

two thousand years, original copies have long gone and what survives is the result of successive copies [sic] with all the consequent possibilities for errors and mistranslations to have corrupted the original text' (17). Such a line of argument is tantamount to dismissing the validity of almost all ancient literary material on the basis that it has, by necessity, been reproduced. Archaeological evidence is surveyed in ch. 1 (10–14), but throughout much of the remainder of the work, the discussion depends primarily upon depictions of Roman vessels and the diagrams which P. has extrapolated from them. Conspicuously, finds of Roman ships or their contemporaries are little used: there is little discussion of those found at Nemi (needlessly destroyed in 1944 but preserved in documentation), those discovered in 1981/82 during the construction of the Mainz Hilton, or the Punic vessel discovered off the coast of Marsala in Sicily, to name but a few well-known examples. In reference to ancient naval terminology, it is argued that 'translation and transliteration of terms relating to ancient warships is an area littered with academic argument, but one which, without "hard" evidence — that is to say the real thing or more definitive discoveries, at least — remains largely speculative' (17).

The book's distinctive feature is presented in Part Two, which is organized as a chronological account of the development of Roman warships. The chapters in Part Two are arranged according to five general periods, with the text in each chapter sub-divided according to the type of ship being discussed. The result is a sequence of case studies of general vessel types or of specific examples. Previous works on the Roman navy and Roman naval history have frequently debated the mechanics of Roman warships and here P. offers distinctive interpretations on a number of common problems. P.'s references to modern scholarship, however, are often vague and footnotes consistently omit page numbers. Conspicuous omissions are Thiel's two important works on the Republican navy and Christa Steinby's recent *The Roman Republican Navy* (2007).

The University of Melbourne
cdart@unimelb.edu.au

CHRISTOPHER J. DART

doi:10.1017/S0075435812000561

N. MORLEY, *ANTIQUITY AND MODERNITY*. Malden, Ma. and Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. Pp. xiv + 182. ISBN 978140513147. £40.00/US\$89.95.

Compact, inquisitive, and useful, this book surveys the use of Greek and Roman antiquity by modern (particularly nineteenth- and early twentieth-century German) thinkers. Morley has read his sources carefully, sometimes providing his own translations, and he uses them in fresh and interesting ways.

'Interesting' is the operative word. M.'s six chapters summarize 'modern' views of antiquity, covering ancient economics, sociology, aesthetics, history, and rhetoric. The book's richness and vivacity grows out of its lattice-like structure, which in each chapter examines the same more or less unchanging group of modern thinkers: Schiller, Marx, Weber, Hegel, Mill, Nietzsche, Adam Smith, Richard Wagner(!) and others. Thus in the first chapter we see Hegel insisting, against the grain of his time, that modernity appears 'lively and free', and antiquity 'insipid': 'Modern times ... have worn out the Greek and Roman garments of their childhood.' In subsequent chapters, Hegel's views about historical stages, ancient art and drama, the historical irrelevance of non-European cultures, the anxieties produced by historical study, 'the limits of empiricism', and 'reason' in history are taken up and aligned or contrasted with contemporary opinion. M. deftly alludes to several Hegelian writings. The analysis then deepens and broadens as each additional thinker enters.

The book opens with a start, by quoting Gramsci, for whom its very *lack* of connection with the present made Latin worthwhile: Latin will 'accustom children to studying, to analyzing a body of history that can be treated as a cadaver but returns continually to life'. M. then poses Finley against Rostovtzeff, as 'primitivist' and 'modernist' historians. Finley had firmly criticized 'primitivism', and 'pre-modernist', though less catchy, serves better: but M. summarizes the issues succinctly and well. The chapter concludes with Nietzsche, as always a perceptive outlier, insisting 'that "antiquity" was as unstable a concept as "modernity"'. (In chapter after chapter, it will be Nietzsche who provides the provocative, often productive, insight.) The next chapter turns to economics, beginning with Marx's demonstration of the power of modern capitalism, then showing, intriguingly, how long it took other thinkers to realize that modernity was economically superior to 'ancient times'. Max Weber, overlapping with Marx in some respects, noted the increased modern emphasis on technology, free labour, state policy, the rule of law, rationalized

production, and a ‘mentality’ that demanded ‘forgoing immediate gratification for the sake of future returns’.

Turning to the ‘Classical Critique of Modern Society’, M. mentions thinkers who viewed antiquity as free from ‘alienation’. Here and elsewhere, M.’s brevity is tempered by citations of his own earlier studies in ancient economics. Whether Marx ‘intended’ ‘class’ to be ‘almost universal’ is a contested topic, though many agree. M. has clearly read and thought about Marx. Economic differentiation could certainly be severe in antiquity, but whether that differentiation led to class-based historical change is another question. M.’s comments on social complexity in Weber are likewise brief but well-informed. Both Durkheim and Weber doubted that modernity brings happiness, and Durkheim’s analysis of social complexity was more pessimistic and sceptical than others’: ‘almost invariably, the basis for such arguments was comparison with the awesome and fully rounded humanity of the Greeks’, who had, it was thought, a *Gemeinschaft* not a *Gesellschaft*. A near consensus held that we have declined from that ‘organic community’. Hegel demurred. Nietzsche, in *Götzen-Dämmerung*, presented a perhaps deliberately ‘incoherent account’ that refused to idealize the Greeks: M. agrees with James Porter that the incoherence was ‘deliberate’. Did Greek art embody ‘eternal beauty’? So many Germans insisted, even if they otherwise favoured modernity. Sometimes, they argued that ancient art was uniquely embedded in the society of its time. On this score (and others), Nietzsche perhaps influenced Weber’s conclusion that modernity is ‘disenchanted’ — a word that haunted Daniel Bell — and its art ‘intimate and not monumental’.

M.’s fifth chapter, ‘History as Nightmare. Conceptions of Progress and Decline’, covers the rejection of history ‘in favor of more present-oriented disciplines’, as well as the (selectively Eurocentric) ‘grand narratives’ of progressive development or long-term decline. Marx’s *Eighteenth Brumaire* and Nietzsche’s *Untimely Meditations* both ‘reveal’ that saturation in historical study can ‘uproot the future’, thus preventing change. W. J. Ashley provides a key quotation in the final chapter, ‘Allusion and Appropriation. The Rhetorical Uses of Antiquity’: ‘An alleged historical fact has often more hold upon men’s minds than any theoretic argument.’ M. notes that Aristotle serves Marx as both an economic authority and a predecessor who has been surpassed. Others, too, used classical allusions, but with mixed results, as Matthew Arnold said. Did Roscher’s claim that a passage in Demosthenes ‘cautions us against the Manchester criterion of national prosperity’ win anyone over? M. uses slavery as a ‘case study’ of the variety of ways in which writers ‘deployed ancient material’. He reviews the many ways in which ancient slavery was invoked, and the perhaps surprisingly widespread readiness to call factory workers ‘modern slaves’. Neither Nietzschean ‘diagnosis’ nor Marxian ‘denunciation’ of slavery wins our adherence ‘except on preconceived political or moral grounds’. In Marx, Nietzsche, and the other subjects of this book, concepts like ‘classical’ and ‘modern’ are disputed without resolution, but in all cases, ‘there needs to be an alternative, a touchstone ... to which we can refer in making sense of our own situation’.

This is an inadequate ‘summary’, passing over many useful observations. The book succeeds not by pressing a single grand claim, but by providing hints and suggestions, backed up by thoughtful reading. Although the conclusion is muted, the book opens up topics often ignored in standard studies of ‘classical influence’, and enables readers to pursue important questions. Further work by M. himself would be welcome, perhaps particularly on the intriguing triad of Marx, Nietzsche and Weber.

Temple University
pericles@temple.edu

DANIEL TOMPKINS

doi:10.1017/S0075435812000573

II. LITERATURE AND LANGUAGE

W. A. JOHNSON and H. PARKER, *ANCIENT LITERACIES: THE CULTURE OF READING IN GREECE AND ROME*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Pp. xv + 446, illus. ISBN 9780195340150 (bound); 9780199793983 (paper). £45.00 (bound); £22.50 (paper).

In the age of the ebook, none of us should need convincing of the multivalence of terms like ‘reading’ and ‘book’; and so the reappraisal to which this volume, the product of a 2006 conference, subjects a once-monolithic idea is timely indeed. Its title and pedigrees will have guaranteed its notice by specialists, to whom its merits will be clear, but classicists of all stripes will want to take notice of its panoptic approach, and may be surprised at the diversity of material it considers.