

Cabinet' also testify to contemporary interest in and imagination of the seamier side of Pompeian life. The enduring contrast between 'life' and 'death' in imaginings of the buried Vesuvian cities is, indeed, one of the most interesting tensions explored by this volume. Several papers touch upon political imaginings of Pompeian life: thus Figurelli explores the politics of representations of slaves in Pompeian settings in nineteenth-century Italian painting, Spiegel builds an interesting case for Proust's use of Pompeii to adumbrate the destruction of old social orders in First-World War Paris, Malamud addresses the political and social context behind the popularity of *Last Days of Pompeii* in antebellum United States, and P. discusses some of the ways in which Pompeii furnished a reference-point within contemporary and subsequent responses to the events of the Second World War and the Holocaust. This list of examples shows, however, that it is Pompeii's destruction at least as much as her status as a record of Roman life that have secured her interest – a tendency which, as Hartnett argues in a fascinating paper on Spinazzola's excavation photographs, has also affected scholarly and archaeological presentations of the city.

It is hard to do justice to the diversity and interest of the range of papers within the space of a short review. Certainly one can imagine this volume offering inspiration to university teachers seeking to devise courses on Pompeii and its reception, as well as to undergraduate and graduate students researching dissertations. What can a volume like this tell us about the present state and methods of classical reception studies? One final contrast seems worth commenting upon: that between those papers that focus on the study of particular 'engagements' with Pompeian material and those that attempt to sketch a broader terrain of cultural reception. This divide is best exemplified by two papers on Bulwer-Lytton's novel, by S. Harrison and M.D. Bridges. While Harrison is struck by Bulwer-Lytton's archaeological exactitude and the manner in which *Last Days'* allusions to Petronius and Apuleius construct a classical pedigree for the nineteenth-century novel, Bridges seeks to locate it within a broader spectrum of nineteenth-century literary and visual receptions, animated by discourses of affect, sentimentality and what she terms 'necromantic pathos', and connecting it to popular entertainments such as the panorama (see too H.) as well as the learned and elite audiences highlighted in Harrison's study. The results are two strikingly different interpretations of the same, highly influential work, and perhaps illustrate two different approaches to the study of classical receptions.

University of Reading

KATHERINE HARLOE
k.c.harloe@reading.ac.uk

KIRCHER AND THE TOPOGRAPHY OF LATIUM

EVANS (H. B.) *Exploring the Kingdom of Saturn. Kircher's Latium and its Legacy*. Pp. xiv + 236, ills, maps. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2012. Cased, US\$75. ISBN: 978-0-472-11815-1.
 doi:10.1017/S0009840X13003466

Athanasius Kircher, a seventeenth-century German Jesuit scholar, is widely known as a learned man who dabbled in everything from geometry and mathematics to alchemy to musicology to hieroglyphics. He also produced works on topography, though this is often a less discussed area of his illustrious career. E. has produced a finely detailed commentary on Kircher's work on the topography of ancient Latium, which served as a basis for future topographical studies of the region. E.'s book sheds light on a fascinating and controversial work, which has been dismissed both by Kircher's contemporaries and

later scholars. Framing his discussion of *Latium* is the rivalry between Kircher and Raffaello Fabretti, a churchman and antiquarian, who published a scathing review criticising *Latium*. E. considers whether Fabretti's critique of Kircher as a topographer is fair and whether *Latium* could still serve as an important reference work for historians and topographers working in the twenty-first century.

The introduction provides background on Kircher and his work leading up to the publication of *Latium*, including his first foray into topographical study, which focused on Tuscany. E. also contextualises Kircher's books, noting that a number of geographers had already written about the region within the wider context of Italy by the time he published *Latium*. However, it was Kircher who first directed his work solely on the specific region, a focus that allowed him to explore it in more detail and depth than his predecessors.

In the first chapter E. begins with an examination of the front matter of *Latium*, including the imagery in its frontispiece, the dedication to the newly elected Pope Clement X, Kircher's stated intentions in writing his books and his methodology. Kircher was clear he would not just focus on Rome, but on the often neglected region around it and be based on his own personal observations. He ultimately intended to describe the ancient sites and compare them with their modern counterparts. E. highlights the moralising tone of his writing, arguing that he is trying to reveal the 'mutability and transience' of human existence through his study of the ancient ruins of Latium (p. 27).

In Chapters 2 to 8, E. provides a detailed discussion of the five books of *Latium*, commenting on such things as Kircher's accuracy in his descriptions and maps and his source material, which included the Bible and various Graeco-Roman writers. He goes through *Latium* methodically, discussing each section in great detail, pointing out places in the text where Kircher's understanding was wrong or deficient. He compares and contrasts Kircher's accounts with those of a number of contemporary writers, many of whom Kircher himself references, such as Philip Clüver and Leandro Alberti, who had written geographical texts on Italy.

Chapter 9 examines the review of *Latium* by Raffaello Fabretti, Kircher's rival. E. introduces this examination with a look at Fabretti's motives and intentions in criticising *Latium*. E. identifies several main themes in the critique: Kircher's boast of having first-hand knowledge, his use of sources, his cartography, his criticism of other scholars and his understanding of Roman aqueducts (p. 188). E. ends the chapter with a look at Fabretti's agenda and proceeds to pick apart the review in order to judge its fairness.

E. concludes with a discussion of the legacy of Kircher's study of Latium. He argues that although much of *Latium* is derivative it is an important synthesis of topographical knowledge. The detail and depth of Kircher's work also adds to its relevancy, since it includes information and accounts not included in the work of earlier writers (p. 213). E. also notes the significance of Kircher's topographical study as a seminal work that inspired research in the field. His discussion of the relevancy of *Latium* in the historiography of topographical study and to modern scholars studying the region could have been more explicit and broad. E.'s book is rather narrowly focused on the content and seventeenth-century context of Kircher's work and the analysis of its legacy is somewhat cursory. It would have benefited from a summation of how his systematic investigation might have influenced topographical research and how his knowledge of Latium has been used or contested by modern topographers, historians and archaeologists.

The volume is extremely detailed and descriptive. It is well researched and informative and E.'s understanding of Kircher's work is substantial. One minor comment is that E. makes frequent use of overly long quotes from Kircher and his contemporaries. Pages of the book are almost entirely devoted to quotes, with perhaps only a few lines

of commentary or explanation from E. While it is of course true that long passages sometimes need to be quoted in their entirety to demonstrate a point, E. is somewhat excessive in this. The longest uninterrupted quote is nearly four complete pages (pp. 52–5) and is longer than E.'s analysis of it.

E.'s prose is clear, concise and erudite. He is thorough and makes extensive use of footnotes, from author commentary to the original Latin of excerpts quoted in the book. Readers will find these notes useful in expanding on the main text. The book contains 27 high quality black-and-white images. However, the details of a few, particularly the maps, are hard to discern and this can be frustrating.

This is an interesting and informative study of Kircher's work on the topography of ancient Latium and its relevance to modern topographical and historical study of the region.

Boise State University

KATHERINE V. HUNTLEY

kvhuntley@boisestate.edu

EXPURGATION

HARRISON (S.), STRAY (C.) (edd.) *Expurgating the Classics. Editing Out in Greek and Latin*. Pp. viii + 224, ills. London: Bristol Classical Press, 2012. Cased, £65. ISBN: 978-1-84966-892-7.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X13003478

This volume of eleven essays discusses editorial *katharsis* in the Classics. The collection examines manipulations of ancient Greek and Latin texts chronologically, ranging from the archaic period to the twenty-first century. The contributors provide wonderful case studies of what the term 'expurgation' may involve: bowdlerisation, anodyne euphemisms, more or less puritanical intimations, or even spiteful exclusions. They succeed in highlighting that what we as readers study, or simply read for pleasure, is the result of various intricate and interdependent mechanisms of selection, edition, translation, publication, social (mis) apprehension and legal procedures, which at times have inadvertently altered the original pieces of literature.

Bowie discusses the cleansing of Greek melic, elegiac and iambic poetry that started with Euenus of Paros (fifth century B.C.E.), continued with Plutarch and later Stobaeus, and can still be seen in nineteenth- and twentieth-century commentaries. B. notes that, even though riskier parts of Archilochus, for instance, are usually omitted, sensuality is not altogether banned if it is meant to edify, as is the case with Plutarch's *How to Detect One's Ethical Progress* 81e. Not much progress can be detected between Plutarch's time and twenty-first-century works, though, as can be seen in Campbell's edition (1967) or in Edmond's translation (1931) of Archilochus.

Ruffell provides a geographically limited overview of the scholarly reception of Aristophanic comic grotesque. He focuses on Mitchell's (1835) and Holden's (1848) editions and lists Aristophanic obscenities in the *Acharnians*, such as phallic, scatological or physical references, that were avoided for the sake of preserving the purity of prurient youths. With exact quotations from the text, accompanying translations and the omitted parts underlined, R. gives a comprehensive exegesis of how expurgation mirrored taboo notions of female sexuality, promoted masculinity, emasculated social liberations or symbolised political liberty in nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarship.

Orrells' analysis of Headlam's Herodas leaves nothing to be desired. His presentation of Headlam's personality and his reception of the *Mimiamb*s in light of the concomitant