

Egyptian history and mythology arise when mediated by popular notions of Egypt versus scholarly ones.

Umurhan closes the book with a ‘coda’, which brings together the main observations and trends found in the preceding chapters and encourages more work like this: bringing media from outside academia into academic discourse on classical antiquity, allowing fresh interpretations of texts to arise and ensuring the subject stays relevant with the passing of time. In the introduction Fletcher states that most of the contributors are classical scholars and metal fans rather than music scholars and concede that this means that the book takes a literary perspective in its analysis of the music, looking mainly at lyrical themes. Considering this, the quality of non-lyric focused musicological analysis the contributors offer, when it arises, is commendable, but the volume may have benefited from the inclusion of contributors from a musicological background who happen to be fans of classical literature. However, the way in which the topic has been approached has the advantage of making the content accessible to academics from various disciplines and subject areas and non-academics, including metal fans, with or without a background in classical literature. The volume makes a welcome contribution to a number of fields including classical studies, reception studies, popular musicology and metal music studies.

*University of Sussex*

GEMMA FARRELL  
[g.l.farrell@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:g.l.farrell@sussex.ac.uk)

## RETHINKING THE NEED OF CLASSICS

GÜTHENKE (C.) *Feeling and Classical Philology. Knowing Antiquity in German Scholarship, 1770–1920*. Pp. xviii + 223. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. Cased, £75, US\$99.99. ISBN: 978-1-107-10423-5.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X20001468

Is it in any way possible to dedicate one’s own energy, even life, to study something that one does not love or like? Could one reach a continuous, indomitable, need to learn without being mesmerised by the object of one’s study? The beginnings of classical philology seem to be telling us that it is not. Pursuing classical studies is more than dry professional calculus: it holds the promise of transforming oneself to the liking of the seemingly perfect model of *humanitas antiqua*. Or at least it should do so according to some of the founding fathers of the discipline. In her book on late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century German scholars who have laid the foundation of what is presently referred to as classical philology, G. proposes as methodological principle an epistemology of emotion, arguing that the historical interest in antiquity of the forerunners of classical philology was underpinned by a unusual excess of feeling. G.’s aim is nothing less but to reshape the genealogy of the discipline – advocating thus for a revaluation of the primary impetus in German classical scholarship. Taking the literature of German scholars as primary sources, G. focuses on texts in which these first classicists engage in affectionate conversations with antiquity in such a way that antiquity becomes personified. Indeed, it is precisely this type of engagement that seems to be the selection criterion for the analysed sources. Another ingredient in G.’s study is to look at the biographies of early classicists as penned by their earliest biographers, as ‘narrative extensions’ of this romanticised relation to antiquity (C. Justi’s biography of Winkelmann [1866–72] and W. Dilthey on Schleiermacher [1870], and also G. Misch’s *History of Autobiography* [1907]).

The Classical Review 71.1 238–240 © The Author(s), 2020. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association

The book, the result of a long-standing interest of G., is made up of six chapters (predominantly in chronological manner), some of them revised and rewritten materials already published. Particular attention is given to authors such as Winkelmann, Herder, Wolf, Schleiermacher, Boeckh, Thiersch, Wilamowitz, Nietzsche and also to lesser known figures such as F. Ast, J.G. Hamann or K.F. Hermann. Similar to Renaissance humanists who thought that ancient sculptures were exempt of colour, we still tend to think that the pioneers of Classics were rational, positivist and enlightened, and that they perceived the past without projecting any 'colours' on it. By revisiting them through the 'language of love', G. argues that German scholars did not perceive and represent the past as objectively or rationally as they were usually praised for, and their relationship to antiquity was one of complicated excitement and longing. Feeling, affection and love seem to operate as necessary conditions in activating the desire towards antiquity. If one does not have a personal relationship to the past, one's access to its intimacy is limited. For some of the German scholars addressed by G., the encounter with antiquity triggered an esthetical rendezvous, in which seduction played an important role. Their reading of Greek antiquity is highlighted by the unambiguous use of amorous imagery and love rhetoric, under the influence of specific paradigms of yearning: the legendary figure of Pygmalion or the example set by the daughter of a Corinthian potter who traced the outline of her resting boyfriend (illustrated on the book's dust jacket) or Alcibiades' exuberant love for Socrates. By deconstructing the language of love behind this initial interest, the beginning of classical philology in Germany could be understood as another facet and adaptation of the love-driven pedagogical model of Plato's *Symposium*.

Love – one of the most problematic pedagogical concepts of European culture from Plato onwards – is revisited by German scholarship, in its most sublime ramifications, to the point that scholars emulated an Alcibiadian love towards antiquity. Plato's personality and the way in which he depicts his teacher, especially in the *Symposium*, appear as leitmotifs that shaped the very discipline of classical philology. By reconsidering the epistemological concept *knowing by love*, G.'s contribution could be taken also as a chapter on the complicated nature of love. G. brings into light a history of *love* from the perspective of the learned, which directs the researcher towards a complex formation of the self: *Bildung*. A problematic term for which it is difficult to provide a perfect English equivalent and whose closest comparable concept is the Greek *paideia*. *Bildung* is at the core of both the ancient and the studied German scholars, as a formation project that links the individual with the universal. Herder states that *Bildung* is realised through the study of the Hellenic past and, in G.'s analysis, the language of *Bildung* and that of love overlap for a 'sentimental *Bildung*'.

This is a refreshing radiography of German scholarship in several respects, whose contribution could be understood as a neo-romantic approach to the romanticism of Classics. It is a history of an important period of classical scholarship, not written by a historian or sociologist, but by a classicist. The author herself looks upon a subject matter with a *passion* that is part of her own object of study. The student of the foundation of German classical scholarship will find here an original enterprise, full of thoughtful remarks prudently evaluated. Throughout reading it, I could not help the feeling that this is an introspective effort of present classical philology to understand its youth and its coming of age, in the same way that psychoanalysis looks at infancy in order to explain adult behaviour. The notable difference is that G. does not venture to relate the present state of Classics to the 'trauma' of the past. Others have engaged in that and found dangerous connections between the philological emulation of the classical past and the rise of German National-Socialism. But then again it is a psychoanalytical endeavour that finds the language of *love* at the formation of any personality, be it also a humanistic discipline;

thus, one could ask whether this is the case for classical philology alone or what G. develops here is the prototype of a theory that can be applied to other disciplines as well.

The writing style of the book falls prey every so often to this passionate approach, edging at times between poetic essay and argumentative prose. It would have been illuminating to contrast the analysed writings with examples from more extreme positivistic approaches of the mentioned authors or other contemporary figures. Unfortunately, the book lacks an analytical table of contents that would help the reader navigate more systematically through it. To some extent, this is compensated by the headers, which cover each section, and an index.

There is another side effect of the book. Beyond its historiographical achievement, its direct effect is on the affect. After reading it, one has the impression of falling in love with the classical world (if one has not already), due to the intense engagement with early scholars in their fierce love and desire to embrace antiquity. Their love is contagious, such as Plato's love for wisdom was for the German scholars, who eventually translated *philo-sophia* into *philo-logia*.

*Lucian Blaga University*

GEORGE F. CALIAN  
calianflorin@gmail.com

## M.I. FINLEY AND HIS LEGACY

JEW (D.), OSBORNE (R.), SCOTT (M.) (edd.) *M.I. Finley. An Ancient Historian and his Impact*. Pp. xviii + 333, figs, ills. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. Cased, £64.99, US\$99.99. ISBN: 978-1-107-14926-7.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X2000150X

This retrospective work on M.I. Finley and his impact is the product of a conference marking the centenary of Finley's birth held at the University of Cambridge (29–31 May 2012). The volume consists of twelve chapters, many written by scholars who likewise will have conferences held in their honour on the centenary of their births. This is not a biography of Finley, rather it is a tightly focused collection of semi-chronological pieces covering various aspects of his career and legacy. The editors are to be credited for the organisation and discipline each of the contributors showed in keeping within their lanes. The volume as a whole raises several overarching questions concerning how to truly measure an academic's contribution and just how one should approach writing history with regards to personal ideology. For reflection on these questions alone, this collection rewards the serious reader well.

Chapters are presented in the order of publication of Finley's books, giving the volume its chronological structure; each chapter is footnoted, with a collective bibliography at the end, which includes a full list of Finley's works in various languages and editions. The contributors include several who knew Finley personally. Of the sixteen contributors, eleven have deep associations with Cambridge, giving this an overall Cambridge-centric aspect.

In a brief introduction editors Jew, Osborne and Scott frame the objective of the conference and this publication, focusing on the questions to be considered and the structure of the volume. They remark on what set Finley apart from other scholars at Cambridge in the 1950s and 60s. British Classics and Ancient History had been narrowly and insularly focused on scrutinising the precise wording of Greek and Latin texts. To this environment Finley brought a broader view based on his grounding in the social sciences, asked different questions and employed different methodologies. He also engaged a broader audience.