things that were less un-Isocratean than some imagine. On the other side of the coin, it seems odd to say that the wise or admirable barbarian has simply disappeared in the fourth century. What of Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia*, the Egyptian strand in Plato’s *Timaeus* and *Critias* or the re-emergence of idealized Scythians detectable in Ephorus? None of these is straightforward, but they *are* part of the mix. Moreover the survival and non-survival of voices plays the other way round too: the tragic discourse of the fourth century is virtually silent; before it lost its voice was it home to the same hostility to the barbarian of which fifth century tragedy provides such important and indeed defining examples? Did fourth century tragedians outdo all of this? Or had they lost interest? Or did Euripidean relativism become a default norm? There is much we do not know.

On the Chinese side of things, the first thing to say is that it would have helped to have a little more in the way of objective orientation in unfamiliar territory. Careful reading and re-reading of the Chinese sections (and internet help) get one some way in grasping the significance of Zhou and non-Zhou, Western Zhou and Eastern Zhou (divided at or around 771 BC), Hua Xia and non-Hua Xia and the Central States and their periphery. But one is left with an uneasy lack of absolute certainty about the inter-relation of these categories at any one time and over time. The emergence into the discourse of the Central States (with the rustic and illiterate tribes that surround them) is particularly sudden, and its presence partly masked from less than perfectly attentive readers by their being sometimes designated just by the Chinese term *Zhong Guo*. The next thing to say is that, although we are told that Chinese and Greek anti-barbarian attitudes were different, some negative characteristics (intellectual, moral, and practical

failings) attributed to barbarians in Chinese sources (cf. 61f) will sound familiar to any reader of Greek literature.

The roots of Chinese xenophobia are sketched right back to the Shang era (roughly 1500-1000), but the situation even in the Spring and Autumn period (770-480) was still ethno-culturally fluid and unprejudiced. This changed in the Warring States era with the eventual emergence of a firm cultural divide between Central States and others. One could wish to have a clearer articulation of how this happened. Compared with the emergence of “Greek” and “barbarian” in a century or so (550-450), the Chinese process seems a long one (8th-4th c.). A clearer affirmation of that contrast, if it is correct, would be welcome. Moreover, since Kim’s position is that the Greek / barbarian and Hua Xia / barbarian divides differ in character because of their different politico-cultural settings (specifically because of the different relation of “Greek” and “Hua Xia” to putative actual major cultural boundaries), it seems reasonable to demand a plainer account of the process by which “Hua Xia” came to correspond to a particular cultural boundary. One can see that Hua Xia expands outwards from a core until the processes of political conflict and cultural negotiation reach a real boundary, whereas “Greek” is constructed in a limited space and mostly against boundaries that are not as profound as those between nomad and settled peoples. But one wants to know why Hua Xia was able to do this and where the identity in question came from: for the Hua Xia equivalent of the construction of Hellenic ethnic identity is not inspected in the book. (It would also help, incidentally, to hear exactly where a denomination like Zhou comes from. We are told [31] that the Shang and, to some extent, the Western Zhou were loosely organized confederacies with a ruling charismatic clan at their centre, and that the Shang cannot properly be called the first Chinese dynastic state. Is it proper to call the early (western) Zhou such a thing? If so, at what point does that change? If there is a change, why is not one profound enough to generate new nomenclature?)

Herodotus bucked the trend of contemporary xenophobia, displaying a degree of (hierarchical) cultural relativism and acknowledgment of Greek debt to non-Greeks. Sima Qian, by contrast, is rarely relativist and is essentially at ease with the forceful application of a *mission civilisatrice* to non-Hua Xia peoples. His general approach to foreigners is not as collections of ethnographic characteristics but as socio-political inferiors to the Han empire located at varying distances from the centre of political power. (Put another way his work narrates political and military interactions between players whose identity is largely taken for granted.) This stance protects him from fantastical othering of distant peoples such as is found in the *Shanhaijing*, but also puts the relativism seen in the *Huainanzi* (where uniform human nature is rendered diverse by the impact of environment and custom) mostly out of reach. In the case of the Xiongnu, however, Sima Qian does describe ethnographic characteristics and takes a negative view of continuing war against them as pointlessly wasteful. Intellectually speaking,

these exceptional features presumably belong together (the immense length of the history of conflict with the Xiongnu and the continuing impossibility of resolving this conflict satisfactorily from the Chinese point of view are key characteristics), but Kim does not elaborate. What he does do is make the bold claim (p.4) that the Herodotean ethnography of Scythia which has “somewhat confused and baffled modern scholarship” is made comprehensible by comparison with Sima Qian’s of steppe-nomads. But the only obvious thing that comes from adducing Chinese material is that it provides independent evidence for features of a nomadic environment that are also found in Herodotus—empirical data that increase the plausibility of some of what Herodotus says. This helps embed the sensibly empirical approach to the text (by contrast with what is found in Hartog *et al.*) already displayed in Kim’s direct discussion of Herodotus’ Scythians. But I doubt that Herodotus IV has ever been that “baffling” to those prepared to be boringly positivist in approaching it. (Nor are the empirical parallels adduced by Kim entirely new to Herodotean scholarship.) In some ways more interesting is the treatment of sedentary peoples in chapter 5, which argues that, whereas in the course of the later archaic and classical periods Greeks made the Lydians—historically a relatively familiar people—more “other,” the Chinese tendency was mendaciously to include outlying peoples in Korea or the South into the Han *ethnos*. It would be nice to know whether the negative “othering” of Lydians was late 6th c. *Schadenfreude* designed to divert attention from Greek subordination to Persia or something that happened after 480/79 when Greeks could stop being embarrassed about their own failings—Sardis remained Persian in 478, but Anatolian Greece was free—but in any event these phenomena reflect Kim’s big picture: the Chinese absorb foreigners when they can, Greeks fend them off. For the fundamental contention of the book is that Chinese xenophobia did not postulate natural or genetic distinctions between different populations and was consistent with the idea that people can become Chinese by adopting Chinese customs. Greeks, by contrast, did believe in the natural inferiority of barbarians and were resistant to the admission of outsiders into their citizen bodies. The reason for this contrast was that the Han Chinese were absolutely confident in their cultural superiority, whereas the Greeks were conscious of being a peripheral and belatedly empowered part of a larger East Mediterranean and Near Eastern cultural community. I make four observations on these ideas.

1. Kim compares Chinese absorption of foreigners with the Roman model. Should he not also have considered the Hellenistic environment? Acquisition of Hellenic identity through acquisition of Hellenic language and culture is a reality then (and the seeds are already visible, albeit in arrogantly Athenocentric form, in Isocrates), and exploration of the similarities and (certainly) differences from the Chinese situation could help clarify both Chinese and Greek cases.

2. A message of J. Hall's *Hellenicity* (Chicago 2002) was that, in the definition of Greek identity, the genetic or genealogical mode of the archaic era was succeeded by the cultural one of the classical. Inasmuch as he speaks of a constant genetic element to Greek exceptionalism he is perhaps rejecting that analysis. If so, that is well and good: Herodotus 8.144 is quite clear that “blood” (quasi-family relations) matter and, *pace* Hall, arguably even gives it a privileged place. At the same time I worry a little about the Chinese side of this issue. We are told that the barbarians around the Central States are “clearly marked as being inferior in the natural hierarchy of All Under Heaven” (p.67), but also that the reason a man living in Central China becomes a man of Central China is not Nature but profuse cultivation (*ibid.*). The reader not versed in Chinese material finds it hard to be sure why Kim allows himself this apparent contradiction. Does it perhaps reflect an awareness that, although the barbarian-Hua Xia barrier may be crossable by adoption of Hua Xia habits, the Chinese nonetheless regard anyone who does not attempt that transition (or is not fit to be forced to make it by Chinese violence) as being quite as inferior as the average Greek thought the barbarian to be?<sup>6</sup>

3. Kim should perhaps have paid more attention to the fact that the excluded foreigner in classical Greece is often Greek. One example is Kim's suggestion that there is a simple analogy between the Herodotean Anacharsis and Ji Zha (p.63). In fact, the latter praises everything he sees, whereas the former is either open to foreign customs and dies for his pains or (on another view—rejected by Herodotus as a playful story invented by the Greeks) thought all Greeks except the Spartans worthless because they had no interest in wisdom. In the Chinese literary environment, therefore, the only function of a noble savage is to bolster Chinese self-satisfaction, but in the Greek one he can be a means of having a laugh at one's own expense or at the expense of another category of Greek. This is a reminder that in the Greek context talk of representation of the foreigner ought not only to be talk of representation of the barbarian—and a reminder that Kim's account leaves one uncertain how true the same might be in China. (The multiplicity of states, even if smaller in the Warring States period, and their mutual conflicts must make one suspect that it may be true.) In any event, one should note the interrelation of this feature of the Greek mindset with Greek identity formation: once one has invented Greeks it becomes easier to invent barbarians, because “Greeks” is already an artificial term embracing a generality of peoples of whom one might naturally be inclined to be suspicious. At the same time considerations of this sort reinforce the feeling that the particularities of the Greek situation are too different from those of the Chinese to make comparisons of more than rather general significance.

---

<sup>6</sup> Xunzi himself noted that although someone may be theoretically capable of becoming something, he may not in practice find it possible to do so (B. Watson, *Basic Writings of Mo Tzu, Hsün Tzu and Han Fei Tzu* [New York / London 1967], 168).

4. That is all the more so when one factors in Near Eastern cultural influence. Kim deserves credit for trying to integrate this phenomenon and Greek acknowledgement of it more explicitly into an explanatory discourse about the invention of the barbarian than is sometimes the case. But, so far as China is concerned, it draws us back to a question posed already: how did the culturally distinct Hua Xia form in the first place? And, so far as Greece is concerned, I do wonder how many of those who contributed to the emergence of the barbarian were anything like as conscious of (and feeling inferior about) cultural links as they were of political and military relations. No one thought the Persians were the original begetters of any aspects of Greek culture, and it was the arrival of the Persians that drove the whole thing. What Greeks might have seen as Kim's East Mediterranean / Near Eastern cultural community had the shared experience of a nasty visitation from an Iranian outsider; but the whole point—to Greeks—was that the Greeks dealt with it better than their non-Greek counterparts.

CHRISTOPHER TUPLIN  
UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL

**Anne Pippin Burnett.** *Pindar. Ancients in Action.* London: Bristol Classical Press, 2008. Pp. 175. ISBN: 978-1-85399-711-2 (Paperback).

**Arthur McDevitt.** *Bacchylides: The Victory Poems.* London: Bristol Classical Press, 2009. Pp. vii, 232. ISBN: 978-1-85399-721-1 (Paperback).

Both of these recent Bristol Classical Press volumes are greatly to be welcomed, as each helps fill a substantial gap in the textbook market. Though there are several good translations of both authors, and (of course, and especially on Pindar) a large number of specialized scholarly studies, interpretative work that is accessible to an undergraduate readership is rare: even on Pindar there has been no general introduction in English since W. Race's volume in the Twayne's World Authors series of 1986; for Bacchylides there is nothing pitched at quite that level of accessibility. McDevitt's volume therefore meets a more pressing need, but Burnett's will also be a fixture on all reading lists for undergraduate courses that deal with Pindaric epinician.

In a brief introduction of only seven pages, Burnett gives an outline sketch of Pindar's career, his ancient reputation, his reception in the Renaissance and after, and one or two of the key controversies of modern Pindaric scholarship. The first of the four chapters then focuses on the contexts of epinician – the athletic festivals, the relationship between poet and patron, the circumstances and context of performance – as well as on key features of the genre – the 'oral subterfuge,' religious and ethical implications, the encomiastic function, and the role of myth. Three chapters then discuss odes for boys, for adult men, and for rulers, in each case focusing on the differences between these categories in social, political, performance, and thematic terms. Odes for boys betray a quasi-initiatory function and exhibit special characteristics such as trainer-praise,

---

references to the victor's youthful beauty, and invocation of feminine deities and personifications. Those of adult males emphasize such things as the civilizing function of organized competition and the political implications of success, especially in equestrian events; while odes in praise of victories won by monarchic rulers (Arcesilaus of Cyrene, Hieron of Syracuse, Theron of Acragas) and their associates are less concerned with the victor's relations with his fellow citizens and more with the ruler's ambitions on the panhellenic stage. A brief conclusion sums up the epinician project of memorializing achievement in song by uniting victor and audience in celebration not only of individual success but also of communal values.

The volume's strengths lie in the vividness, imagination, and enthusiasm with which Burnett evokes the atmosphere of epinician in its original social, political, and performance contexts. Central to this is her method of extensive quotation of passages in translation, interspersed with sparing but always suggestive analysis. Twenty-one odes are quoted extensively, some in their entirety. The translations themselves are one of the best features of the volume, idiomatic and accessible without sacrificing accuracy. It would be a great pity if the book's intended readership were to skip these in their search for the nuggets of information needed for their assignments, for they are both a pleasure to read in themselves and integral to the author's imaginative reconstruction of the circumstances of first performance. Their quality leads one to hope that Burnett might be preparing a complete translation of the epinicia.

It would be unrealistic to expect a volume such as this to provide extensive documentation of every one of its claims or to engage in much scholarly controversy, but still the book's main weakness is its failure to indicate how much of its argument is informed speculation and how much common knowledge. Burnett provides extensive references to the epinicia themselves, but very few references to other ancient sources which might corroborate what she presents as historical detail. Students will therefore not be able to tell (e.g.) that her reconstruction of the circumstances of an epinician's first performance (p. 21) is speculative and controversial, or that the picture of the suspicions that *hippotrophia* on the part of non-tyrant victors may have aroused in their fellow citizens (pp. 88-90) is painted with a rather broad brush. The statements that Hieron of Syracuse "transformed [a] volcano, Aitna, into the site of a city" (p. 102), founded "on the slopes of the recently active volcano" (p. 125) will very likely mislead students unaware that Aetna was founded on the site of the coastal city of Katane. Instructors who want their students to be able to document their assertions and to reflect in their work a better substantiated account of epinician's social, political, performative, and cultural contexts will need to supplement their reading lists with other, less accessible material. But Burnett's work is more likely than any other comparable volume actually to enthruse readers with the project of studying Pindar.

---

McDevitt's translation, with introduction and extensive commentary, of the surviving epinicia of Bacchylides is much more traditional in its conception, format, and execution. A well-documented introduction discusses the Greeks' competitive spirit (as a citizen of a nation which has league tables for everything from hospital waiting lists to university research I sometimes wonder about the value of such generalizations), the athletic festivals and the events that they included, the nature and functions of epinician poetry, and the text of Bacchylides itself. This is followed by a fluent, idiomatic, and lucid translation of the epinicians. As befits a volume intended for classroom use, the translation is closer to the original than the more literary versions of Fagles and Slavitt, but more readable than those of Jebb and Campbell, whose main function is to elucidate a parallel Greek text. It is set out as verse, and line-numbers correspond closely, though not exactly, to those of Maehler's Greek text. (McDevitt follows Maehler rather than Irigoin in the numbering of the odes themselves, in the traditional numeration by cola, as opposed to Irigoin's Boeckhian re-numbering, and in such matters as the extent of Ode 13 and the division of the papyrus text between that ode and Ode 12.) Students will need to be warned that the references to the original Greek text that they will find in secondary literature will occasionally diverge from McDevitt's lemmata and cross-references, keyed as they are to the line numbers of his translation, and no doubt instructors will occasionally find it frustrating that student assignments based on this translation will use erroneous line numbers.

The commentary is a very substantial piece of work indeed. Each poem is provided with an introduction focusing on context and historical background, the argument of the poem itself, and (in the case of the longer odes) the treatment of myth. These are models of clarity, yet also refuse to patronize their readership by over-simplification; thus they provide the most useful resource yet for students coming to Bacchylides for the first time. The commentary's notes are also very full and useful, with detailed elucidation of points of fact, style, and argument and a judicious supply of parallels to illustrate Bacchylides' place in the poetic tradition. McDevitt shows both excellent judgment and commendable independence in his selection of issues for discussion, and even advanced scholars will wish to take note of many of his comments and explanations, including those in which he corrects occasional errors in Maehler's magisterial German commentary (see e.g. on 11. 105).

The concerns of McDevitt's book are traditional, and none the worse for that. He provides a straightforward (soft) Bundyist account of the poems' rhetoric, together with solid historical background, much factual information, and a straightforward literary historical exegesis of Bacchylides' use of myth. Of New Historicism, narratology, or recent interest in the performance, re-performance, and cultural contexts of epinician there is not a trace. Just occasionally, the book's approach can appear quaintly old-fashioned (as in the somewhat Victorian formulation of "the Greek ideal" of "perfection

---



of mind and body” on p. 2). There is also the occasional eccentricity, such as the citation on p. 137 of Julian Jaynes’s totally bonkers book, *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind* (Penguin, 1976), as the sole reference for the development of the notion of *psyche* in Archaic and Classical Greece. On pp. 221-2 this is developed into a lengthy endorsement of Jaynes’s “brilliant” exposition of how a “new consciousness of right and wrong, which did not exist in Homer, and had never existed before,” emerged from the breakdown of the bicameral mind, a phenomenon characterized by the “imposition” of choice and action “from without” by gods who “were what we now call hallucinations” (Jaynes 74, cited by McDevitt 222) and who “took the place of consciousness” (Jaynes 72, McDevitt, *ibid.*).

But these are minor quibbles. In general, McDevitt is a sure-footed and learned guide to basic issues of form, argument, and function in Bacchylidean epinician. The book will be very useful in advanced courses on Greek lyric in translation and no doubt also as source material for courses on Greek athletics. In conjunction with Stephen Instone’s 1996 Aris and Phillips selection of Pindaric victory odes it would make an excellent textbook for a course on epinician poetry in translation.

DOUGLAS CAIRNS  
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

**Simon Goldhill and Edith Hall (eds.). *Sophocles and the Greek Tradition*.** Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Pp. xvi, 336, ill., port.; 24 cm. ISBN: 9780521887854 (Hardback), 0521887852 (Hardback).

Dedicated to Professor P.E. (Pat) Easterling of Newnham College, Cambridge, in honor of her 75<sup>th</sup> birthday, the volume of essays covers topics and approaches that suggest the extraordinary scholarship and influence of its honoree. Several contributors trace the origins of their essays to the advice and encouragement of Professor Easterling, who has been so generous to so many for so long.

The volume begins smartly with an introductory essay by the editors, whose survey of Sophoclean interpretation over the past century and a half should be required reading for anyone drawn to the intellectual history of classical scholarship. They trace the influence of Hegel’s idealism and the aestheticism of Ruskin and Pater on R.C. Jebb, whose groundbreaking editions with commentaries (recently reissued under Easterling’s editorship) set the standard for Sophoclean studies at the turn of the last century. Goldhill and Hall move effortlessly to the influence of Rohde on von Hoffmansthal’s versions of Sophocles, noting the importance of dance (Duncan, Nijinsky) and theatrical innovations on the growing awareness of the performance aspects of tragedy.

The editors identify four main strands of Sophoclean criticism in the 20<sup>th</sup> century: 1) Reinhardt’s attack on historical criticism, followed by Kitto’s interest in dramatic form, Whitman’s heroic humanism, Knox’s work on recurrent patterns of character and

language, and Winnington-Ingram's focus on individual plays, "each in its own unique form, quality and theme" (p. 11). 2) The anthropological turn of Levi-Strauss, Vidal-Naquet, and Vernant, whose idea of the "tragic moment" brings history back into the tragic story, focusing on democratic Athens. Segal weaves the first two strands, drawing on French structuralism and other contemporary literary theory to explore humanist issues, especially the relationship of humans to nature and the gods. 3) Feminist readings of tragedy, especially those of Zeitlin, Foley, and Loraux, whose work supports the editors' claim that "critics, like all of us, are children of a particular epoch" (p. 3). 4) Staging tragedy, both in the ancient world and now, from practical stagecraft to contemporary reception. For the future, Goldhill and Hall posit ongoing interest in the ties between tragedy and the (primarily) Athenian community that produced it; original performance issues; Sophoclean language; and reception viewed through the lens of performance theory.

At times during this survey, the reader feels pressured by the editors' frequent emphasis on the *constructed* nature of the tradition (pp. 11, 12, 18, 19, 22). Perhaps the authors are reacting to the theories of "deconstruction" that have given the overworked metaphor of "construction" its recent ubiquity. The term "selective" would serve better to describe the process by which scholars choose an interpretive strategy over another (or that the editors shaped this volume), indicating that no tradition (including those one embraces or rejects) would wish to claim total inclusiveness. "Construction" suggests a plan from the start, building from the ground up, hardly an accurate metaphor for the way interpretive traditions develop and change.

Following this spirited introduction, the volume sags in the next two essays, each an overheated attempt to make "meta-theatricality" appear central to Sophocles' plays and dramaturgy. Simon Goldhill converts Sophocles' "third character" into an "on-stage audience," arguing that this allows the spectators to see themselves on stage, to watch themselves watching, and so learn something about reflection, doubt, and moral choice necessary for responsible citizenship. Certainly watching Odysseus in the opening scene of *Ajax*, or Neoptolemos caught between one choice and another in *Philoctetes*, makes for engaging drama. But these characters are *not* an audience, but agents and actors in the drama. A better example than those Goldhill offers would be the Chorus in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* deliberating what actions they should take as they hear Agamemnon's death cries within the palace (*Ag.* 1348-71). Although no "characters" are onstage (much less three of them), would the spectators at the theater of Dionysus have been any less likely to see themselves reflected in the dilemma? Throughout the history of the theater, audiences have wondered what they would do in analogous situations as they watch individuals and groups onstage make decisions, reflect, act rashly, and change their minds (consider Medea's famous monologue in Euripides, again with no interlocutors).

Sophocles' third actor may enrich that process, but more in terms of complexity than in the focus for which Goldhill argues strenuously.

In her contribution, Ismene Lada-Richards emphasizes Sophocles' "deep engagement with his own artistic medium, especially his highly self-conscious inquiry into the art of acting." But surely *all* artists worth studying are "deeply engaged" in their artistic medium. As for the art of acting, Lada-Richards makes a beginner's error. Neoptolemos does not learn how to *act* (i.e., create and play a character other than himself), as the author claims. Rather, the son of Achilles learns to *dissemble*, and then fails to continue to do so. Any actor who has played Clytemnestra, Neoptolemos, Ajax, or just about any character will tell you that acting is not the same as lying. Lada-Richards' error arises when meta-theatrical musings lose their basis in the theater, an easy mistake for an armchair theorist, but one that diminishes rather than enriches our understanding of Sophocles' "deep engagement with his medium." The "histrionic self" that Lada-Richards finds so consuming in Sophocles impoverishes the complex ethos of character that informs his plays. The argument approaches the absurd when we read that Neoptolemos represents the late 5<sup>th</sup>-century tension between actors and playwrights (imported by Lada-Richards through Aristotle, writing two generations after Sophocles' death), with the dramatic character nearly taking over the drama (pp. 62-67). At last, Lada-Richards asserts, we can put the "truism that Sophocles' work was written *for* performance to good use" (p. 68). But writing *for* performance does not mean writing *about* it, and it is reductively clever to suggest that Sophocles (so deeply engaged in politics as well as his medium) wrote plays "about" the theater, and not about the world in which that theater played its part.

Happily, the volume finds its feet with a splendid piece by Edith Hall on Deianeira and precipitate decision-making. Hall underlines the way that *Trachiniae* (and tragedy generally) focuses on making choices, exposing the dangers of time pressure, emotional vulnerability, bad advice, and the failure to take good counsel. She masterfully relates those pressures to the larger deliberative apparatuses of the Athenian *polis*, particularly *boulê* (who had special seats at the City Dionysia) and the *dêmos* at large. Rich in detail and clear in analysis, Hall moves the self-reflective theatricalizing of the previous essays into significant dialogue with the context of tragic performance, remaining sensitive to the changing dynamic of the drama onstage. Invoking Diodotus' warning at the end of the Mytilenean debate (Thucydides 3.42.1) on "speed and passion" as inimical to good counsel, Hall helps us understand why tragedy as a genre frequently denies the temporal "space" for calm reflection, why the absence of male authority figures looms large, and why unconsidered decisions have such disastrous outcomes. This essay will find its way into future anthologies of critical writing on Sophocles and tragedy.

The volume then shifts to consider tragic hermeneutics, with Oedipus providing the paradigm. Peter Burian offers a lucid account of the inconclusive endings in *Oedipus*

*Tyrannos*, asking the right question: when everything in the play points to the polluted hero's exile, why does Sophocles deny it? With his typical clarity and interpretive openness, Burian argues that the lack of closure represents Sophocles' refusal to close accounts on Oedipus' character (who, Burian thinks, resembles Creon in *Antigone*, a ruler who also confuses the state with himself). Continuity rather than closure is the play's legacy, forcing the meaning of *Oedipus Tyrannos* into the future, and up to the audience.

Chris Carey's discussion of the third stasimon in *Oedipus at Colonus* combines close textual analysis with useful reminders of the ode's placement (before the arrival of Polyneices, marking the play's *peripeteia*) and the importance of topographic elements near its end, reflecting the play's emphasis on Oedipus as "topologically" defined—via Mt. Cithaeron, the junction of the three roads, and finally Attica (p. 131). Michael Silk analyzes the poetic logic of the unexpected word or verbal turn in Sophocles, comparing his "semantic diversions" with those of Yeats and Virgil. The abrupt adjustment of reference that follows allows the surprising word choice to make sense in retrospect, while at the same time opening up a feeling of being "suddenly lost amidst the cognitive forms of phenomena, because the principle of causation ... seems to be suspended" (p. 143, quoting Nietzsche's *Birth of Tragedy*).

In a *tour de force* of cultural history through Sophoclean reception, Fiona Macintosh analyzes French versions of *Oedipus Tyrannos* in the inter-war period, exploring the reasons for the "irreverent" characterization of the story, particularly by Cocteau, Stravinsky, Gide, and Enescu. Drawing together trenchant details of text and history, Macintosh interweaves national politics, cultural self-definition, performance practices, the role of translations, and the contribution of film (especially Mounet-Sully's 1912 silent *Oedipe Roi*). She demonstrates the passion and specificity with which the French fought over their internal political differences by using art and culture rather than the weapons of military combat (following the horrific bloodbath of World War I and the impending disasters to come, including the Vichy collaboration), while liberating the Oedipus myth from "the Sophoclean straightjacket" (p. 167).

Kostas Valakas opens the final section "Constructing the Tragic Tradition," reflecting once again the editors' emphasis on the tradition's *constructed* nature. Probing 5<sup>th</sup>-century tragedies for evidence of a theory about the genre, Valakas argues that the various viewpoints and "levels of reality" in tragedy "operate on the theoretical basis of Protagorean relativism" (p. 195). That conclusion seems reasonable, but we may wonder how deeply invested such a popular art form was in questioning its own philosophical or ontological bases. Ideas were certainly in the air, and tragedy referred to them, thought with them, debated them, and debunked them. That fact remains a far cry from Valakas' conclusion that the tragedians *privileged* Sophistic perspectives as part of a self-conscious effort to theorize the genre in which they wrote.

---

In “Athens and Delphi in Aeschylus’ *Oresteia*,” Angus Bowie juxtaposes the inability of Delphi to solve the problem of Orestes’ matricide with the effective workings of deliberating humans (particularly the court of Areopagos), concluding that Aeschylus champions human efforts over the ruthlessness of the gods. Bowie weakens an otherwise persuasive case by his eagerness to equate Cassandra with Apollo, his oracle at Delphi, and the general “incomprehensibility of oracular discourse” (p. 219). Far from reflecting that prophetic tradition, Cassandra in *Agamemnon* seems to be its victim. After all, the inability of the Chorus to understand the Trojan prophetess has little to do with the obscurity of what she says, but more with the willful obtuseness of the Chorus.

In “Feminized Males in the *Bacchae*,” Richard Buxton properly emphasizes the importance of discrimination when discussing Euripides’ play. He points out that the male god Zeus is feminized by function (as “mother” to Dionysus), while Dionysus is feminized by form (hair, complexion, effeminate appearance). Pentheus dresses as a woman; Teiresias and Cadmus wear fawn skins and carry *thyrsoi*, but never don women’s clothes. The two old men behave inappropriately for their age, not their gender. Buxton provides a useful corrective to those who forget that the feminized Pentheus on Cithaeron soon appears to the bacchantes as a mountain lion. Then, when brought back to the palace, Pentheus returns “to his starting point as a man: son, grandson, suffering human victim.” Reflecting the practice of the volume’s honoree, Buxton reminds us that, “in this highly discriminating play, the upholding of distinctions is every bit as crucial as the collapsing of boundaries” (p. 247).

The valuable closing essay by Christopher Pelling traces the influence of Plutarch on Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar*, noting that the Greek writer had “adopted a tragic filter for his own presentation of biography and history.” In a model for how reception criticism can illuminate the *original* by attending closely to its epigone, Pelling compares Shakespeare’s text with its source, Sir Thomas North’s 1579 translation of Plutarch’s *Lives*, based not on the original Greek, but on Amyot’s 1559 French translation. Widening source-criticism to include structural debts as well as “narrative substance” (p. 276), Pelling demonstrates how Shakespeare intuited the Plutarch that was missing from these translations, recreating “what Plutarch’s translators had suppressed” (p. 268). By attending to language, dramatic form, and reception, his essay—and the volume as a whole—constitutes a most honorable offering to Pat Easterling. Viva!

RUSH REHM  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

**M.R. Wright.** *Introducing Greek Philosophy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009. Pp. 256. ISBN: 978-0-520-26148-8.

M. R. Wright’s *Introducing Greek Philosophy* aims to be an approachable narrative of the history of ancient Greek philosophy, from its beginnings in the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE to its

later incarnations in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE. The author is especially focused on making out any connections there might be between the unfamiliar landscape of Greek thought and the interests and concerns of the contemporary reader. To do this, Professor Wright begins with a review of each of the major “movements” in Greek thought, its major figures, a sketch of their historical place, and their contributions to what we now take to be an era of unfettered inquiry and exchange of ideas across the Greek-speaking world. Where the evidence is available, the author is careful to offer not only a summary of each thinker’s primary claims but also a rendering of the way each relates to his cultural and intellectual context. Following this brief survey, Wright then goes on to examine the literary forms in which each figure’s thought took shape, and the relationship that these choices have upon the thought expressed there. Finally, the majority of the book is occupied with a more detailed narrative of each thinker’s approach to five areas of philosophical inquiry: i) questions about natural phenomena and the origins of the universe, ii) beliefs about the gods and religious thought, iii) questions about the nature of the soul, iv) theories of knowledge and problems with uncertainty, v) issues surrounding political power and law, and vi) discussions of virtue, what is good, and the role of pleasure in happiness. In addition to the main body of the text, the author also provides an appendix, which is a thorough review of the major sources for the evidence available for the thinkers discussed.

The main success of this work resides in its consistent and direct narrative of Greek thought, one that is in harmony with the majority of interpretations on the subject and that provides even the novice a thorough grounding in the main positions represented by a truly diverse group of thinkers. The book’s reader will come away from this book with a coherent story to tell about the dynamic interrelationship of ideas that took shape in the 6<sup>th</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BCE, which became a significant backdrop for future movements in Western thought.

The author’s strength in providing a narrative of Greek philosophy, however, also serves as the basis of the majority of my critique of this work. Throughout her account, Wright emphasizes the conversation of ideas between thinkers, often allowing this metaphor to over-determine the truth of the extent of the commerce of ideas. While it is true that some authors explicitly and directly take on their predecessors and contemporaries, it is an overly broad claim to say that there was a “movement of arguments and counter-arguments to and fro across the Mediterranean” (13). The author’s persistent assertion (whether explicit or, more often, implicit) that the Greek philosophers were in direct conversation about the same issues undermines the possibility of seeing what, to my mind, is the most important lesson of ancient Greek thought: that while the Greeks were often intensely concerned with the meaning and determination of their common identity, there was by no means any consensus on what that identity was.

---

Whether for the sake of an inexperienced reader or for more sophisticated reasons, Wright conforms to what I will call a method of reconstruction in giving account for the history of thought. Such reconstruction presumes that one can recover the coherence of a tradition of thinking and that this coherence resides *within* the tradition itself. Asserting this coherence actually serves to obfuscate the historian's involvement in the construction of that coherence. In my view, on the other hand, Greek thought is better identified as an ongoing construction of itself—a history of disputes over its direction, meaning, and priorities. This is a project that was never completed in its own time, although it appears to have been through its later *reconstruction* beginning most intensely in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It may be argued that Aristotle himself was a historian of Greek thought, and this is not altogether incorrect. Although not the first, Aristotle attempted a complete account of this history (Wright herself explains that Aristotle's successors were specifically tasked with completing doxographies), but one clearly cannot see this as a history without an agenda. And this is perhaps the truth of Aristotle as a historian; he tells *his own* story of history, as most critics acknowledge, especially when it comes to his accounts of Plato's doctrines.

Ancient Greek thought does not have the purported continuity that Wright suggests. In her chapter entitled, "Pagan Monotheism," Wright argues consistently that Greek thinkers worked their way together toward a more and more coherent theology. The coherence is taken to be the fact that it becomes more and more monotheistic. This account fails in two ways: first, with the assumption that monotheism is a more coherent account of the divine and, second, with the assertion that ancient Greek thinkers in fact did become more monotheistic. For the sake of a unified and single identity for Greek thought and because of the modern assumption that "progress" is measured by the uniformity of a tradition's thought with our own dominant ideologies, Wright sacrifices a complete account for a consistent one. By insufficiently acknowledging the inherent ambiguity and diversity of ancient Greek thought, one risks ignoring part of its important historical legacy. As a result of this choice, whether strategic or principled, Wright's project works to cover over the fact that to tell the history of Greek philosophy as one of progress toward some common goal of knowledge is to impose a narrative upon a set of thinkers who were often themselves intensely interested in the very problem of telling the story of their thought.

Wright's approach is not entirely without resources when it comes to recognizing what I have identified as the lesson of Greek thought. After the introduction to the variety of Greek doctrines, she begins with a promising analysis of the literary forms in which each thinker expresses his ideas and how these literary forms influence what each figure has to offer. Greek thinkers, often taking their cue from the poetic and dramatic traditions, expressed their thought in a variety of ways. Our author appreciates the significance of these different expressive choices when she notes in regard to Plato's

---

works in particular that “Some Platonic scholars are impatient with his literary bent and would prefer to ignore the details at the beginnings of the earlier dialogues and the final myths, and concentrate on the hard philosophy in between, but in Plato’s works the range of styles elaborates the philosophy and cannot be separated from it” (48). Given this focus on the specificity of each author’s style (let alone that of individual works), it is surprising that Wright goes on to endorse a very orthodox rendering of Plato’s works as merely platforms for his spokesman Socrates to reveal Plato’s teachings. Wright acknowledges the importance of the dramas of the dialogues as well as their myths, and appreciating these purportedly non-philosophical features does not directly conflict with the dominant reading of Plato’s dialogues as being divided into the early (Socratic/aporetic), middle (Platonic doctrines) and late (methodological and self-critical) dialogues. While there are clearly distinctions to be made among the dialogues on the basis of many factors, it is not at all clear that the early, aporetic dialogues are merely meant as an homage and portrait of the historical Socrates. This assertion is not on its own particularly pernicious, but it becomes so when this assumption is used to justify the claim that the middle dialogues employ Socrates merely as a character, a “mouthpiece” for Plato’s own thinking. While, to a certain extent, this might be true, it seems more important to note that Plato (or at least what we have left of him in the form of his dialogues) does not make these things clear. As a result, what we have is something unresolved. But that story is indeed a harder one to tell, or at least, not a common one.

Asserting that this ambiguity is intentional on the part of Plato (or any other Greek thinker) requires at least as much argumentation as asserting that we are simply missing the “unwritten doctrines” or that Plato’s insiders had the true intention and meaning of his texts. But in either case, the argument must be made. No one presents the story of ancient Greek philosophy without having an argument on why a thinker should be understood in one way or another, and Wright is no exception. She does, in fact, offer a very brief account of her reasoning on this subject: “If it is agreed that Socrates himself was a doubter, searching for knowledge by examining himself and others, but eventually being unsuccessful and admitting ignorance, then, in those dialogues where he is portrayed as reaching positive conclusions, the spokesman is likely to be speaking for Plato rather than keeping to the *persona* of the historic Socrates” (145).

Whether or not one agrees with the basis of this argument, by making it, Wright seems to violate her promise of open-ended inquiry indicated in the preface to the work. There, Wright marks two difficulties for providing a complete and definitive account of ancient philosophy: “Where only fragments and summaries survive, the conclusions are elusive, and discussions of the original views are still open-ended. On the other hand, even where there is a considerable body of original texts available, as is the case with Plato and Aristotle, although they have been subject to centuries of interpretation,

---



analysis and commentary, their core meanings remain debatable” (viii). Here Wright seems to recognize that her mission cannot be one of simply formulating a narrative of what each figure thought and how those ideas responded to each other. Indeed, she follows this caution with an encouragement to the reader: “We can therefore join the Greeks in their exploration of perennial issues not in the spirit of reading history but more in the expectation of meeting ideas that are worth further investigation” (*ibid.*). Having begun here, I was surprised and disappointed to go on to find that this text is a very traditional history of the Greeks as competitive thinkers, engaged in an anachronistically progressive mission to acquire definitive truth, about which different thinkers simply disagree, and where the resolution and elimination of that disagreement is the measure of the Greeks’ progress toward legitimacy.

To have the aim of a cohesive account that makes sense of something that in many respects simply does not make that kind of sense is a modern bias. But the alternative to this does not require believing that the Greeks were illogical mystics. These thinkers recognized, as Wright notes regarding Plato’s *Timaeus*, that there are distinct limits on human understanding: “there can be no certainty about events that happened long ago” (55). But it seems that Wright, while acknowledging the limited nature of our evidence, still assumes that there *is* some lost evidence of the Greeks as having the plan for a systematic body of knowledge. In the attempt to make Greek philosophy accessible to modern readers, the author has transposed Greek philosophy into a modern project that simply has different contents while maintaining a similar trajectory. Perhaps the only consistent theme among all the Greek thinkers, whom Wright does faithfully reflect in her work, is that thought is not merely an accomplishment but an activity. Even Aristotle, the most systematic of the Greek thinkers, appreciated that the work of knowledge is never done.

All criticism aside, I find this work to be a careful and useful introduction to the variety of ideas introduced by the Greek-speaking thinkers of the 6<sup>th</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BCE. In my teaching, I expect to use portions of this text as an introduction to periods that I cannot cover in depth. However, I would not use it as a single source, given how much the primary sources themselves have to offer the student of philosophy. Professor Wright has taken on the daunting task of telling the story of Greek philosophy, and her success in having done so is to be commended.

HOLLY MOORE  
LUTHER COLLEGE

**Andrew Feldherr, ed.** *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2009. Pp. xviii + 464, ISBN: 978-0-521-67093-7.

This Companion has “two aims: to offer all readers of the Roman historians an overview of the genre which takes particular note of recent methods and approaches, and to

---

stimulate new scholarship” (p. xv).<sup>\*</sup> It consists of twenty-five lively and well-argued chapters written by different scholars. Given that the expressed aim of a Companion, to satisfy inexperienced readers, experts and everybody else too, is beyond the reach of human capacity,<sup>7</sup> *Roman Historians* is an admirable contribution indeed. In arranging the essays by theme, Andrew Feldherr enhances the field instead of merely reproducing the single-author treatment common to this type of survey.<sup>8</sup> He has taken a bold view of what constitutes Roman historiography, and indeed a more coherent and satisfying one than the Companion format can apparently suffer, as I will argue below. Consequently, this book cannot stand alone as an introduction to the Roman historians, though it contains much of interest for the more experienced, and will be an especially good grounding for postgraduates searching for a research topic.

The book is divided into six sections: “Approaches,” “Contexts and Traditions,” “Subjects,” “Modes,” “Characters,” and “Transformations,” organized along roughly periodic lines. So “Approaches” and “Contexts and Traditions” paint Roman historiography as springing from a mixture of Greek literature and native obsessions with the past, and introduce some methodologies in a very entertaining way. The next three sections, twelve chapters, are largely devoted to the three major Latin historians, Sallust, Livy and Tacitus. These essays compare the historians’ treatment of broad themes such as time, space, politics and the treatment of women. The final section, “Transformations,” bands together discussions of imperial Roman historiography, reception studies and a return visit to modern approaches to the historians.

At its best, the volume presents Roman historiography as a field unafraid to ask difficult questions of itself, striking at substantial issues of what the study of historiography is actually for. So J. E. Lendon (ch. 3, pp. 41-61) argues “against historiography,” saying that historiographers do a disservice to the ancient historians. Postmodern analyses lose “a sense of what the historians themselves thought they were

---

\* I found the review of N. Kimmerle helpful (<http://www.sehepunkte.de/2010/05/17624.html> [accessed 11:35am 8 June 2010]). All page references are to the book under review unless stated. I would like to thank Chris Pelling, Julietta Steinhauer and Greg Woolf for reading and commenting on earlier drafts.

7 Feldherr himself describes the contradiction in more resolvable terms in his review of Kraus & Woodman's *Latin Historians* (see fn. 2): <http://www.dur.ac.uk/Classics/histos/1997/feldherr.html> [accessed 10:40am 8 June 2010]

8 Standard surveys discuss the major authors individually: T.A. Dorey, ed. 1966. *Latin Historians*. London: Routledge; C.S. Kraus & A.J. Woodman. 1997. *Latin Historians. Greece & Rome New Surveys in the Classics*. No. 27. Oxford: OUP (repr. 2006 by Cambridge: CUP); R. Mellor. 1999. *The Roman Historians*. London: Routledge, which is clearly influenced in structure by Dorey 1966. Andreas Mehl organizes his introduction by epoch: A. Mehl. 2001. *Römische Geschichtsschreibung. Grundlagen und Entwicklungen: Eine Einführung*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer (not listed in Feldherr's general bibliography). General survey and single-author reading are married in J. Marincola, ed. 2007. *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. 2 vols. Oxford: Blackwell.

---

doing, narrating events that really happened in the past...The result is like the diary of a fat teenager: riveting only to its creator, repellent to others, and illuminating to none” (pp. 60-61).

Lendon is riotously enjoyable throughout, offering up a sort of bar-room brawl of an article in which he takes on all comers, and not entirely fairly at that. Introducing “postmodern” approaches to history in a more positive way is William W. Batstone (ch. 2, 24-40), asking questions that will knock the undergraduate off balance: “while history writes the sequence of cause and effect, in fact the sequence...is that effect leads to cause”; “can there be closure without a simultaneous and deep complicity with rhetoric, narrative, and power?”<sup>9</sup> Lendon on Batstone: “All one can do is weep.”<sup>10</sup>

Disagreements continue throughout. Ellen O’Gorman sees a paradox in the eternal repetitions of language, which undermine the desire of history to record events as “unique, unrepeatable” (p. 236), while a few pages earlier Matthew Roller has argued for a quite different understanding of what uniqueness in history might mean (pp. 214-230; I take Roller’s side). Of course, these overlaps are sometimes ineffective. Feldherr summarizes Cato’s history (p. 304), though Cato has already been dealt with in excellent essays by John Dillery and Ulrich Gotter (pp. 77-107, pp. 108-122). John Marincola’s and Dillery’s contributions also cover much of the same ground without sparking conflict.

The challenging tone is revisited in the final chapter of the book, Emma Dench’s consideration of the Roman historians and twentieth-century (English-language) approaches to Roman history.<sup>11</sup> Dench laments the current state of affairs: since the 1980s revolutions of Wiseman and Woodman, she argues, “we do not seem to have come very far...A further round of self-scrutiny seems well overdue” (p. 405). An editor who gives such prominence to the critical voice has done an excellent job. And yet Dench’s pessimism seems to me misplaced. On the one hand, too many Anglophone scholars are still too narrowly focused on disproving Woodman. This year’s American Philological Association meeting in Anaheim was a case in point. But there are plenty of others who have moved on, and the evidence is to be found in this volume. Harriet Flower on alternatives to written history, Denis Feeney on time and Alain Gowing on exemplarity, not to disparage those names omitted, have all contributed high-class essays on their chosen topics. Several individual chapters would also sit well on

9 pp. 28-29

10 p. 58

11 Internet research suggests that the original title was “Tacitus’ Syme,” which would have more accurately reflected the content of the chapter:

<http://www.cambridge.org/us/catalogue/catalogue.asp?isbn=9780521854535> [accessed 6:57pm 2 June 2010]; [www.fas.harvard.edu/~classics/people/pdf/dench-biblio.pdf](http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~classics/people/pdf/dench-biblio.pdf) [accessed 1:12pm 9 June 2010].

undergraduate reading lists, such as Ann Vasaly on character, O’Gorman on intertextuality, and Benedetto Fontana on early modern political theory.

An inexperienced reader, however, is likely to need help deciding what a Roman historian actually is, and that help will not be found here. Feldherr explains the problem neatly in his introduction: “Roman historiography, like the empire it describes, has messy borders” (p. 2). He establishes strict criteria for inclusion: not *memoranda*, nor antiquities, nor collections of *exempla*, nor epitomes, nor biography, but “continuous prose narratives, intended to be read as ‘fact,’ and organized around the experience of the Roman community rather than those of an individual” (p. 3).

This approach provides a tight definition of scope along generic lines while giving the contributors licence to range across Latin- and Greek-language material.<sup>12</sup> Yet since several contributors have silently adopted contradictory definitions in their essays, a more detailed discussion of what does and does not constitute Roman historiography would have helped avoid confusion. So, for example, Kristina Milnor devotes much of her chapter to Valerius Maximus, whom Feldherr names as specifically *excluded* from the volume (pp. 276-287).<sup>13</sup> Batstone says that “Caesar...has more than an ideological interest in the history he writes” (p. 37), though Feldherr has said that Caesar too does not count. On occasion, writers who actually do fit Feldherr’s definition of a Roman historian, namely Procopius, Appian, and Cassius Dio, are described as “Greek historians.”<sup>14</sup> Better cross-referencing to Gowing’s discussion of Greek-language imperial historians would have helped in the last two cases.<sup>15</sup> Yet another definition of “historian” underpins the appendix (pp. 407-417), a chronological list of “historians” which lumps the likes of Plutarch and Cornelius Nepos alongside Diodorus Siculus and Asinius Pollio, while omitting Strabo.

The issue is exacerbated because the contributors themselves avoid openly saying that their chosen authors are not historians in Feldherr’s sense. In his sophisticated and illuminating discussion of space in history, Andrew Riggsby says that Caesar’s *Gallic War* is “not obviously paradigmatic for *historia* (in many respects I [Riggsby] would argue it is quite the reverse)” (p. 154). This seems tortuous. When not constrained to writing a guide to Roman historians, Riggsby treats Caesar as the writer of *commentarii*, a

---

12 There are, however, several instances where Greek writers might have been expected to feature, but do not. Striking evidence of how historians went about their work in Rome, such as Diodorus’ wonder at Rome’s library facilities, or the letters of Dionysius of Halicarnassus to his Roman historian patron, Quintus Aelius Tubero, telling him how to write history, are hardly mentioned. Indeed, to go by this book, one might think that only Livy wrote history about women in early Rome (pp. 281-284).

13 Feldherr’s remark at p. 2.

14 E.g. pp. 264, 189 & 269 respectively.

15 E.g. pp. 264, 189 & 269 respectively.

related genre, but not history as Feldherr defines it.<sup>16</sup> Why not just say so? In her chapter, Caroline Vout refers repeatedly to Suetonius as a “historian” writing “historical narrative.”<sup>17</sup> Only in her closing remarks does Vout remind us that Suetonius is “writing lives rather than chronological narrative.”<sup>18</sup>

There are, as always, minor points of disagreement. I think it is misleading to suggest that giving Greek or Roman names to foreign gods “inevitably implies a marginalization” (p. 303). Someone should tell all those Greeks worshipping Isis-Aphrodite.<sup>19</sup> I am not sure that we do “imagine historians researching and writing in a vacuum, their vision so dulled by their hours in the archives as to be blind to the images that surround them” (p. 274). Also lacking is guidance in dealing with expressions such as “Dio (Zonaras) and Florus remark that...” (p. 227), despite a brief description of each in the appendix. It is a shame that a chapter discussing fragments, epitomes, excerptors and the like—in other words, about a substantial part of the Roman historiography preserved to us—could not be fitted in, though I could not say which essay ought to make way for it. Velleius hardly appears in the volume at all.<sup>20</sup>

These quibbles aside, this book has much to recommend it. Dividing chapters by theme rather than author mostly succeeds. While it means that beginners and non-specialists are likely to get left behind, there is more than enough here to inspire and excite those hoping to shape the discipline, both now and in the future.<sup>21</sup>

DAN HOGG

LUDWIG-MAXIMILIANS-UNIVERSITÄT, MUNICH

**D. Sailor.** *Writing and Empire in Tacitus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Pp. 359 + xii. ISBN: 978-0-521-89747-1.

In recent years Tacitus has received much scholarly attention, and a diverse array of theoretical and cross disciplinary approaches have deepened our understanding of Tacitus’ complexity, both as a literary artist and historian. Dylan Sailor has now

16 Riggsby, A.M. 2006. *Caesar in Gaul and Rome. War in Words*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press: 133-155, esp. 141-145 on its relation to history.

17 pp. 261-275 *passim*.

18 p. 274. The avoidance of the full quotation of Plutarch, *Alex.* 1.1 is perhaps suggestive.

19 See e.g. RICIS 114/0601, 202/0322, 202/0346, 202/0365 (S.K. Heyob. 1975. *The Cult of Isis among Women in the Graeco-Roman World*, Leiden: Brill: 48-50). Isis was syncretized with several other goddesses, the most well-known case probably being Isis-Demeter: see R. Merkelbach. 2001. *Isis Regina – Zeus Sarapis. Die griechisch-ägyptische Religion nach den Quellen dargestellt*. Munich/Leipzig: K.G. Saur: e.g. §§106-108, see index for further refs.

20 Three passing mentions, according to the general index.

21 Hopefully some prospective postgraduates will heed Honora Chapman's thoroughly justified *cri de coeur*, and turn to the non-canonical historians (p. 327).

contributed a thoughtful study that attempts to contextualize Tacitus' works within his own career: Tacitus, argues Sailor, is not the alienated outsider disillusioned with the imperial court, but an insider who valorizes himself through a close identification with those who were at times deeply disaffected with the Principate. The first chapter, entitled "Authority, autonomy, and representing the past under the Principate," considers the "various modes of life that could be used to demonstrate autonomy" under the Principate that Tacitus explored in his works. For Tacitus the danger in showing one's autonomy raises a conundrum: how were historians to be taken seriously, not simply understood as copyists for the regime, without offending the imperial court? Sailor explores this question through a close examination of Tacitus' treatment of opponents of the regime, and suggests that a significant indicator of authenticity, in the case of works by those such as Helvidius Priscus or Cremutius Cordus, was their proscription, with the result that Tacitus' own work, "stood in constant, implicit need of *apologia* for its own existence" (p. 47). Tacitus consequently tries to align himself with those whose works have been censored thereby distancing himself from those guilty of *adulatio*, a guilt affirmed by the very survival of their work. Tacitus, however, has his work cut out for him, since unlike some ancient historians (such as Sallust) he is not a disaffected outsider but always in the thick of imperial politics, whether as prosecutor of Marius Priscus or proconsul of Asia, (Tacitus' alienation, Sailor notes, is further belied by his funerary monument, p. 49-50).

The next chapter, "*Agricola* and the crisis of representation," (with an outstanding treatment of the *Agricola*'s preface), examines Tacitus' attempts to control the interpretation of the *Agricola* through the representation of his conquest. The difficulty Sailor identifies for both Tacitus and *Agricola* is not new: when the *princeps* has cornered the market on prestige, what is left for the elite to make it elite? Sailor's novel exploration of this question is grounded in the political challenge the Principate posed for men of high standing, and argues that the *Agricola* was a risky work even under Trajan, casting into relief a larger "cultural crisis" that extended well beyond Domitian's tyranny (p. 60). He further ties this discussion with the Stoic martyrs examined in chapter one, noting that those who fell at the hands of Nero and the Flavians, and appear both at the beginning and end of the *Agricola*, set up a tough political standard, one to which Tacitus tried mightily to elevate his father-in-law (p. 114), and ultimately himself too.

In chapter three, "The burdens of Histories," Sailor expands his examination of the crisis of representation and argues that in the *Historiae* Tacitus no longer confronts a single despotic emperor, but on the institution itself: "Tacitus makes the problem over which his writing must triumph an institutional rather than a personal one and thus converts the act of resistance that is the biography into a durable career" (p. 121). His discussion focuses on how Tacitus merges the history of historiography itself with

---

Rome's political history, which includes a close reading of the *Historiae's* preface and asks, how can we read Tacitus' history of historiography there and still believe Tacitus' work has integrity? Tacitus condemns historians under the Principate as guilty either of *adulatio* or *malignitas*, and the reader must include the author himself; but Tacitus here has a very deliberate purpose, which is to elevate the value of his history by implicitly asserting that he will do what no one has done since Actium: he will overcome historians' post-Actium malaise (p. 145). To do so, however, that he must appear to be outside "the relations of power that constitute the Principate as a political form" (p. 147). Tacitus is ultimately striving for both autonomy and authenticity despite official controls over narratives of the past by the *princeps*; indeed, taking this one step further, Sailor argues that Tacitus appropriates almost complete control over historical narrative, usurping what should be the emperor's exclusive domain (p. 179). This is achieved through a variety of rhetorical stratagems, such as Tacitus' survey of the empire at the opening of the work (*Hist.* 1.4-11), which reads remarkably like Augustus' survey in his will (Suet. *Aug.* 101.4; Tac. *Ann.* 1.11.4; Cass. Dio 56.33.2).

Sailor then turns to Tacitus' portrayal of the city of Rome itself in the *Historiae*, and its relationship to the empire (chapter four, "Elsewhere than Rome"). Of particular interest is Sailor's argument that Tacitus shows the loss of semiotic significance of the city and its monuments during the civil strife of 69, with Rome becoming "just another battlefield" (p. 208). Paradigmatic of this loss is the destruction of the Capitoline, whose ruin (and restoration) echoes throughout the rest of the work (in, for example, the debate about its reconstruction, and its actual re-inauguration); Sailor argues compellingly that the Capitoline will have continued to have a significant place in the lost portions of the *Historiae*. The temple's (and Rome's) fate is closely associated with events on the empire's outer reaches too, as Sailor illustrates in his fine discussion of Tacitus' Jewish ethnography: the destruction of the Capitoline temple, he maintains, is closely linked to the ultimate collapse of the Jewish rebellion and the utter destruction (*sans* hope of restoration) of the Temple in Jerusalem (pp. 232-49).

The final chapter, "Tacitus and Cremutius," is an extended discussion of Tacitus' depiction of Cremutius Cordus and its deeper implications for the *Annales*. As Sailor notes in his introduction (p.5), "the story about Cremutius becomes a story about Tacitus and the work's staged victory over the regime's representation becomes an arrogation of sovereignty to Tacitus' writing and to himself." In short, the danger in which Cremutius finds himself as a result of his history implies the same danger for Tacitus, and has consequences for the *Annales'* reception. Tacitus achieves this by drawing certain parallels between Cremutius and himself, as when Cremutius remarks that his history contained nothing currently topical and so should escape persecution, just as Tacitus stated of his own in the *Annales'* opening (p. 309). The episode is intended to show that Tacitus' work needs defense and to establish its importance (p. 251). After

all, a history seeming to have imperial approval would rank with a Velleius (p. 253), and be guilty of the same *adulatio* Tacitus deplores in the prefaces to the *Historiae* and *Annales*. Sailor's discussion includes a thoughtful consideration of the potentially hostile reception of history throughout the Roman literary record and the tradition of closely identifying an author with his literary production (see esp. pp. 276-91). In conclusion, the contribution of Sailor's study to our understanding of Tacitus, both in his contemporary political and literary context, is by no means slight, and offers an important and insightful resource for students of one of antiquity's greatest authors.

STEVEN H. RUTLEDGE

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK

**Page duBois.** *Slavery: Antiquity and Its Legacy*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009.

In *Slavery: Antiquity and its Legacy*, Page duBois sets out with the laudable intention of drawing parallels between classical and more recent periods in the history of slavery. Before a reader can come to grips with the success or failure of this enterprise, however, they should first like to classify the type of analysis that the book purports to attempt. From the jacket and from the introduction, one gets the impression that the book deliberately avoids reference to any one academic discipline, presumably in a bid to increase sales. A glance at the chapters suggests that this is part history, part anthropology and sociology, part literary analysis, and part film studies. But the scant seven pages of footnotes suggest that, despite this broad scope, the book treads very lightly over those debates that it does reference. It is then that we begin to look for some core; some focus. If duBois' primary concern is literary, or with film studies, as the references to *Gladiator* in one chapter suggest, then one would want to see more carefully chosen texts, or films, and more rigorous and sustained analysis throughout. If it is anthropological or sociological, one would want to see more reference to trenchant studies in these fields. And the work is certainly not an historical narrative, since, once more, it is almost entirely lacking in references to the principal studies in this field. As it stands, therefore, the book is of too many fields, and thus it is of none. But even this flaw could be forgiven, if the book provided some alternate focus of its own, but alas, we search in vain.

What this study primarily is, as one learns after a bit of research, is another volume by Page duBois, a well-known popularizer of "classical studies," who began her scholarly life as a postmodernist literary critic of ancient texts, and who in recent years has hit upon a very successful formula, which has gotten her a good many book deals with a variety of publishers. I see that Harvard UP has already published her follow-up to the volume under review. The latest title is *Out of Athens: The New Ancient Greeks* (Harvard 2010), which purports to argue that classical scholars should embrace multiculturalism and literary theory. This is not the first time that duBois has made such arguments:

---



indeed, the book *Slaves and Other Objects* (Chicago 2003), and *Trojan Horses: Saving the Classics from Conservatives* (NYU 2004), contain very similar premises—only in the latter volume her imagined opponent was the American intellectual right as a whole, or at least those who would use classical allusions to support their ideas. When duBois sticks to her usual target, which is the supposed “conservative wing” of the American classics establishment, I cannot but wonder with Nick Fisher, a reviewer of her much more substantial 2003 volume on slavery entitled *Slaves and Other Objects*, whether modern scholars or graduate students need be bothered with such arguments, for the most part. It is quite clear that most of the profession is on the same bandwagon as duBois, and that most of the holdouts against the suggestions she makes (i.e., that history departments should introduce World History rather than merely offering Western Civilization) must have retired some twenty years ago.

The current duBois formula is to write very short books, and to pepper them with frequent allusions to sexuality (including a gratuitous chapter in *Slaves and Other Objects* called “Dildos”), while maintaining a premise that some patriarchal establishment or other is being blind to a more inclusive and egalitarian ideology. Another part of the formula, of course, is to write on topics with taboo or even fetishistic components that might titillate a naïve audience, such as slavery. Fair enough. Reviewers generally praised duBois’ previous work on slavery, in part for its abundant moments of insight, and it is understandable that Oxford would want her to contribute to their “Ancients and Moderns” series, whose goal is to utilize antiquity to “illuminate critical issues of the modern world.” The part of this formula which does not work for me, is that duBois has here discarded her earlier notion, expressed in such works as *History, Rhetorical Description, and the Epic* (Boydell 1983) that history should not be abandoned, even if one is “living in a poststructuralist world.” Instead, this latest volume wholeheartedly espouses the notion that narrative and structure are base fetters that oppress the poetic nature of the author’s ejaculations, and so à la Roland Barthes, what we get is a series of vignettes, and often highly disparate or jarring juxtapositions, which (à la Roland Barthes) the author hopes will impress readers with the notion that they contain some deep wisdom. More often than not, one is simply left scratching one’s head.

The book’s chapter headings are as follows: Chapter I: “Living Slaves;” Chapter II: “Racialized Slavery;” Chapter III: “Ancient Ideologies;” Chapter IV: “Ancient Slavery,” and Chapter V: Spartacus and Gladiator: Slaves in Film. Each of these chapters is broken into several small sound-bytes, utilizing a formula which is currently very popular with publishers of mass market nonfiction. And one cannot but think that the intentionally backwards chronology of the first four chapters, while it might have been used effectively, is at best confusing, or at worst, another post-structuralist gimmick, utilized merely because it was counterintuitive and thus, potentially, hip. Why not treat these slaveries in the order in which they evolved, so that one can trace forward

linkages? Chapter V, on *Spartacus* and *Gladiator*, for its part is too anecdotal to work as film criticism, but it is here as an obvious bone, for timorous teachers to throw to students whom they fear will only read something if it is about movies.

When coming to grips with the subject matter of the book, one must immediately ask: are duBois' three primary subjects of ancient, antebellum and modern slavery in fact good and logical choices? For all of duBois' professed multiculturalism, these three slaveries seem tried and tired, especially when a wealth of new scholarship has opened the field of slavery studies to include nearly every society of the globe. Are there not other slaveries which might be fruitfully added to this mix, e.g., traditional infra-African slavery, or Islamic slavery, Indian, meso-American, or Chinese slavery? The inclusion of such slaveries, especially ones which spanned the Middle Ages, might prove key to helping duBois create a sense of logical or structural connection between ancient and modern slavery, which this book as it stands simply does not do. Regarding the book's treatment of contemporary slavery issues one is left asking the question: "What is 'modern slavery,' anyway?" Surely there are dozens of facets to this issue which require more than two pages of borrowings from Orlando Patterson. Should psychological slavery in middle-class US households really be lumped together with child prostitution in India? Simple comparison here carries with it more than a whiff of exploitation.

In summary, the book feels far too rushed. And if not rushed, then an exemplar of that sort of post-structural "analysis" which, while it had its positive effects, has long since done more than its share of damage to the public's perception of the liberal arts and humanities. But the worrying thing, it seems to me, is what this book says about the academic writing and publishing industry's own sense of what American college undergrads—for they are presumably the intended audience, even if the precise subject remains in doubt—will respond to in class. Is it true that our students of the internet age will only respond to anecdotal, disjointed sound-bytes of information, which must be about sex slaves and the movie *Gladiator*? I believe that duBois could remain populist, and yet provide many useful insights on the relationships between ancient, antebellum, and modern slavery. The value of cinematic representations of ancient slavery could be similarly pursued to fruitful ends. But further introspection, research, and care should be requisite, before something is published that is worth our attention in this grossly over-producing (because over-populated) world. I myself aim for a strong chronological and narrative structure in my history classes, and my students generally appreciate this. I admit that I am somewhat biased against my peers who persist in teaching their classes in an anecdotal or purely thematic fashions, because I feel that most of the time, students emerge from such classes as they came in—with a jumbled sense of causality at best. To my mind, the publication by a major press of such a book ultimately does more harm than good, because it conditions both students, and—perhaps more dangerously—grad students and professors, to believe that this low level of rigour, narrative, and focus is an

---

acceptable standard to set in our classrooms. This is particularly egregious when the book aims to be a major discourse-setter on a topic as important, both historically and in our own times, as that of slavery.

JEFF FYNN-PAUL  
UNIVERSITY OF BRUSSELS

**H. Lindsay.** *Adoption in the Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Pp. xiii + 242. ISBN: 9780521760508.

This welcome and useful volume expands on Lindsay's previous articles to give us the most significant account in English of adoption in the Roman world. For the Romans of the historical period, adoption appears to have been an accepted and well-understood mechanism, but it was one which gave rise to much legal questioning over the consequences. Strong rules and expectations around citizenship, familial cohesiveness, and movement between ranks meant that it was a rule-bound practice, although, like other rule-bound practices, it was open to variation and creative reinterpretation.

The book gets off to a slow start with accounts of adoption in other cultures, an overview of kinship, and an account of Greek adoption. Although this does deliver a number of potential ideas about the nature and reasons for adoption, this material proves of limited use subsequently in the volume, and it is not clear to me that it adds much. Roman adoption, except in one regard, seems to owe little to the customs of others, and develops from a relatively early point. It may be, as Lindsay suggests, that testamentary adoption in the Greek world, which we know about in particular from Athenian law cases, may have become influential on practice in Rome, but it seems to me equally possible that this is a development of the use of wills at Rome instead of intestate succession. Either way, the Greek evidence presented here does not extend beyond the fourth century BC, except for the Rhodian inscriptions. An explanation of how adoption developed in Greece and the near East under Roman rule for instance would have made the comparison more valuable, as would some clear account of the relative frequency or infrequency of adoption in Rome and comparable states.

Once Lindsay is onto the Roman material, the quality of the evidence changes. The argument proceeds largely through the citation of large quantities of legal material, all translated. Lindsay's method is to collect the evidence and to cite it, with a fairly limited commentary, and let it speak for itself, and that is one of the reasons why the volume is so useful, but it is also a limitation, since a reader inexperienced in Roman legal texts may find the volume quite forbidding, and Lindsay does nothing to explain the nature of these authorities. Therefore, the historical development of the practice of adoption is somewhat obscured by the reference to Gaius, Ulpian and the Digest. At one stage, for instance, Lindsay states "some caution is appropriate because of the possibility that the legal rules developed within the time frame under discussion" (106) and that is a

warning that applies rather widely to this account. On the other hand, that is the nature of our evidence. We may assume from the evidence of the Twelve Tables, and a sequence of further arguments based on the apparent antiquity of the *comitia curiata* and the rules over the assumption of property after intestate death, that processes whereby individuals passed from the control of one individual to another within or between families may have existed from an early period of time, but Lindsay rather fully develops some of the consequences. Certainly he is clear and surely correct that what drives the early concern over adoption, and continued into later times, is the preservation of property within the wider family unit. Thus, Lindsay's strongest chapter on adoption and inheritance demonstrates repeatedly the significant connections between the two issues, and draws out a number of examples of stories and disputes over testate or interstate adoptions.

Many of the other chapters read like specialist studies. There is a good account of the problems surrounding Roman nomenclature after adoption, showing how problematic the issue is, and how far individual choice seems to have played a part. Similarly difficult is the issue of the extent to which freedmen used adoption (very little, Lindsay suggests); more frequently, and again for reasons of property, they might be adopted themselves after manumission. Plautus and Terence are used to open up some issues over the relationships within and between families where an adoption has taken place.

Only about three dozen adoptions are known in the Republic; the evidence picks up for the empire. Lindsay discusses many of the individual cases, and specifically with regard to political adoptions, finds that there were few, and a few were simply political. Two of the most famous adoptions, the *adrogatio* of Clodius and the adoption of Octavian by Julius Caesar, are discussed in detail, and it is suggested that we begin to see a change to a more deliberately politically motivated adoption process which then continues into the empire.

Adoption is a complex affair. Insofar as Lindsay's cross-cultural study tells us anything, it is that the reasons for and consequences of moving someone from one family to another are profound. Wherever there are strong familial bonds, this practice must have equally strong justifications. Whilst this volume does not add greatly to Gardner's account in *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life* (Oxford, 1998), which is also to be preferred for its wider scope, it is a helpful collection of the sources, but it seems to me to point to additional work yet to be done. C. Kunst has looked at tensions within families, admittedly, as Lindsay notes, speculatively (*Römische Adoption. Zur Strategie einer Familienorganisation*, Clauss, 2005), but there is still perhaps more to say on how widespread adoption was; Hopkins (*Death and Renewal*, Cambridge, 1983, 49) notes that the incidence of adoption amongst senators was low, but the effects were important. The evidence of Terence's *Adelphoe* also needs to be understood, perhaps, not only by reference to the elite patrons, Q. Fabius Maximus and Scipio Aemilianus, who had both

---

been adopted into other families, but also in the understanding of adoption and quasi-adoption at lower social levels. Moreover, we should note the significance of *tutela*, on which Gardner is more useful, and ask why *tutela* may have been preferable, even in cases of orphanhood, to adoption. The fact that most adoption was of a close relative, but even so it was not especially common, seems to reinforce the rather unusual nature of the practice, and locate it more firmly in elite practice. Finally, however, one area where one might look for confirmation of Lindsay's economic theory is in contemporary Christianity. We are told (23) that the Christian church disapproved; but it is notable that for Paul, adoption was an appropriate metaphor for the transformative nature of God's action in the world. Appropriately in his letter to the Romans (8.15-17) Paul speaks of adoption in the context of inheritance, whilst in his letter to the Galatians (4.5) he has Christ "purchase freedom for the subjects of the law, in order that we may attain the status of sons." Lindsay's account will help us as we continue to try to understand the complexities of Roman adoption.

C. J. SMITH, DIRECTOR  
THE BRITISH SCHOOL AT ROME

**Revell, Louise.** *Roman imperialism and local identities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Pp. xiii, 221 p.: ill., plans; 24 cm. ISBN: 9780521887304 0521887305.

Louise Revell's *Roman imperialism and local identities* brings a fresh perspective to archaeological studies of Roman imperialism through the application of structuration theory to public architecture in selected Roman towns in the provinces of Baetica, Britannia, and Tarraconensis. In the book Revell argues that structuration theory provides a powerful interpretative mechanism for understanding how individuals shaped their own identities in local contexts as well as imperial ones at the same time as they were influenced by these environments. It is not nowadays novel to bring postcolonial theories to bear on Roman provinces, but Revell has produced quite possibly the best application of such theories to date.

In the introduction Revell situates her work in the "post-Romanization intellectual climate" (8) and explains her use of structuration theory, following Anthony Giddens' *The Constitution of Society* (1984). She sees the inhabitants of the Roman Empire as "Giddens' knowledgeable social agents" rather than "unthinking pawns within an imperial system" (13). She outlines a way beyond the stale Romanization debate toward a more nuanced and complex analysis of the production and reproduction of ideology, power, and culture in the Roman provinces. The chapter ends with a brief presentation of the eight towns which form the core of the analysis: Bath, Bilbilis, Caerwent, Clunia, Italica, London, Munigua, and Wroxeter.

The next three chapters focus on urbanism, the emperor, and religion, drawing on textual sources as well as the examination of public architecture in the eight towns. Revell considers urbanism not simply as an ideology fostered by Rome to improve the collection of taxes and the security of the empire, or as the manifestation of certain public building types which an urban center of some repute must contain, but as an ongoing project, continuously created by the routine actions individuals performed on a daily basis when attending a play in the theater, making a dedication, or buying goods in the market. This allows her, for instance, to suggest that the imperial cult, long seen as a binding force imposed from above which held the empire together, relied upon local residents too. As an example, she cites two inscriptions from Munigua to Hadrian (CIL 2.1068-69) to show that “by the very act of setting up these inscriptions, the inhabitants of Munigua acknowledged and reproduced the ideological power of the emperor” (82). Similarly, repeated festivals and dedications perpetuated the importance of the emperor in towns around the empire. But, as Revell makes clear, the existence of the imperial cult, and of the emperor in daily life, varied throughout the empire, with perhaps much greater presence at Clunia, Italica, and Munigua than at the other five towns considered. In a similar fashion, she explores how the *lex coloniae Genetivae* and the Flavian municipal charter set out an idealized vision of Roman urbanism, but that the routine actions individuals performed on a daily basis created varied social structures and identities within Roman towns.

Although there is a short conclusion, perhaps the most extended summary of Revell’s views comes in the fifth chapter, where she tackles the issue of status in these towns. She utilizes archaeological and epigraphic evidence to consider how individuals appeared and moved through temples, basilicas, baths, and amphitheaters. By applying structuration theory, she suggests how wealthy magistrates, priests, and their families achieved and maintained prominent positions in society through routine daily interactions in these spaces. This analysis goes beyond labels of what is Roman or indigenous, or what it is to “become Roman,” to offer what constitutes, in Revell’s terms, “being Roman” (189). It is persuasive, but largely for the elite class. The limitations of Revell’s analysis become apparent near the end of the chapter when she considers the ways in which lower-class individuals interacted with public spaces. As she acknowledges here, her argument, while plausible, becomes a “narrative of the gaps” (184), due to the lack of evidence for the urban poor, peasants, and slaves in the temples, basilicas, and fora of these towns. In order to apply structuration theory to these members of the Roman world, it is clear that we will have to turn to places where they have left a greater quantity of artifacts and ecofacts, such as cemeteries, rural landscapes, and non-elite urban domestic structures. Nevertheless, even if Revell has not shown how structuration theory can be applied to all levels of society, she has succeeded in clearly demonstrating the utility of the structuration approach in urban public spaces. It is

interesting that her conclusion—that individuals constructed a variety of ways of “being Roman”—parallels the conclusion of a variety of “discrepant identities” reached by David Mattingly in *An imperial possession: Britain in the Roman empire* (2006). While Mattingly has explored a wider body of evidence from urban, rural, and military communities, Revell has built a more solid theoretical foundation by integrating structuration into each of her chapters.

The strength of the book lies in its comprehensive theoretical approach, but it would be appropriate to comment on one inadequacy in this area. The book’s title indicates a focus on identity theory, though this is somewhat misleading. Revell does make several comments about identity, and is particularly eloquent in discussing “identity as a discourse” (9, 191-193), but she does not articulate differences between the theories of identity and structuration, and concentrates more on the latter. While, to be fair, there is some overlap between the two theories, they are not interchangeable and this deserves to be sorted out more carefully. A number of minor errors which were not caught during proofreading or copy-editing were noted (e.g., Phocis instead of Panopeus, 78); these were unfortunate but did not disrupt the overall argument.

Despite these criticisms, which I have included in order to stimulate further debate about the application of structuration theory to Roman archaeology, I regard this as a book all scholars of Roman imperialism will want to read, and all libraries ought to purchase. The successful application of this theory to Roman archaeology provides a clear model for further books and articles.

DAVID L. STONE  
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

**Benedict Lowe. *Roman Iberia: Economy, Society, and Culture*.** London: Duckworth, 2009. Pp. 230 + v-viii. ISBN: 9780715643998.

This study by Benedict Lowe (BL) offers a detailed survey of archaeological evidence for the economic transformation of the Iberian Peninsula due to the presence of Phoenicians, Greeks, and Romans from the eighth century BC to the first century AD. The book consists of an introductory chapter and four main chapters divided chronologically, a glossary of technical terms (mostly Latin words with some Greek ones, e.g. *oppidum*, *tessera*, *kantharos*, etc.), and an index of place names. The edition also includes many black and white photos of sites mentioned.

A brief introduction (Ch. 1) explains the goal of the book. Although BL focuses on the impact of Rome on the peninsula’s economic development, he takes seriously into account the economic history of the region in previous centuries as a basis for understanding the later developments. The author highlights the degree of continuity (greater than normally considered) between pre-Roman and Roman industries, at least

in the more developed regions of the Peninsula. The Phoenician impact in the southern and western areas and the later Greek presence in the eastern and northeastern coasts account for a transformation of the indigenous economy that paved the way for the Roman exploitation and settlement in those same areas, and eventually in the whole interior of the peninsula. BL sees Romanization as a dynamic process of interaction between natives and Romans, in which a set “program” of development by the colonizer was not as determinative as the pre-existing conditions and the kinds of exchanges practiced for centuries with other colonizers, namely, Phoenicians and Greeks.

Then BL moves on to the evidence. Chapter 2 presents a synthesis of the impact of Phoenician colonization on the native economy, starting in the eighth century BC, with the last fourth of the chapter offering the corresponding evidence for the arrival of the Greeks, whose presence is most conspicuous from the sixth century BC onwards, especially in the northeast of the Peninsula where formal colonies were established (Empuries being the most important). Showing an impressive acquaintance with Spanish sources and the latest scholarship, BL presents to the reader the evidence for the earliest Phoenician presence, the economic dynamics between the southern native culture known as Tartessos and the colonists, and the main industries exploited, such as metallurgy and fish-salting. As proof of BL’s up-to-date familiarity with the local research and current debates, we may cite the way he highlights controversial topics, such as the extent of agricultural exploitation by Phoenicians in the hinterland (a theory originally considered heterodox but now generally accepted) and the newly discovered presence of Phoenician activity in areas previously considered peripheral, namely modern Portugal and Catalonia. Other industries such as those based on vines and the murex are also represented in his data, to which we should add timber exploitation as an important industry in the Phoenicians’ Mediterranean expansion (e.g., Brigitte Treumann’s article in the recent volume *Colonial Encounters...*, cited below).

Very few publications make accessible to anglophone readers the bounty of up-and-coming Spanish and Portuguese scholarship about ancient Iberia as does BL’s book. Until recently, the only works on the topic in English were the translations of Maria Eugenia Aubet’s *The Phoenicians and the West: their Colonies and Trade* (1987, second edition 2001) and Arturo Ruiz and Manuel Molinos’ *The Archaeology of the Iberians* (1993). BL’s study adds itself to a recent small number of books that are trying to fill this gap, with the appearance in 2002 of M. R. Bierling and S. Gitin (eds.) *The Phoenicians in Spain: An Archaeological Review of the Eighth-Sixth Centuries B.C.E.* (a collection of independently published Spanish articles), and more recently the edited volume with original contributions (in English) by Spanish, Portuguese, and French authors, *Colonial Encounters in Ancient Iberia: Phoenician, Greek, and Indigenous Relations* (M. Dietler and C. López-Ruiz, eds. 2009).



The next three chapters focus on the Roman materials, ordered chronologically, with Chapter 3 on “The Roman Republic,” Chapter 4 on the “Augustan Expansion,” and Chapter 5 with a more general overview of “The Roman Economy” in the first century AD. The most conspicuous aspects in the chapter on Republican times include the appearance of the first villas and the evidence for mixed settlements (not yet *coloniae* proper), with the more intense settlement of Italian immigrants mostly around areas of rich mineral exploitation such as Cartagena. The continuity of earlier industries such as the *garum* production is conspicuous and stays strong, especially in the area of Cadiz.

In Chapter 5 the same kind of synthesis is offered for materials of Augustan times (mid-first century BC to early-first century AD). There are clear signs of expansion into areas previously unexploited by Rome, with the establishment of *coloniae* and *municipia* by Caesar and Augustus, which caused “the transformation of the rural landscape” (p. 87). However, this expansion of Roman settlement does not seem to have deeply transformed the essential composition of the population, according to the author (p. 105), as there is continued evidence of the survival of indigenous settlements (further discussion of this and other important statements would have been welcome). One of the main changes is the expansion of mining to the northwest of the Peninsula (Galicia and Asturias), especially of gold, silver, and tin.

The last chapter includes an account of material changes during the course of the first century, when the Iberian Peninsula functions more fully within the Roman economy, with some allusions to later periods when continuity at particular sites is noticed. This period is marked by the spread of villas in areas previously unsettled by Romans, the expansion of new industries, such as oleiculture (the author’s detailed explanation of olive oil production is welcome, p. 125), and, again, continuity in the long-lived fish-sauce industry. The appearance of business associations between landowners and slaves, detected in the increasing epigraphical evidence, is of particular interest. A decline of Spanish exports, however, is noticeable at the end of the first century AD, with olive imports to Ostia now coming from Tunisia and Tripolitana instead of Baetica. The author links this recession to the increasing social pressure on local elites to invest their excess capital in land and civic euergetism (evident in urban monumentalization) instead of re-investing it in expanding industries. Other possibilities are not discussed. The brief conclusions (pp. 166-68) summarize the main threads that connect the chapters.

As a more general observation, the reader should be warned that most paragraphs in the book (saving the introductory seven pages and the last two), start with sentences such as “Remains of a villa were reported...,” “Excavations at... have uncovered...,” “Ceramic waste has been found at...,” “Two kilns have been found at...” In other words, this book is the product of an outstanding knowledge of the archaeological and epigraphical sources for early Roman Spain, and it is a treasure for those seeking detailed information on archaeological findings. However, anyone looking for

discussion of the evidence here summarized will have to look elsewhere. There is little analysis of the data or in-depth discussion of cultural and social matters (despite the title of the book). This “catalogic” style makes the book a dry reading and will limit its audience to a quite specialized public looking for particular archaeological information. The amount of research behind it, nonetheless, is admirable and we look forward to seeing the author put his knowledge of the fieldwork into a less technical (and more analytical) book for the wider public interested in Roman Iberia.

CAROLINA LOPEZ-RUIZ  
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

**Michael Squire.** *Image and Text in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. ISBN: 978-0-521-75601-3.

Some time ago, shortly before the arrival of the book on review, I found myself contemplating Luc Tuymans’s *W*, on display in the artist’s one-man retrospective at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art. On the picture’s far right, two-thirds cut off by its frame, stood a faceless man in a dark suit; behind him, his spectral reflection appeared in what looked like a badly-cracked mirror that occupied the rest of the picture. Noticing that it was dated to 2008; alerted by then to Tuymans’s left-wing political views; and encouraged by neighboring studies of 9/11 (a scary Condoleeza Rice, and a cheery Dutch anti-immigration politician), I surmised that the ‘W’ of the picture’s title must be the hapless George W. Bush, and chuckled at this seemingly brilliant take-down. Only a large greenish patch at the picture’s left remained unexplained: the reflection of a potted plant, perhaps?

Walking into the next gallery privately pleased with myself for my “discovery,” I saw my wife, and we chatted for a moment about what we’d just seen, including my thoughts on *W*. She replied, “So you didn’t notice the wall board around the corner that described it as Walt Disney against a map of Disneyland?” Thud. (My consolation prize, for what it was worth: the greenish patch that puzzled me must be its “Frontierland” lake.)

Squire’s book, a reworked Cambridge PhD dissertation, begins with a set of somewhat less opaque but even more disconcertingly polysemic Silk Cut cigarette advertisements, using them to introduce his (hardly novel) thesis that the all-pervasive “logocentrism” of Western thought since the Reformation has both warped and stunted our understanding of the visual. Blinded and crippled by it, we need these verbal crutches both to engage with art and to elicit meaning from it. Quoting Donald Preziosi, Squire opines that “art history too has often tended to work within a ‘similarly logocentric paradigm of signification,’” and announces his book’s “historicist concern with the origins and the derivation of academic logocentrism, and with the cultural (and indeed the theological) remove of Greco-Roman antiquity” (p. 8). Long and somewhat

---

preachy, it typifies the hyper-selfconscious auto-positioning vis-à-vis one's field that now seems *de rigueur* in British academe.

Chapter 1, provocatively entitled "Protesting Protestant Art History," begins with Martin Luther and the triumph of the biblical Word. Squire then proceeds to trace the effects of this theological revolution through the German Reformation to Winckelmann, Kant, and Hegel (the architect of "the Lutheranism of art history"); Podro's "critical historians of art," culminating with Panofsky; the "new art history" particularly associated with Michael Baxandall and the department I teach in; and finally, a few contemporary scholars of Greek and Roman art, particularly Tonio Hölscher and (an unlikely confederate) Ann Steiner. All of them stand convicted, to a greater or lesser extent, not only of enslaving images to texts but also (worse) of treating images *as* texts—"as visual means to an a-visual end" (p.89). Instead, we should attend to "the image itself, and the visual mechanics of responding to it" (*ibid.*), radically rethinking "what images and texts were in antiquity" (*ibid.*) and addressing the decisively different relations between them. How far this iconoclastic intellectual history stands up to scrutiny I will leave to others more qualified than I to judge, merely noting at this point that after this stridently crusading agenda Squire's reach turns out to be somewhat longer than his grasp.

Predictably, Chapter 2, entitled "Towards an Older Laocoon: Reviewing the 'Limits' of Painting and Poetry in the Graeco-Roman World," takes on Lessing and his notorious essay of 1766 via Clement Greenberg's not-quite-so-famous rebuttal of 1940. After exposing in classic postmodern fashion the blind spots in Lessing's argument, Squire returns to antiquity and a whistle-stop tour through its images: the cult statue as epiphany, Plato's love-hate relationship with vision, supposed "illustrations of Greek drama" on red-figure pots, "the promise and failure of *ecphrasis*," Phrasikleia, the "Hellenistic turn," the Tavern of the Seven Sages in Ostia, the Casa dei Epigrammi in Pompeii, and so on. In sum, they show that "ancient artists and writers tended towards a more playful, less rigid, and more engaged attitude towards visual and verbal relations" (p.190) than today's allegedly Manichean text-image orthodoxy would envisage.

The rest of Squire's book consists of a series of case studies: the Sperlonga sculptures and the Faustinus epigram (Chapter 3); the "House of Propertius" at Assisi (Chapter 4); Roman pictures of Polyphemos and Galatea and Polyphemos and Odysseus (Chapter 5); and finally, Roman still-life painting (Chapter 6). Squire's eye is keen and his analysis of the pictures is sharp throughout; and his mobilization of appropriate texts (yes!) to elucidate them, or at least—in the case of Sperlonga—to gauge their reception is well taken. Although I am no expert on Roman imperial art, at least two of the chapters—Five and Six—are masterly. I will only protest that the somewhat condescending dismissal of my (early) attempt to contextualize the Sperlonga groups by invoking

Tiberius's particular poetic and prandial predilections overlooks my very different, quasi-"iconotextual" (*ipse dixit*) perspective upon them in a book published in 1990.<sup>22</sup> Moreover, Squire even treads the same path himself a few pages later, when he also invokes the culture of the Roman *cena* to elucidate them. But perhaps he is fairer to others—I didn't have time to check.

In conclusion, apart from its needlessly polemical tone, I have two main reservations about this book.

First, Squire overlooks what has been termed the "rhetorical revolution" of the fifth century B.C. and its decisive impact upon education and all other forms of intellectual activity by the end of the fourth. Hellenistic and Roman culture was a rhetorical culture, where the primacy of the word and of rhetorical modes of thought went unquestioned. And this culture instinctively used myth as its *lingua franca*. For all Squire's posturing about "two-way models of interaction" (pp. 297-99), "Cyclopien iconotexts" (pp. 300ff), and so on, these artworks ultimately were based on and reacted to *stories*—not merely elite texts, but stories told and retold over and over again in every context imaginable and in every way imaginable. At home and in school, forum, agora, theater, basilica, law court, triclinium, sanctuary, and cemetery, rhetoric and myth together ruled supreme. Moreover, as Alan Cameron (in a book overlooked by Squire) and Kristen Seaman (in an as yet unpublished dissertation) have shown beyond all doubt, Hellenistic and Roman artists, if they received any education at all, would have received a rhetorical and mythological one.<sup>23</sup>

Secondly, Squire doth protest too much. He is not alone in his attempts to re-evaluate the relations between the verbal and the visual, and his extended case studies in text-image relations at times suspiciously resemble the work of some of the "logocentric" scholars that he derides. In short, some of the emperor's new clothes look little different from the old ones.

ANDREW STEWART  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY

**Peter Stewart.** *The Social History of Roman Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Pp. xvi + 200, 43 b/w photos. ISBN: 978-0-521-81632-8 (Hardcover), 978-0-521-01659-9 (Paperback).

Peter Stewart's introduction to this volume establishes clearly what he intends to accomplish, but without that explanation, the title of this book could be misleading. It might more accurately have been called *Prolegomena to a Social History of Roman Art*, or *A*

---

<sup>22</sup> *Greek Sculpture: An Exploration* (New Haven 1990) 96-99.

<sup>23</sup> *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004); *Rhetoric and Innovation in the Art of the Hellenistic Courts* (PhD Dissertation, UC Berkeley, 2009).

---

*Critique of Scholarship on the Social History of Roman Art.* It is not a comprehensive history of Roman art interpreted from the perspective of social history, but an introduction to various aspects of that very broad area of study. Stewart also offers a necessarily brief review of relevant scholarship, and offers some suggestions for the directions that future studies might take. Instructors seeking a basic textbook for their Roman art courses will not find it here, but will find very useful supplemental reading for both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The author has taken pains to keep the volume both affordable and readable, probably with students' needs and budgets in mind. The text reviews a number of recent trends in Roman archaeology while avoiding the opaque jargon that so often accompanies innovative scholarship, and that students usually find daunting. The illustrations, while fully adequate for their purposes, are all in black and white, and usually reproduced at half-page scale or smaller. With only a few exceptions, however, those monuments are readily accessible in better reproductions elsewhere, for anyone who wishes to pursue their studies of them further.

Stewart organizes his text into five chapters on fairly broad themes. In the first chapter, "Who Made Roman Art?" he examines evidence for the social status and ethnicity of artists and patrons, and their interaction. Chapter 2, "Identity and Status," examines how private and imperial individuals sought to present and identify themselves through the art that they patronized or collected. Chapter 3, "Portraits in Society," elaborates not only on how individuals presented themselves but how and why others represented them. Chapter 4, "The Power of Images," explores the political and religious functions of art, as well as the question of what constitutes "official propaganda," and of how art with political content was disseminated. Finally, Chapter 5, "Art of the Empire," discusses reception and transformation of Roman art in various regions, the development of provincial styles, and the art of late antiquity. There is no chapter of conclusions; this large and diverse body of material resists glib summation. Stewart does, however, append a bibliographic essay with suggestions for future reading.

Each chapter is divided into several subheadings. "Identity and Status," for example, includes discussions of "The Art of the House," which examines sculpture and painting from domestic settings; "Looking for Trimalchio," which compares the literary evidence of Petronius's *Satiricon* with extant artifacts for evidence of how Roman patrons exhibited their taste and education (or lack thereof!) to their guests; "The Art of the Tomb," and "Sarcophagi." Stewart generally begins each section with a brief sketch of current scholarly opinion on the subject; he then examines ancient literary and epigraphic sources, and finally he selects two or three relevant objects for description and analysis. The discussion of only a few key monuments inevitably produces some distortions; the sheer volume of sculptured sarcophagi that survive, for example, and the need to limit the discussion to just two examples, means that entire categories of objects, such as columnar sarcophagi of both the eastern and the western empire, strigilated

---

sarcophagi, tomb-door sarcophagi, *lenos* sarcophagi, and several other formats, receive no mention at all. The need to limit the choices of material, however, is understandable, as long as the reader clearly understands that this is a small sampling of a much larger body of material.

Stewart's analyses of public monuments are particularly useful when they examine issues of patronage, of who dedicated a work of art and why. Portraits, to which he devotes his third chapter, exemplify the complexity of relationships between the person who was honored by a monument and those who actually paid for its construction. Imperial images must have depended on official prototypes that the emperor and his family commissioned and then made available for duplication. The sitters must have had some say in how they wanted to be represented: as idealized and youthful, harshly veristic, fashion conscious or self-effacingly modest. The finished statues that stood in various cities throughout the empire, on the other hand, were usually commissioned by local authorities or by wealthy private citizens. Those patrons must also have had some say in the style of the copy, as well as the attributes and the statuary body type with which the imperial figure would appear, while the subject of the portrait might never even see the work, let alone exercise any influence over those choices. Imperial statues and portraits of public officials were part of an interaction between patron and client that expressed relationships of power and dependency. Such dedications might involve an elaborate choreography of offers from the city that wished to erect the monument, initial modest refusals by the honoree, and eventual acceptances (Stewart pp. 103-5). Both parties to such transactions needed to avoid the appearance of obsequiousness on the one hand and grandiosity on the other. Only one surviving epigraphic source records this sort of interaction, but the custom of (temporarily) refusing to accept portrait statues has its parallels in the decisions of various emperors about accepting titles. Both Trajan and Hadrian, for example, chose to decline the title of *Pater Patriae* when the Senate first offered it to them, although both eventually accepted it.

When we discuss political iconography, it is all too easy to elide the difference between the political agenda of the person that the monument honors and of those who actually authorized and paid for its construction. Many of the monuments most commonly analyzed for their imperial iconography were not constructed by the emperors themselves or their successors, but by the Senate and People. The patrons of these monuments undoubtedly wished the artistic programs to meet with the approval of the *Princeps*, and might have worked closely with him in the planning of the triumphal arch or altar, but might also have messages of their own to convey to him. Pliny's panegyric to Trajan was clearly intended not only as praise of the new emperor but as a blueprint for a successful regime, and a warning of the sort of behavior that had led to the fall of Domitian just a few years earlier. The subtext of Pliny's many comparisons between the behavior of Trajan and that of Domitian is not subtle, and was probably not

---

intended to be. In the same manner, perhaps, the frieze of the Ara Pacis Augustae, which presents Augustus as first among equals and his family as an embodiment of Roman pietas, might well depict not only the virtues that Augustus cultivated but those that the Senate wished him to display. If we describe the Ara Pacis Augustae simply as a work of Augustus's official propaganda, as Stewart reminds us, we greatly oversimplify the questions not only of what message it conveyed, but of who determined and disseminated that message.

Inevitably, a brief volume that seeks to introduce its readers to a large body of material will have some omissions that any given reader may find frustrating. I would have liked to see much more discussion of the ritual functions connected with funerary art and architecture, and specifically, the festivals such as the Rosalia and Parentalia on which living family members would have visited the tombs of their loved ones. These ritual occasions gave visitors regular access to the interiors of tombs, and the opportunity to observe decorations like the frescoes in Vestorius Priscus's mausoleum at Pompeii (Stewart pp. 68-70, fig. 14). Many, if not most, sarcophagus reliefs were probably planned with these viewers and these ritual occasions in mind, and thus demonstrate a very specific social function for art. Although Stewart's text does not discuss these funerary customs, however, the bibliography does provide helpful references to works like Zanker and Ewald's *Mit Mythen Leben* (Munich: Hirmer, 2004), which do examine funerary art and its relationship to funerary ritual in greater depth.

In short, the subject of this book is both immense and ambitious, and Stewart's discussion wisely does not attempt to be comprehensive. Its intended function as a handbook for students precludes discussion of many issues and problems in the depth that some readers might wish. As a brief and eminently readable introduction to the problems, controversies, and complexities of Roman social history in the study of Roman art, however, the book will undoubtedly be quite useful.

SUSAN WOOD  
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY, ROCHESTER MI

**Mark Bradley. *Colour and Meaning in Ancient Rome*.** Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Pp. xiii, 267. ISBN: 9780521110426.

This book is a reworking of Mark Bradley's doctoral thesis on concepts of colour in ancient Rome. Bradley's interests are in how the Romans thought about and described colours, and how they used colours to make sense of the world. As he points out, the majority of studies on colour in the ancient world deal with the Greeks and Greek art and literature. What makes his study distinctive is the focus on early imperial Rome and Latin literature, what he calls the elite literary and philosophical perspectives about Roman visual culture.

---

The book begins with a long introduction in which Bradley raises questions about the epistemological issues raised by colour in Latin literature. What words were used for which colours, why and by whom; and what, leaving aside the vexed issue of translation, was being described through or meant by these words? One of Bradley's concerns is to show how "colour" can cover a spectrum of concepts: pigment, dye, surface of an object, character, and rhetorical device. This introduction also offers a short, but thorough and very useful, review of modern writings about classical colour terminology and the study of colours.

Seven chapters follow, dealing with particular aspects of colour use displayed in different genres of literary text, but held together by an over-arching discussion about the relationship between perception and knowledge. The first section is on the rainbow, and looks at how different writers, starting with Seneca, described the rainbow in both verse and prose. Using the rainbow allows Bradley to highlight the differences between classical and modern perceptions and descriptions of this phenomenon; he shows, for example, how the Roman rainbow could be one colour, three colours or many colours. For Bradley, the key point here is that Roman authors were concerned to establish links between the colour perceived and the phenomenon producing that colour, and consequently, the evaluation, especially in moral terms, of that phenomenon. This is a theme that runs throughout the book.

From this discussion, Bradley moves to consider colour in the philosophical context of the epistemology of vision. He begins with an examination of the role of *colour*, of the concept of colour, rather than the meanings of specific colours, and the perception of colour, opening up one of the central questions of the book: what did *colour* mean to the Romans? Lucretius, and especially Book 2 of the *De Rerum Natura*, forms the central text for the chapter. Bradley locates Lucretius' ideas about colour in the context of Greek and Hellenistic philosophy, and the discussions there of *chroma*. For Bradley, what Lucretius makes clear is the relationship between perception and experience, the world of the senses and of the sensible, especially in the context of the fluidity of colours and the idea of colour itself. Here again that theme of the relationship perceived by different writers (in this case, Lucretius on colours and the morals of perception) between colours and morality, becomes apparent.

It is a theme built on in the third chapter which focuses on Pliny's use of colour(s) in the *Natural History*, specifically the three chapters, 35-37, in which he looks at pigments, marbles, and precious stones. Bradley argues that we can see Pliny using specific colours and the concept of *colour* itself to make moral as well as aesthetic points, notably in his denunciation of polychromacity and exotic pigments, and in his linking of colour(s) to the value of objects. For Bradley, Pliny's use of colour is a part of that author's philosophical considerations of the relationship between perception and knowledge.



Bradley then goes on to consider colour and rhetoric, looking primarily at the writings of Cicero, the first Latin rhetorician to discuss rhetorical *colour*, as well as Seneca and Quintilian. He argues that *colour* was developed as a category in rhetoric as a means of conveying values and ambiguities, sharing the questions of appearance, classification and authenticity found in Pliny. The *colour* of an oration also displayed something of the character of the orator. In this context, Bradley considers the use of rhetorical *colour* in Roman drama. Although this is only touched on in a couple of pages, it highlights the scope offered by the topic.

This chapter on rhetoric and *colour* opened a discussion on how, for the Romans, colour was a part of the social identity of the individual: character could be read through physical appearance and dress sense; perception led to knowledge. This forms a central theme of the next two sections of the book, which deal with medical literature and descriptions of physiognomy and with ornamentation of the body and colour. Chapter Five examines how different physical colours, such as skin, eyes, hair, were taken by the Romans as indicating different corporeal characteristics, from ethnicity and profession to individual character. It also considers the interpretations placed by Roman writers on physical colour changes such as blushing or blanching, and what these said about the individual. Chapter Six, based around Ovid, Martial and Juvenal, develops these themes in the context of artificial colours and artificial ornaments, especially makeup, clothes, and wigs, and especially as displayed by women. Here, the role played by fake colours in disrupting character readings and the need for the educated male to be able to decipher these misleading signals is central. To the knowing eye, you are what (artificial) colour you wear.

The final section takes one colour, purple, probably the most studied of all ancient colours, as a case study to test the ideas and arguments of the previous chapters. Purple as *colour*, purple as the blood of a sea snail, purple as subject for moral outrage, and as a symbol of luxury, false purple, purple as the imperial colour: all are themes from the book as a whole. Bradley also uses purple to consider the development of abstract colours in the Roman world, by which he means colours that became detached from the objects to which they belonged and increasingly reflected or displayed concepts—purple perceived less as the dye of the blood of the murex and more as qualities such as luxury or power. This is an interesting area where more needs to be said.

This is a densely-written, detailed book that offers a range of interesting and stimulating ideas and insights. Bradley underlines the need to be aware of the nature and context of the particular literary source and the differences between us and them as viewers. He deliberately omits discussion of colour(s) in a visual context, explaining that this is not the purpose of the book. Throughout the book, he is concerned to show the ways in which the Romans used colour(s) to classify and evaluate the world. Bradley is right that colour in the classical world is all about perception, truth and illusion, context

---

and location, morality and immorality and his book shows the significance of colour in the understanding of Roman literature.

LIZ JAMES  
UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX

**Jason König.** *Greek Literature in the Roman Empire*. London, England: Bristol Classical Press, 2009. Pp. 119. ISBN: 9781853997136.

Jason König's (hereafter K.) contribution to the Duckworth's Classical World Series focuses on Greek literature written between 31 BC and AD 235 in the eastern parts of the Roman Empire (for the most part). Special attention is paid to the second and early-third centuries and to the genres often associated with the "Second Sophistic." I am happy to read that K. spends a good deal of time on the ancient novels, which had often been relegated to fringe studies or neglected as literature not worthy of study when they first received the attention of classical scholars, both ancient and modern. Edwin Ben Perry commented on this bias of the ancients in his monumental 1967 work, *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press): "Among the ancients...books of this kind were so persistently ignored by literary critics, and so far from being recognized as constituting a distinct or legitimate form of literature fit for discussion, that no proper name for them as a species, such as the modern words novel and romance, ever came to use" (4). This view used to be commonly held by those in our profession; I was advised against writing my dissertation on the ancient novel and urged to abandon any work in this "marginal sub-genre." I am glad that I ignored this advice. On the changing attitude to the novels, K. writes: "...there has been increasing appreciation and analysis of Imperial Greek literature in recent decades, perhaps in part because of an increasing tendency within our own contemporary culture to view lateness, derivativeness, marginality and hybrid identity as things to be celebrated rather than condemned" (9). But back to K.'s book: *Greek Literature in the Roman Empire* includes a preface, map, introduction, suggestions for further reading, questions for further study and discussion, timeline, and an index in addition to eight chapters: (1) "Novels," (2) "Satire," (3) "Oratory," (4) "Philosophy," (5) "Science and Miscellanism," (6) "History and Geography," (7) "Biography," and (8) Conclusion: Poetry and Prose." K. presents all of this well in a slim volume comprised of only 119 pages.

The wide range of genres and topics covered in this small book reflects a characteristic trend of Imperial Greek literature: the tendency to combine different literary conventions and customs into many permutations of new ways of writing and expression that were "virtuoso displays of ingenuity, fantasy and erudition" (9). In the case of the novels, K. suggests that this unnamed literary genus allowed its readers to imagine as they had not imagined before, for example, to grapple with the concept of fate and the hold it had

---

over the characters in the novels. Foreigners, foreign lands, barbarian cultures, what being Greek really means, elite identity, and the heroes and heroines and the “absurd and grotesque elements of the world they find around them” (14) are topics often found in the novels. K. covers briefly the works by Heliodorus, Xenophon of Ephesus, Chariton, Longus, and Achilles Tatius (the five canonical ancient Greek novelists) in his review. Moreover, and correctly so, K. states that these novels engage in literary games that cause both the ancient and modern reader to stop and ask what they are being requested to read, how they should read the texts, and why they should do so. These different levels of reading allow for diverse and varied levels of interpretation and understanding. However, it should be pointed out that while some texts have multivalent readings/interpretations, some hypotheses can be off the mark. For example, on page 17 K. writes that “When Chloe rescues Daphnis from a wolf trap by innocently unwinding her breast band in order to use it as a rope to pull him up (1.12), can we fail to view that scene with the overtones of eroticised undressing in mind?” While it is true that *Daphnis and Chloe* is intrinsically erotic, not everything in the text has to have an erotic “message.” In fact, the passage mentioned by K. has always struck me as humorous in tone: how can the reader not be puzzled by the sheer length of Chloe’s band? Longus writes: “While they were playing like this, Love made something serious flare up. A she-wolf with young cubs to feed had been carrying off a great many animals from other flocks in the neighboring fields, as she needed a great deal of food to rear her cubs. So one night the villagers got together and dug some pits about six feet wide and twenty-four feet deep.” (The text is from Paul Turner’s 1989 [reprint] translation of *Daphnis and Chloe* [London: Penguin Books]). It is into one of these twenty-four foot deep holes that Daphnis falls and from which Chloe, using her twenty-four foot long breast band, rescues. The entire situation smacks of humour: a twenty-four foot long breast band? Did Chloe have such an ample bosom that it needed so much material to be clothed? Other passages are erotic in tone, context, or content, but not this one. There might be more humour than erotic intention at play. K. also briefly touches upon Apuleius, Petronius, Photius papyrus fragments, and other authors and narratives (e.g., Dio of Prusa, Lucian, early Christian literature) in his examination of the novel that is meant to give us a fuller “picture of Greek prose fiction of the Roman Empire” (23).

K. is correct to point out that the salient characteristic of Imperial Greek literature is that it was written in prose and that poetry does not form a great part of the literary environment of this time period. In fact, “prose writing had a much more exclusive monopoly on literary prestige than ever before” (99). However, the epigraphic record argues somewhat against this comprehensive statement since the use of epigram, melic poetry, and didactic poetry was widespread. Nevertheless, the “voices of Imperial Greek literature are above all prose voices, but they are not for that reason flatter or more

prosaic: rather, prose is the vehicle which makes possible Imperial Greek literature's enormous freshness and hybridity and variety" (104).

*Greek Literature in the Roman Empire* is a solid and succinct introduction to the literature of this period. Moreover, it continues the good work of other scholars who have rightly argued for a greater emphasis on these types of texts, from this historical period, and from that part of the world.

EDMUND P. CUEVA

THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON-DOWNTOWN

**Ellen Oliensis.** *Freud's Rome: Psychoanalysis and Latin Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Pp. xii+ 148. ISBN: 978-0-521-60910-4 (Paperback); 978-0-521-84661-5 (Hardcover).

"In your wound I see my crime, you are my sorrow and my sin, it is my right hand that will be inscribed with your death! I am the author of your end" (p. 23).

In this scene from Book 10.197–9 of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* Apollo is expressing his feelings of guilt over the death of Hyacinth. Running recklessly to gather the discus Apollo had just thrown, Hyacinth was struck in the face and killed. Hyacinth was *imprudens* and Orpheus is quick to point it out. For Orpheus is, as Oliensis (O) notes, "exculpating Apollo in advance by laying the blame for the tragedy on Hyacinth's own impatience" (p. 23). Apollo then says—we are still in Orpheus' song, importantly—that he is not, after all, to blame; for what blame is it to have played, to have loved (*et amasse*)? O notes that Tarrant brackets *et amasse* as the apparent non sequitur does not fit the context; it was play after all, not love that killed Hyacinth. O would keep the line, seeing it as an instance of Orpheus unconsciously projecting his own guilt over failing to rescue Eurydice onto Hyacinth, another beloved who, like Eurydice, suffered a loss at the hands of an *amans*. It is through Apollo that O believes Orpheus "makes in full and at reasonably satisfying length the confession of guilt [over the death of his own beloved, Eurydice] he never made in person" (p. 23). It is a confession of guilt through a projection of blame onto the innocent, and to O this projection onto Hyacinth reflects the "very impossibility" of Orpheus holding innocent Eurydice guilty (p. 23).

Orpheus is not aware of this. This is the unconscious in action. Ovid has constructed the text to portray an Orpheus who believes that mourning for Eurydice is in the past ("Ovid is the knowing author, Orpheus the blinkered character" [p. 25]). This Orpheus is, at least in his own mind, "on the other side of mourning" (p. 19). O argues this is decidedly not the case. Orpheus' unconscious projection of his own guilt onto others "irrupts" through the text. These irruptions of the unconscious are, at the heart of things, what O is most interested in. The unconscious is her most important link to psychoanalysis. But O will not be pinned down on whose unconscious we are talking

---

about. O notes a number of ways the unconscious in literature may be understood, and promptly rejects them: First, often when we look for the unconscious in a text we are looking for the unconscious of the author. As O sees it, interpretations based on this assumption “seem not just profitless but presumptuous, not to say hubristic” (p. 5), since they put the critic on a level privileged above even the author. Second, we may be looking at a cultural unconscious. O argues that the focus on a cultural unconscious seemingly by-passes the label of hubris, since the critic need not say they have some special insight into the author’s mind; but as she notes it really “only displaces the issue of the critic’s superiority to the next level (the critic knows what the author unwittingly communicates that the culture cannot fully express)” (p. 5–6). Third, O rejects the idea that the unconscious in a given text is the unconscious of the reader, which strikes O “as little more than a variation on the authorial unconscious, preferable from the standpoint of theoretical correctness perhaps, but without discernible consequences for reading” (p. 6). Finally, O notes the literary unconscious, which “is a property of literary characters” (p. 6). This final type is to O the least fraught.

Yet in genres such as epic and lyric—her primary concerns in this book through Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, Catullus’ long poems, and Virgil’s *Aeneid*—the unconscious seeps into the surrounding text. Which is to say, while in drama the unconscious of the character is going to be expressed by his own words (Freudian slips, etc.; O notes such an example in Plautus’ Lysidamus of *Casina* [p. 4–5]), “the instant we abandon the stage for non-dramatic forms such as lyric and epic, the picture gets messier, as the boundaries around characters lose their rigidity, letting the unconscious seep out, as it were, into the surrounding text” (p. 6). This seeping unconscious wanders “taking up residence now with a character, now with the narrator, now with the impersonal narration, and sometimes flirting with an authorial or cultural address” (p. 6). O labels this the textual unconscious and it may incorporate aspects of the types of unconscious she mentioned above, and so her solution is to “embrace all of them” (p. 6), for “the textual unconscious is meant to leave space for all possible locations while insisting on the interpretability of its effects” (p. 8). This textual unconscious is for O simply “an enabling postulate, nothing more” (p. 7). It enables O to read more into a poem, to make poems read differently (p. 2). And so O’s approach is not perhaps a purely psychoanalytic one as much as it is an approach that borrows from and alters some thinking from psychoanalysis and Freud.

The textual unconscious is not all, and though it is O’s primary method of examination, the subjects onto which she turns the textual unconscious vary. With Ovid’s Orpheus and with Catullus she is interested in mourning (or more precisely, what she argues are poems that because of irruptions of the textual unconscious mourn despite not seeming to be about mourning). She also turns the textual unconscious onto two psychoanalytical standards: O examines motherhood in Virgil’s *Aeneid*, where she

notes an underlying anxiety about mothers in the scene where Ascanius confronts the Trojan mothers who have just set the fleet on fire. She also tackles sexual difference (specifically, penis envy) in Ovid's story of father-betraying Scylla.

No matter the subject, the textual unconscious is the key, and what matters to O is *what* the textual unconscious does when it irrupts from the text and not from where it irrupts. Still, O clearly does care where it abides, at least sometimes, and some of her readings are contingent upon where exactly the unconscious is abiding. Her reading of Catullus 68b sees the poet unaware that by the "insistent imaging of Allius as dead" (p. 53) Catullus is "unwittingly, and therefore all the more energetically, remembering [his 'forgotten' dead brother] as he composes these lines for Allius" (p. 53). This reading of a Catullus unconsciously guilty over his brother's death is dependent upon the fact that these effects "are meaningful not because they are intended, but because they are not" (p. 55). To assign to Catullus an awareness of what he was doing, of purposefully linking Allius with his brother, strikes O as "unintelligible" and she sees no way of feeding it "back into interpretation" (p. 55). O's reading, as she admits, puts her in danger of being labeled "hubristic" for assuming she knows more about Catullus' poem than does Catullus. She is aware of this and does not seem to mind. O admits she can sidestep that accusation by simply saying Catullus did intend such a reading. She notes this is also hubris: "as if the author's meaning answered exactly to the critic's understanding" (p. 56). O's (false) self-doubt threatens to make things confusing at times. Intrinsic to her approach, the textual unconscious demands for other readings that occur around the irruptions of the textual unconscious. The unintended readings brought about by these irruptions are most interesting exactly because they were unintended. As O says, "if intention were all, reading would be but a poor and pleasureless endeavor" (p. 56).

Neither a fervent advocate, nor an unbeliever in psychoanalytic theory (she does believe in the unconscious (p. 4)), O is not seeking to mount "an all-out defense of psychoanalysis" (p. 1); rather she believes one need not actually believe in, say, the Oedipus complex to find psychoanalytic theory good for thinking with. Some may find that hard to credit when O turns her excellent reading abilities onto that perhaps most discredited theory of Freud's: penis envy. Aware of the controversial nature of the Freudian penis and the Lacanian phallus, O is nevertheless adamant to engage with this aspect of psychoanalytic theory. But penis envy is not her destination and her case (for one, Ovid's father-betraying Scylla) is not to provide evidence that supports the theory; rather, "[p]enis envy and castration anxiety furnish the terrain...not its destination" (p. 95). Again, this is not purely a psychoanalytic approach as much as it is one that uses some thinking from psychoanalysis and Freud to further readings of Latin poetry. Neither does O claim it to be a purely psychoanalytic one. Still, one might ask what is the value of a reading based on a discredited theory? O would answer that such a reading "can provide news about poems, that it can make poems read differently—and

this is always, for me, what matters the most” (p. 2). For readers of this Cambridge series on Roman literature and its contexts O’s work is a welcome contribution to the ongoing discourse, which after all is the purpose of this series.

JASON MCCLURE  
UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

**John Taylor. *Classics and the Bible: Hospitality and Recognition*.** London: Duckworth, 2007. Pp. xi, 204. ISBN: 0-7156-3481-3.

Le foisonnant ouvrage de John Taylor, *Classics and the Bible: Hospitality and Recognition*, est un éloge des textes classiques (les textes bibliques en faisant partie) et une invitation à leur lecture qui se fait de plus en plus pressante et atteint des envolées presque lyriques au cinquième et dernier chapitre. Le programme est vaste, peut-être même trop vaste. En effet, l’auteur propose de comparer des textes d’auteurs grecs et romains—dont la liste est plutôt circonscrite—aux textes bibliques; à tous les textes bibliques, du Pentateuque au Nouveau Testament en passant par les Prophètes, les livres historiques, poétiques et la littérature hellénistique. Il va sans dire que les raisons des analogies entre textes gréco-romains et judéo-chrétiens ne sont pas les mêmes selon les périodes auxquelles ces textes ont été rédigés. Par exemple, le Pentateuque n’a pu être influencé par Homère au point où l’a été la littérature hellénistique ou par les philosophes classiques comme l’a été le Nouveau Testament. Pourtant, Taylor ne s’intéresse pas aux raisons des ressemblances et ne fait que les établir.

Pour essayer de restreindre l’ampleur considérable qu’un tel travail de comparaison aurait pu prendre, Taylor a décidé de se limiter aux passages classiques et bibliques ayant trait à l’hospitalité qu’il présente en étroite relation avec des scènes de reconnaissance (entre personnages, de savoirs enfouis et ignorés, de vérités passées inaperçues...). De prime abord, le chapitre qui ouvre cette étude de Taylor, “Homer,” est un peu confus. C’est au cours de ce chapitre principalement que l’auteur établit le lien qu’il conçoit entre religion, hospitalité et reconnaissance—le respect des règles de l’hospitalité est motivé par l’idée que derrière chaque passant une divinité est susceptible de se cacher et se conformer à ces règles permet de reconnaître cette divinité le cas échéant; au contraire, le non-respect des règles empêche d’identifier la nature particulière d’un hôte. Dans ce premier chapitre, Taylor ne fait qu’esquisser les comparaisons entre Homère et les textes bibliques, il donne des pistes mais laisse au lecteur le soin d’explorer seul les détails plus systématiquement. Il est vrai qu’en quatrième de couverture le destinataire de l’ouvrage a été averti qu’il devait se munir d’un certain nombre de livres pour pouvoir profiter au mieux de l’étude de Taylor. L’auteur brasse au cours de ce chapitre un très grand nombre de textes—et glane des similitudes dans un très vaste corpus en ce qui concerne la littérature judéo-chrétienne—oubliant apparemment parfois de comparer les classiques et la Bible et mettant de côté la restriction qu’il s’était imposée de s’en tenir

aux textes ayant trait à l'hospitalité. En échange, il nous propose ses propres interprétations, souvent passionnantes, de certains passages de l'*Illiade* et de l'*Odyssée*. Au-delà de ces remarques, une phrase particulièrement surprenante est à noter dans un passage qui vise à comparer le Pentateuque à Homère: “[...] the whole Pentateuch (Genesis to Deuteronomy), though formally in prose with poetic interludes [...]” (p 5), phrase dont le but est d'expliquer que sur le plan de la forme Homère et la Bible sont difficilement comparables. Si l'auteur se permet de s'écarter d'une stricte étude de texte et du thème de l'hospitalité, n'aurait-ce pas été l'occasion idéale de discuter des théories affirmant que justement Homère et la Bible ont nombre de traits—stylistiques—communs? Du *The Poetics of Biblical narrative* (Bloomington 1987, par exemple p. 367) de Meir Sternberg et des débats affirmant à partir de là que la poétique du récit biblique est une réminiscence du temps où le texte se transmettait oralement et que les passages récurrents, les formules répétées comme des refrains et autres outils stylistiques resservis à l'identique sans fin avaient pour rôle de permettre au destinataire du texte de se le rappeler (par cœur) et de ne rien en oublier, très précisément comme c'est le cas chez Homère. Le texte biblique n'est donc pas “formally in prose” mais suit bien des règles poétiques invitant à une comparaison minutieuse avec celles de rigueur dans le monde classique (sur ce sujet, on peut se pencher également sur Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, en particulier, “Biblical Type-Scenes and the Uses of Convention” [New-York 1981] pp. 47-63 et Guy Darshan, “Twenty-Four or Twenty-Two Books of the Bible and the Homeric Corpus,” *Tarbiz* [2007/1] [en hébreu] pp. 5-22).

C'est avec le deuxième chapitre, “History, Tragedy and Philosophy”—dont l'introduction elle-même est très détaillée et permet déjà d'envisager un chapitre mieux construit et plus concentré—que l'étude prend son envol et que l'on comprend l'intérêt de ce que Taylor a établi dans le premier chapitre. En effet, à partir de ce point de l'ouvrage, une partie des passages observés et comparés sera souvent empruntée au premier chapitre et les thèmes et perspectives qui y ont été ouverts seront réutilisés. Une continuité est ainsi créée entre les chapitres comme si finalement la même comparaison était filée tout au long de l'ouvrage et permettait d'aborder des thèmes récurrents de différents points de vue. Ce deuxième chapitre s'intéresse à Hérodote, Eschyle, Saül, Sophocle, Job, Euripide, ainsi qu'à Socrate et Jésus. Les comparaisons proposées par Taylor sont très variées et très savantes et font appel à des outils de tous les genres et de toutes les époques (déjà au premier chapitre avec l'application de la théorie des personnages-fonctions de V. Propp aux personnages classiques et bibliques). Le troisième chapitre, “Virgil Between Two Worlds,” compare L'*Enéide* à l'*Illiade* et l'*Odyssée*, à l'Ancien Testament et au Nouveau et se termine avec quelques pages sur Ovide et le Nouveau Testament (et un court passage en revue des représentations de Baucis et Philémon au cours de l'histoire de l'art et de la littérature). La comparaison la plus réussie de ce chapitre est celle d'Enée à Abraham derrière lesquels Taylor propose



de voir se profiler Auguste et le roi David (mais aussi Moïse). L'auteur décrit les deux contextes en question comme ayant pour but de lier un destin national à des plans divins et d'utiliser des légendes ethniques à des fins de propagande impériale.

Le quatrième chapitre suggère de s'intéresser au Nouveau Testament comme à tout autre texte classique et d'y découvrir ce qui reste voilé si l'on veut ignorer son appartenance à la littérature classique mais que l'on comprend soudain en l'envisageant dans un tel contexte. Le thème de la reconnaissance apparaît ici sous une forme comparée à celle de la reconnaissance chez Socrate. Si Socrate force son interlocuteur à prendre conscience de ce qu'il sait déjà, Paul quant à lui fait prendre conscience d'un dieu (d'une religion) déjà connu et adoré sans que ses adorateurs ne s'en rendent compte. En réalité, la conversion (au christianisme) consiste en une reconnaissance interne de la propre vérité—déjà existante—de l'être.

Le cinquième et dernier chapitre enfin se penche sur les résonances des thèmes traités en rapport avec la littérature classique aux XVIII<sup>e</sup> et XIX<sup>e</sup> siècles, s'intéressant tout d'abord à certains Pères de l'Église puis aux Romantiques et à l'époque victorienne, à John Henry Newman, Matthew Arnold, et plus succinctement à Italo Calvino et George Steiner. Ce chapitre tend à fermer la boucle des rapports entre littératures classique et biblique et à encourager le lecteur à poursuivre sur la voie des comparaisons et à être attentif aux échos intertextuels de ces deux cultures (qui ne sont presque qu'une). Enfin, une curiosité est à relever en ce qui concerne les notes de l'auteur; ces notes renvoient toujours à des ouvrages contemporains et à des citations des sources dans la littérature secondaire alors que l'on s'attendrait à être dirigé vers la source primaire classique ou biblique (qui n'est que rarement indiquée dans le corps de l'étude), vers des passages précis des textes étudiés eux-mêmes.

Pour conclure, cet ouvrage de Taylor est très dense et les sujets traités très attrayants. Parfois l'auteur diverge de son programme d'origine et si ce qu'il y ajoute est généralement enrichissant, la façon dont il le fait tend souvent à égarer le lecteur ou à lui faire oublier le but déclaré de l'étude. Il faut de la ténacité pour pouvoir suivre les démarches parfois sinueuses de l'auteur mais son étude est en définitive intéressante, érudite et fructueuse.

STEPANIE BINDER  
BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY

**Wolfram Grajetzki.** *Court Officials of the Egyptian Middle Kingdom.* Drawings by Paul Whelan. London: Duckworth Egyptology, 2009. Pp. xvi + 215. ISBN: 978 0 7156 3745 6.

The present monograph is a modified version of the author's PhD dissertation, presented in a much more accessible form, with the elimination of certain tables and statistics, but

certainly without sacrificing their contents. Unlike most studies which focus on the king, the present book is devoted to the examination of the courtiers who surrounded the king and who must have played an important role in governing the country. Grajetzki's statement in the Preface that "history was made not only by kings" is certainly correct. In fact occasionally kings played a small part, or no part at all in influencing the events of the time. Furthermore, while a number of studies examined the different aspects of the administrative system during the Old and New Kingdoms, the administration in the Middle Kingdom did not receive the attention it deserves. The book under review is therefore a welcome addition to our knowledge of an important yet under researched subject.

Chapter 1 gives a brief survey of the administrative system from the beginning of the Egyptian history to the Second Intermediate Period. Strings of titles, similar to those of the Old Kingdom, are held in the early Twelfth Dynasty, but these gradually disappear and are replaced by new but fewer titles. The Second Intermediate Period is poorly documented in terms of court officials. Titles are divided into function titles, ranking titles and other titles phrases, mainly centered on the relationship to the king. However, contrary to the situation in the Old Kingdom, the kings' sons during the Eleventh and Twelfth Dynasties did not become officials, nor were the kings' daughters married to commoners. The situation seems to have changed in the Thirteenth Dynasty.

Chapter 2 discusses the position of the vizier, his duties and functions, the "office of the vizier," the different titles connected with the vizierate, the possible number of simultaneous viziers and their attire as seen in statuary and relief. It thoroughly traces the history of the office holders throughout the period studied, dating each vizier and examining his known monuments. A similar approach was followed in Chapter 3 for the position of "Treasurer," who was the most significant official after the vizier. In fact from the richness of their monuments it may even be argued that the treasurers were more important than the viziers. Holders of the office were primarily responsible for the private property of the king; they accompanied expeditions for supplying building materials for the king, and were in charge of the palace as an economic unit and of the production and the sealing of goods. More than 100 seals are known for the treasurer Har of the Second Intermediate Period. Grajetzki studied the history of the office and its holders, tracing their succession and known monuments. Some of the better known treasurers include Mentuhotep, Iykhernofret, Senebsumai, Senebi and Har. Chapter 4 considers other important but less documented officials. Those under the treasurer include the high steward, the overseer of sealers and the overseer of the marshland dwellers, while under the vizier were the scribe of the king's document, the overseer of the compound, the overseer of fields, the leader of the broad hall and the overseer of the gateway. Finally the high priests were briefly considered.

Two military positions were treated in Chapter 5, the overseer of troops and the overseer of police. With the invasion of Nubia and Palestine and with wars against the Libyan tribes, the army must have been important, yet we know little about its organization. At the top was the overseer of troops, sometimes referred to as great overseer of troops, whose duty was to mobilize a large number of men for different tasks of military nature as well as for building projects. It is not certain whether a direct line of holders of the office existed or whether they were appointed only when needed. Some of the better documented occupants of the office are Antef, under Mentuhotep II, Nesmont, under Amenemhat I and Senusret I, but it is curious that no overseers of troops are known from the reign of Senusret III, the most active warrior king of the Middle Kingdom. The duties of the overseer of police were somewhere between police and judges.

Chapter 6 deals with the provincial administration, with the vizier at its head and two important officials, the overseer of Lower Egypt and the overseer of Upper Egypt, under him. At the local level the title of overlord of a province, known since the Old Kingdom, disappears in the middle of the Twelfth Dynasty, at which time the titles of mayor/governor and overseer of priests became important. Other titles were held in certain localities, as for instance Khnumhotep II of Beni Hasan who was overseer of the eastern desert and who depicted in his chapel the arrival of people from Palestine. His tomb also shows that the provincial court was almost a copy of the royal court. The author believes that the king was able to change ruling families and that there is no evidence of challenging his power. However, some governors depict royal symbols, which are particularly prominent in the tomb of Ukhhotep IV of Meir. Grajetzki makes some interesting remarks about this tomb, including the representation of a large number of women, as did the kings. However, Ukhhotep's tomb was the last great tomb in the site, for with the reign of Senusret III large decorated tombs disappear, although the office of governor continued with fewer responsibilities, and apparently with less income.

An interesting discussion of career and social mobility is found in Chapter 7. It considers the relationship with the king, networking, the importance of family background, and marriage. Some families remained in top position for generations as we read in the inscriptions of Khnumhotep II of Beni Hasan and in the depiction of Ukhhotep III of Meir of many generations of previous governors in his tomb. However, according to the author there is no evidence of hereditary nobility since new ruling families occasionally replaced earlier ones, but it was essential for the ruling class to be from well-educated social backgrounds. In Chapter 8 the author raises questions relating to the life of court officials; their birth, childhood, circumcision, education, and marriage. He also considers their houses, estates, servants, and leisure time, as well as burial preparations. The last chapter, 9, devoted to women related to court officials,

---

shows that these came from the same social background. Evidence suggests the presence of arranged marriages, as in the case of Khnumhotep II of nome 16 and his wife Khety, the daughter of the governor of nome 17. In general women did not hold high titles and were sometimes buried in a separate shaft in their husband's tomb, or more frequently elsewhere, perhaps not far from his tomb. The book ends in an appendix giving a list of the officials and their dates, a bibliography, and an index.

Wolfram Grajetzki carefully and methodically studied a large number of court and provincial officials, analyzing not only their careers, but also various aspects of their lives, and building his conclusions on maximum evidence. The book is therefore charged with information and original ideas and is very thought provoking. Despite his scholarly approach, Grajetzki presented the material in a very accessible and interesting manner. The author should be congratulated on a fine piece of work which represents a significant contribution to the study of the Middle Kingdom.

NAGUIB KANAWATI  
MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY  
SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA

**Stephen D. Houston and Takeshi Inomata.** *The Classic Maya*. Cambridge University Press, 2009. Pp. 402. ISBN:-10: 0521669723; 13: 978-0521669726.

Writing a monograph on the Classic Maya is a daunting task. The number of active field projects and the amount of research published each year in the Maya area makes a quality synthesis of the Classic Maya a monumental achievement. Stephen Houston and Takeshi Inomata have done a superb job in pulling together this extensive literature to not only give us a history of the Classic Maya, but to present a coherent model of how to understand the social dynamics of Classic Maya civilization.

This book, part of the Cambridge World Archaeology series, is directed at “students and professional archaeologists.” Although the title of the book implies coverage of all Classic Maya society, the authors acknowledge that their focus is primarily on the southern Maya lowlands, considered by many to be the heart of Maya civilization; the northern lowlands are treated in limited detail and the Maya highlands are rarely mentioned. While the authors provide a text that will be of great interest to students and professionals, this book sometimes presumes a prior knowledge of the Maya; for example, the lack of a map describing the different geographic zones of the Maya area mentioned. Therefore, this book is recommended for graduate students or upper level undergraduates with some prior knowledge of the Maya, as well as academics.

With any work of this nature it is inevitable that some research will be omitted (e.g., many of the projects in the northern lowlands) and some of the work presented will be controversial in nature (e.g., the site of Chac II as a Teotihuacan enclave). Yet apart

---

from a few problems with the bibliography and a rather short and uneven summary of Classic Maya history in Chapter 4, the text is well-written and avoids presenting speculative research. In many senses the text is a refreshingly contemporary take on the Classic Maya and serves as a complement to other works which use a more cultural-historical approach.

The main thread of the volume takes into account much of the previous research of both Houston and Inomata. After a short review of Pre-classic Maya society, the authors contextualize Classic Maya society by looking at the dynamics of interaction among and within the different groups of actors who comprised the lowland cultures: royalty, nobles, farmers, craftspeople, traders, and gods, supernaturals, and ancestors. Drawing on classic anthropological literature, Houston and Inomata focus on how the actions taken by different members of Classic Maya society were influenced by a sense of morality. While some Mayanists may balk at any attempt to understand morality in a past society in emic terms, the authors draw on a range of data to argue for certain structural principals that guided, but did not determine, Maya behavior. While this way of portraying the Maya has a whiff of the cross-cultural comparisons to Southeast Asian cultures popular during the 1990s, it is a much more richly textured view of the Maya than the narrow focus on the ritual suzerainty of rulers.

Houston and Inomata's model of Maya Classic society begins with the courtly elite. Both authors have made convincing arguments elsewhere that Classic Maya governmental structures, at least at the high levels of large communities, were based on the dynamics of royal courts. While there is much room for debate whether courts existed during the Pre-classic period or whether their distribution extended over all areas of the Maya lowlands during the Classic period (sites like Chunchucmil, Yucatán, may have a distinct type of political organization as the authors rightly mention), royal courts appear to have been widely distributed over a great portion of the lowlands during the Classic.

Using numerous cross-cultural analogies and shying away from over-generalization, the authors argue that the place of the ruler in the Maya court was as a sacred being that presided over the court; a figure responsible for performances which ensured the well-being of the community and, in general, kept the moral fabric of Maya society together. As the moral object, the ruler held the authority to govern and, in the authors' terms, was the "the glue of the Maya kingdom." Yet at the same time as being the ideological and social pivot for the community, the ruler was the focal actor in the sociopolitical intrigues of courtiers, many of whom were members of the nobility.

From the nobility, Houston and Inomata move on to discuss the roles of gods, supernaturals, and ancestors in Classic Maya society. The authors draw on the ample literature that suggests that the Maya held beliefs in an animate world, with spiritual forces residing in a wide variety of objects, places, and natural phenomena. For the

## Reviews

---

Maya, these forces, as well as ancestors, were active agents in the world they lived in and are as essential for understanding the wide range of moral objects in Classic Maya society as are the rulers.

The authors then focus on the less visible actors in Maya society: farmers, traders, and craftspeople. Related to the recent popularization of humanistic archaeology there has been an increasing trend in the Maya area to focus on the agency of different levels of Maya society, including the once “faceless” mass of Maya farmers. Focusing on archaeological sites such as Joya de Cerén and Aguateca, the authors deftly maneuver the reader through our current knowledge of household studies at Classic Maya sites providing one of the more accessible syntheses on the subject. While it may be difficult to reach a truly profound understanding of the agents at the lower levels of Classic society given the types of data available, Houston and Inomata’s treatment of them gives us a more contextualized view of the complexities of their lives that the current state of Maya archaeology offers us without crossing the line into speculation.

In contextualizing traders and craftspeople, the authors draw on much of their previous research, specifically Inomata’s studies of craft production at Aguateca. In general, this is an excellent review, and while I agree with the authors that the current evidence suggests that Classic Maya economies were heterogeneous, our current understanding of how production and distribution systems functioned is not sufficiently detailed to piece together the variability with decent resolution. For example, while many of us believe that market economies functioned at this time, there is very little evidence that positively identifies them and they may have articulated with other forms of exchange.

Concluding with a discussion of the “Classic Maya Collapse,” Houston and Inomata stress the complexities of this important cultural transition. The authors make some references to Post-classic Maya society, but leave that part of the story for another time, and most likely for other researchers to tell. In the end, *The Classic Maya* is an excellent, contemporary, and detailed treatment of this captivating period in southeastern Mesoamerica. This work will likely remain a staple for Maya studies for many years to come.

TRAVIS W. STANTON  
UNIVERSIDAD DE LAS AMÉRICAS, PUEBLA

**J. Buckler and H. Beck. *Central Greece and the Politics of Power in the Fourth Century BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008. ISBN: 978-0-521-83705-7. Cost: \$99.00**

Fourth-century Greece is one of the most bewildering eras of ancient Greek history and has often been considered the period of the declining polis.<sup>24</sup> This volume aims to

---

<sup>24</sup> Most broad historical surveys take this particular approach. One of the more recent, Sarah Pomeroy,

challenge the popular belief that the fourth century was a period of decay. The text is, however, not a diachronic analysis but rather a spotlight treatment of key events, people, and sources in the fourth century leading up to the Macedonian conquest. It is a collection of articles by John Buckler, one of the most influential historians of the fourth century, and includes an introduction by another equally prominent historian, Hans Beck.

The text begins with a prologue, a useful survey of fourth-century politics which establishes the historical context for the more specific discussions which follow. Beck argues that the Greek *poleis* were mired in their own self-interests resulting in diplomatic chaos. Moreover, he suggests that the city-states were unable to adapt to the ever changing political dynamics of a Greek world incapable of cooperation. Thus, his view of the fourth-century Greek city-state is one in which the *polis* is desperately clinging to the diplomatic traditions of the past.

Following the prologue, the articles are arranged into three thematic sections: "Alliance," "Hegemony," and "Domination." In the first section, "Alliance," the articles address the post-Peloponnesian War world and the shifting alliances during the Corinthian War. The first essay, "A survey of Theban and Athenian relations between 403-371 BC," is the broadest treatment of the group. Buckler seeks to address the reasons for the breakdown in the Theban-Athenian alliance and casts blame on Athenian politicians who could not see beyond the need to rebuild Athenian power. Thus, as the Thebans rose to ascendancy in Greece, the Athenians felt constrained by the alliance. So, when the Thebans were on the verge of destroying Sparta post-Leuctra, the Athenians seemed to have had no qualms about breaking the alliance.

The remaining essays in the "Alliance" section include a treatment of the incident at Mt. Parnassus in 395 (pp. 44-58) which ignited the Corinthian War, a treatment of the Battle of Coronea and its geographic possibilities (pp. 59-70), and an analysis of the King's Peace and its connection to Phoebidas' raid on Thebes in 382 (pp. 71-78). The section ends with a discussion of Sphodrias's ill-conceived raid on Eleusis in 378 (pp. 79-84). Buckler concludes that Sphodrias was indeed acting "with a purpose and under orders" from his king (p. 81). He calls it an "act of intimidation" meant to remind the Athenians and even the Thebans of Spartan military might (p. 83). Sphodrias' actions provided Agesilaus with an opportunity to expand Spartan imperialistic designs at the expense of Thebes, in particular. Though well argued, there is little evidence to suggest that Agesilaus ordered Sphodrias to move on Athens.

---

Stanley Burstein, Walter Donlan, and Jennifer Tolbert Roberts, *Ancient Greece: A Political, Social, and Cultural History* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008) even titles a section "The Crisis of the Polis and the Age of Shifting Hegemonies." See also, N.G.L. Hammond, *A History of Greece to 322 BC* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986) or Thomas R. Martin, *Ancient Greece: From Prehistoric to Hellenistic Times* (New Haven, Yale UP, 1996).

---

Part II, “Hegemony,” focuses on Theban domination of Greek affairs beginning with the re-establishment of the *boiotarchia* in 378 (pp. 87-98). The following two chapters focus on two battles recorded in Plutarch, Tegyra (pp. 99-110) and Leuctra (pp. 111-126). Buckler ultimately concludes that Plutarch’s accounts of the battles at Tegyra and Leuctra are plausible (p. 110, 126). The subsequent four essays discuss the nature of Theban domination which was severely limited by a lack of resources.<sup>25</sup> Buckler suggests that Thebes made no attempt to make their hegemony permanent: “this fragile, personal, and unorganized guidance could hardly endure” (p. 139). The last chapter in this section deals with Epaminondas and the 1994 discovery of an inscription in which his name appears (pp. 199-210). The inscription is significant because it provides evidence for a Theban naval program in 364/3.

The last section of the text, “Domination,” discusses the events leading up to the Macedonian conquest. These chapters are critical to the overall thesis of the text because they show the disintegration of Greek cooperation which allowed Philip II to interfere in Greek affairs. Of particular interest is the last chapter in the section which challenges the commonly accepted position that Philip long had designs to conquer Greece.<sup>26</sup> From Buckler’s point of view, early contact with the Greeks was aimed at protecting his interests in the north. Even when provided with the opportunity to entrench himself in Greek affairs after the Third Sacred War, he hesitated. His reluctance to subdue Greece in the late 340s was a result of his need to secure Macedonian interests in the Hellespont against the Thracian king (pp. 269-271). The Athenians were an ever-present pest to Philip’s plans in the north and it was not until the Thebans, long time allies of Philip, joined with the Athenians that the Macedonian king looked to the conquest of Greece (p. 275).

The work concludes with an epilogue in which Buckler and Beck hope to challenge the perception that the fourth century was a period of decline. Indeed, the fourth century showed signs of innovation and experimentation. For instance, the Greeks attempted to implement new means of establishing order, like federalism (which was technically not an innovation in this period) and Common Peace treaties. They also used new military tactics such as those employed by Epaminondas at Leuctra. Despite evidence of innovation, the Greeks still could not conceive “of a political idea or principle acceptable to others that could bring peace and stability” (p. 282) which adds to the enduring dynamism of the period but also contradicts Buckler and Beck’s overall thesis.

---

<sup>25</sup> “Alliance and hegemony in fourth-century Greece: the case of the Theban hegemony” (pp. 127-139), “Xenophon’s speeches and the Theban Hegemony” (pp. 140-164), “The phantom *synedrion* of the Boeotian Confederacy, 378-335 BC” (pp. 165-179), and “Boeotian Aulis and Greek naval bases” (pp. 180-198).

<sup>26</sup> See Dem. *Olyn.* I, 3.



By far, the strength of the volume is its treatment of primary source material. The footnotes are filled with abundant references to primary material and the essays themselves rely quite heavily on primary documentation. Several of the essays deal specifically with primary texts and the vagaries of our source material. For example, Chapter 10, “Xenophon’s speeches and the Theban Hegemony,” attempts to determine whether the speeches in the *Hellenica* “possess any basis in fact or whether they are nothing more than free inventions” (p. 140). It is a useful analysis of not only the composition of the speeches but also their historical context. He uses Thucydides and Callisthenes as bases of comparison and finds that Xenophon is not at all consistent in his use of speeches. Buckler concludes that Xenophon’s speeches should “never be taken at face value” (p. 164).

One of the interesting qualities of the volume is its inclusion of geographical information in helping to explain some of the events before, during, and after key battles. Buckler has clearly made first-hand visits to these locations to better get a sense of the terrain which helps immensely in the understanding of troop deployments. For example, Chapter 7, “The battle of Tegyra, 375 BC,” compares Plutarch’s account of the “skirmish” (p. 99) to the geographic possibilities of the area. He concludes that Plutarch’s account is “clear and consistent with the topography of Polygyra” (p. 109). Similarly, Buckler examines Plutarch’s account of the battle of Leuctra in 371 (“Plutarch on Leuctra,” pp. 111-126) and comes to the same conclusion, namely that Plutarch is remarkably accurate in his topographical analyses.

This text is not a diachronic narrative of events. It is a text which uses specific treatments of one of the most problematic periods in Greek history to highlight the vitality of the period. It is well edited with copious footnotes and a fairly substantial bibliography useful for any scholar. Buckler’s prose is clear and easy to follow; although, he is a bit prone to philosophizing about historical method. For instance, he states that “historians should never rule out the stupid and irrational in human conduct...” when discussing Sphodrias’ motives in 382 (p. 37).

Overall, it is not a text for someone hoping to get a clear sense of the historical narrative.<sup>27</sup> It is, however, great for scholars of fourth-century Greece who sometimes find it difficult to locate some of Buckler’s articles and who already know the political history of the period.

DAWN L. GILLEY  
NORTHWEST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

---

<sup>27</sup> For historical narratives of fourth-century Greece, see Buckler’s *Aegean Greece in the Fourth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 2003) and L.A. Tritle’s *The Greek World in the Fourth Century: from the Fall of the Athenian Empire to the Successors of Alexander* (London, New York: Routledge, 1997).

**Susan Lape.** *Race and Citizen Identity in the Classical Athenian Democracy.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Pp. xiv + 341, ISBN: 978-0-521-19104-3.

Most works on Athenian democracy explore what a citizen *is* or what a citizen *does*. In this very interesting book Susan Lape proposes to shift discussion to the question of *who* a citizen is and the ways that Athenians answered this question. Her overall aim is to explore the configurations of what she terms racial citizenship in classical Athenian democracy. L. defines as racial citizenship an ideology that construes citizenship as the politically and nationally meaningful traits that citizens inherit from their parents and which qualify and entitle them to citizenship (31-2). Pericles' citizenship law of 451 BC, which stipulated that only people with both citizen parents could be Athenian citizens, together with the Athenian narratives of autochthony construed the Athenian civic body as closed and self-perpetuating; L. examines their implications for Athenian civic ideology. While the use of the term racial might strike many readers as problematic, L. claims that her argument does not intrinsically depend on the use of the term racial and that she uses the term primarily for heuristic reasons (3-5). She distinguishes between extrinsic racism, which is the racism of discrimination towards others with which we are familiar in modern times, and intrinsic racism which is favouritism towards others based on family feeling or kinship (32-3). Athens shows primarily intrinsic racism, but by restricting the privileges of citizenship only to those of proper civic birth, Athenian democracy could also foster extrinsic racism. The book explores a wide range of contexts in which the Athenians debated who should or should not be a citizen and used the narrative of racial citizenship in order to foster national unity and to account for the successes and failures of Athenian democracy.

Chapter 1 (Theorizing Citizen Identity: 1-60) provides a methodological introduction to the terminology used and the research questions posed, as well as a summary of the development of Athenian civic identity and a discussion of the various others (slaves, metics, women) against which citizen identity was defined. Chapter 2 (The rhetoric of racial citizenship: 61-94) examines the rhetorical *topoi* through which racial citizenship was perceived by focusing on Old Comedy and oratory. It examines how comedians and orators attacked politicians and "bad" citizens through a discourse which described them as lacking pure civic origins and attributed to them features which were foreign and external to the Athenian citizen. Chapter 3 (Euripides' *Ion* and the family romance of Athenian racialism: 95-136) provides a detailed examination of how racial citizenship provided the context through which Euripides revisits the myth of *Ion* by linking it to questions of birth, motherhood, autochthony, and citizenship. Chapter 4 (Athenian identity in history and as history: 137-85) focuses on Herodotus and Thucydides and the ways in which both historians challenge the Athenian claims to racial purity and to a racially inherited citizen character that explains Athenian success. The chapter includes a very interesting discussion of Herodotus' presentation of the stories relating to the

---

conflict between the Athenians and the Pelasgians and the Athenian capture of Lemnos as a way of reflecting on the origins of Athenian imperialism. Chapter 5 (Trials of citizen identity. Policing and producing the racial frontier: 186-239) examines the rituals and procedures that affirmed or denied citizenship and the trials connected to them. It discusses the general procedures of *dokimasia* and *diapsephismos*, which tested the claims to citizenship of all Athenians, as well as a detailed discussion of the two surviving speeches which relate immediately to these issues (Dem. 57 *Against Euboulides* and [Dem.] 59 *Against Neaira*). Finally, chapter 6 (Myths and realities of racial citizenship: 240-83) provides a detailed examination of the phenomenon which might seem to directly contradict racial citizenship: the creation of Athenian citizens through naturalization. The chapter examines the procedures available for the naturalization of foreigners, along with a discussion of individual grants of citizenship and in particular of the cases of collective grants of citizenship. L. claims that by presenting naturalization as the adoption of foreigners who benefited the Athenian demos the Athenians were able at a certain level to make naturalization compatible with racial citizenship. Finally, she claims that the stricter limits to naturalization after 403 BC are evidence of the Athenian attempt to overcome the shock of the Civil War through a renewed emphasis on the rhetoric and practice of racial citizenship.

As the presentation of the contents should have made clear, this is a very stimulating and rich book, written in a comprehensible manner, which discusses a variety of different texts and genres and will be of interest to practically all sub-disciplines of Classics. The author should also be congratulated for the subtlety of her analysis and her willingness and ability to discuss pieces of evidence that might seem to contradict or relativize her argument. The reader will find much of interest in the discussions of particular issues and texts, but given the lack of space I would like to focus the rest of this review on the wider issues. At a certain level there is no doubt that L. is right that the Athenians presented their citizenship in terms that can be described as racial. It is particularly interesting that she points out passages in which the failures of Athenian policy can be attributed to the leadership of individuals of impure birth. But this argument is in need of qualifications and delimitations, which are not primarily meant as criticism of this book but as issues that future research should have to deal with.

To start with the first delimitation, although the author presents racial citizenship as a historical phenomenon that emerged in Athens after the citizenship law of Pericles and the democratic reforms of the fifth century, this is not necessarily the case. Here, a comparative approach to the Athenian example would have been deeply desirable. Can we establish that Athenian racial citizenship was different from the conceptions of citizenship in other Greek poleis? Rome would certainly be totally different in this respect, but is there really any difference from other Greek poleis? Was there any

alternative to “racial citizenship” in the classical Greek world, where all communities were based on fictive kinship?

A second delimitation concerns the implications of the term racial. Because it implies inheritance through birth, it can lead to misleading conclusions. There is no doubt, that as the author shows, the Athenians could describe features in racial terms, as when Demosthenes’ baseness is described as “foreign to this land,” i.e. inherited through his Scythian mother (83). But most of the issues described as “racial citizenship” have nothing to do with inheritance through birth and race. When Demosthenes claims that Aristogeiton is “infected with a hereditary hatred for the demos” (75), because his father was disfranchised, this has nothing to do with race: it simply follows the Greek moral principle of helping friends and harming enemies, and accordingly a son would have a moral obligation to be hostile towards those who had harmed his father. In more general terms, it is striking that in most of the cases involving disputed claims to citizenship and allegations of impure birth the focus seems to be on the illegality of accessing those privileges rather than the threat to racial purity. On the other hand, given widespread Greek beliefs on the heritability of various features (e.g. guilt or punishment for the sins of the ancestors) it becomes an open question to what extent the rhetoric of racial citizenship is a novelty of fifth-century Athenian democracy or merely one manifestation of wider and general Greek attitudes.

Finally, while the author justifiably focuses on the inherited features of citizenship, it will be essential in the future to balance it with the performative aspects of Athenian citizenship. L’s own analysis shows how establishing a citizen’s identity was a continuous performance rather than established at birth, and other scholars have shown how citizenship depended on the performance of obligations. As L. herself shows, naturalization depended on the performance of benefactions towards the Athenian demos. The two principles were in potential contradiction, and there is no doubt both that there were situations in which they contradicted each other (the collective naturalizations of the fifth century are the best examples), but also that they could be potentially balanced, as the author claims, for certain occasions.

In conclusion, this is a very interesting book, which raises plenty of interesting questions that should come to the forefront of future research.

KOSTAS VLASSOPOULOS  
UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM

**Iakovos Vasiliou.** *Aiming at Virtue in Plato.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. ISBN: 978-0-521-86296-7. Pp. x + 311.

This book deals with some of the most familiar dialogues of Plato, but with a new approach and a new interpretive thesis. The new approach is that it avoids interpreting Plato’s ethics in terms of the prevailing eudaemonist framework, but focuses on virtue as

---

supreme end and aim. The new interpretative thesis that in what are typically referred to as the “early” and “middle” dialogues, Plato’s Socrates distinguishes between “aiming principles” and “determining principles” and that the distinction structures Plato’s conception of virtue.

According to Vasiliou, an aiming principle sets the supreme aim of an agent’s action and a determining principle actually tells the agent how to act in general or in any particular situation. For Socrates and Plato, the aim principle is that acting virtuously is the supreme aim of the actions. Vasiliou calls this principle “supremacy of virtue” (SV, for abbreviation). SV functions in two ways: as an explicit aim (to do the virtuous action above all) and as “limiting conditions” for action (never act in a way that is contrary to virtue). The determining principle says what virtuous action is in general or in specific instances. These two principles are different, because by itself SV does not answer the determining question.

The book seeks to demonstrate that the aiming/determining distinction runs through and underlines the arguments in the “early” and “middle” dialogues. Thus, the *Apology* shows Socrates’ commitment to SV (Chapter 1); the *Crito* determines what is virtuous now (Chapter 2); the *Gorgias* argues for the supremacy of virtue (Chapter 3); in the five “dialogues of definitions” (*Laches*, *Charmides*, *Euthyphro*, *Protagoras*, *Euthydemus*) Socrates and his interlocutors try to determine what virtue is by trying to answer the Socratic “what is F?” question (Chapter 4), and finally the *Republic* brings two questions together and develops a more detailed account that is consistent with what we have seen in the previous dialogues (Chapters 5-8).

Relying on the distinction between aiming and determining principles, the book develops a series of refreshing views on many much-discussed controversial issues in Platonic scholarship. Let me mention a few as examples. (1) Socrates’ disavowal of knowledge. While most commentators focus on differences in the cognitive state of Socrates in understanding this issue, Vasiliou calls attention to the object of Socrates’ knowledge and lack of knowledge. His view is that what Socrates disavows is knowledge of what virtue is. Yet Socrates consistently avows knowledge of SV and his knowledge of SV does not depend on knowing what virtue is. (2) Socratic incontinence. Vasiliou explains that it is the commitment to SV, not the knowledge that an action is virtuous, that is sufficient for one to do virtuous actions. If one is committed to SV, then wrongdoing must be a matter of ignorance. (3) Thrasymachus’ positions. Scholars have been puzzled with the exchanges between Socrates and Thrasymachus in *Republic* 1. Thrasymachus appears to have raised a number of claims. What is his central position? Can his positions be reconciled? Vasiliou’s explanation is that Thrasymachus moves back and forth between debating SV and arguing about determining questions about just actions, and he also provides an illuminating examination of this vexing exchange in light of the aiming/determining distinction. (4) The subject and the unity of the *Republic*.

Scholars have been debating whether the *Republic* changes the subject, and whether Plato replaces an act-centered account of virtue with an agent-centered one. In Vasiliou's account, the account of justice as a harmony in the tripartite soul in *Republic* 4 answers the aiming question, namely, "Why would one commit to SV?", yet the determining question, namely, "how do we determine what the virtuous action is?" is still central to the *Republic's* discussion of virtue. The question is answered by the metaphysics of the middle books. It is the Forms that answers Socrates' "what is Justice?" question in the *Republic*. This view offers a new explanation of the significance of the central argument of the *Republic*. Vasiliou has made a laudable effort to show that the aiming/determining distinction illuminates not only the *Republic's* internal unity, but also its continuity with the earlier dialogues.

A question can be raised regarding the relationship of the aiming principle and the determining principle. There is a well-known view among scholars that Socrates holds the "priority of definition," according to which without knowing what F is one cannot know anything about F. So how could he claim to know SV, while disavowing knowledge of what virtue is? Vasiliou is well aware of this potential challenge. His answer is that the priority of definition does not apply to SV. One reason is that virtue's supremacy is a function of an agent's relationship to virtue and not an intrinsic property of virtue itself. This point, however, invites another question: how does one know SV? Or why should one adhere to it? In Vasiliou's view, this is not a matter of knowledge alone. It becomes an issue of motivation and amounts to the question "Why should I be virtuous?" He argues that the defense of SV has been consistently and progressively made more sophisticated in the *Crito*, the *Gorgias*, and the *Republic*. To explain the source of that commitment, the book especially stresses that in Plato's ethics the "habituation principle," which is known to be central in Aristotle, also plays a crucial role. According to this principle, the performance of actions of a certain ethical type molds a character of a corresponding type. It provides an important link between virtuous actions and virtuous character, because acting justly has a valuable effect on the soul. The author gives special attention to the discussion of proper education in books 2-3 of the *Republic*. While commentators, in discussing this text, are usually concerned with Plato's views on poetry and education censorship, Vasiliou contends that this section articulates and establishes the habituation principle.

In general, I find the book develops an innovative and important thesis, and the author's arguments are coherent and mostly persuasive. It deserves a strong recommendation. I would like to see more theoretical study on the relationship of the aim principle and the determining principle. The unity of them affects the unity of the *Republic*. Moreover, a recurring issue in contemporary virtue ethics is how the agent-centered virtue ethics accommodate ethical rules for actions. Vasiliou's idea that Plato seeks to bring together these two principles seems to promise a new approach to this

---

issue. Hence, the book is a significant contribution not only to the Platonic scholarship, but also to the development of virtue ethics.

JIYUAN YU

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO

**D. Walsh.** *Distorted Ideals in Greek Vase-Painting. The World of Mythological Burlesque.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Pp. xxx + 420, 108 ills. ISBN: 978-0-521-89641-2.

Es gehört zu den erstaunlichen Phänomenen der griechischen Kultur, dass es kaum ein Thema oder einen inhaltlichen Bereich gibt, über den nicht gelacht werden darf, und in dem keine parodistischen Bilder, Witze, und Humor erlaubt gewesen wären. Daher ist es auch nicht überraschend, dass es zwar vielleicht insgesamt nicht allzu viele (S. 9), aber dafür eine doch inhaltlich reiche Anzahl entsprechender Darstellungen gibt. Walsh behandelt die Bilder auf der bemalten Feinkeramik, die zwischen dem 6. Jh. v. Chr. und dem 4. Jh. v. Chr. entstanden ist.

Im ersten Teil seiner Arbeit (S. 3–36) bespricht Walsh zunächst die bemalte Feinkeramik der einzelnen Produktionszentren wie Korinth, Athen, Bötien, und Unteritalien—unter denen die griechischen Städte Unteritaliens gut die Hälfte der erfassten Bilder ausmachen; vgl. S. 260—in übersichtlicher und prägnanter Weise und gibt dann einen knappen, doch alles Wesentliche umfassenden Überblick zu den Formen griechischen Humors und seines antiken Verständnisses etwa bei Aristoteles.

Es folgt im zweiten und zentralen Teil des Buches (S. 37–244) die Besprechung einzelner Themen, wobei nach Maßgabe des Katalogs 144 Vasen berücksichtigt wurden, nach Walsh ein „selective approach“ (S. xxv). Dabei setzt die Diskussion mit den zum Teil nur schwer verständlichen Bildern des 7. und 6. Jahrhunderts ein, auf die die Bereiche “Violating the Sanctuary,” “Ridiculing the Gods,” und “Subverting the Hero” folgen. Die mythischen Themen betreffen verschiedene Sagenkreise, wobei Themen wie Ödipus und die Sphinx (S. 72 f.) oder vor allem Herakles (S. 264) besonders beliebt sind. Eine interessante Beobachtung ist, dass Bilder mit Theseus anscheinend völlig fehlen (S. 176 f.). Gerade hier wäre es wohl gewinnbringend gewesen, dieses Ergebnis durch die Einbeziehung anderer Gattungen auf eine breitere Grundlage zu stellen.

In einem dritten Teil (S. 245–291) stellt Walsh einerseits die Ergebnisse der vorangegangenen Kapitel unter übergeordneten Gesichtspunkten zusammen—etwa die beliebten Mythenfiguren (S. 263 ff.) oder die bedeutende Problematik des Zielpublikums, bezieht aber auch weitergehende Gesichtspunkte ein, die Fragen wie Kostüm und Drama, die Größe von Figuren oder die zentrale Problematik des Zusammenhangs mit karnevalsähnlichen Situationen betreffen.

Die einzelnen Vasenbilder werden dabei ebenso wie die übergeordneten Gesichtspunkte gründlich und kenntnisreich behandelt, wobei auch Ausblicke auf

parallele Phänomene in der Literatur nicht fehlen. Es stellt sich jedoch eine sehr grundsätzliche Frage: Walsh weist selbst darauf hin, dass es nicht immer leicht ist, “komische” Bilder zu identifizieren, die z. B. auch einfach schlecht und damit allenfalls unfreiwillig komisch sein können (S. 5). Diese Frage betrifft m. E. zwei der von Walsh behandelten Vasengattungen: Die “Caeretaner Hydrien” (vgl. Walsh S. 12 ff.) weisen zwar bunte Bilder und große Drastik auf, doch scheinen sie mir ebenso wenig zwingend komisch zu sein wie manche Bilder der korinthischen Sam Wide-Gruppe (vgl. Walsh S. 16): Dies gilt etwa vor allem im Falle der Vasenbilder Abb. 47–49, die man als Volkskunst bezeichnen könnte, die jedoch nicht eindeutig als komisch gekennzeichnet sind. Auch bei einzelnen Vasen—wie etwa den Perseusbildern S. 183 f.—wird nicht immer deutlich, weshalb sie in diesem Zusammenhang behandelt werden. Die spezielle Thematik der Vasen mit Szenen des attischen Satyrspiels allerdings wird wohl mit allzu wenig Beispielen vorgestellt (vgl. S. 194. 261). Vielleicht wäre dabei ohnehin sinnvoll, die Vasenbilder mit Theaterszenen der Komödie von anderen Mythenparodien zu trennen, da sich hier stärkere Bildungen an Traditionen und vorgegebene Bildinhalte—wie z. B. Masken und Kostüm—ausmachen lassen, während vom Theater unabhängige Bildschöpfungen völlig frei eigenen Vorstellungen folgen können. Es mag noch erwähnt sein, dass Walsh leider N. Himmelmann, *Realistische Themen in der griechischen Kunst der archaischen und klassischen Zeit*, 28, *Ergänzungsheft des Jahrbuchs des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* (1994) nicht herangezogen hat, wo sich grundsätzliche Bemerkungen zur Thematik finden.

Trotz dieser Einwende zu einzelnen Punkten handelt es sich bei dieser Studie um die anregende Bearbeitung einer überaus eigenwilligen Bilderwelt der griechischen Kunst.

MATTHIAS STEINHART  
MUNICH

**Allen E. Jones. *Social Mobility in Late Antique Gaul. Strategies and Opportunities for the Non-elite*.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. ISBN: 1978-0-521-76239-7. Pp. 379. \$90

Allen E. Jones opens his introduction by quoting a remark in Sir Samuel Dill’s *Roman Society in Gaul*, still a reference in English scholarship though published in 1926, to the effect that it is “natural” enough that history pay scant attention to the lower orders. He then sketches, most usefully for the reader who is not already an initiate, the extraordinary development of Late Antique scholarship over the past four decades since Peter Brown so popularized that term. The publication between 1971 and 1992 of the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* (and the subsequent *Biographical Database for Late Antiquity Project*) has made available so much biographical information concerning social elites, even as innovative studies by Brown, Raymond Van Dam, Yitzhak Hen, Giselle

---



de Nie, Martin Heinzelmann, and many others have shown a range of good historical uses to which the abundant hagiographical sources, so distrusted in Dill's day, can be put. Ralph Mathiesen's *Roman Aristocrats in Barbarian Gaul* (1993) and later studies particularly inspired Jones to "try to discover how the non-elites of that transitional age might have developed strategies to cope and/or prosper."

What about sources? While these appear today to be more abundant and exploitable than they were in Dill's time, how pertinent are they to "non-elites"? And for Gaul are we not still overwhelmingly dependent on Dill's major source, Gregory of Tours? For Jones, discussing these questions in Chapter Two, Gregory's dominance is practically a virtue, given his unusual willingness to include stories about non-elite persons, as well as the complexity and sophistication recent scholarship has found in his work. In place of the straightforward, even simple-minded storyteller imagined in Dill's day we have a "shrewd manipulator of text." Jones readily admits his interests are more *mentalité* than just-the-facts; Gregory's world-view can be better understood now thanks to other recent studies of contemporaries, most notably Avitus of Vienne, Caesarius of Arles, and Gregory's good friend, Venantius Fortunatus. Granted, three of these four men sprang from Senatorial families and all ended up bishops. Chapters Three and Four are devoted to analyzing social structure. In the former, Jones distinguishes three aristocracies in barbarian Gaul: the landed magnates, the courtly men of power, and the ecclesiastical aristocrats. In the latter he turns his attention to the three other groups: *ingenui* (non-elite free men), *pauperes*, and slaves. The strategies of personal advancement pursued by the elite (advantageous marriages, obtaining lucrative office at court or in the Church) were imitated, he finds, to the extent possible by non-elite figures. For example, an *ingenuus* from the Berry region, whose family was personally known to Gregory of Tours (they were "not of the highest nobility, but free nonetheless") tended sheep as a boy, showed ability in school, got some kind of post at Childebert's court, returned to take over the family estate at his father's death, resisted his mother's efforts to marry him, entered the clergy as a deacon at Bourges, went off to found a hermitage in the country, and ended up building a monastery and teaching school. The secular career path is illustrated by Leudast, who, born the son of a slave on a royal estate, ran away from his job as an apprentice cook, insinuated his way into the favor of Queen Marcofeva (herself of servile birth) and so enriched himself as her factotum that when she died he bribed Charibert to appoint him Count of the Stables. As Count of Tours he became the determined enemy of Bishop Gregory, whom he tried to bring down with a charge of treason, but he himself perished when word got to Queen Fredegund (another royal risen from slavery) that he was bad-mouthing her. Does Jones' version of this famous story differ from Dill's? The latter is scornful of the "vanity and vicious instincts of the *parvenu*" from whose "libertine insults" no woman was safe. But Jones is impressed by "the lasting influence of the royal officeholder," adept at recovering from reversals of fortune; he

suggests that a shrewd marriage-up may have helped. His bold speculation based on a detail so fugitive in Gregory's account that Dill did not bother to mention it, aptly illustrates with what confidence the more modern historian will distance himself from the judgments of his source.

The rest of the book continues this strategy of taking a different look at more or less familiar material. A whole chapter is given the poor-as-prisoners; the interest is not to learn anything new about social history but to discern a "ritual of the miraculous release of prisoners" seen as a method whereby the Church "increased spiritual authority and amassed clients." "The Active Poor" (Chapter 6) further explores what Jones terms "a relationship of mutual exploitation between clerical patrons and *pauperes*." There were some jobs to be had, such as *fossores* or *ostiarii*; there were also slots on lists of registered poor, *matricularii*, who enjoyed some kind of food and lodging and in return for doing errands or even serving as henchmen at tense moments. There were also beggars promoted to stardom by a miraculous cure, like blind and crippled Maurusa of Tours or the paralytic Foedamia of Brioude, who became enthusiastic witnesses to the power of saints Martin and Julian respectively. The theme of healing and super-normal powers introduces the other two groups Jones presents: Physicians (Chapter 7) and Enchanters (Chapter 8). It is a bit of a stretch to associate with "non-elites" men like Oribasius, super-aristocrat and friend of the Emperor Julian, or the father of the poet Ausonius, who served as a prefect and ranked as *vir illustris*, but the father of Chilperic's physician Marileifus was a slave of the church. *Incantores*, operating in the murky realms between folk medicine, exorcism, prophecy, and magic show up fairly often in our sources. Stories like that of the "Pseudo-Christ" who attracted thousands of followers before he was killed in a confrontation with Bishop Aurelius of Le Puy do indeed bring non-elite actors onto the stage of history, but offer little, finally, in the way of opportunity for social mobility.

One is dismayed to find in a book published by Cambridge (with so fancy a price!) such elementary mistakes as "Gregory harbored obvious animus *for* the woman" (p. 67); "Placinda and Alcima *faired* as badly as their church (p. 123; same error on p. 251) or "help him rid of the large statue" (insert "get," p. 144). Allen Jones has a way with words which could have used some help from a good editor: an ambitious merchant uses "the rhetoric of inclusion to instigate entry into an aristocratic circle"(p. 100); emperors allow officials to "level rampant accusations" and conduct "most volatile late Roman purges" (p. 289); high ecclesiastics "recognize sanctity effusing from individuals of low social station" (p. 215); Caesarius displays "hesitance" (p. 312); a Pseudo-Christ is "agitating society with an errant millennial banter"(p. 331). Where style is concerned, Sir Samuel Dill can still be recommended. Jones usefully separates the bibliography into Primary and Secondary sources; of the latter one can note the great preponderance of publications in English and, for a book about Merovingian Gaul, the hit-or-miss nature

---

of those works in French that are cited. There is a book about the politics of the Burgundian kingdom (Favrod, 1997) but not Michel Rouche's comprehensive synthesis on Aquitaine or Patrick Périn's overview of the Franks, which emphasizes archaeology. Indeed, archaeology is ground upon which Allen E. Jones declines to tread, though it has much to offer in regard to the lives of the not-rich and the unfamous. To have done so would have meant writing a very different sort of book.

BAILEY K. YOUNG  
EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

**C.W. Shelmerdine, ed.** *The Cambridge Companion to the Aegean Bronze Age*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008. ISBN: 978-0-521-81444-7 (Hardcover ), 978-0-521-89127-1 (Paperback). \$29.99 PB.

For many years teaching undergraduate courses on Aegean Prehistory was challenged by a dearth of suitable textbooks about the Bronze Age Aegean. Instructors had little choice but either to forego the textbook option altogether and instead read scholarly articles and reports, which are often too challenging for even advanced undergraduates, or to make do with outdated texts with a limited scope such as Taylour's *The Mycenaean* (first edition 1964) or Hood's *The Arts in Prehistoric Greece* (1978). In the 1990s there were some attempts to remedy the situation, starting with Dickinson's *The Aegean Bronze Age* (1994), whose non-chronological treatment of the material however proves a handicap in the classroom. The situation is now remedied by the appearance of the *Cambridge Companion to the Aegean Bronze Age*: an up to date, clearly structured, and highly readable overview over the current state of Aegean research.<sup>28</sup>

The Companion is explicitly aimed for use in the classroom (p. 15); some contributions implicitly assume an American audience.<sup>29</sup> With its wide scope, it is however equally valuable for the specialist. The book represents the combined efforts of no fewer than 18 well known scholars—all except one from English speaking countries—whose individual contributions have been edited to form a cohesive text. Chapters, each followed by suggestions for further reading and notes, are consistently cross-referenced, and despite the individual styles and emphases of the contributions, they follow a logical progression. The organization of the book is clear: after an introductory chapter by Shelmerdine on “Background, sources, and methods” it is roughly chronological, starting with the Early Bronze Age in Greece (Chapter 2, by

<sup>28</sup> The more recent *Oxford Handbook of the Bronze Age Aegean* (2010) falls, with its more than 900 densely written pages, clearly in a different category.

<sup>29</sup> Chapters 6 and 7, by Younger and the late Rehak, include a comparison of the Minoan conical cup to a Dixie cup (p. 154) and descriptions of the central court at Phaistos as being “a little more than half the size of a United States football field” (p. 148) and of the Phaistos Disk as “the size of a large cookie” (p. 177).

Pullen), the Cyclades (Chapter 3, by Broodbank), and Crete (Chapter 4, by Wilson) and ending with Deger-Jalkotzy's Chapter 15 on the end of the Bronze Age. Thematic chapters (such as Chapter 9 by Betancourt on Minoan trade and Chapters 13A and B by Cavanagh and Palaima on Mycenaean burial customs and religion, respectively) are interspersed. A decision with which not everybody might agree, is that the middle Helladic period does not receive its own chapter but is divided over two chapters, separated by no fewer than seven chapters on the Cyclades and Minoan Crete: "the beginning of the middle Helladic period" forms the last part of Chapter 2, while "the state of affairs at the beginning of the middle Bronze Age" and "settlement organization and architecture" in the middle Bronze Age are inserted in the middle of Chapter 10 by Wright, on Early Mycenaean Greece.

The emphasis of the book is historical, rather than art-historical or anthropological (p. 15); the choice of sites and artifacts, as well as of topics included is somewhat conservative, as is to be expected in a Companion volume. At the same time, the Companion is naturally a product of its age: a recurring emphasis on feasting as related to state formation and social-political organization (Chs. 2, 4, 5A and B—on Protopalatial Crete—and 10), representative of an attempt to explain processes in terms of ideology, and a post-processualist focus on individual experience and even thought (the former made explicit in Knappett's Chapter 5B on protopalatial material culture and in Chapters 12A, on Mycenaean economy and administration by Shelmerdine and Bennett; the latter occurring in Chapters 3, 7—Minoan religion, burial, and administration, by Younger and Rehak—and 13A), represent some of the more recent theoretical approaches in the field. Summaries of research in the sub discipline of Aegean texts, and their integration with more traditional archaeology in Chapters 7, 12A, and 13B, I found especially useful. Occasionally, there are thought-provoking suggestions, such as in Palaima's treatment of Mycenaean religion, where he links the Homeric account of sacrifices performed by Nestor with the archaeologically visible emphasis on feasting and religion at Pylos (pp. 348, 354). Sometimes these suggestions may go too far: when e.g. Younger and Rehak identify (albeit tentatively) the goddess in Xeste 3 in Akrotiri as Artemis, "known in Linear B" (p. 181), one wonders to what extent Mycenaean and Minoan deities may be conflated; their speculations about a (partial?) Minoan matriarchy being replaced by a Mycenaean patriarchy (p. 182) are sure to be contested as well. In fact, Chapter 12B (on Late Minoan II-III B Crete), features Preston's alternative view of the same evidence (as consumption motivated by "strategic social or political reasons," p. 312).

This is not the only case when, where consensus is lacking, both viewpoints are represented (other examples are the issue of "high" versus "low" chronology (pp. 5-7),

or the dating of the final destruction of Knossos);<sup>30</sup> in general, the information is balanced. Although all contributions are of high quality and up to date, they are unavoidably somewhat unequal in perspective and emphasis, with some chapters focusing on explanation for certain key events (e.g. Chapters 5A by Manning and 10, on state-formation on Crete and the Mycenaean mainland, respectively), while others are largely limited to describing sites and artifacts (e.g. Davis' Chapter 8: its central question, "Can we detect a Minoan thalassocracy in the Aegean?" [p. 188] in the beginning and its "explanation of cultural change" [p. 202] at the end, frame the bulk of the article, a summary of the evidence for Cretan material remains or architectural forms at various sites); another example is Chapter 14 ("Mycenaean Greece, the Aegean, and Beyond") by Mee, which is largely a summary of sites. The result is a rich mix of perspectives, where the same sites and phenomena may be described and/or analyzed from different perspectives: e.g. Early Prepalatial Crete features in Chapter 4, but reappears in Chapters 5A and 9; Early Mycenaean Greece is the subject of Chapter 10, but also appears in Chapter 11 (Mycenaean art and architecture) by Crowley.

Many photos (all of which are in black and white) are unfortunately out of focus or otherwise of amateur quality. More important is, however, that the choice of illustrations appears almost random at times: in some cases the photos fail to explain or add to the text (e.g. pl. 13.1), while elsewhere illustrations would have been useful but are lacking. The chapters on Neopalatial material culture (Chapter 6, by Younger and Rehak) and Mycenaean art and architecture (Chapter 11) naturally suffer the most from these imperfections. Another minor criticism is the lack of consistency in terminology between Chapters 7 and 11. The latter chapter introduces the unusual term: "horn bows" (p. 280) for the more common "snake frame headdress" (p. 168) and the somewhat awkward "kneeling the boulder" (p. 279) versus the more common "boulder-embracing" (p. 167). A consistency of the same terms throughout the book would have been more felicitous.

These quibbles however do not detract from the overall quality of this Companion. Impressive in scope, easy to use, very readable, and scholarly and reliable in its contents, this is an invaluable handbook, well worth its price. Students and specialists alike are sure to draw on this book time and again.

MARGARETHA KRAMER-HAJOS  
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

**Scott McGill, Cristiana Sogno, and Edward Watts, eds. *From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians. Later Roman History and Culture 184–450 CE*. Yale Classical Studies,**

---

<sup>30</sup> Betancourt, in Chapter 9, p. 219, and Preston, in Chapter 12B, p. 311, courteously cross reference each other's "different view."

vol. 34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Pp. ix + 321. ISBN: 978-0-521-89821-8.

The “long fourth century” is the subject of the volume dedicated to John Matthews on occasion of his 70<sup>th</sup> birthday. The collection of 13 contributions explores topics of the period from the emperor Diocletian to the emperor Theodosius II. Reaching from 284 to 450 CE, it is an age that lasts more than a century, but it can be seen as a unity as far as social, political, and literary evolution is concerned.<sup>31</sup>

After the editors’ introduction the book is divided in three parts. The first investigates “Politics, Law, and Society,” the second covers “Biography and Panegyrics,” the third describes different “Faces of Theodosius I.” The extraordinary richness and diversity of Matthews’s interpretation and reconstruction of the later Roman society is reflected in the plurality of topics which appear in these essays. It is, however, possible to read this volume in a free manner, without adhering strictly to these parts, because each contribution touches the subjects of politics, law, society, and culture. More importantly a “fil rouge” can be seen connecting most of the papers, i.e. the interplay between classical culture and Christianity.

Investigating Constantine’s testamentary legislation, Jill Harries<sup>32</sup> shows that this legislation is much more embedded in the Roman legal tradition than is often acknowledged. Being the first Christian emperor, Constantine has an image that was and is often distorted. His legislation, even that explicitly concerning Christian matters, was inserted into structures owing to the secular Roman legal tradition. The compilers of the Theodosian Code could use Constantine’s letters and edicts as *leges generales*, i.e. also letters and edicts (or parts of them) referring to specific problems were taken as general law, although this was not necessarily the legislator’s original intention. By selecting, arranging, and excerpting former legislation, the editors could become the factual lawmakers. In such a way unwarranted legislative intentions were in many cases ascribed to Constantine.

---

<sup>31</sup> S. McGill, C. Sogno, E. Watts, *Introduction*, 6.

<sup>32</sup> J. Harries, *Constantine the lawgiver*, 73–92 (Chapter 4). A very interesting law issued by Constantine – CTh. 7.20.2 and the corresponding one in the Codex Iustinianus CI. 12.46.1 – is analyzed in another paper by S. Connolly, *Constantine answers the veterans*, 93–114 (Chapter 5). The passage describes an encounter between the emperor Constantine and his veterans who complain about public duties and taxes and ask for the emperor’s intervention. In the first part of the collection there are two other essays about Roman patronage: P. Garnsey, *Roman patronage*, 33–53 (Chapter 2), analyzes the question of the role of patronage in late antiquity and demonstrates that it increased according to the growth of the bureaucratic apparatus; C. Sogno, *Roman matchmaking*, 55–71 (Chapter 3), describes the activity of powerful patrons in arranging socially and economically advantageous matches on behalf of their protégés, focusing on a special type of *epistula commendaticia* by authors like Symmachus, Pliny, and Augustine.

Similarities between pagan and Christian philosophical biography writing in the fourth and fifth century are inquired by Edward Watts.<sup>33</sup> These writings fulfilled similar functions and used similar rhetoric. By showing the life of a thinker and linking his ideas with deeds, they tried to convince the reader of the power and achievements of his thoughts. Christian biographers used the established argumentation of the pagan philosophical biography genre and applied it to their biographical writing. Thus, Watts recognizes a literary bridge joining philosophical biographies of the tetrarchy with the Christian ones of the Theodosian age.

Paulinus' poem *Thanksgiving to God in the Form of My Journal* (*Eucharisticos Deo sub ephemeridis meae textu*) is analyzed by Josiah Osgood.<sup>34</sup> Ausonius' grandson wrote this autobiography consisting of 616 verses in 460 CE, when he was 84 years old.<sup>35</sup> The course of education had been the same for hundreds of years. Paulinus' early education started at home (in Bordeaux), when he was three years old, with speaking, deportment, and basic morality and he was taught by his parents and possibly by a teacher. Later, in school, it went on with grammar, reading, and poetry. Paulinus mentions reading of Homer and Virgil (in this order)—but no Christian texts. The poem reflects Paulinus's opinion that he was not taught the important education in school, but rather through practical experience in adulthood: "God, or Christ, is the ultimate teacher."<sup>36</sup>

The relationship between the end of Roman historiography in the west and the beginning of a new common consciousness of Latin Christian literature is investigated by Mark Vessey.<sup>37</sup> He describes such a relationship and recognizes that a historical analysis can already be seen in Jerome's *Chronici canones* as a "prologue to the post-Roman historical consciousness of the west."<sup>38</sup>

The imposing figure of Gregory of Nazianzus is object of two different studies. Susanne Elm<sup>39</sup> investigates the characters of Julian, the emperor, and Gregory of Nazianzus, the theologian, who were witnesses of their time and nemesis. Elm describes how it was Gregory's influence that shaped the character Julian as "the Apostate" and "Christ-hater" and framed the dominant view of the latter for centuries. Julian has

<sup>33</sup> E. Watts, *Three generations of Christian philosophical biography*, 117–133 (Chapter 6).

<sup>34</sup> J. Osgood, *The education of Paulinus of Pella: learning in the late empire*, 135–152 (Chapter 7).

<sup>35</sup> Another literary work is investigated by S. McGill, *Another man's miracles: recasting Aelius Donatus in Phoca's Life of Virgil*, 153–169 (Chapter 8), who focuses on the only Virgilian biography written in verse by the biographer Phocas, a grammarian and teacher at Rome in the late fourth or fifth century.

<sup>36</sup> Osgood, *The education*, 145; cf. 148.

<sup>37</sup> M. Vessey, *Reinventing history: Jerome's Chronicle and the writing of the post-Roman West*, 265–289 (Chapter 13).

<sup>38</sup> Vessey, *Reinventing history*, 268.

<sup>39</sup> S. Elm, *Gregory of Nazianzus's Life of Julian revisited (Or. 4 and 5): the art of governance by invective*, 171–182 (Chapter 9).

nowadays been rehabilitated because of the rediscovered “panegyric” made by Ammianus Marcellinus.

The second paper, written by Neil McLynn,<sup>40</sup> describes the effective partnership between Gregory of Nazianzus and another emperor, Theodosius I. Some months after his arrival in Constantinople, Theodosius expelled the bishop Demophilus who did not want to believe in the synod of Nicene. Gregory, willing to accept the terms set by Theodosius, succeeded, but his appointment was a testing one. McLynn intends to enlighten two important Theodosian laws by putting them into the context of the speeches held by Gregory at that time: the edict of Thessalonica in February 380 CE (C.Th.16.1.2), defining Catholic Christianity as the religion the people must believe in, and the command to Eutropius in January 381 CE (C.Th.16.5.6), prohibiting heretical, i.e. homoean gatherings, and ordering expulsion from the cities for those who revolt against it. Gregory’s Oration 37 attests Theodosius being a defender of the church because of such legislation. The emperor issued the laws in favor of his church and the bishop interpreted them in an accurate way.

By describing Constantinople, Brian Croke<sup>41</sup> clears important aspects of Theodosius’s attitude to religion. While Constantine founded the new imperial and Christian capital, his successors used it rather as a transit camp. Theodosius I spent most of his reign in the surroundings of Constantinople from 380 to 394 CE. The city was a cultural and intellectual center at that time. Gregory of Nazianzus and Jerome can be mentioned as examples. Several religious factions were competing and gathered in different churches, whereas the Arians dominated the main churches. Despite his law from Thessalonica, in which he prescribed the Orthodox Catholic religion as support for the doctrinal tenets of the bishops of Rome and Alexandria, Theodosius’s view was to bring congregations together and let them find their common ground by listening to the non-orthodox leaders, too. However, overall and according to this law from Thessalonica, the orthodox group strengthened its position, soon had the control over the main churches, and finally the liturgical places were cleaned from non-orthodox practices.

A particular aspect of Theodosius’ reign is studied by Peter Heather.<sup>42</sup> He analyzes Themistius’ Oration 15 from 381 CE in the context of that time. The author emphasizes the mutual benefit, for Theodosius as well as for Themistius, which characterized this relationship. The former was in need of public reassurance, facing critical political, military, social, and religious problems in Constantinople and the eastern empire, whereas the latter could consolidate his political position once more on grounds of Theodosius’s benevolence. Themistius’ Oration 15 and Oration 16 from 383 CE also reflect the emperor’s ideological and practical efforts to deal with the problems of his

---

<sup>40</sup> N. McLynn, *Moments of truth: Gregory of Nazianzus and Theodosius I*, 215–239 (Chapter 11).

<sup>41</sup> B. Croke, *Reinventing Constantinople: Theodosius I’s imprint on the imperial city*, 241–264 (Chapter 12).

<sup>42</sup> P. Heather, *Liar in winter: Themistius and Theodosius*, 185–213 (Chapter 10).

---



regime mentioned above. Especially Oration 16 shows how Theodosius addressed the second problem, the military one. Hence, Themistius, who seems well informed about these considerations, introduces and argues for compromising peace with the Goths which finally came off in 382 CE and would endure until Alaric's revolt in 395 CE. Heather admits a kind of development line between Theodosius's peace treaty of 382 with the Goths, Alaric's revolt in 395, and lastly, the end of the western Roman empire in 476.

The volume shows well how the coexistence of classical culture and Christian religion is typical of late antiquity. Posterity, and particularly Christian literature, has often oversimplified that dualism. This is evident, for instance, in the case of Constantine<sup>43</sup> and of Julian,<sup>44</sup> who were not just—respectively—a Christian emperor and a non-Christian emperor. I believe that the same applies to Theodosius. This emperor had the vision to bring congregations together: he let them find their common ground.<sup>45</sup> Also his relation to the non-Christian philosopher Themistius is telling in this respect.<sup>46</sup> This all clarifies that Theodosius was not only a paladin of Christianity and that Christian sources have overplayed the context and his motivation, conveying him in this unilateral image to us.<sup>47</sup> For this and many other messages the collection “From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians” is a valuable contribution: it pays a worthy tribute to John Matthews, one of the most eminent late empire historians of our age.

IOLE FARGNOLI  
UNIVERSITY OF BERN/MILAN

**Flora R. Levin.** *Greek Reflections on the Nature of Music*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Pp. xxiii +340 p., 10 figs., bibliography, index. ISBN:13 9780521518901.

Flora Levin's work on ancient Greek music theory has spanned many decades, beginning with her papers “The Hendecachord of Ion of Chios” and “*Synesis* in Aristoxenian Theory,” both of which were read by title at the 93rd and 103rd Annual Meetings of the American Philological Association (APA) and subsequently published in volumes 92 and 103 of the APA's *Transactions and Proceedings*; continuing in her 1967 Columbia University dissertation, “Nicomachus of Gerasa *Manual of Harmonics*: Translation and Commentary” (subsequently revised and published in 1994 by Phanes

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Harries, *Constantine*, 92.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Elm, *Gregory*, 182.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Croke, *Reinventing Constantinople*, 247.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Heather, *Liar in winter*, 185 ss.

<sup>47</sup> On Theodosius's constitutions as eloquent trace of the idea that this emperor cannot be labeled as a model of uncompromising and coherent defender of the Christian faith, see my *Many Faiths, one Emperor. Remarks about the Religious Legislation of Theodosius the Great*, in *Revue Internationale des Droits de l'Antiquité*, 52, 2005 (but 2006), 147 ss.

Press as *The Manual of Harmonics of Nicomachus the Pythagorean*); and extending through her useful monograph, *The Harmonics of Nicomachus and the Pythagorean Tradition* (published in 1975 as the inaugural volume in the APA series *American Classical Studies*), several other papers appearing in *Hermes* (most recently in 2007) and *Alexandria*, and a couple of short articles for the second edition of the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. These are technical studies intended for specialists, all of them quite detailed and carefully presented.

The title of the present volume might lead readers to assume that it expands on her earlier work by providing a close scholarly reading of the various ways in which Greek writers viewed music in philosophical, aesthetic, and technical terms. In fact, though, the book is primarily a defense of Aristoxenus's theory of music against its numerous detractors in later antiquity, the Middle Ages, and even the present day, in which Levin pleads her case not so much by a detailed analysis of classical texts (although there are plenty of quotations) as by arguments that seek to show Aristoxenus's profound insights and the pervasive relationships among music, mathematics, and the cosmos by drawing not only on classical writers (and the usual array of scholars who have written about them) but also on a diverse group of modern writers ranging across psychologists and philosophers such as Carl Seashore, Oliver Sacks, John Sloboda (apparently the source for her treatment of Noam Chomsky and Heinrich Schenker, who are not otherwise cited in the footnotes or the bibliography), Bertrand Russell, Friedrich Nietzsche, Ludwig Wittgenstein, and Susanne (not "Susan," as on p. 4, n. 7) Langer; aestheticians and critics such as Edward Rothstein, Roger Scruton, Deryck Cooke, Robin Maconie, Wayne Bowman, Victor Zuckerkandl, and Peter Kivy; and historians of science and the occult such as Otto Neugebauer, Joscelyn Godwin, Bruce Stephenson, Sir James Jeans, and Jamie James. Even a few musicologists and musicians such as David Blum, Nicholas Cook, J. S. Bach, Ludwig van Beethoven, Felix Mendelssohn, Johannes Brahms, P. I. Tchaikovsky, Igor Stravinsky, Paul Hindemith, Pablo Casals, and Iannis Xenakis are drawn into the mix.

I am not sure that this rather overwhelming array of voices actually helps Levin make her point that "the Greeks were the first to intuit music's essence, and the first to discover the universal laws governing its structure. They were the first to perceive the elements of music not as isolated entities detached from one another but as integral parts of an organic whole from which each part derived its meaning and position" (p. xvi). Musicological readers will be skeptical about many of her musical observations, which appear to be drawn primarily from reading about music rather than from music itself, and thus are likely to remain unpersuaded by arguments about "universal laws" and "music's essence." Classicists unfamiliar with the subject of ancient Greek music theory will probably not gain much sense of the workings of the theory and the complex controversies (ancient and modern) surrounding it, and whatever they make of the

---

testimony of all these non-classical authors, they are likely to remain skeptical about the method of argumentation and the absence of any Greek or Latin in the footnotes to support the numerous translations (which must either be accepted on faith or checked against texts that may not always be readily available), not to mention the seeming lack of awareness of recent scholarship on the text of Philodemus that has altered its interpretation. Specialists on the subject of ancient Greek music theory will find little here they did not already know, and although I personally share Levin's view of Aristoxenus as a philosopher of music whose profound insights have been misrepresented and misunderstood by many (though not all) later writers up to the present day and applaud her for pointing out deficiencies in some of the modern scholarly treatments that have been highly influential in the field (see especially pp. 70–82 and 108), I do not think her arguments will change any minds.

The book is arranged in eight chapters and a *sphragis*, preceded by a brief preface and an introduction stating the author's primary aim (p. xvi):

This book is an inquiry into the diverse ways in which the ancient Greeks contemplated and dealt with the nature of music. My purpose is to exhibit music as an integral part of their philosophical, mathematical, and cosmological pursuits. ... What they achieved in music and musicology, although comparable to their accomplishments in literature, art and science, philosophy, history, mathematics, and cosmology, has gained them far less attention.

Although this aim is certainly pursued, it is in some ways secondary to the author's argument stated at the end of the introduction (p. xvii):

... Aristoxenus' method is in essence a profoundly dialectic one from which he obtained a fixed constant of measurement. This enabled him to deal with problems of attunement that could not be solved by traditional methods of arithmetic and elementary geometry. Through this technique, Aristoxenus arrived at the concept of continuity by observing the surrounding dense (*pykna*) melodic media. The deep-lying power of Aristoxenus' method is that it enriches the study of interrelations among discrete integers. In so doing, he summoned to the aid of theorists new relations among continuous magnitudes. In short, Aristoxenus, I believe, was practicing analytic number theory centuries before its foundations were laid by such luminaries as Peter Gustav Lejeune Dirichlet [*sic, recte* Dirichlet], Bernhard Riemann, Georg Cantor, Leopold Kronecker, and Karl Weierstrass.

Some sense of the tone of the book may be gathered from the evocative chapter titles and accompanying epigraphs. Chapter 1, "All Deep Things Are Song" (from Thomas Carlyle's "Hero as Poet," with Emily Dickinson's Poem 501 as an epigraph), introduces the question "What is music?" This age-old question leads to an introduction of Pythagorean and phenomenological notions of music and the dichotomy between them, drawing in not only ancient writers such as Homer, Plato, Ptolemy, and Bacchius Geron but also many of the modern writers noted above. In fact, almost everyone from Homer to Chomsky appears in this first chapter, with the voices of Dawn Upshaw, Cecilia Bartoli, and Frederica von Stade likened to the voice of Circe along the way.

Chapter 2, “We Are All Aristoxenians” (epigraph from Yeats’s *Sailing to Byzantium*), presents a perceptive treatment of the music theory of Aristoxenus, its basis in Aristotelian concepts, and its transmission by the later Aristoxenians, who largely failed to understand its philosophical bases and reduced it to a series of technical descriptions. She sees this same failure in the work of such modern scholars as J. F. Mountford, R. P. Winnington-Ingram, W. D. Anderson, Giovanni Comotti, J. G. Landels, and M. L. West, while showing echoes of Aristoxenus’s approach in the writings of Maconie, James, Kivy, and others, even if Aristoxenus is not always explicitly acknowledged.

Chapter 3, “The Discrete and the Continuous” (epigraph from T. S. Eliot’s *Little Gidding*), has to do with the problem of defining a melodic line. Is it comprised of discrete points (and if so, what are they and how are they determined?), is it a continuously modulated movement, or is it something else? In Levin’s view, Aristoxenus rejected the notion of music as ruled by number (a view commonly associated with the Pythagoreans) in favor of “the disposition or natural *synthesis* of magnitudes or intervals that admit motion (*kinēsis*) and the discrete points of pitch that admit stoppage (*stasis*).” Thus, “... a melody that accords with the laws of *harmonia* owes its melodiousness not simply to the notes and intervals of which it is composed, but above all, to a definite principle of *synthesis* whereby its intervals (possessed of motion) and its notes (possessed of stoppage) are collocated” (p. 113). This leads to the conundrum: “How can what is truly continuous be constituted of distinguishable or indivisible parts?” (p. 118) and introduces the subject of Aristoxenus’s division of musical space into equal parts, a division incompatible with the Pythagorean system of measurement by ratios. The subject is pursued at length in chapter 4, “Magnitudes and Multitudes” (epigraph from Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* [1020a8–10]), which notes in passing that Aristoxenus chooses one-twelfth (of the interval of a tone, although this is not made clear until the following chapter) as a sufficiently small unit with which “to break down the mathematically logical opposition between magnitude (*megethos*) and multitude (*plēthos*), in effect, between geometry and arithmetic” (p. 121) in measuring musical space; this preliminary observation is then followed by an overview of the Pythagorean system of magnitudes as presented in the famous *Division of the Canon*, sometimes attributed to Euclid.

Chapter 5, “The Topology of Melody” (epigraph adapted from Jane Austen’s *Mansfield Park*), begins with an overview of the relationships Ptolemy draws between the cosmos and various elements of Greek music theory, emphasizing the division of the circle of the zodiac into twelve component parts, related in turn to Copernicus, Kepler, Newton, and even Superstring theory. This leads into a consideration of time and space in music and eventually to Aristoxenus’s establishment of twelve as the number to be used to divide the octave into equal semitones and the tone into equal and commensurable quarters (3/12ths), thirds (4/12ths), and halves (6/12ths), thereby

---

accomplishing the reduction of magnitude to multitude, as adumbrated in the previous chapter.

Chapter 6, “Aristoxenus of Tarentum and Ptolemaïs of Cyrene” (epigraph from Juvenal’s *Satire* 6.165), elaborates on Aristoxenus’s system and the ways in which it was understood by later writers such as Cleonides, Aristides Quintilianus, and especially Ptolemy. The chapter also introduces Ptolemaïs, fragments of whose writings are preserved in Porphyrius’s commentary on Ptolemy’s *Harmonics*. She is the only known female music theorist of antiquity, and the balance of the chapter presents a highly speculative identification of her as the great-granddaughter of Ptolemy I Soter (figure 8, which should have appeared in this chapter rather than the following, is unfortunately reproduced in such a garbled form as to be almost incomprehensible). Ptolemaïs looms large in chapter 7, “*Aisthēsis* and *Logos*: A Single Continent” (with Emily Dickinson’s Poem 1354 as an epigraph), which is devoted to an examination of the conflict between the Pythagorean view of music through *logos* and the Aristoxenian view through *aisthēsis*, conveyed initially in an imaginary dialogue among Ptolemy, Porphyrius, and Ptolemaïs, constructed by Levin from slightly altered excerpts from Ptolemy’s *Harmonics* and Porphyrius’s commentary. Levin then enlarges on each of the respective positions of the dialogue, returning at the end to a reiteration of Aristoxenus’s effort to explain the “*continuum* of musical sound that escapes all traditional geometric representation”: “Aristoxenus was led by his calculations of fixed units of measure to create the finite forms of melody from the infiniteness of the melodic *topos*” (pp. 294–95).

Chapter 8, “The Infinite and the Infinitesimal” (epigraph from Aristoxenus’s *Harmonics* 3.69), observes that Aristoxenus sought “to provide an affinity (*oikeiotēs*) between all the ancient styles of melody (*tropoi*), all the pitch ranges of the voice and instruments (*tonoi*), and all the scales and genera (*systemata* and *genē*) of theory, such that modulations (*metabolai*) from one style, key, and genus to another could be easily effected” (p. 297). Perhaps because so little has been said about it up to this point, a very brief description of modulation among the *tonoi* then follows, after which Levin concludes: by developing a new “concept of melodic space or *topos*, a space inhabited by homogeneous objects—notes, consonances, dissonances, functions, and species ...” and establishing between them spatial relations, “[Aristoxenus] abstracted from the properties of these objects only those that are determined by their spacelike relationships. These relationships define what Aristoxenus conceived of as his Science of Melody” (p. 302).

The purpose of the *sphragis* is unclear. It is an uncredited adaptation of Callimachus, Epigram 2 (Pfeiffer = AP 7.80 = G-P 34), which Levin has also included at the end of her 2007 *Hermes* article, “*Ἀπειρία* in Aristoxenian Theory.”

Unfortunately, the value of this unique book is reduced by a very large number of typographical errors. There is little point in listing all of them here: specialists will easily

spot and correct them; general readers will probably not even notice many of them. Nevertheless, in addition to those noted above, at least a few should be corrected here: the lines of the continuation of n. 58 on p. 119 should be read in the order 1–3, 5–6, 4, 7–9; the chromatic tetrachord shown on p. 152 is incorrect (when the larger interval, 32:27 in its least terms, is subtracted from 4:3, 9:8 is the remainder, which cannot be divided into two equal ratios; Archytas proposed a chromatic tetrachord of 28:27, 243:224, 32:27, but this does not divide 9:8 into anything like equal parts; later theorists would commonly divide 9:8 into the greater semitone of 16:15 and the lesser semitone of 135:128, which are still not equal but differ by only a bit less than a syntonic comma); the pitches given in n. 22 on p. 164 for Earth should be G, A-, G, and those for Mercury are a third too high; the diagram in the continuation of n. 97 on p. 196 misrepresents the proof as actually given by Aristoxenus; on p. 199, the number of semitones in the fifth should be 7 rather than 6; the descriptions of the twelfth and twelve-hundredth roots of 2, credited to Helmholtz's *On the Sensations of Tone*, are not quite correct because Helmholtz presents both sides of the equation as ratios and Levin presents only one side as a ratio (the first reference to the twelfth root of 2 also contains one extraneous number); the fractions for the hemiolic chromatic on p. 202 should be 3/8 rather than 3/4, and several of the fractions on pp. 216–17 are garbled; the first of the enharmonic ratios of Eratosthenes given in n. 23 on p. 215 should be 40:39, and Eratosthenes' computation of the diatonic genus has indeed come down to us (as 256:243, 9:8, 9:8), as Levin herself notes on p. 222, although the ratios she gives for the diatonic genera of Didymus and Eratosthenes are incorrect (Didymus should read 9:8. 10:9, 16:15; Eratosthenes should read as noted just above); the reference on p. 241 to the "Viennese scribe" of Vindobonensis gr. 176, "known to us only as T," is based on a misunderstanding of Ingemar Düring's identification of the manuscript—not the scribe—with the siglum T in his edition of the text of Porphyrius's commentary and the assumption that the scribe must be Viennese since the manuscript is in Vienna, when in fact the manuscript dates from the sixteenth century and the hand is quite probably that of Ioannes Honorios, the famous Calabrian scribe and conservator at the Vatican Library who copied several manuscripts for the Palatine Library; and on p. 299, the *amelodētos* number should be 1/12, not 1/2. Finally, in the bibliography, the sixth and following entries credited to André Barbera are actually by Andrew Barker; "Bowman, A. C." is actually Alan C. Bowen; "James, Sir J." is actually Sir James Jeans; "Nietsche, F." is Friedrich Nietzsche (his name is also misspelled in the title); several authors' names are given multiple times in varying forms; and almost all the Greek that appears in titles is garbled (a problem that appears in the footnotes, too).

Flora Levin died in April 2009, and judging from the quality of her earlier work, I assume these problems result largely from her inability to check the proofs in the final stages of production. If this is so, Cambridge University Press could easily (and should)

have enlisted a specialist copyeditor to check and correct the proofs for her. It is a shame that the final publication of a scholar who contributed so much to the study of ancient Greek musical thought—and who, in addition, was always generous in acknowledging the work of others (my own included)—should not have appeared in a form worthy of this unique and original treatment.

THOMAS J. MATHIESEN  
INDIANA UNIVERSITY