

We turn back in time to a translation: *Rome's Italian Wars*, J. C. Yardley's version of Livy, *Books 6–10*.¹⁰ Oxford World's Classics completes its rendering of the history, and is much to be congratulated on doing so. Yardley has also translated two other volumes in the series, providing some consistency; Dexter Hoyos, who introduced *Hannibal's War*, has written introduction and notes for the present volume too. This book, covering the spread of Roman power over Italy and the struggles of individuals and classes at home (*plus ça change*), is instructive as well as entertaining, and it has benefited from the availability of Stephen Oakley's commentary (Oxford, 1997–2005). Yardley's translation is plain and straightforward, an easy read, with only the occasional yielding to exclamation marks, and Hoyos' introduction and notes – bringing out Livy's difficulties, his strengths and weaknesses – are equally clear. One Valerius Maximus in Tiberius' reign rather patronizes readers, but they will be glad of the chronology, maps, and glossary.

Readers will like to know that Gordon Kelly's *A History of Exile in the Roman Republic* has been issued as a paperback; the original was reviewed here in 2008.¹¹

B. M. LEVICK

barbara.levick@st-hildas.ox.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0017383513000302

Art and Archaeology

Mit Mythen Leben, the 2004 study of Roman sarcophagi by Paul Zanker and Björn Ewald, has appeared (with updated references) in English.¹ This is a cause for gladness among all Anglophones engaged in the teaching of ancient art, because for non-German readers there was frankly nothing to match the intellectual scope and illustrative quality of Zanker–Ewald. Our only regret may be that students will find this explanation of the imagery on the sarcophagi so convincing that further debate seems futile. It is well known that Roman sarcophagi, of which thousands survive from the second and third centuries AD, have had a 'presence' or 'afterlife' in Western art history for many centuries: some were even re-used for Christian burials (the tale of one such case in Viterbo, the so-called 'Bella Galiana' sarcophagus, might be one addendum to the bibliography here). But what did they once signify? Many were produced in marble workshops of the eastern Mediterranean, from which the suspicion arises that Roman customers may not have exercised much discrimination

¹⁰ *Livy. Rome's Italian Wars. Books 6–10*. Translated by J. C. Yardley with an Introduction and Notes by Dexter Hoyos. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. xliv + 391. 2 maps. Paperback £12.99. ISBN 978-0-19-956485-9.

¹¹ *A History of Exile in the Roman Republic*. By Gordon Kelly. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. ix + 260. Paperback £23.99, ISBN: 978-1-107-40733-6. Reviewed in *G&R* 55.1 (2008), 135.

¹ *Living with Myths. The Imagery of Roman Sarcophagi*. By Paul Zanker and Björn C. Ewald. Translated by Julia Slater. Oxford Studies in Ancient Culture & Representation. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012. Pp. xi + 428. B/w and colour illustrations throughout. Hardback £150, ISBN: 978-0-19-922869-0.

when it came to selecting a subject or decorative scheme. (Our authors rather sidestep the question of how much was carved at sites of origin, such as Aphrodisias, then completed – with portrait features added? – in Rome.) Accepting, however, that an elaborate sarcophagus was a considerable investment – the cost calculated as about six months' or even a year's salary for a captain in the Praetorian Guard – and supposing that the imagery were more than a status symbol, we are left with essentially two options. One is to follow the Belgian scholar Franz Cumont and others in analysing the iconography in terms of its clues to Roman beliefs about the afterlife. For certain images of myth this seems to work very well – the story of Alcestis, for example; for others, rather abstruse allegories must be sought: what eschatology is lodged in Medea's tragedy, or a scene of Achilles on Skyros? The alternative is to follow Zanker and Ewald in supposing that the sarcophagi do not so much represent the belief systems of the deceased as offer a sort of visual counselling to the bereaved. Hence the title – *living* with myths, not dying with them: for the regular occasions on which Romans were obliged to remember and honour the dead (*parentalia*, *rosaria*, etc.), sarcophagi on display in family burial enclosures provided 'encouragement to free association' (31) in various therapeutic and consolatory ways. These of course encompass some of Cumont's reconstructions of Stoic comfort and so on – but with its emphasis upon the response of viewers, the Zanker–Ewald approach clearly allows more flexibility of significance. To say that the message often reduces to 'it could be worse' is a brutal summary of the sympathetic and subtle readings expounded in this book. Yet occasionally one could wish for more sophistry. For example, in discussing the consolatory potential of images of Niobe and her unfortunate offspring – a 'massacre of the innocents' with obvious pertinence to *mors immatura* – the authors allude (74) to the curious persuasive strategy deployed by Achilles when he, at last in a mood to yield up the mangled body of Hector, invites the grief-stricken Priam to supper (*Il.* 24.603 ff.). As Malcolm Willcock long ago showed (*CQ* 14 [1964], 141 ff.), Achilles resorts to a formulaic *paradeigma*: 'You must do this, because X, who was in more or less the same situation as you, and a more significant person, did it.' Only in this case the *a fortiori* argument relies upon a rather implausible twist to the usual story, namely that Niobe, having witnessed the deaths of her twelve children – and with their corpses still unburied, since everyone in the vicinity has been turned to stone – adjourns to dinner. No other telling of the myth mentions this detail: indeed, Niobe herself is usually the one turned to stone. Of course this version suits Achilles well enough: if Niobe lost all her children but not her appetite, why should Priam, who has lost merely one of his many sons and daughters, hesitate to share a meal? But did Homer expect his audience to be disconcerted by such mythical manipulation, or was it typical of what happened when myth served as consolation? And if Achilles/Homer may resort to such embroidery, did educated Romans feel inclined to do likewise? Was this part of the presence of myth in 'everyday life'?

A collective book review allows one to make the sort of juxtapositions that occur in everyday life – the plummet from the sublime to the earthy. Here is one such: let us imagine that a Roman family emerges from a mournful veneration of ancestors to find themselves downwind of a local cloth-processing workshop. Relics of premises reckoned to be where a fuller had his establishment (*fullo* or *fullonica*) are known from Pompeii, Ostia, and other Roman cities. However, defining exactly what went on in such premises is not always easy. Fulling is broadly understood as the process

of cleansing and thickening cloth by treading, rubbing, and washing it. But was this part of textile manufacture, or the making of garments? Did it include dyeing? Was only wool treated in this way? The final result appears to have been a denser, smoother material, purged not only of dirt but also of lanolin and natural fats. A possible purging agent leads some historians to relish the nose-wrinkling thought of Pompeians condemned not only to spend whole days up to their knees in stale urine but also to live in the vicinity of such an ammoniacal stench. Revision of the archaeological evidence, and its socio-economic implications, is called for by Miko Flohr's study of *The World of the Fullo*.² As he points out, alternative detergents may have been used ('Fuller's earth' is a naturally occurring clay). So perhaps the shock to the nostrils was not so great as we suppose. And it seems that treading in the liquid all day is misinformation arising from an incomplete literary source. In any case, the results of the cleansing and smoothing process carried a good deal of social and political significance: it gave a tunic or toga that 'whiter-than-white' appearance distinguished in Latin as *candor*, and of course this was practically and symbolically how anyone must appear who was standing for political office – 'whitened' (*candidatus*).

Further use of images, structures, and monuments to illuminate Roman society and economics is apparent in the collection of essays entitled *Roman Slavery and Roman Material Culture*.³ It was a contention of G. E. M. de Ste Croix that 'the working class' in general were wholly invisible in classical art – so as a frontispiece to his ideologically impassioned *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World* (1981) he resorted to Van Gogh's *Potato-eaters*. The iconographical absence remains, I think, remarkable. But we have become more ingenious about looking for traces of slave presence in the archaeological record, and this collection of essays is testament to that ingenuity. In the epigraphic record, for instance, slaves are rarely mentioned as such (e.g. *servus*). So how might servile status be otherwise indicated? One theory is that a Greek *cognomen* in a Latin inscription, if unaccompanied by the letter 'L' for *libertus*, gives a clue. Another line of enquiry is shown by analysis of graffiti from the so-called 'school for [imperial] slaves' or *paedagogium* on the Palatine – a rare instance of 'direct voice' from slaves (including the well-known cartoon comment on Christian belief). Then there is the scrutiny of Roman domestic architecture with a view to its 'geography of containment' – building on the work (again, ideologically impassioned) of Andrea Carandini *et al.* at Settefinestre c.1980 – and, alongside this, the study of certain household utensils and artefacts reflective of slave roles (candelabra, tray-stands, and so on). The late Natalie Kampen leaves a paper on several military *stelae* from the North-west Provinces showing freedmen as valued assistants to the deceased. The most oblique angle to material evidence is taken by the editor herself: reflecting upon scenes of 'Cupid Punished' in various media, she argues that the apparent frivolity of this visual trope is deceptive. Little Cupid shackled and wielding a hoe, or bound and put in a

² *The World of the Fullo. Work, Economy, and Society in Roman Italy*. By Miko Flohr. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. xvi + 401. 159 illustrations and plans. Hardback £90, ISBN: 978-0-19-965935-7.

³ *Roman Slavery and Roman Material Culture*. Edited by Michele George. Phoenix Supplementary Volumes 52. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2013. Pp. vii + 240. 49 illustrations. Hardback £52.99, ISBN: 978-1-4426-4457-1.

cage, does more than mark amorous mischief: he is part of ‘the Roman habituation to physical brutality’ (173), a society in which the torture and degradation of slaves was routine.

NIGEL SPIVEY

njs11@cam.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0017383513000314

Reception

It might seem unduly cautious to consider reception as still an ‘emerging’ sub-discipline within Classics, but a selection of publications from recent years provides evidence of its continuous development and diversification. Edited volumes (the preferred format in reception studies’ infancy) are still very much in evidence, but, as this subject review indicates, an increasing number of monographs bear witness to the confidence and rigour of new work in the field.

We begin with two very different works on the modern reception of Homer. Marc Bizer has produced a highly focused study of the changing and contested role of appeal to Homeric epic in political debates over sovereignty and governance in Renaissance France.¹ Bizer demonstrates the resonance of the Homeric poems for court councillors and men of letters throughout the sixteenth century, an age when monarchs declared their descent from Trojan stock and humanists saw possibilities for advancement in offering advice to kings. The first half of the book spans the decades 1530–1560 and encompasses Guillaume Budé, Jean Dorat, Pierre de Ronsard, and Joachim du Bellay among the Pléiade poets, and the critic of tyranny (and friend of Michel de Montaigne) Étienne de la Boétie. It contains much that will interest classicists, from the perhaps surprising co-option of *both* Odysseus and Agamemnon as figures of princely prudence, to the flexibility of the range of political-allegorical interpretations performed upon the epics in this early period. Bizer draws attention to the foundation of such readings in longer traditions of Homeric (and Virgilian) allegoresis, which were given new stimulus in the sixteenth century through the dissemination of pseudo-Plutarch’s *Essay on the Life and Writings of Homer* and the works of Erasmus (18–30). In the second part he tracks how currents of Homeric interpretation shifted during the French Wars of Religion, as commentators on both sides of the religious divide sought to advance their views on the wisdom or otherwise of toleration, the authority of rulers, and the liberty of subjects by reference to models of kingship, social governance, and self-governance extracted from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. He argues convincingly that the writings of Huguenot critics such as Jean de Sponde were testament to the continued force of humanist notions of Homer as a guide to political wisdom, even as they sought to reject his by-now-traditional authority as a ‘mirror for princes’. This is a learned and specialist work as well as a meticulously detailed one; its primary audience is surely intellectual historians, but, in addition to many

¹ *Homer and the Politics of Authority in Renaissance France*. By Marc Bizer. Classical Presences. New York, Oxford University Press, 2011. Pp. xii + 245. 4 illustrations. Hardback £55, ISBN: 978-0-19-973156-5.