prime role of a capitalism, liberated by centuriation, which ultimately changed the social and political system – the main focus of interest in Weber's work. There is a bibliographical note and a selective current bibliography. Weber's notes are retained and his 'Literatur' section simply reproduced, but Frank has added brief indexes (names and subjects). Where the German word is intractable (as with 'Hufenrecht'), he has retained it alongside his English version. This book is clearly a labour of love and useful as far as it goes; for more scholarly study there is J. Deininger's ('Deininer's', as the translator has it) scientific (*sic*) edition of 1986. So to the great historian of the fourth century. There are major works, but Gavin Kelly's *Ammianus Marcellinus. The Allusive Historian*[22] has a different focus, as he explains: concentration on biographical factors and the dismissal of Ammianus' numerous references to earlier writers (see the *index locorum*) give way precisely to stress on those allusions, which Kelly takes as seriously as students of earlier historians have taken those in Tacitus. Indeed, the first section of the book is entitled 'The Elusive Historian'. But Kelly discovers a relation between autopsy and allusion (which has to be disentangled from intertextuality). In short, we pass from 'naïve self-revelation' to a 'carefully crafted literary persona' (108). Readers will be keen to see how Kelly interprets Ammianus' attitude towards Christianity (he nods with 'Christiani legis': 305): he is inclined to see a pagan affecting to know little of it; that seems plausible, and fits his overall interpretation of Ammianus as a classical writer. This second section is divided into three chapters, besides that on intertextuality, and still entwined with it: 'Sources' (asserting Ammianus' control), 'The Exemplary Historian', and 'Julian's Monument' – which the *Res Gestae* turns out not to be. This refreshing, forward-looking work will provoke responses overall and in detail from scholars who approach the historian from different points; but all will benefit from reading it.

doi:S0017383508000740 BARBARA LEVICK

[22] *Ammianus Marcellinus. The Allusive Historian*. By Gavin Kelly. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge and New York, Cambridge University Press, 2008. Pp. xii + 378. Hardback £55, ISBN: 978-0-5218-4299-0.

Art and Archaeology

The British Museum has a notorious problem when it comes to staging so-called 'blockbuster' exhibitions: namely, the lack of grandiose exhibition space. So it was with the Persians in 2005, and so it showed again for Hadrian this year, with the hyperbole of display titles ('His Rule Changed History') somewhat mocked by the pinched circuit of Hadrianic memorabilia arranged inside the 'historic' old Reading Room. But, as if to compensate visitors either vexed by claustrophobia or else underwhelmed by the range of the exhibits (for example, a water pipe from Tivoli: admittedly well-formed, but a water pipe all the same), the attendant catalogue is ample, handsome, and readable. In fact *Hadrian. Empire and Conflict*[1] is hardly a catalogue at all, rather a thematic historical and archaeological reassessment of

[1] *Hadrian. Empire and Conflict*. By Thorsten Opper. London, British Museum Press, 2008. Pp. 256. 215 figures. Hardback £40, ISBN: 978-0-7141-5074-1; paperback £25, ISBN: 978-0-7141-5069-0.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383508000752 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hadrian, with a simple checklist of objects appended. A brisk introduction sets the scene, identifying precisely how Hadrian's personality 'changed history': 'He laid the foundations for the great flourishing of Greek culture within the Roman world that would ultimately lead to the transformation of the Roman into the Byzantine empire' (26). The slightly toxic influence of Marguerite Yourcenar's *Mémoires d'Hadrien* (Paris, 1951) is acknowledged; then we are off, embarked on the narrative of Trajan's succession, and immediately aware of the difference between Yourcenar's (dare one say) pretentious fantasy and the material testimonia of Hadrianic rule. There are new finds to report – notably pieces of an akrolithic image of the emperor from Sagalassos, and the discovery of what seems to be an Antinous-*heroon* at Tivoli – old monuments calling for fresh evaluation (the Pantheon, the Wall, and much else related to 'Hadrian's building boom'), and, throughout, a cautionary scepticism towards all that we are told by the ancient literary sources about Hadrian (Graeco-Roman intellectuals resented an emperor who aspired to be one of them – at least, they did so once he was dead). And although it must be said that Hadrian himself remains essentially elusive in character, many readers of this book will surely find aspects of Hadrianic history illuminated here: perhaps, for instance, the diagnosis of a medical condition that produced distinctive creases in Hadrian's earlobes; or, it may be, Hadrian's studious 'inheritance' of pederastic behaviour from Trajan. Above all, Hadrian is portrayed here not only as a second Augustus (an early ambition fulfilled) but as arguably more effective than Augustus in reconciling the style and substance of leadership. So we may salute the image-conscious Hadrian, who relied upon slaves skilled with curling tongs to achieve his wavy coiffure; and Hadrian the authentic *imperator*, whose speeches to his troops left no doubt that his strategies were based upon experience in the field. Hadrian's passion for the Bithynian boy Antinous has been described as the final enchantment (in Classical antiquity) of the ideal of *kalokagathia*, 'beautiful goodness'. It happens that the social practice associated with this ideal, namely 'pederasty' (*paiderastia*: 'erotic relations between adult men and adolescent boys'), is nowhere more clearly documented than on Athenian painted vases of the sixth and fifth centuries; and it is a curious feature of modern scholarship that the pederastic scenes on those vases have been largely overlooked as historical documents. In 1947, J. D. Beazley contributed his own typically understated analysis of pederastic iconography to a journal article on 'Some Attic Vases in the Cyprus Museum';[2] otherwise, it was not until Kenneth Dover published his monograph on *Greek Homosexuality* (London, 1978) that the evidence from Attic black- and red-figure pots was properly incorporated into an historical account of 'Athenian' sexual *mores*. The time is overdue for a survey and assessment of the material: and, in their *Images of Ancient Greek Pederasty*,[3] Andrew Lear and Eva Cantarella provide just such. Eva Cantarella, the Milan-based Professor of Greek Law, gained some celebrity in Italy last year with the publication of *L'amore è un dio. Il sesso e la* polis ('Love is a God. Sex and the *Polis*'), effectively an exposition of Greek mythology with Eros as prime mover; here she provides a fastidious opening chapter regarding texts and topics of legalistic concern. The subsequent discussion of imagery is left to Andrew Lear, with due acknowledgment to the late Keith DeVries – otherwise known as

[2] *Proceedings of the British Academy* 33 (1947), 195–242.

[3] *Images of Ancient Greek Pederasty. Boys Were Their Gods.* By Andrew Lear and Eva Cantarella. Abingdon and New York, Routledge, 2008. Pp. xvii + 262. 111 figures. Hardback £65, ISBN: 978-0-415-22367-6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383508000752 Published online by Cambridge University Press

excavator of Gordion, but who had also compiled a database of pederastic scenes and shared this list before his death in 2006. Lear's discussion is not exhaustive, yet makes some significant points about the nuances of pederastic behaviour. Patrokles and Achilles, Aristogeiton and Harmodius – clearly these couples presented myth-historical paradigms for the heroic decorum of pederasty; but, from the visual record, it seems clear that a distinctly 'Platonic' mode of boy-adoration cannot be identified. Carnal compulsion is not to be categorically separated from spiritual kinship: instead, we should recognize that there were dignified ways of both expressing and receiving affection, and shameful ways too. The boy (*eromenos*) who is truly *kalos* must be at most passive, preferably 'hard to get' (that is, wary of gifts), and ideally indifferent to the sexual attentions he arouses from his elders. As Lear points out, scenes of pederastic courtship and 'consummation' (such as it was) are made visually explicit on painted vases but scarcely described at all in Greek literature: so we rely on a certain amount of contextual deduction, not to mention an instinctive reading of 'body language', to determine whether this or that scene qualifies as dignified or shameful. Overall, the interpretations given here are convincing – though one cannot help wondering how much of the imagery is sterilized by sheer stylization (consider, for example, what it might really be like to accept the present of a large, live hare, held out by its ears: the scenario soon loses all tranquillity). According to Pliny (*NH* 34.17), it was a pederastic couple who gave rise to the phenomenon of public memorials in Greek art: the 'tyrannicides' Harmodius and Aristogeiton, whose iconic status as joint martyrs of the Athenian democracy did not efface (apparently) their individual representation. Yet Pliny does not possess a vocabulary adequate to define what constitutes a commemorative 'portrait' – and it would be true to say that we have been suffering from this lack of definition ever since. Does the enterprise of portraiture tend to 'realism' or 'idealization' in its treatment of a subject? Othmar Jaeggi's monograph, *Die griechischen Porträts*,[4] addresses this dilemma directly and intelligently, as far as it goes – but one cannot help feeling that the question is ultimately misleading. Cognitive psychologists have established it as a principle of the memory process that we remember other people by storing images of them as caricatures; that we naturally tend to select and exaggerate those 'memorable' features serving to distinguish one face from another. This is a principle of cognitive behaviour that awaits full analysis in the history of portraiture, but its implications are obvious enough. If the primary purpose of a portrait is to preserve the memory of a person, then should we not expect the efficient portrait-maker to produce an image akin to the image favoured by the hard-wiring of the human brain: an essentially incremental image, an image neither 'realistic' nor 'idealized' but sufficient to mark individual identity? Jaeggi's description of certain Greek portraits as (for example) 'embodiments of manliness' is not wrong – it simply remarks an incidental or secondary effect. No one would deny that Harmodius and Aristogeiton embody manliness (respectively youthful and mature): the point is, has their memory been perpetuated by an artist's isolation of key characteristics? This may not be the best example, since so much here depends upon the association of posture and attitude with a 'historic' event; yet the case can nevertheless be made for a portrait assuming, as it were, a life of its own. Sheila Dillon does not draw upon the resources of cognitive

[4] *Die griechischen Porträts. Antike Repräsentation – Moderne Projektion*. By Othmar Jaeggi. Berlin, Reimer, 2008. Pp. 170. 64 figures. Hardback €39, ISBN: 978-3-496-01392-1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383508000752 Published online by Cambridge University Press

psychology to launch her own 'take' upon the problem of Classical portraits. Rather, in her study of *Ancient Greek Portrait Sculpture*,[5] she proposes abandoning the traditional quest of scholars confronted by Greek portraits – portraits by and large with Roman provenance – which has been to make a classification by names. This is a radical shift of direction, and seems at first sight to subvert the very *raison d'etre* of a portrait. If we cannot recognize some bearded worthy as Homer or Demosthenes or suchlike, what value has the portrait; who wants a portrait of 'Anonymous'? But of course this is more of a problem for modern scholars than it was for ancient patrons. When Martin Robertson salutes the block-headed bust of Themistokles (from Ostia) as 'the first true portrait of an individual European', the identification of a pugnacious block-head with the historical Athenian is secured only by an accompanying inscription; yet, if we had no such 'label' of identity, the physiognomic individuality would be there all the same. So, by focusing on a series of 'unknown' Classical personages, Dillon is able to explore the nuances of appearance for their own sake. The result is a necessary (and overdue) exercise in recognizing the range of sculptural techniques devised by the fourth century BC in order to achieve the rightful end of all portraits – commemoration by an 'increase of being'.

doi:S0017383508000752 NIGEL SPIVEY

[5] *Ancient Greek Portrait Sculpture. Contexts, Subjects, and Styles*. By Sheila Dillon. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006. Pp. xx + 217. 171 figures. Hardback £64, ISBN: 978-0-521-85498-6.

Philosophy

David Sedley this year edits his last *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*[1] – a fine volume, which, among other treats, includes a bravura discussion – with pictures! – of a passage of *Metaphysics* Θ.6 by Myles Burnyeat. Sedley has also published his 2004 Sather Lectures, *Creationism and its Critics in Antiquity*,[2] from which it emerges that there were more creationists in antiquity than we generally suppose. The Presocratics in particular, according to Sedley, were not the mechanists that Plato and Aristotle have encouraged us to think of them as: they differed more in their ideas about how than about whether teleology was part of the story. Anaxagoras' Intellect turns out to have brought about and nurtured the world on the model of a farmer for human benefit; Love and Strife set clear teleological boundaries to the operation of chance in Empedocles; Socrates emerges as 'a fundamentally anti-scientific creationist' (and originator of the 'argument from design'). Critics emerge only in chapter 5 with the atomists, and chapter 6 on Aristotle (whose achievement in thinking of teleology without a controlling intelligence clearly attracts Sedley's admiration). Chapters on Plato and the Stoics set out more traditional versions of creationism. As always with Sedley's work, this is a highly readable and fresh account of individuals – and a subject – of central importance. Sedley champions what Patricia Curd, in

[1] *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*. Edited by David Sedley. Vol. XXXIV, Summer 2008. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008. Pp. 423. Hardback £45, ISBN: 9780199544875; paperback £25, ISBN: 9780199544899.

[2] *Creationism and its Critics in Antiquity*. By David Sedley. Sather Classical Lectures 66. Berkeley, CA, Los Angeles, CA, and London, University of California Press, 2007. Pp. xvii + 269. Hardback £17.95, ISBN: 9780520253643.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383508000752 Published online by Cambridge University Press