(pp. 32–3)? W.'s repeated dismissal of considering 'anterior' identities seems doctrinaire. The Greeks had many ways other than literature of constructing their identities, some of which W. notes (p. 37), to which should be added sculpture, food, entourages, clothes, hairstyles, and gesture. Not all of these were always left at the door of 'sophistic space'. Many might consider that it is keenly interesting to see how speakers/writers (re)invent their identity in performance by playing with their audience's previous impressions. W., of course, is right that texts from the Second Sophistic often are sophistic, elusive, ludic, self-ironizing, and so on, but that does not have to mean that they are all like that all the time. More importantly, they can be like that and have serious points to make which go beyond the self-fashioning of the author. The Cynic strategy of *Spoudaiogeloion*, comic-seriousness, was well known in the Second Sophistic, and frequently employed by W.'s chief witness Dio of Prusa.

Does this book live up to its early reviews? When zipping along with its clever close readings and its drawing out of literary allusions, it comes close. But in its repetitive introduction, the narrowness of its coverage, and its restricted and unconvincing methodology it falls far short. Lacking on one side Aelius Aristides and on the other much about the Roman empire, it comes across as Hamlet without the prince or much of Denmark.

Lincoln College, Oxford HARRY SIDEBOTTOM
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni050

ACHILLES TATIUS

T. WHITMARSH: *Achilles Tatius:* Leucippe and Clitophon. Translated with notes. Introduction by H. Morales. Pp. xl + 164. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-19-815289-2.

As the translator of an individual Greek novel, W. needs to ask himself one question: 'Why should anyone read or buy this rather than B. P. Reardon's *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley, 1989)?' W., in his note on the translation, tackles this head on by remarking that Winkler, the translator of *Leucippe and Clitophon* in Reardon (1989), 'allows himself a very free rein' and by stating that 'this translation has a different set of aims'. Nevertheless, W. proceeds to deny that 'it lays claim to greater "accuracy" ' and that 'the present translation does not claim to be "closer" to the original'. However, W. simultaneously seems to argue in not so many words that this is what his translation does, and in my opinion it is precisely what it should be doing and in fact does do. For W. has produced a readable and faithful rendering of Achilles Tatius' occasionally tortuous Greek and I should not hesitate to refer a student of the Greek novel to his translation over that of Winkler, although I might send a curious friend to the more modern sensibilities of the latter. If I have one complaint, it is that W. can sometimes be guilty of translations which interpret the Greek more than is necessary. For instance, ἅτε δὲ ὢν ἐρωτικὸς (1.2.1) is rendered as 'being myself under the influence of Eros', which makes it sound as if the anonymous narrator is in love (which he may be), but which in the context (of looking at a picture with an erotic theme) seems to imply that he is interested in erotic things (and hence will be eager to listen to Clitophon's narration). Another example occurs at 1.2.3, where the translation of πάντως δὲ ὁ τοιοῦτος τόπος ἡδὺς καὶ μύθων ἄξιος ἐρωτικῶν as 'A setting such as this is delightful, and just right for erotic fiction' goes too far in determining the meaning of μύθων (what's wrong with 'story'?), and at any rate is

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni051 Published online by Cambridge University Press

misleading, since Cleitophon has just protested that τὰ . . . ἐμὰ μύθοις ἔοικε (1.2.2), where μύθοις must imply unbelievability, but with the assertion that what happened to him is actually true. The narrator would surely not then ignore this and so must be referring to the nature of the contents rather than their truth-content. There are one or two mistakes: at the end of 1.12 W. suggests that Charicles has fallen in front of his horse, whereas he has been knocked off backwards by the branches of a tree; 5.13.4 is surely best understood as referring to the same process twice in different words, for W.'s translation makes no sense of τὴν ἐρωτικὴν . . . καρδίαν if the flow of beauty is returning to its source and finding 'the desirous heart' there rather than finding it in the smitten observer; in 5.18 and 7.1 'Sosthenes' should be read instead of 'Sostratus'; and in the useful and thorough notes, which cover mythological and literary allusions and matters of historical fact and literary interest, the first note to 7.12 should read '2.2.5' rather than '1.25'.

In her introduction M. provides a survey of the major questions that surround this novel, including its place within the Greek novel genre, its readership, the author and his date, its geography, style, digressiveness, characterization, and sexuality. Most of this will be familiar to the specialist, but it should prove invaluable to the student. There are one or two sections which do provide food for thought, though: 'A Phoenician Tale' stresses the novel's Phoenician elements which can sometimes be overlooked as merely part of the usual jaunt around the Mediterranean which the *Liebespaar* undergo; and 'Platonic Pastiche' draws attention with excessive, and no doubt necessary, brevity to the engagement of this work with the Platonic corpus (references to the 'Explanatory Notes' might have been helpful). There are several mistakes: on p. xvi the 'Nile's duplicity' at 4.12 is mentioned, whereas the text explicitly denies this ('the Nile never cheats'); towards the bottom of p. xvi 'Achilles Tatius and the other five' should read '. . . and the other four'; on p. xxviii Charmides is referred to as 'the pirate chief' when he is a general; at the bottom of p. xxix the 'intervention of the goddess Isis' is mentioned—for 'Isis' read 'Artemis'. In addition, W. and M. provide a 'Select Bibliography', a 'Chronology of the Ancient Novel', and a map of 'The World of *Leucippe and Clitophon*'. There is also a glossary of 'prominent' names, although its usefulness is at points doubtful: what is the significance of Clitophon being 'the name of the subject of a Platonic . . . dialogue'? Is it really being suggested that it is significant that Theophilus, a very minor character, shares his name with the Athenian comic poet? And why omit Zeno, who plays a much larger part and whose name might have more obvious and potentially interesting associations? It is a shame that such a good translation and useful volume overall should finish on so flat a note.

University of Wales, Lampeter I. D. REPATH
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni051

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE NOVEL

S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, W. Keulen (edd.): *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*. (*Mnemosyne* Supplementum 241.) Pp. xx + 489. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003. Cased, €80, US$93. ISBN: 90-04-12999-5.

This work consists of thirty papers selected from over 100 presented at the third

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni051 Published online by Cambridge University Press