childish fiction. Freud rose to the challenge, as did the modernists in Stefan George's circle, who set out to reclaim myth for reality (p. 55).

Aside from an unfortunate tendency to appeal to overly schematic historical models, this volume is to be recommended to readers of German who are interested in the cultural reception of antiquity around 1900. It has less to say to the professional classicist, for it contains nothing on mainstream German classical scholarship. Since one of the volume's themes is the tensions between the German professoriate and cultural innovators—for which the antagonism between Wilamowitz and Nietzsche may stand as a symbol—this is perhaps a shame.

King's College, London MATTHEW BELL
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni190

A TRIBUTE TO UGO BIANCHI

G. CASADIO (ed.): *Ugo Bianchi. Una vita per la storia delle religioni*. (Biblioteca di Storia delle Religioni 3.) Pp. 525, pls. Rome: Il Calamo, 2002. Paper, €37. ISBN: 88-88039-24-4.

'È stato una delle persone di animo più nobile da me finora incontrate.' Ugo Bianchi (1922–95), the occupant of the chair of the History of Religions at La Sapienza in Rome from 1979 until his retirement in 1992, was a learned, sober, articulate, and endlessly curious scholar capable of evoking warm feelings of respect and gratitude from his pupils ('senza superbia accademica'). A conventional Festschrift, *Ἀγαθὴ ἐλπίς*, edited by the first and most eminent of these, Giulia Sfameni Gasparro, appeared in 1994; the book under review presents an extended retrospect of his intellectual *Werdegang* in the form of essays by different hands, many of which were first presented at a conference organized by Casadio at the University of Salerno in April 1997. Despite having published on a wide variety of topics in Greek, Roman, and Graeco-Roman religion, and edited nine volumes of international conference proceedings, Bianchi is less well known among classicists than he perhaps deserves to be, not merely because his main relevant contribution was in the field of mystery cults and Gnosticism, but also because he was fiercely concerned to defend the cause of comparativism, a mode at odds with the immanent particularism of classical studies. It is instructive that, in a personal letter to the editor cited on p. 189, Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones, born in the selfsame year as Bianchi, writes, 'I did not know *Διὸς αἶσα* [1953] when I wrote *The Justice of Zeus* [1971], or I should certainly have quoted it'. Bianchi's preferred international forum was the International Association for the History of Religions (IAHR), a body familiar to few students of classical religion.

As a student of the history of religions at the Royal University of Rome during the Second World War, Bianchi received an education which would nowadays be considered impossibly demanding, in classical philology, ancient history, epigraphy (Margherita Guarducci), Etruscology (Massimo Pallottino), Italian philology, Assyriology, and Old Persian. His early qualifying work, directed by R. Pettazzoni, was devoted to classical topics: Artemis of Ephesus (1944); the formation of the Capitoline Triad (1947); the archaic Greek notion of destiny (1953). Before his appointment to his first chair, at Messina, however, while he was earning his living as a schoolteacher, he worked mainly on the problems of dualism, especially in

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni191 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Zoroastrianism, and on the history of primitive religion; at Messina (1960–71), he continued with these topics, but began to devote himself more intensively to the general theory of comparativism, and to esoteric religious developments in Greek religion (Orphism, Gnosticism). It was indeed during the early sixties that he developed perhaps his most valuable ideas relating to classical religion, the historical typology of mystic cults, ideas which, however, only appeared in print in the mid-1970s. Once back at Rome, after a brief and rather unhappy period at Bologna, he kept up simultaneous interests in historical comparativism, Mesopotamian religion (Dumuzi-Tammuz and Adonis), the 'oriental religions' of the Roman empire, Gnosticism, Manichaeism, primitive religion, early Christianity, and apocalypticism, becoming a widely respected figure in the field of history of religions, and being elected president of the IAHR in 1990. Casadio has himself published his own brief assessment of Bianchi's achievement in *Kernos* 9 (1996) 11–16, as have Sfameni Gasparro, in her *Themes and Problems of the History of Religions in Contemporary Europe* (Cosenza, 2002), pp. 19–30, and Sanzi, in *Annals of the Sergiu al-George Institute [Bucharest]* 6–8 (1997–9) [2004], 39–46; the present volume provides a far more detailed, nuanced, and sometimes critical account of a remarkable range of densely reflected and strenuously argued ideas.

For the readership of *CR*, it will be best to signal only those essays most relevant to classical religion. Four pieces (Sanzi, Giuffré Scibona, Casadio, Chiodi) document the stages of Bianchi's academic career, often with illuminating anecdotes. Four others (Casadio, Aronen, Pachis, Sfameni Gasparro) deal with his ideas on classical religion. Casadio himself suggests that it was Bianchi's refusal to have any truck with either structuralism or Marxism, and his steadfast disregard for the 'Paris School', that resulted in the marginalization of his suggestive work on Prometheus as trickster (1961), and on the Hesiodic myth of the five races (1963). It is surely the case, too, that his presentation of Orphism as a sort of proto-Gnosticism (1957), and his insistence on the cult's real existence (1974), failed to gain much of a hearing because they ran counter to then widely accepted assumptions. Pachis provides an excellent account of Bianchi's views on the cult of Mithras, which reveal the strengths, and the weaknesses, of the mystic-typology perhaps better than any other example. Sfameni Gasparro shows how Bianchi's sensitivity to historical analogy, and his conception of a dialectic between continuity and innovation, suggested deep links between Orphism, Empedocles, and Platonism on the one hand and Gnosticism on the other: Gnosticism should be understood as the outcome of the Judaizing (or Christianizing) transformation of Greek ideas of world-rejection ('mysteriosophy'). Two other essays (Giusti, Spineto) offer interesting and well-judged accounts of Bianchi's debts to, and differences from, his own Maestri, Pettazzoni and Eliade. All these are well worth reading; but to my mind, the best piece in the book is that on Bianchi's 'religious ethnology', by Alessandra Ciattini.

In postwar Italy, the two dominant intellectual modes were Crocean idealism and Catholic spirituality. As a pupil of Pettazzoni, who had been criticized violently by Croce for his stress on the irreducibility of religion to other categories, but also as a convinced Catholic, B. spent his life attempting, as it were, to reconcile historical positivism and phenomenology. At a time when sociological and anthropological approaches to religion were becoming dominant, he tried to maintain the integrity of the category 'religion' through comparativism while at the same time remaining faithful to the sheer variety of the concrete. As Ciattini points out, this effort was doomed to failure: religion ends up outside history, and comparativism is forced continually to idealize its comparanda. The failure is nevertheless an interesting

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni191 Published online by Cambridge University Press

one, and B.'s range of reference and intellectual acuity lend a particular distinction to all he wrote.

Ilmmünster RICHARD GORDON
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni191

TRADUTTORI TRASFORMATORI

L. HARDWICK: *Translating Words, Translating Cultures*. Pp. 160. London: Duckworth, 2000. Paper, £9.99. ISBN: 0-7156-2912-3.

Even non-specialists like myself cannot fail to admire the way in which classical studies appears to be reinventing itself for a new generation of readers. The quality of scholarship among classicists is no doubt as high as it ever was, but the accessibility of much of the writing today means that many readers can now find a great deal to interest them. Publishers' lists reflect this development, and the quality of school textbooks, as evidenced by the books my children bring home, is superb. What a difference from the primers of my childhood!

Lorna Hardwick's book on translation is a study that demonstrates the new interdisciplinary tendency of much classical scholarship. It is clearly written, full of interesting insights, and appeals to a broad readership in literary and theatre studies. Hardwick's starting point is her recognition of the fact that most readers encounter Greek and Latin literature for the first time through translation. One immediate consequence of this is the need to examine what happens during the translation process, not only in terms of linguistic and stylistic technique, but also in the broader cultural context. She also considers ways in which writers have translated classical texts, particularly epic poetry and Greek tragedy, in highly creative ways, appealing to a new audience and bringing ancient texts to life in terms that both enhance meaning and emphasize the direct relationship between the ancient and modern worlds.

The introductory chapter, aptly entitled 'The Battles of Translation', offers the reader on the very first page a sample of three translations of the *Aeneid*. Gavin Douglas, C. Day Lewis, and David West are contrasted so as to show that though all might have produced accurate translations, nevertheless all have produced very different renderings of the original. This simple example provides the basis upon which H. constructs her argument: understanding the rationale behind such differences enables us to engage with the great debates about faithfulness in translation, and to trace diverse trends in translation norms. H. considers the legacy of E. V. Rieu and the 'readable' school of translation, which opted for prose rather than attempting to render classical verse forms into any modern equivalent, then shows how the work of poet-translators such as Richmond Lattimore, Ted Hughes, and Tony Harrison represents a different perspective on the relationship between ancient and modern writing. These two approaches to translation, both posited on formulating a link between ancient and modern, recur in different ways in the work of the translators she discusses.

Having established the parameters of the debate in her first chapter, H. moves then to a reconsideration of classical translation in the nineteenth century. She challenges the established view that this period can be seen as a dark age in the history of the translation of classical poetry into English, and provides a fascinating account of the translation practice of women such as Anna Swanwick, Augusta Webster, and Amy Levy. The case she presents is that these women began to bring about significant

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni191 Published online by Cambridge University Press