which I forbear to trespass. Of special interest to historians of scholarship is the part played by Colonna's *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* in stirring fresh ingredients from such abstruse sources as Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata* into the rich mythological brew into which the artists dipped for ideas (pp. 126–31 and nn. 244, 249). A. also explores an aspect of Beroaldus' commentary on the *Metamorphoses* overlooked by Konrad Krautter in his monograph (*Philologische Methode und humanistische Existenz. Filippo Beroaldo und sein Kommentar zum Goldenen Esel des Apuleius* [Munich, 1971]; not noticed in *CR*). Like the editions of the *Apulegio*, Beroaldus' book was illustrated with woodcuts. Those in the *Apulegio*, as is instantly clear from the reproductions provided by A., were Tamagni's model for the San Secondo frescoes and were primarily decorative. Those in Beroaldus, also reproduced, are strikingly different; and A. argues that they were not included simply to provide diversion but are integral to the programme of the book and the allegorical subtext perceived by Beroaldo. This thesis is curiously exemplified in the cut purporting to illustrate Lucius' retransformation into human shape. In flat contradiction of Apuleius' text, it shows him receiving a garland of roses from a female figure, with a man dressed in what may he meant as the garb of a Christian priest standing behind him. That scene recalls the edifying ending substituted for the original in Angelo Firenzuola's posthumous *Asino d'oro* (1550), in which Lucius is restored through the intercession of St Jerome and the roses are proffered by 'Costanza Amaretta' (pp. 76–7). A.'s ingenious identification, in the light of Beroaldus' note, of the woman in his illustration as Sapientia still leaves the identity of the 'priest' unclear; and the correspondence between some of these illustrations and the commentary, on any hypothesis, remains far from explicit (pp. 155–7), but there is a problem here which needs to be addressed, and A. deserves credit for tackling it. A cautionary tale, I think, for students of the printed word.

A. makes no exaggerated claims for Tamagni's work: he adapted the illustrations he or his patron selected from the *Apulegio* 'con una certa grazia, anche se pedissequamente . . . Nella pittura gli ambienti esterni vengono caratterizzati da sfondi paesaggistici e gli interni da sobri effetti prospettici realizzati con sfumature di colore' (p. 151). In the monochrome reproductions provided here, much of their impact is inevitably lost; but this is a unique monument to Apuleius' story-telling genius, and for any of his admirers finding themselves in the neighbourhood of Parma, *vaut le détour.*

Cambridge E. J. KENNEY

BURCKHARDT ON THE *POLIS*

S. BAUER: *Polisbild und Demokratieverständnis in Jacob Burckhardts 'Griechischer Kulturgeschichte'*. (Beiträge zu Jacob Burckhardt 3.) Pp. 271. Munich: C. H. Beck,Basle: Schwabe, 2001. Cased, €35. ISBN: 3-7965-1674-2.

Somewhat more than a hundred years after his death, Jacob Burckhardt, professor in history and art history at the University of Basle in Switzerland and the father of cultural history as a genre of its own, is of as much interest as ever. A new critical edition of Burckhardt consisting of twenty-seven volumes is in preparation, and will also include hitherto unpublished manuscripts and lecture notes of the many-sided Swiss scholar, who published and lectured on historical and art-historical aspects spanning from ancient Greece to his own days. As a complement to the new

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Burckhardt edition, a separate series, 'Beiträge zu Jacob Burckhardt', is published. Bauer's work on Burckhardt's view of the Greek *polis* and democracy is part of this new series.

Burckhardt's *Griechische Kulturgeschichte* (*GK*) was published posthumously in four volumes between 1898 and 1902. The work, which was anticipated already during Burckhardt's last years alive (it is based upon lectures given in Basle during the 1870s and 1880s), was in general reviewed critically, partly because Burckhardt based himself mainly on classical authors and handbooks, and made little use of contemporary scholarship. Still, it has become a historical classic with a profound influence on later scholarship, especially in the German-speaking world (it has only been partly translated into English, in 1963 and 1998). Thus, even the popular usage in scholarly publications of the word *polis* in untranslated form goes back to Burckhardt, although Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, for instance, stigmatized it as 'a stupid Burckhardtian catchword' ('ein dummes Burckhardtsches Schlagwort').

Burckhardt gives in *GK* a gloomy picture of the *polis*, describing it as striving for full control and power over the individual. Even culture was to a high degree dominated by the *polis*, which according to him was a *città dolente*, a city of suffering that the individual could not escape. He finds the best example of the imperious Greek *polis* in Sparta. Although Burckhardt in many ways is critical towards Spartan society, he at the same time expresses his admiration for the principles and religious zeal of the Spartans, not to mention their government, which he contrasts positively with the unpredictable Athenian *ekklesia.* According to him, the Greeks never succeeded in combining political equality with individual liberty, and democracy therefore developed into the tyranny of the masses over the individual.

Bauer attempts in his book to analyse Burckhardt's view of the Greek *polis* and democracy in a systematic way, and to evaluate to what extent he may have been influenced by his own political standpoint and environment. Therefore a large part of the book is devoted to describing the context in which Burckhardt studied, lived, and worked. Could he, for instance, have been influenced by the contemporary political situation in Basle as well as in the rest of Europe, or by his teachers (e.g. Boeckh, Droysen, and Ranke) and colleagues (e.g. Fustel de Coulanges and Nietzsche)?

Burckhardt's anti-democratic stance has already before been ascribed to his distaste for the revolutionary movements of the nineteenth century, but Bauer now offers a more detailed analysis. Although political equality according to Burckhardt can only lead to negative consequences, he still favours a state based on social equality, where every citizen can feed himself from his own work. According to Bauer, his preference for oligarchy before democracy may go back to Basle, which until 1870 was basically a city-state governed by a small clique of patrician families (to one of which Burckhardt himself belonged). In the same way Burckhardt's pessimism is probably influenced by the critical years in the 1860s and early 1870s in Central European history.

History is, to quote Burckhardt, always 'the record of what one age finds worthy of note in another', and there is no reason to believe that Burckhardt was not influenced by his own time. Another path which Bauer does not follow, but which also may have turned out fruitful, would have been to analyse to what extent Burckhardt in *GK* is unintentionally influenced by his earlier research on the Renaissance in Italy (above all, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*). Or is it just a coincidence that the idea of the state as a hostile power, the admiration of the Spartan oligarchic government and civic character are all prevalent in the treatises of political thinkers during the Italian Renaissance?

At the end of Bauer's book there are three appendices concerning the relation

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.360 Published online by Cambridge University Press

between Burckhardt and Nietzsche, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and Max Weber, as well as a page concordance between different Burckhardt editions. In conclusion, this is a very well written book which definitely deepens our understanding of Burckhardt and his view of the *polis* and democracy.

University of Helsinki BJÖRN FORSÉN

OUR DEBT TO BAKHTIN

R. Bracht Branham (ed.): *Bakhtin and the Classics*. Pp. xxvii + 299. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2002. Paper, $27.95. ISBN: 0-8101-1906-4 (0-8101-1905-6 hbk).

The Bakhtin phenomenon is fascinating. How is it that a writer from the Stalinist Soviet Union, whose work became widely known even in Russia only after it was translated into French fifty or more years after its initial publication, should be so trendy for classicists? Especially when Bakhtin is given to grand theory and grand pronouncements on Literature, the World, Laughter—the sort of theorizing that makes many professional classicists in the twentieth century, dedicated as they are to the protocols of the footnote, want to duck beneath the parapet. It is not a stirring story of personal heroic resistance to the oppressive State: as the leading Bakhtinian scholar Ken Hirschkop nicely puts it, 'For a long time, we knew very little about Bakhtin's life. Thanks to the efforts of postglasnost Bakhtin scholarship, we now know even less'. Nor is it the express content of his classical criticism. Although he writes on 'epic and the novel', and is one of few writers of his period to take e.g. the ancient Greek Romance seriously, most of his remarks on ancient literature are passed over with rather awkward silence, or alluded to in the most general way as 'stimulating'. Nor is it evident that his interest in the grotesque body of Rabelaisian fantasy would attract the devotees of Apollonian perfection, nor that his love of what he calls the dialogic novel of the nineteenth-century Soviet Union would provide fertile ground for classicists, particularly when cultural and generic specificity are privileged focuses of ancient literary study. Yet what makes Bakhtin 'one of the leading thinkers of the twentieth century' (as Clark and Holquist put it with the biographer's usual lack of disinterestedness) is the productivity of his ideas. His notions of 'the carnival', 'the dialogic', 'the chronotope', the destabilizing force of laughter, the revolutionary gesture of the popular grotesque, have not only been swiftly absorbed into mainstream criticism, but have also been used not just as templates to be dropped over other cultures or literatures (though there are plenty of rather slavish and uninspiring 'Bakhtinian readings'), but as starting points which lead in different and often thrilling directions. This is seen not just in obvious and brilliant reworkings of his material (like Stallybrass and White's *The Politics and Poetics of Trangression* or Terry Castle's *Masquerade and Civilization*—to mention two major books that do not reach Branham's bibliography), but also in such volumes as Emily Gowers's excellent *The Loaded Table* or Amy Richlin's *The Garden of Priapus*, which could not have been imagined without the influence, direct and indirect, of Bakhtin.

This productivity of Bakhtin is the strength and weakness of Branham's bold, explorative, and varied volume. Readers who turn to it to find what Bakhtin thought of the classics will be disappointed: there is no comprehensive guide. Nor will initiands find an account of what Bakhtin said and why it is useful for classicists. (There are

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.360 Published online by Cambridge University Press