

ancient religion, leading to the exclusion of religious questions (about theology and belief) from our inquiries. To an extent this change of perspective has been salutary, for it allows us to study the ancient world without having to stumble over the question that was central to early modern intellectuals: how did the oracles really function? Yet it would be mistaken for us, classicists, to to read Ossa-Richardson's fine book as a history of reception and of debates that we have overcome. In fact, it unearths a different type of response to oracles than the ones we are today able to contemplate. These responses rely on questions that we may have to learn to ask again: what did oracles mean for those visiting them? How can an oracle work as a religious institution? What constitutes a religious response to an oracle? And, ultimately, what does an acceptance of oracles mean for one's understanding of reality? In this way, Ossa-Richardson does not only chart early modern debates but also alerts us to some of the blind spots in modern scholarship.

Peter VAN NUFFELEN

Maria WYKE, *Caesar in the USA*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 2012. 1 vol. 16 x 23 cm, XII-306 p., 36 ill. (THE JOAN PALEVSKY IMPRINT IN CLASSICAL LITERATURE). Prix : 39.95 \$. ISBN 978-0-520-27391-7.

A 2004 biography of John Wilkes Booth, the actor—and scion of a family of actors specializing in Shakespearean roles—who assassinated President Lincoln in 1865, is provocatively entitled *American Brutus*. In a nation ostensibly founded in the defense of liberty against a tyrannous king, Booth's justification of his deed with the tag (falsely attributed to Brutus) "*Sic semper tyrannis!*" resonates uniquely, and perhaps more loudly than in any other nation touched by the classical tradition. As part of a multi-year and multi-pronged approach to the *Nachleben* of Julius Caesar, even into contemporary contexts, Maria Wyke has undertaken to evaluate the dictator's legacy in the culture, both high and low, of the United States—though only in the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. The results of this bold and original conceit are uneven, for a host of reasons, and very much more could have been done to fulfill the promise of this survey. Although it is composed of seven chapters—split into two parts labeled "Education" and "Political Culture"—*Caesar in the USA* gives the distinct appearance of a series of individual studies strung together with very little connective tissue animating the whole. In these chapters' footnotes, Wyke oftentimes acknowledges that several pages are "indebted" to the recently published work of other scholars or to someone else's suggested line of enquiry. Such an approach might have provided a sweeping panoramic vision of Caesar's image in American life, but the highest peaks of this landscape have been ignored in favor of certain low-lying areas that even Caesar would have difficulty traversing. The book even wanders far, at certain points, from the territory staked out in its title. "Caesar" is nominally taken to mean "*Julius Caesar*", though, particularly in the examples offered of "Empire" in the past few decades, it is clearly not this specific Caesar that is being referenced. I doubt that many of my compatriots could, nowadays, identify the precise achievements or failings of Julius Caesar—but then I also live in a country in which members of a political movement regularly label our elected President a "socialist" or "fascist" (or, for the more orthographically-challenged, a "facist"), in the absence of the remotest

understanding of what these terms mean. Nonetheless, it seems disingenuous for Wyke to include renderings of President George W. Bush as “Caesar”, as these images are much more obviously referencing emperors like Commodus (or at least the *Gladiator* version of same) and Nero (or Peter Ustinov’s inimitable conjuration in *Quo Vadis*). Wyke even deviates from explicitly *American* references to Caesar on several occasions, focusing considerable attention on British political cartoons and television series, French fêting of Vercingetorix, German lauding of Caesarian militarism, and Italian (and especially Fascist) emulation of *divus Julius*— in spite, it should be noted, of his less-than-optimal demise. Moreover, while it would be gratifying to believe that textbooks and school curricula captivated the imaginations of young Americans, devoting three chapters to this form of ‘reception’ surely constitutes a case of overstatement. Among the items on display at the Harry S. Truman Presidential Library in Independence, Missouri, is an essay composed by the eighth-grade future president on the theme of Shakespeare’s Portia. While the essay addresses the Portia of *The Merchant of Venice* rather than the Portia of *Julius Caesar*, one would be hard pressed to identify any lingering effects of this Shakespearean study on the young Truman’s mindset. In his estimation, Portia was “Shakespeare’s intellectual woman”, but “A person cannot live without love. ‘Love makes the world go round.’” It may be unfair to gauge Truman’s absorption of Shakespeare from this two-page essay, but American students were probably as indifferent to their teachers’ lessons, however carefully crafted, in 1899 as they were in 1999. Surprisingly, given her previous extensive work on Roman genre films, Wyke does not mention a 2002 film on *Julius Caesar* (directed by Uli Edel and with Jeremy Sisto in the title role) or—even more oddly, after her lengthy analysis of Mankiewicz’s Shakespearean film of 1953— the same director’s *Cleopatra* (1963). Rex Harrison’s Caesar bestrides the first half of the latter film like a colossus, and his memory dominates the second half, as Richard Burton’s Antony constantly tries but fails to measure up to the man displayed so prominently around Elizabeth Taylor’s throat. The most significant failing of *Caesar in the USA* is its lack of sufficient attention to the *one* brief period in American history during which Caesar’s star actually was in its ascendant, perhaps ironically: during the Truman administration (1945–1953). These years witnessed the confluence of the two dominant streams of Caesar’s legacy, namely Caesar, the popular and populist dictator, and Caesar, the military leader who seizes ultimate power. Under Truman, America’s cultural and political life amply reflected these trends—even while the small and unprepossessing man was growing into the office sufficiently to be considered, by contemporary historians, one of the country’s most successful leaders. Perhaps because of her admitted inattention to geographic and regional differences (which are especially significant with respect to “the North/South divide”), Wyke dramatically underplays the impact of Senator Huey P. Long of Louisiana, both during his lifetime and long afterward. Although he was felled by an assassin’s bullet in 1935, “the Kingfish” cast an enormous shadow, particularly in the literary creations he inspired in part or in whole. Sinclair Lewis’ brilliant novel *It Can’t Happen Here* (1935), chronicling the rise of a hypothetical American Fascist, exposed the seamy underside of homegrown, homespun folksy populism, fully the equivalent of *völkisch* fantasies in Europe. Lewis’ “Corpo” insurgent, Berzelius “Buzz” Windrip (misspelled by Wyke as “Windrup”), is the

author of a rambling autobiography called *Zero Hour*, but so close was his resemblance to Long that Lewis rushed a cable to his publishers in September 1935 deleting any reference to “the late Huey Long” while the book was in press. It was precisely Long’s style of populism that prompted a former instructor at Louisiana State University, Robert Penn Warren, to craft one of the giant figures in American literature, Willie Stark of *All the King’s Men* (1946). In both its original form and an acclaimed 1949 film version, Warren’s novel underscored the dangers of a popular figure who was essentially untrustworthy –and intimated that Americans were just as prone as Europeans to being seduced by an appeal pitched on the lowest possible level. The film was quickly followed by *A Face in the Crowd* (1957), in which a compellingly sinister Andy Griffith rises from hillbilly folk singer to politician through sheer force of will. (A remake of *All the King’s Men* –with Sean Penn as Stark and the other three principal characters played (not very convincingly) by British actors– appeared in 2006, clearly alluding to the administration of a man elected and re-elected president because many Americans felt they “could have a beer with him”.) While the populist strain in Julius Caesar’s career path seemed to find equivalents in contemporary America, the militaristic aspect of his rise to power found even more obvious parallels in the late 1940s and early 1950s. At the culmination of a protracted and vitriolic stand-off between President Truman and General Douglas MacArthur over strategy during the Korean War, Truman fired MacArthur in April 1951. At least one biographer, as Wyke notes, has called MacArthur an “American Caesar”, and yet MacArthur was only one among a number of American military leaders of this era who thought in grandiloquent terms about themselves and harbored political ambitions. General George S. Patton was inspired by Caesar (as well as by Scipio Africanus, especially when he envisioned the Battle of Zama in Tunisia), but the clearest example of the Caesar path to power seemed to be the drafting of General Dwight D. Eisenhower as the Republicans’ presidential candidate in 1952. The architect of the D-Day invasion and the invariably respected commander of Allied forces at the war’s conclusion, Eisenhower was, to all appearances, reluctant to run for any political office. Although he was courted by both the Republican and the Democratic Parties throughout 1951, Eisenhower, persuaded that his service was essential –after an indecisive armistice had been declared on the Korean peninsula– agreed to run and defeated the mild-mannered, cerebral Adlai E. Stevenson in November 1952. The prominent historian Richard Hofstadter considered the public’s choice of the “war-hero” Eisenhower instead of the “egghead” Stevenson only the most recent proof of the essential “anti-intellectualism” of American life, and he composed a book on that theme that was awarded a Pulitzer Prize in 1964. Nevertheless, in spite of the anxiety that a military leader could use his power to subvert civilian control of the military, Eisenhower would prove himself a moderate and restrained voice on the use of military force, as encapsulated in his famous warning about the gathering “military-industrial complex” in his Farewell Address in early 1961. But such a result was not anticipated by all in the anxious 1950s. Some of the background notes that resulted in Mankiewicz’s justifiably famous film were drafted in June 1952, at precisely the moment that a conquering general seemed on the verge of seizing political control of his country, perhaps “very loath to lay his fingers off” the crown offered him by Antony? Neither “the people’s dictator” nor the military

leader who, unlike Sulla, had “learned his ABCs” materialized in the 1950s, and radical reconfigurations of education in the 1960s and 1970s virtually excised Julius Caesar from the American body politic. In both temporal and cultural terms, we are very far indeed from 1778, when a command performance of Joseph Addison’s *Cato* could stoke the enthusiasm of George Washington’s soldiers. Jonathan S. PERRY

Nicola ZWINGMANN, *Antiker Tourismus in Kleinasien und auf den vorgelagerten Inseln. Selbstvergewisserung in der Fremde*. Bonn, Habelt, 2012. 1 vol. 16,5 x 22,5 cm, XIV-497 p., 55 fig. (ANTIQUITAS, REIHE 1, 59). Prix : 95 €. ISBN 978-3-7749-3811-3.

Cet ouvrage est une version révisée de la thèse que Nicola Zwingmann a présentée en 2008/2009 à l’université Eberhard-Karls de Tübingen. Le livre constitue une synthèse importante sur le tourisme antique en Asie Mineure et dans les îles proches, un travail qui, comme le souligne son auteur, n’avait été entrepris, jusqu’alors, que de manière incomplète ou, du moins, secondaire. Ainsi Nicola Zwingmann rappelle-t-elle les pages de Ludwig Friedländer, Jean-Marie André et Marie-Françoise Baslez ou, plus récemment, George Williamson, pages qui avaient le mérite d’exister mais avaient toutes en commun d’être des sections de livres aux thèmes plus généraux. *Antiker Tourismus in Kleinasien und auf den vorgelagerten Inseln* est donc la première monographie à s’intéresser exclusivement à ce sujet. D’autres régions touristiques du monde antique n’étaient pourtant pas en reste. Ainsi, l’Égypte gréco-romaine avait déjà fait l’objet d’une étude importante de Victoria A. Foertmeyer en 1989. Qui plus est, les thèmes du tourisme antique en général et, à plus forte raison, du voyage dans l’Antiquité, ont évidemment déjà bénéficié de différentes (sinon nombreuses) études sous forme de monographies. Le programme de l’étude est annoncé de manière claire par une table des matières qui n’en est pas moins détaillée, un avantage non négligeable pour qui souhaite s’informer sur certains aspects en particulier. Après quelques remarques générales sur l’historiographie et sur la notion et les cadres du voyage dans l’Antiquité, différents lieux emblématiques du tourisme de l’époque sont étudiés comme autant de “case studies”. Ils sont répartis en quatre grandes sections : les cités qui incarnent des grands événements du passé (Troie, Rhodes et Pergame), les sanctuaires ou « musées de l’Antiquité » (Éphèse, Cos et Cnide), l’héritage matériel non grec (de l’Âge du Bronze comme de l’Âge du Fer, ainsi les monuments lyciens, phrygiens, lydiens, cariens et perses) et, enfin, les éléments naturels du paysage (essentiellement les grottes). Dans les deux premières sections, le développement suit un schéma récurrent mais qui fait aussi preuve de souplesse lorsque cela s’avère nécessaire. On trouve ainsi presque systématiquement une contextualisation historique et géographique, une synthèse sur les sources disponibles, une description des attractions touristiques de l’endroit, une sous-section sur les infrastructures liées à l’activité touristique (guides, souvenirs, hébergement, prostitution, préservation des monuments, etc.) et une conclusion sous forme d’analyse visant à comprendre l’importance du lieu comme destination touristique. Ce caractère systématique du traitement des lieux (et des données en général) fait potentiellement du livre un véritable outil de travail. S’il fallait n’en retenir qu’un,