

both sections evoke vividly the mass press and its readerships. Bryant Davies' discussion of the toy-theatre replicas and other souvenirs – among the book's highlights in my opinion – connects with one of the most elusive aspects of classical reception: that of non-literary but no less intimate, emotional and creative engagements with the past, right at the hearth.

Chapter 4 returns to an increasingly popular line of enquiry: the classical burlesque. Profiting from Richard W. Schoch's argument that burlesques 'disperse meaning' (*Victorian Theatrical Burlesques* (London 2003), xxviii, quoted on page 252), and in a persuasive discussion of anachronism, Bryant Davies argues that burlesques' 'humour is as much at the expense of neo-classicism as the classical canon itself', suggesting that they problematise the British assumption of classical heritage (262). Chapter 5 outlines narrative and iconographic traditions depicting Scipio Africanus the Younger and Caius Marius in Carthage. The paradox of a city with no ruins becoming a visual emblem of a ruined future is deftly highlighted. I did wonder how these classical engagements with the notion of *translatio imperii* ('transfer of (imperial) rule') implicated ordinary citizens in more than just a sense of self-validation but in material imperialist processes. For example, some undated European chocolate adverts (figs 5.19 and 5.20), featuring Roman soldiers among the ruins of Carthage and Troy, are compelling evidence in Bryant Davies' argument that there was a mass proliferation of such images (332). However, the European chocolate trade's bloody origins in enslavement and imperialism in Africa reminds us that this mass consumption reflects not only that lower-class Europeans were familiar with images of antiquity, but that they were beneficiaries of a vast system of extraction that developed in dialogue with ancient models of empire. When moving away from the model of individual 'elite male' creators in classical reception studies, as Bryant Davies rightly strives to do (44), the contours of privilege and exploitation don't disappear: on the contrary, they become more involved.

The writer's knowledge is compendious indeed, taking in British culture from the long nineteenth century and a multitude of aspects of the ancient world. Occasionally, a little more guidance in navigating such a spread of people and things would increase accessibility. However, careful study is rewarded with a rich trove of fascinating information about Victorian classical reception, as well as some valuable reframing of the topic as a whole.

RHIANNON EASTERBROOK  
Institute of Classical Studies  
Email: [rhiannon.easterbrook@sas.ac.uk](mailto:rhiannon.easterbrook@sas.ac.uk)

LENFANT (D.) (ed.) **Les aventures d'un pamphlet antidémocratique. transmission et réception de la *Constitution des Athéniens* du Pseudo-Xénophon (V<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.-C.-XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle)**. Paris: Éditions de Boccard, 2020. Pp. 290. €42. 9782701805979.  
doi:[10.1017/S0075426922001112](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922001112)

Dominique Lenfant's collection of essays covers several important aspects related to the reception of Ps.-Xenophon's *Athenaion Politeia* (AP).

The issue of its authorship and the date of its composition are marginal to the main aim of the book (except in Ferrucci's chapter), though the editor, introducing the subject matter to give an overall view of each contribution, supports the idea that the AP was written in the fifth century BC (for a date in the early 390s, however, see E. Occhipinti, '(Ps)Xenophon's AP: Genre, Audience, and Fourth-Century Themes of Debate', in *Politica antica* 9 (2019), 11–42, with previous bibliography on the matter).

While one chapter (that of Caire) is devoted to the ancient reception of the *AP*, the rest of the book deals with post-classical reception, following a diachronic scheme. Contributions to the latter aspect feature several topics, such as modern and contemporary political reflections and thought: politicians, scholars, ideologists, intellectuals projected onto the ancient past contemporary concerns and feelings, while using the *AP* to support their own views and policies (see Quattrocelli, Lenfant, Rhodes, Payen, Müller, Ferrucci, Sancho Rocher). The story of the *AP*'s manuscript tradition is explored by Luana Quattrocelli's paper, which is particularly valuable for the reason that it refines the dates of the four manuscripts of the *AP* (A Vaticanus 1950, B, Vaticanus graecus 1335, C Mutinensis  $\alpha.V.7.17$ , M Marcianus graecus 511), and also offers an impressive collection of bibliographical references to it (unfortunately, the author does not include any images of these manuscripts). Other chapters (Pontier, Payen) show the process which led to the questioning of Xenophon's authorship by nineteenth-century scholars.

Another set of topics pertains to the *AP*'s aim, its main themes and its textual features. Cinzia Bearzot discusses Émile Belot (publishing in 1880), for whom the *AP* belonged to the epistolary genre: Xenophon sent a letter to Agesilaus on Athenian government in 378, in order to discourage him from attacking Athens. Christian Wendt turns to Ernst Kalinka, whose main edition of the *AP* (1913; his *editio minor* was issued in 1898), considered the work an exercise in prose style, written by an admirer of Athenian democracy as a tribute to the political view of his audience, members of the elite classes. In Hans Kopp's chapter, we encounter Hartvig Frisch, whose 1941 commentary considered the *AP* to be a treatise expounding a theory of maritime power. Frisch was an anti-fascist Danish scholar who was compelled to retreat from his political activities by the German occupation of Denmark; his maritime theories and laws about sea power were applied to contemporary England.

Emmanuèle Caire deals with the reception of the *AP* by fourth-century BC authors, as well as later ones. She discusses passages from Isocrates, Plato, Aristotle and Theophrastus which show similarities with the *AP* in regard to festivals, social organization and the link between democracy and thalassocracy (Isocrates); criticism of democratic *exousia* ('licence') and the conduct of Athenian demagogues (Plato); and the opposition between democracy and oligarchy, combined with a negative portrayal of democracy as the power of less morally endowed people to obtain political advantages thanks to their high numbers (Aristotle, Theophrastus).

Lenfant's own chapter considers eighteenth-century France, in which the *AP* was much appreciated by both monarchists and republicans who, condemning the French Revolution, considered the pamphlet a kind of manifesto against democratic and extremist parties and, broadly speaking, against the power of the masses. The first French translations of the *AP* were published by the republican Jean-Baptiste Gail in 1793–1795, and anonymously by the monarchist César Henri de La Luzerne in 1793.

A mutual influence was exerted by French and English intellectuals and politicians from the end of the eighteenth century onwards, as Peter Rhodes' and Pascal Payen's chapters well show. In Britain, César Henri de La Luzerne's translation provided material for those who wanted to attack democracy, such as William Mitford in *The History of Greece* (London 1784–1810). English monarchists, unfriendly to the French Revolution and its supporters, exalted monarchy and its good organization, and judged popular sovereignty a form of anarchy. On the contrary, George Grote (*History of Greece*, 1846–1856), who felt admiration for Athenian democracy, believed that the overthrow of elite power by the people was a good thing and that the pamphlet portrayed realities in a tendentious way. Rhodes explains that it was only in the second half of the nineteenth century that the *AP* was placed in its proper context thanks to the work of professional classicists, in Britain as well as in Germany. As Payen's contribution shows, Grote's liberal-democratic leaning influenced Victor Duruy's and Gustave Glotz's readings of Athenian democracy, which resulted in open criticism of the pamphlet's content and prose style.

As we learn from Laura Sancho Rocher's chapter, scholars from Spain and Italy contributed by offering an 'ideologized' reading of the *AP*, but they came to this debate later, from the second half of the twentieth century, when times had changed and new political trends entailed different concerns and responses. The first Spanish translation of the *AP* came out in 1951, under the Francoist regime. Its authors, Manuel Cardenal Iracheta and Manuel Fernández-Galiano, seemed to allude through their text to the authoritarian character of the Spanish regime. Yannick Müller explores Marxist readings of the *AP* given between 1976 and 1982 by Claudine Leduc, Luciano Canfora and Enrico Flores: the modern class struggle was compared to the *AP*'s antagonism between oligarchs and democrats; and its description of democracy was likened to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Finally, as Stefano Ferrucci shows in his survey of Italian scholarship in the 50 years up to 2018, Italian scholars' interest in the *AP* developed after the birth of the Italian Republic in 1946 and during the political crises of the 1970s and 1990s.

The strength of this collection of essays is to show the close connection between classical scholars, or sympathizers with classical literature (politicians, intellectuals, etc.), and the political climate of their own times: modern concerns entail a non-neutral reading of the ancient past, today as yesterday.

EGIDIA OCCHIPINTI

University of Palermo

Email: [egidia.occhipinti@unipa.it](mailto:egidia.occhipinti@unipa.it)

ROOD (T.), ATTACK (C.) and PHILLIPS (T.) **Anachronism and Antiquity**. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2020. Pp. x + 284, illus. £22.49. 9781350115200.

doi:[10.1017/S0075426922001124](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922001124)

Anachronisms are everywhere, especially when dealing with classical antiquity. Niccolò Machiavelli declared in a letter to a friend that by entering his study filled with books he had direct access to the ancient world: '[I] step inside the venerable courts of the ancients ... where I am unashamed to converse with them and to question them about the motives of their actions, and they, out of their human kindness, answer me ... I absorb myself into them completely' (to Francesco Vettori, 10 Dec. 1513, in J.B. Atkinson and D. Sices (trans.), *Machiavelli and His Friends* (De Kalb 1996), 262–65). In this immersive experience, the act of reading is staged as what Tim Rood, Carol Attack and Tom Phillips would call the 'self-conscious practice of anachronism' (219), a time-traveling experience that opens the possibility of a dialogue with figures from the past, typically as an idealized group of sages.

The 'and' in the title of *Anachronism and Antiquity* hints at this book's double focus. The phenomenon of anachronism in antiquity is really only one side of the story. With an impressive number of examples from various contexts, it provides proof of a clear sensitivity to historical difference and chronological errors in antiquity, both in historiography and in (self-consciously anachronistic) literary tropes. But equally important in this book are the omnipresent and indeed inevitable anachronisms in the history of thinking about antiquity, its creative reception throughout the ages and the development of philological and scientific approaches. Anachronism is a multifaceted concept indeed, as is well illustrated by the case study that serves the book as a prelude: a discussion of Solon's advice in Herodotus to 'Look to the end' before deciding about anyone's good fortune. Solon's presence at the court of Croesus is itself anachronistic (anachronism as a mistake in the chronology, cf. chapter 1 'Inventing Anachronism', especially under 'The historian's