

5-2013

Stephen Harrison and Christopher Stray (eds.), *Expurgating the Classics. Editing Out in Greek and Latin.*

S. Douglas Olson

University of Minnesota/University of Freiburg

Follow this and additional works at: <https://crossworks.holycross.edu/necj>

Recommended Citation

Olson, S. Douglas (2013) "Stephen Harrison and Christopher Stray (eds.), *Expurgating the Classics. Editing Out in Greek and Latin.*," *New England Classical Journal*: Vol. 40 : Iss. 2 , 148-150.

Available at: <https://crossworks.holycross.edu/necj/vol40/iss2/11>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by CrossWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in *New England Classical Journal* by an authorized editor of CrossWorks.

shared practices of display and the implications for reception. What stands out above all in this chapter is the intensely urban and public setting of this type of statuary (only seven statues were found in funerary contexts) and the resultant visibility for the elite families in the various cities. These families, with their adroit display of the visual *koine* of the empire, represent cultural competence and connections to the larger world. The proficiency with which the elite families of the (largely) eastern empire in second century CE displayed their cultural competence is further highlighted by non-canonical usages of this honorific portraiture in places as far-flung as southern Spain and the lower Danube, discussed in chapter 6. Even in these locales, however, the value of the Large Herculeanum Woman as a signifier of supra-local connections and participation in the visual *koine* of the empire is still clear, though the significance of this connotation, and expectations of fidelity, could vary greatly at the local level.

As striking as the number of Large Herculeanum Woman portraits produced in the second century CE is, even more surprising is their precipitous decline in the early third century. In the final chapter, Trimble explores the reasons for this abrupt halt in production. Moving beyond the exaggerated accounts of chaos in the third century as an explanation, Trimble focuses instead on the fragile nature of the interconnected network created in the previous century for the production and consumption of honorific portraiture, and also on changes in the societal prejudices towards the "prestige body" (318), which resulted in different expectations for elite identity in the third and fourth centuries.

This monograph is well worth reading, even if the Large Herculeanum Woman portrait type is not one's primary interest. The volume considers much more than this particular type of statuary: there are interesting discussions of the quarrying, production, and carving of a variety of marble objects, including column capitals, garland sarcophagi, and Roman-style stage buildings, in the second century CE, as well as of the meaning and function of honorific portraiture in the Roman imperial city. Trimble's research is thorough, and she actively engages with previous scholarship, some of it very recent, on the topic. She explains the issues in clear language, leads the reader through the argument with interesting and thought-provoking questions, and provides plenty of helpful explanatory footnotes and bibliography.

Maura Heyn
University of North Carolina, Greensboro

Stephen Harrison and Christopher Stray (eds.), *Expurgating the Classics. Editing Out in Greek and Latin*. London: Bristol Classical Press, 2012. Pp. vii + 224. Cloth (ISBN 978-1-849-66892-7) \$120.00.

In matters touching on sexuality, the Western world has developed over the last half-century or so into what at least feels like a relatively frank and open place. We still have taboos, e.g., on pederasty and bestiality, and prejudices (only in 2013 did the first professional American basketball player come out as gay; the first transgender American president is unlikely to be elected for a generation or

two), and a number of personal behaviors remain widely, sometimes even legally prohibited, e.g., extra-marital affairs, polygamy, prostitution. But adults, at least, are more or less free today to read, discuss, and look at what they want, and to live as they please. It is accordingly fascinating to look back on a recent time, still within living memory in some cases, and easily accessible in printed texts, when action and expression were both far more restricted than they are now.

This self-consciously scattershot collection is concerned with the practice of expurgation, defined on page 1 as "the deliberate removal (purging) of offensive material from texts," in this case Greek and Latin texts, with particular attention to the English-speaking academic and semi-academic world of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The challenge is to make the topic interesting, for there seems on the surface little of note to be said about the phenomenon itself. Words, lines, or even whole poems were frequently cut from school-commentaries or translations of ancient texts, or their meaning was carefully obscured. The fact that such excisions were made is not in dispute; the motivations for the cuts (protection of the innocent, however defined) are rarely in doubt, and are on occasion explicitly spelled out by those who made them; and the identity of individual expurgators is clear from the title pages of the volumes in question. One obvious approach to the question, not entirely eschewed in this collection, is to record the history of the treatment of individual texts, noting who eliminated or obscured what, and when, while speculating on why one translator or editor allowed an arguably offensive word, line, or poem to slip through the censor's net to a wider public, while another did not. But this is a dreary business, which amounts to creating long variants on lists of which early modern or modern classicists thought the words "fuck" and "penis" were too offensive for the gentle reader; which thought "fuck" was offensive but "penis" was not; and so forth. The best essays in this volume therefore adopt alternative approaches to the material, showing that expurgation is a more complicated and ambiguous phenomenon than it might at first appear to be—put another way, that straightforward excision is less interesting than other strategies editors and translators have adopted for dealing with troublesome original material; reading the expurgation of texts as an index of larger and less obvious cultural and social changes; or bringing individual, today generally obscure, expurgators and their presses and series vividly to life.

T. J. Leary, "Modifying Martial in nineteenth-century Britain," is a nice example of the utility of the first approach, in that the author explicitly concedes that "When dealing with collections of epigrams, selection (or deselection) is the obvious method of censorship" (130). "Expurgation," in other words, is not really at issue in this case, nor is explicit reference to sexuality the sole criterion that determines inclusion or exclusion of individual poems in an edited collection. So too David Butterfield, "Contempta relinquas: anxiety and expurgation in the publication of Lucretius' *De rerum natura*," shows that troubling sections of the poem could be "cut" but still printed, e.g., in small type or in an appendix, or obscured in other ways rather than simply being ejected from the text. Philip Lawton, "For the gentlemen and the scholar: sexual and scatological references in the Loeb Classical Library," nicely illustrates a plethora of similar strategies in a wide range of early twentieth-century translations intended for the middlebrow reader.

But Daniel Orrells's "Headlam's Herodas: the art of suggestion," makes clear that the real interest and value in the sort of issues this volume as a whole attempts to take on are in the second and third approaches noted above. Orrells's reading of Herodas is often overheated, and his glosses on Headlam's own archaizing poetry occasionally miss the point. The fundamental intertext for the poem in impassioned Sapphics addressed to a girl named Mary, age nine—impassioned enough that any modern American parent would certainly call the police when Headlam's composition arrived in the mail (a point to which I return below)—for example, is patently Odysseus' interaction with Nausicaa in *Odyssey* 6–8. But Orrells's real subject is how commenting on Herodas allowed Headlam to take up larger contemporary social questions involving women's passions and women's education, the simultaneously threatening and alluring "New Woman." This is fascinating stuff, and to the extent that the other essays in the volume fail to meet the standard Orrells sets, it is in part because the contributors are classicists first and foremost, and are thus intimately familiar with the ancient material but less conversant with the early modern and modern cultures that received, or declined to receive, it.

If this volume raises a more general question, however, it has to do with the tone of moral triumphalism apparent in a number of the essays. On the one hand, it is obvious in retrospect that systematic excision and obfuscation in the modern handling of ancient texts was a stupid response to what can reasonably be regarded as a non-existent problem: Does anyone actually read Lucretius or the *Greek Anthology* for titillation? And if they do or did, why should anyone else care, given that sexuality is a secret everyone is in on, or will soon be in on? But treating the Victorians in particular as fools, from whose blinkered view of the world we are now mercifully at last free, also misses the point. In a century or two, someone will probably produce a volume of collected essays in which the pervasive irony and cynicism of early twenty-first-century America—a society in which Headlam's love poem to Mary would almost inevitably have landed him in serious hot water, however innocent and chaste everyone in his own understood it to be—is exposed as an odd, even self-defeating cultural trap. The best essays in this volume are thus sympathetic attempts to read expurgation and similar acts as meaningful and productive cultural practices in their own right; the others merely remind us that we are in some ways lucky to live when we do.

Additional contributions to the volume are: Ewen Bowie, on the extent to which the elegiac, lyric, and elegiac poetry we have may have been purged of obscene content in antiquity; Ian Ruffell, on nineteenth and twentieth-century editions of Aristophanes; Gideon Nisbet, on the nineteenth and twentieth-century reception of Greek epigram; Stephen Harrison, on the early modern reception of Horace; Gail Trimble, on the reception of Catullus before Fordyce; James Morwood, on the Latin Delphin Classics (very brief); and Robert Crowe, on Penguins, with particular attention to Paul Turner's 1956 *Daphnis and Chloe*. Deborah Roberts offers an afterword.

S. Douglas Olson
University of Minnesota/University of Freiburg