

accessible places. However, Nautin would not deny ideological implications of the cult of the saints which shaped the sacred environment within Christian towns.

Paavo Castrén submits a case study on Athens: 'Paganism and Christianity in Athens during the Fourth to Sixth Centuries A.D.' (pp. 211-23). He investigates educational policy, population movement, economic shift and barbarian invasions, describes the transformation of Athens from a centre of pagan culture and learning into 'a modest Christian country town' during the period 500 to 600 and argues that the disintegration of the city was accelerated by the closure of the Platonic school in 529, the migration of the wealthy Athenians to the country, the diversion of resources to Constantinople and attacks on Athens by Slavs and Avars in about 582.

Bryan Ward-Perkins explores some specific cases of 'Re-using the Architectural Legacy of the Past, *entre idéologie et pragmatisme*' (pp. 225-44) and considers various pragmatic and ideological reasons why contemporary builders took over architectural *spolia*. He reviews the Arch of Constantine in Rome, the Aphrodision in Aphrodisia and the Parthenon in Athens and adds a fine digression into the modern restoration programme of Oxford colleges to show that a lack of craftsmanship cannot necessarily be explained by poor economic resources (231f.). Certainly, his cases of re-use of spolia 'show how very difficult, but also how endlessly fascinating it is to speculate, both about what was going on, and about what people were thinking, when, in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, they took over and adapted the buildings of the past' (244).

Gian Pietro Brogiolo has bravely undertaken the task of drawing some conclusions from this rather diverse group of papers, which tackle many different problems (pp. 245-54). No wonder, perhaps, that his remarks on 'the transformation of elites', 'physical transformations of the city' and 'ideological changes' remain somewhat vague.

From a general perspective I doubt whether the decision to divide the original group 'intended to cover together both Town and Countryside' (xiii) was well advised, since we are nowadays convinced that cities should not be studied in isolation, but that we need an integrated view of town and country. But given the scope of the volume we should be grateful to the editors and authors that they have contributed, from an interdisciplinary perspective, to the debate on the transformation of cities between 400 and 800 and to many controversial issues. This volume will certainly stimulate further research in the field and specialists in Late Antiquity, the early Middle Ages and Byzantine studies should browse — and will not be disappointed.

Stefan Rebenich

Universität Mannheim

R. Markner, G. Veltri (eds.), *Friedrich August Wolf, Studien, Dokumente, Bibliographie*, Palingenesia LXVII, Stuttgart 1999. 144 pp. ISBN 3 515 07637 9.

This volume contains, after a brief preface, five contributions. It will be practical to review these in the reverse order of their appearance. Markner prints, with comments, a very full and useful bibliography of Wolf, including reception (102-44). Next

(76-101), the same scholar labels rather extravagantly as correspondence Wolf's letter to Christian Garve (already published previously) as well as Garve's letters (four German and one Latin) to Wolf. For students of Wolf perhaps the most interesting detail in these is his ignoring the letters and refraining from replying to the adoration, but also to some criticism of his method, contained in them. Markner also (48-75) edits fragments of the many versions of Wolf's planned *Einleitung in die Enzyklopädie der Altertumswissenschaft*. Two points of great importance for the future development of the notion of *klassische Altertumswissenschaft* are repeatedly emphasised: first, the cultural superiority of the Greeks and Romans over the other peoples of antiquity, who thereby cease to be the legitimate subject of the study of Classics (e.g. 61: *Es gab in alten Zeiten nur 2 Nationen, die eine höhere Geistes-Cultur erlangten, Griechen und Römer* [here and in the following emphasis original]). ... *Die übrigen Völker des Altertums, als Hebräer, Aegyptier, Perser etc., haben sich nur wenig oder gar nicht über diejenige Ausbildung erhoben, die man Civilisation od. Policirung nennen kann, und von höherer Cultur unterscheiden muß*). Secondly, despite Wolf's appreciation of all branches of study, as evidenced by his interest in classical art, among all remains of antiquity the most important are the literary ones, and their study is the main task of scholarship (e.g. 63: *Unter den Ueberbleibseln des Altherth[ums] sind die schriftlichen die wichtigsten ... Die Kenntniss der eigent[lichen] Litteratur der Gr[iechen] u. Röm[er] macht daher den ersten, den Haupttheil der ganzen Wißenschaft aus ...*).

It is an outcome of the first of these points that is taken up in the two remaining contributions. What was the attitude of Wolf to the Jews and to the study of their antiquities? Anthony Grafton ('Juden und Griechen bei Friedrich August Wolf', 9-31) and Giuseppe Veltri ('Altertumswissenschaft und Wissenschaft des Judentums. Leopold Zunz und seine Lehrer F. A. Wolf und A. Böckh', 32-47) derive somewhat different conclusions from the evidence. According to Grafton, Wolf, though himself liberal in outlook and tolerant to Jews, meant to free the study of antiquity from theology and turn it into the study of classical antiquity by belittling the importance and the cultural contribution of the Jews and other oriental peoples. Veltri sees in Wolf's pupil Johann Severin Vater, who composed textbooks of Hebrew and other Semitic languages, and in the absence of any criticism from his Jewish students Jost and especially Zunz, counterarguments to this claim. More importantly, the influence of Wolf's philological method on the concept of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* gets due weight.

Two issues connected with this controversy are of some importance for present-day scholarship. One, Wolf's astonishingly narrow conception of Hebrew literature, as of almost all gentile scholarship: all Hebrew literature totals only about half the amount of Cicero alone! (23). The equation of Hebrew literature with the Hebrew Bible is often arrogance based on ignorance — one may compare the boast (!) by a scholar of the stature of Eduard Meyer never to have had a glance at the Talmud, the largest corpus of non-classical texts from the Roman Empire (cf. *SCI* 8-9 (1989), 202). Even more urgently one may consider the influence of Wolf's concept on the hierarchy of subjects and academic departments, perhaps the one area where *Black Athena* has made a positive contribution to scholarly consciousness. Still, it seems to

most people perfectly acceptable today that scholars who would shudder at the idea of colleagues quoting classical texts from translations are perfectly content to do so if they have to refer to Hebrew, Aramaic or other non-classical texts (it seems hardly worth mentioning that not only are these translations often inferior to those available from Greek and Latin, but also the conceptual world of these texts is more remote from modern Western minds than that of the classical world). One may hope that readers of this slim, but well produced volume¹ will be encouraged to devote some thought to an issue that seems only rarely to engage our attention.

Joseph Geiger

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

¹ I assume that the nickname of Degen was Ξίφος rather than the nonsense printed at 80.