suggested by Dübner) remains a possibility, although V. also suggests reworking by an early imitator. He advocates the texts of such variants be printed in parallel, to avoid the possibility of consigning a genuine text by Babrius to the apparatus.

Although V. commends the Teubner edition by La Penna and Luzzatto as the standard text which he only supplements, the main focus of his criticism is in fact the work of Luzzatto, who edited Prologue I and fables 1–80, but was also responsible for the entire apparatus. As V. acknowledges, her apparatus is 'full and complete' and 'on the whole accurate' (p. vii), but he often criticizes her overreliance on the Athoan Codex (A), her judgement about transmitted readings, and her emendations. In addition, La Penna–Luzzatto worked from photographic images, and V.'s autopsy sometimes leads to a truer report, often confirming Crusius. For instance, in *Fab.* 70.3 he reports the reading *μόνην* under erasure in A, as reported by Crusius but omitted from the Teubner apparatus, and he shows that in *Fab.* 115.12 Luzzatto's alternate *ἀστέρων* is based on a misreading of the erasure in A so that *πτερῶν* should be retained. Only in a few instances did it seem to me that Luzzatto's text deserves more consideration than V. gives it. Her conjecture at *Fab.* 12.10, on Procne and Philomela, to read *αἳ παρθένοι γ' οὐ χωρὶς ἦμεν ἀλλήλων* (involving more minor changes than V. suggests) adds an appropriate emotional element and makes sense of the line; I would prefer it to V.'s brackets indicating interpolation. Nor does it seem likely that he is right to retain the transmitted reading *αὐτόν* as the subject of the infinitive *βοηθεῖν* in *Fab.* 20.3 against Fix's conjecture *αὐτός*, an intensive pronoun with another verb accepted by Crusius, Perry, and La Penna–Luzzatto, since *βοηθεῖν* implies help from another rather than self-help. But these are mere quibbles, and overall V.'s work provides a valuable check on the readings in earlier editions and convincing suggestions for improvements.

Despite the complexity of the topic, V.'s discussion is remarkably clear and readable. He helpfully summarizes each fable and quotes enough of the text in question that the reader does not need constant reference to a full edition. Obviously based on years of careful work, his study is in the nature of a prolegomenon to a new edition, and we can only hope that he will provide us with such. In the meantime, scholars will have to supplement the apparatus in La Penna–Luzzatto with his corrections, and read their text against his arguments for change, plausible variant traditions, and deletions.

University of Cincinnati KATHRYN GUTZWILLER

DE DEA SYRIA

J. L. LIGHTFOOT: *Lucian:* On the Syrian Goddess. *Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary.* Pp. xx + 606, maps, ills. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Cased, £80. ISBN: 0-19-925138-X.

Among the numerous writings transmitted under Lucian's name, *De Dea Syria* is something special. It is written not in the classicizing Attic that Lucian commands so brilliantly, but in a would-be Ionian which sounds charming and quaint at the same time; nor does it handle its theme in the witty and often caustic style which is Lucian's hallmark, but in a more detached mode, in which narrative naivety, seemingly earnest reasoning, and subtle irony peculiarly mingle in ever-changing degrees. With the appearance of Lightfoot's book, the work can claim one more distinction: it has

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.343 Published online by Cambridge University Press

provoked the writing of one of the best commentaries on a piece of Imperial Greek literature currently available.

The book's extensive introduction first presents the 'Anatomy of a Deity' (pp. 1–85), developing the fullest picture ever attempted of the goddess at the centre of the religious place on which the work focuses. Already here the characteristics of L.'s handling of her task become clear: she tries to gather the evidence as completely as possible and does not shirk difficult questions, even though they cannot always be satisfactorily answered; this, however, is a fault not of L.'s, but of the frequently equivocal and lacunose material she has to deal with. She nevertheless succeeds very well in acquainting the reader with the unfamiliar world of Near-Eastern goddesses (the 'Dea Syria' Atargatis and her numerous relations) within the context of Greco-Roman antiquity, and with the thorny questions of whether and how much they mutually influenced or assimilated each other.

The second substantial part of the introduction, fittingly titled 'Anatomy of *De Dea Syria*' (pp. 86–221), opens with a short but lucidly written section on 'Genre' (reaching the conclusion that *De Dea Syria* 'can be seen as a Hellenistic *Fachschrift* masquerading in the language and style of classical Ionian logography: content and form do not coincide', p. 90); then L. turns to the language of the treatise and provides the reader with an excellent survey of Imperial literature written in (pseudo-)Ionic ('Pseudo-Ionism', pp. 91–7) and a detailed presentation of all the features of the special form of Ionic exhibited in *De Dea Syria* (pp. 97–142); an interesting by-product of this painstaking review is that this language has many features in common (more, in fact, than with any other pseudo-Ionic work) with the shorter treatise *De astrologia*, which—though being a part of the Lucianic corpus as well—is commonly regarded as not by Lucian (on the implications of this see more below). The section on 'Sentence-structure and Style' (pp. 142–58) brings out well the many borrowings from Herodotean style, enriched with certain rhetorical, even Gorgianic, devices absent from Herodotus himself. Commenting on the 'Structure of the Treatise' (pp. 158–61), L. concludes that 'the author has adapted a pre-existing form available for the description of nations, used in Herodotus and in post-Herodotean ethnography, to the description of a temple' (p. 159). In 'The Personality of a Periegete' (pp. 161–74), L. adapts C. Dewald's distinction (*Arethusa* 20 [1987], 147–70) of three components within the authorial personality of Herodotus (i.e. the narrator, the investigator, and the critic) and finds all three components (with certain nuances) in the author of *De Dea Syria* as well. In the subsequent section, 'Characterising the Foreign' (pp. 174–84), L. discusses the depiction of 'un-Greek' features in *De Dea Syria* and again discovers remarkable similarities with Herodotean procedures, but also some interesting differences (e.g. the fact that in §32 Atargatis is not simply identified with Hera, but at least partially with other Greek goddesses as well), concluding: 'Herodotus provided the author with the tools; but what he wrought with them is still an extraordinary achievement, part appreciation, part deformation, of the Holy City of Hierapolis . . . no other Greek author ever tried to do a thing like this' (p. 183).

After these sections on language, style, and authorial self-presentation, we are finally ready for the tantalizing question of authorship (pp. 184–208). L. lucidly sketches the history of this debate, at the same time giving the principal reasons why scholars doubted or denied that *De Dea Syria* had been written by Lucian: for the doubters, the treatise seemed to exhibit an attitude towards religion all too alien from Lucian's usual pronouncements (this is still the basic position of the most recent attacks on his authorship, with which L. ably deals on pp. 200–4); on the other side, the 'defenders' could 'save' the work for Lucian only by claiming that it was nothing but an

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.343 Published online by Cambridge University Press

elaborate satire, thus sacrificing all documentary value the work might possess for insights into the status of Near-Eastern religions in Imperial Roman times. L.'s response to this dilemma is mainly twofold: First, she amply and convincingly demonstrates that there are so many substantial correspondences between *De Dea Syria* and other writings of Lucian that the only plausible conclusion to be drawn from this is that the work was indeed written by Lucian (p. 189–96). Again, many similarities emerge with *De astrologia* (see above), and L. therefore unhesitatingly concludes that this treatise must also have been written by Lucian, which now seems a distinct possibility.[1] Secondly, she persuasively maintains that Lucian was surely capable of writing in more than just one (satirical) mode: 'We have no right to demand absolute uniformity of outlook from Lucian's works; . . . if the text seems untypical of his more outspoken attitudes elsewhere, then the ethnographical genre and imitation of Herodotus are in very large part responsible' (pp. 199–200). Lucian was indeed a great admirer of Herodotus' style (L. draws attention to Lucian's praise of Herodotus in the *prolalia* thus entitled [p. 197]; she might have pointed as well to another *prolalia* entitled *De Dipsadibus*, which can in some respects also be regarded as a piece of Herodotean writing, though not in Ionic) and a very capable imitator of a wide range of styles, as L. rightly points out (p. 196). In the final part of her defence of Lucian's authorship L. points toward the reason why Lucian might have written such a piece which escapes one-sided classification: by presenting himself as a Herodotean narrator/author he could excellently show how successfully he had made himself at home in the world of Greek *paideia*, while by choosing such a peculiar subject he could also draw attention to the rich cultural and religious heritage of the region in which he himself had his origins (on Lucian's ambivalent stance toward these origins, see L.'s remarks on pp. 205–7).

In the final section of this long chapter L. herself pronounces on the 'Evidential Value' of our text (pp. 209–21). Between the extremes of taking everything Lucian says at face value and not believing a single thing in it, she very sensibly keeps to a middle ground, stressing that 'only a complex reading can suffice for this most complex text', because it is an 'indissoluble mixture . . . of informativeness and literariness' (p. 221). This seems indeed the best approach to tackle the many questions raised by *De Dea Syria*: Lucian presents many things that were indeed there, but he presents them very often in a deeply 'Herodotized' (and thus distorted) manner.

In the last part of the introduction ('Text'), L. gives a clear account of all the manuscripts containing *De Dea Syria* (pp. 222–35), looks at the lacunae extant in the tradition (and variously filled by some manuscripts; pp. 235–6), and considers the value of the corrections made by Arethas in the text of manuscript E (pp. 236–8). There follow a stemma (only for *De Dea Syria*, not for all of Lucian) on p. 239, a survey of preceding editions (pp. 239–42), and remarks on her own editorial principles (pp. 242–3).

The text, 'based on fresh collations of all important witnesses' (p. 222), differs substantially from Macleod's in nineteen places (not counting the different treatment

[1] *De astrologia* would certainly merit a study of its own. In two other cases I do not agree with L.'s view of Lucianic authorship: she regards (without giving reasons) the *Asinus* as a genuine part of Lucian's *oeuvre*, but why should we believe that Lucian either wrote the certainly considerably longer original of this epitome or the epitome itself? There is no evidence that he ever tried something like a full-blown romance; nor is the *Asinus*' language Lucian's carefully wrought literary Attic. On p. 156 n. 309 she also seems to regard the *Demosthenis encomium* as Lucianic, which is at least highly doubtful.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.343 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of *ν* ephelkystic and of anaphoric *σφεων*, *σφισι*, *σφεας* as enclitics; see p. 123). In §§25 and 28 she supplies the lacunae retained by Macleod with supplements already provided by correctors of G and Arethas (while, like Macleod, she retains the lacuna in §17). In the other thirteen places she accepts conjectures (four of which did not yet exist when Macleod edited *De Dea Syria*): §6 (p. 250, 13) *θωϊή* Holford-Strevens; §12 (p. 254, 1) <*παιδῶν*> *γυναῖκας* West; §18 (p. 258, 11) *σε* Bekker; ibid. (p. 256, 14) *προξενέειν* Koen; §20 (p. 260, 12) *ἀπωθήσομαι* Naber; §23 (p. 262, 15) *λελήθεεν* Bekker; §25 (p. 264, 12) *αὐτόθεν* Holford-Strevens; §28 (p. 266, 17) *καὶ ἀγαθὰ συναπάσῃ* Reitz; §32 (p. 270, 12) *ἐσορέῃ* Du Soul (Solanus); §49 (p. 276, 16) *ἱστᾶσι* Bekker; §50 (p. 276, 25) *ἀλλήλων* Holford-Strevens; §57 (p. 280, 5) *εὐωχέεται* Koen; §60 (p. 280,15) *τιν'* Fritzsche; in §7 (p. 250, 21) she follows Russell's and West's suggestion and deletes *Βυβλίνην*, in §16 (p. 256, 17) she deletes *τὸ* (before *ἐμοί*), in §29 (p. 268, 9) she omits *ἐς* before *μέγα*, and in §60 (p. 280, 17) she obelizes *τοῖσι δὲ νέοισι*. Most of these changes are convincing, all of them plausible.

The English translation usually conveys the sense of the Greek accurately; it does not try to render the quaint note of the Pseudo-Ionic dialect (as Harmon did, to whose translation L.—somewhat harshly—attributes a 'virtuosic unreadability'; others, though, might find it rather charming). In numerous places this translation is a marked improvement on her predecessors, mainly because of L.'s better understanding of the text itself.

In a few places one may disagree with L.'s rendering: On pp. 255/257 top (§15) the division between subordinate and main clause seems to be wrongly placed (it should be 'For when Rhea castrated him, he ceased to live as a man, assumed female form and donned women's clothes'); on p. 257 bottom (§17) the rendering 'when disaster struck' of *ὡς . . . μιν ἡ συμφορὴ κατέλαβεν* is at least misleading (cf. Harmon: 'whan the infortune oppressed him'); on p. 264 (§24) *θεὸν* is not 'god' but 'goddess', as the following relative pronoun (*τῆς*) shows; on p. 271 (§32) Harmon's rendering ('and if thou remeve thee, hir regard folweth thee') of *καὶ μεταβαίνοντι τὸ βλέμμα ἀκολουθέει* seems more accurate than L.'s ('it . . . and follows your gaze as you move'); ibid. (§33) *ἐς κομιδὴν τοῦ εἶπον ὕδατος* is simply 'to fetch the water of which I have spoken', not 'to fetch the water in the way I have described'; on p. 273 (§39) *οἱ* is 'her' (just Semiramis), not 'them' (cf. Harmon); on p. 277 (§50) the parenthesis 'crowds of galli and the sacred persons . . .' seems to be wrong, because these two groups (introduced by *δέ*) are not the same as the *πλῆθος* mentioned before (introduced by *μέν*) and probably identical with the many spectators mentioned in §51. Ibid. (§51): the sentence *καταλέξω δὲ καὶ τὰ ποιέουσιν* is left untranslated.

After text and translation, an ample commentary (pp. 287–536) provides such a wealth of linguistic and factual information that it really leaves nothing to be desired. I did not manage to find even one serious point to quibble with. I found only very few things to add: p. 328 (§8): for *μυθέομαι* see also the famous fr. 1 of Hecataeus; p. 353 n. 7: for Conon's tale about Semiramis see now M. K. Brown, *The Narratives of Konon* (Munich and Leipzig, 2002), pp. 97–102; p. 409: an unequivocal Homeric example for *λίσσεσθαι* with *γούνων* (not provided by L.) would be *Il.* 9.451. Even those who might only want to consult this commentary on a few points will quickly discover what a goldmine it is. There is no space here to go into greater detail; I will just single out L.'s excellent treatment (p. 523–8) of what is done with the children in §58.

There follow two appendices ('On the Syrian Goddess's Titles and Epithets in Greek and Latin Inscriptions and Papyri', pp. 537–9; and on the mysterious *Σημήιον* of §33, pp. 540–7), three maps, an extensive bibliography (p. 552–66), and four indexes (of passages cited; of Greek words; of Semitic words; and a general index); the last of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.343 Published online by Cambridge University Press

these (pp. 583–606) in particular will help the reader enormously to discover the wealth of this exceptionally rich book.

The book's production is well-nigh flawless; there are not many misprints (p. 40, second para.: supply 'the' before 'city's culture'; p. 49 n. 110: read 'Dihle' instead of 'Dihke'; p. 63, second para.: read 'possibilities' instead of '-tes'; p. 138, second para.: read 'identified' instead of '-fed'; p. 142, first para.: read ἔρσεν- instead of ἔρασν-; p. 185, second para.: insert 'as' before 'a piece' and read 'Leichtgläubigkeit' instead of '-glaub-'; p. 191 n. 476: read 'Wedemeyer' instead of 'Weder-' and note that the second part of the title is not 'und die Dea Syria' but 'und die Schrift 'Über die syrische Göttin''; p. 194 middle: read 'wachsenden' instead of 'wächs-'; p. 266 l. 18: wrong accent on ἀγαθὰ; p. 311 n. 32: read πανηγύρεις instead of -ριες; p. 320, first para.: read Araros (from -ώς) instead of -us; ibid., second para.: read 'Phoenician' instead of '-can'; p. 372, first para.: read 'dedication' instead of '-ction'; p. 406, first para.: read 'Stephens–Winkler' instead of '-ckler'; p. 426, last para.: 'Herodotean' has fallen out before 'phrases'; p. 517 n. 7: read 'Amphiaraus' instead of '-raeus'; p. 524 n. 4: read 'Whittaker' instead of '-cker') and even fewer factual errors (p. 71: read 'Pelias' instead of 'Peleus'; p. 98 n. 46: read '12' instead of '11'; p. 108: forms like γίνομαι can already be found in Alexis and are normal in many writings of Aristotle, i.e. in the fourth century B.C.; p. 368: it is not 'in the land beyond the western ocean' where 'Lucian' and his crew discover an alleged inscription of Heracles and Dionysus in *VH* 1.7, but on the first island within that ocean; p. 384 n. 1: read 'Candaules' instead of 'Cambyses').

One may hope that L.'s book will quickly become a model, and that other still neglected writings of Imperial Greek Literature will be made as excellently accessible as *De Dea Syria* now is.

Georg-August-Universität Göttingen HEINZ-GÜNTHER NESSELRATH

PLOTINUS ON EROS

A. PIGLER: *Plotin: une métaphysique de l'amour. L'amour comme structure du monde intelligible.* Pp. 299. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 2002. Paper, €32. ISBN: 2-7116-1577-4.

This monograph is a revised doctoral dissertation completed under the direction of Gilbert Dherbey at Paris-IV in 1999. Its central thesis is that Plotinus, though in most matters a self-consciously faithful exegete and interpreter of Plato, introduces a radically new conception of love (ἔρως). This new conception pervades—indeed, structures—his entire metaphysics. As a result, Plotinus is justly labeled a 'neo'-Platonist rather than the 'paleo'-Platonist he aspired to be. In the first three parts of the book (pp. 9–198), the author develops this thesis by means of a systematic consideration of the use of the concept of love in the central texts dealing with the three primary principles of Plotinus' metaphysics—the One itself, Intellect (νοῦς), and Soul (ψυχή). In the fourth part, she considers matter, as a principle of evil both at the cosmic and at the personal levels.

The core texts upon which Pigler bases her argument are found at 6.8 [39], Chapters 15 and 16, where Plotinus speaks of the first principle of all as 'itself love, object of love, and self-lover'. Since the One is absolutely perfect and simple, the remarkable implication of these passages is that Plotinus, against Plato, does not conceive of love

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.343 Published online by Cambridge University Press