multitude of brilliant and perceptive observations and is a salutary reaction against the recent scholarly trend. It will greatly contribute to the ongoing discussion and appreciation of this Ovidian work.

University of Udine GIANPIERO ROSATI

SCRIPTAE PUELLAE

M. WYKE: *The Roman Mistress. Ancient and Modern Representations*. Pp. x + 452. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Cased. ISBN: 0-19-815075-X.

This volume contains an Introduction followed by ten essays, equally divided between 'Love Poetry' and 'Reception'. As W. makes clear in the introduction, only two of the essays—concluding pieces on receptions of Messalina—are entirely new. Of the preceding eight, the notes of the first four have been supplemented with references to literature that has appeared since original publication, while essays five to eight have undergone more substantial revision.

Students of Roman love elegy will give a warm welcome to the collection of W.'s influential series of five articles on the genre, and be grateful for the generous bibliographical supplementation or revision performed on them. The addition of a detailed general index and a lengthy Index of Classical Passages Cited further increases both access to these classic articles and the value of the collection as a whole. Since the texts of the majority of the articles on elegy are in essence unchanged, and their place as foundations for modern readings of elegy assured, I need make no comments except of a general kind. The first is to note W.'s frank and disarming admission (p. 2 n. 1) that Propertius is the focus of the essays on love elegy, and that the 'elegies of Ovid are considered only where they appear responsive to those of Propertius, and those of Tibullus scarcely feature at all'. As W. implies here, one cannot necessarily generalize from Propertius to the rest of love elegy—especially if the true full range of the genre is considered, including Ovid's erotodidactic poetry and the *Heroides*. The tone which these articles maintain as a group is attractive: readable, fluid, with no melodramatic epigraphs from Nietzsche or Lacan, and (perhaps not a coincidence) few promises on which W.'s criticism—or the elegies—cannot deliver. Also welcome is the retrospective influence of W.'s later work on reception on the new versions of these articles on elegy. For, in addition to more lengthy and explicit engagement with the views of previous scholars than in the originals (e.g. pp. 14–17) and the helpful addition of translations lacking from the originals, a number of genuinely useful modern and early-modern illustrations have been introduced. The fifth paper, a version of W.'s 1994 *Ramus* article on 'Taking the Woman's Part', has been more substantially recast so as to reflect its final position here in the series of articles on love elegy. Engagement with previous scholarship was a notable feature of the original, but it is here thoroughly updated and pushed to centre stage. Amongst new material added, in welcome anticipation of the concerns of the second half of the collection, is a series of reflections on Mark Antony. (A final, if trivial, point is the transformation rich and strange which these four articles have undergone from their original appearance in the likes of *JRS*: glossy paper and a fancy type replace—in this handsomely produced volume—the austere layout and production values of the journals. The effect is strangely disorientating.)

The second half of the collection offers, in addition to the pair on Messalina, three

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.392 Published online by Cambridge University Press

chapters on receptions of Cleopatra. The first chapter, with its investigation of representations of Cleopatra in Augustan poetry, acts as a useful bridge between the love elegy of the first half of the book and the more modern Cleopatras and Messalinas of the second. However, W. persuasively argues in the first half of the book that '. . . Propertian elegy's poet-lover appears to adopt, provocatively, the position of an Antony . . . Its elegiac mistress, however, is not figured comparably as . . . a sovereign Cleopatra' (p. 171). In which case, one wonders—from the viewpoint of the unity of the collection—why Cleopatra bulks so large in the second half. One answer is that the Augustan poetic narratives of Cleopatra, at least, show as little interest in awarding the queen her rôle as divine protectress of Egypt as Propertius does in granting his mistress the rôle of sovereign woman logically correlative to his Antony.

Chapters 7 and 8 revisit and expand on some of W.'s earlier work on ancient Rome in the cinema. Initial contact with the previous chapters is established by highlighting the debt of film-makers to the *meretrix regina* of the ancient sources (p. 245) and their myth of the West's victory over the East, although interests here are soon (necessarily) widened to allow for a study of Cleopatra as site for exploration of modern imperialism, gender and ethnicity. If Cynthia is of interest to Propertius only in so far as she helps to define his identity, Cleopatra takes on, among others, the rather different rôle of depicting the Orient-other as a woman (feminizing, alluring, penetrable). But, along with all the expected references to Orientalism, the gendered western gaze, Americanization, and commodification, one would have welcomed more recognition of the well documented ability of readers—above all where the mass media are concerned—to sift, traduce, resist, misread, and even ignore the manifest or intended meaning of the cultural products which they are consuming (crucially, of course, where films made in one country are viewed in another). Having said that, the material studied here is fascinating, particularly W.'s pages on Elizabeth Taylor as Cleopatra. Chapters 9 and 10, on Messalina 1870–1970, run in illuminating parallel with Cleopatra 1910–1960 and focus on another *meretrix regina*, this time in the very heart of Rome, and on such complementary issues as the empress as a site for the consumption and exploration of sexuality, femininity, and tyranny. Here W. weaves a narrative, based on extensive primary research, from such diverse media as Italian dictionaries, medical literature, theatre, cinema, novels, and even the BBC's infamous—all wobbly sets and terrible lighting—mid-1970s small-screen version of *I, Claudius*. The very plenitude of the material provokes an unsettling contrast with the first half of the book: the constant suspicion that we have too little and know too little afflicts all who work on Augustan literature; while study of the reception of antiquity in theatre, book, and film surely threatens continually to ramify into a Complete History of the Twentieth Century.

University of Manchester ROY K. GIBSON

VITRUVIUS

I. K. McEwen: *Vitruvius. Writing the Body of Architecture*. Pp. xiv + 493, ills. Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 2003. Cased, £26.50. ISBN: 0-262-13415-2.

This is an immensely stimulating book, not in the least because of its idiosyncrasies. McEwen, who is not a classicist and therefore can expect the same carping from the guild that greeted Diane Favro's successful *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.392 Published online by Cambridge University Press