with the wealthy, villa-dwelling élite of south-east England seems fully justified. Scholars such as Rivet and Frere are found guilty of an élitist concern with mosaics and hypocausts rather than mud huts; even Martin Millett may be found writing of the spread of Roman culture as 'progress' (p. 142). The notion of 'progress' employed here (and in Haverfield's work) is, H. argues, necessarily implicated in imperialism. It is not clear to me that scholars of colonial studies (for whom this book is described in the blurb as 'essential reading') would be very struck by the part recent Roman archaeologists have played in sustaining the imperialist world order (stressed by H., p. 153). Still, relativism is probably a more productive position to adopt for students of the ancient world; the recent shift toward excavating native villages rather than Roman-style villas will surely generate a more balanced picture of Britain under Roman rule.

British imperial administrators may well have looked to the Romans for frontier management strategies (as H. argues, p. 42), and Britons may well have sought to justify their own empire through comparisons with the enduring and prestigious empire of the Romans (though points of contrast often received greater emphasis). The attitudes of those modern scholars whose work is castigated by H. may indeed owe something to the concerns of earlier generations with empire. In the end, though, it is not clear that material discussed in the final section of the book is much illuminated by the preceding sections (or vice versa). A low point of this work is the sub-structuralist table of binary oppositions (Roman vs. native, Englishman vs. Celt, civilized vs. barbarian, 'us' vs. 'other', etc.) which he argues characterizes twentieth-century accounts of Romanization (p. 148). As H. himself concedes, one of the most striking features of discussions of the Romans in Britain is the slipperiness of identifications. Henty and Kipling are often seen as exemplars of turn-of-the-century imperialism—yet their pictures of Roman Britain are significantly diverse. While Henty invites his readers to identify with a young British leader who emulates Roman virtues, Kipling's central characters—though deeply attached to Britain—are Roman by descent. H.'s obsession with the evils of imperialism does not allow him to consider other factors which may have influenced debates about the Roman empire in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Britain. In the end, these were perhaps as much about justifying the position of Classics (perceived even then as under threat) as about legitimizing the British empire.

H.'s writing is inelegant, occasionally, indeed, almost incomprehensibly awkward. There are places, particularly in the earlier sections of the book, where the text lurches from one summary to another of the work of other scholars, often without spelling out their implications for H.'s own argument. Much of the material he has assembled is, however, of great interest. This will be a useful book for anyone studying Rome's place in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Britain.

Birkbeck College, London CATHARINE EDWARDS

VIRGIL IN THE VENETO

CRAIG KALLENDORF: *Virgil and the Myth of Venice. Books and Readers in the Italian Renaissance.* Pp. viii + 251, 12 pls. Cased, £40. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999. ISBN: 0-19-815254-X.

Kallendorf sets out his stall in a reflective introduction on his approach to the history of reading in light of the various trends in book history over the last forty years (it

© Classical Association, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.367 Published online by Cambridge University Press

seems odd, though, to start by contrasting his method with Rudolf Pfeiffer's in his *History of Classical Scholarship* [Oxford, 1968], a book which aims to do what it says on the cover and nothing else). He finds a slightly uneasy home with reader-response critics, where 'the experiences of real readers' are at the centre of literary history, a model tempered by his appreciation that the material form of the book must affect the responses of readers. Here, and more assertively in the afterword, he situates himself as a historically conditioned reader responding to fifteenth- and sixteenth-century readers as they responded to Virgil.

His 'real readers' are those who placed notes in the margins of 251 printed copies of Virgil, in Latin or Italian, which were printed in Venice or the Veneto in those centuries, and who themselves lived in the city or its territory. These annotations are used to propound the thesis that Virgil somehow struck a special chord with Venetians. They found in his texts material that echoed and sustained what is now called the 'myth of Venice'—in essence, that the city was uniquely stable and unchanging over the centuries, that its republican form of government was unimprovable, that its citizens were more than others endowed with piety and a sense of justice, so forming a cohesive 'interpretive community' where individual and factional interests yielded to the common good. The core of the book is an analysis of these annotations as they refer to morality, religion, and society. Where they fail, K. copiously and intelligently supplements by consideration of the commentaries (from Donatus and Servius to Landino and Badius Ascensius) that channelled these responses, of book illustrations that reflected or reinforced them, of Venetian poetry and drama that shed light on them, of schooling, printing history, and censorship that sought to accommodate or contain them. 'Accommodation' (of Virgil to the myth of Venice) and 'Resistance and Containment' (bringing objectionable or worrying aspects of the poetry into line with that vision) form balancing sections of each substantial chapter.

The result is a wide-ranging, multi-layered and informative discussion of the uses of Virgil in Renaissance Venice, all underlain by a consistent vision which K. takes to be distinctively Venetian. I am not so sure. It is a brave attempt to make sense of a sample of jottings in books that happen to survive nowadays in the Veneto. It is presumed that such books, if printed in the Veneto (Venice, Padua, Treviso, Verona, Vicenza are the towns counted as relevant; why not Brescia?), must equally have had owners from the Veneto, but this is by no means clear. As K. admits, most of the named owners (and most annotators have no name) are nowadays unknown to history and, unless they have a characteristically Venetian name, cannot be assumed to hail from Venice or the Veneto. Some of the present sample need not even be Italian, such as the 'Johannes Proger' on p. 155 who owned an incunable now in the Biblioteca Correr in Venice, surely the much-studied Nördlingen collector Johann Protzer. A note on p. 30 suggests that widening the net to take in the big international collections such as the British Library or the Bibliothèque nationale would lead only to 'a study of the reception of Venetian cultural values abroad'. Yet for the incunable period, where figures are easily assembled, those two libraries alone have between them thirty-two editions of Virgil published in the Veneto, many in multiple copies, where libraries in the Veneto (including just those towns mentioned above) can today show only nineteen editions, the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana itself having no more than nine. Many of those copies in the BL and the BN certainly had Venetian owners in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, some of them identifiable by name and perhaps by the other things K. is interested in—by gender, educational and social level, religious attitudes, and so on.

Well, *non omnia possumus omnes*: to conduct such a study on an ideal level would

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.367 Published online by Cambridge University Press

take one far beyond London and Paris, and would require the energy of several very long-lived Kallendorfs. The sample annotators as we have them do in fact sit well with the general thesis that Venetian humanists tended to affirm the civic values of their metropolis and not challenge them, even if much of the annotation is (as is the way of most annotators everywhere) banal and predictable. But there are fascinating insights and rewarding digressions along the way, and we must be grateful (again) to Craig Kallendorf for the learning and industry packed into this elegant book.

London MARTIN DAVIES

NEW IDOLS FOR OLD?

M. Wyke, M. Biddiss (edd.): *The Uses and Abuses of Antiquity*. Pp. 281, figs. Bern: Peter Lang, 1999. Paper, £25. ISBN: 0-8204-4217-8.

'Classical culture was once a temple at which we worshipped and our entry into it frequently confirmed our own cultural worth'. Thus Wyke and Biddiss begin their introductory essay, raising the reader's anticipation of radical iconoclasm. What is offered instead is a succinct summary of recent stages in the debate about the distribution of guilt for the various misogynies, ethnocentrisms, élitisms, and imperialisms which are variously to be found within antiquity and in its subsequent appropriations. The editors attack the transmission model (and its associated terminology of 'legacy' and 'heritage'), and demonstrate alternative ways of analysing and explaining the relationships between ancient and modern cultures. Their selection of essays recognizes that classical culture has been made protean by the theory and practice of modern engagements with its images and themes.

However, the editors perhaps accept too readily the assumption that antiquity has invariably been appropriated in order to silence or demonize challenges to the cultural supremacy of politically dominant white males. Social and cultural conservatism and even Romantic Hellenomania are surely nowadays soft targets, and current research is creating more nuanced perspectives about ways in which classical referents in art, literature, and theatre have been exploited as radical tools in aesthetic and political debate: Empedocles was a source for Chartist poetry as well as for Matthew Arnold, and Amy Levy's refiguration of *Medea* offered a devastating critique of late nineteenth-century attitudes to race and sexuality. Furthermore, sensitivity to the subtleties of Victorian cultural politics or to the ambivalent relationships between classical and post-colonial literatures inevitably returns critics to the ancient sources (both written and material) with a fresh inquisitorial agenda.

Several of the essays in the collection do serve as valuable challenges to simplistic models of appropriation, notably Carolyn D. Williams's study of Boadicea and English neoclassical embarrassment, and Edith Hall's discussion of burlesque and parody as a major feature in the staging of Greek tragedy in Britain between 1845 and the 1880s. Unusually in reception studies, Hall examines the commercial aspects of staging Greek plays. It would also be useful to probe the reasons why certain plays were selected for burlesque—*Alcestis* was perhaps anyway on the ragged edges of tragedy, but the potential of *Medea* for melodrama and black humour may also have been attractive (a factor exploited in 2000 by Liz Lochhead's version, premiered in Glasgow, and by the Fiona Shaw/Deborah Warner production in Dublin; for documentation see *http://www2.open.ac. uk/ClassicalStudies/GreekPlays/*).

The editors group the essays in four main sections. After Williams's and Hall's

© Classical Association, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.367 Published online by Cambridge University Press