precedence over time, so perhaps giving us a means of distinguishing the work from one of universal history'? (Well, yes.) What periods does Strabo look at? He mentions foundations, the Persian Wars (but without a focus on Athens and Sparta), and then his own period. So, why is the *Geography* not a history? Because it is not interested in history (p. 304). So, what is Strabo's universalism (pp. 307–28)? Rome is the focus, and Rome is behind the whole conception. Indeed, the work 'was a spatial parallel' to Nicolaus' universal history, though the discrete presentation makes it difficult to claim a universal conception (pp. 313–14). Yet, Strabo is also part of an Hellenic tradition, and his 'geography' must be located within Greek discourse (pp. 329–36). Given this, it is disappointing to fall back on Bowersock's old idea of Strabo's 'proposed reader, the Roman πολιτικός (man of state) educated in Greek φιλοσοφία (philosophy)'. We do not know (1.1.16 [9] has no bearing on such a reader). What we do know is that the work was not mentioned for some time. And one reason for that is that Strabo was writing at the end of an epoch and the direction he took was not congenial to the coming one. With exceptions (of course), a Rome-focused view of the world was not at the centre of intellectual life in Greek in the next few centuries. The possibility, however unsuccessful, of basing oneself properly in the Greek world was preferable despite or because of the extension of Roman citizenship and jobs, leaving Strabo's problematical loyalties firmly on the shelf.

University of Warwick SIMON SWAIN

EROS CONTEXTUALIZED

C. CALAME: *The Poetics of Eros in Ancient Greece* (first published in Italian, trans. by J. Lloyd). Pp. xxvi + 213, pls. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999. Cased, £21.50. ISBN: 0-691-04341-8.

It is a common habit for translations to change the titles of their original, but in this case it might have been preferable to retain it. *I Greci e l'eros: simboli, pratiche, e luoghi* does actually describe the contents of the book, for Calame has much to say beyond the confines of poetics. Symbols, practices, and places all receive the benefit of his acute and sensitive eye, and the book is full of interesting aperçus and enlightening observations. It is divided into five parts, each of which deals with a different aspect of Eros and is arranged so that C.'s argument can be seen developing from one stage to the next in a clear progression, which is often lacking in works of a less delicate sensibility.

C. begins with poetry, and Euripides' *Hippolytus* in particular, and shows how the effects of love are portrayed therein in terms especially of their physiological impact—Eros is regularly kept separate from the organs of intellect: hence the importance of understanding the range of suggestions contained in such terms as *pothos*, *kharis*, *himeros*, and *thumos*. Since the principal evidence we have of Greek (i.e. largely Athenian) culture consists of texts and pictures, it is crucial to our proper understanding of the words and our interpretation of pictorial representations that we constantly place them and grapple with them in their contexts. Thus C. emphasizes that poetry and ornamented objects were linked with particular institutions such as the symposium and the palaestra, and must be interpreted in relation to them, not wrenched from their social settings. Part 1 is largely devoted to etymological argument and especially to the study of *philotes* in the melic poets. Same-sex love, we learn, is doomed to create an asymmetrical and therefore unhappy relationship, and this

© Classical Association, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.327 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mismatch between the desire of the lover and the elusiveness of the beloved pervades all archaic poetry which constantly dwells on the dissatisfying side of love. But *philein* and *philotes* emphasize trust in the mutuality established by love, and when found in the context of paederasty (as opposed to homosexuality, to which C. devotes some very instructive space) reflect a relationship which was intended to integrate young men into society and young women into marriage. Eros, then, like a physician, can reconcile contrarieties and maintain balance in both the individual and society.

C. reminds us of the important caveat that melic and epic poetry are literary and symbolic constructs, and that in consequence we cannot recreate real sexual practice from them. He also draws attention to a significant difference between the two: epic poetry tends to deal with relationships between a man and a woman, thereby illustrating in relation to Eros love fulfilled, whereas melic poetry tends to deal with relationships between a man or woman and an adolescent, usually of the same sex, and to show that these portray love frustrated. Melic poetry, however, sublimates the same-sex erotic desire and so corrects the imbalance inherent in the relationship, and by the time we come to the Alexandrian erotic epigram this has turned into a literary game for intellectuals. C. now turns to the link he sees between erotic iconography and erotic poetry. These, he claims, are homologous: the krater, for example, becoming an erotic declaration after the same manner as a love poem; and this discussion leads into Part 3, which reviews the interaction between Eros and the *polis* in the form of the symposium for men and the status of *hetaira* for women. Here C. points out that obscene iconography regularly links sexual excess with the presence of wine in the symposium or the *komos*, and that 'hetaira' is not an easy word to understand, since her status oscillates between masculine and feminine, and even individual contexts do not always clarify what the Greek writer has in mind when he uses the term.

Part 4, which deals with places such as the flowery meadow and the garden, sits uneasily with the rest of the book. One can see why C. included it, but the subject matter reads a little as though it were a separate article or belonged to a slightly different discussion. A section on the Arrhephoroi is perhaps the least satisfactory part of the book. C. plausibly dismisses the notion that the girls were taking part in an initiation ritual, but his own notion—that the rite introduced a few specially chosen Athenian girls to their future function as mothers of citizens—is not in the least convincing. A final part discusses Eros in his philosophical and mystic guises, particularly as he was seen by Plato and the Orphic fragments.

C. thus largely eschews the interests and emphases of Foucault, which, as he rightly observes, have been too influential among Anglo-Saxon scholars, and in consequence we are given fresh insights into a wide range of Greek psychologies and institutional practices. The translation is smooth and readable, although the insistence upon exact transliteration from the Greek occasionally jars, as in 'egkomia' (p. 86), and someone translating from Italian should know better than to refer to 'a' graffiti (p. 106).

University of St Andrews P. G. MAXWELL-STUART

THE GREEK FAMILY

C. B. PATTERSON: *The Family in Greek History.* Pp. 286, 6 figs. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1998. Cased, £21.95. ISBN: 0-674-29270-7.

The study of the Greek family has for a long time been the younger sibling (families

© Classical Association, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.327 Published online by Cambridge University Press