The Classical Review

NEW SERIES VOLUME XLVIII NO. 2

(VOLUME CXII OF THE CONTINUOUS SERIES)

1998

HOMER AS SPEECH

E. J. BAKKER: *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse* (Myth and Poetics). Pp. xiv + 237. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1997. ISBN: 0-8014-3295-2.

In this book B. presents to a wider audience his work on 'Orality and Homeric Discourse' already published in a series of articles over the past years. His central claim is that Homer should be approached not as (written) literature or oral poetry but instead as a flow of speech through time. Part 1, 'Perspectives', introduces the text of Homer as a transcript of spoken discourse. Starting from the dichotomy 'oral' versus 'written', B. argues against the view that Homeric epic is a special type of poetry, suggesting instead to regard it as a type of speech. What this means is elaborated in Part 2, 'Speech', where a new understanding of Homer's paratactic style is advocated on the basis of 'ordinary speech' as described by the linguist W. Chafe. Adopting Chafe's approach to language, B. explains some of the more striking features of Homeric discourse with reference to cognitively determined linguistic strategies. In the third part, 'Special Speech', he investigates some of the ways in which Homeric epic in turn departs from 'ordinary speech'. Here the key feature is metre. B. argues that some characteristics which other types of discourse, such as rhetorical prose, display at the level of syntax have their counterpart in the metrical period of the Homeric hexameter. To those familiar with B.'s work, there will be few surprises in the detail. What is new is the attempt to draw together in one sustained argument the results of ten years of research. In many ways, this attempt must be judged successful. Although potentially complicated, B.'s argument is almost always unassuming and easy to follow. Linguistic jargon is kept to an acceptable minimum, and the footnotes are mostly short and to the point. The book is also equipped with a helpful index.

On the whole, B. is most convincing where he relies least on the ideas of others. His study of particles such as δέ–δή, μέν–μήν, καί, (ἄ)ρα, γάρ, οὖν—here restated as Chapters 4–5—may serve to illustrate the successful mixture of bold intuition and high linguistic competence which characterizes B.'s work at its best. Against the 'cataloguing' δέ which separates intonation units and invites the audience to move further along the narrative line (pp. 62ff.), B. sets καί as an inclusive element which tends to occur within such units (pp. 71–4). Μέν prepares for the progression carried out by δέ and opens a 'frame' within which the following sections may be viewed (pp. 100–8). The concept of framing, not perhaps entirely fortunate given B.'s criticism of spatial metaphors elsewhere (e.g. p. 120 on ring composition), is also important for the somewhat bolder suggestion that the Homeric hexameter developed out of a system of 'staged' noun-epithet phrases (Chapters 7, 8). Such assertions are hard to prove,

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and the fact that B. tries to do so by dividing the *Iliad* into areas of 'quintessential action' (p. 168) and 'anti-action' (p. 169) does not inspire confidence in his results. However, B. does succeed in showing that the mechanics of formulaic language may be viewed as one phenomenon of periodization among others. Just as rhetorical prose is organized in syntactical periods (pp. 138–46), Homeric metre can be seen as a 'routinized' variant of the rhythmical period (pp. 186ff.). The analogy with American folk preachers (pp. 133–5) suggests a link with ritual practice.

Much of what B. argues is convincing and has a strong intuitive appeal. However, his results are undermined in part by his strict adherence to the doctrines of modern cognitive linguistics. Here I would draw attention to a slightly alarming phenomenon. It is rightly assumed today that research carried out in fields other than classics can have a stimulating effect on the discipline. B.'s book further contributes to this beneficial development. However, it also highlights some of its less welcome aspects. Throughout the volume, B. follows Chafe in arguing that spoken discourse of any time and culture reflects a series of biologically conditioned foci of consciousness. Given that such foci can only be verbalized one after the other, and in the order in which they present themselves to the speaker's mind, 'ordinary human speech' is 'naturally' paratactic. As evidence for this Chafe—and B. with him (e.g. pp. 43, 48)—cites the so-called 'Pear Film project' in which a number of people are shown a short film and then asked to give a narrative account of it. The result is appropriately paratactic, but this proves little. How 'ordinary', we may ask, is the situation described? How important is it that the persons in question are paraphrasing a film? Why are they asked to produce a narrative and how does this relate to speech in general? B. does not address any of these questions, nor does he come to terms with such dubious concepts as 'the one new idea constraint' (pp. 99, 103). Here as elsewhere Chafe and his 'experimental research' (p. 46) determine the tone and scope of B.'s discussion to an extent which threatens to obstruct rather than stimulate the proposed hermeneutic encounter. As B. himself remarked some time ago, 'the application to the Homeric style of the concept of the fragmentation of oral narrative into idea units has . . . an immediate appeal' (*TAPA* 120 [1990], 5). More immediacy and less application, more Bakker and less Chafe, would have made a better book.

Cambridge JOHANNES HAUBOLD

HOMERIC HYMNS

G. ZANETTO (ed.): *Inni Omerici: Testo greco a fronte.* Pp. 314. Milan: Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, 1996. L. 16,000. ISBN: 88-17-17136-0.

There have been some useful books published on the Homeric hymns recently, most notably Jenny Strauss Clay's literary treatment of the four major hymns, *The Politics of Olympus* (Princeton, 1989), but this book fulfils a need by providing a handy edition with commentary and facing translation. Z. is familiar with all the relevant scholarship, and he makes judicious use of it, while not being afraid to come up with suggestions of his own. The introduction discusses the nature and function of the hymns, with a section on each of the major ones. Z. rightly points out the aetiological and theogonic nature of the hymns, which deal with conflicts among the gods and their acquisition of τιμαί. He has an interesting discussion of why archaic Greeks did not find it odd to honour their gods by telling stories of struggles, thefts, and deceits. He deals sensibly with the problem of the hymns' function, following the

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

standard view that they were used as preludes to recitations of epic at festivals but suggesting that later the longer hymns came to be performed on their own.

Some recent works have questioned the traditional suggestions about the performance context of particular hymns, but Z. rightly reaffirms the theories that the Demeter hymn (*Dem*) was composed for an Attic/Eleusinian context, the (Delian) Apollo (*Ap*) hymn for performance on Delos, and the Aphrodite hymn (*Aph*) to honour Aeneadae in the Troad (Z. argues that it was composed on Lesbos). He probably goes too far, however, in stating that *Dem* is a true liturgical hymn, designed to be performed as part of the Mysteries. He picks his way sensibly through the problems of the Apollo hymn: he accepts the Burkert/Janko hypothesis that the combined hymn was performed at a Delian festival organized by Polycrates in the 520s. Z. suggests that on this occasion Cynaethus of Chios added to the older Delian hymn a Pythian one composed by him but using mainland traditions (but surely it is more likely that the Ionian Cynaethus composed the Delian half). On the Hermes hymn (*Herm*), Z. stresses how the hymn shows his *metis* and trickery, and summarizes the nature of Hermes well.

The commentary is naturally selective, but helpful and informative. Z. of course makes use of the existing commentaries, but thinks for himself, and if one compares his commentary with Cassola's important edition, *Inni omerici* (Milan, 1975), there is often not much overlap. Cassola's commentary is more erudite, but Z. is frequently more interesting reading. Particularly lively is his commentary on *Herm*, where he brings out well the 'Hermetic' nature of the god's various actions. On 64, where Hermes has a 'desire for meat' he comments that this seems Titanic, like Prometheus, but later Hermes renounces this and introduces the ritual of Olympian sacrifice. His lawless characteristics are legitimized by his entry into the Olympian system. On 111, which says that H. invented fire, Z. again points out the link with Prometheus, and notes that he invents it in the context of sacrifice. So he invents the sacrificial ritual and offers a model which all mortals conform to. H. is the first priest; as the last-born Olympian with Titanic links he joins past and future, and starts a new dimension of time. On the start of *Ap* Z. makes the interesting point that the god's abrupt arrival on Olympus may symbolize that he was seen as a ' late-arriving' god. Z. shows awareness of epic narrative conventions, for instance pointing out that Leto's offer to Delos follows a pattern of persuading someone to do something good by offering a material incentive (cf. *Il*. 9.260–99; 10.303–12).

I had one or two quibbles: at *Ap* 117 Z. comments that the kneeling position for giving birth was normal in ancient Greece, whereas in fact the use of a birthing-stool seems to have been more common and is regarded as the norm by Soranus. *Ap* 370ff. derives the name *Πυθώ* from the serpent's decomposition (*πυθέσθαι*). Z. mentions accounts of the vapour that inspired the Pythia, and suggests this is an aetiology for a real geological phenomenon: however, it has been proven for a long time that there can never have been any real vapours issuing from the rocks at Delphi.

The translation is clear and accurate. It is more concise than Cassola's Italian translation, with generally shorter lines. Cassola is more pedantic in seeking to convey exactly what he thinks every part of the line means, but there is generally not much to choose between the two. An example is *Ap* where the hymn has the vague phrase *πρὸς κίονα πατρὸς ἑοῖο*. Z. is content to translate literally '*alla colonna del padre*', whereas Cassola's translation explains it as '*alla colonna presso cui siede il padre*'.

The text is Z.'s own, based on the editions of Allen (Oxford, 1936) and Cassola. Z. mainly follows Allen, almost always agreeing with him against Cassola. This is often wise, as Allen is more conservative, while Cassola is prone to make unnecessary

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

alterations. However, Z. does not follow Allen blindly and is prepared to follow Cassola or disagree with both. Some examples: *Ap* 20: Z. does better than Allen or Cassola with this difficult line. He prints the most probable reading *νομοὶ βεβλήαται ᾠδῆς*. Allen has the singular *νόμος* where a plural is required, and Cassola prints *βεβλήατ' ἀοιδῆς*, unnecessarily emending the contracted form. *Ap* 51: Here Z. rightly follows Cassola in printing the emendation *ἦ ἄρ χ'*, since *ἀνειρομένη* in 50 must be followed by a question. H. 1.11: Here Z. accepts Allen's ingenious conjecture *τάμεν*, while Cassola prints the simpler *τὰ μὲν*. The lack of context makes it hard to decide this one, but Cassola seems more likely to be right.

Z. also provides a useful and up-to-date bibliography, and several reproductions of vases representing scenes relevant to the hymns. All in all, this is a welcome handy edition of the hymns, and will be useful to any who wishes to study or teach them.

University of Malawi MIKE CHAPPELL

PINDAR SELECTED

S. INSTONE: *Pindar: Selected Odes: Olympian One, Pythian Nine, Nemeans Two & Three, Isthmian One:* Edited and translated (Classical Texts). Pp. viii + 213, ills. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1996. £35.00/$49.95 (Paper, £14.95/$24.95). ISBN: 0-85668-668-9 (0-85668-669-7 pbk).

I. wants to make his edition 'user-friendly to both those who know Greek and those who do not' (p. vii). To assist the former he has provided a vocabulary at the end of the book. For the latter he has 'tried in the translations to get across something of the rhythm and idiosyncratic style of Pindar's Greek while keeping them readable and accurate' (p. vii). In keeping with the format of the series, the commentary is based on the translation. The selection claims to be representative of the corpus of Pindaric victory odes, so as to enable the reader to 'appreciate both what are the regular features of a Pindaric ode and also the odes' heterogeneity' (p. vii). It includes, in I.'s words, 'Pindar's most famous ode' (*O*.1), two odes containing 'delightful myths' (*P*.9, *N*.3), one short ode (*N*.2), and one ode that 'provides the opportunity for evaluation of the influential Pindaric criticism of E. L. Bundy' (*I*.1).

The general introduction includes excellent sections on myths (pp. 10–12), performance (pp. 13–15), athletics (pp. 15–18), *Nachleben* (pp. 22–9), and the transmission of the text (pp. 29–31). The section on language and style (pp. 18–22) offers an informative overview of some compositional and stylistic features with examples in translation.

In his section on 'Pindar's Life and Times' (pp. 1–7) I. gives a cautious overview of the discussion as to what extent Pindar's texts respond to their historical settings. In this he happily distances himself from mainstream modern Pindarism, which is often unduly dismissive of the possibility that some of the various parts of an ode derive relevance from text-external circumstances. The drawback of this section, however, is that I. does not systematically connect historical allusions with the encomiastic purpose of the odes. For example, his hypothesis that Pindar's choice of 'stories of monstrous individuals' in the Sicilian odes is motivated by the cruelty of his commissioners (pp. 2–3) seems problematic in the light of the central aim of the genre,

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

praise of the victor. The same is true for the idea that 'the evil intent of the victor' in *P*.8.81–2 'recalls the attitude of Athens toward her enemies, among whom had been Aegina' (p. 5). In the next section (on the 'origins of the victory ode', pp. 7–10), I. makes explicit his critical position underlying these interpretations: he argues against the view 'that the sole purpose of all the odes we know as epinicians was to praise the victor', calling Bundy's influential formulation of this view 'exaggerated' (p. 8, cf. also pp. 171–2). Although I. may be right in implying that Pindar has a tendency to stretch the genre by combining a multitude of seemingly disconnected themes, it is questionable whether this hybridization of the genre would include the licence for the poet to include straightforward criticism of the athlete.

I.'s criticism of Bundy's method (pp. 171–2) is refreshing, but misses the point. He lists five passages from *I*.1 'where our understanding requires background knowledge' and concludes: 'a rhetorical analysis gives us a superficial understanding of *I*.1, but we would understand the ode better if we also had available for analysis the historical background and additional personal information about Pindar' (p. 172). Few would argue against the idea that we would know more if we had more information. The point is rather that Bundy's method fails to explain what it claims to explain. The tool used by Bundy and his school in order to deal with the issue of unity in Pindar's odes is the concept of 'foil'. Passages in the odes that were before regarded as irrelevant are now exonerated from this accusation by labelling them as 'foils'. This entails the subordination of elements which Pindar merely juxtaposes, to the effect that 'for accidental irrelevance, the spontaneous outpourings of the garrulous poet who inhabited the odes before Bundy's monograph appeared, we are given contrived irrelevance. But the irrelevance is still there' (Carey, *Eranos* 78 [1980], 155). Thus Bundy not only fails to fulfil his promise to demonstrate that there is no passage in Pindar that is not in its primary content encomiastic: he also fails to describe the odes as unified wholes, in which every detail makes sense.

The format of the series does not allow the commentator to go into the details of the Greek. But I. has not let himself be discouraged from addressing features of Pindar's 'flamboyant style' (p. 19). He has even turned the handicap into an advantage by taking up the challenge of explaining stylistic characteristics for a readership that does not necessarily know any Greek. And he actually succeeds in elucidating features of 'the striking and imaginative way' (p. 19) Pindar expresses himself on the basis of an English translation, both in the introduction and in the commentary.

The most valuable aspect of this book are I.'s interpretations of the odes' macrostructure. Fortunately, I.'s relatively centrifugal conception of the genre as it emerges from his introduction is not reflected in his interpretative agenda: he does address the question as to how each of the poems commented upon makes sense as a unified whole, and how it fulfils the aims of the genre. In this he avoids the pitfall of what Glenn Most called 'monofunctionalism': his interpretations demonstrate that most elements of a Pindaric ode have several different functions, which all, on different levels, contribute to the ode's unity. His overview of eight major points of relevance of the myth in *O*.1 (pp. 90–1) is exemplary in this respect. The lucid explanations of the architecture of the odes, combined with subtle interpretations of the manifold relevance of their various parts, amount to convincing readings of the odes as unified works of the literary art, which will certainly advance the beginner's appreciation for Pindar as a poet.

Leiden University ILJA LEONARD PFEIJFFER

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PINDAR TRANSLATED

W. H. RACE (ed., trans.): *Pindar I: Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes; Pindar II: Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, Fragments*. (Loeb Classical Library, 56 and 485.) 2 vols. Pp. viii + 385; 486 + 3 maps. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1997. £11.95 each vol. ISBN: vol. I 0-674-99564-3, vol. II 0-674-99534-1.

This excellent Loeb edition of Pindar supersedes the antiquated volume edited by Sandys in 1915. Its most notable feature is clarity: the Greek typeface is a pleasure to read; the translations are crisp and accurate, though so literal that the Theban eagle no longer soars; plentiful notes both explain Pindar's recherché allusions and bring out how more than one interpretation of the text is often possible.

R.'s text, though primarily based on the latest Teubner editions of Pindar by Snell–Maehler and Maehler, differs from theirs in many details and numerous readings, a list of which would have been useful; among the more important are: *O.*2.97, *O.*11.17, *P.*1.77, *P.*5.15–19, *N.*1.66, *N.*4.90, *I.*8.11, *Paean* 6.74.

In the introduction R. rightly points out that the victory odes are not just poems of praise but 'complex mixtures of praise (and blame) . . . advice' etc.; but it is odd that having said this he should on the adjoining page endorse Bundy's outdated generalization that Pindar's odes are 'dedicated to the single purpose of eulogizing men and communities'. There follows a judicious biographical sketch in which R. stresses the difficulties surrounding interpretation of apparently personal statements in the odes. A synopsis of each poem prefaces each translation, but a bit more in the way of explanation (e.g. of the relevance of the myths in the odes) would have been useful. R. in general adopts a cautious approach to interpretation of the text, and rightly, given how little we know (as opposed to believe) about so many factors. So, on whether or not the κόρακες of *O.*2.87 refer to Bacchylides and Simonides, *O.*3 was for a Theoxenia, the odes were performed by a choir, R. gives us the evidence and lets us make up our own minds. And in the footnotes he often suggests alternative possible translations (so e.g. on *P.*1.2, 57, 67–8; *P.* 8.94–5; *N.*3.18, 41–2; *N.*7.31, 49–50; *N.*8.46; *N.*9.15, 20). Again, R. draws attention to the problem of reference at *P.*5.72–81, *P.*8.56–60, *N.*7.85 (do the words refer to the poet or to the chorus?), and sensibly evaluates each case on its own merits—Pindar speaks for himself in the first two examples, for the chorus in the last. This seems the right approach to a thorny problem: Pindar is ready to vary his *persona* in order to make it on occasion speak what is true of the chorus rather than of himself, just as he is ready on occasion to introduce into the mythical narratives elements that more properly belong to the victor's circumstances than to the myth. R. also takes a refreshingly realistic approach to instances when Pindar says he is late with a poem (see introductions to *O.*10 and *N.*3), not adopting the unlikely idea that the lateness is purely a rhetorical fiction. He includes in vol. II virtually all the fragments of which significant sense can be made, and in the case of those surviving in ancient quotations regularly provides more of the context than does Maehler in the Teubner edition. R. sows supplements with the hand, not with the sack as Sandys was wont to do, and sometimes reports conjectures not in Maehler's edition (e.g. *Paean* 8a.20, Grenfell-Hunt's *'Eρι[νὺν*).

Some points of detail: *O.*1.26, 'pulled' is too strong for ἔξελε: Pelops was only a baby when Klotho 'took him out of' the cauldron; *O.*2.86–7, R. offers an ingenious interpretation: 'If you want the full story (τὸ πάν) about the afterlife, go to interpreters (not to me, as I must get on with praising Hieron)'; *O.*4.10–11, much as one would

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

like it, it is not clear that the Greek (*Ψαύμιος γὰρ ἵκει ὀχέων*) can mean 'For it [the *κῶμος*] comes in honor of the chariot of Psaumis'; *O*.7.53, can *σοφία ἄδολος* mean 'native talent'?; *O*.11.10, the 'very difficult sentence' *ἐκ θεοῦ δ' ἀνὴρ σοφαῖς ἀνθεῖ πραπίδεσσιν ὁμοίως* is unlikely to mean 'with help from a god a man flourishes with a wise mind just as well', as this implies that one can flourish without help from a god; better, 'a man with a poet's wit blossoms with god's help just as much' (sc. as a victorious athlete does), i.e. with divine help both can flourish; *P*.2.67, the interpretation suggested in the note (*τόδε μέλος* refers to lines 1–67, *τὸ Καστορεῖον* to 69–96) is unlikely to be right since the whole ode celebrates an equestrian victory (cf. 1–12), i.e. all of it is a *Καστορεῖον*; it is more likely that we have alternative descriptions of the whole ode; *P*.8.78, R. prints *μέτρῳ κατάβαιν'*, translating 'Enter the contest in due measure', but would Pindar (or anyone else) recommend this? It is the *δαίμων* of 76–7 who works *μέτρῳ*, hence retain *καταβαίνει* (which has the additional advantage of avoiding the un-Pindaric repetition of *ἐν*); *N*.10.19, *βραχύ μοι στόμα*, 'my mouth is too small', R. following *LSJ* s.v. *βραχύς* 2; rather, 'my breath is too short' (Bowra), i.e. 'my mouth has not time'; *I*.4.47, R. supplies a useful reference to authenticate Pindar's saying that a fox plays dead and lies on its back when awaiting an eagle's swoop. Only very occasionally is the meaning of R.'s translation unclear: *O*.1.111–12, 'And now for me the Muse tends the strongest weapon in defense'; *O*.10.7, 'For what was then the future has approached from afar'; *P*.4.286, 'opportunity in men's affairs has a brief span' (better, 'the right moment in dealings with people does not last long').

As one can readily see, Pindar's cryptic and enigmatic *gnomai* commonly cause great problems of interpretation. They are a translator's nightmare, and there will not often be unanimity about their meaning. In general, R. has tackled both them and the rest of Pindar with great success, and this edition will be of lasting value.

University College London STEPHEN INSTONE

THE GREEK STAGE

H.-J. NEWIGER: *Drama und Theater: Ausgewählte Schriften zum griechischen Drama*. (Drama: Beiträge zum antiken Drama und seiner Rezeption, Suppl. 2.) Pp viii. + 380. Stuttgart: M&P, 1996. Paper, DM 65. ISBN: 3-746-43135-6.

This volume, containing the bulk of N.'s work on Greek theatre between 1961 and 1994, is divided into three sections: the Greek theatre (three articles and two reviews), tragedy (five articles and two reviews), and comedy (nine articles and two reviews). Section one begins with N.'s introduction to 'Drama and Theatre'. The treatment is broad-brush rather than detailed, and reflects the article's origins in a larger introductory volume (*Das griechische Drama*, edited by G. A. Seeck, 1979). The whole is carefully constructed: it begins by stressing the importance of viewing the tragic texts as performance scripts, then discusses the organization of the Dionysia, the theatre sites, costumes, and masks, concluding with a brief mention of the peculiarities of the stage equipment of Old Comedy and Menander. Both the strengths and weaknesses of N.'s writing and scholarship are immediately apparent. His fat footnotes brim with secondary literature which is handily brought together in a concluding bibliography. But the density of reference to various authorities in the text turns large stretches of it into little more than an annotated bibliography. Thus in the first article the names Pickard-Cambridge, Bieber, Travlos, Webster and Ghiron-Bistagne *inter alios* occur interminably. This is hardly disquieting, given the importance of these authors' findings. What does disappoint is N.'s inability to

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

progress beyond them, or at least to synthesize their work in a more pleasing and illuminating fashion than that made possible by a barely augmented list. N. is, however, to be applauded for his efforts to consider the implications of archaeological evidence.

The following three brief articles largely repeat in potted form the stagecraft material of Chapter One. This response seems especially narrow in the case of Chapter Four, a review of S. Melchinger's *Das Theater der Tragödie*. N. praises Melchinger as a man of the theatre yet does not follow him in his attempts to explicate the meanings of the plays. Once again, we are left with a parade of 'Bauforscher', but no discussion of the texts. This absence is particularly noticeable in the fifth and last article from the first section, which discusses the role of the ekkyklema and machine. Comparison with the publications of the late Uwo Hölscher on the same topic reveals the importance of not divorcing discussion of theatrical props from their malleable dramatic use in specific scenes.

Section two is devoted to tragedy. Its first chapter discusses the reference to Electra in Ar. *Clouds* 534ff. and interprets this as evidence for an early dating of Euripides' *Electra* (cf. the more cogent analysis of Walter Burkert in *Museum Helveticum* 47 [1990], 65–9). Questions of dating dominate the second piece, a review of works on the earliest surviving Greek tragedy (Koster), the year of Sophocles' *Trachiniae* (Schwinge), and Matthiessen's study of Euripides' *Electra*, *IT*, and *Helen*. N. is unconvinced by Koster's defence of Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women* as the earliest surviving play, but his argument is merely to point to the *communis opinio* and has long been superseded by Garvie. Matthiessen's insistence (p. 173 of original) that research into chronology is only worthwhile if it contributes to our understanding of the works concerned might have been better observed.

A major shortcoming of this collection is the amount of repetition between articles. Thus much of the *Electra* material reappears in the next article on Hugo von Hofmannsthal's version of the myth. (Here again there are many footnotes devoted to everything N. has read on the topic or did not quite see in time.) And the fourth article, titled 'The *Oresteia* and the Theatre', is largely a reprise of material in the very first article of the book. N. attempts in the next piece, on Euripides' *Phoenissae*, to trace the connections between the events in the mythical play world and 'the external and internal, political and moral situation of his time' (p. 187). The provenance of the text, programme notes for a 1981 production of the play by the Württembergisches Staatstheater, rules out unnecessary annotation; N. considers the political, moral, and intellectual complexity of the play and argues for its continuing relevance to modern power structures. This short piece addresses itself directly to the major issues of the work and is thus one of the most successful of the entire collection. However, it is followed by an article, 'Guilt and Responsibility in Greek Tragedy', which fails to do justice to its ambitious title. N. essentially paraphrases some Aeschylean scenes of decision-making; disappointingly, he does not fully consider the moral issues involved.

The third section is in many ways the most rewarding. N. is dealing with his specialism (Greek comedy) and his handling of the details is more assured. But there is still very little Greek quoted and considerable repetition both between articles (particularly concerning stage-furnishings) and from his earlier work on Aristophanes, *Metapher und Allegorie* (Munich, 1957). Nevertheless, these pieces are certainly of importance to editors of Aristophanes (particularly of *Birds* and *Frogs*), and it is convenient to have them together in one volume.

Sandy Lodge, Middlesex WILLIAM ALLAN

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TRAGEDY FOR HISTORIANS

C. PELLING (ed.): *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*. Pp. xii + 268, 13 pls. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. £40. ISBN: 0-19-814987-5.

Of books on Greek tragedy there is no end; and of books on its historical aspects there is no dearth. This one promises to be somewhat different, but does not fully deliver. As the title indicates, the historian is upfront: the seminar series on which the book is based was (preface) 'for ancient historians rather than literary critics, though in the hope that it might do something to bond the two groups'. In the short preface the editor draws attention to relevant trends in the study of tragedy: recognition of its civic importance; concern with audience response rather than authorial intent; and stress on exploratory character. The substantial concluding chapter, which draws together the various contributions with stress on these aspects, ends, 'Part of civic ideology, in fact, was to feel worried about civic ideology, in the right place and the right setting. And the tragic theatre was the right place.' Cleverly argued and expressed; but where does it leave tragic critics and historians? Was the desiderated bonding a brief marriage of convenience in Oxford, or will it lead to a lasting union? Perhaps neither those who teach Greek tragedy nor those who teach Greek history will be impelled to rewrite their courses. Those concerned with tragedy may find their focus a little extended but they will not find it altered. Those concerned with history (if not put off at the outset by such phrases as that on p. 13, repeated on p. 17, about the 'Self and Other'—that odd couple who pop up regularly throughout and become insistently obtrusive on p. 19; it is wrongly supposed that their importance is universally acknowledged) will not find much 'evidence', far less 'documents' or 'sources', to add to their stockpile (cf. pp. 9, 21, 63, 109, 213); and are likely to be disappointed by recurrent talk of 'refraction', 'resonances', and 'reconstruction' (*pace* Pelling on allegedly common ground, p. 214). Both groups may reasonably be surprised to find so little on New Historicism, which makes only a belated and brief appearance (p. 214). This is not an important book overall, but a book on an important subject with some important contributions. A (necessarily brief) consideration of each chapter follows.

Pelling ('Aeschylus' *Persae* and History') shows that an artistic dimension may underlie expressions apparently indicative of locale and chronology (land and sea, light and dark); and assesses the play's challenge to the divide between Greek and barbarian. Easterling ('Constructing the Heroic') establishes the importance of 'heroic vagueness', a tragic world where details remain indeterminate, and relates this to two plays, *Orestes* and *Oedipus Coloneus*. Bowie ('Tragic Filters for History: Euripides' *Supplices* and Sophocles' *Philoctetes*'), after an excellent—and needlessly apologetic—survey of tragedies which may be designated 'historical' in seeming to refer specifically to particular recent events, relates *Supplices* to the battle of Delium and *Philoctetes* to the political fortunes of Alcibiades.

Sommerstein ('The Theatre Audience, the *Demos*, and the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus') considers the probable composition of the theatre audience and argues for a change in its socio-political orientation; this part of his chapter seems to carry more conviction than the analysis of *Suppliants*. Wilson's chapter ('Leading the Tragic *Khoros*: Tragic Prestige in the Democratic City') is the odd one out, as no actual tragedy is featured; it is needlessly long (with a needless excursus in the *theorikon*) and 'presents in outline' issues to be discussed 'in greater detail in a forthcoming book', for which we might have waited. Vidal-Naquet ('The Place and Status of Foreigners in Athenian Tragedy')

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

offers a slightly adapted version of a previous publication (1992, in French) and no surprises.

Halliwell ('Between Public and Private: Tragedy and Athenian Experience of Rhetoric') imaginatively explores the ways in which tragedy treats rhetoric, integral to the Athenian experience but perceived as ambivalent, simultaneously craved and appreciated yet feared and distrusted; the main focus is on *Seven against Thebes* and *Oedipus Tyrannus* but many other plays are adduced. Parker ('Gods Cruel and Kind: Tragic and Civic Theology') contrasts the genres of tragedy and oratory with regard to their presentation of the gods; civic and individual theology are usefully distinguished. These two contributions make illuminating use of material not often brought to bear on tragedy.

Sourvinou-Inwood's chapter ('Tragedy and Religion: Constructs and Readings'), despite its catch-all title, is rather narrowly focused, being essentially an extended review of, or response to, J. D. Mikalson, *Honor thy Gods: Popular Religion in Greek Tragedy* (Chapel Hill, 1991); here too we might have waited for the books advertised in nn. 4 and 6. (A small question for mothers: can we really regard Hippolytos as a 'normal and good son', as claimed on p. 179?) In a valuable contribution, Osborne ('The Ecstasy and the Tragedy: Varieties of Religious Experience in Art, Drama, and Society') examines the artistic representation of maenads, on both a numerical and an art-historical basis, and arrestingly relates these to dramatic representation, especially that of the *Bacchae*.

The book has the usual list of 'References' and there are two indices: Index of Passages Cited and General Index. The second is skimpy in the extreme, containing little more than proper-names, some transliterated Greek terms, and an arbitrary stress on a few terms of criticism (such as 'distancing' and 'zooming' with otiose cross-reference); it is wrongly headed Index of Passages Cited on pp. 266-8. There is not much overlap between contributions (but Sommerstein's comments on metics, on p. 67, might have been correlated with those of Vidal-Naquet, recapitulated on p. 215; and 67 ought to be added to the index, s.v.). Books of collected essays are fashionable, and seminar series like conferences feed the fashion. Perhaps the trend needs to be questioned, and with it the tyranny of 'research assessment', which leads somc scholars to seek two (or more) publications for the price of one. I suggest that bookbuyers might request a similar discount.

Kyoto University E. M. CRAIK

ZEITLIN: SELF, OTHER, OR THE SAME?

F. I. ZEITLIN: *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literatare* (Women in Culture and Society). Pp. xx + 474. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1996. Cased, $60/£47.95 (Paper, $19.95/£15.95). ISBN: 0-226-97921-0 (0-226-97922-9 pbk).

This volume is a collection of nine essays by Z., eight of which have appeared elsewhere before, with the ninth a longer version of one published elsewhere (see below). This publishing phenomenon, very popular it seems among North American academics, of reprinting one's own essays that are not yet all out of print, with either little or no change, is clearly motivated in most cases by a mercenary drive towards

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

annual page-counts and citation-indexing. Z. herself has on several occasions published the same piece more than once in different places and within a short interval of time even before this collection (see her acknowledgements on pp. xv–xvi). However, as anyone who uses Z.'s work will know, she is nothing if not influential worldwide, especially among English-reading classicists. In this country perhaps her best-known 'follower' is Simon Goldhill. For this reason this collection performs a useful function. It brings together the majority of her most memorable essays, and she has taken the time to revise and update them for this edition. Her own introduction offers a perceptive example of self-analysis and makes very interesting reading, especially when Z. illustrates the close relationship between herself as writer and her written text.

Any reader of Z.'s work cannot fail to appreciate her openness to a wide range of critical methodologies, especially those of anthropology and of the continental European literary critical theorists. Her willingness to integrate and apply these new approaches to familiar texts has resulted in a monumental amount of scholarship, which has in turn inspired countless other academics around the world. This collection allows one to pause to consider and study the development of Z.'s legacy. Z.'s earliest work was on drama, especially the *Oresteia*. Her detailed studies of sacrificial imagery remain standard reading for all undergraduates today (but are not reprinted here). They mark her first encounters with gender and symbolism: motifs which themselves recur throughout this volume. Indeed a keen interest in illusion and representation characterizes all her subsequent work.

Ancient drama is the subject of seven of the nine essays, ranging from Aeschylus to Aristophanes. Here we find the familiar essays on misogyny in the *Oresteia*, *eros* in the Danaid trilogy, Dionysos in *Hekabe*, *eros* in *Hippolytus*, identity in *Ion*, feminine rôle-playing ('playing the Other'), and gender and genre in *Thesmophoriazusae*. Throughout Z. studies the intricate mechanisms for representing ideologies of gender in ancient Athens, examining the boundaries and definitions of literary genres, and deploying familiar classical critical tools alongside the then less familiar ones from psychoanalysis and sociolinguistics. Again and again we see 'Self' versus 'Other', Desire, and the Dynamics of Mythography for specific social, political, and cultural goals. Here we are certainly not studying literature in isolation from its author, audience, or society. Each essay is characteristically lengthy and exhaustive, with a wealth of footnotes revealing an impressive appreciation of secondary scholarship. They are not always easy reading, and teachers should be ready at times to offer their students *explication* of Z.'s *texte*!

The remaining two essays focus upon archaic literature. 'Figuring Fidelity in Homer's *Odyssey*', also in Beth Cohen's admirable *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's* Odyssey (Oxford, 1995), examines the symbolism of fixity and fidelity in that poem. 'Signifying Difference: The Case of Hesiod's Pandora' is a longer version (with more notes) of her paper 'Signifying Difference: the Myth of Pandora' in R. Hawley & B. Levick (edd.) *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments* (London, 1995), and complements her chapter 'The Economics of Hesiod's Pandora' in E. Reeder (ed.) *Pandora. Women in Classical Greece*' (Princeton, 1995). Here Pandora is studied firmly in her historical and literary context as a symbol of social ideals and anxieties, thus recalling similar work in this area by Page duBois.

Although Z. writes primarily for classical scholars, all these essays contain transliterated Greek and would certainly be of interest to Greekless readers, especially in the fields of gender studies and dramatic criticism. Z. perhaps more than anyone else of her generation epitomizes a certain strand of classical scholarship. If later

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scholars of the history of our discipline want a representative sample of late twentieth-century North American classical scholarship, then they should be more than satisfied with this collection. Clearly it ought to be purchased by college libraries and serves as a useful reference work for individual scholars. It contains a helpful composite bibliography and an index of key passages discussed, as well as its traditional general index.

Royal Holloway, London RICHARD HAWLEY

THE OCT EURIPIDES

J. DIGGLE (ed.): *Euripidis Fabulae, Tomus III:* Helena, Phoenissae, Orestes, Bacchae, Iphigenia Aulidensis, Rhesus (Oxford Classical Texts). Pp. vii + 482. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994. Cased, £14.50. ISBN: 0-19-814595-0.

Reviewers of earlier volumes of this edition have warmly praised D.'s virtues as editor, which are still much in evidence in this volume. We are all in D's debt, both for his labors in collecting the evidence and his acumen in assessing it.

Volume III contains two plays of the Byzantine triad (*Pho.*, *Or.*), two non-triadic select plays (*Ba.*, *Rhes.*), and two 'alphabetic' plays (*Hel.*, *I.A.*). For *Pho.* D. is able to rely on the collations of Mastronarde and Bremer. For all the other plays, he has collated all the MSS himself. D. has also brought new papyrus evidence to bear, sifted through 500 years of conjecture, restoring suggestions to their rightful first proposers in the process, and made numerous new conjectures. The result is a text improved in hundreds of places. I concentrate here on *Hel.* and *Pho.* An asterisk indicates a reading or conjecture mentioned only in the app. crit.

The following are some of the places D.'s text is certainly right against Murray and others, or highly attractive: *Hel.* 8 τοῖςδ' <ἐν>) δώμαcιν Lenting; 42 more accurate information on MS readings; 59 ἤν μὴ Dobree; 67* οὐ μὴ for μή μοι Diggle; 69 Πλούτωι Nauck; 72 ἐχθίcτης Dingelstad; 78 εἶ Cobet; 119 cκόπει δὲ A. Y. Campbell; 121–2 del. W. Ribbeck; 174b πέμψαιτε Bothe; 215 χιονόχρωι Wecklein; 218 τί δ' ἀνὰ Bruhn; 228 ὀλβιεῖ Bothe (πάτρια μέλαθρα is much more easily referred to Menelaus' father than to Helen's); 282 ἥ δ' Diggle; 287–92 del. Goguel; 324–6 del. Goguel; 377 κηρὸc Diggle; 379* del. Dingelstad; 434 ἔχοιμεν Paley; 494–5 διπλοῦν . . . γαῖά τιc Nauck; 503–9 del. Willink; 516 ἐπλάθην . . . δόμοιcιν Diggle; 525 πέδον Blaydes; 530–40 del. Willink; 565 ἄρ' restored from *Thesmo.* 911; 574* coί Lightfoot; 607* λιποῦc' ἐρεμνὸν Schneidewin; 622 ξυμβεβᾶcί μοι Willink; 677 εἶτ' Diggle; 678 ἔμολον ἐc κρίcιν Willink; 694 ἀπο<πρὸ> . . . ἀραῖον Diggle; 705 del. Kirchhoff, 706 Matthiae; 709 τί δ'; ὡc F. W. Schmidt; 728–33 del. Willink; 738 οὗ Tyrwhitt; 771 del. Diggle; 773 τἄλλα Herwerden; 780 del. Valckenaer; 818 οὐ γνώcεταί μ' ὅc εἰμ', ἐγῶιδ'· ἐρεῖ δὲ τίc; Diggle; 892–3 del. Hartung; 987 ψόγον Diggle: 1006 Κύπριc Canter; 1008 del. Badham; 1009 πατρόc Wecklein; 1013–6* del. Hartung (attractive); 1033 δ' εἰc ἓν . . . φέροντε Jackson; 1117 πολιὰ Herwerden; 1141 ἀμφιλόγοιc Dobree; 1153–4 Willink's transposition gives exact responsion; 1168 προcεννέπω Lenting; 1197 del. Hartung; 1226 Dale's lacuna after this verse is marked, though no supplement is suggested; 1229–30 Jackson's suggestions for reversing these lines are accepted; 1372 del. Prinz; 1460 αὔραc . . . εἰναλίαc Diggle; 1467 λάβοι Pflug; 1524 Murray's βέβηκε promoted to text; 1650–5 del. Willink; 1685 justly daggered, with a suggestion by Willink in app. crit.

Pho. 26–7 del. Paley; 114* ἆρα πυλᾶν (Diggle) κλήιθροιc χαλκόδετ' ἔμβολ'<ἐν> (Fritzsche); 118 del. Diggle; 133* δ' om. Π^3 et Z^{b2} (but why not adopt?) and 133 οὗτόc ἐcτι Π^3; 166 βάλοιμεν Diggle; 176* <πότνα> Cελαναία Paley (D.'s note is a model of concision, as well as showing how to say 'overlap' in Latin); 307–8 δὸc τριχῶν Camper; 308–9 κυανόχρωτι . . . πλοκάμωι Geel; 344 οὔτι GX; 361* τάρβουc ἐc τοcόνδ' Diggle; 375–8 del. Usener; 387 om. Π^{13},

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

del. Haslam; 399 *εὐδίαν* Jackson; 438–42 del. Leidloff et olim Hartung; 448–51 del. Diggle; 453 *cοφοῖc* Markland; 478–80 del. Diggle; 502 *ὀνόμαcιν* Markland; 504* *ἢ θεοῦ* post Haslam (*ἢ ἡλίου*) Diggle; 566 *δαπανηρὸc* Π^{15}; 572 *ἄρα cτήcειc* Porson; 665* *κιχὼν* Kock; 690–6 del. Willink; 710* *πυκνοῖcι* Reiske (but he might have mentioned West's *μάργοιcι*); 754–65 del. dos Santos Alves; 770* *ἄξοντα* Markland, Valckenaer; 774–7 del. Walter; 781 om. Π^{10}, del. Haslam; 807b *Cφίγγ' ἀπομουcοτάταιcι* Nauck; 833* *cτεφάνοιc ἕcτακεν Ἀρείοιc* Diggle, Willink; 847 *παῖc ἔτ' ἀπτὴν* Hermann; 868 om. S, del. Reeve; 869–80 del. Fraenkel; 882 *μέλη* Markland; 886–90 del. Fraenkel; 1038a *ἄλλοτ'* Diggle; 1078 dist. Diggle; 1305 *ξίφοc* Hermann (exceptionally bold but convincing); 1724 *ἀλαίνειν* Musgrave; 1759 *ἔγνων* VG, coni. Musgrave.

In the following places I would have preferred a different solution: *Hel.* 2–3: surely readers should be told that Ar. *Thesm.* 855–7 gives an entirely different text of 3 and warned that some have been puzzled by the two unconnected objects of *ὑγραίνει* (Heiland suggested *δρόcωι* for *γύας* in 3). 37: Orelli's *cυμβάλλει* clears up the problems discussed by Dale and should have been mentioned. 422: Reiske's *ἔκβολ' οἷc ἀμπίcχομαι* deserved a mention. At any rate, if D. has an example to set against Dale's objection (see Smyth §1217) that anaphoric *αὐτοῦ*, etc. is postpositive, he could have cited it here. 510: Both Lobeck's *τόδ'* and Paley's* *μὲν* create asyndeton: Nauck's *δ' ἓν* deserved a mention. 593: D.'s *κακῶν* is apparently an unconscious alteration of L's *πόνων*. 601: Murray printed Scaliger's *θαῦμ' ἔcτ'*, which makes sense; D. prints L's *θαυμάcτ'*, which, as far as I can see, does not. 932: D. gives *ἐπὶ τὸ cῶφρον* without note, but L reads *εἰc*. This may be an unconscious conjecture, but it is a good one: cf. *Or.* 617. 972: L. Dindorf's *ἤ νυν* supplies a needed connective. 1422: Herwerden's *τἀνθάδ' ὡc* could have been mentioned. 1679: Instead of Schenkl's deletion of 1678–9 D. could have mentioned Madvig's *ἐν πόνοιc*.

Pho. 413–4: In spite of Mastronarde's spirited defence of the transmitted line order at *Contact and Discontinuity* 48–51, Jacobs's transposition of these lines to follow 408 deserves better than a curt *vix recte*. 1335–7: These three lines are the only ones D. saves between 1308 and 1353. But can one really believe in a Euripidean messenger who speaks in tetrameters and who uses *διccῶc* to mean 'twice'? D. is prepared (app. to 1308ff.) to admit that we have lost *chori cum nuntio colloquii pars*, but it appears we have lost it all.

Pho. sharply divides editors in the matter of interpolation. Of its 1766 transmitted lines Murray deletes 23, Mastronarde 60, and D. some 444. Most of D.'s deletions strike me as highly plausible, and I am sure that he is much nearer the truth than the other two. Most radically, D. deletes 1582–1766 wholesale but leaves open the possibility that this basically spurious framework contains some genuine lines.

D.'s treatment of *I.A.* is the only thing that substantially disappoints expectation. The play contains much that Euripides could not have written, and it must have been left incomplete at his death and supplemented by others. But these later passages are of different eras, and the two most important questions for anyone interested in the fifth-century theatre are (1) Which parts of this play did Euripides write? and (2) Which parts, though not by Euripides, belong to the first production shortly after his death and which parts are later still? D., with uncharacteristic diffidence, does not feel he can answer the first question decisively and invents a new notation to indicate varying degrees of suspicion. He does not explain, in this edition or elsewhere, why, for example, he calls 1098–119 'vix Euripidei' but 1130–3 'fortasse non Euripidei'. So the first question is answered both tentatively and summarily. The second is not addressed at all. Readers will have to make up their own minds, with no help from the editor, what the first audience might have heard.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Since I am thanked in the preface for help with proof-reading, a list of misprints is a confession of failure. But the confession must be made: p. 5, line 15 'Teubnerianae', *Hel*. 588 *Ελ.*, 709 *ἀληθῶς*, 874 *σοι* is the reading of L; 1316 *πάνοπλος*; *Pho*. 863 *ἐπέσταλκ'*; *Or*. 1195 *σώιζηι*; *Ba*. 32 (app.) *αὐτὸς*; 87 *εὐρυχόρους*; 1026 *ὄφεος*; 1098 (app.) *τ'*, 1177 *Κιθαιρὼν* (prius), *I.A*. 729 and 825 *Δαναΐδων*.

To the Addenda and Corrigenda in Tomis I–II add (Tomus I): p. 66 (Alc. 713) pro *ζώηισ* lege *ζώιης*; p. 82 (Alc. 1121) pro *βλέψον* leg. *<Ηρ.> βλέψον*; p. 262 (Hip. 1261) pro *Αλ.* leg. *Αγ.*; p. 263 (Hip. 1288) pro *ψεύδεσι* leg. *ψευδέσι*; and (Tomus II): p. 9 (ad 153) pro *οὔ που* leg. *οὔ πού*; p. 43 (ad 1003) pro *ἐμβατεύουσα* leg. *ἐμβατεύσουσα*; p. 131 (Herc. 373) pro *Θεσσάλων* leg. *Θεσσαλῶν*; p. 215 (Tro. 723) pro *πατρός* leg. *πατρὸς*; there are also extraneous marks at *Su*. 2, *Tro*. 666, 758, and *I.T*. 315, and the line indication in the app. crit. to *Ion* 1196 occurs twice.

University of Virginia DAVID KOVACS

HECUBA

J. MOSSMAN: *Wild Justice: a Study of Euripides'* Hecuba. Pp. xiii + 283. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995. ISBN: 0-19-814789-9.

A book-length literary study of a single tragedy is a comparatively rare phenomenon. When undertaken by a critic as clear-sighted and undogmatic as M. it is a valuable undertaking. The book contains a series of finely-nuanced discussions, and is carefully structured to avoid doubling back on itself. M. begins by discussing the sources available to Euripides in conceiving his play, before moving on to an excellent Taplinesque analysis of structure and stagecraft (though I would have welcomed more here on the function of Hecuba's dream). Then there is a useful chapter on the chorus, which contains several arresting general insights, such as: 'In many ways the Greek tragic chorus sits on the border of the distinction between form and content: their choral odes both reflect the intellectual and emotional themes of the action ("Content") and make concrete breaks between episodes ("Form")'.

The fourth chapter, 'Rhetoric and Characterisation', opens with an incisive and up-to-date discussion of the vexed question of characterization in Greek tragedy (with excellent bibliography). M. argues that tragedy's apparent tendency to portray 'types' rather than individuals is in fact the result of the limited number of individualizing traits awarded a character, given that tragic figures need to be instantly comprehensible. She aptly quotes de Mourgues on the similar technique of characterization in Racine: 'although this discarding (of individualising traits) represents a drastic simplification of the reality we know, it conforms admirably to a deeper kind of reality' (*Racine, or, The Triumph of Relevance* [Cambridge, 1967], p. 34). M. further argues that a character's use of rhetoric—a feature for which *Hecuba* is clearly remarkable—is not a barrier to, but a means of, characterization: Greek rhetorical theory makes close connections between persuasion and personality. Rhetoric, as well as tragedy's many other formal elements with their 'stylisation of reality', is an advantage to the portrayal of character rather than a hindrance. M. follows this excellent theoretical discussion (pp. 94–102) with an analysis of the rhetorical exchanges that constitute the major part of *Hecuba*, showing how each stage figure is characterized through their use and abuse of words, their verbal powers, and their persuasive skills.

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

M. is also incisive about the death of Polyxena. Although the sacrificing of virgins is a motif used by all three tragedians, she concludes that it is unwise to treat such scenes too generically, and argues against the generalizations made by, for example, Loraux, as well as against the sexual interpretation of the Polyxena scene made by such as Michelini: if all violent sacrifice creates suppressed sexual excitement, this does not imply that Euripides intends an overt erotic appeal. Polyxena's baring of her bosom—a warrior's gesture—is unusually described using two words for her breast, *μαστούς τ' ἔδειξε στέρνα θ'* (560). Rather than creating an erotic charge, M. argues, the conjunction is surely there to recall the mother–daughter link, as on leaving Hecuba at 424 Polyxena had cried, *ὦ στέρνα μαστοί θ', οἵ μ'ἐθρέψαθ' ἡδέως*; similarly, she argues, the statue she is compared with in the same phrase, *ὡς ἀγάλματος κάλλιστα* (560–1), has a funerary rather than erotic context.

Hecuba, *mater dolorosa*, paradigmatic victim of the vicissitudes of fortune and yet the perpetrator of cruel revenge: not the least virtue of this admirably balanced book is its careful analysis of both these aspects, the disturbing conjunction of which has led many recent critics (M. cites Arrowsmith, Méautis, Abrahamson, Conacher, Buxton, Nussbaum, Reckford, and Lembke) to read the play as a tragedy of character. Hecuba is 'a noble nature corrupted by extreme misfortune' into a bestiality which her extraordinary dog transformation is then seen to confirm.

M. argues well against this view. After showing in illuminating detail how Euripides builds Hecuba up to be a pattern of suffering she goes on to set her revenge against ancient views of *timoria* and *timorein*, constructing a cultural 'grid' by means of Homer, other tragic poets, Herodotus, Thucydides, and the Athenian legal system. From this work, a view of contemporary approval of revenge within certain limits emerges (even, possibly, against an enemy's children). M. argues that because of the destruction of her *polis*, Hecuba's revenge need not be limited by wider social constraints. Furthermore, unlike the vengeance of an Orestes or an Electra, it is taken externally to, and on behalf of, family, not, catastrophically, within it. This does not of course make Hecuba's revenge totally acceptable, but it does redefine and qualify it in important ways. M. then explores the difficult topic of dogs in religion, myth, and literary imagery, rejecting the view that the dog in any simple way represents Hecuba's savagery. Euripides' strategy is against such a reading too: as she comments, the scene in which Hecuba might be accused of savagery, the blinding, is insulated from the account of the metamorphosis by the *agon* in which she is thoroughly reasonable.

M. concludes that *Hecuba* is not a tragedy of character, neither is it a 'war play' in the sense that *Trojan Women* is. Rather, it is a revenge play (which also makes use of a sacrifice-plot and suppliant drama motifs) set in a world with no *polis* and apparently no gods. The rhetoric serves to show that words too can be like weapons—sometimes, though not always, deadly. The disturbing ending reflects the state of flux in such a world.

An epilogue discusses the possible impact of Euripides' portrayal of Hecuba on later literature in antiquity, and then considers the play's influence on Renaissance revenge-drama.

London BARBARA GOWARD

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

MENANDER II

W. G. ARNOTT (ed., trans.): *Menander II*. (Loeb Classical Library, 459.) Pp. x + 501. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1996. Cased, £11.95. ISBN: 0-674-99506-6.

In 1979 A. published the first of three volumes that will ultimately constitute the Loeb Menander, replacing Allison's 1921 edition,which encompassed most of what was then known of the playwright's work within the pages of a single book. This in itself is a remarkable indication of the continuing miracle of recovery that Menander has enjoyed this century. Seventeen years after A.'s first volume, and following completion of his magisterial commentary on the fragments of Alexis (Cambridge 1996), comes vol. II, a worthy addition to the trilogy, which continues to display all the meticulous scholarship one has come to expect of the editor, combined with an admirable clarity in taking his readers through the pitfalls that beset much of the evidence presented. If anything, indeed, the challenge of vol. II has been greater in that the plays are far more fragmentary than was the case with those in vol. I and at times they contain tantalizing problems of interpretation. In keeping with the tradition of Greek alphabetic ordering of the plays, A. includes in the volume *Heros*, *Theophoroumene*, *Karchedonios*, *Kitharistes*, *Kolax*, *Koneazomenai*, *Leucadia*, *Misoumenos*, *Perikeiromene*, and *Perinthia*, for some of which, namely *Kitharistes*, *Misoumenos*, and *Leucadia*, he has been able to take advantage of new discoveries. In the case of *Leucadia*, for instance, the fortunate overlap of text between (1) a scrap of papyrus strongly suggesting by virtue of internal references that it comes from a *Leucadia* play (of which there were numerous versions by different playwrights in antiquity), (2) an untitled book fragment known to be by Menander, and (3) similarities with Turpilius' Roman adaptation (*Leucadia* fr. 11) has brought into prominence a play that Sandbach did not include at all in his *OCT*. What is more, we now have a short scene, part of an exchange between a temple servant and a young girl, ostensibly from the play's beginning, that is remarkable for its shift from spoken trimeters to sung anapaestic dimeters. Of the other more fragmentary plays included here, *Kolax* and *Perinthia* are significant in that parts of them were later used by Terence in the creation of his *Eunuchus* and *Andria*. It remains a constant source of disappointment, though, that the scant remains of both Menandrian works provide so little insight into either the scope of Terence's borrowing or even the truth of the statements he makes about them in his prologues.

In contrast to the previous volume, A. provides no general introduction. Some might perhaps regret the omission and have hoped to see some exposition of those many aspects of Menander's dramatic technique not covered earlier, but A. has evidently preferred (correctly in my view) to leave such matters to the general handbooks already in print, where they can be tackled in greater depth than would have been possible here, and to devote himself rather to the plays themselves. Instead of an introduction he gives a brief Preface setting out some of the innovations he has introduced. So, for instance, he has adopted new schemes for numbering lines in plays like *Kolax* and *Misoumenos* for which the discovery of new fragments had threatened to turn the traditional system into something of a nightmare. In the case of *Misoumenos*, one has to applaud his efforts since the new system both escapes the complexity that had grown up and is sufficiently 'relaxed' to allow for the discovery of new text in the future. Less successful, I feel, is the veritable forest of marginal letters and numbers that marks the margins of *Kolax* as A. attempts to indicate that the

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

major source consists only of extracts from the play, while maintaining contact with the numbering in Austin's edition (*Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta in Papyris Reperta* [Berlin, 1973]) and indicating those places where this differs from the systems of Körte and Sandbach.

As before, A. prefaces each play with an introduction detailing the MSS involved along with other evidence that helps to fill inevitable gaps, be this later adaptation or the scenes depicted in the Mytilene mosaics (S. Charitonidis *et al.*, *Les mosaïques de la maison du Ménandre à Mytilène* [Berne, 1970]). Further, more detailed, discussion of the action itself follows within the body of the text, explaining and linking what can be at times extremely fragmentary sections. This is especially important for a play like *Misoumenos*, which from all appearances was among the playwright's most popular in antiquity but which, despite additional finds, remains enigmatic on many points, all too often providing evidence of problems but not their solution. We glimpse Menander's skill at creating complication and manipulating his audience's emotions, but exactly how the obligatory happy ending was contrived remains shrouded in uncertainty. In such circumstances, where the considerable remains of a play like *Misoumenos* consist all too often of tattered scraps of papyrus (in contrast to the better preserved scenes of *Perikeiromene*), the problems facing an editor multiply exponentially when, with the Loeb format, he must not only establish a convincing Greek text, but then interpret it by what is arguably the most taxing route: a translation that does not fall to pieces in a sea of uncertainty, and a connecting narrative that does not come to depend largely upon imagination. lt may be argued that A.'s running commentary is at times prone to repetition on the left- and right-hand pages, but when one considers that the Loeb series has two often distinct readerships—those interested in the original Greek and those seeking precise and detailed information through the medium of English—the outcome is hardly surprising, no more so indeed than the omission of suggested variant interpretations, discussion of which belongs in an altogether different work. Similarly, in some situations A.'s translation, rendering the original in iambic pentameters, can lack the fluency that was the hallmark of Menander's style, but, again, the need for precision within the context of a highly fragmented text, when the flow of argument and theme can only be vaguely glimpsed, makes this an inevitable consequence.

Overall, A.'s achievement is a considerable one. He has shouldered the challenge of making accessible to his readers the worn and tattered fragments of many of the plays included here and has succeeded, combining scholarly acumen in terms of text with a rare ability to elucidate dramatic movement in circumstances that to many appear impenetrable fog. The third and final volume of the series, scheduled to appear in the year 2000, is awaited with eager anticipation.

University of Warwick STANLEY IRELAND

CAMERON'S CALLIMACHUS

A. CAMERON: *Callimachus and his Critics*. Pp. xiv + 534. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995. Cased, $49.50/£37.50. ISBN: 0-691-04367-1.

C. sets out to establish a chronology for some of Callimachus' most important works and other events in his life, and to re-evaluate Callimachus' statements about poetry, in particular the much-debated prologue to the *Aetia*.

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The first part of the book deals with the background to Callimachus' poetry, using copious literary and other evidence. The opening chapter discusses the testimonia to Callimachus' life, the Ptolemaic court, and Callimachus' likely relationship to it; Chapter II investigates the possible opportunities for public performance open to a poet in Ptolemaic Alexandria, and Chapter III considers the symposium, demonstrating that it was still a lively institution in the third century. This provides a context for the composition and performance of much of Callimachus' poetry, but although C. claims (p. 71) that it is 'generally assumed' that the Hellenistic symposium was no longer a venue for the performance of new poetry, this view is no longer so widely held (see for example Joan B. Burton, *GRBS* 33 [1992], 243–5).

This leads me to a more general criticism: C. attacks supposedly established views which in fact have lost currency in recent years. For example, it is no longer universally agreed (and in fact never was) that Callimachus issued a blanket condemnation of all attempts to write epic. Nor do modern readers necessarily 'find it hard to imagine how [Callimachus] saw Aratus as a kindred spirit' (p. 327). Like Callimachus himself (pp. 153–4), C. may not be as controversial as he makes himself out to be, despite the many new insights and interpretations of individual passages he has to offer.

C. establishes a chronology of Callimachus' work relative to that of other poets active at the time, tied where possible to historical events (summarized on pp. xiii–xiv). He argues for this chronology on the basis of allusions to other poems and to contemporary events, particularly those involving the ruling family in Alexandria. While C. himself admits (p. 261) that any such chronology must be partly conjectural, there are good reasons not to place too much confidence in it. It only takes one piece of evidence about dating or temporal priority to be wrong (for example the dating of the epigram *AP* 5.202 or the relative dates of the *Argonautica*, *Aetia* I–II, and *Hymn* 5, discussed in Chapter IX) and everything which has been deduced from it will become insecure. Moreover, this type of argument assumes that it is not possible for a poet to be influenced by a poem which has not yet been published; this does not sit well with the world of lively literary exchanges outlined by C. in his earlier chapters. C. does admit (p. 249) that the issue of priority between Callimachus and Apollonius in particular is difficult to decide, but on the same page he dismisses the testimonia to the existence of a *proecdosis* of the *Argonautica*. The *proecdosis*, if it existed, would be as clear evidence as one could hope for that part at least of the *Argonautica* was circulated in advance of the publication of the poem as we now have it (on p. 255 C. is willing to entertain the reverse possibility, that Apollonius had access to unpublished works of Callimachus). I would have liked C. to have given this piece of information about the process of composition of the *Argonautica*, with its implications for the mutual influence of Callimachus and Apollonius, as much attention as he gives to many other testimonia on literary topics.

It is central to C.'s chronology of Callimachus' work that the *Aetia* was published in two stages (appearing around 270 and 243 respectively), and that the prologue originally only introduced the first two books (this is argued for in Chapters IV–VI). C.'s interpretation of the prologue itself, expounded over Chapters VII–XII, sees it as an anticipation of criticisms which might be made of the *Aetia*, in which Callimachus insists that a bombastic style is inappropriate to elegy (for a similar interpretation, see A. Allen, *The Fragments of Mimnermus* [Stuttgart, 1993], pp. 146–56). He believes that the Telchines are correctly identified by the Florentine scholia, and that lines 9–12 compare shorter poems of Mimnermus and Philitas favourably to longer ones.

C.'s remaining chapters discuss various topics which bear on Callimachean poetics. Chapter XIII considers the supposed importance of Hesiod to Callimachus,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

concluding that it has been overrated. (As elsewhere, though, he pays comparatively little attention to the *Hymns*, where the influence of Hesiod is often clearer than in the rest of the corpus.) The next chapter, 'The Cyclic Poem', interprets epigram 28 Pf. as a criticism of the archaic poems comprising the Epic Cycle rather than as a comment on contemporary epic. Chapter XV discusses the ending of the *Hymn to Apollo*, assigning the hymn the same early date as *Aetia* I–II, and arguing that there is no specific reference to Homer. In Chapter XVI, C. dismisses claims that four passages in Theocritus refer to a polemical position which Theocritus took on the writing of epic. Chapter XVII examines the mix of tradition and innovation in the *Hecale*; C. argues that the third-century poems which have been grouped together as 'epyllia' are too diverse for such a categorization to be useful. Before leaving Alexandria behind, C. concludes (pp. 452–3) that Callimachean polemic is mostly negative and that it is impossible to reconstruct from it Callimachus' views on (for example) the *Argonautica*. The final chapter is the almost obligatory discussion of the influence of the *Aetia* prologue in Rome; C. decides that Roman allusions to the prologue bear out his interpretation of it, while also being adapted to their new context.

There are three appendices; the first is a discussion of an epigram by Hedylus which refers to Antimachus' *Lyde*. The second and third deal with the legendary thinness of Philitas and the status of the women mentioned in Asclepiades' epigrams; both are revisions of previously published work and have only indirect bearing on the main body of the book.

In his concentration on temporal and other relationships to other poetry, and on the precise meaning of the texts he discusses, C. pays little attention to the purely literary properties of Callimachus' poetry. In particular Callimachus' capacity for playfulness and irony is sometimes overlooked. Is even the *Aetia* prologue meant to be taken entirely seriously, when it introduces a long poem containing the deeds of kings and heroes which Callimachus claims to have repudiated?

C. makes many observations on other matters, discussing such topics as the question of the age at which people in antiquity considered themselves to be old (Chapter VII), the ways elegy was used in Hellenistic times (pp. 149–52), and the absence of large-scale historical epic in the third century (Chapter X). In particular, he digresses on the lives of other poets such as Nicander and Aratus, making great efforts to evaluate the likely worth of sources; when these sources have themselves to be reconstructed out of later writings (as with the 'Critic' he discusses on pp. 194–210) I feel that he is optimistically pushing the extant evidence too far.

The book is handsomely produced, with a few typographic errors (the seventh line of p. 432, the page number on p. 100) and errors in the text ('no can agree which' p. 253). There are also some errors in quoted Greek text (e.g. σεἐ for σεέ p. 253). The index of passages discussed could have been more extensive. In a work of this length which is so wide-ranging, it is frustrating to be unable to find (for example) the discussion of F 380 (p. 100) or of *SH* 239 (p. 137) in the index.

Callimachus and his Critics brings much more material to refuel well-worn debates about Callimachus' poetry, which have in the past often been focused narrowly on the same few texts. Although his conclusions may not always be new and his inferences are at times risky, he has thrown down fresh challenges to anyone working in this area.

Bath VIRGINIA KNIGHT

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

EPIC RECOVERED

V. KNIGHT: *The Renewal of Epic: Responses to Homer in the Argonautica of Apollonius*. (Mnemosyne, Suppl. 152.) Pp. x + 335. Leiden, New York, and Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1995. ISBN: 90-04-10386-4.

This work is a thoroughly revised version of K.'s Cambridge dissertation of 1990. Having set aside the original doctoral version for a while, K. returned to a plethora of new interpretations of the poem, which are still coming at us thick and fast. No longer can we justifiably say that Apollonius of Rhodes is a forgotten or maligned poet. Inevitably nowadays one publishes a work on him without the benefit of a number of the latest views. K. especially regrets not having M. Campbell's *Arg*. III commentary on hand. The title well explains the content of the book which, after (I) the introduction, divides into four other main sections covering (II) the Homeric recurrent scene such as a sacrifice, a boxing match, or a storm at sea, (III) battle scenes, (IV) the respective peripatetic episodes of the Argonauts and Odysseus, and (V) the gods of the *Argonautica*. It is important to note that K. has largely disregarded the other literary sources which influenced A.R.

In the introduction, which is somewhat prosaic, with little new or exciting in it to whet the Apollonian scholar's appetite, one is nevertheless immediately aware of the amount of scholarship involved in the work, and in this respect one is reminded of K.'s distinguished mentor R. L. Hunter. But the introduction is much too long, and the work would have been better served if there had been a succinct introduction and a summary at the end. For example, K. presents us with a 'Test Case (46): The Symplegades' as an illustration of a type of allusion to be considered in later chapters. What is the point of this? Why do we not just read about it in the later chapters? K.'s 'Test Case' is, after all, a good example of how Apollonius selects elements from different Homeric scenes and applies them to various scenes throughout his entire poem; and it is good that, on this occasion at least, K. does not ignore A.R.'s use of a 'non-Homeric' source (Hes. *Th*. 179) to make a dramatic point.

I do so agree with K.'s views on *contaminatio* (p. 23) and rejoiced at her avoidance of the term 'because it sounds pejorative'. I also agree with K.'s analysis that it is not possible to separate the *Argonautica* into *Odyssey* and *Iliad* halves as has been done with the *Aeneid*. The poem would then be Odyssean, yet even the most Odyssean section (the central part of book four) contains a scene closely based on *Il*. 24 (p. 30). K.'s understanding of A.R.'s method of creative selectivity is solid and well expressed throughout the book.

The fact that Cyzicus' bride was Cleite, the daughter of Merops of Percote, and not Larisa, the daughter of Piasus of Thessaly, is not only a good example of A.R.'s skilful application of even the smallest elements from Homer but is also a fine example of K.'s understanding and analysis of A.R.'s technique (pp. 85f.), as, indeed, I have recorded elsewhere ('Apollonius of Rhodes: The Cleite and Byblis Suicides', *SIFC* 15.1 [1997], 48–54). But while K.'s discussion of Homeric echoes in A.R. is excellent in many of the episodes, this kind of approach does not tell the whole story without a concomitant study of the other literary sources used by A.R., especially in the same episodes. The title of K.'s book notwithstanding, this worries me in that one very quickly gains the (false) impression that A.R. looked only to Homer for inspiration. In A.R.'s Cyzicus episode, for example, the relevance of Rhea and Mount Dindymon is missed entirely in this type of study, which is a pity.

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It is interesting that K. should refer to the sexual overtones in the Apollonian version of the episode of the Sirens, and in particular single out (204) '*παρθενίην . . . ἐβιήσατο* "overpowered . . . virgin [voices]" (4.909)', with its suggestion of rape, and *ἐπιβρομέω*, with its Sapphic echo. For, although K. refers to A.R.'s description of the Sirens' song as *λείριον*, she omits to mention that in A.R.'s day the *λείριον* was also the name of a flower called Aphrodite's Joy, with its rather obscene-looking middle-part named the genitals of an ass!

K. shows clearly (pp. 60–200) how the Circe episode is an excellent paradigm of the ways in which a single Homeric episode may influence various scenes throughout A.R.'s poem, even providing a unifying link between them. I was particularly impressed by K.'s exegesis of the Lemnos episode as a further case in point (pp. 162–9). The character of Circe in Homer makes one think at once of the character of Phineus in A.R. Both characters, as K. rightly points out, derive from the same universal folktale. K. demonstrates the important point that the similarities between A.R.'s Phineus and Homer's Circe are for the most part not shared with A.R.'s Circe.

I have very few gripes about this book. A minor irritation is that many of the relevant Greek passages appear at the end of their respective sections rather than in the appropriate place in the text. It is, however, a thoroughly sound, careful, and detailed piece of scholarship, if somewhat unexciting.

University of Natal STEVEN JACKSON

AIRS, WATERS, PLACES

J. JOUANNA (ed.): *Hippocrate*: Tome II: 2e partie: *Airs, Eaux, Lieux*. Texte établi et traduit (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. 374. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1996. 375 frs. ISBN: 2-251-00451-3.

J. has produced an outstanding edition and translation of the Hippocratic *Airs, Waters, Places*. The first 184 pages provide full discussion of a number of textual problems as well as setting the piece in its medical context. J. introduces *AWP* in dramatic style; it can be seen not only in terms of particular modern sub-disciplines, as the first text on the influence of climate on medicine, or the first anthropological work of world literature, but more sweepingly as 'un des grands textes de référence pour l'histoire de la culture' (p. 8). The text and translation are then followed by 100 pages of detailed notes, which act as a continuation of the notes given within the main body of the text, and an *index verborum*.

J. provides a thorough discussion of the structure and aims of *AWP*, focused on the questions of the unity of the text and the unity of the author raised in the present century, when some commentators have separated the 'medical' part, directed at the travelling physician needing to establish himself in a new geographical location, from the 'anthropological' section, and have argued that these are two different texts, perhaps by different authors, merged into one. J. disagrees. He looks at the type of medicine described in *AWP*, considering disease causation and the author's 'nouvelle conception rationelle de divin' (p. 24), investigating the attitude to climatic factors in other Hippocratic treatises, and demonstrating how *AWP*

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

combines an overarching grand classificatory schema—four different possible orientations of the city—with the complexity of particular local situations, so that environmental determinism can coexist with acknowledgement of individual difference. The physician arriving at a new city is concerned less with the individual's age and gender, and the influence on that individual's health of dietary factors, than with the collective and the diseases affecting the city as a whole. J. investigates how diseases are named in the text, noting that they are usually not explained, a factor supporting the suggestion that *AWP* is aimed at the physician rather than the lay reader. J. suggests that one original feature of the author's approach is the distinction between local diseases, due to local factors, and general diseases due to seasonal changes.

J. situates the anthropological sections of *AWP* within the context of ancient ethnography from Hecataeus onwards. The originality of *AWP* here lies in the author's attempt to extend his knowledge of medicine, and the general laws he has derived from this, into the study of the ethnography of people in health. J. argues that, where the Hippocratic writer can be compared with Herodotus, it is clear that the two authors are working from different sources (p. 59).

J. also looks at the position of *AWP* within the Hippocratic corpus as a whole. He supports the thesis that it is by the same author as *On the Sacred Disease*; he argues that it is close to *Epidemics*, the texts written by those itinerant physicians at whom *AWP* is aimed; and he suggests that, while the author of *Regimen* knew *AWP*, the former went much further in offering a neat binary organization of the world. As for the date of *AWP*, J. situates it somewhere between Herodotus and Thucydides.

In a particularly detailed and valuable section, J. traces the reception of the text in antiquity and beyond, noting the textual problems caused by the lacuna at the end of Chapter 12, the loss of the Greek of Galen's commentary, and the loss of Greek manuscripts for *AWP* itself before V, the twelfth-century Vaticanus gr. 276. Until the end of the nineteenth century, editors of the text were relying on later manuscripts derived from V, but since V itself transferred sections of *AWP* into the treatise *Wounds in the Head*, the chapters were not being read in their original order. A manuscript superior to V, one owned by Gadaldini in the sixteenth century, was subsequently lost, but its arrangement of chapters can be reconstructed from Gadaldini's published and manuscript notes, and through variants attributed to an 'ancient codex' by Baldinius: it appears to have given the chapters in the order 1–6, 12–24, then 7–11. But a more ancient tradition still can be reconstructed from early Latin translations, citations in Arabic writers, and Galen's commentary on *AWP* preserved in Arabic, Latin, and Hebrew. Since Diller's critical edition was published in 1970, further progress has been made with J.'s own discovery of the final chapter of *AWP* in the late thirteenth-century manuscript P, Parisinus gr. 2047a. Further new contributions come from Latin translations, one of which may go back to sixth-century Ravenna, the other being made from the Greek in the late eleventh or early twelfth century. This last translation is particularly valuable as it derives from a different manuscript tradition to that used in V.

This is an exemplary edition, which should bring *AWP* before the audience it deserves both in classical studies and beyond.

University of Reading HELEN KING

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

THE TRUTH OF HISTORY

P. BUTTI DE LIMA: *L'inchiesta e la prova: immagine storiografica practica giuridica e retorica nella Grecia classica*. (Piccola Biblioteca Einaudi, 635.) Pp. viii + 201. Turin: Einaudi, 1996. Paper, L. 25,000. ISBN: 88-06-13590-2.

'In quali modi si fa credere lo storico antico?' From this daunting starting-point B. narrows down his field into a manageable thesis: his purpose is to investigate the claim to truth in historiographical discourse of the classical period, with particular reference to Herodotus and Thucydides; and after noting various possible relationships of ancient historiography with rhetoric, medicine, and the juridical field, he takes the last of these as the basis of his inquiry.

In the first part of the book, then, B. examines various elements of Athenian juridical practice. The first chapter discusses procedural aspects, including the sovereignty of the popular courts and their lack of accountability for their verdicts; the restricted rôle of officials in the legal process and determination of the facts; the presentation of the facts only in the speeches of the opposing parties; the lack of specialist legal knowledge among the jurors, which contrasts with the expertise of logographers; and the origins of rhetoric and logography. The second chapter considers the rôle played in the reconstruction of the events by speeches, and within the speeches the importance in particular of the various types of proof as defined by Aristotle, especially *eikos*. There is little that is new in all this, but B. offers a clear and up-to-date summary of scholarship on the various issues.

In the second part B. compares the historiographical methods of Herodotus and Thucydides in the search for and presentation of a 'true' account of events. This is the core of the work, and close and perceptive analysis of numerous passages brings out well the similarities and differences between the two historians. The first of the topics covered here is the presence of the historian himself in the narrative and how his interventions may constitute indications of veracity, with a useful discussion of autopsy in Herodotus (especially Book 2) and its rhetorical function in persuading the reader. The rôle of autopsy is less transparent in Thucydides (though his description of the plague, for example, stemmed from his own suffering of it), but B. notes how the history begins with the relationship between veracity and the presence of the historian at the events he is describing, and how Thucydides expresses his ability, as an exile, to get information from both sides and to investigate at leisure—and so composes a precise image of his methods of historical investigation, enunciated for the purposes of persuasion. A second topic is the historians' use of informers and other sources: e.g. how the mention of the sources used in a narrative (and of course Herodotus cites his sources far more frequently than Thucydides) again creates an image of veracity and so is persuasive. Thucydides himself admits to the difficulties he faced in obtaining reliable information, and B. offers a sensible discussion of various passages that indicate 'livelli diversi di credibilità della narrazione'. He then moves on to an extended discussion of the means of proof used by the historians, and, given that they were employing rhetorical methods, this is set against the rhetorical/juridical background. *Tekmerion*, *semeion* (both words are used by Thucydides in discussion of the distant past), and *martyrion* (mainly in Herodotus; B. erroneously states the word only occurs once in Thucydides) are methods of proof which act as guarantees of the veracity of the facts asserted in the narrative, such as with conjecture about past events for which there is no real evidence (e.g. what language the Pelasgians spoke, Hdt. 1.57).

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Finally, B. considers the role of *eikos* (and *eikazein*) in historical narrative, which indicates the historian's intervention. Its use is justified in Thucydides by his belief in the permanence of human nature; and B. gives examples of its different shades of meaning, such as it was 'natural' that the combatants had difficulty seeing during the war's only night battle (Thuc. 7.44.2).

B. is aware of the dangers inherent in his comparative approach, not least the fundamental divergence between history and the juridical sphere with regard to the rôle of investigation and inquiry in establishing facts, and he concludes his book with a brief discussion of these. In sum, there is plenty of interesting material here, but especially in the historiographical part of the study. The work originated in the author's *tesi di dottorato* under the supervision of L. Canfora (who writes the prefatory note). As one would expect, therefore, the research is diligent and thorough, and there are extensive footnotes as well as a comprehensive bibliography (though it surprisingly omits Stephen Todd's *The Shape of Athenian Law* [Oxford, 1993]). An index and list of passages cited would have been helpful.

Queen Mary and Westfield College, London MICHAEL J. EDWARDS

AGAINST ALCIBIADES

P. C. GHIGGIA: *[Andocide]* Contro Alcibiade: *introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*. (Studi e testi di storia antica, 4.) Pp. xxxii + 309. Pisa: Edizione Ets, 1995. Paper, L. 30,000. ISBN: 88-7741-857-5.

There are many reasons why the *Against Alcibiades*, found as a fourth speech in the MSS of Andocides but agreed by almost all not to have been written by him, deserves a full-length commentary of the kind provided by G. Not the least of these is its seeming importance as an historical document illustrating the practice of ostracism at Athens, but therein lies the nub of the problem. For since it is impossible on various grounds that the *Against Alcibiades* was actually delivered on the purported occasion, there is ample room for doubt as to the true nature of the work (i.e. a real speech, a political pamphlet, or a rhetorical exercise), let alone as to its author and date; and if it was in fact a later exercise, the reliability of the information it provides becomes all the more suspect. The problems are discussed in exhaustive detail by G. in his long introduction (pp. 9–121), which begins with a brief section on the context of the speech (as we may conveniently describe it) followed by a synopsis. In the third section of the introduction G. reviews the history of modern scholarship on the speech from Meier's *Commentationes* of 1861 and 1863—this is useful, though it is a rather superficial survey, and more space might have been given over to these relatively few studies of the speech, in particular (since G. takes the opposing standpoint) to Raubitschek's spirited defence of its authenticity. Some examples from Feraboli's excellent stylistic analysis, which casts strong doubt on Andocidean authorship, would also have been in order. G. then moves on to the speech's later attestation in the ancient sources, with a good discussion of Plutarch's source material for the *Life* of Alcibiades. (Given that G. provides a translation of the speech and so is presumably aiming at a wider audience than specialist Greek scholars, it would have helped those with little or no Greek if the extensive quotations here had also been accompanied by a translation.) Section five considers

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the identity of the speaker (plumping rightly, in my view, for Phaeax) and Section six the ostracism in question (showing, again rightly, that it was not connected with the ostracism of Hyperbolus in 417 or 416, which is usually thought to have been the last occasion when the process was employed, but with a putative contest between Phaeax, Nicias, and Alcibiades in 415). Finally, in Section seven G. attempts a dating and attribution of authorship, reaching the (by no means original) conclusion that the work was a fictitious speech with the character of a pamphlet, composed sometime in the 390s and put into the mouth of Phaeax before the voting in the ostracism; and he makes the interesting (and original) suggestion that its author was Aeschines Socraticus, who is known to have written a dialogue entitled *Alcibiades*. G. is perfectly justified in succumbing to the temptation to attribute the speech to a known figure, but as with other theories advanced over the dating and authorship of the speech, once it is admitted that what we have is a literary exercise, the internal indications of a *terminus ante quem* and of the milieu of its composition lose much of their force. I recently refereed an article which makes a cogent case for a rather later dating of the work, and it is unlikely that agreement can ever be reached here. That said, G.'s arguments are thorough and in themselves plausible.

Discussion of the *Against Alcibiades* is inevitably dominated by the above-mentioned issues, but there is a good deal more to this excellently produced book than the introduction. G. gives a brief but useful account of the MSS and editions of the speech; a text with full apparatus; and what the book's cover describes (accurately, as far as my Italian allows me to judge) as *un agile traduzione italiana*. There is also an extensive and scholarly commentary, which is tied to the Greek text but which would again be more accessible to the Greekless reader if the frequent quotations from the sources were translated. The book ends with two helpful indexes and a comprehensive bibliography.

One further feature of the book deserves special mention. A preface of twenty-four pages is written by G.'s mentor, Silvio Cataldi, in which Cataldi works through the speech discussing with his usual perception various possible indicators of date and authorship. This makes the volume worthwhile reading in itself, and in some ways Cataldi's summary of G.'s arguments tends to overshadow G.'s own introduction. But this is not to take anything away from the latter. G.'s volume displays all the qualities of the finest scholarship and should become indispensable for students in this field.

Queen Mary and Westfield College, London MICHAEL J. EDWARDS

POLITICUS

C. J. ROWE (ed., trans.): *Plato:* Statesman (Classical Texts). Pp. vi + 245. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1995. Cased, £35/$49.95 (Paper, £14.95/$24.95) ISBN: 0-85668-612-3 (0-85668-613-1 pbk).

Only Stallbaum ever produced a complete commentary on Plato, *c.* 1825–60. Since then the total number of adult commentaries on Plato by no means matches the linguistic and interpretative effort put into many other Greek texts. On the *Statesman* R. has Campbell's superbly intelligent but sometimes laconic treatment

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to compete with, and also Skemp's sometimes woolly but often helpful translation with notes. Do not throw away Campbell or Skemp, but look for full attention to detail in Rowe.

Fullness has exacted its price in almost unreadably small and cramped type in the commentary—70,000 words in seventy pages. The main Greek text is in larger type but is spoilt by frequent stretched spacing of lines where there can be no intention to indicate quotation or emphasis. The operator or the machinery must learn how to divide Greek words, tricky though that can be.

The introduction is concentrated (about 10,000 words). Pp. 1–3: πολιτικός may well have been an insufficiently elegant term for orators to use, but perfectly current and neutral in tone in conversation. Pp.4–8: R., in a very condensed section, resists urges to find metaphysics in the *Statesman*. There are perhaps three metaphysical flashpoints. (i) Quoting Cohen, R. rightly warns us that *eidos* and *idea* sometimes mean 'class', sometimes 'property of a class'. (But he should have translated accordingly; at 262b1 'class' is surely the wrong choice.) (ii) A property, though all properties are abstractions, may still be a visible property, redness, as distinct from an invisible property, justice; the skill of weaving is more visible, Plato must mean, than the skill of statesmanship. (iii) There may be a problem in how we can discover statesmanship if it is at present uninstantiated and if its supposed imitations are really not statesmen at all. R. is right to argue that in the *Statesman* nothing metaphysical seems to be made of these three points, despite the metaphysical interest they would have seemed likely to have had for the middle-period Plato, but R. should perhaps underline more clearly that these are three quite distinct points not necessarily requiring to be fused with each other even by Plato.

Pp. 8–11: R. debates whether the *Statesman* is a failure as drama. Could one not reply that the Visitor's complex presentation with immense and varied detail, myth, digression, analogy, and satire (298–9) compensate a great deal for this? But the baroque style and structure perhaps rather get in the way of the content.

The Myth (pp. 11–13 and commentary). Here there is currently debate. Lovejoy in 1935 in Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism . . . . in Antiquity* gave an impossible reading of the *Statesman* myth, declaring Plato's presentation 'somewhat confused and inconsistent' (p. 158). Brisson and R. follow Lovejoy, who introduced the view that we now live in a second golden or semi-golden age, which is a kind of mixture of one previous golden age and one previous regressive age.

To most readers this myth seems very clearly to suggest that we now live in a regressive age, and though the motivation of this 'new' view is clear—to avoid pessimism, and to ascribe value to skills, there is no possibility of deriving it from the text, and it misses Plato's ultimate point. True, in a regressive world men are driven to use skills, and perhaps even to try to evolve a skill of governing themselves; but no other skill is any real approach to the skill of an ideal ruler, and we learn from the myth that in our age, the ideal ruler has left us to ourselves, and will only save us when we have over time totally forgotten any traces of the ruling skills we have been trying to recollect from the earlier age. Our governmental skills will not develop; we do best to change nothing of the laws we already have; only a divine visitation could do better than that—though of course a returning *divine* ruler would be bound by nothing of what he found in the world as it now is. I slightly 'remythologize' some of what is perhaps put in demythologized form later in the dialogue.

R. is I suspect better aware than Lovejoy and Brisson of the difficulties of getting the 'new view' out of Plato's text, though he makes strenuous efforts. Some comments: (i) R.'s wish to understand τῆς αὐτοῦ κινήσεως at 269 e4 as 'its own motion, namely

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

circular movement *in either direction*' might satisfy a reader who began at 269 d5, but surely not one who has read 269 c7–d3. (ii) By the time we reach *τἀναντία* at 270 b8, however, we can read that simply as 'the opposite of what happens *now*' (b7) without upsetting what we have already learnt, namely that the cosmos' own movement is the backward cycle. (iii) At 272 b2 it is surely easy to accept that in the description of this cycle as 'said-to-be that of Zeus', the 'said-to-be' precisely prepares for the discovery that in fact no god directs this cycle. R. agrees here, and accepts the standard view that the MSS' *νῦν* must be removed from 271 d4. (iv) The notion that in the regressive cycle we get skills as 'gifts from Hephaestus and Athena' very similarly shows Plato making a jesting allusion to standard mythology in a context where his main intention is clearly to supersede it. I suspect Plato would have been amazed at any misunderstanding here. R. again agrees here *contra* Lovejoy.

Political Theory (pp. 14–19 and commentary). Plato undoubtedly makes one very important point, partly anticipating Aristotle on practical thinking, that in the changing circumstances of real life, flexibility in decision-making and administration is vastly superior to rigid application of law. How to achieve this he does not know, except to postulate an ideal ruler; but since the ideal ruler seems to be seldom present Plato's second-best recipe for 'real life' is totally rigid application of the law. This (a) seems contradictory and (b) raises the question of where 'the law' came from, and what makes it worth sticking to—or is absolutely any law automatically worth sticking to? I earlier hinted at one mythologizing possibility; perhaps Plato thought that the laws we have remain from a previous era. But I am really no more inclined than R. is to think Plato gave the myth a literal meaning, and I remain baffled by this problem. The apparently sincere and not sarcastic force of *πείρα* and *χαριέντως* at 300 b1–3 comes as a surprise; R., however, does see sarcasm; and at 301 e2–3 who are they who must *συνελθόντας συγγράμματα γράφειν . . . μεταθέοντας τὰ τῆς ἀληθεστάτης πολιτείας ἴχνη*? And how can any truth be achieved? Does Plato believe in some form of communal *ἀνάμνησις*, and if so is the myth still in his mind after all? I incline on the whole to take the 'pessimistic' view of this dialogue (*contra* Vlastos and R.) and to see Plato (as often thought) moving away from a strong hope of finding ideal rulers to a despair requiring the establishment of very rigid laws—this even in a dialogue whose strongest political concern is precisely the badness of rigid laws. Or did Plato in stressing his second best course merely succeed in distracting us from his ideal 'first best' recommendation? There is a great wealth of discussion provided in R.'s commentary in this area.

I have no space to take up more points from the commentary. Continuous reading of a detailed commentary inevitably drives one to hanker after firm decisions, trenchancy, and brevity, but users consulting individual notes will welcome their fullness and balance. I can vouch for the fact that when resisting some of my suggestions on textual points R. always states the position very fairly. I usually remain obstinate, but he has taken great care with opposing views even on small points. A concluding aphorism: always remember that it is the context, not the lexicon-entry, that settles meaning in a given passage.

University of Edinburgh DAVID B. ROBINSON

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

XENOPHON

P. KRENTZ: *Xenophon*: Hellenika II.3.11–IV.2.8 (Classical Texts). Pp. iv + 220. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1995. Cased, £35.00/$49.95 (Paper, £14.95/$24.95). ISBN: 0-85668-641-7 (0-85668-642-5 pbk).

O. LENDLE: *Kommentar zu Xenophons Anabasis:* Bücher 1–7. Pp. xxxi + 527, 77 ills. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1995. Cased, DM 78. ISBN: 3-534-12813-3.

Two Xenophon commentaries, but contrasting volumes. K.'s is the second in (presumably) a series covering all of *Hellenica*, L.'s is free-standing (and page-for-page much better value at hardback prices). K. includes text and translation, L. neither. L. has *c*. 2 pages of commentary per OCT page, K. only *c*. 1.5. K. includes an introduction on X.'s life/works, the character of *Hellenika*, the themes of 2.3.11–4.2.8, chronology, and the MSS. It is brief (with parts repeated from the first volume), but still outstrips L.'s six-page *Einleitung* which represents user's instructions, not a survey of the literary, historiographical, chronological, topographical etc. problems which *A*. poses. But 'Xenophons "Anabasis" verdient . . . eine genauere Lektüre', and line-by-line commentary is a prime *desideratum*. Both volumes are illustrated, L.'s, naturally, more richly. A notable feature is use of line-drawings based on modern photographs—which gives a charmingly antique feel without markedly diminishing their value—but the backbone is a series of maps showing the army's route. There are odd errors (Tell Kuneise is misplaced on fig. 14: H. Gasche, in P. Briant (ed.), *Dans les pas des Dix-Mille* [Toulouse, 1995], p. 201 n. 1) and inconsistencies (figs 21, 23 differ on the Tigris's ancient course near Nimrud; fig. 5 reproduces Janke's 1904 map of the Syrian Gates, but the text follows Janke's 1910 views), and the maps only cover L.'s version of the route, but the reader can have no serious complaint. Alongside contrasts one similarity is the low priority of literary/linguistic commentary. K. notes, e.g., X.'s fondness for animal-similes; L. remarks, e.g., that 7.4.7f. exemplifies X.'s effortless ability to evoke a scene, or that domestic details in 4.5.24 enliven the narrative. But it is symptomatic that L. makes no comment on the unprefaced abruptness of 1.1.1. (He also fails to stress that the homoerotic vignette in 7.4.7f. plays against a chilling background of cold-blooded execution.) Another similarity is that both volumes are very much to be welcomed.

K.'s general approach to *Hellenica* is sound—alive, as he is, to its unsystematic selectivity, ambiguity, paradigmatic intent, and manipulation of readers' responses—so I merely note some miscellaneous points. 126. '*Harmostai* (literally "fixers").' Why not 'tuners', 'composers', or 'arrangers'? 128. K. believes the Thirty envisaged an *Ersatz*-Sparta. (In general K. does not aggressively push the approach to the Thirty found in his 1982 study.) 129. The dagger-bearing youths must be Scythian archer-policemen because they would have been outside the amnesty had they been citizens. But many citizen associates were amnestied—the amnesty remarkably held that 'simply following orders' was a valid excuse. The dagger-bearers of Thuc.8.69 still look a good parallel. 131. The association of Theramenes and ships in Ar. *Ran*. 534f. deserves mention. 136. The question whether *hetaireiai* are a purely fifth-century *political* phenomenon might be aired: cf. M. H. Hansen, *Athenian Democracy* (1991), pp. 281f. 139. If the Thirty invented execution-by-hemlock, it merits comment that the democracy retained it—if it *was* ever standard: is it not only reliably attested in 399 (Socrates) and 318 (Phocion etc.)? 141. Is it really odd that X. names one cavalry fatality but not the other two? That he named Nicostratus because he knew him personally—and better than the other two—seems plausible enough. 142. Did Athens need a permanent prison large enough for 300 people at once? 144. The analogy with Megistias (Hdt. 7.228) has a topographical parallel, with the revolutionaries at the top of a steep

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

climb and then (as at Thermopylae) descending into the flat ground in front. 147. Whatever *isoteleia* means, citizens surely had it already. 151. The Spartan burials in Kerameikos are indeed 'quite striking'—as if even Spartan dead were martyrs in the cause of Athenian liberty. 154. Referring *andres* in 2.4.42 to city-men has attractions but should the sarcasm of *kalois* not be better signalled? 155. *eti kai nun* statements in *Cyropaedia* are more complex than K. suggests, as is the whole of what K. (p. 6) calls 'a literary fiction'. 157. 'Themistogenes of Syracuse' suggests justice and the presumed objectivity of a Syracusan observer. If *A.* was written after 371, X.'s Corinthian residence might also be relevant. 161. Polyaen. 2.19 is a copy of Thuc. 3.34.

Occasional assertions in L. are undocumented (1.5.3 [bustard meat], 5.3.12 [Artemis Ephesia without multiple breasts]) or ill-documented (7.4.17 [*pelte*-straps: three ill-identified items are cited, other evidence neglected]), but the commentary generally explains itself lucidly—even dangerously: to say penal mutilation survives in fundamentalist countries is safe (p. 80); to call it 'brutal' courts politically correct complaint.

Chronological framework. L.'s running count of *stathmoi* is—unhelpfully—not a count of days because (a) revisiting a previous camp (2.l.2f., 3.5.13) is not counted as a new *stathmos*; (b) X.'s omission of stages in 2.5.1, 4.2.24–4.3.1 is rectified, but his overestimate at 4.6.4 is not; and (c) there are numerous rest-days. L. espouses a 'late' chronology with the army leaving in April 401 and reaching Trapezus around the start (p. 291) or end (p. 329) of June 400. This allegedly matches environmental and climatic evidence, but involves legerdemain (2.3.15 is put in October/November 401, but 4.3.7f., barely three months on, is March 400). Bluntly, the time X. assigns to Kurdistan/Armenia seems inadequate to match climatic parameters. (V. Manfredi, *La strada dei Diecimila* [1985] supposes two months are missing from X.'s record.)

Sources. A diary is probable. But the length of 5.5.7–6.1.13 does not (*pace* 346) show X. kept unusually full notes at Cotyora—the narrative lacks abnormally circumstantial details. L. admits no hint that Sophaenetus' *Anabasis* might be spurious, and finds Ctesias outside Cunaxa as the source for Chalybian victory-rituals (4.7.16: unnecessary) and the list of governors in 7.8.25f.—for L. believes 7.8.25f. (and 2.2.6, 5.5.4) are by X. though not supposed to remain in the definitive text of *A.* He also believes X. capable of invention (143 [Menon's death]).

Topography. There are many identifications to make (L. does not always oblige: e.g. 1.2.7f., 1.2.20, 3.4.24–30, 6.3.5, 6.3.10, 6.5.12, 6.6.38) and solutions often differ from those in e.g. Manfredi, sometimes marginally, sometimes more grossly (e.g. Myriandus–Thapsacus), sometimes extravagantly (Armenia—but that is traditional). One shared view is that X. inverted Opis and Sittace—which means the army marched along the Median Wall without X. saying so: a problem, especially for L., who argues elsewhere that they only march along a river if X. explicitly says so (1.4.19/1.5.1, 2.4.28). L. believes in the variable parasang—excessively, when the twenty-five parasangs at 1.2.23 are *c.* 2 km apiece (the detailed explanation sounds inconsistent with conditions immediately outside the Cilician Gates) and 4.7.1/15, 4.8.1, and 4.6.5 offer parasangs of under 2, *c.* 2.5, and *c.* 3 km apiece, all without explanation. If bad snow is the cause, why is there none in the accompanying narratives?

Miscellaneous. 51. L. claims Cyrus had no actual authority over the Greeks (*ekeleuse* in 1.6.4, 1.7.1 means 'urgently requested'). Can this be true? It does not follow from the Greek army's being several independent armies without an overall commander. 106. L. thinks X. right about palm-*enkephaloi* (2.3.16). Joannès (Briant *o.c.* 191) disagrees—probably rightly, though terminological fluidity about so-called 'palm-cabbages' makes certainty difficult (and illustrates the ease of confusion). 148. Is L. over-flattering X. in seeing as a motive for accepting Proxenus' invitation the desire of a philosophically educated man of wide horizons to meet a remarkable man (Cyrus)? 205. The one-hypaspist-per-hoplite doctrine worries me—actual references often associate them with officers—and L.'s acceptance of it seems inconsistent with his

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(understandable) scepticism (p. 94) about *diplasia* in 4.1.13. 209. Must Orontas be personally present at 4.3.4? 223. L.'s explanation of the 'towers' via (non-military) nineteenth-century Armenian house-building unduly neglects more mundane needs for fortification in an exposed border area. 272–3. The Scytheni sound like remnants of well-attested eighth/seventh-century northern intruders into Anatolia and Western Asia. L. appears to envisage more recent *arrivistes* but does not explain. 353 wrongly relocates the *agoranomoi* riot just west of Cerasus rather than at Cotyora. 396. 6.5.1, 6.5.2ff. are surely two separate days. 432. L. identifies Tranipsae and Herodotus' Nipsaei (4.93): but Hdt. 1.c. does not say they lived around Salmydessus.

University of Liverpool C. J. TUPLIN

A GREEK CRITIC IN ROME

S. FORNARO: *Dionisio di Alicarnasso, Epistola a Pompeo Gemino: Introduzione e commento*. (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 95.) Pp. vii + 280. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1997. Cased, DM 98. ISBN: 3-51907644-6.

A very full introduction (forty-three pages) and commentary (202 pages) sandwich the *epistola prefatoria* of the 1554 *editio princeps* (Henri Estienne) in Greek original and Italian translation together with a bibliography. Dionysius' own letter (in Aujac's text, which supplies line numbers[1] and lemmata) is twenty-two pages. Comment centers on the text and on Dionysius' place in the context of ancient literary criticism. The scholarship is careful and the analysis thorough. My principal (but not my only) criticism is that the care and thoroughness are not always guided by the criterion of relevance.

In the Letter to Pompeius Geminus Dionysius (D.) undertakes two very different tasks: defense of his criticisms of Plato and exposition of his views on a handful of historians (Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Philistus, Theopompus: 'un canone piuttosto personale', p. 17). Large portions of the Letter are excerpted from other treatises (404 lines out of 581: 76 from the *de Demosthene* and 328 from the second book of *de Imitatione*), but F. does little with the differences between versions. She ducks the question of the relative order of composition, assuming, for example (contra K. S. Sacks, 'Historiography in the Rhetorical Works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus', *Athenaeum* 64 [1986], 65–87), that the text of *de Imitatione* is a reworking of the Letter (pp. 238 on 4.4.3 *σβέννυται*, 242 on 5.3.2 *πικρόν*, 244 on 5.6.13 *μικρός τε*, etc.). F. argues rather for the essential unity of the Letter, without quite coming to terms with the authorial assertion that so much is borrowed.

A large number of notes criticize Aujac's text and apparatus, reviving readings or repairs adopted by earlier editors and, very occasionally, offering something new. There is no list of places where F. differs from Aujac. Many notes supplement Aujac's rather abstemious apparatus or correct its attributions, and some of these, including

[1]References are by chapter, section, and Aujac line-number, an awkward format. Consider the first section of Chapter 2, which covers four pages of Aujac's text: the notes on that section (admittedly a long one) occupy thirty-seven pages of commentary, within which the references scroll from 2.1.1 to 2.1.25 (or so) four times. Without Aujac in hand this is almost impossible to use (indexing is minimal) and even with it, it is unnecessarily cumbersome, even for the author: on 2.3.12 *ἐπικινδυνοτέρων* there are two notes (158 and 160).

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the fine note on 3.14.18 *παραγράψας τῇ Ξέρξου φυγῇ* (pp. 207–9)[2], are very welcome. But there are too many notes rehearsing the reasons for readings that are in the end rejected.

Another major emphasis is providing a literary critical context for D.'s remarks. Particularly fruitful for the second half of the Letter is the quarrying of Homeric scholia and Philodemus. But some notes have grown into essays on the history of a critical term from Plato to Themistius, not omitting Roman and Christian sources (e.g. 1.1.2 *εὐπαίδευτον* [pp. 66–9], 1.7.11–12 *ἐνέργεια* [pp. 97–100], 2.1.12 *πίνος* [pp. 121–4], 2.1.22 *ζόφῳ* [133–5], 2.1.23 *συστρέψαι* [pp. 137–9], 2.1.24 *ἀπειροκάλους* [139–41]; for others see the *Indice delle principali parole greche* [p. 280]). A corollary (though not a necessary one) to this focus on ancient criticism is an inattention to D.'s Augustan context, which is evoked just in passing apropos realism (p. 161), patriotic historiography (p. 176), Maecenas (p. 228), and universalism (p. 240). And scant attention is given to characterizing the addressee: his identity is probably unrecoverable (p. 4 n. 7) but one can do better than say 'probabilmente un greco, certo un uomo culto' (p. 4); 'lessico . . . "colorato" di platonismo' (p. 157) is only a start.

F. is best on D.'s apologia for his critique of Plato. His claim to be following Plato's lead in using *σύγκρισις* as an analytical tool is richly documented (on 1.3.3–4 *ἡ γὰρ ἀλήθεια* etc., 1.10.7 *ἁμαρτημάτων*, 2.1.18 *τὸ καλλιεπεῖν*, etc.) and even extended: F. also shows D. adopting Platonic language. Thus, for example, the note on 1.1.7 *σεβαστικῶς* of D.'s veneration for Plato, alluding to Platonic desciptions of '"amorosa" venerazione' (p. 75). Also on 2.1.13 *ἠρέμα* (p. 125), 2.1.14–16 *καὶ ὥσπερ*, etc. (pp. 125–6 'nel momento in cui Dionisio deve descrivere lo stile platonico ideale, si attiene, nel lessico, alle descrizioni platoniche dei luoghi ideali'), 2.1.19 *ὁρμήν* (p. 130), and 2.1.3 *χειμάζεται* (p.143). Of course allusions worthy of the name ought to make the reading richer for those who see them, and some two dozen of those suggested here do not.

The commentary is weaker on the historians, primarily because F. fails to illustrate D.'s remarks about, say, Herodotus and Thucydides with references to Herodotus and Thucydides, offering instead passages from the critical literature that too often pertain to oratory or poetry. Even when D. quotes a passage from Philistus, F. does not try to understand the critical vocabulary from the example but offers bibliography on 'dottrine sulle figure con rassegna delle fonti, da Gorgia agli stoici' (p. 243).

In sum, a commentary of much erudition, but less useful than it could have been.

Amherst College, Amherst, MA CYNTHIA DAMON

[2]The note, however, begins with an oversight: the genitive is the transmitted text, not the dative.

ARRIAN II

A. B. BOSWORTH: *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's* History of Alexander: *Vol. II. Books IV–V*. Pp. xviii + 382, 4 figs, 10 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995. £45. ISBN: 0-19-814829-1.

B.'s second volume of his commentary on Arrian's *Anabasis* deals with Books 4 and 5 and lives up to the expectations raised by the previous volume, which dealt with Books 1–3. It is witness to the author's growing affection for his subject (p. v; cf. rev. of volume I in *C.R.* n.s. 31 [1981], 189). Students who know little or no Greek may

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hesitate to use this Commentary. But if they do, they will miss out. B. has much of real value to tell the reader of Arrian and the historian of Alexander. Some of the more detailed comments complement his previous publications. Of course, the reader should consult the volume with a copy of B.'s *Conquest and Empire* (Cambridge, 1988) to hand; the Greekless, as B. recommends (p. 11), will use Brunt's translation of the *Anabasis* in the Loeb series.

The two central books of Arrian's account of Alexander narrate the campaigns and events of 329 to 326. Book 4 features an assessment of Alexander (4.7.4–14.4), including the murder of Cleitus, the *proskynesis* episode, and the speech of Hermolaus, while Book 5 takes us to the Eastern limits of Alexander's campaigns, up to the River Indus and into the Punjab, where Alexander meets Porus in the battle of the Hydaspes (5.8.4–19.4; on which see now A. B. Bosworth, *Alexander and the East. The Tragedy of Triumph* [Oxford, 1996], Chapter 1, esp. pp. 5ff.).

The Commentary underlines how Arrian tries 'to set the achievements of the king in the best possible light' (p. 11). The final episode of Book 5, the revolt of the army at the Hyphasis (5.24.8–39.5), illustrates this point. B. draws out very clearly the rhetorical contest between Alexander and the representative of the Macedonian troops, Coenus (see e.g. p. 352 on 5.27.4 on the limits of Alexander's achievements). The construction of the argument allows Alexander to be shown as a vastly ambitious commander with aspirations which his troops would prevent him from achieving. Here and elsewhere, B. takes care and time to suggest where he thinks Arrian is speaking and where events from contemporary accounts are being used or recycled.

B. is authoritative but avoids filling out the references. Balakros, one-time satrap of Cilicia (p. 42: 4.7.2), is said to have been killed 'some time before late 331' (p. 43), repeating B.'s argument from the first volume (*A Historical Commentary on Arrian's* History of Alexander [Oxford, 1980], p. 219). B. offers a different date from but does not mention Waldemar Heckel, who put Balakros' death much later (*Z.P.E.* 70 [1987], 161f. has 324; accepted by Reger, *Z.P.E.* 89 [1991] 155; also see now Heckel's *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire* [London, 1992], p. 261 with n. 57).

As B. points out, one of the more notable features of Book 5 is the attention to geographical problems. Not only does Arrian summarize the geography of India (5.5.2–6.3), he also anticipates his *Indica* (*Anab.* 5.4.3–5.1). B. establishes the tradition on which A. was drawing. The appendix on 'Arrian's use of Nearchus' identifies passages in the *Anabasis* where B. believes Arrian has drawn on details from the writings of Alexander's admiral. Part of the exercise in the separate publication of the *Indica*—which B. shows must be read closely with the *Anabasis* (p. 229)—is to refute the fictitious and imaginative accounts of previous writers, notably Ctesias and Herodotus. On one count, however, Herodotus seems to have been justified. The gold-digging ants (Hdt. *Hist*. 3.102), mentioned with some scorn by Arrian (*Anab*. 5.4.3.; p. 231), have been identified recently by a French explorer, Michel Peissel, as marmots (*Arctomys himalayanas*). Apparently the ancient Persian word for this creature translates as 'mountain ant' and may have misled Herodotus. Observed on the Dansar plateau in Baltistan, close to the India–Pakistan border, the marmots burrow underground, to a depth of three feet, and throw up heaps of sand, some of which is gold bearing. A Balti scholar, Professor Muhammad Yousuf Husainabadi, reported that only recent military restrictions put an end to the local Minaro people's collecting gold from the region (*The Times*, 4 December 1996, p. 12, 'Fabled gold-digging "ant" unmasked').

Book 5 also features the death of Bucephalas. Alexander's favourite horse serves an important unifying theme in Plutarch's *Life* of Alexander. There the taming of the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

horse symbolizes the ambitious spirit of the young Alexander (see B. on pp. 313f. for the respective ages of horse and master). The location of the city founded in Bucephalas' honour offers a more insurmountable problem (pp. 311–16: Arr. *Anab.* 5.19.4–19.6). Fraser has suggested that Bucephala was located below modern Jalalpur but implies there is little hope of finding anything from the early settlement (P. M. Fraser, *Cities of Alexander the Great* [Oxford, 1996], pp. 161–2 with n. 105).

Crucial to Book 4 is Alexander's divine status (e.g. 4.8.3, pp. 53f.; 4.9.9, pp. 65ff.; see also 5.26.5). One of the most celebrated passages is the debate on *proskynesis.* B. argues that Arrian echoes the discussion of Alexander's divinity which actually took place at the time in 327. He concludes that '*proskynesis* was intended by Alexander as an act of worship as much as court ceremonial' (p. 70). Since the publication of B.'s volume, G. L. Cawkwell ('The Deification of Alexander the Great: a Note', in I. Worthington (ed.) *Ventures into Greek History* [Oxford, 1994], pp. 293–306) has restated the case that the practice of prostration 'had nothing to do with religion' (p. 296). This particular debate will continue into the next, and final, volume of B.'s Commentary on Arrian where we will await, among others, his remarks on the treatment of Alexander among the Greek cities (e.g. Arrian 7.23.2).

If the second volume is any indication, we can expect the third and final volume of B.'s commentary on Arrian to continue to provide real insight into Arrian's writing and the construction of his history. These volumes will surely grace the bookshelf of any student of Alexander the Great.

University of Liverpool GRAHAM OLIVER

POLEMO

W. W. READER, in collaboration with A. J. CHVALA-SMITH: *The Severed Hand and the Upright Corpse: the Declamations of Marcus Antonius Polemo.* (Society of Biblical Literature: Texts and Translations, 42: Graeco-Roman Series, 12.) Pp. xxvi + 540. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996. $49.95. ISBN: 0-7885-0282-4.

Polemo was an important sophist of the Second Sophistic, who numbered among his many admirers Herodes Atticus, but unfortunately most of his writings are lost. Only two declamations survive, opposing speeches by the fathers of Aeschylus' brother Cynegirus and the polemarch Callimachus on the question of who should deliver the funeral oration over the Marathon dead; although these hardly rank among the most inspired examples of the genre, they certainly deserve the close attention of a modern edition and commentary. This need has been amply met by the present study. R. offers an exhaustive discussion of the manuscripts, a revised text with full apparatus, an English translation, and an extensive commentary, as well as an introduction to the life of Polemo and his works, the genre of declamation and the theme of the surviving speeches, and various analyses of Polemo's vocabulary.

The most scholarly and impressive part of R.'s book is his discussion of the manuscript tradition. Of the only five editions hitherto published the last was Hinck's Teubner of 1873, and Hinck collated only nine of the eighteen MSS known to R. and his textual collaborator Chvala-Smith. Their collation and convincing stemma of all the MSS will doubtless prove indispensable to the editors working on an updated Teubner text (see p. 79 n. 63). The long commentary (some 224 pages on 115 sections

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of text) is also impressive, with historical and rhetorical material, and very thorough grammatical notes designed especially for the inexperienced student of Greek. There are bound to be quibbles over any commentary; R. does not explain, for example, the reference in A30 to Naxians and Eretrians (a brief discussion of the Ionian Revolt here would assist the student, to whom so much of the commentary is addressed), though in later notes on A38 and 43 he refers us to Herodotus' descriptions of their capture. My main criticism, however, would be that the layout of the commentary is confusing, since the notes on each section are simply divided into paragraphs and not tied in the usual fashion to lemmata. The translation follows the maxim 'as literal as possible, as free as necessary' (p. 88), with which few would disagree in a work of this kind, but it is doubtful whether we really need 'words represented in the Greek text but which are only implied or which are inserted for the sake of clarity are placed in square brackets'. As a result, e.g., the translation of the anarthrous *βασιλεύς* is always '[the] king', even though the note on A9 explains that the article had been omitted when the expression referred to the King of Persia ever since Herodotus. Such pedantry may well benefit beginners in Greek, but the translation is in consequence rather less easy on the eye.

At the end of the chapter on the MSS comes a section entitled 'The Production of a Critical Greek Text', where, for the benefit of the newcomer, R. describes the basic stages in the production of a textual edition. This is indicative of the area where I feel that he has at times fallen between two stools. The book, he declares (p. 5), 'is aimed at both professor *and* student', and this leads to the strange juxtaposing of, in this instance, intricate textual scholarship and very basic introductory material (yet with that common German term *stumpfsinnig* on p. 85!)—and in that order here. In the first chapter the biographical details of Polemo's life are culled largely without critical comment from Philostratus; and an elementary description of the battle of Marathon based on How and Wells is followed by an altogether more informative description of the classical tradition concerning the involvement of Cynegirus and Callimachus in the battle. Again, R. apologizes for the length of his book, but in attempting to explain everything so clearly he tends to repeat himself—thus we are told that Polemo delivered the dedication speech at the temple of Olympian Zeus in Athens in 131/132 C.E. on pp. 13 and 15, again on p. 17 with a quote from Philostratus (*VS* 533), on p. 23 with a reference to the same passage, on p. 33 with the same reference but with the date simply 131 C.E., and on p. 41 with the date given as 131/132 C.E. once more. Table 2 is printed twice, on pp. 54 and 70; also, the constant quoting of Philostratus in English with selected words from the Greek in brackets is otiose. Finally, the book itself would have greatly benefited from two things, firstly closer editing in R.'s own exhaustive manner. This might have picked up the numerous typographical errors and inconsistencies (e.g. Bar Kochba on p. 4 becomes Bar Kokhba on p. 16; 'Plataeans' generally, but Plateans on p. 32, Plateia p. 198; 'promonitory' p. 12; 'multic-ethnic' p. 18; 'exericises' p. 23). Secondly, there is no general index, which is essential in a work of this length.

R.'s volume is clearly a labour of love. It serves as a good introduction to declamation for students of Greek and as a monument to close textual scholarship, and on both counts is to be highly recommended. The mixture of both in the same volume may, however, seem incongruous; and I could wish that some of the body had been severed.

Queen Mary and Westfield College, London M. J. EDWARDS

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

GREGORY'S LIKES AND DISLIKES

L. LUGARESI (ed.): *Gregorio di Naziano: La morte di Guiliano l'Apostata*. (Biblioteca Patristica, 29.) Pp. 302. Fiesole: Nardini, 1997. Paper, L. 45,000. ISBN: 88-404-2034-7.

A. LUKINOVICH, C. MARTINGAY: *Le dit de sa vie, Grégoire de Nazianze*. Pp. 368. Geneva: Editions Ad Solem, 1997. Paper, Sw. frs. 210. ISBN: 2-940090-14-9.

For Gregory of Nazianzus' second invective (*Oration* 5) against the emperor Julian, Bernardi's *Sources Chrétiennes* text is printed (with very minor modifications) together with a reliable facing Italian translation. Although students are likely to opt for Bernardi's French version, L.'s clarity has much to commend and his notes are fuller, being particularly good on literary and Biblical parallels for Gregory's language and themes. L. also provides a long introduction which surveys the key themes of the speech, in particular Julian's responsibility for the attempt to reconstruct the Jewish Temple at Jerusalem, his Persian campaign, and his sorry death. L. argues, plausibly, that this speech should not be treated as a unit with *Oration* 4, the other Julianic invective; rather, *Oration* 5 reflects Julian's contested reputation, in death as well as in life, with the posthumous eulogies of Libanius (*Orations* 17 and 18), and perhaps of others, requiring a rejoinder. Thus the invective illustrates aspects of Julian's reign which worried Christians and where they were determined to win the argument: Gregory emerges as a combative author who reshapes recent history for current purposes, to ensure that the right lessons are drawn from the Apostate's short reign. In particular Gregory wished to prevent the emergence of a romantic image of Julian as doomed hero (one might note the Alexandrian connotations of Julian's alleged attempt to suggest divine status by disposing of himself secretly in the Tigris). To this end he focused on Julian's defects of appearance and character: L. elucidates Gregory's intentions here, but might have said more about the success of this passage (§§19–24), whose influence can be traced through the impact of its recherché vocabulary (e.g. Theophylact 4.5.1 used Gregory's evocative $\beta\rho\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\omega}\delta\eta\varsigma$ to convey the impression of unpleasant spluttering laughter). But there are few complaints.

The French translation of Gregory's autobiographical poem in iambic trimeters, composed after his brief spell as bishop of Constantinople (381), is less useful. Carolinne White's version in the Cambridge Medieval Classics series (1996) will be consulted by English readers, and her volume has the advantage of including four of Gregory's shorter personal poems. For the French Lu. provided the basic translation, which was then transposed into verse by M., but the page layout is so bad that the translation degenerates from facing into sequential (e.g. pp. 154–5: no overlap between text and translation). A more serious problem, which also affects White's brief introduction and laconic notes, is a tendency to accept Gregory's account of his own career as accurate: Gregory was always a reluctant bishop, pleased to have been useful to the Nicene cause during his brief stay in Constantinople (379–81); he was innocent (OK!), but resigned his throne to avoid controversy, a new Jonah saving the Nicene ship (1838). It is likely that Gregory was an odd and difficult individual, but it is time that his career is subjected to critical scrutiny: his illnesses were well-timed, as he admits (1745), and provided convenient cover for his retreat from Constantinople; they did not convince contemporaries (1818–24, 1930), some of whom regarded

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

his hypochondria as an excuse for self-indulgence (142–4). Gregory's time at Constantinople was contentious, and his protestations of naive innocence probably conceal a determined attempt to retain power and prevent a new bishop capitalizing on the opportunity to champion the Nicene cause with imperial collaboration. It is significant that Gregory uses Biblical high priests as parallels for himself throughout his career (Samuel, 91, 507; Elijah, 292–3; Aaron, 507), a conception of himself at odds with the rhetoric of reluctance. The crucial factor for Gregory, as he was well aware, was the loss of the emperor Theodosius' support, at which Gregory indirectly hints (1012); once that became clear Gregory had to abandon his ambitions, though cooperation with Theodosius' wishes ensured a smooth final interview, which Gregory could then reshape to his own advantage (1902–4). But the produce of his harvest was to be enjoyed by others who had not poured out sweat in its production (1260–72). Gregory's willingness to reshape history when denouncing Julian should alert readers of his apology.

Lu.'s notes are of varying assistance. English-language scholarship is not well represented (e.g. n. 58 needs a reference to T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*), but French publications are also ignored (e.g. n. 57, Dagron on Saint Thecla; n. 59, Dagron or Mango on Constantinopolitan churches would have corrected the description of Holy Apostles as the Cathedral Church). Some aspects of ecclesiastical behaviour, e.g. the exchange of synodical letters with Peter of Alexandria (858–63), are misunderstood, though there are clearer discussions of heresies (notes 139–63).

Gregory is ripe for reassessment, the treatment recently accorded by Neil McLynn to Gregory's Latin contemporary, Ambrose of Milan, who had a similar ability to create his own image for history.

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

TWO MEDICAL TEXTS

I. GAROFALO (ed. with commentary): *Anonymi medici* De morbis acutis et chroniis. Translated by B. Fuchs. (Studies in Ancient Medicine, 12.) Pp. xxviii + 375. Leiden, New York, and Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1997. ISBN: 90-04-10227-2.

A. M. IERACI BIO (ed., trans.): *Paolo di Nicea:* Manuale medico: *testo edito per la prima volta, con introduzione e note.* (Hellenica et Byzantina Neapolitana: Collana di Studi e Testi, 16.) Pp. 398. Naples: Bibliopolis, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 88-7088-366-3.

In volume twelve of Brill's series dedicated to ancient medicine, G. presents a hitherto almost unknown medical treatise by an anonymous physician of the Imperial age on acute and chronic diseases, written in Greek. The only other such treatise to be preserved in Greek is that of Aretaeus, while in Latin we have only the adaptation of Soranus in Caelius Aurelianus. Although the division of diseases into acute and chronic can be seen as early as the Hippocratic Corpus, it would appear that chronic diseases were not treated specifically until much later—not before Themison (first century B.C.), according to Caelius Aurelianus. G. suggests both medical and economical reasons for the earlier lack of interest, namely the difficulty of curing chronic diseases and the expense the protracted treatment would generate

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for the patient. As for the latter explanation, it is questionable whether the number of individuals rich enough to afford such treatment increased considerably in the Roman Empire. (A comparison between the patients mentioned in the Hippocratic *Epidemics* and Galen's patients would be bound to be misleading.)

At the turn of the century two German scholars attempted to attach a name to the author of the treatise, Anonymus Parisinus (AP): R. Fuchs identified him with Themison, and M. Wellmann with the pneumatic-eclectic Herodotus, passages of whose work are preserved in Aetius, Oribasius, and Paul of Aegina. G. does not suggest any identification, but refutes Wellmann's claim by pointing out the doctrinal and linguistic divergences between AP and Herodotus. The section on language is brief, but G. promises (p. xii n. 47) a forthcoming study specifically on the topic.

AP's treatise describes sixteen acute illnesses, thirteen of which appear also in the Hippocratic Corpus, and thirty-four chronic diseases, *a capite ad calcem*. (It is interesting to see that various authors do not necessarily agree on whether an ailment is acute or chronic. Thus, e.g., colic is an acute disease in AP, but chronic in both Aretaeus and Caelius Aurelianus. AP and Caelius Aurelianus class madness among the chronic diseases, while Aretaeus considers it as acute.) Each of the chapters is divided into three subsections—cause, signs, and treatment—the titles of which may not have featured in the original. AP has come down to us in four, mutually independent, MSS, of which only the Parisinus suppl. graec. 636 is complete. None of these is earlier than the fourteenth century, but, according to G., they all go back to a common majuscule source. (G. does not explain, however, why the presence of lacunae should prove that they were already present in the archetype.) As for modern editions, the present volume is the first complete edition, sections of AP having been published by Fuchs (1894, 1900, and 1903) and Wellmann (1905).

An indirect tradition for AP can be found in several authors, namely Oribasius, Aetius of Amida, Paul of Aegina, and, in particular, Philumenus, himself one of Oribasius' sources. G. prints the Latin text as preserved in Philumenus, a translation of almost the entire chapter on dysenteric rheumatism (XLII in AP), as well as the causes and therapy of dysentery (XLIII).

The title page does not make it entirely clear whether Brian Fuchs is the translator of the Greek text or of the whole book, but it is presumably the former. The translation is fluent and very readable, although occasionally words remain untranslated (most noticeably the entire phrase in brackets at I.6.20f.).

The volume contains a bibliography and four indices: an *index nominum proprio-rum*, a particularly thorough *index graecus* (of about seventy pages), an *index auctorum et locorum laudatorum*, and an index of foods and drugs. The latter, in particular, will be very useful to scholars interested in Graeco-Roman pharmacology. Classicists and medical historians will welcome this complete edition of the text with its scholarly commentary, and the translation makes it accessible even to those who are not proficient in Greek.

Ieraci Bio offers the first edition of a text by an otherwise unknown author—as the publishers proudly proclaim, 'a Greek medical textbook neglected for centuries'. The presumed author's name comes from the *inscriptio* of four of the MSS as well as the title of two collections of texts, all of which have *Παύλου Νικαίου*. It is uncertain whether the second word is a hybrid form of *Νικα*[*ι*]*εύς* or an adjective derived from the place-name *Νίκη*, but I. opts for the former.

Throughout his work, Paul of Nicea (P.) appeals to the authority of 'Hippocrates', who is the author most frequently quoted, albeit via Galen's mediation. He is referred to in terms of reverence—e.g. 'my teacher' at 123.34.f.—which in turn are often lifted

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from P.'s sources. I. rightly highlights the 'sacralizing' character of these references: Hippocrates is presented for his *auctoritas* rather than actually used as an author.

The main sources drawn on by P. are Galen, Oribasius, and Paul of Aegina, the third source securing the seventh century A.D. as the *terminus post quem*. The *terminus ante quem*, however, appears to be more problematic. In 1964 the German scholar K. Schubring cautiously suggested the fourteenth century, the date of the oldest MS, but I. argues against this dating on the grounds of internal as well as external evidence. As for the former, some textual errors can be explained by transliteration and therefore a ninth- or tenth-century majuscule archetype, and the language would support this hypothesis.

As far as external factors are concerned, it would seem that some texts transmitted by ninth- or tenth-century codices have some relation with P. Among these, one with the title *Quomodo visitare debes infirmum*, preserved in a tenth-century Beneventan codex, has a strong similarity with P.'s first chapter. A longer version of the same text also survives in the as yet unpublished *Liber Byzantii* (which consists mainly of a Latin epitome of Chapters 61–133 of P.). I. suggests that—unless the various writings were using a common source—these factors point to the ninth or tenth century as a *terminus ante quem*. I. also hypothesizes that the presence of these texts in the Beneventan region may suggest the availability of P.'s work in Southern Italy and thus explain certain parallels with Salernitan authors, in particular Gariopontus and Petroncellus.

The work itself is a textbook showing characteristics of a *Gebrauchstext*; it is obviously a compilation, written in a question-and-answer format reminiscent of, e.g., Rufus. I. suggests that the first five lines are part of an extended title, the prooemium starting after them. In the latter, P. explains the causes of diseases as alterations of the four humours caused by either external (air) or internal (food) factors. The preface is followed by a chapter on the medical visit: questions to ask the patient or those present and symptoms the doctor should look out for (pain, fever, variations of the pulse). It would seem that this chapter has much in common with the texts mentioned above and also with a Salernitan treatise, *De adventu medici ad aegrotum*.

Chapters 2–10 deal with various types of fevers, and the rest of the book, Chapters 11–133, describes diseases and their treatment *a capite ad calcem*, with the inclusion of some wounds and injuries as well as some surgical operations. (Given that they include amputations, I.'s 'minor surgery' is slightly understated.) Each chapter is subdivided into a descriptive/explanatory section opening with τί ἐστιν or similar expressions, and one on treatment, under the heading πῶς οὖν θεραπεύσῃς. There is no gynaecology and no internal surgery—I. suggests that these would have been the subject of specialized treatises, but this reason is not entirely convincing, especially since there is some surgery. Magic or amulets are equally absent.

I. describes the text as being on an intermediate level between treatises on medical doctrine, such as some of Galen's, and medical epitomes. Its deliberately (?) simple language and the absence of rhetorical embellishments also confirm its identification as what Rydbeck has classified as *Zwischenschichtsprosa*. Although it is a compilation of passages taken from various sources (many of which are known), these are not cited by name. According to I., this was done because it was not the purpose of the work to provide that kind of information, which may be true, but it is also a common feature with later medical writers. I. makes a good case for the argument that compilation—a standard device for Byzantine writers—was not mindless repetition, but reflected the author's personality through his choice of authors and passages. In two short chapters I. also describes P.'s language and the MSS with various *lectiones*.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It would have been useful to have the translation running parallel with the Greek, or at least the notes as footnotes with the former, but presumably typographical reasonings lie behind the decision not to do either. The translation is close to the original and yet fluent. (The confusing sentence at the end of Chapter 105, p. 195, appears to be the result of a misprint—'ha suppurare' for 'fa suppurare'.) There are indices of Greek words, names, and cited passages, and also a brief index of modern authors. It is a great pleasure to see a 'new' medical text in print, and I.'s edition will be most useful for medical historians, classicists, and medievalists.

Wellcome Unit, Cambridge C. F. SALAZAR

FIVE EASY EXERCISES

A. DALZELL: *The Criticism of Didactic Poetry: Essays on Lucretius, Virgil, and Ovid* (The Robson Classical Lectures). Pp. xii + 212. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1996. Cased, $50/£37. ISBN: 0-8020-0822-4.

In these essays, an expanded version of his 1990 Robson lectures, D. approaches didactic from the perspective of a generic criticism, and focuses in particular on (i) didactic poetry's construction of the teacher–pupil relationship as it emerges from the attitude to the reader that is implied by the text; and (ii) the attitude manifested in a didactic poem towards its subject on the part of the author. Nobody would deny that the triangle of relationships between author–teacher, addressee–pupil, and subject–teaching marks out the formal centre of didactic as a genre, but what results is a restricted and unadventurous view of these strange but fascinating poems. One of the problems is that there is little discussion of the wider historical and cultural contexts for the professed instructional purpose of didactic; teaching is an unexamined term, and, apart from some general remarks on the replacement of verse by prose as the chief vehicle of technical instruction by Hellenistic times, little attempt is made to ask what was being taught and for what purposes at different periods in antiquity, and what the implications of a teacher-rôle might be, for example in an Alexandrian milieu where the archaic concept of the poet as *sophos* is overlaid by the role of the scholar-poet as purveyor of specialized knowledge, or in an early Augustan context where education becomes inseparable from the ideological programme of the *princeps*. The definition of an 'armchair school of practical knowledge' to cover ancient texts like the *Georgics* as well as modern glossy books on gardening (pp. 111–12) is too loose to be helpful.

D. worries a little about the admissibility of 'genre' as a critical category, and adopts a commonsensically pragmatic approach, laying some stress on didactic's careful self-positioning within a tradition going back to Hesiod. But the decision to include detailed consideration of only the three most commonly read Latin didactic poems, by Lucretius, Virgil, and Ovid, excludes a full exploration of didactic as a genre developing over time. Even within his own limits D. is not always abreast of critical developments: little attention is paid to work on genre by scholars such as Conte and Hinds, and on the question of the didactic addressee, so central to the book, there is no reference to *MD* 31(1993), devoted to 'The Addressee in Didactic Epic', or to M. Citroni's work on poetic addressees.

Two chapters are devoted to Lucretius. The first, addressing the two topics

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

identified as central by D., argues that the poem is intended for a sophisticated audience, more interested in Greek literature than anything else; since E. J. Kenney's classic article of 1970 on 'Doctus Lucretius', few would deny that Lucretius writes for a thoroughly Hellenized audience, but D. perhaps underplays Lucretius' pride in the Latinization of his subject-matter, in its way as much a triumph as that of Epicurus over the demons of superstition. The question of the relation between philosophy and poetry is handled through helpful if routine discussions of unity, argumentative rhetoric, imagery (surprisingly D. West's *The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius* is not in the bibliography), wordplay (D. is sceptical about 'atomology'), and metre. The second chapter, on 'The Philosophical Language of Lucretius', reinforces the previous chapter's conclusion that poetry is more important than philosophy for Lucretius by arguing that Lucretius in fact contributes little to Latin philosophical vocabulary, and that the task he sets himself is rather the stylistic one of finding concrete and vivid ways of expressing Epicurean ideas in order to create an effective poem.

The chapter on the *Georgics* gets off to a sluggish start with discussion of the dead issue of whether or not the poem was written for real smallholders. That recent important books by Perkell and Farrell do not even figure in the bibliography may be deliberate, given D.'s project of rolling back criticism of the last thirty years. First a reading of the poem in terms of an alternation of didactic sections with purple passages is reinstated with the argument that the 'set pieces' were added later to the basic didactic structure. Next D. takes aim at what he sees as the over-solemn readings of modern critics by arguing for the centrality of the humorous and mock-heroic; he is certainly right to stress the (very Alexandrian) detachment in much of the writing, but it is only part of the story, and D. himself points to the constantly shifting tone of the poem. The battle of the bees is droll, but it also carries a melancholy reflection on the proud ventures of human beings. Finally D. seeks to sweep away the whole wave of criticism that followed Erich Burck's demonstration of the unity of the poem by appealing to the adequacy of Addison's 'beauties and embellishments' reading of the *Georgics*. Of course, late-twentieth-century readings are only a stage in the ongoing reception of the poem, but neither do early-eighteenth-century readings have any claim to an absolute validity. Furthermore the contradictions of the poem in fact pose no difficulty for the more earnest postmodern kind of critic, and at the last D. himself is betrayed into precisely the kind of portentous interpretation that he rejects when he says (p. 129) 'the contradictions in the poem are the contradictions of life'.

The final chapter approaches the *Ars Amatoria* from the point of view of the fun and games that arise from crossing elegiac failure with didactic efficacy, from turning the lover's *fides* as 'fidelity' into erotodidactic *fides* as 'credibility'. D. adheres to a Veynian view of elegy's basic lack of seriousness; what distinguishes the *Ars*'s humour is that it makes no pretence at all to serious personal revelation. None of this is very new, but it is handled deftly and elegantly.

New Hall, Cambridge PHILIP HARDIE

FIGURED REPETITION

J. WILLS: *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*. Pp. xvi + 506. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-814084-3.

This important book gives a comprehensive analysis of various forms of repetition in Latin poetry from Ennius to Juvenal; over 10,000 passages are cited, and a

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

full *index locorum* rounds off an indispensable work of reference. Many parallels are produced from Greek poetry, especially Homer and the Hellenistic poets; the dramatists appear less often. Among Latin prose authors quoted Cicero and Livy are prominent, but for the sake of completeness more might have been said about Greek prose. It is striking how almost every locution examined has some analogy in Greek, but the Romans may have given even greater prominence to traditional patterns.

The subtitle is elucidated in an introductory chapter. As a preliminary W. explains how an allusion may be suggested or confirmed by the arrangement of the words; for instance, Prop. 3.3.31 'volucres, mea turba, columbae' points to Virg. *Ecl.* 1.57 'raucae, tua cura, palumbes'. In particular he shows that a reminiscence may be underlined by a corresponding use of repetition: thus Homer's *ἦ κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες* (*Il.* 1.255) is imitated at Hor. *Serm.* 2.3.195 'gaudeat ut populus Priami Priamusque'. This is a subtly observed phenomenon, but it is not common enough to justify a place on the title-page.

Part I of the book deals with different forms of gemination. First we meet doubled vocatives, which are usually separated ('Dorippa, mea Dorippa'); but it seems fanciful to see Enn. *Ann.* 106 'o Romule, Romule die' (where the adjective comes last) as an imitation of Hom. *Il.* 5.31 *Ἄρες Ἄρες βροτολοιγέ* (p. 51). W. records the repetition of a loved one's name at Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.198 'Asteris ante dapes, nocte Asteris, Asteris ortu'; for such obsessive gemination add Hor. *Odes* 1.13.1f. 'Telephi . . . Telephi', Ov. *Met.* 7.707f. There are useful sections on ritual cries like 'deus ecce deus' (p. 61), or calls for water or weapons (pp. 54, 62ff.). But when Catullus says 'invita, o regina, tuo de vertice cessi, invita' (66.39f.), it is hard to agree that Virgil splits the *geminatio* between *Aen.* 6.460 'invitus . . . cessi' and 12.809 'et Turnum et terras invita reliqui' (p. 74).

W. next turns to 'expanded gemination', especially epanalepsis (as at Virg. *Ecl.* 9.27f. 'superet modo Mantua nobis, Mantua vae miserae nimium vicina Cremonae'). He shows that this figure, like so many others, goes back to Homer, who uses it particularly in the description of heroes (so Virgil at *Aen.* 6.162ff., etc.); instances in prose are very limited (p. 125). He illustrates the increasing use of epanalepsis in the Hellenistic poets, pathetic passages of Catullus, and Virgil; at *Ecl.* 6.33f. he reads with the codex Palatinus 'ut his ex omnia primis omnia et ipse tener mundi concreverit orbis', and suggests an imitation of Lucr. 6.528f. 'et quae concrescunt in nubibus, omnia, prorsum omnia' (p. 131). He cites Juv. 8.159f. 'obvius adsiduo Syrophoenix udus amomo currit, Idymaeae Syrophoenix incola portae' without mentioning the next line 'hospitis adfectu dominum regemque salutat'; the new verb *salutat* illustrates how epanalepsis should not be used, and Leo's *salutans* is plausible. He goes on to mention the interwoven repetitions at Virg. *Ecl.* 8.48ff. 'crudelis tu quoque, mater' etc. (p. 181); more could be said either here or on p. 423 about this typically bucolic 'ringing of the changes' (cf. for instance Theoc. 1.4ff., Virg. *Ecl.* 7.61ff.; also Call. *H.* 2.9ff.).

Part II deals with different forms of polyptoton, which according to W. is particularly common in Lucretius, Ovid, Manilius, and Seneca. Beginning with nouns, he cites temporal expressions like *diem ex die*, honorific titles like *rex regum*, instances from battle ('legitque virum vir' etc., going back to Homer), and the hitherto nameless category of 'amorous polyptoton' (as in 'labra labellis', etc.). In discussing adjectives, W. deals with comparatives like Catull. 22.14 'infaceto est infacetior rure', a pattern that goes back to Sappho in Greek and Plautus in Latin. When he turns to verbs he concentrates on the *figura etymologica*, which is relatively rare in classical Latin; Hor.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Odes 3.29.50 'ludum insolentem ludere pertinax' is surprising for so economical a poet.

Part III discusses 'modification', where a word appears in a different form in a new clause. W. points to the figure's occurrence alike in oratory and sententious maxims ('multos timere debet quem multi timent'). At Catull. 31.12f. he does well to read 'salve, o venusta Sirmio, atque ero gaude, | gaudete vosque . . .' (p. 292), though on pp. 13 and 248 he accepts the conjecture *gaudente* without comment. He deals with changes of tense (common in Cicero), and sequences like 'aut videt aut vidisse putat' (Virg. *Aen.* 6.454); for this he cites parallels in Apollonius and Milton (pp. 307f.) that make it a genuine 'figure of allusion'. He turns to 'participial resumption' (pp. 311ff.), as at 'ille fugit fugiensque . . .'; he notes that this construction is rare in Greek prose apart from Herodotus and Plato. A chapter deals with the rhetorical figure of *climax* or *gradatio* (pp. 329ff.), as in 'Africano virtutem industria, virtus gloriam, gloria aemulos comparavit' (*Rhet. Her.* 4.34); illustrations are provided from genealogy (add *Matth.* 1.1–16), commonplaces about 'Pelion on Ossa', and the pursuits of animals and lovers.

Part IV on 'parallelism' deals with places where words are repeated in successive clauses. W. shows how the repetition occasionally underlines a reminiscence; thus Virg. *Ecl.* 8.41 'ut vidi, ut perii . . .' recalls Theoc. 2.82f. *χὡς ἴδον ὡς ἐμάνην*, and less obviously Hor. *Odes* 1.15.9f. 'quantus equis, quantus adest viris sudor' refabricates the anaphora at Hom. *Il.* 2.388ff. *ἰδρώσει . . . ἰδρώσει*. Another section deals with the sacral repetition of *tu* (Norden's Du-Stil); it could be noted that this structure is hardly found in earlier Greek poetry.

Part V first discusses 'positional patterns', as when a word is repeated or varied at the same place in the line (pp. 389f.). Then there are the places where a compound is repeated by a simple verb, or (more rarely) a simple by a compound; and there is a note on instances of oxymoron like 'concordia discors' (rarer in Latin than Greek, which has the advantage of alpha privative). A further chapter deals with changes of prosody (pp. 461ff.), as in the treatment of mute and liquid (Virg. *Aen.* 2.663 'pătris, pātrem'), or the variation at Virg. *Ecl.* 3.79 ' "valē, valĕ" inquit'; it could be added that this shortening suits a voice fading in the distance. A much commoner phenomenon in Latin is here called 'ictus-shift', as at *Aen.* 4.657 'félix, heu nimium felíx'.

W. adds an epilogue on 'unfigured repetition' (pp. 473–7), that is to say places where the repetition seems to lack rhetorical point. He points out that in Virgil's description of Cerberus at *Aen.* 6.417ff. *ingens* occurs at 417 and 423, *immanis* at 418 and 422; such repetition of a leitmotiv need not worry anybody, and is particularly common in the tragedies of Seneca. But in places where the repeated word is much closer, W. underestimates the possibility of textual corruption, as 'perseveration' may have occurred. But though 'unfigured repetition' needs more work done on it, Professor Wills's treatment of 'figured repetition' is authoritative.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford R. G. M. NISBET

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PLAUTUS TRANSLATED

D. R. SLAVITT, P. BOVIE (edd.): *Plautus: The Comedies* (Complete Roman Drama in Translation). 4 vols. Pp. x + 373; ix + 397; xi + 400; xi + 377. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995. Cased, £37 (Paper, £13). ISBN: 0-8018-5070-3 (0-8018-5071-1 pbk); 0-8018-5056-8 (0-8018-5057-6 pbk); 0-8018-5067-3 (0-8018-5068-1 pbk); 0-8018-5072-X (0-8018-5073-8 pbk).

S. and B.'s project to produce translations of the whole of Roman drama in an accessible and reasonably affordable form is unquestionably fine. The Johns Hopkins University Press series of *Complete Roman Drama in Translation* is a long-awaited and most welcome tool in the recent and, I hope, ongoing rehabilitation of Roman drama. Plautus' twenty-and-a-bit plays are packaged into four volumes of the series with fourteen different translators involved in the work. Most of the translations were commissioned for this project, while seven of them are reprinted from earlier publications.

I think it useful to list the contents of each volume, indicating with an asterisk those translations that have previously been published. Volume I contains Carrier's translation of *Amphitryo*,* Segal's *Miles Gloriosus*,* Moore's *Captivi*, Beacham's *Casina*, and Taylor's *Curculio*. Volume II contains Carrier's *Rudens*, Bovie's *Aulularia*, Tatum's *Bacchides*,* Garrett's *Mercator*, and Tatum's *Truculentus*.* Volume III contains Burroway's *Poenulus*,* Chappell's *Asinaria*, Epstein's *Trinummus*, Carrier's *Epidicus*, and Bovie's *Mostellaria*.* Volume IV contains Bovie's *Persa* and *Menaechmi*,* Dillard's *Cistellaria*, Beacham's *Pseudolus*, Poster's *Stichus*, and Wright's translation of the fragmentary *Vidularia*.

The principle of distribution between the volumes is unexplained and remains unclear to me. Was it intentional to scatter the current canon of favourites, which I take to comprise *Amphitryo*, *Miles*, *Casina*, *Rudens*, *Aulularia*, *Mostellaria*, *Menaechmi*, and *Pseudolus*, throughout the four volumes? If so, that may have been a rash decision. Financial exigencies are likely to lead teachers to prescribe texts which require the minimum purchase—and this leaves the two Penguin Classics volumes as undisputed leaders for most Plautus-in-translation classes, without any reflection on the quality of the translations. If, however, a teacher plumps for one or two of the Johns Hopkins volumes, this could lead to renewed interest in some of the plays which are currently out of critical favour, which is much to be welcomed.

Each volume begins with a brief preface by B. in which he sketches the main features of the plays in that volume. Each play is preceded by a brief introduction (usually four or five pages, though they range from two to ten pages) written with just four exceptions by the translator. The introductions are very uneven and vary widely in their usefulness: more guidance from series editors might have been helpful here. Many provide a synopsis or overview of the play, sometimes acute, sometimes rather predictable and pedestrian. I was delighted to find occasional reflections of contemporary scholarship, e.g. mention of the fine articles by Eleanor Leach on *Rudens* and by Cynthia Dessen on *Truculentus*, along with discussions of textual matters concerning *Bacchides* and *Vidularia*, but in general I was disappointed that the important work of John Wright and Maurizio Bettini, to name but two, seemed not to inform discussion of the themes and dynamics of the plays. The least stimulating introductions are largely those by B., to *Rudens*, *Persa*, *Poenulus*, *Mostellaria*, *Aulularia* (where his highly traditional view of the play ignores the exciting sociological issues raised by it), *Trinummus*, *Epidicus* (where interpretation hardly

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

advances beyond remarking upon the presence of four pairs of male characters and balancing characters, respectively), and *Menaechmi* (where there are excellent remarks on the Italian 'fescennine spirit' [IV: 84] but no discussion of the physical and metaphysical significance of the *otium/negotium* opposition that the play presents).

The best and most interesting introductions address the very activity of attempting to translate Plautus for a modern audience, describing some of the difficulties of translation and the strategies adopted. Of these Richard Moore's description of translating *Captivi* is undoubtedly the most engaging. For example, in his introduction to *Mercator* (well translated as 'The Entrepreneur'), George Garrett addresses the difficulties facing the translator of comedy from another time and place with both honesty and confidence, drawing a thought-provoking analogy with Shakespeare (II: 249). A number of translators tackle the crucial question of how to reflect Plautus' use of a variety of metres and in particular his exploitation of songs, *cantica*, in the plays. Henry Taylor makes strong cases for the use of 'the added artificiality of rhyme' and for the updating of jokes (which can, of course, so easily backfire) in his introduction to *Curculio* (I: 323) and Carol Taylor describes the process that led her to adopt a 'rhythmical idiom . . . with frequent, though irregular, use of full or partial rhymes at caesuras and ends of lines' in her translation of *Stichus* (IV: 316). The best introductions talk about Plautus' language, 'rich with punning . . . all sorts of verbal fun and games . . . anarchic moments' (*Mercator*, II: 251). Phrases like 'that unbuttoned and subversive quality' (*Cistellaria*, IV: 179) and 'dazzling verbal dexterity' (*Casina*, I: 256) convey to the Latinless reader the translators' awareness of an essential quality of Plautus. The translators also describe their solutions to particular difficulties. For example, R. H. W. Dillard describes his (doubtless controversial) reaction to the substantial *lacunae* in *Cistellaria*, namely, the creation of two new characters called Lacuna and Hiatus (IV: 177–8), while Fred Chappell makes no bones about describing his translation of *Asinaria* as an 'adaptation', a 'musical comedy' with characters named Manny and Rip and Lena, which will surely be much more memorable to our students than the polysyllabic Greek names which would have been meaningful to Plautus' original audiences.

But as I see it, there is just one central issue: performability. As Beacham puts it, these are 'scripts to be performed' (*Pseudolus*, IV: 236). This of course connects with a wealth of other issues, such as the use of metre and rhyme, inclusion of stage directions, topicality and the updating of jokes, the use of puns and obscenity, and so on, as mentioned above. But as Dillard says, introducing *Cistellaria*, the aim (surely) is to breathe comic life back into [plays that have] become nearly comatose from centuries of dry, literal translations' (IV: 179). This series is, I assume, aimed at introducing Latinless students in a number of disciplines to Roman drama. For this, it is certainly desirable that the translator have a 'theatrical imagination', as Richard Moore pronounces in his introduction to *Captivi* (I: 185). This is a principle enunciated by several more of the translators, for example, James Tatum introducing his *Bacchides* (which 'does have a logic that works in the theater', II: 156) and *Truculentus*, Carol Poster introducing her *Stichus* ('actable on the contemporary stage', IV: 317), and Richard Beacham aiming 'to enhance [*Pseudolus*'] appeal in contemporary production while respecting the meaning, method and mood of the original text' (IV: 236). But do they put it into effect?

The translations that seem to me to work best are those where performability is always imaginable. For example, Richard Beacham's *Pseudolus* and *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Wedding* (*Casina*) both really zip along, even if the language used is occasionally old-fashioned and rather laboured. Henry Taylor's

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Curculio, Fred Chappell's *Asinaria*, and James Tatum's *Bacchides* and *Truculentus* are similarly lively, with the last three of these all benefiting from the unusual decision, in this collection, to alternate *prose* speech with songs, when the other translators have preferred blank or free verse throughout. The use of prose offers the translator more flexibility while maintaining pace. By contrast, some of the translations in these volumes, e.g. *Amphitryo*, *Captivi*, and *Mostellaria*, while not exactly pedestrian, lack the pace, vivacity, and playfulness of the Latin, perhaps because of decisions to use little rhyme or rhythm, and occasionally descend into a plodding and lumbering pace which hardly does justice to Plautus' scintillating dramaturgy.

If I had to choose one, that would be easy: Erich Segal's *The Braggart Soldier*, republished from his *Plautus: Three Comedies* (New York, 1969), is a *tour de force*, an object lesson in how to translate Plautus. Consider the flamboyant language of the opening scene, the rhyme used in Palaestrio's 'prologue' speech, and the fabulous use of rapid rhythm and rhyme for the long and lively scene between Milphidippa, Palaestrio, and Pyrgopolynices (I: 140-8). A quotation will perhaps demonstrate the prioritization of verve over nit-picking accuracy: Segal renders lines 188–92, *os habet, linguam, perfidiam, malitiam atque audaciam,* | *confidentiam, confirmitatem, fraudulentiam.* | *qui arguat se, eum contra uincat iureiurando suo:* | *domi habet animum falsiloquom, falsificum, falsiiurium,* | *domi dolos, domi delenifica facta, domi fallacias*, as 'She has cheek, a lot of lip, loquacity, audacity, | Also perspicacity, tenacity, mendacity. | If someone accuses her, she'll just outswear the man with oaths. | She knows every phony phrase, the phony ways, the phony plays. | Wiles she has, guiles she has, very soothing smiles she has.' (I: 82–3).

The process of translating (as I know from experience) involves impossible choices and consequently (as I also know) it is impossible to please everyone. This collection will prove enormously useful to all of us who want to make the verve, vigour, and sheer exuberance of Plautus' action and words available to students who are unable to access the Latin. Naturally, it is uneven. Nevertheless, many of these translations convey vividly to any modern audience that western comedy is indebted to Plautus as (to borrow Beacham's words from his introduction to *Pseudolus* [IV: 233–6]) the 'Father of Farce' and 'Father of Musical Comedy'.

Royal Holloway, London SUSANNA MORTON BRAUND

SONGS OF INNOCENCE AND EXPERIENCE

M. PETRINI: *The Child and the Hero. Coming of Age in Catullus and Vergil*. Pp. 136. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997. ISBN: 0-472-10460-8.

The central thesis of this insightful book is that Virgil follows Catullus in an obsessive interest in the transition from childhood to adulthood, viewed negatively as a passage from an innocent and idyllic state to a world of deception and betrayal. P. generates a version of the Virgilian 'two voices', one pessimistic and the other optimistic, out of the insistent Catullan opposition between an ideal past and the bleak reality of the present, operative at the levels both of Catullus' personal experience (disillusionment with Lesbia), of the history of the individual (marriage as the uprooting of the *virgo* from a *hortus conclusus*), and of the history of mankind (the decline of the ages as traced in Catullus 64). The coincidence of individual and

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cultural histories is certainly a central strategy of the *Aeneid*, which might almost be defined as an epic of transition, in which the literal and figurative passages attempted by Aeneas as well as by the youths who either fail to attain a stable adult identity (Nisus and Euryalus, Pallas, Lausus, Marcellus) or succeed (Iulus) reflect the large-scale historical transitions that are arguably the poem's ultimate subject. From this point of view the synchronism in *Eclogue* 4 (the subject of the last chapter) of the life of an individual with the ages of the world offers a kind of blueprint for the *Aeneid*. P. sees in Iulus an avatar of the mysterious *puer* of *Eclogue* 4; very suggestive is the notion that the curious indeterminacy at the end of the poem as to whether Iulus is still a *puer* or already a *vir* (p. 88 'oddly lingering childhood') speaks to a sense of being on the historical cusp, where there is hope but no certainty as to the future success of the new Roman order. One of the many nice touches in the book is the interpretation of Venus' removal of Ascanius to her Idalian pleasance at *Aen.* 1.691–4 as an attempt to protect him in a world of innocence (p. 90); oddly P. does not note the echo of Cat. 64.87–8.

Eclogue 4 appears to reverse the inexorable process of decline charted in Catullus 64, but P. twists it into a psychological allegory of 'the cycle of illusion, disillusionment, and the return to illusion again' in the life-history of 'every *puer*' (p. 121). This involves taking *Ecl.* 4.26–36 (the *puer*'s education in *heroum laudes et facta parentis* and the second age of heroes) as 'the *emergence* of treachery in the boy's life' (my emphasis), surely very difficult when we are told that the renewal of the heroic age is the expression of the 'traces of *former* sinfulness' (31 *priscae uestigia fraudis*; cf. 13 *si qua* manent *sceleris uestigia nostri*). *Eclogue* 4 is fantastic, but I am not convinced that we must read the fantasy as illusion rather than hope. The reviewer cannot help but fulfil the author's rueful prediction on p. 1 that 'Surveys of Vergilian scholarship . . . will immediately count this book among the works of the "Harvard School" '. P. speaks repeatedly of the death of the old heroic world and of the meaninglessness of heroic values in the world of Aeneas (and of Virgil). The idea that Evander is a sentimental and idealizing focalizer of heroic events and persons in the past is novel and interesting (pp. 50–3), but P.'s remorseless emphasis on the tricky and deceptive quality of Virgil's heroic world overstates the case: the behaviour of the actors on the night of the sack of Troy is the result of very special circumstances rather than of a paradigm shift in heroic values, and the problems of the ending of the *Aeneid* arise, if anything, from too close a convergence between Virgilian heroism and the old Homeric variety. P. most illuminatingly suggests (p. 58) that the phrase *uincet amor patriae* (*Aen.* 6.823) has a programmatic value within the *Aeneid* comparable to the *omnia uincit amor* at *Ecl.* 10.69 and *labor omnia uicit* at *Geo.* 1.145–6; but *amor patriae* is at least an ideal, not the mark of a faded and fallen heroic world.

There are some surprising omissions and bibliographical oversights. Very little is said of Camilla, surely an ideal subject for P.'s approach. Discussion of the link between marriage and youthful death in battle would have benefited from an awareness of Don Fowler's 'Virgil on Killing Virgins', in M. Whitby et al., *Homo Viator* (Bristol, 1987), pp. 185–98. To use the term 'initiation' of the transition from childhood to adulthood surely cries out for some reference to the anthropological models applied to the study of the Greek *ephebeia* (I make some suggestions in C. Martindale (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Virgil* [Cambridge, 1997], pp. 320–1). Engagement with David Quint's 'Repetition and Ideology in the *Aeneid*', *MD* 24 (1991), 9–54 would have lent nuance to P.'s claim that the Virgilian Troy is simply reproduced in Italy (e.g. p. 32). Discussion of the parallel between *Aen.* 10.136 and Prop. 3.7.49 (pp. 105–6) is enfeebled by the failure to consult Stephen Harrison ad loc.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

But these are incidental weaknesses in what is a genuinely fresh and thought-provoking essay on some very familiar topics.

New Hall, Cambridge PHILIP HARDIE

THE EPODES

D. MANKIN (ed.): *Horace*: Epodes (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics). Pp vii + 321. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Cased, £40/$64.95 (Paper, £14.95/$22.95). ISBN: 0-521-39469-4 (0-521-39774-X pbk).

For many years there has been great need of an English commentary on H.'s *Epodes*, and both M. and the editors of the green-and-yellow series are to be congratulated on this publication. The book is first-rate: M. never avoids difficulties and, although I have reservations about some key issues, he always tries to solve them with honesty and integrity. Devoid of the pretentious and empty verbiage which too often passes for literary scholarship these days, his work is the result of an immense amount of labour and his discussions unfailingly sustain the reader's interest.

M. begins his introduction with sections on H. and the historical background (pp. 1–6). The statement that the poet was 'the son of an ex-slave' will now need to be taken in conjunction with G. Williams, '*Libertino patre natus*: true or false?', in *Homage to Horace* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 296–313, while M.'s scepticism about the literalness of *Epist*. 2.2.51–4 (where J. A. Davison provocatively punctuated before *audax*) is surely justified by the topos of the 'poor poet'. On H.'s *amicitia* with Maecenas M. adopts a position close to P. White in *Promised Verse* (Cambridge, MA, London, 1993), and his scepticism over the Sabine farm might have been supported by reference to A. Bradshaw ('Horace *in Sabinis*', *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 5 [1989], 160–86), who earlier had suggested that Maecenas' 'pretensions as a writer', to which M. refers, are playfully parodied in *C*. 3.8 (*Philol*. 114 [1970], 145–50). Whether Maecenas 'faded from the scene' politically in later years, as M. accepts, is a question which has been recently disputed (G. Williams, *Between Republic and Empire* [Berkeley, London, 1990], pp. 258–75; P. White, *CP* 86 [1991], 130–8). Throughout these sections, during which the 'liberators' are engagingly given inverted commas which will infuriate some readers, we could have done with some reference to I. M. Le M. DuQuesnay's fundamental discussion of H., Maecenas, and their shared background (*Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus* [Cambridge, 1984], pp. 19–27).

There follow sections on the *Epodes* as related to Greek iambus and as a collection of poems (pp. 6–12). M. shows in a later section (pp. 14–22) that H.'s metres are 'Archilochean down to minute details', but it does not seem to me a necessary consequence that H. 'leaves no question as to his chief model, the early Greek *iambi* of Hipponax and especially Archilochus' (p. 6). Though H. makes his position clear many years later at *Epist*. 1.19.23–5, and though both Arch. and Hipp. are alluded to at *Epd*. 6.13–14, surely no reader of *Epd*. 1 (and M. insists that the collection be read in linear fashion) would have concluded that H. was embarking on a career as a second Archilochus. M. accepts the view of Greek iambus which has been argued by e.g. Dover and M. L. West (and which I do not believe to be as uncommon amongst Latinists as M. seems to imply); but, while we may agree that iambus 'was essentially "blame poetry" ', I detect a slide in M.'s exposition (p. 9): the elements which he

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

associates with blame poetry have become so broad that they scarcely seem to provide defining points of contact with H.'s poems (see also e.g. p. 49, intro. to *Epd*. 1). Despite M., H.'s relationship with early Greek poetry remains something of a problem, which the greater survival of Archilochus' verse might have illuminated.

The next two sections of the introduction are devoted to language, style, and metre (pp. 12–32), subjects to which M. returns in Appendix 3 on 'cretic-shaped words'. Much of this material, particularly the highly detailed metrical analyses, will be found extremely valuable. The whole is rounded off by a brief section on the text (pp. 32–4), to which might have been added R. G. M. Nisbet's reviews of Borzsák [*sic*] and Shackleton Bailey (respectively *Gnomon* 58 [1986], 611–15 and *Collected Papers* [Oxford, 1995], pp. 192–201).

M.'s introduction and commentary raise two major issues, of which the first concerns the arrangement and chronology of the collection. The central poem is the Actium epode (9), which M. seems to take as the focal point (pp. 10–12). Since the first poem depicts the preliminaries to Actium (M. suggests the spring of 31 B.C.), it seems to follow from his position that the intervening poems (2–8) must depict the short period between spring and late summer of that year (though 7 is dated to early 32 B.C.). Thus 4 belongs to this period rather than to a time before Naulochus (as commonly thought). It also follows from M.'s position that the subsequent poems postdate Actium: thus Maevius' departure (10.1) is suggested to have been from the harbour at Actium, while 11 (with its reference to December) is set 'perhaps at Octavian's headquarters late in 31', and 13 (with its winter storm and reference to H.'s December birthday) suggests 'the time of uncertainty after Actium' (and the *tu* of 13.6 is Octavian). Since this hypothesis extends also to 16 ('the poem's place in the Epode book would seem to suggest a time after Actium'), many readers may conclude that this is one implausibility too many.

The second issue concerns Canidia, who features in two poems (5, 17) and is suggesed by M. to be also the subject of two others (8, 12). In Appendix 2 M. discusses this figure and opts for the view, which is pursued in the comm., that she symbolizes 'Rome's "senescence" ': 'it is even possible that Canidia somehow represents Rome "herself" ' (pp. 300–1). It follows from this position that the boy's murder in 5 'seems in a sense to repeat and perpetuate' the curse mentioned at the end of 7, while 17 'is another symbolic representation of the curse afflicting both individual and city'. Yet the reference to Canidia at 5.7–8 seems impossible to square with such symbolism, analogies to which are suggested as a key to 6, 10–11, and 14–15.

I nevertheless did not find that these two misconceptions vitiated the comm. as a whole, where the annotations are thorough and excellent (see e.g. on 1.10, 9.34, 10.22, 11.6, 13.6, 15.13, 16.3–10). It is particularly gratifying to see extensive use of, and quotation from, Rosamund Miles's superb dissertation; and M. is especially good on linguistic features and the like which predate H. and/or recur in his *oeuvre*. Still, more parallels from later authors would have been welcome, and reference to G. B. A. Fletcher, *Latomus* 51 (1972), 490–1, would have supplied key parallels on 2.6, 3.15, 5.30, 7.13 (see also Heubner on Tac. *H*. 3.71.3), 15.16, 17.1, and 17.71. I append some further comments in detail:

1.1 *Ibis*: Cf. Tib. 1.3.1 *Ibitis*. **2**.11–12 M., whose notes seem to me contradictory, thinks summer is referred to, but S. J. Heyworth, in a paper to which M. surprisingly makes no reference, concludes that 'we must have a spring scene' ('H.'s second epode', *AJP* 109 [1988], 75); Heyworth also explains *infirmas oues* (16) by reference to Varr. *RR* 2.11.9, transposes lines 23–8 to follow 16, and defends the variant *riuis* (25); 37 *malarum* (*curarum*): see J. Delz, *MH* 50 (1993), 217–19; 39 *pudica*: for this marital virtue see S. Treggiari, *Roman Marriage* (Oxford, 1991), e.g. pp. 105–7. **4**.4

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

crura dura compede: No note on the rhyme (suggesting a limp?) or the pun (again at Plaut. *Capt*. 651, Tib. 1.7.42, Ov. *Am*. 2.2.47, Plin. *Ep.* 7.27.5); 9 *huc et huc euntium*: see Kraus on Liv. 6.25.9; *huc . . . huc* (for *illuc*) is at least as early as Cat. 61.34; 19 *latrones*: see B. Shaw, *P&P* 105 (1984), 3–52. **6**.2 *aduersus* after an adj. is far more common than M. implies (*TLL* 1.856.39–55). **7**.9–10 *dextera* completes a 'ring' with 1 *dexteris*, and for H. and Parthians see R. Seager, *Athen*. 58 (1980), 103–4; 19–20 *fluxit . . . cruor* looks back to 3–4 *fusum . . . sanguinis*, and *sacer* to 1 *scelesti* (in the sense 'lying under a curse'): the cyclical structure of the poem mirrors the cycle it describes.

Epd. **9** is categorized by M. as 'a blame poem': its likely setting is Actium, 'possibly on board a ship in the Caesarian fleet', and the timing is 'shortly after it has become evident that Antony has been defeated'; H.'s 'qualms' at the end of the poem arise 'from uncertainty as to how Octavian will handle his victory'. The absence of H. and Maecenas from Rome would give point to the parenthesis of 3 if we were to adopt (which M. does not) Shackleton Bailey's *si* for *sic*; but it is not at all certain, to say the least, that Maecenas ever left Rome (see my note on Vell. 88.2). Another problem is that 33–8 reveal that 'H. and Maecenas are already drinking', and 33 in particular (esp. *puer*) strongly suggests a symposium, as M. recognizes; but, despite M.'s appeal to Arch. 4W, I find it hard to imagine such a symposium on board ship, and W. J. Slater, to whom M. does not refer, states that the celebration 'is clearly not held at sea' ('Symposium at Sea', *HSCP* 80 [1976], 169). A further problem is the Caecuban wine. Since the opening lines of the poem are ambiguous (not fully brought out by M., but see e.g. G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality* [Oxford, 1968], p. 215), the precise circumstances are initially unclear; but in 35–6 H. asks for Caecuban, the same wine as mentioned in 1–6: M. is obliged to argue that this later wine 'cannot be the same Caecuban mentioned at the beginning' (36n.), which seems highly implausible. I still prefer the view, endorsed by Miles, that the dramatic moment of the poem is a drinking party which takes place in Rome after the news of Amyntas' desertion (17–18) but before the final victory, which in 27ff. is imagined by the revellers (much as a German victory is visualized by a sober Ovid at *Tr*. 4.2).

Epd. **11**.2 *scribere uersiculos*: I do not see why the dimin. is 'probably contemptuous' (cf. Cat. 50.4 *scribens uersiculos*, also verse-initial); 2–3 *amore . . . amore*: on such repetitions see now J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry* (Oxford, 1996), p. 160; 11 *contrane . . . ualere* is described as an 'exclamatory infinitive' but is printed in the text as a question; 25–6 *amicorum . . . libera consilia*: cf. *S*. 1.4.132–3 *liber amicus, | consilium*. **13**.1 and 5: See N-H on *C*. 2.9 (intro., p. 135, referring to the epode). **14**.6 *deus, deus*: See Wills, 61, 90; 9 the playful point of *Samio* is surely to distinguish Anacreon's beloved Bathyllus from Maecenas'. **15**.1 *Nox erat*: For this motif see H. MacL. Currie, *LCM* 18 (1993), 92–5. **16**.2 *suis . . . uiribus ruit*: For this motif see E. Dutoit, *REL* 14 (1936), 365–73; 50 *refertque tenta . . . ubera*: cf. Virg. *G*. 3.396–7 *ubera tendunt | et . . . referunt* (also of goats); 52 *alta . . . humus*: it might have been worth quoting Virg. *G*. 4.459 *alta . . . in herba* (also of a snake, and line 464 below = *Epd*. 14.11 above, as M. notes ad loc.); 64–5 on the repetition of *aere*, which has been questioned, M. does not mention Orelli's idea (transmitted also in J. Gow's edition) that H. is imitating Lucr., who was certainly imitated by Virg. in this respect (see Wills 131–2, who [160] has no doubts about the present case). **17**.18 *honor*: Cf. *C*. 2.11.9; 21 to N-H on *C*. 2.11.5–6 add M. Bettini, *Anthropology and Roman Culture* (Baltimore, London, 1991), pp. 115ff. for representations of time.

The meagreness of this haul will, I hope, provide final evidence of the overall excellence of M.'s book.

University of Durham A. J. WOODMAN

WEST'S HORACE

D. WEST: *Horace: The Complete Odes and Epodes—A New Translation* (World's Classics). Pp. xxxiii + 200. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. Paper, £6.99. ISBN: 0-19-283246-8.

Translations in this series are designed for the interested layman, and so this review

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

has been entrusted to a layman rather than a scholar, and moreover to one who is glad to count the author among his friends.

The eye-catching cover is a detail from Alma-Tadema's *The Roses of Heliogabalus*, in which two female diners are being overwhelmed by the descent of tons of rose petals. What lies within this allurement? The bare bones consist of thirty-three pages of introduction, including short sections on H.'s life, divergences from the Oxford Classical Text, a select bibliography and chronological survey, sixty-two pages of notes and glossary, and 131 of translations.

Translations of Horace are legion, and the industry shows no sign of abating. *Quot homines, tot Flacci*. What are we to expect from a distinguished Horatian scholar? All that W. tells us in a tantalizing note is: 'Translation of poetry is always impossible, but translation of Horace's odes is inconceivable. Literal versions are useful to Latin students, but bear no relation to the character and tone of the poetry . . . What is offered here is . . . not written in any regular metre . . . It aims to give a text which enables non-Latin readers to gain some understanding of the detail of the poetry and of how it works, and to do so in English which can be read without revulsion.' So what we are to expect is something less than 'translation' (in a somewhat exalted sense), but more than a literal version. It is not clear whether it claims to be poetry or prose, and perhaps such labels are unimportant; at any rate there will be no regular metre. The text aims to give some insight into the detail and working of the poetry. Finally there is the modest ambition that the reader will not be revolted by the English.

To take the quality of the English first. There is no fear of revulsion. On the contrary, the easy flow of language, which contrives to be at once unassuming, yet appropriate and sensitively chosen, calls for admiration. Yet every so often one encounters words which seem to come from a slightly alien register. Sometimes they are attributable to a passion for accuracy ('parrot-wrasse' p. 5, 'kidlings' at least twice, 'garlands woven with lime tree bark' p. 55, 'daily darg of wool' p. 105). More often stray words seem not quite in place ('dry-bottomed'—of ships p. 29, 'bulging'—of sails p. 64 and horns p. 92, 'Rhone-swigger' p. 74). Such features, however, do not revolt, but assume an endearing quality as the personal voice of W. And at its best this voice can be commanding. Take, for example, the following rendering of 3.29.53–6:

> 'I praise her [Fortune] while she stays. If she shakes out
> her swift wings, I return what she gave, wrap myself
> in my virtue, and look for honest Poverty,
> the bride that brings no dowry.'

The introduction of the bride, only implied in the Latin, is an inspiration. The claim to surpass the merely literal is made out.

The treatment of 'the detail of the poetry' is the other great strength of the work. W. is determined to give the reader the truth and the whole truth, and since he gives no hostages to form, he is able to concentrate on the substance. The reader can be sure that what he is given is every nuance that the eye of a sensitive expert can discern. At times this devotion to accuracy is taken to an extreme, as when metaphors are translated literally ('reaching the roller' p. 17, 'the rope will run back with the wheel' p. 89, 'put horns on the poor man' p. 98). On the other hand W. does not hesitate to cut down the Latin periods where English requires more manageable units ('Teach us sad songs, | Melpomene. Your father gave you a clear voice | and with it the lyre' p. 45). Such devotion to completeness necessitates a considerable quantity of baggage. No name, no reference to mythology, geography, or contemporaries is modified or passed

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

over, and hence the need for the glossary of names and notes (always helpful), where some decorous touches of humour are allowed to appear ('The Matine Hills: these being in the south of Italy, would in normal circumstances have been safe from flooding by the River Po' p. 139).

What about 'how the poetry works'? It is here that reservations must be voiced. W. distances himself from the prose merchants by dividing up his versions into lines which correspond closely to H.'s own. This has the advantage of giving the reader some insight into part of H.'s technique, the division into stanzas and the enjambment between lines and stanzas, and thereby a feel for the shape of the verse which is completely absent from the undifferentiated prose of, say, Wickham. But this is some way short of the aspiration to give an insight into how the poetry works, and here an element of contradiction emerges. How can a method which jettisons metre justify such a claim? Except for some recognizable blank verse in the *Epodes* (and appropriately in *Exegi monumentum*), W. makes no concession to metre, nor does he substitute the other discipline sanctified by English language and practice, rhyme. A medium freed from these bonds cannot bestow insight into the intense discipline imposed by imported metres, which is such a central feature of the poetry of the *Odes*. I do not suggest that W. is necessarily misguided to reject the traditional disciplines available to the English poet, merely that the claim to offer insight into the working of the poetry as well as the detail is too large without qualification. Indeed, it is so large as to fall into the area which W. himself characterizes as 'inconceivable'. W.'s is a version which illuminates every corner of the detail, but only a limited part of the working.

I have noticed very few definite errors. On p. 69 there seems to be a redundant 'then' in the second stanza; on p. 107 the order of trees and rocks is for some reason reversed; the last line of p. 112 has 'shinning' for 'shining', and in the next stanza the first word of the last line should surely be 'nor' rather than 'not'. And does anyone else believe that when H. describes himself as *ex humili potens / princeps* . . . the *potens* means no more than 'I was able' (p. 108)? This seems to me a rare case of palliation *amoris causa*.

I hope I have not allowed reservations to outweigh admiration. This translation is outstanding for accuracy, honesty, and sensitivity. It will be a godsend for non-Latin readers of all ages, and deserves to hold the field for a generation as the first-choice English version of the *Epodes* and *Odes*.

Lincoln's Inn COLIN SYDENHAM

HOC, MONEO, VITATE MALVM

R. GAZICH: *'Exemplum' ed esemplarità in Properzio*. (Scienze filologiche e storia—Brescia, 6.) Pp. xv + 341. Milan: Vita e pensiero: Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, 1995. Paper, L. 50,000. ISBN: 88-343-0465-9.

The long-prevalent idea that mythological *exempla* in Propertius had little function beyond the ornamental began to die in the 1970s, thanks largely to Margaret Hubbard's *Propertius* (London, 1974) and John Sullivan's *Propertius: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge, 1976); G. is the latest to attempt to hammer a few more nails into the already battered coffin.

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

True to his title, G. not only pursues the point of a substantial range of specific *exempla*—brief or extended, mythological, historical, or other—but also examines Propertius' broader use of 'esemplarità', that is, his explicit or implicit presentation of anyone or anything as a model, an exemplar. In Part I ('Il problema dell' *exemplum*') he first offers theoretical definitions (mainly culled from ancient works on rhetoric) of the nature and purpose of *exempla*, and analyses three different Propertian modes of introducing them ('tipologia linguistica, argomentativa, narrativa'). Then he surveys the use of *exempla* by pre-Propertian writers, ranging from archaic Greece to Republican Rome. In Part II ('L'esempio in Properzio') he first offers close examination of selected Propertian passages under a sonorous collection of chapter-headings (e.g. 'Identificazione e allusività', 'Flessibilità e rigidezza'); in practice there is little difference in type of material and manner of discussion chosen for each chapter. Then, under the chapter-heading 'Conclusioni al mezzo', G. embarks on a more technical examination of what he sees as the characteristic structure of Propertian *exempla*: a 'narrative' kernel within a 'normative' frame (these different components allegedly marked by tense-changes), the whole being held together and integrated into its context by a series of 'semi' (key words or semantic motifs strategically repeated). Finally he reaches the subsection 'Conclusioni'. But Part III ('Funzione e puntualizzazione')—the longest—is still to come. The first three chapter-headings here hijack narratological jargon: 1. 'L' *exemplum* e il referente' (the 'message of the discourse'); 2. 'L'emittente' (the 'sender'); 3. 'Il destinatario' (the 'receiver' or 'addressee'). But again, in practice there is not much meaningful distinction between these categories. In what remains, G. returns to selected techniques and formulae used to introduce Propertian *exempla* and closes with two chapters which he claims (p. 291) will build on the earlier material to highlight certain key features, but in fact they serve mainly to allow analysis of additional passages. At this stage the reason for the mid-way 'Conclusioni' becomes clear: there are none at the end.

Not that G.'s final chapter has no value. On the contrary, his attempt to show here that Propertius offers *himself* as the ultimate exemplar of the lover-poet and, through the *exempla* of Milanion (1.1), Protesilaus (1.19), and Amphion (1.9, 3. 2, and 3.15), answers Virgil's implied criticisms at the end of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* of the love-poet's art and political-moral outlook is one of the most perceptive sections. Indeed, throughout the book sensitive analyses and moments of insight are to be found: for instance, G. is persuasive in demonstrating how Theocritus uses *exempla* to move through different moods (pp. 35–8); in suggesting that *exempla* illustrating a state rather than an action are characteristic of love-elegy (pp. 85–6); and in recognizing links beween Propertius 1.1 and 1.12 (p. 122). Too often, however, the reader is left completely unadvised of, or inadequately assisted with, serious textual problems affecting the interpretation of crucial passages (e.g. 1.13.13–20 at pp. 65–6, 1.1.11–16 at pp. 114–16, 1.7.16 at pp. 214–15).

As a whole the book unfortunately does not come off. G.'s theorizing is generally not well integrated with his practical criticism, and too many too diverse approaches are attempted between the same covers, resulting in the repetition and incoherence obvious from just the summary of content above. Though G. frequently uses traditional philological methods, he also jumps experimentally on the bandwagons of various -isms and -ologies, without ever apparently being able to make up his mind which, if any, are truly serviceable for his purpose, or demonstrating convincingly that his use of fashionable idiolect is ever more than a cosmetic overlay. He does, admittedly, succeed in newly contemplating the elegies of Propertius within a

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

narratological framework, but whether as a result they will be any better understood or any more *enjoyed* I very much doubt.

University of Wales, Swansea JOAN BOOTH

NON VI SED SAEPE CADENDO

M. BECK: *Die Epistulae Heroidum XVIII und XIX des Corpus Ovidianum: Echtheitskritische Untersuchungen*. (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums: Neue Folge: 1. Monographien, 11.) Pp. 348. Paderborn, etc: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 3-506-79061-7.

B.'s contribution to this long-running debate differs from its predecessors in being grounded on a verse-by-verse examination of the entire text of two of the disputed epistles. There are obvious practical reasons for this limitation, and the choice of 18–19 avoids the subsidiary complications of 16.39–144 and 21.147–250 (n. 15). However, B. thereby fails to take account of an important positive anomaly (so to call it), the idiosyncratic and uniquely Ovidian use of *nec* = *et* '*ne/non*' at 16.83, 21.222 (Kenney, *CQ* 29 [1979], 396). B. also disallows Dousa's risqué interpretation of Leander's joke about keels and dockyards (18.207–8). That, which is in the same vein as Paris' unmistakable innuendo about Helen and Theseus (16.161–2), is characteristically Ovidian (cf. Booth, *LCM* 8 [1983], 101–2; Heyworth, ibid. 17 [1992], 59–61; McKeown on *Am*. 1.9.29–30).

There are here no glaring metrical anomalies comparable to that at *ES* 113 (see Knox ad loc.). Of those briefly discussed by B. (pp. 17–19) only *certe ego* at 20.178 appears damning at first sight, but he fails to note that what really damns it is its utter fatuity. No poet in his senses could have written it. It is, then, language and style on which the argument turns. In principle B.'s criteria (pp. 21–2) are unexceptionable; in practice he often misapplies them. He repeatedly overstates his case or simply mistakes the point, and his literary judgements sometimes invite reservation. There is space here only for some representative examples of these shortcomings.

18.13–14 Even if the construction of *quem . . . tegi uolumus* were unexampled in Ovid it would be unobjectionable, but it is not. **25–6** B. objects to *spatium* in apposition to *septima nox agitur*; but this phrase = *septem noctes*, like *sexta ceruice* = *sex ceruicibus* at Juv. 1.64. (I recur below to B.'s unwillingness to countenance linguistic innovation by the poet.) **27–8** B. desiderates an epithet with *pectora*, having like most commentators (the accurate H. T. Riley an honourable exception) failed to grasp that the description is general, 'sleep that soothes the (human) breast'. **39–40** It is true that the omission of the preposition before *aequora* is anomalous, but so is that of *cum* at *Am*. 1.4.15 (McKeown ad loc.). (Both already registered as unique by H. M. Eller, *Studies in ἀπὸ κοινοῦ in Ovid* [Diss., Chicago, 1938], p. 43.) If one is Ovidian, why not the other? **53–4** *Pace* H–S, Manil. 2.294 is not an instance of *cuncta* = *cetera omnia*, but *F*. 5.55 is; cf. e.g. *Am*. 3.9.19–30, and see A. J. Bell, *The Latin Dual & Poetic Diction* [Oxford, 1923], p. 195. **119–22** As with *certe ego* at 20.178, B. misses the point: it is the outright absurdity of the sense that cries out for correction. Housman's excision of 119^{b}–121^{a} solves all the problems at a stroke. **19.7–8** It seems (regrettably) to have been Heinsius *fils* who initiated the still current mispunctuation of line 7, which B. consequently misconstrues. This is an example of the not uncommon

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

distributive construction illustrated by Housman on Manil. 1.269–70 (+ *addendum*) and McKeown on *Am*. 1.10.19.

B. repeatedly stigmatizes as unOvidian usages first found in these letters which then do not recur until the Silver Age (cf. above on 18.25–6). In fact this is a well-documented Ovidian characteristic: cf. e.g. Hollis on *AA* 1.255, McKeown on *Am*. 1 *passim*. At 18.210 he is willing to pass *piger ad* because it is also found at *Ex P*. 1.2.121, though its next appearance is in Seneca. But what law ordains that a poet must do something at least twice if he is to do it at all? A similar point, *mutatis mutandis*, can be made apropos of diction or usages that B. identifies as prosaic.

B. can be seriously imperceptive. **18.15–16** He objects to the phrase *porriget . . . manum* as proper only to an encounter with a person. Quite so: Leander identifies himself with his letter as Ovid had done with his ring in *Am*. 2.15. **47–8** His comments on *obmurmurat ipse* are likewise wide of the mark: the god's rejection of Leander's prayer is conveyed *in propria persona*. The point is sharpened if, as Rosati ingeniously suggests, there is an allusion to the etymology of Boreas ἀπὸ τῆς βοῆς (Gell. 2.22.9). **81–2** Of course Leander is impervious to the implications for himself of the song of the halcyons; it is integral to his character to be blind and deaf to such warnings, just as Paris is to the meaning of Hecuba's dream and Cassandra's vaticinations (16.49–50, 123–6). **133–4** B. sees no humour here, only 'eine maßlose Übertreibung . . . widernatürlich und unsinnig'. **19.21–2** So far from being anomalous, *odioso* is practically a technical term: Ovid uses it exclusively of those placing obstacles in the path of love. **165–70** B. is evidently not prepared to entertain the idea that Hero's wild and inconsistent proposal might be a deliberately intended and effective reflection of her mental state (cf. his remarks on Cydippe, n. 844).

However, when all such caveats, which could be multiplied, are entered, there remains a body of oddities and anomalies that taken together ought to give a dispassionate critic pause. Again there is space only for a few examples. **18.49–50** Leander's location of the Icarian Sea 'near' Abydos is ignored or glossed over by the commentators; this is rather more cavalier than e.g. the geo- and topographical insouciance of *F*. 4.499–500, 907–8 (Fantham ad loc.). **59–60** Taken with the imperfects at 55–60, 75–80, *fere* poses a real problem: is Leander describing his first visit (cf. 107 *illius . . . noctis*) or does *furti tempora prima mei* (54) mean 'the earlier occasions of my stolen love'? I skated over this confusion too easily in my commentary. At 19.45 *fere* is more easily defensible, but even there it has the look of a metrical eke. **115–18** The repetition *peto . . . repeto* is indeed hard to defend. (I am tempted to read *relego*, comparing *Tr*. 1.10.24, where Micyllus' *relegit* is found in one thirteenth-century MS.) **162** *immensus* is hardly the *mot juste* for the Hellespont, which Leander himself a few verses later calls *breuis aqua* (174). Mechanical borrowing, as B. would have it, or the poet effectively empathizing? Carelessness or focalization? Where does sensitive interpretation end and special pleading begin? **215–16** The real problem with *in aspectu . . . habe* is not the lack of parallels, but the fact that the natural meaning is not what the context requires, 'put the light where I can see it', but 'keep your eyes fixed on it'. **19.35–6** *signa notamque* does indeed look like an irreflective borrowing from *F*. 3.650, and (as B. does not remark, but then neither did I), the poetic plural is unusually licentious. **63–4** The anacoluthon (which again I inexcusably failed to note) is indeed uncharacteristic of Ovid. **117–18** I should also have queried *scio* in the apparently unexampled sense 'know of (someone)'.

So, a usefully astringent intervention. This verdict, however, must be qualified by regret for the consistently negative spirit which informs B.'s discussion and what Stephen Hinds (*MD* 30 [1993], 44) has termed the 'vocabulary of disparagement'

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

('inkriminierend' is a recurrent expression) in which it is conducted. Whether or not it was Ovid who wrote these epistles is in the larger perspective of secondary importance (cf. Hinds, ibid. 44–5). The really interesting discussion begins where investigations such as this one leave off. *Pace* B., we still have here 'poetry from the major league of Augustan verse' (Barchiesi, *BMCR* 8 [1997], 47). If these poems are by an imitator, what were his (her?) motives? Did s/he deliberately suppress his/her own identity, and if so, why? Have we here one of the 'minor Latin poets' hypothesized by A. G. Lee, 'who made it their business to imitate a particular classical author . . . and who prided themselves on subduing their own individuality in the process' (*Ovidiana* ed. N. I. Herescu [Paris, 1958], p. 469)? That would have been an act of notable self-abnegation in one who was an artist of such exceptional powers and who knew and exploited the Greek sources with such technical dexterity (B.'s treatment of this aspect [pp. 23–6] is very thin). Or are these after all, as I have suggested elsewhere, first drafts by Ovid himself? That may or may not be the most probable scenario; it would perhaps be the most instructive.

Cambridge E. J. KENNEY

METAMORPHOSEN

L. SPAHLINGER: *Ars latet arte sua: Untersuchungen zur Poetologie in den Metamorphosen Ovids*. (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 83.) Pp. 378. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 3-519-07632-2.

G. TISSOL: *The Face of Nature: Wit, Narrative, and Cosmic Origins in Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Pp. xii + 238. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997. ISBN: 0-691-01102-8.

Since the mid-1980s the production of doctoral theses on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in Germany and in the English-speaking world has reached well-nigh industrial proportions. Whilst only some of the Anglophone scholars have actually published their work, mostly only after several years of meticulous revision, all of their German colleagues have put their books on the market shortly after presenting them to their respective faculties. None of these latter publications, however, greatly further our understanding of Ovid, whereas a number of their English and American counterparts, e.g. Hinds's *Metamorphosis of Persephone* (Cambridge, 1987), could already be termed 'classics'. The books of S. and T. reflect this situation quite perfectly. S.'s volume raises a question often asked in this periodical, namely whether or not there is really any sense in the German university ruling that dictates the prompt publication in some form of every thesis come rain or shine. T., on the other hand, has presented us with the first significant study of Ovid's narrative technique in the *Metamorphoses* since Bernbeck's *Beobachtungen zur Darstellungsart in Ovids Metamorphosen* (Munich, 1967).

S. tantalizes with a title promising a monograph on the poetics of the *Metamorphoses*. Recent scholarship has shown ever more clearly that reading Ovid as a self-reflexive author is of vital importance for our interpretation of his work. Epic narrative can by nature offer little scope for explicit poetics, thus for the

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Metamorphoses it is especially important to look at the ways in which Ovid relates implicitly to contemporary discourse by bringing certain motifs to bear on this through adaptation, or simply by creating ambiguity. So far such analyses have only been undertaken in interpretations of individual passages from the *Metamorphoses*, and one might have hoped to find a systematic examination in S.'s book. It does not materialize. S. is not interested in the metapoetical level of meaning in Ovid's polyphonic verses, or in any intertextuality relevant to poetics. In fact, it is hard to decide whether or not S. is at all aware how useful it could be to try this kind of approach. He focuses solely on Ovid's thoughts about the ethical responsibility of poets as expressed, or as he reads them, in descriptions of works of art or in artist myths in the *Metamorphoses*.

S.'s findings are then finally simply these: for Ovid every form of artistry has a religious dimension and therefore 'richtige' (p. 130) poetry is a form of service to the gods. The *Metamorphoses* are 'proper' poetry because the work is based on a religious *Weltanschauung* which sees art as a means of interpreting the world and the world, in turn, as a regimen created by the gods to some meaningful end. S. reaches this conclusion after interpreting the proem and the *sphragis*, the stories involving artists (he includes Polyphemus amongst these!), passages relevant to the 'Götterbild' in the *Metamorphoses* (here, however, he confines himself almost exclusively to the cosmogony in 1.5–88), and passages in which works of art are described. His interpretations are not quite what one would normally expect nowadays; it does not seem to have occurred to him, for example, to distinguish between narrator and author. He invariably offers only the following menu: lengthy summary of the contents, often with barely any regard for the actual wording of the text, exhausting discussions (sometimes the footnotes take up a whole page) of the work of countless scholars, but unfailingly never of those whose observations have really been significant (such as Sharrock for Pygmalion, Hinds for the Musomachia and Feeney on the 'Götterbild'). And *Quellenforschung*, especially on the cosmogony. Profound analysis and stringent argumentation are, by contrast, 'off', and obviousness is often simply implied with expressions such as 'clearly' or 'without a doubt'.

If S. classes the kind of poetry symbolized for him by the pictorial representation on Arachne's tapestry (6.103ff.) as critical of the gods and therefore 'falsch' (pp. 62–81), then he must expect to be asked why he considers the *Metamorphoses*, which are for the greater part thematically akin to the tapestry, to be 'richtige' poetry. But S. knows for a fact that the affects, which Ovid realized were the 'eigentliche Kräfte der Geschichte' (p. 331), were judged negative in their effects by the poet, in keeping with his religious *Weltanschauung*; two 'Musterinterpretationen' (pp. 332–40 on 1.452–567 and pp. 340–7 on 9.450–665) illustrate the point. S. is astonished to find towards the end of his book that he has in his reading of Ovid come quite close to the mediaeval *Ovide moralisé* (p. 331). Perhaps he should have delayed the publication of his work until his approach had at least benefited from a touch of Enlightenment.

By contrast, T. is completely at home with the methods of modern criticism, and thankfully neither strictly orthodox in their application nor overly steeped in the jargon. He demonstrates that instability and change in the world of the *Metamorphoses*—T. quite rightly sees the illustration of these factors as one of the central themes of the work—also make themselves felt in the style and narrative technique. Chapter 1 is devoted to verbal wit—the original thesis (1988) did not include this section, which I regard as the best chapter in the book—which, T. says,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ought not to be pigeon-holed, as it frequently has been over the ages, under 'glittering trifles' (Dryden): it is actually vital to a deeper understanding of the *Metamorphoses*. Using a number of passages which he labels according to the form of wordplay found in them (e.g. syllepsis; T. is the first to focus on this) and interpretations of whole narrative units, T. illustrates convincingly the principle of 'fluid interchange of literal and metaphysical, physical and conceptual' (p. 36). Meleager, for instance, who dies when Althea sets fire to the log on which his life depends (8.515ff.), is himself virtually 'transformed' into a log, at least on the level of language, his death throes being described with 'burning' metaphors (pp. 54f.).

This chapter on metamorphosis and wordplay offers a number of interpretations which represent a considerable improvement on other readings to date, particularly in the sections on the Myrrha and Byblis narratives (pp. 36–52) and on personifications (pp. 61–88). The same can be said of Chapters 2 and 3, which deal with 'narrative disruption'. This is the term T. uses to denote unexpected turns taken by the narrator within a narrative unit, by which the actions of a character, for example, can suddenly be seen in a quite different light. The Daedalus myth (8.183ff.) demonstrates the point. The exile arouses pity at first, but later, after an account of the events leading up to his banishment, he is quite suddenly 'unmasked' as a murderer and no longer seems so deserving of pity (pp. 97–105). Narrative disruption is no unknown, having been examined e.g. by Bernbeck, but one idea here is new: that it too involves the principle of metamorphosis. Some of the examples listed by T. do, however, lead me to wonder whether he is perhaps overstretching the concept of transformation, e.g. when he writes at the end of his interpretation of the Scylla narrative: 'The intersection of genres in Scylla's story, and the multiplication of allusive parallels within it, also contribute to the stylistic embodiment of transformation' (pp. 152–3). Nevertheless, Ovidians will profit greatly not only from T.'s analysis of the sudden changes on the narrative surface—an analysis unparalleled in its meticulousness—but also from his observations on Ovid's use of 'disruptive traditions' (Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis* and *Hecale*; Propertius 4.4: pp. 131ff.).

In the fourth and final chapter, in which T. examines the relationship between aetiology and metamorphosis, his main concern is to 'consider, in stylistic and narrative terms, how the *Metamorphoses* is a reaction to the aetiological thrust of the *Aeneid*' (p. 177). In his interpretation here of Ovid's *Little Aeneid* (13.623–14.608) T. rightly sees 'Ovid's great theme of universal flux . . . set in contrast to Vergilian providence' (p. 184). An earlier version of this interpretation (published in *Helios*) failed to take into account older literature on the *Little Aeneid* (e.g. S. Döpp's article in *RhM* 134 [1991], 327–46), and the omission has not been rectified here; various ideas in this chapter also tally with ideas advanced by E. A. Schmidt in his 1991 book *Ovids poetische Menschenwelt* (T. cites it in a different context), so that on the whole there is little here that is actually new. This cannot be said of the other chapters, however, and a mixture of old and new is only to be expected in a book which examines so thoroughly a subject that has been neglected for so long—in this case the narrative technique of the *Metamorphoses*, which T. analyses in the light of the most up-to-date narratological findings. His results here are so important that his book will make essential reading for any further studies.

University of Munich NIKLAS HOLZBERG

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

SENECA TRAGICUS

A. J. BOYLE: *Tragic Seneca: an Essay in the Theatrical Tradition*. Pp. 262. London: Routledge, 1997. ISBN: 0-415-12495-6.

Seneca has rarely been in critical favour. With the significant exception of the Renaissance—for which he and Plautus served as the paragons for Tragedy and Comedy—he has languished unread and unproduced. Even Quintilian (a fellow Spaniard) does not mention him at all in his scholarly survey of Roman tragedy. And when he does allude to Seneca elsewhere, it is only to show his students the 'corrupt rhetorical style' which they must avoid at all cost (10.1.125).

In his preface to the 1927 reprint of Thomas Newton's *Tenne Tragedies* (1581), T. S. Eliot exhumed Seneca from the graveyard of scholarly handbooks. He dismissed the traditional denigration of the poet's endless ecphrastic passages, sententious dialogue, and, above all, hypertrophied rhetoric, declaring that 'without bombast we should not have had *King Lear*'. In his view the plays were the Imperial Roman equivalent of 'broadcasted drama' (p. 70) and as such very effective. Eliot unfortunately ends on a low note, concluding that Seneca was 'not a poet of the *first* rank' (p. 70). Thus the playwright was reburied with little ceremony.

With the single exception of Otto Regenbogen's 'Schmerz und Tod in den Tragödien des Senecas' (*Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg* [1927–8], 167–218), the ensuing arid years were rarely punctuated by small, worthwhile but not brilliant studies. The real resurgence came in 1966, when a reprinting of the *Tenne Tragedies* with Eliot's preface occasioned 'Senecan Tragedy' (*Arion* 5 [1966], 422–71), the magnificent essay by the late John Herington. His new, deeper readings celebrated 'the superb *speakability* of Senecan verse'.

It is interesting to compare H.'s chilling picture of Nero's insane Rome with a treatment of the same corrupt era by his contemporary Petronius. Both depict the depravity to which the Empire has descended. The comic novelist presents the decadence of the provincial *plebs*, the tragic dramatist the sleaze among the patricians in the capital city's corridors of power. H.'s spark lit the bonfire of interest in Seneca.

B. is a true epigone, acknowledging at the outset that H. provided the 'inspiration' for his learned and imaginative study. And yet he dissents from two of H.'s key arguments. First, he believes that the plays were actually *performed* and he sees this visual element as a significant aspect of Seneca's art (pp. 78ff.–81ff.). Most importantly, B. also disagrees with H.'s view that an examination of 'the Greek so-called originals' would be fruitless and 'probably best ignored' (p. 447). Indeed, the very antithesis informs his entire approach. Steeped in Senecan verse, B. examines the playwright's use of imagistic patterns and polarities—even techniques like ring composition—to structure the plays. More provocative still, he focuses on passages in which the playwright refers to or comments on previous Greek and Latin texts—especially Euripides, Ovid, and Virgil, demonstrating Seneca's originality in rewriting and recasting his models into a Roman mould, which his audience could not fail to appreciate.

He is an eloquent guide through the playwright's nightmarish world—one of earthquakes, both interior and exterior. (Perhaps influenced by Stoic beliefs, Seneca is obsessed with the image of the destruction of the universe.) His characters' minds are always in turmoil, which is reflected in nature—rivers swell and spill over their banks, stars freeze in their courses. Universal chaos looms. The heroes' inner struggle (a

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

conflict of *Furor* and *Ratio*) is writ large on the outside world. Seneca is a master of the Pathetic Fallacy.

The eight tragedies (B. athetizes *Her. 0.* and *Oct.*) share numerous themes, such as: fortune's wheel, birth as destiny, the cyclicity of evil, 'blood will beget blood', crimes will incite further crimes. Take the prologue to *Thy*. It is spoken by the spectre of Tantalus, grandfather of the play's antagonists and himself guilty of plotting tecnophagy. But Seneca is not satisfied by Tantalus' dire predictions of the horrors to come. He brings a Fury on stage to urge him to stoke his descendants' rage and make them perform *more* and *greater* atrocities. Or *Med.*, where the heroine, incited by her previous *scelera*, outdoes herself by killing her children, yet finds her revenge is incomplete—because Jason has not actually *witnessed* the horror with his own eyes (992–3).

Then there are the victims of malign fate. Seneca's Oedipus is the polar opposite of the bold hero of Sophocles' drama. Whereas at the beginning of the Greek play he is very much in command, facing the unravelling of his destiny unafraid, in Seneca's prologue he is already on his knees, cringing in terror at the wrath of fate and afraid of everything—including himself (*meque non credo mihi*). In stark contrast to the 'heroic humanism' of the Sophoclean predecessor, Seneca's play is infested with 'guilt, fate, human impotence and the concomitant pointlessness of prayer;' (p. 93). B. shows us the real model for Seneca's protagonist by citing Tacitus' account of Nero's post-matricidal behaviour (*Ann.* 14.8.4). The description is strikingly suitable for the 'new' Oedipus.

B.'s most provocative chapter discusses 'The Palimpsestic Code'—the messages to be deciphered beneath the many layers of Senecan text. In *Phaed.*, for example, he finds allusions to Virgil, Ovid, and, most importantly, Euripides. B. reads these multitextual moments as 'cultural signals'. The playwright has not only rewritten the *Hipp.*; he has totally Romanized it. Here, Phaedra does not commit suicide immediately after her encounter with Hippolytus, but instead tries to persuade Theseus that she has been wronged and must therefore kill herself to preserve the family honour. The language of the scene suggests she is trying to recast herself into a kind of Lucretia. She declares:

> temptata precibus restiti; ferro ac minis
> non cessit animum: uim tamen corpus tulit.
> labem haud pudoris eluet noster cruor. (ll. 891–3)

This is indeed an artful twist. And then the gruesome end of the play recalls the final scene of Euripides' *Bacc*. Here Theseus bends over the torn fragments of his son, trying to put them together again. B. notes how Seneca further stirs his audience's emotions, with a visual reference to the Roman ritual of '*concinnatio corporis*, the gathering of the body parts and re-making of the body, owed to the dead' (p. 87).

In *Tro.*, B. finds references to poets ranging from Homer to Lucretius and even to the playwright's own *Ag.* (p. 89). The theme itself has a special dimension for the Roman audience: 'The cultural semiotics of the Trojan myth were laid out and played out in political (and artistic) word and fact. Imperial Rome was Troy rewritten and reborn' (p. 91).

Perhaps B. occasionally sees too many palimpsests in Seneca's text. After all, Latin literature was a deliberate echo of a Greek model and thus *per se* referential. Nevertheless, he demonstrates convincingly that Seneca goes beyond Virgil, whose Homeric reworkings have been extensively demonstrated.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Yet would the Roman spectator appreciate all the rich but subtle complexity of his text? Who in fact did the playwright envision as the audience for these *carmina*—as Tacitus refers to them? One thinks again of Petronius, whose literary style is similarly recondite and multi-layered. Or perhaps Seneca's work was aimed at the man—or monster—to whom he had been teacher, speechwriter—and would ultimately fall victim.

In any event, B.'s *Tragic Seneca* has rescued the Latin playwright from the purgatory of Eliot's 'second rank' and raised him to a place in the pantheon of genuine dramatic artists. It is an admirable piece of work.

Wolfson College, Oxford ERICH SEGAL

VALERIUS FLACCUS

G. LIBERMAN (ed.): *Valerius Flaccus:* Argonautiques: *tome I* (Chants I–IV): *Texte établi et traduit* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. cxxii + 284, 1 map. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1997. 415 frs. ISBN: 2-251-00455-6.

M. FUCECCHI: *La τειχοσκοπία e l'innamoramento di Medea. Saggio di commento a Valerio Flacco* Argonautiche 6, 427–760. (Testi e studi di cultura classica, 19.) Pp. 300. Pisa: ETS, 1997. Paper, L. 32,000. ISBN: 88-7741-997-0.

L. divides the introduction to his edition into two main sections: the author and his work, and the text of the *Argonautica*. The preamble to the first section contains some interesting observations on, for example, the sensibility of the poet and the subject of tyranny, but they would have greater force if his arguments had been more carefully structured and expressed. L.'s arguments regarding the date of the poem are also difficult to follow. L. seems to want to believe that most of the poem was written under Domitian, but certain arguments are rather forcefully contrived towards this conclusion. L.'s section on Valerius' imitation of Virgil is written with greater clarity, but in considering such imitation on a macroscopic level L. does not distinguish sufficiently between deliberate imitation and the existence of comparable features inherited independently from the Argonautic tradition. L.'s appreciation of Valerius' Virgilian imitation seems in fact to be very superficial. Although acknowledging that such imitation occurs in new contexts or with different points of reference, he fails to consider the implications of these changes. To L. this imitation is no more than *un jeu*. It is remarkable, finally, that L. considers neither imitation of Apollonius nor the poet's originality in any depth.

L.'s discussion of the textual history of Valerius Flaccus does not warrant the length which he devotes to it. He makes very few significant contributions of his own but repeats at great length the material and conclusions of previous scholarship, often, it must be said, without adequate acknowledgement of their source. The excessive length of his discussion derives also from his failure to discern where a subject is no longer at issue, e.g. the independence of L from V. He also shows poor understanding of mediaeval scribal methods and practices, and ought sometimes to express himself in more cautious terms. The new ideas which L. does contribute on the whole are

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

plausible enough, although the reasoning behind them frequently neglects alternative scenarios or in some other way fails to convince.

L.'s apparatus criticus is cluttered by remarks that would better have been reserved for the notes. Errors such as *post* armis *(u. 168) distingui solebatur (sic)* (*apud* 4.169) also jar.

The orthography which L. adopts for his text is, wherever possible, that transmitted by MS V. This creates readings which are very bizarre, particularly given the dubious basis of the policy. L.'s punctuation sometimes shows little sensitivity to the text (cf. 4.153, 4.169) and at other times could help the reader more (cf. 1.7, 1.49). Into the text itself, L. incorporates a large number of post-mediaeval and modern conjectures. Many of these were originally suggested by Heinsius, for whom L. expresses great (one ought perhaps to say excessive) admiration in his introduction. Many, however, are the result of his own labours. L.'s justification of these conjectures generally falls into one of two extremes: he either concentrates on showing the possible progress of the corruption on a palaeographical level while neglecting to discuss the sense, or he takes too far Haupt's and Housman's famous saying regarding *Constantinopolitanus* in place of *o.* Frequently, L. sees an error in the text where no one has done so before, but on these occasions his arguments of corruption usually fail to convince. The end result of all this interpolation is a text which, one strongly suspects, Valerius Flaccus himself would barely recognize as his own.

The translation is by far the most successful element of L.'s work. Coping well with the compression of Valerius' language, L. faithfully renders the text into fluent prose, on the whole capturing the mood of the original Latin well. Inevitably there are a few details over which one might quibble: in treating *populis* and *terrae* (1.10) as a hendiadys, for example, L. seems not to see the significance of both words as separate entities; in restructuring the poet's sentences (cf. 1.5–6, 1.25 etc.), L. alters the emphasis of the original statements; occasionally, his translation is rather heavy-handed (cf. 1.99, 2.112 etc.) and at times it could leave a clearer impression of his understanding of the text (cf. 2.85). The main annoying habit of L.'s translation occurs where he marks obeli in the text. On each of these occasions, L. curtails his translation at the point of the corruption, thus interrupting its fluency, even where the sense required in the text remains obvious.

F.'s introduction provides a section-by-section analysis of Valerius' sixth book, concentrating on that portion which is covered by his edition and commentary (i.e. 427–760). This analysis is informative, perceptive, and stimulating. He reveals clearly the intertextual texture and significance of Valerius' poem and contributes numerous other fascinating observations, only a small number of which may be mentioned here: by allowing just the two goddesses, Juno and Venus, to intervene in the situation (as opposed to the three in Apollonius) and by portraying both as dissemblers (as opposed to the frank conversation in Apollonius), Valerius gives vitality to the traditional rivalry between them; in an interesting inversion, Medea, from huntress, is subtly depicted as the prey of the hunter (584ff.); the simile concerning Medea (492–4) has particular force when considered in the light of the only other preceding simile dedicated to her (5.343ff.); etc.

F.'s discussion of the textual transmission of Valerius Flaccus is sharp and succinct, providing an accurate summary and astute evaluation of current scholarship. To say that there is not much to say about his text and apparatus criticus is also intended as a positive compliment. F.'s text is admirably and appropriately conservative, not sacrificing anything to misplaced scholarly enthusiasm. On the few occasions where he resorts to obeli, his commentary correctly identifies the problem and provides detailed

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and salient discussions of potential solutions. Two minor points that one could raise are that at 443–4 it would have been helpful to have more punctuation in the text, to indicate how F. understands the structure of the sentence; in 666, the conjecture marks around *sensere* are slightly surprising, given that this word is, according to F. himself, transmitted by C.

On the whole, F.'s translation has been very carefully and successfully undertaken. Inevitably there are details over which one might quibble: sometimes he loses the force of a word (cf. *sociam* 450 [surprising, given F.'s own admission of the importance of this word, p. 13]; *pugnas* 601; *nece* 626); occasionally, he adds to his translation more than the text justifies (cf. *variopinti* 492; *esule* 498). It is noticeable also that F. has not been as careful with the punctuation of his translation as with that in the text.

F.'s commentary discusses textual, grammatical, stylistic, metrical, and structural matters, and, with frequent reference to earlier commentators on both Valerius and other classical authors, is highly informative. F. reveals literary precedents on varying levels, from the microscopic detail to the macroscopic perspective. He ably teases out the niceties of the text with great perception and sensitivity.

To conclude, this edition and commentary, although limited in the extent of the text covered, will go a long way toward establishing the poetic credibility of Valerius Flaccus. It is to be hoped that further work will proceed from the same pen in the near future.

University of Birmingham P. RUTH TAYLOR-BRIGGS

VAL. FLAC. VII

A. PERUTELLI (ed.): *C. Valerii Flacci Argonauticon Liber VII*. Pp. 494. Florence: Felice le Monnier, 1997. Paper, L. 70,000. ISBN: 88-00-81277-5.

How many commentaries on Valerius Flaccus VII do we need? After Taliercio (1992) and Stadler (1993), P. gives us the third in six years. Fortunately his work should be good enough to discourage further proliferation for a while.

In one matter at least, P. has new ground. The discovery of the last leaf of the lost manuscript **C**, known only from Carrion's edition, has made the textual transmission of Val. an interesting question again. P. gives this its due, with lengthy and informative discussion of **C** and other recent discoveries. This should be useful for students of Book 7; be warned, though, that P. has no interest in the rest of Val.'s text. The reader must look elsewhere for information on the Sangallensis, since it breaks off in Book 4; a long discussion of the annotations of Bartolomeo Fonzio fails to mention his collation in the first two books of a *vetus(tus) codex*, apparently Ugoleto's codex, from which our surviving manuscripts descend (V. Fera, *GIF* 31 [1979], 230–54).

A section on style and metre is less satisfactory; two examples must serve. Defending 'Irim' at 4.77 and 7.186, P. imagines that Courtney prints 'Irin' because he has misread the Vaticanus (**V**) rather than because of the general behaviour of Greek words in Val., attested by metre as well as manuscripts. The absence of elided *-im* (against unelided *-in* at 2.379, 3.158, 6.65) may not be conclusive in so short a text; but it makes clear that Val.'s usage is not that of Virgil, whom P. cites in support of 'Irim'. P. tells us that lines ending in a monosyllable are not unusual, without distinguishing the normal case of two monosyllables at verse end (7.355 is one of only three instances in Val. of a single monosyllable at verse end); on the other hand he carefully

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

distinguishes the case of prodelided *est* at verse end—and gives a list of every instance in Book 7. Another section reviews Val.'s debts and influence and tries to characterize his poetry and its place in cultural developments. P. emphasizes and praises Val.'s interest in psychology ('la sonda del narratore penetra in profondità fino alle radici dell'animo umano' apparently); he suggests that this interest concentrates on the sentiments, while leaving contradictions in the characters unexplained, because the concept of the individual was in crisis, challenged by the absolute power of the emperors.

Text and apparatus seem clearly presented and generally well chosen, although the reader will find occasions for disagreement on most pages (inevitable in Val.). Two possible complaints: a few worthwhile conjectures are missing (e.g. 357 *poenis* Bury, 631 *ibant* Krenkel, 640 *letalis* Watt); P.'s discussion of textual problems often fails to mention why others have thought differently. The text incorporates four of P.'s own suggestions: 177 *durus* (unnecessary and an odd combination with *pudor*); 263 *tibi* (creates more problems than it solves); 404 *silebant* (a good solution for a real problem, though Val.'s brevity of expression may be the culprit); 463 *gramina* (see below).

The commentary is richer than its predecessors, particularly in its sensitivity (occasionally excessive) to the poem's use of earlier literature and relationship to other genres. Notes on vocabulary are often uneconomically expressed, sometimes superfluous, and by concentrating on the origins of Latin epic diction say little about Val., for whom Virgil and Ovid are more important than Ennius; some comments are misleading (e.g. 323 *nescioqŭis* 'fin da Catullo') or fail to give help where needed (e.g. 85 *pharon*; 626 *dissipat*). The translation has been made peculiarly difficult to consult, printed in a separate section, with no indication of line numbers from beginning to end.

Detail: **1** *te quoque Thessalico iam serus ab hospite vesper dividit*: P. takes *quoque* as comparing Medea with Perses, whom Pallas removes from battle with Jason at 6.745ff.; it means 'even you', an unstated comparison with less interested spectators than Medea. **52** *saeva . . . pascit hiems*: Aeetes is hardly accusing the Minyae of being wreckers, not a conclusion offered by the evidence before him (their ship, cf. 5.438), nor one that suggests the question 'vobisne domos esse putem . . .?'. **57** *aut ego cum vittis statui feralibus Hellen?*: P., rightly avoiding more drastic corrections, prints *haud ego*; but since the line still lacks context, perhaps we should retain *aut* and assume a lacuna after 56 (cf. Virg. *Aen*. 10.93). **77** *novales*: cf. Ap. Rh. 3.411 *νειὸν Ἄρηος*. **91** Since *vest<r>a* is difficult, why not *ista*? **109** P. prints Delz's suggestion *domo adque . . . postes*; but the ambiguous combination *ad* + *que* is generally avoided. **122** 'Theme and variation' rather than adversative *-que* (translated 'ma'). **127** P. criticizes editors who attribute 'semet sic' to Lemaire and not to Baehrens; it is suggested in Lemaire's apparatus as what lies behind **V**'s reading, 'semels'. **190f.** Comparison of other passages where gods take position as spectators on mountains (e.g. Hom. *Il*. 8.47ff., 13.11ff.) might establish how unusual, or not, the present case is, where 'watching' is not the prelude to action. **463** (Medea) *carmina . . . solvit figitque per artus | Aesonidae*: while others print the conjecture *volvit*, P. finds *carmina . . . figit* difficult and conjectures *gramina* (is *gramina . . . figit* easier?), understanding *solvit* as 'dissolved'; better perhaps to understand *solvit* as 'released', which gives a formal contrast with *figit*. **464** *septeno murmure*: a good observation that 'sevenfold' is appropriate both to the magic (add Ap. Rh. 3.861 *ἑπτάκι*) and to the shield it protects. **615** The line gives perfect sense if *ubi*, as we should expect, means 'where'.

The following misprints might cause confusion: app. crit. l. 441 *manebunt*]

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

manebant; text l. 548 *totas*; p. 189 (middle) *rates*] *trabes*; p. 207 *II 742, 68sgg.*; p. 314 (beginning) *cornua vitta*; (end) *cruentem*] *cruentis*; p. 434 (middle) *Sext*.] *Sest*.; p. 435 (end) *caelo.*

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae NIGEL HOLMES

CLAUDIAN

M. DEWAR: *Claudian, Panegyricus de Sexto Consulatu Honorii Augusti*. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Literary Commentary. Pp. lvii + 432. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. Cased, £55. ISBN: 0-19-814864-6.

This impressive volume is the first edition of *De Sexto Consulatu Honorii* since K. A. Müller's (Berlin, 1938) and the first ever in English. Of the ever-lengthening series of editions of Claudian's major poems it is certainly the fullest and most meticulous. For an idea of the extended scope of this work, presented as a literary commentary, compare D.'s 432 pp. on a poem of 660 verses with one of R. G. Austin's acclaimed commentaries, say that on the 900 vv. of *Aeneid* 6, or even Claire Gruzelier's on the 1172 vv. of *De Raptu Proserpinae* (Oxford, 1993), both of just over 300 pp.

This, the latest of Claudian's datable compositions, our only 'evidence' for the battle of Verona and perhaps the least formally structured of the panegyrics, finds him at the height of his powers and in gloriously high spirits for a threefold celebration: with Honorius' inauguration as consul for 404 are joined the rare event of his visiting Rome and his triumph for the rout of Alaric's first invasion of Italy, 401–2, though Honorius, the nominal *triumphator*, is constantly upstaged by the real hero, his father-in-law and guardian, Stilicho. Just as Claudian in *IV Cons*. contrives to gloss over the poisoned relationships between East and West following Gildo's revolt, the same feline surefootedness is used here to disarm criticism of Stilicho as, with the fear of a Gothic thrust down the peninsula removed, the relief of the landed gentry of the senatorial class gave way to grumbling and suggestions of collusion over his once again having spared Alaric to fight another day when he might have annihilated him once and for all. D.'s literary preoccupations entail no sacrifice of historical or political considerations, and the easily missed strands of tension subsisting between Court and Senate are skilfully teased out. He has also availed himself to good advantage of recent work on the baffling niceties of fourth-century ceremonial.

The contested chronology of the battles of Pollentia and Verona, with current opinion inclining towards 402, is argued along the lines of a rebuttal of articles by J. B. Hall (*Philologus* 132 [1988]), who argues for 403, and T. D. Barnes (*AJP* 97 [1976]), who, separating the two by over a year, places Verona in 403. Their arguments are deconstructed on the back of another article, by M. Cesa and H. Sivan (*Historia* 39 [1990]), and D. places 'the bulk of the evidence', largely the inscriptions recording the Honorian restoration of the Roman walls, behind 402 (pp. xivff.). The text is Hall's Teubner text of 1985 with, punctuation and spelling apart, some seven changes of marginal significance: *pr*. 24 *dei!* (*deos*), 113 *Thyestiaden* (*Thyestiadae*), 136 *putat* (*parat*), 267 *diverso* (*diversi*), 398 *periere tyranni* (*favere tyrannis*), 491 *certamina* (*certamine*), 569 *chalybe* (*chalybem*). Two old cruces are obelized, *solus* 550 and *aspectus* 619. The latter seems impenetrable, but v. 550 (*quod clemens aditu, quod*

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pectore, solus | *Romanos vetuit* . . .) so punctuated, and understood in terms of seeming and being (see Gesner ad loc.), does not deserve D.'s extravagant strictures. Particularly welcome is the successful rendering into good plain English of a poem which, from the baroque brilliance of the grand opening to the noise and complexity of the military tattoo at the end, has at many points baffled the Loeb translator (M. Platnauer, 1922) for one and the reviewer for another. At v. 21 D. rejects *recondunt* in favour of *retundunt* but translates the former; on the 'Thundering Legion' (347), *contenta polo* is probably 'confined to heaven' rather than 'content with Heaven's aid'. D. makes heavy weather of the tidal phenomenon of the Po delta in some four pages of notes on vv. 495ff., where Platnauer is well in line with Procopius' description of the same phenomenon (*Bell*. 5.1.16 ff.).

Good introductions to each section of the poem ensure that newcomers to the poet and the period are at no disadvantage. Older hands will appreciate the extended discussion even where inconclusive (and often necessarily so, for Claudian *is* vague) of particular problems like the mysterious wrong-footing of Theodosius by Alaric at the Hebrus in 389 (?) or 391 (104ff.), or the 'three' imperial visits of the preceding century (392ff.). D. keeps the reader alert to the barely perceptible dissolving of one aspect of the celebrations described (*adventus*, triumph, consular inauguration) into another in a sort of timeless montage (p. xlvi n. 60, nn. 491–3, 561–4). A particularly useful note accompanies vv. 594–6, *habituque Gabino* | *principis et ducibus circumstipata togatis* | *iure paludatae iam curia militat aulae*. *Pace* D. nn. 145, 193–200, it does look as though good weather and dried up river beds assisted Alaric's advance, whereas a different state of affairs hampered his retreat (144f.) even if there was no actual flooding. On p. 90, *IV Cons*. 362 *polluta potestas*, referring to Eugenius' usurpation in 392–4, is wrongly connected with Eutropius' consulship in 399.

D. has not been stinted as to space: the parallels he adduces are quoted at length and discussed no less expansively. This is not an unmixed blessing and can lead one into temptation, whereas considerations of space can concentrate the mind wonderfully. Where two writers, relating similar circumstances, fall back on the same resources of expression, dependence or imitation should not be too lightly assumed. D. states this principle on p. 395, while failing to observe it in several places. A few examples must suffice. In his note on Honorius' libation at the Tiber (520), D.'s efforts to establish a connection between Deucalion and Pyrrha and Stilicho and Honorius, solely on the strength of the words *libatis* . . . *lymphis* in Claudian and Ovid's *libatos* . . . *liquores* (*Met*. 1.371ff.), are strained enough in all conscience without further attempting to equate the end of the great flood with the retreat of the Goths. The 'similar sense and phrasing' of 581f., *illum* . . . *diem* . . . *referres* | *quo*, and Stat. *Theb*. 2.309f., *animum subit illa dies, qua*, are not significant enough to suggest a comparison between faithful Stilicho and perfidious Polynices. At 79, *tenero* . . . *ab ungue*, would Claudian's listeners have recognized with D. 'a reversal of the thrust' of one of Horace's Roman odes, 3.6.21? Is this not asking rather a lot?

A few points have escaped the vigilance of the author and his friends: *pr*. 9, *quies* missing after *prima*; *pr*. 24, 'comprised of'; 215, *aestiuus puluer*; 551, 'dispensed from' for 'exempted from'.

D. shares with his readers a real enthusiasm for this poem, but a commentator's estimate of his author is often, in the strict sense of the term, peculiar.

Dundonald, County Down WILLIAM BARR

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ANNALES

M. CHASSIGNET (ed. and trans.): *L'annalistique romaine:* Tome I: *Les annales des pontifes et l'annalistique ancienne (fragments)* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'association Guillaume Budé). Pp. cxxxv + 187. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1996. 275 frs. ISBN: 2-251-01392-X.

A new edition of the fragments of the Roman annalists could not be more welcome, and C. has well lived up to the expectations generated by her excellent edition of Cato, *Origines*. In this first instalment we find the meagre evidence for the pontifical records and *Annales Maximi*, as well as the fragments of Fabius Pictor, Cincius Alimentus, Postumius Albinus, and Acilius. There are *indices nominum* in Greek and Latin, an *index testimoniorum*, and supplementary notes which comment on the fragments themselves. The only serious shortcoming is the absence of a bibliography, an absence that has its own implications. The long introduction has over 400 footnotes, many of them containing bibliographical information, but after their first appearance books or articles are cited by author name only. Tracing these first references can be a very laborious matter. A bibliography is, of course, not customary in an edition; but if it tells us anything, what the republication of these fragments makes clear is that it is absurd to regard an edition of the annalists as equivalent to the publication of an extant text. There is not a single direct citation from one of these authors; and the result is that the reconstruction of the texts depends to an inordinate degree on scholarly exegeses of the secondary sources, access to which would be facilitated by a bibliography. In this respect, C. is operating within a convention that, ironically, is shown to be inadequate by the very success of her own attempt. C. has eminently succeeded in presenting the remains of the early annalists in an accessible form. But what kind of impression of the annalists does such an ordering of *testimonia* (I hesitate to call them fragments) produce?

As C. points out, in spite of its 1914 revision, Peter's *Historicorum Romanorum Fragmenta* was a thoroughly nineteenth-century production, appearing in its first edition in 1870. It remains, however, a question whether the superiority of C.'s achievement rests more in advances in book production than in being able to draw upon a century of great scholarly progress. Not that C.'s own scholarly credibility is in any way compromised: her long introduction (around 100 pages) describing the annalistic tradition should become the classic treatment of the theme. What little we know about each author, including valuable descriptions of their reception, is clearly presented; ancient theories of the origins of historiography at Rome are juxtaposed with a much lengthier discussion of modern theories. All in all, it is extraordinarily well balanced, and C. treads lightly through the arid field of *Quellenkritik* with a sense of proportion and a scepticism of grand generalizations that are not normally characteristic of it. One of her favourite words is *nuancé*, and, particularly on the vexed question of what kind of early priestly records existed as a precursor of the literary annals of Fabius Pictor et al., her presentation of different theories is admirably sensitive. But the lucidity of her arguments only exposes all the more clearly what an enormous quantity of words has been expended upon a subject which is represented by such uninformative fragments of authors, about whom so little can with any certainty be known. The clarity of the layout, the convenience of a parallel translation, and the helpful commentary all make clear that the interest of the

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

annalists lies not with what we know about them, but what purpose they can fulfil in supplementing our understanding of early Rome, or, more accurately, of supplementing Livy's or Dionysius' account of early Rome. Just like Peter, C., for all her labour, cannot present the annalists to us as any more than a source on which Livy and Dionysius drew, and one that is in all essentials lost.

The fragments do not, in short, enable us to form a clear picture of how historiography began at Rome, and it is to the credit of this edition that the material is not presented in such a way that this conclusion is obscured. Indeed, in the short final section of the introduction where she discusses her own methodology, I seem to detect a note of calm regret concerning the difficulty of the whole project. Nevertheless, fetishists of the new will be glad to know that C. does include some new fragments (described on pp. ci–cii); most of these hinge on the fact that Peter regarded *Origo Gentis Romanae* as a forgery, although Fabius Pictor F1 is now the inscription discovered in 1969 in Taormina, which gives a brief summary of his work. Otherwise, the value of the edition lies in its accessibility, its clear presentation of the fragments, C.'s exemplary sanguineness in the face of so many lacunae, and above all the marvellous introduction, which I recommend for separate reading as an enlightening introduction to the Roman annalists and all their problems.

University of Birmingham MATTHEW FOX

PISO THE HISTORIAN

G. FORSYTHE: *The Historian L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi and the Roman Annalistic Tradition.* Lanham, New York, and London: University Press of America, 1994. Pp. xi + 552. ISBN: 0-8191-9742-4.

The Roman annalists are currently undergoing a revival of interest: editions have recently appeared of the early annalists (M. Chassignet), Cassius Hemina (C. Santini), and Licinius Macer (S. Walt), and a group of British scholars is currently engaged on an edition of all the lost Roman historians to replace Peter's long-serving *HRR*. The present work is a notable contribution to this movement. It is the first full-length study of Piso, arguably the most important of the annalists of the later second century B.C.

In structure F.'s volume is hybrid. Although it provides text, translation, and extensive commentary on the fragments of Piso's *annales*, it is organized as a monograph. Two introductory chapters are followed by three chapters which present the commentary on the fragments, arranged by small groups rather than individually, while the text and translation of the fragments are relegated to an appendix. This arrangement and the lack of a concordance to Peter's numeration make the book somewhat awkward to use. In the appendix the passages in which the fragments are embedded are cited at generous length, but no attempt is made to distinguish typographically the sections which purport to derive from Piso.

The first chapter discusses Piso's family and career, on which see now also I. Hofmann-Löbl, *Die Calpurnii: politisches Wirken und familiare Kontinuität* (1996). Chapter 2 deals with a number of aspects of his historical work: his 'education' (i.e.

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cultural influences); the date of composition (arguing for a late date on tenuous grounds); language and style; annalistic form and content; and relationship to the *Annales Maximi*. F. (pp. 42–53) argues for the view that Piso treated the early republic in greater detail than his predecessors and was the first of the Roman historians to give a strictly annalistic account from the inception of the republic to his own day. This may be correct, but the case is less solid than F. allows: see the counter-arguments (disregarded by F.) of B. W. Frier, *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition* (Rome, 1979), pp. 255ff. As for the *Annales Maximi*, F. (pp. 53–73) reasserts, against Frier, the traditional view that, when Piso's contemporary Scaevola stopped the compilation of the pontifical *tabula*, he arranged for the publication of the eighty-book edition mentioned by Servius Auctus. This is regrettable, for, as Frier showed, this notion has no ancient support but rests merely on a conjecture by Mommsen. At least in the form adopted by F., the conjecture is very implausible: few will follow him in supposing that, when the *Origo Gentis Romanae* (17.3–18.3) cites the fourth book of the *annales pontificum* for various tales of the Alban kings, it is drawing on the work of Scaevola and his associates.

The fragments as established by F. include two which Peter omitted (16, 33). Peter listed six fragments as of uncertain location, but F. finds contexts for them all: in some of these cases his conjectures have some plausibility (4, 10, 34 = 41–3 P), but in others they are purely fanciful (1, 8, 35 = 40, 44–5 P). The contexts of the other fragments are mostly clear, but F. is surely wrong to follow Lachmann and Peter in assigning F 25 (18 P) to the Lucretia story: the fragment concerns the pardoning of an offence, but Piso, like our extant sources, surely treated Lucretia as blameless (*contra* F., p. 246).

F.' s commentary is on a very lavish scale and deploys great erudition. Often, there is good judgement as well: a notable instance is his demonstration that the Palatine Porta Ianualis, which still appears in recent works on Roman topography, is the product of a mere misreading of Varro (pp. 185–7). Unfortunately, however, F.'s zeal for learning and enthusiasm for speculation not infrequently get the better of both his judgement and his sense of relevance. A good deal of the commentary is devoted to matters which have at best only marginal bearing on the fragment under discussion. At times F.'s views seem to me simply perverse, as in the following instances: the tribunate held to originate as an uncontentious office of the state, not opposed to the patricians (pp. 264ff.); defence of the statement of F 39 (= 29 P) that Rome built a large fleet against Hiero (pp. 352–62); claim that Livy makes 'a direct causal connection' between the importation of Asian luxury at Vulso's triumph and the Bacchanalia, and that this connection derived from Piso (pp. 385ff.).

F. has produced a work of great learning, which makes a valuable addition to the scholarly literature. It may be consulted with profit on a wide range of topics, but must be used with caution.

University of Nottingham J. W. RICH

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LIVY 28 & 29

P. JAL (ed., trans.): *Tite-Live: Histoire Romaine:* tome XVIII; *livre XXVIII* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'association Guillaume Budé). Pp. lxi + 148 (1–104 text double), 3 maps. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1995. 295 frs. ISBN: 2-251-01394-1.

P. FRANÇOIS (ed., trans.): *Tite-Live: Histoire Romaine:* tome XIX; *livre XXIX* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'association Guillaume Budé). Pp. cxii + 164 (1–86 text double), 5 maps, 7 tables. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1994. ISBN: 2-251-01377-6.

The Budé Livy (henceforth L.) continues its swift pace. As in previous reviews of volumes in this series, I shall confine myself to consideration of textual matters. This is not to belittle the importance of writing explanatory notes on the text of L., or the quality of the introductions and notes which J. provides for book 28 and F. for book 29 (these follow the usual Budé format, and are particularly useful on historical matters); but a review is not the easiest place in which to discuss major problems of historical and literary interpretation. We await a full modern commentary on these books, but in the meantime anyone interested in their historical aspects should consult J. and F.

Another reason for concentrating on textual matters is that the Budé series has now reached those books of L.'s third decade of which the textual criticism is most interesting and profitable. For books 21–5, and for much of book 26, our sole source for the text is the fifth-century codex *Puteaneus* (P) = Paris Lat. 5730 or, in places where it has now lost leaves, MSS derived from it. P is a fine testimony to ancient civilization and letters, but is desperately corrupt and offers only an insecure basis for emendation. However, for books 27–30 it is joined by the so-called Spirensian tradition (Σ). In an exemplary recension August Luchs established in 1879 that Σ may be reconstructed from on the one hand S = an almost entirely lost uncontaminated MS once at Speyer, and hence probably German, whose readings were reported by Rhenanus in the Froben edn (Basle) of 1535, and on the other a series of extant Italian witnesses. Luchs ranked these Italian witnesses in the following order of importance: (i) H = Harl. 2684 (s. xv), which from 29.3.15 to 30.21.12 has no contamination from the Puteanean tradition then dominant in Italy, but which is elsewhere of no use to editors; (ii) V = Pal. Lat. 876 (s. xv), which presents the readings of Σ with some contamination from P's descendants; (iii) Θ, a group of MSS of which the oldest members are probably Marc. Lat. Z 364 (1389) and Burn. 198 (s. xiv^2), which has suffered from rather more contamination than V; (iv) corrections (perhaps of s. xii^2) to N = Laur. 63.21; and (v) F = Laur. 89 inf. 1 (s. xv), a MS which is very contaminated but contains some Spirensian readings not in VΘ. Since Luchs wrote, scholars have isolated amongst the *recentiores* four further Italian witnesses to Σ of some consequence: (i) Billanovich (*JWI* 14 [1951], 137–208) showed that corrections in A = Harley 2493 were made by Petrarch and derive from Σ; (ii) Billanovich also drew attention to L = Paris 5690 (s. xiv$^{1/4}$), which he claimed was an uncontaminated descendant of Σ but which Reeve (*RFIC* 115 [1987], 409–30) and I (*CR* n.s. 38 [1988], 43–4) have shown to be more contaminated than V or Θ; (iii) in 1985 three bifolia from an Italian MS of s. xi were discovered at Nancy (O): these present a pure

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Spirensian text but with later heavy correction from a Puteanean source; and (iv) Reeve (in J. Diggle, J. B. Hall, and H. D. Jocelyn [edd.], *Studies in Latin Literature and its Tradition* [PCPhS Suppl. 15, 1989], 107–8) established that E = Est. Lat. 385 (s. xv^2) was a close relative of V.

Even after Reeve's *RFIC* articles of 1986 and 1987, which dispersed much of the fog in which Billanovich's wrong but seemingly authoritative pronouncements had enveloped the tradition, some questions remain to be answered, of which the two most pressing are perhaps these: was O the parent of all Italian witnesses to Σ, and are there other useful witnesses to Σ in hitherto uninvestigated Italian witnesses?

Reeve provided a thorough study of O and suggested with some confidence that L derives from $O^1 + O^c$; because of erasure and correction in O he was not able finally to establish whether or not H (where Spirensian), V(E), or Θ also derive their Spirensian material from uncorrected (H) or less corrected (V[E]Θ) states of O. If HVEΘ do not derive from O, then it follows that O must once have had at least one twin. F., the first editor to discuss O, seems unaware of the larger question, but at 31.5 *quod* HVEΘN^{c}F: *quo* OL: *ut quod* Π and 32.12 *patique posse uisus* SHΘN^{c}A^p: *patique uisos posse* VE: *patique posse uisa est* OL: *patique posse uisa* Π: *pati quoque uisa* F his *apparatus* (from which I draw the readings of OL, and to which I add the readings of E), if accurate, would provide some evidence germane to it, in that it suggests that in these passages there were uncorrected errors of O which would make it difficult for the other Spirensian witnesses to derive from it. I have not seen O itself, but photographs suggest that in both passages it has been corrected and that its original reading would cause no difficulty for the derivation of the other Spirensian witnesses from it. F. (p. ci) largely confirms Reeve's view about the relationship of L to O, but suggests that 29.32.8 *praelati*] *relati* O^1?HVEΘ: *perlati* L: *lati* (?) O^c and 32.9 *ulterioris* $\Pi\Theta$L: *interioris* S?OHVE pose a problem for the derivation. However, in the first passage L's reading could very easily be a progressive corruption (or, alternatively, O could have been corrected to *perlati* before *lati*). The second passage is harder, but it seems clear from photograph that O did once read *ulterioris*: could *interioris* have been changed to *ulterioris* and then back again to *interioris*? At any rate, L shadows the text of O^{1+c} so closely that it is inconceivable that it does not derive from it. Neither F. nor J. have inspected any new MSS.

When a text has been edited as often as Livy 28–9, it is reasonable to require a new editor to present an apparatus which is entirely up to date and uses all the right witnesses. To do this he must clearly use P (or substitutes where it is not extant), S, H (where it is pure), OVE, the two oldest witnesses to Θ, N^c, and A^p. He should also cite evidence for the readings of the lost MS (Λ) from which most Italian members of the Puteanean family descend, so as to offer a control on correction and contamination in the Spirensian witnesses. For this several early MSS could serve, but it makes sense to use A and N since N^c and A^p are needed for their Spirensian material. L offers little or nothing not found in VEΘ, but, as it derives from O and represents an independent strand of Spirensian tradition, it is perhaps as well to cite it (I modify my remarks at *CR* [1988], 44), and the same is true of F.

Neither Budé editor is quite 'up with the state of the art', although F. comes close: he does not use F (which does not much matter) or E (which matters rather more), and he cites eliminable non-Italian descendants of P; but otherwise I cannot fault his choice. J. does use F but fails in both other respects; he also cites later witnesses to Θ (Laur. 63. 17, Conv. Soppr. 263) in preference to those mentioned, H where it is of no use, and Italian MSS of no consequence such as Paris Lat. 5733 and Pal. Lat. 874 (both derive from the extant Q = Vind. Lat. 33, itself a descendant of Λ offering nothing new to an editor using N and A; see Reeve, *RFIC* [1987], 143, 145, 158, 163 on the first and 149 on the second). In their apparatus Budé editors are traditionally reluctant to use Greek sigla to eliminate *lectiones singulares*, and in both these editions much space is wasted, not least by eliminable descendants of P. However, it is a welcome development that J. is now willing to use ϵ for the coincidence of V and his

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

witnesses to Θ. Nevertheless, one can still improve upon this, and as a suggestion for future editors, I shall use the following Greek sigla in this review: Θ, ϵ (the obvious siglum for the parent of V and E, despite the fact that J. has used it for a different purpose), Φ (a new suggestion for a reading shared by all of [O]$\epsilon\Theta$L); Λ (for a reading of N/N^1 A/A^1 not found in P); and Π (for a reading of P found also in Λ). The *lectiones singulares* of V, E, or individual witnesses to Θ need hardly ever appear in the apparatus. As the following textual discussions will show, this notation allows the necessary evidence to be presented very economically. Readings are taken either from J. or F. or from Luchs, except that the evidence of E is here deployed for the first time.

Although J. and F. have constituted their texts with some care, there are many passages for which it is possible to argue that they have made the wrong choice of reading. Those passages beside which I have placed an asterisk are discussed by F. in his article 'Liviana quaedam. À propos du livre XXIX de Tite-Live: leçons nouvelles et conjectures', *Latomus* 53 (1994), 118–23, where he explains some of his choices. On 28.3.5, 3.9, 12.8, 28.12, 38.1, 40.3, 42.17, 42.20, 29.6.5, 17.12, 19.3, and 22.10 I have nothing to add to what I have written at *CR* n.s. 38 (1988), 42–9 (a review of Walsh's Teubner text of books 28–30) or n.s. 42 (1992), 547–51 (an article arguing for Luchs's deletion of 29.22.10). Other passages may be divided into four categories.

In the following the reading of Σ should probably have been preferred to that of P or the conflation of the readings of P and Σ offered by some Spirensian witnesses and modern conjectures: **28.7.4–5.** *eodem ferme die ab Attalo rege Opuntiorum urbs capta diripiebatur. concesserat eam regi praedam Sulpicius, quia Oreum paucos ante dies ab Romano milite expertibus regiis direptum fuerat. cum Romana classis Oreum sese recepisset, Attalus . . . terebat tempus* (*cum Romana classis oreum sese recepisset* N^{c}F: *cum Romana classis eo se cepisset* Π: *Romana classis oreum sese receperat et* SΦA^p). Luchs (p. cxxxv) demonstrated that P's *eo* is impossible and adopted the reading of SΦA^p, whose coincidence must give the reading of Σ. J., following Walsh, adopts the reading of N^{c}F, which is in effect a conflation in which the reading of P has been emended by lifting *oreum* and *recep-* from Σ. This conflation cannot be proved wrong: but the *cum*-clause gives a less natural flow to the passage and, since the reading of the main witnesses to Σ makes good sense, there is no particular reason to follow N^{c}F. **10.16.** *M. Valerius proconsul, qui tuendae circa Siciliam maritimae orae praefuerat, triginta nauibus C. Seruilio praetori traditis, cum cetera omni classe redire ad urbem iussus* (*praetori traditis* Weissenborn, followed by Conway and Johnson [henceforth C-J], Walsh, and J.: *praeditis* Π: *traditis* ΦN^{c}A^{p}F), Weissenborn's conjecture neatly combines the reading of P and Σ but has the disadvantage of postulating corruption in both branches of the tradition. It is more economical to follow Luchs and adopt the reading of Σ: it is clear from §3 and §9 that Servilius was praetor, and since in §13 L. did not see the need to write *C. Seruilio praetori* instead of the plain *C. Serulio*, he is unlikely to have added *praetori* here (he put *proconsul* in apposition to *M. Valerius* because this is his first reference to Valerius in his 'annalistic' chapter, and he wished to remind readers of his status). **29.1.1–2.** *Scipio postquam in Siciliam uenit, uoluntarios milites ordinauit centuriauitque. ex iis trecentos iuuenes, florentes aetate et uirium robore insignes, inermes circa se habebat, ignorantes quem ad usum neque centuriati neque armati seruarentur* (*et* ΠLF: om. $\epsilon\Theta$N^c; *insignes inermes* N^c, followed by C-J, Walsh, and F.: *inermes* ΠL: *insignes* S$\epsilon\Theta$FA^p). *inermes* makes no sense, but *insignes* gives excellent sense and should be adopted. N^c has no authority of its own, and its reading is clearly a conflation of what S and P offer. Since *inermes* duplicates the following *neque armati*, the conflation is unattractive. P's *et* causes no difficulty but it is obviously possible that Σ was correct to omit the word. **11.6.** *cum Romam deam deuexissent, tum curarent et eam qui uir optimus Romae esset hospitio exciperet* (*exciperet* ΠF and F.: *acciperet* $\epsilon\Theta$: om. H). In the context of the Mater Idaea *excipere* is used at *per.* 29.9 and Val. Max. 7.5.2; but that *acciperet* is much more likely to be correct is shown by the use of *accipere* in this context at §8 *quaerendum uirum optimum in ciuitate esse, qui eam rite hospitio acciperet*, 14.5 *de Matre Idaea accipienda*, 14.10 (quoted below), 18.2, 34.3.8, 5.10 35.10.9, 36.40.8, Cic. *har.* 22, *fin.* 5.64 (most of the Livian passages are adduced by Luchs, p. c). **14.12–13.** (The *Mater Idaea* is taken from her ship on arrival at Rome.) *matronae primores ciuitatis . . . accepere . . . eae per manus succedentes deinde aliae aliis . . . in aedem Victoriae, quae*

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

est in Palatio, pertulere deam pridie idus Apriles (*deinde* Π F: om. HΦ) For the meaningless *deinde* the Froben edn. of 1531 (followed by Walsh) reads *deinceps*. However, the reading of HΦ gives perfect sense: cf. 4.22.5 *diuiso exercitu qui alii aliis succederent ad pugnam*, 36.22.5 *Romanis in magna copia militum succedentibus aliis in stationem aliorum*, 43.18.7 *cum sine intermissione interdiu noctuque, alii aliis succedentes, pars scalas muris <pars> ignem portis inferrent . . .*, in none of which passages does L. use *deinde or deinceps*. F. follows Luchs and C-J in retaining *deinde*, but *fort. delendum* in his apparatus shows that he nearly divined the truth.

In many passages (several involving word-order) it is impossible to make a certain choice between P or Σ. But when all else is equal, it is prudent to follow Σ as the more reliable source; and sometimes it is possible to adduce evidence (albeit not conclusive) which shows that the reading of Σ is somewhat more likely to be correct. **28.14.19.** *et iam conflixerant cornua cum quod roboris in acie hostium erat . . . nondum ad teli coniectum uenissent* (*acie hostium* ΠF, followed by J. and Walsh: *hostium acie* Φ, followed by Luchs) L. puts *hostium* before a part of *acies* on about twenty-nine occasions, after it on about ten occasions. **38.12.** . . . *quia sacrorum cura pontificem maximum in Italia retinebat* (*sacrorum cura* Π, followed by J.: *cura sacrorum* ΦF), *cura* comes first in the two other passages (1.33.1, 27.8.6) in which L. employs the phrase *cura sacrorum*. **42.12.** (Fabius Maximus reflects on the possible dangers of invading Africa) *quid porro si . . . Carthaginienses ultro ipsi nouum exercitum in Italiam . . . miserint* (*ultro ipsi* ΠF, followed by J.: *ipsi ultro* Φ). Cf. 43.6.13 *quae ipse ultro pollicitus sit*. **29.8.2.** *ob egregiam fidem aduersus Romanos* (*aduersus* Π: *erga* HΦF). With *fides* L. elsewhere uses *aduersus* at 35.48.8 and 45.8.4, but *erga* at 1.2.5 and on nine subsequent occasions. **29.4.** *laetissimus tamen Romanis in principio rerum gerendarum aduentus fuit Masinissae* (*a. f. M.* Π: *a. M. f.* HΦLF: *M. a. f.* ϵ). The agreement of HΦLF eliminates the reading of ϵ, and in support of their reading against that of P cf. 8.36.2 *neque ciuibus satis laetus aduentus eius fuit neque . . .*, and note that L. likes to end sentences with *fuit* (Packard, *Concordance* ii.702–6). **34.3.** *ad Uticam tum castra Scipio ferme mille passus ab urbe habebat* (*ferme mille* Π and F.: *mille ferme* HΦF). When using the plural *milia passuum* L. places *fer*(*m*)*e* both before and after *milia* (contrast e.g. 30.9.11 and 31.25.1); but when using the singular *mille passus/-uum* he much more often places it after *mille* (see 4.27.3, 5.26.5, 23.44.7, 24.14.2, 29.2.4, 31.24.10, 41.1.8, and note also 21.7.2: contrast only 24.20.1 *castra ab urbe ferme passus mille locat*, where the word-order is not quite parallel to that offered by P in our passage).

In the following passages. where J. or F. print the reading of Σ or of some witnesses to Σ, that of P seems more likely to be correct. **28.33.5.** *primo missilibus territauere; deinde emissis* (*IT*: *missis* SΦF) *leuibus telis, quae inritare magis quam decernere pugnam poterant, gladios nudant*. Although L. very occasionally uses the simple *mittere* with *telum, hastam* (*uel sim.*) for the compound *emittere* (I have noticed 7.23.8), *emittere* is very much the *mot juste* in this context: cf. 2.46.3 *pilis inter primam trepidationem abiectis temere magis quam emissis, pugna iam . . . ad gladios . . . uenerat*, 9.13.2, 31.35.5 *uelites emissis hastis comminus gladiis rem gerebant*, 32.17.13 (all with more or less the same sequence as we find in our passage); also 9.32.6, 9.39.6, 10.40.13, 26.4.7, 28.2.6, 30.18.11, 33.18.12, 34.37.6. **29.20.2.** (on Scipio) *quem . . . spe destinauerit* (sc. *ciuitas*) *Hannibalem ex Italia retracturum* (*retracturum* S?Φ, followed by J.: *detracturum IT*). In support of *IT* Luchs (pp. lxxxx and ci) adduced the decisive parallels: 26.6 *ad Hannibalem detrahendum ex Italia*, 30.20.9 (Hannibal) *ex diutina possessione Italiae est detractus*, and 30.30.14 *me sextum decimum iam annum haerentem in possessione Italiae detraxisti*.

Some other passages (several involving a conjecture by F.). **28.10.12.** *et Q. Mamilio* (codd.: *Mamilius* Voss) *ut collegae iurisdictione tradita Galliam cum exercitu cui L. Porcius praetor praefuerat obtineret decretum est*. Voss's conjecture (adopted by C-J, Walsh, and J.) is obviously attractive, but in support of the paradosis Luchs (p. cxxxvi) well cited 36.2.1, *L. Aemilio Paullo in ulteriorem Hispaniam, praeter eum exercitum quem a Fuluio proconsule accepturus esset, decretum ut nouorum militum tria milia duceret et trecentos equites*. This parallel makes emendation dangerous. ***29.7.9–10.** (Hannibal departs, being unable either to stop the Roman attack on Locri or to help the Carthaginian garrison in the town) *Hannibal . . . nuntioque misso ad eos qui in arce erant ut sibimet ipsi consulerent, nocte motis castris abiit*. (10) *et qui in arce erant, igni iniecto tectis quae tenebant, ut is tumultus hostem moraretur, agmen suorum fugae simili cursu ante noctem adsecuti sunt*. (*fugae simili* $\Pi\Phi$: *-le* C^cM^c, adopted by F.; *cursu ante noctem* Φ: *curuante noctem* P: *curuante nocte* Λ: *iuuante nocte* recc., adopted by F.) F. well observes that the paradosis offers an illogicality: if Hannibal departed in the night, and the Carthaginian garrison joined his troops on

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the march (which is surely the implication of *agmen*), then it is hard to see how they could have done this *ante noctem*; he further observes that the idea of a march being like flight is found elsewhere in L. (e.g. 6.32.10 *fugae simili agmine petunt Antium*). Unfortunately he does not see that his own reading removes an apt variation on this theme ('they followed with a dash that resembled flight'), offers a most improbable idiom (*agmen fugae simile adsequi*, very different from that found at 6.32.10) and makes Hannibal retreat in excessive disorder. Either one should accept the illogicality, or delete *nocte* before *motis*, or emend *ante noctem* (*ante diem*, *ante <finem> noctis*, *ante noctem <mediam>*, *[ante] nocte[m]* [the last in Drakenborch's Lov. 5, the penultimate suggested to me by Professor Reeve] seem possibilities). If F. had read Drakenborch's note on this passage he would not have written *conieci* beside *iuuante nocte*, which Drakenborch reports from three *recentiores*, and which is doubtless found in several more. ***14.10.** *P. Cornelius cum omnibus matronis Ostiam obuiam ire deae iussus isque eam de naue accipere et in terram elatam tradere ferendam matronis.* F. places his conjecture *ibique* for *isque* in the text, but the repetition of *matronis* then becomes rather awkward. *isque*, which contrasts with *P. Cornelius cum omnibus matronis*, is to be explained as 'and he alone (was ordered)'. ***25.1–2.** Both P and Σ (minor corruptions ignored) offer *quantum militum in Africam transportatum sit non paruo numero inter auctores discrepat: alibi decem milia peditum, duo milia et ducentos equites; alibi sedecim milia peditum, mille et sescentos equites, alibi partes plus dimidia rem auctam, quinque et triginta milia peditum equitumque in naues imposita*. Editors agree that a verb is needed to govern *imposita*, and for . . . *equitumque in naues imposita <inuenio>*, conjectured in the 1518 ed. Moguntina, one may compare four places where L. uses *inuenire* with *alibi* (26.49.1–2 *obsides . . . quorum quantas numerus fuerit piget scribere, quippe cum alibi trecentos ferme, alia tria milia septingentos uiginti quattuor fuisse inueniam . . . capta alibi decem milia capitum, alibi supra quinque et uiginti inuenias*, 27.1.13 [*inueniam*], 30.16.12 [*inuenio*]) and some thirty-one other passages where he uses *inuenio* (or, in two instances, the perfect *inueni*) with reference to what he found in his sources. F. conjectures *equitumque inuenias imposita*, arguing that *inuenias* might easily have been corrupted into *in naues*: but (i) *in naues imponere* is very regular in L. (some twenty-one other instances), and one should hesitate before eliminating it by conjecture; and (ii) in this context the first person singular of *inuenire* is regular (see above), the second found only at 26.49.2 (quoted above).

Luchs still dominates the textual study of books 26–30, and his Berlin edition of 1879 remains indispensable. In *recensio* he made the decisive advance of modern times; in *emendatio* he did not possess the divinatory genius of the elder Gronovius or Madvig, but in arbitrating between the rival claims of P and Σ he deployed his outstanding knowledge of Livian idiom (which surpassed even that of such fine contemporary Livian scholars as W. Weissenborn and H. J. Müller) with great effectiveness. In attempting to supersede Luchs the twentieth century has made only fitful progress. The Oxford Classical Text of C-J presents a thoroughly bad text and an uncritical apparatus. Walsh's 1983 and 1986 Teubner editions make an important advance, in that for the first time in the constitution of the text the authority of Σ is given full weight, but their apparatus are gravely defective, and too many of the editor's own conjectures appear in the text. In his use of Σ J. has wisely followed Walsh (but removing some of his conjectures), and thus his text, though (as we have seen) disputable at many points, probably comes as close to what L. wrote as any edition of book 28 yet produced; but he is sometimes careless in constituting his apparatus, and he does not use all the right witnesses. F. offers a better apparatus than J. but is rather more shy with Σ, and hence produces a less good text. I hope to live long enough into the twenty-first century to see the appearance of the edition which these books deserve.

University of Reading S. P. OAKLEY

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ESSAYS FOR ERIC HANDLEY

A. GRIFFITHS (ed.): *Stage Directions: Essays in Ancient Drama in Honour of E. W. Handley.* (Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies, Suppl. 66.) Pp. viii + 160, 12 pls. London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1995. Paper, £25. ISBN: 0-900587-77-6.

If Festschrifts have to exist as a genre, I can think of few more deserving recipients than Eric Handley, a man whose long association with the Institute of Classical Studies has been marked by a rare depth of scholarship, an unswerving and infectious enthusiasm for his subject—or, rather, those many disciplines in which he is equally at home—his perennial willingness to share his expertise with others, and his basic humanity. I say 'if Festschrifts have to exist', since all too often such volumes can become over-inflated collections of such disparate material that few find much of interest within their covers, and even fewer can afford to have them on their shelves, as though the very quantity of paper is meant to demonstrate the standing of the recipient, a final resting place for essays that have languished in bottom drawers, unpublished and otherwise unpublishable. It is all the more heartening, therefore, to see in this tribute to Handley a baker's dozen of articles all linked to one another by their underlying connection with ancient drama, yet even so ranging from representations of pre-dramatic komasts (Axel Seeberg), through the depiction on later ceramics of events associated with scenic performances, their personnel, and effects (C. W. Dearden, A. D. Trendall, J. R. Green), the status of the protagonist (G. M. Sifakis), the interrelationship of genres (John Davidson, Erich Segal), and scrutiny of individual works (Shirley Barlow, Keith Sidwell), to the relationship of stage and audience (Christina Dedoussi), Greek jokes in Roman comedies (Alan Griffiths), the possible cause of dramatic decline in Republican Rome (E. J. D. Jory), and the reason for the disappearance of Menander's plays in late antiquity (Pat Easterling). All this, moreover, in the space of only 160 pages!

Space precludes full discussion of every paper in the volume, but students of the theatre's early history will find some thought-provoking material in Seeberg's 'From Padded Dancers to Comedy', which deals with the interpretation of komasts found on early Corinthian wares—whether they represent public symposia settings and thus some form of proto-dramatic performance. There is always the temptation with this kind of material, where available evidence is marked by its overall paucity, to extend its interpretation beyond what might be justified. It is a temptation I am not sure S. has avoided. In turning to later ceramics, Dearden argues that depictions of a girl dancing on what seems to be part of a potter's wheel in the presence of one or more phlyax actors indicates the possibility of their use in real comic performances, not least those of Aristophanes. More wide-ranging is Green's discussion of theatrical motifs on later fifth- and fourth-century pottery—the significance, for instance, of masks depicted in contexts not connected with performances themselves. This is actually the longest paper in the volume, well argued and with some fine, if rather small-scale, illustrations aptly used to underpin G.'s argument that the mask passed beyond being simply a piece of theatrical equipment to become something of an independent entity. In a similar way the actors themselves developed a rôle outside the theatre proper as companions of Dionysus.

Dealing with the interrelationship of genres is Davidson's 'Homer and Sophocles' *Philoctetes*' and Segal's 'The Comic Catastrophe: An Essay on Euripidean Comedy'. The first compares themes found in the *Odyssey* and Sophocles' play. D. highlights, for

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

instance, the correspondence between the lands of Lemnos and Ithaca, or Lemnos and the island of the Cyclopes, the cave in which Philoctetes lives and that of Polyphemus and others, the motifs of sleep and wakening, young men as companions of Odysseus (Telemachus and Neoptolemus, both advancing on their own journeys to maturity), and the pivotal rôle of the bow. Many of the topics have been touched upon elsewhere, as D. fully acknowledges, and must remain incomplete because of the loss of other potentially relevant texts, but his assemblage of material is extremely useful and very cogently argued. Less overtly plausible perhaps is Segal's offering in which he deals with Euripides' use of comic features in *Ion*, *Helen*, and what remains of *Andromeda*. S. makes a good case for his argument, but to some extent it is an argument that sorely neglects the other side of the coin.

Studies of individual works are provided by Barlow's exposition of *Medea* as a subversive play, showing how the image of Medea established by Chorus and Nurse is undercut by her actions, characterized as they are by 'cool, collected and developed thought' (p. 37): a Medea 'with a mind', not the stereotypical female, subject to her emotions, but one who challenges expectations. It is in this spirit that she is able to manipulate the males around her, who are as blind to the reality of Medea as they are to the reality of the life they impose on their womenfolk. The picture B. presents of Medea is in fact more typical of the epic hero, someone for whom the prospect of ridicule overrides all restraint and permits the worst of atrocities. Yet B. argues that at the end Euripides surprisingly backs away from the full implications of what he has created. True, Medea survives, but she does not escape being a victim of her actions as sympathy swings from her to the plight of Jason and 'popular misogyny, popular chauvinism' (p. 45). The ability of Aristophanes to attack his rivals 'by presenting plays *as though by another poet*' is a theme Sidwell has developed elsewhere in the context of Eupolis. Now Cratinus is subjected to similar treatment in a paper characterized by close argument backed up with footnotes that are at times of Germanic proportions. With characteristic rigour S. first surveys the available evidence for interaction between poets before admitting 'it might seem reckless to attempt to go further' (p. 65), and then proceeds to do just that. The result is cogently formulated, complex, and provocative, but the question of whether the evidence really did allow the conclusions reached is one that kept coming to my mind. What cannot be in doubt, though, is the major contribution S. continues to make to the way we look at the comic playwright. The other contributors to the volume will, I hope, forgive me for not including any detailed consideration of their offerings here. There is so much of interest, so much detail on so many topics, that a full-scale treatment would only divert readers from the immediate message of this notice—to read the collection of essays itself, for this is a worthy tribute to a worthy scholar, a volume where virtually every student of the ancient theatre will find something of value.

University of Warwick STANLEY IRELAND

REVENGE

J. KERRIGAN: *Revenge Tragedy: Aeschylus to Armageddon*. Pp. xviii + 404. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. £40. ISBN: 0-9-8121l86-5.

This is an audacious, wide-ranging, and exciting book. The subtitle is less a postmodern throwaway line than it might seem: this remarkable book considers a vast diversity of material and yet the effect is not one of scattering or randomness

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but one of harnessing all possible (and some almost-impossible) material to the illumination of the central theme of revenge.

It is perhaps inevitable that some readers will find a chapter which, for example, ranges from Aeschylus to *Dracula* to anthropology to horror films alienating, overzealous in an anxiety to please the new academy. I would suggest, however, that they would be quite wrong in so doing. It is the whole achievement of *Revenge Tragedy* to demonstrate that the rigour and erudition of the traditional academy can enrich and develop the expansiveness and energy of the new one. The book is both intellectually surefooted and exciting: old and new material are used with a searching and focused intelligence, so that canonical works, films, and genre fiction work together as the material of K.'s investigations. The juxtapositions which are thus achieved are always points of departure for further possibilities.

Some of the structuring of the book is indeed audacious: there are several chapters which are best approached as meditations on the theme of revenge, meditations which draw on a vast repertory of reading and listening. The very idea of 'revenge' itself is seen, as the book progresses, to open out into ever-wider possibilities, from the restoration of a damaged equilibrium to the mainspring of detective fiction to the conflicts depicted in gender-retribution fiction. In other chapters, the new connections which are set forth between one text and another, one idea and another, function with an almost poetic movement of image and idea. In the best sense, some of the illuminations which K. achieves through the placing of texts and ideas resemble the intuitions more often found in original fiction or verse. It is rare to find a critic who takes so many justified risks, who is always courageously present as the articulating shaper of arguments and chapters.

It is impossible to give a full account of a metamorphic, richly diverse succession of arguments. Again, the analogy with reading original fiction or original verse holds good. There are, however, points which can be extracted to give some indication of the range and diversity of this work. To juxtapose Agamemnon with Dracula may seem at first merely clever, but as K. develops his argument, the whole sense that a death is not a closure within a culture of retribution opens out into a discourse which illuminates and changes any reading of the Greek originals. A good example of the kinds of reward which this book offers is the rich argument that fictions of disclosure from (perhaps) *Zadig* onwards are the revenge dramas of the modern world, and stand in a direct relation to the dramas of revenge of antiquity and of the early-modern period. What is gained here for the reader is a kind of double illumination: a tool for guessing how the *Oresteia* might have affected its original audience, but also an exposition of its inherent seriousness.

The chapter on the figure of Medea is superb, working forward from antiquity to Cherubini's opera and beyond, and in the process offering continual insights to the reader of the classical text, including a subtle and thoughtful reading of Pasolini's film. The analysis here of the icon of Medea (there is some particularly interesting writing on Delacroix's painting) and the iconic Callas, who played the rôle in Pasolini's film, is an example of the breadth of this study functioning at its best. Sensitive to art at all levels and aware of all nuances from the popular anecdote (Callas perceived a certain weight and demeanour as those of 'Medea') to the political encodements with which Pasolini himself weighted the film, to those elements intrinsic to the story which no treatment can avoid, this chapter seems to me to offer a clear example of how the academy might progress in the study of the central works of the traditional canon. There is an unconventional awareness of the 'trivia' of passing culture (later in the book there is a remarkable use of some instances of the trope of revenge by tabloid

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

journalism), but this is assimilated into an argument as dynamic as it is serious in its direction.

Again the treatment of Seneca and the Elizabethans (a subject which some would consider to have been overworked already) offers a remarkable succession of insights and comparisons. The use again of popular material on the classical themes is particularly illuminating. The placing of Jasper Heywood within the subtle moralizing tradition of the Counter-reformation is both timely and illuminating. The treatments of the central text of the book, the 'revenge tragedies' of early-modern England, is sustained and focused, although perhaps of less direct interest to the classically oriented reader. The chapter on Mozartian opera is equally skilled, but again is perhaps of less direct relevance to the classical academy.

I would suggest, however, that no reader can fail to be engaged by the final two chapters. They are entitled 'Medea Variations: Feminism and Revenge' and 'On Aristotle, Violence and Dialogue'. Both chapters offer lucid meditations on how the issues of the tragedies of classical antiquity manifest themselves in the gender-politics and the philosophy of the late twentieth century. They offer a whole series of possibilities for the revaluation of the classical canon. More immediately I would suggest that these closing chapters, and indeed the whole of K.'s remarkable monograph on revenge, offers not only numerous suggestions for further development of his ideas, but also a rich, generous repertory of ideas on which any tutor who is committed to teaching classic texts in the modern academy can draw with benefit and (despite the sombre theme of the book) with real pleasure.

University of Warwick PETER DAVIDSON

LATINITAS

W. M. BLOOMER: *Latinity and Literary Society at Rome*. Pp. viii + 327. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997. Cased. ISBN: 0-8122-3390-5.

Why did Julius Caesar and other politicians spend valuable time writing treatises on grammar? Of what use was Varro's massive work on the history of Latin? What do Seneca's strange collection of declamatory memories and Phaedrus' hybrid book of fables have to tell us about Roman education, ideals of linguistic decorum, and literary audiences? B. has written what might have been an important book on the 'ways Roman literature used representations of and reflections on proper and improper language . . . Latinity emerges not as marble language—the unchanging formal sheen of language and literature—but as an artificial, contested field of identity and social polemic' (p. vii). This is not a new idea, but B. rightly stresses that Latin scholars are frequently trapped by interpretative models of organic development, and by ancient canons of grammar, diction, and style. In reading and assessing ancient literature, we have all too often bought into the standards advocated by writers like Varro, Cicero, Seneca the Elder, or Tacitus, each of whom reflects not the truth about Latin and Latinity, but their own truths, designed to investigate or, more often, to bolster their own sociopolitical or cultural prescriptions and ideologies. So, for instance, B. argues that the treatment of set declamatory themes in the Elder Seneca 'explores not so much linguistic or legal possibilities . . .

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as social responsibilities and allegiances . . . [The declaimers'] innovations do not consider novel legal interpretation but rival ways to evaluate . . . motives and behavior' (p. 140). He is interested as much in what the texts say as in how they say it; so in the *Satyricon* he analyses the way the freedmen deploy syntax 'as a domineering, sexual instrument of social control' (p. 211), and looks at the figure of Trimalchio as the 'channeler and interpreter of speech and signs' (p. 228). He uses theory, especially the work of Bourdieu and of sociolinguistics, pervasively and without jargon; the integration of modern approaches and philological reading is particularly successful.

But the book is seriously flawed by what I can only assume to be carelessness. It may be pedantry to register misspellings of names (so 'Willamowitz,' p. 131) or typographical errors (of which there are, in fact, few—but in the Latin, for *alterum* read *alteram* [Tac. *A*. 1.23, twice on p. 178], and for *strennus* read *strenuus* [p. 187]). But we are told that Livy wrote 126 books (pp. 44 and 251 n. 13), that Virgil was born a Paduan (p. 45), that it was Arminius who called what the Romans achieved 'desolation not peace' (p. 176), that Tiberius speaks to the senate 'for the dead Germanicus' at Tac. *A*. 1.52 (p. 283 n. 14), and that Sulla was Marius' praetor (p. 306 n. 83). On p. 174, *A*. 1.11.3 *in questus lacrimas uota* is conflated with *A*. 1.7.1 *lacrimas gaudium questus adulationem*, with the result that we are told that 1.8 is the next paragraph after 1.11. Such confusion, together with contradiction, reigns throughout the book. So e.g. p. 38, on Crates' broken leg, 'This inaugural story for Western philosophy'—but p. 40, 'However, like Crates's accident, Varro's work is no pivotal moment in the story of philology'. Argumentation is, on the whole, far too sloppy. 'The storm of the *Aeneid*' (by which I assume B. means that in book 1) is introduced on p. 187 with no warning—was an explanatory sentence cut or never written? On p. 56, in what was to me the least clear chapter in the book (frustratingly, as Varro warrants more discussion than he gets), B. discusses *Ling. lat*. 5.53, in which Varro cites unnamed *alii* twice and finishes by saying *eundum hunc locum* [sc. *Palatium*] *a pecore dictum putant quidam; itaque Naevius Balatium appellat*. B.'s analysis: 'The poet's *figura etymologica* comes last, disparaged perhaps by the final *quidam* (people whose names do not matter).' No argument for such a use of *quidam*; no mention that *alii . . . alii* occurred just above (apparently without disparagement); and no awareness that the poet is precisely the one person whose name is given, as one—presumably—of the *quidam*. Claudius Quadrigarius and Livy's stories of Manlius and the Gaul are alleged (p. 183) 'to provide arguments and diction for Germanicus' speech' at Tac. *A*. 2.14, but the only example given—termed 'description straight from the prior historians'—is that Germanicus claims there will be no immense shields or unwieldy spears in the forest (*immensa barborum* [sic] *scuta, enormis hastas*). But neither Livy's nor Claudius' Gaul has a *hasta* (he prefers a sword), and his *scutum* has no epithet, being described only as *proiectum*; further, both prior historians make the point that the Gaul takes a position from which Manlius has to dislodge him (e.g. Claud. 10b Peter *ita . . . constiterunt . . . statum Galli conturbauit*; Livy 7.10.9 *ubi constitere*)—*contra* B.: 'The barbarian, encumbered with massive shield, is never allowed room to station himself.' Much of this may stem from a failure to revise a preliminary version adequately (the impression of haste is increased by the fact that much of the last chapter does not benefit from B.'s accurate and helpful translations of the Latin he quotes). Repetition is pervasive: the worst case is Sen. *C*. 9.2.24, cited no fewer than three times in seven pages, each time in support of the same point. Finally, the bibliography has some major, and perplexing, omissions (e.g. Pelling on Germanicus, Sinclair or Plass on *sententiae*,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

McCulloch on narrative causation—to pick just three relevant items not in the chapter on Tacitus).

Sections of the chapters on Tacitus, Petronius, and Seneca the Elder, and the whole treatment of Phaedrus, are challenging and illuminating. But the pervasive logical confusion, careless writing, and errors of fact compromise B.'s authority. It is hard to know what to trust, especially where one is not an expert on a given topic. Specialist and non-specialist readers alike will need to approach this innovative and often thought-provoking work with caution.

Oriel College, Oxford CHRISTINA S. KRAUS

FABLES

J. G. M. VAN DIJK: *AINOI, ΛΟΓΟΙ, ΜΥΘΟΙ*: *Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature. With a Study of the Theory and Terminology of the Genre*. (Mnemosyne, Suppl. 166.) Pp. xxx + 683. Leiden, New York, and Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1997. ISBN: 90-04-10747-9.

The ancient fable has for decades now been the poor relation amongst research topics in the classics. This is particularly true of the English-writing world, where nothing of note has been published since B. E. Perry's studies appeared, the most important of these being his edition of *Aesopica* in 1952. Now, however, we have once again, in the shape of D.'s book, an exhaustive opus on the fable, one which continues the work of interpreting and editing the texts and thus maintaining the high standards set by Perry. D. analyses meticulously all fables which appear as *exempla* in extant Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek literature—both those actually cited in full and those merely alluded to—and also offers a new edition of each of the texts he discusses. Taking into account modern attempts to define the genre and analysing any theories voiced by ancient authors on the subject, along with the terminology they used, D. has laid a firmer foundation than any fable scholar before him for his own definition. His book virtually represents (even if D. does not say so) the first volume of a monumental work which would combine a history of the genre in antiquity with systematic interpretations of all relevant texts.

D. rightly remains quite faithful to a definition of the genre which Perry too found most cogent—that of Theon (*Prog*. 3; in D. p. 408, text G 20c)—and describes the fable simply as 'a fictitious, metaphorical narrative' (p. 113). This leaves him a certain amount of leeway in his decision as to which of the short narratives, or of the references to such, used in Greek literature from Homer to the end of the Hellenistic period to illustrate specific thoughts, can be labelled 'fable' and which not. D. arrives at a total of fifty-six fable texts and thirty allusions to such (cf. the synopsis, pp. 389–99). This represents considerable progress in comparison with all previous attempts to register the texts. He has judiciously furnished all texts with a sort of code number; Hesiod's only fable (= F; A = allusion, T = testimony, G = genre theory), for example, is tagged 'Hes. 2F1', being discussed in section 2 of D.'s chapter on fables in epic. The indices offer a concordance of these and the numbers found in other standard fable editions, a list of motifs indicating which fable uses each, and an *index locorum* showing which passages from ancient authors correspond to D.'s own numbers. Unfortunately—and somewhat frustratingly—there is no straightforward

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

index that does not rely on the complicated coding system to tell readers where to find any mention of given texts, passages, etc. In order to find anything one has to thumb back and forth and can never be quite sure that one has seen everything that D. has to say on any given point.

D.'s central aim is to examine all the fable texts and allusions collected in his book according to various aspects, analysing their function within the verse and prose texts in which they are embedded; to do so he arranges the fables according to 'host' genre, rather than proceeding chronologically. Unlike his predecessors, who mostly looked at the 'extra-collectional' fables separately, D. reaches some very valuable conclusions about the 'manifold intertextual and metaphorical relationships between the fable and its context' (p. xv). He shows again and again that a fable can be of particular significance for the interpretation of the work in which it is included (e.g. pp. 270–4 on the fable Hdt. 1.141.1–2, which 'helps to tie together the two digressions framing it and the central theme of the *Histories*'). D. is quite at home with the methods of modern criticism and is thus able to offer important new findings even in texts that have in the past already been examined thoroughly a number of times, e.g. Hes. *Op*. 202–12 (pp. 127–34).

It is, of course, the fable scholars who will profit more from these findings, rather than those interested in the contexts. D.'s definition of the genre may be correct from a modern point of view, but it will probably not always have been valid in antiquity, and certainly not familiar to all authors who quote fables. This makes itself felt at the end of D.'s book in his appendix 'Non-fables and Non-allusions' (pp. 631–83), which leaves some question marks. Included here is, for example, the story of Thales, who falls into a well while walking about and stargazing (Plat. *Tht*. 174a). D. classifies it as an anecdote, while he acknowledges Aes. 40 Perry, where the same fate befalls a nameless ἀστρολόγος, as a fable. Yet Socrates uses the Thales story as he would a fable—to illustrate a point—and, like Aes. 40, its structure is typical for the genre; it even has a *survenant* to offer. If D. had classed this and other narrative inserts according to such external characteristics, he would have had to shorten his list of 'non-fables'. Anyone analysing systematically Plato's method of exemplification by way of narrative illustration will be disappointed here.

How heavily the definition of the genre can depend on an author who tells fables becomes particularly obvious when we look at the *Aesopus Latinus* in the *Codex Wissemburgensis* version. The author who, around 350 A.D., turned fables of Phaedrus into Latin prose picked only (with one exception: 4.1 = 60 Thiele) stories in which at least one animal (or alternatively inanimate being) appears. This is the first sign of a tendency to define the fable as animal fable, and we see this again in the *Aesopus Latinus* of 'Romulus' (before 500 A.D.), a text which, because it opens Heinrich Steinhöwel's *Esopus* of 1476/77—a book that was to be reprinted over 200 times and translated into a variety of European languages—was crucial in the shaping of modern conceptions of the fable. Had D. followed the generic definition favoured by the *Aesopi Latini*, he would have had to extend his list of 'non-fables'. However, even if D.'s criteria for classification are not going to please all of his readers all of the time, his interpretations of the texts he does acknowledge as fables will most certainly achieve this. The sequel announced in his introduction (p. xx)—to be an examination of the 'extra-collectional' fables from Imperial times—gives us something to look forward to in the next millennium.

University of Munich NIKLAS HOLZBERG

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

READER'S DIGEST

G. SCHMELING (ed.): *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Pp. x + 876, maps. Leiden, New York, and Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1996. Cased, $251. ISBN: 90-04-09630-2.

This is a good and useful collection, and one that should certainly be purchased by libraries and individuals who can afford it. Readers who know nothing about the ancient Latin and Greek novel will discover here all the basic information. Professionals will find on the whole good discussions of all aspects by the relevant experts in particular areas. Unsurprisingly, this is not a volume which advances many new positions. Rather, that sense of assurance which is the product of (in most cases) several decades of work is to be found in abundance. Sometimes the result is an understandable brevity, but most authors have been well behaved and have given us material of the requisite quality.

S. himself should be congratulated for the successful organization of a lengthy tome (the work is already known by his name). The division of labour is essentially in three. The first eleven chapters form a general section. Niklas Holzberg tackles the important question of definition of the novel by arguing for a very inclusive categorization (which reflects his own extensive interests), even if most ancient readers 'certainly remained unaware' of any such thing. Consuelo Ruiz-Montero follows with an informative and learned discussion of the 'rise of the Greek novel', covering genre (not in as much detail as H.) and the various literary traditions that feed into the novels, such as utopian fiction, historiography, drama (including New Comedy), epic, Alexandrian elegaic/love poetry, and also investigates the formal rhetorical background of the novel's period of production, the influence of older near-eastern fiction, and the much debated question of whether the novels are religious texts (particularly of eastern cults). Finally R.-M. comments on the crucial 'social context' of the novel, hailing Perry as the first to identify the importance of this (in fact it was Rohde). Ewen Bowie follows with his important (and to my mind correct) analysis of the readership of the Greek novel (a fairly narrow educated élite). Graham Anderson next offers a taste of his numerous contributions to novel studies, focusing on popular storytelling elements. He is followed in Chapter 6 by a useful piece from Alain Billault on the basics of characterization, again concentrating on the Greek tales. Apuleius at least gets a look in in Roger Beck's balanced assessment of the debate about the novels' religious charge, in which he finally (like many others) comes down against the sophisticated imaginings of Reinhold Merkelbach. Women loom large in the Greek novel and their rôle is explored by Renate Johne in the book's longest chapter (featuring a cameo from Apuleius). Heinrich Kuch and Antonio Scarcella follow in their primary areas of expertise, the role of barbarians and a lengthy piece on social and economic affairs. Finally Massimo Fusillo explores with his usual flair the gains for the ancient novel from modern literary criticism, including narratology of story and narrative (with a good dose of 'Genettics', to use Ewen Bowie's pun), reader-response theory, psychoanalytical readings, and post-structuralist theories (including feminist approaches, history of sexuality).

At the end of his intelligent survey of recent approaches to the novel (*CPh* 91 [1996], 63–73) John Morgan wonders if theoretical approaches are now waning. Bryan Reardon, musing on the location of the next International Conference on the Ancient Novel (ICAN III), asks if it will be 'Theoretical, like much of ICAN II [or *s*]*treng philologisch*'?' (*PSN* 26 [1996], 6). Theoretical approaches may only survive if the

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ancient novel successfully enters the modern literary academy. Whatever their future, they will always need traditional interpretation and elucidation. The second part of S. offers just that with individual studies of Chariton (Bryan Reardon), Xenophon (Bernhard Kytzler), Longus (the quasi-modish Richard Hunter), Achilles Tatius (Karl Plepelits), Heliodorus (John Morgan), Petronius (S. himself), Apuleius (Stephen Harrison), and *Apollonius King of Tyre* (S. himself). The aim of these discussions is to summarize the plot, to provide information about transmission, to tackle the essential questions of date and place, of religious and spiritual concerns, of language and style, of sources, and the relationship to other (novelistic) fiction, and in some cases to comment on the *Nachleben*. It seems unlikely that this volume would be read at one go, but if it were, the variation between each of these sections, whether by design or accident, is some relief to the burden of information. Occasionally even radical ideas are advanced, such as Harrison's that Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* parodies Aelius Aristides' *Sacred Tales*. Most are content with some kind of orthodoxy (not necessarily the same one), though each has his own angle (e.g. S.'s plausible view that *Apollonius King of Tyre* is an original Latin novel, not a translation from the Greek).

The question of why the Latin novel consists only of three utterly dissimilar texts is one that might have been explored somewhere among the Roman authors. As it is, the rest of the volume luxuriates in studies of the numerous mostly Greek novel-like works of extended prose fiction: Lucian's *True History* (Anderson), Dictys and Dares (Stephan Merkle), Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* (Bodil Due)—why is this work included?—the development of the Alexander legend (Richard Stoneman), Philostratus' *Apollonius* (Anderson), a ragbag of authors from Euhemerus to Dio (Holzberg). It is a relief to move on to Susan Stephen's survey of the many short fragments of Greek novels surviving on papyrus. Yet there is more: Richard Pervo on Christian fiction and Roderick Beaton on the late Byzantine novel, Gerald Sandy on the Greek novel's *Nachleben* in the British and French novel, M. Futre Pinheiro on the same in sixteenth-century Iberian literature. Finally the volume is graced with twelve maps, several of which appear to have nothing to do with it at all, and a lengthy bibliography (also available in cyberspace).

Warwick SIMON SWAIN

CONSTRUCTING HEROES

J. ALVAR, J. M. BLÁZQUEZ (edd.): *Héroes y Antihéroes en la Antigüedad Clásica* (Historia, Serie Menor). Pp. 332. Madrid: Cátedra, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 84-376-1505-4.

The book is the result of a group of lectures delivered in the summer school in the University of Complutense in Madrid. There are fourteen papers based on the subject of heroes and antiheroes in antiquity. It covers a wide historical period from the heroes of the Greek period and the Roman Empire to the Christian era. It is centred mainly on military and political persons, rather than on mythical or legendary figures.

The book principally studies ancient historiography and its methodology. Alvar's article on Hannibal expresses the aim and guiding principles of the book, which is 'not to restore the past, but to reflect on the procedures which others have employed' (p. 138). In other words, the book studies the methods of ancient historiography. It

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

focuses in particular on the complex ways in which history constructs its heroes and their anti-types. The articles are very different from each other in style and approach, and each one has its own particular subject. However, the common aim of the articles is to show the complexity of how the image of a hero is created and the political issues which are involved in the creation of a heroic character. It also explores the way in which history constructs the images of the hero and anti-hero which contemporary' society requires.

The book begins with mythological heroes. Blázquez's article studies the depiction in Roman mosaics from Spain (IV–V A.D.) of mythological scenes from the youth and education of Achilles, and of mythological stories from the life of Paris. López's article about Melquart (the Phoenician god-hero) and Herakles focuses on the official use of the hero in the foundation of colonies in the extreme West, and studies the iconographical depictions of both heroes in Hispanic coins.

Plácido's article introduces the subject of the hero and the state. With the figures of Socrates and the Sophists, it studies the impact of philosophical ideas on democracy. The book goes on to focus on political figures. Lozanos's article shows how, in the person of Alexander, a political figure acquires semi-divine attributes and religious power.

Martinez-Pinna's article studies the myth of the foundation of Rome which created a paradigm for the Latin hero: his bucolic nature, the first years of his life away in the countryside, and his capacity for divinization. Roldan's article on Cicero and Catiline studies the political atmosphere before the Catilinarian conspiracy. Santos's article studies Trajan and Nero, and offers a wide documentation to see both characters from different perspectives and inside their historical context.

Gascó's article changes the view of the hero from people to cities. He studies how Lucian, in his work about Nigrinus, shows Greece as a model of virtue against Roman vice. He also studies the work of Lucian against Alexander of Abonuteichos and his oracle, pointing out how the religion of Alexander was based on the philosophical background of his time, rescuing him from being the anti-hero described by Lucian.

Following this religious focus Piñero's article develops the figure of Christ as a spiritual guide whose authority does not come from political power, showing the opposite process from the case of Alexander (Lozano's article). Julian and Theodosius, in the article of Santos Yanguas, are used to show how Christianity, by the manipulation of historical evidence, constructs the image of Theodosius as a hero.

Gracco's article develops the theme of the reversal of how an anti-hero of the past is transformed by history into a hero of the present. Mangas's article presents a critique on the method of how ancient tradition studies the relationship between Germanicus and Tiberius. Finally, Gasperini's article returns to the subject of mythology with which the book begins. It studies the figures of Battus and Taras—two foundational heroes of Cyrene and Tarentum respectively—in epigraphical documents and in inscriptions discovered recently in Cyrene.

This is an erudite book which presents the interrelation of the hero and his antagonist, and is successful in avoiding polarity. For this purpose it makes use of a wide range of documentation for the figures which it studies. The reader obtains a full view of the positive and negative aspects of the characters in relation to their historical period and the future transformation of their images. Literary and philosophical documents, and archaeological remains are studied in great depth in relation to the configuration of the image of the hero. This is a good book, which gives

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a lot of information about the history of politics and religious ideas to the general reader and to the specialist.

University of Warwick CARLA BOCCHETTI

CONSTRUCTING THESEUS

C. CALAME: *Thésée et l'imaginaire athénien: Légende et culte en Grèce antique* (Sciences Humaines). Pp. 491. Lausanne: Editions Payot, 1996 (2nd edn. revised and corrected). Paper, Sw. frs. 50. ISBN: 2-601-03175-1.

What is the relationship between myth and ritual? This is the question to which C. addresses himself in this book, now in its second edition, corrected and updated with references to work that has appeared since 1990 and with a new index. He does so first by means of a long theoretical introduction ('lecture ardue certes, mais enrichissante', as Pierre Vidal-Naquet acknowledges in his preface), and then by a detailed analysis of the legends and cults associated with Theseus.

The theoretical approach adopted by C. is one influenced in particular by the idea of the 'schéma narratif structurale' of A. J. Greimas and also by his own anthropological inquiries in Papua New Guinea. Myth and ritual are seen, together with figurative art, as two manifestations of the same 'processus d'élaboration intellectuelle' or 'processus symbolique'. There can be a relationship between the two, but to attempt to establish the priority of myth or ritual is futile. Moreover, the relationship is not a necessary one (pp. 50, 169): that the Greeks, starting with Herodotus, began to explain ritual in terms of myth (pp. 26, 164–5)—albeit, C. claims, without any firm concept of the *aition*—was not inevitable; myths, equally, can exist without the support of rituals.

C.'s 'semio-narrative' approach structures his whole work: his treatment of the myths and rituals associated with Theseus takes place in turn through an 'analyse syntaxique' (Chapters II and III) and an 'analyse sémantique' (Chapters IV and V), a procedure that inevitably leads to a certain amount of repetition of material. Chapter II follows Theseus' career along the thread (the analogy is C.'s) provided by Plutarch's life. Variant versions of each main episode are exhaustively inventoried. Chapter III then looks at the links between these myths and cults founded by Theseus, both Attic and island cults, and Chapter IV looks at the 'isotopes' (distinct from themes) underlying first the actions of the mythical figures (e.g. initiation, legitimacy, sexuality, the exercise of power) and then the rôle of the gods and their locations (e.g. Poseidon and the sea). In the lengthy Chapter V, C. puts the cults of Theseus into their spatial setting and into the context of an Attic ritual calendar determined by the 'isotopie alimentaire' of the development of a civilized diet.

Only in the last chapter (VI) does C. introduce a diachronic perspective into his analysis, tracing the gradual Athenian appropriation of Theseus and the transfers of emphasis from one strand of Theseus' myth to another, from his first emergence in Greek literature down to his transformation into the embodiment of an ideal of meritocratic democracy in the fourth century. Highlights in this process of 'resémantisation' are the new stress in the late sixth century on Theseus' journey from Troezen to Athens, the function of Athenian territorial preoccupations, and the development, inspired by Athens' naval empire, of Theseus' marine adventures in

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Crete, Delos, and Naxos: the Minoan thalassocracy, for example, is seen as the mirror or the 'prefiguration of Athens' naval hegemony' (p. 426). C. sees the role of individuals in this process of myth-making as minimal (though cf. p. 448): the intervention of Cimon serves only to crystallize 'les convergences et les virtualités d'un récit en gestation depuis de nombreuses années' (p 441). While this blurring is a welcome relief from discussions which envisage myths as a form of political resource easily converted into votes, the question of how precisely political figures such as Cimon contributed to the development of Theseus' myth deserves rather more discussion. In his concluding remarks on the relationship of myth and ritual (summarized at pp. 446–9), C. avoids any glib universal formulation. Myth is 'decidedly not' the *legomenon* to the *dromenon* of ritual. Whether a ritual has reoriented a myth or vice versa is difficult to determine; rather, simply the 'processus symbolique' has acted upon both ritual and myth as a result of the same historical and ideological circumstances: myth and ritual 'mettent en scène le processus de la production de la culture'.

Such conclusions, after the fanfare of the introduction, leave the reader still hungry. The strength of this book lies in its detailed analyses. However, with the pattern-making that puts Theseus 'outside of the norm' spatially, juridically, and socially (p. 70), or which creates the metaphorical connection between the 'maturation' of plants and the 'maturation civique' of young men (p. 448) and with the 'spatialisation' of Attic cult that culminates in a picture of Athens as six concentric circles, not just a bipolarity but a hexapolarity (pp. 371–2), this is not a work that is likely to convert the uninitiated: some index of that is its negligible impact on two recent works in English, H. J. Walker's *Theseus and Athens* (New York, 1995) and Sophie Mills's *Theseus, Tragedy and the Athenian Empire* (Oxford, 1997).

University College London THOMAS HARRISON

MAGNUM MYSTERIUM

A. C. CASSIO, P. POCCETTI (edd.): *Forme di religiosità e tradizioni sapienzali in Magna Grecia. Atti del convegno, Napoli 14–15 dicembre 1993*. (Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli, Sezione Filologico-Letteraria, 16.) Pp. 217, 3 pls. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 1994. Paper. ISBN: 88-8147-085-3.

This collection of conference papers takes as its theme the diffusion and distribution of mystery cults and philosophical movements in the Greek colonies of southern Italy. Its stated aim is to examine which Greek mystery cults and forms of belief were adopted in Italy, how they were transmitted, and what impact they had on the non-Greek populations of the hinterland. Further to this, it also seeks to examine philosophical movements which were either prominent in the western colonies or which originated there, with a view to establishing whether a specifically western Greek philosophical tradition ever emerged. As with many collections of conference papers, the reality does not quite live up to these ambitious aims, and there is little sense of any clear conclusions emerging from the volume. However, this is not

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to denigrate either the individual papers, which highlight some important and interesting aspects of the subject, or the theme, which is an important one in the history of the western Greeks, and which fully deserves to be addressed.

As is almost inevitable with collected conference papers, the coverage of the subject is not entirely even. The emphasis is strongly on mystery cults and evidence for religious belief, with philosophy definitely taking a back seat. The contributions by Sassi and Breglia Pulci Doria are the only items devoted primarily to the philosophical aspect of the theme, although the paper by Giangiulio touches in some respects on Pythagoreanism. Almost inevitably the philosophical contributions are dominated by the influence of Pythagoras and his beliefs, but none of them fully explain why this should be so pervasive in the western Mediterranean. Giangiulio's exploration of the links between certain Apollo cults, notably at Croton and Metapontum, and Pythagorean belief is intriguing, but given the prevalence of cults of Apollo in Greek colonial society it does not entirely explain why certain communities took to Pythagorean beliefs so readily. Similarly, Breglia Pulci Doria's paper on cults of the Sirens gives some intriguing insights into their relation with Delphi and Pythagoreanism, but looks at these more as a general phenomenon, without relating them to their western context. In contrast, Cerri's contribution on the cult of Leucothea is more specific, and aims to clarify the whereabouts of this particular Siren cult. Perhaps the most wide-ranging of this group of papers is that of Sassi, who puts forward the suggestion that, far from being divergent philosophical traditions, the so-called 'Ionic' and 'Italian' philosophical traditions were not that different in essence. The polarization is explained as an artificial division imposed in the first instance by ancient authors such as Diogenes Laertius, and then by Renaissance humanists.

On the whole, the coverage of mystery cults is rather stronger than the coverage of philosophy, with papers falling into two main groups—exploration of the significance of particular cults in the west, and consideration of detailed problems posed by particular cult institutions or texts. Importantly, most contributions seek to place the history of mystery cults in Magna Graecia in the context of wider developments in Italy, rather than isolating the issues as something peculiar to the Greek communities. Poccetti, for instance, stresses that the initiatory nature of mystery cults has the effect of loosening them from the context of the *polis* and 'internationalizing' them, allowing them to take in initiates from beyond the confines of the state, and even from other ethnic backgrounds. In support of this, he identifies the influence of Bacchic cults, Orphic cults, and the cults of Demeter and Persephone as attested in a series of Oscan inscriptions from Campania and Lucania. Similar problems of cross-cultural influences are addressed by Lazzarini, through examination of a specific text, and Dubois, through the much-debated office of *laukelarchos* at Naples. Lazzarini's *defixio* comes from Calabria and is Greek in its religious terms and in language, but is the product of a Bruttian community and is aimed at a group of individuals whose names are Oscan. Dubois argues that the title of *laukelarchos* derives from the Italic *loukos* or *lucus*, thus identifying this person as the custodian of a sacred grove. All three papers underline the necessity of addressing the Italic background to the cities of Magna Graecia, as well as the panhellenic angles stressed by Giangiulio, and also by Casadio in his impressive and useful collection of the literary and archaeological sources for Dionysiac cults in the west.

Despite some unevenness of coverage of the subject, this is a stimulating collection of papers which will make the history of the cults and intellectual traditions of Magna

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Graecia much more accessible, and give valuable insights into the impact of these cults on both Greek and Italic communities.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne KATHRYN LOMAS

EARLY GREEK PHILOSOPHY

C. C. W. TAYLOR (ed.): *Routledge History of Philosophy I: From the Beginning to Plato*. Pp. xxvi + 494. London and New York: Routledge, 1997. £55. ISBN: 0-415-06272-1.

This new series, the Routledge History of Philosophy, joins the long parade of general reference works and histories like the Cambridge Companions and the various Encyclopedias and Dictionaries of Philosophy. It provides a chronological survey of the history of philosophy, which is aimed at both general readers and specialists. By way of general orientation this volume contains a good chronology extending from 776 B.C.E. to the death of Plato in 347, a list of sources and a glossary (which are too brief), and indexes of topics and names, as well as an *index locorum*.

The twelve contributors are indeed 'recognized authorities', as advertised, but the division of topics and the focus of individual chapters are open to question. Three general themes which receive insufficient attention, in my view, are the religious dimension of ancient philosophy, certain scientific topics (especially in biology and medicine), and both the literary aspect of philosophical texts and the treatment of philosophical issues in Greek literature. Robin Osborne's 'The *Polis* and its Culture' is an erudite general introduction to early Greek culture, especially literature and politics. He addresses important themes such as social conflict and the problem of authority in Homer, Hesiod's cosmogony/theogony, and the sociopolitical context in archaic Greece, including the relationship between law and literacy. Excessive time is spent on summaries of the Homeric poems and on religious ritual and festivals, and not enough on religious ideas or on the moral issues which arise in archaic literature.

Malcolm Schofield's 'The Ionians' recapitulates many of the claims advanced in his contribution to *The Presocratic Philosophers* (Cambridge, 1983): Anaximenes is much more important than his predecessors in several respects; Anaximander's ἄπειρον is 'between the elements' rather than the 'mixture' of all things' (p. 61); and Xenophanes marks 'the transition from Milesian cosmology to the metaphysical and epistemological orientation shared by Heraclitus and Parmenides' (p. 79). Catherine Osborne comments on every aspect of Heraclitus' thought, which is impressive in itself given the enormous range of his interests and his obscurity. Unfortunately, some themes are handled rather superficially, most notably the soul fragments, but also Heraclitus' cosmology and his critique of Ionian cosmology. As in her book, *Rethinking Early Greek Philosophy* (London, 1987), she usefully emphasizes the importance for understanding Heraclitus of reading the contexts within which a saying is quoted. She also rightly claims that thought, language, and belief are context-dependent and that names and significations are polyvalent. Too often, however, she invokes these general points as if they constitute a satisfactory explanation. An example is the anemic interpretation of fr. 32: 'One, alone, the wise, likes and dislikes to be spoken of by the name of Zeus'. Her invocation of the

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ambiguity of naming merely restates the problem, which must be addressed by discussion of different levels of religious truth.

Edward Hussey's chapter on the Pythagoreans and Eleatics is a mixed bag: an embarrassingly inadequate summary of Pythagoreanism (three pages), a compressed but excellent analysis of Zeno's paradoxes, and a satisfactory but disappointing discussion of Parmenides. In his twenty-one pages on Parmenides Hussey goes for the veridical interpretation of *ἐ̂ναι*. But why dismiss other construals of the verb as 'exotic'? Exotic students of Parmenides can also justly complain that their hero is reduced in stature if the only objects of knowledge are 'necessary truths' as Hussey asserts (p. 146). M. R. Wright makes the case—employing bald summary with too many quotations—for the importance of Empedocles by arguing that the Sicilian's theories often anticipate modern science in remarkable ways. Other interests are largely ignored; on which see now Peter Kingsley's excellent *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery, and Magic: Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition* (Cambridge, 1995). (Her bibliography is slim and, remarkably, there are no footnotes.) In thirty pages C. C. W. Taylor, in perhaps the volume's best chapter, provides a marvelously clear and comprehensive explication of Anaxagoras and the atomists, and a bold reading of Anaxagoras' mixture. He argues that A. 'drew no systematic distinction between stuffs and qualities' and hence that the mixture of everything in everything is not limited to qualities, i.e. the opposites. On Anaxagorean *νοῦς* he too cautiously rejects the possibility that its omnipresence adumbrates immateriality. (It is unclear why Parmenides and the atomists do not receive separate chapters, given their importance.)

G. B. Kerferd's chapter is an informative survey of the major sophists Protagoras, Gorgias, Prodicus, Hippias, and Antiphon, with an additional four pages on the lesser sophists. Then comes a brilliant thematic chapter by Ian Mueller on Greek mathematics and harmonics from Thales to Plato. Primary topics are Euclid's *Elements*, the five geometric solids, Theaetetus' contributions to mathematics and harmonics, Pythagorean mathematics, and Hippasus' discovery of incommensurability. The only weakness here is that much of the discussion is too technical for the general reader (including this reviewer).

The volume concludes with four chapters on facets of Plato's philosophy: 'Socrates and the Beginnings of Moral Philosophy' by Hugh Benson, 'Plato: Metaphysics and Epistemology' by Robert Heinaman, 'Plato: Ethics and Politics' by A. W. Price, and 'Plato: Aesthetics and Psychology' by Christopher Rowe. Except for Benson's, these chapters contain inadequate bibliographies. Benson is a prominent advocate of the Vlastovian approach to the early dialogues, which sees them as representing the views of the historical Socrates. Along with Taylor's and Mueller's, this is one of the best chapters in the volume, but, despite the vigour and clarity of the exposition, the narrowness of focus in a survey of this kind is disappointing. Benson is content to explicate the craft-analogy and moral expertise, and how Socrates' commitment to them sets him apart from 'folk psychology'. Thus, except for brief and often illuminating remarks in the notes, he largely ignores questions about happiness, Eros, politics, and religion. Heinaman's contribution is informative but predictable and unexciting. His is an analytical and non-contextual approach to central metaphysical and epistemological problems in Plato. The first author quoted is, therefore, Aristotle, on universals and definitions; the first dialogue quoted is the *Parmenides*. Platonic motivations for seeking out transcendent forms in the middle dialogues should be more central. Inordinate attention is devoted to the later dialogues, while *Phaedo*, *Symposium*, and *Republic* are barely mentioned. His assessment of Plato's epistemology is limited to recollection in the *Meno* and *Phaedo* and the inquiries of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the *Theaetetus*, but he is silent, again, on the *Republic*. Price's brilliantly written essay takes up Socrates' defense of justice and proposals for reorganizing society in the *Republic*. The focus here is perhaps too narrow but Price knows how to turn a phrase: 'Recent writers, tired of debating whether Plato avoids fascism, debate tirelessly whether he achieves feminism' (p. 410). Price is brief but rewarding on central aspects of moral psychology (Eros, egoism, and altruism)—more so, at any rate, than Christopher Rowe, who was assigned the topic. While Rowe adequately summarizes many of the key arguments in psychology and aesthetics he ignores the myths of the afterlife and does not discuss sufficiently the ultimate destiny of the soul. Plato's critique of poets and mimetic poetry in *Ion* and *Republic* is ably presented and Rowe profitably inquires which part of the soul responds emotionally to poetic representations. He promotes the view that Plato tests ideas in different literary and dramatic contexts, and thus we should not look too hard for consistency among views in different dialogues. But this principle can be overindulged, as when he suggests that Plato seems less committed to the soul's immortality in the later dialogues or when he discerns significant disagreement between *Phaedrus* and *Republic* on the character of reason's desire for the good.

University of New Mexico JOHN BUSSANICH

PARMENIDES AND MONISM

P. CURD: *The Legacy of Parmenides. Eleatic Monism and Later Presocratic Thought*. Pp. x + 280. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998. Cased, £32.50/$45. ISBN: 0-691-01182-6.

The standard view—call it 'M'—is that Parmenides was a monist: his *Truth* attempts to prove by pure reason that there exists only one real entity, a perfect plenum, eternal, changeless, motionless. But there have for some time been rumblings of discontent with the consensus. And now C. has written a monograph calling it in question and offering an alternative story.

C.'s challenge to M has three main strands. (1) M makes Parmenides' principal philosophical thesis an existential claim. But thirty years' work on ἔστι has shown that in early Greek down to Plato the verb has mostly veridical or predicational functions, not existential (C. is here as elsewhere particularly indebted to A. P. D. Mourelatos, *The Route of Parmenides*). (2) M excludes the possibility of according any kind of truth to belief in the changing world of the senses. Unsurprisingly adherents of M have been unable to give a satisfactory explanation of why in that case Parmenides presented a detailed cosmology in the second part of his poem. (3) Later Presocratic cosmologists—Anaxagoras, Empedocles, the atomists—all take pains to devise systems which accommodate fundamental Parmenidean axioms, notably the requirement that ultimate realities cannot come into being or perish. None of them registers any awareness of a need to defend the very idea of a *pluralist* system against M.

So M, according to C., is highly problematic. In its place she proposes a Parmenides much closer to his philosophical predecessors as well as his successors: a thinker who does not outlaw pluralist cosmology but articulates stringent conditions for doing it properly. The key idea is what C. calls 'predicational monism' ('P' for short). She reads Parmenides fr. 8 as arguing that whatever is is essentially just one thing: 'should it be F, it is all and only F with no possibility that it can also be G' (p. 68). This is the notion Parmenides is expressing when he states that what is is μουνογενές. It is the same

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

notion as Plato would introduce when he characterizes e.g. the Form of Beauty as μονοειδές. Indeed Plato's Forms, being also eternal and unchangeable, are according to C. conceived by Plato precisely as satisfying Parmenides' conditions for true being. And on her reading the hypothesis of a plurality of Forms is entirely consistent with P, which does not rule on *what* exists. There is nothing un-Parmenidean in positing that there is an F itself *and* a G itself. What does follow from P is that the F itself must be all and only F, not also G, and the G itself all and only G, not also F. Of course, the theory of Forms is not cosmology. But Empedocles' four roots or the different varieties of atoms or Anaxagorean χρήματα were similarly conceived—so C. proposes—as eternal, changeless entities satisfying the requirements of P. Plato is in a sense 'the last Presocratic' (pp. 228–9), albeit a maverick who transposed application of P from cosmology to a novel domain.

C.'s most interesting chapter deals with the cosmology of 'mortal opinion', which like other scholars she dubs 'the *Doxa*'. It is a constraint on any interpretation that the *Doxa* be shown to have two purposes, 'one positive and one cautionary' (p. 116). Parmenides warns us that it is deceptive (fr. 8.52; cf. fr. 1.30), but he also promises that it will prevent one from 'ever falling into or being taken in by mortal error' (C.'s rather incautious gloss [p. 104] on fr. 8.61). C. suggests that the *Doxa* fulfils its positive rôle by 'providing a model for an adequate explanation of the reports of sense experience' (p. 116). This is achieved by making Light and Night, the fundamental principles of the cosmology, entities which can mix and separate, but are *not* described as undergoing change or coming-to-be and passing-away—i.e. just those processes which are elsewhere highlighted as the characteristically muddled content of mortal opinion. But in another way Light and Night *are* infected with the error of mortal opinion, for they are 'enantiomorphs' (p. 107): Light can only be understood as not-Night and Night as not-Light. So mortals who posit Light and Night as the principles of their cosmology will find themselves taking the forbidden path of is-not (fr. 2.7–8), or more precisely the backward-turning road which makes is and is-not the same and not the same (fr. 6).

C. can point to fr. 8.53–9 for an indication that a dualism of opposite sensory forms is the key error in the *Doxa* we should be wary of. She also makes the suggestion (on the basis of fr. 1.31–2; cf. fr. 7) that mortals in general go wrong in supposing that sensory 'appearances constitute the whole of things, and so must be the reliable objects of knowledge' (p. 114). Are these two errors intrinsically related? C. certainly thinks Parmenides must have been struck by the prevalence of dualisms in Ionian cosmologies in general and in Heraclitus' system in particular. But is Parmenides' idea that *any* attempt to explain the world solely in terms of sensory appearances will inevitably involve dualism, and therefore the backward-turning path, since sensory appearances have an inherently enantiomorphic structure? C. might perhaps have done more to articulate the complex structure of mortal error evidently presupposed in Parmenides' various pronouncements on the subject.

The Legacy of Parmenides could profitably have made its case with greater brevity and sparkle. Its critics will not find it hard to spot points that are weak, unclear or contestable in the argumentation, e.g. in C.'s account of the 'much-contested testing' (fr.7.5). But overall her alternative to M puts a serious and well-argued interpretative challenge. It will give Parmenides scholars and their students more to grapple with than they have encountered in the constant outpouring of writings on this thinker for a good long time.

St John's College, Cambridge MALCOLM SCHOFIELD

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

INNATE KNOWLEDGE

D. SCOTT: *Recollection and Experience: Plato's Theory of Learning and its Successors*. Pp x + 289. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. £35/$54.95). ISBN: 0-521-47455-8.

S. offers an exploration of ancient Greek theories of learning and discovery, which starts from a re-examination of Plato's discussion of recollection in *Meno*; with this, S. claims, the first theory of innate knowledge emerges. Then a brisk run through *Phaedo*, *Phaedrus*, and *Republic* leads into a major study of Aristotle's interest in experience and subsequent dissatisfaction with innatism. An analysis of related Hellenistic concepts follows, and the account then pauses for 'interim conclusions' before the section on innatism and empiricism in the seventeenth century, here mainly involving some serious work on John Locke's Platonism. The final conclusion, which actually introduces new material on Mill and Sidgwick, brings the study full circle with a quotation from Hare's *Plato* (in the Past Masters series) on the continuing Socratic–Platonic requirement that those working from intuition 'give an account' of what is said. 'Even now too many philosophical frauds are unwilling to face the auditors in this way' (p. 268). S. completes his volume with a wide-ranging bibliography, an index of ancient passages cited, and a decent general index.

From the first section S. argues that, in *Meno* and the 'middle period' dialogues, Plato is not explaining how the concepts of ordinary thought are formed as a prelude to their development into fully-fledged definitions, for these concepts come from perception and hearsay; on the contrary, it is only when we are puzzled or dissatisfied with the concepts as so received that recollection comes into play. Philosophy for Plato is a radical break with ordinary thought rather than a seamless development from it, and this central tenet is there from the start in the theory of recollection. In the solution to the 'paradox' at *Meno* 80d, which is a *personal* challenge to Socrates (S. fails to translate the important vocative here), and in the slave demonstration, a way is suggested of advancing beyond holding opinions into the achievements of successful inquiry and discovery, open to those who are ready and willing to undertake a hard intellectual struggle at an advanced level of learning despite initial (and understandable) despair at the enormity of the task. The contrast between the origins of opinions (in the world of perception) and of knowledge (within oneself) clearly then foreshadows the central books of the *Republic*, reinforced, S. suggests, by the seemingly casual mention of Teiresias at the end of *Meno*, who, in his physical blindness and inner sight, is a forerunner of the philosopher-statesman stumbling with seemingly impaired vision out of and then back into the cave. Platonic pessimism about the pre-philosophic state of ordinary people is countered by his 'enormous optimism' that human understanding has the ability to transform itself (p. 85)—optimism surely exaggerated by S., given the rarity of philosophers likely to achieve this end.

Once his thesis on Platonic innatism is established (along with what looks uncomfortably like intellectual snobbery in its concentration on 'higher learning'), S. is able to develop the long section on Aristotle as a reaction to it, opposing to philosophic introspection and recollection an empiricism related to sense-perception and a learning which starts from what is familiar. In this way knowledge in nature and knowledge in us can be distinguished and also bridged by the movement from potentiality to actuality in science, and the achievement in ethics of the good life. Here the difference between Plato and Aristotle in their very understanding of ethical

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

philosophizing becomes clear and is maintained by S. through possible objections: 'for Plato it must involve the challenging and rejection of appearances, for Aristotle their refinement and distillation' (p. 139).

New theories of innateness, as well as interest in 'ordinary' learning and the formation of primary concepts, characterize the Hellenistic schools. S. argues that the Stoics are particularly important in two ways not hitherto sufficiently appreciated. Firstly, they found in disposition rather than recollection the central focus of innateness, and secondly, they interpreted dispositionalism as a natural tendency towards virtue, bringing with it related common concepts which could subsequently be upgraded on the acquisition of wisdom to a higher level. 'As a result of the starting-points or resources given us by nature we are disposed both to certain patterns of behaviour, and to the formation of certain ethical ideas and beliefs' (p. 207). In this it is the Stoics (following Aristotle) and not Plato who should be recognized as the main influence on the seventeenth-century discussions of moral principles and the innateness of metaphysical ideas, making the relation between the Hellenistic and the early modern periods far more interesting and complex than is usually supposed.

The arguments throughout the thesis are dense but clear, and any opponent to the premisses and conclusions has much to do to overthrow them. S. has already given an account of the influence of Plato's *Meno* on the Cambridge Platonists (in his contribution to the excellent collection of essays by Baldwin and Hutton on *Platonism and the English Imagination*, reviewed in *CR* n.s. 46 [1996], 147–9), which extends the range of the present volume. His work therefore is to be welcomed particularly for contributing to the inclusion of Platonism in the current interest in the reception of the classical heritage.

University of Wales, Lampeter M. R. WRIGHT

ARISTOTLE ON CONTRADICTORY PAIRS

C. W. A. WHITAKER: *Aristotle's* De Interpretatione: *Contradiction and Dialectic* (Oxford Aristotle Studies). Pp. x + 235. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. Cased, £30. ISBN: 0-19-82361-9.

The *De Interpretatione* has traditionally been viewed as a treatise on propositions: it is thought both to presuppose the *Categories* (a treatise on terms) and prepare the way for the *Prior Analytics* (a treatise on syllogistic). Within this traditional framework, the contemporary trend in *De Interpretatione* research has been to concentrate on isolated bits of the text: scholars have focused on Aristotle's theory of language (in Chapters 1–4) and on his discussion of fatalism (in Chapter 9). The remainder of the text has been thought to be of little philosophical interest and doubts have been raised as to whether the work as a whole forms a coherent unity (some hold that Chapter 14 is a later addition which is not consistent with certain claims made in Chapter 7).

W. challenges both the traditional approach to the *De Interpretatione* and the (more narrow) contemporary approach. He argues that the work does not take as its main subject propositions. Rather, its subject is contradictory pairs. In addition, he argues that it neither presupposes the *Categories* nor prepares the way for the *Prior Analytics*. All of the preliminaries for the discussion of contradictory pairs are supplied in Chapters 1–6 and the remainder of the work provides the 'essential theoretical

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

background for dialectic' (p. 182). Thus, the *De Interpretatione* is oriented not towards the *Prior Analytics*, but towards the *Topics* and the *Sophistici Elenchi*. W. argues that the work forms a coherent, well-structured unity. Chapters 1–6 are taken up with preliminaries, culminating in the definition of the contradictory pair and the introduction of the Rule of Contradictory Pairs (RCP): 'Of every contradictory pair, one member is true and the other false' (p. 79). Chapters 7–9 deal with contradictory pairs which do not obey RCP. (Aristotle sees negation as the assertion of the separation of elements which are offered as combined in an affirmation. Thus, it does not immediately follow from his account of contradiction that it is impossible to violate RCP.) Chapters 10, 12, and 13 deal with problems of assigning certain types of assertions to their contradictory pairs. Chapter 11 provides the theoretical underpinning for the discussion in Chapter 8. Chapter 14 (far from being a later addition) is a proper summation of the whole work. Here Aristotle justifies the dialectician's study of contradiction by establishing that when one accepts the truth of the contradictory of a thesis, one accepts the truth of the belief which is most opposed to belief in the thesis. Finally, W. counters the contemporary approach. He argues that Chapters 1–4 do not provide a study of language in general. Rather, these chapters, together with Chapters 5–6, provide a study limited to just those features of language that are of direct relevance to dialectic. He also argues that Chapter 9 is not a detached study of fatalism. Rather, it is one part of the larger study of those contradictory pairs which violate RPC.

This book is a wonderful success. It will no doubt be the standard study of the *De Interpetatione* for some time to come and it will certainly help to spur on an already growing interest in Aristotelian dialectic. W.'s scholarship is impeccable. He brings both a firm understanding of the literature and a masterful grasp of philological issues to a study that is driven by a desire to fathom the philosophical questions which are treated and raised in this often neglected text.

Two parts of the book will be of particular interest to the specialist: (1) the discussion of Aristotle's treatment of future contingent assertions in Chapter 9, and (2) the discussion of the *Metaphysics* Γ4 refutation of those who deny the Principle of Contradiction (PC) ('it is impossible for the same thing to hold and not to hold of the same thing in the same respect at the same time' [p. 183]) in Appendix I. In the former discussion, W. argues that it is RCP, and not the Principle of Bivalence (PB) ('Every assertion is either true or false' [p.111]), which when applied to future contingent assertions leads to fatalistic conclusions. He argues that Aristotle's own solution to the problem of fatalism cannot be placed within the categories that have been generated in the contemporary debate, because those involved in the debate have worked on the assumption that, for Aristotle, it is PB which leads to fatalism. In the latter discussion, W. argues that Aristotle does not make use of his own doctrine of substance in the principle refutation of those who deny PC (at 1006a28–1007a20). W. argues that the refutation is grounded upon the theory of signification that is advanced in the *De Interpretatione*, according to which the 'ontological status of something is not relevant to whether or how its name is significant' (p. 194). So, according to W., Aristotle's request that the interlocutor signify a single thing (see 1006b11–14) should not be taken to be a request that he name something in the category of substance.

College of William and Mary JOHN E. SISKO

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ARISTOTLE ON SOCRATIC COMMUNISM

R. MAYHEW: *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's* Republic. Pp. xii +162. Lanham, Boulder, and New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997. Cased, £42 (Paper, £17.95). ISBN: 0-8476-8655-8 (0-8476-8654-X pbk).

This volume aims to enhance our understanding of Aristotelian political philosophy by offering a full interpretation of the early chapters of Book II of the *Politics*, which deal with earlier accounts of desirable constitutions, primarily that given in the *Republic* of Plato. While the cover laments the absence of any book-length treatment of the passage this century, ideological neutrality would previously have been difficult to achieve given the controversial nature of 'communistic' theories. There are also dangers inherent in the treatment of small sections of an author in isolation. The present treatment is both balanced and appreciative of the wider context, including useful background investigations on (e.g.) self-sufficiency (pp. 38–51) and friendship (pp. 73–85).

M. argues correctly that much of Aristotle's criticism deeply involves the issue of the unity of the state, the desirability of which is affirmed at *Republic* 462, and which Aristotle believes to be an impediment if unity is not of the right kind. Thus followers of Greek political thinking will soon find themselves plunged into detailed discussion of technical issues concerning unity (pp. 15–20), involving passages from the *Metaphysics*. Unity is what Aristotle sees as the ultimate aim of the theory of *Republic* V (*Pol.* 2.2.1), and this fact deserves greater emphasis, since it clearly depends on an *interpretation* of the text rather than direct statements within it. The central rôle of unity in the *Republic* was stressed by H. J. Krämer (*Arete bei Platon und Aristoteles* [Heidelberg, 1959]), and one must allow that Aristotle, while not free of bias as a critic, was in a privileged position as an interpreter.

More time might have been spent considering what it is that Aristotle thinks he is criticizing. The assumption from the outset is that it is Plato's *Republic*, and reference to the work itself at 1261a6 lends credibility. However, the implication that Aristotle is actually 'commenting upon' passages of Plato (p. 69) is to be resisted, since nothing suggests that either Aristotle or his audience will have a text of Plato before them; rather we have Aristotle's own response to ideas within a work read widely among his students. Moreover Aristotle speaks as if it is the theory of Socrates, notably that on the community of wives and property, which is under investigation: it is not a philosophic work, but a theory present in a small part of it which is investigated, and like the denial of incontinence (*EN* 7.3) and the equation of the virtues with knowledge (*EN* 3.6, 6.13), Aristotle clearly associates that theory with Socrates; this may be contrasted with his treatment of the Athenian Stranger in the *Laws* (*Pol.* 2.6.4–5; *EN* 2.3) and 'Socrates' in the *Philebus* (*EN* 10.3), who are treated as Plato himself. Hence when M. glosses *τάχ' ἄν εἴη μᾶλλον ὁ βούλεται ποιεῖν ὁ Σωκράτης* (2.3.2) 'Aristotle says that this is probably how Plato wants to be understood', he ignores the distinction between the social aims of Socrates and the written meaning of Plato. As a translator of the *Ecclesiazusae* (Buffalo, 1997) M. would be aware that communistic theories were circulating well before *Republic* V could have been 'published', and Aristotle's evidence that they are Socratic (however misguided) should not be tampered with.

The contribution of this book to an understanding of Aristotelian political theory is not seriously called into question by the failure to address these wider issues of the history of philosophy, nor by rather cursory treatment of historical issues (e.g.

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Arcadians at 1261a29), missed philological points (e.g. at 1261a14: the μὲν . . . δὲ and the variant reading), and occasional clumsy translations (e.g. ἢ ὅσον ἑκάστῳ ἐπιβάλλει, 1261b35, becomes 'or [only with] as much as falls to each [individually]', where Saunders [Oxford, 1995] renders 'or only in so far as it falls to the individual to do so' and I prefer 'or to the extent that each individual has a share', see LSJ II 6: alternatively '*than* each individual . . .'). At p. 105 translation of 1263a26–27 seems to have become strangely fused with the end of the preceding sentence, resulting in mere paraphrase, but without wider implications.

M. ends by defending Aristotle's uncertainty as to whether Plato (read 'Socrates') intended the working classes to be involved in any sharing of wives and property (1264a11–17; pp. 129–35). This is entirely justified. It matters crucially that Aristotle recognizes the limited scope of the deliberations within *Republic* V, and sees that Plato passes by the practical organization of a state in his haste to provide for an ideally constituted ruling class. Aristotle saw what we may forget: that the *Republic* is not properly a work of politics.

University of Newcastle, N.S.W. HAROLD TARRANT

ARISTOTLE AND KANT

N. SHERMAN: *Making a Necessity of Virtue: Aristotle and Kant on Virtue*. Pp. xviii + 387. Cambridge, New York, and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1997. £45/$59.95 (Paper, £15.95/$19.95). ISBN: 0-521-56383-6 (0-521-56487-5 pbk).

S. has composed a 'new dialogue' or 'nuanced conversation' between Aristotle and Kant. The subject is virtue; more particularly, 'the role of emotions and practical reason in each theorist's account of virtue'. Chapter 2 discusses the place of emotions in Aristotle's ethics, and Chapter 4 does the same for Kant. Chapter 6 deals with Aristotle on practical reasoning, and Chapters 7 and 8 deal with Kant on practical reasoning. (Chapter 1 is introductory, Chapter 3 provides an interlude on the Stoics, and Chapter 5 an interlude on friendship in Aristotle and in Kant.) There is an extensive bibliography—much of the book builds on recent Anglo-American work in moral philosophy.

'Careful attention is paid to the details of texts, but with an eye toward creating a shared discourse' (p. xi). Is there a 'shared discourse'? Although S. considers various general objections to her enterprise, she takes for granted a certain intellectual affinity between her two heroes.

Thus she intends to investigate 'the way Aristotle and Kant each frame their conception of moral inquiry' (p. 5). Did Aristotle have 'a conception of moral inquiry'? To be sure, he had various ideas about practical inquiry; but you will search the Ethics in vain for moral inquiry—or, come to that, for moral philosophy. Again, S. takes it for granted that an Aristotelian ἀρετή is much the same beast as a Kantian *Tugend*. In particular, when she talks of Aristotle's virtues she has her mind on one type of ἀρετή, virtue of character. (Virtues of intellect are barely mentioned. S. suggests that 'Aristotle's separation of the virtues of character and intellect . . . should be viewed as little more than an expository device for taking up these notions *ad*

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

seriatim' [p. 161]. But this is not so—if only because the general remarks which open *EN* B do not apply to the virtues of intellect.) Aristotle never links virtue to emotion: he links (some) virtues of character to emotion.

But such general worries are impertinent; for S. does not claim that there is a 'shared discourse'—she means to 'create' one. And much of the book is indeed creative. S. holds that moral discourse must show 'sensitivity to the demands of context. To capture context requires a careful narrative of the overall landscape of a case in a way that highlights salient features' (p. 271). In order to decide what you ought to do, or to justify what you have already done, you must spin a morally sensitive story—and perhaps that is all you need, or can, do. Chapter 6 finds such narratives in Aristotelian deliberation and Chapter 7 grafts them onto Kantian moral reasoning. And thus 'there is greater rapprochement between the authors' than you might have guessed (p. 325). The rapprochement is S.'s own creation: it may well be philosophically fruitful, but it has no historical or exegetical credentials. Aristotle knows nothing of narratives. Nor, I suspect, does Kant.

Again, S. urges that 'emotions are ways of evaluating and perceiving particulars (i.e. they are forms of appraisal) . . . In some cases, they will be essential ways of obtaining information' (p. 251). And she ascribes this notion to Aristotle; for according to him, emotions are 'intentional' or have 'propositional content'. One difficulty here lies in the obscurity of the thesis that the emotions have propositional content: the pertinent Aristotelian texts, all from *Rhet*. B, offer no general theory and offer nothing more than a collection of commonsensical remarks; S. herself gives no clear statement of the thesis and her text oscillates. (E.g. 'When I am angry I feel pain at the thought that I have been insulted' [p. 64]; 'Emotions are not blind sensations, but judgements of what we take to be good and bad in the world' [p. 73]. The two sentences do not sit well together; and each is clearly false.) A second difficulty: whatever the intentionality thesis may be, it cannot yield the notion that the emotions are ways of gleaning information about the world; and nothing suggests that the notion was known to Aristotle.

The shared discourse is 'created'; but not because 'careful attention is paid to the details of texts'. The book has little to contribute to ancient philosophy, or to the exegesis of Aristotle. (And I doubt that Kant has anything to offer to Aristotle or Aristotle to Kant.) Moreover, I get the impression that S. is not primarily interested in exegesis: she is interested in moral philosophy; she considers two accounts, an 'Aristotelian' and a 'Kantian', of certain moral phenomena; and she hopes to show that these accounts, though generally held to stand at opposite ends of a spectrum, in fact are close to one another. About this project—which has nothing to do with ancient philosophy—I have said nothing at all. May it suffice to remark that it will fascinate anyone who is *au fait* with certain aspects of contemporary ethics, and that it will delight every fan of what I once heard described as *le style Noyer*.

There is a generous sprinkling of misprints. The title grates and does not fit the contents.

University of Geneva JONATHAN BARNES

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

HELLENISTIC PHILOSOPHY

G. STRIKER: *Essays on Hellenistic Epistemology and Ethics*. Pp. xviii + 335. Cambridge, New York, and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1996. Cased, £37.50/$54.95 (Paper, £13.95/$19.95). ISBN: 0-521-47051-X (0-521-47641-0 pbk).

Here are fifteen papers, seven on epistemology and eight on ethics. There is also a fighting preface. All the papers are distingushed. All but one has been previously published. The collection is supposed to 'make it easier to see some of the connections between the topics taken up in individual essays'. It does so. And in any event, who would not want to have all the pieces under one hat?

'Fifteen papers'—or rather, thirteen papers and two monographs. For the volume contains, in its epistemological part, '*Κριτήριον τῆς ἀληθείας*' and, in its ethical part, 'Following Nature', each of which contains more matter than the average book. (The former, a classic since its first appearance, has been Englished; and it will now perhaps be read as often as it is cited.) The first paper is the novelty: 'Methods of Sophistry'. Then '*Κριτήριον*', followed by papers on Epicurus and sense impressions, on the sceptical Academy, on Aenesidemus, and on the relation between Academic and Pyrrhonian scepticism; and the first part closes with a *reprise* on the criterion. The ethical part begins with some general reflections on the nature of Greek ethics. Next, *ἀταραξία*, Epicurean hedonism, and natural law. Then the monograph, followed by *οἰκείωσις*, Antipater, and Socrates and the Stoics.

The pieces have not been revised (and cross-references have been added only sparsely). The volume has an excellent *index locorum*. But the index of names is useless, and there is no index of subjects. (May the second edition incorporate one.) Nor is there a bibliography. All the material has been reset; but the original pagination has not been recorded, a vexatious omission. The typeface is small, the Greek font a different size from the Roman; and for my eyes there are too many words to a page. The Cambridge Press, uncharacteristically, has not done its author proud.

The preface announces that the essays are 'discussions . . . addressed . . . to a wider philosophical audience'; and S. says: 'I tend to believe, naturally enough, that some present-day philosophers might find it useful to compare notes, as it were, with their Hellenistic predecessors. It is in this modest sense that I hope these essays may also be a contribution to philosophy *simpliciter*'. 'Some . . . might . . .'; and perhaps one or two will. But not all the essays will encourage them: half the pieces are scholarly *tours de force* which it would be absurd to recommend to a layman. The preface does not mention classical scholars; but ancient philosophy is one of what, in these parts, are called *les sciences de l'antiquité*; and I hope that someone working on, say, the poetry of Lucan might find it worth swapping notes on Antipater.

The preface also urges that 'as far as thinking about philosophical problems is concerned, historians of philosophy are doing much the same as specialists in systematic fields'. Most of these specialists are indeed nothing other than historians, historians of contemporary philosophy. Real philosophers are rare birds. But the difference between a historian of philosophy and a philosopher is no less distinct than that between a historian of mathematics and a mathematician. A historian of philosophy is interested in truths of the form 'x said that P'. A philosopher is not. To be sure, in order to establish that x said that P, you had better understand what it means to say that P; so that if the saying is a philosophical saying, you had better have a smattering of philosophy. But the same is true, *mutatis mutandis*, for mathematics.

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This brings me to the new item in the collection. The item argues that the fifth-century sophists are best regarded not as philosophers but as dialecticians. A dialectician is someone who 'is not a propounder of doctrines but only of arguments. He does not set out to establish the truth in each case, but merely shows what reasons there might be for holding a given view or indeed its contradictory.' A little later: 'Offering plausible arguments on both sides of a controversy may have been all the Sophists did.' Now, first, there is no evidence that the sophists always argued on both sides of the question—did Protagoras argue against relativism? Did Gorgias argue against Helen? And secondly, the sophists surely did propound doctrines. To be sure, they may not have believed the doctrines they propounded. 'I find it hard to believe that anyone should ever have thought that Gorgias seriously advocated the view that nothing is . . .'. 'Gorgias' arguments . . . are certainly not serious in the sense of being honest attempts at establishing their conclusions.' Perhaps not. (Who cares?) But for my part, I find it scarcely easier to imagine that Parmenides was 'serious' than to imagine that Gorgias was 'honest'. If that makes Parmenides a dialectician, then dialecticians are philosophers. And S. agrees; for at the end of the essay she suggests that 'if it were not for Plato's insistence that a philosopher must settle for a definite doctrine, we might say that <the sophists> were philosophers after all'. So we might, and so we should—and boo to Plato. (Does 'Plato insist . . .'? Certain words are put into the mouths of characters in Plato's fictional dialogues. Why suppose that Plato himself believed what he has his fictions declare? And—again—why care?)

I have concentrated on the new item because the old items are long familiar. I have pummelled it lightly because S. would be appalled if I did anything else. For the new item well exhibits one of S.'s less common virtues: she is provocative without being *outré*. All that she writes can be read and reread with pleasurable profit. But the book does not need my endorsement: anyone with the mildest interest in ancient philosophy will have bought it as soon as it reached the bookstands.

University of Geneva JONATHAN BARNES

PLATONISM

H. DÖRRIE, M. BALTES: *Der Platonismus in der Antike, 3: Der Platonismus im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert nach Christus. Bausteine 73–100: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Pp. xix + 440. Stuttgart/Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1993. DM 605. ISBN: 3-7728-1155-8.

H. DÖRRIE, M. BALTES: *Der Platonismus in der Antike, 4: Die philosophische Lehre des Platonismus. Einige grundlegende Axiome/ Platonische Physik (im antiken Verständnis) I. Bausteine 101–124: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Pp. xvi + 567. Stuttgart/Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1996. DM 695. ISBN: 3-7728-1156-6.

Before his untimely death in March 1983, Heinrich Dörrie had laid the foundations for a monumental and systematic collection of texts documenting the history and character of the ancient Platonic tradition. Platonism on D.'s conception (see Bd. 1, pp. 6–32) is the philosophical-religious edifice that began to be constructed by self-styled *Πλατωνικοί* from around 100 B.C. onwards and came to be the dominant intellectual and spiritual phenomenon of the Roman Empire. D. himself had all but

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

completed preparation of the first volume, on the movement's historical roots in the Academy, which subsequently appeared in 1987 under the editorship of his widow, Annemarie Dörrie. (See M. Schofield, *CR* n.s. 38 [1988], 69–70.) D. had also prepared much of the material for the second volume, on the fortunes and reputation of Plato and his works during the Hellenistic period, which, revised and completed by Matthias Baltes, with the assistance of Frau Dr Dörrie and Friedhelm Mann, appeared in 1990. The third volume completes the project's initial phase devoted to Platonism's cultural and historical background within the ambitious overall structure D. had envisaged for the series (see Bd. 1, pp. 54–61) by presenting evidence bearing upon the revival of Platonic studies in the second and third centuries A.D. It is primarily the result of B.'s own labours, for D. had left only incomplete versions of the texts and translations along with preliminary sketches for portions of the commentary. The fourth volume marks the beginning of the project's next phase, the actual exposition of Platonism's distinctive philosophical doctrines. While continuing to follow D.'s original programme, it is almost exclusively B.'s own work.

The two volumes adhere to the by now familiar format: the presentation of 'Bausteine' or 'building blocks'—a text or group of texts illustrating a particular topic or theme—with clear and accurate facing German translation in the first part, followed in the second by a separate section of commentary on each text interspersed with summary discussions, and bibliography. Volume 3 (Bausteine 73–100) begins with texts illustrating the historical circumstances of philosophy under the Empire, in particular the state's provisions regarding philosophy and its teachers (73), and the decline of philosophical studies in the first part of the third century A.D. (74). There follow the elements of a *Prosopographia Platonicorum* (75–6) and a description of the activity of the Platonic exegetes and commentators (77). The majority of the volume (78–96) presents the external evidence for the period's commentaries on individual dialogues (78–81), the concordances and lexica to Plato that began to appear (82), the general presentations of Plato's doctrines (83), and the monographs on various issues of particular importance to the Middle Platonists (84–96). The final sections concern observations on Plato's terminology (97), how Platonists were viewed by non-Platonists (98), and how Plato himself was viewed by Aristocles of Messene and Atticus (99–100). We learn who the noted Platonists of the era were, what they wrote, and that both they and their writings were more numerous than one might have expected. Although we know little or nothing about most of the 170 or so individuals and the hundreds of works mentioned in the texts and commentaries, the volume's masterfully assembled evidence paints a lucid and (generally) convincing picture of the period's amazingly copious and diverse industry of Platonic scholarship, exegesis, and commentary. These authors may have attempted assiduously to avoid *καινοτομία* in their diligent pursuit of philosophically and philologically accurate interpretation of Plato's writings, but their efforts resulted nonetheless in a true renaissance of Platonic thought and in the emergence of a distinct new intellectual outlook.

The difficult task of describing its substance commences with Volume 4 (Bausteine 101–24). This follows the practice of ancient handbooks in beginning its presentation of Platonism's philosophical doctrines with a preliminary discussion of the division of philosophy (101) and of the most prominent definitions of its nature and end (102). The definition of philosophy as *γνῶσις τῶν ὄντων ᾗ ὄντα* leads into an exposition of the various Platonist distinctions among types of being, of the increasingly intricate divisions of being (103–6), and of the important role of the *analogia entis* in grasping the nature of, and the interconnections among, the various grades of being (107–10). The second part of the book begins the series' exposition of the characteristic

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

doctrines of Platonic physics (for us, metaphysics) by setting out the rival views on the number and nature of principles or ἀρχαί (111–22) and on the thorny problem of whether matter should count as a principle (123–4). Here we witness the efforts of the Middle Platonists to reduce to a system certain key metaphysical concepts scattered unsystematically throughout the Platonic corpus. These efforts resulted in divers theories affirming the primacy of as few as one and up to as many as six principles. In his commentary B. admirably avoids the potential danger in a synoptic presentation of blurring distinctions between variants of a particular theory. At the same time, he provides sensible accounts of how these theories evolved from the study of Plato's own words and from what was known of discussions among his immediate successors, and he points the way forward to subsequent developments. B.'s synoptic view or 'system of systems' provides a useful perspective to set alongside histories that proceed chronologically through the views of the major figures and is in fact preferable in many ways as an initial orientation.

The volumes' main shortcomings result from their continued adherence to D.'s somewhat cumbersome mode of presentation. Although the provision of the texts with a brief apparatus criticus is a welcome improvement upon the previous volumes, one still must cope with the irritating style of printing the texts with generally a single colon per line, which gives them an unnatural, quasi-poetic appearance. The 'Bausteine' approach itself, moreover, often seems ill-suited to the material at hand. Since the texts themselves are often too brief and/or enigmatic to be read usefully on their own, and since additional primary material is frequently presented in the commentary, a more integrated method of presentation might have been desirable. B. is all the more to be commended, then, for having coped successfully with the limitations of the format so as to produce an at once scholarly, judicious, and eminently readable guide to some difficult and often unfamiliar territory. Although specialists will inevitably take issue with B. on particular points of interpretation, they should be immensely grateful for the vast amount of labour and learning evident in these volumes, and they will eagerly anticipate those to come.

Clare Hall, Cambridge JOHN A. PALMER

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY

C. STEAD: *Philosophy in Christian Antiquity*. pp. xii + 261. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994. Paper. ISBN: 0-521-46553-2.

S. is a patristic scholar of note, whose contributions over several years to elucidating the thought of, above all, Greek Christian writers of the fourth century (especially Gregory of Nyssa) have been characterized by analytical acuity and a robustly critical approach. His major study, *Divine Substance* (Oxford, 1977), is a landmark in the application of modern logical method to early Christian accounts of the nature of God. The book under review is a revised English-language version of *Philosophie und Theologie I* (Stuttgart, 1990), which appeared as the first volume of a series devoted to the development of Christian thought. Its publication in English is to be welcomed, for, despite the recent explosion of interest in late antiquity in general and its philosophical currents in particular, there is no other book on the market that provides an introductory survey of the topic as intellectually stimulating and challenging as S.'s (Gerard Watson's *Greek Philosophy and the Christian Notion of*

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press