
This book is a contribution to the study of Greek values and literature. It comes in the form of a chronological survey of the operation of aidos in literary texts from Homer to Aristotle, and is firmly based on readings of individual passages. The emphasis is on the poets and the great philosophers. The justification for this is that the study concentrates on those writers who have something to show us about aidos, or those who have something to tell us. The indication that the orators and historians are omitted because they have nothing new to add to our understanding in this regard is supported by references to the author's preliminary researches, but may act as a spur to those readers interested in prose writers. Cairns clearly establishes that the individual poetic context is important in understanding aidos, and readers may remain sceptical about whether there is indeed nothing of interest in (for example) Xenophon's educational writings until they have been invited to consider it. More prose contexts might also have obviated the charge that an understanding of aidos based on sophisticated poetic texts and on the great philosophers may give an unreal view.

Cairns's study of the concept of aidos is nevertheless an impressive achievement. The Introduction offers a general definition of aidos as: 'an inhibitory emotion based on sensitivity to and protection of one's self-image' and discusses the nature and theory of emotion, the connexion of aidos with honour, and the alleged distinction between shame and guilt and between shame and guilt cultures. Abundant reference is made to philosophical, psychological and anthropological scholarship outside classics and the major thesis of the book is stated, that the shame/guilt antithesis is invalid, that there is no case for distinguishing between motives that spring from regard for the good opinion of others and from self-regard, and that aidos is not reducible to cold calculation of the consequences of a behaviour, but involves internalised as well as external standards and pressures. The author seeks to pursue instead (p.47) 'a more detailed appreciation of the differences (as well as the similarities) in the
ways in which we and the Greeks construct our experience, and of the structural differences that lie behind them.' The strength of the book is indeed that it offers a complex view of what might have appeared a simple notion. The chronological scope and the range of authors and genres and individual passages examined ensure this complexity, and the author's own readings and commendable caution in not coming to simple conclusions also tend in this direction. The study is not restricted to *aidos* and its cognate forms either, but extends to other cognate concepts (e.g. *nemesis, aischos, aischron, aeikes, elenchos*), and due account is taken of changing linguistic usage.

The main study begins with Homer, proceeds through selected poets such as Hesiod, Theognis and Pindar, thence to Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, and finally to selected sophists and philosophers, Plato and Aristotle. It is impossible to do justice here to the full 474 pages of discussion, but pp.68ff. on *aidos* in battle gives a good indication of what readers might expect. Adkins sets the agenda and the question is whether *aidos* is related to competitive or co-operative behaviours, calculated rational or instinctive emotional motivation, and whether it springs from external or internal pressure. Cairns argues for complexity. He establishes from examples that *aidos* is indeed related to an assessment of how a certain behaviour will appear to others, but is frequently a force for social cohesion. Various passages follow in which different relative views emerge of the external pressure, for example when Diomedes fears what his enemy Hector will say if he flees, even though Hector has the favour of Zeus, and Nestor tries to dissuade him from this extreme sense of *aidos*—no-one will believe Hector when he says such things. Diomedes is operating from emotional instinct rather than calculation, and his youth may also make his *aidos* atypical. Context, character and circumstance therefore complicate the 'message' of the text. Diomedes is indeed subject to external standards, but Cairns argues here that his concern for what others might say presupposes an internalised self-image which he hopes that others will share. There follow examples in which characters consider ignoring the external 'look' of their actions and acting according to their own judgement, though in the end they bow to external pressure. Cairns uses such passages to prove that intentions are at least worthy of consideration in certain circumstances. There is indeed a complex plurality of susceptibilities to *aidos*, as Diomedes and Nestor have already shown. Paris ignores the taunts of Hector and contents himself with his own interpretation of his actions. Hector further complicates the simple notion of bowing to popular opinion when he suggests later that 'reasonable' people will grant Paris his bravery in spite of his present
inaction, which assumes different standards of external judgements between reasonable and unreasonable men. Cairns ends the section by emphasising that though results matter more than intentions, this is not the product of psychological inability to consider intentions, but a consequence of the 'personal and emotional character of the situations' in which the heroes find themselves. The epic context is indeed a particular complicating factor, and modern comparisons may not always be helpful. Hector is the most reflective of the heroes in this regard, and the complete agreement between his *aides* and his *thymos* in the famous episode with Andromache is taken as an indication that he at least has internalised the external pressure.

The subsequent discussion of *aides* emphasises change as well as continuity. The section on the poets down to the fifth century shows awareness of the difficulties of comparing Homeric notions with those expressed in these other genres. The more personal nature of the poetry, the fragmentation, the individuality of the voices, the different social and literary contexts, and perhaps the greater degree of realism all complicate any simple notion of the chronological development of the concept. The discussion of *aides* in Hesiod highlights the importance of context, in this case the application of the advice to Perses. Significant passages are found in the Homeric Hymns and Callinus. Tyrtaeus proves largely traditional even though the invention of the polis offers a different context for *aides*. Solon keeps his own 'conscience' over against popular opinion well before Socrates. Theognis makes *aides* central to a coherent view of goodness. The mainstream lyric poets are not much mentioned—presumably with good reason.

The treatment of *aides* in the tragedians takes the discussion beyond individual passages and continues to focus on what is new. Aeschylus' *Supplices* and Sophocles' *Ajax, Electra and Philoctetes* see *aides* in operation over whole plays. Cairns admits that the word *aides* does not actually occur in *Philoctetes*, but he makes a good case out of cognate terms. Sophocles emphasises conflict between different or partial views of *aides*, while Euripides presents it at work in its philosophical and educational and sexual context. The shift from *aides* as prospective inhibition of a future action to retrospective guilt about a past action emerges particularly in Euripides, and his language reflects the development toward an internalised 'conscience'.

*Aides* in its sophistic/philosophical context and the idea of 'conscience' are pursued in the final chapter through the works of
Antiphon, Aristophanes and Protagoras. Surprisingly, Democritus offers 'the most sophisticated analysis of the essential operation of *aidos* offered by any classical thinker'. Plato and Aristotle demonstrate the complexity of the concept, but do not offer systematic accounts of it. Aristotle indeed 'gives the impression of a great intellect grappling with a popular concept whose complexity resists easy absorption into an Aristotelian framework'.

The book in summary conveys a complex impression of an important concept and its operations over a range of authors and contexts, and offers readings of passages and whole works which will need to be taken into account in future discussions.
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Every now and then a book comes along that immediately stamps itself as a classic in the area of Greek and/or Roman literature. One thinks, *inter alia*, of G. Williams' *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (1968) and F. Cairns' *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (1972). Feeney's long and stimulating book has all the hallmarks of such a book.

An introduction and first chapter ('The Critics') examine how ancient critics read the gods and the attitudes of critics and poets to fiction. Two arguments are the focus of his first chapter: first, the classical tradition embraces both poets and critics and the depiction of the gods by post-Homeric epicists was part of an intellectually diverse response to earlier poetry; secondly, the representation of the divine in epic poetry is a