have had it read by a native speaker to avoid awkwardnesses in the title and elsewhere ('pooping and peeing', indeed!); but there is no mistaking his meaning. Finally, why has B. W. Winter already produced a second edition of his *Philo and Paul among the Sophists*?[19] He cites works published in 1998 by M. Alexandre and T. Morgan;[20] he adds sections, revises, and translates Greek. The book importantly plunges us into the Second Sophistic before its accepted opening by analysing two Jewish thinkers, opposed to its methods and ethos, conversant with its techniques. Its back-cover garlands come from journals of religion; I cite an historical periodical:[21] '[Winter] illustrates masterfully how these authors accommodate . . . both their native traditions and literary influences as well as those of the Hellenistic and hellenizing world' . . . 'a superb application of detailed philological analysis to the significant Greek texts'. A few blemishes (the confusing presentation of *P.Oxy.* 2190) purchasers deserved to avoid; they might regret losing 'agnostic activity, that is, athletics and boxing' (210).

BARBARA LEVICK

[19] *Philo and Paul among the Sophists*. Alexandrian and Corinthian Responses to a Julio-Claudian Movement. (Ed. 1, SNTS Monographs, University Press, Cambridge, 1997) ed. 2, W. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2002 (adding the subtitle). Pp. xx + 302. Paperback.

[20] M. Alexandre Jnr., *Rhetorical Argumentation in Philo of Alexandria* (Scholars Press, Atlanta, 1998); T. Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge, 1998).

[21] R. A. Hawley in *Journ. Hell. Stud.* 101 (2001), 121.

Art and Archaeology

He wrote execrable Latin. Though his work has been a precious resource for scholars down the centuries, no one praises his style. This is one reason why the author of the encyclopaedic *Natural History* may be considered as no more than a compiler of facts and curiosities. And though he is said to have met his death while on a scientific mission – fatally investigating the pyroclastic motions of Mount Vesuvius in AD 79 – his nephew has left us with the memorable image of Pliny the Elder as something of a couch potato, insatiable for any quantity of information, even while taking a bath (Pliny the Younger, *Letters* 3.5). We consult but do not read him. Is that fair? Sorcha Carey's fresh study of the Elder Pliny, *Pliny's Catalogue of Culture*[1] does not set out to apologize on his behalf; but she soon convinces us that the capacious project of the *Natural History* is worth trying to understand for its own sake. Pliny is arguably the founding father of Western art history – his pervasive influence upon European Renaissance writers on art, not only Vasari, still awaits proper assessment – and certainly our principal ancient guide to the personalities and accomplishments of Greek painters and sculptors. True, his knowledge of the 'great masters' of Classical art seems (by contrast to Pausanias, travelling around Greece *c.* AD 150) largely gleaned from secondary sources, not direct observation. But Pliny was not just a sponge for whatever might amuse a Roman art-connoisseur in the mid-first century AD. His writings on art reflect *his* views: in other words, Pliny the *scriptor* is not to be ignored. Carey's careful exposition of passages from the author reveals a medley of rhetorical topics embedded within, and of course she can supply a ready complement of illustrations and case-studies by which Pliny's remarks might be interpreted or judged. It is a complex exercise: nonetheless, Carey locates for

[1] *Pliny's Catalogue of Sculpture*. Art and Empire in the *Natural History*. By Sorcha Carey. Oxford U.P., 2003. Pp. xiii + 208, with 9 colour and 60 monochrome illustrations.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/51.2.270 Published online by Cambridge University Press

us a 'voice' of Pliny that is distinct and consistent. Pliny valued *utilitas* above all else: like his younger contemporary Julius Frontinus, he considered no work of human ingenuity more wonderful than an aqueduct (*NH* 36.123). Artists were good so long as they served the community (*NH* 35.118). Pliny's text may be haunted by the Roman Republican suspicion of art generally as so many clever manifestations of vicious *luxuria*, and some would deem the author a Stoic in his view of the world; but perhaps the more charitable assessment of Pliny with regard to art and artists is as a *bona fide* Platonist – a follower, at least, of the Plato happy to accept art that served the needs of a well-governed city (*Republic* 607). It was typical of Pliny that he appended a list of contents to the *Natural History*, so that his patron Titus might waste no time in finding such information as he required. It was characteristic of Pliny, too, that counting the quantity of statues on view in ancient Rome was an otiose task. It was enough to say that numbers were excessive. Peter Stewart, in his *Statues in Roman Society*,[2] does not hazard to estimate the absolute size of Rome's 'other population' of marble and bronze, but a tally of half a million by the mid-first century AD may be credible – one statue to every two persons. In any case, it was a huge crowd; a *populus copiossisimus* whose near-disappearance is little excuse for general scholarly oversight down the ages. Stewart redresses this neglect, plausibly rehabilitating the very term 'statue' itself from modern disdain (we prefer the more self-expressive 'sculpture'). Some of his analysis may frustrate those investigating particular aspects of Roman response to the images all around them – for example, the nude is only considered in passing as a manifestation of 'the statuesque' – but overall this is a very coherent and articulate history of how one population coexisted and interacted with the other. Various modes of reverence and imitation ('posing') are explored, of course, along with the deployment of statues as status-symbols; but Stewart pursues the tangible rapport, too, concluding with a masterful account of the phenomena of *damnatio memoriae* and early Christian iconoclasm. Throughout, his eye for spotting statue 'quotations' on walls, coins, lamps and in other media helps to convey something of the lost ubiquity of his subject. From various literary sources and excavated villa-sites – notably the Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum – it is known that some Romans might have large private collections of statuary. Such grandiose proprietors of art may reckoned as an 'elite', perhaps just 2% of the population. They did not, however, monopolize the viewing of art, nor indeed its ownership. So how did the other 98% respond to the images around them? This is the question which John Clarke addresses in his *Art in the Lives of Ordinary Romans*,[3] a substantial exercise in demotic art history that is motivated by intellectual interest, not (apparently) any zealous Marxist pieties. Decades ago, the Italian scholar Bianchi Bandinelli influentially isolated a 'plebian' style in Roman art, residing at first as a sometimes clumsy or subversive stratum below the Classical formalities of patrician or Imperial commissions, then eventually tending to dominate even official monuments (such as the Arch of Septimius Severus at Rome) after *c.* AD 200. Clarke is more concerned with subjects than with style, focusing perhaps somewhat predictably upon scenes of 'low life' and menial labour, images from toilets and taverns

[2] *Statues in Roman Society*. Representation and Response. By P. C. N. Stewart. Oxford U.P., 2003. Pp. xvi + 333, with 48 black and white illustrations.

[3] *Art in the Lives of Ordinary Romans*. Visual Representation and Non-Elite Viewers in Italy, 100 B.C.–A.D.315. By John R. Clarke. California U.P., 2003. Pp. xi + 383, with 156 monochrome illustrations and 24 colour plates.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/51.2.270 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and so on; but he meditates, too, on how 'non-elite' Romans might have viewed more expensive acts of patronage. Notoriously the 'non-elite' make little noise in the literary record: Clarke searches for soundings in legal documents, epitaphs, graffiti, papyrus scraps and anonymous doggerel, but often he has to rely on his own instinctive sympathies. So he explains the children represented on the Ara Pacis in terms of their value as 'human interest' – like seeing the President with his dog, or Prime Minister *en famille* – and he develops the idea (launched by Burkhard Fehr) that Trajan's Column strives to show how military logistics reflect the order of civilian society, and encourages aspirations of upward mobility. Occasionally this method seems overstretched: Clarke's contention, for example, that the man whose 'modest house' had a peristyle decorated with scenes of the AD 59 riot in and around Pompeii's amphitheatre was an unrepentant hooligan who enjoyed seeing social order 'turned upside down'. And throughout the book, a reader might feel haunted by the suspicion that the 'ordinary Roman' remains as elusive as today's 'man in the street': we know that slaves and freedmen could be more literate than their masters, with Trimalchio looming as the satirical caveat against any over-deterministic analysis of Roman class-structure. Nonetheless, Clarke's evident enthusiasm for his topic, complemented by some good photography, sustains the narrative. And together with the other two books noticed here, this study offers a robust answer to the old academic problem of how to define the *Romanitas* of Roman art. Roman art is constituted by those images the Romans chose to live with. The key part of that definition lies in the choosing.

NIGEL SPIVEY

Religion

In a recent interview with some members of the Magic *equipo* at the University of Málaga, in their new journal MHNH, Christopher Faraone rightly claimed that magic is now a 'hot field' in the United States. But until now it has been difficult to find a suitable collection of materials for undergraduate teaching: Georg Luck's *Arcana Mundi* (1985) is excessively intellectualist, and contains almost no documentary texts; Hans-Dieter Betz's *Greek Magical Papyri* and John Gager's *Curse-Tablets*, both admirable, are too specialized for the purpose. In many ways, Daniel Ogden's new reader rises admirably to the challenge.[1] It offers more than twice as many texts as Luck (300), intelligently selected with an eye to discussions in the recent literature. It is well sign-posted, so that themes and topics can easily be followed up. The commentaries are succinct but helpful; and there is a (generally) excellent bibliography, usefully assorted under individual topics. The latest or best editions have been used, and all the passages have been heroically re-translated by the editor. There are also some – rather grainy but adequate – illustrations (but no list of them in the fore-matter). Despite the care taken to make the book user-friendly, there are inevitably one or two blips. If, for example, one looks up 'Ephesia grammata' in the index, one draws a blank; likewise with 'Androcydes', the most important commentator on these magical words. The entry '*voces magicae*' lists, forbiddingly, 24 items, most of which are bound to be simply magical papyri in which such words occur, so one had rather try looking under the best-known text relating to the

[1] *Magic, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. A Sourcebook. Edited by Daniel Ogden. Oxford U.P., 2002. Pp.+ 353. Hardback.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/51.2.270 Published online by Cambridge University Press