The Classical Review
VOLUME 50 NO. 2

2000

ODYSSEUS' RETURNS

G. DANEK: *Epos und Zitat: Studien zu den Quellen der* Odyssee. (*Wiener Studien*, Beiheft 22.) Pp. viii + 526. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1998. Paper, DM 92. ISBN: 3-7001-2720-0.

The *Odyssey* is arguably the finest tale in Western literature, and the telling of it skilful in narrative detail and subtle in psychological understanding; yet it contains more apparent incoherences than the *Iliad.* These are not particularly familiar to English-speaking readers, as few Homerists of the analytical persuasion have written on the *Odyssey* in English. However, in Germany there has been a great deal of work, arguing that the *Odyssey* as we have it contains relics, echoes, or hints of other versions of the tale of Odysseus' return. Even Schadewaldt, who was convinced himself and convinced others of the unity of composition of the *Iliad*, thus effectively bringing an end to a century of German scholarship, was nevertheless driven to an analytical explanation of the *Odyssey*, specifying two successive composers. There have been other authoritative analysts in recent years, in addition to the old style analysis contemporary with that of the *Iliad*, of, for example, Kirchhoff, who influenced D. L. Page's *The Homeric Odyssey* (Oxford, 1955).

Georg Danek is a scholar at the University of Vienna, where Professor Hans Schwabl has continued the fine tradition of Albin Lesky. D. has been known up to now especially for his doctoral dissertation *Studien zur Dolonie* (published in 1988), in which he solved the problem of *Iliad* 10, or at least came as near to a solution as seems possible at this time (see *CR* 39 [1989], 178–80); he has now produced a huge book on the *Odyssey*, which may turn out to be just as important. His model is Kullmann's *Die Quellen der Ilias* (Wiesbaden, 1960), for he too is dealing with the material behind his epic; but his method is different. Almost the whole of the book, from p. 29 to p. 505, consists of a running commentary on the *Odyssey* book by book, discussing issues as they occur. He has read very widely, especially in the numerous contributions that have appeared in the last few decades. He is also, from proximity, extremely well informed about the South Slavic heroic poetry which has since Milman Parry acted as comparative literature to Homer, though his extensive bibliography surprisingly omits the final contributions of A. B. Lord in this field: *Epic Singers and Oral Tradition* (Ithaca, 1991) and *The Singer Resumes the Tale* (Ithaca, 1995).

Epos means the *Odyssey*, but also previous epic versions of Odysseus' return, and *Zitat* means, not verbal quotation, but a habit of the author to allude to ('cite') alternative versions, whether actual (i.e. known to him and in many cases to his audience also) or potential. D. considers it probable that in other tellings of the tale Odysseus and Penelope got together at an earlier stage than in our poem and together

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

planned vengeance on the Suitors, that Laertes elsewhere played a larger rôle than we see in the *Odyssey*, perhaps taking the place occupied for us by Eumaeus, that the false tales of Odysseus, involving Crete and Thesprotia, reflect other versions in which they were real, that Telemachus had on occasion included Crete in his itinerary (this on the strength of Zenodotus' readings at 1.93 and 285), that in other songs Odysseus arrived back in the nick of time, on the very day in spring when the Feast of Apollo fixed the adulthood of Telemachus and the immediate remarriage of Penelope. These and other alternative versions are (often casually) 'cited' in our text, thus occasioning uncertainty about the course of the story, and involving the instant making of key decisions especially by Odysseus—an explanation more acceptable than that of Marylin Katz (*Penelope's Renown* [Princeton, 1991], reviewed in *CR* 42 [1992], 250–2), who introduced the narratological concepts of 'indeterminacy' and 'deferral of closure'. In all of this D. is a convinced unitarian, seeing the poem as the uniform conception of a single mind.

In connection with the 'citation' of other versions he frequently uses the slightly cryptic phrase *Die Thematisierung von Alternativen* (e.g. in the title of his introductory chapter, pp. 7–23). What he seems to mean is the bringing in as topics ('themes', as in Lord's concept of 'Composition by Theme') alternative possibilities for the development of the story. In the quite common situations when a character, usually Odysseus, considers 'in his heart and mind' two alternative lines to follow (e.g. several times in the Circe episode) and then either chooses one of them or sometimes takes a third course, D. considers that the unselected procedures have thus been presented to Homer's audience, and in a way become topics; they may have appeared in other versions, or could potentially so appear, or finally may be 'impossible variants', which could not be realized without introducing unacceptable deviation.

A special case of apparent 'Zitat' has been much in the minds of German-speaking Homerists—the question of whether the *Odyssey* shows particular debts to the *Iliad.* For the most part D. is against this, seeing even the ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει complex (*Od.* 1.358, 11.352, 21.352) as a general reference to men's reaction to women in the oral tradition rather than specifically derived from Hector's words to Andromache at *Il.* 6.492. He summarizes the *Odyssey*'s view of the Trojan war as non-Iliadic: it sees the killing of Memnon, not Hector, as the greatest deed of Achilles, the rescue of Achilles' body as the greatest of Ajax, and the Agamemnon who talks to Achilles in 24 as the Agamemnon of the Trojan war, not the Agamemnon of the *Iliad.* On the other hand, the *Odyssey* poet knew the *Iliad:* Patroclus, not Antilochus, was Achilles' greatest friend; and Eurybates in 19.247 comes from *Il.* 2.184.

On the question how much of the *Odyssey* is new invention and how much comes from earlier versions, D. has a useful criterion: where the telling of a story contains all the detail needed for full understanding, it may be original composition by the poet; where it is allusive and assumes prior knowledge in the audience, it comes from his sources. Thus he can argue that the *Odyssey*'s hearers knew of Odysseus, Telemachus, Polyphemus, and the Suitors, but not of Calypso; that they knew of Autolycus, Odysseus' grandfather, but not of the scar and the boar-hunt.

There is a vast amount of discussion of almost all major issues in the narrative, though hardly ever of the small textual or linguistic problems which also worried the analysts; perhaps the latter only at 13.158. It may be of some interest to list the most extensive treatments:

1. Pp. 66–73 Penelope's web.
2. Pp. 142–50 The quarrel between Odysseus and Achilles referred to at 8.73–82. D.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

has the interesting suggestion that some extended version of the later stages of the war began with a dispute of this kind in the Greek army.

3. Pp. 165–70 The apparent duplication of the storm at 9.67–81. D. explains most precisely that the first storm (67–73) was the general one that affected almost all the Greek ships on their way home, for which the poet has a clear and chronological conception in his mind; the second (80–1) was just the usual inclement weather round Cape Malea.

4. Pp. 310–20 The removal of the weapons from the great hall.

5. Pp. 347–55 Penelope's appearance before the suitors in 18.158–303. This has become the most discussed difficulty in the *Odyssey*. How could Penelope behave in that way, and why was Odysseus secretly pleased? D. tells us that the episode suggests four possible motifs and that we are wrong to try to explain it simply in terms of Penelope's motivation in the tale that we have; she could be (a) cheating the Suitors; (b) desperately continuing her delaying tactics, if only for a short time; (c) planning their death in collusion with her husband; or (d) finally giving up her resistance. Each of these might be thematic in some other version of the tale. He makes the important point that 283 *νόος δέ οἱ ἄλλα μενοίνα*, the awareness of which explains Odysseus' satisfaction, does not mean that she was duping them, but that it was not her wish to remarry (cf. 2.92, 13.381 in the same context); thus (b) is the case in our Odyssey.

6. Pp. 374–82 The foot-washing scene. Here he makes the excellent point that, although the sequence almost leads to recognition by Penelope as well as Eurycleia, and after it Penelope even acts as if there has been recognition by setting up the contest of the bow, thus providing her husband with an opportunity and a weapon, nevertheless it would have been decidedly flat in the *Odyssey* situation to have her recognize him through the agency of a third party.

7. Pp. 465–76 Agamemnon's specification of what later became features of the cyclic *Aithiopis* in his speech to Achilles in the Underworld.

8. Pp. 478–84 Amphimedon's version of events.

In all this argument, based on the belief that the unitary poet of the *Odyssey* evokes material from other versions of the tale, there is some danger of overinterpretation. D. does not give the *Odyssey* poet much credit for artistic invention; if an alternative action is suggested, he too readily assumes the citation of another version. He is somewhat overinfluenced by the superficial cleverness of certain recent publications. He sometimes engages in unprofitable speculation. Nevertheless, this is an important book; and D. shows the same admirable qualities as in his work on the *Doloneia*—breadth of scholarship and independence of mind.

University College London M. M. WILLCOCK

HOMERIC STUDIES

J. M. FOLEY: *Homer's Traditional Art.* Pp. xviii + 363. Philadelphia: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999. Cased, $48.50. ISBN: 0-271-01870-4.

M. GIORDANO: *La supplica. Rituale, istituzione sociale e tema epico in Omero.* Pp. 253. Naples: A.I.O.N., Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1999. Paper.

Much of Foley's new book will be familiar to those who have read his earlier books

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and recent articles. For others, it is a fine introduction to his work. F. is the most faithful representative of the tradition of Parry and Lord. He is faithful, however, by innovating-within-tradition. Having abandoned the confining orthodoxy that viewed oral and written composition as mutually exclusive categories, F. calls Homeric epic 'oral-derived', whether composed-in-performance or not, and he emphasizes 'traditional' rather than 'oral'. He has also fruitfully turned oral theory away from the performer to include reception. With broad learning and common sense, he directly faces the task of trying to read oral-derived texts, with due attention to the ways in which they resemble and are different from written literature.

F. politely but firmly rebukes those who have dismissed the South Slavic analogy without trying to appreciate the tradition and its poems, let alone learning Serbo-Croatian; at the same time, he recognizes that the analogy has limits. His discussion of the parallels and differences is exemplary and everyone interested in Homer should know it.

The central concept throughout F.'s work is 'traditional referentiality'. This is clearest and most useful at the level of formula: many Homeric expressions have meaning beyond their denotation, because their traditional context is evoked whenever they occur. '*Υπόδρα ἰδών* says more than that a character glowered. Along these lines, F. argues that Penelope's infamous 'stout hand' at *Od.* 21.6 marks her action as heroic. A similar process applies to type-scenes and entire story-patterns. F. analyzes feast and lament to show how variation creates meaning (unsurprisingly), and then moves to large-scale story.

Not everything convinces. F. compares 'Homer' and South Slavic legendary singers; the comparison is very suggestive for 'Homer' as a biographical construct, but F. seems to think it says more than it does about the composer(s) of our poems. His use of the term *σῆμα* for traditional referentiality rests on an oversimplification of Homeric signs and obscures these more than it elucidates poetic techniques. He applies the Return pattern to argue that the *Odyssey* is not unusual either in incorporating so much of the story into first-person narrative, in the ambiguity of Penelope, or in the continuation after the reunion of Odysseus and Penelope. Inevitably, the parallels come from outside the Greek epic itself, and do not quite convince. The *Odyssey* is a Return Song, to be sure, but it seems to me that the poem invites attention to motive as South Slavic songs do not. However, the book is always readable and highly reasonable. Anyone who still thinks that oral theory is not central to understanding the epics as 'literature' needs to study this work.

Giordano examines supplications primarily within the epics themselves, but as social mechanism, not as poetic theme. (K. Crotty's *The Poetics of Supplication* [Ithaca, 1994], with its different concerns, is an interesting complement.) For G., supplication is an attempt to deflect aggression. Hospitality and supplicancy are alternative ways of managing outsiders. The suppliant takes a position of extreme inferiority relative to the supplicated, who becomes godlike. Its gestures have close animal parallels, but G. also argues for the importance of the verbal component. This has five essential parts: apostrophe, performative (explicit reference to the gestures and/or use of *ὑπέρ*), request, motive for consent, and benediction. G. also argues that persuasive rhetoric is not just a trivial accompaniment to a compelling ritual; the speeches of suppliants go far beyond the obligatory schema, and indeed show rhetorical self-consciousness. Battlefield supplication, G. convincingly argues, fails in the *Iliad* not because the ritual is inadequately performed (Lycaon is not killed, as J. Gould suggested at *JHS* 93 [1973], 80–1, because he gives up physical contact with Achilles), but because the warrior is not obliged to accept supplication, and his desire

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for vengeance is more powerful than pity. Nor is this kind of supplication secondary to an 'original' supplication at the hearth of a house; both types are equally authentic. The language with which the poet narrates supplication is more flexible than is other ritual language.

The greatest strengths of the book lie in the convincing discussion of the importance of rhetoric and in its insistence on the social nature of supplication—it is a human institution with divine authority. It makes a strong case that even the post-Homeric supplication at an altar or shrine is addressed to a human community. However, in trying to maintain a clear line between supplication and other requests or prayers the argument sometimes becomes incoherent. Though in places physical contact is said to be necessary for supplication, other passages imply that a performative may serve: Hector's dying plea (*Il.* 22.338–43) is apparently a supplication, although physical contact is not achieved, because the performative reference to Achilles' knees replaces such contact—even though the final chapter, on the lexicon of supplication, argues that there is no real allusion in the passage to touching the knees. Odysseus' request to Nausicaa is likewise a supplication (*Od.* 6.149–85). Thetis' request to Hephaestus (*Il.* 18.429–61), though, is not a supplication, although she speaks of coming to his knees, because she has a prior claim on him and is treated as a guest. So Chryses' attempt to ransom his daughter in *Iliad* 1 is not a supplication, and neither is the Embassy in 9. This somehow misses the point. Despite 'tema epico' in the title, the book has nothing to say of the literary functions of supplications or how the poet may have adapted social reality for his purposes. Even if Chryses' request is not a supplication, it is surely a parallel for Priam's supplication of Achilles in 24. Whatever the reality, within the epics supplicancy appears to belong within a continuum of forms of request that are not unambiguously distinct, but vary according to the relations of power and the rhetorical choice of the person in need. The book's emphasis on rhetoric does not go quite far enough.

Similarly, supplicancy may well be in origin a way of dealing with outsiders. If it is so significantly a matter of being an 'outsider', though, why does Thetis supplicate Zeus in *Iliad* 1, but is a guest in Hephaestus' house in 18? She would seem to have strong prior claims on each of them, and to be equally 'outside' in both situations. G. suggests that Thetis can supplicate Zeus because as a sea-deity she is not a full member of the Olympian group, and could perhaps argue that since Thetis once gave shelter to Hephaestus, her bond with him is closer. But it would surely be more productive to think of group membership more complexly: whether an individual is or is not a member of a particular community is often open to question. Thetis chooses to be an outsider in 1, and tells Zeus that he need have no fear in rejecting her request (who is the divine protector of someone who supplicates Zeus?), while the rejection will show that she is 'most dishonored'. Hephaestus, however, has nothing to lose by helping her, so she has no need to manipulate him in this way. Homeric characters are social actors, whose 'rules' are subject to manipulation.

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor RUTH SCODEL

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TRIBUTE TO MILMAN PARRY

F. LÉTOUBLON (ed.): *Hommage à Milman Parry. Le style formulaire de l'épopée Homérique et la théorie de l'oralité poétique.* Pp. vii + 419. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1997. Paper, Hfl. 180. ISBN: 90-5063-227-0.

This book contains the proceedings of a conference held in Grenoble. Its aim, as set out in the introduction (C. Calame, A. Hurst, F. Létoublon, pp. 1–8), is to review the work of Milman Parry and the influence it has had on modern Homeric scholarship, and to open up avenues for future research. Contributions are in English, French, and German, and they are divided by the editor into five sections: the first, entitled 'Milman Parry et les études Homériques', opens with a reassessment of Parry's relationship with his teacher Antoine Meillet (C. de Lamberterie, pp. 9–22) and then goes on to recapitulate, and develop further, some of the problems arising from his method. These include the meaning of tradition (J. Peradotto, pp. 23–31), the historical background of the Homeric language (C. Ruijgh, pp. 33–45; P. Wathelet, pp. 47–55), the process by which the Homeric text became fixed (G. Nagy, pp. 57–78), phenomena of repetition and word clusters (D. Bouvier, pp. 79–92; J. Hainsworth, pp. 93–103; T. Krischer, pp. 105–16), word order (J. García-Ramón, pp. 117–27), choices between alternative linguistic forms (E. Crespo, pp. 129–36), formula and narrative structure (F. Létoublon, pp. 137–46), and finally the artistic control of the traditional poet (L. Muellner, pp. 147–57). The second section, headed 'L'analyse des formules et de la métrique Homériques', contains studies of formulaic language in a more technical sense: E. Visser starts with a restatement of his theory of versification by single words (pp. 159–72). Other contributors treat of specific problems, such as the rearrangement of formulaic material in *Il.* 2.731 (N. Maurice-Guilleux, pp. 173–82), double accusative and formulaic language (B. Jacquinod, pp. 183–8), and the little understood phrase *Ἄργος . . . ἱππόβοτον* (P. Sauzeau, pp. 189–99). Section 3 is dedicated to 'the formulaic tradition after Homer' and opens with studies on the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (J. Foley, pp. 201–14), and on formulaic diction in archaic lyric (C. Calame, pp. 215–22). J. Bouffartigue and A. Hurst then turn to later antiquity with papers on Themistius' use of Homeric quotations (pp. 223–36) and Homeric hexameters in the *Codex of Visions* of the Bodleian library (pp. 237–50). Section 4 ventures into 'literary' terrain, asking in what ways Parry's findings can enhance the modern reader's appreciation of the texts. A. Kahane focuses on the place of vocatives in the Homeric hexameter (pp. 251–62), while R. Martin, N. Felson-Rubin, and I. de Jong (pp. 263–74, 283–92, and 293–302, respectively) study the effects of character language from different angles. In two more general papers, S. Schein discusses Parry's reading of Homeric poetry (pp. 275–81), while D. Pralon re-examines the representation of Homeric poetry within the poems themselves (pp. 303–15). Section 5 is left to non-classicists to reflect on what the work of Parry and his successors has meant to their discipline. This includes papers on formulaic language in French and German medieval narrative poetry (P. Walter, pp. 317–26; J. Haudry, pp. 327–36), on echoes of Homeric themes in the French Alps and the Caucasus region (C. Abry and A. Joisten, pp. 337–54; A. Christol, pp. 355–68), a paper on the language of West African epic (J. Derive, pp. 369–78), and finally an account of B. Bartók's collaboration with A. Lord (Y. Lenoir, pp. 379–96).

In many ways the collection is typical of its genre. On the positive side one should mention the wide range of interests, methods, and styles which the conference

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

format allows. Although designed to reinscribe French scholarship into the—by now American—mainstream of Homeric studies (hence the scarcity of relevant contributions from other countries), the collection does offer an interesting cross-section of current research in the field. Many of the papers are published here for the first time, and readers who do not expect a synthesizing vision will find much of interest. Some examples: de Lamberterie's essay on Parry in Paris usefully puts into context what is still too often seen as an act of creation *ex nihilo* (e.g. p. 15). Bouvier draws attention to interesting instances of formulaic recurrance, such as repeated uses of the adverb *πρῶτον/πρῶτα* (pp. 91f.). Not everyone will follow his views on the short- and long-term memory of Homeric bards (pp. 86f.), but the phenomenon itself is well described. In Section 3, Bouffartigue successfully challenges modern conceptions of what happens when late ancient orators quote Homer, concluding that 'the formulae in question do not adorn an already established text but themselves constitute the text' (p. 233); and in Section 4, Martin uses formulaic analysis to further our understanding of Homeric characters in an elegant and convincing way (e.g. pp. 270f. on Telemachus' use of formulaic language).

On the negative side we notice the familiar lack of reflexive focus. For example, one may think it remarkable that Section 4 (on Parry and literature) turns out to be dominated by American critics; yet, there is little sign of reflection on what that might mean. Similarly, the papers collected in Section 3 raise interesting questions: given the ever-increasing authority of Homeric poetry in Greek antiquity, when and how do we get to an era 'after Homer'? Or, if—thanks to Parry—'orality' has today become something of a heuristic master key to the Homeric texts, what is *not* 'oral' in Greek literature down to Themistius and beyond? Again, the reader will be disappointed to find critics from both sides of the Atlantic reluctant to take issue. On the whole, one gets the impression that here, as so often, the political stakes were rather too high to allow for much experimentation (despite the hunt for Polyphemus-stories in the woods of Savoy; one wonders whether a contribution on Middle Eastern material would not have been somewhat more relevant). Experienced readers of conference proceedings will excuse these shortcomings; and for those who hold out to the end there is as a reward Lenoir's thoroughly refreshing account of how the great musician-scholar Bartók paid *his* tribute to Milman Parry, transcribing and analysing much of the music Parry recorded in former Yugoslavia. The result, we are told, was uncompromising, sometimes idiosyncratic, but always inspired scholarship.

Girton College J. HAUBOLD

PUCCI'S POETICS

P. PUCCI: *The Song of the Sirens. Essays on Homer.* Pp. xiii + 251. Lanham, Boulder, New York, and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997. Paper, $21.95 (Cased, $52.50). ISBN: 0-8226-3059-1 (0-8226- 3058-3 hbk).

'Meaning', as Pietro Pucci suggests in the preface (p. x), 'emerges from the tension that organizes the linguistic artifact'. Like his other work, *Song of the Sirens* is essentially an attempt to expose this organizing tension and to understand its workings. The book contains ten essays on Homer and represents some of P.'s most

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

important work. Eight have been previously published (some in Italian). Two are completely new. Together the essays span almost twenty years (a splendidly Odyssean time-frame . . .) of his scholarship. Yet, as P. himself says in the preface, the critical concerns and ideas that have guided him have remained the same. The book is an intricate philological and historical study of heroic values and the poetics of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Its readings are anchored in the work of thinkers such as Nietzsche, Heidegger, De Man, and Derrida. Those who are familiar with anti-essentialist philosophies and find them useful will discover here an outstanding, indeed indispensable, contribution to our understanding of Homer. There are of course scholars who are not sympathetic to such approaches as hermeneutics, phenomenology, and deconstruction. These scholars will not like *Song of the Sirens*. But the debate with such scholars is a broad issue that belongs elsewhere. It is not about P. or about *Song of the Sirens* as such.

Many of the themes that have regularly occupied P.—polytropy, the Muses, epiphany, enchantment, *kleos*, to name only a few—are discussed and developed in this book. P.'s other book on Homer, *Odysseus Polytropos* (Ithaca, 1987), directed more of its critical efforts towards the *Odyssey* and its poetic perspective. The present volume places important emphasis on the *Iliad*, on Iliadic values, and on intertextual relations from the Iliadic perspective. Of course, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are inseparable intertexts, something which has always been made clear in P.'s writing, both in practice and as a matter of principle. We are thus taken through a complex, 'orchestral' maze of heroic and poetic codes. For example, P. concludes, after many pointed discussions, that *kleos* 'straddles a contradictory structure of both positive terms (compensation, immortality, and truth) and negative ones (mere repetition, with its passivity and valuelessness, frailty of the human being, voice, purpose, and mere rumor). It functions as the '"supplement" [in the Derridean sense of this term; A.K.] of Iliadic poetics' (p. 229). The *Odyssey* in turn questions and destabilizes Iliadic 'protocols' (as P. aptly calls them) of *kleos* and heroic action, resulting in a vast and sublime artefact that enacts a metaphysics of displacement. P. repeatedly (esp. pp. 229–30) and rightly qualifies this conclusion, stressing that we nevertheless often put aside Homer's bewildering, irreducible potential. We actively forget that 'heroic decisions are made by simplifications and cutting off alternatives'. Herein lies the essence of P.'s historicism: it is the acceptance of privileged protocols by Homeric characters and our own complicity with those protocols that shape Homeric poetry, or what he calls 'the formidable ideological engine whose success we all know' (p. 230). P. acknowledges that he too cuts off alternatives, that he cannot eject himself from history (see e.g. the caveat on p. xi). But precisely for this reason he is also very good at exposing the constraints of reading, readership, and textuality in Homer.

Theoretical perspectives aside, there are also many valuable pointed discussions in this volume. Chapter I considers the 'Iliadic' character of the Sirens, and the tensions and ironies of their presentation in the *Odyssey*. Chapter II argues that the proem of the *Odyssey*, through its formulaic diction, generates an excess of signification, and through the very same tightly regulated formulaic discourse, a deficiency of signification. Iterability of the formula 'both enhances the metaphysical intentionality of epic language and debunks it' (p. 21). Chapter III studies the language of the Muses, and especially the famous invocation in *Iliad* Book 2. Here P. concludes that the text reveals both the anxiety of repetition (memory, epos, *kleos*, etc.) and its vital, reassuring aspects. In Chapter IV P. deconstructs heroic motivation in the *Iliad*, and especially the hero's reasons for accepting his own death. In Sarpedon's speech to Glaukos (12.310–28) P. finds both an affirmation of the rightful position of kings

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and an awareness of the Lycians' suspicions about it. Sarpedon is thus a reader of the 'supplementarity' of the *Iliad*, and of *kleos* which 'intimates simultaneously and contradictorily the truthful and imperishable renown (*aphthiton kleos*) and the irresponsible, occasional rumor' (p. 65). The text, P. argues, reads itself and its own aporetic nature as 'writing' (this term is used again in its specific Derridean sense). P. stresses that this paradoxical reading nevertheless drives Sarpedon towards decisive, valiant acceptance of his own death. The textual analogy is clear: 'exposure of the power of the negative reveals how the text makes sense' (p. 68). In Chapter V P. considers divine epiphanies and 'textual epiphanies'. The bottom line here (literally) is that 'the text betrays its own textuality—the fact that it is always a text, a fiction, and not a cross-section of truth or reality' (p. 80). The discussion of epiphanies continues in Chapter VI, where P. identifies two broad Homeric strategies. The first, largely Iliadic, reduces the reader's sensation of the divine to a mere voice. The second, typically 'Odyssean', relies on revelation in disguise.

Reading details from scenes of epiphany in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, P. discusses the intertextual relations between the two poems. Chapter VII considers patterns of iteration in the laments of Briseis and Akhilleus over Patroklos in the *Iliad.* These are 'antiphonal' in that they respond to each other like elements in a complex musical piece. Chapter VIII examines the figures of Odysseus, the Cyclops, and the Phaeacians, as representations of 'self' and 'other'. P. exposes the contradictory rhetoric of Odysseus' narrative, which thus ceases to offer a simple dichotomy and precise epistemological definitions of 'civilized' and 'savage'. But again, P. is ever aware—and rightly!—of the fact that we as readers often cling to (false) epistemic certainties. Why should we be so stubborn? As P. (following known arguments by Nietzsche and others) says, in doing so we prefigure the coherence of our own existence (p. 128). Exposing the dissolution of epistemological schemata, P. stresses, is not a 'parlor game'. It is the means of exposing the prodigious epistemological complexity of texts, representations, language, and, ultimately, our existence. Chapter IX is a careful and detailed analysis of Odysseus as a narrator, of the discontinuity between his functions as narrator and 'plot-agent' and thus of the end of the (Iliadic) race of heroes. Chapter X is a summary of sorts. It is a moving, powerful discussion of honor and glory in the *Iliad.* P. sets up these two terms as the markers of incompatible Iliadic systems and poses some profound (and ultimately unanswerable) questions about Homeric poetry and its lessons.

P.'s prose style is not always of the 'John loves Mary' type. Mostly his rhetoric is an integral component of the argument. Those who feel that ideas are independent of discourse, or that simplicity of language is all, might as well give up complex Greek terms such as *kleos*, *aretê*, or *polytropos* in favor of unqualified translations such as 'fame', 'excellence', and, well . . . 'whatever' (to borrow a current colloquial favorite). Life would then be truly simple. I noticed some typos (e.g. p. 72, *ἦλθε δ᾽ Ἀθήνη* and *στῆ δ᾽ ὄπιθεν*), some missing apostrophes (e.g. pp. 115, 128, 129), and Horkheimer and Adorno's *Dialectic of Enlightenment* was missing a date in the bibliography, which, one hopes, will be corrected in the next edition. But let us separate the wheat from the chaff. P. is one of the most important post-structuralist critics working in Classics today. This collection of essays represents some of his best work, and is essential reading for all those who are interested in Homer.

Northwestern University A. KAHANE

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

EARLY GREEK POETRY

D. E. Gerber (ed., trans.): *Greek Iambic Poetry. From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC; Greek Elegiac Poetry. From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC.* (Loeb Classical Library 259; 528.) Pp. viii + 551 (Iambic); viii + 493 (Elegiac). Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1999. Cased, £12.95 each. ISBN: 0-674-99581-3; 0-674-99582-1.

David Campbell's five volumes of *Greek Lyric* (1982–93) are satisfactorily complemented by these two, which likewise replace old volumes by J. M. Edmonds. They contain most of what is in my *Iambi et Elegi* except for a few minor or fourth-century figures and poets already dealt with in Campbell's volumes—a sensible principle, though it has the disastrous consequence that the most important of all papyrus finds of early elegy, the new Simonides from P. Oxy. 3965, as it appeared just too late for Campbell, is missed altogether. The hexameters of Phocylides are included, but not the *Margites* (which, however, will appear with the Homeric Hymns, epic fragments, and Lives of Homer in a new volume commissioned from myself).

The most miserable papyrus scraps are omitted, but G. is quite generous with the only moderately miserable ones which yield disconnected words and phrases, if no continuous sense. He is also generous with critical apparatus and with citation of sometimes repetitive testimonia; intermittently too with annotations, which include some useful references to recent literature. The accounts of the poets in the introductions to the volumes, however, are perfunctory.

The edition breaks no new ground, but the texts are in general accurately printed. Errors deserving of note occur at Solon 13.14, where *ἐξ ὀλίγου* must have been intended; Euenus 9a, the words 'e Simplicio infra citato', taken over from Gentili–Prato, here have no reference; Archil. test. 3.44 should read *εἰρημένον*, test. 24 *οἱ Λυκαμβίδαι*, and fr. 45 *ἀπέφλυσαν*; 189, Wilamowitz's correction was *ἐγχέλυς*; 196a.31 should read *ἄπεχε*, [328]. 9 *ἐκροφοῦντες*, and Sem. 12 *σπλάγχν'*.

The aim of the translations, as stated in both prefaces, is 'to provide an English rendering which represents the Greek as closely as possible without being stilted or ambiguous'. It is certainly faithful, though stiltedness is not always successfully avoided. Pronominal *ὃ μέν* or *ὃ δέ* followed by a participle tends to be mistaken for the article (Solon 13.67–9, 36.10–13, Sem. 7.117), and *ὅτε* (*ἄν*) + subj. tends to be mechanically rendered by 'whenever' (Phocyl. 9, Sem. 1.17, al.). I do not begrudge G. his numerous borrowings of words, phrases, and whole lines from my own translations (*Greek Lyric Poetry* [Oxford, 1993]), but he might have cited the title somewhere.

In prose sources such as grammarians, where no translations are available, he sometimes goes astray. At Mimn. 21, *ξένως* means 'outside Sophocles'; Solon 30a, *ἐν ταῖς ἐπιγραφομέναις Ἐλεγείαις* does not mean 'in the elegies ascribed to him' but 'in the book entitled *Elegies*'; 43, *ὑπτία* means 'flat'; Critias test. 2, *τὰ φερόμενα συγγράμματα* means 'the writings that are current'; test. 3, *καθ' ἑαυτόν* means 'in his own time', and *τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους* is not predicative; Adesp. eleg. 20, *per hemistichium* = 'by the hemistich'; Archil. 34, Apollonius Dyscolus is wholly misunderstood; 88 *ἐπὶ τῶν θερμῶν ὑποθέσεων* means 'for fervid subjects'; 303 Eustratius misunderstood; 324 (p. 284), *κόμμα* is 'word-group', not 'coinage'; Sem. 10a, not 'now *κομᾶν* has the meaning of *κουριᾶν*' but 'what we now call *κομᾶν* they called *κουριᾶν*'; Hippon. 66, *ὑποτακτικὰ μόρια* are subordinating conjunctions,

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and Tzetzes is saying that the Ionians sometimes used these without a subjunctive following; 114a, ἐπάγει is 'adds', not 'concludes'; 118A.3, ὦι λοιδορεῖται is 'the man he is abusing'; Adesp. iamb. 36, Plutarch mistranslated.

Occasionally more up-to-date editions should have been cited: Kindstrand for Ps.-Plutarch on Homer (Archil. 131); Lasserre–Livadaras for Et. Gen. α–β (Archil. 230, al.); Rispoli for Philod. *De musica* 1 (Archil. 253); Lolos for Tzetzes' *Iliad* exegesis (Hippon. 65, 70). Perhaps not all of these have yet reached Western Ontario.

Other points (elegy volume): p. 4, Alcman probably lived a good generation after Tyrtaeus rather than being 'roughly contemporary'. Tyrt. 11.2, the slanting neck is that of the slave (cf. Thgn. 536). 11.17, Tyrtaeus certainly had no aversion to spearing a fleeing enemy in the back. Solon 4.7, not a new sentence but an added subject to the preceding one. Lines 17–25 are I think all gnomic, not reportage. 15.3 (= Thgn. 317), 'quality' would be preferable to 'virtue'. 21, read 'what Solon appended to what he said'; delete the footnote. 34.7, μάτην is 'wantonly'. 39, some confusion between 'a mortar' and 'mortar'. 43, more likely from a hexameter than a pentameter. Theognis, p. 167, read 'of which O and *p* are copies' and 'of which XDUrI are copies'. 25, the reading of the ostracon, ουν for ὁ, should be noted and probably adopted. 42, τετράφαται means 'are oriented'. 323, 'by <believing>'. 328 '<only> the gods'. 682, κακόν is indefensible. 733, θυμῶι is the sinners' heart, not the gods'. 832 γνώμη is 'decision for', not 'awareness of'. 925 προκαμών is 'dying prematurely'. 1160a, for my ὠνέο σοι cf. Nonn. *D.* 8.50. 1203, the first sentence is about conviviality, not funerals. Dion. Chalc. 3.5, κατακλῖνῆ will make the line myuric. Adesp. eleg. 23, οὕτω is correlative to ὡς. 61 is now firmly linked to Archilochus (W. B. Henry, *ZPE* 121 [1998], 305).

(Iambus volume) p. 8, Hipponax's date should be lowered; see Degani, *Studi su Ipponatte*, 19f. Archil. test. 4 vii 17, τιμῶν is surely a participle. Fr. 102, the Homer is mistranslated. 119, 'to fall as the labourer to his flask'. 219, read πύ]ργος δ' οὐ . . . τάφρος (S. R. Slings, *ZPE* 79 [1989], 1ff.). Hippon. 36.4, δείλαιος does not mean 'cowardly'. 42, Attales, not Attalus. 136, a nonsensical text, corrected in *JHS* 106 (1986), 206. 146a, add Phot. ε 738. Adesp. iamb. 52, it is the lovers who are fine-bred, not the birds.

By contrast with Campbell's volumes, there are no indexes.

All Souls College, Oxford M. L. WEST

IMAGES OF THE POET

R. NÜNLIST: *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung.* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 101.) Pp. viii + 412. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998. Cased, DM 96. ISBN: 3-519-07650-0.

In the field of early Greek poetry a systematic investigation of the use of imagery has long remained a *desideratum.* Although various studies touch on certain aspects of the subject, they are nevertheless highly selective (e.g. V. Pöschl, *Bibliographie zur antiken Bildersprache* [Heidelberg, 1964]), since inevitably a complete synopsis of the material would go beyond the capacity of a single scholar. As Nünlist puts it: 'Im Rahmen eines Einzelprojekts kann diese Lücke freilich nicht geschlossen werden' (p. 10). Accordingly, N. has focused his investigation on the imagery which reveals the poet at work, in short, the poetological imagery. The study consists of three parts: (1) an introduction in which N. defines his use of the terms 'imagery' and 'poetological' (pp. 1–11), and discusses such issues as the fictionality of early Greek

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

poetry and the epinician 'I' (pp. 11–35). For his analysis N. adopts the principles developed by I. A. Richards in his well-known theory of metaphor (*The Philosophy of Rhetoric* [New York, 1936, ^{2}1965]). Operating with the notions 'tenor' and 'vehicle', N. provides the reader at the end of the book with a very useful listing of the 'vehicle-terms' (pp. 388–92) which greatly facilitates the study of imagery for the user who wishes to consider a particular aspect. (2) The main body of the work is divided into nineteen chapters which treat the imagery of animals, messengers, handicrafts, medicine agriculture, hunting and sport, light, flow, flowers, bodily ornament, movement, money, hospitality, wakening, and honey, as well as some isolated types such as embracing and swimming. Two appendices deal with the ship of the symposiasts and the divinities of inspiration. Each chapter assembles the material which corresponds to a generic image, e.g. that of animals, with the familiar song-birds as well as the eagle, bees, beasts of prey, etc. The distribution of material in different chapters 'dient lediglich der Übersichtlichkeit . . . Die Bildkomplexe sollen aber keinesfalls einen "genetischen" Zusammenhang zwischen den einzelnen Bildern und Ausdrücken suggerieren' (p. 26). In this way N. can show that even the vehicle-terms which at first sight seem to have nothing to do with imagery are in fact relevant. For example, the imagery implicit in the phrase *μέλος γλάζεις* (p. 62, no. 1.50) is brought to light by comparison with the special use of *ἀμέλγω* discussed in a previous example (p. 62, no. 1.49). (3) The results of N.'s investigation are then used to show how individual poets make use of imagery (pp. 338–452). The case of Pindar well illustrates the appropriateness of the method chosen. Even if the poet surpasses his rivals Simonides and Bacchylides in the number and variety of poetological imagery, it is only by a comparison with them that the significance of the observed phenomena is revealed. Thus we learn that Pindar's style is characterized by the use of adjectival metaphors and a distribution of imagery throughout a given composition, while Bacchylides, for example, employs his imagery in a more mechanical way, placing it usually at the beginning and the end of a poem. Such conclusions could hardly have been reached if the study had been confined to an examination of individual poets taken in isolation. Moreover, the exhaustive survey of the material in the main section (pp. 37–328) permits an insight into the genesis of different types of imagery or, in N.'s terminology, into how the poet moves from F(undament) 'foundations' to B(ilder) 'imagery'. In the case of a *fragmentum dubium* (p. 50, no. 1.31), *κύκνος ὑπὸ πτερύγων* attributed differently in ancient testimonia to Terpander (we miss the reference to Gostoli's discussion [pp. 125–8] in her edition of the poet [Rome, 1990], mentioned in the bibliography), Ion, and Alcman, I would question whether it really represents a F(undament). The same phrase found in *H.Hom.* 21.1 (discussed on p. 48, no. 1.26)—perhaps the two texts are identical—is rightly classified as a B(ild). In any case, the phrase must be seen in the light of the Hesiodic F(undament) *πυκνὸν ὑπὸ πτερύγων* (pp. 45–6, no. 1.18) used of the *τέττιξ*. The observation surely deserves more than the summary footnote (p. 48 n.16) it receives. Likewise, the object of the polemic statement that 'die Darlegung ihrer [sc. Parmenides and Empedocles] philosophischen Lehrmeinung in hexametrischer Form zum philosophischen Grundkonzept der beiden gehört und mitnichten *faute de mieux* erfolgt ist' should have been identified.

A few minor points of criticism. In discussing Simon. *Eleg.* 11.14–15 (p. 191, no. 8.34) it is implied that a decade separates the poet's two poems on the battle of Thermopylai (480 B.C.) and that of Plataea (479 B.C.), whereas in fact both were composed at approximately the same time. At p. 51, l. 21 read 'ein<e> . . . Vergleichung', at p. 225, l. 22 read 'genau[e]', at p. 338, l. 1 read 'ihr<e> . . . Bilder', at

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

p. 373, l. 1 (bibliography) note that Gentili's book *Poesia e pubblico* is now available in a revised and augmented third edition.

None of this detracts from the genuine merit of the present study. We are grateful to the author not only for having produced a work of great erudition which will be indispensable for all scholars working in the field of early Greek poetry but also for having dispelled such prejudices as that 'archaic' lyric is 'einfach', 'noch nicht entwickelt', a product 'einer "in den Anfängen steckenden" Gesellschaft' (p. 362).

Domdidier ORLANDO POLTERA

RECOVERING PINDAR'S METRE

H.-C. GÜNTHER: *Ein neuer metrischer Traktat und das Studium der pindarischen Metrik in der Philologie der Paläologenzeit.* (*Mnemosyne*, Supplementa 180.) Pp. xv + 220. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 90-04-11008-9.

The notion that Pindar's verse was composed 'in measures freed from rule' prevailed in the Greek world, e.g. Didymus, before Horace (*Carm.* 4.2.11f.) and continued to influence the interpretation of the poet down to August Boeckh's rediscovery of its periodic structure (*Über die Versmasse des Pindaros* [Berlin, 1809]). What a scholar of the second century A.D. made of the metrical form of the *Epinicians* is shown by the ancient metrical scholia (last edited by A. Tessier [Leipzig, 1989]) in which each ode is analysed colon by colon and duly labelled with such terms as 'acatalectic trochaic dimeter' and 'dactylic penthemimeres', e.g. *Pyth.* 1.1 (e_eD), an analysis which is largely followed in the line divisions of the medieval manuscripts, and which lives on in the numbering of the lemmata in A. B. Drachmann's edition of the *scholia vetera* (Leipzig, 1903–27). The ancient metrical scholia together with the abbreviated metrical handbook of Hephaistion (second century A.D.) provided medieval Greek scholars with a basis for their own study of Pindaric metre. Examples of their results can be seen in the early twelfth-century versified treatise of Isaac Tzetzes (*De metris pindaricis commentarius*, ed. A. B. Drachmann [Copenhagen, 1925]), in the so-called *Tractatus Harleianus* (ed. W. Studemund in *Index lectionum in Univ. Litter. Vratislaviensi* . . . [Breslau, 1887]), and in the Pindar editions of the Palaeologan triad, Thomas Magister, Manuel Moschopulus, and Demetrius Triclinius (selected readings in the Pindar edition of A. Turyn [Oxford, 1952], more in that of Tycho Mommsen [Berlin, 1864]). To these Hans-Christian Günther has now added a new metrical treatise, dating from the fourteenth century, which he recognized as such in the codex *Vaticanus graecus* 896 (described as a commentary on Hephaistion by P. Schreiner in his recent catalogue [Città del Vaticano, 1988]). In the volume under review this short fragment, edited by G. (pp. 189–95) under the title *Tractatus Vaticanus*, is compared in detail with the *Harleianus* with respect to its structure (pp. 1–6), the Pindar text on which they are based (pp. 7–44), and their respective metrical analyses (pp. 45–60).

In his analysis of the structure of the *Vaticanus* and *Harleianus* G. convincingly demonstrates that both derive from a common source and that the latter is less complete. In particular, the *Harleianus* differs from the *Vaticanus* in that it draws on a smaller selection of Pindar verses for illustration whereas the *Vaticanus* offers, apart

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from some losses in the manuscript, the complete text of the first strophes and epodes of the *Olympians*. In the second chapter G. sets forth the Pindar text of the *Tractatus Vaticanus* arranged by cola (iambic, trochaic, dactylic, anapaestic, choriambic, etc.) and type (hypercatalectic dimeter, hypercatalectic monometer, acatalectic dimeter, etc.). A study of the metrical analyses of both treatises demonstrates that the *Vaticanus* and *Harleianus* normally agree with those of Tzetzes. Where the *Vaticanus* differs from the *Harleianus* it represents a first attempt to go beyond the analysis of Tzetzes.

For many readers the most interesting chapters of the book will be the third (pp. 61–70) and fourth (pp. 71–166), which deal with the conjectures and metrical emendations of the Byzantines in the text of Pindar. The scholars of the Greek East were markedly conservative in their treatment of classical texts, limiting their interventions to more or less conscious normalizations and banalizations of the text. Where corruption was apparent in their metrical analysis the Byzantine scholars preferred a revision of the colometry or an assumption of metrical freedom to a change in the text. Nevertheless Moschopulus and Triclinius were able to achieve a degree of progress in that they subjected the Pindaric text to a systematic metrical analysis and undertook a methodical correction in accordance with it. On the other hand, the corrections in the *Olympians* which Irigoin ascribed to their predecessor Maximus Planudes are shown by G. (p. 65) to derive from a genuine manuscript tradition. G. graphically illustrates the achievement of the Byzantine philologists in the correction of the Pindaric text in the form of the treatment of examples from the *Olympians* under forty-three headings (pp. 88–166). In each example we are given first the classification of the ancient metrical scholia followed by the text of the *codices veteres*, then the metrical analysis of Tzetzes followed by the schemata of the scholia found in the Moschopulus manuscripts, thirdly the text of the Moschopulus manuscripts, then the text of Triclinius together with his metrical analysis, and, finally, the analysis and text of the *Tractatus Vaticanus* and the *Tractatus Harleianus* insofar as the corresponding passage has been transmitted. For examples of Byzantine success in emendation we may note *Olym.* 1.59 where Moschopulus' ἀπάλαμον (a Hesiodic hapax) for ἀπάλαμνον of the *codices veteres* restores responsion and *Olym.* 1.73 where Moschopulus' εὐτρίαιναν (a Pindaric hapax) for εὐρυτρίαιναν (codd. vet.) likewise restores responsion. In the case of the *Olympians* Moschopulus' contribution to the restoration of disturbed responsion was such that Triclinius found little scope for his own improvements, but was generally content to adopt the emendations of his predecessor while continuing Moschopulus' work for the rest of the Pindaric corpus.

In a final chapter (pp. 167–85) G. essays a characterization of Byzantine conjectural criticism of the Pindaric text. The basic tool of the Palaeologan philologists was the restoration of responsion, which, with the help of their own reading of the ancient poets, allowed them to achieve a respectable advance in the improvement of the text for the first time since antiquity. An important new result of the present study is the emergence of Moschopulus as a major critic whose work in metrics paved the way for the better known achievement of Triclinius. These two were the true predecessors of the Italian and Northern humanists who went on to develop a more critical approach to the ancient Greek texts in a cultural environment freer of the restraints of authority that dominated the Byzantine world. The author deserves a final word of thanks for undertaking and efficiently executing the demanding and time-consuming task of editing and, above all, situating the new metrical tractate in its scholarly tradition with

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the resultant enlargement of our knowledge of the development of metrics and textual emendation in the Greek world of the fourteenth century.

University of Fribourg BRUCE KARL BRASWELL

SYMPOSIUM SOPHOCLEVM

J. GRIFFIN (ed.): *Sophocles Revisited. Essays Presented to Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones*. Pp. x +343, figs, ills. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Cased, £48. ISBN: 0-19-813006-6.

This is a festschrift with a theme. Jasper Griffin has to be thanked for producing a collection of essays in honour of Hugh Lloyd-Jones that concentrates on one topic: the plays of Sophocles. The result is a clearly focused volume, which has much to offer to anybody interested in Sophocles and Greek tragedy.

Apart from a dedicatory poem by Colin Austin and an introduction about Lloyd-Jones the man and scholar by Bernard Knox, there are twelve articles. Between them, they reflect the breadth of Lloyd-Jones's own scholarship: there are pieces on religion, the political and literary context, language, and reception. For all this diversity, there is a unifying thread: like Lloyd-Jones's work, many contributions are characterized by the close attention they pay to the text of the plays.

The collection opens with what might well become a standard article on gods in Sophocles. Robert Parker sets out clearly just how little certainty the plays give readers and spectators about the rôle of the gods, and makes this recognition the basis for a discussion of divine justice. He concludes that there is a 'negative form' of 'theodicy' (p. 25) in Sophocles: gods seem to mitigate human suffering or at least compensate for it, 'but too much remains unexplained and unknowable for strong positive claims about divine justice . . . to be possible' (p. 26). Robert L. Fowler's discussion of 'Three Places of the *Trachiniae*' also has much to say about the superhuman aspects of Sophoclean tragedy (as well as other things). The third of his places is Herakles' injunction to Hyllus not to lament him. Drawing on a number of parallels, Fowler makes a case for interpreting this as one of many things that make Herakles' death more than an ordinary human one. In a third piece concerned with superhuman matters, Martin West argues that inherited curses are generally less important in Greek tragedy than is often made out. Much of his criticism is convincing. Possibly, West could have made this an even more interesting piece if he had gone further, discussing the rôle curses play, as much as the rôle they do not.

Something similar may be true for Jasper Griffin's contribution. Griffin argues against the tendency to interpret Greek tragedy solely with reference to the Athenian *polis*. Again it would be interesting to put more emphasis on the positive side of the argument. Griffin would like to see more attention paid to matters such as the 'intense emotion' created by the plays and 'religion' (p. 92). It might have been worthwhile bringing together discussion of these topics with the many valuable points made by political interpretations. Malcolm Heath also engages with recent trends in the study of Greek tragedy. He suggests that *Philoctetes* does not have to be read as a play that questions, rather than asserts, sets of values (although it may). For instance, rather than stressing (as Simon Goldhill does) Neoptolemus' conflict between loyalty to the collective and to social or moral values, one might draw the moral that it is important not to obey the wrong leaders in the first place—a moral in line with Athenian ideology. Arguably, there is more emphasis on Neoptolemus' dilemma than on his

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

choice to obey Odysseus; but this is a very interesting article, showing that it may be a mistake to look exclusively for problems and questions in Greek tragedy.

P. E. Easterling analyses 'the concentration and power of [Sophocles'] language' (p. 96), which is so easy to perceive and so hard to describe. Easterling chooses as her tools of analysis the terms 'contradiction', 'shading between literal and metaphorical meaning', and ' "charging" of themes through concentration and the ever-varied use of repetition' (p. 96). Applying these concepts to two speeches in *Oedipus at Colonus*, she is able to pin down a number of the qualities and mechanisms of Sophoclean writing. G. O. Hutchinson writes about time in Sophocles. He suggests that awareness of the difference between an 'imperfective' and a 'perfective' mode, that is, between emphasis on permanence and on decisive, final events, can sharpen our understanding of lines, speeches, scenes, and whole plays. Stephanie West investigates possible Herodotean influences on *Antigone*. Not all of them are as obvious as the well-known parallel between Intaphernes' and Antigone's arguments about their respective brothers. Nonetheless, this article is a reminder that we should look not just to Homer and earlier tragedy for intertextual connections. Links to yet another body of texts are explored by Netta Zagagi, who collects comic patterns in *Ichneutae*, some of which are attested in Old Comedy, others only in New Comedy and Roman comedy.

The last part of the collection is devoted to the reception of Sophoclean tragedy. The centrepiece is an article by Edith Hall on the history of *Electra* in Britain. Hall traces the story from *The Tragedie of Orestes* by the Oxford scholar Thomas Goffe (*c*. 1609–19) and the royalist 1649 translation by Christopher Wase (addressed to one of the daughters of Charles I) down to and beyond the female readers, adaptors, and eventually performers of *Electra* in the nineteenth century (the first attested performance of the play in Britain took place in 1883 at Girton College). Hall's attention to the various political and social contexts, to performance history, iconography, and much else makes for compelling reading. Flanking Hall's piece, there is a learned discussion by Leofranc Holford-Strevens of the changes Latin literature made to Sophocles and the reasons for these changes, and a comparison by Richard Stoneman of German translations of Sophocles down to the mid-nineteenth century in the light of contemporary translation theory.

In short, this is a pleasingly unified festschrift with some pieces that are likely to become standard points of reference—a worthy present for one of the most prominent Sophoclean scholars today.

University of Manchester FELIX BUDELMANN

'THINGS ARE SELDOM WHAT THEY SEEM!'

H. M. Roisman: *Nothing Is As It Seems: The Tragedy of the Implicit in Euripides'* Hippolytus (Greek Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches). Pp. xvi + 211. Lanham, Boulder, New York, and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999. Cased, £18.95. ISBN: 0-8476-9092-X.

Roisman's study of Euripides' *Hippolytus* is hailed by the general editor, Gregory Nagy, as an analysis 'from the standpoint of drama as drama' (p. ix). For those readers who would welcome an approach that might bring to bear recent developments in performance studies upon Euripides' tragedy, *Nothing Is As It Seems* may well be disappointing. When R. explains her theoretical perspective herself, it does not seem

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

promising at all: she boldly proclaims her interest in the implicit in terms that may well suggest that *Hippolytus* is about to meet with the rigours of the Method (pp. xiii–xvi); and her pronouncement that she will consider the question of the 'tragic flaw' in Chapter VII of the book (p. xv) is no less alarming. Fortunately this prefatory material misleads, and beyond lies an intriguing and highly readable account of the *Hippolytus*, where her Verrall-like agenda seems to work well.

R. follows Wilamowitz–Moellendorff in seeing Phaedra as a skilled manipulator of language; and what makes her reading persuasive is her attempt to read the extant *Hippolytus* against the lost *Hippolytus Veiled*. R. speculates that in the earlier play Phaedra did not simply offer herself, but the throne as well, to Hippolytus, and that it was this act of rebellion against Theseus, rather than the act of sexual immorality, which caused such an offence to the Athenians (p. 15). R. goes on to argue that in the first version Hippolytus responded favourably to Phaedra's advances, but that after wakening he veiled himself in shame (she convincingly demonstrates with evidence from elsewhere that veiling is something done after rather than in anticipation of a shameful act—pp. 15–16).

When R. comes to read the second play, she rejects the generally accepted notion that it 'corrects' the first by making both Phaedra and Hippolytus chaste: Hippolytus, in her reading, is not against sex *per se*; he is only determined to avoid *illicit* sexual activity. R. argues that Aphrodite's pronouncements in the prologue are to be understood not as godlike utterances, but the partial comments of an interested party (pp. 6–9); and since Theseus in this later version is not the philanderer he usually is presented as being in Greek myth, Euripides is deliberately denying Phaedra any justification for her extramarital passion (p. 19).

In this way, R. is able to demonstrate how meanings are often conveyed indirectly by allusions to other versions. But she is not in danger of circular argumentation, because in addition to her reconstructions of the lost *Hippolytus Veiled*, she also draws on the evident parallels between the *Hippolytus* and other near-contemporary plays. The *Hippolytus* was produced the year after Pericles' death, when issues of legitimacy and citizenship were much debated; and R. considers the prominence of illegitimacy in the play in connection with both the Periclean legislation of 451 and the parallel concerns in the *Oedipus Tyrannos* and, to a lesser extent, the *Medea* and the *Andromache*. Hippolytus' status as *nothos* is fragile: he tries to prove both to himself and to others that he is truly noble; and he tries, above all, to win his father's acceptance. Euripides, according to R., does not take sides: Hippolytus could have been seen by the fifth-century audience as either a living example against the iniquities of the Periclean legislation or as representative, with his excesses, of the unwanted intruder (pp. 179ff.).

Each of the seven chapters provides a running commentary on the drama as it unfolds, and however convincing the overall argument might be, there are details with which one might wish to quibble. Phaedra is deemed to be on stage during the scene between the Nurse and Hippolytus, and Cassandra's silent presence in the *Agamemnon* is unconvincingly invoked in parallel (pp. 99–100); again with reference to the contrasting parallel scene at the end of the *Agamemnon*, the chorus's failure to intervene to prevent Phaedra's suicide is somewhat bizarrely construed as reluctance *in case* they were to save her (p. 120). There are also examples of hairsplitting literalism, which fly in the face of the prefatory claims to be considering the play 'as drama'. With near-Voltairean pedantry, we are asked to see Theseus' comments about the off-stage mourning cries on his arrival as being in some way problematic. R. argues that 'it is not lamentation and wailing but cries for help that issue from the palace'

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(p. 126), even though the chorus have just pronounced Phaedra dead (pp. 788–9). Similarly insensitive to theatrical convention is her carping about Hippolytus' alleged dilatory arrival on Theseus' return (p. 135).

These minor problems apart, the book merits close attention and will no doubt provoke considerable debate. Although I, for one, will not be tempted to try to apply R.'s approach of delving for the implicit to other Greek tragedies, I am fully persuaded that it can yield fruitful results in the case of the *Hippolytus*.

Goldsmiths' College FIONA MACINTOSH

STRUCTURED SPACE

D. WILES: *Tragedy in Athens: Performance Space and Theatrical Meaning*. Pp. x + 230, 4 pls, 13 figs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Cased, £37.50. ISBN: 0-521-46268-1.

This ambitious and important new book by David Wiles is a macroscopic structuralist approach to a stagecraft-question which has suffered from comparative neglect: space, or rather 'spatial practices', how 'Greek performances were created within and in response to a network of pre-existent spatial relationships' (p. 4). As opposed to 'atomic questions such as "Where does she enter?" '(p. 86), which have dominated the stagecraft-approach for some time now, W.'s project is to ask 'structuralist questions' concerning the socially conditioned spatial relationships between the theatre-space and its surroundings (e.g. the theatre and the sanctuary of Dionysus), spatial parameters within the theatre-building (e.g. orchestra and skene), and the ways in which the plays themselves evoke space and spatial relations, particularly through the chorus.

The first chapter starts with stimulating thoughts on the impossibility of an 'empty space' before launching a polemical critique of Taplin (a universal scapegoat throughout). The main points of dissent are: (a) there is 'no logical basis' (p. 5) for T.'s working hypothesis that all significant action is indicated in the text, and T.'s 'positivist quest for the visual meaning is saturated in presupposition' (p. 13); (b) T. is unsophisticated on the problem of 'meaning'; (c) there is undue 'Aristotelian' emphasis on the emotional response of the ancient or any other viewer and an untenable thought/feeling dichotomy; and (d) a fatal neglect of the chorus in both dramatic and religious terms.

I do not think that all of this is fair—(b) especially amounts to little more than accusing T. of having conceived and written a book not in the 1990s but in the late 1960s/early 1970s. But (a) and (d) especially are valid and serious points. Yet while W. has a great deal of interest to say on the chorus (see below), point (a) is raised but never developed convincingly. It would need more and better argument to show that T.'s working hypothesis is mistaken beyond remedy. And if so, what is it to be replaced with? Regardless of where our various approaches take us, where to start from if not from 'positivism'? It is this lack of 'boring' positivism which turns W.'s showpiece in Chapter I (pp. 10–12), a discussion of the ending of the *Hippolytus*, into a failure. Based on the assumption, allegedly shared by T., that Phaedra's corpse is visible alongside that of Theseus throughout the final scene, W., apart from questioning the 'significant-action hypothesis', asks 'macroscopic' questions about the neglected female body and the relation between the male and the female expressed in this scene which T. is said to have been blind to. But not only has T. never claimed that

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Phaedra's corpse is visible throughout (*GTA* 136 is given as a reference [p. 11 n. 28], but neither here nor elsewhere does T. actually say that). More importantly, W. can be proved wrong from the text, for Artemis leaves the dying Hippolytus saying (1437–9): *καὶ χαῖρ'· ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐ θέμις φθιτοὺς ὁρᾶν/οὐδ' ὄμμα χραίνειν θανασίμοισιν ἐκπνοαῖς·/ὁρῶ δὲ σ' ἤδη τοῦδε πλησίον κακοῦ*. On W.'s scenario these lines simply do not make sense: the goddess cannot argue that she has to leave because it is improper for her to see a corpse if Phaedra's corpse has been on stage all along. Hence it must have been removed earlier on (probably at 1101 without textual indication, itself a point of interest), and the basis for W.'s discussion evaporates. It is a pity that for the purpose of illustrating the right questions and his justified methodological reservations W. has so prominently chosen the wrong example.

The extremely useful Chapter II examines the location, building, and resources of the theatre of Dionysus in Athens with constant comparison to other sites. Like Scullion before him (in his excellent *Three Studies in Athenian Dramaturgy* [Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1994], esp. pp. 38–41, which should be read alongside), W. argues for a circular orchestra in the theatre of Dionysus, a view which I feel will rightly become the standard one again. Chapter III, together with Chapters II, V, VII, and VIII the strongest of the book, argues that the centre of the orchestra is the visual focus of the fifth-century stage and in thought-provoking ways explores how various plays (e.g. *Oresteia*, *Ion*) use the area of visual strength between skene and mid-orchestra and its inherent spatial opposition. In Chapters IV and V W. attempts to reintegrate a neglected vital element, the chorus, into (structuralist) stagecraft. The central claim of Chapter IV is that 'the metrical identity of strophe and antistrophe means choreographic identity' (p. 103). In elaborate lists and analyses a series of choral odes is given choreographies in which one and the same movement expresses the core of a given passage both in the strophe and the antistrophe. This is an area about which we know absolutely nothing, so there is little point in arguing whether W. is right or not. Chapter V very interestingly and innovatively examines the rôle of the chorus in spatio-temporal transformations, i.e. the ways in which the chorus evoke a whole range of localizations in a 'meta-space' created by their lyrics and choreography.

In Chapters VI–VIII W. develops his central notion of the schematic nature of Greek theatre space, which is marked by binary oppositions along the horizontal, vertical, and inside/outside axes. Greek drama takes place in an 'absolute space' (p. 135), and against Hourmouziades W. argues that 'in *every* Greek tragedy the two *eisodoi* articulate an opposition between two off-stage locations, and that these locations are opposite both topographically and symbolically' (p. 134). This fixed binary opposition works very well with some plays, but what about, for instance, *Bacchae* (not discussed by W.)? The two off-stage locations are Mt Cithaeron (62f.) and Thebes (352f., 434), which, according to W.'s doctrine of absolute space, should persistently be represented by the two separate *eisodoi*. For the topographical and symbolical opposition to be continuous each *eisodos* ought to be the only way to get to Mt Cithaeron and Thebes respcctively. Yet the maddened Pentheus is to be led through Thebes before watching the Bacchants on Mt Cithaeron (854f., 961), an arrangement which makes an obvious big point. 'Inside/outside' (Chapter VII) discusses the rôle of the eccyclema and the (polysemous) skene, which leads to particularly interesting results for the *Oresteia*. How various plays exploit the tripartite structure of the vertical axis (the dead, mortals, gods) is the subject of Chapter VIII. I find most intriguing W.'s remarks on the vertical hierarchy and intensity of viewing in a theatre where the whole of the audience look down on the actor(s) (pp. 176f.). Chapter IX, 'The Iconography of Sacred Space', is concerned with

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the visual meaning(s) and dramatic importance of altars and divine statues. Chapter X argues for a high degree of metatheatricality and audience integration in tragedy, especially through cult-aetiology and by casting the audience into the rôle of political participants.

In its firmly structuralist parts W.'s book will face the sort of criticism that structuralism, especially in its 'straitjacket' binary manifestation, has always provoked: that of being interesting, sometimes fascinating and convincing, while often over-rigid. But it is high time to redress the balance of a review that has, probably unfairly, focused on areas of disagreement. This *is* an important book, written by a scholar with refreshingly wide personal theatre-practice, often highly innovative, always thought-provoking, wide-ranging, and intellectually adventurous in its large claims, while at times outstandingly perceptive in points of detail (e.g. pp. 139–41 on the theatrical integration of the sun). It is W.'s lasting merit to have put the question of space firmly and sophisticatedly on the agenda. People will disagree with W., but no one can afford to ignore his voice.

Merton College, Oxford MARTIN REVERMANN

HIPPONAX REDIVIVUS

A. KERKHECKER: *Callimachus' Book of* Iambi. Pp. xxiv + 334, pls. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-19-924006-X.

K.'s long-awaited study sets itself a challenging, though strictly delimited, agenda: 'provide a complete survey of Callimachus' Book of *Iambi*; check Pfeiffer's text against other editions and the papyri, and explain his arrangement of the fragments; secure the understanding of linguistic and antiquarian detail (in selection; this is not a full commentary); attempt an interpretation of each poem as a whole; consider the arrangement of the poems, and the composition of the Book' (p. 10). Let me say at once that K. seems to me entirely successful in these admirable aims; this volume is a major contribution to the study of Hellenistic poetry and ought, as both K. (p. 8) and I hope, to lead to renewed interest in a whole raft of 'iambic questions' upon which K. merely touches.

The *Iambi* are wretchedly preserved, but what does survive is of such interest both for itself and its subsequent influence that the fragments have never lacked for critical attention, some of which has quite simply ignored the precarious textual basis upon which we are forced to depend. K. has now put us all in the debt of his enviable papyrological skills by setting out with exemplary clarity what we can and cannot know, and the parameters within which we must make our decisions. K. weighs the textual possibilities with fine judgement (pp. 88–9 on *Iambus* 4 is a good example), and even the papyrologically challenged ought to be able to follow the broad thrust of most of the argument, for the detail of fibre and wormhole is largely confined to the footnotes. More often than not K.'s account merely increases admiration for Pfeiffer's extraordinary achievement, but Pfeiffer's text has such authority that it becomes easy to take it all on trust, and K. carefully shows the folly of such intellectual laziness; his account of Callimachus' text should now be the first port-of-call for literary critics of all persuasions.

'The *Iambi* need an extended commentary', observes K. rightly (p. 219), but in the meantime he has given us more than enough to be going on with; many of the long

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

notes, with exhaustive lists of parallels, mean that the poem-by-poem essays also contain much that one would otherwise look for in a commentary. The discussion of the infamous *οἱ δὲ τραγωιδοὶ τῶν θάλασσαν οἰκεύντων | ἔχουσι φωνήν* in *Iambus* 2 (pp. 54–8) runs carefully through the whole gamut of attempted solutions before concluding, apparently, that the passage is 'merrily incoherent', as a means of characterizing the speaker; here and elsewhere K. is prepared to go in whatever direction the evidence seems to him to point. So, too, he has a fine sense of idiom and nuance (his defence [pp. 138–9] of his emendation *ποιήσηι* for *ποιήσηις* at 5.30 is a good example), and—as with the best commentaries—careful readers of K. will learn much about Greek along the way. K. is, however, also a stimulating literary critic of these poems. He is particularly strong on modulations of voice and levels of irony: for him the *Iambi* are a progressive series of studies in the iambic, and particularly Hipponactean, mode, beginning with Hipponax himself, chosen in preference to Archilochus in part simply because of his association with the choliambic verse: 'by the third century, the trimeter had lost its "Iambic" character' (p. 5). At the heart of Callimachus' book lies for K. a concern with 'manners', with how seriously to take oneself and one's moralizing; K.'s Callimachus is indeed the ancestor of the satiric Horace. Two discussions which show K.'s strengths to particularly good advantage are *Iambus* 6 on the statue of Olympian Zeus, with a most illuminating account of the relation of this poem to the traditions of *propemptikon* and *ekphrasis*, and *Iambus* 12, the 'birthday' poem which emerges as a brilliant Pindarizing miniature.

On the much discussed question of the number of *Iambi*, K. comes down cautiously but clearly in favour of thirteen: the *explicit* may simply have been forgotten after *Iambus* 13, and the individual *μέλη* were treated like the individual hymns. K. moves from this conclusion to suggestive remarks about the internal organization of the poetry book (the relation of 1 to 7 deserved some attention here), and the relation between these developments and the scholarly practice of editing; students of Latin literature would be well advised to give attention to these pages.

When confronted with such an outstanding piece of work, it may seem churlish to end with two question marks, particularly as they concern presentation rather than substance, but they have, I think, their own importance. Despite (or because of?) the studied caution with which he approaches a very difficult text, K. holds his literary views strongly—what he terms 'the pestilence of poetological neo-scholasticism' (p. 9) is ceaselessly hounded—and he can be a very sharp critic (cf. pp. 280–2 on some of Alan Cameron's arguments, 'an unholy alliance between positivism and New Criticism'). It is less surprising that such polemic sometimes backfires (e.g. p. 290 n. 109) than that not even the ancients are spared: there is a frankly silly attack on Hermocles' paean on Demetrius Poliorcetes (pp. 147–8, 'composition is shoddy, thought poor, syntax flabby . . . and the dreadful iotacistic pun in 19!'), although a moment's reflection about the relation of that poem to comic and popular traditions would cast these 'defects' in a quite other light. Occasionally the polemic moves, in my view, too close to sarcasm (e.g. pp. xi–xii on Benjamin Acosta-Hughes's Berkeley dissertation, which will shortly be published in the *Hellenistic Culture and Society* series); whatever the reason for this (it does not appear to be a self-reflexive iambic joke), what we rather need is the kind of open discussion between different methodologies from which the study of Latin poetry has so conspicuously benefited.

Secondly, the book is full of long passages of untranslated Greek and German, upon which crucial stages of the argument often depend. Here more thought was necessary about the relation between a book and a doctoral thesis, of which this is 'an all but unchanged version'. There is a real danger—and here I am conscious that I have

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

used this refrain before—that those who would both benefit most from and make best use of K.'s important study, namely graduate students concerned with Greek and Latin poetry, will be deterred by the forbidding appearance of these pages. The worst fate that could befall Hellenistic poetry is that it really become (again) the closed playground of 'those who know'.

Pembroke College, Cambridge RICHARD HUNTER

PAN, DEUS ARCADIAE

H. BERNSDORFF: *Das Fragmentum Bucolicum Vindobonense (P. Vindob. Rainer 29801). Einleitung, Text und Kommentar.* (Hypomnemata 123.) Pp. 177. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999. Paper, DM 60. ISBN: 3-525-25220-X.

This is a welcome and useful book on an interesting text: the Vienna bucolic fragment (first published in 1932; also in Gow's *Bucolici Graeci* [Oxford, 1952], pp. 168–70). It contains an introduction, text and translation, plates of the papyrus, commentary, bibliography, and various indices.

In his introduction, B. offers helpful guidance concerning the reconstruction of the manuscript, the content of the poem, and the questions of genre and authorship. In the end, most of these problems prove insoluble, but B. succeeds in giving a skilful and sensible survey of the evidence and the options. He takes great care over separating what can from what cannot be known, and demonstrates (beyond mere suspension of judgement) which solutions would appear plausible, if one were minded to press the material available. According to B.'s preferred hypothesis, the fragment comes from an epyllion by Bion.

In his interpretative summary (pp. 52–61), B. is less circumspect. His account is little short of a wholesale surrender to structuralist theories (and jargon). Instead of an inductively arranged synopsis paraphrasing the text, he presents a deductive application of predetermined principles. True, B. does explain why he regards them as pertinent (p. 54); but the impression remains that (at least in this section of his book), far from trying to overcome the fragmentary state of the text, B. allows it to decompose into a world of motif-atoms, which then proves a rich hunting ground for structuralist 'relations'. However, B. is well aware that he is running the risk of 'eine bloße Spielerei mit Ähnlichkeits- und Kontrastbezügen' (p. 60), and this section does not set the tone for the rest of the book. The commentary (especially the introductory notes to individual passages) shows a much more discerning interest in the shape and composition of the poem.

The fragment shows Pan constructing a syrinx. Is this the moment of its invention? Is the poem aetiological? No, says B., because Silenus already knows the syrinx; it is not a novelty (pp. 16, 21–2, 27). Lloyd-Jones suggests that Pan may have lost a *σῦριγξ μονοκάλαμος*, and now invents the *σῦριγξ κηρόδετος* (p. 16 n. 22; cf. p. 46). B. objects that the lost instrument is called *πηκτίς* in l. 11, and that the etymology given in l. 63 (*π*]*ηκτίδα πῆξε*) would make it very odd for the *μονοκάλαμος* to be given this name (ibid.; cf. pp. 88, 89). Perhaps the point was that the *πηκτίς*, so far simple, *ἔσχε τὴν αὑτῆς φύσιν* only when Pan invented the composite one. Or perhaps the lost syrinx

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

was a πολυκάλαμος—which appears to be different from the κηρόδετος in Ath. 4.82 p. 184A (unless, that is, you follow Salmasius: p. 30 n. 50).

B. takes ll. 65–6 to indicate that Pan goes to Mycene (pp. 137–40; cf. pp. 13–22). Alternatively, they could give the content of Pan's song (p. 139). B. objects (ibid.): 'Schwierig scheint mir an dieser Deutung jedoch zu sein, daß Pan das Spiel erst in 71 zu beginnen scheint. Wie kann er also vorher ein Lied vortragen?' An answer is suggested by Dover on Theocr. 4.30: 'No one can sing and play a syrinx simultaneously, but passages of song can alternate with passages of piping'.

Some points of detail.

Line 7 τὸν] δὲ ἰδὼν μ[α]λ̣ερ̣ὸ̣ν̣ κτλ., 'Silenus saw that he was angry' (and decided to tease him)?

Line 12 μελέων κλέος εὑρύ. A reference to 'seinen früheren Ruhm als Musiker' (p. 79; cf. p. 90)? The following relative clause suggests 'your famous song'.

Lines 26–7. On l. 26, B. writes (p. 109): 'Der verlorene Schluß des Verses enthielt das Subjekt zu ἴδοιτο in 27'. And further on (p. 110): 'Ich sehe nicht, wie sich σέ, das als Objekt zu ἴδοιτο (27) erwartet wird, an dieser Stelle ergänzen läßt'. There would be room for it at the end of l. 26: the subject of ἴδοιτο need not have occupied all of the lacuna, or could even have come later. However, this would be a strange position for σέ. After σέ<ο> in 25 and τοι in 26, it may not be required. Thus, χορείης at the end of l. 27 is unproblematic (p. 112). (B. prefers Schmidt's σ' ἀοιδῆς—where, surely, σ(έ) comes too late in its clause? Similarly, Oellacher's ἀγῶνος would presumably have to be σ' ἀγῶνος.)

Line 56. On p. 112 (φιλόδροσος), add Call. *Ap*. 110–13 with Williams; R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford, 1968), p. 284. On p. 113 (αὖθι), add Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 1.35; Massimilla on Call. fr. 1.17.

B.'s edition is a reminder of Pan god of music, Arcadia land of piping herdsmen, Arcadians masters of song. When Virgil's Meliboeus calls Thyrsis and Corydon 'two veritable Arcadians', he is not suggesting that you can tell they are foreigners: he pays a compliment to their musicianship. For a decade now, a consensus has been growing that, about Virgil's Arcadia, Snell was wrong (R. Jenkyns, 'Virgil and Arcadia', *JRS* 79 [1989], 26–39; cf. his book *Virgil's Experience. Nature and History: Times, Names, and Places* [Oxford, 1998], pp. 156–69). The case 'against' Snell was summed up (in a rather different spirit) twenty-five years ago, in an article that goes far beyond mere refutation (E. A. Schmidt, 'Arkadien: Abendland und Antike', *A&A* 21 [1975], 36–57; revised in his book *Bukolische Leidenschaft oder Über antike Hirtenpoesie* [Frankfurt am Main, Berne, and New York, 1987], pp. 239–64; quoted by D. F. Kennedy, '*Arcades ambo*: Vergil, Gallus and Arcadia', *Hermathena* 143 [1987], 47–60, at 57 n. 13; cf. n. 12). Schmidt saw that the Arcadia of the *Eclogues* could not be identified with the Arcadia of pastoral poetry, and recognized the rôle of Sannazaro in the process of trans- formation. He described the conditions of Snell's misapprehension, and examined the question: if Virgil's Arcadia is not pastoral—what is it? (Cf. Kennedy, pp. 49–50, 54, 55–6.) And with his answer, Πὰν συρικτάς is in harmony.

Worcester College, Oxford ARND KERKHECKER

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PHILODEMUS

D. SIDER: *The Epigrams of Philodemos. Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Pp. xi + 259. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. Cased, £58. ISBN: 0-19-509982-6.

Finally: the first real book on Philodemus' poems *ever*. A newly edited text, sensitive translations, sparkling commentary, and a substantial introductory essay; meticulous scholarship, but accessible, even reasonably priced. This is surely the book to bring Philodemus to the appreciative wider audience he deserves. What is the catch?

For a start, the introduction: a marvellously clear piece of writing, and full of holes. Cicero says Epicureans are 'an impoverished lot', therefore Philodemus is poor (p. 5 n. 11), although Cicero makes things up about Epicureans to get at Piso (same page, body text). The 'stitched together' aneedote of a stay at Himera (p. 9) becomes assumed fact (p. 10). Philodemus writes on the pain of growing old in a foreign land, therefore Philodemus must have been growing old in a foreign land, namely Italy (p. 12). Maybe this is unfair criticism; either you attach validity to this kind of reconstruction or, like me, you do not. For me, Sider's biographical tendency is at its least plausible when he attempts to place Philodemus' poetic activity within a philosophical schema that will somehow explain it (pp. 28ff.). Expecting Philodemus' epigrams to 'illustrate his views' (p. 32) or 'manifest his theory of poetry' (p. 38) sets them a task that may not be to their taste. It is also an open invitation to any number of circularities.

'Quare me temeritatis opprobrium subire non puto': in a sense, we have been here before. S.'s project is uncannily similar to a much-derided attempt made in 1926 by Albert Linnenkugel to re-flesh one of the most prolific poets of the Greek Anthology, the satirist Loukillios. *De Lucillo Tarrhaeo Epigrammatum Poeta, Grammatico, Rhetore* (diss. Paderborn, 1926 = *Rhetorische Studien* 13: I quote his p. 56): Linnenkugel's title gave the game away. This was to be a comprehensive authorial profile, establishing the poet's real-life identity, and then demonstrating how the career and concerns of 'Lucillus' shaped the verse: a 'verissimam . . . imaginem' of the poet's life and work (p. 113). As such it was bold, novel, and panned. Mostly, it must be said, by time-wasters (Martin, *Gnomon* 5 [1929], 124–6; Preisendanz, *Phil. Woch.* 50 [1929], 289–95).

S.'s image rests on firmer foundations—we know a fair bit about Philodemus, and it has a potential for truth that Linnenkugel was never aware he lacked. I wish I believed half of it. As it stands, S.'s Epicurean is as limp a poet as Linnenkugel's grammarian; both are doctrinaires, with none of the sense of fun that makes the texts themselves so rewarding. This is a particular let-down for Philodemus, given the sensitivity with which S. has edited and presented his text—given, also, S.'s own evident urbanity and style. All I intend to do here is look at the first few poems in S.'s arrangement and see whether Philodemus can come out and play. (I take incipits from the book's consistently fine translations.)

Poem One (*AP* 5.131 = 11 GP): 'The harp playing of Xanthippe and her talk'. Philodemus distinguishes levels of the soul within a context of erotic infatuation (3)? Hardly: Xanthippe's love will burn the speaker's soul (φλέξει σε), and philosophical schemata of the soul will not matter one bit. Loosely, the sense of 3–4 looks to me more like: 'all that about "from what" and "at what time" and "in what manner" . . . it's gone right out of my head, it's beside the point'. (Maybe this is a lot to read into

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

οὐκ οἶδα, but epigrams cannot help being concise; that is what makes them so challenging and exciting to read.) Emphatically, his soul will burn (4). So much for metaphysics.

Poem Two (*AP* 5.80): 'An apple am I'. S.'s Epicurean wit sparkles in the notes: 'This apple, not having read its Denniston, is sparing of connective particles' (p. 65). But where is any discussion of where the poem is headed? (*À la* Strato: eat up life's pleasures while they are fresh.) 'The theme . . . fits in well with the Epicurean idea that one should enjoy the one life we have' (p. 65), suggests S., philosophically. The theme is, plainly: Xanthippe, please have sex with me now.

Poem Three (*AP* 9.570 = 14 GP): 'Xantho formed of wax'. Terrific scholarship here, worn lightly: S.'s note on (e.g.) διπτερύγῶν (2) is a first-class bit of digging. But should the final distich be there at all, and if so, who speaks? S. expects an 'Epicurean corrective' (p. 69) from sensible Xanthippe—S.'s Xanthippe is a good girl, and correspondingly finds one; but it is hard work for small return (pp. 71–2), and worryingly top-heavy, given the badly broken final line. S. must be right that Xanthippe speaks here, but 'get lost, loser' seems a simpler gloss on her reply.

Poem Four (*AP* 11. 41 = 17 GP): 'Seven years are coming up on thirty'. Columns of text (σελίδες) are being torn from the roll of the speaker's life by advancing years, but 'the narrator's despondency . . . is dispelled by the thought that his life and verses will be cheered up by the presence of Xanthippe' (p. 73). Again, top-notch textual archaeology by S: his note on ἑπτὰ τριηκόντεσσιν (1) is particularly tasty. So too are remarks on Philodemus' striking use of metaphor. But, again, where is the joke in 7 κορωνίδα? The erudition continues to dazzle (pp. 76–7), and S.'s conclusion—'Phil.'s point is that Xanthippe is the koronis that marks the end of the manic stage of his life' by joining him as life-partner (p. 77)—is possible, but so are other readings. What is more, it requires some heavy-handed punctuation in the final line to make it turn out philosophically: 'Inscribe her immediately as the koronis, Mistress Muses, of this my madness' (S.'s rendering, 73). Instead I would suggest: 'as *my* koronis, Muses, Mistresses of this my madness'. It gives pretty good sense, and it is funny. Just as in S.'s Poem five (*AP* 5.112 = 18 GP), Philodemus in comically premature mid-life crisis is finding white hairs, 'heralds of the age of good sense'—but good sense has not yet arrived. In my preferred reading of Four, Philodemus—put that in as many brackets and inverted commas as you like—recognizes that the joke is on him despite his philosophy. He invites Xanthippe to be the end of him (κορωνίδα), at the same time making her the grand finale of his poetic output within the genre of erotic epigram (5 μέλονται).

In short: the scholarship is a joy, the writing a delight, the joke generally much better if you do not insist on it being philosophical. The text lends itself readily to a playful, mischievous Philodemus who can poke fun at the very idea of philosophy, if there is a good punchline in it; a Philodemus who does not always confine himself to one unambiguous 'point'.

In the end, though, S. invites nitpicking of this sort for the same basic reason as Linnenkugel: both break entirely new ground. For all its flaws, Linnenkugel's *De Lucillo* was the first thing remotely worth reading on Loukillios. It remains so, in small company. S. too, working with intelligence and flair, has brought his poet out of the shadows; more, he has made him his own. He gives us a Philodemus worth reading as a poet, and tries to draw new connections. I do not believe that half of them work; but if I ever write a book this flawed, I will be a very happy man.

Oxford GIDEON NISBET

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TROUBLED WATERS

F. Fajen (ed.): *Oppianus* Halieutica. *Einführung, Text, Übersetzung in deutscher Sprache, ausführliche Kataloge der Meeresfauna.* Pp. xvi + 409. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1999. Cased, DM 158. ISBN: 3-519-04290-8.

F. began his systematic analysis of the tradition nearly forty years ago and has crowned his labours with the present edition. His earlier collations of sixty-one MSS (Meisenheim, 1969) and of some recent finds (*Hermes* 107 [1979], 286–310) have revealed a degree of contamination which has persuaded him (*Abh. Mainzer Akad.* [1995] 2) that a comprehensive stemma and elimination are impossible. This edition, the first to be based on the MSS for 150 years, assumes familiarity with the elaborate infrastructure already in place. Two pages (pp. XI–XII) briefly introduce the cumbersome apparatus but offer next to nothing on the seventy-eight MSS, their present locations (in fact from St Petersburg to Minneapolis), layers of correction, lacunae, or dates. Access to F.'s earlier publications, to which the apparatus makes constant reference (×80 in 3.1–168!), is needed for intelligent deciphering of its contents. F. could profitably have taken as a model J. B. Hall's presentation of the even more intractable sources for Claudian's *De raptu Proserpinae* (Cambridge, 1969), but has added to his problem by overloading his descriptive apparatus with material which properly belongs in a linguistic commentary, with *exhibet*/*-ent* used to introduce up to a dozen witnesses, a liberal citing of discarded conjectures all preceded by *proponit*, parallels with *Cyn.*, and references to Denniston, *Greek Particles*[2] and A. W. James's *Studies*. To report in an apparatus the erroneous readings of earlier editions and where the error was subsequently exposed (e.g. on 2.290) is tacitly to admit the need for separate annotation on orthography and textual history.

Assembling this huge repertory of variants has made possible a fresh look at the many hundreds of places where Mair's Loeb depends on too limited an awareness of the tradition or on conjecture. Apart from punctuation and minor orthography, I counted 390 changes from Mair, more than half of which make little difference either way, but in the great majority of the remainder F.'s selection from his array of readings is superior: 1.53 *ἵσταται*, 73 *ἰλήκοι*, 409 *μάκαρ*, 466 *ἀπαλύξασα*, 2.308 *ἐνιπρίσασα*, 586 *κυδοιμῷ* (imitated in Tryphiodorus 192, but the punctuation of 585–6 should mark off the central chiasmus *ἄκριτα . . . ὀδύνῃσι* to show that the adverbial phrase qualifies *ἑλίσσεται*); 3.131 *ἀγκίστροιο φύγῃσι*, 143 *πεσόντες*, 178 *τευθίδος ἢ* (cf. 190), 321 *ὁμοῖον*, 339 *ἄγρη πιανέεις*, 496 *πέλεν* (Mair's *θόρεν* anticipates 497); 4.44 *ἰθύς*, 89 *ἄκατον*, 257 *ἀμφίκλαυτον*, 437 *πομπίλοι*, 615 *ἄγρην*; 5.6 *γόνος* (Schneider's *γένος* is awkward in view of 71), 93 *ἑκών*, 102 *ἄεθλος*, 255 *βαρυγλώχινα*, 267 *λαῖτμα* (was *κῦμα* introduced for the alliteration? Cf. 269), 281 *πῦρ καὶ θηρὶ θοώτερον*, 624 *μέσον πόρον*. I still prefer Mair only in 1.144 *σπαίρουσι* (much livelier), 496 *κάπτουσι* (cf. Arist. *HA* 541 a 13), 619 *δρόμον* (for F.'s *πόρον* cf. 617); 2.519, 5.218 *μαινομένη* (cf. 222), 507. Conjectures are more problematic. Out go three dozen of Schneider's, with little or no loss except at 5.68 where *φαιός* fits the pilot-fish better than *βαιός*, and possibly 2.208 where Hermann's *λύσσα δ' ἀεί* attracts. I welcome Brunck's *κυφός* (2.152), *ἐμφῦσαι* (4.153), *ἐρωμανέοντες* (403), missing his *ἅλις* (5.342, for the ensuing anaphora) and *κατιόντι* (551, where *μογέοντι* anticipates 557 and 567). Koechly's excellent *ξηρῆς ἔπι* (2.214) is here, with *καθήμενον* (392) and *ἄψ δέ* (4.332), Gualandri's likely *ὀδμήν* for *αὐδήν* (4.317), but not West's *ἀχάλινοι* (5.368). F. introduces over a dozen of his own, and I see little or no improvement at 1.771, 2.91

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Gow's ἐπάνωθε is better), 473; 3.18, 585, 599; 4.568; 5.342 (φόβος is much stronger), 367, 485, 610; but his restoration of 1.637 is successful, and ἐδόκευσε (2.411) is more convincing than ἐλόχησε, presumably a gloss. Duals return at 1.259, 570; other restored forms rightly resist Schneider's Attic conformity: dat. pl. -ῃς for -αις, ἑρπηστής for ἑρπυστής, ἀντάω for ἀντιάω, εἰλέω always with *spiritus asper*, δαγμ- for δηγμ-, Homeric εἰ + subj. for ἤν, wk aor. endings for εὗρον.

While the apparatus painstakingly details variants and relates each choice to selection-criteria in one or more of F.'s publications (on 3.340 it offers 'microfilm' as a Latin word!), the reader will be disconcerted to find as a consequence that below the German translation on each facing page extends a large expanse of blank paper for which uses could so readily have been found: a textual commentary complementing the apparatus; explanation of the sigla groupings; the extensive and important scholia, and the paraphrasis (only the latter available in a modern edition); most of all, the many allusions to Homer, Hesiod, and the Alexandrians, which suggest a more complex reading of the poem than the superficially didactic F. himself unquestioningly assumes to be adequate (pp. IX–XI). A very brief introduction draws largely on Keydell in *RE* to present the *Halieutica* to first-time German readers (a discussion of what constitutes its special 'poetische Fassung' would have been welcome), and F. ends with seventy pages of indexed fish-lore compiled from standard reference works. The book would have been reduced by about eighty pages had the translation been printed continuously at the end; its German is concise, and I notice Mair's preferences are followed at 1.7, 142, 2.5, 215, 3.166, 5.338–9, 349, but not at 5.416 where the condemnation of dolphin-hunting as ἀπότροπος is correctly rendered 'verabscheuungswürdig' and not as Mair's anachronistic 'immoral'. F. has tried to produce a book for two different classes of reader, which are not necessarily exclusive but in practice almost entirely so. The one is unlikely to have much use for what is copiously provided for the other, while having its own needs far from satisfied. Still, the text is now standard, the apparatus indispensable. There is an *index nominum*, but the many new readings are nowhere listed separately. As a result, the utility of the García/Pérez *Concordance* and of the relevant part of James's *Index* is considerably reduced. I noticed misprints in the text at 3.50 ὀπωινῆσιν and 4.473 ἐμφεφύασιν.

Llanelli BYRON HARRIES

NONNUS' FUNERAL GAMES

H. FRANGOULIS (ed., trans.): *Nonnos de Panopolis XIII*, Les Dionysiaques xxxvii (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. xiv + 191. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-00471-8.

Nonnus' capacity for surprise is no novelty, but in Book 37 he turns surprise on its head by modelling his funeral games for Opheltes rigorously on *Iliad* 23, a shock in this 'most unHomerlike of epics' which aims to 'subsume, contain and ultimately surpass his poetic ancestor' (N. Hopkinson in his *Studies in the Dionysiaca of Nonnus* [Cambridge, 1994], pp. 9, 26; see further pp. 30f.). Frangoulis' close analysis confirms received opinion that Nonnus here gives us Homer virtually neat with little cognizance of the intervening games of Virgil, Statius, Silius, and Quintus—hence no advance on the problem of Nonnus' knowledge or ignorance of Latin poetry.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In context if not in content, however, the games are not without surprise. Like Homer, Nonnus eschews funereal celebration for his hero's main opponent (Deriades is not killed until Book 40), but apparently goes to the opposite extreme in foregrounding Opheltes, unmentioned before 32.186 where he features in a bare list of eleven victims of Deriades' spear. When Dionysus returns to battle in 35, restored by ambrosia from the breast of his old enemy Hera, unburied Opheltes is juxtaposed reproachfully with living Deriades (35.374 *Δηριάδην ζώοντα καὶ ἀκτερέιστον 'Οφέλτην*) as incitement to revenge, while Dionysus' sense of shame in Crete declares Opheltes' provenance. A reference in the same passage (35.385) to the wounded Cretan leader Asterios, like Hymenaeus a lover of Dionysus, accounts for Dionysus' depth of feeling, but the ingenious hypothesis of Francis Vian (*ZPE* 122 [1998], 71–8; cf. *Les Dionysiaques* t. x, pp. 94–6) was needed to explain the presence in the *Dionysiaca* of Asterios and his Cretans: he proposes that Nonnus' source was Dionysius' *Bassarica*, which probably drew upon a *Cretica.*

Vian's thesis draws attention to another difference between Nonnus and Homer—a change of tone by which a limited erotic interest supplants the pathos of Achilles' loss of Patroclus, like a father's of his son (*Il.* 23.222–5), emphasized in the opening passages of *Iliad* 23 where the shade of Patroclus reproaches his master. In a book of exceptional length for the *Dionysiaca* and only 120 lines short of *Iliad* 23, the curtailment of Homer's initial sequence from 257 lines to 102 (shown in F.'s comparative table, pp. 44f., the first of several useful schematic presentations of Nonnus *vis-à-vis* his antecedents) is indicative. For Iliadic lament both in Troy and the Greek camp (*Il.* 23.1, 9f.), Nonnus forcefully substitutes an early reference to the Indians' burial of their dead with tearless eyes (*D.* 37.3 *ὄμμασιν ἀκλαύτοισιν*), fortified by their belief in metempsychosis, which is expounded over three lines. Metempsychosis is well treated in her note (pp. 105f.), but F.'s meticulous classification of Nonnus' similarities to and variation of Homer in her long *Notice* (pp. 1–74) is occasionally blinkered to broader divergences in the thought-world of the two poets.

Nevertheless F. accumulates a useful if unsurprising list of areas where Nonnus departs from Homer: he often suppresses direct speech, especially conversation (e.g. in the foot race, p. 56; although a long speech before the chariot race anachronistically surveys Greek games, 37.131–53, while rules for the archery contest are lengthier than Homer's, *D.* 37.714–21, cf. *Il.* 23.855–8); he introduces mythological ornament, often in direct speech (e.g. Pelops and Hippodamia, 37.338–41, 428–30) or modifies details (e.g. the winds, 37.71f., cf. *Il.* 23.193–8); he adds catalogues (e.g. trees felled for the pyre, 37.15–18; in place of Homeric dialogue, p. 29), technical description (e.g. in the boxing- and wrestling-matches, where Roman elements are included: cf. Hopkinson, *Studies*, p. 41 n. 132), *ecphraseis* (e.g. the two stone semi-circular turning-posts, 37.105–13), and contemporary allusion (e.g. crowd frenzy at the races, 37.269–78, 439). He judiciously 'corrects' Homer (e.g. by adapting the chariot-race narrative to include the last contestant, pp. 24f.), but, in contrast to Alexandrian poets, seldom 'glosses' Homeric language (Hopkinson, *Studies*, pp. 15f.). He suppresses some less plausible incidents (e.g. the return of Meriones' arrow to his feet after transfixing the dove, *Il.* 23.876f.) while erotic motives influence divine intervention at 37.638–45 and when Apollo assists Dionysus' beloved Hymenaeus from brotherly affection (37.736f.). Nonnus' greatest divergence from *Iliad* 23 is at the end, where an amicable javelin fight in armour combines elements of Homer's vicious hoplomachy (*Il.* 23.798–825) with his concluding javelin contest, conceded to Agamemnon as a mark of respect (*Il.* 23.884–97): Dionysus' insistence on avoidance of bloodshed (37.754–7, 773f.) constitutes further 'correction' of Homer (*Il.* 23.805f.).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

F.'s text judiciously corrects accents (e.g. lines 22, 28, 90) and occasionally diverges more boldly from Keydell (lines 62, 277), but discards superfluous conjecture (lines 533, 592–3). The notes provide concise comment on matters textual, linguistic, literary, and thematic, conveniently accessed by the *Index rerum notabilium* (which might usefully have been fuller). Overall this is a workmanlike volume whose conspicuous achievement is close comparison of Nonnus' text with Homer's (a desideratum: Hopkinson, *Studies*, p. 31), providing essential groundwork for broader understanding of their relationship.

King's College London MARY WHITBY

ATOMIST FRAGMENTS

C. C. W. TAYLOR: *The Atomists: Leucippus and Democritus Fragments* (The Phoenix Presocratics Series). Pp. xii + 308. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1999. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-8020-4390-9.

This series, designed for modern students of the Presocratic philosophers, is well served with a volume containing an extensive choice of fragments and testimonia of the two main atomists, Leucippus and Democritus.

'The aim of this work is to present the ancient evidence, both direct and indirect, for the thought of Leucippus and Democritus, and to assist the critical evaluation of the thought of those philosophers by the provision of a commentary on the evidence' (p. xi). To realize this aim, Taylor enunciates his three main criteria (pp. xi–xii). (1) The biographical evidence for Leucippus is separately presented from that of Democritus, but no distinction between the two is made in respect of doctrines. (2) The biographical section of the testimonia closely follows the order of D–K, but the various sections on the doctrines of the atomists are not based on any selection previously published (i.e. D–K's or Luria's selections; on the latter see the review of C. Baffioni, *Elenchos* 2 [1981], 161–92); where the atomists are mentioned in the context of a continuous argument, as is frequently the case in Aristotle, T. presents sufficient context to make the direction of the argument intelligible. (3) He has not attempted to include every passage in ancient literature in which the atomists are referred to but translates enough to provide the essential evidence, with further references to guide the reader who wishes to research further the doxographical tradition on particular points.

The volume begins by a choice of fragments of both philosophers (pp. 1–51): one fragment of Leucippus (L) and 162 of Democritus (D). The fragments of Democritus are classified in different sections: Life (D 1), General (D 2–3), Works on nature (D 4–11), Literary criticism and theory of language (D 12–13), Theology (D 14), Epistemology (D 15–22), and Ethics—this section being divided into two heads: fragments attested or confirmed by writers other than Stobaeus (D 24–35) and ethical sayings from that collection (D 36–162) (part of those sayings is attributed by Stobaeus to a 'Democrates', cf. J.-M. Flamand, D. Gutas, 'Democrates', in R. Goulet [ed.], *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques* [Paris, 1994], ii.644–9). The texts are in Greek and translated by T. himself (p. xii). In some cases, the fragments have been supplied with critical notes in English. The second part of the book includes

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

testimonia on the life of Leucippus (pp. 53–4), and on the life and thought of Democritus (pp. 54–156). The commentary (pp. 157–234) 'with the exception of the section on Ethics and Politics, is almost exclusively confined to the testimonia' (pp. xi). Not everything is new there: 'portions of the commentary were previously published in the chapter "Anaxagoras and the Atomists" which I contributed to *Routledge History of Philosophy*, *vol. 1*, ed. C. C. W. Taylor (London, 1997)' (p. vii).

The book is completed by an English translation of the *Sayings of Democrates* (pp. 235–8). We find subsequently: a list of passages cited as sources (pp. 239–60), as well as notes on sources (pp. 261–4); the concordances with D–K and with Luria (A, in the order of this volume, pp. 265–82, and B, in the order of D–K, pp. 282–9); the bibliography on pp. 291–8; the index of names and subjects on pp. 299–303; and the passages from ancient authors and other passages on pp. 304–8.

This volume advances understanding of the Atomists' thought, and will certainly be useful to a large range of readers. The criteria T. applies to the choice of fragments and testimonia, and the changes he worked out regarding their classification, open the way to what could be a new edition of the *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, which remains a desideratum.

On the whole, T. is well informed of the progress of the research, and on recent bibliography, though he seems unaware of some important works on Democritus, e.g. P. M. Morel, *Démocrite et la recherche des causes* (Paris, 1996), L. Orelli, *La pienezza del vuoto* (Bari, 1997), J. Mansfeld, *Prolegomena* (Leiden, 1994), pp. 97–105, and H. Tarrant, *Thrasyllan Platonism* (London and Ithaca, 1993).

I shall finally point out some addenda and corrigenda minima concerning mainly the testimonia. P. 58 n. 36: the text of the MSS is also accepted by G. Onodera, *Philologus* 137 (1993), 104–9 (*contra* J. Brunschwig in M.-O. Goulet Cazé [ed.], *Diogène Laërce*, *Vie et doctrines des philosophes illustres* [Paris, 1999], p. 1081 n. 3). P. 65 test. 33, p. 248 read: Himerius, *Declamations*. P. 65 test. 35: a new edition of the text with corrections can be found in the *CPF* I 1** 43 7T. P. 94 test. 77a: a new edition is available in Orelli, op. cit., pp. 154–6. P. 153 test. 208: republished by S. Laursen, *CErc* 27 (1997), 40–1. P. 155 test. 213: on the testimonium, see D. Delattre, P. M. Morel, *ZPE* 121 (1998), 21–4, and J. Hammerstaedt, ibid., 25–7. P. 156: the testimonium of *papyrus Herculanensis* 1788 is false, cf. Gigante–Indelli (cf. p. 298 n. 124), 463–4. P. 261 Agathemerus: read geographi. P. 262, and elsewhere read: (Diels) . . . Doxographi.

Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris TIZIANO DORANDI

GREEK ORATORY

S. USHER: *Greek Oratory: Tradition and Originality*. Pp. xi + 388. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Cased, £55. ISBN: 0-19-815074-1.

Students of Greek oratory have long benefited from Stephen Usher's work—his many important articles, his Loeb edition of the *Critical Essays* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and his 2½ volumes of Greek Orators for Aris & Phillips. This latest book treats classical oratory from its beginning in the sophistic period to its end (at least for us) in 322 B.C. U. sets his work squarely in the tradition of Dionysius, one of whose aims was to assess the classical orators' literary merit in purely aesthetic terms.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

U. cites Blass, Jebb, Dobson, and Kennedy as his modern predecessors, but he differs from these in his concentrated focus on literary style. His goal is stylistic analysis, and he presents biographical, historical, legal, and other matters only as background for this purpose.

The book begins with 'The Early Rhetorical Tradition' (including tragedy until 420, but no later lest it overlap with Antiphon) and proceeds through Antiphon, Andocides, Lysias, and so forth down to Dinarchus, with a quick look at 'Ceremonial Oratory' (i.e. funeral orations) at the end. For each orator U. includes a brief biography and then discusses each speech in chronological order in about one to four pages. In each case he identifies the situation and summarizes the author's treatment, noting stylistic points as they arise. Appendices on the *Tetralogies* (probably by Antiphon) and Gorgias' *Palamedes*, a useful glossary of technical terms, a bibliography, and two indices complete the volume.

The subtitle identifies two specific concerns, tradition and originality. The former consists primarily of recurring rhetorical features. U. identifies the parts of speeches, common themes, or *topoi*, and many individual figures of speech—the traditional building-blocks out of which orators constructed their works. But his real interest is originality, and he repeatedly observes where and how a writer is or is not being original. Claims of an orator's originality depend, of course, on the accurate determination of the chronology and authenticity of his speeches, which are often uncertain, but U. generally steers a reasonable path through the many difficulties regarding these issues. He also copes fairly well with the chronological overlap among several orators, especially those with long careers. He divides Isocrates into Logographos (the six early court speeches) and Sophistes, and Demosthenes into Logographos I, Symboulos, and Logographos II, giving the assembly speeches and most of the long forensic speeches (19–24) to the Symboulos but for practical reasons leaving 18 for Logographos II.

The search for originality raises many other questions, however, that U. either ignores or treats only implicitly. For instance, since most speeches are now lost, for all we know, a feature he labels original may have been used in dozens of earlier speeches. More important, why should originality be a primary criterion for assessing literary merit? Did an orator's success or reputation really depend on his originality? Would Dinarchus rank higher in U.'s opinion if fewer earlier works had survived? Where did this criterion of literary merit originate? Is it just a modern value? Other important considerations also remain unexamined. For example, we read in connection with Lysias 1 that 'the literary requirements of the published speech placed it at a point of further removal from reality', but U. never discusses the process of writing or publishing a speech, or the vexing issue of revision, or the nature of these literary requirements. He has treated some of these issues before, but it would help greatly to have his current thinking on them.

Other examples: U. dismisses the success of Aeschines 1 as due in large measure to performance, but does not discuss the rôle of performance in oratory; surely it played some part in Demosthenes' victorious speeches too. With Isocrates matters get especially complex. U. recognizes that Isocrates renders traditional generic categories inoperative and credits him with the new genre, *politikos logos*, but he has trouble (as do all critics) giving a positive account of this genre. And he omits *Against the Sophists* entirely, in part on the ground that it is 'not oratory in any recognizable sense'. What then is oratory for Isocrates, who pushed so far beyond traditional boundaries? U. cites Too's work on this question (*The Rhetoric of Identity in Isocrates* [Cambridge, 1995]), but then defines Isocrates' oratory only in traditional stylistic terms (periodic

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sentences, etc.). Finally, although he speaks of Demosthenes' 'self-identification' with his audience and sees him as educating it, he does not mention Josiah Ober's *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens* (Princeton, 1989) or Harvey Yunis's *Taming Democracy: Models of Political Rhetoric in Classical Athens* (Ithaca, 1996).

It is easy, of course, to criticize someone for not writing the book the reviewer wants, and I should hasten to add that U. largely accomplishes what he sets out to do. Although reviewers may read the book straight through, many others will read only the discussions of certain orators or speeches, but they will find these useful and enlightening. The book also provides a good starting point for a study of rhetorical tropes and figures in oratory. In this regard it should be noted, however, that the General Index is not complete and gives only a selection of places where U. mentions a given feature, that in the Index of Speeches one must know to look for some of Demosthenes' speeches near the end under Apollodorus, and that there is no *index locorum*. Still, the book will be useful, and not just for its many detailed studies. Perhaps its most impressive feature is U.'s overall assessments of orators, particularly Demosthenes, whose novelty, U. argues, is 'a matter of literary intention realized through form and scale rather than identifiable technical or rhetorical innovation'. 'Oratory, for Demosthenes, has become a medium of political education' in which 'disquisition on broader subjects of historical or political interest' serves to reach 'an enlightened and timeless readership'. This is not an entirely novel conclusion, but U.'s assessment is more precisely and elegantly stated, and more thoroughly illustrated and supported than anything I am familiar with. Despite some limitations, then, this book has considerable strengths and will interest all who work on the orators.

The University of Texas MICHAEL GAGARIN

ARISTOTLE'S POLITICS

P. L. P. SIMPSON: *A Philosophical Commentary on the* Politics *of Aristotle*. Pp. xxxvi + 476. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1997. Cased, $40.95. ISBN: 0-8078-2308-5.

P. L. P. SIMPSON: *The* Politics *of Aristotle: Translated with Introduction, Analysis and Notes*. Pp. xliv + 274. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1997. Cased, $39.95 (Paper, $12.95) ISBN: 0-8078-2327-9 (0-8078-4637-6 pbk).

Teachers and scholars alike should welcome these companion volumes, which contain a new translation and a fresh commentary on the *Politics* of Aristotle. They would make an ideal set of prescribed readings for a graduate seminar and would even be suitable for advanced undergraduates, as I discovered recently when teaching the *Politics*. So I can recommend them to fellow teachers and colleagues with a few small reservations which I shall note shortly.

In his introduction to the first book, Simpson explains and defends some of his principles of translation: e.g. his decision to translate *polis* as 'city' rather than as 'state', or *politeia* as 'regime' rather than 'constitution'. I find most of his choices plausible but I want to take issue with his explicit (p. xxviii) decision to translate *kalôs* almost everywhere as 'nobly' in order to draw the reader's attention to the ethical overtones of Aristotle's use of the term. While I agree that in many places the use of

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the adverb *kalôs* has moral connotations. there are several contexts where 'nobly' is positively misleading as a translation, and I have compiled a sample of such passages.

At 1265a13 the context requires either 'excellent', 'fine' or even 'outstanding'; cf. also 1265a21. At 1265b31 'spoken well'; cf. also 1277b13, 1295a36, 1293b1, 1325b14, 1282a15, and 1332a12. At 1307a8 and 1294b17 'good mixture' is the required translation. Other miscellaneous instances: 1294a6, 1295b33, 1297b39–40, 1300b38, 1305b20, 1331b36, 1332a28, 1339a12, and 1342a34.

Other remarks: at 1275a34 S.'s translation of *tô(i) eidei* as different in 'notion' is dubious, since the context suggests that Aristotle means difference in kind because of the underlying subject being different, i.e. the issue is ontological not nominal.

Unlike the standard Oxford commentaries, S. opts to give a much fuller narrative of the main lines of argument, along with a more comprehensive discussion of disputed points. In many ways, this is more satisfactory than the standard commentary, especially for students who wish to get a more general grasp of the issues rather than be dragged into esoteric scholarly disputes about the Greek text. This is not to suggest that S. does not pay adequate attention to the Greek, since he does in fact opt for some unorthodox readings of the text, while giving reasons for his choices. For instance, at 1276b34 he omits 'tên' from the Greek and translates *kata mian areten einai teleian* as 'by reference to a single complete virtue'. At 1281a41 he suggests a plausible reading of the Greek (*doxeien an luesthai*) rather than accept the emendation (*an eu legesthai*) proposed by Richards, which Reeve accepts. At 1295b12, however, I find that S. chooses an implausible reading from the available Greek variants, as I think it most likely that Aristotle sets opposite extremes against the mean, i.e. those in the middle neither avoid nor seek rule.

S. declares his intention of providing a philosophical commentary, rather than one which is either philological or historical. However, by 'philosophical' he means 'analytical' in the narrow sense of being concerned mainly with the analysis of arguments, both individually and as a whole in the text. This excludes any serious concern with the rhetorical features of the text, such as identifying its intended audience, or what it implies or deliberately leaves unsaid. Given the excesses of recent Straussian interpreters, such ascetism about hidden meanings in Aristotle's texts is very welcome. It also makes for a more plausible hermeneutical approach, especially since the *Politics* was most likely given as a set of lectures within the Lyceum to an adequately prepared audience. In fact, S. explicitly adopts some of the hermeneutical assumptions made by Aquinas; namely, that the text forms a unity that can be grasped through its philosophical content. But, even in the case of an Aristotelian text like the *Politics*, one might still cavil at S.'s implicit assumption that 'philosophical' equals 'analytical', since it is arguable that at least a few literary and rhetorical features should get some attention, e.g. the style of Aristotle's introductions and concluding summaries, the aporetic structure of the inquiry in some places. In any event, S. (1998, p. xv) seems to be mistaken in completely equating the requirements of a rhetorical reading with the idiosyncracies of a Straussian reading.

Perhaps the most controversial aspect of S.'s project is the reordering of traditional Books 7 and 8 as new Books 4 and 5, so let me say a few words *pro* and *contra*. In terms of their content, there is fairly convincing evidence that Aristotle intended to give his treatment of the ideal *polis* a central place in the *Politics*, since it is introduced in Book 3 as the next important topic after the definition of the citizen. Subsequently, the traditional Books 4–6 provide a discussion of the second-best *polis* that seems to presuppose the treatment of the best *polis*, which is not treated adequately in Book 3.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Therefore, it makes good sense to insert the traditional Books 7 and 8 between Books 3 and 4, even though many scholars have baulked at previous attempts to do so.

In his introductions to both books, S. has given a rather plausible rationale for reviving these attempts to provide some kind of unity and order for the text of the *Politics* that has been handed down in an apparently disorganized condition. In addition to the reasons which he has given, let me add from my (limited) experience of teaching the *Politics* that it makes pedagogical sense to read the books in the order proposed by him. Assuming that the work is a series of lectures, such pedagogical considerations should perhaps be given more weight by scholars. On the other hand, a case can be made for reading the books in their traditional order on the grounds that it reflects the more empirical and anti-utopian character of Aristotle's political thought by comparison with that of Plato's *Republic*. In fact, however, I find that Plato's *Laws* is a better companion text for reading the *Politics* because they share similar historical features. With regard to the general context for the *Politics*, S. refuses to say anything about its historical context so as to avoid begging the question against Aristotle, who seems to have regarded the *polis* as natural rather than as an historical artefact. However, S. does take seriously the philosophical context, since he begins his translation and commentary with the last chapter of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. He argues (1998, p. xxii) that this provides the only indispensable context for reading and understanding the *Politics*.

In general, I think that S. has succeeded in what he sets out to do. He has provided a very readable and fairly literal translation of the text, supported by informative summaries of chapters and sections. His commentary is reasonably full on most issues, and it does manage to be philosophical in that it covers the main issues, while provoking us to reflect on the perennial problems associated with the theory and practice of politics.

NUI Maynooth & Boston College JOHN J. CLEARY

PARTHENIUS OF NICAEA

J. L. LIGHTFOOT: *Parthenius of Nicaea*. Pp. xiv + 607. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999. Cased, £75. ISBN: 0-19-815253-1.

Parthenius is one of antiquity's worrying ghosts: despite posthumous celebrity, his own verses have all but disappeared without bodily trace, but he returns to haunt discussion of neoteric poetry and Roman elegy (particularly, of course, since Wendell Clausen's celebrated 1964 essay, 'Callimachus and Latin Poetry'); an empty chair must always be left for him at the commentator's feast. In this spectral rôle he has become a sort of Greek Gallus, and it is almost too good to be true that the extant collection of prose *Erotika Pathemata* is prefaced by a dedicatory epistle from one to the other; their shared obscurity has merely increased their powerful hold on the scholarly imagination. L. has had the good idea of bringing the verse fragments together with the *EP* to try at last to restore some flesh to this insubstantial presence; this is a good idea principally because it ought to make us think about the nature of literary production in the first century B.C.

L. offers a text and translation of both the fragments and the *EP*, together with full (but separate) introductions to both and a large-scale commentary. At six hundred

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(always learned, but sometimes rather leisurely) pages, this is clearly more attention than Parthenius has received in quite a while, though apparently there could have been more: in the poetic commentary, L. aims 'to supplement, but not to supplant, Meineke's classic commentary in his *Analecta Alexandrina* of 1843'. This is a strange use of the rhetoric of modesty, for if it were true we would have to ask 'Why?'; in fact, of course, L. patently does replace (and more) Meineke's modest thirty-four pages, and her book is bound (and rightly so) to become a 'standard reference'. (L. strangely does not mention the edition with commentary of the *EP* by G. Spatafora [London Studies in Classical Philology XXVII, Athens, 1995].) L. writes fluently and with a certain (rather drily scholastic) humour ('Nicole claimed to distinguish ten hands in the *Arete* scholia, which is clearly excessive, though there might be two'). Nevertheless, she makes no concessions to her readers: all parts of the book are full of untranslated Greek and Latin, even where the point at issue is not linguistic and quotation in English would have served just as well. This seems to me a particular pity for the *EP*, upon which L.'s work throws much new light and raises many questions of interest to scholars in a number of fields; I hope that the book's forbidding appearance will not prevent L.'s introduction to the *EP*, which helpfully discusses the nature of this curious work and its place within the traditions of ancient mythography (L. decides for a cautious optimism about the reliability of the transmitted ascriptions for the stories of the EP), the corpus of narrative motifs, the moral world of the *pathemata*, and narrative style and technique, from being widely appreciated. It is here and in the mythographic introductions to the individual *pathemata*, which helpfully catalogue parallel and analogous stories, that the book really comes alive. This introduction (pp. 228–40) offers an informed and suggestive account of the issues of interpretation which such Hellenistic 'myths' pose, though the commentary steps only gingerly into the murky waters of detailed analysis ('nature' and 'culture' in the death of Leuconoe [p. 430], the inevitable 'scapegoat' [pp. 421–2], etc.), or even holds it at a safe distance—'a structuralist might point to the opposition in both myths . . .' (p. 459). Sometimes L. might have been more forthcoming about how she understands the logic of P.'s stories. *EP* XXVI is the story of how a son of Telamon, a murderer and would-be rapist, is killed by Achilles, who then honours his martial prowess with a great burial mound around which hero-cult seems to have developed (ἔτι νῦν ἡρῶιον Τραμβήλου καλεῖται); 'there is no necessary connection between the Apriate and the Achilles sequences' (p. 518), but P. made such a connection explicit, and L. here ducks the commentator's task. So, too, L.'s operating assumptions about the relation between the Parthenian stories and the supposed 'sources' are sometimes unclear, leading to a pursuit of 'the original story' or of details which P. chooses not to supply; pp. 452–3 (*EP* XIII) on the rôle of the nurse and Harpalyce's culinary arrangements ('P. gives no details about the way the child was cooked, but Harpalyce will probably have boiled and roasted him . . .') is a good example. Nevertheless, L. has made a genuine contribution to the study of ancient storytelling, and her book should become an important resource in this field. So, too, the survey of the language of the *EP*, an important and rather neglected source for literary *koine*, offers a clear account (as well as serving as a reminder of just how much corruption seems to lurk in this problematic text).

The introduction to the scanty poetic fragments is no less full and will be much cited, e.g. for a useful survey of Hellenistic elegy, but it is in the nature of things that variations on the 'there is no real evidence whatsoever' (p. 41) theme occupy a prominent place. L.'s long discussion of 'Parthenius in Rome' conveniently assembles much familiar 'evidence' and speculation, and itself reaches a respectably cautious

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

position, without (unsurprisingly) really advancing the argument. Parthenius was later a favourite poet of Tiberius, who famously used to harry grammarians with problems such as the identity of Hecuba's mother (Suet. *Tib*. 70.3); he might well have asked also about Euphorion's influence on Gallus (L. pp. 59–64) or Philitas' 'problematic' (L. p. 48) relation to Parthenius. L. herself seems less than enthused about 'the tiresome question of a "neoteric" school' (p. 54).

Some details: 10. 'Demosthenes of Bithynia who writes surprisingly good hexameters . . .'. Why 'surprisingly'? Better, however, to be patronized than damned like Isidorus, whose Isis hymns have 'execrable' metre, but 'are interesting for the writer's possible familiarity with Callimachus' (p. 30). 17–18. Apparent ignorance of Marco Fantuzzi's introduction to the Italian edition of Ziegler's *Das hellenistische Epos* (Bari, 1988) is surprising. 23. Like J. D. Reed, *Bion of Smyrna* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 15, I am unpersuaded that *Lament for Adonis* 64–6 contains 'apparent polemic against Nicander'. 24 and *EP* XIV. For Alexander Aetolus see now E. Magnelli, *Alexandri Aetoli Testimonia et Fragmenta* (Florence, 1999). 35. On elegiacs and lamentation cf. *MD* 29 (1992), 18–22. 135 (fr. 1). Why should P.'s use of *ἀνανέμειν* in the sense 'read' be assumed to imitate Theocr. 18.48? 181 (fr. 28), *νύμφης ὑδατόεντα γάμον*. Some comment on the play with the metonymic sense of *νύμφη* as water is necessary. 190–1 (fr. 33). The discussion of W. Clausen, *Virgil's Aeneid and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry* (Berkeley, 1987), pp. 8–9, is curiously omitted, though 'exquisite gloss' used of both *σαρωνίδος* and *βεῦδος* perhaps suggests that L. is familiar with it (cf. Clausen 8 'two exquisitely rare words'). 246 and 498. The important fact about *ὁ τὴν Λέσβου κτίσιν ποιήσας* is that such a style is regularly used when the author is unknown or uncertain, as, for example, frequently happens with poems of the 'epic cycle', cf. *Titanomachia* frr. 1, 4, 6–8, *Thebais* frr. 2–3 Davies, etc.; at the very least, this does not strengthen the case for Apollonius of Rhodes. 367–71 (*EP* proem). L. has an excellent discussion of both the language of the prefatory epistle and of the *ὑπόμνημα* as a 'genre', but I would have welcomed more discussion of (i) P.'s particular use of prefatory *topoi* (a comparison with Catullus 1 would be enlightening); (ii) the implications of *κατανοήσεις*, in a desperately difficult sentence: what relation of teacher–pupil/patron–client is established here?; and (iii) why does P. (only) occasionally quote *verbatim* from poetic versions, and how does this fit what is said in the Preface? 402. 'P. seems to be starting the story afresh without realizing that he is doing so'. If so, this would have important general consequences which L. should spell out. 495. L. attractively emends the name of the 'heroine' of *EP* XX to 'Leiro'; Oenopion's daughter is given as *Λιρώ* on a roughly contemporary Chian inscription. 512. The note on Hipparinus' curious 'Thessalian accent' is inadequate: why does he play out this charade (a chastity test for the beloved?). *EP* XXIX (Daphnis). C. Zimmerman, *The Pastoral Narcissus* (Lanham, 1994) is a strange bibliographical omission. L. misrepresents (I think) the 'vulgate' Daphnis story: the 'natural' interpretation of the relevant texts is not that the nymph who loves Daphnis tries 'not to seduce him, but to ensure his permanent chastity', but that she warns him not to sleep with anyone else. It is the text of P. which is the odd man out: Jacoby's *ἄλλῃ* or *ἀνθρωπίνῃ* for *αὐτῶι* deserved a mention, and Gaselee too translates 'mortal woman'. 535–7 (*EP* XXXI, an everyday story of incest and necrophilia). Presumably *συνεῖναι* does not refer to a single act of intercourse: the 'relationship' continued until the body began to decompose. Such 'shorthand' is typical of P., and deserved a note. 545. The defence of *αὐτῶι γήμασθαι* (*EP* XXXIII) stretches credulity.

OUP deserve congratulation on the generosity and accuracy of the production: I

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

picked up a mere handful of misprints (on p. 517 the final sentence should [I think] read: '*Achilles* has come to Lesbos . . . the embattled locals summon *Trambelus* . . .').

Pembroke College, Cambridge RICHARD HUNTER

MARCUS AURELIUS

P. HADOT (ed., trans.): *Marc Aurèle:* Écrits pour lui-même *1* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. ccxxv + 57 (text double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-00472-6.

This is the first of a projected two-volume Budé edition of Marcus Aurelius' *Meditations*, named after the title in our earliest manuscripts (*εἰς ἑαυτόν*). The editor is Pierre Hadot, the distinguished intellectual historian, working in collaboration with Concetta Luna. H.'s wife, Ilsetraut, a noted scholar in her own right, has helped especially in establishing the text. Marcus Aurelius is not exactly neglected; but this is a very welcome addition to our scholarly resources. The main works at present are an excellent Teubner text (Dalfen, 1979, 1987), a two-volume edition with translation and full commentary (Farquharson, 1944), and a first-rate monograph on the *Meditations* as a literary-philosophical text (Rutherford, 1989). English-speaking readers also have a Loeb (Haines, 1916), and two translations with introductions and notes (Rutherford, 1989, and Gill, 1997, the latter with a new translation by Hard). The Budé is most closely comparable with Farquharson's edition. Although Farquharson's commentary remains valuable, especally for its comments on language, the Budé brings many new features, in addition to compactness and availability.

Every aspect of this volume gives evidence of meticulous care and scholarship of the highest standard. The text, while close to Dalfen's (but with less deletion of supposed interpolations), has been newly established with a substantial apparatus. There is a wide-ranging introduction with a further forty-two pages of *notes complémentaires*, mainly on textual and linguistic points. H.'s special academic concern is with the history of forms of expression and their conceptual implications, notably that of practical ethics or *l'exercise spirituel*. This is the main subject of his *Philosophy as a Way of Life* (Oxford, 1995) and it figures prominently in his philosophical introduction to the *Meditations* (*The Inner Citadel* [Cambridge, MA, 1998]). That concern is sometimes apparent in his comments here. Particularly suggestive is the idea of the *Meditations* as internalized dialogue between ideal and personal reason (pp. xxxiv–xxxix), and the contrast between the self-address of Books 2–11 and the catalogue in Book 1 of what 'I' (as ethical agent) have learnt from others (pp. liii–lx). But H. has been scrupulous in including material that may be of interest to the full range of readers of Marcus, including no less than seventy-four pages on the historical background of the individuals named as sources of inspiration in Book 1.

The main surprise in this volume is that, though a full-length study, it only covers Book 1 of the *Meditations*, while Books 2–12 are to be treated in a second volume. In fact, this is a defensible procedure. Book 1 consists of a connected account of Marcus' ethical debts to a range of named individuals and the gods; the other books are collections of localized reflections, which seem to be entries in an informal philosophical diary. So Book 1 requires a rather different kind of elucidation. Also,

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

this volume contains an introduction to the *Meditations* as a whole and a survey of the manuscript tradition which, presumably, will not be repeated in the second volume. But Book 1 certainly gets very full treatment. The mere thirteen pages of Greek text receive over 140 pages of introduction.

How far does the volume justify this wealth of attention? There is scope, in the introduction, for unhurried discussion of topics of continuing debate, such as the contrast between Marcus' favourable comments on his adoptive brother Lucius Verus and his wife, and the more negative or ambivalent presentation of them in other ancient sources (pp. cxix–cxxxvii). H. also contributes to the question of how far Marcus' practice in government reflected his Stoic ideals. H. supports the view that Marcus is consistent (citing, for instance, Marcus' stand on gladiatorial games, pp. cxlii–ix), while also suggesting that his ethical and political ideals, as reflected in Book 1, are less doctrinaire and more in tune with Roman practice than is sometimes appreciated. Noteworthy here are his comments on the ideal of the *ciuilis princeps* (pp. cxli–ii), on 'moderation' as a virtue (pp. clvi–x), and on the quasi-Republican constitutionalism of *Med.* 1.14 and 16 (pp. clxviii–clxxxiii).

But, above all, Book 1 emerges as another key text from the earlier imperial period on ethical development (or life-long learning), a central preoccupation of Seneca and Plutarch, for example. Here, I feel, H. could have pressed certain questions rather further than he does. How far, one might ask, does Marcus' account of his own ethical development reflect a specifically Stoic approach? Is there, for instance, a stress on active, cognitive learning rather than on (more passive) habituation? If so, this might help to explain Marcus' apparently overcharitable attitude towards his brother and wife. What Marcus records (*Med.* 1.17.6, 18) is, perhaps, *what he learnt to value* through his relationship with them, rather than a more conventional appraisal of their ethical character. H. discusses the possible influence of Epictetus' version of practical ethics (pp. clx–clxviii), but does not consider the relevance of Stoic thinking on development as *oikeiôsis* to the ethical or political ideals of Book 1. However, H. has done much in this excellent volume to provide us with the materials to pursue this question and others, and to whet our appetite for its sequel.

University of Exeter CHRISTOPHER GILL

PAUSANIAS IN ELIS

M. Casevitz, J. Pouilloux, A. Jacquemin (edd.): *Pausanias:* Description de la Grèce, *livre V:* L'Élide (I) (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. xxxvii + 279, 3 maps. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-00473-0.

This is the third volume to appear in the new Budé edition of Pausanias' *Periegesis* (M. Casevitz et al., Paris, 1992) after Book 1 (Attica, cf. *CR* 44 [1994], 28–9) and Book 8 (Arcadia). The translation is by the late Jean Pouilloux and has been edited by Casevitz, who, as in the other two existing volumes, prepared the Greek text; Jaquemin provided the commentary.

In recent years Pausanias has received a lot of attention: there is a comparatively new Teubner edition (M. H. Rocha-Pereira, Leipzig 1973–81, 1989^2) and an Italian edition is in progress (Valla edition, D. Musti, L. Beschi, Rome 1982–). An increased

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interest in Pausanias' own time, the second century A.D., may have contributed to this development, and as a guide to many archaeological sites in Greece Pausanias continues to be indispensable. The new Budé series offers comprehensive, high-quality access to Pausanias for French readers, although the price of this ten volume text edition may prove an obstacle to its wider circulation. The format of the edition, with text, translation, and commentary combined in one volume per book, makes this edition practical for use in Greece, although maps and plans are kept to a bare minimum.

This volume contains the first part of Pausanias' description of Elis and its main site, Olympia. The select bibliography is a useful introduction to relevant works on Elis and Olympia: numerous special studies are cited within the commentary; the general Pausanias section of the bibliography provides a good update to Chamoux's bibliography in Volume I. The editors also include indices of personal names, artists, athletes and Olympic victors, cited texts, and toponyms. The chapter-by-chapter summary at the beginning of the text is another useful feature of this edition. Addenda and corrigenda for Volume VIII are tucked away between this volume's maps and table of contents: once all volumes have appeared it will be rather im- practical to follow up these notes in the order of appearance of the different volumes, and a collection of all corrections in the last volume would be desirable.

An introductory notice points out the problematic issue of dividing Elis and Olympia between Books 5 and 6: a combined edition of these two might have been a worthwhile project. However, the comparative brevity of Book 5 allows a more extensive commentary than those of Books 1 and 8; this is indeed welcome because at Olympia Pausanias' very detailed description is combined with a lot of comparative material, both from the excavations and from literary sources. The author of the introduction (not named, presumably Jaquemin?) also deals with Pausanias' sources, and seems to follow a tradition of Pausanias scholarship that attempts to name his literary sources, emphasizing his dependence on earlier periegetic literature. This is a problematic issue which, together with C. Robert's work (*Pausanias als Schriftsteller* [Berlin, 1909]), might have been approached with more scepticism. A discussion of Pausanias' sources for Books 5 and 6 should include a study of the epigraphical material and of Pausanias' handling of inscriptions; such an introduction might still be a worthwhile addition to Volume VI.

Pausanias' text has been edited several times already, and Casevitz can provide a relevant apparatus without having to make his notes too extensive. The translation is readable and accurate. Writing a commentary on Pausanias is no doubt an uphill struggle: a variety of comparative material has to be discussed, numerous references and allusions need explanation, and minute details can trigger elaborate scholarly debates that have to be taken into account. This commentary tackles the task rather well: as with all commentaries, it will not always answer all the questions that come to the mind of an attentive reader but it covers a wide range of issues and, perhaps even more importantly, it combines the necessary brevity with clarity and the relevant references to facilitate further investigation. While it will hardly provide new information to expert readers in their own fields, the strength of this commentary is that it combines different lines of enquiry.

Pausanias' Olympia is among his most widely used site-descriptions and any work that makes this text more accessible must be welcome. For French-speaking readers (and possibly others, too) it will be welcome that Jaquemin provides a digest of the mainly German archaeological studies of the site, a feature that might also be useful for undergraduate teaching, especially in archaeology. The work may not be as

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

extensive as the classical commentaries by J. G. Frazer (London, 1898) or H. Hitzig and H. Blümner (Berlin and Leipzig, 1896–1910), but it shows the importance of an up-to-date commentary that includes recent scholarship. The remaining volumes of the edition should be expected with impatience.

St John's College, Oxford/King's College London MARIA PRETZLER

GRAMMATICA TRIUMPHANS

D. L. BLANK: *Sextus Empiricus:* Against the Grammarians (Clarendon Later Ancient Philosophers). Pp. xlix + 436. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £55. ISBN: 0-19-824470-3.

The ancient philosophers among you will have already read this book, such is the importance of its topic, the excellence of its author, and the prestige of its series, whose general editors J. Barnes and A. A. Long have backed an unbroken string of winners. Ditto for the historians of ancient grammar, to whom Sextus *AM* 1 is well known.

It is rather the classical generalists among you—and those specialists who specialize in anything literary—whom I wish to convince of this book's value and interest.

No one advances in the ancient languages without at least a passing interest in language itself, and for many of us it becomes a recurrent element in our research. Classicists combine this linguistic curiosity with a curiosity about ancient minds, and thus should wish to know how the ancients conceived of language, and what theories they developed about its nature. In the Hellenistic period, these theories were codified in the science of grammar: it purported to present a complete picture of the nature, structure, and functioning of language, from its simplest phonetic elements to its most complicated literary expressions in Homer and the poets. Nor was this extensive realm of theorizing merely the private possession of a few; the technical views of the scientific grammarians percolated throughout the educational system. Indeed, our own textbooks—our Chase and Phillipses, Hansens, and Quinns—take their shape to an astounding degree from the theories that ancient grammarians developed.

Every classicist thus has multiple reasons to find this material pertinent to his work, even before we turn to the weightiest reason: that grammatical science was a central component of the intellectual cultures that it is our discipline to study. Its current marginal position in classical studies, like the even more outrageous expulsion of ancient philosophy from classics departments altogether, leaves our students with a distorted and lacunose sense of ancient thought.

Still, it must be conceded that ancient grammatical theory can seem extremely dry and uninviting, and that the authors who transmit it to us do nothing to advertise its interest. A malicious fate has decreed that nearly our 'best source for the grammatical science of the second century B. C.' (p. v), its Hellenistic heyday, should be a crabbed and contentious skeptical philosopher, whose sole reason for discussing grammar at all is to demonstrate its uselessness, incoherence, and intellectual nullity. But Sextus has a saving grace: no matter how petty his refutations may be, his reportage is utterly scrupulous. His complete reliability in detailing the views of his opponents makes him a priceless boon to the student of ancient philosophy, and likewise to the student of ancient grammar.

Sextus' attack on the grammarians is one of his longer books—around ninety-two pages of Loeb Greek, in part because the first forty of 320 sections are devoted to

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

showing the bankruptcy of all learning, as a general introduction to his demolition of the liberal arts seriatim (logic gets the axe in *AM* 7–8, while *AM* 1–6 tackle the rest of the trivium and quadrivium). Typical of its detailed contents are the long arguments that elements (i.e. letters) do not exist (99–120), nor do syllables (121–130), nor parts of speech and sentences, and so on—all of which are irreplaceably informative about ancient controversies surrounding the proper theoretical accounts of elements, etc. The structure of grammatical science itself was a matter of controversy; from Sextus we learn current views about the place of etymology, glosses, and mythological lore within the overarching science of grammar.

Blank's edition is a triumph. The translation is excellent. The commentary is very full—nearly five times the text—and provides good treatments of the individual arguments and exceptionally rich citations of related grammatical texts, most of which are unlikely to be familiar to the general classicist. (Our introduction to a blizzard of new names is much facilitated by the excellent end-matter, which provides full *indices locorum*, *rerum*, and *personarum*, as well as a really useful 'Glossary of Authors'.) Especially welcome are extensive quotations from Philodemus, for many of whose works it is still hard to find texts, much less translations.

It is the leading virtue of B.'s commentary that he always guides us through the screen of Sextan perversity into the positive riches that lie behind. The non-philosopher's heart is likely to have sunk at the mention above of arguments that syllables, for example, do not exist—one fears that any such exercise must consist in the merest logic-chopping, and cannot reveal anything truly informative about ancient views on language. However, by combining close attention to Sextus with extensive and wide-ranging parallels from the other remains of ancient grammar, B. is able to transmute the flimsiest quibbles into solid evidence about the tenets of the ancient grammatical schools. Read Sextus alone and he may strike you as footling; read B.'s commentary and a lost world of scholarship and intelligent controversy emerges from the mist.

The introduction accomplishes several important objectives in moderate scope. It sets out the intellectual backdrop to the grammatical controversies—both the general history of debates over what it means for something to be a *techne*, and the particular nexus of intellectual trends that binds together empiricist medicine, Epicurean philosophy, skepticism, and grammar. It then argues for two positive points. First, B. argues (pp. xxxiv–l) that we should attribute a great deal of the content of *AM* 1 to an Epicurean source, known also to Varro, which itself attacked a grammatical treatise by Asclepiades of Myrlea, whom Quintilian used. Secondly, B. champions (pp. l–lv) the consistency of Sextus' skeptical stance, in opposition to readers who have thought that *AM* 1 veered into dogmatical pronouncements.

With this second line I completely agree. On the first point, I am persuaded that Sextus does make some use of an Epicurean source, but I suspect that B. is too quick to see Epicurean material *hic et ubique*, and accordingly gives Sextus too little of a rôle in composing his own book. As a single instance of a repeated concern, I strongly doubt his claim on p. 325 that the divisions of senses for the terms 'grammar' in *AM* 1.44 and 'astrology' in *AM* 5.2 are 'characteristically Epicurean'.

If a review must cavil, then I should complain about the handling of some finer points of philosophy (*peritrope* is not the same as the *consequentia mirabilis* of Aristotle's *Protrepticus*, p. 123; *Euthyphro* 5e–6a is badly botched on p. 314; Stoic *epistemai* are not an 'especially certain, firmly grasped variant' of Stoic *technai*, p. xxxii). But a review should also weigh defects against merits, and here the scale preponderates overwhelmingly to the good. B. has poured into this volume the results

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of decades of immersion in the study of ancient grammar, and the pay-off for readers is immense. Those of us primarily interested in Sextus will have our eyes opened to the vast tradition of controversy that lay behind his apparently extemporaneous cheap shots; those interested in grammar wlll find a thorough treatment of one of the central pieces of evidence; and those interested in the classics quite generally will find an ideal introduction to a central element of ancient culture that is far too important to remain ignored.

Yale University TAD BRENNAN

HISTORY AS MNEMONICS

G. S. SHRIMPTON: *History and Memory in Ancient Greece*. Pp. xvii + 318. Montreal, Kingston, London, and Buffalo: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997. Cased, £28. ISBN: 0-7735-1021-4.

This book is described on the cover as a 'study of the effects of memory and mnemonics in early Greek history writing'; it is, however, much more complex than this would suggest, being an ambitious attempt to understand the purposes and techniques of ancient historical writers from an ancient standpoint. Shrimpton is particularly interested in the conceptual framework of historical investigation: the first part of the book contains some extended discussions of metaphors for the writing of history, and comparative methodology, which seem designed for an undergraduate audience. His discussions of historians, on the other hand, are often quite complex, presupposing familiarity with modern debates. The first chapter outlines five fundamental proposals on which the book is based, of which the two most significant are the contention that historical truth in Greece was decided by communities, not individuals, and more remarkably, that recent discoveries in physics will allow us new perspectives on the past, bringing us closer to understanding ancient writers. S. discusses twentieth-century discoveries in science which emphasize uncertainty as opposed to empirical knowledge, citing a large number of modern works on science, especially chaos theory and quantum mechanics; he suggests that these discoveries will bring about a shift in general patterns of thought, making us better able to understand ancient writers in their context. The central point, that the intellectual milieu in which ancient historians composed their works was very different to that of modern historians, is worth making, but the argument from modern theories is not always very illuminating. For example, on p. 220 an interesting argument about the nature of cause and effect in ancient historical writing is preceded by a discussion of particles moving backwards in time; the metaphor only serves to confuse a point which a more traditional approach might make more clearly. S. also exaggerates the meaning of certain theories: chaos theory, for instance, far from declaring nature too complex to describe, in fact recognizes order and predictability in apparently chaotic systems, while the theory of entropy is a metaphor borrowed from physics, not a law applying to history itself.

When discussing the historians, S. draws a primary distinction between regional and Panhellenic history: regional history he sees as mainly document-based, using inscriptions and objects to support a particular version of history for the glorification of a city or people; Panhellenic historians, like Herodotus and Thucydides, used such sources to produce large-scale histories without reference to documents. S., as one

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

might expect, is keen to give fourth-century historians their due, and in his discussion of regionalism affords Theopompus pride of place as the first historian truly independent of regional bias: 'Was Theopompus and not Thucydides the real individualist of early Greek historiography?' (p. 184). This passage makes much of the Athenocentrism of Thucydides, and Thucydides is the author about whom S. has most to say. He argues that the famous seasonal structure is a mnemonic device, associated with oral habits rather than the pursuit of accuracy; this theory (pp. 190–8 and Appendix 2) is the springboard for a new interpretation of some of the programmatic sentences at the beginning of the work. Thucydides, S. argues, designed his *Histories* so that they could be easily memorized and recalled; hence calling them a *ktema es aiei* meant that they were intended as a mental possession which could be consulted periodically (*es aiei*). His history is not *mythodes* because presentation has been sacrificed to a mnemonic structure. The famous claim about the speeches at 1.22 is also reinterpreted as a mark of Thucydides' *lack* of 'scientific' rigour, not 'I found out carefully what actually happened', but 'the factual reports arising from the things done were arranged by me with great care' (p. 46). Thus S. is at pains to depict the historian as a thinker little different from his contemporaries, rejecting the image of a 'scientific' Thucydides advanced beyond his time. These arguments are challenging, if not entirely convincing. The discussion of contemporary readings of Thucydides is also valuable: S. depicts a historian demoralized by the turn of events at the end of the Peloponnesian War, giving up in despair because his project would necessitate recounting a history which his audience would not want to hear (*mnesikakein*).

With the discussion of regionalism, the problem of judging the accuracy of sources emerges. Initially S. is very sanguine about the ancient historians' reliability, but the question is given extended consideration in Appendix 1, which is essentially concerned to refute the arguments of Fehling about Herodotus' sources (D. Fehling, *Herodotus and His 'Sources': Invention, Citation and Narrative Art*, tr. J. G. Howie [Leeds, 1989]). The authors reject tests for 'correspondence' between Herodotus' work and known phenomena or sources, because these arguments are based on conjectures of what was seen and done. Instead they classify source references and work out percentages to show the nature of source citations in each book (oddly based on the Penguin translation). The conclusion (perhaps unsurprisingly) is that source citations are a function of the type of material under discussion: named and cited sources are more common in non-Greek history, while Herodotus' accounts of alien cultures seem inaccurate because of the difficulty of cross-cultural observation. But painstaking though the analysis is, it does not decisively establish the accuracy of all Herodotus' statements.

In structure, the book seems somewhat underdeveloped, comprising two long chapters (pp. 9–79 and 80–227) with two long appendices; the second chapter covers a diverse range of topics concerning historical verification, and would have benefited from clearer subdivision. Proof-reading, especially of names, is poor. *History and Memory in Ancient Greece* is interesting, although not a book one would recommend to an undergraduate unfamiliar with the field. It combines some new and challenging ideas with a very untraditional approach, and although the project is ultimately not quite coherent, anyone working in the field of Greek historiography will want to read it.

University of Wales Cardiff SIAN LEWIS

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

MORE CATULLAN ANSWERS

J.-W. BECK: *'Lesbia' und 'Juventius': Zwei* libelli *im Corpus Catullianum: Untersuchungen zur Publikationsform und Authentizität der überlieferten Gedichtfolge.* (Hypomnemata, 111.) Pp. 329. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 3-525-25184-X.

H. DETTMER: *Love by the Numbers: Form and the Meaning in the Poetry of Catullus.* (Lang Classical Studies, 10.) Pp. 366. New York etc.: Peter Lang, 1997. Cased. ISBN: 0-8204-3663-1.

Did Catullus do it or not? Both of these books are devoted to the old question about the arrangement of his poems as we know them. A new basis for answering it has been created in recent years by interpretations of Roman poetry collections which no longer try to reconstruct the chronology of the poems, but simply take them as they come. Analysis in particular of Augustan *libri* has repeatedly shown that the interaction of poems develops a continuous discourse which successively unfurls central and subsidiary themes. Catullus, as demonstrated above all by T. P. Wiseman, can now be seen to introduce first his three central themes, 'Lesbia', 'Iuventius', and 'abuse of political power', in the *Polymetra* 2–29, with extra internal proems (14b and 27) for themes 2 and 3. The remaining *Polymetra* then offer variations on these three and on closely related subsidiary motifs (like 'friends'). The first *carmen maius*, 61, brings in as a new central theme 'marriage and family'. In 65–8 the poetic discourse takes in varied ways an elegiac turn, and the epigrams following contain a mixture of all central and subsidiary themes in elegiac couplets. What used to be viewed as madness proves, when compared with similar Roman collections, to be method, banishing any doubts that Catullus was the architect of this arrangement.

Both Beck and Dettmer read the poems in order of appearance, but their contribution to the Catullan Question, or rather its answer, is so strongly coloured by the biographical approaches that their conclusions fail to convince. B. tends to spike his own guns somewhat with aesthetic appraisals of the poems. Of the entire *Liber* only 2–14, which form a group presenting the central theme 'Lesbia', really appeal to him. He tirelessly impresses upon us that these *carmina* number amongst 'the most sensitive and tender' in Catullus's collection (p. 95) and that they must be read as a 'lasting testimony to his tender feelings' (p. 317). The group 14b–26 he finds, by contrast, so shockingly obscene that he repeatedly stresses how 'nasty' and 'dreadful' they are (pp. 156, 179). Their filth does, however, prove for B. how pure the other group's purity is. He interprets thematic and structural links between the two groups as evidence that they were composed as two complementary units—here he presents many fine observations (pp. 154–288)—and concludes that Catullus published poems 1–14 as a *libellus*, and that 14b–26 followed as a second *libellus* and foil. The order of the remaining poems he finds less methodical and therefore lacking in any recognizable premeditation. A tedious examination of arguments for and against Catullus as editor of the whole *Liber*—the discussion with its endless quotations takes up over one-third of a book that is in any case too long for the subject—leads B. to the conclusion that the poet might, some time after the appearance of the two *libelli*, have published the entire collection as a 'second edition' himself, but that this may have been done posthumously too.

Why two *libelli* and not just one? Because Furius and Aurelius, who according to 16

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

called the poet of 5 and 7 a *male mas*—B. makes the right connection here—had read these poems in a previously published book (pp. 132ff.). The possibility that Catullus is staging the appearance of these critics for metapoetical reasons is not considered by B., just as he fails to see that the often noted reversal of gender rôles in 1–14—*poeta*/*amator* womanish, *puella* lascivious, even nymphomaniac, therefore 'manly'—could be taken together with 14b–26—*poeta*/*amator* suddenly 'supermanly' as 'Priapus' (16.1, 14; 21.13)—as a contribution to Roman gender discourse. Recent Catullan studies, with their examinations of Roman sexualities and of the semiotics, intertextuality, and narratology of Latin poetry, have led us away from the biographically read Catullus and his 'tender feelings', but B. has not included these in his deliberations. With his vision thus impaired, he has not seen the linking of the themes 'Lesbia' and 'Iuventius' to 'abuse of political power' and 'marriage and family', and has therefore failed to comprehend the thematic structure of the *Liber Catulli* in its entirety. Had he adjusted his sights, he might have realized that it makes little sense to separate his postulated *libelli* from the rest of the poems.

D., as opposed to B., aims at demonstrating the 'poet-made' structural unity of the collection and points promisingly in her introduction to the function of Catullus' central themes as 'organising principle' (p. 5). Sadly, her attempts to delineate the interaction of the individual poems in terms of its significance for interpretations of the whole generally fail, because she pays much more attention to the 'ring arrangement of the corpus' than to the linear structure of poem groups, to which she devotes less than thirty pages altogether. She divides the *Liber Catulli* into 'nine consecutive rings based on thematic reciprocity' (p. xiii). This she achieves not only by thematically linking adjacent poems—here she draws some valuable conclusions—but also by plotting broader thematic loops, so that she manages to separate the nine groups by a series of thematically linked framework poems and to demonstrate with inner rings the unity of the groups. The paradigmatic forces tend to take over at times in such analyses, and D.'s is no exception. Where there is no immediately recognizable thematic connection between two poems, she makes one. Two instances: 4 and 11 are related because 'the epic adventures to be experienced by Furius and Aurelius . . . correlate with the epic adventures of the boat' (p. 9), and 85 and 93 'are joined by the opposing themes of passion for Lesbia and indifference towards Caesar' (p. 191).

D.'s arbitrary creation of thematic correlates is particularly questionable when used to provide new arguments for a biographical interpretation of Catullus. By taking (without any textual evidence) poems 58, 59, 69, 71, 77, and 100 to refer to one and the same person, she constructs a 'linear and circular arrangement' of Caelius Rufus poems and thus corroborates 'the traditional identification of Lesbia as Clodia Metelli', whom we 'know', thanks to Cicero and his *Pro Caelio*, to have had an affair with Caelius Rufus (pp. 150ff.). I can cheerfully let the chance to refute such 'argumentation' pass here, because Wilfried Stroh has already presented truly substantial reasons for supposing that Cicero invented a relationship between Caelius and Clodia for his own rhetorical purposes (*Taxis und Taktik* [Stuttgart, 1975], pp. 265ff.). Evidently B. has not read this. Still, there is a positive side to her sins of omission as regards relevant literature. An essay by Rudolf Rieks (*Poetica* 18 [1986], 249ff.), in which he suggests reading *Gellius* for *Caelius* (!), might have persuaded her to include poems 74, 80, 88–91, and 116 in her Caelius Rufus cycle, and so to reduce her own method to absurdity.

University of Munich NIKLAS HOLZBERG

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

SUUS CUIQUE ATTRIBUTUS EST ERROR

D. F. S. Thomson (ed.): *Catullus: Edited with a Textual and Interpretative Commentary*. (*Phoenix* Supplement 34.) Pp. 578. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1997. Cased. ISBN: 0-8020-0676-0.

Thomson's new *Catullus* offers, in addition to a revised and augmented version of his critical edition (Chapel Hill, 1978), a commentary in which he explains his readings and advances his interpretation of each poem. However, only as a contribution to the *recensio* of Catullus' text does the book represent genuine progress, whereas T.'s foray into the territory of literary criticism halts in the research of the seventies. The text and apparatus of the first version already marked a considerable improvement on Mynors's results: T.'s text relied much more heavily on *emendatio* than the latter's, and his apparatus was the first to render the Veronensis clearly discernible. Visibility is even better in this edition, thanks to the inclusion of T.'s further studies on textual history, these having profited from the work of G. Billanovich, J. Butrica, and D. S. McKie. As he demonstrates in the second part of his prolegomena, collation of codex R, which derives together with G from the lost X, has proved 'that a manuscript must have intervened between V and OX' (p. 26)—codex A, written around 1300. T. believes that he can reconstruct readings from A by differentiating the variants in R^2 (pp. 38–43). The results of such analyses are rather meagre. True, the critical apparatus, when compared with its 1978 predecessor, has benefited. But of all the eighty-one changes made to the actual text (cf. T.'s list on pp. 69–71), about half (apart from typographical errors) have to do with punctuation, spelling, and word order, while the rest consist mainly of emendations. Highly commendable as T.'s codicological work is—the table of manuscripts too is vastly improved—its yield is greater for the study of Catullus' *Nachleben* than for the reconstruction of his original wording.

One of the changes made by T. to his 1978 text brings us straight to our criticism of his interpretative methods. By replacing in 63.63 the MSS' *ego mulier* with Scaliger's *ego puber* for no plausible reason, he unwittingly reveals—as frequently in his book—that he has not absorbed important modern studies, here, for example, Skinner's '*Ego mulier* . . .' (*Helios* 20 [1993], 107ff.). Moreover, in the literature referred to by T. (it reaches up to 1995) there is not only nothing on gender discourse, semiotics, intertextuality, or reader response—themes which have contributed considerably in recent years to our understanding of Catullus—but names like Batstone, Fitzgerald, Janan, Miller, Newman, Pedrick, Richlin, and Selden are not mentioned at all by T.; a number of titles very close in content to T.'s approach, such as the books by Ferguson, Lyne, Martin, and Schmidt, are also missing. It is indeed no simple task to establish which literature T. did use, because his bibliographical references are scattered over the whole book under five headings: the chapter 'The Progress of Catullan Studies from the *Editio Princeps* to the Present Day', which names only editions and commentaries (pp. 43ff.), the 'Bibliography' in two parts ('General' and 'On the History of the Text': pp. 61ff.), the list 'Sources (Other than Editions) of Modern (Post-1600) Emendations Cited in the *Apparatus Criticus*' (pp. 94ff.), and the specific bibliographies for each single poem. However, the interpretations mentioned in these last were clearly not consulted much by T., as he rarely enters into a discussion of other scholars' opinions. His further development of the consulted results of Catullan scholarship is limited to a continuation of the commentaries by Baehrens,

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ellis, Fordyce, Friedrich, Kroll, and Quinn (and here T., to his own detriment, left out Syndikus).

The questions on which T. concentrates in his 'interpretative commentary' are accordingly predictable. As is made clear in the first half of his prolegomena with the section on 'The Poet's Life, Works, and Literary Environment' (a paraphrasing of handbook knowledge), he takes the biographical approach, and the preliminary remarks that accompany the explanatory notes on each text are therefore composed in the main of prosopography and dating. Also, since for T. 'the debate on the question whether C. arranged and published the collection of poems as we have it is still open' (p. 9), he does not ask whether linear reading could shed new light. Thus he—as once Ludwig Schwabe—can allocate the Lesbia poems each to different phases of her relationship with 'Catullus', the chronology of which differs from the order of the poems. As regards content, then, T. focuses solely on such 'historical' aspects, clearly because for him the true function of any 'interpretative commentary' lies in explanations of the language used—here T. works with the customary parading of parallels, and in a formal analysis of the text. The introduction to each poem opens with a structural computation (often, however, a very arbitrary one: for *c.* 8, for example, with its *fulsere* 3/8, *obdura* 11/19, and *at tu* 14/19, I would calculate a symmetrical (2 + 6) + 3 + (2 + 6), not T.'s 2 + 9 + 7 + 1) and contains, like the notes, for the most part observations on style; these, in turn, dwell largely on sound effects. T. is obviously very much at home in this area, but comparisons with his predecessors' commentaries show that he has little new to add.

The same applies to the parallels cited. But then, an 'interpretative commentary' published in 1997 would hardly be expected to pile on more material anyway: one would hope instead for a meaningful application of existing material as a path to a deeper understanding of any given text. At 64.348–69, for example, T., like his predecessors, cites the Achilles parallel in Homer, *Il.* 18.122–4, but neglects to mention that those verses mark a key scene in the epic, that this intertextual reference—as M. Stoevesand has shown in her brilliant article (*WJA* 20 [1994/5], 167ff.)—suggests that Catullus modelled his Achilles on Homer's, and that the parallel is therefore of considerable significance for the interpretation of *c.* 64. It is not only the intertextual signals that T. fails to decipher, but also the intratextual ones. An example: at 11.20 he offers no explanation for the not immediately penetrable *ilia rumpens*, but simply names two verses where Catullus uses the word *ilia.* In one of these, 80.8, *ilia rumpere* is, however, immediately understandable (it means *fellare*), and this would fit quite nicely in 11.20, where—suggestively enough?—Lesbia is the subject. Alas, T. is no friend of Catullus' obscener side and mostly passes over the like in silence. He even prefers to ignore almost completely the double meaning of countless words and phrases (J. N. Adams's *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* [London, 1982] was not consulted either). Is that really doing justice to a poet who names (*c.* 16) as one important function of his *versiculi* the erotic stimulation of his readers?

All that is genuinely new in T.'s commentary is the textual criticism resulting from his meticulous codicological studies. Perhaps he would have been wiser to confine himself to this area. An 'interpretative commentary' ought only to have been written after in-depth collation of modern approaches to Catullus.

University of Munich NIKLAS HOLZBERG

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A FIGURE IN A LANDSCAPE

R. JENKYNS: *Virgil's Experience. Nature and History: Times, Names and Places.* Pp. xiii + 712. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-19-814033-9.

The central purpose of this book is, according to its author, an investigation into Virgil's attitude to nature and landscape; it is concerned with ideas of nature, time, history, and nation; it proposes that Virgil and Lucretius between them effected a transformation in the poetic perception of nature which has marked Western literature ever since. This transformation shows itself in the realization that a person may feel history, identity, and the divine through the acute but imaginative perception of the landscape. The book's 677 principal pages are divided into fifteen chapters in six parts: Before Virgil, The *Eclogues*, Lucretius, The *Georgics*, The *Aeneid*, and After Virgil.

The book's problems are caused and compounded by its length. This is not the result of doxography in the modern style, which Jenkyns rejects (doing without even a bibliography); it results, rather, from the praiseworthy desire to write a discursive, literary work of old-fashioned scholarship, focused on what the ancient authors wrote and the context in which they wrote it, illuminated by reference to the nineteenth-century authors J. knows so well, and founded on the conviction that a book about poetry is a book about life. The occasional deliberate pastiche of Syme adds to the fun, but a belletristical approach to scholarship when spread over nearly 700 pages runs the risk of repetition and loss of focus, a risk realized here more than once. Furthermore, the shifts in subject-matter are unnecessarily distracting; for example, why, when there is a chapter on Aeneas in the Underworld, does analysis of Anchises' speech find a place in the preceding chapter on the Wanderings?

This is very frustrating. Readers, especially undergraduate readers, will struggle through a book which at its best is shrewd, observant, sensitive, and enlightening. J.'s skills in the close reading of a passage, in the identification of *le petit fait significatif* (as he would call it), in the demonstration of literary inheritance, and in the explanation of poetic art can be exemplary. His analysis (at pp. 537–41) from each of the four different viewpoints present in the text of the Trojans' journey up the Tiber (*Aen.* 8.86–117) is, for example, a model of its kind.

Setting Virgil's work in context, J. provides an introductory discussion of Virgil's sensibility, including a careful (but questionably relevant) discussion of his sexual sensibilities, a tour of the way landscape was represented in ancient Greek poetry, and a survey of the social, cultural, and political attitudes current in the late Roman Republic. The discussion of landscape in Greek poetry is well judged, although limiting it to poetry means no reference to Plato's *Phaedrus* (see A. Parry, *YCS* 15 [1957], 15–19) or the instructive differences between the *locus amoenus* described there and Cic. *de Orat.* 1.24–9. The starting point for a significant part of J.'s discussion is Ruskin's conception of the pathetic fallacy which highlights the distance between the ancient and the modern habit of mind. Nonetheless, J. emphasizes also the distance between Greek description of landscape and, for example, Virgil's description of the African harbour (*Aen.* 1.157–73), where attribution of feelings to the scenery is an important part of Virgil's perception not merely of the pictorial character of the place but of its mood.

Moving from Greece to Italy, Cicero naturally provides an important focus: the idea of the two *patriae*, an incipient feeling that nature may be of value even if not

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

spectacular or useful, and a sense of the associative quality of places and the many layers of the past are harbingers identified by J. of Virgil's sensibility. There is naturally room for disagreement on emphasis.

Whether J. is right to go further than J. C. Davies (*G&R* 18 [1971], 152–65) in detecting the incipient appreciation of the 'pure beauty' of nature in Cicero is certainly open to question. In discussing Cicero's sense of the associative quality of places, however, he does not go far enough: Ann Vasaly has shown, in *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory* (Berkeley, 1993), the central importance of *locus* and ambiance to Cicero's rhetorical strategies, both in exploiting the pre-existing associations of monuments and topography (particularly striking given the lack of interest shown by the ancient rhetorical theorists), and in exploiting the link between *locus* and *ethos*. Cicero himself (*Fin.* 5.2) refers to the *tanta vis admonitionis* which inheres in places.

J.'s consideration of these attitudes is limited to written sources: disappointingly, given the attention he pays to Virgil's novel use of 'scaena' at *Aen*. 1.164, he does not consider what can be learnt from Roman painting or make use of the work of E. W. Leach (see particularly *Vergil's Eclogues: Landscapes of Experience* [Ithaca, 1974], pp. 70–112) to do so. Vitruvius' references to landscape-painting (7.5) might also have merited attention.

One of J.'s principal emphases is the way in which Virgil brought a new eye to the commonplace and showed the familiar as both strange and wonderful. Another is Virgil's exploration of how the mind's eye and the literal eye work together. Some of the best parts of the book, such as the journey up the Tiber, already mentioned, or his analysis of *Geo*. 2.157, are explanations of these important aspects of Virgil's art. In these aspects J. detects the influence of Lucretius, and in Part Three J. analyses the aspects of Lucretius' poetry which were of principal significance to Virgil: an interest in the detail of the visible world, study and admiration of the commonplace, the importance of nature, and the demonstration of the emotional link between man and the world around him. These points are well founded and well observed, even if the argument is diffused through over eighty pages.

J. is also good at analysing what he calls the 'prismatic effect' by which people and places are seen from different perspectives. The associative qualities of proper names and changes of names and their significance to Virgil are also well brought out, although one might have hoped for more emphasis on his etymological/aetiological plays and the tradition from which they emerge: see J. O'Hara, *True Names* (Ann Arbor, 1996). More disappointing is the lack of proper analysis of Aeneas' wanderings: H.-P. Stahl (in Stahl [ed.], *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context* [London, 1998], pp. 37–84) has recently shown what can be done; and setting the wanderings in the periplus tradition would also have been desirable. Analysis of the Catalogue of Italians is also surprisingly lacking (one thinks of L. A. Holland, *AJP* 56 [1935], 202–15).

This is not, in short, the book that one hoped J. might write, but from its sensitive insights and love of poetry the committed reader can still expect to gain.

Merton College, Oxford J. S. C. EIDINOW

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

OVIDIAN MONOLOGUE

U. AUHAGEN: *Der Monolog bei Ovid.* (ScriptOralia, 119.) Pp. 244. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1999. Cased, DM 86. ISBN: 3-8233-5429-9.

This revised dissertation, the fruit of research carried out at the University of Freiburg in cooperation with E. Lefèvre, presents for the first time a highly organized and informative overview of monologues in the various works of Ovid and in Roman literature in general. A.'s astute close readings of individual Ovidian monologues will be of use to those interested in Ovid's rhetorical style and in the larger question of the relationship between speech and writing in imperial Latin literature. In addition to examining familiar examples in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*, A. makes a case for reading *Heroides* 1–15 and selected elegies in the *Amores*, *Tristia*, and *Epistulae ex Ponto* as monologues. She argues that the monologue form plays a leading rôle in Ovid's poetry and is a central witness to his mannerist style, which distinguishes him from earlier Augustan poets. Although monologue may be understood as a convention of drama and epic, A. rightly observes its applicability to other genres. By her definition, monologue involves a speaker in an extreme situation speaking alone with no real addressee except the self (e.g. Ariadne on Naxos, Medea in love, Ovid in Tomis). In A.'s view, poets such as Catullus, Virgil, and Propertius exploit the fictive orality of monologues to make the emotions of their speakers seem spontaneous, realistic, and directly accessible. Ovid, by contrast, develops the monologue into a vehicle for literary games, in which the fictional speaker is intellectually detached from his or her predicament and mines it for witty rhetorical points. Consequently, an Ovidian soliloquy makes little pretense of psychological or emotional realism, but seeks to entertain through grotesque and paradoxical constellations of thought. In this respect, A. contends, Ovid is a child of the late Augustan age, writing for readers like himself who were weaned on the make-believe of imperial declamation rather than the realities of civil war.

A. does not locate the origins of Ovidian monologue in Greek drama or epic but in the laments of Ariadne in Catullus 64, Dido in *Aeneid* 4, and Propertius in 1.17. The main part of the book is occupied with a catalogue-like analysis of these three cases and seventeen of Ovidian monologue: *Her.* 10 (Ariadne) and 9 (Deianira); *Am.* 2.16, 1.6, 1.7, and 1.13; *Met.* 7.11–71 (Medea), 9.474–516, 585–629 (Byblis), 10.320–55 (Myrrha), and 3.471–506 (Narcissus); *Fast.* 3.471–506 (Ariadne); *Tr.* 1.2, 1.3, 3.2, and 3.10; and *Pont.* 3.7. All monologues are assessed according to four critieria established by E. Lefèvre in his article on 'monologo' in the *Enciclopedia virgiliana*: what the structure or associative logic of the monologue is; how the speaker structures time by changing tenses and moods; whom the speaker apostrophizes; and how the speaker fictionalizes his or her surroundings. In the concluding part of the book, A. briefly surveys the literary reception of Ovidian monologue in early imperial literature and in modern German literature. Of relevance here, A. observes that Seneca restages speeches of self-deliberation from the *Metamorphoses* that out-Ovid Ovid in rhetorical display. By contrast, the epic poets Lucan, Valerius Flaccus, and Statius do not consistently follow Ovid's practice or ignore it.

The greatest strength of this book is the stylistic analysis of individual monologues (e.g. *Her.* 10), yielding insights into the speaker's flow of thought, manipulation of time, and fictionalization of the landscape to mirror the soul. Also praiseworthy is the scope of the book, which shows that the monologue form is not restricted to the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Metamorphoses (or, one assumes, to the lost *Medea*), but is a recurring and essentially unchanging feature of Ovid's *oeuvre*. However, A.'s claim to have found the golden thread that unifies Ovid's different works may go too far. To be sure, monologue is markedly prominent in *Metamorphoses* 7–10 and is a form well suited to Ovid's exilic laments. Yet, as A. admits, the form is non-existent in Ovid's didactic works and there is only one example in the *Fasti*. More crucially, it is debatable whether *Heroides* 1–15 are first and foremost tragic soliloquies or letters with an addressee. A. too readily dismisses both the fiction of epistolarity (see now J. Farrell, 'Reading and Writing in the *Heroides*', *HSCP* 98 [1998], 307–38, esp. 310) and the evidence that the heroines' letters notionally constitute one-half of a dialogue (cf. the responses of Sabinus in *Am.* 2.18.27–34 and the double epistles in *Heroides* 16–21). Finally, one may object that some of the *Amores* (2.16, 1.6, 1.13) identified by A. as monologues have marked dialogic elements and may be categorized in other terms (cf. J. C. McKeown's commentary on these poems). There is little question, however, that A. reveals a significant strand of continuity in Ovid's work—a single voice speaking alone *in extremis*. By investigating this area, *Der Monolog bei Ovid* makes a welcome contribution to Ovidian studies and offers general audiences a valuable chapter in the history of a literary form that Ovid made his own.

Pennsylvania State University S. M. WHEELER

OVID'S AUDIENCES

S. M. WHEELER: *A Discourse of Wonders: Audience and Performance in Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Pp. x + 272. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999. Cased, $37.50. ISBN: 0-8122-3475-8.

Building on the narratological approach, in particular Stanley Fish's reader-response criticism—but using the jargon sparingly and always with *ad hoc* explanations—W. produces a new Ovid between two worlds: the world, namely, of viva-voce performance, which the implied author stages as the dramatic fiction of a 'singing' narrator with corresponding 'narratorial audience', and the world of the written book, of the *Metamorphoses* in the form available to actual audiences since about A.D. 8. By differentiating not only between the implied author and the *persona* of the narrator, but also between the 'implied audience' and a 'narratorial audience', W. is able to demonstrate on several levels of interpretation a certain tension between two modes of reception. This becomes evident where, for example, the book divisions, which are not perceived by the narratorial audience because their narrator is performing a *carmen perpetuum*, are at least hinted at and thus perceptible to the implied audience: the implied author can make the 'boundary-crossing' of a character coincide with the end of a book, or use verbal allusions to remind the audience that every papyrus book-roll has its *umbilicus* (pp. 87–93).

Having unrolled a kind of introduction to the methods and findings of recent studies on the *Metamorphoses* in Chapter I—he demonstrates here with a hawk-eyed analysis of the proem (thirty pages for four verses!) how the text and with it the reader undergoes constant metamorphoses because of the unexpected ambiguity of the phrasing—W. prepares the ground in Chapters II–IV for his own particular mode of interpretation. He first illustrates very convincingly (e.g. by means of a comparison with the *Fasti*, which, unlike the *Metamorphoses*, contains explicit remarks about its textuality) that we are meant to picture the narrator of the *Metamorphoses* as a

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

performer who 'delivers his song to a listening audience' (p. 40). W. goes on to characterize the narrator and the narratorial audience, concentrating not so much on the figure of the former—I would have liked to hear more about him—as on the relationship between him and his audience. This is revealed in a variety of textual signs which W. examines very thoroughly on pp. 101–16: the use of 'generalizing second person address [pp. 101–3 and again in more detail in Chapter 6 with a mine of brilliant observations], rhetorical question, parenthesis and other forms of narrative commentary'.

While it is quite evident that Ovid does create the fiction of an oral performance of his *carmen*—and the numerous passages in the text in which an internal narrator talks to an internal audience provide an analogy—I have some reservations about W.'s characterization of the narratorial audience: he sees it as one which is 'rhetorically educated, hellenized, and well versed in Greek and Roman poetry' (p. 100). Exactly what one would assume the implied audience of the *Metamorphoses* to have been. Why then differentiate at all between the two? Let us look here at one example of narrative commentary not examined by W. After recounting several strategies employed by Tereus in the hope of winning Philomela's favour, the narrator exclaims: *pro superi, quantum mortalia pectora caecae noctis habent!* (6. 472f.). And he no doubt really means this too. However, an audience which has noted the intertextuality of the preceding verses (461ff.), and has therefore realized that this lecherous foreign devil (458–60!) is systematically trying out the *praecepta* from the *Ars Amatoria* on how to *capere puellam*, i.e. the rules of cultivated eroticism, is more likely to savour the implied author's irony than to share the narrator's disgust. Now, is the latter talking to an audience of this calibre, or is it not more likely that he is addressing a less sophisticated audience that would, like him, merely perceive Tereus' *scelus* (473)?

Whether or not a distinction between the two audiences is at all useful is a question W. himself asks, and he does admit that 'in many respects the narratorial audience verges on being implied, because the narrator does not specify its identity' (p. 85). But W. suggests, for example, that 'the two audiences are to be differentiated by degrees of belief and disbelief' (ibid.). He demonstrates this in one of the three chapters (V, VII, and VIII) in which he applies his theories. In Chapter VII he interprets the *concilium deorum*, at which Jupiter uses calculated rhetoric and an unreliable account of Lycaon's *scelera* to convince the other gods that they must agree to the annihilation of mankind, as a narrative which—especially in view of the parallel drawn between Jupiter and Augustus in verses 200–5—illustrates in exemplary fashion the 'dangers of disbelief'. Yet here, as in the other passages discussed in Chapter VII, the belief and disbelief in question are those of a narratorial audience within an embedded narrative.

Any implied criticism on my part stems merely from a desire to point out the possible dangers of applying modern literary theories to ancient texts, but I do not wish to question in general the method as such. Quite apart from the fact that W. himself is fully and explicitly aware of the pitfalls, his book demonstrates very clearly that his chosen path of interpretation leads to many new and significant insights to which conservative approaches remain blind. In his examinations of Ovid's text W. is able to combine extraordinarily keen perception with a vast knowledge of ancient literature and complete familiarity with current research, so that *A Discourse of Wonders* must certainly now be counted amongst the most important monographs on the *Metamorphoses*.

University of Munich NIKLAS HOLZBERG

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

RENAISSANCE OVID

A. Moss: *Latin Commentaries on Ovid from the Renaissance*. Pp. xv + 260, 7 ills. Signal Mountain, TN: Summertown, for the Library of Renaissance Humanism, 1998. Cased, $45. ISBN: 1-893009-02-S.

Ovid has been one of the principal beneficiaries in the recent boom in reception studies, as a spate of books in the last fifteen years or so attests. One thinks of L. Barkan, *The Gods Made Flesh* (New Haven, 1986) and J. Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford, 1993), as well as the essays collected in C. Martindale, *Ovid Renewed* (Cambridge, 1988), H. Lamarque and A. Baïche, *Ovide en France dans la Renaissance* (Toulouse, 1981), and—most recently—P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi, and S. Hinds, *Ovidian Transformations* (Cambridge, 1999). Moss herself has made important contributions both to Ovid and to reception studies generally with *Ovid in Renaissance France* (London, 1982), *Poetry and Fable* (Cambridge, 1984), and especially her recent ground-breaking work on Renaissance reading, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford, 1996).

In the present work M. follows three famous episodes from the *Metamorphoses* through the commentaries of eight Renaissance humanists from Raphael Regius (1493) to Thomas Farnaby (1636). The episodes are Apollo and Daphne, Actaeon, and Echo and Narcissus. M. begins with the Latin text of the three stories and George Sandys's 1632 translation on facing pages. For each commentator she presents a brief introduction, a translation of his preface (sometimes abridged) and commentary, and some endnotes. She concludes with a short bibliography.

The format is modest and the treatment spare, but for the most part M.'s brevity pays off. With only a few (but very sure) brush strokes she has painted a complex picture, situating Ovidian interpretation in the context of Renaissance intellectual and religious history and relating it to such interesting phenomena as book illustration, emblems, and commonplace books. Her broad and deep knowledge of mediaeval and Renaissance hermeneutics, evident on every page of the introductions and endnotes, makes her a sure-footed guide through the thickets of material; her eye for the pertinent detail and her clarity of thought and presentation keep the reader with her all the way. The illustrations are well chosen and neatly integrated into the discussion.

Most of M.'s commentaries were designed primarily as school texts—which means that they provided both a way of reading Ovid and a way of reading in general to boys and young men in the formative stages of their intellectual development. The texts, like schoolbooks of any age, not only provided information, but were derived from and intended to convey ideological and societal expectations and assumptions. Given their period, many of these assumptions are moral and religious. (Some are merely gender stereotypes. Thus, Raphael Regius on Apollo's plea to Daphne in *Met*. 1: 'Very ingeniously Apollo lists his powers, his family connections, and his famous discoveries in order to entice Daphne to love him, for women are particularly susceptible to any of these things' [p. 42].)

The ideological assumptions remained more or less constant, but the hermeneutical approach varied with the time and circumstances of the commentator. We should note, however, that none of the commentators employed anything like the critical and purely aesthetic styles of reading practiced by modern readers. (For Renaissance reading practices, see J. Hankins, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance* [Leiden, 1991], i.18–26.) Very few saw the epic as more than a repository of separate fables in need of interpretation.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Raphael Regius (1493) wrote a humanist commentary, treating the epic 'as a document about the ancient world' (p. 30). He 'underlines elements of pagan morality . . . consonant with Christian principles but does not rewrite pagan fables in Christian language' (p. 30). Petrus Berchorius (Petrarch's friend, Pierre Bersuire), whose fourteenth-century work was first published in 1509, practiced mediaeval allegoresis, finding in Ovid's fables the same moral and spiritual meanings he saw in scripture. His allegorical reading was 'a process of decoding, a process in which the original text is displaced by a reformulation of truths already known' (p. 62). (The discussion of Bersuire's method and sources [pp. 61–8] is one of the most interesting sections in the book.) Georgius Sabinus (Georg Schuler, 1554), a Protestant, believing that Ovid intentionally conveyed universal moral lessons but without knowing the truths of Christianity, provided moral, but not spiritual, interpretations and treated the fables as exempla. The Jesuit Jacobus Pontanus (Jakob Spanmüller, 1618) expurgated Ovid and also treated the stories as exempla, his commentary fully in tune with the threefold aim of Jesuit education: 'good morals, good Latin, and solid erudition' (p. 159). But not too much erudition, apparently: 'the Jesuit commentaries are a small contributory factor in the evolution of the typical seventeenth-century gentleman amateur, who wears his learning with grace and elegance, and for whom pedantry is a social solecism' (p. 162).

M.'s brevity, so generally admirable and no doubt mandated by the format of the Library of Renaissance Humanism, still left me wanting more biographical information and historical context as well as answers to some questions. Are her eight commentaries the only ones published between 1493 and 1636? If not, what are her principles of selection? Why cite the 1518 and not the 1493 edition of Regius, especially since the later edition includes the Lactantius summaries Regius disdained and the somewhat extraneous observations of Jacobus Bononiensis?

But these are quibbles. M. has assembled a group of texts probably not available together in more than one or two libraries (if that). Her clear and readable translations will be a boon to Latinless readers, and her introductions and notes provide a mini-history of Renaissance hermeneutics useful to anyone interested in reception studies.

Bryn Mawr College JULIA HAIG GAISSER

LE TOMBEAU DE STACE

F. Delarue, S. Georgacopoulou, P. Laurens, A.-M. Taisne (edd.): *Epicedion: Hommage à P. Papinius Statius, 96–1996*. Pp. 344. Poitiers: La Iicorne: UFR: Langues Littératures Poitiers, 1997. Paper, frs. 150. ISBN: 2-911044-08-8.

A commemorative volume to mark the 1900 years that have elapsed since the assumed date of Statius' death (A.D. 96) is welcome. The editors have succeeded in drawing together a number of prominent Statian scholars, whose contributions deal with the epics, the *Silvae*, and also aspects of the *Nachleben* of Statius.

David Vessey's introductory piece, 'Honouring Statius', begins with Nisard's negative evaluation of the decadence of later Latin literature, before examining attitudes to Statius, both in England and in France, in the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries, when there was far more dispute on the poet's worth. The

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

uncertain verdicts of the earlier period are in a sense a counterpart to the range of modern responses to post-Augustan Latin literature. Bernhard Kytzler considers the *Thebaid*'s true theme and offers the suggestion that the poem is really about *pietas*. Kytzler sneers (p. 34) at Ps.-Fulgentius' view of the conflict between Theseus and Creon as one between *humilitas* and *superbia*, but modern scholars would do well to recollect that their own techniques of reading texts such as the *Thebaid* or indeed the *Aeneid*, where one concept is often paramount and privileged, are not in fact so different from the allegorizing tradition which they affect to despise. Donald Hill's '*Thebaid* 1 Revisited' expands on his earlier discussion of the rôle of Jove, and convincingly shows that the god is in fact incompetent and lacking in control of events throughout the poem; Hill then argues that this should exclude identification of the god with Domitian, whose absolute power, while it lasted, was far more successful than that of Statius' Jove. William Dominik offers a summary reading of the *Thebaid*, while Roger Lesueur considers the interplay between political and private life in the poem. Sylvie Franchet d'Espèrey interprets the conflict between Pietas and Tisiphone in *Theb*. 11 as not between good and bad, but between violence and non-violence. Sophie Georgacopoulou offers a subtle and perceptive discussion of catalogues and lists of persons in the *Thebaid*, while Paola Venini shows how 'medium . . . Borean inlabere' (*Theb*. 7.6) is a reference not to the geographical north, but to the wind Boreas. Marie-Catherine Olivi considers Statius' presentation of Amphiaraus in relation to earlier versions of the myth, and Irene Frings argues persuasively for the similarities between the narration of Hypsipyle in *Thebaid* 5 and that of Aeneas to Dido in *Aeneid* 2 and 3.

Antonio La Penna's 'Modelli efebici nella poesia di Stazio' is an excellent treatment of the presentation of young men across the Statian corpus, showing the connexions existing between such figures as Parthenopaeus and Achilles in the epics, and such diverse youths from the *Silvae* as Glaucias and Crispinus (2.1; 5.2). Giuseppe Aricò warns against the tendency to view the *Achilleid* as a kind of romance in verse solely on the evidence of the portion that we have, and reminds us that a work which Statius considered a prelude to celebration of Domitian himself (*Ach*. 1.19, 'magnusque tibi praeludit Achilles') was unlikely not to focus on the more heroic exploits of its hero, had the rest of his story been told. Louis Foucher's 'Stace et les images d'Achille' considers representations of Achilles in visual art.

On the *Silvae* Anne-Marie Taisne, in her 'Échos épiques dans les *Silves* de Stace', shows how Statius uses figures from Homer and Virgil as exempla alongside figures from his own epics (to give an example missed by Taisne, note the double comparison of Crispinus with Ascanius and Parthenopaeus at *Silv*. 5.2.118–24), and adroitly draws attention to the paradox that the *Silvae*, a lesser and more ephemeral genre, nevertheless are rich in material drawn from epic. Jean-Michel Croisille's 'Stace, peintre de *Realia*' looks at *Silv*. 1.6 and 4.9. On *Silv.* 4.9 he makes the interesting suggestion that the poem is a parody of Martial 4.88, though his condemnation of the failure 'par les pluparts des commentateurs' to see the links with Catullus and Martial is unfortunate in view of his own failure to make any mention of Coleman's commentary, which does refer to both Martial and Catullus. Gabriel Laguna Mariscal gives a clear and extremely useful account of the influence of Stoicism and Epicureanism on the *Silvae*, showing that there are even occasions where Statius seems to offer a synthesis drawn from both traditions, as at *Silv.* 2.3.67 'sed medius per honesta et dulcia limes', where Laguna sees *honesta* as a reference to Stoic virtue and *dulcia* as a reference to Epicurean *uoluptas*, reflecting the public and private life of Atedius Melior. Alex Hardie sets *Silv.* 1.2 and 1.4 in the context of the *ludi saeculares* given by

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Domitian in 88, and suggests that Arruntius Stella, whose marriage to Violentilla is celebrated in *Silv.* 1.2, may in fact be the author of the *carmen saeculare* of that year. Fernand Delarue's 'Paradis' is a discussion of the significance of the title *Silvae*; he goes against the prevailing belief that *Silvae* refers to the Greek *hule*, 'raw material', preferring to emphasize the title as a metaphor, with 'forest' as an emblem of complexity. Delarue argues that 'les deux sens, "Matériaux bruts" et "Fôrets" sont inconcilables. Le premier titre est abstrait et dépréciatif, le second concret, pittoresque et valorisant', rejecting the possibilities of 'la polysémie' (p. 288). Hinds's subsequent discussion (1998) of the metapoetic qualities of *silua* (*Allusion and Intertext* [Cambridge, 1998], pp. 11–14) may, however, make an accommodation between the two positions more possible.

There are two excellent contributions on the *Nachleben* of Statius. Michael Dewar's 'Episcopal and Epicurean Villas: Venantius Fortunatus and the *Silvae*' suggests that as well as the epithalamic connexion between Statius, *Silv.* 1.2 and Venantius Fortunatus, *Carm.* 6.1, there is also the strong possibility of Statian influence from the *Silvae* (1.3, 2.2, 3.1) on the villa poems of Venantius. H.-J. van Dam's 'The Coming of the *Silvae* to the Netherlands' gives an invaluable discussion of the history of the study of the *Silvae* in the Netherlands in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—dealing in the south with such figures as Bernaerts, Livineius, Lipsius, and Laevinus, and in the north with scholars such as D. Heinsius and Meursius. This article is a splendid resource for any scholar interested in Statian textual criticism.

University of Liverpool BRUCE GIBSON

MAXIMIANUS AMAT

C. S. Öberg: *Versus Maximiani. Der Elegienzyklus textkritisch herausgegeben, übersetzt und neu interpretiert.* Pp. 205. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell International, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 91-22-01824-7.

Versus Maximiani is one of the manuscript titles of a cycle of elegies generally thought to have been written in the second quarter of the sixth century A.D. Ö. argues that the author of the poems and the person described prominently in them are not identical, and that the latter's name Maximianus conceals a real person who is being subjected to satirical attack by the poet. (Although Etruscan origin is ascribed to Maximianus, she wonders whether this is Cassiodorus—metrically similar and chronologically ideal—but does not press this or any other identification.) This discussion of author and 'Hauptperson' is one of the two main services of this book. The other is to list and describe fifty-three manuscripts and present all their readings: this is done in thirty unforgivingly dense pages between the *Kommentar* and the *Quellenapparat*. Contamination evidently makes the construction of a stemma impossible (but for the complex tradition of 1.227–234 we are given a 'Wurzel' of a stemma).

Facing the Latin text is a German translation which is almost invariably close and helpful. There is no apparatus criticus beneath the text, and even in the notes, where textual questions predominate, there is little guidance about which manuscripts say what: if not content with the editor's counting of manuscripts or her division into *antiquiores* and *recentiores* one must plunge into the thickets mentioned above. After a promising beginning with the diagnosis of a problem in 1.2 and an original conjecture (*quies*) to solve it, the notes are brief and disappointing. The note on 1.28, for example,

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

only divulges at the end that some manuscripts give *tragicos* (which is surely right, whether or not the *lectio difficilior*). At 1.58 the transmitted *quaeque* after *ultima* seems excellent, *pace* Schetter, whose study of the poems thirty years ago is influential throughout. At 1.240, where the manuscripts divide between the first and third persons, the third person is not, as alleged, guaranteed by the surrounding context—far from it—and adds to the problems raised by the following line, where Ö.'s translation (untypically, I hasten to add) does not match her text. In 5.138 *nec his* is a poor suggestion, anomalous in metre and hardly supported by the bare observation that negative words preponderate among the manuscript readings. In general it may be said that although Ö. stated the principle (p. 86) that her choice of reading would be governed by *Inhalt*, *Sprache*, and *Stil*, as well as *paläographische Erklärungsmöglichkeiten*, it is the last of these things, along with the constant search for something that can be stamped *lectio difficilior*, that has the upper hand.

The notes give little help with the meaning of difficult passages, e.g. the bland 1.50 (*non res in vitium sed male facta cadunt*), the parenthetical 1.83–4 (where the reference to *corporis partes (mediae)* seems to have been suggested by the foregoing reference to *mediis . . . rebus*, the golden mean, and could rank as a joke). In 1.170 I wonder if *magis* is 'platter', and in 1.260 suggest that *opus* is used sexually, as it certainly is in 5.84. There are unexplained difficulties at 1.7–8 and 5.120: in both the possibility of a lacuna should at least be considered. Most surprisingly, the notes make almost no use of the *loci similes* assembled in the *Quellenapparat*. There is a wealth of material there, though there are many areas that an investigation conducted by CD-ROM cannot reach. Juvenal on old age is barely mentioned, let alone other possible 'Quellen' for the long catalogue of senile problems in the first poem. Readers will easily add their own observations: a few are Hor. *Odes* 3.21.11–12 at 1.49, Auson. *Epigr.* 13.5 Green (interestingly, the later variant of that line) at 1.231, and Claudian *In Ruf.* 1 pref. 21–4 at 1.292. The reference to Virg. *Aen.* 6.546 at 5.123 is on Ö.'s formal criteria an interloper; but at least it seems to show appreciation of the rich mock-epic tone of the agitated reflexions on sudden impotence and then the cosmic rôle of the *mentula*.

These amusing elegies (part of a core curriculum in the Late Middle Ages) about an old man with more than one foot in the grave and an obsession with the sexual conquests he never made deserve to be more accessible. Much interpretation remains to be done. In the present case, it looks rather as if there was no pause between the submission of this doctoral dissertation and the delivery of copy to the printer; certainly much more time and thought should have been given by those concerned to matters of presentation, method, and scholarship.

University of Glasgow ROGER GREEN

PICTURING NERO

C. SCHUBERT: *Studien zum Nerobild in der Lateinischen Dichtung der Antike*. (Beiträge zum Altertumskunde 116.) Pp. 503. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998. Cased, DM 168. ISBN: 3-519-07665-9.

In a book without a vigorous thesis or a modish method, Schubert offers a reasoned, intelligent catalogue of Roman poetry related to Nero. S. casts his net wide, aiming to take in all of the poetry—even to the end of antiquity—characterizing Nero. The book more resembles a Neronian literary encyclopaedia than a literary study or focused literary history. There is no abundance of surprises here, but there is a large

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

volume of useful analysis and bibliographical material. S. seems particularly to admire J. P. Sullivan's *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nero* (Ithaca, 1985), and hopes to provide a continuation and expansion (p. 411).

The first section of S.'s doctoral dissertation covers the period from Nero's accession until his death. There are longer or shorter analyses of Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* and *De Clementia*, Calpurnius Siculus, Persius, Lucan, Columella, the *Einsiedeln Eclogues*, Petronius, Seneca's tragedies and *Epistulae Morales*, and Baebius Italicus' *Ilias Latina.* S.'s understanding of poetry, as can be seen, is rather broad. The second section follows through to the end of the Flavian period, discussing, amongst others, the *Octavia*, Martial, Valerius Flaccus, Silius Italicus, and Statius' *Silvae*, then adds a section on prose writers, Pliny the Elder, and Josephus.

Although it might have resulted in a larger book, it is a pity that S. did not survey prose as even-handedly as poetry. In his third chronological section ('From the Adoptive Caesars until the End of Antiquity'), Tacitus, Suetonius, and Cassius Dio are passed over. They fall outside the 'poetic' ambit. To have measured poetic treatments of Nero against, say, Tacitus might have provided a tighter focus. At any rate, this third section looks briefly at Juvenal and Pliny the Younger, even more briefly at Tacitus, Suetonius, and Cassius Dio, and finally at some late historians and some Christian poets (Ausonius, Prudentius, Claudian, Rutilius Namatianus, and Sidonius Apollinaris).

Following S.'s chronological analysis is an interesting outline of his main themes. For those in a hurry, this may be the section to turn to first. S. divides ancient poetic treatments of Nero into two camps, one positive, one negative. The positive tradition subdivides into two (p. 413). The first, begun by Seneca with the *Apocolocyntosis* and continued in the *De Clementia*, is taken over and broadened by Calpurnius Siculus and the second *Einsiedeln Eclogue.* Lucan's *De Bello Civili* moves further by linking in Augustan motifs of *pax*, *iustitia*, and the *aurea aetas*, embodied in the person of the idealized ruler. The second panegyric stream also begins with the *Apocolocyntosis* and, continued in part by Lucan, focuses on Nero's artistic ability (Nero as Apollo *citharoedus*). It appears also in the first *Einsiedeln Eclogue* and Baebius Italicus. The negative tradition has no markedly unifying traits. Forming part of this tradition, as he believes, are the 'protests' of *De Bello Civili* 4–10, the Neronian parody of Persius 1, the 'disillusioned fatalism' of Seneca's tragedies and letters, and Columella's disapproval of Nero's agrarian policies. This tradition persists into the Flavian period, in the *Octavia*, Martial's poetry, and that of Statius, amongst others. With different emphases, it flows on through Juvenal into late antiquity and early Christian writing.

S.'s method exemplifies the German biographical/historical style. This is marked in the discussion of Seneca's tragedies and *Epistulae Morales*. Although Nero is not mentioned in these, S. believes the tragedies provide a warning to Nero against certain modes of behaviour. So (p. 212) he seems to see an admonitory link in the *Oedipus* between Oedipus and Nero, then Jocasta and Agrippina. The political attitude to Nero in the *Epistulae Morales* matches that of the tragedies. In the former the specific deformations of the tyrant's life were discussed (avarice, etc.), in the latter the generalities of the tyrant's life (the misuse of power above all). The problem is that the specifics of the tyrant's misbehavior are of such a general nature as to apply equally to a Cambyses or Nero.

1998 was probably a difficult year for publication. If S. had had access to V. Rudich, *Dissidence and Literature under Nero: the Price of Rhetoricization* (London, 1997), J. Henderson, *Fighting for Rome: Poets and Caesars, History and Civil War* (Cambridge, 1998), or S. Bartsch, *Ideology in Cold Blood: a Reading of Lucan's* Civil War

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Cambridge, MA, 1998) he might have read things differently—the *De Clementia* and the *Apocolocyntosis* and the second *Einsiedeln Eclogue* might have seemed more ironic. S. might, had he grappled with such critics, have provided less sanguine readings, paid more attention to formalist interpretations of Nero or Lucan especially (W. R. Johnson, *Momentary Monsters: Lucan and his Heroes* [Ithaca, 1987] perhaps) or to the increasingly popular deconstructive/intertextualist readings (J. Masters, *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's* Bellum Civile [Cambridge, 1992], or Henderson on Lucan, for example), or even the ideologically driven historicism of Florentines such as E. Narducci, *La provvidenza crudele: Lucano e la distruzione dei miti augustei* (Pisa, 1979). At any rate, a book as big as this, even in German, cannot avoid taking a position on the Anglo-American debate. That F. M. Ahl, *Lucan: an Introduction* (Ithaca, 1976), V. Rudich, *Political Dissidence under Nero: the Price of Dissimulation* (London, 1993), S. Bartsch, *Actors in the Audience* (Cambridge, MA, 1994), C. Martindale, *Redeeming the Text* (Cambridge, 1993), and even G. Williams's Sather Lectures, *Change and Decline* (Berkeley, 1978), amongst others, are not cited diminishes its polemical impact.

Let me finish on a constructive note. The book will prove useful for the many people now working in the literature of the period. The discussions of Baebius Italicus, the *Einsiedeln Eclogues*, Persius, and Calpurnius stand out. The reasoned clarification of the two strands of reaction to Nero is very helpful.

University of Calgary PETER TOOHEY

FLAVIAN EPIC

F. RIPOLL: *La morale héroïque dans les épopées latines d'époque flavienne: tradition et innovation* (Bibliotheque d'Études Classiques). Pp. 595. Louvain and Paris: Éditions Peeters, 1998. Paper, Euro 60. ISBN: 90-429-0693-6.

R. looks at the nature of the heroic ideal found in Flavian epic by examining the *Argonautica*, the *Punica*, and the *Thebaid* from a variety of perspectives, offering reflections on a number of determined themes and looking at the way these poems relate to and reflect their sources. Accepting the premise that behind the *Aeneid* there lies a conception of Roman history that focuses on a moral and spiritual renewal under Augustus, he explores whether these poems reflect the ideology of the imperial regime in the same way that Virgil's *Aeneid* did (p. 13). There is thus a comparison with the *Aeneid* and Virgil's methods throughout.

R. begins by examining the paradigms of heroic valour by looking at, first, heroic succession (both the hero's own lineage, and the Flavian epic hero as a successor to the Virgilian epic hero), then the figure of Hercules, and finally the figure of Mars. R. notes that Flavian epicists reintroduce the idea of divine filiation (e.g. Silius' acceptance of a Jovian descent for Scipio [pp. 79–84]), present in Virgil but lacking in Lucan. However, Flavian epicists do not treat divine descent the same way as Virgil did, stressing direct filiation as in the case of Aeneas. Instead, they treat it symbolically, using it as a signal that their heroes are invested with certain qualities that make them heroic. R. next examines the place of Hercules in Flavian epic—regardless of his prominence in each epic, the figure of Hercules and how he is portrayed touches on fundamental aspects of the heroic ethic (pp. 86–163). In comparing Valerius and

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Apollonius, R. argues that the Latin poet expands the rôle of Hercules and depicts him as the perfect embodiment of the heroic ethic, developing more fully through the course of his involvement in the epic; in fact, Hercules disappears from the epic at the point where he is ready to be apotheosized. Hercules is invested with a greater nobility in the Latin epic, seen, for instance, in the suffering he undergoes at the loss of Hylas, a suffering lacking in Apollonius. It is, then, to this ideal that Jason is compared and toward which he reaches through the course of the epic. By looking at Hercules in this way, R. is able to integrate scenes such as the liberation of Hesione and the deliverance of Prometheus into the overall plan of the epic, and thus see them in a more positive light than is often the case. By contrast, Silius employs three distinct images of Hercules, one in each hexad of the epic, to illustrate the three different types of heroic ethic present in the poem. In the first hexad, Hercules is put forth as a model for heroic imitation and his association is primarily with Hannibal. In the second, he is associated more closely with Fabius and represents the ideal of ancient Italy; he is conceived of as national hero. Finally, in the third hexad, he is associated with Scipio and emblematic of the Stoic hero and a renewal of *virtus Romana.* Thus the figure of Hercules emerges as one of the unifying factors of the *Punica*. In the *Thebaid*, two aspects of Hercules are employed, largely to inform the actions of two characters: Menoeceus and Theseus. In the first instance, it is the idea of moral purity and self-sacrifice that is important, while in the latter, Hercules and Theseus are paralleled by their ideal heroic and altruistic actions. For Statius, Hercules (in these two characters) embodies the values of *virtus* and *pietas*. Through the treatment of Hercules, each poet attributes certain Stoic qualities to his heroes, integrating the Stoic Hercules with the Hercules of the mythical tradition. R. goes on to argue that there is, latent through the Flavian epicists, a parallel between Hercules and both Vespasian and Domitian.

The remainder of the book examines the way in which certain values and ethical themes are portrayed, again by comparison with predecessors, notably Virgil. For example, *pietas* (pp. 256–312) is handled very differently by the Flavian poets; it is not a universal concept, as it was for Virgil, in large part because the Flavian universe is conceived of as less moral. If we accept that *Pietas* is the understanding of a divine plan and divine will, as R. asserts, then there are no heroes who exhibit the degree of *Pietas* found in Aeneas. Even though Statius assigns a rôle to *Pietas*, it is combined with *iustitia* and *clementia*, and is more consistent with Stoic humanism and altruism than with Virgilian epic. This analysis leads to a final discussion of how the heroic morality that is developed in Flavian epic relates to contemporary imperial ideology. Flavian heroes are representative of the emperors, and the figure of Theseus is instructive. He has symbolic importance in his ability to bring peace, and is compared to Vespasian and Domitian, but the comparison is not as explicit as that of Aeneas and Augustus in the *Aeneid*. In addition, while Theseus is modelled on a Virgilian scheme of traditional heroic humanity, in permitting the burial of Creon he also exhibits a *humanitas* lacking in Aeneas and is thus representative of a new heroism in the *Thebaid.* In all, there is a different ordering to the universe in Flavian epic than we find in Virgil; *humanitas* replaces the moral *pietas* that is prominent in the *Aeneid.* This situation is, R. suggests, in keeping with a hierarchy of virtues as evidenced by Flavian propaganda. He further argues that this reordering of virtues is in keeping with a Stoic outlook: Silius employs a Ciceronian stoicism, while Statius employs a Senecan. He notes, however, that these are not Stoic poets, but poets influenced by Stoicism. Moreover, this Flavian stoicism does not extend to the political realm; despite the prominence of tyranny in Flavian epic, the epics are neither attacks on nor apologies

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for the principate. R. sees an adaptation of the Virgilian heroic ideal for Flavian realities, emphasizing the events of A.D. 69; what emerges is an ideal based on Stoic morality and a renewed emphasis on *humanitas*.

The argument is supported by copious notes and a generous bibliography. There is, however, an annoying inconsistency in footnoting (e.g. the citations of Garson, pp. 107–9). The lack of an *index locorum* is also frustrating, especially given the way the epics are discussed. Those wishing to consult the book for specific passages will encounter great difficulty in locating the various discussions. In its attempt to find a coherent plan for Flavian epic and to distinguish it from previous epic, the book makes a worthwhile contribution to the study of Flavian literature.

University of New Brunswick, Fredericton JOHN GEYSSEN

SPECTATORS BOTH AND SPECTACLE

A. FELDHERR: *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History*. Pp. xiv + 251. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1998. Paper, £11.95. ISBN: 0-520-21027-1.

Spectacle has served as an important critical concept for scholars over recent decades, particularly in studies of historiography and epic: Borzsák ('*Spectaculum*: Ein Motiv der tragischen Geschichtsschreibung', *Acta Classica Debrecenensis* 9 [1973], 57–67), Davidson ('The Gaze in Polybius', *JRS* 81 [1991], 10–24), Walker ('*Enargeia* and the Spectator in Greek Historiography', *TAPA* 123 [1993], 353–77), Leigh (*Lucan: Spectacle and Engagement* [Oxford, 1997]), Keitel ('*Foedum Spectaculum* and Related Motifs in Tacitus *Histories* II–III', *Rh. Mus.* 135 [1992], 342–51—not in F.'s otherwise comprehensive bibliography) and Feldherr himself ('Ships of State: *Aeneid* V and Augustan Circus Spectacle', *CA* 14 [1995], 245–65) have all tackled this issue. F. uses the notion of spectacle in this study in a broader sense than some previous scholars: 'By *spectacle* I refer not only to the shows of the circus and arena . . but to the external, visible component of all rituals and public acts. . . . It was through seeing and being seen that the social relationships of watcher and watched were realized and the status of each defined' (p. 13). F. sensibly warns his readers (pp. ix–x) that he is not primarily concerned with Livy's text as a means of gaining access to the historical reality of the past (although his subtle readings of particular episodes will surely offer food for thought to those who approach the text with this aim). Instead he sees the *AUC* as a work which can (and should) be located within the political and cultural discourses of Livy's own place and time. For F., who agrees with Luce about dating, this would mean completion of the first pentad by 27 B.C. (p. 48 n. 149, cf. p. 221 n. 8). This discussion, relegated to a footnote, could perhaps have been usefully included in the main text and expanded, particularly given the direct implications of this question for F.'s methodology. Some speculation about the date of the second pentad might also have been constructive, since episodes from Books 6–10 are the main focus of F.'s discussion: Kraus (*Livy AUC Book VI* [Cambridge, 1994], p. 5) proposes that Books 6–10 were published before 23 B.C., and Oakley (*A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X: Volume I* [Oxford, 1997], pp. 109–11) suggests that Books 6–10 were composed at some point between 30 and 25 B.C., perhaps even towards the beginning of this period.

Chapter I, 'Vision and Authority in Livy's Narrative', argues that Livy's exploitation of the visual dimension lends his text an authority which he himself lacks,

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and 'invites us to measure his work against the other forms of public display that also presented a visible image of the Roman past' (p. 3). In this context, F. offers a positive evaluation of how Livy uses *enargeia* as a bridge between past and present, not simply to entertain his readers. Next, turning to the ritual departure of the consul P. Licinius Crassus from Rome in 171 B.C. during the campaign against Perseus of Macedon (42.49.1–6), F. suggests links both between the internal spectators at the *profectio* and the readers of Livy's history (especially as constructed in the Preface), and between Licinius Crassus and Livy himself. In this context, F. sees *enargeia* as a 'chance to make his audience's experience approximate those of his ancestors' (p. 11). I take F.'s point, but this formulation seems to me to avoid some interesting questions about the *differences* between internal and external audiences here and elsewhere.

Chapter II, 'Historian and *Imperator*', explores the relationship between holders of *imperium*, such as Papirius Cursor and Camillus, and the rôle of Livy as historian, arguing that the text is as essential to their *imperium* as their *imperium* is to his text. In Livy's narrative of the battle of Aquilonia (10.38–41), F. characterizes Papirius' speech as a kind of *spectaculum*, which gains power because his predictions (10.39.16) are vindicated by verbal echoes in the narrative of the Samnite destruction (10.41.3). Yet this technique is not exclusively Livian. It would have been fascinating, for example, to have seen how Tacitus played out the questions raised about Caligula by the doomed Arruntius, who speaks 'vatis in modum' (*Annals* 6.48). Arruntius, like Papirius Cursor, may have appeared to impose meaning on subsequent events in the lost books of the *Annals*. Chapter III, 'Duels and *Devotiones*', analyses how Livy depicts the *devotiones* of the Decii (8.9 and 10.28–29), and the duels of the Torquati (7.9.8–7.10.14 and 8.7) and Corvus (7. 26). F. convincingly argues that these scenes are not doublets, but proposes that Livy deliberately repeated certain elements in the duels, which we should read together if we are to understand them properly. The process of watching becomes a marker of national character, as both internal and external audiences share in a socially cohesive spectacle, which underscores their Roman identity and differentiates them from the Gauls. This spectacular narrative mode thereby enhances the *AUC* as a vehicle for exempla. Chapter IV, 'Sacrifice, Initiation and the Construction of the *Patria*', considers the fall of Alba Longa and explores how 'the bond between individual citizens and their *patria* is forged and tested by making them spectators at acts of violence' (p. 116). In an excellent discussion, F. examines the duel between Horatii and Curiatii in relation to Roman/Alban identity, and uses the death of Horatia to shed light on an 'internal contradiction within the logic of patriotism itself' (p. 134). Finally, turning to the execution of Mettius Fufetius, F. engages with Girardian theory and considers the question of sacrifice as a positive force both in the text and in Augustan society. Chapter V, 'The Alternative of Drama', sets the spectacles of Livy's text against drama, a more ambiguous form of visual display. Since drama could either subvert or reinforce the social hierarchy depending on circumstances, Livy had to use the theatrical template judiciously. F.'s perception of a link in Livy's text between the excesses of dramatic performance and kingship generates a nuanced study of Tarquinius Superbus' reign as a negative exemplum.

This is an absorbing study which raises as many questions as it answers. For example, why do these episodes from early Roman history lend themselves so well to F.'s task of locating Livy's work within the political and cultural discourses of the Augustan era? Does their very chronological distance give Livy greater freedom to shape his material? How much continuity is there between Livy's use of the spectacular in the early and later books? It is clear that F. could potentially have

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

produced an enormous study, and he has resisted the temptation to embrace too much material from Livy for the scope of his work. Even so, I would have welcomed it if F. had discussed the relationship between Livy's early books and Augustan society from a standpoint which was more firmly rooted in the political and social developments of the 20s B.C. On balance, this is a book which may ultimately have more to say to Livy specialists than to those whose research interests lie in Augustan society, but it should not be neglected by either group.

University College London RHIANNON ASH

LIVY'S MONUMENT

M. JAEGER: *Livy's Written Rome*. Pp. xii + 205. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998. Cased, $39.50. ISBN: 0-472-10789-5.

Livy is experiencing a resurgence of late, particularly in the USA, where the *Ab Urbe Condita* is the subject of an increasing number of doctoral theses. J.'s is the latest substantial product of this resurgence. Its concern is with Livy's 'representation of space, monuments, and memory' and with 'the *Ab Urbe Condita* as a spatial entity, a monument, and a lengthy act of remembering' (p. 8). These interests are pursued in an introductory chapter, which discusses Livy's history as a 'monumentum', and four separate studies of individual episodes.

The first study concerns the battle with the Sabines which results from the seizure of their women. J. analyses the relationship between the events of the battle and the stylized landscape in which they take place, arguing that this relationship is much richer in potential meaning than in Livy's predecessor, Piso (fr. 6P). In Livy, Sabine success depends on the advantage of higher ground (the Capitoline); Roman success depends on valour and divine favour. A reversal of the natural narrative sequence emphasizes the vanity of Mettius Curtius' boast of victory, delayed until the reader has already heard Romulus' prayer to Jupiter and seen the Romans rally at the gate of the Palatine. J.'s approach is subtle and detailed but eventually fails to convince. J. observes correctly that the narrative gives the reader and the Sabine women the same viewpoint on events: the women burst unannounced from the sidelines into the action. But the moral (?) purpose J. ascribes to Livy carries little conviction: 'while Livy's audience can fall anywhere on the sociopolitical continuum, it must be able to stand outside of events and then move to participate in them, like the Sabine women, or to participate in events even while finding his [*sic*] way out of them, like Romulus' (p. 55). If J.'s reading is correct, then Livy's message is at best opaque.

In the second case study J. follows the rise and fall of M. Manlius Capitolinus. J.'s most novel contribution is a new reading of Manlius' defence of the Capitol: 'Livy emphasizes the critical nature of this moment by calling attention to its centrality and extremity . . . Defense of the center comes at a critical moment by means of a center. Manlius' bivalent action of striking with a shield, using it as a defensive and offensive weapon, makes the boss of the shield both a center from which the space under Roman control must expand (this is as far inward as Rome will withdraw) and a turning point (this is as close as the Gauls will come to capturing the city completely)' (pp. 65–6). What is lacking is a demonstration of why such a small detail (the 'umbo') must bear such interpretative weight (simply to observe its absence from other similar sources is insufficient). In contrast, J. has a good discussion of Livy's picture of

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Manlius, a man whose fame, conceit, and rhetoric all derive from his heroism on the Capitol. This is both strength and weakness, for the people are only swayed by his rhetoric as long as they can see the Capitol. J. is also good on the contrast with Camillus, who rejects a move to Veii precisely because of the dangers inherent in settling a place which would be a living monument to one man (esp. 5.30.2).

J.'s penultimate study focuses on two important episodes from the Second Punic War: the Roman response to the disaster at Cannae in 216 and the rôle of L. Marcius in the resurgence of Roman fortunes in Spain in 212. J. shows that Livy constructs his narrative of the aftermath of Cannae in order to emphasize the part played in the Roman recovery by control of corporate memory. This theme also appears in the treatment of L. Marcius, whose success resides in his ability to substitute memory of success for memory of recent failure, in particular to draw on the reputation of the dead Scipios. The study closes with a discussion of the end of Book 25, where the 'Shield of Marcius' is juxtaposed with the spoils of Syracuse brought to Rome by M. Marcellus. Livy explicitly remarks that the spoils presage the moral decline of his own time, and J. notes that 'Livy's account teaches the reader who sees the pillaged temple of Honos and Virtus to remember the shield of Marcius as well and thus to find the way back from a troubled present to a morally uplifting Roman past' (p. 131). J. is justified in seeking to interpret this juxtaposition of 'monumenta', for Livy could have placed his discussion of the spoils at the end of his narrative of the sack of Syracuse, before events in Spain. J. explains that 'Marcius' story was embedded in the account of the sack of Syracuse to salvage what was . . . a moral defeat' (p. 126), thereby questioning Burck's view that Livy delayed his reporting of events in Sicily in order to end the pentad on a high note. But J.'s alternative is not finally convincing, partly because it exaggerates the negative tone in Livy (he thinks the seizure perfectly justified), and partly because it ignores Marcellus' victory over Epicydes and Hanno (25.40.5–41.7), which follows Livy's account of the Syracusan spoils.

J.'s longest and perhaps most ambitious study is a reinterpretation of Livy's notorious treatment of the trials of the Scipios. In J.'s view, the introduction of variant accounts (which Livy admits render impossible any secure account of the trials) is not to be seen as his bowing to an unpalatable historiographical imperative, but Livy's embracing features of the historical record which allow him to advance a broader and more coherent interpretation of Scipio Africanus. Livy welcomes the uncertainty introduced by these variants because they draw attention to an historical figure who transcends any normal historical treatment. Even Scipio's final resting place is unknown, and the broken monuments which Livy says he has observed at Rome and Liternum are a metaphor for the historical record itself. This is a novel and challenging interpretation. It is certainly the case that Livy's willingness to entertain irreconcilable variants is an index of Scipio's importance as an historical figure (indeed Livy suggests as much: 'haec de tanto uiro, quam et opinionibus et monumentis litterarum uariarent, proponenda erant' [38.57.8]). But must we prefer J.'s interpretation to the less complex alternative, that Livy feels bound to admit his own inability to steer a reliable course through the defective evidence? Could not his mention of the monuments simply be to advertise his own autopsy and thereby to justify his own failure to create a coherent narrative?

It is not possible in such a short review to respond comprehensively to the content, both good and bad, of J.'s work. The above can do little more than give a flavour. Some general remarks do, however, seem appropriate. It should be obvious that I approach Livy from a more traditional viewpoint. The major disagreement would be in our assessment of the range of literary techniques which an ancient historian might

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

use to project meaning, and therefore the complexity of the messages which he might be able to convey. J. reckons this ability to be extremely high; more traditional critics reckon it much lower. There is shared ground in the attempt to discover authorial intent, for, while keen to use the insights and language of literary theory, J. for the most part (she is not *always* transparent) attempts to discover what Livy sought to convey to his readership. But the more extravagant of J.'s conclusions underline the need to be more self-conscious and critical about the criteria employed in authenticating our reading of the ancient historians.

The Leys School, Cambridge S. J. NORTHWOOD

VALERIUS MAXIMUS

J. BRISCOE (ed.): *Valerius Maximus,* Facta et Dicta Memorabilia (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana). Pp. xlii + 888 (2 vols). Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998. Cased, DM 175 per volume. ISBN: 3-519-01916-7; 3-519-01917-5.

The past decade has seen a remarkable revival of interest in Valerius Maximus. No fewer than three books have appeared in the English-speaking world: W. M. Bloomer, *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility* (London, 1992); C. Skidmore, *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen: The Work of Valerius Maximus* (Exeter, 1996); D. Wardle, *Valerius Maximus, Memorable Deeds and Sayings, Book I, Translated with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford, 1998). Classicists should also be aware of A. J. Kennedy's fine edition, *Christine de Pizan: Le Livre du corps de policie* (Paris, 1998), a work deeply indebted to Valerius Maximus.

Behind all these studies looms the impressive figure of K. Kempf, whose masterly textual editions began in 1854 and ended with the Teubner text of 1888. For well over a century readers have had to rely absolutely on Kempf's work. It was therefore with considerable interest that one witnessed the production of the first two volumes of the Budé edition of R. Combès (Books 1–3, 1995; Books 4–6, 1997), an interest soon dissipated by the less than satisfactory textual work of the editor.

Fortunately we now have this splendid new Teubner edition of Briscoe, a text sure to become the Kempf of the twenty-first century, clearly destined to remain authoritative *plus uno saeclo*. It is based (as was Kempf's) on the manuscripts A (Bern, Burgerbibliothek 366) and L (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ashburnham 1899) both ninth century, but adds G (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale 5336) of the eleventh century. The importance of G (strangely ignored by Combès) was first recognized by Dorothy Schullian. To bolster the readings of ALG, B. deftly uses the evidence of the two epitomes of Iulius Paris and Nepotianus from Late Antiquity. It may very well be the case that exhaustive examination of the many other surviving MSS of Valerius Maximus would turn up emendations of value, but one can hardly blame B. for his honest admission (p. xix): *non sum nescius multas lectiones in codicibus latere nec omnes me editiones perscrutatum esse*. It would indeed be the work of a lifetime, and may all too possibly not yield much of value.

One great drawback of Kempf's text (but one imposed upon him by Teubner rules then current) was the lack of any listing of such valuable information as historical sources, parallel passages, etc. In this respect we owe B. another debt: at the bottom of

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

virtually every page is a list, often extensive, of such useful cross-references, including most helpful citations from such standard works as *RE*, *Degrassi*, and *MRR*. For the non-historian this is a blessing indeed.

B.'s text itself is judiciously conservative, with a frequent use of the *obelus* to mark the all too numerous *loci conclamati.* Book 1 contains (apart from matters of simple orthography) about forty changes from Kempf's text; yet virtually all of these are instances of choosing differently from the manuscripts' readings, or choosing an emendation already recorded by Kempf. Naturally one can disagree with the choices B. has made. For example, 1.7.1 (p. 55.29) *aditum sibi ad caelum instruxerat*, where Kellerbauer suggested the attractive *struxerat*; Kempf printed *struxerat*, supporting his acceptance by reference to 5.4.1 *aditum iuxta moenia urbis Volsco militi struxit*, and made the same correction at 6.9.15 *aditum sibi in caelum struxerunt* (LA^1 read *instruxerunt*, A^c corrects, B. retains *instruxerunt*). The addition of the *in-* after the preceding *-m* is fatally easy, and Kellerbauer strengthened his case by adducing Tacitus *Hist.* 3.49.1 *vi<a>m sibi in potentiam struere.*

An important and intriguing question lies behind the (undoubtedly correct) acceptance of G as a primary witness to the text: to what extent are we justified in seeing it as a constant carrier of genuine tradition? G throughout has (presumably correct) readings not to be found in A and L; yet so many of these look like fairly obvious corrections. Thus 1.8.6 (p. 71.104) *ubi eos tardiores animaduertit* (*eos* G: om. AL; this seems to be an unnecessary 'correction' in G); 1.8. Ext. 8 (p. 78.251) *cum iocabundus . . . reuerteretur* (*reuerteretur* A^cL^cG; *reuertetur* AL); 1.8. Ext. 12 (p. 80.280) *regis Bithyniae filius* (*Bythiniae* A^cL^cG; *Bythiae* AL); 1.8. Ext. 17 (p. 81.303) *tam aequalem* (*tam* A^cG; *tantam* AL). B. is willing (p. viii) to allow that often these 'correct' readings are due to conjecture, but appears to side with Schullian in believing that other such readings would have been beyond the conjectural capabilities of the scribe or his source. This, I suggest, is to underestimate the powers of a mediaeval scholar. A text now in Cambridge (Clare College 26, s. $XIII^{2/4}$, written in the south of England) of Books 1–7 of Aulus Gellius quickly disabuses one of any such view: it embodies massive emendation, sometimes erroneous, but often anticipating later conjectures by several centuries.

It is one of the many virtues of this splendid edition that B.'s careful and always masterful presentation of the evidence gives the reader the opportunity to battle with such questions in full command of the facts. It is hardly too much to hope that the coming decade will see yet another flowering in studies of Valerius Maximus.

Amherst College PETER K. MARSHALL

CURTIUS REHABILITATED

E. BAYNHAM: *Alexander the Great: The Unique History of Quintus Curtius.* Pp. xiv + 237. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998. Cased, $39.50. ISBN: 0-472-10858-1.

Baynham's study (originally a PhD dissertation, *Alexander 'Rex, 'Dux' and Tyrannus*' [Diss. Wellington, 1989]), provides a welcome addition to the (modestly) growing trickle of interest in this author. It is exciting to lay hands on what promises initially to be a literary exegesis of a text which tends to attract Alexander-historians rather than readers with literary or cultural interests (p. 13), but disappointingly, B. fails to acknowledge recent theoretical developments in literary and historical criticism.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Nevertheless, she does raise and discuss some fundamental issues and passages, e.g. Curtius' presentation of Alexander in his 'epilogue' (p. 100), and Curtius 9.5.21. Unfortunately, without reading the entire text it is difficult to see how these analyses might effectively be accessed, and an index of passages discussed would have made a useful addition to B.'s work.

Chapter I (pp. 1–14) also serves as the introduction, and focuses on the familiar problems and uncertainties surrounding Curtius' text: the lost books, lacunae and textual uncertainties, the uncertain identity of the author, and the lack of ancient impact. B. deals concisely and unexceptionably with the date issue in an appendix (pp. 201–19), summarizing recent scholarship and finally suggesting publication under Vespasian.

Literary context for Curtius is a difficult topic to address successfully, both because of our uncertainty concerning when his 'context' might have been and also because 'minor' authors tend to attract a rhetoric of models and influence. B's claim that the aim of Chapter II (pp. 15–55) is 'simply to demonstrate Curtius' literary context and to establish a background for an appreciation of the historian's arrangement of his material and the development of his main themes' (p. 15) collides with both of these issues without addressing either satisfactorily. The discourse of the 'model' (p. 30) is problematic because of its implications of conscious imitation or influence (p. 31). B. is more successful when evoking a sense of a 'common ground' (p. 26) or 'parallelism' (p. 32).

On Curtius' structure, B. makes several trenchant observations, refuting the familiar criticism that the *Historiae Alexandri* is a collection of rhetorical purple passages, and outlining a carefully structured narrative based on two pentads in which each book closes with a climax and opens with a marked reference to the previous book's conclusion (pp. 35–46). It would have been interesting to see B.'s interpretation of the broad correspondence between Books 5 and 10 (the deaths of the two kings and the fates of their empires), but discussion of this equivalence is omitted. Structurally, the issues raised in Chapter II are undercut by an oversimplistic conclusion. B. argues that, 'given the hostile attitudes toward Alexander expressed in Latin literature elsewhere', Curtius' audience may have been underwhelmed by his 'too fair' appraisal of Alexander (p. 55). Latin literature, even in the late Republic, was by no means uniformly hostile to Alexander (e.g. Cicero *ad Att.* 12.50; *ad Fam.* 5.12.7), and although lack of ancient reference to Curtius' narrative is puzzling, this explanation does not hold water.

Chapter III (pp. 57–100) perpetuates the (inevitable) *Quellenforschung* (pp. 57–85) that pervades Curtian scholarship, and concludes with analyses of three sections of text designed to elucidate Curtius' use of sources (pp. 90–100). B.'s discussion of the wider debate about Curtius' use of sources offers insightful comment on the twentieth-century Alexander-scholarship of W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* (2 vols, Cambridge, 1948), and F. Schachermeyr, *Alexander der Grosse: Ingenium und Macht* (Vienna, 1949) (pp. 63–6). Disappointingly, B. does not assess the contiguity or otherwise of the ancient and modern historians of Alexander. Similarly, a more extended examination of Curtius' comments on his historiographical methodology (Curtius 5.6.8–9, 7.8.11, 9.1.34) would have been welcome. After all, as B. goes on to admit: 'It is difficult to determine the extent to which the first generation of historians also created their own "Alexanders" ' (p. 70).

With B.'s second triad, we move into the main body of the discussion. Chapter IV (pp. 101–31) deals with the rôle of *fortuna* in Curtius' narrative, opening with an excellent discussion of Curtius' necrology of Alexander (pp. 101–4). This discussion is

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

continued when B. considers the structural function of Alexander's meeting with Sisygambis and Darius' family (Curtius 3.12.15–26). B. argues persuasively that this episode functions as a second preface (p. 127), prefiguring the events surrounding the necrology in Book 10, the corresponding elements of prophecy and summation, and the rôle of Sisygambis in both instances. The parallelism between Alexander and Darius is an important theme in B.'s study (pp. 118–23), and B.'s conclusions on *fortuna* are incisive, suggesting that by enslaving *fortuna* to Alexander Curtius is corrupting the relationship and making Alexander's great debts to his *fortuna* evidence of an unhealthy master–slave connexion, and evoking the manipulative imperial freedmen of the mid-first century A.D. (pp. 128–9).

The final two chapters (V and VI, pp. 132–200) are concerned with a discussion of *regnum*. B. focuses initially on developing the parallelism between Alexander and Darius in the first pentad (pp. 132–64), considering a selection of episodes, e.g. Curtius' treatment of the Charidemus episode and its ironic rôle prefiguring Alexander's descent into tyranny (pp. 136–40). The implications of this episode are developed to suggest that Alexander's behaviour at Tarsus acts as a complement (pp. 141–4). B. reads the two linked episodes as making a key statement on the way in which *regnum* can conflict with *libertas* and *fides*, while also demonstrating how in tune with the political anxieties of first-century A.D. Rome Curtius was.

Overall, there is much to praise. Developments in Curtian studies are making it ever more difficult simply to dismiss this author as a second-rate historian, and B.'s work should help to focus attention on this growing openness to literary analysis rather than historical verification in engagement with the *Historiae Alexandri*. It is unfortunate, therefore, that while promising much, B.'s study still retains many of the traditional features of Curtian scholarship (the date question, *Quellenforschung*) without clear evidence of the critical application of the literary theory. It is to be hoped that the issues and approaches raised in this first major study for some years will provide a spur for future, more adventurous works.

University of Keele DIANA SPENCER

FRONTO

M. P. J. VAN DEN HOUT: *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto*. (*Mnemosyne* Supplement 190.) Pp. xi + 725. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1999. Cased, $259. ISBN: 90-04-10957-9.

Eleven years after van den Hout published his second edition (hereafter vdH^2) of Fronto's works, his commentary, promised in his first edition of 1954 (hereafter vdH^1), has finally appeared. The warm welcome to which this indispensable work is entitled is not impaired by such faults as may be found.

Of these the most serious is that, exhaustive as v.d.H.'s reading seems to have been up to the 1980s, little published since vdH^2 even on Fronto (let alone, say, Gellius) is cited save reviews of the edition; no account is taken, for example, of A. Peri's claim ('Note Frontoniane', in *Moûσα*: *Scritti in onore di Giuseppe Morelli* [Bologna, 1997], pp. 345–51), to have discerned at 227.12–16 by direct examination the improved readings *remotis* <*dei*>*nde libris* for *redires inde ..libris*, *pote ad* for *poteras* <*ad*>, *longam* for *aliquam*, and *te* before *oblectares* (so Mai^1), nor of her emendation *nonam*

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for *quintam* at l. 12. At p. 705 v.d.H. confesses that he has not seen an article by Werner Eck in *ZPE* 91 (1992), 236–42, which would have made him read *AIΛ<IΩI>* in the heading of *Amic.* 1.2 and rewrite his note on 171.12. Worse, at p. vii he states: 'in 143 [Fronto] became consul suffectus for the months of July and August'. We have all said so, but in 1995 Eck and M. M. Roxan published in *Festschrift für Hans Lieb*, pp. 77–99, a diploma proving that the true year was 142; see too Eck, *RhM*^{2} 141 (1998), 193–6. The implications of this fact for the chronology and context of the letters thus remain for another to determine; a pity, for chronology is given due attention. Even the date of Minucius Felix is discussed at length (259.8), though Pennisi's fourth-century Fulgentius is accepted 'not without hesitation' but without argument (269.1).

After a brief biographical introduction, unfortunately without proof-texts, pp. 1–629 present a detailed commentary; there follow a list of translations, eight 'indices' (*sic*), a bibliography, and amendments to the prolegomena and text of vdH^2. Reference is by page and line of the edition; this bids fair to become the standard mode, but the failure to identify individual works—not even the transition to 'testimonia et fragmenta' at 259.1 is marked by a subheading—makes the commentary unusable with any other edition—even Portalupi^2—and separates *m*^{2}'s readings from the text that they explain or vary. Our need to have his edition at hand allows him, except where he has changed his mind, to take his text for granted, looking discreetly away from mere gibberish and leaving his apparatus to warn the reader, for example, that *pater Tullios* (125.4), admirable though it is in sense, is 'incertissimum' (vdH^2 app. crit.).

The main emphasis of the commentary is philological; in so difficult a text that is as it should be. Rarely is comment on Fronto's language sought in vain; but having written (p. x) 'Although scholastic, Fronto's Greek is correct Attic' (say rather Atticistic), at p. 557 he offers no justification of the Latinism *Ὀμήρῳ μάρτυρι* 248.5. At 11.15 *tam velocia stativa*, misunderstood from M^{c}Quige in 1824 ('such a rapid progress') to Portalupi^2 in 1997 ('queste tappe cosi veloci'), Haines saw that the true sense was 'such headlong halts'. So, implicitly, does v.d.H.: '*velocia stativa*: an oxymoron', but a fuller note might have served better; elsewhere he is not slow to combat other opinions in frank terms. Still, his frankness stops short of confessing that he too shared them in vdH^1: for examples see 15.8–9, 29.6, 219.2. Yet *adamasios*, even if not the truth, may as *lectio difficilior* lead us to it; the Virgilian commentator Asinius Pollio may well be an impostor of the fourth century, not a scion of a consular family reduced to schoolmastering in the second; in *Fer. Als.* 2.3 the expected sense is that truth does not need adornment, nor is *nostri* problematic: Favorinus was a friend of Fronto's (Gell. 2.26; that they discuss colours is irrelevant) and was admitted to the imperial *salutatio* (Gell. 4.1, 20.1).

Having in my review of vdH^2 (*CR* 41 [1991], 76–80) considered, not without perplexity, the treatment of *Amic.* 1.19 (182.4–12, 20–2), I turn to pp. 427–31. The letter is dated 'closer to 167 than to 160' because of Fronto's weariness; 'Gellius' is rightly identified with Aulus (contrast vdH^2 284), whose work is assumed to have been published about this time without reference to discussions suggesting otherwise; 9.11 n. is cited for *ab G-*. Ll. 6–7 are rendered 'with all that learned and petty rhetoric, I now prefer something that is really substantial'; for *panem* he compares Petronius 46.7, which of course (though he misunderstands Ernout and Hesseltine) means that law, unlike letters, will bring in bread, i.e. the money to buy it. In l. 8, *saepe sileo*, *qua in amico prodesse possim, quid caro amico* (sc. *prodesse possim*), we are not told why Fronto should keep silent on how he may benefit his friend; as v.d.H. rightly observes,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sileo does not mean 'I cast about', which was my rendering of the *agito* doubtfully read by Hauler at the end of the sentence where vdH^2 has an otiose *amico*. The final sentence is innocently translated 'so, struck by fate, you have as a friend a solitary man; he (Fronto) had acquired his art for a mortal man (Fronto)', as if Julianus suffered because Fronto was solitary, or Fronto's art were at issue, with an even less germane allusion to Ter. *HT* 77. Better is his treatment of m^2's readings: *saviata* is explained as 'charming' (cf. 8.19, 78.27; this seems to be right, the literal sense being lost; cf. Gellius' *insubidus*, not 'undersexed' but tasteless'), and *viribus* is proposed for *moribus*. In general, however, v.d.H. remains reluctant to emend; at 57.27, in order to resist *significent*, he makes *significet* agree across *remotis et requisitis* with *verbum*.

Fronto's self-proclaimed love of truth, taken too seriously by some writers, is cut down to size on p. viii: he flattered Pius and Marcus, and brushed aside the weaknesses in Verus' character. This is fair comment, as is v.d.H.'s acknowledgement that Pius' accession was a new beginning for Fronto after his insecure existence under Hadrian; with regard to Verus, perhaps M^{c}Quige (p. 65) put it best: 'Fronto seems to have been a complete courtier, and to have been well aware of the danger of sporting with the Lion.' The dead Hadrian, by contrast, suffers in accordance with Fronto's own dislike and Pius' policy of contrast; v.d.H. recognizes the unfairness (see on 208.10), but strangely applies 209.9–11 to Trajan, at 209.7 citing Volkmann in *Der Kleine Pauly*, who says plainly 'Hadrian aber gab 117 die Eroberungen Traians auf' (iv.535). At 25.6 v.d.H. detects a jocular tone, but one does not joke about Mars in battle-rage and Father Dis. Commenting on Marcus' reminiscence of Fronto, he notes that 'Marcus uses *τύραννος* and *τυραννικός* always in malam partem' (265.23), without drawing the consequence that since it does not refer to monarchy in general, and since the evils of tyranny were a commonplace, Fronto's teaching must have been more specific; what else but tales against Hadrian?

A congeries of *Einzelerklärungen* must of its nature contain statements with which this or that scholar will disagree. That is no reason for ingratitude towards v.d.H. for his monumental labour, and the publishers for a book produced according to their normal standards. Any resentment I might have felt at becoming 'Holtrop-Strevens' (29.6) is dissipated on seeing *classicus* (263.28, from Gell. 19.9.15) translated 'fist class'. Good boxers are said even now to have class; at last we know the reason.

Oxford LEOFRANC HOLFORD-STREVENS

GRANDIS FABVLA

M. Zimmerman, V. Hunink, Th. D. McCreight, D. van Mal-Maeder, S. Panayotakis, V. Schmidt, B. Wesseling (edd.): *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass, II:* Cupid and Psyche. Pp. xii + 236, 13 ills. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 90-6980-121-3.

In the imposing array of the Groningen commentaries on Apuleius' great novel there is one notable lacuna: Cupid and Psyche. Here is a harbinger of the volume that will fill that gap, a collection of articles developing a number of relevant topics in greater detail than is practicable in commentary format. It is an important feature of the book that several writers look outside the confines of the story to the problem of its

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

relationship to the *Metamorphoses* as a whole. On this Paula James has some admirable remarks:

> There seems to be no end to interrelationships with the mainframe narrative that this *anilis fabula* . . . has produced. We are almost spoiled for choice in the search for main links, because correspondences multiply along with the commentators. . . . For this reason the discovery of further connections . . . is as likely to confuse as to clarify the function of the fairy story within the fantasy. However, that is a risk all devotees of Apuleius gladly take in order to alert the reader to the fascinating fragmentations of motifs that characterise his narrative. (p. 35)

Well said: the critic should be prepared to live dangerously—and in this case, as I have suggested elsewhere, we do well to keep in mind the possibility that Apuleius *meant* to confuse us.

As Boccaccio observed in the *Genealogie*, 'Si huius tam grandis fabulae ad unguem sensum enucleare voluerimus, in ingens profecto volumen evaderet'. *Mutatis mutandis* a reviewer of this book must feel much the same: here summaries and brief comments will have to suffice. K. Dowden presents a picture of Apuleius' Platonism (my somewhat superficial evaluation of which he rightly criticizes) in which the Gnostic influences characteristic of middle Platonism can be seen at work. I believe there is much to be said for his dating of the *Metamorphoses* to the 150s rather than the 180s, a view to which (*pace* Harrison, p. 65 n. 31) I have for different reasons now come round myself (*The Golden Ass*, tr. Kenney [Harmondsworth, 1998], pp. xxviii–xxix). Maeve C. O'Brien sees '*Cupid and Psyche* [as] an explanation in the mode of platonic myth, of Apuleius' discourse theory' (p. 33). This thesis is not always easy to square with the words of the text. Psyche-as-Soul is not 'saved' by speech (p. 30); she is rescued by the spontaneous action of Cupid when she is unconscious. Nothing that has been said to her by anybody has had the slightest inhibiting effect on the *improspera curiositas* that is almost her final undoing. Nor does O'B. manage, any more than any other interpreter has ever done, to reconcile the allegorical message of the story with its abrupt epic-Olympian denouement, taking refuge in that hardy critic's standby, ambivalence, aka cop-out. Paula James's adventurous exploration of some of the motifs linking the stories of Psyche and Lucius is, as we have come to expect, suggestive and stimulating, though tending occasionally to depend on free paraphrase rather than precise explication of the Latin. S. J. Harrison provides a workmanlike demonstration that 'the depth of epic allusion in the episode differentiates it from the rest of the *Metamorphoses*' (p. 51). His contention that 'allusions to Plato provide not an ideological or philosophical key to the *Metamorphoses*, but a demonstration of the author's literary learning' (p. 57) is calculated to provoke further debate. W. S. Smith examines the relevance of the story to the novel as a whole in terms of recurrent concepts and motifs stemming in particular from Euripidean tragedy. It is not always easy to detect a guiding thread in this rather loosely organized discussion. Danielle van Mal-Maeder and Maiike Zimmerman undertake to distinguish the 'many voices' (p. 84) which they detect in the old woman's narrative. I am sceptical, particularly of their attempt to characterize the *anus*-narratrix herself. Take that old crux, her purported gloss on nectar, *quod uinum deorum est* (6.24.2). Charite, to whom she is telling the story, has evidently had a classical education (4.26.8), as she ought to have remembered if she had been attending. Is it a plausible touch in this supposed portraiture of her that—at the very end of a tale replete with all sorts of mythological material, some of it treated with arch allusivity (e.g. 4.28.4), which has been taken completely for granted—Apuleius should make her go out of her way to explain this

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

commonplace detail? What is the point? If this is irony, in whose voice and at whose expense? ('F ist demnach interpoliert.' Appalling contingency!) H. Pinkster's discussion of Apuleius' choice of tenses concludes that it is conditioned by context and the demands of sense and expression. What else should one have expected? Susanne Brodersen's contention that Cupid's palace displays many of the characteristics of a Roman villa is similarly uncontroversial, though the same cannot be said of her rendering of the problematic phrase *id genus pecudes* (5.1.3) as 'other [sc. gregarious] wild beasts' (p. 117 and n. 19). Apuleius was writing Latin. (Again, one senses the *genius loci*, ever eager to save F's credit.) Silvia Mattiacci provides a useful conspectus of Apuleian allusivity; her point about the Catullan (Grecizing) character of Apuleius' metre, which I had missed, is well taken (pp. 142–3). S. Panayotakis shows how the story reflects the violence and disorder of the world of the novel in which it is embedded. Wyse H. Keulen interprets the speech of the *gauia* (5.28) as a 'pivotal event' in the story, with implications in particular for the characterization of Charite (p. 187). A striking conclusion is provided by J. L. de Jong's discussion, supported by good illustrations, of the creative freedom with which Renaissance painters treated Apuleian ideas and images. A 'General Bibliography' (actually a list of works cited) and a General Index complete the volume.

A postscript on jargon (cf. *Échos du monde classique* n. s. 13 [1994], 369–70). New to me are 'interdiscursivity' (p. viii) and 'homo-', 'hetero-', 'extra-', and 'intradiegetic' (p. 53 n. 8). The last two of these are particularly vile, but do we need any of them?

Cambridge E. J. KENNEY

AMMIANUS 23

J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler (edd.): *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXIII*. Pp. xxiii + 299. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 90-6980-120-5.

The introduction offers (1) a defence of the structure (including digressions) and function of Book 23: it is intended to stress both the magnitude of Julian's enterprise and the atmosphere of foreboding that enveloped it from its very inception; (2) a discussion, resulting in a cautious *non liquet*, of AM's possible use of written sources as opposed to his own experience and interviews with other participants; and (3) a discussion of the chronology of Julian's movements from his departure from Antioch to his arrival at Dura.

The opening account of the failure to restore the temple at Jerusalem (23.1) establishes the ambience of gloom and doom. The discussion (1.2) rightly plays down political and anti-Christian aspects of the scheme (the latter emphasized by Christian sources); the opportunity for sacrifice was surely the chief motive, though the silence of Jewish sources suggests that there was little Jewish enthusiasm for the scheme.

Praiseworthy comments on content abound throughout: the following catalogue is by no means exhaustive. 1.6: the stress on the fortuitousness of the priest's fall underlines its significance. 1.7: on the apparent ambiguity of AM's reactions to opposition to the expedition. 2.1: on AM's overstatement of Julian's reluctance to use foreign auxiliaries. 2.2: on the combination of speed and careful planning and the importance of secrecy. 2.6: on Julian's activities at Hierapolis. 2.8: on the presage of

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Julian's death (after Fontaine). 3.9: on Julian's supply fleet. 4: on the deficiencies of AM's account of artillery. 4.2: a strong case for *ferrum* = 'stock' and a plausible interpretation of *canalis angustus*. 4.6: *sublimis* is correctly understood. 4.14: on firedarts and the interpretation of *concavatur* (both after Brok). 5.2: on *interiores limites* (after Millar). 5.3: on the possible Persian capture of Antioch in 'the time of Gallienus'. 5.7: the conclusion that AM's report is 'somewhat garbled' is eminently reasonable. 6: an excellent introduction to the Persian excursus; throughout the chapter there are good collections of possible sources, parallel accounts, etc. 6.32: excellent introduction to the sub-digression on the Magi, and the divergences between AM's attitude and the norm. 6.67: on the sources for silk production. 6.76f.: on the sources for the habits of the Persians. 6.80: on the prohibition on speaking, etc. during meals. 6.81: on instances of collective guilt. 6.84: on the inconvenience of Persian clothes. 6.85: an interesting suggestion that the point of the mini-digression on pearls is to allude to the suggestion that Constantine was responsible for the war. 6.85–8: on pearls, their origin and value.

There are numerous succinctly informative notes on individuals, among them 1.4: Julian's four appointees; 2.3: Alexander the governor of Syria; 3.5: Sebastianus; 5.3: Mariades and the various accounts of his fate; 6.19: the praise of Apollonius. Geographical matters are also well handled, notably at 5.1: Cercusium; 5.7: the problem of the location of Gordian's tomb; 6.23: Vologessia, Babylon, Ctesiphon, and the inadequacies of AM's account of its history; 6.43: a plausible explanation of AM's apparent error in placing Persis next to Parthia; 6.64: the Chinese and AM's lack of knowledge of them (rightly dismissing alleged allusion to the Great Wall).

Judgement of linguistic and textual problems is usually sound. Thus 1.2: good arguments for Valesius's *dividens*; 1.4: likewise for *ad eum* rather than *ad se*, and that *ab* = 'from' not 'by'; 1.7: on possible solutions to V's *vimoris*; 2.2: in favour of *cum primum*; 2.6: a good Ovidian precedent for *capax* of a city; 3.4: *propere* (better than *imperatori*) is to be taken with *disponenti*; 3.5: on the interpretation of *potius*; 3.6: on the construction of *iumentum . . . poposcit*; 3.9: a good case for *contextae*; 4.2: the most attractive suggestion is *[et] ac*; 4.5: a strong case for *prosternitur* being corrupt; *subter* is to be taken with *invenerit*; 4.8: a good defence of Valesius's *arietis*; 4.9: good discussion of the problems; 4.12: good on *trisulcus*; 4.15: a sound case for removing V's *arcus*; 5.4: on the nuance of meaning of *tristes*; on separating *ita* from *intempestive*; on the interpretation of *nondum . . . exorata*; 5.5: the defence of V's *ultro* is attractive and might have been more strongly urged; 5.8: a cogent case for *incedebat*; 5.15: a good discussion ending in favour of *fracto*; 6.12: the second explanation of *ergo* is surely correct; 6.15: *copiosa* is rightly preferred; 6.22: on the sense of *declarans*; 6.27: a good case for Heraeus' *regnasse*; 6.33: *qui* must = Hystaspes even if AM's facts are wrong; 6.46: on the meaning of *perspicua*; 6.55: good on both sense and text; 6.66: in favour of G's *celsitudine*; 6.67: a strong case for *mollientes*; 6.75: correct interpretation of *dissonas* (after Fontaine); clearly correct that *ne generaliter* cannot stand and that *ut* is the best way out.

As ever there is little of which to complain. At 2.5 it is perhaps rash to assume without discussion that Julian's plan to winter in Tarsus meant that the expedition was to last for only one season—what exactly does 'bring the expedition to an end' mean? 5.1: Julian may well have reached Cercusium on 1 April, but that does not entail that *principio mensis Aprilis* in any sense 'means' 1 April. 5.18: more on Julian's motivation and war-aims would have been welcome. 5.19: what exactly does Julian mean by annihilation and, given the evidence that suggests some less drastic goal, does he mean what he says?

On linguistic and textual matters, at 4.11 it is probably best to leave *detrectet* alone;

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the sense is perhaps 'turn aside' rather than 'protect from'. 5.3: the only solution seems to be to obelize *exacerbantia*, given the practical difficulties attendant on *ex arce ruentia*. 6.32: it is not clear to me what solution, if any, is proposed for V's *machagistiam*. 6.70: *quibus* can perhaps stand, though none of the parallels cited is exact; the presence of *omnibus* in 39 makes that passage easier. 6.80: *graves* may have been suggested by the two passages of Horace cited, but there the meaning is 'burdensome (to Rome)', whereas here it must be different; perhaps something like 'inclined to throw their weight about'? 6.82: of the parallels cited for *parum* = *haud*, 28.4.2 is apposite, but in 14.1.6 *parum* surely indicates that men were less on their guard than they should have been against the spies.

All students of AM must once more salute with gratitude the diligence, ingenuity, and expedition of the Dutch team: long may their endeavours continue to flourish.

Liverpool ROBIN SEAGER

AURELIAN

F. PASCHOUD (ed., trans): *Histoire Auguste 3.1: Vies d'Aurélien et de Tacite* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'association Guillaume Budé). Pp. lxi + 348, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1996. ISBN: 2-251-01395-4.

T. KOTULA: *Aurélien et Zénobie: L'unité ou la division de l'Empire* (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis n. 1966). Pp. 209, one map, ills. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wroclawskiego, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 83-229-1638-8.

The last decade has seen substantial work on the *Historia Augusta*, culminating in André Chastagnol's translation of the whole collection (with an excellent introduction and useful notes) and the new Budé edition that began to appear in 1992 with J.-P. Callu's edition of the lives of Hadrian, Aelius Caesar, and Antoninus Pius. Paschoud's is the third volume to appear in this series.

P. opens with a brief statement on the 'state of the question', referring readers to the more complete (and very good) discussions of Chastagnol and Lippold (originally in *RAC*, now reprinted in A. Lippold, *Die Historia Augusta* [Stuttgart, 1998], pp. 15–33). P.'s point is to indicate disagreements with Callu's analysis of the sources in the general introduction to the first volume, and to argue that, for the end of the third century, the *HA* presents a pastiche that is dependent upon Latin histories, all probably written in the fourth century, and to explain how views that P. had earlier argued were those of western polytheist aristocrats entered the tradition known to Zosimus. In this P. builds not only upon his own earlier work, but also upon the conclusions of B. Bleckmann, *Die Reichskrise des III. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1992), with whom P. disagrees only in so far as Bleckmann would also deny direct use of Greek sources (Herodian and Dexippus) for the earlier period. Their position is important as a rejection of the emerging *communis opinio* that the author of the *HA* knew and used Greek histories, including that of Eunapius, argued by Barnes in his important book on the sources of the *HA*, accepted by Callu and Chastagnol; both views are assailed in the response to P. that appears in Lippold's collection of essays, pp. xiv–xvi, which nonetheless supports the notion of a western perspective, albeit of

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the time of Constantine! P. can press his views too far: though he presents a strong case for a second Latin history that offers narrative details not derived from the Kaisergeschichte, one may well question the lengths to which he goes in fleshing out the putative content of this history.

Another problem that arises from interest in the sources is that it may occlude discussion of the period covered. There are also times when P.'s discussion of historical details is less helpful than it might be. A case in point is the German invasion of Italy that Aurelian repulsed in 270. P. argues in favor of Saunders's rejection of Alföldy's argument that the two fragments of Dexippus that report negotiations with Germanic tribes relate to a single invasion, and is concerned to show that the *HA* account derives from Nicomachus on the basis of passages in the Anonymous and Petrus Patricius; neither is quoted, which makes the argument less easy to follow, as does the annoying arrangement of the commentary according to P.'s analysis of the text (pp. 1–4) rather than conventional chapter divisions (p. 119). Here one is better served by T. Kotula's useful monograph on Aurelian and Zenobia, which lays out the sources in a convenient table on pp. 68–9, making it possible to follow the discussion (even if one disagrees with his ultimate verdict in favor of Alföldy). Likewise, on an important point, he dates the break between Zenobia's Palmyra and Rome to the reign of Claudius, where P. simply states that it occurred under Aurelian. P.'s reconstruction, which connects the Palmyrene invasion of Egypt with Aurelian's problems with the Germans in 271 (p. 135), is not easily defensible.

K.'s more expansive treatment shows how the Palmyrene invasion of Egypt in mid-October of 270 followed upon the annexation of Arabia (whose governors were appointed from Rome in the time of Odaenathus, as shown by H.-G. Pflaum, *Syria* 29 [1953], 307–30) and thus that the war actually broke out under Claudius. The papyrus evidence (to which P. is curiously blind) attests the third year of Claudius (270) until October. Aurelian's year 1 is subsequently attested on coins from the mint of Alexandria, but at roughly the same time there are several papyri dated by consuls alone in October/November 270, suggesting that the Palmyrene invasion had already begun. Papyri attest Vaballathus' control by the end of November. It misrepresents the evidence to suggest that Zenobia had not asserted Palmyrene domination of the east until after Claudius' death. Here there is a point where the tendency of the literary sources might receive a bit more attention. The *HA* places the capture of Egypt under Claudius, while Zonaras places it under Aurelian. The *HA* thus appears to depend on a tradition that conflates the whole Palmyrene operation under Claudius, as the war began in his time, while the tradition represented by Zonaras and Syncellus places it under Aurelian, who would ultimately bring the war to an end. These traditions simply reflect different ways of telling the same story, not two different views of the events.

Despite Zenobia's effort to suggest that this would not necessitate a permanent breach with Aurelian, it is difficult to dissociate the events of 270 from the war that broke out in 272. The rupture of 270 was irreparable as K. rightly sees (p. 115)—just as was the rupture between the central government and the rulers of the *imperium Galliarum*. It took time for Aurelian, like his predecessors Gallienus and Claudius, to mobilize for a major campaign. Aurelian restored central control over the bulk of the Severan empire, but this was a goal that he shared with these predecessors. As K. perceptively points out, Aurelian's massive reconstruction of Rome's walls in 271 had more than a military purpose: it was intended to symbolize the eternity of both the city and its empire in the face of the crisis (p. 165).

If Aurelian was one of the most successful emperors of Rome, he was also among

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the most ambivalent in the later tradition. At *HA V. Aur.* 44.2 we are told that Diocletian remarked, whenever the ferocity of Maximian annoyed him, that Aurelian was a better general than he was a princeps. P.'s note on this passage reveals the difficulties in commenting on a text such as the *HA*. This note (p. 205) contains a superior demolition of the authenticity of the anecdote. But, while P. also notes that the *asperitas* of Maximian is a theme shared between the polytheist and Christian traditions, he does not discuss the implicit denigration of Aurelian as savior of the empire in panegyrics of the Tetrarchic and Constantinian period. Aurelian had, after all, been styled as *pacator et restitutor orbis* (*CIL* xii.5561) and even as *perpetuus gloriosissimus indulgentissimus imperator restitutor orbis* (*CIL* viii.22449), language which may well reflect that of contemporary panegyric. We know of one man, Gaius Callinicus of Petra, who followed the ten-book history of Alexandria that he dedicated to 'Cleopatra' (i.e. Zenobia) with a work *Concerning the Restoration of the Roman Empire* (presumably by Aurelian) (*FGrH* 281 T 1). Subsequently Aurelian's accomplishments are glossed over so that the era after Gallienus is presented as one of perpetual chaos until Maximian arrived (*Pan.* 8.10), and the damage inflicted on Rome in the *clades Catalaunica*, the battle where Tetricus' army was defeated (*Pan.* 5.4.3), might be stressed.

With regard to the memory of Aurelian, there was the problem of his murder by a cabal of high-ranking officers, and the crisis that ensued over their punishment that was connected with the death of Tacitus at Tyana, a few months after his accession; this is all we really know about the reign of Tacitus, whose biography is also edited by P. in the volume under review. P.'s treatment of the absurd story that there was a six-month interregnum after Aurelian's murder—two months is nearer the truth—is good (p. 252), as is his handling of the traditions concerning the emperor's murder (pp. 296–300). In general terms, P.'s detailed comments on the text, the nature of fictions and their connections with the late-fourth-century date are very fine. His feel for the nuances of the author's Latin is exemplary.

Both P. and K. have made real contributions to the study of a very confused period of Roman history. Despite awkwardness of layout, and an occasional unwillingness to venture beyond *Quellenforschung* in his analysis, P.'s volume may join Chastagnol's as a starting point for study of this period.

The University of Michigan DAVID S. POTTER

HISTORICIZING HISTORY

D. S. POTTER: *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian: Approaching the Ancient World.* Pp. x + 218, 5 figs. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. Paper, £12.99. ISBN: 0-415-08896-8.

Potter's book is part of a series, *Approaching the Ancient World*, which is intended to 'provide an introduction to the problems and methods involved in the study of ancient history' (series preface). This book has suffered from insufficient copy-editing and proof-reading; details of the consequent errors are in Prof. Woodman's review of this in *Histos* 2 (1998). I will concentrate in this review on the overall structure and scope of the work.

P.'s project is to historicize the literary texts of the Roman world by concentrating

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

on the process of their production, from sources and inspirations, through writing up, to publication. His purpose in this is to present a history of the 'participants in the literary culture of the Roman empire' (p. 1). At the same time P. has an eye on the contemporary historian of antiquity, so that his literary history of Rome is contextualized within a wider history of twentieth-century scholarship and historical theory. The extent to which each history is implicated in the other is reflected in P.'s embedding of issues—such as Marxism, Jacoby's collection of historical fragments, and Leopold von Ranke's impact on American historiography—into the midst of his narrative about the ancient world. While this is intellectually defensible, I suspect a student (the intended reader of the series) would miss the point in the transition from, say, how we interpret individual treason trials under the emperors to a brief history of the use of paradigms in historiography from Gibbon to Foucault (pp. 44–8).

Rather than carping about this at every point in the book, it is perhaps better to state at the outset that this is not really a book for students poised on the brink of a course in ancient history. Too much prior knowledge both about antiquity and about the development of the historical discipline is assumed throughout. While I do not believe that an introductory volume should in any way *protect* students from the ambiguities and complexities of the study of antiquity, I think it would be more effective if individual examples were pursued consistently at some points in the discussion, preferably with quotations from the sample texts. For instance, when P. scrutinizes the paradigms within which scholars tend to view the literature of the Augustan Age he summarizes the 'Augustan *vs.* anti-Augustan' debate with reference to Virgil (pp. 49–50), but in his attempt to move the discussion beyond 'simple polarities' (p. 50) instead of returning to the Virgil reference he concentrates on Ovid and the elegists (pp. 51–5). Again, a reader who has had no previous exposure to the literature is not going to receive a clear impression of what the issues might be, or what particular parts of the (often extensive) poetry are giving rise to these issues. If this book is not for the ephebic ancient historian, who is it for? I suspect it would be appropriate for the experienced student, one who has already assimilated what might be termed the basic information about the ancient world, and who would therefore benefit from being introduced to the more fragmentary and (perhaps) marginal writers with which P. is often concerned.

The structure of this book is modelled on the process of producing a history, as either an ancient or a modern; the four chapters (Definitions, Texts, Scholarship, Presentation) move from sorting out what kind of thing a history is, through the evidence available to the writer, to the stylistic issues confronting the narrator at the writing-up stage. There are, however, moments where the structure becomes less clear, especially in the longest chapter, 'Texts'. Here the discussion is wrong-footed at the outset by P.'s categories of 'participant', 'illustrative', and 'narrative' texts, which obscure rather than illuminate his thoughts on the modern historian's use of ancient fictive literature as historical evidence. These categories fail to be useful, first, because they can be seen to overlap even at the moment of definition; secondly, because the defining criteria of the three categories are not consistent (the first two seem to be distinguished by aim [but are not really], and the third is distinguished from the preceding two in terms of content); and finally, because P.'s use of the last term in this categorical sense overlaps his use of the same word as a simple gloss on 'account' or 'text', so that the reader is never entirely sure which usage is paramount at any point.

Despite some problems in structure, a reader could enjoy dipping into the individual episodes, such as the essays on Dio and Herodian (pp. 85–90), and Near

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Eastern records of the past (pp. 95–102). P.'s knowledge is extensive in both time and space; he tends to barrage his audience with discrete information to such an extent that the overall theme of a particular sequence is lost. The effect is somewhat like being taken around an enormous library by the history professor; his remarks may follow on from the order of bookshelves or from his own trains of thought, they may not always link up into a unified argument, but they may nevertheless set a determined student off on a trail of curious inquiry.

University of Bristol ELLEN O'GORMAN

BORDER CROSSING

C. S. KRAUS (ed.): *The Limits of Historiography. Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*. Pp. xi + 363. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 1999. Cased, $109. ISBN: 90-04-10670-7.

'Anyone wishing to know about the historical Jugurtha will not be helped much by these essays'; thus Pelling in the closing paragraphs of his epilogue. For all that he then insists that the study of the literary techniques of historians, the main focus of this collection, is no less vital than the reconstruction of the original historical events, this seems a curiously apologetic note on which to conclude a survey of such an original and thought-provoking volume. Bringing together papers on Chinese, Hebrew, and other eastern texts, as well as on the familiar Greco-Roman historians, this book not only confirms that historiography is currently one of the most lively and exciting fields in classical literary studies, but also suggests the enormous possibilities of a broader cross-cultural study of writings about the past.

It is impossible in a short review to do justice to the range of ideas and perspectives on offer here; every chapter repays careful reading. The classicists focus for the most part on detailed readings of individual authors. Rood explores the complexities of the relationship between Herodotus and Thucydides through the latter's references to the Persian Wars; Thucydides both responds to and rejects aspects of his predecessor's work as he constructs the Peloponnesian War, and above all the Sicilian expedition, as a reversal of the earlier victory. Jaeger offers the guiding metaphor of the labyrinth as a way of reading Livy; the work itself is a monumental achievement, while the events it describes are dominated by sudden changes of perspective, twists and turns—and the task of every historian may be seen as the plotting of a single path (which in retrospect is made to seem inevitable) through the confusion of events.

Levene relates the deliberative speeches in Tacitus to ancient debates on whether moral arguments are clearly separable from arguments from advantage. Tacitus' grim conclusion, presented not so much through the speeches themselves as through their context and the reactions they provoke, is that moral arguments which are not clearly separated from other arguments are ineffective, while explicitly moral arguments are used by immoral people for immoral ends. Kraus considers the thematics of disorder in Sallust's portrayal of Jugurtha—illicit exchange, delay and rapid motion, and substitution all bring about instability and confusion—and emphasizes the paradox that Sallust's praise of intellect is constantly baffled by his own narrative. Clarke discusses the methodological problems faced by aspiring writers of universal history, and argues

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that there must be a significant connection between such literary ambitions and the equally ambitious conquests of Rome.

The most exciting aspect of this volume is the inclusion of chapters on non-classical material, and the wider perspective this introduces; one is forced to recognize how often scholarly specialization can lead to tunnel vision. Arguments about the definition and classification of classical historiographical texts—the focus of Marincola's paper here—too often ignore the relationship of such texts to those from other cultures, or simply assume that the Greco-Roman tradition is the only 'true' form of history. Many of the authors here, notably Uchitel on the Hittites, Michalowski on ancient Mesopotamia, and Sancisi-Weerdenburg on Persia, are explicitly concerned with this generic question; for the most part they emphasize the differences between their texts and the classical model of historiography, and argue that to evaluate such texts purely in terms of their resemblance to Thucydides is wholly inadequate.

Classicists would equally benefit from seeing Greco-Roman historiography not as the model for all historical writing but simply as one tradition among many of writing about the past. If this then persuaded us to look more closely at writings from other traditions, we might be struck by the similarities as much as by the differences. Certainly this was my experience in reading the chapters by Schaberg and Li on Chinese historiography; their accounts of the depictions of bad rulers, the misinterpretation of portents, and the imposition of order through retrospective judgements called to mind many ancient analogies. These two articles in particular, along with those of Bolin on the Hebrew Bible and of Michalowski, are clear, accessible, and thought-provoking, engaging in the sort of broad debate where classicists might both learn from other traditions and make their own contribution.

It is disappointing, therefore, that the chapters here are so self-contained; it seems that only the editor and Pelling (whose epilogue does raise interesting points on cross-cultural comparisons) saw all the papers before publication. It is also disappointing that so many of the classicists seem to have written with specialist audiences in mind, whereas the 'visitors' were clearly conscious of the need to communicate with those from other disciplines. I find it difficult to imagine that many Chinese or Hebrew scholars will tackle these sophisticated but rather introspective papers, or that they would find the returns proportionate to the effort. The exception is Marincola's paper, whose specialized focus (a critique of Jacoby and an attempt to rethink the classification of classical historiographical texts) nevertheless produces a set of ideas on generic definition and its consequences which could well be illuminating if applied in other cultural contexts. One might look for more extensive consideration of, for example, the politics of definition and the policing of the boundaries, but he deserves great credit for the breadth of his perspective and his willingness to engage with theoretical and methodological issues.

This is an extremely rich volume. It offers not only provocative and important studies of individual historians, but a range of ideas on narrative technique which may productively be applied in our readings of other historical texts. One can only hope that it will also inspire classicists to seek dialogue with scholars of other cultures, and to think about their subject in the wider context of what seems to be a human tendency to look for patterns and meaning in the past.

University of Bristol NEVILLE MORLEY

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

READING NOVELS

S. SWAIN (ed.): *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel.* Pp. x + 412. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Paper, £16.99. ISBN: 0-19-872188-9.

S. J. HARRISON (ed.): *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel.* Pp. xxxix + 337. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Paper, £16.99. ISBN: 0-19-872174-9.

Simon Swain claims that *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel* is 'a selection of the most useful recent work on the ancient Greek novel for those teaching, taking courses on, or researching the subject' (p. v). In fact, the principle of collection seems to have been whatever was cheaply available but not already included in other recently published essay collections on the novel (listed on p. 34). Even as a supplement, this collection is scarcely worth the money. In his introduction on current scholarship, S. writes as if the readers were already familiar with the terms of the discussion. This is unhelpful for teaching undergraduates, who would be better served with a more structured presentation like that of *The Roman Novel* (see below). For the more advanced, his arguments seem overly tendentious and sometimes out-of-date. We are told that 'novel' has ousted 'romance' as a name for these works, and therefore it is better to use it, though 'romance' is 'perfectly acceptable in contexts stressing erotic themes' (p. 3). Both of these modern terms carry generic and cultural baggage. The change from 'romance' to 'novel', as with the change from 'oriental' in origin to Greek, reflects the growth in popularity and increased status that these texts currently enjoy within the classical community. D. Selden in *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore, 1994), pp. 39–64, historicized this process and M. Doody in *The True Story of the Novel* (London and New York, 1996), pp. 1–32, suggested that these shifts occurred for ideological reasons. Whatever we may think of their arguments, S.'s failure to note them is indicative of a more crippling bias. He consistently faults postmodern readings of the novel, setting up traditional explications of text as better. A case in point: he labels John Winkler's essay on Heliodorus as 'a brilliant example of a clever reading . . . by one of the best representatives of this school of criticism [narratology?]'. But Winkler's approach, we are told, 'works better for Apuleius . . . since [his] is a cleverer, less straightforward text' (pp. 31–2), while Bryan Reardon's essay on Chariton is 'elegant', and 'without the assistance of narratology [he] simply tells us how the novel functions as literature' (p. 33; see also p. 26). This is unnecessarily oppositional. S. seems not to understand transcultural critical strategies like narratology, and privileges his own view that the novels were didactic in purpose and 'encoded the civic values of the elite' (p. 28). Given that the extant novels and their fragments range in date from the first to the fourth century A.D., and could have been written anywhere in the Greek-speaking urban environment of the Roman Empire, his remark is both a truism (what else could they reflect, since only élites read and produced literature?) and of limited critical value. The novels of Chariton and Heliodorus are separated by several hundred years, the one set in Greece and the Persian Empire, the other in Egypt and Ethiopia. To reduce them to a series of formal similarities and supposed authorial intentions is to ignore the clues in each that can open up vastly more complex worlds.

The reprinted essays range in date from 1981 to 1994 and are organized into

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'General Studies' and 'Specific Studies' on four of the five canonical Greek novelists—Chariton, Longus, Achilles Tatius, and Heliodorus. An essay on Lucian is included as well. In the general section, Ewen Bowie's survey of the novels duplicates much in the introduction and could use updating, since scholarship on the novel has exploded in the fifteen years since it was written. Suzanne Said's 'The Country Seen from the Town' differs little from her essay on the city in *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore, 1994), pp. 216–36; Brigitte Egger's essay on 'The Role of Women' seems to be an earlier version of her piece in the same collection, pp. 260–80. Tomas Hägg measures these ancient texts against a set of criteria drawn from modern studies of the historical novel. Among the specific studies, Bryan Reardon's essays on the structure and plot of Chariton and Achilles Tatius are very useful, but available elsewhere. Froma Zeitlin's and John Winkler's articles on Longus (not included; see p. 31) are much more important than Bernd Effe's and Lia Cresci's considerations of Longus' relationship to the genre of pastoral. John Morgan's essay on the didactic function of Knemon's tale in Heliodorus cannot compare to his 1982 article (not included; see p. 31). The most welcome part of the collection is the translation into English of two of Massimo Fusillo's essays: one on erotic conflict in the novels, the other on Lucian's comic vision. Fusillo is a major scholar of the novel whose work (written in Italian) is less well known than it should be.

The Roman collection avoids many of the faults of the Greek, in part because there is less in the way of serious competition, in part because of a clearer editorial vision. Stephen Harrison provides a careful introduction, treating briefly but adequately subjects ranging from available concordances and bibliographies, language and style, and literary interpretation to *Nachleben.* The collection includes fourteen essays—six on Petronius, eight on Apuleius—ranging in date from 1969 to 1990. They address questions of unity and narrative technique (particularly the rôle of ego-narrator), the relationship of the Roman novel to Greek antecedents (including Menippean satire and recent Greek papyrus finds), the relationship of Roman novels to their Roman precursors, social context, for Petronius, linguistic register, and for Apuleius, Neoplatonism. The quality of the essays is uneven and a few appear outdated in view of recent book-length studies like J. J. Winkler's *Auctor and Actor: A Narratological Reading of Apuleius'* Golden Ass (Berkeley, 1985) or G. B. Conte's *The Hidden Author: an Interpretation of Petronius'* Satyricon (Berkeley, 1996), but that notwithstanding, the range of material and the various critical perspectives included make this a useful introduction to the subject.

Several essays deserve mention: Froma Zeitlin's 'Petronius as Paradox: Anarchy and Artistic Integrity' is an important critical reading. She argues that the *Satyricon* 'expresses a consistent vision of disintegration through the interrelationship of form and content' (pp. 2–3), moving from modern genre theory to situate Petronius' narrative strategies within their contemporary context. Alessandro Barchiesi's 'Traces of Greek Narrative and the Roman Novel' (translated from Italian) makes the essential but often ignored points that formal similarities between Greek and Roman material are of dubious significance and can be multiplied *ad infinitum*, while 'functional similarities . . . provide a more useful starting point for interpretation' (pp. 128–9). Fergus Millar's 'The World of the Golden Ass' is an excellent sketch of the social and political background of the text and provides a secure foundation for literary interpretation. Joseph DeFilippo offers an intriguing contextualization of Lucius' *curiositas* in terms of Plato, Neoplatonism, and Isiac religion.

Two carping criticisms: Greek, Latin, and German are not always translated into English, thus restricting the usefulness of the volume for non-classical

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

undergraduates. A maddening editorial mark (‖) appears throughout the text (fifteen times alone in the DeFilippo essay).

Stanford University S. A. STEPHENS

DOUBLES

W. DONIGER: *Splitting the Difference. Gender and Myth in Ancient Greece and India.* Pp. xi + 376. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1999. Paper, £15.95 (Cased, £43.95). ISBN: 0-226-15641-9.

This is an entertaining and stimulating book, full of interesting insights. I had better say this at the outset, because I have serious reservations about its programme and method; it seems to me less satisfactory, less rounded, than most of its author's earlier works on Hindu mythology, while the Greek material is both less, and less substantially treated, than the subtitle might give one to expect.

To take the second point first: it is not in itself a problem that D.'s acquaintance with the Greek texts is secondhand, but it is indicative of an inequality in the balance between Indian and Greek. The first two chapters take two pairs of women whose stories are indeed strikingly comparable: the chaste Sita and the unchaste Helen, and the strong variant traditions that in place of each real woman a phantom double was abducted; and the guilty Ahalya and innocent Alkmene, each seduced by the chief of the gods in the shape of her own husband. So far, so good; but the parallels in the next two chapters are much less close, and the Greek elements steadily decrease. Chapter V offers as its sole Greek contribution Narcissus, who is only by special pleading relevant to the supposed theme of body-part transposition among males, and Chapter VI, on sexual transformation, gives us only Teiresias. So far is the Greek situation from D.'s mind that, while dealing extensively with the idea that certain mythical themes current in Hindu India (and nineteenth-century Europe) indicate suppressed homosexuality, she omits to explain how such a theory could be modified to cope with a society in which homosexual relations are anything but 'closet'. In fact, though the 'prelude' asks us to consider whether the relationship between Greek and Indian myths is genetic, due to contacts and borrowings, or merely the product of the human condition (D. believes that 'gender trumps culture', p. 309), this is not a particularly important issue for the present work, since it presents few convincing Greek parallels.

Indeed, it is a weakness of the book that too much is collapsed together, made to seem similar, when it is really too far apart for comparisons to be illuminating—or at least, as illuminating as D. wishes. The monster Scylla bears a passing resemblance to some stories about the goddess Mariamman or Renuka, in that the bodies of both are split between top and bottom; but in Scylla's story there is no transposition of body parts—the central event of the Mariamman myth—and the fundamental concerns of the Indian story, purity and caste, are entirely absent. More interesting is the comparison between the long and complex story of Nala and Damayanti, and the recognition of Odysseus by Penelope. Damayanti and Penelope are both clever and faithful wives who recognize their husbands in difficult situations, but again the two stories are not as much alike as D. contends. It is central to her argument that these

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stories extend the Ahalya/Alkmene idea of the divine double of the human husband, yet this is a motif conspicuously absent from the *Odyssey*. The alternative to Odysseus is not Zeus or Poseidon disguised as Odysseus, but one of the all-too-human and easily recognizable Suitors. (The reading of 23.218ff. on p. 160 makes no sense to me.) The real parallel with Damayanti is not with the first part of the story, where the heroine chooses her human husband from among a group of gods all exactly like him, but with the second part where after many years of separation she sets a test to find and recognize her long-lost husband.

I could cite other examples where a theme seems to me to be so widely stretched as to lose any real coherence; the second half of Chapter V, for instance, has little connexion with the first (but perhaps this is an example of the form imitating its subject matter, the splitting of bodies). D. probably thinks this does not matter; she can be disconcertingly lax on accuracy and cavalier about her method. Thus the misuse of *bīja mantra* to mean 'seed text' (p. ix), the absurd endnote 306 on p. 321: 'I thought this was in Milan Kundera's *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*, but it's not', and more seriously the admission (p. 303) that the chronological imbalance between Hindu and Greek texts has been 'somewhat artificially leveled' by the use of later European versions of the stories. How indeed can the Alkmene of Molière or Giraudoux—or even Dracula, or Jekyll and Hyde—have a relation to other forms of the myth that is comparable with one that springs from a living religious tradition?

Perhaps, as far as D's programme goes, none of this *does* matter. She professes to be less interested in general statements than in particulars, and if read as a series of interpretations of individual stories, with sometimes useful comparisons, the book has its strengths. Anyone interested in gender studies, and these days that ought to mean all of us, should gain something from this book. D.'s arguments on the difference between the sexes when it comes to splitting and doubling are mostly convincing, at least with regard to India, and the first two chapters supply real Greek parallels. She has also some good asides: on Orientalism, for instance (p. 256), and on the avoidance of moral responsibility by 'splitting away evil' (p. 257).

But something is missing, and it is odd, though not entirely uncharacteristic, that it should be missing from a book formed of lectures on comparative *religion*. D. sporadically supplies some theological and philosophical background, but not nearly enough, especially for the non-specialist reader. It is indeed central to the stories of Sita and Helen that the abducted doubles are doubles of women, but a discussion of the shadow Sita which does not take seriously into account concepts of illusion and/or māyā, itself often gendered as the female aspect of the divine, is inadequate. Again, there is very little here to suggest that the Hindu narratives have anything to do with a devotional tradition—an aspect which (for instance) often makes the choice between a god/God and a human very different from the way it is presented in the Greek context. There are different ways to look at myths of course, as D. herself is well aware (e.g. *Women, Androgynes and Other Mythical Beasts* [Chicago, 1980], pp. 9–12), and it may well be that it is my own bias which leads me to find these ways unsatisfactory and incomplete. In the end, whether you agree that gender is more important than culture in these stories depends on what you are looking for.

St Hilda's College, Oxford EMILY KEARNS

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

GENDERING MAGIC

C. A. FARAONE: *Ancient Greek Love Magic*. Pp. xiv + 223. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1999. Cased, £21.95. ISBN: 0-674-03320-5.

M. GIORDANO: *La parola efficace. Maledizioni, giuramenti e benedizioni nella Grecia arcaica*. Pp. 70. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 88-8147-153-1.

Faraone is possibly the most creative and challenging scholar working in the expanding field of ancient magic. His fascinating *Talismans and Trojan Horses* (Oxford, 1992) and numerous important articles over the last fifteen years (they occupy more than a page in the bibliography here) have generated high expectations for this new volume, and these are not disappointed. The subject of *Ancient Greek Love Magic*, at the intersection of magic studies and gender studies, could not be more timely. The handling of magical evidence is characteristically authoritative and insightful, the manner of its presentation is approachable and engaging, and the style is lucid throughout, with some schematic points economically conveyed through tables.

Specialists will already be familiar with many of the work's constituent parts from F.'s previously published articles (p. xii), but the book now weaves them into a developed and largely persuasive argument for a new typology of ancient love magic. Two basic types are distinguished: *erôs* ('sex') magic and *philia* ('affection') magic. The former is normally and ideally used by men for the seduction of women, the latter by women to retain the affection of husbands or established lovers. The (not inappropriate) identification of *erôs* with one of these types doubtless explains why F. has titled his book *Love Magic* as opposed to *Erotic Magic*, the term by which the general category has conventionally been known hitherto. The *erôs* type exploits, alongside incantations, such things as the *iunx* (wryneck spell), *agôgê* (attraction spell), *agrupnêtikon* (insomnia spell), voodoo doll, and 'apple'-throwing spell (various forms of soft fruit may actually be used). These spells typically act by torturing their victim with burning, insomnia, or madness until they bring themselves to the practitioner's door. The *philia* type exploits, alongside incantations, such things as amulets (including cord-amulets), rings, love potions, and ointments. These typically act by reducing the lust of their victim for a third party or by reducing his anger towards the practitioner (the Greeks curiously associating anger and lust in this way). Hence, interestingly, *philia* magic, far from constituting a milder form of *erôs* magic, actually attempts the inverse operation. *Erôs* spells have affinities with cursing magic, *philia* spells affinities with healing magic. This articulation will surely play a fundamental rôle in future work on ancient love magic. It is further argued that *philia* potions were typically poisons given in small doses. They were supposed to calm the man down by deadening him a little. This is why they were maddening, paralysing, and fatal when administered in excessive dosages, as was usually the case in the stories. Their action could also be seen as feminizing.

This magical culture has, F. believes, far-reaching implications for our understanding of gender in antiquity and of the 'construct[ion of] the victims of these spells as desiring subjects' (p. ix; classicists should not worry—this phrase constitutes the author's one and only feint towards Foucauldian obscurantism). It is a commonplace

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that the Greeks believed the female sex to be the more passionate, lascivious, and lacking in sexual self-control. But the opposite belief (the one familiar in the modern west) underlies the configuration of ancient love magic. With *erôs* magic lustful men try to warm up coldly chaste women. With *philia* magic women try to chill the vigorous lust of men. We are to conclude, therefore, that contradictory beliefs about the balance of sexual desire between the sexes competed with each other. There were occasions upon which, contrary to the model, women would use *erôs* spells and men *philia* spells. Such instances also have ramifications for gender. Courtesans could use *erôs* spells to recruit clients; in so doing they tell us that they were structurally male. (It follows, by the way, that our favourite practitioner of love magic, Theocritus' Simaetha, must now be viewed unambiguously as a courtesan—a pity, if true.) Men could turn to *philia* magic to secure a favourable attitude from their superiors, such as a slave from his master or a subject from his king. In so doing they tell us that they were structurally female. Winkler was F.'s mentor, but his influential notion that erotic curses attempted to free the practitioner of his lust by transferring it to the person after whom he lusted is largely rejected, and rightly so (pp. x, 82–6, 172).

F. deals briskly with the traditional but largely futile argument over the definition of 'magic', although some may consider that the definition he chooses for himself merely substitutes one problematic term, 'supernatural', for another. His touch is a little less sure in the justification of his work's cultural and temporal parameters. The study formally investigates magic in the Greek tradition only and formally ends in the first century B.C., a period he sees as constituting a watershed in magical history, since it is the point at which ancient magical culture became syncretized. But he inevitably draws very heavily on the Greek magical papyri, syncretized as they are and composed, for the most part, some four hundred years after the first century B.C. However, the rich evidence for love magic in Latin poetry, which is derivative of Greek material and which would have gone some way towards plugging this temporal gap, is left almost untouched. This neglect is particularly apparent when F. builds up his case for an association between witchcraft and prostitution, vestigial as it is in the Greek evidence, with comparative material ranging from medieval Europe to modern Algeria, but passes in silence over Latin elegy's stock figure of the bawd-witch (e.g. Tibullus 1.5, Propertius 4.5, Ovid *Amores* 1.8; p. 155). Nor is any significant use made of the heavily Hellenized Apuleius' lengthy defence against the charge of using love magic on his wife.

The book offers a particular argument about Greek love magic and does not claim to be a general survey of the subject. Even so, one wishes that F. had taken time to give us more detailed accounts of some hardy-perennial issues, such as the nature of the puzzling *hippomanês*. (And does the name of Atlanta's suitor, Hippomenes, become significant, now that we know that their story constitutes a mythical projection of an *erôs* spell?) Obvious omissions in areas F. takes focally as his own are few. The neglect of the tale of Acontius and Cydippe is, however, curious. It would have been good to know what he makes of this myth, which seems to blend together an apple spell, an *agôgê* spell, and a deceitfully exacted oath (Callimachus *Aetia* frgs. 67–75, Aristaenetus *Letters* 1.10, and Ovid *Heroides* 20–1). Homer's Circe is also under-exploited. Is Odysseus' demand that Circe swear not to render him *ἀνήνορα* before taking him to bed a precaution against feminizing *philia* magic (*Odyssey* 10.301 and 341)?

Perhaps the most significant chink in F.'s armour is his handling of gender issues. He speaks in generalizing terms about the behaviour of 'gays' in the Greek world in a way that appears to project contemporary western notions of sexuality onto antiquity

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(p. 148). Halperin's work does not appear to have been fully digested. More striking still, in view of the fact that the bibliography bristles with 1999s, is the neglect of James Davidson's *Courtesans and Fishcakes* (London, 1997), which would have greatly enriched his discussions of sex and power, and of the social context of courtesans (pp. 156–7, etc.). On another tack, I doubt that the recurring concept of 'Mediterranean culture' (pp. 85, 124, 154, 166–7), much beloved of Cohen too, has a useful rôle in ancient social history. Indeed I wonder whether it is founded upon anything more substantial than contemporary Anglo-Saxon stereotypes.

The translation of the 'blank' formula in the Magical Papyri, ὁ/ἡ δεῖνα, with 'Mr/Ms . . .' adds an odd air of formality. The logic that, throughout, transliterates ἴυγξ as *iunx* but ἴυγγες as *iugges* escapes me (*iugx*? *iunges*?). And why *thelksas* (p. 87 n. 187)? Why *pepusmenos* as a transliteration of πεπρημένος (p. 202)? ZHLOTUPIA (p. 188) is stranded between alphabets. Macrons (occasionally a circumflex, p. 62) are applied to transliterated Greek and withheld from it in arbitrary fashion (sometimes even within single words, p. 76 n. 154). ἐπίκληρος never seems to get one. Less often, macrons appear where they do not belong (p. 121 n. 82). Greekless readers may not rely upon them. Taillardat twice becomes -et (pp. 44 and 124). Neaera lurches from *Neara* to *Neaeira* (pp. 154–7). Sadly, we are everywhere confronted with 'B.C.E.' and 'C.E'.

Giordano's interesting little book also establishes a taxonomy. She makes an ideal differentiation between prayers and curses/blessings/oaths in the archaic period. Prayers typically employ second-person imperatives; they are addressed to deities and ask them to bring about the thing desired. Curses/blessings/oaths typically employ third-person optatives; they act directly and 'analogically' upon reality itself through the power of speech. Her survey is divided into two parts, one on Homer, the other on the Lyric Poets. Particular attention is paid to the rôle of cursing and oath-taking in the formation, structure, and protection of the early Greek state.

University of Wales, Swansea DANIEL OGDEN

ANCIENT MAGIC

D. R. JORDAN, H. MONTGOMERY, E. THOMASSEN (edd.): *The World of Ancient Magic. Papers from the First International Eitrem Seminar at the Norwegian Institute at Athens 4–8 May 1997*. Pp. 335, ills. Bergen: The Norwegian Institute at Athens 4, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 82-91626-15-4.

F. GRAF: *Magic in the Ancient World. Translated by F. Philip*. Pp. 313. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1999 (first published as *La magie dans l'antiquité gréco-romaine. Idéologie et pratique*, Paris, 1994). Paper, £10.95. ISBN: 0-674-54153-7.

The World of Ancient Magic is a solid and attractively presented collection of articles. It includes contributions from some of the great and good of ancient-magic studies. Those with a serious interest in the field will want it on their shelves. Eitrem is primarily honoured by an opening memoir of him by Kleve, 'the only classicist in Oslo old enough to remember him', and by Kraggerud's piece, 'Samson Eitrem and the Death of Dido', which picks over his 1933 article on the subject. Eitrem thought

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the magical aspect of the suicide somewhat half-heartedly developed; Kraggerud contends rather that the integration of magical elements into the episode enhances its emotional perspective.

Many of the contributions deal with lead curse tablets. Jordan himself edits three very important ones. A fourth-century Attic tablet in the Ashmolean, here in its *editio princeps*, employs the terms κατέδησεν, καταδεσμεύω, and ἀντικαταδεσμεύω, and places Versnel's distinction between 'curses' and 'prayers for justice' under further strain. The famous curse against Kerkis (sex still uncertain) and others, including prostitutes (*DT* 52), appears here in the first edition to be published by a scholar who has actually inspected it, and with some significant new readings. Most welcome is a further edition of a tablet first published in 1997 that rewrites the history of ancient love magic. It had been generally accepted that erotic binding curses were confined to the effecting of separation until the A.D. period, when, in North Africa, they also developed the ability to effect attraction. Yet here is a binding curse (καταδεῖ) of attraction from Macedonian Acanthus, datable to the late fourth or early third century B.C. Voutiras's piece argues that curse tablets can address their ghosts with euphemistic names out of respect for the dangerous power they may exercise. The case depends upon two tablets: the well-known later Hellenistic (Arcadian?) one addressed to 'Pasianax', 'Lord of all', of which Voutiras himself has recently provided a new edition (*Διονυσοφῶντος γάμοι* [Amsterdam, 1998], pp. 64–6), and a late antique tablet recently discovered in Hungary and addressed to 'Abrasarx' (*SEG* 40.919). Versnel's long article seeks to nuance Faraone's now standard theory about the agonistic context in which curse tablets were made. The makers of curse tablets were, he argues, particularly keen to prevent or punish *schadenfreude* at their own expense (the Greeks *did* have a word for it: ἐπιχαιρεκακία). However, the only real evidence for this in the Graeco-Roman tradition is the undated curse from Amorgos against the wicked Epaphroditus, an uncharacteristically personal document. Curbera returns to the problem of metronymics in the curses. No knock-out blow is delivered to the *mater-certa-pater-incertus* line, but he prefers to think that metronymics were taken over from Egyptian onomastic practice and became popular because they could be perceived as magical inversions of the patronymic norm. Gordon speculates at length on the significances of lists in curse texts. His comparison of column-lists of names in earlier Athenian curse tablets to those in democratic epigraphy is unpersuasive. The notion, however, that the listing of the victim's body parts in later tablets 'enacts' a debilitating 'disarticulation' of them is intriguing, as are his observations on the underlying 'matrices' and 'sub-matrices' which structure these lists. At Dodona lead tablets had a different function: they put questions to the oracle. Christidis anticipates the much-desired publication, imminent at last, of the 1,400 question tablets excavated there by Evangelidis. He provides editions of those that bear upon magic, and Dorios the *psychagôgos* is at last rendered accessible. Two other tablets ask whether their makers have been the victims of a *pharmakon.*

The best piece on wider magical issues is Dickie's article on the tradition of the literary, 'Pythagorean' collectors of magical lore in antiquity. The tradition is traced back from its reflections in *Cyranides* and Pliny through Anaxilaus of Larissa and Nigidius Figulus to the fascinating figure of the Hellenized Egyptian (?) Bolus of Mendes. Sande persuasively reads the pseudo-coin 'cortoniates' of the later Roman Empire as good luck charms. They draw this power from the portraits of the fortunate celebrities with which they are decorated. Graf argues that the only ancient society to perceive divination as a subclass of magic was the imperial Roman one, which viewed astrology and magic alike as the province of magi and Chaldaeans. Since itinerant

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

soothsayers had to be banned because they threatened the state's monopoly on public divination, the practitioners of magic had to go too. Bain establishes that 'The Black Land' (*Μελαινῖτις γῆ*) was a Greek sobriquet for 'Egypt'. This strengthens the case that the word 'alchemy' derives ultimately from *χημία*, 'blackness', and that it advertises the perceived Egyptian origin of the craft. There are also two more salvos in the interminable magic–religion debate. Braarvig tells us that we should distinguish between 'intra-textual' representations of magic (those of its practitioners), 'inter-textual' ones (polemical representations of it by those within the same society), and 'extra-textual' ones (supposedly dispassionate representations of it by those outside the society). On applying this to case studies, he observes that little survives of 'intra-textual' representations. Thomassen's approach to magic is reminiscent of that of Graf in Faraone and Obbink's *Magika hiera*: magic is an appropriation of ritual power for personal ends; magic's rituals maintain a dialogue with 'religious' ones, imitating some of them whilst inverting others. Faraone and Johnston summarize their recent books. There is also a piece by Fuglesang on the development of amulets in Viking and medieval Scandinavia.

Graf's *Magic in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA, 1997) is already an established and respected work. It was first published in French in 1994, but the English version translates the slightly expanded German version of 1996. It contrives to combine a general (albeit far from summary) introduction to the subject with a series of discrete and important arguments on specific topics. Particularly successful are Chapters III and IV. In the first case, studies of the tale of Cresimus and the trial of Apuleius demonstrate the tendency for newcomers to a society to attract accusations of magic. In the second, Graf repackages his *Helios* (1994) article to discuss the similarities between the magician's apprenticeship and mystery-initiation.

University of Wales Swansea DANIEL OGDEN

THEURGY

C. Van Liefferinge: *La Théurgie. Des Oracles Chaldaïques à Proclus*. (*Kernos* Supplement 9.) Pp. 319. Liège: Centre International d'Étude de la Religion Grecque Antique, 1999. Paper.

Carine Van Liefferinge's work is a most welcome addition to the burgeoning field of theurgy studies. The doctoral thesis from the Free University of Brussels claims a double objective: (1) to re-examine the difference between magic and religion; and (2) to present theurgy as the instrument for reviving pagan philosophy and politics. V.L., quite reasonably, divides her study into three chapters. These chapters separate authors in light of how they relate to Iamblichus' *De Mysteriis* as the largest and most coherent work on theurgy. The first chapter discusses theurgy in the *De Mysteriis*, followed by theurgy before Iamblichus (the Chaldean Oracles and Porphyry), and last, theurgy after Iamblichus (Julian and Proclus). V.L. subdivides each of these chapters into numerous sections, providing each author and individual works by the same author with strict attention. This unique survey masters a range of difficult material, and its comparative, anthropological approach fleshes out nuances often ignored by other studies. But a word of warning—this book is not for the uninitiated! A certain familiarity with theurgic concepts is assumed by the author.

The first chapter defines Iamblichean theurgy against philosophy or theology.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Using a distinction created by Iamblichus himself, the author argues that contemplative philosophy and theurgy are two separate things. Theurgy alone can bridge the gap between the human intellect and the supernatural concept of the intellect, although philosophy and theology are indispensable preambles to the supra-intellectual rite. With this distinction made, the author turns to her twofold objective. First, that theurgy differs from magic, not so much in its practical performances, but rather in the philosophy of its work. The theurgist evokes the gods using divine songs given by the gods. These evocations elevate submissive humans to the gods—in this way they are unlike the magical incantations that purport to bind the gods and drag them to earth. V.L. sets out four justifications by which Iamblichus distinguishes magic and theurgic rites: universal sympathy, hierarchy of superior beings, divine providence, and divine immanence/transcendence. The concept of universal sympathy refers to the amity that unites the gods to man for successful rites. Because plants and herbs belong to a chain of being from inferior to superior, they can be used to draw the theurgist back to the One. By creating a hierarchy of superior beings, Iamblichus explains the existence of demons and the possible evil they produce in the rites. Divine providence explains how the gods aid men by their goodness and are not under constraint, while the concept of a god both immanent (present in inanimate material) and transcendent offers an explanation for the material aspects of theurgy. With the distinction between magic and religion clear, the author moves to her second objective, theurgy as pagan revival. In *De Mysteriis*, Iamblichus enlists Neoplatonist philosophy in the cause of correcting the decline of pagan ritual. Thus, material rites allude to practices in traditional sacrifice rather than magical practice.

The second chapter of the book analyses theurgy before Iamblichus. Although this chapter focuses primarily on the Chaldean Oracles and Porphyry, there is interesting discussion of theurgic origins in Homer, Pindar, Plato, and Egyptian religion. The author structures her study of the Oracles by making direct comparisons with Iamblichus. This approach is helpful in that it lends coherence to the somewhat fragmentary nature of the Oracles and shows how Iamblichus introduces the Oracles into his own philosophy. V.L. makes other comparisons between the Oracles and Iamblichus—notably, their similar concepts of the theurgist and arguments against magic. This section is most illuminating when the author outlines the soteriology and ontology of the Oracles themselves, providing a clear look (and laying out some nice parallels with Numenius) at a difficult philosophy. The section on Porphyry approaches each of his works individually, causing a bit of overlap in the discussion, but making it a section useful for the student interested in examining a particular work or passage of his. The discussion of magic and pagan revivalism is along the same lines as that given for Iamblichus and the Oracles.

The third chapter examines the political–religious concerns of Julian and the philosophical interests of Proclus. After his conversion (or initiation) to paganism in 351, Julian integrates his penchant for Plotinus and theurgic rites with his goals for the empire. V.L. compares Julian's thought with Iamblichus' in so far as both apply philosophical Neoplatonism to the language of the mysteries. She gives a sound explanation of his *Letter to Theodore*, where Julian reveals himself as a king, philosopher, and theurgist as he reconciles contemplation and practice. In this text, Julian justifies the cult in terms of theurgy and announces the reforms he envisages for the pagan clergy. The section on Proclus sticks to the author's double objective and explains the philosopher's reliance on the Oracles. There is a noteworthy discussion of Proclus' use of the term theurgy in the plural so as to differentiate cults from the mysteries.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The three chapters of the book cohere well, although they also stand on their own. Well-delineated sections, a useful index, and the sheer volume of passages collected make this book a useful reference tool.

Trinity College Dublin SARAH KLITENIC

PARMENIDES

P. THANASSAS: *Die erste 'zweite Fahrt'. Sein des Seienden und Erscheinen der Welt bei Parmenides.* Pp. 301. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1997. Paper, DM 58. ISBN: 3-7705-3163-9.

P. A. MEIJER: *Parmenides Beyond the Gates. The Divine Revelation on Being, Thinking and the Doxa.* Pp. xv + 274. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1997. ISBN: 90-5063-267-X.

Panagiotis Thanassas's doctoral thesis comprises five chapters: (I) Das Sein, (II) Die Zeichen, (III) Die Doxa, (IV) Die Differenz, and (V) Epi-logos. There follow the fragments with a translation, and an index of names.

T. begins with fr. 1.28–32. He rightly defends (pp. 36–41, 49) the reading *πάντα περ ὄντα* (l. 32) instead of *πάντα παρῶντα*, but interprets the participle in an ontological sense: '. . . you shall comprehend, how the appearing things should in an accepted way (be assumed to) exist', and concludes: 'The *δόξαι* are not imaginations of arbitrary opinions, . . . but human assumptions.' However, he should not have assigned an ontological sense to *ὄντα*, because they are on the ontical level, in a preliminary, assumed state of being (*δοκίμως εἶναι*).

T. (pp. 66f.) describes how, in his view, Parmenides may have conceived of thinking: 'Through thinking man ascends from the world of phenomena, . . . from the Doxai and from sense perceptions—not . . . to build a second world and to deny . . . the first, but by means of . . . *νόος* . . . definitely to comprehend this unique world common to all of us.' He observes (p. 68) that in Parmenides *νόος* receives for the first time the meaning of an ability to test the truth claims of the senses. I find this exposition basically plausible, but wonder how *νόος* distinguishes between being and not-being in the testing of the *δοκοῦντα*. T. rightly establishes (p. 78) that knowledge is always *about* something *as* something. How, then, is this evaluation possible for an agent, *νόος*, which only disposes of two alternative choices, Being or Not-being, without further qualification? T. rightly posits that Being must always be thought of before Not-being. He states (p. 80): 'Being, as well as Not-being, is something that is thought.' He here relies on fr. 2.2, but this verse is in overt opposition to fr. 8.8–9.

T. is a convinced 'idealist'. On p. 88 he drily states: 'In the interpretation struggle the materialists have no chance.' Discussing fr. 3 he (pp. 83f.) adopts Heidegger's understanding of *τὸ αὐτό* as expressing identity in an informal sense, i.e. an affinity, and (p. 84) concludes: 'Not the *δοκοῦντα*/*ὄντα* around us, which we comprehend with our senses, but their comprehended beingness, is what is equalized with thinking by Parmenides.' T. (p. 84 n. 139) refers to Heidegger, who observed that 'thinking' and 'being' cannot be interchanged, and that thus it is not correct to translate *τὸ αὐτό* as 'the same'. One wonders, however, if there are parallels for this less precise use of *τὸ αὐτό*. If Heidegger's interpretation is right, T.'s statement (p. 86), 'Sein und Denken sind *ἀλλήλων αἴτια*', turns out to be false. T. (correctly) presumes that Being is the prerequisite for thought, as well as that on account of which thinking is. He also

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

expresses mutuality at p. 87: '. . . die *gegenseitige Verwiesenheit und Aufeinanderbezogenheit* von Denken und Sein' (T.'s italics). This description blurs the relation between agent (*νόος*) and that on account of which thinking is (= the beingness of *τὰ δοκοῦντα*).

In the light of T.'s 'idealistic' interpretation, it is striking to read on p. 88 that '[Parmenides] Denken und (gedachtes) Sein für *koextensiv* gehalten hat' (my italics). Presumably, this is a *lapsus calami* for 'koexistierend'. In any case, the term is unfortunate.

At p. 97 T. launches his conclusion about the character of the Parmenidean Being: 'Sein ist eine Idee'. He defends this thesis through a Platonizing argument (p. 99): 'Being is always being of . . . *τὰ ὄντα* or *τὰ δοκοῦντα*, which thus enter into a *μέθεξις* of the Form that warrants their beingness and allows them to appear as being.' This interpretation is glaringly anachronistic. Without inspiration from Plato's thinking, T. would never have arrived at it.

T. (p. 107) incorrectly maintains that Parmenides always uses the participle *ἐόν* in its verbal sense: *ἐόν* is nominal at frr. 4.2, and 8.35, 37. T.'s assertion (p. 115) that commentators have always emphasized the nominal shade of meaning of *ἐόν* is exaggerated, and too general. T.'s conception of Parmenides' Being as idealistic is in my view basically reasonable, and I find his clear criticism (pp. 117–43) of the spatial interpretation convincing.

T.'s supplement of the lacuna in fr. 6.3 with *ἄξω*, instead of the generally adopted *εἴργω*, is not acceptable. *Πρώτης* refers to the second way, not the first, and in verse 4 the reference is to the Doxa. Furthermore, *ἀπό* becomes impossible. Incidentally, on p. 200 n. 81 T. mistakenly follows Gadamer's wrong interpretation of *γλῶσσα* (fr. 7.5) as the organ of speech.

Such mistakes are regrettable but of limited importance. However, a major objection must, in my view, be directed against T.'s exaggeratedly idealistic interpretation. Nevertheless, he has achieved an imposing exposition of Parmenides' philosophy.

P. A. Meijer has taken upon himself the task of reviving the old interpretation of Being as temporal, spatial, solid, and material, and that of saving the existence of the Doxa. His book contains four parts, followed by a bibliography and two indices, *nominum* and *locorum*.

M. begins with the problem of the identity (fr. 3) of Being and thought. On p. 6 he puts the crucial question: 'How can a spatial, material and temporal Being square with the identity of Being and thinking?' He first (pp. 6–14) rejects epistemological, veridical, predicatological, and existential interpretations of Being, because all these attempts explain away all spatial, temporal, and material qualifications.

M. (pp. 15–28) convincingly argues that time in Being is a tenseless present, different from the 'doxical' time that has all tenses. More problematic is the issue of spatiality and materiality. M. (pp. 29f.) blames interpreters for metaphorizing Parmenides' spatial terms in fr. 8. He affirms (p. 37) that 'the fact that [Being] remains firmly in its own place, and is limited by great bounds sufficiently guarantees its spatial character. . . . Parmenides [nowhere] says . . . that those characters should be taken as *not* spatial' (M.'s italics).

This conclusion *e silentio* is as such questionable, and it is not correct. M. (pp. 39f., 45) admits that fr. 8.43 *σφαίρης ἐναλίγκιον ὄγκῳ* is a comparison, though he would not call it a metaphor. In fact, Parmenides undeniably does *not* say that Being *is* an *ὄγκος*. In my view, this very phrase reveals the core of Parmenides' problem, that he had not attained to a clear conceptual distinction between physical/material/corporeal/spatial and mental/immaterial/incorporeal/not-spatial. The equalization of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mind and Being, described in apparently material/spatial terms—with the sole exception of the simile in 8.43—displays this situation.

M. (p. 45) admits that 'the material aspect of Being cannot be connected with the material aspects of the Doxa'. He describes Being as 'a solid which is completely filled with Being: a kind of *ontical* matter. . . . This ontical matter must be indestructible . . . It [has] one basic quality: solidity'. In n. 267 (p. 46) M. would call this matter 'transcendent' or 'abstract'. M. should not have used the term 'ontical' about the matter of Being. The question arises: Is Being existent? On p. 242 M. answers: 'However, if the Doxa is only not Being in the sense that it has nothing to do with Being, the spherical, immobile Being *beyond our world*, then the Doxa *can exist*, provided one is *not tempted into identify to Be and to exist*' (my italics). In other words, M. makes Being a transcendent, not existing, ontical matter! To save the Doxa from non-existence, while keeping Being independent and unrelated to it, M. ends by driving ontology altogether from his doctrine—for the Doxa is of course not qualified for ontological status.

M. (rightly) assumes (p. 73) that *νόος* is the subject of fr. 4.2 *ἀποτμήξει* and, consistently with his spatial–material conception of Being, understands this verb and the context concretely (p. 75): 'Fr. 4 is Parmenides' attempt to show that the mind when coming to Being does not harm Being.'

M. (p. 125) identifies four 'ways'. At p. 108 he states: 'It was [not] Parmenides' aim to present ways which assert the existence of whatever as a reality. It is ways of *thinking* that are at stake' (M.'s italics). He maintains (p. 117): 'Parmenides' objective is . . . to find and describe . . . Being itself; Being as such is wholly separated from "all things", which belong to the Doxa, which is our world.' Thus he again arrives at the notion of a transcendent Being. One may well ask: *What* is Being actually? And, considering that he assumes that this entity is spatial and material, it is justifiable to ask: *Where* is this Being situated?

M. (p. 141) concludes: 'The Doxa is *not a way of inquiry* at all' (his italics). This is questionable, seeing that the thinking of the *πλαγκτὸς νόος* of mortals is expressly called an *ὁδὸς διζήσιος* at fr. 6.4. M. (p. 59) calls this activity 'the mortal form of *thinking*' (his italics). Denying the way means denying that the Doxa exists—but M. insists (p. 246) that it does.

M. (p. 242) rightly observes that Being is not a criterion of truth. To claim that it is, is a logical failure. In fact, trying to explain Parmenides' poem as consistent is bound to fail.

Gothenburg University SVEN-TAGE TEODORSSON

THE SUFFICIENCY OF VIRTUE

JULIA ANNAS: *Platonic Ethics, Old and New* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology). Pp. viii + 196. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1999. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-8014-3518-8.

The art historian Edgar Wind once deplored the fact that 'a Stoic frost has so often invaded the garden of Plato' (*Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance* [Oxford, 1980], p. 142). For A., by contrast, the exploration of affinities between Platonic and Stoic ethics is one of many fruitful lines of enquiry suggested by a group of ancient commentators on Plato, the 'Middle Platonists' of the period from the first century B.C. to the second century A.D., who provide the inspiration for this book.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A.'s sources (prominent among whom is 'Alcinous', author of a *Handbook of Platonism*, of uncertain date but falling within the period just mentioned) approach Plato in a spirit from which she thinks present-day readers have much to learn. In the first place they, like him (but unlike most modern ethical theorists), work within a framework of 'eudaimonism'—the attempt to find a true specification of the nature of happiness. Then they have the advantage of not yet being in thrall to the developmental view which has dominated the last century of Plato scholarship: that is, they do not feel compelled to arrange the extant dialogues so as to display a progression from early 'Socratic' views to more mature, fully 'Platonic' ones, but are willing to allow Plato the use of different styles for different dialectical or didactic purposes, not assuming that such changes of register must correspond to changes of intellectual position. (A.'s first chapter, perhaps the most rewarding, opens with the remark of Arius Didymus—'probably to be identified with Arius the court philosopher of Augustus'—that 'Plato has many voices, not, as some think, many doctrines' (pp. 175, 9). She argues that this mode of reading need not follow the precedent of Paul Shorey in representing the unity of Plato's thought as the effect of a dogmatic 'fixed faith' (p. 23). Again, these commentators can dissuade us from subjecting Plato to 'anachronistic and inappropriate demands' for ethics to be founded in some other discipline such as politics or metaphysics (p. 116). They can also direct our attention to themes that have been comparatively neglected in modern Plato studies—for example, the idea that our happiness (or final end) consists in 'becoming like God' (Chapter III).

If there is a single ethical thesis that A. regards as characteristically Platonic, it is that of the sufficiency of virtue for happiness—a point on which Plato was recognized in later antiquity as concurring with the Stoics and as diverging from Aristotle, with his greater concessiveness towards our interest in conventional goods. (One writer, Atticus—a Platonist of the second century A.D.—furnishes some vigorous comments on the 'petty and grovelling' nature of the Aristotelian position, pp. 50–1.) The polemical centrepiece of the book, to be found in Chapters IV and V, is A.'s criticism of the rôle played by the *Republic* (a set book at Oxford since 1853) in the curriculum of English-speaking universities, and of the way this has obscured what, for her, is Plato's distinctive contribution to ethics. She recommends that we follow the 'Middle Platonists' in thinking of this dialogue not as a uniquely important or central text but as one among many in which Plato develops an argument for the sufficiency of virtue. But she also urges us, when we do read it, to reject the Victorian tradition of doing so 'politically'—that is, she wants us to think of it as being about ethics *rather than* politics; and she argues further that its ethical content should not be seen as logically dependent on the doctrine that knowledge culminates in a grasp of the Form of the Good—that is, the text should not be read 'metaphysically' either. On both these counts, the Stoic reception of the *Republic* can serve as an example to us, since this school rejected both the epistemology and metaphysics (p. 102), and the anti-egalitarianism (p. 89) of the dialogue, while endorsing its main ethical argument.

A. finds a soft target in the *Republic*'s 'elitist' political proposals, which are 'both obnoxious and simpleminded' (p. 98 n. 7). These proposals, however, need not embarrass us, since the accompanying ethical theory is detachable from them: 'The most [Plato] commits himself to is the position that the structure of the ideal state, as a model of rational control, is the structure that the would-be virtuous person must internalize' (p. 81). Similarly, 'The authoritarianism of the *Republic*'s claim about philosophers' moral knowledge springs not from their intellectual training, nor from

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

grasp of the Form of the Good, but from Socrates' idea that you should do what the expert says' (p. 99).

It is certainly illuminating to be shown the historical evidence for this alternative tradition of Platonic interpretation, which A. argues has the potential to 'wake us from our developmental slumbers' (p. 165). On the intrinsic merits of her theoretically compartmentalized *Republic* there is more room for disagreement. Is it, in fact, possible to forswear a 'political reading' of this text while still conceding, as A. does, that it contains a vision of the *ideal* state—an account of that 'structure which is, in a state, moral' (p. 82)? And is there any reason why ideas that we find commendable should not be organically linked, in the mind of their author, with others that we find repellent? If Plato's ancient commentators tended to bypass this problem with the help of dissociative methods of reading, that might just show that they were no better than we are at dealing with intellectual and emotional ambivalence. (A. adopts a more measured tone in regard to the dispensability of metaphysics, apparently accepting from Plato the suggestion that without this discipline 'a person's grasp of ethics is isolated, and may not be stable' [p. 115], and applauding the attempt to make ethics, logic, and metaphysics 'hang together' [p. 112]; but she condemns as muddled the attempt to derive ethical conclusions from metaphysical premisses, and maintains that Plato's theory of Forms provides the 'wrong kind of grounding' for practical virtue [p. 105].)

This is a lively and contentious book, mixing scholarly partisanship with useful exposition of a variety of texts; it is clearly written throughout and should interest students as well as professionals. The appended 'Cast of Characters' is very helpful in making the argument surveyable.

Worcester College, Oxford SABINA LOVIBOND

THE PARMENIDES

A. H. Coxon: *The Philosophy of Forms. An Analytical and Historical Commentary on Plato's* Parmenides*, with a new English translation*. Pp. 172. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1999. Cased, Hfl. 65. ISBN: 90-232-3460-X.

Perhaps the most appropriate volume to compare with this work is the recent translation of Plato's *Parmenides* by Mary Louise Gill and Paul Ryan (Indianapolis, 1996), which also includes a substantial introduction, by Gill, a full bibliography, and a seven-page analysis of the deductions from Part II of the dialogue.

A. H. Coxon's edition seems to be aimed primarily at advanced students and scholars, rather than beginners. The Gill-and-Ryan edition (hereafter 'Gill&Ryan'), though certainly challenging, is much more nearly accessible to beginning students. C. lards his discussion with passages in Greek, sometimes followed by English translations, sometimes not. His work has more to say about the fragments of Parmenides, and about Anaxagoras and pre-Socratic philosophy generally than does Gill&Ryan; and it certainly has much more to say about Aristotle (some of it quite derogatory and dismissive) than Gill&Ryan. It also offers a three-page listing of all the occurrences in Plato's dialogues of the important idiom, *ὅ ἐστι*.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Yet there are many respects in which C. is actually much less scholarly than Gill&Ryan. He includes only a one-page bibliography (compared with Gill& Ryan's seven pages), and the most recent item on it is Richard Robinson's *Plato's Earlier Dialectic* (Oxford, 1953). To be sure, a few later articles and books are either quoted from or alluded to in C.'s discussion, but sometimes with only incomplete citations, or none at all. Worst of all, there is virtually no consideration of literature on the *Parmenides* from the last three decades. In particular, there is no mention of Constance Meinwald's *Plato's Parmenides* (Oxford, 1991), M. M. McCabe's *Plato's Individuals* (Princeton, 1994), Kenneth M. Sayre's *Parmenides' Lesson* (Notre Dame, 1996), or Gill&Ryan. Yet those four volumes together constitute a remarkable flowering of scholarship on the *Parmenides*, perhaps the most sophisticated and imaginative attempts in modern times to understand this perplexing dialogue.

Notoriously, the *Parmenides* falls into two quite disparate parts. In Part I a young Socrates encounters Parmenides and his pupil, Zeno. Socrates argues for and tries to defend the Platonic Theory of Forms against criticisms by Parmenides that have become the most famous criticisms of that theory in the history of philosophy. In Part II Parmenides presents a dialectical exercise the import, relevance, and even exact structure of which commentators have been unable to agree upon.

C.'s translation of Part II is direct and plausible. Unfortunately, however, the Greek text simply underdetermines translation. The best remedy for this situation is to put plausible alternative readings in footnotes or in the commentary. Gill&Ryan follows that procedure, C. does not.

The difficulty with C.'s translation of Part I is quite different. In other available translations Part I is made quite accessible even to a beginning student of Plato. C. makes it too often inappropriately arcane. Thus, to pick a very simple example, C. has Parmenides open his exchange with Socrates this way: 'Socrates, he said, your impulse towards propositions deserves our great admiration'(130b). What does Parmenides mean? Gill&Ryan put the point this way: ' "Socrates", he said, "you are much to be admired for your keenness for argument!" '

The most striking thing about C.'s historical introduction and commentary is its attempt to argue, against almost universally received opinion, that the Theory of Forms in Plato's *Phaedo* is not really Plato's own theory at all, but a theory Socrates himself conceived and developed! C. rests part of his case for this thesis on reasons for thinking that Socrates' 'autobiography' at *Phaedo* 96a–100a does indeed record Socrates' own intellectual development. But, of course, one could accept the historicity of that autobiography without also supposing, as C. does, that the preceding and immediately following discussion in the *Phaedo* records a genuinely Socratic discovery. Incidentally, C. fails even to acknowledge Gail Fine's admirable *On Ideas; Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's Theory of Forms* (Oxford, 1993), in which there is a carefully argued attempt to distinguish a Socratic theory of forms from the Platonic theory (see esp. pp. 49–54).

C. seems to think that the dramatic setting of the *Parmenides* supports his claim of the general historicity of the *Phaedo*. Thus he tells us that 'the assumption, implicit in the *Phaedo* and explicit in the *Parmenides*, that it was in his early youth that Socrates originated the conception of Predicate-terms as each naming an individual being, is gratuitous unless founded on historical fact . . .' (p. 9). Yet if Socrates had really discovered the Theory of Forms when he was a young man, as C. supposes, and had also, as a young man, had that theory roundly criticized, as reported in *Parmenides* I, we could hardly expect him, when an old man awaiting death, to trot out the old theory all over again in apparent innocence of the Parmenidean criticisms.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The most daunting challenge that faces any commentator on the *Parmenides* is to try to explain how Part II might have been considered by Plato an appropriate sequel to Part I. Meinwald offers an arresting and highly plausible response to this challenge. McCabe has a different response, perhaps one equally worthy of consideration. So far as I can determine, C. has none, except to deflate our expectations by reminding us that 'Parmenides promises only that from "his formidable and vast sea of arguments" (137a) and others like them the swimmer may emerge with the mental equipment for "an authentic intuition of reality" (136c) . . .' (p. 165).

University of Massachusetts/Amherst GARETH B. MATTHEWS

PLATO'S PARMENIDES

J. A. PALMER: *Plato's Reception of Parmenides*. Pp. xiii + 294. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999. Cased, £45/$65. ISBN: 0-19-823800-2.

Palmer's primary aim is to elucidate Plato's understanding of Parmenides. Hitherto, he claims, either the relation between Plato and Parmenides has been ignored, or there has been a 'widespread failure to engage in the preliminary exploration of the dynamic of Plato's appropriations [of Parmenides] that should serve as the basis for any serious assessment of the relation' (p. 6). Too often scholars trying to understand Plato's relation to Parmenides have succumbed to what Palmer calls 'essentialism': they begin with an independent account of Parmenides, assuming that this 'places one in a better position to understand his influence on later philosophers' (p. 9). Palmer seeks to avoid this error by eschewing the historical Parmenides in favour of constructing a picture of him from Plato's uses of Parmenides' thought. He works his way through many dialogues, drawing out the Parmenidean strains that he finds there. He begins with the ascent to the Beautiful in the *Symposium*, turns next to the myth in the *Phaedrus*, and then to the *Meno*. He examines in detail arguments from *Republic* 5, and he cogently links them to Parmenidean claims about the possibility of knowledge. More contentiously, he argues that the three epistemic states there mirror three routes of inquiry laid out in Parmenides' poem. In all this P. develops an account of Plato's Parmenides by finding linguistic parallels, similar arguments, and shared epistemological and metaphysical assumptions. P. then turns to the *Parmenides* and the *Sophist*, arguing that in these dialogues Plato both clarifies and rethinks his uses of Parmenides, and seeks to 'recover the Parmenidean legacy from certain sophistic appropriations to which it had been subjected'. P. is quite right to argue (pp. 145–7) that the Eleatic Stranger does not claim that he is a parricide of Father Parmenides; rather, P. argues, in attacking the Sophist he is rescuing Parmenides, and doing this entails rejecting the Sophistic, but not the genuine, Parmenides. Thus, he will seem a parricide to those who think that the Sophists have Parmenides right. The arguments concerning the *Parmenides* and the *Sophist* are complex, and the reader follows a particularly twisting trail at this point. In the last six chapters, P. begins with the first part of the *Parmenides*, turns to the Sophists and Parmenides in the *Sophist*, returns to the transition to Part II of the *Parmenides*, then discusses the fifth and sixth deductions of that dialogue, the *Sophist*'s critique of Eleaticism, and the fourth deduction of the *Parmenides*. He then turns to an account of Plato's uses of Parmenides and Xenophanes in the *Sophist* and the *Timaeus* (with

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a discussion of the arguments about time and aging in the first and second deductions of the *Parmenides*), concluding with a reconstruction of Plato's understanding of Parmenides, and an account of the crucially important second deduction of the *Parmenides*. These discussions are insightful and fruitful, although P.'s ultimate refusal to take a firm stand on the overall 'moral' (his term) of the *Parmenides* is disappointing.

P.'s arguments are rewarding, even if one is not convinced by all of them. The refusal to begin with an interpretation of Parmenides himself allows the reader to watch P.'s interpretation develop, and to work through worries and problems with him (although not all the problems are solved; P. seems, even at the end, deeply ambivalent about giving an account of monism both in Parmenides himself and in Plato's understanding of Parmenides). P. is right to argue that understanding Parmenides' influence is not a simple matter of beginning with an account of his views, and then imposing them on later thinkers, and that a 'reception-oriented' account is more likely to succeed. But there seems to be an essential tension in P.'s own method and its results. It is crucial to his project that he not begin with an independent account of Parmenides, and he disavows any such aim in both the introduction and the conclusion of his book. At the same time, however, he rejects claims about Parmenides because they do not cohere with what he sees as necessary to justify his own claim that a certain Platonic position is 'appropriated from' Parmenides. He argues that certain passages are not to be seen as Plato's rejection of a Parmenidean claim or assumption but rather as Plato's reconsideration of his own understanding of Parmenides. Further, his interpretation of the *Sophist* depends on seeing it as Plato's attempt 'to recover' Parmenides from various Sophistic appropriations (with the apparent assumption that Plato returns to a purer understanding of Parmenides). But how can one justify such claims unless one is tacitly relying on an interpretation of Parmenides? Palmer draws a sharp distinction between two types of historical project—the first the attempt to give an account of a certain philosophical (or literary) figure, the second the attempt to discuss a thinker's influence or legacy in later thought (p. 9), and says that these projects are not only quite different, but can and must be kept separate (disparaging those who, in his view, muddle them). It is salutary to be reminded of this distinction, and those who study ancient philosophy would do well to keep it in mind as they work. But in practice this distinction is not a firm one—especially when our evidence is as sketchy as it is for Greek philosophy.

This is a learned book and there is much in it that is both new and valuable. The discussion of the sight-lovers of *Republic* 5 (identifying them with certain of the Sophists—Hippias, Protagoras, and Gorgias among them) is very good, and the accounts of Gorgias' influence on the arguments of the *Parmenides* and the *Sophist* are particularly insightful. Palmer has read widely and critically, and he engages with much modern and contemporary scholarship. (It must nevertheless be noted that his comments on the work of others more than occasionally exhibit the contentious spirit that the Zeno of Plato's *Parmenides* attributes to his younger self.) There is an *index locorum*; the rather parsimonious General Index includes subjects and names (both ancient and modern), but it does not cover those scholars discussed in the often substantial footnotes.

Purdue University PATRICIA CURD

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

NEW DIRECTIONS

M. S. LANE: *Method and Politics in Plato's* Statesman (Cambridge Classical Studies). Pp. xiii + 229. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-521-58229-6.

N. NOTOMI: *The Unity of Plato's* Sophist: *Between the Sophist and the Philosopher* (Cambridge Classical Studies). Pp. xxi + 346. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-521-63259-5.

Since they are on two more or less explicitly linked dialogues—about as explicitly linked as they could be—it seems appropriate to treat these two new additions to the Cambridge Classical Studies series together; and, indeed, while the first is primarily about the *Statesman*, it also has a fair amount to say, both directly and indirectly, about the *Sophist*, insofar as it is concerned with the method common to both.

Melissa Lane claims that this method should not be too easily assimilated to the 'collection and division' Plato's Socrates discusses elsewhere, insofar as it contains a new element, the use of 'examples' (*paradeigmata*). The Plato of the *Sophist* and the *Statesman* sees examples as a kind of control for the process of division, without which it is liable to go astray, as the first part of the *Statesman*—beginning as it does without an example—illustrates. Contrast the comparatively wild success of the *Sophist*, which comes up with no fewer than six albeit 'slippery and overlapping' definitions of the sophist before arriving at a seventh and final one, six of the seven beginning from some point in the initial division of the 'example' of angling: 'That division produces six slippery and overlapping definitions [before the seventh] on this reading implies more aspersion on sophistry than on division' (pp. 27–8). It is only in the *Statesman*, however, that we find explicit reflection on example. In other dialogues Socrates can be as 'deft' in his use of resemblances and similarities as the orators (pp. 90–3); now Plato proposes something much more 'self-aware' and systematic (p. 93), which is even a condition of success in the case of the most important subjects in both *Sophist* and *Statesman*, though not in the case of examples themselves (p. 27). L. herself detects a limited but important resemblance between these Platonic *paradeigmata* and Kuhnian paradigms, which 'play analogous roles in relation to similarity and to another method. Both examples are exemplars; the *paradeigma* governs our further inquiry into statecraft, the paradigm governs further inquiry into a range of problems presented to a sub-discipline. And both exemplars function in part by focusing, and so selecting, certain similarity relations as relevant to the inquiry' (p. 87).

The second of the three parts of L.'s book treats the *Statesman* myth, and the discussion of its uses and shortcomings, as the 'fulcrum' of the dialogue. In particular, 'The passage criticizing the story (277a–c) serves as a fulcrum for the introduction not only of *paradeigma* but also of measurement' (p. 125). The myth is itself, by implication, a *paradeigma*, but one that does not observe due measure: it has a grandeur inappropriate to the occasion. It is partly in this notion of measure, appropriateness to the occasion, or the *kairos*, that L. goes on, in her third part, to discover the connection between method and politics in the *Statesman.* The Stranger portrays statecraft ('statesmanship') as wresting from rhetoric its command of the *kairos*: 'the Stranger argues that there is, in effect, a meta-*kairos*—which determines when rhetoric should itself be used, and knowledge of which belongs only to statecraft. Statecraft determines whether rhetoric, force, or no action should be

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

unleashed against a group of people at any given time (304d4–e2)' (p. 135). There is here a fleshing-out of L.'s view, already stated on p. 4, that 'the central concern' of the *Statesman* is 'the uncompromising vindication of the nature, possibility, and authority of political expertise (in relation to its rivals)'—that is, 'in a dynamic temporal context' (p. 137). 'Construing political knowledge dynamically, accepting a certain inevitability of conflict, and also considering options for politics in the absence of knowledge, the *Statesman* tests the limits of an objectivist approach to political value and is limited in turn by the possibilities of such an approach' (p. 11). For the true statesman to do his job (regulating other experts, and 'facilitating the perception of the timely good by the citizens') 'demands the ability to understand what is relevantly similar and to distinguish this from what is relevantly different. The capacities for exemplifying and for dividing, and for finding the mean, which are exercised in the Stranger's methods of inquiry, are the same capacities on which the political knowledge which it defines will have to rely. Method and politics in the *Statesman* become one' (p. 202, the concluding words of the final part).

When a year or more ago I wrote some brief notes on L.'s book for *Phronesis* (44 [1999], 76), I identified two questions that might be raised, and after a second reading they still seem to me worth raising. The first question was about the rôle of 'the finest and greatest things' at *Statesman* 286a (not 284a) in the activity of L.'s statesman, the point of my question being that her interpretation seemed to me to make him too Aristotelian, too little in need of the kind of account of the good and the beautiful that the dialogue (still?) seems to treat as the primary objective—for the dialectician, but also apparently (if method and politics are indeed one) for the statesman. My second question was in a way complementary: how radical, in fact, is the instability of human affairs the Stranger envisages at 294a–b? If I understood, and understand, L. correctly, political knowledge in the *Statesman* has to be dynamic because reality itself is dynamic, and in effect open-ended. That is one possible reading of the passage, and an example of the way the notion of *kairos* is used, but the reference could—well, so a more orthodox view would claim—also just be to the impossibility of tying so *complex* a subject-matter down once and for all in terms of a fixed set of rules (after all, the same is said to hold of all expertises: if even the most expert medical handbook will become outdated, that is not—surely, for Plato—because new diseases will have evolved). These issues merge into a larger one, about just how *political* the *Statesman* is: very, according to L.; not very, on the less exciting view I am opposing to it, and hardly more than either the *Republic* or the *Laws*. But it is precisely because L. has shaken herself so free of the traditional perceptions of Plato in general, and of the *Statesman* in particular, that her book is so rewarding—that, and because she fights her corner with such skill that there is hardly any part of her reading that seems less than possible and attractive. Even if one were to reject the central parts of her thesis, about the congruence of method and politics in the *Statesman*, and the nature of the method involved (the part, perhaps, where she has to work hardest), still these might be said to provide the best answer Plato *might* have given to the (*Euthydemus*'s) question about what political expertise is supposed to consist in—that is, apart from the ability to make people as good and happy as possible.

If the unified character of the *Statesman* emerges almost accidentally from L.'s argument, Noburu Notomi begins by assuming the unity of the *Sophist*, behind its 'many faces and appearances' (p. 10). This may look like an unsafe assumption: why must there be 'a certain deep connection between the problems [any] dialogue concerns' (pp. 9–10)? (Why should it not just be a case, sometimes, of one thing leading to another—despite N.'s brief survey on pp. 30–9?) But it certainly looks like a

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

good idea at least to start—where, essentially, N. starts: for 'assumption' read 'hypothesis'?—by trying to see if one can make sense of a dialogue as a whole, and especially so in the case of the *Sophist*, where notoriously the approach of many readers has been to discard what M. calls the 'Outer Part' (216a1–236d8, 264b9–268d5) in favour of the 'Middle Part' (236d9–264b8). Given that there were no constraints on the author, it seems reasonable, and reasonably urgent, to ask exactly why he located the middle in the outer bits. Of course, it might just be that the latter simply provide an occasion for the former; but in that case they look remarkably overlong and overelaborate. Moreover, the Stranger says several times over, both in and outside the *Sophist*, that the middle bit is for the sake of the outer ones—i.e. for the sake of defining the sophist. The virtue of N.'s book is to explain in detail how the relationship works, which shows, perhaps more effectively than any survey of putative parallels, that what the Stranger/Plato says about the *skopos* of the whole is to be taken seriously—at least for the most part (see p. 209). (N. shows little inclination to try to separate the Stranger's voice from Plato's, in a way that now seems to have become a fashion in some quarters.)

What matters more to Plato than anything else in the *Sophist*, on N.'s view, is to separate the philosopher from the sophist. (N. himself agrees with Plato's priorities here: it matters to all of us that philosophy be shown to be possible. Outer, then, is at least as important philosophically as Middle.) The appearance in the sixth definition of a figure who both is and is not Socrates—in whom philosophy and sophistry overlap—'seems to suggest that we should not without question assume Socrates is the model philosopher, but must undertake a new, objective inquiry into the nature of the philosopher; this is why the definition of the sophist is required' (pp. 67–8). A key part of what differentiates philosophical inquiry from sophistry shows up immediately after the 'confusion' apparently involved in the sixth definition, as the two inquirers move on to a New Attempt in 231b9–233d2. Whereas the sophist is satisfied with mere appearances, the philosopher wants to distinguish the true from the false, even while being capable himself of throwing up the false—as the earlier attempts at definition, and especially the sixth, have shown: 'appearance', *phainesthai*, is for N. the key term and/or concept in the *Sophist*, in a way itself serving to unify the whole. But this New Attempt then provides opportunities for a sophistic counter-attack, in the Middle Part, where the attempt at definition is for the moment suspended, and the Stranger and Theaetetus mount a *philosophical* defence. In what I find one of the most illuminating parts of the book (Chapters VI–VII), N. demonstrates the (roughly Thesleff-type; cf. p. 41) 'pedimental' structure of the Middle Part: how it begins from the basic issue of the definition of the sophist, then moves on successively to the problems of appearance, image, falsehood, and—'the highest philosophical problem, on which all the other difficulties depend' (p. 171)—what is not (and what is), and finally to the passage on dialectic and the philosopher (253c–254b, itself linking Middle with Outer: p. 237) at the top. The philosopher, crucially, unlike the sophist, is able to admit his own falsehoods, and so to progress ('The real enemy is within us', p. 201); but that will depend on his being able to kill off old Parmenides, or at any rate deprive the sophist—especially Protagoras—of the potent weapon he forged from that source (pp. 201–4). The Middle Part also justifies the method of division—which can then be used to polish off the definition of the sophist in the second Outer Part. The first five definitions are revealed as having captured 'at least some aspects of the sophist's art', and so 'true appearances seen from certain viewpoints', while the 'sophist' of the sixth was a mere 'apparition' (p. 277). So we reach the 'ironical'

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sophist, mimic of the wise (veering close again to Socrates himself), becoming more aware of his ignorance the harder he tries to conceal it.

The few occasions when N.'s book seems to me to falter tend to occur when he is trying, as he does at various points, to hang the sophist/philosopher contrast on the single peg of 'appearance': this just begins to look over-ingenious, and gets in the way of the main argument rather than supports it (of course 'appearance' is central in the *Sophist*, and of course there is a degree of play with *phainesthai*, but the project of the dialogue surely does not to any degree depend on it). But that main argument itself is impressive. Overall, this is in my view one of the best things written on the *Sophist*, certainly in recent years. If, as I hope, it receives the attention it deserves, it ought significantly to change the direction of discussion (currently still looking somewhat fossilized, despite some other attempts at updating) on the dialogue. L. is in the same league, too, even if her alternative, definitely sophisticated *Statesman* looks to me more optional than N.'s *Sophist*. Two outstanding books, then, and from the same outstanding stable.

University of Durham C. J. ROWE

DEFINING PLACE

H. S. LANG: *The Order of Nature in Aristotle's Physics: Place and the Elements*. Pp. xii + 324. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-521-62453-3.

Lang's book is in three parts: (1) an analysis of Aristotle's account of place in his physical works; (2) a discussion of the movements of the elements; and (3) (the shortest) an attempt to bring these two themes together. The centrepiece of the book (pp. 66–121) is a controversial and implausible interpretation of *Physics* 4.1–5, the chapters in which Aristotle gives his account of place.

Aristotle's preliminary definition of the place of something is 'the limit of the surrounding body <at which it is in contact with the thing surrounded>' (*Physics* 4.4, 212a6–6a). This definition is later refined into 'the first immobile limit of what surrounds' (*Physics* 4.4, 212a20–1). L. takes the surrounding body (τὸ περιέχον) to be the sphere made up of the fifth element or 'first body' (p. 111), and paraphrases Aristotle's definition as 'the limit of the first containing body' (pp. 110, 122, etc.). She therefore takes Aristotle to be defining not the particular (ἴδιος, *Physics* 4.2, 209a33) place that a body occupies, but rather the common (κοινός, *Physics* 4.2, 209a32) place of all things (p.75). As a result, she speaks mostly of place *tout court*, rather than the particular place of *such-and-such a body*. However, Aristotle's main interest in *Physics* 4.1–5 is to define what the particular—most precise—place of some body is. For instance, 'you are now in the universe because you are in the air and that is in the universe, and you are in the air because you are on the earth, and similarly you are on that because you are in this very place, which surrounds no more than you' (*Physics* 4.2, 209a33–209b1). The principle that two bodies cannot be in the same place at the same time (cf. *Physics* 4.1, 209a6–7) presupposes a notion of *particular* place.

On L.'s interpretation, place is *something like* the outer surface of the universe. But in fact, L. does not believe that Aristotle holds that places are surfaces. (She thinks that the outer surface of the universe is 'the first visible effect of place as a limit':

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

p. 122.) She argues that, although surfaces and 'place' are both limits of bodies, 'place' is not a surface, but another kind of limit, one which is a 'constitutive principle: place renders the cosmos determinate in respect of "where" ' (p. 28, and thereafter *passim*). L. is right to say that not every limit is a surface—after all, the limits of things other than bodies are not surfaces. But Aristotle always takes the limit of a *body* to be its surface, and nowhere calls the limit of a body a 'constitutive principle'. Even in *Physics* 4.2 Aristotle argues that since the place of *x* seems to be the first thing which surrounds *x*, it might be identified with *x*'s 'surface, i.e. limit' (209b8–9). This shows at least that in his discussion of place, Aristotle takes a body's limit to be its surface. It simply makes no sense to say that something's 'constitutive principle' is the first thing which surrounds it. The orthodox interpretation is not without its difficulties: specifying precisely the identity conditions of the inner surface of something's surroundings is not easy. L. might more profitably have attacked on this front.

L. has to reject Ross's inclusion of the bracketed words in Aristotle's first definition of what a place is, namely 'the limit of the surrounding body <at which it is in contact with the thing surrounded>' (*Physics* 4.4, 212a6–6a). For if place is, as L. believes, the limit of the whole celestial sphere, then it is not appropriate to have a reference here to the limit at which it is in contact with something surrounded by it, since for the vast majority of bodies (e.g. you and me) there is no such limit. (Moreover, the bracketed words would show that the limit of the surrounding body is its boundary or surface, not its 'constitutive principle'.) The words do not appear in the manuscript tradition, but are preserved in the Arabo-Latin translation, Themistius, Simplicius, and Philoponus (as Ross indicates in his apparatus and note ad loc.). L. states that 'these words appear *only* in the Arabo-Latin translation' (p. 92, my italics), which 'is often (and notoriously) interpretive' (ibid.). She does not mention, let alone assess, the evidence from the commentators, although Simplicius actually says that Aristotle uses the word 'first' in the second definition as shorthand for the phrase 'at which it is in contact with the thing surrounded' which appeared in the first definition (584, 19–20). L. also misconstrues Ross's Greek to mean 'Place is the limit of the surrounding body at which it [sc. place] is in contact with the thing surrounded' (cf. p. 92). She sees that *this* cannot be what Aristotle meant (the *relata* of '*x* is in contact with *y*' must be bodies), but fails to see that in the English translation, 'it' picks up 'the surrounding body', not 'place' (or, in Greek, that τὸ περιέχον σῶμα should be understood as the subject of συνάπτει.) L. gets it wrong because she is trying to eradicate references to the particular—what she calls 'local' or 'proper'—place of something.

Finally, L. has grave difficulties interpreting the passage in which Aristotle discusses what the place of a boat on a river is, and which culminates in the second and more refined definition of what a place is. Most standard interpretations take Aristotle to be worried by the fact that the surface of water surrounding the boat might be constantly changing even though the boat's place might not be changing, e.g. if it is moored. L., bizarrely, takes Aristotle to be choosing between the river and the boat as potential candidates for place (*tout court*) and so resorts to taking the passage metaphorically (p. 113: 'the boat/river metaphor'). She suggests that Aristotle simply wishes to show that his account of place 'agrees with the wisdom of the ancients' (ibid.; cf. p. 279) who 'speak of a river, Okeanos, the source of all things; it surrounds the earth, and the sun moves on it as a vessel on a river' (pp. 98–9); 'by . . . identifying the river with place, he emphasizes that his account agrees with the ancients for whom "the whole river" represents place' (p. 99). L. surely refutes her own interpretation by *reductio ad absurdum*.

None of the really important questions concerning Aristotle's account of what a

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

place is are tackled, and although the second part of L.'s book contains some interesting observations concerning the elements and their natural movements, one cannot help remembering that, on her account of place, local motion cannot be understood as 'change of place', nor can Aristotle's doctrine of 'natural' places easily be understood. L.'s unacceptable interpretation of Aristotle's account of place limits the interest and usefulness of the whole book.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford BENJAMIN MORISON

STOIC DETERMINISM

S. BOBZIEN: *Determinism and Freedom in Stoic Philosophy*. Pp. xii + 441. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £48. ISBN: 0-19-823794-4.

This magisterial book addresses a central topic in the history of philosophy. It situates the Stoic theory of causal determinism against the background of an exact and philosophically rich understanding of their physics and metaphysics, and presents it in the context of the most careful scrutiny of sources and evidence for any aspect of Stoicism of which I am aware.

Quite possibly there is no aspect of Stoicism more written about than determinism, along with a network of related questions (such as responsibility, choice, divination, free will, and providence). Stoic determinism is also a mainstay of many an outreach campaign conducted by ancient philosophers—extended arguments in which we aim to connect important aspects of philosophies long dead with live contemporary issues. The current revival of interest in Stoicism is now twenty-five or thirty years old, and the air is thick with interesting and interested debate. A book like this one, which anchors such discussion firmly in a scrupulous assessment of the evidence for the Stoic theory, is overdue and establishes a new and more solidly fixed reference point for the topics it treats.

The outline of the book is clear. An introduction describes the author's aims and method, summarizes the sources available, and sketches the history of works dealing with the problems of fate and determinism in the ancient world. The prominence of Chrysippus in the ancient debate and evidence motivates the heavy concentration on him. After a long first chapter which introduces vital background from other aspects of Stoic theory, Bobzien devotes five chapters (270 pages) to the reconstruction and assessment of various aspects of his theory. Chapter II deals with his argument from bivalence and the critique of Epicurus reported in Cicero's *De Fato*, along with his argument from the truth of divinatory predictions. Chapter III situates Chrysippus' theory in the context of various modal concepts, including those of Diodorus and Philo. Equally important is an argument (pp. 131–6) that the epistemic analysis of modalities reported by Alexander at *De Fato* 176 is not Chrysippean and certainly not the only Stoic position on the matter. Chapter IV analyses the arguments of Cicero's *De Fato* 11–15, which include attacks on the compatibility between Chrysippus' modal notions and his acceptance of divination. Here B. invokes her exacting analysis of Chrysippus' theory of causation (and the difference between causal claims and empirical generalizations in the Hellenistic period) to show that the attack fails, based in part on a compelling analysis of why his distinction between negated conjunctions and conditionals matters; of incidental importance is her demonstration (p. 146) that the famous example Cicero used here ('if someone was born at the rising of Sirius he will not die at sea') is an invented example and not an actual theorem of

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hellenistic astrology. Chapter V is devoted wholly to the so-called Idle Argument and the reply based on co-fated events. Chapter VI deals with arguments against Stoic theory based on the claim that determinism is incompatible with moral evaluation. Here the analogy of the cone and cylinder takes centre stage, and the complex ancient sources for it are handled with particular sophistication. In this chapter more than elsewhere B.'s determination to treat an ancient problem in its own terms, not conflating it with modern issues (such as the so-called free will problem), pays rich dividends.

So dominant is Chrysippus in the history of the issue in antiquity that B. is able to organize her material by, in effect, isolating the two interesting blocks of relevant material which are *not* his work. Hence Chapter VII deals with the issue of freedom in Epictetus, which is shown to be distinct from early Stoic material on causal determinism, and argues that what is often taken to be one of the key pieces of evidence for early Stoic thought about freedom and determinism (the simile of the dog and the cart in Hippolytus) owes its distinctive character to Epictetus rather than the early Stoa. And Chapter VIII argues vigorously for the view that the shadowy target of Alexander's *De Fato* is not a spokesman for some version of Chrysippean determinism, but rather a distinctive compatibilist theory, derived from the work of a relatively obscure Stoic philosopher, Philopator, who is known to us from Galen and Nemesius, and probably worked between 80 and 140 A.D. (p. 368). If B. is right, then, we have three major blocks of Stoic thinking about determinism: an early phase dominated by but not limited to Chrysippus, which establishes the philosophical foundations; the widely influential reflections on freedom developed by Epictetus; and a roughly contemporary elaboration by Philopator, which casts a very long shadow over later ancient discussions of the Stoic doctrine.

B. does not argue that either Epictetus or Philopator was 'unorthodox'; their contributions remained consistent with Chrysippus' causal determinism and enhanced it. Like Hierocles at about the same time, Epictetus and Philopator were professional Stoics maintaining and yet developing the foundational work of the early school. For historians of the school and for those interested in the development of philosophy under the Roman empire, B. has performed an important task in establishing the distinctness of these later views from the work of the early school. For most of the last twenty-five years scholarly and philosophical attention has focused on exploiting later evidence to reconstruct early Stoicism; the works of Epictetus and the attacks of Alexander and Nemesius among others have been used and misused as evidence for Chrysippus, and have, as a result, not been employed to aid our understanding of the period for which they are in fact the best evidence. B. has made this proper use both possible and necessary.

The features of her method which make this possible are its greatest strengths. First comes her exact and careful analysis of the historical evidence: who in the ancient world wrote books on fate, who criticized whom, who reported on whom. This is source analysis rather than *Quellenforschung*. B. has sharply delineated the Chrysippean theory by systematically applying a methodological principle familiar from Edelstein and Kidd's work on Posidonius. They declined to treat Posidonius as the unnamed source for a great deal of allegedly Platonized Stoicism in later antiquity; so too B. declines to treat 'Chrysippus' as an anonymous catch-all for Stoic theories not incompatible with early doctrines (which is roughly what von Arnim and those, including the present reviewer, unduly influenced by his collection have tended to do).

But it is B.'s acute discrimination between broadly similar arguments and isolation of significantly distinct formulations of the same position that enables this historical

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

care to bear fruit. For it is no good seeing that, on the historical evidence, Alexander's specific target need not be Chrysippus if the differences between Philopator's version of the theory and that of Chrysippus are not appreciated (see pp. 43 and 372–3). What makes this acuity possible is a profound understanding of Stoic physics and logic (Chapter I contains some of the best analysis of Stoic ideas on the incorporeals that I know of), and the detailed grasp of philosophical argumentation we expect from B. (whose previous work on Stoic modal logic provides an important foundation for parts of the present book).

Inevitably there will be disagreements about details of interpretation in a field where the literary evidence underdetermines the kind of exact philosophical formulation we seek. Some might even raise doubts about the methodological puritanism which works so well to distinguish what is demonstrably Chrysippean from everything else, suspecting, for example, that some features of later theory stem from Chrysippus even though they are not properly—by B.'s exacting criteria—attested for him. But her discussions of the various sources are invariably well informed, acute, and formulated with a precision that will permit meaningful disagreement rather than muddle.

This is a handsomely produced volume, lucidly written and without needless ornamentation. A well chosen bibliography and *indices locorum*, *nominum*, and *rerum* complete the volume.

University of Toronto BRAD INWOOD

ARCHAIC GREEK LAW

K. J. HÖLKESKAMP: *Schiedsrichter, Gesetzgeber und Gesetzgebung im archaischen Griechenland*. (*Historia* Einzelschriften 131.) Pp. 343. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1999. Paper, DM 98. ISBN: 3-515-06928-3.

In the last two decades there has been a marked revival of interest in Greek law among historians, and the study of law has become much more closely integrated with the study not only of political institutions but of cultural history more generally. In the last decade this historical concern with law has been extended to archaic law, not least because of the influence of Karl-Joachim Hölkeskamp, who as the first Finley Fellow at Darwin College Cambridge and as a Fellow of the Hellenic Center at Washington became well known in the English-speaking world. His 'Written Law in Archaic Greece', *PCPS* n.s. 38 (1992) was a landmark article, much discussed and debated both in print and out of it. It established the framework in which the competing collections of archaic laws, Van Effenterre and Ruzé's *Nomima. Recueil d'inscriptions politiques et juridicques de l'Archaïsme grecque* (2 vols, Rome, 1994–5) and Koerner's *Inschriftliche Gesetzestexte der frühen griechischen Polis* (Cologne, 1993), could be used with historical profit.

Now, seven years on, we have H.'s own full-scale survey of archaic Greek law. An introductory chapter reviews past scholarship, tackling in particular the issues of codification and of whether laws formalize existing practice or introduce innovations; H. insists that understanding has to be based on known single laws and acts of lawgiving, and that these must be understood in their context. The following chapter looks at ancient traditions about lawgivers and lawgiving, examining at length Plato's and Aristotle's treatments of lawgiving and lawgivers. These are careful and interesting surveys. H. valuably stresses that every single law in Plato's *Laws* is part of an overall enterprise, and that lawgiving is a once-for-all affair in Plato. H. brings out

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

particularly well the extent to which the traditional *topoi* about lawgiving that prevail in later sources are already at least implicit in Herodotus, and his must become the classic reference point for future discussions of these traditions.

The core of the book (pp. 60–261) is Chapter III. Here H. examines archaic laws on a city-by-city basis, but omitting Athens and Sparta. He explains this organization by suggesting that to do otherwise would be to import assumptions about the typological unity of archaic Greek law, and the exclusion of Athens and Sparta by the alleged banning of written law and absence of actual remains from the latter, and by the more than adequate treatment of Drako and Solon by other scholars in the case of the former. The accounts that follow demand that the reader has texts to hand, since little is quoted extensively (either in the original or in translation). They are organized alphabetically by city, and so offer no developmental view.

In offering commentary on the whole surviving corpus of archaic law H. has set himself a massive task. His interests are primarily in the nature of the laws, and in the issue of whether single surviving laws were parts of larger collections or codes. This leads him to neglect other issues on which comment would have been welcomed, and sometimes, as a result, to make unjustifiable assumptions with regard to the issues in which he is interested. I give one example. In his discussion of the law from northern Arkadia first published by Beattie in 1947, H. fails to note Dubois's edition in *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien* II (Louvain, 1986) or the full problems of reading and interpretation, in particular the question of whether it is coloured garments (as H. assumes) or leather ones that are at issue, and whether it is purity or display that is being regulated (he makes no reference to Parker's discussion in *Miasma* [Oxford, 1983]), and, if display, whether it is the expense of the clothes or their eroticism which is problematic. How we answer these questions affects our whole view of the archaic Greek city and its concerns. It also affects how closely we think this law relates to the much later law from Andania, which also regulates women's clothing in a sacred context. Rather against his principle that one should not simply assume that the laws of any two cities were engaged in the same exercise, H. uses the limited range of the much longer Andania law as his major argument against thinking that the northern Arkadian law, which in the form in which it survives has no prescript (not an uncommon feature of sacred laws), was part of a more extensive act of lawgiving. But until what exactly is at stake in the northern Arkadian law is settled, the assumption that the Andania law is closely parallel must remain a dangerous one.

The final chapter sketches the general picture, with some interest in historical development. H. here discusses the laws of Solon, stressing that what Solon did must be seen as a bundle of individual specific measures and not a code. H. argues that, since ancient authors quote such individual measures and the epigraphic remains preserve such measures, it is reasonable to regard what survives as representative of what once existed. He stresses the variety and detail of provisions, and concludes that archaic laws were made to combat specific transgressions or solve specific conflicts, reasserting previously unstated norms in the face of breaches. This is the picture upon which H. insisted in 1992, and indeed a large part of this final chapter is more or less closely translated by the 1992 article. This is disappointing; H. refers frequently to more recent literature (up to 1999 publications) in his footnotes, but he does not engage with his critics (effectively ignoring the criticisms of some and misrepresenting those of others).

Two issues in particular needed fuller discussion: literacy and the importance of procedure. H. continues to assert that the detail in archaic laws was possible only with writing, not even mentioning the 'remembrancers' (*(hiero)mnemones*) in his

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

discussion of the Tiryns law and ignoring the qualifications strongly argued for by Rosalind Thomas ('Written in Stone? Liberty, Equality, Orality and the Codification of Law', *BICS* 40 [1995], 59–74 and in L. Foxhall and A. Lewis, *Greek Law in its Political Setting* [Oxford, 1996], pp. 9–31). Some laws, in their surviving form, spend most space defining offences; rather more take greater space outlining the procedure for dealing with the offence than outlining the offence itself; some are entirely concerned with procedure. H. takes the traditional line that concern with procedure is inevitable: it is no use declaring an act an offence unless you also provide some means of ensuring redress against offenders. But laws which focus on procedure alone open up the possibility that what is most at issue is not that there should be some action against offences, but that action against offences be taken only by certain people and in certain ways; that is, that the need to sort out the procedure, not the need to label particular actions offensive, is the prime motivation for writing down law. The strong possibility that Solon's laws were written down in an order determined by the magistrate responsible for action, not by a categorization of offences on other grounds and not randomly, offers some support for this priority, as it also offers support of greater emphasis on 'codes' than H. allows. All future work on early Greece will be enriched by the resources that this book offers, but those unconvinced by H. in 1992 are likely to remain so.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford ROBIN OSBORNE

ΦΙΛΟΔΙΚΕΙΝ ΔΟΚΟΥΜΕΝ

M. R. CHRIST: *The Litigious Athenian*. Pp. viii + 317. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999. Cased, £33. ISBN: 0-8018-5863-1.

The Old Oligarch claimed that the Athenians tried more cases than any other community on earth. What made the Athenians so litigious? Was all this a sign of civic health or political decay? These are the questions M. Christ sets out to examine.

C. begins in his first chapter with a cursory description of the Athenian legal system, but one is struck by a curious omission: C. does not look for the weaknesses that might have made the system vulnerable to abuse. C. also neglects to mention several measures designed to prevent litigiousness, such as statutes of limitation, the laws forbidding the re-opening of a case, *atimia* for malicious prosecution, and the *paragraphe* procedure. Chapter II, 'The Invention of Sycophancy: Idea and Ideology' (pp. 48–71), comes to the unremarkable conclusion that Athenians were hostile to sycophants, while Chapter III, 'Litigation and Class Conflict' (pp. 72–117), compares the attitudes of the upper class and the rest of Athens toward sycophants. C. (pp. 73–5) gets off on the wrong foot by repeating Ober's mistake of confusing social class with economic stratum (to use Weber's terms, *Stand* with *Klasse*). The rest of the chapter shows that 'concern over sycophancy was not confined to an extreme fringe'. Yet it is hard to tell whether C. thinks the criticism of sycophants stems from upper class dissatisfaction with democracy (Osborne) or that all Athenians, regardless of social class, hated sycophants (Harvey). On the one hand, he recognizes that Aristophanes and the other comic poets suggest that 'sycophancy was not a class issue

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but an Athenian one' (p. 114), yet also claims 'elite Athenians engaged in a certain legerdemain to transform their pet peeve, sycophancy, into a matter of public concern' (pp. 116–17). Whatever Aristophanes' political views, it is certainly striking that the *Knights*, his most savage attack on the arch-sycophant Cleon, won a resounding success before a popular audience. All the evidence makes it hard to avoid the view of Aristotle that 'everyone hates a sycophant', but C. prefers to equivocate.

Instead of studying the evidence to discover whether the sycophants actually posed a serious threat to democratic stability, C. looks only at attitudes to 'Public Suits and Volunteer Prosecutors' (pp. 118–59). He examines the concerns Athenians had about volunteer prosecutors, and how the latter tried to allay these concerns. But C. thinks abuse of the legal system was not a real problem because the courts 'could . . ., by issuing verdicts against prosecutors who seemed overzealous or corrupt, police the city's watchdogs' (p. 159). But what about 'the frequent and sometimes capricious use of *eisangelia* against generals' (p. 136)? M. H. Hansen rightly called the abuse of *eisangelia* 'a shadow over the Athenian democracy', but C. blandly claims that 'on the whole, Athenians appear to have been relatively comfortable with its use'. It seems as if C. has forgotten about all the evidence he examined in the previous chapter, which indicates quite the opposite, namely, that the Athenians were anything but 'comfortable' with the ceaseless prosecution of their magistrates.

Chapter V is the strongest part of the book. C. rightly questions Cohen's belief that the Athenians viewed the courts 'as merely another resource to draw upon, another arena where conflict may be pursued'. C. then shows how litigants constantly portray themselves as reluctant accusers, and how litigation is viewed by prosecutors and defendants alike as an affront to the ideals of *philia*. Above all, the courts offered a peaceful alternative to violence, and many Athenians preferred to go to court rather than pursue violent feuds.

Chapter VI, 'Beyond the Letter of the Law', takes its title not from a phrase in the Attic orators but from a verse in the Bible. C. attempts to argue that the Athenians, like Jesus, were critical of the letter of the law, but stayed loyal to its spirit. This view runs into serious obstacles: first, the numerous detailed citations of laws by the orators, and second, the terms of the Dicastic Oath, which bound Athenian judges to vote in accordance with the city's laws and decrees. C. draws attention to a phrase in the oath that permitted judges to vote what they considered most just when the law did not give an answer, but suppresses the fact the orators rarely found the clause relevant. By contrast, the phrase about voting in accordance with the laws is frequently invoked.

C. claims Athenian courts were hostile to legal expertise and subtle arguments, but fails to make a crucial distinction between legal experts and speakers trained in rhetoric. The Athenians respected legal experts such as the Exegetai (Dem. 47.68–70) and the Areopagos. What the Athenians suspected were deceitful arguments of the sophists, which twisted the laws (e.g. Ar. *Clouds* 1170–220). C. also exaggerates the gap between the knowledge of the average judge and that of the logographer by forgetting that the Athenian lawcode was relatively simple. C. tries to use Hyperides' *Against Athenogenes* to support his position and claims this case 'appears to be based very much on considerations of fairness . . .', not on the law. Not true: as Meyer-Laurin has shown, the laws cited at 13 and 15 are directly relevant to the case.

If C.'s book has any value, it is as a *Sammlung* of commonplaces employed by litigants in Athenian courts. As an account of litigation in Athens, C.'s book is both incomplete and misleading. Most seriously, C. never faces squarely the disturbing features of the Athenian legal system. Athenian democracy was a noble experiment that deserves our admiration for its devotion to protecting the freedom of its citizens.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Modern democracies have proven more successful in part because they have not repeated the mistakes the Athenians made. We still need a thorough study of the flaws in the system of justice that condemned Socrates to drink hemlock.

City University of New York EDWARD M. HARRIS

LAWYER-QUAESTORS

T. HONORÉ: *Law in the Crisis of Empire 379–455 AD. The Theodosian Dynasty and its Quaestors.* Pp. xii + 320, 2 discs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-826078-4.

This book reflects the culmination of over a decade's work by Honoré on the legislation of the Theodosian Age. Indeed, five of its thirteen chapters have appeared in earlier versions elsewhere, though they have evolved since. In the dedication 'to the unsatisfied', H. challenges the remaining sceptics of his now well-established method whereby, rejecting the concept of a blanket 'chancery style', he analyses the combination of vocabulary and syntax-components of legal texts to reveal the intellectual and moral personalities of their authors: in this instance the quaestors who acted as the formal mouthpiece of the later Roman emperors. From the first known examples in the 350s, the quaestors were naturally members of the imperial consistory, but their functions grew (to include, from the 370s, drafting legislation), as did their dignity, eventually ranking alongside retired praetorian prefects. Discerning changes in style, H. detects that most quaestors took office in December/January (though I am dubious of the link that H. suggests with the timetable of the urban magistracy of the same name) and held it for one to two years, but some for as many as four. Known career patterns are varied: the odd one came from the traditional western senatorial aristocracy and a couple were appointed on purely literary merits, but most rose through the imperial *scrinia*. A successful quaestor, of whatever background, could expect to proceed to a praetorian prefecture within a few years.

As with the second edition of *Emperors and Lawyers* (Oxford, 1994), the printed analysis is supplemented by H.'s entire textual corpus on accompanying discs. This derives principally from the Theodosian Code, whose literary merits H. champions. Having sorted his texts into separate 'eastern' and 'western' sequences, listed chronologically (E1–997 and W1–656), H. assigns them, where possible, to quaestors, similarly sorted and listed (E1–30 and W1–19). The sequences are not as symmetrical as the book's title might suggest, the eastern sequence running from Theodosius I to II (A.D. 379–450), the western from the year of Gratian's death to that of Valentinian III's (A.D. 383–455). Of the individuated quaestorships, on the basis of traditional prosopography H. is able to put names to nearly fifty per cent, offering certain identifications for thirteen and possible identifications for eleven more. He gives each quaestor, whether named or not, a rating for literary ability, reflecting a good or poor attempt at a high or a plain literary style; though, perhaps through oversight, E24, guilty of verbal clusters, is given no rating. By a combination of prosopography and verbal traits H. also distinguishes those whom he considers are identifiable certainly or probably as Christians (fourteen) or as having received a technical legal training (twenty), drawing particular attention to the correlation of the two (ten are both).

In conformity with their general rôle, quaestors were responsible for the style but not content of laws, though they might contribute their own opinion as members of

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the consistory where that of a lawyer would clearly carry weight. Within the constraint of adopting a suitably dignified tone, H. discerns four approaches: copying out a proposal with minimal change, recasting it in their own words, affectation of a haughty majestic persona, or impersonation of an emperor's peculiar idiolect. For instance, the quaestors of Theodosius I characterize him by an uncommon fondness for *tamen*. Letters 39 and 40 of the *Collectio Avellana* are an exception. Here the indignant tone and violation of conventions betray the authentic voice of the emperor Maximus without quaestorial smoothing. H. concludes that proportionally more lawyer-quaestors aimed at a plainer literary style and succeeded in composing more accurately. Still, technical legal training and rhetoric were far from mutually exclusive. Indeed, the fact that two-thirds of the quaestors attempted literary distinction indicates the continued prestige of a high style, even if slightly more than half failed. Eloquent orators without legal training tended to lack the self-confidence to interpret imperial enactments for themselves, but H. still reserves the highest praise for the incisiveness of one such: Nicomachus Flavianus. Nor was style without consequences for content; a sophisticated but technically vague style allowed greater scope for judicial interpretation, but H. stresses that such looseness should not be confused with 'vulgarization'.

Although legal training was not a formal prerequisite for even such an acknowledged avenue of advancement as practice at the bar of the praetorian prefecture, H. detects it with increasing frequency amongst his quaestors. Distribution of these lawyer-quaestors was not even, however, since they were primarily a Constantinopolitan phenomenon. From the first quaestor of Theodosius I, lawyers were a regular feature in that court, while H. only manages to identify five for the west, the two most significant of whom (the first in 389 and that of 425–27) he argues were imposed on the young Valentinians II and III by their older eastern colleagues. H.'s novel identification of this last as Antiochus senior, chairman of the first Theodosian Code commission, is of considerable consequence; it links Antiochus' experiences in the more chaotic western realm, where he was responsible for issuing a 'mini-code'—including a definition of *leges generales* and the so-called 'law of citations' (to resolve conflicts of juristic opinion)—with the inspiration for the Theodosian project. This H. sees as the prime achievement of the lawyer-quaestors, so that a description of its structure forms a natural digression in H.'s eastern sequence (a chapter arguing for a lawyer's authorship of the *Historia Augusta* is a less natural interruption to the western sequence). Arising from this, H. raises the question of whether the 'rule of law' ethos propounded by the lawyer-quaestors contributed to the east's survival of the 'crisis of empire', which in H.'s terms comprises the struggle of the Theodosian regimes with the problems of a state-within-a-state posed by the barbarians and to some extent also the church. In answer, H. contends that the *lex Romana* and *lex Christiana* were better integrated in the east than in the west. I am not sure that this is really demonstrated, but there was a striking, and perhaps not simply coincidental, convergence in the approach of the two, which combined the delineation of a corpus of authoritative texts with a drive to iron out inconsistencies.

My only substantial complaint is that the practices of author and publisher combine to render what would be an admirably precise and efficient system of cross-referencing—by chapter number and number(s) of the footnote(s) corresponding to the relevant section of the main text—extremely irksome because of the absence of chapter numbers from the running heads. Otherwise this book represents another triumph for H., providing important new insights, whether or not one accepts the significance of the rôle of lawyer-quaestors in the survival of the east. For H. has

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

undoubtedly demonstrated that the Theodosian era saw technical expertise (at least in law) join the traditional claims of wealth, family, and liberal education in the competition for public advancement.

University of Nottingham R. W. BENET SALWAY

KELLIS ACCOUNTS

R. S. BAGNALL (ed.): *The Kellis Agricultural Account Book (P.Kell. IV Gr. 96)*. (Dakhleh Oasis Project: Monograph 7; Oxbow Monograph 92.) Pp. xii + 253, 20 pls. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1997. Cased, £45. ISBN: 1-900188-40-6.

The Kellis Agricultural Account Book (KAB) is one of the more spectacular discoveries resulting from the work of the Dakhleh Oasis Project. It was found in the kitchen of House 2 in the village of Kellis (modern Ismant el-Kharab) together with the Kellis Isocrates Codex, which has been published separately by K. A. Worp and A. Rijksbaron. The book is an extremely well-preserved codex consisting of eight leaves written on both sides, which contain almost 1800 lines of accounts of various kinds pertaining to an estate unit based in the village. The accounts are presented for each of three indictions (5th–7th), which, on the basis of the pricing data, Bagnall suggests correspond to either A.D. 361/2–363/4 or A.D. 376/7–378/9.

B., assisted by six other scholars, has produced an exemplary edition of this complex account book. The introduction not only provides a clear and comprehensive analysis of the codicology and palaeography of the book as well as the information to be gleaned from the text on a wide range of subjects—accounting practices, crops, measures, prices and valuation, prosopography, topography, and religion—but also adds a significant archaeological dimension by usefully describing the find context, the history, and physical appearance of the village of Kellis, and the Dakhleh Oasis Project as a whole. The text is presented with a facing-page English translation following it line for line, thereby considerably aiding its consultation. A very full and helpful commentary is followed by an appendix of commodity prices which updates the list provided in B.'s 1985 monograph on *Currency and Inflation in Fourth Century Egypt*, excellent Greek and English indices, usefully subdivided by subject, and twenty well-reproduced plates of the codex, its text, and its find context.

The KAB presents not a systematic account of income and expenditure but instead a series of accounting units falling into several different categories. Most of these units are present for each indiction, although not necessarily occurring in the same order. The largest category comprises income accounts for a wide variety of commodities which represent rent owed by tenants. Of the other categories of accounts the most important are those listing expenditure of wheat and barley, wine and jujubes, the storehouse accounts, and what B. calls accounts of 'payables and receivables'. The lack of care with which the accounts were compiled suggests that, rather than being intended for external consumption, the KAB seems to have functioned as a journal enabling the writer, whom B. argues was a *pronoetes* or manager, to keep track of the rent payments collected from the tenants for whom he was responsible and the expenditures made from them. It cannot therefore be compared with the sophisticated monthly accounts compiled by the *phrontistai* of the third-century A.D. estate of Aurelius Appianus, which have been used by Dominic Rathbone to suggest the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

possibility of economic rationalism in its management (*Economic Rationalism and Rural Society in Third Century AD Egypt* [Cambridge, 1991]). Indeed, the information contained in the KAB would have been insufficient for compiling accounts of this kind.

The estate for which the writer of the KAB was a manager belonged to Faustianus son of Aquila, who probably lived with his wife in the town of Hibis in the more eastern Kharga Oasis about 150 km from Kellis, and is consequently rarely mentioned in the accounts. Like other estates attested from Egypt, it consisted of a number of separate units which may have been scattered across the whole of the Dakhleh Oasis, although most of the places mentioned in the KAB seem to be assignable to the area of Kellis itself. Each unit was under its own *pronoetes*, several of whom are attested by the KAB, although there was a high degree of cooperation between them. The KAB gives no hint that land belonging to the unit at Kellis was directly worked rather than being leased out to tenants, although it is quite possible that other units of the estate followed a different practice. During the three years covered by the KAB there is considerable stability in the tenants attached to the unit at Kellis, which is matched by a great uniformity in the anticipated rents.

The unit at Kellis received income in a wide variety of commodities, although it was very common for rents to be paid in a commodity other than that in which they had been assessed (or, occasionally, in cash). The only actual money account concerns payments for *angareia* (transport requisitioned by the government), which is interestingly managed like a commodity income account. B. suggests that the estate derived its profits largely from the sale of olives and olive oil, and advances the interesting hypothesis that olive cultivation formed the principal engine of growth in the Dakhleh Oasis during the Roman period, just as it did in some other areas of the Empire, especially in the marginal and semi-desert lands of North Africa.

The wider social context of the estate is most clearly revealed by the references to religious officials and institutions. Of greatest interest are that one of the tenants of the unit at Kellis was a monastery of Mani and that there were several disbursements of wheat and other foodstuffs for *agape*, interpreted as referring to a Christian communal meal.

The publication of the KAB adds significantly to our knowledge of estate management in Roman Egypt and its value will increase as continuing survey and excavation in the Dakhleh Oasis provide ever more archaeological information about its environmental and human context.

University of Reading/Christ Church, Oxford MICHAEL SHARP

EPHORS

N. RICHER: *Les Éphores. Études sur l'histoire et sur l'image de Sparte (viii^{e}–iii^{e} siècles avant Jésus Christ)*. Pp. 636. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1998. Paper, frs. 190. ISBN: 2-85944-347-9.

The ephors were hard to handle, for our sources. They were too many at a time for easy focus; too briefly in office to leave ingrained memories; usually too obscure in their origins to be placed prosopographically; too inconspicuous on ventures outside Lakonia. They, like the system they upheld, eluded easy categorization. Aristotle had them as a democratic element, and their power as 'tyrant-like', *ἰσοτύραννον*; for Arkhytas of Taras they were oligarchic. They provided the continuous government

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the most powerful Greek state. Their resistance to analysis makes modern study the more important and intriguing. Nicolas Richer has now provided a major review of the ephorate which is lucid, honest, and in important ways convincing. His work will aid and stimulate study for decades to come.

French scholarship has formed an important element in modern analysis of Sparta. Within the French tradition R.'s links are more with the social historian Ducat than with the analyst of the Spartan mirage, Ollier. Indeed, the contrast with Ollier is instructive. The *tendance* contributed by Ollier to modern analysis was to ignore, or to discount, the claims to realism of detailed ancient representations of Sparta. R. is near the opposite pole. His explicit evaluation of particular sources, usually well judged, is less extensive than one might have expected in so large a study. The *tendance* here is to accept what the ancients tell us. Thus Plutarchan anecdotes and apophthegms are treated generously. The ephor Epitadeus survives; modern studies—of de Ste Croix, Cartledge, Schütrumpf, and Hodkinson—have portrayed as a fiction this supposed introducer of freedom in gift and bequest; R. waits until p. 529 (n. 26) to hint at his doubtful status. There are cognitive gains to be made from an inclusiveness such as R.'s. To dismiss as creative stereotyping anecdotal themes about Sparta may keep us from detecting real patterns of Spartan behaviour which set the stereotypes going.

R.'s respect for the patterns in ancient portrayals of Sparta is surely linked to his admiration for the workings of Sparta itself. His is a work of high restraint, as one might expect of what was originally a doctoral dissertation; there is no reductive thesis. However, his emphatic words on the Spartan cult of *pathemata* could reflect an attitude towards Spartan political culture more generally: 'un système absolument cohérent et délibérément cultivé comme tel' (p. 231). R. may be looking to explain Sparta's success in the classical period, rather than its failures; the conclusion (which may profitably be read first) suggests this strongly. If so, I must record my warm sympathy, given that Sparta's ingenuity has until recently been somewhat neglected by scholars. In looking for Spartan acumen, we may swim—strongly and riskily—with a current in our sources; for instance, at the start of the *Lak. Pol.* Xenophon is quite clear about his seeking to explain Spartan success. The success of this shrinking *polis* cries for explanation; the coherent system emerging from sources classical and (especially) late readily yields one. But that coherence is a thesis alluring and overdone, as well as helpful. Close questioning of our sources seems essential.

An interest in Spartan success rather than failure would explain R.'s brevity on perhaps the most sensational episode in the history of the ephorate: the murder of four serving ephors, and the suppression of their office, by Kleomenes III in 227. This responds, as R. well sees, to the—again unprecedented—judicial killing of a king by a panel of ephors: Agis IV, Kleomenes' predecessor in reform, in 241. A fuller treatment of these episodes would have enhanced R.'s thesis on the formidable strength of the ephorate down the years. It might have complicated—though not undermined—his general argument that the ephors were for the most part drawn from, and seen as representing, the *damos* rather than the social élite; for the two radical kings, ephors were all too likely to align with the wealthy few. Our ultimate source for these third-century events, Phylarchos, needs fuller analysis.

An account of Phylarchos' method, his bias in favour of the reforming kings and his mastery of detail—circumstantial or novelistic—would also have shed further light on an episode where R. does dwell: the watching of the stars by a panel of ephors under Agis IV, to determine whether a king needed to be deposed. (Unsurprisingly, one did: Agis' opponent, Leonidas II.) R. bases on this Phylarchan episode an

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

extensive argument that here was an institutional check on regal power, of great antiquity and a sign that the ephorate tended of old to outrank the kingship. Now, R. rightly stresses in another connection that at this period Spartan history was being reshaped for partisan ends (p. 271); Kleomenes III, desiring to suppress the ephorate, argued that it had been invented by kings as ancillary to the kingship. But Kleomenes also made partisan comment on a bygone ephor named, or nicknamed, *Asteropos*—'Star-face' or Star-eye'—who had expanded the power of the ephorate. R. believes that Asteropos is historical, and suggests a date at the end of the seventh century (p. 107 n. 76). Kleomenes' reported claim is that Asteropos was far from being one of the earliest ephors (Plut. *Kleom.* 105). Does this reflect that Asteropos' chronological position in Spartan story was unusually insecure, perhaps because he was a recent invention—an invention contrived to support the invention of the whole star-watching principle? Much has survived from the classical period on Sparta's divinatory practices, but, as R. observes, there is no record of such star-watching by the ephors at any period before the third century. Was Asteropos, in other words, a partisan back-formation, like the transparent 'Prytanis' and 'Eunomos', grandfather and father of the lawgiver Lykourgos (Plut. *Lyk.* 1)? Do not Asteropos, and the whole prejudicial process of star-watching, have an even better claim than Epitadeus to be identified as late invention?

R.'s chapters on the early history of Sparta set out helpfully both ancient passages (in Greek with French translation) and modern doxography, calmly presented. Much here is inevitably speculative. R. suspends judgement with healthy frequency; the phrase 'However that may be . . .', *Quoi qu'il en soit*, is a motif. R. has a valuable argument (pp. 25ff.) against an incipient modern orthodoxy concerning the lost pamphlet of the exiled king Pausanias of the early fourth century. R. demonstrates the flimsiness of the text recording this—a lacunose fragment of Ephoros. We do not even know whether it stated that the pamphlet was 'about' or 'against', *περί* or *κατά*, the laws of Lykourgos. As R. shows, we certainly should not be confident that the pamphlet so much as mentioned the 'Great' Rhetra, let alone that it took any particular line concerning the relationship between the Rhetra and the ephorate, as, for example, that the ephorate was a post-Lykourgan creation, attributable to king Theopompos.

In his last chapters comes what may prove to be the element of R.'s book most fertile for future scholarship: a well-judged review of Greek passages concerning the governance of Sparta by the ephors in the classical period. R. argues that the power of the ephors can at certain points be seen to be pre-eminent (pp. 393, 421). Whether, overall, kings or ephors had more influence over the governance of Sparta is a question perhaps obscured for ever by Sparta's secrecy and by the biases against recording what the ephors (in contrast to the kings) did in detail. But R.'s book demonstrates that the rôle of the ephorate was central. He accepts, with Ducat, that the ephors had a stabilizing rôle, shifting to add their weight against whatever elements of the state might at different times stray from 'Lykourgan' norms (pp. 499, 505). Such shifting might help to explain the uncertainty of Greek writers as to the political colour of the ephorate. Recent scholarship on Sparta has revealed ways in which Lakonian methods resembled those of Athenians and other Greeks. The stereotype of 'Spartans versus others' was encouraged by Spartans themselves, whose linguistic usage, R. shows (p. 467), assimilated other Greeks with barbarians—rather as (we may add) Herodotos and Athenian writers assimilated Spartans with barbarians, in connection with the status of kings and women at Sparta. R.'s work also allows us to see an important point of similarity between the modes of daily

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

governance in the two most successful Greek states: in both, dominant officials were common men, *οἱ τυχόντες, ἐκ τοῦ δήμου πάντες* (Aristotle, *Pol.* 1270b—of the ephors), who left office permanently after one year.

University of Wales ANTON POWELL

ΟΨΟΠΟΡΝΟΜΑΝΙΑ

J. N. DAVIDSON: *Courtesans and Fishcakes: the Consuming Passions of Classical Athens.* Pp. xxvi + 372, map, pls. London: HarperCollins, 1998. Cased, £25. ISBN: 0-312-18559-6.

One reason for the very late appearance of this review (admittedly, not the only one) is that in its eagerness to get this important and innovative study of Athenian discourses about food, drink, and above all sex instantly noted in the broadsheet papers (to be rewarded with rave reviews, e.g. by Oliver Taplin in the *Observer*, 15 June 1997), HarperCollins apparently omitted to send copies to the professional journals. By now, the book has already not only deservedly gained a wide popular readership (and thereby introduced thousands to the underappreciated delights to be found in Aeschines' *Timarchos* or Athenaeus), but has also established itself as a significant contribution to the current discussions over 'sexual constructionalism' and the ideological conflicts over pleasure, control, and power in democratic Athens.

The work originated as a thesis under Oswyn Murray's supervision, and his influence may be detected, both in the desire to give a more central place to the history of the symposium and of pleasures in general, and in a subtle and refined concern for contemporary as well as ancient problematics. Davidson has, however, his distinctive voice: the book concludes with a cool but determined plea to make more realistic our presuppositions about pleasures and how to exploit or control them. The book as a whole is written with a warm relish for language and metaphor (both in the texts and of his own), and an astringent wit; the transition from thesis to bestseller has been done with style and thoroughness. Here, though, it may be appropriate to comment that one's enjoyment of the book's readability and fun is at times balanced by irritation at the partial absence of normal scholarly apparatus. D. apologizes to the general reader (p. xxiv, and cf. p. 34) for 'establishing some basic facts . . . supported with citations from ancient texts', suggesting the possibility of impatience at this 'spadework', while justifying it (perfectly fairly) as 'cutting edge' stuff on very interesting topics; readers of this journal may long at times for more detailed discussions of crucial texts, or (occasionally) more exact, less modernizing, translations or paraphrases (e.g. p. 219, on Aesch. 1.26: 'decent men had to look away' at Timarchos' shameful exhibitionism obscures the interesting reference to men veiling themselves in vicarious shame). The endnotes are inadequately signalled; individual references, usually jumbled in a job lot per paragraph, can be hard to identify or track down, and alternative views may be rejected with little or no argumentation. But there is so much that is fresh and exciting, and argued with rigour as well as verve, that these limitations may be tolerated in a book which has brought new and significant ideas on these topics to so wide a public.

The first major theme is food, and above all *opson*, which, as D. convincingly demonstrates (first in *CQ* 43 [1993], 53–66), came increasingly to denote cooked fish rather than any type of tasty, non-cereal, food; because fresh fish was often expensive and in limited supply, the price of *opson* was politically and socially sensitive and the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

opsophagos, fish-lover, often criticized for his ravening gluttony (gobbling it down when sizzling hot), and ostentatious and selfish extravagance. D. seems a little more prepared here than in the earlier article to allow that middling citizens may have been able to save up to enjoy fresh fish on special occasions (pp. 186–7; a bottle of champagne is, typically, his plausible parallel). I am less sure that the apparent congruity between fish prices in comedy and the inscription from Acraephia in Boeotia apparently seeking to prevent rip-off prices at the sanctuary can offer much comfort (see also my comments in Harvey and Wilkins, *Aristophanes and his Rivals*, forthcoming). I also doubt if this argument makes acceptable the title's 'fishcakes', which remains remarkably inappropriate for those of us to whom the word suggests the cheapest choice in the chippy. Alcohol, its social uses and abuses, constitutes the second major theme, and D. makes it a splendidly invigorating and intoxicating one. There is a great deal of very welcome and largely persuasive detail here on the social settings of drinking: the commoner *kapeleia*, bars, wine-shops, and often also brothels, receive attention as well as the *symposia.* The apparently endless discussions in Athenaeus on the different shapes of drinking cups yield fascinating commentary. I would select above all the effective subversion of the ideological justification of the deep so-called 'Spartan' *kothon*: its shape probably was not in fact designed for Spartan soldiers drinking muddy water on campaign but for those with a greater taste for deep drinking than they were prepared to advertise outside.

The remaining chapters, focusing on desire, sex, and politics, are doubtless the pages read with most attention, and will attract the greatest debates. The discussion of Athenian ideological discourses about the different, but constantly shifting or dissolving, categories of women (wives, *hetairai*, *pallakai*, and *pornai*), with its broad distinction between two modes of discourse, each with its own associated strategies, contexts, and metaphors, focused respectively on money and commodification, and on gifts, friendship, and seduction, is subtle and balanced, and markedly advances our understanding; one may compare it now with Leslie Kurke's ambitious and fascinating attempt to trace the earlier development of these competing discourses in the archaic period (*Coins, Bodies, Games and Gold* [Princeton, 1999], Chapters V and VI; see pp. 179–82 for her direct response to D., not always convincing, especially her assertion that D.'s focus on expenditure and economics ignores the political dimension). D. seems to me to allow, here, very effectively, for the coexistence of competing discursive strategies concerning descriptions, distinctions, and evaluations, both positive and negative, of sexual partners, activities, and relationships.

More controversial, and in my view less wholly successful, is D.'s assault on the prevailing 'phallocentric and penetrative' orthodoxy, after Dover and Foucault, of Athenian homosexuality. D.'s new analysis correctly and revealingly demonstrates that many descriptions of *euryproktoi* and *kinaidoi* focus not on passive acceptance but on insatiable sexual desire, and assume positive anal pleasure, marked by vigorous movements; terms like *euryproktos* and *lakkos* applied to youths may indicate then not the permanent widening of the anus by repeated buggery but rather the capacity to widen or contract it to increase pleasure. Such youths may be condemned as actively lewd and insatiable, in ways comparable to allegations made about sex-mad women; and such terms are often used more broadly, to incorporate many forms of insatiable desire. What is, however, perhaps excessive about this important analysis is that D., apparently reacting with irritation against a monolithic and 'simplistic' view (see pp. 168–82, 253–5), wishes to *replace* the orthodoxy of these 'penetration people' with his new set of discourses; it seems to me more plausible to allow—as he does often elsewhere—a multiplicity of competing moral or social valuations of such devi-

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ations from the norms. There remains much evidence for the association of phallic assertiveness with masculinity, which D. has not convincingly dispelled or, indeed, cited: despite his broad claims (see p. 169), Greeks could often see anal rape or forced masturbation as a means of asserting power or inflicting revenge (see e.g. Ar. *Ach*. 592, *Knights* 355, 364, 962–4, *Thesm.* 157–8, and Theokr. 5.41–4, as well as the supposed 'radish' punishment inflicted by a cuckold in reassertion of his lost masculinity). I remain convinced that the 'Eurymedon vase' would be likely to have suggested a political interpretation, conveying the idea that 'we Greeks can bugger the Persians as we did at Eurymedon, because they are softies', implying perhaps a variety of ways in which Greeks can now dominate and exploit the Persians (see now A. C. Smith, 'Eurymedon and the Evolution of Political Personifications in the Early Classical Period', *JHS* 119 [1999], 128–41). Here above all, in this richly enjoyable and illuminating book, D. is in danger of pushing his arguments too far, and of seeming to replace one over-simple account with another.

Cardiff University NICK FISHER

ATHENIAN DEMOCRACY

J. OBER: *Political Dissent in Democratic Athens. Intellectual Critics of Popular Rule*. Pp. xiv + 417. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998. Cased, £24.95. ISBN: 0-691-00122-7.

In 431 B.C.E. the Athenian democracy controlled a large empire, possessed the largest fleet in the Aegean, and had over 6,000 talents in its treasury. A mere twenty-seven years later the democracy was bankrupt, and had lost its fleet and empire. The next century was no better: the Athenians were able to rebuild their fleet only by accepting Persian gold, and their attempt to revive their empire ended in failure at Chaeronea. These blunders and many others gave the critics of Athenian democracy plenty to write about.

All of these events appear to have escaped the notice of Ober. For him Athenian democracy was a stunning success, which made it very hard for opponents to criticize. He tells us (p. 34) that the Athenians had the wisdom to be postmodernists: they knew that 'all knowledge is political'. What is more, 'Athenian democracy was not founded on a formal constitution or on a set of metaphysical/ontological/epistemological certainties [*sic*], but rather was undergirded by a socially and politically contructed "regime of truth" ', which O. calls 'democratic or demotic [*sic*] knowledge'. This knowledge enabled the Athenians to make 'reasonably intelligent, binding . . . decisions on internal matters and foreign policy'. Why would anyone criticize this postmodernist nirvana? According to O. (p. 39), the wealthy, educated élite were not happy mainly because democracy deprived them of privileges they would have enjoyed under other systems. He thus rules out *a priori* the possibility that Athenian democracy contained any flaws that deserved criticism.

Having made up his mind before approaching the evidence, O. is forced to pass over several texts to maintain his thesis that the critics formed a unified community and tended to attack democratic knowledge rather than criticize specific laws and procedures. For instance, one would expect in a book on critics of democracy to find in a chapter on Aristophanes some discussion of the *Knights* and its satire of Cleon's tactics, or of the *Wasps* with its parody of the democratic courts. But O. strangely chooses to study only the *Assemblywomen* and skip over (or suppress) the more

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hard-hitting critique of democracy in the earlier plays. Rather than analyzing Aristophanes' critique of pay for attending the Assembly (*Eccl*. 183–8), O. differs with scholars like Cartledge, and struggles to make Aristophanes into a proto-feminist; anyone who reads the chaotic meeting of the women in the prologue will find this interpretation unconvincing.

The chapter on Thucydides, which is often little more than plot summary, is similar. O. seeks to analyze Thucydides' political views, but he tends to ignore the historian's criticisms of the Assembly in passages like 2.22 or 4.28 and, most remarkably, his praise for the mixed constitution instituted by the Five Thousand (8.97.2). Instead O. attempts to infer his views from strained readings of passages taken in isolation. O. interprets Thucydides' account of the debate about the alliance with Corcyra as a veiled attack on democratic knowledge, but fails to place the debate in the diplomatic context of the Thirty Years Peace (see Sheets, *AJP* 115 [1994], 51–73, an article O. knows but ignores). The translation of 2.37.1 (p. 86) is badly mangled (*προτιμᾶται* is rendered 'decided in advance', *κατὰ τοὺς νομοὺς* 'with regard to access to the law', and *ἴδια* is omitted). In his analysis of the debate about Mytilene, O. finds Diodotus' 'metarhetoric' is just as muddled as Cleon's. This is a strange conclusion given Thucydides' undisguised contempt for Cleon.

One finds the same strategy of argument by omission in the chapter on Socrates and Plato. O. tries hard to make Socrates into an enemy of 'democratic knowledge' in the *Apology* and the *Crito* by reading a great deal into Socrates' statements about what the *οἱ πολλοί* believe. But O. ignores the fact that the democracy was founded on the rule of law, and Socrates in both works shows that he believes strongly in this democratic ideal. (O. mistakenly believes Athenian Law was primarily procedural; see now C. Carey, *CQ* 48 [1998], 93–109.) O.'s analysis of Plato's views about rhetoric and democracy looks only at the *Gorgias* and the *Republic*, and ignores the *Phaedrus* and (most seriously) the *Laws.* The result comes close to being a hatchet-job: O. thinks that Plato found the Athenian *demos* incapable of making good decisions yet suppresses passages like *Gorgias* 455b–d, where we find a more optimistic view. Nor does O. give Plato much credit for Socrates' defense of democratic views against the admiration for tyrants expressed by Polus and Callicles (who for O. is a product of democratic training!). For a more balanced account of Plato's views about the rôle of rhetoric in politics, one should read H. Yunis's *Taming Democracy* (Ithaca and London, 1996).

The chapter on Isocrates is equally selective. O. singles out two out of Isocrates' twenty-one speeches and devotes most space to the *Antidosis*, which has little to say about democracy aside from a few moralistic swipes at current demagogues. There is more discussion of democracy in the *Areopagiticus*, the other speech O. looks at, but he does not ask whether there is any link between its proposals and the activity of the Areopagus in the 340s, as Wallace has argued. Did Isocrates' suggestions in the *Philippus* have any influence on the Macedonian king and his decision to found the League of Corinth? Wilcken thought not, but O. does not even ask the question. Yet how can one write about Isocrates as a critic of Athenian politics without studying his involvement in (or distance from) politics? O. tries hard to make the teacher of rhetoric into a member of the 'critical community' yet says nothing about his speeches on the monarchy in Cyprus, his letters to Philip and other kings, or his pro-Spartan *Archidamus.* Was Isocrates interested in serious reform or merely in attracting wealthy students to pay his Ivy League fees? By ignoring most of his *oeuvre*, O. evades the tough questions about Isocrates and has little to offer aside from the banal observation 'Isocrates is a master of form rather than content'.

By contrast, the chapter on Aristotle' *Politics* attempts to place the philosopher in

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

his historical context, but O.'s efforts to connect his ideas with contemporary events is not persuasive. O. claims Athens conformed to Aristotle's final type of democracy where decrees were supreme, not laws. This cannot be so: the Athenians made a strict distinction between laws (*nomoi*) and decrees (*psephismata*), and granted priority to the former (see Hansen, *GRBS* 19 [1979], 127–46 and 315–20). O. reviews Aristotle's ideas about 'who should rule?', notes his points about collective wisdom and the unsuitability of the *banausoi* to participate in politics, and summarizes the analysis of the four types of democracy. O. claims that the *politeia* of Books 7–8 is not utopian, but a practical proposal for Alexander's colonies in Asia. But there is no evidence that Aristotle or his associates ever played a rôle in founding these new *poleis* (certainly not Callisthenes or Nicanor), or that their laws reproduced Aristotle's proposals. O. (p. 347) also believes Aristotle invented the doctrine of natural slavery as a way of escaping a democracy that included *banausoi*, but, as Garnsey has shown, the idea that there were slaves by nature predates Aristotle. O. then speculates that Aristotle advocated 'aristocratic *poleis* under the umbrella of a hegemonic international order' imposed by Macedon, an idea that ignores Aristotle's aversion to military empires (*Pol.* 7.2).

Readers will find a more reliable study of the critics of democracy in A. H. M. Jones's short but perceptive essay on the topic in his *Athenian Democracy* (Oxford, 1975). All in all, this is an extremely disappointing book.

City University of New York EDWARD M. HARRIS

BACTRIA

F. L. HOLT: *Thundering Zeus. The Making of Hellenistic Bactria*. Pp. xviii + 221, maps, figs, 27 pls. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1999. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-520-21140-5.

Publications on Hellenistic Bactria are infrequent, and H.'s study of early Bactrian history, the scanty sources, and methodological problems will join a select company in which W. W. Tarn's monumental *The Greeks in Bactria and India* (Cambridge, 1966) is still the only comprehensive synthesis.

H.'s first three chapters ('The Hellenistic Background', 'Across the Chasm', 'An Elusive Dynasty') constitute a prologue which deals with basic questions of the historical context for the establishment of the Graeco-Bactrian state. H. stresses the rôle of the Seleucids in building the political, economic, and cultural basis which subsequently served the Diodotids (pp. 21–37); that the transformation of the Seleucid Bactrian satrapy into an independent state was essentially peaceful is proved by archaeological research at Ai Khanoum (p. 55). Chapter IV ('How Money Talks'), which analyses the problems of using coins as historical sources, is a methodological introduction to the book's core. H. discusses numismatic research methods and interpretations; the arcana of this academic specialism bedevil Bactrian studies, since the coin experts and other historians have failed to understand each other's language and methods. Chapter V ('Thundering Zeus') presents the results of his profound numismatic analysis and shows their relevance to reconstructions of Graeco-Bactrian history, especially the first two rulers.

Both kings struck coins with Zeus throwing a thunderbolt on the reverse. The first series of coins were issued in the name of king Antiochus II, but later the name Diodotus appeared in the legend. The standard view is that an obverse portrait of an

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

older man belongs to Diodotus I, that of a younger to his son, Diodotus II. Specimens with the portrait of the dynasty's founder and the legend BASILEOS DIODOTOU are usually taken to represent the older Diodotus' final step on his way to full independence for the Bactrian kingdom. H.'s proposition, based on analysis of die links, is completely different. He identifies six series of coins divided into two main groups distinguished by the portrait of the elder or younger Diodotus (two and four series respectively); each series is divided into several groups arranged chronologically according to die links (p. 92, fig. 4). Coins with the legend of king Antiochus were struck by both Diodoti. Two mints were used, one in Ai Khanoum, the other, probably, in Bactria; the former served both Diodoti, the latter only Diodotus II. Three series of coins (D, B, F) with the name Diodotus in the legend were issued by Diodotus II. The series B coins, which bear the portrait of Diodotus I, are usually taken as evidence that he claimed a royal title, but H. argues this is false since the coins were struck by the younger Diodotus after his father's death. H. concludes that Diodotus I never accep- ted the title of king, or at least that there is no numismatic evidence (p. 100); this would support the 'low chronology' for Bactrian independence, though H. emphasizes his disagreement with all current theories about the chronological problems of the Graeco-Bactrian secession.

Chapter VI ('The World of Bronze') investigates Bactrian bronze coins and the information they provide on economic matters, religion, cultural interaction, etc. The last chapter ('The Monarchy Affirmed') sketches the history of the Graeco-Bactrian kingdom after the Diodotids. Four appendices, a glossary for nonprofessional readers, and some illustrations (mainly coins) bring the book to a close. Appendices A, B, and C are catalogues of the Diodotid coins analysed by the author. Appendix D presents the most important ancient texts connected with Bactrian history.

H.'s lament about the gulf separating numismatic specialists and other historians is directly relevant to assessment of his own work: only professional numismatists will have the expertise to assess his conclusions fully. But outsiders will be put on their guard by H.'s failure to subject the literary sources to a thorough analysis. The texts are, indeed, limited, but it is dispiriting to see them relegated as sources of minor importance which can only provide predictable answers; perhaps Justin and Strabo deserve greater consideration.

Although H. professes to include nonspecialists in his audience, this is an inspiring text for the experts; a more general perspective on Graeco-Bactrian history from the very beginning to the last Indo-Greek kingdoms would be required to bring this fascinating topic alive for the wider public. But, for the specialists in the history of Hellenism in Central Asia, this will join the small corpus of key texts.

Jagiellonian University, Cracow STANISLAW KALITA

THE UNQUIET GRAVE

S. I. JOHNSTON: *Restless Dead. Encounters between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*. Pp. xxi + 329. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1999. Cased, £30. ISBN: 0-520-21707-1.

The interesting title of this book led me to think immediately of *nekuomanteia*, for which I turned to the index. There 'necromancy' yielded only one page reference,

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

while under 'nekuomanteion' the reader was referred to 'oracles of the dead', where I was surprised to find only a few page references. The explanation for this given on p. xiii is that this topic is already dealt with elsewhere, and that Johnston's opinions do not differ markedly from those of other scholars, but it was disappointing to find this particular aspect not dealt with in much detail. In fact, the book opens with a 'Prologue' at the beginning of which (p. vii) is a translation from Herodotos of the story of Periander and Melissa (5.92), the most famous reference to an oracle of the dead in classical Greek literature. Having said this, J. has chosen some interesting categories to deal with.

In the first chapter, 'Elpenor and Others: Narrative Descriptions of the Dead' (pp. 3–35), J. takes her reader to Homer, where there is of course much interesting information about meetings between the living and the dead, and here she starts (of course) with the *nekuia* of *Odyssey* 11, in which the shades of the departed in Hades must drink of sacrificial blood before they can speak. But whether the Homeric *nekuia* is actually Greek could be doubted. This sort of ritual is well known from Near Eastern practice, but the fact that J. does not give any specific evidence for such practices in any other Greek source seems to indicate that it is only a literary construct, reflecting Near Eastern tradition; similarly, vase depictions of this scene do not reflect reality. There is another category of deceased: those who have not yet come to their rest in Hades, characters such as Elpenor, Odysseus' companion who has not received funeral rites. Not only this, but Elpenor—like Hektor—can threaten to harm the living unless he is properly burled, an idea which is strong in Greek belief.

J. has useful summary discussions of funerary rites, festivals of the dead, apotropaic rites, and days for the dead, and in addition deals with curse tablets in Chapter II, 'To Honor and Avert: Rituals Addressed to the Dead' (pp. 36–81). Most of this is familiar ground, and J.'s contribution here is the discussion of the recently discovered *lex sacra* on a lead tablet from Selinounte dating to about the middle of the fifth-century B.C. (see M. H. Jameson, D. R. Jordan, and R. D. Kotansky, *A 'Lex Sacra' from Selinous* [Durham, NC, 1993]). A person believing himself to be pursued by a ghost is instructed to perform rituals: purification, offering the ghost water for washing, a meal, salt, and a sacrifice.

J. examines the *goês*, which she sees as 'one type of Greek wizard' who 'entered Greece during the late archaic age' (p. 82), in Chapter III, 'Magical Solutions to Deadly Problems: The Origin and the Role of the Goês' (pp. 82–123). She discusses the possibility that the Greeks developed new ideas and attitudes towards the summoning of the dead and the types of assistance for which they could be invoked from Mesopotamian (pp. 87–90) or Egyptian models (pp. 90–4). While hepatoscopy clearly has Mesopotamian parallels and is almost certainly much indebted to Sumerian practice, the same is perhaps true, J. argues, of necromancy (which is not J.'s theme); she also argues, almost certainly correctly, that the Egyptian 'letters to the dead' of 2300–1200 B.C. do not represent an earlier variety of the curse tablets used by the Greeks from the late sixth century (at the earliest) onwards.

Three categories of restless dead existed: those who for one reason or another had not had funeral rites conducted for them and lie unburied (the *ataphoi*), those dying prematurely (*aoroi*), and those who died violent deaths (the *biaiothanatoi*, which include heroes; Chapter IV, 'The Unavenged. Dealing with Those who Die Violently' [pp. 127–60], concerns them). Not all *biaiothanatoi* were restless: heroes dying glorious deaths in battle had no need to harry their killers; Achilles' ghost demands his comrades in threatening fashion that Polyxena be sacrificed at his tomb, not because of his death in battle, but because his funeral rites have not been grand enough. The

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

points about the presence of ghosts or the Erinyes at the Eleusinian Mysteries seemed unconvincing (pp. 130–9).

Two chapters deal with encounters between the dead and women in childbirth or their newly born babies: Chapter V, 'Childless Mothers and Blighted Virgins. Female Ghosts and their Victims' (pp. 161–99), and Chapter VI, 'Hecate and the Dying Maiden. How the Mistress of Ghosts Earned her Title' (pp. 203–49). The final chapter, 'Purging the Polis. Erinyes, Eumenides, and Semnai Theai' (pp. 250–87), is where J.'s promise of a new reading of the *Oresteia* comes into play. What J. argues (see esp. p. 264) is that before the Erinyes were propitiated at Athens their main rôle was concerned with blood relationships, but that in the *Oresteia* their rôle is subordinated to 'male control of women, patrilineal marriage, and the primacy of the polis'. While it may have been Aeschylus' intention to convey this transformation (and I doubt if it was), the Erinyes in fact maintained their traditional characteristics.

Points are sometimes repeated to ensure that the reader has grasped J.'s conclusions, but this seemed a case of labouring the point rather than furthering understanding. The bibliography is comprehensive and an excellent guide to the literature on the subject. There is a useful selection of transliterated Greek terms, with plural forms sensibly given (pp. xvii–xix). This book, dealing with ghosts, how to get them to harm your enemies, and how to get rid of them, is an interesting and invaluable discussion of the topic.

University of New England, Armidale MATTHEW P. J. DILLON

PUBLIUS CLODIUS PULCHER

W. J. TATUM: *The Patrician Tribune Publius Clodius Pulcher*. Pp. xii + 365. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999. Cased, £39.95. ISBN: 0-8078-2480-1.

Clodius is too interesting and colourful a character not too have been given a full study in English before now. T. admits (p. 40) the insuperable obstacles in the way of any attempt to write a full biography, and what he has done is to concentrate on those events in the 60s and 50s connected with Clodius' life and career, and at the end face the question 'did Clodius matter?'. The unsurprising conclusion is that this arrogant, reckless, well-connected, good-looking terrorist (T.'s words) did—'briefly but intensely'.

In the first chapter, T. sensibly gives his own view of the nature of Roman politics and society. In particular, he discusses the term *popularis*, and argues that as well as being seen by historians as someone trying to achieve goals by appealing to the people in opposition to the senatorial majority he should also be judged by his motive, which might vary from time to time. The term is not precise, of course, and T. at the outset cautions against too precise a definition of the political activities of Clodius. Seven chapters follow the introduction and examine Clodius' career chronologically. 'Handsome Arrogance' (to 63) highlights the orthodoxy of Clodius' early methods of advancement. The incitement of Lucullus' troops at Nisibis to mutiny might seem a sign of things to come years later on the streets of Rome, but T. is more understanding—'patently an aberration'. In this chapter, T. too briefly considers the evidence on which his study is based. Cicero is the primary source, and it is not enough merely to state 'that Cicero's evidence constitutes an unfriendly account of Clodius's activities requires no argument'. Chapter III discusses the Bona Dea scandal which

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nearly cost Clodius his political career. For T., it was just reckless curiosity, 'little more than a lark', he wanted to take a peek. There is a discussion of *Calvum ex Nanneianis* (*Att*. 1.16.5), identified by some, including Shackleton Bailey, with Crassus. If so, then it was he who saved Clodius from conviction, thus leading to the theory of strong Crassan influence on the rest of Clodius' career. But Clodius, T. asserts, had no need of money from Crassus, and was able to fund the corrupting of the jury out of his own resources. Licinius Calvus is likely rather than certain to be the one referred to. Ad- mitting that 'certainty eludes', he concludes that 'M. Crassus may safely be dismissed from consideration' (p. 85). Chapter IV, 'From Patrician to Plebeian', discusses in perhaps too much detail the technicalities of transfer to the plebs (*transitio ad plebem*). In the end, Clodius became a plebeian not by *transitio* but by adoption, thanks to Caesar and Pompey, whose purpose was to keep the critical Cicero quiet. Chapters V and VI, 'Popular Tribune' and 'Demagogue', deal unevenly with Clodius' tribunate in 58. There are two pages on the *Lex Clodius* (*sic*) *de collegiis*, and a total of sixteen on the other three measures he promulgated at the start of his tribunate. The Tigranes episode and the assassination attempt on Pompey receive cursory treatment. 'Formid- able Adversary' (Chapter VII) takes the narrative to April 56, a period in which the picture of Clodius as a man of violence given to acts of terrorism is drawn fairly and clearly by T. Chapter VIII, 'The Appian Way', brings the narrative to a close. Given its notoriety and also its consequences, the murder of Clodius deserves more than the single page treatment T. affords it. But it is consistent with a view that the author has that if something is, in his opinion, well known, it need not be considered at any length. Among other examples (pp. 126–7, 185, 210) may be noted the references to the first months of Caesar's consulship (p. 103 with p. 284 n. 78), where words like 'utterly shocking' and 'enormities' demand amplification. There is a conclusion and a three- part appendix, in which he discusses Clodius' name. Not Pulcher, but why 'Clodius' and not 'Claudius'? 'Faddism' is T.'s preferred view.

Some minor points: not all Latin or indeed Greek is translated. The longer passages are and all readers can thus engage in the ensuing discussions. But there is still much that is not translated. Students of urban politics in whatever society will surely find their own fields of study illuminated by this book and they, as well as classicists, deserve full access. The bibliography is full, but room should have been found for E. Rawson's 'The Eastern Clientelae of Clodius and the Claudii', *Historia* 22 (1973), 219–39; *CAH* IX (1994^2), which has eighty-five references to Clodius in the index; and Beesly's essay on Cicero and Clodius (1866, reprinted in *Catiline, Clodius and Tiberius* [London, 1878]), the importance of which has recently been stressed by T. P. Wiseman ('E. S. Beesly and the Roman Revolution', in *Roman Drama and Roman History* [Exeter, 1998])—'His experience of the reality and the dangers of radical politics enabled him to read the Ciceronian evidence with a sensitivity to *populares* thinking unparalleled in any historian before or since' (p. 134). The index is detailed and helpful, but there is no list of passages cited or discussed.

We have come some way from the depiction of Clodius by Forsyth (quoted by Beesly, p. 77) as 'one bold, bad man'. T.'s picture is of a normal politician, sometimes given to violence and not always of his own choosing, having to cooperate with others on various issues in various ways in order to promote his own political interests. Cicero's judgement of him in July 59 as a man flying around in a frenzy with nothing stable about him (*Att*. 2.22.1) is not necessarily inconsistent with T.'s picture. Perhaps the three dynasts, who dominated the political arena for much of Clodius' career in the 50s, have receded a bit *too* far from centre stage here in order to focus attention on the uncertain political path being trodden by Clodius himself. In general, the book

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

represents a welcome and substantial contribution to our understanding of Clodius and his place in the history of the late Republic. It will deservedly feature on the reading lists of courses on the late Republic and provoke debate among students and professional historians for some years to come.

University College Dublin VICTOR CONNERTY

ROMAN DEMOCRACY

F. MILLAR: *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*. Pp. xvi + 236. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 0-472-10892-1.

This book is a polite challenge to a view of Roman Republican politics which prevailed in the late twentieth century. M. opposes the idea that *clientelae* dominated. Instead, he argues, Republican Rome was 'a variety of democracy' (p. 208). His case is memorably presented and will have a lasting influence on debate. It does not pretend, however, to close the subject. Supporting (and conflicting) material is far from exhaustively displayed, as M. is aware. There is also at times an incompleteness of argument.

M. identifies something which, in a less urbane writer, might have been represented as a collective failure of honesty in the modern genre of Roman history. Romanists are seldom candid, at least with their students, about our fundamental ignorance of important aspects of the Republican constitution. And as M. says, it is 'extraordinary that the student of today cannot turn to any textbook that sets out in comprehensible terms the key features of the system' (p. 3). The formally oligarchic voting structure of the *comitia centuriata* is widely emphasized in modern times. But, as M. reminds us (p. 206), in the late Republic it was the *comitia tributa* which passed the overwhelming mass of legislation, and without formal timocracy: 'Why is so little emphasis given to the fact that in the *comitia tributa* every citizen could vote on an equal basis, with no priority accorded to wealth or social status?' (p. 204). This uneven emphasis both results from and reinforces the view that the Republic was in reality, if not in form, oligarchic.

The most memorable aspect of M.'s case for Roman democracy is probably his detailed picture of Republican politics as an open-air activity. So much was decided transparently in a relatively tiny area, the Forum, which thereby became a participatory theatre for the common citizen. *Quaestiones* sat there; the *comitia tributa* met there after 145; the bench of the ten tribunes was also there. Indeed, both the *tributa* and the tribunes were within a few yards of the Curia, the Senate being 'unique among all the public institutions of the Republic in regularly meeting indoors under a roof' (p. 39). Even the Senate, therefore, could hear the shouts of the nearby crowd, 'through whom senators had to make their way to and from meetings'. It was this crowd within the Forum, more than the Senate, whose 'voting power . . . had effects that were felt from Britain to the Euphrates' (p. 196).

A subsequent step in M.'s argument is more dubious: that because ordinary Roman citizens were permitted access to—even a formal share in—decisive political processes, they employed that access in ways which outdid the effects of *clientelae*. Much of the detail M. himself collects raises problems for his view. Men from as far as Cisalpine Gaul journeyed to Rome to vote. Why? If they were few (some of the minority who could afford the journey from their own resources), that might suggest that they

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

expected the active voters from Rome and nearby to be few enough, at least in the relevant tribes, not to overwhelm voters-from-afar. But the fewer voters are, the more easily they may be bribed—a point widely understood in the courts of the Athenian *demokratia.* Or did wealthy voters-from-afar travel to Rome so as themselves to deploy *clientelae*? Was it commonly the case that voters-from-afar were bribed, and so might be numerous because well subsidized—as surely is a strong possibility when Caesar canvassed for Antony in Cisalpina, in 50? Cicero, in M.'s own quotations, shows, at times, a puppeteer's attitude. In public he berates a tribune for speaking of the plebs 'as if he were speaking of some dregs and not of a class of excellent citizens' (*De leg. ag.* 2.26). In private: 'I thought that the dregs of the city could be cleared out' (*Att.* 1.19.4). Cicero privately suggests using a 'hired crowd' (*comparata multitudo*: *Att.* 3.23.1–4); publicly he condemns such venality (*Pro Sest*. 125–6). M. is aware (p. 96) of his great dependence on Cicero, who is by far the main source for the *contiones* which feature largely in his argument. The nature of Cicero as a source should have been more fully discussed. For example, did his own lack of a hereditary *clientela* limit his insight in that area? Did his insecure vanity encourage him to overestimate, at times, the power of argument, and the numbers of the uncommitted available to be swayed by it? M. notes on occasion the persuasive bias in Cicero's words; should we not also be on guard concerning Cicero's words, which M. believes (p. 219), that with tribunician power restored in 70 the *dominatio* of the senators was over (*Verr*. 2.5.175)? Manipulation of politics by and for the few, because secret, might leave little trace. Even *clientes* on duty might often have an interest in passing themselves off as common citizens honestly convinced by the arguments, in the hope of influencing any who were uncommitted. It is a rare privilege to see, in Cicero, the two faces of a grandee in private and in public. Can we assume that his less literary peers were less manipulative?

M. shows that in the late Republic the *contio* was typically intended as a meeting of like-minded enthusiasts in a single cause. Possibly helpful comparisons with modern political demonstrations are missed; rather, the approach in general seems campus-bound—indeed, faculty-bound. The contrast which emerges from M.'s book, between fervent attenders at *contiones* and casual (p. 33) spectators of political processes in the Forum, would be recognizable to anyone who has watched passers-by in a modern city bewildered and alienated by an intense demonstration. Even in the headiest (and most prosperous) of modern times, few demonstrators have the stamina, the resources, or the commitment to assemble often. One can well imagine how, for Byzantines, the word δημοκρατία came to mean 'a street riot', a transient thing. An instructive difference, between ultra-modern societies and others, concerns simple bribery, flagrant in Rome, well evoked in George Eliot's picture of pre-Victorian England in *Felix Holt, the Radical*, where honest endeavours at election time are thwarted by distributions of cash in ale-houses. If we are tempted to see *contiones*, where information might indeed be disseminated, as a vital organ of democracy, we should remember that well-attended meeting in the Forum which drove away a consul in 67. It was a meeting of bribe-distributors, *divisores*, an occasion on which M. might have dwelt for longer (cf. p. 84). M. usefully observes that the big names of late Republican politics tended to have houses close to the Forum. He might have compared the mansions of Georgian grandees in St James's and Westminster, permanently close—literally, as well as in spirit—to the places of decision. From such places men of hereditary confidence and leisure could operate formidable and discreet networks where, in twentieth-century terms, the 'memo was deadlier than the demo'. When the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

memo, or its nearest ancient analogue, was oral, it was likely to evade the historical record.

One misses also in M.'s book, and especially in its final chapter, 'What Sort of Democracy?', regard for the distribution of enduring wealth among Romans. The longevity of Athens' democracy probably resulted in part, as Aristotle believed, from the widespread distribution of land among the citizenry. The large question of how far Roman extremes of wealth allowed to the majority the moral independence to resemble Athenian democracy does not here begin to get due prominence. The expression 'rent-a-mob', when used against twentieth-century demonstrators by professional politicians and journalists, was an anachronism, but one revealing of memories within a privileged class. When Cicero described his contemporary 'little plebs' as given to attending *contiones*, it was in connection with popular hunger, and need for subsidies: *illa contionalis hirudo aerarii, misera ac ieiuna plebecula* (*Att*. 1.16.11). To Rome the concept of rent-a-mob might apply lamentably often; repeated funding might produce persistent crowds. However, in furtherance of M.'s thesis—and in fairness to Roman crowds—one might also have welcomed some acknowledgement of refreshing episodes of popular independence in post-Republican times. The defiance of Octavian by crowds celebrating the safe return of those proscribed by the Triumvirs and saved by Sextus Pompey; the persistent pressure on Augustus from the public to spare Julia; the large crowds which attempted in Nero's reign to save a household of slaves from collective execution: assertions of popular wishes might fail in their immediate objects, but still have enduring effects on the powerful few.

University of Wales ANTON POWELL

ROMAN VOTERS

ALEXANDER YAKOBSON: *Elections and Electioneering in Rome. A Study in the Political System of the Late Republic. (Historia* Einzelschriften 128.) Pp. 251. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1999. Paper, DM 98. ISBN: 3-515-07481-3.

During the past fifteen years or so, a lively debate on the character of Roman republican politics has been fostered by scholars like Peter Brunt and Fergus Millar, who have taken exception to an 'orthodoxy', according to which the political process was controlled by an oligarchy chiefly through patronage. Yakobson follows their lead without accepting some of their exaggerations. So far as concerns the late Republic, he takes it for granted that the case for the importance of the common people in legislative assemblies, *contiones*, riots, etc. does not need to be pleaded again.

The crucial question, therefore, seems to be whether the élitist model of Roman politics can still be upheld with regard to the elections of consuls and praetors. Y. concludes with a clear denial, indicating, however, that his results so far apply only to the late Republic, especially the Ciceronian age, on which (apart from an introductory chapter on Marius) his study focuses. A number of scholars who have dealt with electioneering in this period could not cope with the apparent contradiction that candidates wooed the *plebs urbana*, though it simply did not count within the voting

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

system of the *comitia centuriata.* Following estimations that the census qualification required for the first class was 40,000–50,000 sesterces or even less (to be compared with the 400,000 sesterces for knights), Y. rejects the view that those seventy *centuriae* represented the 'wealthy citizens'. Instead they must have comprised people of quite different social standing, including at the bottom even the more respectable parts of the *plebs urbana.* Since one cannot assume unanimity among the knights and the first class, it was improbable that a decision was reached at the earliest possible stage, i.e. after the second class; the more the vote was split, the more the following classes were likely to be actually called to the pollbox. The precise census ratings for the five classes are unknown, but the most serious problem is the lack of any data concerning the distribution of citizens among the classes, and the internal composition of the first class (e.g. the proportion of members with a fortune of, say, 300,000 sesterces in comparison with those having 50,000).

Since such questions cannot be answered, Y. considers the behaviour of candidates as the clue to understanding the election system. There is plenty of evidence for their serious concern about reputation with the urban population, their tremendous efforts to gain popularity by games and banquets, and the money spent for outright bribery (with comparatively small sums for the individual recipients). Though there were other possible motives for a display of generosity, according to Y. candidates must have been convinced that there was a close connection between their respective expenditure of time and money and their prospects of being elected. As Y. himself points out, a rational calculation was not really possible since the number of voting units to be called up was unpredictable, and their patchwork composition and the secret ballot excluded the identification of the actual voting, not only of individuals but also of communities. *Pace* Y., this all suggests that candidates were likely to invest even beyond margin utility.

Y., however, considers the anonymity of voting as a factor telling against the decisive importance of patronage mechanisms for the result of elections. To rally the voters as clients would have presupposed the capacity of individual patrons or of 'brokers' like the *divisores* to control voting blocks to a degree that allowed for freely transferring them to candidates. However, the sources are too ambiguous for such an assumption. Y. rightly states that the *salutatores* and *adsectatores* who floated between candidates within the city cannot be considered dependent clients, but he does not address the problem whether the motivation of rural voters to attend the polling was essentially influenced by a sense of obligation to follow the recommendation of their patrons. Nor does he discuss the implications of the assumption (which he shares) that at consular elections citizens had two votes. Can we rule out that they considered one as 'bound' and the other as 'free'? The combination of *tribus* and *centuriae* still favoured the citizen with a country domicile, urban voters making up only eight out of seventy *centuriae* of the first class. That the 'urban vote was . . . more important than the Italian one' (p. 61) therefore can only hold true in the sense that it might tip the scales. That the ' "floating votes" . . . seem to have constituted the main part of the Roman electorate' (p. 109) remains a conjecture; all in all, the impact of patronage networks might have been much more important than Y. is inclined to acknowledge.

Doubts are also raised by his attempt to demonstrate that essentially 'political' issues played an important part in canvassing. The evidence concerning consular elections is not strong, and should not be supplemented by examples of competition for the tribunate, since the possibility of presenting an agenda for future legislation must have made for a considerable difference of approach.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This attempt at a new assessment of the elections is likely to stimulate fruitful discussion on the political culture of the (late) Republic.

Humboldt-Universität, Berlin WILFRIED NIPPEL

PATIENTISSIMUS VERI

B. LEVICK: *Vespasian*. Pp. xli + 310, 9 maps, 34 pls. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. Cased, £25. ISBN: 0-415-16618-7.

This is the third in Barbara Levick's trilogy of imperial biographies after *Tiberius the Politician* (London, 1976) and *Claudius* (London, 1990). All these books go beyond a strictly biographical approach and expound in an authoritative way the social, political, and administrative history of Rome of the first century A.D. L. has an enviable mastery of the ancient source material, including literature, inscriptions, and coins. The narrative is confident and readable, sometimes with short pithy sentences that are rather reminiscent of early Syme. Important problems are treated in a decisive and scholarly fashion, yet not so that they overburden the book with complex argumentation. Key themes include Vespasian's family and early career, the civil war and his march on Rome, imperial strategy on the frontiers (here it should be remembered that of all Roman emperors Vespasian was one of the most experienced in military command when he came to power), the establishment of a new, stable regime and the facing down of opposition, financial policy, imperial ideology and its presentation, the steps taken to achieve physical and moral regeneration in Italy and the provinces, the emperor's relationship with the upper classes, and the political development of the dynasty. The book is made easy to consult by a table of key dates, good indexes, and a concordance for McCrum and Woodhead, *Select Documents of the Principates of the Flavian Emperors* (Cambridge, 1961). The book also contains a very useful collection of maps, which are often neglected in works of this kind, and excellent plates well chosen to illuminate the text.

L. rightly accepts that Vespasian's bid for the purple was planned in advance and that he deliberately tried to win over potential supporters in Rome. Naturally he depended on the eastern legions, which amounted to nearly one-third of the troops available in the empire, and after the Jewish war they were in a high state of readiness and trained in combat. Perhaps we should hear more about the psychology of the soldiers. It may well have been Vespasian's standing as a successful military commander that allowed him speedily to impose discipline after the civil wars were over. L. argues that Vespasian, once safely in power after the fall of the long-standing Julio-Claudian dynasty, needed to achieve not only physical reconstruction after the ravages of civil war, but also moral or psychological restoration. In modern parlance, he needed a good public relations adviser. This is a crucial and very interesting part of the book, though L. judiciously refuses to exaggerate Vespasian's personal contribution and initiative. 'Enhancement was a natural consequence of stabilization' (p. 151). In addition, L. makes the most out of the scattered evidence on financial affairs, and offers a careful political analysis (at which she excels) of Vespasian's relationship with his sons. L.'s passing comments and observations are always interesting, e.g. on the social transformation of the senate (esp. pp. 174–6), and what we mean by 'Romanization' (pp. 142–3).

The book contains such a wealth of information that there is bound to be something to question. In respect of publicity and the formation of public opinion, L.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tends to see ideology as imposed by the Flavians, rather than as part of a dialogue between ruler and subject that Zanker envisaged in his analysis of the Augustan principate (*The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Ann Arbor, 1988). It is difficult to see how Vespasian's attempt to reclaim *subseciva* for the state indicated 'a style of government attentive to the people's needs' (p. 73), since in fact it caused great disturbance in Italy. 'Subsequently he (Vespasian) was moved by the distress of delegations, because all the landholders in Italy were in turmoil, and intermitted his ruling' (Agennius Urbicus [Thulin, p. 41]). Domitian later abandoned the plan, as L. points out (p. 99). Vespasian's motive was surely a straightforward attempt to raise money. L. thinks that Vespasian's appointment of Titus (a senator) as praetorian prefect was a setback for *equites*, who normally held this position (p. 180). But the very fact that Titus was appointed praetorian prefect was a recognition of the increasing importance of the prefecture that would be reflected in the status of the *equites* who later held it. It is also rather surprising to read that the army in Nero's reign was behind in its pay, 'but that was nothing new' (p. 37). Surely this cannot have been commonly the case. The allegation depends on a comment in Suetonius (*Nero* 32), who may well have been generalizing from a single instance known to him.

But these are minor points of debate in an exemplary book. It helps the biographer's task that Vespasian does at least have a personality. As well as that, he came to power when the Roman empire was facing a major crisis. He ended civil war, brought peace, stability, and reconciliation, made an important contribution to the organization of Rome's frontier zones, and set imperial government on a new course with its second important dynasty. This was a striking achievement, and many of the benefits he brought endured despite the breakdown in relations with the upper classes in the reign of Domitian. Therefore Vespasian seems to be a worthwhile topic for a biography, and *Vespasian* does its subject full justice. This volume will be an essential addition to the bookshelves of all those interested in the study and teaching of Roman history, and for those with a more casual interest it is thoroughly enjoyable to read.

The Queen's University of Belfast BRIAN CAMPBELL

THE GOVERNOR'S HOUSE

R. HAENSCH: *Capita Provinciarum. Statthaltersitze und Provinzialverwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit.* (Kölner Forschungen 7.) Pp. 863, maps. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp van Zabern, 1997. Cased, DM 228. ISBN: 3-8053-1803-0.

Major Roman finds on German soil have a way of making themselves felt across the empire. After the discovery in the early 1980s of the sanctuary at Osterbürken, containing dozens of votive inscriptions set up by *beneficiarii*, came a comprehensive epigraphic corpus of all the *beneficiarii* inscriptions of the Roman empire, E. Schallmayer et al., *Der römische Weihbezirk von Osterbürken I: Corpus der griechischen und römischen Beneficiarier-Inschriften des römischen Reiches* (Stuttgart, 1990). Haensch's even more imposing volume on provincial capitals has been inspired at least in part by a similar discovery, that of the praetorium of the legate of Germania Inferior beneath the streets of modern Cologne (discussed on pp. 65–73, and at length by H. in *Geschichte in Köln* 33 [1993], 5–40). Nearly nine hundred large and densely packed pages make up an astounding monument of scholarship, which

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

will clearly remain the fundamental treatment of this subject, at least until it is superseded by substantial new epigraphic discoveries. (It was the fate of the *beneficiarii* corpus to be overtaken within a year by the discovery of the largest single known concentration of such inscriptions, at Sirmium in Moesia Superior [M. Mircovic, *Chiron* 24 (1994), 345–404].)

H. addresses two main questions. Did the Roman provinces have designated governors' residences or administrative centres from which their governors (and also other provincial officials) operated? If so, where were they located? The book falls into three sections: a methodological analysis of the evidence; an exhaustive overview of the relevant documentation; and a series of detailed appendices on related questions, notably ones concerning the governors' staff and the evidence for the *conventus* system in Asia. The book also contains large, lemmatized indexes, especially the subject index, which should be consulted as an effective guide to the book's contents.

H. reaches a provisional positive answer to his first question in a well-argued early chapter (pp. 18–36). But this is only the prelude to the main undertaking, an evaluation province by province of the inscriptions and other relevant information. The methodological preference for epigraphic over other forms of evidence, as the primary source of information about Roman provincial administrative practices, is spelled out explicitly on p. 37. However, whereas the ancient literary sources provide more or less direct information on the general problem of governors' residences, the evidence of most of the inscriptions is at best indirect, and thus much more problematic to evaluate; many historians have reservations about preferring it to more explicit forms of evidence. For all the labour and expertise which is lavished on interpreting Roman inscriptions as a source for Roman practices in provincial administration, a case such as this is often an exercise in squeezing information from the evidence which it was not designed to yield. Furthermore, while inscriptions, intelligently interpreted, may be the surest way of working out the system of administration, even H. concedes that our knowledge of what administrative officials actually did derives primarily from literary sources (pp. 133–4, discussing Gallia Lugdunensis).

Although the study's main aim throughout is to establish the location of the residences of provincial governors, the separate sections on each province systematically address related issues, such as the evidence for the residences of procurators, quaestors, and legates, and also deal thoroughly with other aspects of provincial administration, e.g. the provincial *conventus* system and the administration of imperial estates. Each item in the argument and piece of evidence is exhaustively contextualized.

The documentary section is extremely laborious to use. Each entry comprises the classification of one or more items in the hierarchy of evidence, with bibliographical reference(s). The texts themselves are only partially reproduced, supplemented by H.'s often cryptic comments. Footnotes frequently discuss details which have not been flagged in the main text, or which do not affect the main argument. The exposition is thus almost impenetrable (see pp. 648–9 for an example of several notes which are barely relevant to the text).

Many users of the first part of the book will be daunted by its sheer length. H.'s arguments are characterized by extreme scholarly caution, but they are also repetitious. Since the evidence is assessed for each province individually, and since the same categories of evidence appear in many or most provinces, the same arguments for measuring their 'Aussagekraft' are repeated time and again. This approach is a benefit to those who choose simply to consult the book for what it has to say about an individual province, as each of these separate essays can stand more or less on its own.

No doubt specialists will find room to contest some of H.'s inferences and

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

conclusions. His scepticism sometimes appears exaggerated. Strabo 4.3.5 says of Durocortum in Gallia Belgica, ἡ μητρόπολις αὐτῶν Δουρικορτόρα . . . δέχεται τοὺς τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἡγέμονας. For H. this is no proof that Durocortum was the governor's residence, since in Strabo's usage the term ἡγέμων might also denote other leading Romans, in particular members of the imperial family (as the singular clearly does at 3.4.20). He compares Strabo's remarks in 4.3.2 on the Roman mint at Lugdunum, καὶ τὸ νόμισμα χαράττουσιν ἐνταῦθα τό τε ἀργυροῦν καὶ τὸ χρυσοῦν οἱ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἡγέμονες. Since the right to mint especially gold coinage was confined to the emperors, H. infers that they are the subject of the reference in the second passage, and that the full phrase οἱ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἡγέμονες was a way of distinguishing such superior authorities from ordinary Roman governors (pp. 19–20; repeated at p. 130). Two considerations put this dubious argument out of court. First, Strabo elsewhere uses phrases such as οἱ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἡγέμονες unequivocally to denote governors (clear examples are at 12.6.5; 12.3.1; 14.5.6). Secondly, at the time when Strabo wrote there was only one emperor, Augustus, who in a legal sense could authorize the minting of precious metal coin at Lugdunum. Thus the use of the plural in 4.3.2 must refer either to 'Roman authorities' in general or, more probably, to the successive governors of Lugdunensis, who exercised devolved authority as the emperor's legates. His meaning is made still clearer by the fact that in the very next sentence he refers to Augustus in an unambiguous fashion as Καῖσαρ ὁ Σεβαστός.

H.'s discussions, however, are more likely to be overtaken by new evidence than by revisionist judgements. Thus the section on Lycia and Pamphylia was completed without knowledge of the new *stadiasmus* inscription from Patara, which documents the decision of the first governor of the new province in A.D. 45 to measure out the provincial road system from the city, and may also indicate that Lycia was a separate province from Pamphylia at this time. If so, the text is a very strong indication, if not definitive proof, that Patara was its 'Provinzhauptstadt' (*SEG* [1994], 1205). One might in particular look for novelties from Cappadocia, which has barely been explored and is so far sparsely documented, such as the new discoveries from the western region around Tyana (D. H. French, *Epigraphica Anatolica* 28 [1997], 118–19 nos. 4–5) and from the likely provincial capital, Caesarea (M. H. Ballance, *Anatolian Archaeology* 2 [1996], 13; an inscription recording the construction of defensive walls of the *metropolis* under Gordian III by the procurator Ulpius Draco).

The overall conclusions are presented with the same caution as the argument relating to particular provinces (pp. 361–89). Sixty-six provinces are considered in all, but the existence of governors' residences can be taken as established beyond doubt only in thirty-nine cases. In about thirteen of these the residence remained the same throughout the history of the province. This total contrasts with the single instance of Africa Proconsularis, where the residence was certainly transferred from Utica under the Republic to Carthago. In two cases, Arabia and Dacia, H. is tempted to resolve apparent conflicts in the evidence by postulating that their governors' residences were also moved, from Petra to Bostra and from Sarmigethusa to Apulum respectively. There were no fixed rules or criteria by which governors' residences were chosen, although relevant factors can be identified. The local political centre of a province, defined as the place where the provincial council met, was usually but not always identical with the governor's residence, in cases where reliable evidence for both has survived. We may thus safely conclude that there was no imperial policy concerning these issues. H. does not consider one important possibility, which none of his evidence or arguments would exclude, namely that not all provinces contained

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

governors' residences. In some of the cases where none is attested, it is perfectly feasible that none existed.

How important are H.'s conclusions for understanding Roman provincial administration? Despite its length, and the depth of its scholarship, this book will not change received opinion about the basic framework of Roman provincial administration. H. concedes that even when the existence of a governor's residence can be established, it was not necessarily the principal place where a governor's duties were exercised. Establishing the facts about official residences remains less important than working out what was done there. A key function may have been to accommodate permanent archives, which supported the state bureaucracy, a topic no less controversial than the question of governors' residences. As it happens, H. investigated this question in another section of the doctoral dissertation from which *Capita Provinciarum* derives, and published it separately in a masterly article: 'Das Statthalterarchiv', *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Romanistische Abteilung* 109 (1992), 209–317. While the new book will clearly command respect as an indispensable work of reference, the article, a ground-breaking study on a matter of central importance, is required reading for anyone concerned with the theory and practice of Roman provincial administration.

University of Wales Swansea STEPHEN MITCHELL

A PERFECTED MARTYR

E. K. FOWDEN: *The Barbarian Plain. Saint Sergius between Rome and Iran.* Pp. xix + 227, maps, figs. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1999. Cased, $55. ISBN: 0-520-21685-7.

It is a pleasure to accord this study a whole-hearted welcome, a rare occasion when the jacket's publicity is fully justified by the interest and quality of the contents. Sergius, a fourth-century officer martyred at the fort of Resapha (Rusafa), became the focus of international veneration, receiving valuable dedications from not only the imperial pair Justinian and Theodora, but also the Sasanid King Khusro II and one of his Christian wives, Shirin. Sergius also became a saint favoured by the Ghassanids, the client grouping of Arab tribes which protected Rome's eastern frontier for much of the sixth century. At Resapha, there are substantial remains of the fortifications, with elaborately decorated gates, three large intramural churches, various ancillary structures such as cisterns, and an extramural church, which have been investigated by the German Archaeological Institute since 1952. Assemble all this and there is the material for a stimulating and penetrating analysis of historical geography, frontier societies, international relations and religious patronage; this is exactly what Fowden provides.

The first chapter investigates the *Passion* of Sergius and his less famous fellow martyr Bacchus, with preference for a Tetrarchic rather than a Julianic date (pp. 12–16); certainty is impossible, but this is the plausible context since the lack of actual martyrs under Julian was an embarrassment which led to the transformation of casualties such as Artemius, executed for misdemeanours as governor in Egypt, into martyrs. The development of the cult and the spread of images of the saint are also reviewed. The second chapter digresses to consider the development of Martyropolis

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as a parallel for the connections between religious beliefs and frontier defence in the east. Chapter III surveys the geographical importance of Resapha, in terms of defence, trade routes, and the transhumant and sedentary Arab populations of the frontier zones; this also includes a summary of the latest archaeological discoveries and thinking about the ruins at Resapha. The next chapter continues the geographical focus, but this time through consideration of the spread of Sergius' cult to specific areas of Syria and Mesopotamia, including into the Sasanid kingdom; it emerges that Sergius transcended contemporary Christological divisions, receiving attention from Chalcedonians, Monophysites and Nestorians alike. Chapter V investigates the interest in Sergius displayed by men of power, Emperor Anastasius, who obtained a thumb as a relic, Justinian and Theodora, who constructed a church to Sergius and Bacchus in Constantinople (the extant Kuçuk Aya Sofya Çami) and dedicated a bejewelled cross at Resapha, Khusro I, who despoiled the shrine, Khusro II, who returned Justinian's cross which his grandfather had looted and provided other dedications, and the Ghassanid king al-Mundhir, whose name is praised in the extramural structure, which F. plausibly identifies as a church at the site of Sergius' martyrdom. The final chapter continues the story of Sergius' cult after the Islamic conquests, when the shrine may have lost its geopolitical importance but still remained a powerful religious focus. There is much to savour here, whether it be the impact of geographical factors on the distribution of the cult, the power of the saint's name, whose popularity increases dramatically across the three volumes of *PLRE*, the important analysis of the multiple uses to which churches might be put and the resulting tensions between religious and secular powers, or the interaction of churches and mosques in the Ummayad Period.

Slips are rare: the reference to Kavad's capture of Martyropolis in 502 suggests a long siege (p. 57), which contradicts both Procopius and the reasonable reconstructions of the Persian advance from Armenia to Amida in that year; Justinian, not Justin, issued an Aphthartodocetist Edict (p. 83); Theophylact's report of Khusro II's plea to Sergius opens his fifth book, not chapter (p. 136), and the account of the actual gifts occupies 5.13–14: Justin II was blamed for the botched attempt on al-Mundhir's life, not Tiberius (p. 172). F. does not note (p. 136 n. 21) that the traditional hypothesis that Evagrius as well as Theophylact depended on John of Epiphania has been queried (Whitby, *Emperor Maurice*, pp. 244–5); she does not refer to Evagrius' evidence (4.28), which implies that the reliquary of Sergius was one of several silver coffins, presumably all reliquaries, when discussing the location and distribution of the holy remains at the site. The interpretation of the final chapters of Evagrius' *Ecclesiastical History* as concerned with 'important participants in the political life of the frontier zone' (p. 136) seems very dubious; of greater relevance to Evagrius was the involvement in these affairs of his patron, Patriarch Gregory of Antioch, whose contacts with shrines and holy men are highlighted, and the fact that a narrative of dedications, conversions, miracles, and saints allowed him to wind up his whole narrative with the traditional fare of ecclesiastical historiography. A couple of bibliographical omissions might be noted, even if I am the author: 'Notes on Some Justinianic Constructions', *BNJ* 23 (1987), 89–112, at 102–5, briefly discusses the respective involvement of Anastasius and Justinian in the development of the fortress at Resapha; '*Deus nobiscum*: Christianity, Warfare and Morale in Late Antiquity', in M. M. Austin, J. D. Harries, and C. J. Smith (edd.), *Modus Operandi*, *Essays in Honour of Geoffrey Rickman* (London, 1998), pp. 191–208 is relevant to F.'s project of integrating religious belief and military action. Such observations, though, are pernickety or marginal to F.'s main subject, and simply underline the quality and accuracy of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the work overall. Believe the blurb: 'an excellent book . . . hard to exaggerate its importance'.

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

ROMANS AND THEIR BATHS

G. G. FAGAN: *Bathing in Public in the Roman World.* Pp. xiii + 437, figs. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1999. Cased, $57.50. ISBN: 0-472-10819-0.

The focus of this book is on bathing as 'a social event', i.e. 'the people who used the baths and those who provided and maintained them' (p. 11). To draw a representative picture of bathing in Rome, the author collects literary sources (ranging from poetical to technical writings) and archeological findings. F.'s approach differs, then, from the one taken by S. Busch, who, in his recent study, *Versus Balnearum* (Stuttgart, 1999), reviewed in *CR* 50 (2000), 67–8, limited himself to epigrammatic sources.

F. first takes us on 'A Visit to the Baths with Martial' (pp. 12–39), which unfortunately offers little more than a paraphrase of Martial's epigrams. F. has no doubts that they present us 'with a particularly clear window onto the social operation of public baths at Rome in the late first century A.D.', and the possibility of fictionalization in them is quickly brushed aside: 'the effectiveness of his satiric verse rests on reference to the shared cultural and social experiences of its audience' (pp. 13–14). This may be so, but F. does not take into account that the authors of his literary sources may have chosen unusual events as their subject-matter, rather than everyday life. His overall picture of the Roman baths is thus 'one of a noisy, vibrant place, with dinner parties meeting; bathers eating, drinking, and singing; vendors shouting; prostitutes strutting; and thieves prowling' (pp. 38–9)—possibly a distorted view.

Particularly disappointing is F.'s superficial discussion of erotic motifs in bathing literature. He limits himself to the question of male/female mixed bathing and arrives at the conclusion that 'the empire no doubt contained baths to suit the tastes of both the prude and the pervert' (p. 27). Homoerotic bathing experiences are almost entirely ignored in his study, even though this aspect is featured in Martial's epigrams on the baths (cf. H. P. Obermayer, *Martial und der Diskurs über männliche 'Homosexualität' in der Literatur der frühen Kaiserzeit* [Tübingen, 1998], pp. 251–2, reviewed in *CR* 49 [1999], 570–1).

F.'s collection of sources on Roman bathing for his account of 'The Growth of the Bathing Habit' (pp. 40–74) is more useful. I doubt that F. is right to dismiss the opinion that Plautus' remarks on the baths may reflect Greek rather than Roman life simply because 'it would make little sense for him to portray situations completely alien to his audience' (p. 45). But his overall argument that the popularity of bathing grew steadily in the first centuries B.C. and A.D. and that there was 'a more dramatic rise in the bathing habit' in the early empire (p. 74) is well-attested by his sources. F. also examines possible social and medical reasons for this increasing popularity of the baths (pp. 75–84, 85–103).

In general, F. achieves his most convincing results when he works with ancient technical and biographical (rather than poetical) writings, as well as modern archeological studies. He examines various imperial and non-imperial bath benefactions in Rome and Italy (pp. 104–75), and tries to reconstruct the social background of

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

individuals who provided the baths, and the reasons why baths were donated in the first place. F. himself points out that these examinations must remain speculative, but they are nevertheless stimulating.

In his chapter on 'The Physical Environment' of the baths (pp. 176–88), however, F.'s argumentation does not hold water because again he confuses literary depiction with general historical realities. His sources do make clear that the quality of the bathing water was an important issue in Rome, but sources such as Martial's poems on ill people using the baths (12.17, 12.83) or his obscene epigrams on 'perverts' fouling the water (2.42, 2.70, 6.81) need not be unclouded reflections of grim realities. These poems tell us a lot about Martial's sexual invective (cf. Obermayer, op. cit., pp. 220–2), but they do not necessarily provide evidence 'that many of the empire's baths operated in a condition far below even ancient expectations' (p. 188).

The book finishes with an excellent chapter on 'The Bathers' (pp. 189–219). F. argues that all social ranks used the baths including, at times, the emperor and probably even slaves. His careful analysis of mainly historical and inscriptional writings does not suggest that baths therefore functioned as social levellers, but that, on the contrary, 'it seems highly unlikely that members of the elite . . . checked their *dignitas* at the bath door along with their cloaks' (p. 215).

There are useful appendices with the texts and translations of F.'s epigraphic sources (almost half of the book is taken up by appendices, indices, illustrations, and bibliography). The wealth of text material made available by F. contributes greatly to the value of this well-written book. His examinations are often stimulating, even if at times they require a reader who is more cautious than the author.

University of Munich SVEN LORENZ

THE ROMANS

D. S. POTTER, D. J. MATTINGLY (edd.): *Life, Death, and Entertainment in the Roman Empire*. Pp. xiv + 351, 28 figs. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1999. Paper, £12.95. ISBN: 0-472-08568-9 (0-472-10924-3 hbk).

This collection of essays is intended to serve as a coursebook for introductory lecture series on Roman civilization; the essays are concentrated on fundamental aspects of Roman society, and no prior knowledge of antiquity on the reader's part is assumed.

There are seven chapters in all, ranging in length from seventeen to sixty-nine pages and grouped into three sections: 'Social Structures and Demography' (three chapters); 'Religion' (one chapter); and 'Bread and Circuses' (three chapters). There is also an introductory survey of the issues and a helpful note on epigraphic and papyrological sources. The bibliography is, somewhat confusingly, separated into four parts: one for Chapters I–III; one for Chapter IV; one for Chapter V; and one for Chapters VI and VII. They are all grouped at the end of the book, so that the reader has to turn to the beginning of the bibliography in order to work out where the part she needs to consult is situated. This is irritating and unnecessary. The entire bibliographical section amounts to fourteen and a half pages; merging all four sections

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

would not have resulted in an unwieldy list. This is, however, the only feature of this volume which I would consider to be a serious miscalculation.

The first chapter, on 'The Roman Family' by Ann Hanson, covers the composition of the family and the rôles of individual members. H. frequently draws out how family structures operated in the wider social sphere, such as in comedy or in the political self-positioning of Caesar's heir. She includes brief case histories, not only from the familiar lives of Cicero and Pliny, but also from an Egyptian provincial family in the second century A.D. Detailed and absorbing, this is an excellent start to the book. Maud Gleason's contribution, on 'Elite Male Identity in the Roman Empire', is the briefest essay in the volume, but includes discussions of gender, rhetoric, and education, drawing on literary and visual evidence to illustrate her arguments.

The sex life of the ancient Romans is always going to hold more immediate appeal for students than demography, the subject of the third chapter, but Bruce Frier makes the issue an attractive one. The strength of this essay is that F. does not merely introduce demography, but presents this aspect of study as one already charged with arguments and controversies. This gives a direction to his essay, and demonstrates (like the best pieces in this book) that an introductory volume does not need to be bland or passive in its presentation of material.

One of the editors, David Potter, contributes the first of his two essays, on Roman religion, focusing on the extent to which religious activities influenced or organized the Roman conceptualization of space, time, and history. This is another absorbing essay, though perhaps slightly less clear in structure than P.'s second contribution. David Mattingly, the second editor, co-authors the next essay with Greg Aldrete: 'Feeding the City'. They describe the supply system which developed in response to the consumer needs of the city of Rome, and vividly convey the immense manpower required to operate and administer the system.

The final two chapters are devoted to what is called by Potter the 'entertainment industry'. The first, by Hazel Dodge, examines the structure and evolution of buildings devoted to leisure: the theatre, amphitheatre, circus, and baths. The variety of architectural developments and the number of examples cited leads in some places to an obscuring of the main arguments, especially when D. relies on exclusively verbal description. That said, this chapter is well illustrated throughout. Potter returns for the final chapter, which is devoted to the entertainers themselves. The gladiator (a subject of much recent scholarship) is put firmly in perspective here, as P. covers athletics, various types of theatrical performance, and chariot racing in detail.

The book as a whole is entirely successful in its projected aim: an immense range of detailed information about antiquity is presented in readable and largely sophisticated discussion. The introduction locates the market for this book in the educational establishments of North America, but British classicists and ancient historians need not feel that it has no place on their shelves. In the current drive for widening access to university education many of us feel that our target audience should not in the future be confined to those students who have already studied the ancient world at school. Increasingly we need to be able to suggest to our students reading that is introductory but also in-depth and challenging, and this book is one possible reading that we can offer.

University of Bristol ELLEN O'GORMAN

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

KINSHIP DIPLOMACY

C. P. JONES: *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World.* Pp. 193, figs. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1999. Cased, £21.95. ISBN: 0-674-50527-1.

In 1988 Jean Bousquet published an extraordinary inscription from Xanthus in Lycia. Ambassadors from Cytenium in mainland Greece had approached this distant city to raise money for the reconstruction of their own city's walls. The inscription preserves the elaborate mythological arguments used by the Cytenian ambassadors as they sought to demonstrate to the Xanthians that their two peoples were related (*REG* 101, 12–53). That arguments based on kinship, whether mythical or historical, were part of the Greek diplomatic repertoire was no new discovery, but this inscription was a revelation in its detail. Its publication drew attention to the need for a substantial study of the rôle of kinship in ancient diplomacy. Louis Robert had long promised such a book, but only with his death have others dared to trespass on his territory. First there was O. Curty, *Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques* (Geneva, 1995), and the discussions that it provoked (notably from A. Giovannini, S. Hornblower, and E. Will). Now follows Jones's study, S. Lucke's *Syngeneia: epigraphisch-historische Studien zu einem Phänomen der antiken griechischen Dip- lomatie* (Frankfurt, 2000), and my own contribution, *Troy between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power* (Oxford, forthcoming).

J. has written a short, rather dense, book, which incorporates numerous examples of kinship diplomacy within a laconic survey of Greek and Roman history from the time of Homer through to late antiquity. The book is as much about the changing nature of ancient diplomacy as it is about the rôle of kinship in diplomatic exchanges. As political conditions change, so the practices and objectives of diplomacy also change. Thus, argues J., the instability of the Hellenistic world led cities to use diplomacy in the pursuit of self-preservation (pp. 58–63 on the spate of diplomatic activity at the end of the second century B.C. bring out vividly the sense of crisis), whereas in the more stable environment of the Roman empire cities directed their diplomatic activities towards the search for prestige. Diplomacy itself gradually came to lose its importance as power came to be increasingly in the hands of individuals rather than communities. Much of the evidence for the use of kinship in diplomacy stems from the Hellenistic period, declining under the Roman empire, though not disappearing. J. is, however, not only concerned with change; he also explores the way in which kinship is used to establish links with non-Greeks. This is in fact 'one of the main functions of kinship diplomacy' (p. 16), as common ancestry draws in those on the margins of the Greek world, hence the space that J. devotes to the Macedonians, Epirotes, Lycians, Jews, and, of course, the Romans. J. is in danger here of understating the importance of kinship in exchanges between Greeks. Nonetheless, this Greek willingness to embrace such peoples within their kinship networks helps call into question the supposed exclusivity of the Greeks.

J. tends to like brevity; the text is short, the notes concise, the bibliography select. This does not always help clarity. The Trojan ancestry of the Romans is an important theme in the book, but J.'s interpretation of it is at times obscure. Much of Chapter VII seems to assume that Trojan ancestry would have prejudiced the Greeks against the Romans (cf. pp. 84, 86); the absence of any clear explanation for this is frustrating, especially as on p. 88 the prejudice is apparently overcome. In the same chapter the unwary reader might think that Polybius tells us of the Trojan past of Eryx or Segesta

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in Sicily, whereas he has nothing to say of it at all. Chapter VIII offers the intriguing suggestion that Rome reorganized the League of Athena Ilias in the Troad shortly after 188 B.C., but it rests on much less secure foundations than J.'s text implies; there is no evidence, as far as I am aware, that Demetrius of Scepsis asserted that Ilion 'was transformed by the arrival of the Romans'; only the endnote reveals that the date of the rebuilding of the temple of Athena Ilias is disputed, and even here the mention of Augustus could lead a reader to think that any alternative date is later, not earlier; nowhere does J. say that many, including the current excavator, C. B. Rose (who is cited), place it in the third century, in other words before any Roman presence in Asia.

In the introduction J. compares kinship diplomacy to a rainbow, visible in certain conditions. His objective, he writes, is 'not to grasp that rainbow, but to trace its arc in the specific context of Greco-Roman antiquity'. This is one of the problems with the book. It surveys a vast period, but never really gets to grips with what kinship diplomacy was, or, to be more precise, what it meant to the Greeks. Why did the Greeks use such arguments? How effective did they expect them to be? Were they even intended to persuade at all? Although J. promises to deal with questions such as these (p. 2), they seem to be postponed until the conclusion and then are only treated in fairly cursory way. J. does an impressive job of tracing the rainbow, but he still left me wondering what it was doing there.

University College Dublin ANDREW ERSKINE

TABLE MATTERS

I. NIELSEN, H. SIGISMUND NIELSEN (edd.): *Meals in a Social Context: Aspects of the Communal Meal in the Hellenistic and Roman World.* (Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity 1.) Pp. 245, 55 figs, 2 tables, 1 map. Aarhus, Oxford, and Oakville, CT: Aarhus University Press, 1998. Cased, £24.95. ISBN: 87-7288-697-8.

Meals in a Social Context originated as a conference held in Denmark in 1995, which was designed to explore 'the communal meal as a reflection of religion and society in the Hellenistic and Roman world'. A number of themes recur over several contributions to underline the importance of communal dining for defining social groups and for articulating social relations and cultural values in various historical settings. Given the scope of the subject, the volume cannot treat all relevant topics. The editors outline (p. 10) some issues that had to be overlooked: ritual meals in connection with 'pagan' Greek and Roman cults, communal dining in urban associations, commemorative meals among Jews and Christians, and archaeological evidence for funerary banquets. It is, therefore, something of a luxury to have an essay on 'Salt, Fish, and the Sea in the Roman Empire' by Peter Ørsted (pp. 13–35), since it is difficult to see how this contribution throws light on the focal point of the volume: meals in their social context. This criticism cannot be levelled at the remaining nine chapters. Keith Bradley and Hanne Sigismund Nielsen both discuss the degree to which family dinners contributed towards the definition of the nuclear family as a social unit. Bradley's well-documented and nuanced chapter (pp. 36–55) argues that the Roman élite dinner was not primarily designed to bring members of the nuclear family together or to socialize children; it was much more important as an occasion for the host to advertise his status and cement his social connections.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Wives and children sometimes took part, but the fact that they usually sat rather than reclined marked out their subordinate status spatially and symbolically. Although it is possible that our sources ignore more routine family meals, Bradley makes a persuasive case for élite dinners as spectacles of social display. Sigismund Nielsen's much briefer treatment of dining among social groups below the élite (pp. 56–66) is less convincing. She argues that meals did not play any rôle in defining the nuclear family because below the élite it was not important as a social unit. She uses as evidence tombstones from Isola Sacra, the necropolis of Portus near Rome, which suggest that the social bonds between slaves and their owners, freedmen and their former masters, and patrons and clients were much more important than those between close kin. But port-cities such as Portus, with their distinctive local economies and social composition, were hardly the norm and so cannot be used as evidence for Roman family structures across the entire Roman world. Hugh Lindsay surveys literary evidence for Roman funerary banquets (pp. 67–80). In the space allowed, it is difficult to do justice to the complexity of the material, noticeable particularly in the very brief discussion of 'low-status celebrations' in funerary *collegia*.

The archaeological evidence for Hellenistic and Roman dining is the focus of authoritative contributions by Katherine Dunbabin (pp. 81–101) and Inge Nielsen (pp. 102–33). Dunbabin demonstrates how the shape of dining rooms changed considerably from the egalitarian Greek *andrones* of the Classical period to the more hierarchical dining spaces of the Hellenistic period, that were in turn taken over by the Romans for their *triclinia* in the Republican period, and then exported back to the Greek world in the imperial period, which resulted in the elimination of earlier forms of Greek domestic dining architecture by the second century A.D. Honest enough to admit that the lack of evidence for Greek houses of *c*. 100 B.C. to A.D. 100 does not allow a precise chronology of the changes to be established, Dunbabin has produced a subtle and stimulating account. Her aim is not simply to describe domestic dining spaces, but to infer from their remains the likeliest forms of social behaviour that gave rise to, and animated, them. This discussion whets the appetite for her much fuller treatment of Roman dining now in preparation, and makes a useful contribution to the debate on cultural interaction between the Greek and Roman worlds. Inge Nielsen discusses dining spaces in Hellenistic royal palaces (pp. 102–33), and makes an interesting distinction between those monarchies, such as the Macedonian or Pergamene, that were inspired from Greek notions of monarchy and more autocratic dynasties, such as the Seleucids, Ptolemies, and Hasmoneans, who developed more 'oriental' notions of kingship. The former preferred the squarer, more communal form of the Greek *andron*, while the latter developed larger, more ceremonial spaces that emphasized the elevated status of the king.

The remaining papers address how Jewish and early Christian communities regulated communal meals. David Noy's analysis of Rabbinic sources throws considerable light on Jewish meals in the Roman world (pp. 134–44). He demonstrates not only that diaspora Jews were less exclusive than Christians in their dining practices (and much less exclusive than Tacitus and Philostratus would have us believe), but also that some Jewish intellectuals shared a number of dining practices, and even occasional meals, with élite non-Jews. By contrast, Per Bilde's study of the dining practices of the Essenes at Qumran (pp. 145–66) shows how this heterodox sect—unlike the majority of Jews—invested each meal with religious significance and restricted access to full members of the Essene community, who upheld a Zadokite interpretation of Torah at a time when the Temple was under the control of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hasmonean high priests. An example of a Christian community gradually developing a distinct, and more sacral, tradition of commensality (the Eucharist) is evoked in Geert Hallbäck's analysis of Paul's discussion of dining practices among the early Christians at Corinth (pp. 167–76). The theme is developed in L. Michael White's analysis of the manner in which Christian communities came to mark themselves off culturally and ritually from the Jews in their dining practices (pp. 177–205). The Eucharist developed as a ritualized meal of key sacral and social significance: sacral in that it evolved into the central Christian liturgy; social in that participation was restricted to, and hence defined, the Christian community. Dining for simply social purposes, though useful earlier for integrating Jews and Gentiles into the new Christian communities, became less important and was eventually removed from Christian buildings. For diaspora Jews, however, communal dining never assumed a liturgical function, remaining an important social ritual often practised inside the synagogue, as the dining facilities discovered at synagogues at Stobi, Dura-Europus, and Ostia would suggest.

These essays elucidate some important aspects of communal dining in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds. Greeks, Romans, Jews, and Christians shared more dining practices than has often been assumed, but communal meals did help to define social, cultural, and religious groups. Their organization, function, and architectural setting evolved over time, reflecting political, social, and religious changes. By no means all aspects of this rich subject have been exhausted; one would like to see more work, for instance, on public banquets in the Roman world. But this volume, despite its occasionally uneven quality, is valuable not least for bringing together material from parts of the Mediterranean world that have all too often been kept apart by artificial disciplinary boundaries between Classical, Judaic, and Early Christian Studies.

York University, Toronto J. C. EDMONDSON

REASSURING THE PATRIARCHY

A. O. Koloski-Ostrow, C. L. Lyons (edd.): *Naked Truths: Women, Sexuality and Gender in Classical Art and Archaeology.* Pp. xv + 315. London: Routledge 1997. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-415-15995-4.

D. Larmour, P. Miller, C. Platter (edd.): *Rethinking Sexuality: Foucault and Classical Antiquity.* Pp. 258. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998. Paper, $18.95. ISBN: 0-691-01679-8.

S. Deacy, K. F. Pierce (edd.): *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds.* Pp. x + 274. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co. (with The Classical Press of Wales), 1997. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-7156-2754-6.

The three collections here under review of essays on ancient sexuality and gender are rather different in subject-matter, materials, and tone. Due to restrictions of space, I will not name-check all thirty-four papers, but characterize, draw out notable contributions, and respond to issues raised.

The essays in *Naked Truths* focus on the art (and archaeology) of Greece (and Rome); there is a long bibliography and useful index and glossary. I found less theory

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and theoretical language than in other work on art and gender, and plenty of grouping and categorizing and argument about *what was*; however, there was in many essays a simplistic characterization of the patriarchy and its dominance over images, the occasional (and largely token) acknowledgement of (often putative) resistance to it, and a peculiar kind of sentimental sympathy for its victims which seemed unproductive.

Reilly says Greek 'dolls' were not toys but votives relating to *menarche*—I was unconvinced. Cohen's excellent study of the baring of the female breast in images seems a very useful starting-point for the potentially rewarding study of (female) dress and undress in ancient images. Younger says the child folding the cloth on the East frieze of the Parthenon is a boy, that 'it is a miracle' that the girl—'superfluous', 'poignant', 'lost, alone'—balancing him on the other side is there at all and that here and elsewhere the frieze evokes the educative elements of Greek Love; I found these points respectively cogent, wistful, and wistful. Ajootian looks at images of hermaphrodites; some are defenders against the Evil Eye in baths and gymnasia, places where people were vulnerable; sleeping hermaphrodites are voyeuristic, a surprising variant of sleeping women; the first point was partly convincing, the latter very. Bonfante relates the occurrence or non-occurrence in different regions of nursing mothers in classical art to the continuing presence of fertility-/mother-goddess religions on the one hand and fear of female nakedness on the other. Snyder, Bernal, Salomon, and Koloski-Ostrow demonstrate respectively how images of Sappho (as silent), Clytaemnestra (as bloody and unnatural but ultimately defeated), Cnidian Aphrodite (as abashed), and a whole variety of Pompeian frescos in a whole variety of ways reassure the patriarchy. Even if these conclusions were repetitive, the contributors collect, nevertheless, a lot of interesting material and bibliography on women and their images in antiquity. The critical question, of course, is to what extent predictable conclusions have been arrived at by collecting only predictable materials and reading them only in predictable ways. The question that goes largely begging is why the patriarchy needed such continual reassurance.

Kampen in the final summary essay notes that what 'emerges' is 'the complexity of the process by which men and women were inserted into a social order', both in the multiplicity of ways that social identities are constructed and reproduced in gendered bodies, and in the 'problematic relationship of images and social practices'. This was not my impression. Almost all the 'complexity' of this collection seems due to difficulties of interpretation in the modern world, not to any sensitivity to complexity in the ancient world. Kampen's own subsequent diversion, however, towards the question of monarchy and desirability—an intriguing idea well worth pursuing further—was an unexpected compensation.

If the value of *Naked Truths* lay, above all, in the material it collected, *Rape in Antiquity* is useful simply for drawing attention to a neglected issue. I was struck by a number of points, above all the contrast between the plentiful images of rape in myth (a very thoughtful paper by Deacy on Athena and the vulnerability of goddesses, a highly suggestive essay by Arieti on the creative function of rape in Livy's early Rome) and the absence of evidence for actual rapes. (1) Is this a reflection of a diffidence in recognizing rape as a category? Harrison concludes his clear and thoughtful paper on Herodotus with a question: '. . . was all sex rape, or was there no such thing at all?' Yet, as he points out, the Greeks were capable of distinguishing between willing and forced intercourse, as debates over Helen's culpability demonstrate. (2) Was rape (of free women by men other than their husbands) less common then? Pierce in her useful study of New Comedy notes that the way the slave Onesimos mentions Pamphile's

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

rape in *Epitrepontes* makes it sound a not uncommon event. I would add that the vulnerability of the girls at the Tauropolia is extraordinary and implies that rape was not a great anxiety. The Greeks may or may not have considered *moicheia* a worse crime, but their apparent lack of concern about rape compared with *moicheia* certainly seems to indicate that rape was considered, in some way, less of a danger. This could be a question of opportunity; women were less likely to be alone. Mycerinus' wife was said to have cut off the hands of the servants who failed to prevent her husband raping her daughter, while in *Epitrepontes*, Pamphile is raped when she wanders away from all the other women. On another level did Greek emphasis on masculine self-control, the representation of lust as animal, make Greek men think of rape as a weak, bestial, slavish, even effeminate act? To what extent is the satyr alter-ego or quite Other?

(3) Some further points about this scene. Habrotonon describes Pamphile afterwards running in evident disarray to where she and the other girls, presumably, are gathered; she makes no complaint when she gets home, but neither does she automatically ruin her reputation. Habrotonon and the others were discreet; it is the pregnancy which caused problems. And how would ancient rape be investigated and dealt with (a) if the rapist was known to the girl, and (b) if the rapist was a stranger? (4) Are cultural constructions of bodily integrity important? Saunders, in an excellent essay, with some extraordinary, from a classical perspective, material on Chaucer and rape in medieval thinking, underlines the extreme Christian emphasis on chastity. Sissa's work on Greek virginity has not been universally accepted, but she does demonstrate that the Greeks were not preoccupied with the rupture of the hymen. What of pregnancy, then? To what extent does pregnancy imply culpability in ancient Greece? (5) Finally, why is there so little reference to rape in warfare? The citizens of the invaded territory would surely have noticed and minded. Why is there so much emphasis on barbarians committing this crime? Why do the phallocratic Greeks not boast more about the number of enemy women they have raped, the populations they have diluted? (An interesting essay by Ogden on protection of bloodlines is more concerned with legitimacy than genetic imperialism.)

As should be clear from these questions, *Rape in Antiquity* seems premature, and each contributor is forced to wrestle with the critical question of definition independently—should arranged marriages (cf. Hopwood) be included? There is much work to be done on the cultural construction of volition, violation, permission, and personhood as well as on the basic terminology of rape and its epistemology before the next collection, but the editors and organizers of this conference have demonstrated that there is an issue here, however much it is obscured or shrouded in Greek society and/or by its text-makers; simply drawing attention to ancient rape and its silences is an achievement.

Rethinking Sexuality is on another level altogether. The contributions are uniformly well-grounded and clearly thought out; both editors (an excellent introduction, 'situating' ancient Foucault) and contributors have risen to the occasion. The introduction is followed by two further attempts at situating Foucault, as anti-psychoanalytic and (in some way) anti-sex (Black, to me the most useful paper), as a thinker thinking himself as an exercise, I think (Vizier). The other papers make familiar charges about Foucault's errors: that his picture of antiquity is unbalanced; in particular, that he neglects women as subjects and objects (Richlin ostensibly self-examining her hostility to Foucault but ultimately unforgiving; Foxhall, supplementing and modifying the notion of penetration-anxiety by adding in the *oikos*; DuBois reluctantly but graciously acknowledging his inspiration), that he omitted useful texts (*Satyricon*, says McGlathery, Catullus, says Miller) and was not subtle

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

enough in reading the ones he included (Carnes on *Symposium*). Since in his earlier work Foucault had conspicuously drawn attention to history's most marginal characters and historiography's neglected themes and texts, and since he was perfectly capable of producing complex and nuanced readings, he had earned a little credit, I think, and the contributors should have shown a little more humility in thinking about what Foucault's project was exactly, if not 'a balanced overview of ancient sexuality through nuanced readings of a wide variety of often complex texts', which is implicitly what they assume it was and what it most clearly was not. Foucault was an 'archaeologist', not a 'new historicist'.

There is no reason, of course, why criticisms of Foucault's work can be made only in terms of Foucault's own project. Foucault's antiquity is two strata, each characterized as uniform enough to distinguish them starkly enough from other, higher levels, in his enormous and ambitious and, all in all, complex sexual archaeology of the Western Subject. The antiquity of classicists is an ancient *world*, and sexuality, even subjectivity, is just one part of that complex world, or one particular way of viewing it. However, most of the contributors buy into the notion of antiquity as distinct, alien, and culturally constructed, even as dominated by an active–passive polarity without giving Foucault credit for trying to explain the power of that construction, and without wondering how their criticisms of him might be undermining their own platforms. Foucault did not take these ancient strata for granted, and studied them in formation. For classicists, unavoidably, the ancient world, no matter how much they acknowledge that it is culturally constructed, is ready-formed. They are for the most part students of squash and connoisseurs of angle and bounce. Foucault, in his study of antiquity at any rate, was a surveyor of squash courts, attempting to show how economics and dietetics, erotics, and sexual acts come together and align forces in the biopticon of the passive/active, ethically negative/ethically positive, ancient object/subject. His history was essentially imbalanced and reductive, attempting to identify the most important modes of problematization, the net effects of constructing forces and the most targeted site for the production of the most productive branch in the genealogy of the Western Subject, a site occupied by the citizen male. Texts formed part of the 'apparatus', reflected the apparatus, or avoided its embarrassing problems in revealing ways, but it was the apparatus, not its particular texts, that Foucault was interested in. His texts are as generic as the texts on madness, grammar, prisons, handwriting, etc. he had used in his earlier work. The ancient *dispositif* is broader than some of the modern knowledge regimes, but it is by no means boundless.

As I have argued elsewhere, I think this emphasis on ancient or at least classical Greek sex as dividing sexual participants into active and passive winners and losers is not only incompatible with the ethic of *enkrateia*, but misplaced altogether, and it is a great shame that Foucault, overly impressed by the experts, wasted time on it. It is not something texts talk about, and it was discovered by reading through Greek reticence, impelled in Dover's case, at least, by a very modern campaign against sexual hypocrisy, and founded above all on predictable, universalizing, even sociobiological readings of sexual images, and the notion that, in Foucault's words, 'the Greeks show more than they tell'. (Black, in particular, should have asked, in default of psychoanalysis and confession, what kind of will to truth produced so much modern certainty about ancient sexual acts). The philosophy of self-control produced a very different sexual ethic, which at the very least de-emphasized the modern 'Don Juan' kind of macho sexual structure, and perhaps made it more-or-less unthinkable. On the field of interpersonal, including sexual, relations, I would argue that the awkward distinction between commodity exchange and gift exchange provides a much better account of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the production of both objects and of autonomous subjects, that the notion of autonomy links interpersonal ethics to *enkrateia*, but that anxiety about not turning into a commodity is reinforced not only by a powerful alignment of hidden discourses and (inferred) symbolic practices, but through explicit practices (discursive and non-discursive), explicitly subsidized by, among many other things, law and status-structure. If there is difficulty in distinguishing these two modes of exchange, that is because they can be hard to distinguish, especially when one kind of transaction is defined precisely by its specificity, not because the 'real' problem lies elsewhere. Timarchus' problem, then, is not the inferred problem of sexual passivity, but the explicit problem of prostitution, and Aeschines does not mitigate but reinforces the image of loss of autonomy, even of Timarchus' objectification, by referring to his sexual 'conquests' of aulos-girls, hetaeras, and other men's wives.

I am unimpressed, therefore, when classicists juxtapose ancient texts with a rigid sexual system of active/passive, winners/losers, subject/object, and discover 'complexity'. Using the wrong question to interrogate ancient literature is bound to produce knots and much of the apparent sophistication of the post-Foucauldians' ancient world comes from an attempt to find space for negotiation with the non-negotiable zero-sum zone. Already we have a discourse manifested in texts, a discourse of +/– protocols, hidden by but implicit in those texts, a discourse where these protocols are played with and a further level, 'the real world' (often merely postulated), where protocols are inverted or even ignored. How can a culture maintain so many levels in discourse and practice necessarily separate enough not to cancel each other out? More importantly, how can we be so confident of discerning them, ultimately through the same texts? Where do we find the happy pathic? Where is he happy?

Although I think it is true that Foucault put the problematization of sex-acts at the heart of his work on the ancient Subject, he did not invent the zero-sum model and it is, if anything, even more prominent in the work of feminist scholars and theorists such as Dworkin, MacKinnon, Keuls, and indeed Richlin. Woman as the phallocracy's unproblematic loser is as much a problem for feminism (or a certain variety of feminism) as it is for Foucault, and it is by no means clear how a wistful sympathy for or longing for ancient woman, 'superfluous', 'poignant', 'lost, alone', gives her more dignity than her omission, especially if, as I would argue, she is an unproblematic eternal loser only for (of) modern scholarship.

Naked Truths is the most useful, *Rape in Antiquity* the most important of these collections. *Rethinking Sexuality* is by far the most thoughtful and intelligent, but the contributors need to ask how brick walls can be constructed out of bouncing balls, or to elucidate further how antiquity produced and maintained enough separate realities to allow modern scholars to indulge themselves in the strange economics of having one's cake and eating it.

Birkbeck College JAMES DAVIDSON

METAMORPHOSES

D. MONTSERRAT (ed.): *Changing Bodies, Changing Meanings. Studies on the Human Body in Antiquity.* Pp. xvi + 234. London and New York: Routledge, 1997. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-415-13584-2.

This collection of articles has as its central theme attitudes towards the body in antiquity and, as such, it is a welcome addition to the growing literature on the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

subject. Herein the interpretation of the 'body' covers a number of meanings and signs: physical, physiological, and metaphorical. While methodologies vary there is an overarching approach in the treatment of the body as a historiographical category, as both a lived-in entity and a vehicle for the expression of socio-cultural values. The difficulties of studying the body, the dangers of essentialism, and the creation of assumed similarities between the emotional and physical conditions of peoples across time and cultures are avoided. The chronological range of the papers is very wide but the links between articles are carefully constructed to produce a coherent and provocative volume. It proceeds with chronologically and thematically grouped papers.

Part I: Perfect Bodies and Imperfect Bodies: Nicholas Vlahogiannis, 'Disabling Bodies'; Richard Hawley, 'The Dynamics of Beauty in Classical Greece'. V. and H. discuss the different effects of the physical perception of the body and the cultural values that accrue to models of either disability or physical beauty. V. notes the ambiguous attitudes of the ancients to disabled individuals: they may be outcasts or considered gifted by the gods. The diverse meanings attached to disability, such as a punishment sent by the gods, or comic in the world of the gods themselves, have implications for the value of the physical body in society and the place and reaction to the disabled by any community. H., on the other hand, considers perceptions of the physical body in ancient Greece, and how writers, to reinforce social distinctions, use this idea of beauty, particularly female beauty. In two case studies, Euripides' *Medea* and *Electra*, he illustrates the way beauty and the manipulation of feminine appearance conjure up a whole series of reactions in an audience. For instance, in *Electra*, physical beauty and the rejection of it are fundamental to understanding the characterization of Clytemnestra and Electra. The use of beauty and feminine 'tricks' by Clytemnestra contrasts with the poverty and baseness of Electra's life—implications of how women were perceived, partly as beautiful but also full of artifice.

Part II: Bodies and Signs in Latin Literature: Angus Bowie, '*Exuvias effigiemque*: Dido, Aeneas and the Body as Sign'; Penelope Murray, 'Bodies in Flux: Ovid's *Metamorphoses*'. B. concentrates on a reading of Virgil's use of body and physical metaphor in the story of Dido and Aeneas. This suggests an impressive re-reading of *Aeneid* 4 focusing on the physical responses of Dido. B. stresses the uncertainty of the text, our inability to take a position on either Dido's belief in her marriage or Aeneas' denial of it. Following the use of bodily metaphor through the text this produces a more open, and more sympathetic, reading of Virgil than many modern texts. M. concentrates not on the physical transformations but on the mental anguish of those who are transformed in Ovid's text: the human knows that he/she has been trapped inside a body that is not his/her own and suffers from the treatment/condition of that body. It is not that Io is transformed into a cow but that her bodily shape is now a cow, within which Io with all her human feeling still exists. Those transformed retain human consciousness so that the awfulness of their situation is made apparent to themselves and to the reader. The point here is that, unlike other transformation stories in the ancient world (e.g. Circe, Plato's), the human body is central to human identity.

Part III: Modifying the Early Christian Body: Gillian Clark 'Bodies and Blood: Late Antique Debate on Martyrdom, Virginity and the Resurrection'; Terry Wilfong, 'Reading the Disjointed Body in Coptic: from Physical Modification to Textual Fragmentation'. Early Christianity was much predicated on the body, and here C. has laid out some of the paradoxes that appear in the attitudes to the physical self that appear in some of the early Christian texts. Martyrdom certainly presented a

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

permanent transformation of the body, but where it was viewed by traditional Romans as degradation, it was a very visible and public triumph to the Christians. For them, the mutilated body was transformed into a body of spiritual power that existed after death in the form of relics. W. examines Coptic texts for interpretations of first actual physical modifications of the body, and then the use and fragmentation of these by the authors of the texts. Women seem to suffer particularly from this 'disjointedness' in Coptic texts—being referred to by body parts in comparison to the whole male body. Interesting particularly is the fragmentation of the body of the Virgin Mary.

Part IV: The Ancient Body's Trajectory Through Time: Lynn Meskell, 'The Irresistible Body and the Seduction of Archaeology'; Dominic Monserrat, 'Unidentified Human Remains: Mummies and the Erotics of Biography'; Jane Stevenson, 'Nacktleben'. M. presents by far the most theoretical chapter, questioning the approaches of archaeologists to the body and the assumptions they make about it—the buying in of fairly unreconstructed social and anthropological theories, and a failure to advance them as scholars in those disciplines are doing. She questions the whole nature of the binary opposition that is so pervasive in 'body literature'. This is the most stimulating of the pieces and comes as a shock in the reading, which has so far developed thematically and chronologically. L.M. offers a good summary of the state of play to 1997, and is hopeful that things have moved on. She argues that the body has been appropriated by academic conceptualizations and the discourse of power, and discusses the seductiveness of Foucault's model of the body/power relations. This is very densely written, and most coherent when discussing, tantalizingly briefly, her own research and that of Sarah Tarlow in Orkney. D.M. discusses late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century reading of mummies, and stresses the desire to create biographies for the anonymous bodies, particularly as objects of erotic interest. The particular characteristics of the Romano-Egyptian mummy portraits played into late nineteenth-century cultural assumptions of Greek beauty. Coupled with an eroticization of perceived orientalism, the mummies were transformed into sexual objects and arenas for a discourse on sexuality. S. examines the interpretation of Greek nudity by late Victorian and Edwardian England, and its tension with more traditional Victorian attitudes to nudity. This is a serious chapter, but is shot through with amusing examples of Victorian reaction to nakedness, e.g. the eighteen foot high nude statue of Achilles paid for by subscription from the ladies of England which scandalized contemporaries. The obsession among many intellectuals of the nineteenth century with the young male body and its framing in a 'Hellenized' discourse results in many amusing examples, but also serves to remind us that the body, and its implications for the construction of self, is ever open to interpretation, and every culture's reading of it is open to reinterpretation by those of later times—a salutary end to the volume.

University of Birmingham MARY HARLOW

SEXUAL EDUCATION

I. STAHLMANN: *Der gefesselte Sexus. Weibliche Keuschheit und Askese im Westen des römischen Reiches*. Pp. 242. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1997. ISBN: 3-05-0029995-1.

'Die Ablehnung der Lust <hat> die abendländische Geschichte weit nachhaltiger geprägt als der Hedonismus.' Ines Stahlmann opens her book on female chastity and

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

asceticism with this quote, taken, as it were, from a book on Epicurus. While one might debate the relevance of asceticism in the history of the Western world, the author definitely has a point as far as recent scholarly writing is concerned—it seems an inexhaustible topic, and rightly so.

S.'s principal contribution to the scholarly discussion of chastity, asceticism, and its practices is her investigation of the cultural and in particular legal notions of female chastity in the Western part of the Roman Empire from Augustus to Constantine. In so doing, she seeks to elucidate those aspects of the Roman imperial 'mentality' that prepared and thus made possible the fundamental shift from female chastity as a behavioral norm, demanded by society, to asceticism as an ideal life, fulfilling the aspirations of the individual (p. 11). Here, according to S., two interrelated shifts were fundamental: first, the transfer of power and moral authority from central persons, the *patres familias*, to a more centralized institution, i.e. the 'state'. Augustus' legislation on marriage and adultery with its clear implication of 'inner-family' intervention is the pre-eminent manifestation of this first step. The thus diminished *patria potestas* resulted in the second shift, a changing perception of the nature of women. During the heyday of *patria potestas* women were firmly under the control and hence entirely the responsibility of the head of the household. As a consequence, women were considered weak (*infirmitas sexus*) and frivolous (*levitas animi*), characteristics that denied the existence of any individual agency and therefore responsibility for one's actions. Laws and norms regarding chastity sought to counteract these failings, but were imposed and enforced within the family (pp. 29–35). The transfer of legal and moral control from a person to a legislative organ, i.e. the process of institutionalization that characterizes, according to S., the shift from republic to empire, was by necessity accompanied by a process of individuation, by which S. understands primarily the internalization of previously externally enforced norms and laws. This affected men as well as women, but in the latter case it led to a reconceptualization of female nature: where previously weak and frivolous women needed to be controlled, they now could be educated.

For S., this shift from woman understood essentially as an object without will and hence responsibility to woman as an object of education represents the decisive move in the preparation of Rome for Christian asceticism. This is so because, first, to be susceptible to intellectual and educational formation requires agency, i.e. will as well as the capacity to be responsible. Secondly, education is predicated on a process of internalization, and this internalization of the norms of chaste behavior provided fertile soil for the seed of an essentially anti-Roman concept, lifelong continence and, most importantly, the rejection of the quintessential Roman female rôle, that of a matron, a wife, and mother. Without Pygmalion no Melania.

S. traces the shifts outlined above through a detailed analysis of Roman legal texts, accompanied and augmented by literary, medical, and epigraphic sources. In my opinion, the first part of her book is by far the strongest (pp. 29–141); it offers compelling reading and welcome additions to much that has been said on the notion of female chastity, and dovetails in many fascinating ways with other recent works covering the same period, in particular Judith Perkins's *Suffering Self* (London, 1995). Once S. moves towards the second part of her book, however, dealing with Christian asceticism, her work is considerably weaker, due in large part to the fact that her secondary material derived almost exclusively from the 'binnenchristlichen Perspektive . . ., die für historische Fragen nicht befriedigen kann' (p. 16). In other words, in the body of her work almost none of the relevant, primarily anglophone scholarship on the subject published since 1990 has been consulted, with the exception

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Peter Brown, including, startlingly, Elisabeth Clark's seminal works on the topic. This is a pity, because it deprives S.'s second part of much of the sophistication that could have highlighted her many fascinating insights, gleaned from a careful reading of primary sources. Thus, her readings of Tertullian, Cyprian, and Novatian emphasize the degree to which their respective notions of chastity and virginity remained quintessentially Roman, i.e. gradually move from being something enforced externally to something susceptible to education. The final move towards complete internalization did not occur, so S. argues, until the fourth century, and was, to read between her lines, another one of those presents offered by the Greeks.

Regardless of its weaknesses, though, *Der gefesselte Sexus* is a book well worth reading. Written by someone with obviously excellent training in the social history of the early Roman Empire, it offers welcome insights and substantiates with a wealth of material its claim to both continuity and change in the perception of virginity and chastity from Augustus to Augustine.

University of California at Berkeley SUSANNA ELM

POMPEII

P. ZANKER: *Pompeii: Public and Private Life* (first published in German, 1995; trans. by D. L. Schneider). Pp. ix + 251, figs, pls. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1998. Paper, £14.50. ISBN: 0-694-68967-4.

The fate of Pompeii, however tragic, affords a unique opportunity to study an urban society cut short by the events of A.D. 79. Here we can see the urban fabric as it had evolved over the centuries; there the tastes and lifestyles of an urban population. Such studies are not without their problems, given the date at which so much of Pompeii was excavated and the nature of the published record, but none of this detracts from the site's potential as a working laboratory where new insights are constantly being gleaned by successive generations of scholars. These insights are all the more interesting because we can combine the tools of the historian and the archaeologist, in order to explore issues and ideas which might otherwise be less sharply focused from either side of the disciplinary fence. Paul Zanker's book is one attempt to go beyond the obvious bricks and mortar, to produce a larger picture, in line with the increasingly rich literature of the last twenty years.

Essentially this is the English version of a book first published in Italian in 1993 and then in German in 1995, which was based on two core articles, one on the successive urban landscapes of Pompeii which was written in 1988, the other on late Pompeian domestic taste which appeared in 1979. These were prefaced by an introductory essay, written in 1993, which clearly sought to provide the necessary cohesion for a monograph format. The whole is richly supported by some 129 illustrations (sixteen in colour), together with an extensive set of reference notes designed to direct the reader to more recent writings and alternative ideas and interpretations.

Axiomatic to the introduction is the belief that the organization of space within a city must be studied in relation to the society which produced it, 'drawing connections between the use of space and residents' particular lives, habits and needs'. This paves

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the way for an examination of the different 'townscapes' which the inhabitants produced over time, and for a discussion of those townscapes within the wider context of both the Greek and the Hellenistic city, and that of the later empire. It also paves the way for an assessment of 'domestic taste and cultural self-definition', with specific reference to the way in which villa culture, with its overtones of Greek lifestyle, was increasingly incorporated within and adapted to the needs of private homes; again recent work on houses and internal decoration is provided to anchor the debate in a wider context. Written as it was last in the sequence, this chapter allows Z. to update his ideas and to provide a contextual and theoretical framework which is both lucid and stimulating. The chapters which follow provide the original exegesis of the ideas with appropriate examples and illustrations.

First comes a chapter on 'urban space as a reflection of society', wherein the author seeks to identify four successive townscapes. Thus we are introduced to the Hellenistic city of the Oscans, with its opulent private houses, theatre quarter, baths, and developing forum; the city of the Roman colonists, exuding confidence in its new public buildings and temples, and in the houses and tombs of its leading families; the townscape of the Augustan era, with its ubiquitous imperial structures and monuments (especially around the forum), so obviously influenced by the climate of religious and cultural renewal; and last but not least, the changing landscape of the city's final years, with many of the core public buildings around the forum in ruins and the rise of the nouveax riches in their urban houses. All are splendidly reconstructed from the evidence with a beguiling sense of authenticity and clarity, but anyone who steps back will realize that things are never so simple nor straightforward; Z. himself admits that he is now less certain of the last phase after the earthquake—surely the 'townscape' which should be at its clearest?—so we must be cautious about the apparent clarity of the earlier phases. Much, no doubt, will also need revision as the results from the Forum project and elsewhere are published.

The second core chapter is focused on the 'Domestic Arts in Pompeii'. At its heart lies a study of the *villa urbana* as the embodiment of the adoption of Greek culture by the upper class in the late republic, and its progressive imitation and adaptation within the townscapes of Pompeii. The thesis is admirably worked through in a series of rich examples, including the 'miniature villa in the town' (represented by the House of Octavius Quartio), the 'garden full of sculptures' (House of Marcus Lucretius), and houses with 'large pictures for small dreams' (House of Romulus and Remus). These set the scene for a discussion of the way in which the values associated with the villa penetrated beyond the lifestyles of the rich to other levels of society and to the most modest of Pompeian houses. Interesting questions are thereby raised as to how material expressions of wealth can be studied to provide insights into how people created and moulded their status and cultural identity. Much of this clearly coincides with recent archaeological concerns about material culture and identity, where the complexity of such issues has become abundantly clear. In some ways this chapter has stood the test of time less well since its conception, but here as elsewhere cross-reference to the introduction and the footnotes helps direct the reader to more recent work and to updated commentaries.

This is a fascinating little book which heralds much that is now at the heart of modern debate. It is well written and illustrated, full of ideas and insights. No doubt much is overpainted in bold and strident colours, larger than life by comparison with the reality; no doubt, too, many of the details need greater clarification and caution, but for a comparable set of essays which seek the greater vision and the larger

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

picture—unfettered by the often boring factual detail—the reader will have a long way to look.

University of Wales Lampeter BARRY C. BURNHAM

WOMEN IN EGYPT

J. ROWLANDSON (ed.): *Women and Society in Greek and Roman Egypt: A Sourcebook*. Pp. xviii + 406, 49 pls, 7 figs, 3 maps. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Paper, £16.95 (Cased, £45). ISBN: 0-521-58815-4 (0-521-58212-1 hbk).

There was not long ago a brief, but for the papyrological world relatively sharp, exchange by e-mail concerning student access to the texts of Greco-Roman Egypt. On one side stood the forces of traditional European scholarship (if you want to read the ancient text, learn the language), and on the other a new world of classics in translation. It was an interesting glimpse of different educational attitudes, aims, and methods. While extremely rare in continental Europe, classical civilization courses have been flourishing in the universities and schools of the English-speaking world for three decades, and there has been a thriving business in the source-book industry to respond to the undoubted demand for translated material. Classical Greece, especially Athens, was the first big target area, but since then the scope has widened and now there are source-books on all sorts of themes and periods. Social history is particularly popular as the sources are often difficult to access and not helpfully presented: collections of Greek and Latin inscriptions, for instance, have rarely offered even a translation, let alone a commentary.

It is in some ways a curious anomaly that Greco-Roman Egypt has been so slow to enter the classical civilization curriculum. After all, our main source, the papyri, opens a window onto Egypt offering a view that, however geographically and chronologically arbitrary, is quite unmatched anywhere else in the ancient Mediterranean: the immediacy, freshness, and detail of the documents should make Egypt an obviously exciting choice for translation courses. Even if papyrologists sometimes seem to write in code, the subject is one of the best organized in classical scholarship: texts, for instance, from the time of the earliest publications at the end of the nineteenth century, nearly always come with introduction, commentary, and translation. The Oxyrhynchus volumes on their own could function as a sort of extended source-book. On the other hand, Egypt has developed as an area reserved almost exclusively for highly specialized research, much of it in languages other than English: the best handbook is in Italian, and, apart from a few exceptions such as Alan Bowman's excellent *Egypt after the Pharaohs* (London, 1986), there is not a great deal of general work available. The accessibility of the subject can only be improved by Jane Rowlandson's splendid source-book on women and society. She has collected a team of ten of the most able collaborators in the papyrological world, including experts in Demotic and Coptic (contrast earlier attitudes: in an unpublished letter of March 1902 which he sends from excavations in the Fayum to his friend Gilbart Smyly in Trinity College Dublin, Bernard Grenfell recounts the finding of papyri, but adds: 'fortune, however, dealt us a nasty blow by causing demotic to preponderate greatly').

Source-book strategy varies. Some set out as much material as possible with almost no explanation. This work, aimed at non-specialists in a subject with which they are

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

very unlikely to be familiar, wisely chooses throughout an explanatory, rather than just a presentational, mode. Indeed, unusually for a source-book, you can read it straight through as a coherent social history: it makes rather good and balanced reading, all the more remarkable in view of the fact that each chapter was prepared by a different pair of contributors. The introduction on the historical background and nature of the sources is a masterful summary, compact, but clear and engaging; and much the same can be said of the briefer, but still substantial, introductions to each chapter: royalty and religion; family matters; status and law; economic activities; being female. Every passage also has its own introduction, often longer than the passage itself. There are forty-nine plates, again all carefully explained. There are notes for the reader on the transliteration of words and names, the presentation of the translated texts, Egyptian dating systems, and on money, weights, and measures. There is a glossary of key words, three maps, a list and concordance of texts (the latter useful, the former less so), a very good index, and sixteen pages of bibliography (useful to the expert, but perhaps discouraging to the non-specialist?). It is in short a work of the highest quality, devised and executed with exceptional care. Its usefulness will stretch beyond courses solely about women: much of the material has wider application, as the title announces ('Women *and* society'). Chapter III, for instance, provides a wonderful series of case studies on different aspects of the family. Quality comes at a price: just under £17 for the paperback version is scarcely a snip for students, but these days, I suppose, just about manageable.

'I beg you, mother, do look after yourself,' a young recruit to the Roman fleet writes home after arriving in Rome, 'and do not worry about me, for I have come to a fine place.' If this strikes a chord of understanding down the centuries, nonchalant references to child exposure and other alien features of ancient society will bring a chill of strangeness; but whether familiar or alien, the sources from Egypt are of extraordinary interest, and this book fulfils an important function in bringing them to a wider audience. Other source-books on Greco-Roman Egypt will follow; they will have to be good to match this one.

Trinity College Dublin B. C. McGING

WHOSE ROMAN AFRICA?

D. Cherry: *Frontier and Society in Roman North Africa.* Pp. 291. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-19-815235-3.

Romanization is once again a big issue, though all too often the chosen scholarly battlegrounds are provinces rich in evidence for Roman period material culture, but comparatively lacking in literary sources or substantial epigraphic evidence. North Africa ought to be an excellent area for exploring this theme, with its abundant epigraphy and extraordinary preservation of sites in the frontier region. This book promises much in its title, but the material presented is ultimately disappointing. We learn as early as p. vii that C. will 'describe Rome's impact on the culture, society and economy of the frontier region in Algeria'—by any definition, a somewhat more restricted area than the title implies. To complicate matters, C. makes frequent allusion to the frontier zone in neighbouring Mauretania Caesariensis, but very little reference to affairs along the rest of the frontier of Africa Proconsularis, in what is now southern Tunisia and north-western Libya. C. even shows a preference for

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

seeking parallels in Britain, rather than in Tunisia and Libya. More seriously, his analysis of frontier and society picks very selectively from the available evidence, and largely ignores the archaeological data. This undermines the validity of the general conclusions that will later be drawn.

The initial chapters provide an unexceptional overview of the pre-Roman landscape and people, and of the development of the Roman frontier (illustrated by some poor maps). Although a vast array of works is cited in the footnotes, there is a curious lack of direct engagement with current ideas. For instance, C. frequently claims great novelty for his views, when to my mind he is revisiting established arguments. It is hardly novel these days to claim that the North African linear barriers were non-defensive in origin, that they were primarily designed to control the movement of people and to facilitate the levying of customs dues on transhumant populations (pp. 58–73). I simply do not recognize the supposed scholarly consensus he attacks—many of the views at issue have had no real constituency among serious scholars since the early 1980s, making much of his discussion a succession of 'straw man' arguments. There are also some significant factual slips or blindspots—for instance, the assertion on p. 49 that there was no significant frontier restructuring after Hadrian and before Severus. In fact, there are numerous indications of frontier refinements in the later second century, in some sectors pushing the military presence into new areas. Similarly, at various points (e.g. p. 63), the inhabitants of the northern Sahara are characterized as nomads, whom he sees as having posed no sort of military threat. He fails to recognize the importance of the oasis communities of the Sahara, where substantial sedentary populations were sustained by sophisticated agriculture. Whilst there were transhumant groups also, the presence of large population centres was a complicating factor along the African frontier.

At the core of the book is his study of the impact of Rome on the frontier region—Romanization, if you like to use the term. Again there are lengthy footnotes (e.g. p. 75) on recent scholarship, but overall a failure to engage with the ideas coming out of such studies. C. believes that there was no Roman policy to promote Romanization, urbanization, and sedentarization in the frontier zone, a view with which many will have sympathy, but his subsequent analysis does not do justice to the larger issue of tracking cultural change in the frontier zone. On 'measuring Romanization', C. swiftly disposes of what he terms 'unworkable models' (pp. 82–92) and fixes on onomastic study, and in particular analysis of marriage patterns, as the key approach (pp. 92–100). The subsequent analysis of epigraphic evidence for marriage patterns, essentially an expanded version of an earlier article, takes up over half of the book (pp. 100–40, with a series of appendices, pp. 162–253). C.'s analysis comes down to a very simple division of the available epigraphic material into a series of categories: marriage between Romanized partners (both have Romanized names); Romanized male marries un-Romanized female; Romanized female marries un-Romanized male. The ostensible conclusion is that there were very few Roman–native marriages, though the picture would have been more nuanced had he extended his analysis also to the Tripolitanian sector of the African frontier. There are a whole series of potential methodological problems here relating to:

1. the significance of names (under C.'s definition, a person with a Roman name was Romanized; and vice versa);
2. differential rates of name replacement to be expected across the province (for example, in and around the legionary fortress there may have been a far larger number of native Africans who had acquired Latin names by the time most

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

epitaphs were erected—a point borne out by C.'s own comparison of the town of Thubursicu Numidarum);

3. the extent to which Latin tombstones were an affectation of more Romanized couples, with the result that mixed 'Roman'–non-Roman marriages were intrinsically less likely to be recorded.

On the question of changing onomastic practices in Roman Africa it is surprising, given how crucial the issue is to his argument, that C. does not fully discuss the thesis of J.-M. Lassere in *Ubique Populus* (Paris, 1977), or the highly pertinent work of Birley on the adoption of Latin names by the Libyco-Punic élite at Lepcis Magna (*Libyan Studies* 19 [1988], 1–19). The crucial problem is that the arbitrary division of 'un-Romanized' and 'Romanized' people using C.'s criteria has no bearing on the actual ethnic status of those involved or on how their social outlook may have changed over time.

C.'s conclusions are that the Roman army formed a very isolated and separate community in the frontier zone, and that it brought little change to the region across the several centuries of its presence. Had he analysed the evidence of religious practices in military, urban, and rural communities, following the pattern established by V. Brouquier-Redde for Tripolitania (*Temples et cultes de Tripolitaine* [Paris, 1992]), he might have found further support for this view. But C. surely goes too far in minimizing all socio-economic change, when there is a good deal of evidence to show that the Roman period was one of profound transformations. The statement (p. 140) that there was apparently 'no evidence to show that there was any really significant measure of cultural change in the region during the period of Roman occupation' is one of several dubious assertions.

There is no doubt some interesting material in C.'s analysis of marriage patterns, but I was left pondering in the end whether it justified development beyond the original article. The failure to engage fully with wider historical debates and to explore the archaeological evidence of the frontier zone reduces the utility of the thesis presented. Although the book contains individual statements with which I would concur, the overall picture assembled is too lopsided to represent a 'Roman Africa' that I, or many others, will recognize.

University of Leicester DAVID MATTINGLY

HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY

HOLGER SONNABEND (ed.): *Mensch und Landschaft in der Antike: Lexikon der historischen Geographie*. Stuttgart and Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 1999. Pp. xii + 660, 112 ills. Cased, DM 98. ISBN: 3-476-01285-9.

This elegantly printed and, at about the size of *Whitaker's Almanac*, compact work of reference on 'Man and Landscape in Antiquity' presents itself as a 'Lexicon of Historical Geography' but ranges much more widely. Researchers and students will find much of value in the volume, and while it underexploits its strengths it also breaks new ground.

The fifty-three contributors are almost all German or based in Germany; the universities of Stuttgart, Heidelberg, and Munich supply one-third of the authors and

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

half the articles. Only eleven other authors are featured, of whom eight are from Italy and the USA. The articles (all in German) range in length from one to nine pages, but fewer than ten per cent of them exceed four pages and many occupy a page or less. Illustrations are, as the editor claims, not merely decorative but made to work for the text, often by means of lengthy and interesting captions. Supplementary material includes a list of contributors with their articles, and indexes of persons (both ancient and modern), places, and topics; all three could usefully have been combined into a single index. Each entry has a bibliography of between about three and twenty items, including non-German works; these sections must have posed great problems of selection, but there are surprising omissions. There are a few misprints (including some in non-German names or bibliographical citations).

The 214 entries are arranged alphabetically; their titles are repeated in a list at the front of the volume, followed by a second listing arranged under nineteen categories, from which I draw random examples (with titles translated): sources and methods (e.g. demography, historiography, cartography, medicine), land economy (e.g. agriculture, fish, wood, transhumance), population (e.g. enemies, migration, clothing), climate (e.g. cold, wind), politics, society, and administration (e.g. nobility, capital city), religion (e.g. asceticism, gods, mythology), the military (e.g. civil war, peace, signalling), geology and geomorphology (e.g. earthquakes, erosion, vulcanology), economy and trade (e.g. professions, piracy), geography and topography (e.g. deltas, rivers, islands, lagoons), architecture (e.g. baths, bridges, town walls), traffic and communication (e.g. units of measurement, streets), technology (e.g. mining, mills), and small batches of articles on aspects of law, flora and fauna, art, language, and mentality.

It will be clear to the reader that an extremely wide range of topics is covered. Here, however, lies the difficulty with the volume: an apparent lack of clearly focused aims. On the one hand, the editor is to be commended for making linkages, if at times only implicitly, between issues of historical geography and other areas of ancient society and culture. It is undoubtedly stimulating to find short essays on the acropolis, amphitheatres, armies, asceticism, and baths that determinedly seek out connections with the title of the volume. On the other hand, the attempt to do so is not always wholly successful, as with the (otherwise excellent) entries on nobility, astronomy, hagiography, music, and dance or those on particular kinds of buildings. Some of the more specific articles (such as the astronomical cluster: eclipses, comets, meteorites, meteors, etc.), while they clarify ancient people's scientific and religious understanding of the physical world, often have no clear point of contact with historical geography as it is normally understood (at least by English-speakers). Other entries are only a few lines long and have something of the appearance of afterthoughts, like the all too tantalizing paragraphs on energy sources, agricultural technology (without a reference to K. D. White), architecture (where more cross-references were surely needed), fish (no mention of Gallant), 'Totenkult' (oddly titled: its scope is rather 'Gräber' or 'Friedhöfe'), deserts, and so on. Against that background the interesting entries on 'Strategie' and 'Taktik' seem out of scale (pp. 524–39).

Relationships between cognate articles are sometimes unclear, as with the nexus 'Ackerbau'–'Agrargeographie'–'Agrartechnik'–'Agrarverfassung'–'Landwirtschaft', which partly duplicate one another (the absence of a synthesizing entry on 'Landschaft' is surprising). The scope of some entries is puzzling: 'Afrikanistik', for example, covers only Carthage. The inclusion of articles on broad topics such as Egyptology or foreign policy alongside narrow ones such as sealstones raises the question of what kind of audience was envisaged. Some authors have only enough room to set out basic concepts, as if writing (albeit at a high level) for the uninitiated. This seems

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

particularly true of some entries on classical culture, and one wonders whether the imagined readership did not include geography students unfamiliar with the Greco-Roman world. Other articles seem designed to establish the philosophical credentials of a discipline, like the one that tells us (p. 14) that 'agrarian geography, also designated "land-economic geography", is a branch of economic geography and, as such, in turn a branch of anthropogeography'—a somewhat forbidding definition, characteristic of the openings of many entries.

Despite these reservations there is still much valuable material here, especially in those articles one would most naturally call geographical. There are instructive, if sometimes brief, overviews of technical matters such as building materials, nutrition, agriculture, forestry, ethnology and ethnography, trade, cartography (by Richard Talbert), colonization, town planning, and many other themes, as well as good clusters of entries on economic and demographic aspects, the military uses of space, and communications. A particularly good set of entries covers topographical features of the landscape (rivers, mountains, isthmus, canals, capes, marshland, and others, in addition to those named above, under 'geography and topography'), and brings out their economic, cultural, and strategic significance. Many essays, indeed, persuade one how much we, as classicists, can learn from historical geographers.

For students, teachers, and researchers of antiquity who wish to understand Mediterranean landscapes and integrate that understanding into their work, the more straightforwardly geographical parts of the *Lexikon* will certainly fill gaps left by works like the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Viewed in this light, the volume represents very good value.

University of Leicester GRAHAM SHIPLEY

MINOAN LANDSCAPES

L. ROCCHETTI (ed.): *Sybrita. La valle di Amari fra Bronze e Ferro. Fascicolo Primo.* (CNR Istituto per gli Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici. Ricerche greco-italiane in Creta occidentale II. Incunabula Graeca 96.) Pp. 254, maps, figs. Rome: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale, 1994. L. 180,000. ISBN: 88-8011-020-9.

M. TSIPOPOULOU, L. VAGNETTI (edd.): *Achladia. Scavi e ricerche della Missione Greco-Italiana in Creta orientale (1991–1993).* (CNR Istituto per gli Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici. Incunabula Graeca 97.) Pp. 218, maps, figs. Rome: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale, 1995. L. 270,000. ISBN: 88-8011-071-3.

In parallel with at least ten recent major investigations into the urban life of Minoan civilization and at least seven regional surveys, excavations at smaller towns, rural sites, and sanctuaries have proceeded apace. In all this the work of the Italian CNR's Istituto per gli Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici at Rome (Director M. Salvini) has been exceptionally fruitful. In addition to the achievements reviewed here, the first volume, reporting the Neolithic and Late Minoan I site of Nerokourou in west Crete, was published in 1989 (Incunabula Graeca 91).

The Amari valley, nestling between Mt Ida and Mt Kedros in west central Crete, is

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a landscape of paradise. Settled continuously from the Bronze Age to the present it provides an easy passage from the Mesara plain in the south to Rethymno and the northern coast. Of particular importance have been the excavations at two Middle Minoan centres, *c*. 1700 B.C., Apodhoulou in the south and Monastiraki in the centre of the valley. Recent analyses of surviving organic residues show that their pottery contained olive oil and, at Monastiraki, pine-resinated wine (the earliest known retsina). A third important site dominated the north end of the valley; named Sybrita in Graeco-Roman times, it is the focus of the project noticed here, under the direction of L. Rocchetti and in collaboration with the Ephoria of west Crete.

Sybrita is a rather heterogeneous, though fundamental collection of reports and papers on the Amari essentially from late in the Bronze Age (LM III C, twelfth century B.C.) into the Iron Age. Rocchetti introduces the project, the valley, and its settlement. Fiandra and Militello discuss a clay sealing, *c*. 1600 B.C., from Phaistos and inscribed su-ki-ri-ta in Linear A, a name appearing also on an LM I pithos from Haghia Triadha and on eight Linear B tablets (LM III A) from Knossos. Administrative links are implied, precisely reflecting the chronologically successive economic importance of the three centres. But which Amari site was su-ki-ri-ta in these periods and whether su-ki-ri-ta = Sybrita are matters open to discussion, as in the long paper by Scafa. He argues strongly for the equation and suggests that the Monastiraki settlement was su-ki-ri-ta in the Middle Minoan (Protopalatial) period, the hill site at Thronos taking over the name and capital status from the end of the Bronze Age (LM III C) and continuing as Graeco-Roman Sybrita. This is very plausible, but leaves open (and not discussed) the location of su-ki-ri-ta at the high point of Minoan culture, the Neopalatial period (MM III–LM I), when indeed the name occurs (see above) at Haghia Triadha (itself not su-ki-ri-ta). Moreover, the excellent survey report on Sybrita's immediate territory by Belgiorno gives almost no indications of LM I occupation in the area.

The wider relationships of the Amari with domains north and south are well brought out by Kanta (with credit to Polygioryi's work published elsewhere), within a strong historical perspective. This paper complements much of Scafa's philological–nomenclatural argument and likewise proposes Monastiraki as the first su-ki-ri-ta. La Rosa usefully summarizes the evidence, mainly cultic, of Haghia Triadha at the time of Sybrita's first occupation (LM III C).

Two papers present burial evidence, the full publication (Gavrilaki) of a tomb at Apostoloi near Sybrita (probably LM III A 2 rather than III B) and a discussion of the cemeteries of Apodhoulou (as too in Kanta's paper) and Armenoi (Godart, Tzedhakis), the latter site outside the region.

By far the longest and most substantial paper, a major work in itself, is the study by Kourou and Karetsou of the sacred cave of Hermes Kranaios near Patsos, north west of the Amari valley. They present a richly illustrated catalogue and discusssion of 112 objects from the cave, dating religious use from LM I to Archaic and in Roman times, but particularly in late LM III (Sybrita's first period), when many bull, bovid, and wild goat figures and figurines were deposited.

The volume ends with an account of the ancient sources for the name of Sybrita and of the first archaeological visits, by Evans and Halbherr (logically better near the beginning of the book), and with two preliminary reports on the current Greek–Italian excavations at Sybrita/Thronos. These are demonstrating the first major occupation of the site in the early twelfth century B.C. (LM III C), when there were surprisingly many and close ceramic correspondences with contemporary Knossos. Sybrita and Knossos are but two of many sites (Khamalevri and Eleutherna: Pyrgi are

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

others north of the Amari) which are providing abundant new evidence for knowledge of this century and for the case that this was the beginning of continuous Greek occupation into the period of the Classical *poleis*. Buildings of the Protogeometric and Geometric periods are currently being revealed.

Achladia, like *Sybrita*, is much more than the publication of a single site. Again a Greek–Italian collaboration, it is the fruit of more first class joint research by M. Tsipopoulou (of the Ephoria) and L. Vagnetti (of the Istituto) in the Seteia area of eastern Crete. Beginning from excavation in a 'low level' Neopalatial (Late Minoan I) settlement at Achladia: Platyskhinos, with heroically detailed publication of the unexciting ceramic (sherds) and other finds therefrom; taking in the adjacent and contemporary 'villa' at Riza (excavated and published by N. Platon; see now comprehensive papers by L. Platon and by Tsipopoulou and A. Papacostopoulou on the Seteia valley 'villas' in R. Hägg (ed.), *The Function of the Minoan 'Villa'* (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen 4°, 46 [Stockholm, 1997]); cleaning, recording, and republishing N. Platon's important LM III A I–III B tholos tomb close to the Platyskhinos settlement, together with photographs of its now lost contents generously supplied by L. Platon from his father's archives; supplementing this with a most thorough and richly illustrated architectural and comparative study of the tomb by P. Belli, who draws attention to its Mycenaean characteristics, and of the surviving human remains (one a mature woman) by M. Liston; surface-surveying the Achladia area; incorporating a major petrographic analysis of the ceramic fabrics of Late Minoan east Crete by P. Day; the volume then proceeds to integrate these works into a geographical and diachronic study (in English) by Tsipopoulou of all the evidence for settlement and land use in the Late Minoan III period in the Seteia area. Excellent maps support this work. Finally there are comprehensive summaries of the whole project by Tsipopoulou and Vagnetti in Italian, Greek, and English.

The sequential reconstruction (see too *The Function of the Minoan 'Villa'*, *supra*) is all the more meritorious since the evidential base is severely constrained by the looting of large numbers of the relevant cemetery sites, which has left mere vestiges of scores of once well-furnished tombs. The emergent broad historical framework for the Seteia area has many correspondences with but also, especially in relation to Mycenaean Knossos, differences from that of Sybrita and the Amari. In eastern Crete the sequence is essentially fourfold: neopalatial (LM I) large urban and palatial centres (Petras in the case of the Seteia valley), to which smaller settlements and large estates ('villas' and their surrounding buildings) were linked; LM III A–B (1350–1200 B.C.) dense occupation in relatively small settlements and hamlets (with Mochlos and Myrsine [implied mainly by their tombs] to the west and Palaikastro to the east standing as much larger urban units), LM III C (twelfth century B.C.) retreat from the now insecure coasts to hilly, less accessible inland sites east and west of the Seteia valley, with very little occupation in it; use of even more inaccessible sites at the transition to the Iron Age (eleventh century B.C.), perhaps under pressure from newcomers (Dorians?) from central Crete. If scientific excavation can be conducted before looters arrive this picture will quite certainly be richly enhanced from the base so well presented here.

University of Bristol PETER WARREN

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ARGOS AND THE ARGOLID

A. Pariente, G. Touchais (edd.): *Ἄργος και Αργολίδα: τοπογραφία και πολεοδομία*/Argos et l'Argolide: topographie et histoire (*Πρακτικά διεθνούς συνεδρίου*/Actes de la table ronde internationale, *Αθήνα–Ἄργος* 28/4–1/5/1990 Athènes–Argos). (*Ελληνογαλλικές έρευνες*/Recherches franco-helléniques, 3.) Pp. xiv + 507, text figs, 14 pls, 9 overlays, 2 foldout plans. Nafplio: Ypourgeio Politismou, D′ Ephoreia Proistorikon kai Klasikon Archaiotiton/ Athens: École française d'Athènes (distributed by Paris: de Boccard), 1998. Paper. ISBN: 2-86958-140-8.

Despite their slow publication, the thirty papers in this hefty volume (mainly in French and Greek, each with an abstract in the other language) amply illustrate the value of many years' collaboration between the Greek Archaeological Service, responsible for rescue excavations in Argos, and the French School at Athens, which has mounted systematic excavations of major monuments. The conference on which the book is based aspired to synthesize the data from many periods (only the later medieval is unrepresented) and over 600 excavations, and to inform future decisions about the development and conservation of the modern town. A key element was the compilation of a master plan, incorporating both Greek and French data, which forms the basis of eleven period plans at the end of the volume. The findspot symbols from each period are duplicated on tracing-paper pages between which the folding end-plan can be inserted, making it easy to see the changing extent of the town.

The volume is divided almost equally into three chronological sections: prehistoric–Geometric (pp. 9–162), archaic–Hellenistic (pp. 165–323), and Roman–modern (pp. 327–478). Each includes one or more papers drawing together all the archaeological data for a given period. In the first, G. Touchais and N. Divari-Valakou (pp. 9–21) observe that Bronze Age settlement was divided between the south-eastern slopes of Mt Larisa in the south and the Aspis hill to the north. Mycenaean Argos had no palace, tholoi, or Linear B tablets, but in LH III B the southern settlement, deserted since MH II, was reoccupied. The town was partly abandoned only after LH III C, the cemetery remaining in use. From *c.* 1000 B.C. Argos expanded but was still a discontinuous settlement. While continuous PG–LG occupation is uncertain, the city had a flourishing manufacturing sector and three organized cemeteries throughout the Geometric; groups of cist graves point to a military élite.

K. Barakari-Gléni and A. Pariente (pp. 165–78) note that between the seventh and late fourth centuries the agora acquired a complex of public buildings; archaic–Hellenistic workshops concentrated around it. The fortifications (incompletely traced) were renovated in the late fourth century, when the upper Aspis was resettled. Hellenistic modifications included a bouleuterion and perhaps the orchestra, whose purpose and date (late fifth to mid-third century) are unclear. The early third-century theatre was part of a building programme, perhaps initiated after Argos's liberation from Cassander by Demetrios; the city peaked in the mid-third century, and again after the defeat of Nabis by Flamininus. The street plan remained more or less unchanged through time but expanded in the Hellenistic period. The Hellenistic–Roman town had two cemeteries and some intramural burials. Clay was extracted locally in the first century B.C.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A. Banaka-Dimaki and others (pp. 327–36) note a southward expansion in Roman times, with major second- and fourth-century buildings in and around the agora, two Hadrianic aqueducts, and several late Roman basilicas. Intramural burials persisted, but the city continued to use three designated cemeteries, two of them relocated in the early Christian period. C. Abadie-Reynal (pp. 397–404) argues that the Slavic invasions did not cause immediate urban collapse, but were preceded by a gradual sixth-century decline in building activity and a rise in rural settlement.

Besides other specific studies too numerous to mention, A. Douzougli-Zachou (pp. 23–39) and P. Darcque (pp. 103–15) review settlement in the Argive plain down to the EBA and in Mycenaean times respectively. Three further papers, the first two in English, explore relations between the early *polis* and the rest of the Argolid: R. Hägg examines differences in Protogeometric–Geometric burial practices (pp. 131–5); A. Foley argues that Geometric burials may reflect ethnic and economic differences, and perhaps political disunity, within the Argive plain (pp. 137–44); and F. de Polignac examines the late Geometric cultic landscape, in which the Heraion, equidistant from the principal settlements, provided a focus for competitive display both within the Argive élite and between them and neighbouring élites (pp. 145–62). In a generously illustrated study Ch. I. Piteros considers the changing topography of the town, particularly its roads (pp. 179–210); like him, Pariente and others (pp. 211–31) consider the agora in detail. J.-C. Moretti (pp. 233–59) examines the cult places between which the theatre was installed. M. Piérart (pp. 337–56) reconsiders Pausanias' itinerary in the light of archaeology, establishing that he followed seven routes, and identifying problems posed by his return journeys to the agora. Studies of Roman monuments are followed by papers on the modern urbanization of Argos and the management of the city's archaeological heritage. The volume ends with a full catalogue of excavated building plots with map references, an invaluable research tool that one wishes were available for other Greek towns.

A more unified treatment is still awaited, but this volume paves the way for an enriched understanding of the development of Argos in all periods.

University of Leicester GRAHAM SHIPLEY

BOEOTIA

J. M. FOSSEY (ed.): *Boeotia Antiqua V. Studies on Boiotian Topography, Cults and Terracottas*. (McGill University Monographs in Classical Archaeology and History 17.) Pp. xiii + 138, 8 figs, 51 pls. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1995. Paper, Hfl. 120. ISBN: 90-5063-177-0.

J. M. FOSSEY (ed.): *Boeotia Antiqua VI. Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Boiotian Antiquities (Loyola University of Chicago, 24–26 May 1995)*. (McGill University Monographs in Classical Archaeology and History 18.) Pp. xii + 151, 11 figs, 33 pls. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1996. Paper, Hfl. 145. ISBN: 90-5063-468-0.

Few other geographical areas outside Athens have received such consistently wide scholarly attention as has Boiotia. A series of international conferences on Boiotian studies over the last decades has produced a respectable output of related contributions in the field. *Boeotia Antiqua* Volumes I–IV had already established

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

itself among these as a source of information on the latest Boiotian issues even before the welcome launch of a regular series. This was announced in the preface to Volume V, and promptly accomplished with the immediate publication of Volume VI in the following year. The declared aim of this recent series is to provide a forum for 'early dissemination of field results' (v.xii). The product is two rather loose collections of essays, numbering eight and eleven respectively, which include preliminary site reports and site identifications, and studies in local history, historiography, religion, and art history, all in some way linked by a common interest in the topography of ancient Boiotia and the areas immediately adjacent to it.

The strength of these volumes thus lies in their potential to shed new light on some old, even very old, questions on Boiotian localities, and especially in the contributors' uncomplicated attitude towards the quick publication of fresh discoveries. So Volume VI, for instance, starts with a helpful, if unnecessarily polemical, up-to-date survey of recent field activity in Boiotia by the editor. Imminent building activity has prompted Morin and Gauvin to conduct a surface study of the long-known minor prehistoric site of *Kastro Livadhostru* near Kreusis at the Gulf of Corinth. In a preliminary assessment based on the results of the Oropos Survey Project, Cosmopoulos discusses factors determining the patterns in the rural settlement area between the Amphiareion and the ancient city of Oropos. Tritle suggested an identification of some traces of buildings found on Euboia just opposite Oropos with Amarynthos and the sanctuary of Artemis, which will have to await more detailed archaeological investigation to be confirmed. Lastly, an inventory of an arsenal dated 343/342 B.C. was recently unearthed during the first two excavation seasons of 1991–2 at what Munn identifies as the Boiotian–Attic frontier site of Panakton. This, together with several ephebic and one garrison dedication, forms a valuable addition to the corpus of classical garrison inscriptions. Medieval layers at the same site suggest that in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the ancient fortress embraced a small agrarian community (Gerstel).

The battlefields of ancient Greece customarily remain the same for the scholars of their topography. Buckler's engaging discussions on the locations and strategies of the campaigns fought at Koroneia in 394 B.C. and at Tegyra in 375 B.C. are no exceptions to this general rule. The author, however, makes a good case for redefining the significance of the events in their immediate contexts, both political and literary. In a forthright piece, Müller gives a vivid analysis of the ferocious political resistance that the pro-Perseus trio of Boiotian cities (Haliartos, Thisbe, and Koroneia) summoned up against the impending Roman armies during the three decades preceding their eventual capture in 171/70 B.C. Her specific regional perspective does much to refine the prevailing picture of a Greece universally subdued to its unforgiving conquerors.

The religious historian's interest in topography is also awakened. The editor himself, in keeping with recent interest in theophoric names, reviews the evidence for the rare *Ἡράκων*. Its cluster in central Greece, Attica, and the Megarid, but especially in places near Mt Kithairon, is tentatively related to Hera's cult at Plataia, which was of more than immediate local importance, and the distribution of her cults in the wider area. If this connection were true, it would also give further evidence for the spread of cults regardless of borders between given areas, which were often more notional than real. The core of Deacy's examination of the important but unidentified cult(s) of Athena Itonia and Alalkomeneis lies in the comparison of the goddess's local Boiotian and Attic traditions (including her specific 'auletic' connections). Finally, Zeus Basileus, a prominent deity at Lebadeia whose massive post-classical

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

temple edifice has recently been uncovered again, receives his share in a solid piece of work by Turner. Her valuable contribution on the Basileia offers a detailed discussion of these games, which were certainly not minor. It should open up further consideration of the much-neglected local agonistic festivals in post-classical Greece.

Boiotian artefacts end up in a position perhaps rather more marginal than intended. Through statistical analysis of the proportions of Boiotian *kouroi*, Guralnick seeks to place these works of art found in backwater Boiotia within the mainstream sculptural canon. Kassab Tezgör advances the recent trend in the study of terracotta figurines away from art historical considerations towards the socio-economic circumstances of their production and diffusion. Her case study traces the possible circulation of Boiotian moulds to Myrina in Asia Minor and subsequent distribution from the local atelier there.

Though it should be noted that some pieces in these collections are less well researched than others, in their entirety they reflect the authors' often long-standing personal engagement in, and acquaintance with, Boiotia. It may, however, come as a surprise to the disinterested reader that personal differences between twentieth-century 'Boiotarchoi' occasionally reach the public domain in this way. Though clearly aimed at a readership with intimate knowledge of Boiotian locales, generous provision of maps and photographs facilitates access for anyone who has not walked all of the rather remote places himself. It is to be hoped that the series will continue.

Darwin College, Cambridge BARBARA KOWALZIG

PERGAMON

W. RADT: *Pergamon. Geschichte und Bauten einer antiken Metropole.* Pp. 376, abbs, maps. Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 1999. Cased, DM 98. ISBN: 3-89678-116-2.

Wolfgang Radt is the Zweiter Direktor of the Istanbul branch of the German Archaeological Institute, and he has supervised the excavations at Pergamum in Asia Minor since 1971. The volume under review is a revised and enlarged version of a similar work published by the same author in 1988. In the new volume, as in the old, he has attempted to combine the history of the city with the results of over a hundred years of excavation in a form that would provide a quick orientation for scholars unacquainted with the site and serve equally as a reliable guide for travelers and general readers. The structure of the new work is exactly as it was in the previous one: German discovery of the site, the landscape, potted history from Philetairos to the fourteenth century of the modern era, the walls and city plan, systematic review of buildings and remains, and biographies of the principal German scholars who worked in Pergamum.

Much of the text is unaltered from the earlier version, but the results of the last ten years of excavation and research have been incorporated where necessary. In particular, the 1994 season has led R. to fix the foundation of the Great Altar in about 170 without allowing, as he had previously, for a date in the previous decade of the second century. As for the Traianeum, new fragments of the inscription mentioning Zeus Philios and Trajan provide, according to a personal communication from Helmut Müller to R., a date of 114/115. R. assigns a cult statue of Hadrian in that building to the last years of his reign and invokes an inscription for the emperor's permission to erect the statue 'in his father's temple'. But he becomes somewhat

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

defensive in confronting Aelius Aristides' reference to a Hadrianeum in Pergamum, which C. P. Jones has suggested is the building known as the Traianeum (*Pergamum: City of the Gods* [1998], p. 74): 'Die heute übliche Bezeichnung "Trajaneum" ist sicher nicht falsch, weil der Tempel als Kaisertempel unter Trajan begonnen wurde, daß sie aber—nach Fertigstellung des Tempels unter Hadrian—benutzt wurde, ist durch keine antike Quelle belegt. Es gibt im Gegenteil eine Stelle bei dem Rhetor Aelius Aristides, die von einem "Hadrianeum" in Pergamon spricht.' After 120 years of excavation it would be odd to postulate an utterly unknown building that has to be distinguished from a known temple in which Hadrian's statue was actually displayed. The temple may have started out as a Traianeum, but it evidently ended up as a Hadrianeum.

R.'s work appears now in a much larger format than before, which is certainly less convenient for travelers but permits sharper photos. The illustrations are often as they were previously, but recent *anastylosis* is given full documentation (notably for the so-called Traianeum). Additional drawings and plans are helpful, particularly for the Asclepieum. The new layout is more attractive. There are stunning juxtapositions, showing sites as they appeared when first discovered and as they are today. There is a noticeably more generous use of colour, and the quality is excellent. As in the previous edition, the removal of the Great Altar to Berlin, although not its retention, is firmly justified on the grounds of imminent destruction at the hands of nineteenth-century *Kalkbrenner*.

Attentive readers will be rewarded by occasional revelations in the photo captions. For example, in the old edition a photo of Dörpfeld standing beside a thin and rather sensitive looking young man is accompanied by the following text: 'Wilhelm Dörpfeld in Pergamon. Neben Dörpfeld ein jüngerer Mitarbeiter, vermutlich der Architect P. Sursos (1904)'. The same picture, much larger and clearer, now bears a caption identifying the young man as the splendid epigraphist Hugo Hepding, to whom the German School in Athens devoted a memorial colloquium a few years ago. It is startling to think that as recently as 1988 no one had recognized him.

For those who know Pergamum and the magnificent array of the *Altertümer von Pergamon*, the present volume will be a pleasant reminder of that great site. For initiates into Pergamene studies, it will furnish the necessary orientation and a good bibliography. But what is unusually valuable here (as already in the 1988 version) is the final section devoted to modern archaeologists. The biographies are well done and well illustrated, and if there is a certain triumphalism in the parade of excavators the Pergamene team has just cause to be proud. The lineage is distinguished, beginning with the engineer Carl Humann. The names of Conze, Dörpfeld, and Wiegand still loom large in the history of archaeology. The biography and photograph of Erich Boehringer will prove nostalgic for many Turkish hands of the older generation.

Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton G. W. BOWERSOCK

GREEKS OUTSIDE GREECE

G. R. Tsetskhladze (ed.): *Ancient Greeks West and East.* Pp. xxi + 623, figs. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 1999. Cased, $160. ISBN: 9004-11190-5.

There are important pieces gathered here, and it was an excellent idea to make available the work of so wide a range of non-anglophone scholars, but overall this book does little credit to editor or publisher. As the title indicates, the volume has a

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

criterion (investigating traces of Greeks outside Greece), but no central problem. The papers are organized in geographical groups, in an order that is also broadly chronological, preceded by a long paper on Rostovtzeff in England (which knows a lot about Rostovtzeff, but too little about England) and two further papers with no particular geographical focus (Tuplin's discussion of Greek ethnic prejudice, and Hind's introduction to Pomponius Mela). Cross-references between papers are very few, work published in 1996 or later is ignored (various contributors lament that books and papers from 1997 or 1998 appeared too late to be discussed), no editorial discipline has controlled scholarly prolixity, and it is all too catastrophically obvious that no native English eye has surveyed many of the pages. It is possible to work out what is meant by sentences such as 'Not even the occasionally symposiast iconography of the vases would be sufficient, in my opinion, to convince the Iberians of undertaking a "civilized" consumption of that product' (pp. 320–1), or 'Practically, only in the specialized work by V. D. Blavatskii, it has been correctly noticed that a characteristic feature of the formation of a cultural level is its being saltatory' (p. 545), but editor and publisher owe it to both their authors and their readers to ensure that what they publish makes immediate sense in some language or another.

Most of the papers are concerned with the interpretation of particular textual claims, archaeological finds, or sites. A few are more ambitious, looking at the theoretical framework within which cultural processes are to be understood. Two papers stand out for their theoretical acuity. Christopher Smith's paper, subtitled 'Barter and Exchange in the Archaic Mediterranean' (the title, 'Medea in Italy', provides no adequate guide to the contents), uses anthropological work from the late 1980s and 1990s to raise general issues of cultural exchange in a most stimulating way. Zosia Archibald's 'Thracian Cult—from Practice to Belief' is concerned with how a distinct cultural identity can be deduced, emphasizing the need for wide-ranging comparison both within a culture and between cultures in order properly to understand the significance of any particular class of material remains.

Of the papers on texts, the most wide-ranging is Tuplin's, which gathers a large body of fascinating material, only to examine it in the light of a definition of racism (prejudice on the basis of physical or genetic differences) too narrow to bring out the full significance of the evidence. Luisa Moscati-Castelnuovo's paper on the eponymous Amazon Cleta insists both that there *was* a settlement Cleta in Italy and that the Amazon Cleta's story was a creation of Lycophron. David Braund's discussion of Scythian mares'-milk cheese effectively reveals something of the process of Greek ethnography. Askold Ivantchik's use of near-eastern as well as Greek sources makes clear how very complicated are the literary and historical issues surrounding claims of Scythian 'rule over Asia'.

Two famous sites, Al Mina and Pithekoussai, receive important treatments. John Boardman's re-examination, layer by layer, of the evidence from Al Mina takes further his 1990 *OJA* paper, partly on the basis of evidence that has come to light more recently and which is also discussed here by Rosalind Kearsley. Neither scholar seriously changes their already published views, but these must now be the expressions of those views to which others refer. Bruno D'Agostino's paper, using new material from Cumae to raise very sharply the question of its relationship to Pithekoussai, would have benefited from freeing itself from the emporia/apoikia distinction. An overdue re-examination of the Fusco cemetery material by Rune Frederiksen is unfortunately another paper whose English erects a serious barrier to the reader's understanding.

Of the artefact studies, Gillian Shepherd's of fibulae bears upon the question of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

whether Italic fibulae in graves at Greek settlements in Italy and Sicily indicate the presence of native women and so of intermarriage; her careful contextual analysis demonstrates that they do not. Other artefact studies largely bear upon the general issue of Hellenization. The most general are Adolfo Dominguez's survey of Hellenization in Iberia, and Gocha Tsetskhladze's exploration of the Anatolian roots of local cultures in Pontus, where the total absence of plates renders the reader incapable of assessing claims of resemblance between objects. Jaques Vanschoonwinkel argues against exclusive Mycenaean influence on the Philistine pottery, seeing it rather as 'a local and hybrid production that adopted a variety of cultural influences' (p. 95). Sara Aguilar examines the context of Iberian stone sculpture in general and the Dama de Elche (whose authenticity is defended in an appendix against Moffitt's already largely forgotten attack) in particular, stressing that local concerns determined what was made of Greek stimuli. Thurstan Robinson interprets the 'Nereid Monument' at Xanthos in terms of the local context in which Erbbina is developing a new visual language to express his power. Susanne Ebbinghaus's detailed study of Thracian rhyta (finely illustrated with her own line drawings) needs the context of a still broader study of the rhyton and suffers badly from the book's habit of putting references into the text, even if they take up five or six lines (footnotes are restricted to discursive matters). V. D. Kuznetsov, in a paper which makes excellent use of Athenian epigraphic evidence on building practices, argues overmuch that the earlier dwellings of Greek settlers in the north Black Sea were not 'dug-out's or 'semi-dug-out's but mud-brick buildings of fully Greek type, with dug-out cellars. Mikhail Treister writes at great length on Sarmatian *phalerae* and their origins (the remarks on Ebbinghaus's paper apply to this too). N. Gigolashvili argues that the silver aryballos from Vani has closer affinities to Achaemenid than to Greek products.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford ROBIN OSBORNE

PRAYERS IN STONE

B. S. RIDGWAY: *Prayers in Stone. Greek Architectural Sculpture (ca. 600–100 B.C.E.)*. Pp. xvi + 255, ills, figs, pls. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 0-520-21556-7.

Greek architectural sculpture has a special place in the study of ancient glyptic: it is usually datable, at least more reliably than most freestanding pieces; it is unlikely to have been totally replaced by Roman copies which now constitute its only surviving presence, and is capable of ongoing reinterpretation in relation to the sites in which it played a religious and didactic rôle. Its place in the overall design of the buildings to which it belongs has been undergoing much more serious study of late, in the wake of increased recognition that there are repeated themes and linked, if not repeated, treatments of them, or of individual motifs. Architectural groups are often more interesting and sophisticated than contemporary free-standing ones, where the latter survive at all. Where they do, or can be reconstructed, they are frequently sets of single figures rather than figures which react to one another or are formally related.

This volume publishes the Sather lectures of a scholar with a reputation for very austere, even pessimistic, analysis of ancient sculpture, a ruthless diagnostician of

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the copy, or the archaizing original: B. S. Ridgway is one of the major agents in contemporary moves away from attribution studies as a major component of work in this field. Much of her previous work has, naturally, been concerned with free-standing material, and an overall treatment of architectural sculpture is an important departure for her, and a bonus for her readers at many levels.

The lectures have been expanded into six substantial chapters, which go straight to the problems which now grab attention most insistently. The introduction addresses the current situation: why study architectural sculpture? What are the limitations attached to doing so? This provides the framework for a discussion of aims, methodology, and the evidence, which leads neatly to the more edgy topics of the other chapters. What do we define as architectural sculpture? Is it just the figures, or should we include carved patternwork, and that oddly elusive and multivalent form, the column, and its base and capital? How far is visibility an issue? We may want to read very complex messages or themes into a sculptural programme. Would the ancient viewer have had the desire or knowledge to do so? Would the designer have intended as much? R. sounds a characteristically cautionary note against chronological relativism (or anachronism).

The chapter on the use of colour dovetails into the question of visibility; we still find the idea of the familiar material transformed in technicolor difficult. The alarming transformation of the Peplos kore by the restoration of her paint on the cast in the Cambridge cast gallery shocks us still, as does the painting by Alma Tadema showing a private view of the Parthenon frieze. R. reproduces Loviot's reconstruction of a corner of the Parthenon, and Furtwängler's of part of the Aegina east pediment; both of these are crude in that they use intense red and blue distributed evenly and contrasted with the white flesh of the figures. R. argues, convincingly on the basis of this material, that naturalism and the visibility of individual figures were not as important considerations in the use of colour as compositional emphasis.

The last chapter, on the architect, sculptor, and patron, is equally important for the student at any level; this is where R. addresses problems of design, if indeed there were designs in any sense compatible with our view of the process involved. R. is sceptical of any attempt to see the evolution of a consensus on content or placing, or even themes, and 'we should not be influenced by that anomalous building we call the Parthenon'. There is a salutary survey of conflicting positions on what rôle, if any, Pheidias played in its decoration. Another section expresses a negative view of political intervention in sculptural programmes in most sanctuaries, which neatly offsets more enthusiastic attempts to see political messages everywhere. This controversy should run for a while yet.

The volume is a level-headed survey of the problems of interpretation, message, visibility, and design, which will not go away, but are rarely considered together at length. A very important aspect of the book as a whole is its insistence on the religious nature of its material, and the effect that that had on its appearance and deployment. It is at least an implication of the whole argument that our difficulties in understanding both process and product have much to do with the secularism of our own culture. The chronological and geographical spread of the material alone, together with a generous bibliography and some far from standard plates, make this a valuable stimulus and a useful reference book, whether or not we like R.'s anti-relativist, indeed minimalist, conclusions.

University of Glasgow ELIZABETH MOIGNARD

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

POLYSEMOUS POTS

T. HACKENS (ed.): *Ancient and Traditional Ceramics.* (European Post Graduate Course 10, held at Ravello, European University Centre for Cultural Heritage. PACT, 40.) Pp. 153, figs, maps. Rixensart: Council of Europe, 1994. Paper, Bfrs. 1500. ISSN: 0257-8727.

I. LIRITZIS, G. TSOKAS (edd.): *Archaeometry in South-Eastern Europe.* (Second Conference in Delphi, 19–21 April 1991. PACT, 45.) Pp. 543, figs. Rixensart: Council of Europe, 1995. Paper, Bfrs. 5500. ISSN: 0257-8707.

J. P. CRIELAARD, V. STISSI, G. J. VAN WIJNGAARDEN (edd.): *The Complex Past of Pottery. Production, Circulation and Consumption of Mycenaean and Greek Pottery (Sixteenth to Early Fifth Centuries BC). Proceedings of the ARCHON international conference, held in Amsterdam, 8–9 November 1996.* Pp. vi + 321, maps, figs, tables. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1999. Cased, Hfl. 140. ISBN: 90-5063-327-7.

T. SCHREIBER: *Athenian Vase Construction: a Potter's Analysis.* Pp. xvi + 296, figs. Malibu, CA: The J. Paul Getty Museum, 1998. Cased, £53.50. ISBN: 0-89236-465-3.

This group of publications might be seen as a signpost to, if not comprehensively representative of, the current range of approaches to the study of ancient Mediterranean pottery, both plain and figured. At one end of the spectrum is the diagnostic tendency: pottery is a chronological tool with which to date your site or its phases, or, a more dangerous claim, a clue as to who was where when. At the other, it may, of course, be an *objet d'art* studied in what looks like a gilded vacuum to the outsider, or, perhaps more acceptably, a product of a particular set of social needs which can be seen as a way of understanding something of those needs and that society. Methodologies may be scientific, aesthetic, as objective as possible, or a fairly obvious product of the writer's background and predilections, and these two approaches are not mutually exclusive. Conferences, inevitably, abound; how should we deal with an object category which is omnipresent in the actual and conceptual world on which we work?

The two PACT volumes in this parcel publish proceedings of two conferences which were centrally concerned with precisely these issues: Volume 45 consists of numerous short papers on the application of material analysis, applied mathematics, geophysical prospection and other physico-chemical approaches to pottery and other problems: the metal parts of the Parthenon, computer reconstructions of archaeological sites, and the geological attribution of building marbles to their points of origin are among the contributors' wide range of specialist interests. Volume 40 is devoted, as its title suggests, to ancient and traditional ceramics, and the conference it reports was in fact largely concerned with methods of fabric identification and what the identifier hopes is the interpretation of distribution patterns which follows. Many of the papers are in fact a very useful guide to the intellectual history of the particular issue with which they deal, and we have papers which range between stylistic and physico-chemical analysis of Mediterranean pottery in general, and some of the less-publicized types

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Corinthian pottery, Punic trade-amphorae, and a descriptive explanation of the Beazleyite approach to the analysis of figured wares in particular. All of these have much to say to the initiated, and the last I recommend to the beginner.

I would say the same of the slightly more recent ARCHON conference proceedings. This meeting was explicitly about the production, circulation, and consumption of Mycenaean and Greek pottery between the sixteenth and the fifth centuries B.C., a period no doubt deliberately chosen because it can include the pottery of both prehistoric and historic societies, figured and unfigured wares, and domestic and quasi-industrial production. None of the contributors has, at any rate for this purpose, a primary interest in Attic black and red figure as a medium for figure drawing. This directs the papers towards asking questions about distribution and reception, defining 'native' and 'foreign' wares, and the interaction, or identity, of these types of classi- fication with those used to describe the consumer. Bibliographies are impressively broad-based; where the contributors are not the traditional ones in this area, that is all to the good, and many of their papers benefit from taking a step onto the verges of the usual paths through the field. Overviews of some of the periods less standard to the literature are welcome, and so are those of well-explored periods which seem to be less susceptible to overview. The early Iron Age rates several rather different papers, and so does the Mycenaean period.

Studies of the fabrication techniques of Attic black and red figure are intermittent. Shape studies of particular forms appear occasionally, sometimes with the aim of producing a framework within which to trace individual makers or workshops, hand in hand, naturally, with the evolution of the pictures which appear on them. The painting techniques, both aesthetic and chemical, have been studied too; much is now known about painting methods, firing, and even kiln packing; some scholars feel more confident still about the management and employment patterns of an Athenian pottery workshop. What is often lacking is knowledge of the actual construction methods involved in making, say, a volute krater; we occasionally have fascinating insights from the intensive study of one workshop or potter's output in specific cases. The lekythos maker noticed via a CAT scan by Winifred van der Put (in P. Heesen, *The J. L. Theodor Collection* [1996], pp. 203–5) who had trouble in centring his vessels on his wheel, and thereby produced internally lopsided cylinders, is a case in point. Some others have approached shapes through formal geometry, a process helped by traditional profile drawing, which often has the effect of regularizing the apparently symmetrical on paper, where the vessel itself, despite its formal and architectonic appearance, has the asymmetry and irregularities of the handmade. Schreiber is a master potter who has made a major study of the vases in the Getty Museum and other collections from the viewpoint of their individual construction; she published an important and illuminating article on handles as long ago as 1977, and she has engaged the interest of visitors to the Getty with a practical demonstration on kylix making for some years.

Athenian Vase Construction is laid out alphabetically in sections devoted to individual shapes, each of which has its specialized tale to tell. A column of serial diagrams at the side of the page shows the process of throwing the vessel and giving it handles or other features peculiar to the shape. It uses specific examples of the standard shapes, illustrated with numerous photographs and drawings, not only to demonstrate how the shape was arrived at and put together, but also, in some cases at least, where the process went wrong. This is quite as interesting as any demonstration as to how it should have worked, particularly in a type of ceramic which is famous for its qualities of formality and repetition. A commonplace of practical museum studies

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is the instruction to the novice: 'If it has handles, don't use them to pick it up!' We see why the handles of volute kraters tend to come off; not only are they attached to a vessel which is heavier than they can support, but the potter, in one case at least, failed to meld the lower join adequately with the body, and there is a visible disjunction. Standard shapes are subjected to comprehensive analysis of this sort, but so are the more unusual and complex: an askos in the shape of a duck, which, fortunately for this purpose, is in fragments, is analysed from the inside, and it becomes apparent that its body was wheel-thrown, whereas its head and neck were mould-made. The joins are an important source of information, as are the indentations made by the fingers of the maker, neither of which mean as much as they should to the non-practitioner. Tool marks reveal much about workshop equipment: the sponge-marks inside the mouth of an olpe, or the throwing-grooves rising from its base.

This is a sumptuously produced and absorbingly interesting volume which ought to find its way into any serious library on ancient ceramics. All the volumes reviewed here are a positive reflection on the current state of play in ceramic studies, a broad field with something to offer to most kinds of critical interest in material culture, and perhaps a stronger emphasis on the maker.

University of Glasgow ELIZABETH MOIGNARD

ARCHAIC ITALIAN ROOFS

P. S. LULOF, E. M. MOORMANN (edd.): *Deliciae Fictiles II. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Archaic Architectural Terracottas from Italy, held at the Netherlands Institute in Rome, 12–13 June 1996.* (Scrinium 12.) Pp. viii + 266, many figs. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers, 1997. Hfl. 170/US$113.50. ISBN: 90-5170-441-0; ISSN: 0929-6980.

C. RESCIGNO: *Tetti campani. Età arcaica. Cuma, Pitecusa e gli altri contesti.* (Pubblicazioni scientifiche del Centro di Studi della Magna Grecia dell'Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II, 3a serie vol. 4.) Pp. 414, 37 pls (drawings), 205 figs (halftone). Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider editore, 1998. Paper, L. 300,000. ISBN: 88-7689-137-4.

Temple roofs in central Italy, unlike those in Greece, were covered with richly decorated terracotta revetments from the Orientalizing down to the late Hellenistic (Republican) period. In Italy and Sicily, but not in Greece, similar protections were applied not only to temples but also to civic and private buildings (and occasionally to tombs as well). This means that the materials commonly defined as architectural terracottas usually constitute by far the most abundant and significant category of finds from the non-funerary sites of pre-imperial Italy outside the Greek colonies; their potential as a source of information (of many different kinds) is correspondingly enormous. Arvid Andrén's magisterial *Architectural Terracottas from Etrusco-Italic Temples* (1940) provided a timely framework for the spate of new discoveries in the postwar decades. These same finds, however, and the equally revealing re-examinations and 'excavations' in museum storerooms they prompted, showed that the phenomenon had begun much earlier, extended much further, and

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

involved more complex relationships than was previously thought. For some time now the need has been felt, and at least partly addressed, not just for a comprehensive new corpus, but for more sophisticated methodological approaches, focusing on context rather than on individual pieces or groups, in the hope of achieving a better understanding of complete roofs (and the buildings they covered)—and hence of their economic, social, political, and religious as well as their 'artistic' implications.

The quantity and complexity of research in the field has brought into existence a veritable phalanx of specialist 'Italic *terracottari*', who in 1990 first gathered to exchange news and views in the Swedish School at Rome (*Deliciae Fictiles I* = *ActaInstRomSueciae*-4°, 50, 1993). Six years later, a second meeting was held in the Dutch Institute on the centenary of the first excavations at Satricum: *Deliciae Fictiles II* contains its proceedings. The period under review on this occasion was limited to the Archaic, while more space was allotted to Campania and Sicily, and to technical matters.

The relevance of the latter—in both the ancient and modern spheres—is not limited to the four items that appear under this heading. Reviewing the past and present state of play, N. Cuomo di Caprio advocates integration of the humanistic and the scientific approaches, the adoption of more consistent formats for the storage and presentation of both kinds (what others have called 'soft' and 'hard') of data, and a coordinated strategy of thin-sections and compositional analyses. S. Ciaghi's comparative examination by computer imaging of similar plaques from different locations, detecting variations too minute for recognition by eye (and suggesting the use of punch stamps in the preparation of moulds), offers a powerful means of identifying detailed relationships between workshops, however distant (or otherwise) from each other. Good evidence for the independence of Etruscan regional traditions in respect of mainland or colonial Greek productions is produced by I. Edlund-Berry through a (dauntingly abstruse) computerized curve-fitting analysis. In J. Kenfield's paper (which is not the only one to be seriously at odds with its own 'summary'), the selective use of coarse slip or refined *epidermis* in the finish of the revetments at Morgantina suggests a well-argued revision of old-fashioned assumptions concerning the chronology and extent of the 'Hellenization' of this inland Sicilian town.

More Sicilian materials, generally of early date, attest to hitherto unsuspected connections—like a new type of sima at Syracuse (C. Ciurcina), Campanian antefixes in the hinterland of Himera (E. Epifanio Vanni), and painted wall plaques at Naxos (M. C. Lentini). For Campania, G. Greco rescues a rare figured relief frieze from the Paestan storerooms; B. d'Agostino and L. A. Scatozza anticipate some of their findings concerning, respectively, the Archaic and Sub-Archaic decorations of the Doric Temple at Pompeii; and C. Rescigno illustrates the rôle of Cumae in the early formation of the distinctive and influential Campanian tradition.

Most of the contributions, however, revolve once more around Latium and Etruria: from R. Knoop's instructive summary of the Satrican material and its problems, to an early ram's head from the Cannicella sanctuary at Orvieto-Volsinii, for which S. Stopponi finds close parallels in the animal acroteria from the Upper Building at Murlo. In between, F. M. Cifarelli brings us up to date with the situation on the acropolis at Segni, and M. J. Strazzulla provides a stimulating interpretation of its fragmentary pedimental high-relief; equally far-reaching is M. Mertens-Horn's reading of the Corinthian connotations in the myths represented by the acroterial statues of the Mater Matuta temple at Rome (S. Omobono)—whereas C. Parisi Presicce's proposals for the same complex met with properly adverse reactions; and the Tempio

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Grande at Vulci, illustrated by A. M. Moretti Sgubini, is tentatively attributed by M. Pandolfini to Menerva, on the basis of a painted inscription on an antepagmentum plaque. On more general themes, G. Aversa surveys architectural ram's heads in Central Italy; V. Kästner examines aspects of Etruscan corner simas; M. von Mehren discusses (rather confusedly) frieze plaques with composite figured motifs (the author of the item cited on p. 223 n. 10, incidentally, is the present reviewer, not her distinguished namesake B[runilde] S[ismondo] Ridgway as written); C. Wikander tests the feasibility of grouping and dating a small number of figured plaques through detailed measurements of their accessory elements. While the discussions of pieces in the Ashmolean Museum and at Princeton will surely leave many readers frankly depressed at the waste of R. De Reuver's and P. Lulof's talents on objects effectively deprived of any scientific value by decontextualization, it is encouraging to read N. Winter's report on the progress of her new and certainly monumental corpus of the Etruscan material: this is indeed eagerly awaited.

If for Etruria and Latium the persisting emphasis on 'stylistic and technical' analysis finds a degree of justification in the virtual disappearance and sadly inadequate documentation and publication of the buildings that all these terracottas were made to cover (cf. Knoop in *Deliciae Fictiles I*, p. 64), this appears to be even more literally applicable in the case of Campania. And yet, despite the immense difficulties of the task (and well aware of the challenging requirements of modern scholarship), Rescigno endeavours to organize his analysis of the Archaic productions of this innovative and pivotal region into specific 'systems' of individual roofs. The subtitle, besides defining the chronological span, points to what can be seen as the limitation of the work, but is in fact also one of its strengths. While 'the other contexts' include a good number of sites beyond Cumae and Pithekoussai, these two centres receive much more detailed attention than any of the rest (in the catalogue alone, forty-eight and forty-three pages respectively, as against e.g. eighteen for Pompeii and twenty-one for Capua); but this is because R. adopted the sensible policy of including only essential references for materials already (or about to be) published, providing instead full information and illustration for unfamiliar finds—among which those from the earliest Euboean establishments are undoubtedly the most significant.

After the introduction (pp. 19–25), containing a lucid history of research (and a sober dedication to the memory of Nazarena Valenza Mele), a chapter on technique and typology (pp. 27–40) also includes a guide to the organization of both classification and catalogue. In the first, appearing under the modest title of 'Indice morfologico' (pp. 41–188), the various functional forms (tiles, antefixes, simas, plaques, acroteria) are described and discussed in relation to their specific contexts—often reassembled here for the first time—in the different sites where each is attested. Just under half the book consists of the catalogue ('Sezione topografica', pp. 189–373), precious not only for the first edition of important materials such as those of Pithekoussai (pp. 239–81), but equally for the succinct discussions of the evidence and literature for every centre and individual monument (see, for example, the account of the contradictory interpretations most recently (1986–94) advanced for the Pompeian documents [pp. 282–3 with n. 2]). The conclusions (pp. 375–89) summarize the results, adopting a broad chronological division between an experimental phase (first half of the sixth century) and the better known consolidated Campanian tradition of the second half of the century; some useful 'considerazioni preliminari' on the workshops are also offered. 'Segni di montaggio' are reproduced, with comments, in the appendix (pp. 389–99).

'The work stops at the definition of the forms and the discussion of the contexts.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Further interpretation requires more reflection and new analytical data' (p. 377): such restraint is admirable in a young scholar, especially one who has already offered in this volume a wealth of new data, well integrated with what we had before in a careful and wide-ranging analysis. For good measure, and unusually for this publisher, the high-quality photographs are well organized and sharply reproduced (only the indistinct smudge of the greys in the 'colour' scale for the drawings [p. 415] is a reminder of the persistent inadequacy of computer printing), and the price is almost reasonable.

University of Edinburgh F. R. SERRA RIDGWAY

STATUES OF STATUS

M. SEHLMEYER: *Stadtrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit. Historizität und Kontext von Symbolen nobilitären Standesbewusstseins*. (*Historia* Einzelschrift 130.) Pp. 319, 20 b & w ills, 3 plans. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1999. Paper, DM 124. ISBN: 3-515-07479-1.

This study of the evidence for honorific statues at Rome, a revision of the author's Göttingen dissertation of 1997–8, is comprehensive and well documented. It has the feel of a catalogue or handbook at times, but makes judicious judgements and gives a reasonable picture of development throughout the Republican period.

There are seven chapters. The first investigates precedents from Italy and Athens, and offers some thoughts on the present state of research. Succeeding chapters proceed chronologically, dividing the history of honorific statues into five phases. The final chapter lists some conclusions, and returns to the political significance of the phenomenon. The latter is of great interest, and could perhaps have been developed more comprehensively.

After a discussion of *imagines*, which emphasizes their political value and owes much to Harriet Flower's recent book on the subject, S. opens his first phase (338–*c*. 285 B.C.) with the equestrian statues erected to the consuls Maenius and Camillus in 338. These were the first historical 'Ehrenstatuen' at Rome (pp. 48ff.), and belonged to an age of conflict with Latins, Samnites, and Greeks, when the Roman nobility was sharpening its exclusivity and honing its presentation skills. The second phase (*c*. 285–200 B.C.) is dominated by 'triumphal' statues in military garb placed on the Capitol. S. sees a decline in variety that he connects with the development of the triumph in the third century. Yet rostral columns, statue-bearing *fornices*, historical paintings, and *imagines clipeatae* make an appearance too. The process undoubtedly gathered momentum in the great age of Hellenization that formed the third phase (*c*. 200–130 B.C.). Censors found it necessary to clear the Forum of 'Privatstatuen' (pp. 152ff.); unsanctioned displays of booty were similarly removed from the Capitol (pp. 159ff.). There were naked statues in *municipia* during the second half of the second century—indeed, the Terme Ruler is Italian (p. 174)—but S. argues that there were no naked statues in Rome itself before the time of Octavian, because of the greater social control there (p. 175). I have doubts about this, for there are very few surviving examples, and it seems more probable, as Erich Gruen has argued, that the municipal notables took their lead in this matter from Rome, much as Paul Zanker has shown that the notables at Pompeii took their lead from Romans in matters of display and presentation.

In the fourth phase (*c*. 130–80 B.C.) S. sees another decline, which he explains in

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

political terms as a reaction to the upheavals of the Gracchan period. Perhaps the nobles did make a tacit decision to limit displays of individual power for their common good; or perhaps the slowdown in military conquest and economic activity is more important. Certainly the Roman people showed remarkable initiative in reacting to men like Marius and the relatively minor figure Marius Gratidianus (praet. 85) (pp. 199f.). The seated statue for Cornelia was a new form (p. 187). During the fifth and final phase (82–2 B.C.) the warlords gradually monopolized the receipt of honorific statues, and new, extravagant forms appeared. Sulla received a golden equestrian statue (p. 204), Caesar was awarded an ivory image (p. 227). Statues in precious metal, of monumental size, naked, and bearing divine attributes were used prominently during the propaganda wars of the triumviral period (an age of 'Statuenpolitik' or 'Statuenkrieg'). S. is heavily influenced by Zanker in his views of both the triumviral period (pp. 238ff.) and the Forum of Augustus (pp. 262ff.). I was surprised not to find an extended discussion of statues like those from Prima Porta and Via Labicana.

There were perhaps less distinct divisions between his periods than S. allows, and his classifications are unavoidably problematic. 'Ehrenstatue', after all, was not a Roman category (p. 12). S. identifies 'Ehrenstatuen' for the living, 'Memorialstatuen' for the deceased (akin to 'Grabstatuen' but not located at the tomb), 'Triumphalstatuen', 'Privatstatuen' such as those removed from the Forum, and 'Kultstatuen', which were a phenomenon of the late Republic beginning with the Gracchi. However, it is not always easy to tell who erected a statue or whether the subject was alive or dead; and, among other potential complications, a statue in military garb need not be a 'Triumphalstatue'. In spite of S.'s caution and attention to overlap, these things impede our attempts to appreciate their significance. There are good sections on the political use of statues in the Comitium (pp. 103ff.) and on the Capitol (pp. 128f.), but the strictly chronological method, moving from example to example, prevents a more discursive approach. There seems room for further speculation about how the statues were used and about their significance at different periods, to different groups, and so on. The shift from recognizing *honor* to conveying it, associated with the late Republic (pp. 274ff.), might have been a more ambiguous and fluid matter throughout the whole period of this study.

The quality of coin portraits, tables, and plans is high, and most extended passages of Greek and Latin are accompanied by German translations. The historian in search of a comprehensive collection of evidence sensibly discussed will be grateful for this book, which is better in these respects for its period than G. Lahusen's *Untersuchungen zur Ehrenstatue in Rom* (Rome, 1983).

The University of Auckland TOM STEVENSON

IRISH GUIDANCE?

G. W. BOWERSOCK, P. BROWN, O. GRABAR (edd.): *Late Antiquity. A Guide to the Postclassical World.* Pp. xiii + 780, ills, maps. Cambridge, MA and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999. Cassed, £29.95. ISBN: 0-674-51173-5.

Disappointment is the reaction envisaged to this guide to the tranformation of the classical world between the mid-third century and *c.* 800, to judge by the defensive

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tone of the Introduction. Here the Irishman's definition of a net is cited, 'a lot of holes tied together with string', to defend the editors' acceptance that their wide-ranging endeavour should not be all-inclusive. Blanket coverage for such a theme is impossible, and indeed undesirable, but there are holes aplenty among the items accorded an entry in the alphabetical Guide, which occupies two-thirds of the volume; the logic of omissions frequently escapes me. Among historians Priscus of Panium is omitted, whereas his predecessor Olympiodorus and successor Malchus are included, Theophanes and Sebeos are out, but Malalas and Moses Khorenats'i in. Among military men, Stilicho is present, but Aetius, Aspar, Belisarius, and Narses are not. Among cities, Amida, Ankara, Pergamum, Palmyra, Sardis, and Serdica are absent. Emperors such as Diocletian, Theodosius I and II, and Zeno do not appear, whereas Constantine and Anastasius do. Arians, Arianism, and neo-Arians do not feature, in contrast to Origenism. Ostrogoths and Vandals yes, but Visigoths, a more enduring ethnic group, no. Among provinces or regions, Bithynia, Britain, Dalmatia, Illyricum, Lazica, and, most extraordinarily, Armenia are absent. The editors suggest that their Index will provide the string to permit users to pick up material to fill in the gaps and 'follow subjects, places, and persons that are not dealt with explicitly in the essays or articles', but many of the names above are simply not there. Armenia was important in late antiquity, geopolitically because of its location between Rome and Sasanid Iran, and then between Umayyad Syria and the Caucasus, religiously because of the impact of Christianity on international relations, and socially and militarily because of the prominent rôles played by members of the noble class of *nakharars* in the Byzantine and Sasanid courts and armies. But the Index under Armenia just offers '*See* Alphabets; Caucasus; Moses Khorenats'i'; a gaping hole remains in a sensitive area.

The *Guide*'s agenda is laudable: to tie together the different major components of its chosen period, Rome and Byzantium, Sasanid Iran and the early Islamic Caliphate, whose different academic demands, especially their different and difficult languages, too often lead to separate treatment; to present the results of recent research, in particular archaeological investigations, which have challenged accepted wisdoms; to encourage readers to travel across the half millennium and vast geographical extent of late antiquity. The Index does not help much with 'travel' (no entry); 'travellers' is cross-referenced to Baptism and Buddhists, but not to possibly relevant topics such as diplomacy, pilgrimage, letters, roads, or *cursus publicus*. Translation might seem another promising route in view of the introduction's allusion to the importance of the transmission of Greek knowledge through Syriac and Arabic, but there is no Index entry and the user may miss the dozen or so lines at the end of the article on Syriac. North Africa is an area which sees transitions from prosperous Roman province to ethnic kingdom to reconquered Byzantine exarchate, wracked by religious disputes, to Islamic Ifriqya, but the brief entry in the guide cannot embrace such a broad spectrum. The emphasis on recent scholarly advances might have led to the inclusion of entries on trade, the economy, perhaps shipwrecks, or even the Pirenne thesis, whose reinterpretation or revision is central to the more positive view of late antiquity which the editors rightly seek to promote, but they are all absent. If one wishes to tie together scattered material on Christology, or to trace the importance of eunuchs in the different parts of late antiquity, again there is no help.

Since the Index does not give the net its necessary string, more is required of the ten introductory essays, but here too there is a defensive tone: 'we have not wished to sacrifice the vividness of a personal introduction to selected themes to the harmless drudgery of a comprehensive survey' (p. xii). All the essays indeed contain interesting

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

material, but the editors should have given greater direction if the *Guide* was to fulfil its mission. For example, the first essay, Averil Cameron's 'Remaking the Past', is a brief but typically provocative overview of Greek and Roman intellectual culture; here is a fascinating topic which cries out to be extended into the early Islamic period, but there is no discussion of vital topics such as *hadith*, *khabar/akhbar*, or *isnad*, which could have introduced readers to characteristic aspects of Islamic narrative and historiography; the *Letter of Tansar*, which would have brought in Sasanid Iran, is not discussed. Useful material is already available in Averil Cameron and Larry Conrad (edd.), *Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam*, *I. Problems in the Literary Source Material* (Princeton, 1992), the first publication of a series of important workshops whose cross-disciplinary agenda anticipated that of the *Guide* by a decade and which, in spite of extremely slow publication, has already delivered important results on economic, fiscal, and military issues as well as sources. In the same way, Christopher Kelly's 'Empire Building' is lucid on the Roman Empire (fuller treatment in his contribution to *Cambridge Ancient History* XIII), but this topic is not pursued into the Byzantine or Umayyad worlds where themes and junds (neither in the Index) might have been considered. Patrick Geary's 'Barbarians and Ethnicity' is more problematic since he ignores all Peter Heather's work on Goths and Huns, arguably the most important recent research on this theme, since Heather's approach and conclusions run counter to his own agenda; the editors might helpfully have stepped in to prevent this distorted presentation. Hugh Kennedy on 'Islam' announces his intention to focus on Syria, in which context he discusses the transformation of the classical city (the best overall treatment of late antique urbanism in the volume, but surely in an odd location), but the result is that many aspects of the message of Islam and the explosive conquests cannot be covered. Yizhar Hirschfeld's 'Habitat' provides a lucid survey of diverse recent work on Roman housing, but this does not extend into the post-Roman west or the Islamic world, and his brief forays into conditions in the countryside and agriculture should have been better keyed in to diverse entries in the *Guide* (where, for example, 'cadaster' is not tied in through the Index). Overall the essays which best meet the volume's integrative agenda are those of Caseau and Fowden on religious matters.

If the volume fails to deliver its ambitious goals, there is still a wealth of interesting scholarship succinctly presented. Diverse material on social and cultural aspects of Late Antiquity will, in particular, provide a vital supplement to the two volumes of *Cambridge Ancient History* (XIII, XIV) which are deficient in this general area. But it remains frustrating that a major press has invested substantial money in a project which a little extra care could have made so much more useful; for example, *OCD*, to which the editors refer as a source for further information, provides the network lacking in this Guide by a thorough system of textual cross-references. Editors are, to an extent, beholden to their contributors for what they actually receive to publish, but this distinguished triumvirate could surely have demonstrated to Harvard the benefits of decent connections, and have suggested to some contributors that certain items needed to be incorporated. Students will find much of interest here, sometimes accidentally, but it is likely to assist most those who already have some knowledge: it may not be the best starting-point—the Irishman's guidance on getting to Dublin springs to mind.

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

DIY CLASS. CIV.

J. PURKIS: *Teach Yourself Greek Civilization*. Pp. viii + 148, ills. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1999. Paper, £8.99. ISBN: 0-340-71142-6.

P. JAMES: *Teach Yourself Roman Civilization*. Pp. viii + 195, ills. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1999. Paper, £8.99. ISBN: 0-340-741141-8.

These books are designed to meet a welcome upsurge of non-specialist interest in the classics, evidenced, for example, by the unprecedented numbers signing on for Greek at the Open University (where both authors lecture), media interest, the success of summer schools, and the recent publication of a stream of books such as *A Bluffer's Guide to the Classics*, *Classics: a Very Short Introduction*, and *The Intelligent Person's Guide to the Classics*.

The 'teach-yourself' approach is a bold one, as is the publisher's claim on the back of *Greek Civilization* that it is a 'comprehensive history' in which 'the subject is thoroughly explored'. Purkis himself seems less certain, stating more plausibly in his introduction that 'it would be impossible to provide a complete picture of Greek history, literature or art in a volume of this kind'. One challenge faced by the authors is to identify the target readership; another to decide on a structural principle; a third to distinguish 'teaching yourself' Greek or Roman civilization from merely reading a book about it. There are similarities of format but also differences between the two volumes; I shall deal with *Greek Civilization* first.

P. envisages a likely reader as a non-specialist whose interest has been aroused during or in anticipation of a holiday in Greece. He is unsure quite what level of ignorance to assume and generally takes it to be profound. The result is that he seems unbearably patronizing at times, with pronunciation guidance (HERA—Here-a), and questions like 'What products of modern Greece can you find in your local supermarket? Answer: olives, olive oil etc.', and language like 'Zeus is quite capable of acting in a nasty and underhand way'. There is a tendency to presume that because the reader is unfamiliar with Greek civilization, s/he is generally culturally ignorant.

However, the structural principle adopted is a reasonable one: after an introductory chapter 'locating the Greeks in space and time' (and establishing aspects of 'Greek-ness', notably imagination and the willingness to speculate), the approach is more or less historical, with each chapter linked to a particular site, from Mycenae and Pylos to Byzantium, by way of Olympia and Delphi, Ionia, Sparta, Athens, Epidaurus, and Alexandria. It is easy to see how a wide range of topics can arise from these, and a strength of the book is its breadth. There are sections on, to give but a few, omens and oracles, architecture, lyric poetry, drama, the Ionian philosophers and the Ionian revolt, Socrates and Plato, and the Hellenistic world, with a range of source material. Inevitably, treatment is brief and selective, but there is a reasonable range of source material and guidance to its interpretation.

The 'teach-yourself' aspect is catered for in several ways: the reader is 'the student' and addressed as 'you'; the aims of each chapter are given at the beginning, with questions which are to be answered in what is to come; the style is chatty and evokes a tutorial—'now let us turn', 'just make the obvious comments—there is no hidden mystery', 'we now move on', 'you may well be amazed'; questions are posed for the reader: 'What do you make of this?' A 'discussion' (a misnomer—in fact the author's

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press

comments) then follows. This format is familiar from Open University materials but is less succesful here. The reader may be invited to speculate, but s/he is also told what to think; heaven forbid that 'out-of-date critical preconceptions' should be applied by the would-be autodidact (hence the archly entitled section, 'Taste and All That', and timely warnings never to be heard admiring the Laocoon or thinking that colour on Greek temples might have been attractive).

The final chapter suggests ways of 'taking it further'. This includes visiting museums ('It is amazing how much material is stored up in museums', the author discovers), a reading list which, even though highly selective, still has some crying omissions, and websites.

The illustrations are, frankly, terrible. It is hard to imagine the new reader, perhaps excited by a visit to Greece, being other than repelled by these dull black-and-white photographs, and the question must arise as to why, with so many attractive books available, and this one by no means cheap for what it offers, anyone would buy it.

Roman Civilization is a considerably more substantial and confident work. It too ranges widely, though without relying on an historical approach. Five chapters—'City Tour', 'Roman Holiday', 'Point of Departure', 'Meeting the People', and 'Going Abroad'—enable James to cover a huge range of topics (the first, for example, covers politics, religion, and mythology, as well as more obvious urban themes along with worthwhile extracts from Ovid, Virgil, and Horace; the second develops from the *Ara Pacis* and Augustan propaganda to attitudes to the countryside in Cicero, Cato, Tibullus, and Virgil, economic issues, and an exploration of the villas at Boscoreale and Laurentum). With a much more specific aim of teaching the student how to interpret primary evidence, there is a wealth of material accompanied by fresh and vigorous discussion. This is a most enjoyable and at times even exciting book for specialist and non-specialist alike. The non-specialist is not patronized, and even the modernisms (Mercury a 'kind of divine facilitator') and occasional humour grate less.

Roman Civilization seems better to meet the aim of helping the reader to 'develop rewarding ways of looking at an unfamiliar culture'. The last two chapters are particularly successful in building a coherent and satisfying picture from sources as divergent as Servius Sulpicius, the Oxyrhynchus papyri, and Sidonius. Appendices (including a time-line, food, names, and gods), the bibliography, and suggestions for further study are practical and helpful. The photographs, alas, are no better.

The Godolphin and Latymer School JENNIFER GIBBON

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.2.446 Published online by Cambridge University Press