



# The Classical Tradition

Art, Literature,  
Thought

Michael Silk, Ingo Gildenhard, and Rosemary Barrow

WILEY Blackwell



---

# The Classical Tradition

Art, Literature,  
Thought



---

# The Classical Tradition

Art, Literature,  
Thought

Michael Silk, Ingo Gildenhard, and Rosemary Barrow

WILEY Blackwell

---

This edition first published 2014  
© 2014 Michael Silk, Ingo Gildenhard, and Rosemary Barrow

*Registered Office*

John Wiley & Sons Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

*Editorial Offices*

350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA

9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK

The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services, and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at [www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell](http://www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell).

The right of Michael Silk, Ingo Gildenhard, and Rosemary Barrow to be identified as the authors of this work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

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, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic books.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as trademarks. All brand names and product names used in this book are trade names, service marks, trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners. The publisher is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and author(s) have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. It is sold on the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services and neither the publisher nor the author shall be liable for damages arising herefrom. If professional advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

Silk, Michael.

The Classical Tradition : Art, Literature, Thought / Michael Silk, Ingo Gildenhard, and Rosemary Barrow.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4051-5549-6 (hardback)

1. Classical literature—History and criticism. 2. Civilization, Classical—Influence.

I. Gildenhard, Ingo, 1970- II. Barrow, R. J. (Rosemary J.) III. Title.

PA3013.S55 2014

880.09—dc23

2013028383

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Cover image: Calum Colvin, *Brief Encounter*. By permission of the artist.

Cover design by Nicki Averill

Set in 10.5/13 pt Minion by Toppan Best-set Premedia Limited

---

# Contents

List of Figures	vii
List of Plates	viii
Prologue	ix
Acknowledgements	xiii
<b>Part I Overview</b>	<b>1</b>
§1 The Classical Tradition and the Scope of Our Book	3
§2 Mapping the Field	10
§3 Eras	15
§4 Sustaining the Tradition: Classics and Education	32
§5 Authority and Authorities	52
§6 Masters of Knowledge	61
§7 Models of Style	69
§8 Beacons of Morality	79
§9 Love Guides	87
§10 Special Relationships	98
§11 The Visual Arts: Contexts and Connections	102
§12 Popular Culture and Its Problematics	119
§13 Languages and Language	137
§14 Modes of Engagement	166
§15 Translation	173
§16 Science and Sensibility	199
§17 Looking at the Past	224
§18 The Classical Tradition – and the Rest	241
<b>Part II Archetypes</b>	<b>249</b>
§19 Preface	251
§20 The Dome	253

§21	The Hero	263
§22	Word-Genres	276
<b>Part III The Imaginary</b>		<b>287</b>
§23	Preface	289
§24	Myth	292
§25	The City: Rome	306
§26	Forms of Government	322
§27	The Order of Things	331
<b>Part IV Making a Difference</b>		<b>341</b>
§28	Preface	343
§29	Originators	346
§30	Points of Departure	358
§31	Ideas and Action	375
<b>Part V Contrasts and Comparisons</b>		<b>391</b>
§32	Preface	393
§33	Painting	394
§34	Political Thought	402
§35	Poetry	411
Epilogue		428
Bibliography		432
Index		475



---

# Figures

1	Giulio Romano, 'Jupiter and Olympias'	90
2	Nicola Pisano, pulpit detail (Hercules), Baptistery, Pisa Cathedral	104
3	Marcantonio Raimondi, engraving of the Apollo Belvedere	105
4	Flemish tapestry after Charles Le Brun, <i>The Tent of Darius</i>	112
5	Filippo Brunelleschi, Santa Maria del Fiore, Florence	255
6	Forum shopping arcade in Caesars Palace, Las Vegas	261
7	Jacques-Louis David, <i>The Death of Marat</i>	271
8	Chris Gollon, <i>Venus (I)</i>	338
9	Thomas Gordon Smith, 'Vitruvian House'	365
10	British Library piazza, London	430
11	Giorgio de Chirico, <i>The Soothsayer's Recompense</i>	431

---

# Plates

Colour plates appear between pages 370 and 371

- 1 William Blake, *Albion Rose (Glad Day)*: see §3, p. 27
- 2 Francesco Xanto Avelli da Rovigo, maiolica dish representing the Laocoon: see §11, p. 106
- 3 Calum Colvin, *Brief Encounter*: see §11, p. 117
- 4 Nicolas Poussin, *The Arcadian Shepherds*: see §14, p. 171
- 5 J. M. W. Turner, *Modern Rome: Campo Vaccino*: see §17, p. 224
- 6 Umberto Boccioni, *Unique Forms of Continuity in Space*: see §17, p. 239
- 7 Claude Lorrain, *Aeneas on Delos*: see §25, p. 318
- 8 Titian, *Worship of Venus*: see §33, p. 397
- 9 Jacques-Louis David, *Paris and Helen*: see §33, p. 398
- 10 Giorgio de Chirico, *The Uncertainty of the Poet*: see §33, p. 399

---

# Prologue

During the writing of this book, colleagues who have enquired about the work in progress, and then learnt the title, have usually assumed that our collaboration must be intended to produce some sort of ambitious survey of classical receptions. What we are attempting is significantly different, but actually more ambitious: a rereading of a formative aspect of Western culture and, thus, a rereading, however partial, of Western culture itself in the perspective of the classical. Our scope is therefore wider, though our focus is certainly more coherent – but our potential readership is in any event more open-ended. We hope to appeal to a diverse readership among all who are concerned to make sense of almost two millennia of cultural developments and achievements, whether as advanced students, general readers, or fellow scholars; and if we have a particular hope, it must be that the outcomes of our efforts will be of serious interest to those with scholarly expertise across a broad spectrum of contemporary, modern, early modern, and medieval studies, along with the classics and its receptions, as well. We invite them, not least, to ponder the wider contexts into which we have placed their special concerns.

Although in various senses we do go ‘back to basics’, ours is not an introduction to the field. We do aim to offer an overview of the classical tradition, and a point of reference for a wide variety of different matters, but the book is not a survey, even if many of its sections do survey relevant material in whole or part. Nor is it a catalogue: we make no pretence to complete coverage of our field.

As we explain more fully in the opening section (§1), the book is a continuous work, and not a sequence of separate essays. It is not for us to dissuade readers from selective reading, but such readers should at least bear in mind that texts, works of art, topics, perspectives, may be presented in one section and presupposed in another.

We do not – let us stress at the outset – assume that the more classical is superior to the less, nor, indeed, that the less is superior to the more. If we assume anything, it is that a rereading like ours is as desirable as its subject is important.

If this was a research proposal, we would stress the extent to which we have sought to offer fresh appraisals of a wide range of material and to make new

connections among a multitude of artists, writers, thinkers, works, and developments, well-known and lesser-known, that are not normally brought together in one volume, let alone in one (re)reading. Our ultimate concern, however, is with what is sometimes sceptically referred to as the grand sweep or the big picture. In today's academy, professional compartmentalization, allied to various strands of relativism (not least, postmodern suspicion of 'metanarratives'), has encouraged a timidity in the face of such large readings which we see as, ultimately, absurd. Anyone who supposes they can do without grand sweeps or big pictures is deceiving themselves. Everyone relies on them. The question is whether it is enough simply to rely on them in the form of outdated surveys or, perhaps, fashionable critiques – or, instead, seek to improve on them. Assuming we have made some headway in that direction, however, we do not suppose that there can be anything definitive about any such improvement, and if our efforts provoke others to improve on ours, we shall be the first to applaud.

Ours has been a collaboration in the fullest sense of the word. Over a period of years, the co-authors have debated the contents, the arguments, the organization, and the minutest detail of the book, and while our respective spheres of special expertise have naturally helped to determine which of us produced an initial draft for which section, the fact is that every section has been redrafted several times, and that all three of us have contributed to every section as it now stands. The book has been a joint project, and we are, all three of us, committed to it, as a whole, in its final form.

'Art, literature, thought': we have sought to achieve a balance between our treatment of the three, not necessarily in quantifiable terms, but certainly in the sense that all three have been kept in view, as appropriate, throughout the book. 'Thought', perhaps, deserves a special comment. In our usage, the word in effect subsumes thought about antiquity, thought about art, thought about literature, and indeed thought about thought, as well as, for instance, specifiable aspects of cultural, ethical, and political thought; it would, however, be misleading to claim that technical philosophical or scientific issues, in particular, bulk large in our discussions.

Out of the many cultural traditions that have contributed to 'the' classical tradition, our concern (as we explain in §1) is primarily with four: the Italian, French, German, and those of the English-speaking world (in linguistic terms, this subsumes not only the corresponding four languages, but also post-classical, transnational Latin). In general, we have sought, once again, to keep a balance between our treatment of the four – but with one significant exception. Where close literary readings are called for, it will usually be literature in the English language that is to the fore – if only for reasons of simplicity of exposition and appropriateness for a readership whose common language is English.

### Practical Information

(a) *Arrangement by sections*: our book is divided, not into chapters, but into thirty-five continuously numbered sections (of varying lengths), which are grouped into

five ‘Parts’ (again of varying lengths), followed by an epilogue. This arrangement is designed to follow the contours of our subject and our treatment of it, with no loss to practical convenience. It may be noted that the sections (§§) are often used as a basis for cross-reference: ‘cf. §24’ or simply ‘(§24)’.

(b) *Annotation*: though there is a good deal of annotation here, it is in fact highly selective. Across the many areas we confront, we have not sought to annotate every point where there is a diversity of published views, or an occasion for citing secondary literature (cf. (c) below). Our policy, however, has been to use the notes not only for essential reference, but to flag up some of the many tangential issues in which our discussions are implicated.

(c) *Secondary literature*: publications are cited in the notes in a version of Harvard style – ‘Trask (2000) 278’ (or, within brackets, ‘Trask 2000: 278’) – with full citation in the Bibliography (pp. 432–74). Some items (usually primary sources) are not cited in Harvard style, and not included in the Bibliography. With secondary literature, we rarely attempt to be comprehensive: our scope precludes it. We source quotations, always. For the rest: in some cases, we cite exemplary items; in others, a specific discussion; in others again, a cross-section. But we have not cited secondary literature for the sake of it. We have often preferred to cite primary sources instead; and in particular we avoid citing any secondary literature for aspects of, or works or individuals from, classical antiquity. In the case of scholarly works published in foreign languages, we have sometimes opted for English translations, where adequate and readily available, but especially where the translation is also a revised version. We have not attempted to match the formal bibliographies in works of reference like France (2000), Grafton, Most, and Settis (2010), Kallendorf (2007), Reid (1993), the monumental *Pauly, Classical Tradition* (2006–10), or the one-volume *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (2012).

(d) *Primary texts* from classical antiquity are cited (usually in the notes) in conventional form (‘Horace, *Odes*, 1. 13’). Where possible, this is also our procedure with texts from later periods, in whatever language (‘Dante, *Inferno*, 4. 85–90’). Line numbers (etc.) in such references (both for classical and for later material) assume numbering (etc.) within the text in its original language. Where the option of such numbering (etc.) is not available for post-classical texts, we cite, if possible, by chapter or section or other manageable and unmistakable subdivision: ‘Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy*, 15’; ‘Rabelais, *Pantagruel*, 8’; ‘Vasari, *Lives*, 2, Ghiberti’. For primary texts (post-classical and classical), we avoid, so far as possible, citing by particular editions (to which many readers will have no access) and especially by page numbering in such editions; and unless exceptionally, we avoid including primary material of any kind in the Bibliography. The exceptions usually involve those few cases where reference is made, for some special reason, to particular editions: ‘Dryden’s preface to his translation of *Ovid’s Epistles*: Watson (1962), 1. 268’. In such cases, the publication is Harvard-styled under the editor’s name, not the author’s, and in the Bibliography is entered correspondingly under the editor’s name (but without the ambiguous ‘ed.’, which is reserved for collections of essays or the like): the whimsical modern practice whereby Dryden, though dead in 1700, can be presented as authoring a publication in 1962 has little to recommend it.

(e) *Translation*: in general, all quotations in languages other than English are accompanied by translation (at least on first citation), either in the text or the notes. All translations are our own, unless otherwise indicated; for literary texts, we have made a point of providing our own, wherever possible. Titles of post-classical works in languages other than English are cited in the original, in English, or in both, as seems appropriate, but titles of classical works are often cited only in their most familiar form, whatever that happens to be ('Virgil, *Aeneid*', but 'Cicero, *De Amicitia*').

(f) *Orthography*: spelling and punctuation systems in our four languages (as also in post-classical Latin) have changed considerably over time, and in some periods practices are less than consistent. We have found it difficult, and ultimately undesirable, to follow any consistent practice ourselves. Our rule of thumb is that texts later than c. 1580/1600 are cited in modernized spelling (etc.) (as is common practice, for instance, with the English of Shakespeare and the King James Bible), though with German material, in particular, we sometimes modernize from Luther onwards (i.e. the best part of a century earlier). The upshot is that (e.g.) Montaigne and Shakespeare are (broadly) modernized, whereas Dante and Chaucer are (broadly) not; and that (e.g.) seventeenth-century English is usually quoted without a plethora of capital letters; whereas (e.g.) we refer to Du Bellay's *Deffence*, in original spelling, and not to his *Défense*. Conversely, some later titles in French and German are left unmodernized ('Leibniz, *Ermahnung an die Teutsche*', not '. . . *Deutsche*'), as are some English verse-usages like Keats's 'light-wingèd Dryad' and 'deep-brow'd Homer'.

(g) *Latin titles*: we have sought to distinguish classical and post-classical by generalizing the convention whereby classical titles are fully capitalized ('Cicero, *De Amicitia*'), post-classical only capitalized initially ('Hobbes, *De cive*').

(h) *Dates*: where primary texts (books etc.) are cited with a date – 'Gibbon, *Decline and Fall* (1776–88)' – this usually refers to date of publication, unless specified as date of composition. In the body of the book, we usually eschew birth, death, or *floruit* dates for artists, writers (etc.). For reference, such dates are included in the Index, under the name of the artist (etc.). All centuries can be assumed to be AD unless otherwise specified.

(i) *Abbreviations*: with the needs of a mixed readership in mind, we have generally avoided abbreviating titles, both of primary works (ancient or other) and especially of modern journals (etc.). Standard abbreviations themselves ('etc.') are largely confined to the notes. Our chief concession to *ad hoc* abbreviation is the intermittent use (but only in the notes) of Roman numerals for centuries ('XXI' = 'twenty-first century').

---

# Acknowledgements

We are indebted to the following, for help with illustrations: Valentina Bandelloni and Alan Kirby, of the Scala Picture Library; Jacklyn Burns, of the J. Paul Getty Museum; Shelley Hales; and especially Calum Colvin, Chris Gollon, and Thomas Gordon Smith, for generously allowing us to reproduce their work; likewise to our respective universities for helping to defray the costs involved. We owe a debt of gratitude to Ian Wong for help with the index. Various friends and colleagues have read some or all of the book in draft: Matthew Bell, Antonio Cartolano, Terence Cave, David Hopkins, Deborah Howard, Sebastian Matzner, Rosa Mucignat. We offer them warm thanks for their comments and advice. We are grateful, too, for the helpful suggestions made by the publisher's readers and, not least, to Haze Humbert and the staff of Wiley-Blackwell, along with Graeme Leonard on the copy-editing side, for their efficiency and patience.

Michael Silk (King's College London)

Ingo Gildenhard (University of Cambridge)

Rosemary Barrow (University of Roehampton)





---

Part I  
Overview



---

## §1

# The Classical Tradition and the Scope of Our Book

The classical tradition covers a millennium and a half of cultural achievements, historical developments, facts, fictions, and phenomena on many levels. It subsumes the many ways in which, since the end of classical antiquity, the world of ancient Greece and Rome has inspired and influenced, has been constructed and reconstructed, has left innumerable traces (sometimes unregarded), and has, repeatedly, been appealed to, and contested, as a point of reference, and rehearsed and reconstituted (with or without direct reference) as an archetype.

Interest in aspects of the classical tradition is currently as active as it is widespread. The classical canon may no longer dominate the modern mind, as it once determined the responses of elite circles in the past, but we live in a time when Hollywood blockbusters about ‘three hundred’ Spartans or the tale of ‘Troy’ attract enthusiastic audiences around the world, when innovative stagings of Greek drama are a familiar presence in many countries, when idealistic notions of, or anxieties about, ‘democracy’ continue to engender debate, and when the enduring tussle between Britain and Greece over the ownership of the Elgin (or Parthenon) marbles shows how cultural goods tied up with the classical tradition can still be a matter of high politics and national interest. These and countless other achievements, developments, and debates, past and present, are increasingly the focus of a miniature explosion in publishing and what is almost a new academic discipline in its own right.<sup>1</sup> Various, often controversial, factors may have played a part here, not

---

<sup>1</sup> ‘New’, though ‘the classical tradition’ was identified as long ago as Victorian England (John Addington Symonds invokes, and contrasts, ‘Christian and Classical Traditions’ in his *Renaissance in Italy: The Fine Arts*, 1877, ch. 1), while it was formally institutionalized as a field of study in the Warburg Institute, first in Hamburg (from 1921), then in London (from 1934).

least the switch, within classical education in the English-speaking world, from language skills to ‘classics in translation’ (§§4, 15), but the level of interest in the classical tradition, both among the classically trained and across the arts and humanities, is beyond dispute.

What is ‘the classical tradition’? In contemporary usage, ‘classical’ and ‘the classics’ may mean a Beethoven symphony, the novels of Tolstoy, the films of René Clair – or a range of notable entities, from permanently-in-fashion dress designs to pre-quantum mechanics.<sup>2</sup> For our purposes, ‘the classical’ means the world of ancient Greece and Rome, and ‘the classical tradition’ means reflexes of,<sup>3</sup> uses of, reconstitutions of, or responses to, the ancient world from the disintegration of the Western Roman Empire to our own day. But – given that ‘classical’ has always had strongly positive connotations, and ‘tradition’, arguably, too (§2) – this entire domain is inevitably caught up in implications of value. For a start, it is not just any aspect of the Greco-Roman world that inspires and influences, but, overwhelmingly, the special and the privileged – Homer’s *Iliad*, Plato’s dialogues, the ruined glories of Phidias’ marbles – even if the process of inspiring and influencing can sometimes seem to make the whole of antiquity special and privileged anew.

The classical tradition overlaps with the reception (or receptions) of Greece and Rome. They are not the same thing, and for several reasons.<sup>4</sup> First, because the reception of Greece and Rome includes readings and rereadings from within the ancient world itself.<sup>5</sup> There will be all manner of particular differences, but there is no necessary difference in kind or in hermeneutic status, between a response to Virgil’s *Aeneid* from Virgil’s own time, one from later antiquity, and one from a later age – say, T. S. Eliot’s response, in a pair of provoking essays (§35). Yet though these are all instances of the reception of Virgil, only Eliot’s essays can meaningfully be referred to the classical tradition. Conversely, the classical tradition is wider in scope. Many of its embodiments are not classical receptions in any meaningful sense. Post-classical versions of classical archetypes sometimes involve reception, sometimes not (§19). Equally, the Romance and Modern Greek languages are momentous post-classical reflexes of Latin and Ancient Greek, and as such clearly belong to the

<sup>2</sup> All, on different levels, authoritative. The association of ‘classical’ with authority is inscribed in its etymology from Latin ‘classis’ (‘fleet’/‘army’, as well as social ‘class’; cf. §3 n. 14) – as it is in (e.g.) the use of ‘classical’ architecture for buildings required to connote authority, from banks to museums. ‘Authority’: cf. §5.

<sup>3</sup> We borrow – and extend – this use of ‘reflex’ from historical linguistics, where the word stresses the fact of descent without any implication of purposeful transmission or adjustment: ‘*reflex* . . . a word or other linguistic form which is directly descended within a particular language from an ancestral form taken as a reference point. For example . . . Italian *donna* “lady” is a reflex of Latin *domina(m)*’: Trask (2000) 278. In our extended usage, the word is reapplied from particular linguistic forms to whole language systems and other large behavioural structures. Thus, the Italian language *per se* is (largely) a reflex of Latin *per se* (§13), and medieval Italian carnival (partly) a reflex of ancient ceremonial or ritual (§12).

<sup>4</sup> Compare and contrast e.g. Budelmann and Haubold (2008) and Caruso and Laird (2009) 2–3. See further §2.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. e.g. Martindale (2006).

classical tradition, but they are not, in themselves, ‘receptions’ of anything. Whether the same should be said of Medieval Latin, and of Renaissance Latin too, is another matter; both, in any event, belong straightforwardly to the tradition.

Then again, the classical tradition, as a continuum, subsumes not only direct engagements with antiquity, but engagements with earlier engagements. Like Eliot, the poet Milton responds to Virgil’s poetry; unlike Eliot, he responds not as critic, but by and within his own poetry, which – from *Lycidas* to *Paradise Lost* – creates (among much else) an idiosyncratic classicizing idiom that looks back to classical Latinity in general and Virgil’s Latin among others. In this sense, Milton’s poetic language represents a distinctive embodiment of the classical tradition; it is also the object of an Eliotian critique in a notable essay, which, however, makes virtually no reference to antiquity at all. That essay is eminently discussible as itself a critical contribution to the tradition and as significant evidence for Eliot’s sense of his own distinctive place within it<sup>6</sup> – but there is nothing in the essay to invite talk of ‘reception’ of antiquity, nor indeed is the essay commonly discussed as such.

Above all, though, whereas ‘classical’ and ‘tradition’ tend to prompt consideration of value, ‘reception’ does not. In a nutshell, the ‘classical’ of ‘the classical tradition’ tends to imply canonicity, even when the post-antique engagement with the antique is anti-canonical (as is the case, most obviously, with engagements within popular culture: §12). Indeed, notwithstanding the fact that it is precisely the value associated with the classical over hundreds of years that has brought its multiple receptions into being, reception studies tend to operate in a relativistic spirit, generally preferring cultural-historical engagement with such issues to critical engagement. All in all: reception *studies* have helped to make what was once the preoccupation of a minority of classicists, and others, fashionable – while reception *theory* has helped to generate better understandings of various aspects of the field – but in no sense has ‘reception’ itself been shown to redefine, let alone to replace, ‘the classical tradition’ itself.<sup>7</sup>

The scope of the classical tradition is vast. Its many continuities (and discontinuities) range from high culture to low, from politics to sport, from law to urban planning, from the Romance languages, and the Modern Greek language, to the international, largely Greek-derived terminology of modern science and the continuing use of botanical Latin names for plants – and not just by professional botanists, but by ordinary gardeners too.<sup>8</sup> And if the scope is vast, the variety of usage that arises from particular points of reference is no less so.

Take Augustus and his age. Often regarded as (and seemingly regarding itself as) a ‘classical’ age in its own right, on the model of fifth-century Athens, with its

<sup>6</sup> Milton, Eliot, and Virgil: §35.

<sup>7</sup> Value: §§2, 18, Epilogue. Reception theory and the field: Martindale (1993), (2006).

<sup>8</sup> In Britain, for instance, herbs like ‘salvia’ and ‘artemisia’ are as familiar under those names as under their English names, ‘sage’ (*salvia officinalis*) and ‘wormwood’ (*artemisia absinthium*). As these examples suggest, botanical Latin uses classical lexemes or word-shapes, but not necessarily according to the rules of classical Latin usage.

sublimely assured art and architecture and public poetry, the Augustan age has in turn inspired classicizing revivals, along with other responses, in great profusion. It has bequeathed to the Western world the concepts of urban renewal in the grand manner<sup>9</sup> and of ‘the classic of all Europe’ (Eliot on Virgil again: §35). And the ideals it has been taken to embody have been acclaimed and denied and reinvented, from Charlemagne and Alcuin (who relived the relationship between Augustus and his poets) to the Holy Roman Emperors (who retained ‘Imperator Augustus’ in their titles), from Cosimo I of Florence (who promoted himself as a Renaissance version of Augustus the autocrat, saving the state from the instabilities of republicanism) to John Dryden (founding father of the English ‘Augustan’ poets, who reconfigured the same historical schema in his youthful ‘Astraea Redux’, composed to celebrate the restoration of Charles II), from Joachim Du Bellay (who invoked ‘that most happy age of Augustus’ as a model for the emergent French aspiration towards a great language and a high culture) to Benito Mussolini (who commemorated his hero’s 2000th birthday with a grandiose Fascist exhibition in 1937–8)<sup>10</sup> to W. H. Auden (whose poem ‘Secondary Epic’ sniped from below at Virgil’s lofty vision of Augustus as a carrier of destiny). In this example, and a host of others, it is hard to overstate the rich complexity of a tradition that has Greco-Roman antiquity as its unifying point of reference, but comprehends such a variety of forms and figures, social settings and relations, themes, media, and conflicting ideologies.

The range of our book, and the diversity of its connections and appraisals, reflects this ‘infinite variety’, but (we repeat) the book makes no attempt to take account of all possible points of reference, in topical, chronological, or geographical terms. While it contains its proper share of facts and figures, attested origins and unmistakable developments, our overall aim is an informed reading of the tradition that responds to diversity by making critical sense of it, and stimulates our readers to form, or sharpen, their own responses and assessments – perhaps in contrast to ours. Our emphasis is on art, literature, and thought: art, with more than passing attention to architecture; literature, with the same attention to theatre, opera, and film; thought, philosophy, and ideas, including, not least, ideas about, or associated with, art and literature themselves. Given the intricate relationships between literature and language, and thought and language, issues of language will impinge significantly on the discussion. So too will the interrelated histories of classical scholarship (§16) and education (§4), and also – interrelated again – of translation (§15). The ideological implications of the tradition will be a recurrent theme, as will the relation between high culture and low (we confront this directly in §12) and the related question of value.

Within art, literature, and thought, we have again made no attempt to scrutinize all media and all periods across all the cultures of the world. The classical tradition at its widest is a global phenomenon (witness Gandhi on Plato, Roman influences

<sup>9</sup> According to Suetonius (*Augustus*, 28), Augustus’ proud boast was that ‘he found Rome built of brick and left it in marble’. Cf. §25.

<sup>10</sup> *Mostra Augustea della Romanità*.

on the architecture of the mosque, the Greek-tragic evocations of the plays of Soyinka); and it has certainly been in constant dialogue with other cultural traditions throughout its history; but our discussion is concentrated on Western culture and, within Western culture, on the primary and closely related cultural traditions of Italy, France, Germany, and the English-speaking world.<sup>11</sup> Among much else, this means that we have relatively little to say about Byzantium,<sup>12</sup> which sustained the language, learning, and texts of Greek antiquity for a thousand years after the collapse of the Roman empire in the west, and which has considerable importance as a site of the classical tradition in its own right. Our focus is on the classical tradition in its undoubted heartland.

Within these limits, we seek to give a sense of the diverse contents of the tradition, but we are more concerned to ponder its coherence,<sup>13</sup> delineate its profile, and explore its typology. In effect we are asking a series of questions about the tradition overall.

What *is* 'the tradition overall'? How do we identify its boundaries? We confront this question repeatedly, especially in Part I of the book, from §1 (the present section) to §18.

What is its trajectory over time? Here, within the long march (or meandering) from late antiquity to the modern age, we give more than usual attention to the status of the eighteenth century as a transitional era, and to the Romantic generation as a turning-point (see, most immediately, §3 and §5). But the book is anything but a linear history, though many of its sections contain historical sketches.

What definitive forms does the tradition take? Reception, though itself a broad category, is only one such; and any answer to the question must take account, also, of reflexes (of which language is surely the most important: §13), of archetypes (§§19–22), and, as we have already pointed out, of engagements with earlier engagements (exemplified, representatively but not only, in §35). 'Engagements', in their considerable variety, we also categorize in different terms in §14.

What kinds of difference has the tradition made? This is a question we attempt to confront by placing the classical in and against the context of the non-classical. We do so both in large terms (§18) and by a focus on specific case studies (§§28–31).

<sup>11</sup> Initially, but not of course exclusively, European. Here as elsewhere, recent scholarship seeks to take account of the marginalized and the peripheral (as, in conventional terms, they would be regarded), along with the canonical and the central: see e.g. Goff (2005), Goff and Simpson (2008), Hardwick and Gillespie (2007).

<sup>12</sup> Our most significant omission besides is Spain (esp. significant in the Renaissance) and the Hispanic world.

<sup>13</sup> Regarding this 'coherence', we note a revealing comment by the Nigerian playwright, Femi Osofisan, on his *Women of Owu*, an adaptation of Euripides' *Trojan Women*, first performed in 2004. His play addresses, not Western audiences (familiar, perhaps, with the Euripides), but 'a Nigerian audience . . . the audience I am familiar with': Budelmann (2007) 30. In a post-colonial perspective, there will be both new creativities to add to the old and new ways of reading the old, including the classical old: Euripides 'reclaimed' as 'world literature' is different from Euripides as part of the Western classical tradition.

We also do so, more pervasively, by presenting the more ‘classical’, at any one time or place, as part of a less ‘classical’ whole. Our very different discussions of popular culture (§12) and Rome (§25) may be taken as representative here.

What kinds of relationship are there – comparative, contrastive, interactive – between the tradition in our four cultures? Between its embodiments in different periods? And (in some respects the most challenging question) between the art, the literature, and the thought of our title? – challenging, if only (though not only) because these three large areas of human creativity and endeavour are seldom brought together in any concerted way in contemporary understandings of the present or past, classical-related or other. These questions are not the kind that allow neat or simple answers, but we have had them in mind throughout.

And, not least, a question that arises directly from the others: what are the different ways in which the tradition can profitably be approached and understood? This question, along with the questions about relationship just cited, has determined the shape of our book. The body of the book is organized as thirty-five sections, of varying lengths, in five parts. Part I (§§1–18) is designed to represent an overview of the tradition and its diversity (this is outlined in detail in §2); Parts II–V present a series of closer readings from alternative standpoints: ‘archetypes’ (§§19–22), ‘the imaginary’ (§§23–27), ‘making a difference’ (§§28–31), ‘contrasts and comparisons’ (§§32–35).

In a more practical sense, considerations of diversities and alternatives have helped to determine the shape and size of the thirty-five sections. Some sections present their material at relative length, as with the important topic of language (§13). Others, much shorter, we offer as pointers for debate. Two in particular, §10 (‘special relationships’) and §18 (the classical tradition and *other* traditions), belong here – though in both cases the desire to avoid long lists of illusory counter-examples is also a factor. The shortest sections, designated as ‘prefaces’ to the several Parts that follow the overview (§§19, 23, 28, 32), seek to provide a theoretical framework for the different kinds of material, and different kinds of discussion, that follow them. But short or long, prefatory or discursive, every section is intended to contribute to a critical reappraisal of the tradition as a whole.

We use the word ‘critical’ advisedly. Any satisfying treatment of art, of literature, of thought, calls for critical judgement. Such judgement is exercised not least in the choice of examples, and here we are not just selective: we repeatedly argue from particular examples – a technique (this is no coincidence) most familiar in literary criticism. But in any case the classical tradition in these large areas is so implicated in value judgements from the past that any attempt at ‘impartiality’ now is likely to end up as a quaint evasion. Conversely, though, it may be acknowledged that in art and literature, in particular, achievement is not ‘superannuated’,<sup>14</sup> and that there is a clear distinction between such areas and those where judgement now is largely superfluous and the classical tradition is a matter of essentially historical interest.

<sup>14</sup> Compare and contrast Eliot’s refusal to ‘superannuate’ Shakespeare, Homer, *or* ‘the rock drawing of the Magdalenian draughtsmen’ (‘Tradition and the Individual Talent’, 1920).



- [read The Hungry Scientist Handbook: Electric Birthday Cakes, Edible Origami, and Other DIY Projects for Techies, Tinkerers, and Foodies](#)
- [download online The Meme Machine \(Popular Science\) book](#)
- [Stitch Encyclopedia: Knitting: An Illustrated Guide to the Essential Knitting Stitches pdf, azw \(kindle\)](#)
- [read Waiting for the Barbarians \(Penguin Great Books of the 20th Century\) for free](#)
- [Julian book](#)
- [Barron's Visual Dictionary: Spanish: For Home, Business, and Travel pdf, azw \(kindle\)](#)
  
- <http://xn--d1aboelcb1f.xn--p1ai/lib/The-Hungry-Scientist-Handbook--Electric-Birthday-Cakes--Edible-Origami--and-Other-DIY-Projects-for-Techies--Tinkere>
- <http://www.1973vision.com/?library/The-Other.pdf>
- <http://econtact.webschaefer.com/?books/The-Case-of-the-Exploding-Speakeasy.pdf>
- <http://thermco.pl/library/The-First-Rasta--Leonard-Howell-and-the-Rise-of-Rastafarianism.pdf>
- <http://junkrobots.com/ebooks/An-Army-of-Phantoms--American-Movies-and-the-Making-of-the-Cold-War.pdf>
- <http://www.netc-bd.com/ebooks/Life-Beyond-Earth--The-Search-for-Habitable-Worlds-in-the-Universe.pdf>