statues and poetry in archaic and classical Greece (Chapter 5: 'The Image in the Text'). In all, *Images in Mind* draws effortlessly from surviving objects of arts and descriptions of them (and their uses) from Homer through the classical age as S. explores the rich relationship between things that represent and people (or gods) represented. Particularly persuasive (with Pandora) are her treatments of archaic *korai*, late archaic and classical representations of Nike, the Athenian Tyrannicides, and the relationship of statue and ode that courses through archaic epinician poetry.

To praise *Images in Mind* for its readings of individual sculptures and literary passages is not to reduce the book to a pastiche of virtuoso analyses. *Images in Mind* will certainly engage scholars of archaic and classical literature as well as art historians, but it deserves a much wider audience. Just as it soars beyond what this reviewer sees as theoretical incongruities, the book's significance is not limited to its adroit management of visual and textual materials. *Images in Mind* is a uniquely valuable exploration of the distinctly visual culture of archaic and classical Greece. So in her epilogue ('Lucian's Retrospective'), S. recaps the relation of visual and textual meaning by looking through the lens provided by a Lucian's *Eikones* and *Pro eikonibus*. While the statues of archaic and classical Greece were already known (as they are now) primarily in the memories preserved by texts, Lucian nonetheless preserves his sense of the very different visual culture of a past era when he has Lycinus remember that Homer made his wounded Menelaos come fully alive in *Iliad* 4 by describing his 'bloodied thighs in the likeness of ivory tinged with crimson' (p. 305).

Iowa State University JAMES F. MCGLEW

ROMAN BUILDINGS IN LITERATURE

A. SCHEITHAUER: *Kaiserliche Bautätigkeit in Rom. Das Echo in der antiken Literatur*. Pp. 338. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2000. Cased, DM 120. ISBN: 3-515-07465-1.

Andrea Scheithauer has performed a valuable service here in pulling together the literary testimonia for imperial building projects in the city of Rome. This study has value both to archaeologists, who can place their results in a more secure relationship to the literary remains we possess, and to literary scholars wishing to know which of an emperor's building projects was attracting the attention of poets, historians, encyclopedists, et al. It does not seem that S. has missed any author of note from the first four centuries C.E. This study is doubly welcome, coming as it does after M. Horster's *Literarische Zeugnisse kaiserliche Bautätigkeit* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1997), which discusses literary testimonia for imperial building activity outside of Rome.

The book falls into eight chapters, with an introduction and afterword. The introduction lays out the rationale for the project and speculates on some of the issues (i.e. social status, fear, etc.) conditioning the accounts we have of imperial projects in the literature. S. also discusses the wide range of sources canvassed to create the account. Chapters 1–7, respectively, detail the building activities of Augustus, the Julio-Claudians, the Flavians, the adoptive emperors, the Severi, the emperors between 235 and 284, and Diocletian/Constantine. Each of these seven chapters surveys the activity of the emperor according to type of building activity. Discussion dexterously treats any of the following that apply to an individual emperor: temples, *fora*, miscellaneous building meant to legitimate the dynasty, building activity of the emperor's

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.122 Published online by Cambridge University Press

relatives, repair of existing monuments, aqueducts, streets, baths, public works in general, etc. The eighth chapter consists in a series of ten self-contained discussions of the evidence S. has adduced. The themes of these discussions include aesthetics, morals, *liberalitas*, religion, quality of life, ideology/politics, and social status of the writer.

As noted above, this book is a valuable work. It is incredibly useful to be able to gauge the reception of any one particular monument or type of building activity across all the authors who have written about it. The discussion of Augustus' forum (pp. 62–9), for example, brings together the *Res Gestae*, Ovid, Pliny the Elder, Velleius Paterculus, Virgil, Suetonius, Dio, and SHA. But what pleases comes at a price. The book's determined focus on chronology and projects of individual emperors does not make for an enticing narrative thrust. Also, the presentation of the testimonia contiguously necessarily decontextualizes them and places side by side evidence from contexts that have widely diverging objectives (consider, for example, SHA and Velleius together). But to be fair, there surely was no other way, and the reader should regard this book as one to consult. Three indices (literary sources, ancient persons, and general subject [Latin and German]) make such an approach to the book viable.

A final thought about the book: toward the end of the introduction (p. 26), S. briefly elaborates a theoretical basis for her study. The names of Iser and Eco appear, as well as a reference to Reader Response Criticism. For a moment there is a frisson at the thought of theoretical engagement on the horizon. This engagement does not eventuate; had it done so, the book would have been prohibitively long. But an effect remains: the evocation of the sender of the message, its recipients, and variations in the horizons of expectation (*Verstehenhorizontes*) in recipients depending on when and where they lived makes this reader question the ability of the categories S. uses (aesthetics, morals, liberalitas, etc.) to function as stable categories of analysis. Will not these categories be as contingent as the witnesses of the buildings? How can aesthetic appreciation of an imperial monument be separated from its political effects? But I surely ask too much; let these complaints be taken as encouragement to further scholarly work on the evidence S. has ably provided.

Hamilton College MARK MASTERSON

SOLON

A. J. Domínguez Monedero: *Solón de Atenas*. Pp. 301, ills. Barcelona: Critica, 2001. Paper. ISBN: 84-8432-298-X.

The aims of this book are historical. Domínguez Monedero is not concerned to analyze Solon as poet or to examine the relation of Solon's poetry to archaic poetic traditions. D.M. summarizes his aims as follows: to analyze the figure of Solon and his work in Athens, as well as the conditions of Athens in the sixth century and the consequences of Solon's legislation for later Athenian history. D.M. does not set out to establish a revolutionary new interpretation of Solon's contributions to Athenian society, but more modestly to establish the state of the question, and to make some suggestions in regard to the problems of interpretation. Thus the primary contribution of this book is its comprehensive presentation of the issues, evidence and scholarly controversies. D.M. has thorough control of his sources, is balanced in his assessment of the issues, and is up-to-date (with a few exceptions noted below) in his knowledge of scholarship. In short, this is a useful summation of the evidence and bibliography on Solon and sixth-century Athens.

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.122 Published online by Cambridge University Press