

Campbell takes as his overriding theme the relationship of difference and distance in looking at other peoples. An ethnocentric Graeco-Roman civilisation views the peoples at their world's boundaries in terms of breaking down of the norms of the Mediterranean centre; an idea familiar to readers of Hartog and of other studies such as J. S. Romm's *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought* (1992). But Campbell looks in particular at the ways in which the peoples at the geographical extremities are endowed with features also attributed to the peoples of prehistory: spatial and chronological primitivism are frequently bound together. To this end, he rightly gives careful attention in the first three chapters to the various accounts of evolution and prehistory to be found in both mythological and philosophical contexts.

Particular stress is laid on the potency, longevity and relative stability of the various components of these myths of primitivism. Like Hartog, he tends to take them as indicative of ethnocentric mirrors on society; although they will offer reflections with different elements and emphases according to the particular context or outlook of the gazer. He notes the importance of Lovejoy and Boas' study and makes a timely re-evaluation of their ideas with important modifications. He argues, for instance, that their divisions of ancient ideas into positive and negative accounts of primitivism and progression is 'essentially false'; the two viewpoints were not nearly so clear-cut and are better viewed as 'two sides of the same coin' (p. 40). Elements from one or the other may predominate in any one observer's view, but, equally, we may find elements of both in the same account. Moreover, elements may not necessarily be given their expected evaluation; for example, the horror invited by Herodotus at the lapse into cannibalism of Cambyses' army in distant Ethiopia is not replicated in his description of the cannibalism of the Scythians, where the author makes no attempt to hide or romanticise their bloodthirstiness but does not criticise them either. In place of Romm's suggestion of a diachronic development, from an early positive view of the Scythians in Homer to a later negative view which Ephorus and Strabo try to combat, Campbell favours a more complex picture, where elements of opposing views may coexist.

The description of the Scythians, of course, raises the question, in cases where the people of the edges have some basis in reality, of the relationship between reality and myth. Such is the power of the myths of primitivism, in Campbell's view, that the latter tend to win out over reality, even when such peoples become more familiar. In other cases, the myth is preserved by relocation. In contrast to the images of the primitive peoples themselves, their geographical locations are far more fluid, and the myth can migrate to locations further afield once its original locality comes too far within the sphere of actual geographical knowledge. Even then, however, memories of the myth may linger in its original home, coexisting with elements of real ethnography, a phenomenon observable in the case of the Isles of the Blest.

The discussion of a 'real' geographical location, Arcadia, which is also home to a powerful primitivist myth, complicates the general picture which ties the strange/primitive/exotic to the geographical edges. Boundaries need not always be literal. With the Arcadian myth, the baggage of primitivism is

unpacked in a real location in the Mediterranean centre. This is an important qualification to the linkage of distance and the primitive 'other' and deserves more attention than it is given here.

A final chapter takes the discussion beyond antiquity and considers the continuation into later ages of what Campbell terms the domination of geographical thinking by conceptual models and the frequent bending of geography to accommodate anthropological preconceptions (p. 133). Thus, the Christian paradise sometimes gains a geographical location influenced by ancient utopias and may even be visualised entirely in terms of elements from the ancient tradition of exotic geography and anthropology, as in Ps. Lactantius' third-century description. Finally, early explorers of the New World carried with them the ancient imagery of marginal monsters, transplanting it once again into new locations. Once again, however, the cultural transference was by no means straightforward. The individual world-views and personal experiences of these later gazers into the anthropological mirror influenced not only which elements of the primitivist myth were highlighted, but also the interpretations placed upon them.

Campbell's study suggests that ideas of marginal humans were not in themselves marginal to ancient thought. On the contrary, they were integral to ancient ideas on the origin and nature of society and inseparable from fundamental questions of identity. They cannot be divorced from central aspects of philosophical thought, from cosmology to ethics, and are embedded in mythological constructs of the world. Campbell's book is too short to give a comprehensive treatment of such a large topic. Instead, the reader is offered a selection of illustrative examples or case studies. These are, however, well-chosen and are backed up by an excellent and wide-ranging selection of texts. As well as acting as a general introduction to the topic, this book will, appropriately, offer many new avenues for further exploration to those already acquainted with the fascinating world which it outlines with clarity and insight.

MARY BEAGON  
University of Manchester

*Oxford Readings in Ancient Literary Criticism.*

ANDREW LAIRD (Ed.).

Oxford University Press, 2006.

Pp. xii + 491.

Price £95.00 (\$295.00) Hardback £37.00 (\$55.00) Paperback.

ISBN-10: 0-19-925865-1, ISBN-13: 978-0-19-925865-9 Hardback.

ISBN-10: 0-19-925866-X, ISBN-13: 978-0-19-925866-6 Paperback.

This book is a seminar waiting to happen. Andrew Laird had one eye on Russell and Winterbottom's *Ancient Literary Criticism* (Oxford, 1972) when he made this collection, thinking to supplement that popular collection of texts with 'standard scholarship on canonical texts or major themes of ancient

theory and criticism' (p. 10). If one were to add a narrative survey, such as *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Volume I: Classical Criticism*, edited by G. Kennedy (Cambridge, 1989), or a synoptic overview, such as D. A. Russell's *Criticism in Antiquity* (Berkeley 1982), one would have the building blocks for a rich and wide-ranging survey. And such a course could as easily be directed at students of comparative literature as at classicists since Laird has translated all Greek and Latin and has chosen pieces to interest 'students and specialists in modern literature and poetics' (p. 9). Specialists will also find the book valuable not only for the convenience of having a number of classic essays together but for Laird's stimulating introduction and supplementary bibliography. The actual selection may strike some as a bit old-fashioned, but the book certainly has the potential to be an excellent teaching tool.

Everyone perhaps will think of an article that might have been included, but almost all are essays one would wish students to have read. Taken as a whole, the harvest is rich enough that it would be fussy to complain at Laird's bypassing – all the while acknowledging their importance (pp. 10-20) – such figures as Aristophanes, Cicero and Quintilian. As most titles will be familiar, I offer only a rapid overview of the contents. In starting off with Penelope Murray's 'Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece', Laird elides, probably wisely, the complexities of recovering pre-Socratic criticism; at the same time, Murray's essay neatly sets the table for the classical tradition with her demonstration that its central opposition between conscious artistry and frenzied genius is not an outgrowth of primordial 'Principles of Greek Literary Criticism' (the title of W. J. Verdenius' much cited essay from *Mnemosyne* 1983) but goes back to philosophic and literary agendas of Plato. I was delighted to see this followed by N.J. Richardson's magisterial 'Homeric Professors in the Age of the Sophists' (1975), though – to skip ahead – I confess I wished Laird had been able to find a more basic introduction to the Homeric scholia than Richardson's equally influential 'Literary Criticism in the Exegetical Scholia'. Students who need to distinguish a b from a T scholium will not find help in this learned discussion, and Richardson's focus on examples of sensible, especially Peripatetic interpretation gives an incomplete picture of the interests and methods – not always sensible or even sane in our eyes – of these scholars and teachers. By contrast, Don Fowler's introduction to 'The Vergil Commentary of Servius' manages, for all its brevity and generality, to suggest both the oddities and insights to be found in this corpus.

The vast sea of Platonic aesthetics is approached through Elizabeth Belfiore's 'A Theory of Imitation in Plato's *Republic*'. This densely argued 1984 study valuably combines Plato's remarks on poetry and on the visual arts in an attempt to smooth over the contradictions (as I still see them) between the way *mimesis* is presented in Book 3 of the *Republic* and Book 10. A general comparison between the positions of Plato and Aristotle is then provided by Stephen Halliwell's 'Plato and Aristotle on the Denial of Tragedy'. This thoughtful piece suggests that we move beyond the simple opposition of the two as moralist and formalist, and consider instead how tragedy posed a fundamental challenge to each thinker's ideas about the

possibilities for human happiness. To round out Aristotle, Laird has found A.M. Dale's valuable essay on *ethos* and *dianoia* in the *Poetics* and has reprinted (yet again, but it is welcome) Jennifer Barnes' translation of Bernays on catharsis, a *locus classicus* of the 'outlet' interpretation, discounted in the 1980's but now I am happy to see apparently renaissance.

Post-classical Greek criticism begins with Tony Long's 'Stoic Readings of Homer', an important revisionist account that explodes the facile generalization that all Stoics read all poetry as all allegory all the time; instructive examples show that these subtle thinkers were hardly blinkered, tin-eared readers. Other stereotypes are overturned in Elizabeth Asmis's 'Epicurean Poetics', most importantly the idea that hostility to poetry was the default Epicurean position. Her lucid and valuable survey goes from Epicurus through Lucretius, taking in Cicero and Philodemus (as of 1991) along the way.

To bridge the two national traditions, Laird has fruitfully foregrounded the topic of 'Rhetoric and Criticism' with an old gem by Donald Russell. The Dean of the history of criticism gives a solid overview of a massive subject along with stimulating perspectives, such as the observation that, from a rhetorical point of view, poets like Catullus and Propertius would have been seen as dramatic performers. Not bad for 1967. Russell is also tapped for his 1973 'Ars Poetica', a 'diffident' but creditable attempt to summarize the elusive poem. In 'Theories of Evaluation in the Rhetorical Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus', D. M. Schenkeveld argues, challengingly (though I have not seen this 1975 challenge taken up), that Dionysius' many literary judgments exhibit no coherent literary theory beyond a general affinity for those rhetoricians/theorists known as *kritikoi*. A negative conclusion, but valuable as keeping Dionysius in view; this huge corpus from a cardinal literary epoch seems to this reviewer to be as underutilized as Athenaeus was fifteen years ago: Dionysius obviously has much to tell us about Roman and Greek ways of forging cultural identity through literature, but we still need to develop a better sense of his *oeuvre* and the best ways into it. Longinus is served by a brief piece in which Doreen C. Innes argues that the 'Structure and Unity' of the *Peri hypsous* depend on repeated themes and imagery. Innes' careful discussion of the problems surrounding the programmatic sentence at 15.2 is well worth studying, though I still consider 'On the Sublime' the hardest piece of ancient criticism to do justice to in an essay (closely followed by the *Ars Poetica*). For this reason, my own suggestion of an essay Laird might have included would be 'A Reading of Longinus', Neil Hertz's cult classic from *Poétique* of 1972, subsequently reprinted in *Critical Inquiry* 9.3 (1983), pp. 579-96 and in his *The End of the Line: Essays on Psychoanalysis and the Sublime* (New York, 1985).

Plutarch's *Quomodo adulescens* is represented by another essay by Schenkeveld, which is typical of his many contributions to the history of criticism: it is a narrowly focused, very specific study that makes us confront the deepest issues raised by the work in question. The most off-beat (and recent) contribution in the book is Bruce Gibson's 1999 essay on 'Ovid on Reading: Reading Ovid. Reception in Ovid *Tristia* 2'. Gibson smartly applies a poetics of reception to the poem in order to complicate attempts to chalk it

up as either pro- or anti-Augustan. It is an important example of the possibility of considering formal poetic theory as *materia poetica*; so one must not object that the same topic could have been exemplified in a study of, say, Virgil, among countless other ancient reader/writers. Somewhat more traditional but no whit less rewarding is T. James Luce's 'Reading and Response in Tacitus' *Dialogus*'. Luce combines a pellucid review of scholarly controversies about the work with the powerful suggestion that interpreters bear in mind that Tacitus' speakers are giving a series of rhetorical performances.

After Fowler on Servius (see above), Thomas Rosenmeyer's 'Ancient Literary Genres: A Mirage?' (1985) points out that modern definitions of classical genres have a very insecure basis in the conflicting and confused ancient testimonies. He suggests (too radically for me) that the concept is useless because the prevalent ancient model of the poet as craftsman encouraged writers to think of their task less as following rules than as rivaling, aemulously, founding fathers in each form. Finally, Denis Feeney's 'Criticism Ancient and Modern' brings the whole project into focus by arguing that the value of ancient criticism can never be to provide a 'right', historically valid way to read ancient literature. Feeney reminds us that whatever we find useful in the ancients' modes of reading and whichever of their techniques and concepts we incorporate into our own exegetical practices, what we end up doing will perforce be *modern* criticism; tradition is not a place where we can hide from the choices that face us now.

Those who know Laird only from his more adventurous critical writings may be surprised at the 'varsity hue', as he puts it, worn by most of these essays. The average date of publication works out to 1984 (this after setting aside Bernays, which first appeared in 1857). To compensate for this Laird peppers his introductory chapter with notes to make connections with contemporary theory that are largely lacking from the essays themselves. And he has appended an extensive and up-to-date list of suggestions for further reading that makes an excellent entrée to current research. (Here again one ought not quibble, but I must say Thomas Cole's *Origins of Rhetoric* [Baltimore, 1991] belongs among the works on that topic.) Taken as a whole, however, it must be said that the collection gives little sense of developments in the study of ancient criticism since the 1990s. The most suggestive recent work has focused, in line with the general trend in literary scholarship toward cultural studies, less on canonical texts and problems than on bringing to light a larger set of cultural practices – often with recourse to inscriptions, archaeological remains and monuments – within which literary criticism made sense. The theories that Plato or Aristotle concocted about tragedy, for example, can be more fully appreciated in the light of such collections as Peter Wilson's *The Greek Theatre and Festivals: Documentary Studies* (announced from Oxford for June 2007) or Douglas Cairns and Vayos Liapis' *Diogenesalexandros: Essays on Aeschylus and his Fellow Tragedians in Honour of Alexander F. Garvie* (Swansea, 2006), both of which can help us understand tragic criticism as a response to the festival culture of the ancient world. So too, a theorist of 'imitation' would be helpfully reminded by Edith Hall's recent *The Theatrical Cast of Athens: Interactions between Ancient Greek*

*Drama and Society* (Oxford, 2006) that *mimesis* was far more than a problem in metaphysics.

Impeccably *au courant*, Laird is cognizant of these trends but has reservations about the turn toward cultural studies. In his introduction, 'The Value of Ancient Criticism', he worries that 'cultural historical' approaches (p. 7) can too easily decline into 19<sup>th</sup>-century positivism; he proposes that rather than 'establishing the context of critical thought about literature' (p. 9) we should exploit the continuities between ancient and modern literary discourse that make ancient critical texts particularly helpful for interrogating our own assumptions about literature. I agree with Laird that much cultural criticism nowadays is formulaic and predictable, and that those who assume that modern criticism is so advanced and sophisticated that it has nothing to learn from antiquity are, at best, parochial (p. 22). But I think his program for a dynamic, self-critical use of ancient criticism entails problems. Laird does not work out his agenda in detail, but I worry that the very perspectives we should single out from the ancient tradition as fruitfully provocative would be, by virtue of our having noticed them and taken them seriously in the first place, ultimately harmonisable with a classicizing view. Consider, for example, what we are to make of Laird's passing observation (p. 9, n. 20) that Plato's distinction in *Republic* 3 between *logos* and *lexis* – roughly between the 'stuff' and the 'mode' of a narrative – is the 'origin' of such significant later oppositions as that between *fabula* and *sjuzet* among Russian formalists or the narratologists' *récit* and *histoire*. What does this tell us? I do not, like some anti-historicists, recoil in horror at the very mention of the word 'origin'; we all know that it means only that the first attested logical equivalent of these testable historical datum, even if its significance must be cautiously assessed. (I myself suspect Plato's *lexis* is a catachresis of earlier rhetorical terminology, which favored *-sis* abstracts, but such fine-grained precision is beyond our evidence.) The point is that even on a generous conception of what constitutes an historical sequence of ideas, a 'tradition', there is an extremely wide gulf – in terms of social and cultural import, in relation to the prestige of science and so forth – between what such a phrase meant in the early fourth century and what those later dyads meant amid the great philosophical and linguistic revolutions of the early twentieth century. Not all structuralisms are the same, and part of the job of the history of criticism should be to help us appreciate the difference that can separate two critical formulations that are, considered atomically, close to synonymous. The ancient texts give us more than theoretical positions on which we might take a stand.

In the end, the approach Laird recommends tends toward making the history of criticism a history of ideas. To be sure, bearing down on the concepts and terms thrown up by ancient critics and noticing how they were revised and passed on offers invaluable perspectives on their literature, whether one aims to reorient one's own critical approach or to place ancient ways of reading in wider contexts. But this valuable collection can support another approach I would not like to be lost from sight, and this is to write a

history of criticism that is itself criticism, an encounter with the unique forms of intertextuality to be found in ancient writing about ancient writing.

ANDREW FORD  
Princeton University

*Cleopatra and Rome.*

DIANA E. E. KLEINER.  
Belknap Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2005.  
Pp. 340. Price: US\$29.95. ISBN 0-674-01905-9.

The thesis of Kleiner's book is that Cleopatra, through the art which she commissioned with Julius Caesar and Mark Antony, was a partner in a dialogue between elite Romans and Egyptians whose medium of communication was the visual arts. The result is that a plausible case can be made that Cleopatra and her monuments made a profound contribution to art in the age of Augustus' (p. 8). This immediately begs the question 'What monuments?' The Caesareum near the harbour in Alexandria, on which Cleopatra and Caesar collaborated, has now disappeared. Although Cleopatra may have added reliefs to the pre-existing Ptolemaic temples at Dendera, Edfu, Kom Ombo, and Philae, she did not herself initiate any new temples in Egypt. Nor did Antony leave any physical or written record, either in Alexandria or in Rome, of his time with Cleopatra. In fact it is not until we reach the time of Augustus and Cleopatra is safely dead that we find much evidence of 'Egyptianization' in Rome.

Unfortunately this initially interesting idea of Kleiner's, which deserves to have been first argued out and established if possible on a scholarly level in a journal like the *American Journal of Archaeology*, completely disappears from view in the early chapters of her book. This seems to be due to the exigencies of the general readership/coffee table book format into which the book has obviously had to be slotted. What we get instead are several chapters of ported biographies, firstly of Cleopatra herself (Chapter 1, 'Cleopatra Superstar'), then of The Major Players (Livia, Octavia, Julius Caesar, Mark Antony and Octavian Augustus), then of what is called The Supporting Cast (Julia, Gaius and Lucius Caesar, Tiberius, Agrippa, Messalla Corvinus, and Maecenas). It is difficult to understand what most of these last have to do with the book's theme, particularly those like Gaius and Lucius Caesar, who are written out of the script so early in the piece.

It is not until we get to p. 68 that we get back to the main thrust of the book. In chapters 5, 'Cleopatra Architecta', and 6, 'Alexandria on the Tiber', Kleiner discusses Cleopatra's relationship with Caesar and her visits to Rome in 46 and 44 BC and speculates on Cleopatra's possible involvement in Caesar's building projects, including his remodeling of the Roman Forum and construction of the Julian Forum. However, as she concludes, 'Cleopatra's contribution to Caesar's Rome is not easy to prove; there is no incontrovertible evidence, and thus there is room for speculation' (p. 96).

This is quite correct. It is one thing to recognize the Egyptian contribution to Caesar's 46 BC reform of the Roman calendar where Pliny, *NH* 18.2.11, explicitly tells us of the assistance given him by the Alexandrian astronomer Sosigenes, or the influence of the great Alexandrian Library as an inspiration for his plan for a similar public library in Rome. It is quite another to think of Caesar's building plans as inspired, even indirectly, by his experience of the civic centre of Alexandria.

Chapters 7 and 8 deal with the heroic and divine identities (Alexander the Great, Dionysus, Hercules, Apollo) which the protagonists Caesar, Pompey, Antony and Octavian adopted to define their self-image. Chapter 9, "Queen of Kings": Cleopatra Thea Neotera', similarly deals with the depiction of Cleopatra. These chapters are a lot stronger, as one would expect from an art historian. But Kleiner's acceptance of the triple uraeus as a secure identifying feature of statues of Cleopatra (p. 140) makes me uneasy. All of the statues with this feature, particularly the Hermitage statue (pl. 9.2), could just as well belong to Arsinoe II: see on this R. Bianchi, pp. 18-19 in S. Walker and S.-A. Ashron (eds.), *Cleopatra Reassessed* (London, 2003). Kleiner's later statement (p. 289) that she was unable to take account of this volume since her own text was completed before she became aware of its publication hardly inspires confidence in the reader. *Cleopatra Reassessed* represents an important reaction by scholars in the field to materials in the *Cleopatra of Egypt: From History to Myth* exhibition, shown in Rome, London, and Chicago in 2000-2001. In it different contributors question the identification of several supposed portraits of the queen. Although it is an extreme position, it may well be argued that the coin portraits remain our only secure guide to what Cleopatra may have looked like.

Chapters 10-19 address a diversity of topics, from the Egyptianizing monuments of Augustan Rome and the iconography of the Ara Pacis, to coin portraits of contemporary females and the power hairstyles of members of the imperial family. I do not want to take issue with particular points in each chapter, but in chapter 10 I do wish to query Kleiner's apparently uncritical acceptance (pp. 157-8) of Dio's story of Octavian's feigned profession of love for Cleopatra (Dio 51.8.5-6). Robbed by her suicide of his desire to win her over and parade her in his triumph, 'his frustration likely stayed with him and appears to have motivated him to continue to try to possess her' (p. 158). This desire for posthumous possession is then misrepresented as the driving force for any and all of the Egyptianizing elements in Augustus's public building programme. The appropriation of Egyptian obelisks (p. 168), the Egyptian decoration of the walls of the Aula Isiaca and the Villa Farnesina (pp. 170-4), the emperor's use of a signet ring bearing a sphinx, and the use of the sphinx as a coin type and its appearance on the breast plate of the Prima Porta statue (pp. 182-7) can all be sheeted home, it seems, to Augustus's desire for possession of Cleopatra's iconic power.

This is simply psychohistory for which there is no evidence. Dio's story of love, feigned or otherwise, is just rubbish, with no basis in fact. Indeed a few pages later Dio contradicts himself in his subsequent account of Octavian's meeting with the queen (Dio 51.12) where it is the Roman's coldness towards her which leads to Cleopatra's despair and final act of