

Edited by LORNA HARDWICK
AND STEPHEN HARRISON

CLASSICS IN THE MODERN WORLD

A Democratic Turn?



CLASSICAL PRESENCES

OXFORD

CLASSICAL PRESENCES

General Editors

LORNA HARDWICK JAMES I. PORTER

CLASSICAL PRESENCES

Attempts to receive the texts, images, and material culture of ancient Greece and Rome inevitably run the risk of appropriating the past in order to authenticate the present. Exploring the ways in which the classical past has been mapped over the centuries allows us to trace the avowal and disavowal of values and identities, old and new. *Classical Presences* brings the latest scholarship to bear on the contexts, theory, and practice of such use, and abuse, of the classical past.

Classics in the Modern World

A 'Democratic Turn'?

Edited by
LORNA HARDWICK
and
STEPHEN HARRISON

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Oxford University Press 2013

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2013

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

ISBN 978-0-19-967392-6

As printed and bound by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	viii
<i>List of Figures</i>	ix
<i>List of Contributors</i>	xi
<i>Introduction</i>	xix
Lorna Hardwick and Stephen Harrison	

Section 1 Controversies and Debates

1. Questioning the Democratic, and Democratic Questioning <i>Katherine Harloe</i>	3
2. Against the 'Democratic Turn': Counter-texts; Counter-contexts; Counter-arguments <i>Lorna Hardwick</i>	15
3. The Divided Legacy of <i>Politikon</i> : Democracy and Conflict through Roman Translation <i>Alexandra Lianeri</i>	33
4. A Democratic Turn in the Reception of the Roman–Dutch Law of Treason in South Africa? <i>John Hilton</i>	47
5. Labour and the Classics: Plato and Crossman in Dialogue <i>Michael Simpson</i>	63

Section 2 Area Study—The United States

6. Appropriations of Cicero and Cato in the Making of American Civic Identity <i>Barbara Lawatsch Melton</i>	79
7. Classics as a Weapon: African Americans and the Fight for Inclusion in American Democracy <i>Margaret Malamud</i>	89
8. Civilization and Savagery at the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition <i>Robert Davis</i>	105
9. The Expansion of Tragedy as Critique <i>Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz</i>	119

10. Investigating American Women's Engagements with Graeco-Roman Antiquity, and Expanding the Circle of Classicists 131
Judith P. Hallett

Section 3 Education: Ideologies, Practices, and Contexts

11. The Democratic Turn in (and through) Pedagogy: A Case Study of the Cambridge Latin Course 143
Joanna Paul
12. Classics in West African Education: The Rhetoric of Colonial Commissions 157
Barbara Goff
13. Back to the *Demos*: An 'Anti-classical' Approach to Classics? 171
Martina Treu

Section 4 Greek Drama in Modern Performance: Democracy, Culture, and Tradition

14. Can 'Democratic' Modern Stagings of Ancient Drama be 'Authentic'? 183
Mary-Kay Gamel
15. Demotic Power to the People: The Triumph of *Dimotiki*, the Triumph of *Medea* 197
Anastasia Bakogianni
16. Aristophanic Performance as an All-inclusive Event: Audience Participation and Celebration in the Modern Staging of Aristophanic Comedy 213
Angeliki Varakis
17. Constructing Bridges for Peace and Tolerance: Ancient Greek Drama on the Israeli Stage 227
Nurit Yaari
18. *The Silence of Eurydice*: Case Study for a 'Topology of Democracy' 245
Dorinda Hulton

Section 5 Creativity—Female Agency in Fiction and Poetry

19. Ovidian Metamorphoses in the Fiction of A. S. Byatt 263
Fiona Cox
20. Catullus and Lesbia Translated in Women's Historical Novels 275
Elena Theodorakopoulos

21. Female Voices: The Democratic Turn in Ali Smith's
Classical Reception 287
Fiona Cox and Elena Theodorakopoulos

Section 6 The Public Imagination

22. Heroes or Villains: The Gracchi, Reform, and
the Nineteenth-Century Press 301
Sarah Butler
23. Democracy and Popular Media: Classical Reception in
Nineteenth, Twentieth, and Twenty-First Century Political
Cartoons—Statesmen, Mythological Figures, and
Celebrated Artworks 319
Alexandre G. Mitchell
24. Practising Classical Reception Studies 'in the Round': Mass
Media Engagements with Antiquity and the 'Democratic Turn'
towards the Audience 351
Amanda Wrigley
25. In Search of Ancient Myths: Documentaries and the Quest for
the Homeric World 365
Antony Makrinos
26. Truth, Justice, and the Spartan Way: Freedom and
Democracy in Frank Miller's *300* 381
George A. Kovacs
27. A 'Democratic Turn' at the Ashmolean Museum 393
Susan Walker
28. All Mod Cons? Power, Openness, and Text in the Digital Turn 411
Elton Barker

Afterword 427

S. Sara Monoson

Bibliography 433

Index 475

Acknowledgements

No book gets into print without the concerted efforts of many people in addition to the contributors. This is even more true for a book that originated in collaborative discussions that took place over many months and we warmly thank all those who, in addition to the authors included here, led discussions and contributed insights to the e-seminar (autumn and winter 2009/2010) that preceded the 2010 conference, at which many papers, including most of the chapters in this volume, were first presented and discussed. Special thanks for their roles in the e-seminar are due to Maureen Almond, Michael Broder, Deborah Challis, Michael Ewans, Rachel Friedman, Shelley Hales, Paula James, Vassilis Lambropoulos, Rosanna Lauriola, Jane Montgomery Griffiths, Kate Nichols, Amanda Potter, Sonia Sabnis, and Elke Steinmeyer and for their contributions at the conference to Maureen Almond, Alastair Blanshard, Kate Boshier, Bracht Branham, Robert Crowe, Freddy Decreus, Dorota Dutsch, Helen Eastman, Ahmed Etman, Kenneth Goings, Stephen Hodgkinson, Fiona Macintosh, Steven Mailloux, Chris-Ann Matteo, Justine McConnell, Sara Monoson, Laura Monros Gaspar, Eugene O'Connor, Michele Ronnick, Hara Thliveri, and Yana Sistovari. We also benefited greatly from the enthusiasm and comments of the graduate students who attended the workshops that formed part of the conference.

The e-seminar was co-ordinated and the 2010 conference organized by Carol Gillespie, who until her retirement in 2011 was project officer for the Reception of Classical Texts Research Project at the Open University and for the international Classical Reception Studies Network. It is safe to say that none of the activities that resulted in this book could have taken place without her organizational flair and resourcefulness in maximizing international communications. The planning of the conference itself and the workshops for students also benefited from the input of Anastasia Bakogianni, Jessica Hughes, and Kate Nichols—and from the financial support of the Arts Faculty Research Committee of the Open University.

For bringing the book to publication we thank the staff at Oxford University Press, especially Hilary O'Shea and Taryn Das Neves. We are grateful to the anonymous readers for their astute comments and suggestions and to the production manager (Rosie Wells), the copy-editor (Francesca White), and the proofreader (Jo North). Henry Stead compiled the integrated bibliography and the index, and designed the cover, and we thank him for his hard work and attention to detail. We are especially grateful to Sara Monoson for agreeing to write an Afterword and producing it during a very busy time.

LH and SJH

List of Figures

5.1	Richard Crossman (right) with Harold Wilson, British Prime Minister 1964–1970 and 1974–6, at the Labour Party conference in Blackpool in 1961	65
5.2	Richard Crossman, with microphone and loudspeaker, campaigning in the Oxford city by-election in November 1938, the year following first publication of <i>Plato Today</i>	75
8.1	Grand Basin with Golden Statue	108
8.2	‘Bird’s eye view of the World’s Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893’	113
8.3	Samoan Village on the Midway Plaisance	115
11.1	A sample page from the Cambridge Latin Course, Book 1 Stage 9	149
11.2	Sentences from the Cambridge Latin Course, Book 1 Stage 1	150
13.1	The Chorus of Satyrs, in the show <i>I Cercatori di Tracce</i>	177
13.2	The Chorus of Nymphs, in the show <i>I Cercatori di Tracce</i>	178
13.3	The Chorus, in the show <i>I Cercatori di Tracce</i>	178
18.1	Arianna Economou, as Eurydice, stands amongst relatives of the dead at a mass grave	248
18.2	The first panel: Arianna Economou, as Eurydice, outside the palace of Thebes	249
18.3	The second panel: Arianna Economou, as Eurydice, outside the palace of Thebes	250
18.4	The third panel: Arianna Economou, as Eurydice, inside the palace of Thebes	252
23.1	Cartoon by Kyr	323
23.2	‘The Yankee Nero’	325
23.3	Cartoon by David Low	326
23.4	‘Fiddler’	327
23.5	Cartoon by Steve Greenberg	329
23.6	Cartoon by Rex May	329
23.7	Cartoon by Goetz Wiedenroth	330
23.8	Cartoon by Jacques Sondron	331
23.9	Cartoon by Frank Arthur Nankivell	333
23.10	‘Un Nouvel Hercule Farnèse’	334
23.11	‘The Farnese Hercules’	335
23.12	Cartoon by Clive Goddard	336

23.13	‘The Hercules of the Union, slaying the great dragon of secession’	337
23.14	Cartoon by Plantu	339
23.15	Cartoon by Ferdinand von Reznicek	340
23.16	Laocoon, engraving	341
23.17	Laocoon	342
23.18	‘Canada’s Laocoon, or, Virgil on the Political Situation’	343
23.19	‘Lao(s)koon’	344
23.20	‘MacLaocoon’	345
23.21	Laocoon caricature of Richard Nixon	346
23.22	Cartoon by Janssen	347
23.23	Carton by Heng	348
27.1	The atrium of the new Ashmolean Museum, looking towards the Islamic World and Human Image Galleries	394
27.2	A new style of information panel and a low-density display in the Neil Kreitman Gallery of Early India at the Ashmolean Museum	399
27.3	A new style of information panel and a high-density display in the Oxfordshire section of the Rome Gallery at the Ashmolean Museum	399
27.4	The refurbished Fox-Strangways Gallery of Renaissance Art in the Cockerell Building of the Ashmolean Museum	400
27.5	The Arthur Evans Gallery of the Aegean Bronze Age at the Ashmolean Museum, opened in the 1980s	401
27.6	The Aegean World Gallery, 2009, Ashmolean Museum	401
27.7	Children’s displays in the Money Gallery, Ashmolean Museum	402
27.8	The Sir John Myres display, A. G. Leventis Gallery of Ancient Cyprus, Ashmolean Museum	403
27.9	Late Bronze Age contacts in the eastern Mediterranean, seen from the Aegean World Gallery, Ashmolean Museum	404
27.10	The Ancient World Gallery, Ashmolean Museum, seen from the bridge on the first floor	405
27.11	Lighting and labelling in a high-density display: late Bronze Age contacts in the eastern Mediterranean, seen from the Levant Gallery, Ashmolean Museum	406
27.12	New, illustrated label for the ‘Amarna Revolution’ section of the new Egyptian Galleries, 2011, Ashmolean Museum	407
29.1	<i>Transmission</i> , 1934, by American sculptor Leo Friedlander, New York, Rockefeller Center	431

List of Contributors

Anastasia Bakogianni received her Ph.D. in classics from the University of London, UK. She is currently a lecturer in classical studies at the Open University, UK. She also holds a post as a Research Fellow at University College London, UK. Her first monograph, *Electra Ancient and Modern: Aspects of the Reception of the Tragic Heroine*, was published by the Institute of Classical Studies in 2011. She has also edited a forthcoming two-volume collection of essays, entitled *Dialogues with the Past*, on aspects of the reception of Graeco-Roman culture. Her interests lie in Greek tragedy and culture and its reception, particularly in the mediums of opera, cinema, art, and poetry. She has published articles on all these aspects of the reception of Greek drama.

Elton Barker is a lecturer in classical studies at the Open University, UK. Author of *Entering the Agon* (Oxford University Press, 2009), a book that explores representations of debate in ancient Greek literature through the dynamic of dissent and authority, he has published widely on epic, historiography, and tragedy, with particular interest in the interplay between literature, culture, and politics. More recently he has been at the forefront of efforts to develop digital resources for complementing, enhancing, and innovating classical research, as principal investigator of three interdisciplinary projects: the AHRC-funded Hestia (<<http://www.open.ac.uk/Arts/hestia/>>), which uses digital tools as part of a multidimensional analysis of Herodotus' representation of geographic space; the Google-funded GAP (<<http://googleancientplaces.wordpress.com/>>), which develops an automated means of discovering and visualizing ancient places in texts; and the JISC-funded Pelagios (<<http://pelagios-project.blogspot.co.uk/>>), which facilitates links between online resources through the ancient places to which they refer.

Sarah Butler is an honorary research fellow at Royal Holloway, University of London, UK and an associate lecturer at the Open University, UK. She is the author of 'Ancient Rome and the Town and Country Debate' (*New Voices in Classical Reception*, 2011) and *Britain and Its Empire in the Shadow of Rome: The Reception of Rome in Socio-Political Debate from the 1850s to 1920s* (Continuum, 2012). Her current projects include an investigation into the apocalyptic urge, civilizational end and the fall of the Roman Empire, and looking at how the classics continued to act as a class marker in the interwar period and beyond.

Fiona Cox is a lecturer in French at the University of Exeter, UK. She has published widely on classical reception and on nineteenth- and twentieth-century French literature. She is the author of *Aeneas Takes the Metro; Virgil's Presence in Twentieth Century French Literature* (Legenda, 1999) and *Sibylline Sisters; Virgil's Presence in Contemporary Women's Writing* (Oxford University Press, 2011). She is also guest editor with Elena Theodorakopoulos of a Special Issue of *Classical Receptions Journal* on Contemporary Women's Writing and the Classical Tradition (November 2012).

Robert Davis has just completed his dissertation 'Performance and Spectatorship in United States International Expositions, 1876–1893' at the Graduate Center, City University of New York, looking at fairgoer experience at nineteenth-century world's fairs. He has published articles on public engagement with classics in *New Voices in Classical Reception Studies*, *Comparative Drama* (for which he won the Philadelphia Constantinidis Essay in Critical Theory Award), *Journal of American Drama and Theatre* (co-authored with Amanda Wrigley), and is contributing chapters for the forthcoming *Meet Me at the Fair: A World's Fair Reader* and *The Oxford Handbook of Greek Drama in the Americas*.

Mary-Kay Gamel teaches Greek, Latin, and theatre arts at the University of California, Santa Cruz, USA. Since 1985 she has been involved in more than twenty-five stagings of ancient and medieval drama as director, dramaturg, and/or producer, many in her own translations and adaptations, as well as productions of Shakespeare, O'Neill, Ayckbourn, Orff, Stoppard, and brand new scripts. She has written widely on ancient plays in performance both in the original context and later, and is working on a book on concepts of authenticity in staging these works.

Barbara Goff is professor of classics at the University of Reading, UK. She has published extensively on Greek tragedy and its reception, and on classics in postcolonial contexts. She is editor of *Classics and Colonialism* (Duckworth, 2005) and co-author, with Michael Simpson, of *Crossroads in the Black Aegean: Oedipus, Antigone, and Dramas of the African Diaspora* (Oxford University Press, 2007). Recent and forthcoming work includes 'All Aboard the Bacchae Bus: Reception of Euripides in the 20th and 21st Centuries', in the *Blackwell Companion to Euripides* (Blackwell, 2013) and *Your Secret Language: Classics in the British Colonies of West Africa* (Bloomsbury Academic Press, 2013). She is currently researching Plato at the WEA, as part of Working Classics, a project with Michael Simpson on classics and the British Labour movement.

Judith P. Hallett is professor of classics and a distinguished scholar-teacher at the University of Maryland, College Park, USA. She has published widely in the areas of Latin language and literature; women, sexuality, and the family

in ancient Greece and Rome; and the reception and study of classics in nineteenth- and twentieth-century America and England.

Lorna Hardwick is emeritus professor of classical studies in the Open University, UK. She has published extensively on the reception of Greek drama, classical poetry, and historiography, including *Translating Words, Translating Cultures* (Bristol Classical Press, 2000). She is joint editor, with Carol Gillespie, of *Classics in Post-Colonial Worlds* (Oxford University Press, 2007) and, with Christopher Stray, of *A Companion to Classical Receptions* (Blackwell, 2008).

Katherine Harloe is a lecturer in classics at the University of Reading, UK. She is the author of *Winckelmann and the Invention of Antiquity* (Oxford University Press, forthcoming 2013) and co-editor of *Thucydides and the Modern World: Reception, Reinterpretation and Influence from the Renaissance to the Present* (Cambridge University Press, 2012).

Stephen Harrison is professor of Latin literature at the University of Oxford and fellow and tutor in classics at Corpus Christi College. He has published many books and articles on Latin literature and its reception, including *Generic Enrichment in Virgil and Horace* (Oxford University Press, 2007), and is editor of *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics: Literary Theory and Classical Scholarship* (Oxford University Press, 2001), *Living Classics* (Oxford University Press, 2009), and *A Companion to Latin Literature* (Blackwell, 2005).

John Hilton is professor of classics at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Howard College, Durban, South Africa. He was awarded his doctorate—a philological commentary on Books 3 and 4 of the *Ethiopica* of Heliodorus—by the University of Natal in 1998. His publications include *Alma Parens Originalis: The Receptions of Classical Literature and Thought in Africa, Europe, the United States, and Cuba* (Peter Lang, 2007); *Apuleius: Rhetorical Works* (Oxford University Press, 2001), *An Introduction to Latin 1–4* (Multicopy, Durban, 1990–1), and numerous chapters and articles on various topics, including the reception of Roman Law in South Africa with particular reference to slavery at the Cape of Good Hope, the ancient novel (especially Heliodorus), onomastics (the name Azania and the names given to the nations of Africa), classical reception studies, and computer applications in classical philology.

Dorinda Hulton is a freelance director, dramaturg, and research fellow in drama at Exeter University, UK. She has been working in association with creative artists in Cyprus since 2003. Eight inter-arts performances of ‘new work’ have arisen out of this collaboration, and been presented, with Echo-Arts, Cyprus, in different venues on either side of the military border, and at international festivals in Portugal, Slovenia, and

Germany. The performance of *the still small voice of the people* was selected to represent Cyprus at the New Plays from Europe festival in Wiesbaden in 2006. Five articles authored by Hulton in relation to this practice-as-research have been published in journals including *PAJ* (*PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art*), *STP* (*Studies in Theatre and Performance*), and *PR* (*Performance Research Journal*), and she has co-edited a number of articles by international theatre artists for a journal entitled *Theatre in Times of War* published by the European Off Network.

George A. Kovacs is assistant professor of ancient history and classics at Trent University in Ontario, Canada. His primary teaching and research interests include the performance and stagecraft of Athenian theatre, as well as appropriations of Greek and Roman antiquity in modern mass media and popular culture. At Trent he is also director of the Classics Drama Group and with them has staged Euripides, Aristophanes, and Menander in English translation. He is the co-editor of *Classics and Comics* and *No Laughing Matter: Studies in Athenian Comedy* (both with C. W. Marshall). He is currently preparing a monograph on the performance and reception of Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis*.

Alexandra Lianeri is assistant professor of Greek and translation theory at the University of Thessaloniki, Greece. She has written in the fields of the reception and translation of antiquity, the theory and history of historiography, translation theory, and the history of political thought. In addition to articles in these fields she has co-edited the volume *Translation and the Classic* (Oxford University Press, 2008) and edited the volume *The Western Time of Ancient History* (Cambridge University Press, 2011). She is completing a monograph on the modern history of ancient democracy and co-editing a volume on the history of ancient philosophy.

Antony Makrinos received his Ph.D. in classics from University College London, UK in 2005. He has been a visiting lecturer in the School of English and Drama at Queen Mary College and he is currently a research and teaching fellow in the Greek and Latin Department at University College London. His interests include Greek epic, especially Homer; Greek education; scholarship in Byzantium; and reception studies, especially Homer on film and popular culture. He is currently working on an edition of Eustathius' *Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* (book 1). He is the co-editor of *Modern Views of Greek Antiquity* (forthcoming, Centre for Scientific Dialogue and Research, Cyprus) and the co-editor of *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Homer: From Byzantium to the Enlightenment* (forthcoming, Brill 2016). He has contributed to many University College London and King's College London, UK courses in classical studies and he has produced teaching material on classical themes for a

number of EUROCLASSICA workshops for European and international students.

Margaret Malamud is professor of ancient history and Islamic studies at New Mexico State University, USA. She is the author of *Ancient Rome in Modern America* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), and co-editor of *Imperial Projections: Ancient Rome in Modern Popular Culture* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001). She is currently working on 'Classics as a Weapon: Debating Slavery' and 'Liberty through Classical Exempla', funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Barbara Lawatsch Melton teaches in the Department of Classics at Emory University in Atlanta. She has published an annotated edition of Andrew White's Voyage to Maryland (1633): *Relatio Itineris in Marilandiam* (1995), and her recent publications have focused on seventeenth-century monasticism. Her current research is concerned with classical receptions in Germany and British North America, and their relationship with the formation of civic and political cultures.

Alexandre G. Mitchell is a classical archaeologist by training (DEUG, Licence, Maîtrise, D.E.A.: Strasbourg, France; D.Phil.: Oxford 2002), who has worked on Greek pottery and Roman terracotta. His main opus is *Greek Vase Painting and the Origins of Visual Humour* (Cambridge University Press, 2009, paperback 2012). His current long-term research focuses on classical Greek and Roman reception in editorial cartoons since the turn of the twentieth century published in British and American newspapers (and in a large choice of European newspapers). In the shorter term, he is funded by the University of Fribourg (Switzerland) to research classical reception in editorial cartoons since 2009, focusing on references to the 'Greek crisis' in a number of European newspapers. Alex is also a fiction writer (*The 13th Tablet*, Haus Publishing, 2012). Currently he is an honorary associated researcher at the Institute of Archaeology, University of Oxford, and a *collaborateur scientifique* at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland.

S. Sara Monoson is professor of political science and classics at Northwestern University, USA. She is the author of *Plato's Democratic Entanglements: Athenian Politics and the Practice of Philosophy* (Princeton University Press, 2000). Her study of uses of 'Socrates' in contemporary popular media, *Socrates in the Vernacular*, is forthcoming from Harvard University Press.

Joanna Paul is a lecturer in classical studies at the Open University, UK. Her research in the field of classical reception studies covers a number of different areas, with a particular focus on reception in contemporary popular culture. She has published on a variety of cinematic receptions of antiquity, from Fellini to Alexander, and her monograph on *Film and the Classical Epic*

Tradition is also part of the Classical Presences series (Oxford University Press, 2013). Her current projects include further work on the modern reception of Pompeii, and research into childhood engagements with antiquity, in both pedagogical material and children's literature.

Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz is the Margaret Bundy Scott professor of comparative literature at Hamilton College, USA. She has written two books, *Anxiety Veiled: Euripides and the Traffic in Women* (Cornell University Press, 1993) and *Greek Tragedy* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2008), and co-edited *Feminist Theory and the Classics*, with Amy Richlin (Routledge, 1993), and *Among Women: From the Homosocial to the Homoerotic in the Ancient World*, with Lisa Auanger (University of Texas Press, 2002). She is one of the co-editors and translators of *Women on The Edge: Four Plays by Euripides* (Routledge, 1999). She has more recently turned her attention to modern performances of tragedy and to the ways of using art, and tragedy in particular, for social justice. The future contains several articles as well as three more edited volumes—one on teaching difficult subjects in the classics classroom, one on ancient sex and gender, and one on the idea of the gaze in antiquity.

Michael Simpson is senior lecturer in the Department of English and Comparative Literature at Goldsmiths, University of London. He is the author of *Closet Performances: Political Exhibition and Prohibition in the Dramas of Byron and Shelley* (Stanford University Press, 1998), which is a study of closet drama within a culture of (self-)censorship, and of numerous essays on the drama, theatre, poetry, and novel of the Romantic era. Two of his other interests, in classical literature and postcolonial drama, intersect in *Crossroads in the Black Aegean: Oedipus, Antigone, and Dramas of the African Diaspora* (Oxford University Press, 2007), which he co-wrote with Barbara Goff. Within Romantic studies, he is currently writing a book on distraction in British Romantic literature; within classical reception studies, he is co-writing, again with Barbara Goff, a cultural history of classics and the British Labour movement.

Elena Theodorakopoulos lectures in classics at the University of Birmingham, UK. She has written on Latin poetry and on films. With Fiona Cox, she has edited a special issue of *Classical Receptions Journal* (2012) on the subject of contemporary women's writing and the reception of classical literature. Her current research is on Catullus and his reception.

Martina Treu is researcher in Greek language and literature at the IULM University in Milan, Italy, where she teaches ancient drama. She is also working on different projects concerning theatre for IULM University. She is member of the Imagines Project (<<http://www.imagines-project.org/>>) and of the Research Centre on Ancient Drama at the University of Pavia, Italy

(<http://crimta.unipv.it>). For some years, she has been visiting assistant professor of ancient drama at the University of Venice, Italy and at the Catholic University, Brescia, Italy. She has worked in European theatres and cooperated as a dramaturg in a few adaptations of classical texts for the stage. Her main works concern: Aristophanes' chorus and satyr-drama in ancient and modern performances; adaptation and reception of Greek drama; Greek mythology in modern theatre and literature.

Angeliki Varakis is lecturer in drama at the University of Kent, UK. Her research interests include the modern staging of ancient Greek drama and the theatre of Aristophanes. She has published articles on the use of mask in modern productions of Greek theatre and has participated in a series of practice-based research projects involving the mask. Her most recent publication is 'Body and Mask in Aristophanic Performance' (*Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 53: 17–38).

Susan Walker was appointed keeper of antiquities at the Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford in 2004. She led the curatorial team for the whole museum through scheme design stage of its recent redevelopment; then she led detailed curatorial work on the galleries of ancient and medieval Cyprus, Rome 400 BC to AD 300, and the Mediterranean world from AD 300. In 2010–11 she contributed the Roman funerary display to the remodelled galleries of ancient Egypt and Nubia. From 1977 to 2004 Susan Walker was assistant, then deputy keeper of Greek and Roman antiquities at the British Museum, where she curated the Wolfson Galleries of Classical Sculpture and Inscriptions, Rome: City to Empire and three major temporary exhibitions. She is currently researching for publication the Ashmolean's Wilshire Collection of late Roman gold-glass, sarcophagi and inscriptions, and a recently acquired bronze head of the emperor Marcus Aurelius from Brackley, Northants.

Amanda Wrigley is postdoctoral research associate on the AHRC-funded project 'Screen Plays: Theatre Plays on British Television', University of Westminster, UK and part-time associate lecturer on A219: Exploring the Classical World, the Open University, UK. Previously she was Mellon-Sawyer postdoctoral fellow in classics, Northwestern University, USA (2009–10) and researcher, Archive of Performances of Greek and Roman Drama, University of Oxford, UK (2001–9). Her latest books are the monograph *Greece on Air: Engagements with Ancient Greece on BBC Radio, 1920s–1970s* and the edited volume, with Stephen Harrison, *Louis MacNeice: The Classical Radio Plays* (both Oxford University Press, 2013). She is currently writing *Greece on Screen: Greek Plays on British Television*. In 2011 she guest edited the *Comparative Drama* special issue on *Translation, Performance, and Reception of Greek Drama, 1900–1960: International Dialogues*. Journal articles include 'A

Wartime Radio Odyssey: Edward Sackville-West and Benjamin Britten's *The Rescue* (1943)' (*The Radio Journal*, 8.2) and 'Greek Immigrants Playing Ancient Greeks at Chicago's Hull-House: Whose Antiquity?' (with Robert Davis) (*JADT*, 23.2). See <<http://amandawrigley.wordpress.com>>.

Nurit Yaari is professor of theatre studies at the Yolanda and David Katz Faculty of Arts, Tel Aviv University, Israel. She has authored two books, *French Contemporary Theatre 1960–1992* (AFAA and Entr'Actes, 1995) and *Le Théâtre de Hanokh Levin: Ensemble à l'ombre des canons* (éditions Théâtrales, 2008), edited *On Interpretation in the Arts* (Tel Aviv University, 2000), and two books on Israeli prominent playwrights, *The Man with the Knife in the Middle: The Theatre of Hanoch Levin* (with Shimon Levy, Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 2004) and *On Kings, Gypsies and Performers: The Theatre of Nissim Aloni* (Porter Institute/Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 2006). Her articles, published in Hebrew, English, and French, focus on ancient Greek tragedy and its reception in the theatre of the twentieth century, and on different aspects of the Israeli theatre. Professor Yaari is serving as artistic consultant for the Khan Theatre of Jerusalem, and served as artistic director of IsraDrama, an annual event organized by the Institute of Israeli Drama to expose Israeli plays and playwrights to the international theatre community.

Introduction

Lorna Hardwick and Stephen Harrison

Greek and Roman texts, material culture and ideas have always been widely and radically used and re-used by individuals and by societies, and in recent centuries this has gradually included more people who have not had a formal classical education of any kind. Discussions about the relationship between classical languages and the vernacular or the demotic continue, as do debates about the broader artistic, intellectual, and social role of classical material in human experience and imagination. As well as analysis of the relationships between ancient and modern aesthetic sensibilities, there is also continuing controversy about the extent to which ancient concepts and events (*logoi* and *erga* in Thucydidean vocabulary)—whether rooted in historiography and philosophy or in literature and theatre—provide a fertile field for thinking and action in the contemporary world. In the last fifty years, re-writings and re-imaginings of Greek and Roman material have become more prominent in public awareness, both as part of the advocacy of liberation and emancipation and in social and political critique. Such contested appropriations are not new and there is a long history of examples in which classical referents have been used by all sides in struggles for political and social power and aesthetic authority.

What is striking about current debates is the way in which three strands of apparently differently orientated enquiry have come together. The first partly derives from concerns about the decline of classics as a field of academic study in the general curriculum in schools and universities and therefore about the perceived retreat in the public consciousness of classics as a modern subject of study. Such perceptions add a note of contemporary anxiety to the history of ‘classics in education’, a history that is addressed in several essays in this volume and which is continuing to yield a varied scholarly literature (for example, Archibald, Brockliss, and Gnora forthcoming; Connolly 2010; Goings and O’Connor 2010, 2012; Greenwood 2010; Hanson and Heath 1998; Stray 1998). Secondly, there are challenges to deeply embedded stereotypes

about the elite Western associations of the study of classics and its contextual associations, ancient and modern. Neither the stereotypes nor the challenges are unproblematic. Phiroze Vasunia has pointed to 'the fascinating richness of the interaction between the Graeco-Roman tradition and empire'. Yet, while acknowledging the ways in which 'Greek and Latin traditions have shaped European colonial and imperial activities since the Renaissance' he also points to the dense interplay of human and institutional actors and the 'many dynamic interventions, responses, and accomplishments of the colonizers and the colonized' (Vasunia 2010: 285). This situation has led to substantial scholarly interest in which the focus is not merely on the modern context but also on its dialogical relationship with the ancient. Comparable dynamisms might equally well be discovered in the role of Graeco-Roman traditions in the political climate within states and in other conflicts, such as those of gender and class. The third development that underlies the concerns of this book is the contemporary increase in multifaceted public interest in Greek and Roman material, often mediated in the public imagination through popularizing cultural forms. In these, too, the classical material is not merely distilled and re-crafted (although it may be) but is also a catalyst for debate, not least in its reconfiguration of public and private spheres, in the economic and political contexts of its generation and consumption and in its problematic relationship with antiquity.

This edited collection investigates the extent to which the confluence of these and other closely related issues might be said to be bringing about a 'Democratic Turn' in the role of classics. The term carries with it several perspectives. One perspective looks at the differing ways in which Greek and Roman ideas, texts, and images have been absorbed, re-worked, and communicated in the wider world in the modern period. A second focuses on how these have been investigated by scholars and identifies the precise research questions, conceptual approaches, and theoretical frameworks that have been brought to bear on these 'receptions' and their interpretation, including shifts in choice of topics for research. A third perspective opens up questions about the types of ancient and modern agency involved in the transmission and transformation of Greek and Roman material. This aspect includes questions about how the relationships between ancient and modern, and between example and generalization might be interpreted. It is therefore necessary to examine the interface between on the one hand the raw materials thrown up in the ongoing relationships with Greek and Roman material that are part of subsequent cultural histories and, on the other hand, the research methods and intellectual typologies used by scholars to collect and explain these, including questions about relationships with the ancient texts and contexts.¹

¹ For the relationship between concepts of 'tradition' and 'reception', see Budelmann and Haubold 2008.

Thus the questions raised by the idea of a 'Democratic Turn' are historical and philosophical as well as artistic and political. An important underlying feature is that assumptions about the inherent superiority of ancient works now tend to be more closely questioned, both in scholarship and in the wider public sphere. There has been renewed acceptance of the independent status and value of new works. This debate has a long literary and performance history from the seventeenth century onwards (recently addressed in Hall and Macintosh 2005; Hopkins 2008; Harrison 2009; Rees 2009; Gillespie 2011; Reynolds 2011). Furthermore, research has tracked ways in which both ancient and newer works have become better known among less privileged groups, not only through education but also through social institutions and entertainment, with the modern receptions sometimes acting as an introduction to the ancient. The range of media that use classical material has been extended (and is still developing) and the independent status and value of new works is increasingly investigated for the commentaries and insights that they might provide on the ancient texts and contexts, as well as on the times, places, and languages of their own provenance. Theoretical perspectives on reader and spectator response have widened the constituencies that are perceived to be involved in various phases of the construction of meaning. The theories of German scholars such as Jauss and Iser and their followers (see Martindale 2006 and Hardwick 2003: ch. 1) have been influential, as have concepts of performance that privilege the bodily co-presence of actors and spectators as the defining feature of the creation of meaning in theatre. Such approaches to performance are often accompanied by the claim that theatrical experience is itself transformative (Fischer-Lichte 2010). Nor is interest confined to literature and theatre. There have been extensive studies of the modern use of ancient material as a basis for political and ethical ideas. Some of this research has focused on classical material that has provided the raw material for counter-discourse or resistance in situations of political and cultural oppression (Bradley 2010; Goff 2005, 2013; Hall and Vasunia 2010; Hall, Alston, and McConnell 2011; Hardwick 2000; Hardwick and Gillespie 2007; Vasunia 2013).

All these phenomena raise questions about the relationship between critical approaches in scholarship and cultural and political practices outside academia. As well as focusing on classical material in contexts of dissent and resistance, recent scholarship has examined the other side of the coin, turning the lens on investigation of the ways in which Greek and Roman texts, ideas, and images have been exploited to justify tyranny and atrocity (including Hall, Alston, and McConnell 2011; Krebs 2011; Nelis 2011; Orrells, Bhambra, and Roynon 2011) and some have investigated the relationship between this and education systems (Roche 2010; Schmidt 2001). Such a range of possible lines of enquiry inevitably raises problems about how to frame questions that both do justice to the huge amount of material and yet provide focus and coherence. Page duBois has referred to the 'proliferating, unpredictable connections' that

are to be found in the webs and networks that provide the raw material for studies that explore the implications of classics outside Western thought and outside the academy (duBois 2010: ix). This is surely equally true for investigations that situate classics within the academy and within the broad parameters of Western traditions and practices and which seek to do justice to those multifarious implications. Duncan Kennedy has highlighted how the engagement between subsequent thinkers with the ancient texts creates new generations of narrators and ‘from the new narrator’s privileged perspective, the past is reconfigured in the light of the new end, and a new order is imposed on history’ (Kennedy 1999: 31). The particular challenge faced by the researchers who collaborated in addressing key aspects of the topic of this book was to resist the temptation to impose a new order on history (some of which is comparatively recent and thus doubly difficult to interpret) and instead to identify and discuss examples that provide crucial evidence on which judgments can be made, not merely in the provisional situation of our present but also by the scholars of the future. The rest of this Introduction sets out some of the conceptual issues and describes the successive phases of the collaboration that have resulted in this book.

1. HAS THERE BEEN A ‘DEMOCRATIC TURN’? THE CONCEPT OF THE ‘TURN’ IN CULTURAL ANALYSIS

The word ‘Turn’ (which has also been applied to cultural studies, translation studies, and performance) may in its ‘soft’ sense signal a redressing of balances, a pendulum swinging back from perspectives that were thought to have become too dominant. So a ‘Democratic Turn’ might be seen as turning the focus away from the association between the study of antiquity and a limited elite group with the necessary education, wealth, and leisure and towards a wider constituency of users. However, the conceptually ‘hard’ sense of a ‘Turn’ can also indicate lasting epistemic shifts in perceptions of how texts are constituted and in how meaning might be ascribed and transmitted. There are crucial questions about how these texts may relate to the various ‘presents’ that experience them and which in their turn construct a ‘past’ that generates its own traditions. Examples of types of ‘Turn’ conceptualized in recent scholarship in the arts and humanities in general, and which have special resonances and heuristic value for the study of classical material, include the translation turn, the cultural turn, and the performative turn. So far as classical studies are concerned, the textual turn and the mythical turn have also been creeping onto the agenda.

Scholars' debates about all of these 'turns' have been important for classical reception studies, which by definition is concerned with cultural traffic. This traffic is not just between ancient and modern. It includes movement via mediating contexts and then within receiving cultures. Some assumptions about the direction and persistence of particular 'Turns' have been challenged by classical scholars, especially in terms of the balance between performance and textual analysis of ancient drama and the need for a renewed 'textual turn' has been suggested.² Can such a plethora of 'Turns' be accommodated in any meaningful way (see Hardwick in this volume)?

2. THE USE OF THE TERM 'DEMOCRATIC': EMOTIVE? DESCRIPTIVE? OPAQUE?

'Democratic' is an example of a concept that is common to both the academic and the public spheres, which are therefore pivotal if there is to be the kind of clarity and critique that facilitates a genuine public engagement. The word 'Democratic' itself carries contested meaning and contradictory resonances.³ Its use yields a plethora of examples of the sometimes abrasive relationship between attempts to analyse an ancient field of evidence in terms of its own concepts and the necessarily disjunctive force of the concepts brought to bear on this from the modern scholars' world view; 'democracy' and 'democratic' provide one of the most problematic instances. The implications of this, both from the point of view of historical and comparative analysis and from the point of view of the scholar's obligation for reflection, underlie a number of the essays here. Extension of access to classical material and/or incorporation of some features into mass or popular entertainment and pastimes may be one aspect of 'democratic' openness but that is only one facet of the wider issue.

There are also interesting problems in the associations that have grown up between related but different concepts. For example, pluralism and diversity are sometimes used as terms of cultural approval in the contemporary world, yet they are often vaguely defined and are not necessarily accompanied by democracy. Liberation movements, too, may or may not attract approval, but in either case they are not necessarily 'democratic' either in intention or in effect. Popular or mass cultural forms may be manipulative rather than enabling. There may be aspects of Greek and Roman cultures that, in alluring

² See for example Hardwick 2002 and Perris 2010.

³ At the time of writing (summer 2012) the global and European financial crises had led to situations in which European 'democratic' government might be led by unelected technocrats and there was also considerable debate about how 'democratic government' might be defined and conducted in African states with diverse community histories.

ways, transmit ideas and practices that are far from democratic (even in some cases repulsive). What is being transplanted covertly or being received unknowingly? Above all, how can such processes be investigated and explained?

3. THE 'WORLD' THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THE DEBATE IN THIS VOLUME—ANCIENT, MODERN, CONTEMPORARY?

The title of this book defines the enquiry in terms of 'Classics in the Modern World'. The choice of 'modern' rather than 'contemporary' was made for two reasons. Firstly, although 'contemporary' is an accurate description of the time frame discussed in many of the essays, one aim of the research was also to consider how present-day developments are rooted in specific histories and traditions. Some of the essays that focus on intellectual history discuss material from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; those that consider public media include extensive material from the nineteenth century as well as from more recent times. So in questioning '*what*' might constitute a 'Democratic Turn', consideration also has to be given to '*when*'. For example, Catherine Edwards has commented on the relationship between epistemic shifts and turning points in history (Edwards 1999: 18). Edwards' study focused on the reception of Rome in European culture and therefore took 1789 as the basis for discussion. The Area Study of the United States (Section 2 in this book) recognizes that 1776 needs to be the starting point for investigation of the relationship between classical material, Greek and Roman, and the constructions of American national and cultural identity that took increased energy from the time of independence from Britain. Secondly, the use of the word 'modern' recognizes that even in cases in which particular receptions seem to proclaim and activate a direct relationship between the ancient and the contemporary (the hour-glass model), both the infrastructure to that reception and the scholarly methods that are used to investigate it represent a process that is more like a palimpsest. In that model, re-writings, re-envisionings, and various forms of mediation produce a complex and multilayered document in which the ancient material is always represented, both in its mediation in the modern world, both chronologically and spatially, and subsequently in the contemporary world. A related theme running through many of the essays is that of the relationships between the public and private spheres. The former is a defining factor of any form of democracy. In his study *Theatre and Citizenship*, David Wiles commented that 'it is in the public sphere that theatre and citizenship converge . . . it becomes increasingly irrelevant to talk of democracy in the absence of a functional "public sphere"'

(Wiles 2011: 208). One of the aims of this book is to explore the question of ‘where’ the fields for a ‘democratic turn’ might be, how these might have changed and be changing, and how they might be shaped and used in their interactions with Greek and Roman antiquity.

4. THE PRELIMINARY CONVERSATIONS UNDERLYING THE RESEARCH

Such questions formed the basis of the extensive collaborative research project on the theme of the ‘Democratic Turn?’ that has run from 2009 to the present. The first stage was an electronic seminar (2009) in which themes were discussed and examples prepared and shared by a large number of participants from several continents.⁴ In 2010 an international conference was held in the UK on the theme *Classics in the Wider World, 1776 to the Present: A ‘Democratic Turn’?* This volume represents a selection of responses to the debates fostered by that conference. Papers have been chosen in order to focus on the most important themes and topics that were common to a significant cross-section of participants. (Two papers were commissioned subsequently in order to address in detail topics that emerged as strands in the conference.) We hope that the essays also provide an illustration of how research on specific examples underpins the conceptualization and investigation of meta-questions (see further below) and will therefore be of interest to all arts researchers, students, and practitioners who work with Greek and Roman material, whatever their discipline of origin. The vertical and horizontal links between individual essays and sections should provide pathways for those who are interested in looking beyond their own specialisms. Since there is also considerable discussion of how ancient material and its mediations impact on the wider world, and are shaped by it, we hope that the discussions will also be of interest to readers beyond academia. There is no attempt to be comprehensive but instead we have tried to provide the equivalent of an archaeological ‘cross-section’ into areas of importance.

The initial discussions between the collaborators in the e-seminar identified a large number of important but challenging areas. Not all the essays address all of these problems—it was agreed that it would be undesirable and counter-productive to impose a rigid template of key questions that all essay must address—but they provide a discursive thread through the collection, allowing readers not only to relate different essays and sections to each other but also to

⁴ The unedited proceedings are archived under Eseminar at <<http://www2.open.ac.uk/ClassicalStudies/GreekPlays/>>.

provoke connections with their own work. There were three main strands in the e-seminar: (i) the debate and its terms; (ii) issues in particular sub-fields and questions about how case studies could contribute to the analysis of broader questions; (iii) implications for and in pedagogy and dissemination.

It quickly became clear that we were not dealing with a fixed and all-embracing 'democratic turn' but with many. The idea offered a fluid tool for discussing and comparing a range of possibilities, including ways in which defining features and emotive associations might change over time. The different notions and practices of democracy that developed over time provided a comparative index, both chronologically and across different national and cultural contexts. This led to a decision to include an Area Study in the book, so that various aspects could be considered over time and in terms of their inter-relationships. It also underlay the decision to include different national and artistic traditions, both within sections and across sections.

Underlying the debate was the problem of the value that was implicitly and sometimes explicitly attached to 'democratic' as a descriptive term that also carries some uncomfortable baggage and might be used with approval or with disapprobation. What was the root of the desire to appropriate the term to characterize either a particular reception or its academic study? Many participants warned of the dangers of complacency and over-reliance on present-day perspectives, given that most academics saw themselves as beneficiaries of a reasonably free and uncensored living and working environment (see Hilton's and Malamud's essays for historical perspectives on the painful hinterland to this). Some took the issue further than others (cf. Hardwick in this volume on the denial practised in supposedly liberal societies) while most accepted the need for critical self reflection (see Treu's invocation of Bourdieu) and applied this also to the interactive aspects of scholarship, especially in cross-disciplinary contexts (Hallett). Recognition of the power of thinking as itself a civilizing force (for instance in the search for liberties) was combined with an acute sense of the difference between enabling access and participation and the further step of ensuring liability to scrutiny. Alexandre Mitchell put on the agenda the point that classical material was just as liable to 'use and abuse' in democratic contexts as in oligarchies or tyrannies. Awareness of how cultural artefacts and the ways in which they are described and evaluated are embedded in power structures (academic as well as socio-political) was a recurring theme.

That led to discussion about the differences between 'popular' and 'mass' access to and use of classical material and so to probing of the issues surrounding the links between democracy and empowerment. Paula James pointed out that questions about how classical motifs and figures are received in the popular consciousness have diverse implications. Those could range from 'what audiences bring in terms of experiences, educational or otherwise, and expectations about mythical models and figures from the past and what

the movie or TV industry rightly or wrongly assumes about their viewers demographically and intellectually' to the effect on the average bricklayer, stonemason, carpenter of the use of Greek or Roman artistic symbols in nineteenth-century trade union banners and certificates.⁵ Did this dampen down rather than empower class consciousness? As she pointed out, 'even militant strike posters [in the nineteenth century] referenced the rights of the workers to the benefits of the British Empire, with the Roman Empire as its model'. This perspective was taken up in different ways by several discussants and included emphasis on the importance of analysing para-material as well as the work itself. Para-material might include the varieties of rhetoric used to advertise a film or TV series or a comic book, the cover images, prefatory words offered by a translator, and pithy advertising tags. There was, too, a sense that there are many different 'publics' and, as Deborah Challis emphasized, different 'public places'.

Maureen Almond intervened to challenge the idea that writers and other creative practitioners had a 'democratic' purpose in mind. In her view, based on her perspective as a poet, this might be an interpretation added by commentators—'I find myself asking, is there really a "turn" here or we are all involved in a situation in which reception of the classics is, like everything else, in a state of constant change, influenced as much by individual issues such as ambition, reward, recognition, acclaim, motive as by "big" issues such as civil liberties, equality, human rights, social justice etc.' She described her approach in responding to poets such as Ovid and Horace in the social context and idiom of her own north-east England: 'some of us recognize that when there is something worth saying it is worth saying twice (the Second Way) . . . reducing elitism and exclusion in the contemporary poetry world has always been important to me, but I have never seen it as a quest for increased democracy. What has driven me is a strong desire to share the joy and enlightenment of poetry . . . Being able as a practitioner to attach an ancient context to a modern situation somehow emphasizes and confirms the continuity of the human state, and as a poet my interest, first and foremost, is in the human state.'⁶ Almond's comments caused the seminar members to reflect on the different sources and characteristics of agency in the dynamics of classical reception. It was pointed out, for example, that the preoccupations of female readers and writers could be as tyrannical in their way as those of the male elites who had hitherto been dominant: the implications of female agency are analysed in this volume by Cox and Theodorakopoulos. Angeliki Varakis raised questions about the privileged status of the theatre director and the non-democratic working methods that may be brought to bear on Greek plays

⁵ See Ravenhill-Johnson, (2013).

⁶ Maureen Almond went on to give a poetry reading at the conference. For her reflections on her work with Latin poetry, see Almond 2009.

that originated in a democratic context. This is a theme that is threaded through a number of essays (Gamel, Hulton, Treu).

The seminar also raised questions about the different ways of ‘knowing’ and ‘communicating’ antiquity. Kate Nichols suggested that visual association was a strong force in building mass engagements with antiquity and was still under-researched, although the position is improving.⁷ She stressed that it was important to maintain a sense of historical perspective—‘I am anxious that we don’t perceive the mass audience as a historically new development, for classical culture was woven into the fabric of ordinary life long before Russell Crowe strapped on his sandals in *Gladiator*.’ She also pointed to the perennial problem that is the ‘down-side’ of the potential of classical reception studies: its enormous range, both chronologically and in terms of subject matter. She advocated foregrounding of the insights of reception theorists in order to give coherence and focus and insisted on the relationship between classical reception research and understanding of the discipline of classics.

This part of the discussion prompted two further clusters of observations. The first addressed the difficulties in tightening the focus in order to achieve more acute analysis when we are ‘constantly discovering a broader, richer, classical presence through time’ (Robert Davis). The importance of achieving ‘thick’ description and commentary in case studies, but presenting this together with an explanatory framework that clarified the implications for broader questions, was a shared aspiration. That is integral to any project that seeks to link detailed rigorous research with attempts to frame and investigate meta-questions. The second cluster of observations was directed at ways in which classical receptions and figures might be and were being used in theoretical discussions (see for example duBois, 2010, ‘Twenty-first-Century High Theory and the Classics’;⁸ Hamilakis 2007; Leonard 2005, 2010, 2012). Vassilis Lambropoulos called for greater attention to the reception of classics in political theory over the last three centuries, because the philosophy of politics has remained closely engaged with the Greeks and Romans (see Lianeri, Lawatsch-Melton and Monoson in this volume).

5. CONFERENCE DEBATES

The next stage in the development of the research discussions took the form of a three-day conference (June 2010). This included a workshop for research

⁷ See for example Coltman 2009; Hales and Paul 2011; Hughes 2011; Bilsel 2012.

⁸ duBois (2010: 174) explains that, rather than to ‘offer critiques of misreadings of the ancient world’, her aim is to alert classical scholars to the ways in which theorists such as Judith Butler and Giorgio Agamben ‘engage with the same shifting elements of an ancient world that classicists themselves find endlessly compelling’.

students, who also took part in all the sessions and discussions and presented poster displays of their work in progress. The conference provided the opportunity to experiment with the most productive groupings of papers across thematic panels (all of which were plenary). So, for example, the theme of education and pedagogy was not confined to a panel on education but, in addition to Chris Ann Mateo and Elton Barker's discussion of 'Crossing Boundaries through Digital Humanities in US schools', also included papers in other panels, such as 'Nietzsche as Educator' (Bracht Branham) which was part of an intellectual history panel. Discussion of the histories of African Americans and classics was informed by papers on 'African-American Rhetoric: Christian Political Theology and Classical Culture' (Steven Mailloux), 'Classical Curricula at Black Colleges and Universities' (Kenneth Goings and Eugene O'Connor) and a prosopography 'People of African Descent and Classical Studies' (Michele Ronnick). A panel contributed by the American Philological Association included papers on 'Protecting Lysistrata: Classical Drama and Political Activism' (Dorota Dutsch) and 'Venus Orta Mari and Other Fantastic Advice' (Kate Bosher and Jordana Cox). The panel on Public Experience and Popular Classics included papers on 'Penguin(s) Classics' (Robert Crowe) and 'Pompeii in the Crystal Palace: Comparing Victorian and Modern Virtual Immersive Environments' (Shelley Hales). A 'Practitioners' Voices' session included a discussion of the role of the theatre director, led by Helen Eastman, and a poetry reading by Maureen Almond, who was Poet in Residence. Almond also discussed the several and different audiences she has in mind: 'colleagues and people with a general interest in poetry, academics, and because of the ordinary, everyday contexts in which I tend to set my poems, non-poetry people who might simply be able to identify with the life style contained within my poems'.⁹ The input of practitioners was complemented by Yana Sistovari's paper 'Re-animating Antiquity: Gardzienice Theatre's Process into Contemporary Performance' and Graham Ley's 'Aristophanes and the Skills of the Comic Actor'. Finally, a closing Round-Table discussion provided overview comments on the conference as a whole by Freddy Decreus ('Epistemological Questions'), Nurit Yaari ('Questions of Practice'), Ahmed Etman ('Comparisons with the Impact of Classics in Egypt'), and Alastair Blanshard ('Classical and Popular Cultures').

The heady three days of the conference showed not just that the cake might be cut in different ways but that the richness of the mixture needed careful layering. The most rewarding discussions emerged from points of intersection, when papers explicitly and implicitly spoke to the deep debates in the area of research from which they had grown and also brought their conclusions to

⁹ For example in Almond 2002, 2004, 2009. For Eastman's reflections on her experience and approaches as a dramaturg and director, see 'Interview with Helen Eastman', in *Practitioners' Voices in Classical Reception Studies* (2010) at <<http://www2.open.ac.uk/PractitionersVoices>>.

bear on the trajectories followed by the conference theme in neighbouring fields. The structure of this book thus reflects the conference identification of key areas which combine the ability of case studies to present close analyses that illuminate their own field and also provide threads that run across to and through other sub-fields.

Section 1, *Controversies and Debates*, includes five essays and sets out to probe some ways of exploring the topic through intellectual history and political analysis. The first three essays are primarily conceptual in focus. Katherine Harloe explores the problematics of being a (thinking) democrat, drawing upon critiques of contemporary political discourse offered by political theorists in order to consider some possible implications of adopting the phrase 'democratic turn' and to suggest some future possibilities. In contrast, Lorna Hardwick (who drew the short straw among the conference organizers and was given the brief of attacking the notion of a democratic turn) aims to uncover the awkward and sometimes repressed implications of the term and to consider arguments against both 'democratic' and 'turn' formulations. Alexandra Lianeri's essay explores the entanglement of the Greek and Roman democratic heritages and how this has produced an internally conflicted set of 'imperatives' that actually map a conflict at the centre of Western democratic genealogy. The fourth and fifth essays focus on historical examples. John Hilton's essay examines the long history of treason trials in South Africa, discussing how Roman Law was received and re-shaped at times of heightened political tension culminating in the birth of a newly democratic South Africa. Michael Simpson examines the relationship between Greek philosophy, government policies, and public media in the hinterland of the Labour governments in 1960s Britain.

The five essays in Section 2, *Area Study—The United States*, take forward perspectives from intellectual and socio-political history, providing an area study of the United States, with 1776 as its initial inspiration. Barbara Lawatsch Melton's study discusses how Cicero and Cato emerged as eighteenth-century iconic figures in the early shaping of the foundational narrative of liberty and civic engagement. Margaret Malamud then examines how the training in classical oratory and debate which was fostered by that narrative then provided African American intellectuals with powerful weapons to fight for inclusion in civic society and politics. Robert Davis analyses the ideological pairing of classical art and architecture with American cultural aspirations for 'civilization' in the 1893 World's Columbian Exhibition at the Chicago World's Fair, attended by almost 50 per cent of the United States population. Davis argues that the exhibition's alignment of American (and Western) progress with classical civilization is emblematic of the loaded cultural politics of receiving antiquity. Nancy Rabinowitz's essay moves the focus to contemporary times, reviewing how drama was used to define and explore contentious issues, notably to critique claims by the US and the UK that war in Iraq

was part of a mission to export democracy. In the final essay in the section Judith Hallett carries forward the volume's aim to encourage critical self-reflection among scholars, relating this both to the intellectual climate in American academia and to female contributions to classical reception (thus also providing a linking thread to Section 5's discussion of creative writing by women).

Section 3, *Education: Ideologies, Practices and Contexts*, presents three essays which discuss very different examples of educational processes. Each links to one or more of the other sections in its focus on a particular national or social context, medium, or philosophy of democratic practice. Joanna Paul's case study of the Cambridge Latin Course addresses ways in which pedagogical systems and materials can both be important vehicles for disseminating knowledge about the classical world and at the same time reveal significant rifts in contemporary social and educational attitudes.¹⁰ Barbara Goff discusses a distinctive narrative of independence in the continent of Africa in her study of the place of classics in education (providing comparative material to Malamud's essay in Section 2). Martina Treu describes the role of classical material in drama as community education in Italy, anticipating Gamel's discussion of the organizational and creative dynamics in theatre companies.

Section 4, *Greek Drama in Modern Performance: Democracy, Culture and Tradition*, develops this theme. It contains five essays which examine different facets of productions of Greek drama in relation to each other and to threads in the whole volume, opening with Mary-Kay Gamel's discussion of the relationship between approaches to modern performance and different notions of authenticity. The next two essays consider the relationship between ancient and modern in the context of modern Greece. Anastasia Bakogianni discusses how the history of debate about the use of archaic or demotic language in performance led to 'unintended' consequences by facilitating the impact of a cross-cultural performance aesthetic. Angeliki Varakis focuses on Aristophanic precedent in her discussion of audience and performer participation in the re-invention of ancient comedy under the direction of Karolos Koun. The concluding two essays in this section introduce different examples of the use of Greek tragedy to construct bridges between alienated peoples. Nurit Yaari's essay discusses Greek and Jewish cultural histories in the context of modern Israel; Dorinda Hulton's essay describes a practice-as-research project that explored how creative artists can foster understanding between people of different faiths and cultures in present-day Cyprus.

Section 5, *Creativity—Female Agency in Fiction and Poetry*, contains three essays that consider the role of women in the reception of the classical world,

¹⁰ For a transhistorical and transnational focus on similar issues, see Archibald, Brockliss, and Gnora (eds.) forthcoming.

as authors, as teachers, as popularizers. Fiona Cox and Elena Theodorakopoulos discuss issues of gender that link with other studies in the volume. Individual essays then explore how the novels of A. S. Byatt apply Ovidian myth in their presentation of female characters, appropriating male elite culture (Cox) and how the engagement of several female novelists with the love story of Catullus and Lesbia presents approaches to translating and contextualizing Catullus' poetry as well as revealing a somewhat sentimentalized view of the poet to be delivered to a popular audience (Theodorakopoulos).

Section 6, *The Public Imagination*, contains seven essays and focuses on the diffusion of classics through a variety of media and at different critical points in which the histories of democratic debate and the dissemination of classical material converge. Sarah Butler's essay addresses contrasting ways in which the figures of the Gracchi were used in nineteenth-century newspapers in Britain and Ireland in the context of parliamentary reform. Alexandre Mitchell switches the focus to visual humour, analysing the 'democratic' impact of classically derived political cartoons in newspapers in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The visual strand in the volume is also taken up in George A. Kovacs' discussion of the comic book industry and in particular how fantasy fiction in Frank Miller's *300* reveals contradictions in the representation of democracy in the political climate in the United States. Susan Walker discusses the contexts and achievements of museum practice in developing display and interactive experiences for the public, and Antony Makrinos puts forward a model for analysing appropriations of classical material in TV documentaries. Amanda Wrigley draws on her extensive research in radio archives to discuss how the BBC used ancient Greek literature, myth, and history as part of its cultural mission in the two post-war eras, and Elton Barker moves the volume theme to the immediate present in his discussion of the contradictions that have emerged in the use of digital technology as both a source of access to classical material and an agent in its re-shaping.

Finally, Sara Monoson, who was present throughout the 2010 conference, provides an Afterword, reflecting on the achievements and difficulties in the collaborative project.

6. SITUATING THIS PROJECT

Such a project, ambitious though it is, inevitably raises more questions than it can answer. It should provoke a tightening of the lens on scholarship, in classics, classical reception, and related areas, especially regarding the questions that scholars ask and the means and evidence they use to address them. Many of the conceptual issues that have stimulated the arguments that go back and forth in this collection will require further refinement and the 'unintended

consequences' identified by Almond in relation to creative work will also be evident in the results of research. The ongoing debates will undoubtedly benefit from research projects that are still under way and which, although they have a different rationale and focus, will shed further light on the concerns of this volume.

One such investigation that is already making an impact beyond its originating framework is the major research project on Sparta conducted at the University of Nottingham, directed by Stephen Hodkinson.¹¹ This is publishing substantial treatments of the reception of Sparta and although its concerns are different from those of this volume it is sure to provide important evidence that enables debates to move away from an Athenian focus in the Greek material that is used for so much reception analysis and thus to take further account of comparative and critical perspectives. A distinctive feature of the project is that it brings together strands of research that are often kept separate: comparative analysis of social institutions; historiographical treatment from the eighteenth-century onwards, including comparisons with other societies; intellectual contexts of the appropriation of Sparta in modern European thought.¹² The research project on the reception of Thucydides, funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council and directed at Bristol University by Neville Morley, also promises an extensive publication programme and will provide analysis of how Thucydides' text and ideas have been transmitted, translated, interpreted, and used in democratic and non-democratic contexts (see also Hardwick in this volume). It will chart how the tensions between different representations of democracy in Thucydides have shaped not only receptions of Thucydides but also the development of new intellectual and practical disciplines, such as International Relations.¹³ Class aspects of classical reception, both historical and conceptual, require detailed scrutiny and the embryonic work in this area will be substantially enhanced by a new project starting in 2013. This is 'Classics and Class in Britain 1789–1917', also AHRC funded and to be directed by Edith Hall at King's College London.¹⁴ The project will undertake extensive archival research on material relating to the working class in Britain and Ireland to identify and collate published and unpublished material on the understanding and use of classical material, texts, figures, and images. Apart from its intrinsic importance, this

¹¹ See especially Hodkinson 2009 and Hodkinson and Hall 2011.

¹² For details of the Centre for Spartan and Peloponnesian Studies and lists of publications, see <<http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/csps/about.aspx>>.

¹³ For an indication of the range of approaches in the early stages of the Thucydides project, see already Harloe and Morley (2012) and <<http://www.bris.ac.uk/classics/Thucydides>>.

¹⁴ See already Hall 2008a and the conference on this subject held at the British Academy in 2011.

project will provide essential ‘pillars’ of the kind of evidence that will be needed to support work on bridge-building meta-questions in several areas.¹⁵

In the field of Popular Culture, there have been a number of articles and books devoted to the variety of media through which Greek and Roman material has been reworked and disseminated to wider audiences.¹⁶ For example, Dunstan Lowe and Kim Shahabudin (2009) focused on the mass and contemporary culture intersections with Greek and Roman material and included contributions on videogames and Internet news groups in their edited collection, as well as the results of research on radio and children’s books. The growing interest in the relationship between science fiction and Greek and Roman myths and texts is raising important questions about epistemologies and ways of thinking.¹⁷ However, much still remains to be done to bring together aspects of Popular and Mass receptions as the basis of a systematic analysis and especially to examine the effects of the tendency of some popular media towards revival and perpetuation of stereotypes (and not only in their treatment of classical material).¹⁸ There is, too, potential in research into how practitioners use and re-figure classical material to include its use in therapy and community projects of various kinds. Several contributors in this volume refer to community theatre in educational and social contexts. The US project ‘Ancient Greeks/Modern Lives’, funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities and led by Peter Meineck (who is also the artistic director of Aquila Productions), aims to take theatre to community centres and to work with military veterans and others who have themselves experienced the traumatic situations that are the subject of Greek tragedies (for comments on the widely differing implications of such developments, see Hardwick in this volume).¹⁹

A feature common to some of the investigations into dissemination and diffusion of Greek and Roman material is that they involve assessment of the dynamics of indirect and associative perceptions of the ancient material and societies—for example, generalized perceptions that Homer is a ‘poet of war’ may be more influential than translations of the *Iliad*.²⁰ Similarly, popular belief that ancient Greece was ‘the cradle of democracy’ may obliterate distinctions between the systems of government of Athens and Sparta, as well as

¹⁵ A research project on Classics and Censorship is being established at the Charles University in Prague and aims to compare the situation in the Czech Republic under Soviet domination with that under other regimes in other countries.

¹⁶ For instance Lowe and Shahabudin 2009; Blanshard 2010.

¹⁷ See for example Annes Brown 2008; Rogers and Stevens 2012.

¹⁸ See the new entry ‘Popular Culture’ by N. Lowe, 2012, in OCD4.

¹⁹ For further information see the website <<http://ancientgreekmodernlives.org>>; Meineck 2009; Tritle 2000.

²⁰ Alice Oswald’s long poem *Memorial: An Excavation of the Iliad* (2012) exploits this perception to bring to prominence the ‘minor’ figures killed in the *Iliad* but largely unexamined by Homer, thus also challenging the epic focus on the leading heroes.

between the various phases in the development and decline of the Athenian democracy and its contrasts with modern forms. Collapse of distinctions between concepts in the ancient world itself and concepts in the world of those studying it or experiencing it are part of the theoretical and methodological framework of academic scholarship (see Hodkinson 2009 for a summary). At its most acute this collapse may result in the classical equivalent of what Alastair Blanshard has called 'factoids', things that become accepted as 'facts' although they are not, or may not, be true, 'an assumption or speculation reported or repeated so often that it is popularly considered true' (Blanshard 2010: xi, commenting on dictionary definitions of the word). 'Factoids' represent one aspect of the 'slippage', temporal, spatial, and linguistic, that occurs when ideas and episodes are 'cherry-picked' for use in other contexts or when a term that is rhetorically or emotionally attractive assumes the force of authority (see Hardwick in this volume). One of the aims of this collection in problematizing and exploring the multiple facets of a notion of a 'democratic turn', is to make sure that the term cannot be simplistically hijacked to become a cultural 'factoid'.

Communicating understanding of such processes presents special challenges for the theory and practice of public engagement. One distinction that needs to be made is between that of Public Scholarship and the role of the Public Intellectual. The public intellectual is, as James Porter has argued, an important species of classicist-academic: 'an engaged public intellectual who not only can create new public audiences for the field and the academy at large, but who can also enter into debates within the large public sphere and can contribute in ways that only a perspective on the very origins of western culture and political life can afford. Indeed, the two missions, of self-survival and altruistic engagement, can be fruitfully aligned' (Porter 2008: 479).²¹ Porter's re-assertion of the value of the relationship between classics and the public sphere is based on its importance throughout history—'the pursuit of the Classics has always been embedded in the production of public discourse. From its various moments of founding into late antiquity, the Renaissance and beyond, the field has been every bit as much public and political as it has been a matter of the solitary scholar or grammarian pouring over the relics of the past' (Porter 2008: 479). However, one effect of the questions being asked in this volume, especially questions focused round the links between notions of democracy and pluralities of public communities, is to prompt an examination of other forms of public engagement beyond that of political discourse and debate. That aspect of the role of scholars is often called Public Scholarship. For example, Ivan Karp is concerned with 'the large but often unacknowledged body of credentialed and uncredentialed workers who produce and

²¹ Porter's remarks were based on a panel session which he organized together with Joy Connolly, at the 2005 meeting of the American Philological Association.

disseminate knowledge for the various segments of civil society that we call “publics” (Karp 2012: 288). Karp has identified two problems in this area. The first is that communication between the ‘credentialized specialist’ and the complex of communities that make up broader society is difficult. Karp suggests that this is one effect of the pressures of specialization and notes that the adverse effects are in both directions: ‘a second consequence of the separation of communities is that the knowledges that local communities and different cultures use to manage their lives and solve their problems also become unavailable to specialists [whose work it is to aid those communities]’ (Karp 2012: 289). The second problem derives from the first and is that limited access to ‘the knowledge and symbolic capital of expertise also hinders the exposure that different communities composing the social fabric of societies have to one another’ (Karp 2012: 289).

Karp’s analysis is a broad one and not the result of specific concerns about communication of knowledge of Greek and Roman material. However, his discussion does focus on the role of museums as sites for public scholarship and communication; ‘museums and universities alike, even private ones, are public spaces: they are enmeshed in the social fabric of the cultures out of which they grow. Thus, broadly speaking, all scholarship is public’ (Karp 2012: 291). He recognizes the conflict between two claims. The first is that the scholar is and must be in the position of the privileged ‘knower’ (the objectivist position). The second is that members of communities are the only possible ‘owners’ of knowledge about them (the relativist position). Karp advocates a third position based on his belief that all human existence is fundamentally plural. From that perspective, the task of the scholar is ‘to stand both inside and outside of any given community at one and the same time’ (Karp 2012: 292). Susan Walker’s essay in this volume exemplifies some of the ways in which an academic who is both a specialist researcher and a public scholar engages with local political and community infrastructures in order to bring about communication and understanding through various kinds of organization, display, and participation.²²

That kind of task underlies, in different forms and contexts, many of the essays in this volume—both in their ‘thick’ description of particular case studies and in their willingness to engage with a meta-question that requires scholars to consider not only what they do but also how they do it and with whom. Most of the spheres of action of participants in this collective enterprise are inevitably circumscribed by the exigencies of time, place, and language as well as by the specificity of the communities (intellectual, social, and cultural) of which they consider themselves to be members. However, even on this micro-scale, the enterprise offers a tantalizing preview of the further

²² For discussion of the relationship between participation, understanding, and deliberation in models of a ‘democratic turn’ see Hardwick in this volume.

possibilities that have been outlined by Ngugi Wa Thiong'o in his study of a humanism that is not limited by its point(s) of departure. Instead of what he calls 'an aesthetic feudalism', he sees the possibility of a network in which 'there is no one center, all points are balanced and related to one another by the principle of giving and receiving' (Ngugi 2012: 61).²³ The essays in this volume have been prepared and offered in that spirit of engaged debate.

²³ The essay from which Ngugi's formulation is drawn formed part of his Welleck Library Lectures in Critical Theory, given at the University of California, Irvine in May 2010.

EDITORS' NOTE

While this book was in press, we received the very sad news of the deaths of two of the participants in the 2010 conference discussed in the Introduction. Professor Kate Boshier (Northwestern) died in March 2013 and Professor Ahmed Etman (Cairo) in August 2013. Both gave papers at the conference and in these and in their contributions to the discussions contributed enormously to the substance and ethos of the research collaborations. We dedicate this book to them with great affection and respect.

Section 1

Controversies and Debates

Questioning the Democratic, and Democratic Questioning

Katherine Harloe

In 2008, in the introduction to a collection aimed at ‘suggesting ways in which work in the field might develop in future’, Lorna Hardwick and Christopher Stray identified ‘the scope of the so-called “democratic turn” in classical reception analysis’ as ‘an embryonic debate that seems likely to gather momentum’ (2008: 3). They provided a broad and suggestive list of ‘historical’ topics that might fall under this theme: debates over the senses of priority associated with ancient and modern art and literature, the extension of educational opportunity to previously excluded groups, the study of classical receptions among broad publics and in ‘popular culture’, and exploration of the relation of ancient texts and performances to ancient and/or modern democratic political contexts.

The contributions to this volume bear out Hardwick and Stray’s prediction, while extending the range of topics even further. Yet a leitmotif at all stages of the collaborative research that underlies it, including the e-seminar debates which preceded the main conference, was a set of concerns about how far it is appropriate for classical reception researchers to adopt the term ‘democratic’ as a term of self-description, the difficulties of elucidating its meaning, and the dangers of ‘alluring but false’ associations.¹ These seem apposite for several reasons, the first of which is pithily conveyed by the characteristically acerbic opening of John Dunn’s *Western Political Theory in the Face of the Future*:

We are all democrats today. Mr Major and Deng Hsiao-Ping, Mr Gorbachev and President Yeltsin, Mr Mandela and even President de Klerk. (1993a: 1)

¹ See in particular the first round of e-seminar discussions on ‘the debate and its terms’, archived at <http://www2.open.ac.uk/ClassicalStudies/GreekPlays/e_archive/2009/Intro.htm> (accessed 9 December 2011). The phrase ‘alluring yet false’ comes from Hardwick’s first contribution.

The proper names serve to date Dunn's 'today' rather precisely to the early 1990s. But these sentences come from the second edition. The original opening read as follows:

We are all democrats today. Mr Callaghan and Madam Mao, Mr Brezhnev and President Amin, Mr Trudeau and even Mr Vorster. (1979: 1)

Dunn required only minimal changes to update his statements to the post-Cold War era. And this underlines one of his main points: that over the past two centuries, against all historical expectation, the word 'democracy' has become an extremely widespread—indeed, almost universal—term of approbation, which has been adopted by a wide variety of actors to claim legitimacy for different political projects. For Dunn, this means not only that whatever specific meaning the term 'democracy' carried in its original Greek context has changed significantly. It also suggests that no determinate meaning may now attach to the word:

At this level democracy is a highly desirable label for which the exceedingly heterogeneous class of modern states show a strong predilection when they come to describe themselves in public. It would be naive to think of it as giving a very helpful descriptive resumé of any particular factual situation . . . Democracy, then, may once have been the name of a particular form of regime, a very particular form indeed. But now it is the name for the good intentions of states or perhaps for the good intentions which their rulers would like us to believe that they possess. (Dunn 1993a: 12–13)

Broadly similar considerations apply to liberalism, that other near-ubiquitous term within modern Western political cultures.² The political theorist Jeremy Waldron has called liberalism:

a remarkably successful political ideology, inasmuch as its leading principles—freedom, toleration and equality before the law—have been accepted as part of the self-image or public relations of the world's most powerful and prosperous societies. Its proponents are uneasy, however, with the common inference that the social, economic and political reality of these societies is what liberal principles amount to in practice (just as Marxists were uneasy about the presentation of the Soviet Union and its satellites as 'actually existing socialism'). They insist, quite properly, that liberalism is a set of critical principles, not an ideology or rationalization. (1998)

A self-professed liberal, Waldron is committed to the possibility of the outlining of a set of distinctively 'liberal' values and beliefs; he nevertheless concedes

² 'Liberal' perhaps commands less of a consensus than 'democratic'; it may be used in abuse as well as in approbation, and—even if we restrict our discussion to Anglophone contexts—carries different connotations on either side of the Atlantic. For some thoughts on the term's history, joined with a sceptical view of the coherence of contemporary liberal thought, see Geuss 2001.

that any attempt to survey the positions termed 'liberal' by historical actors would generate a series of Wittgensteinian family resemblances, 'a complicated network of similarities . . . overlapping and criss-crossing', rather than 'any single cluster of theoretical or practical propositions that might be regarded as the *core* or the *essence* of the ideology in question' (1987: 127, quoting Wittgenstein 1968: 32e). If some would characterize Waldron's 'liberal' principles—freedom, toleration, equality before the law—as 'democratic', this only indicates how thoroughly two originally separate and sometimes opposing political ideas have become combined (some might say, confused) in mainstream political discourse.³

In the light of these issues it seems prudent for students of classical receptions to regard the term 'democratic' with caution. At first consideration, its broad reference may make it attractive as a term to characterize the diversity of interesting research presently carried on in the field. From another perspective, though, this is why reception researchers should be wary of the term. Is it a fitting label to denote a plurality of related foci in contemporary reception studies? Or would using it simply replicate the situation identified by Dunn, where a diversity of agents, engaged in a heterogeneous set of projects, find it desirable to lay claim to the label 'democratic' even though they mean very different things by it and may be unable to articulate precisely what they *do* mean?

In addition to their candidate list of historical topics related to the 'democratic turn', Hardwick and Stray also identified a 'philosophical' issue: how any such turn might relate to the fundamental turn to reader or audience propounded in the reception aesthetics of Jauss and Iser and emphasized in Martindale's (1993, 2006) influential recasting of their theories for classics. Do reception theory's 'democratic' credentials consist in its granting the reader a fundamental (some might say, sovereign) role in determining the meaning of a classical text? Yet:

if readers and audiences do indeed have a role in the 'construction of meaning at the point of reception' there are further questions to be asked about the relative importance of immediate response based on experience as against deferred and reflective response. It is also necessary to consider the relative status of the multiple meanings represented by the responses of unconnected individuals and the more consensual judgements arrived at among groups of different kinds (including the classically educated or 'reception-orientated' students or

³ Liberal theory since Locke has been characterized by insistence upon the importance of individual rights, conceived of as protections of the individual against encroachments by the will of another. These may include protections against the will of a democratic majority or its representatives. The 2011 protests by Muslim women forbidden by French law from wearing the burkha in public and the 2008 Californian referendum, which overturned the decision of its Supreme Court to permit same-sex marriage, are recent examples of rights and democracy in opposition in modern Western political cultures.

general readers or spectators; a 'reception-friendly' doctrine of the expert may yet see a revival). (Hardwick and Stray 2008: 3–4)

The role of 'expert' judgement within a democratized notion of classics is a question reception studies has yet to debate fully, and is to my mind more pressing than concerns about the dangers of 'trivializing' if 'popular classics' courts the 'banal or the quotidian' (Martindale 2006: 11).⁴ But my main concern about whether 'democratic' is a helpful label for reception research stems from the thought that, like 'liberalism', 'democracy' belongs to that most treacherous class of political concepts: those that slide effortlessly between designating a political ideal or aspiration and describing existent institutions. Dunn's roll-call of leaders who have sought to classify their rule as 'democratic' reminds us that purportedly descriptive uses of the term may carry an implicit, yet powerful, legitimizing force. In reception studies as in politics, we should be wary of using such ideologically freighted terms as if they describe the reality of our practices.

1. DEMOCRACY BETWEEN IDEOLOGY AND ASPIRATION

There is of course a sense in which it is unobjectionable to use 'democracy' and its cognates to describe existing states of affairs. It is clearly correct, in some sense, to characterize fifth-century Athens as democratic despite its exclusion, in norm as well as in fact, of most of its population from a share in political power. There is likewise a sense in which it is right to call twenty-first century Britain a democracy despite its surveillance culture, disrespect for the human rights of certain minorities, and (in the eyes of some of its citizens) wildly unrepresentative political system.⁵ This disenchanted use of the term 'democratic' is a far cry from the strongly positive connotations that can surround the term when used by politicians. Then it seems to connote the claim that a particular set of political arrangements embodies some ideal state of affairs, or at least comes sufficiently close to embodying it, that those arrangements count as legitimate.

Pride comes before a fall, and when such audacious claims run headlong into historical realities they may trigger a salutary disorientation. A good

⁴ Both are connected to the question of the appropriate home for classical reception studies in the modern academy. Is reception best conceived of as a sub-field of classics, an interdisciplinary research area with connections to several disciplines, or something new and autonomous? Answers to this question have important implications for the training and careers of the next generation of researchers (see Porter 2008: 478–9). Some of the anxieties that commonly surround questions of disciplinary competence in reception studies may be helped by collaborative modes of work. It is unfortunate that prevalent professional structures in the humanities militate against collaboration.

⁵ See, for example, Anti-Trafficking Monitoring Group 2010.

example was the United Kingdom 2010 general election result, when the failure of any single party to secure an overall majority resulted in the formation of a two-party coalition government bound by an agreement that differed markedly from the platform set out in either party's manifesto. Was this a 'democratic' outcome? It happened in accordance with a set of electoral procedures that were subsequently endorsed by a clear majority of those citizens who bothered to vote in a referendum on the issue.⁶ Perhaps all this means is that democracy in practice isn't as brilliant and clear, doesn't have quite the diamond-standard degree of 'cosmopolitan charm' (Dunn 1993a: 2) many voters had assumed.

The key point, however, is that the bivalent (so to speak) character of the word 'democracy' may also have the opposite effect. Because of its legitimizing force, using it may direct our attention away from those features of existing arrangements that fall short of these ideals. The short answer to why using the term 'democratic' to describe present practices is problematic is that it may encourage an unreflective and myopic form of self-congratulation.⁷ 'We are all democrats today', understood as expressing a state of affairs, may simply encourage complacency.

For such an attitude to develop within reception studies would be less poisonous than a similar vice among our politicians. It is nevertheless worth being on our guard. This worry lies behind my doubts about using the term 'democratic' to describe the comparative or historical studies of ancient and modern democracies or engagements with the classics among non-elite audiences that have characterized some really good recent work in the field. Are such extensions of classicists' traditional areas of concern enough to constitute a 'democratic turn' within the discipline? This does not seem right: such projects may be motivated by democratic concerns, they may even have democratic consequences; but whether any particular research topic turns out to be 'democratic' ought to depend upon how it is carried out, the purposes towards which it is directed, and its dissemination, not simply on its subject matter.

2. ASPECTS OF DEMOCRACY: AORIST OR IMPERFECT?

Additional problems arise when the word 'turn' is combined with 'democratic' in this context. For its precedents—such as the 'linguistic turn' in twentieth-century philosophy or the 'cultural turn' in the human sciences—implied a transfer of focus: a *turning away from* prior questions and procedures as well

⁶ In a referendum held on 5 May 2011, 67.9 per cent of UK voters rejected a proposal to introduce electoral reform in the shape of the 'alternative vote' system.

⁷ Alternatively, a weary cynicism.

as a *concentration on* something else.⁸ Yet the label ‘democratic’, already potentially troublesome when applied to existing practices, becomes even more so when, having been claimed in this manner, it is then used as a term of contrast with other agents or groups.

Again, this would not matter so much were it not for the pervasive legitimizing force the term carries in the modern context. Not even Pericles had the gall to present democracy as the only legitimate form of government, even if he did claim that Athens provided an education to all Hellas. But in a world where democracy (hazily defined) is presented as the sole basis of secular political legitimacy, and where it is often assumed to be synonymous with other, highly valued political principles such as inclusivity and equality, it is all too easy to cast those who have not ‘got with the programme’ as not only undemocratic, but also anti-democratic or otherwise indecent. Despite its universalizing rhetoric, this use of the term ‘democratic’ is at bottom excluding: it serves to pick out and valorize one group by comparison with another.⁹

Such strategic and ideological uses of language are understandable among agents who are struggling for recognition within authoritarian orders. Recent history has made their attraction for those who have assumed the duty to ‘democratize’ others plain to see. What concerns me most about the transfer of this use from politics to reception studies is that it may lead us to caricature both the classical past and alternative ways of studying it. It is all too easy to fall into radical-sounding platitudes about the essentially elitist (or Western, or Eurocentric) qualities of traditional classics, and to cast reception studies as a critical hero detoxifying the tradition and righting past wrongs.¹⁰

This is not to say that no correcting perspectives are needed to the multifarious elitist, Eurocentric, imperialist, and racist uses that have been made of the classics. But there are a number of problems here. First, if we really believed that engagement with a classical text was an *essentially* elitist or Eurocentric gesture, the most obvious solution would be to let the classical moulder on the shelf and direct our attention towards other literatures and cultures. Second, it is unjust to the ancient material: I challenge anyone to convince me that there is something essentially Eurocentric, White, or Western about the poetry of Homer, the culture of Hellenistic Alexandria, or the writings of Lucian. Such understandings result from the blinkers we and our predecessors have worn as we constructed our traditions; they are not ‘antiquity in-itself’. Finally, as Kate Nichols (2009) has commented, ‘classics have long been used by non-elite [one might add non-White, non-Christian,

⁸ See Hardwick (Chapter 2) in this volume.

⁹ There is a sharp historical irony here, as the word ‘democratic’ entered modern political discourse as a term of disapprobation applied to a particular political faction. See Dunn 2005: 57–61.

¹⁰ For various perspectives on the issue see Hardwick (Chapter 2), Lianeri (Chapter 3), and Gamel (Chapter 14) in this volume.

non-European] groups'. La Vopa (1998) has argued that the Latin School in eighteenth-century Germany provided an important conduit of social mobility for young men from poor and uneducated backgrounds; beyond this, Latin as a non-vernacular language was in some ways a leveller of privilege, effacing social distinctions that superior command of polite idiom in German revealed. In Ireland during the same period, the association of Latin with Catholicism combined with other cultural and economic changes to place classical texts on the curricula of non-elite schools, making them available for anti-establishment and 'revolutionary' appropriations (McElduff 2006). To mention these examples is to register my unease that to lay claim to the label 'democratic' to characterize relatively recent developments in reception studies may be to overlook the more nuanced and pluralistic picture that a less polemicizing consideration of the history of our discipline may bring. We should also remember that although it has now 'gone global', 'democracy' considered historically and in the *longue durée* is at least as good a candidate for an essentially Western construction as 'classics'.¹¹

3. DEMOCRACY AS (SELF-)CRITIQUE: EDWARD SAID'S HUMANISM

I have rejected notions of a 'democratic turn' which content themselves with extending the subject matter of classics to new areas, or which operate with a strong and potentially self-congratulatory contrast between 'our' procedures and those of past interpreters. These criticisms stem not from weary cynicism about democracy's hollow rhetoric but rather from the sense that democracy is, as Waldron says of liberalism, a 'set of critical principles, rather than an ideology or rationalization'. To emphasize this is to turn to the other pole of democracy's meaning in the modern world: as a critical vision. This is, in Dunn's words, the ideal of a society in which 'in the end it must be the people that decides what is to be done' (Dunn 2005: 135). Dunn suggests that this ambitious project can never be realized in actuality, certainly not in the context of the highly unequal socio-economic world order that exists today. Democracy's value lies in its status as 'a permanent reminder of the terms in which governmental decisions must be vindicated, and the breadth of the audience that is entitled to assess whether or not they have been vindicated':

Until democracy's triumph, the rightful scale of that audience was always seen as pretty narrow. It was defined by a layering of exclusions: those without the standing, those without the knowledge or ability, those without a stake in the

¹¹ Dunn 2005.

country, the dependent, foreigners, the unfree or even enslaved, the blatantly untrustworthy or menacing, the criminal, the insane, women, children. Democracy's triumph has been the collapse of one exclusion after another, in ever-greater indignity. (2005: 135–6)

This is an open-ended process, and democracy continues to play a crucial role in countering the continual tendency of the modern socio-economic order to reproduce hierarchies:

The role of democracy as a political value . . . is to probe constantly the tolerable limits of injustice, a permanent and sometimes very intense blend of cultural enquiry with social and political struggle. The key to the form of life as a whole is thus an endless tug of war between two instructive but very different senses of democracy. In that struggle, the second sense, democracy as a political value, constantly subverts the legitimacy of democracy as an already existing form of government. But the first, too, almost as constantly on its own behalf, explores, but then insists on and in the end imposes, its own priority over the second. (2005: 171)

What role might classical reception studies play in this eminently political process? One (contestable) answer is suggested by the lectures on 'Humanism and Knowledge' Edward Said gave towards the end of his life, which were published posthumously as *Humanism and Democratic Criticism* (2004). In these, Said offered a retrospective upon his four decades of work as a scholar and teacher of 'Western humanities' at Columbia University—or, as he was happy to call himself, a humanist. 'Humanism' is not a popular term of self-identification in the modern academy, and questions have been raised about the ideological exclusions inherent even in attempts to recuperate a 'critical' humanism in opposition to earlier, more elitist traditions.¹² Said was adamant that exclusivity constitutes an abuse of humanism rather than its essence, and sketched a positive conception of humanism as a fundamentally 'democratic' practice, where 'democratic' means both 'open to all classes and backgrounds' and part of 'a process of unending disclosure, self-criticism, and liberation' (2004: 22).

Said presents democratic humanism as a model of reading involving two 'very crucial moments', which he terms, interestingly enough, 'reception' and 'resistance' (2004: 62–76). 'Reception' is the moment of interpretation, the effort on the part of the scholar, writer, or artist to comprehend an alien utterance, text, or cultural form. Said's hermeneutic of reception is intentionalist: a position many classical reception researchers would seek to modify. Most would, however, agree with him that the work of interpretation requires various conditions: think-space, time, and certain kinds of discipline (be these of knowledge, practice, or mental capacities such as concentration).

¹² See recently Honig 2010.

Said's moment of 'reception' is common to all kinds of intellectual endeavour. It is, however, insufficient to render humanism democratic: for this, the second moment is necessary. Said introduces 'resistance' in a manner connected to his first-order political stance:

For if, as I believe, there is now taking place in our society an assault on thought itself, to say nothing of democracy, equality, and the environment, by the dehumanizing forces of globalization, neoliberal values, economic greed . . . as well as imperialist ambition, the humanist must offer alternatives now silenced or unavailable through the channels of communication controlled by a tiny number of news organizations. (2004: 71)

Said's political diagnosis certainly renders his view of humanism's task more urgent, but his notion of 'resistance' is independent of this. At its centre lies the humanist's commitment to *formulating* and *remaining open to* alternative perspectives:

There is no doubt . . . that whatever reading one does is situated in a particular time and place, just as the writing one encounters in the course of humanistic study is located in a series of frameworks derived from tradition, the transmission and variation of texts, and accumulated readings and interpretations. And just as important are the social contests that, generally, I shall describe as those between the aesthetic and historical domains.¹³ At the risk of simplifying, it can be said that two situations are in play: that of the humanistic reader in the present and that of the text in its framework. Each requires careful analysis, each inhabits both a local and a wider historical framework, and each must solicit relentless questioning by the humanist. (2004: 74)

Humanism's commitment to questioning given frameworks means it is always open to extension in its fields of concern. The canon is open-ended: the number and kinds of works deemed worthy of interpretation cannot be limited, even in principle (Said 2004: 22–8). But Saidian 'resistance' also involves a crucial element of *self*-criticism: the willingness to revise one's own perspectives and to move beyond them if they are revealed to be limited and exclusive. What distinguishes this from the kinds of reflexive criticism more familiar to scholarly labour is the arena in which they occur. Rather than locating the reflective moment in the humanist's study, or in conversations within fairly limited circles, Said places it within the open-ended space of contested values, priorities, and arguments that constitutes the contemporary political and social world:

Education involves widening circles of awareness, each of which is distinct analytically while being connected to the others by virtue of worldly reality. A reader is in a place, in a school or university, in a work place, or in a specific country at a particular time, situation, and so forth. But these are not passive

¹³ See Said 1993: xi–xii.

frameworks. In the process of widening the humanistic horizon, its achievements of insight and understanding, the framework must be actively understood, constructed, and interpreted. And this is what resistance is: the ability to differentiate between what is directly given and what may be withheld, whether because one's own circumstances as a humanistic specialist may confine one to a limited space beyond which one can't venture or because one is indoctrinated to recognize only what one has been educated to see or because only policy experts are presumed to be entitled to speak about the economy, health services, or foreign and military policies, issues of urgent concern to the humanist as citizen. Does one accept the prevailing horizons and confinements, or does one try as a humanist to challenge them? (2004: 75–6)

This comment expresses the direct connection Said saw between his duties as a humanist and as a national and global citizen. It explains why he characterized 'humanism as a useable praxis for intellectuals and academics who want to know what they are doing, what they are committed to as scholars, and who want also to connect these principles to the world in which they live as citizens' (2004: 6). For the humanistic commitment to criticism of given frameworks cannot exclude criticism of the social and political order one inhabits, its (and hence, in some sense, one's own) limitations and exclusions. Democratic and critical humanism is thus continuous with democratic and critical citizenship.

What might it mean to cast classical reception studies as a form of democratic and critical humanism in the manner Said recommends? I believe, first of all, that it implies a certain view about the significance of academic specialism(s). Specialisms are part of what equips researchers (whether in the humanities, social, or natural sciences) to offer distinctive perspectives; like all forms of expertise, they bring with them a kind of authority. What unites researchers in the multidisciplinary field of classical reception studies is not a common stock of specialist knowledge and training, but a common commitment to the critical study of the spectrum of interpretations of classical material that connects the modern and ancient worlds. Stories about the classical past continue to shape contemporary cultural, political, and social ideas and practices; consequently, there is a role for critical questioning of those stories. Reception studies can help meet this need, but a 'democratic' reception researcher ought to be committed to using his or her authority to complicate those stories, widen their cast of characters, and open up debates over their meaning, rather than to close them down.¹⁴

¹⁴ A similar point has recently been made by Mary Beard, who (without using the term 'reception') calls for a shift towards an understanding of classics as 'a cultural language that we have learned to speak, in dialogue with the idea of antiquity'. Beard counsels that 'we [Classicists? Contemporary citizens?] should be much more alert than we often are about the claims we make about the classical world—or, at least, we should be more strategically aware of whose claims they are.' As an example she gives 'the common statement "The ancient Athenians invented democracy"', a claim which indicates a contemporary 'projected . . . desire for an origin' more

A second task for a democratic classical reception study follows on from the first: to give more effort to identifying the limitations and exclusions involved in our own positions. Reception *theory* has always acknowledged that ‘the mediated, situated, contingent . . . character of readings . . . includes our own readings quite as much as those of past centuries’ (Martindale 2006: 3, 5; see also Humphreys 2010: 201). Yet this recognition has remained largely at the level of programmatic proclamation, compared with the zeal researchers have sometimes shown in criticizing the exclusions of other (historical) receivers. A more thoroughly self-critical reception studies would pay greater attention to the politics of our own interpretations, make more effort to articulate them and hold them up for inspection.

Finally, ‘democratic’ classical reception studies on the Saidian model have something to say about the forms of ‘inspection’ to which we must open up our work. For another aspect of the reception researcher’s activity would be a commitment to formulating, defending, and revising the perspectives won in our studies in public spaces: not only disseminating them to other scholars and students but allowing them to inform and be informed by perspectives that arise in communication with others inside and outside the academy. For one of the most enduring conceptions of what ‘democracy’ involves is a space and a set of procedures that enable the views of different agents to be expressed, debated, and to play a role in forming the conditions of communal life. A ‘democratic turn’ in classical reception studies would then mean a whole-hearted commitment on the part of reception researchers to cultivating and participating in such spaces.¹⁵

than a historical fact (Beard 2012: 50–1, 54). Such myths play important roles in contemporary social, political, and cultural discourses; it is these that reception researchers’ expertise can complicate and challenge.

¹⁵ In an argument which my own resembles in several respects, Porter (2008: 479–81) has issued ‘a plea on behalf of the need for a new kind of classicist-academic: the engaged public intellectual who can not only create new public audiences for the field and the academy at large, but who can also enter into debates within the larger public sphere and can contribute in ways that only a perspective on the very origins of western culture and political life can afford’. I agree with Porter’s observations on the structural impediments to public or (as the title of another recent collection would have it) ‘applied’ classics, as well as his characterization of the history of classics as one of ‘a publicly *contested* heritage’: an identity which renders it—as Porter has argued elsewhere—as promising a site as any for the study of modernity’s various self-understandings. Yet the casting of publics as ‘audiences’, or a conception of classics as something ‘applied’ in other areas stands in danger of glossing over the *transformative* aspects emphasized by both Said and (arguably) the longer history of articulations of classics’ public value. Here it may be apposite to consider the more active and participative roles played by ancient democratic audiences (whether in the assembly or the theatre), in holding political actors to account. The advent of modern, representative democracies has tended to shift the focus from questions of participation and accountability to those of representation. What forms of public (as opposed to more narrowly political) accountability and participation might be appropriate to a democratic classics?