

(chronologically and historically) somewhat isolated in this volume. Nevertheless, this paper is of itself a useful study of the significance of Latin during the early phases of the British Empire.

Hardwick's short paper 'Refiguring classical texts: aspects of the postcolonial condition' considers the appropriation of classical literature — principally tragedy — in a range of post-colonial contexts (including African, Caribbean, Irish, and Scottish). It picks up a number of ideas explored in G.'s introduction and elsewhere and does a nice job of pointing the way to the future of research in this area; this would have made a suitable concluding paper to the collection.

In 'Greek tragedies in West African adaptations', Budelmann closely examines the characteristic features of a diverse handful of late twentieth-century West African adaptations of Greek tragedies. He demonstrates (among other things) that themes such as slavery and colonial authority are frequently deployed as expressions of dissidence and West African identity in these plays. Budelmann also draws attention to the prevailing authorial attitude (also evident in Greenwood's paper) that classical literature offers a set of universally-shared values which are as relevant to the peripheries as they are to Europe, as well as pointing to some of the religious and ritual similarities of Greek and African theatre. In the end, though, Budelmann opts for the safe conclusion that what all his examples share is discursive variety and individuality.

*Classics and Colonialism* is a welcome collection of stimulating and original papers on a subject we are likely to see a lot more of in coming years. As is perhaps to be expected of a volume of six papers on such a wide-ranging theme, it can seem in its entirety a little fragmented and incohesive. The collection addresses several important issues — not just the place of classicism in imperial ideology, but also the effects of classical models on both colonial and post-colonial societies; one downside of this is that the volume provides insufficient material to form many overarching conclusions about any of these phenomena. In addition, there is little sense of a logical order to the collection and engagement between papers is relatively superficial. Consequently the volume as a whole may seem totemic and ahistorical (one of the wider intellectual risks run by classical reception studies); little comment is offered on the important issue of the evolution of classical discourses alongside the development and collapse of imperial authority. G.'s collection is also heavily weighted towards literary criticism, and the many different manifestations of interaction between Classics and empire — visual, material, and political — are left comparatively neglected. Thus, *Classics and Colonialism* opens up the field rather than exhausting it. This said, one of the volume's intellectual merits is its emphasis on the re-configuration of classical discourse in the colonial peripheries and its close attention to literary criticism. It also contains a full and up-to-date bibliography, and will be of great interest to readers working in the field of classical reception, as well as (hopefully) modern historians of empire, to whom the volume makes a strong case for the significance of classical literature and culture in shaping and formulating post-colonial identities.

University of Nottingham

MARK BRADLEY

R. HINGLEY, *GLOBALIZING ROMAN CULTURE: UNITY, DIVERSITY AND EMPIRE*.

London: Routledge, 2005. Pp. xiii + 208, 10 figs. ISBN 0-415-35176-6. £16.99.

This is not, *prima facie*, a book about globalization. Hingley writes (2), 'My ambitious aim is to provide an up-to-date review of useful approaches that have been developed to explain the ways that material culture related to "Roman" identity'. Forty pages of endnote references (1,140 endnotes equates to approximately ten per page) and thirty-two of bibliography illustrate the extent of the synthesis attempted. The back cover notwithstanding ('from Britain to Syria'), this is a review of the primarily anglophone debate of the last ten years, focused almost exclusively upon the North-Western provinces. In this it is successful (although note D. Mattingly, 'Being Roman: expressing identity in a provincial setting', *JRA* 17 (2004), 5–25, which has already moved things on with his promised discussion of 'discrepant identities').

There are, however, several sub-texts and a problem: one apparent sub-text is the relevance of Roman studies to the present day; another is the nature (and so the relevance) of globalization. The former emerges indirectly, after J. Toner, in the idea that 'making the empire more relevant to the present should form part of the project to revitalize Roman studies' (4); the latter is only explicitly embraced in the final two pages (119–20, but see also 5–6). Herein lies the problem: I am very unclear whom H. thinks he is addressing (it is never made explicit). As a synthesis, which references almost every statement made, it is extremely difficult at times to extricate H.'s voice

from the summary of others. But more than this, it is very unclear, until the final two pages, where H. himself stands; rarely is it made explicit to the reader the extent to which this study, which argues that the globalizing trends of the contemporary world provide the ideal context in which to explore the previous and current approaches 'that have been developed to explain the ways that material culture related to "Roman" identity' (2), is itself no more than a product of its times, just like all those being summarized and critiqued. Between the dedication and the contents page (vii), H. quotes Mattingly: '[T]he modern literature on Roman imperialism is ... itself part of an imperialist discourse of remarkable longevity in a post-colonial age'. H. must be quoting this in a knowing fashion, but he does not leave the reader wholly convinced. Even the plea in the final two pages, against a view which interprets globalization primarily in terms of negotiation and as a positive influence of the West upon global development, leaves one unsure if this account has broken out of the cycle any more than those that went before. The most telling moment comes at 108–9, where, quoting Dyson on the comparative model of 'American commercial imperialism', H. observes that Dyson writes 'with, I suspect, a touch of irony' (I take this to mean that H. thinks that Dyson's use of the model is deliberately knowing and reflexive; if, however, H. merely means that Dyson was being ironic about American imperialism, then the self-awareness which a critique of past views ought to entail is being left dangerously implicit in both cases). H. continues (109), 'The argument adopted here is that, having rejected outmoded models of Roman imperialism that drew upon the culture of the nineteenth and earlier twentieth century, we should, instead, look to contemporary theory, as expressed by works on globalization, to develop rather more decentralized and dynamic images of the Roman world. Roman culture, in these terms, could be adopted in a flexible manner to symbolize variable motivations'. Whither irony?

Why is this a problem with audience? The majority of the book is a summary of existing debates, and would seem at first glance therefore to be aimed more at the student. But, it reads more like a dialogue with H.'s colleagues. Ch. 2 summarizes the 'Romanization' paradigm, and the debate up to and beyond M. Millett's *The Romanization of Britain* (1990); ch. 3 makes a stab at the question of culture (= identity), before advancing the discussion to G. Woolf's *Becoming Roman* (1998); ch. 4 seeks to address the material side of this debate (the work of P. Zanker looms large in the background), examining 'the ways in which Roman identity was projected across the empire through the adoption and adaptation of material culture' (72) — and it is here that the first significant engagement with actual evidence occurs, with case studies of Tarraco and Verulamium. By this stage (93), the conclusion reached would seem to be the by now unsurprising one that we must consider the complex evidence for variation across the Empire. While 'Roman identity is useful as a concept of cultural unity' (for considering power relations), it is too élite-focused, and H. finally moves, in ch. 5, from emulation models, a focus upon the élite, and the blunt tool of 'Roman identity', to examine several specific case studies (seal-boxes and the use of Latin; *terra sigillata*, pottery and consumption). The discussion at this point is heavily informed by the ideas of R. Laurence, and the case studies are essentially summaries of existing work. It is also much too brief. H. writes (109), 'The aim has been to examine the potential of a central, global concept of Roman culture and its relationship to the identity of the élite across the West, and also to point out the problems with such a simple discussion through a brief exploration of the opportunities that material culture offered to others'. And here's the rub: all but the final ten pages have been a synthesis, however knowing, of the past focus upon primarily élite culture in the Western provinces.

If we are going to engage in reflexivity, perhaps the biggest problem lies precisely in a debate which never looks beyond its own protagonists. The topics tackled in the final ten pages of ch. 5 have been well developed in other fields, far beyond the North-Western Roman provinces — even within the narrow world of classical archaeology, one need only look at the work of Greek colonial archaeology in recent years for active engagement in questions of pottery and consumption; for sophisticated engagement with the role of 'bric-a-brac' and its multiple reuse and reinvention the work of P. Van Dommelen in Sardinia springs to mind (*On Colonial Grounds* (1997)). The almost total absence of other European voices from this debate is striking: this is a remarkably British, post-colonial debate, and the opening quotation from Mattingly is almost unbearably apt (it scarcely needs pointing out that voices from beyond Europe can rarely even be adduced as missing).

And so back to the question of audience: as a synthesis for students of the 'Romanization' debate, in the North-Western provinces, to the beginning of the present century, it will serve. But

H. has not seized his opportunity to revitalize the debate about Rome's relevance or to situate it clearly within current globalization debates: topics about which he clearly feels strongly, and for which an extended essay length format like this could have been stimulating. (For globalization and Rome, see R. Witcher, 'Globalisation and Roman imperialism', in E. Herring and K. Lomas (eds), *The Emergence of State Identities in Italy in the First Millennium BC* (2000), 213–25.) The deeper questions about the role of reception studies, why Rome deserves the place it has in the Western educational cannon, and the place of Rome — and ourselves as the self-appointed custodians of that study — in the continuing, highly relevant, and politically charged debates about the Western tradition remain untouched.

Merton College, Oxford

JONATHAN R.W. PRAG

J. KÖNIG, *ATHLETICS AND LITERATURE IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE* (Greek culture in the Roman world). Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005. Pp. xix + 398, 12 figs. ISBN 0-521-83845-2. £55.00.

This is not a book about athletics. It is a book about discourse about athletics. In fact, as König demonstrates, when writers of the imperial period appear to be engaged in discourse about athletics, they are often really engaged in discourse about something else.

K.'s effort is original in a number of ways. Previous scholars have often mined the texts he uses for evidence about the *realia* of ancient athletic practice, while ignoring their literary qualities and the complex way they engage with issues of cultural identity and professional authority. Literary scholars, on the other hand, tend to go lightly over epigraphic evidence that bears on 'Second Sophistic' writing, but K. has conscientiously read through the epigraphic corpus of L. Robert for commemorative inscriptions relating to athletics. K.'s synthesis, the product of a sensibility that seems at bottom more literary than historical, yields a nuanced work of cultural studies, with many subtle readings of the various types of ideological contestation with which writers about athletics were engaged.

K. sees a common type of dynamic tension at work in writers on athletics and the athletic body. There is a pull in two directions: an impetus towards connection on the one hand (be it mimesis of the exemplary athletic body or identification with the Hellenic past), and towards a sense of disconnection and incompleteness on the other (the exemplary athletic body, if truly outstanding, cannot be replicated, and the Hellenic past, to which athletic activity holds out the promise of connection, keeps receding just beyond one's grasp). After the introduction, each chapter builds towards an extended discussion of a literary text, and begins with a review of related epigraphic material. Ch. 2 treats the paradoxes of the gymnasium: is it an institution whose value lies in its insulation from practical business and its connection with old-time Hellenic tradition, or is it an institution so divorced from the practical demands of warfare and politics as to be ridiculously irrelevant to the demands of life in the present? K. suggests that it was the *ephebeia*'s very irrelevance that gave it prestige, marking out elite youths for present-day political leadership on the basis of archaizing accomplishment. Lucian's *Anacharsis* playfully sets a philhellenic outsider who criticizes gymnastic tradition against a comically inept insider who defends it.

Is the athletic body a figure of perfection or excess, a paradigm for emulation or an unattainable ideal (ch. 3)? The boxer statues at Aphrodisias, with their scarred faces, standing near an idealized Diskophoros, would have engaged the viewer in such questions. The commemorative inscription for Markos Alfidios, a young athlete who died in Naples, which celebrates his moral and physical excellence, evokes 'a paradoxical combination of imitability and inaccessible idealization' (131), and provides a close epigraphic parallel to Dio's encomia for Melancomas. (Characteristically, K. offers no text or translation of this fascinating inscription, though he paraphrases Dio and other literary texts for pages on end). Dio cannot lose sight of the corrupting potential of athletic beauty, and K. connects this with Dio's concerns about successfully combining philosophical virtue with participation in civic life.

The Olympic games (ch. 4) provided the model for many 'iso-Olympic' festival foundations in the imperial period, and the system of dating by Olympiads, as used in this period, could be seen as 'a way of bringing all time — Roman time included — under a Greek aegis' (162). K.'s discussion of how Phlegon's fragmentary *Olympiads* juxtapose Roman military victories with Greek athletic victories is particularly fascinating (174–80). K. situates Pausanias among other compilatory texts of the Roman Empire, and explores how his virtual tour of Olympia, which mentions