

privileged class and high social status which differentiated those having this knowledge from the unsophisticated masses was no longer an adequate reason to promote Greek learning.

The fifth part is about 'cultural forgetting', as G. put it, namely "how personal and institutional interests work to refashion and to silence the authors" (p. 299), in this case Plutarch ('The value of Greek. Why save Plutarch?'). G. argues how Plutarch himself had to "reinvent" his Greekness at the beginning of the dominance of Greece by the Roman Empire. By listing some texts from *Moralia* as well as from *Lives*, G. emphasises how Plutarch – like Lucian – was part of the educational curriculum since the Renaissance. For some reason, G. ignores the pseudo-Plutarchean *De liberis educandis*, which was one of the most common Greek texts for beginners from Byzantine times to the Age of Enlightenment. According to G., Plutarch was also seen as an apostle of liberty during the French revolution, and an important author for such different authors as Montaigne and Rousseau. However, like Lucian, his works experienced a drastic withdrawal from the curriculum at the end of the nineteenth century. G. puts the blame on academic criticism which saw Plutarch as "an incoherent collector of other people's knowledge" and the re-evaluation of the Victorians who dismissed him as a "small-town antiquarian" (p. 288). If earlier Plutarch was seen as a revolutionary, he was now seen as a petit bourgeois, a second-rate mind. This chapter also functions as a warm apology for Plutarch, giving reasons why he should be more widely read than he is today.

In all, this book is mostly a delightful reading experience. Goldhill is a storyteller and the book is valuable as a source for ideas for a more thorough investigation within a theoretical framework (e.g., imagology). The details which G. provides are, however, overwhelming – an index rerum would have been very useful – and the place of some anecdotes is certainly in the footnotes. G. offers a reasonable picture of how the answers to the questions "Who knows Greek?" and "What has it meant to know Greek?" have varied in different times. Although he often bases his argumentation in earlier research, he also frequently manages to provide unfamiliar evidence (re-reading Lucian, Plutarch, Erasmus' letters) and new connections. His central argument about Greekness as not only a constructed quality, but also as a self-formative act for western intellectuals is – if not altogether new – at least unfamiliar while discussing the debate about cultural and national identities. And why have these passionate, past conflicts about Greek usually escaped our notice? Maybe because "Greekness" means much less for us than all these Grecomaniacs presented in this book.

*Tua Korhonen*

PAUL. W. LUDWIG: *Eros & Polis. Desire and Community in Greek Political Theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002. ISBN 0-521-810365-5. XIII, 398 pp. GBP 47.50.

At first sight, the title of Ludwig's book is startling since one would not spontaneously connect such concepts as *eros* and *polis*. On the other hand, the title fits well with concepts of 21<sup>st</sup>-century society, according to which everything can be associated with sex, and when sizing this book, I was waiting (hoping?) for some kind of version of an ancient "Sex and the City". But, of course, "sex and the city" is not the correct way to read the title, and if *eros* and *polis* are interpreted as "sex" or "love" and "politics", the name of the book becomes less astonishing. In fact, the same year as Ludwig published his book, another work with very similar subject

matter appeared: Victoria Wohl: *Love Among the Ruins: The Erotics of Democracy in Classical Athens* (Princeton 2002). Today, thanks to the rapid flow of information, everyone is very well informed of the latest sex scandals of Anglo-American politicians (extra-marital adventures of political figures are not as quickly labelled as scandals in France and Italy, it seems), and the connection between political power and sex seems to be self-evident. Ludwig's book, however, is not simply about "sex and politics" either, but a more complicated study on ancient Greek political discourse and different aspects of "love". Despite the raffish title, the book is also very much a study on the Platonic theory of love and ideal society as portrayed in the *Symposium* and *Republic*.

My difficulty in fully digesting the book had a lot to do with the title itself, or rather, the definition of *eros*. Although it is true, of course, that it is difficult to separate and define exactly the different Greek words meaning love (ἔρως, φιλία, ἀφροδίσια plus derivative nouns and verbs), most people would probably agree that, e.g., parental love, sexual attraction, love of one's country or hometown, and love of food are not same things. Ludwig admittedly tries to define his usage of *eros*, e.g., as compared to K.J. Dover's (*Greek Homosexuality*, 1989), but in a way, the reader remains confused: should different forms of *eros* be seen as representations of the same "feeling" and be traced back to the same source or not? To me, L. seems to argue that there is basically only one *eros*, with the limitation that higher (political) *eros* can be felt only when the basic needs are satisfied (thus, love of food is left out of the definition of *eros*). L. also supports the use of the term "political *eros*" by stating that in ancient thinking, *eros* formed a bridge between the private and public spheres.

The aim of the study (p. 3) is to find out whether there are suggestions of *eros* being political or made political. It also asks what is the significance of homoeroticism within the Athenian democratic system and how sexual desire in its different forms is reflected in political life. The cases studied are rivalry between lovers, relationship between older and younger lover, *eros* as *hybris* (i.e., aggressiveness connected with or caused by *eros*), and the "sublimation" of *eros*. The method of the study is literary-philological, but it also makes use of sociology and psychology, and even post-modern theories of *eros*.

To make the task even more ambitious, the author wants to "bring the ancient political discourse into dialogue with modern political thinking and selected contemporary authors". The author, however, has found himself in a situation where the material under investigation grew extensively, so he has narrowed it down (to Plato's *Symposium* and *Republic*, Aristophanes' *Knights*, *Birds* and *Clouds* and Thucydides for the most part), which has led to some oddities: I found it surprising that Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazousae* and *Lysistrata* have been left out. In fact, I found it strange that L. takes the trouble to explain the inclusion of Aristophanes "in the ranks of serious political thinkers".

The study is divided into three main sections, progressing from "individual love" to patriotism and imperialism. There are some recurring themes throughout the study; e.g., does *eros*, especially political *eros*, always represent some form of "love of one's own" (οἰκειότης)? Or does it contain higher tones, is it an equivalent with love of goodness and beauty? Much of the book is also about the status and importance of homosexuality and educational pederasty, which seem to be embedded in ancient Greek culture.

The first two chapters concentrate on Plato's *Symposium*, which introduces "the ladders of levels of love" in speeches by different persons. L.'s starting point is the speech of Aristophanes, the famous myth of first "race", creatures in globular form. These creatures

were cut into two parts by Zeus as a punishment, and after that, were looking for their other halves. One of the questions put to the reader is, should we understand Plato's Aristophanes as favouring homosexual love which, according to the myth, is said to result in work, activity and success in politics. Or does the fact that the myth is put into Aristophanes' mouth, a comedian and a satirist, mean that Plato in fact favours heterosexual love, which concentrates on family? L.'s discussion on the matter is fascinating and versatile and makes good observations on Aristophanes' position in the speech: we do have an ironic portrait of Socrates in Aristophanes' plays, hence Aristophanes' speech must be put in context in Plato's works respectively and thus, we could have an equally ironic portrait of Aristophanes and his ideas in the *Symposium*. L. also indicates that Aristophanes' speech functions as a transition between Phaedrus' and Pausanias' views, according to which homosexual *eros* creates strength in communities, and Socrates' speech in which *philosophia* is represented as the highest form of *eros*. In his plays Aristophanes, criticizes political pederasty as a system, where one climbs in political hierarchy not because of talent or devotion, but by having sex with the right men. Thus, L. looks further into Aristophanes' character and position in the *Symposion* and compares his views as represented in his plays. He concludes that the comedian's pacifist tendency could also be linked with his support for heterosexual love, homosexual love being based heavily on *philotimia* and creating aggressiveness. L. explores in a credible way the relationship between irony, satire and the concept of political pederasty. L. shows in his discussion on the argumentation on *pro* and *contra* the "naturalness" of homosexuality that the apparently favourable attitude of Aristophanes' speech towards homosexuality should be put in proper context both in the Platonic and Aristophanic world. At this point, L. poses the central question: does love of one's own mean narrow (but safe) heterosexual *eros*, which is consummated in producing a child, or the higher, homosexual *eros*, which produces social activity but aggressive behaviour as well?

L. finishes the first part of the book by placing the results of his study in the context of modern discourse. Interestingly, L. points out the problem of modern, tolerant democracy that makes it difficult to maintain unconventionality, and which, little by little, tames, e.g., the creative force of homosexuality, bringing it into line with middle-class, conventional family life. Homosexuality is not condemned, it is made part of the sameness. According to the Platonic view, male lovers in antiquity would have concentrated on spiritual and political achievements, whereas today they must think about mortgages, succession rights and possible adoptions, in quite the same manner as those living in heterosexual relationships. Today, I think, the place to look when searching for unconventionality and "otherness", would be the virtual worlds (e.g., "Second Life", where the laws of normal life are not valid and where people apparently are free of certain material obstacles.)

The second part of the book (chapters 3–5) concentrates on the concept of political *eros* and, in addition to Plato and Aristophanes, it also discusses Thucydides' history, in which one might detect proper political *eros*: love of "honour, empire and fatherland" as well as *hybris*. Before entering into Thucydides' concept of political *eros* (3.5), L. illustrates the tradition (archaic poetry, Aeschylus and Sophocles, natural philosophy, sophistic history) of using the word *eros* and its cognates in non-sexual contexts. L. then analyses Thucydides' account of the Sicilian expedition and points out that Thucydides begins his narrative of the incident describing how Athenians fell in love with the disastrous plan: ἔρωσ ἐνέπεσε τοῖς πᾶσι. L. points out that the megalomaniacal desire of the Athenians to enlarge the empire is described in

analogous terms to a daring sexual escapade. The core of Thucydides' political erotic theory is in the concept that the Athenians' love for their city is meritocratic by nature: Athens must be loved because it is good and beautiful, not simply because it is the home of the Athenians. Thus, Thucydides shows political *eros* to be as uncontrollable as *eros* between individuals.

Chapter 4 is about the negative side of *eros*, that is, aggression and *hybris*, an essential concept in Greek culture, roughly meaning deliberate humiliation of another person or getting pleasure in shaming others. The humans desire to dominate other people and the potential sexual pleasure it gives (L. makes also an excursion into modern theories about rape) leads L. to ask how, or whether, *eros* results in creating aggression. The question is discussed further in chapter five, where L. uses the somewhat odd term "thymoeidetic", transferred to English from the Greek θυμοειδής, found also in the *Republic*. "Thymoeidetic" is a derivative of the word θυμός, which can roughly be interpreted as meaning the part of the soul which creates emotions. Thus, *thymos* is also understood as the part of the soul by which we also feel φιλία. *Philia* can, if misused, become anger, envy or hatred; hence, *thymos* is also a synonym for anger, ὀργή. L. indicates that in Platonic erotic theory, the irascible part of the soul, θυμός, is the one, which causes political activity through envy. After a lengthy and complicated discussion, L. concludes that Plato does not hold that *eros* itself could cause aggression, but it originates from *thymos*. Since *philia* is also from *thymos*, jealousy and vindictiveness do not occur unless related to things that are considered one's own, *philoï*, and are thus objects of *eros*.

Chapter 5 raises the interesting question of sublimation, i.e., the transfer of sexual desire to a non-sexual (higher) level: L. argues that sublimated love was more common or prevalent in Greek society that favoured homosexual relations and that sublimation was a part of the lengthy adolescence of the Greek youth. Sublimation was also an essential part of the idea of political pederasty, the delicate relationship between older *erastes* and the younger *eromenos*. L. draws attention to the ambivalent attitude to homosexuality in classical Athens: homosexual desire was accepted and encouraged, but not the actual act. L. also points out that sublimation was not something that was generally considered a good thing: according to Cynic philosophy, man is an animal and sublimation disguises the true nature of a human being. Stoics chose sex over love because sex was a lesser evil on the path to *ataraxia*. In connection with the complex and problematic field of sublimated love, the author himself confesses that he is not altogether happy with the term, and he says he retained it only in lack of a better word: philosophers do not "sublimate" their love when they understand that intellectual apprehension is the "real" form of *eros*, and sex is only an image of it. Rather, the rest of us, the ordinary people, "profane their natural, philosophic *eros*". L. also compares Freudian and Platonic ideas of sublimated *eros* and concludes that, although these are not identical, abstaining from sex might result in achieving higher spiritual and creative levels in both theories.

The discourse concerning political *eros* ends with an attempt to see signs of sublimation outside Platonic texts. L. discusses the views of the Better Argument in Aristophanes' *Clouds*: whether his rosy picture of the students could be considered sublimation and whether Aristophanes consciously connects "erotic" vocabulary with political? The discussion is interesting and the note that sublimation "is a house of cards" which is destined to last only a short time struck me as a clever insight. On the other hand, L., perhaps, might have tied up the loose ends of his argumentation rather better: as it is now, it leaves the reader somewhat confused whether one can see any kind of political theory in Aristophanes' production.

The question of sublimation functions as a bridge to a wider *eros*, love of common

good and patriotism and the last part of the book, entitled "The Polis as a School for *Eros*", concentrates on the idea of how *eros* was "educated" to rise above sex in Athenian society. L. observes how the Greeks tried to train the sexual desire to become harnessed for the common good. I found the first subtitle "Civic nudity" somewhat strange. L. owes the term to an article by L. Bonfante, "Nudity as a Costume in Classical Art" (*AJA*, 1989) and "civic nudity" is used to separate it from "ritual nudity", nudity in initiation rites. To be honest, I also expected the discussion to be on a more metaphorical level, and was somewhat astonished to find out that L. indeed discusses nudity in the meaning of athletes not wearing clothes. The basis of the discussion is Thucydides who connects athletic nudity with the high level of Greek culture as opposed to barbarians who find nudity unacceptable. L. refers to modern ideas of nudism, according to which actual nudity functions as a restriction on erotic feelings. In Plato's ideal society, nudity is indeed a factor which is meant to dampen sexual feelings: hence, the goal would be male-female nudity which would create strong bonding between all citizens, as homosexuality (moderated by male-male nudity) brings men together and thus create a strong state.

In the third and final part of the book "Patriotism and Imperialism as *Eros*", L. attempts to give a synthesis of the political erotic theories found within the works of Plato, Thucydides and Aristophanes. The starting point of the discussion is the recurring theme: love for one's family is the most narrow and selfish genre of "love of one's own". The political version of it is love of one's fellow-citizens and country. According to erotic theory, Athenian citizens had a *philia*-based family-like bond. L., then, discusses the nature of patriotic love. Considering the often aggressive forms of love of one's country, it is asked if it is erotic in nature or rather thymic, i.e., based more on ambition and love of glory than love of fellow citizens. L. strives to show that Thucydides (especially in the Funerary speech) compared the Athenians' relationship to their city with that of an *erastes* to the beauty and magnificence of an *eromenos* and used erotic terminology accordingly. The Athenians' love affair with their city becomes evident when Thucydides sets the Athenians' and the Spartans' patriotic motives side by side: Athenians love their city not only because it is externally beautiful but because it is objectively worth loving. The Spartans, on the other hand, did not have an alternative or any other object of love, not even a family (in Spartan society, e.g., the parent-child bond was broken at the age of seven). The goodness of Athens is based on the very freedom it gives to its citizens. Thus, the Athenians' love for Athens is on a higher level than that of the Spartans, as it is based on a free choice, on love between citizens bonded to each other and creating communities based on *philia*.

In the last chapters of the book, L. both sums up and collects the aspects he has put forward in the course of the study but, at the same time, turns the argumentation upside down. The peak of political *eros* can be seen as the desire to conquer and colonize new places; in Athens' case this means the Sicilian expedition. But the result of this political erotic adventure is defeat. Accordingly, in a political erotic context, it can be read that the result of imperialism (connected to the desire to see new places) is cosmopolitanism. A cosmopolitan, then, loses one's own, a cosmopolitan can no longer be a patriot, and "the coloniser becomes colonised by the foreign land he falls in love with" (p. 371).

As L. himself acknowledges, his study does not answer the question "what is love", but it shows that there are two separate aspects in *eros*, "the need to possess and response to beauty" (p. 378). Despite the complex structure of the book and wide range of topics, *Eros and Polis* manages to prove that political science can be a "sexy" topic. As a subjective comment,

I would like to note that the book is extremely demanding: it mixes texts from Greek authors with modern cultural and political theories, as well as theoretical language with examples taken from modern everyday life. There were moments when I could not see the relevance of the comparisons made (e.g. civic nudity, striptease and unwrapping gifts). On the other hand, there are many thoughtprovoking ideas and observations concerning both ancient and modern culture and one must admire the huge amount of literature referred to. I also enjoyed enormously the colourful and witty language but I also have to admit that as a non-native English speaker I learned a lot of new (to me) words, and that digesting the book took a long time.

Tiina Purola

KATJA LEMBKE: *Ägyptens späte Blüte. Die Römer am Nil*. Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie. Unter Mitarbeit von C. FLUCK und G. VITTMANN. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 2004. ISBN 3-8053-3276-9. 131 S. EUR 38,32.

*Ägyptens späte Blüte* is a contribution to the *Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie*, a series in which have been published, *inter alia*, books on the archaeology of both ancient Egypt and many of the Roman provinces. This book continues in both veins, finding its focus in the fusion of the Nilotic traditions with the western innovations after the annexation of Egypt to the Roman Empire, concentrating more on the material testimonies of the cultural contacts than the direct workings of the Roman government on the banks of Nile.

Lembke stresses the unique nature of Egypt as a Roman province, the great prestige of its own ancient civilization and the rare scale of its influence on the culture of the rulers. Hence, after a brief historical account of the reign of Augustus onwards, she proceeds to present the reception of Egyptian culture by the Romans and the resulting interpretations in the Egyptizing art that found its way into both public and private spheres. Then follow accounts of the Roman influence on the Egyptian traditions of town planning, religion and culture of death. The culture of the frontiers, the oases, the eastern desert and the upper course of the Nile, are treated in a separate chapter.

Lembke's work has been augmented by the texts of a Coptologist and an Egyptologist. A philologist greets with joy Vittmann's chapter on writing and administration, a theme complementing the otherwise archaeological focus of the book. The closing chapter by Fluck sketches the life and thought in late-antique Egypt in the context of early Christianity. The appended timeline and glossary are without doubt useful aids for non-specialists and students, while the lists for further reading offer an up-to-date summary of literature on the themes discussed.

The book presents in detail the results of the meeting of two strong traditions and discusses both Egyptian influences in Rome and the Roman ones in Egypt, a well-founded juxtaposition. Although the earlier cultural contacts fall outside the scope of the book, the later developments would have been contextualized by a fuller account of the pre-Augustan ones, such as the arrival of Egyptian cults in Rome.

Lembke's experience as a classical archaeologist and an Egyptologist, in fieldwork, teaching and museums alike, is reflected with enjoyable results in her book. It is a handsomely illustrated guide to the material manifestations of the Roman rule of Egypt likely to appeal