of 1871. Then follows the Greek text, an exact reproduction of Kayser's except only for the font, with the translation on the facing page. The only imaginable reason for this slavish fidelity is that C. has taken over the Greek text of the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, which also used Kayser's 1871 edition, but for some reason he has not chosen to alter it at any point. In other words, the dead hand of Kayser still weighs heavily on this text, as it did on that of Wright in 1921 and of the *TLG*. There is perhaps a lesson here about the drawbacks of modern technology. The *TLG* is a marvelous instrument, but it will set back the cause of scholarship if it has the effect of deadening critical thought.

It is a natural consequence of this timidity that C.'s Greek text is not up to the standard of his commentary. It is an especial shame that he has not made use of the proposals of two great scholars of the eighteenth century, Valckenaer and Reiske. Most of these became known through two articles of K. Schenkl, *WS* 14 (1892), 271–3 and 15 (1893), 200–2. Thus, according to the manuscripts (VS 2.26.1, 612–13 Ol.), Philostratus says that Heracleides was notable as a high-priest of the Lycians, *τὴν δὲ λειτουργησίαν οὖσαν οὐ μεγάλου ἔθνους Ῥωμαίων μεγάλων ἀξιοῦσιν ὑπὲρ ξυμμαχίας, οἶμαι, παλαιᾶς*. C. translates, 'una liturgia, questa, che, pur riguardando un popolo non grande, è ritenuta tuttavia degna dei grandi romani in virtù, credo, di un'antica alleanza'. But even if *ἀξιοῦσιν* is taken to mean 'people think', as it seems to be by C., what sense would it make for the priesthood to be thought 'worthy of great Romans'? Valckenaer's *Ῥωμαῖοι* (anticipated by Valesius) cries out for adoption. In this and other cases, Wright at least notes the emendations without adopting them, while C. is silent. To this extent his text represents a regression from Wright's of 1921.

In an appendix, C. gives an Italian translation of a short early essay by Constantin Cavafy on the Second Sophistic. 'I feel great sympathy for the so very despised sophists of the ancient world . . . This misfortune of theirs, this silence which Destiny has imposed upon them—how intolerable it would be to their ghosts—should make us indulgent and compassionate.' A hundred years have more than fulfilled Cavafy's hopes for these artists of the word.

There is still much to be done with the *Lives of the Sophists*. Perhaps it is not too late to hope for a critical edition, but even failing that, a fresh text with translation to match would be welcome. It will be a long time, however, before we need a new commentary, and this one deserves all our gratitude.

*Harvard University* CHRISTOPHER P. JONES
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni049

## HOW TO BECOME GREEK

T. WHITMARSH: *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire. The Politics of Imitation*. Pp. xiv + 377. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-19-924035-3.

Two quick-off-the-mark reviews relevant to this book are eulogistic in tone. For Lawrence Kim, 'The breadth, subtlety, and richness of writing on display is remarkable; if you want to understand why the Second Sophistic is undergoing such a resurgence in Classics, to grasp what is at stake in the literature and why it is so exciting, and can only read one book on the topic, this should be it' (*Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2003.03.14; cf. T. A. Schmitz, ibid. 2002.02.22). Can W.'s book live up to this sort of thing? Could any?

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni050 Published online by Cambridge University Press

First a very brief run through the main texts used, and an extremely selective outline of some of the main arguments. Chapter 1 (pp. 41–89) looks at the different ideas about *mimesis* in *How the Young Man should Listen to Poetry* by Plutarch and *On the Sublime* by 'Longinus', as well as in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Lucian, Achilles Tatius, Longus, and Heliodorus. It is suggested that *mimesis* not only emphasizes continuity with the past, but also points to discontinuity. In Chapter 2 (pp. 90–130), to argue that *Paideia* not only reinforces the norms of society but transgresses them in various areas, W. deploys for social status pseudo-Plutarch, *On the Education of Children*, Longus, Philostratus' *Heroicus*, and the case of Herodes' Agathion, for gender Plutarch and Musonius Rufus, and for Hellenic identity Favorinus and Lucian. Chapter 3 (pp. 133–80) looks at the oppositional but contested identities constructed in the writings on exile of Musonius, Dio of Prusa, and Favorinus. The orations *On Kingship* of Dio form the heart of Chapter 4 (pp. 181–246). 'Agonistic self-promotion' is detected as the 'primary aim of these texts' (p. 210). An interesting, though some would consider possibly irrelevant, reading of Marcus Aurelius' *Meditations* is included (pp. 216–25). After arguing that any investigation into the 'real' attitudes of Lucian is pointless, and setting up culture during the principate as 'spectacular', in Chapter 5 (pp. 247–94) W. gives us his readings of *Sale of Lives*, *Fisherman*, *Nigrinus*, *On Salaried Posts*, and *Apology*.

To return now to the introduction (pp. 1–38) and methodology: as texts are not clear windows onto the minds of their authors, W. holds that the investigation of the 'real' attitudes of writers is ultimately fruitless. Furthermore, the pursuit of contemporary reader responses is chimerical. Instead, W. explores the identities created, or 'performed', in texts. He is emphatic that these are not just reflections of 'anterior' identities created elsewhere. The former approach, which he labels 'expressive-realist', is to be avoided because, born out of Romanticism, it is unthinkingly stuck in a specific time and space, and it is 'outmoded'. The latter approach, which is to be embraced, is, implicitly, bang-up-to-date (W. never faces up to the inevitable here), and its anachronism (a word which W. claims to be 'unfocused and misleading') is 'designedly so'. W. wants to provide plausible interpretations which are useful for us; in his words 'to expropriate into a sociolect comprehensible to modern readers'.

Here we can look at one identity 'performed' in a text. W. boasts his plain speaking: 'I have sought to avoid jargon' (p. 32). The reader might then be rather discombobulated to find a couple of pages later that the concept of Greeks as politically powerless purveyors of culture '"metaphorized" into a set of resources that enabled parasitic irony and esoteric hermeneutics to take over', or that it was 'not simply a blazon, an emblem synecdochic of Graeco-Roman complementarity as whole'. He or she should have seen it coming. Big statements of intent do not end up on p. 32 by mistake. Just like the ancients, the modern reader is being 'subjected to a radically ludic uncertainty by means of a range of literary strategies' (p. 34). Intertextuality is in overdrive here. The Greek texts are sophisticated, playful, and ironic. This text is the same.

Part of the identity of W. is 'traditional' classical scholar. The explicit eschewal of 'a spurious attempt at authenticity' in transliterating Greek names (p. vii) is, of course, an implicit claim to be capable of it, and is delightfully undercut by later doing it anyway (p. 103 n.50, on Protesileus/Protesilaus). The appendix translating Favorinus' *On Exile* is beating the old buffers at their own game. But the 'performed' identity of W. is 'contested'. W. as conventional classicist is withheld until p. 32, and is introduced with an air of mild surprise ('Indeed, in certain ways, my critical practice is that of a

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni050 Published online by Cambridge University Press

traditional commentator'). The dominant identity is postmodern literary critic. Look at one footnote on 'cultural identity':

> an enormous topic: for central contributions to the debate, see Said (1978); B. Anderson (1983); Gellner (1987); Spivak (1988); Bhabha ed. (1990); S. Hall (1990; 1992); Rutherford ed. (1990); Young (1990); Viswanathan (1990); Bhabha (1994); S. Hall and du Gay eds. (1996). For lucid discussion of the relevance of 'identity' in ancient contexts, see Grahame (1998), 157–60; Miles (1999). (p. 35 n. 147)

You really cannot say that any of the usual suspects are missing from the line up. Yet W. is not an uncritical reader of modern theory. 'I refer to Derrida's theory of the linguistic sign (*or "trace"*), that signifies (*so he argues*) by necessary reference to an original signified, but in fact gains its significance by means of its position within a system of signifiers. *As he puts it*, *with characteristic ellipsis* . . .' and so on (p. 174 n. 151). Look at those controlling and (slightly) distancing phrases (italics added).

'To read these texts . . . is to learn how to become Greek' (p. 32). This points to an answer to one of the main interpretive questions posed by this book. Where did half the title go? The Roman empire seems to have wandered out of the frame. It puts in the odd appearance; it undergoes a decisive break in its attitudes to *Paideia* with the death of Domitian, after which emperors 'cultivated and promoted Greek intellectuals' (pp. 15–16, 165–6, 183–4), and the fourth century sees 'a (notional) empire-wide conversion to Christianity, reversion to paganism, then reconversion' (p. 84). The latter is laconic, the former dubious. The 'decisive break' seems an uncritical acceptance of the rhetoric of Pliny and Trajan. All previous emperors, including Domitian, had positioned themselves close to *pepaideumenoi*. Most of the time in this book the empire remains unchanging and out of shot. But if close reading of these texts is all it takes to learn about Greeks under the principate, then there is not much need for historical 'background'.

The lack of interest in political, social, or economic history probably underpins the book's vagueness in chronology. Philosophers are commonly associated with *parrhesia* 'in this period' (p. 67). Although Dionysius of Halicarnassus 'is substantially earlier than the majority of writers treated in this book . . . the themes he raises are thoroughly germane to the literature of second- and third-century Greece' (p. 72). Heliodorus may have written in the fourth century, but concentration on 'narrow historical explanations . . . ignore the text's self-conscious self-positioning within the *longue durée* of the period of novel writing' (p. 85). W. dragging on stage Greek writers from outside his main period raises the question of the literary 'disappeared' in this text. Why has W. excluded the philosophers Epictetus and Maximus of Tyre, the travel writer Pausanias, the historians Cassius Dio and Herodian, and the sophists Aelius Aristides and Aelian, among others? Above all, how can a book discuss the creation of Greek identities in the period of the Second Sophistic and not *The Sacred Tales* of Aelius Aristides? Maybe it is all just down to factors of time and space, but the suspicion arises that they have 'disappeared' because they may not fit all that well into W.'s 'identities performed in the text with no anterior identity' scheme.

So how 'useful' is W.'s approach? The 'expressive-realist' line might deter other ways of thinking, but its complete rejection closes down a way of reading that is both enjoyable and valid. Romanticism may have widened and deepened such readings, but it did not invent them. Readers before the eighteenth century probably did consider that Augustine's *Confessions* told them something about his 'real' views. If contemporary reader responses are unrecoverable, why does W. spend some time trying to show that the ancients, just like him, went in for 'detailed and sophisticated reading'

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni050 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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

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

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

## ACHILLES TATIUS

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

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

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni050 Published online by Cambridge University Press