The Classical Review

VOLUME 50 NO. 1

2000

WEST'S *ILIAD*

M. L. WEST (ed.): *Homeri* Ilias. *Volumen prius rhapsodias I–XII continens* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana). Pp. lxii + 372. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998. Cased, £64.10 (Paper, £21.95). ISBN: 3-519-01430-0 (3-519-01431-9 pbk).

A better edition of the *Iliad* has long been needed. The readings of the OCT, which everyone trusts, depend more on Aristarchus' recommendations than on MS tradition; it also prints without brackets dozens of lines introduced from parallel passages ('concordance-interpolations'). H. van Thiel's *Iliad* (Hildesheim, 1996), based on a judicious selection of medieval codices and many new scraps of ancient MSS ('papyri'), exhibits the same peculiarities as his *Odyssey* (see *Gnomon* 66 [1994], 289–95). Those of West's edition obtrude less, since W. aims both to remove weakly attested lines and to report the evidence from ancient scholarship. That he has not fully succeeded in either respect must not diminish our gratitude for the immense labour, knowledge, and text-critical acumen behind this edition.

W.'s *Praefatio* explains the transmission, largely rightly (but he thinks Homer wrote). Following van der Valk, he holds that Zenodotus was arbitrary and the majority of Aristarchus' unique readings are wrong (p. 7); van Thiel explains their unacceptability differently, discounting them as marginal parallels (*ZPE* 115 [1997], 13–36). W. has gathered a mass of testimonia. As for MSS, he includes 840 (*sic*!) new Oxyrhynchus papyri; hence his numeration differs from van Thiel's (his choice of codices and sigla are almost identical). The unity of the Roman and medieval vulgate becomes ever clearer.

W.'s account of orthography may raise more hackles, but much of what he does is to report the progress of linguistics. One can disagree, not about the sequence of phonetic changes, but where Homer falls in relation to them; here a statistical approach helps, as does Milman Parry's fundamental article 'The Homeric Language as the Language of an Oral Poetry' (*HSCP* 43 [1932], 1–50). But W. neglects Parry's basic tenet that oral singers modernize their diction up to the point where metre prevents it, e.g. in diectasis. Hence the many inconsistencies of W.'s editing; hence his trust in ancient scholars who, unaware of oral poetry, contradict and in my view modify the paradosis. Thus W. prefers forms like *σαῶσι* to the MSS' *σοῶσι*, and prints *ἠβώοντα* rather than the transmitted *ἡβώωντα*, where the MSS support Parry's principle. Puzzled (p. xxxiii) by the MSS' preference for *ναιετάωσα* over *-όωσα*, W. misses how the *α* remains when the root contains that sound (Parry, *art. cit.* 34).

As W. knows, the alphabet of our Homer is neither the Ionic one in which the epics

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

were first written down, nor the Attic one without η and ω in which they were partly transmitted; in both E was used for $\overline{\epsilon}$ and O for $\overline{o}$, written ει and ου from *c.* 400. W. rightly abolishes the fourth-century use of ευ for εο with synizesis (but, alas, adds no synizesis-marks). *Pace* Aristarchus, he retains many augments; but Parry's principle suggests that we should also restore them where possible—perhaps even against Hermann's Bridge (as this remains unbroken only if we trust readings unique to Aristarchus, one wonders whether the latter built it). W. restores e.g. εἵλκε, once *ΕΛΚΕ*, but tolerates ἑστήκει, ἔγρετο, ὄχθησαν (1.570), καταμύξατο (5.425) or δὲ ἴδε (5.846). If there is no rule, then one should follow the MSS, but W. does not do that either. He puts εἴδη for the past of οἶδα, because the MSS' ᾔδη is preceded by a hiatus, as if it had been unaugmented *ἔεἰδη (p. xxxiii); but such forms reflect diectasis with an early *scriptio plena*, e.g. τάδ(ε) ἐᾐδη. Again, W. reads εὐπλοΐην (p. xxiv), but not Ἀτρεΐδης or κόϊλος for κοῖλος (Myc. *ko-wi-ro-*); yet all entail contraction across a lost ἔ. Again, he prefers τεθνηότος (Aristarchus) to -ειότος (the MSS), whereas -η- is usual before *e* but -ει- before *o*. For consistency, he would need to restore *ᾗος for unmetrical ἕως, which he keeps (Parry's principle requires εἶος). He restores the old gen. *-οο where formulae once had it, putting e.g. *Ἰφίτοο* CC- rather than unmetrical *Ἰφίτου*; he does not consider whether Homer sang *Ἰφιτόου*, just as *ὅο became ὅου (2.325). Likewise one may reinterpret ἐπιδημίου ὀκρυόεντος as ἐπιδημιόου κρυόεντος, not -ίοο κρ- (9.64), or *ΛΥΚΟΟΡΓΟΣ* (once *Λυκόεργος) as Λυκόουργος.

Since W. expels the article, e.g. at 3.18, he is reduced to daggering 1.11. ἁμός cannot be Doric and should not have a rough breathing (p. xvii); there are no other Doric forms, and it had a psilosis, of Asiatic Aeolic origin, which persisted when the tradition passed to Ionic singers, just as they retained ἄμμες rather than replace it with *ἥμες. W. should have dared to print acc. τρῖς (p. xxxvi). *Pace* p. xxvii, Aristarchus was inconsistent in adding ν-mobile to pluperfects, and one should not (cf. van Thiel, art. cit. 33).

W.'s text, nicely presented save that the apparatus often spills over the page, rightly runs the individual books together. He defies all known MSS in bracketing some 68 verses (not to mention the whole *Doloneia*): 2.491–2, 525–6, 535, 547–51 ('Attic'—but see M. Haslam in I. Morris and B. Powell [edd.], *New Companion to Homer*, 83), 674, 703, 742–4; 3.18–20, 144; 4.60–1, 159; 5.398–402, 487–9, 887; 6.334, 388; 7.135, 196–9, 315, 334–5 ('Attic'), 371; 8.73–4, 185, 199, 421–4, 528, 535–8 (this is in ring-composition!), 557 (but 558 is ill attested and should go); 9.320, 416, 523; 10.147 (if absence from 'rr' damns a verse, the *recentiores* involved should be named and used elsewhere), 409–11; 11.540–2; 12.6, 14, 372, 426, 449.

Inattentive readers will be misled by how W.'s brackets fail to distinguish such speculations (which are not necessarily wrong, merely hard to prove) from weakly attested lines, as Aristarchus deployed athetesis alongside omission. Yet W. wrongly retains *c.* 25 weakly attested verses: 1.358 (interpolated from 18.36), 375 (from 16); 2.62 (from 25), 2.839 (from 12.97); 3.272 (from 19.253), 319 (from 297, to supply a verb of speaking), 343 (from 4.80); 4.196–7 (from 206–7: Talthybius saw the wounding, and so does not need to be told as Machaon does), 450 (from 8.64), 461 (from 503); 5.378 (added to supply Aeneas' name), 444 (from 16.711), 532 (from 15.564); 6.283 (to supply an object); 7.174 (from 119), 326 (from 367), 385 (from 327), 419–20 (a variant for 418, but botched, as W.'s conjecture to 420 acknowledges); 8.244 (from 15.376, cf. van Thiel), 380 (from 13.832); 9.95 (from 7.367), 695 (from 30); 11.801 (from 16.43). W. fails to signal that mechanical error probably caused omission at 1.486, 493; 2.141,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

644, 812; 4.55, 149–50, 484; 5.584, 669–70, 673; 8.263–5, 410, 429–30, 547; 9.44, 120; 11.215.

As for choice of readings, W. standardizes some variations between repeated passages, which, I believe, reflect oral composition: thus he makes 4.205 conform to 195; 5.538 to 17.518; 5.757 to 872; 5.797 to 2.389; 5.883 to 458; 6.96 to 277; 8.116 to 137; 8.339 to 22.230; 8.353 to 202; 9.137 to 279; 9.151 to 293; 10.336 to 347. He adopts many readings unique to ancient scholarly editions, not all of which can be trusted: 1.124 (cf. *The Iliad: A Commentary* IV, 275), 142 = 309, 241, 424, 522; 2.144 (ὡς fits in Philodemus), 164, 264, 436, 579; 3.206 (read σεῖ'), 362; 4.17 (αὖτως), 426, 527; 5.403, 542, 549, 656; 6.112, 266; 7.272; 8.349; 9.88, 132 = 274 (bis), 317, 393, 397, 564 (read κλαῖ' ὅ τε), 657; 10.54 (from 11.805), 169, 291, 341; 11.146, 314, 424, 564; 12.67, 465 (cf. op. cit. 83). I query the modern conjectures adopted at 1.453, 549; 3.22, etc., read βιβῶντα (cf. op. cit. 260 and van Thiel, art. cit. 32 n. 39); 4.132 (I do not understand W.'s emendation); 11.413.

Often the MS variants chosen are palmary (e.g. 2.210), but not always: 1.574, read σφῶ'; 1.581, φέρτατος; 2.36, ἔμελλεν; 2.204, 218; 2.462, ἀγαλλόμεναι; 801; 3.188; 3.295, ἀφυσσάμενοι; 3.368, 393, 434; 3.442, omit γ'; 5.272; 5.387, read τρισ-; 5.567 (bis), 603; 6.226, ἔγχεσι; 6.285, φρέν' ἀτέρπου; 6.484; 7.259, 284; 8.163; 9.58, 314, 383; 10.493, ἀμβαίνοντες; 10.579, where *P. Köln* 182 supports Ω* (so van Thiel); 11.423, 686, 773; 12.64, 459. Also, at 2.285, print ἐλεγχιστὸν; 2.461, Ἄσίω(ι) is obscure; 5.723, 12.58, print Bentley's conjectures; 5.818, follow Aristarchus; 6.456, read Ἄργε' ἐοῦσα; 7.340, follow H. Stephanus; 8.410, W. prints δ' ἐξ (in fact from Aristarchus) as if no other reading exists, but the MSS have δὲ κατ'; 8.471, read βοώπι; 9.414, ἴκωμι; 10.515, etc., ἀλαοῦ σκοπιὴν; 11.36, βλοσυρώπις.

The apparatus could cite more parallels (as van Thiel does), reconstructed spellings, and Linear B, e.g. 11.434 'cf. Myc. *e-wi-su-*'. Without making a systematic search, I noted deficiencies in reporting the scholia: 1.5, add 'Nic u.v. (Eust. 19.42–5)' for πᾶσι; 1.58, since Arn ascribes μετέφη to Aristarchus, he knew a v.l. προσ-; 2.456, κορυφῇ was a v.l. (sch. bT); 2.558, cite 3.230 (Arn/A); 3.10, for ἤυτ' cite καὶ ἄλλαι; 3.348, after 'Did' insert 'Sel (Tz. sch. Hes. *sc.* 415)'; 4.122, for 'Arn' read 'Zen ap. Arn'; 4.129, 139, 205, 249, add '(nov. Did)' (and *passim*); 4.456, 'deprec. Ar', but contrast Arn/A; 5.28, before 'Z' add 'Arn (e Ar?)'; 5.118, add 'Rhi (ci. Ludwich ap. Did)'; 5.249–50, add 'Arn'; 5.549, the *Ilias Latina* implies τ' Ὀρσι-; 5.656, add 'οἱ πλείους (Hrd)'; 6.244, give variant in T^{λ}; 8.415, T's 'variant' comes from misunderstanding Did/A; 9.57, insert 'Nic' before '1123'; 9.58, insert 'Nic' before '1122'; 9.197, for 'cit. Parmeniscus' read 'Ar.? ap. Parmeniscum'; 9.632, before '1151' insert 'bT^{λ}'; 10.161, add 'ἐρύκει Ar: ἐέργει nov. Did.'; 10.253, delete 'non resp. Aristot.' (Aristotle paraphrases it as τρίτη μοῖρα λέλειπται); 10.469, cite van der Valk's emendation of sch^{T}; 11.437, Ar knew both readings (διχῶς); 11.459, ὅπως is also in bT^{λ}, but read ἐπεὶ; 11.537, Ar did not read ὀπι- (see Erbse); 11.757, for 'Ar (?)' read 'Demetrius Scepsius Ar Nic'; after 'Z' add 'schT'; 12.75, for 'perperam' read 'recte'. W. sometimes fails to report the term πᾶσαι in Didymus' epitomator, indicating lections usual in the ancient *emendatiores*: so 1.447 (delete 'Zen'), 567; 3.51 (read σχεδὸν ἐν <πάσαις> ταῖς χαριεστέραις—my addition), 244 (in Ap. D.), 369, 406; 5.231 (σχεδὸν ἅπαντες); 7.171; 9.394, 639.

Misprints: p. lix, add 'rr recentiores'; 1.350, read θῖν'; 1. 355, for ',' read '·'; 2.125 app., τισι is Erbse's misprint for τισιν; 2.390, 6.651, 8.81, 10.530, insert space before ἵππ-; 3.306 app., read ο]υ γαρ; 4.55 app., read '566'; 4.145, 148, 230, 238, 7.337 app., for 'Ω' read 'Ω*'; 5.5, read ὀπωρινῷ; 5.446, insert γ'; 6.280–9 app. (*passim*), for '480a' read '481'; 8.349 app., read 'Zen rr'; 10.362, read ὑλήεντα, ὁ δὲ.

Given that it has been claimed, by some who would have us know less than we used

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to, that there *was* no original text of Homer (see *JHS* 118 [1998], 206–7), these disagreements are minor. Although the prudent scholar will use it cautiously, W.'s edition may well become the OCT of the next century.

University College London RICHARD JANKO

HOMER AND TROY

L. Isebaert, R. Lebrun (edd.): *Quaestiones Homericae. Acta Colloquii Namurcensis habiti diebus 7–9 mensis Septembris anni 1995.* (Collection d'Études Classiques 9.) Pp. vi + 305. Louvain-Namur: Éditions Peeters, 1998. Paper, B. frs. 1400. ISBN: 90-429-0591-3.

The work of M. Korfmann at Troy has redirected attention to the site and its implications, and prompted our Belgian colleagues to bring together experts in the problems of ancient Anatolia and some of those whose interests focused on the Homeric poems. Such a promising interchange of views ('aussi novatrices soient-elles') should have lent a degree of unity to this collection. If it did not do so, the fault lay with the Homerists, who failed to take up the implicit invitation to consider what sort of tradition, and subject to what sort of accidents and distortions, linked the Troy of the archaeologists and the Troy of Homer. (Perhaps not many European Homerists would lay claim to the necessary expertise.) In its place we are offered speculations on the name of Penelope (F. Bader), the depiction of old age in the *Iliad* from the Achaean and Trojan viewpoints (M.Casevitz), the *Odyssey* as an essay in moral philosophy (P. Fabre), the function of *ekphraseis* in the epics (Fr. Létoublon), Diomedes' place in the legendary history of the Argolid (P. Marchetti), and the Homeric view of the Trojans (P. Wathelet). Interesting as these papers are (and that of Létoublon is both sensitive and exhaustive), the similarity of their range to the collection of I. McAuslan and P. Walcot, *Homer* (Oxford, 1998) and its divergence from those of E. Bakker and A. Kahane, *Written Voices, Spoken Signs* (Cambridge, MA, 1997) and E. Anne Mackay, *Signs of Orality* (Leiden and Boston, 1999) highlight an alarming divergence between the interests of European and the younger transatlantic Homerists.

The core of the collection is a group of four papers on the problems of Troy and ancient Anatolia. J. Freu's formidably annotated article looks again at the Wilusa question in the light of recent revisions of the geography of the Hittite world. Wilusa, he concludes with due hesitation, should be placed south of the Troad. R. Lebrun reverts to the older and more optimistic location 'in the Troad or its immediate vicinity'. The qualification might include the valley of the Cayster, Freu's tentative location. There has, of course, from the time of their decipherment been a strong will to believe that people and places of Greek saga were mentioned in the archives of Hittite emperors. Sceptics have pointed to the absence of any certainly Hittite object at Troy and to the serious garbling implied by optimistic identifications. J. Vanschoonwinkel reviews the archaeological evidence for the dates and fates of Troy VI and VIIa and concurs with Blegen that Troy VI was the victim of earthquake and Troy VIIa of war. W. Jenniges confronts the puzzle of the Hellespontine Lycians of *Il.* 5.105 and 173. His solution to this strange geographical distribution of the Homeric Lycians is to take the name as an echo of Luwian, the language in Hittite times of western Anatolia.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Linguistics is represented by two papers. Y. Duhoux looks for evidence of tmesis in Linear B texts, finds none, and concurs with G. C. Horrocks (*Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 26 [1980]) that epic tmesis dates the origins of the *Kunstsprache* to a period anterior to the destruction of the Mycenaean palaces. S. Vanséveren seeks to connect adjective σχέτλιος with ἔχω with a basic sense 'obstinate' (see *LSJ* s.v., though I take their primary citation, *Il.* 10.164, as an ironic or comradely use rather than a *schema etymologicum*). The function of σχέτλιος is to protest at unreasonable conduct—under which head one may, of course, include obstinacy.

Comparative studies receive a brief mention from P. Wathelet, comparing the provision of names for Trojans in the *Iliad* with that of Saracens in the *Chansons de Geste*, a quarry that in general awaits exploration. C. Vielle examines the prologues of Greek and Indian epics for similarities both on the surface (the origins of a great war) and in underlying outlook (divine worries at the overpopulation of the earth and divine dissensions parallel to the human).

Finally, space is found for two papers on the *Nachleben* of the Homeric epics. M. Brix briefly describes attitudes to Homer among nineteenth-century romantics, among some of whom the Greek epic could be assimilated to the *Chansons de Geste* as a pure Castalian spring of folk-poetry. A more practical problem, as shown by M. Mund-Dopchie, confronted the Age of Discovery: had Odysseus anticipated Columbus and da Gama? Could he be a rôle-model for the explorers? Did his voyages justify European expansionism? *Chaque age à son goût.*

New College, Oxford J. B. HAINSWORTH

EMPEDOCLES

A. Martin, O. Primavesi: *L'Empédocle de Strasbourg (P. Strasb. gr. Inv. 1665–1666). Introduction, édition et commentaire.* Pp. xi + 396, 6 pls. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998. Cased, DM 78. ISBN: 3-11-015129-4.

The announcement in 1994 of a set of new papyrus fragments of Empedocles was an important event for students of the Presocratics and of early Greek poetry. The papyrus itself was put into the hands of Alain Martin in 1990, and by 1992 a preliminary identification had been made; when the nature of the text was made public Oliver Primavesi was recruited as a collaborator in preparing the text for publication. The appearance within a mere five years of an exemplary edition of the new material is an astonishing testimony to the hard work and scholarly responsibility of the editors. The relatively low price and outstanding production standards of this volume are to the credit of the publisher, de Gruyter.

The importance of this volume is twofold. First, it presents to the scholarly world seventy-four lines or part-lines of Empedocles. This is significant enough in itself, but the value of these lines is increased out of all proportion to their bulk by the fact that twenty-five of them overlap with known fragments. (For example, thanks to a five-line overlap, the thirty-five lines of fragment 17 D.-K. are now supplemented by the remains of thirty-four new lines.) This enables us to locate the new material with certainty in relation to what we know about Empedocles' poetry and so forces a serious re-evaluation of individual fragments and the character of his *oeuvre* as a whole.

Second, Martin and Primavesi have produced such a clear and comprehensive

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

account of the papyrus, its discovery, nature, and relationship to the poetry and thought of Empedocles that this book can and should stand as a model of scholarly and pedagogical exposition. A description of the contents of the volume is called for. Part I contains four substantial chapters in 119 pages. Chapter I describes the papyrus, its physical, bibliographical, paleographical, and orthographic characteristics, as well as the few traces of editorial sigla in the papyrus. Chapter II summarizes the story of the text: its original production and relation to the literary environment in Egyptian Panopolis, its re-use in a copper-covered funerary wreath, its eventual purchase in 1904 for the Deutsches Papyruskartell, and an account of its transfer to Strasbourg where it was sadly neglected for most of this century. Chapter III examines with admirable thoroughness how the contents of the new papyrus relate to major points of Empedocles' doctrine and their treatment in the scholarly literature, and advances carefully restrained assessments of what the new material can contribute to the reconstruction of his thought. Chapter IV extends this with a sober estimation of what the new material can tell us about the literary work of Empedocles. Together Chapters III and IV provide an admirable summary of the current state of Empedoclean studies and what the papyrus can contribute to it.

Part II is the edition, integrated with a re-edition from the principal manuscripts, of the indirect tradition of those fragments which overlap with the papyrus. The fifty-two small pieces of text which survive were sorted into six 'ensembles' (four of them of usable size) and five stray pieces (two containing only one letter). Transcription and reconstruction of the usable ensembles are on facing pages, with palaeographical notes and full apparatus. There are translations into French and English at the foot of each page of the reconstruction. A facsimile of the major fragments concludes Part II. Part III is a comprehensive line-by-line commentary (pp. 159–323). An appendix retells in more detail the story of the acquisition of the text, including transcriptions of pertinent original correspondence. A ten-page English summary of the book precedes indices: of words in the text, of papyri cited, of ancient authors cited, and of Empedoclean material cited. The bibliography is masterly, and the photographic plates with which the volume concludes provide readers with raw material for second-guessing the editors (should they be so inclined) and for illustration of the arcane craft of the papyrologist.

Only a brief sketch of what the new material offers is possible here, although it should be noted that there are a number of minor textual improvements in previously known verses made possible by the access to a direct tradition provided by the papyrus. Ensemble 'a' extends fr. 17 considerably, providing a further development of the picture sketched there of the alternation of Love and Strife and the temporary creatures which emerge from their interactions. Ensemble 'b' extends the known fr. 76, but reveals that previous reconstructions of that fragment from the text of Plutarch have been faulty; the evident topic of the fragment (a description of animals with earthy, hard outer parts) is, however, not changed. Ensemble 'c' overlaps with fr. 20; it adds one scarcely usable line before fr. 20, but presents us with a crucial new reading in line 2 (= 'c'3). Ensemble 'd' is nineteen lines in length and is largely cosmological in character; it confirms that Empedocles used the form $\phi\iota\lambda\acute{\iota}\eta$ as well as $\phi\iota\lambda\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$; (see fr. 18 D.-K.) and (far more significantly) includes fr. 139 D.-K. (replacing one hitherto problematic reading, $\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\sigma\iota$, lips, with an obviously correct one, $\chi\eta\lambda\alpha\hat{\iota}\varsigma$, claws): this is Empedocles' explosive lament for his previous sinful carnivorous behaviour. Until now, fr. 139 had been assigned to the 'Purifications' by virtually everyone.

Ensembles 'a' and 'd' (along with 'c'3) yield the most important results for our understanding of Empedocles' works and doctrine. Of these, it is certain that 'a' comes

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from what Simplicius knew as Book 1 of the 'Physics'; a stichometric indication in the papyrus shows that the combination of fr. 17 and 'a' consisted of lines 233–300 of that book. The place of 'd' is less obvious, but the editors argue that it must have followed fr. 62 D.-K., which Simplicius cites as from Book 2 of the 'Physics', on the grounds that it seems to refer back to events described in fr. 62, a claim that is plausible enough, though hardly certain. Regardless of that, 'd' is of a piece with the detailed cosmology of the Simplician 'Physics'. Even on a more conservative reconstruction than the editors offer, 'd' clearly weaves together Empedocles' cosmological theory and his doctrine of daimons in a manner which would have shocked Diels, and still has the capacity to surprise those who think that two distinct Empedoclean poems contained distinguishable doctrines on physics and on religious matters.

The editors conclude that the fragments normally assigned to two different poems represent an integrated doctrine covering religious and physical themes. This is strikingly confirmed by a small detail found at 'a'(i)6 and at 'c'3. For here Empedocles seems to have written *συνερχόμεθ'* where the secondary tradition would have led us to expect *συνερχόμεν'*. It is 'we' who come together, not the roots (which the use of the neuter would entail). It is true that each of these passages shows a correction to *ν* over the *θ*, in a second hand. But the surprising use of 'we' is confirmed by the unproblematic appearance of *[εἰσ]ερχόμεθ'* at 'a'(ii)17 in a cosmological context, and the editors argue convincingly that the *ν* is a later correction made on the basis of a different textual tradition. The personal voice of Empedocles, speaking for humanity—or at least for embodied daimons—is heard clearly amidst the cosmology.

The second major contribution deals with the 'cosmic cycle'. The extension to fr. 17 shows convincingly (again, even on a reconstruction of the text more conservative than the editors propose) that the cycle did include a double, not a single, cosmogony, that animals came into being and passed away twice, in a world of increasing Love and again in a world of increasing Strife.

The new material, then, supports the cosmological reconstruction of O'Brien and others, just as it confirms the position of those who have argued for a single integrated doctrine which must be derived from all fragments regardless of whether they have been traditionally classed as 'Purifications' material or 'Physics' material. The editors have themselves remained agnostic on the question of whether there was a single poem or two. I confess that my own assessment of the new material is more sanguine. Having argued, in the previous state of our knowledge of Empedocles' literary remains, that 'the balance of probabilities points tentatively' to the hypothesis that there was only one poem (*The Poem of Empedocles* [Toronto, 1992], p. 9), I find that the placement of fr. 139 in a physical context and the occurrence of the personal 'we' in the sequel of fr. 17 tips the scales even further in that direction. It would have been wonderful if the new fragments had revealed a title or titles for Empedocles' work; it would be satisfying if we really could conclude that ensemble 'd' was from 'Physics' 2 rather than from a separate 'Purifications'. But, as the editors rightly note, what matters most is that the new fragments establish definitively the need to adopt the hypothesis of a single integrated doctrine spanning material traditionally regarded as cosmological and as religious. Such definitive results are rare in the study of the Presocratics, and for that as well as for the exemplary professionalism of the editors we should be very thankful indeed.

University of Toronto BRAD INWOOD

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

HISTORICIZING ANTIGONE

W. B. TYRRELL, L. J. BENNETT: *Recapturing Sophocles' Antigone*. Pp. xiv + 176. Lanham, etc.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998. Paper, $21.95 (Cased, $53). ISBN: 0-8476-9217-5.

This book is a contribution to one of the core projects of classical scholarship in recent years: highlighting the importance of social and political context in the interpretation of ancient works. Wm. Blake Tyrrell and Larry J. Bennett set out to 'recapture Sophocles' *Antigone*' or, as they put it in their preface (p. xiii), 'to return the *Antigone* to its setting among Athenians of fifth-century Athens'. Appropriately, their main focus is on Antigone's burial of Polynices. T. & B. are probably best known for their suggestions about links between *Antigone* and Athenian public funerals and funeral orations. In this book they expand on those suggestions, drawing also on particular historical events such as the Samian War, and on other literary texts such as the *Iliad*, to establish how Antigone's, Creon's, and the other characters' attitudes to the burial might have been perceived.

The bare bones of T. & B.'s argument are as follows. The plot of the play, with a Theban leader refusing to have the corpse of his Argive enemy buried, alludes to a contrast that was part of Athenian self-definition in the second half of the fifth century. Athenians take great care to bury the dead, both friends and enemies; Thebans do not. In tragedies, funeral orations, and elsewhere, Athenians sometimes told stories about the intervention with which they secured burial for the Argive dead against the will of the Thebans. Looked at in this context, Creon is clearly in the wrong and Antigone clearly in the right. What makes evaluation of Antigone more complex, however, is that she is a woman. Unlike Ismene, who wants Polynices buried but is unwilling to resist Creon, Antigone stands up against a man. On the one hand, Athenians would agree she is right to insist on burial for Polynices, on the other, they would regard her as overstepping her rôle as a woman when she opposes the rule of a man. What Sophocles does in creating this conflict, T. & B. go on to argue, is draw attention to the anxiety public funerals for the war dead may have created in women. These public funerals assumed some of the responsibilities that used to lie with the family and in particular with women. The offence that Creon gives to Antigone by not allowing her to bury her brother is not unlike the offence that public funerals may have given to the women of Athens. According to T. & B., therefore, *Antigone* allows us to look for some traces of these women's 'social practices and discourses' (p. 28).

T. & B.'s emphasis on historical context adds to the understanding of the play. It provides a tool with which to evaluate Antigone's burial of Polynices in terms that are more precise than 'the gods' or 'the family' and thus gives extra depth both to the plot of the play as a whole and to the phrasing of individual passages. As always, the challenge is to decide just how to integrate the funeral orations, the passages from the *Iliad*, or the historical events that form the background to *Antigone* into the overall interpretation of the play. How much weight would Athenian spectators give to what they may have regarded as Creon's typically Theban disrespect for normal funeral rites and how much to his intention to protect his city? To what degree would they see in Antigone a generic woman who suffered from the city's institutional intrusion into her sphere and to what degree an individual woman with her own particular aims and needs, confronting an individual man with his own particular aims and needs? Such questions are immensely difficult to answer. Like all tragedies, *Antigone* draws on many frames of reference.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

One of the passages that loom particularly large in T. & B.'s book (pp. xiii–xiv, 112–18) is a case in point: Antigone's often deleted statement that she would not have died for a husband or for a child as she now does for a brother (vv. 904–20). The gist of T. & B.'s argument is this. Many critics have objected to the passage because Antigone's exclusive focus on her brother has struck them as inconsistent with her general phrasing earlier, especially in the passage in which she invokes the unwritten laws (vv. 450–60). T. & B. side with those who accept the passage as genuine. Taking their cue from an argument put forward by Sheila Murnaghan, they point to the Pericles of Thucydides' funeral oration (Thuc. 2.44), who tells the parents of the war dead that it is right and proper for parents to sacrifice their children for the good of the city and consoles them with the hope of further children. The scene before Antigone's speech, they argue, has evoked Antigone's marriage to Hades, and accordingly she now behaves as a married woman. Surrendering her husband and children to the city, she resembles the Athenian wives that Pericles talks about. Many readers are likely to find some of the details of this argument unpersuasive, but my point here is a general one. T. & B.'s appeal to the audience's knowledge of funeral orations is useful and Thucydides' Pericles is certainly relevant. The crucial question that arises is 'relevant in what way?'. Other critics (both those who delete the passage and those who keep it) appeal to another relevant text, the speech by Intaphernes' wife in Herodotus (3.119). They also appeal to character, regarding Antigone's speech as an expression of her almost obsessive commitment to her brother or indeed as a desperate attempt to find a rational explanation for what she has done. There are many different methods of coming to terms with this speech. What I want to stress in response to T. & B.'s book is the need for finding nuanced ways of weighing up such different arguments against one another and of combining them with one another. This will always remain an important challenge for every student of the play.

University of Manchester FELIX BUDELMANN

THE LOEB ARISTOPHANES

J. J. HENDERSON (ed.): *Aristophanes.* Vol. I: *Acharnians, Knights.* Vol II: *Clouds, Wasps, Peace.* (Loeb Classical Library, 178 and 488.) Pp. viii + 408; 606. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1998. Cased, £11.95 + £12.95. ISBN: 0-674-99567-8 and 0-574-99537-6.

Aristophanes and the Loeb Classical Library have not hitherto got on well together. The editor originally designated, the great Harvard Aristophanist J. W. White, died in 1917, leaving apparently nothing in a publishable state, and eventually in 1924 an editor was brought back from Hades (or Elysium) in the shape of B. B. Rogers, with the series editors (presumably E. Capps and L. A. Post) as his ghost writers supplying introductions and notes; this unsatisfactory product of a committee that never met held the field for three-quarters of a century. A replacement commissioned from the present reviewer (with the collaboration of the late David Barrett) fell victim to a financial crisis in 1978, and the Rogers edition was hastily reissued with a perfunctory page of bibliography added. Now at last Aristophanes begins to join the completed Sophocles and the progressing Euripides and Menander, with a Loeb text and translation to which undergraduates and non-specialists may safely make rapid

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reference, produced by a scholar who has proved himself over many years an outstanding interpreter of Aristophanic comedy and who in the next volume will be publishing his *third* translation of *Lysistrata* (cf. *Aristóphanês' Lysístrata* [Cambridge, MA, 1988] and *Three Plays by Aristophanes: Staging Women* [New York and London, 1996]).

Henderson's general introduction gives a reliable, unpretentious account of the theatrical, institutional, and social background against which the plays are to be viewed; its only important shortcoming is that it often takes up controversial positions (with most of which I sympathize) without indicating where alternative views can be found, and readers (especially student readers) would be well advised to use this introduction in conjunction with Stephen Halliwell's in *Aristophanes: Birds, Lysistrata, Assembly-Women, Wealth* (Oxford, 1997; see *CR* 49 [1999], 252–3). H. takes some pains (i.19–21) to controvert my argument (in C. B. R. Pelling (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* [Oxford, 1997], pp. 64–71) that the theatre audience in Ar.'s time was probably a skewed sample of the citizen body; he has already admitted, however (i.11), that the two-obol seat charge 'may well have deterred the poorer classes from attending', and this is an understatement—for if the charge was burdensome enough in the mid-fourth century to make it worthwhile to introduce theoric subsidies to defray it, it must have been much more so in Ar.'s time when other prices, and money incomes, were generally lower. It is somewhat misleading, too, to equate 'the era of the entirely apolitical New Comedy' with 'the oligarchic period of 322–307' and to claim that political comedy reappeared thereafter (i.12): to be sure, one does find after 307 some comic attacks on political personages, but they are thin on the ground, and without exception they are directed against safe targets—individuals who at the time of production were neither present in Athens nor in control of Athens (Timokles, to whom H. refers in this connection, has no political allusions at all likely to postdate 322).

The Select Bibliography will be a useful tool for the readership envisaged. Some of the editions listed (including my own) may be flattered by being called 'critical'; it is indeed arguable that there has never yet *been* a complete critical edition of Ar. It is a pity that there is no section on the relationships between comedy, society, and politics, which is just where H.'s readers will be most in need of alternative points of view and on which he has himself done distinguished work (notably in J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin [edd.], *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?* [Princeton, 1990], pp. 271–313). Some bibliographical guidance on individual plays would have been welcome: H. merely lists annotated editions (to which should be added those of *Clouds* by G. Guidorizzi [Milan, 1996] and of *Peace* by S. D. Olson [Oxford, 1998]).

At i.28 H. feels compelled to devote a paragraph to the danger that Aristophanic language and action 'may strike some readers as being shockingly crude, sexist, homophobic, xenophobic, or the like', and to explaining why in his translation he has, very rightly, made no attempt to spare these readers' feelings. When I said something similarly apologetic in the introduction to my 1973 Penguin translation of three plays, the series editor (the late Betty Radice) pulled me up sharply, and the sentence was deleted. H.'s apprehension is an alarming indication of the increasing combined power, at least in the USA, of the zealots of religious fundamentalism and of political correctness: at this rate, if there is a third Loeb Aristophanes in another seventy-five years, it may well be more thoroughly bowdlerized (or *kastriert*, as Germans used to call English-language editions of Ar.) than the first was. It might nevertheless have been possible to avoid the gratuitous slur cast on the million inhabitants of my native city in H.'s translation of *Ach*. 518!

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

H. offers a text of his own constitution, but with only minimal critical annotation—which makes it rather surprising that he should provide, in the introductions, a brief account of the textual tradition of each play. On *Knights* (i.224–5) H. takes a controversial view of the position in the tradition of M and Γ^2: comment on this must await the publication of his edition of *Knights* in the Clarendon series.

H.'s declared principle (i.38) is that his textual notes 'alert the reader . . . to textual problems, variants, or conjectures that significantly affect the interpretation . . . of the Greek'; but many such are in fact passed over in silence. At *Wasps* 1537, to take only one example, a textual note is surely imperative, since it makes a substantial difference to our information about Athenian theatre history whether Ar. wrote ὀρχούμενος; (RΓ) or ὀρχούμενον (V*j*), and the latter has support from the scholia (εἰσέρχεται ὁ χορὸς ὀρχούμενος, οὐδαμῶς δὲ ἐξέρχεται fere LAld: in VΓ the first three words have been lost).

Significant emendations or articulations not previously published are:

Knights **373-0-2-1** in that order, with attributions correspondingly adjusted (this gives 373 to the sausage-seller—but bristles are plucked out of hides, not out of meat or offal); **847** punctuated after ἐπίσχες rather than after ἀσπίσιν; **940** ἐσθίων ἅμ' ἀποπνιγείης (very persuasive); *Clouds* **995** οὖ (for ὅτι—the language is still strained, but this is probably to be attributed to the speaker's euphemistic circumlocution, cf. 974 μηδὲν . . . ἀπηνές); **1310** e.g. ἄποινα τεῖσαι (for τι κακὸν λαβεῖν, presumably taken as a gloss); *Wasps* **457** given to Xanthias, **458** to Bdelykleon, **459** to Xanthias again, and **460** (the claim of victory) to 'general' Bdelykleon (this last in agreement with Thiercy); *Peace* **605** ἧψατ' αὐτῆς (Herington) (but on the story Hermes is telling, it was Perikles, not Pheidias, who first laid impious hands on Peace).

To some extent the translation falls between several stools—as perhaps any translation of Ar. must that aspires to be both reliable and readable. H. makes a serious attempt to capture the various distinctive registers of language that Ar. uses (and that he often jumbles in a wild medley), but what was presumably extremely funny in Greek can often be merely weird in English. Virtually always his renderings are based on a sound understanding of the Greek, and at many points they display admirable *vis comica*. Some of his best touches, alas, will be hidden from most readers: few are likely to perceive, for instance, that in *Wasps* 928 ('one copse can't support two robbers'), in addition to the evident pun on 'cops/robbers', there is another on 'robbers' and 'robins', that this is faithful both to the proverb which Ar. is adapting (οὐ τρέφει μία λόχμη δύο ἐριθάκους) and to biological fact (the robin being one of the most rigidly 'territorial' of all birds), and that the pun is actually an improvement on Ar. himself, who could do no better than replace ἐριθάκους by the totally dissimilar word κλέπτα.

Modesty is one thing, however, and obscurity is another. I am not sure that H. has always put himself in the position of typical Loeb users, who will not be Aristophanic specialists, may (these days) have a rather shaky command of Greek, and may take the translation as authoritative. For these users, more notes explaining the literal sense, where H. has (normally for good reason) departed from it, would be very welcome. In general, indeed, the annotation is very thin, considering the density in Ar. of crucial allusions to matters the average user is unlikely to know about (or is at risk of being misled about—e.g. the wildly exaggerated claim at *Wasps* 707 that there were a thousand tribute-paying cities). Many phrases are signalled by inverted commas (in text or translation or both) as being quoted or adapted from other poetry, but much too often the curiosity thus aroused is left unsatisfied. Stage directions, too, could with advantage be more numerous. In the passage where Philokleon is tricked into acquitting Labes (*Wasps* 982–1002), H. has only three inconsequential stage directions, making much of the script quite hard to understand; my translation (Warminster, 1983) and Pascal Thiercy's (in *Aristophane: Théâtre complet* [Paris, 1997]) each contain thirteen stage directions in this passage. Sometimes even entrances

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and exits are forgotten: Xanthias is rightly sent off at *Wasps* 843, and then in 899–904 we find him and the two dogs all present although there has been no direction for their entrance.

A few points from introductions, translations, and notes: *Acharnians* **920** ἐνθεὶς . . . εἰς τίφην rendered 'put it on a beetle's back'; cf. Dunbar on *Birds* 202–4. *Knights* **1407** ἐκφερέτω is translated 'escort', and the final stage direction has Paphlagon 'marched off' by two slaves; but the word for that would be ἀπαγέτω, and it is better to see Paphlagon, like Lamachos in *Ach.*, Socrates in *Clouds*, and in a sense Euripides in *Frogs*, as suffering a comic death, here appropriately followed by an ἐκφορά. *Clouds* **intr**. (ii.5) 'in the absence of unbiased information about Socrates . . . we must accept *Clouds* as a valid expression of what public opinion . . . might be expected to believe about him, in the Athens of 423–*c*. 416': it is perhaps rash to assert this without qualification (were not comic spectators conditioned to expect exaggeration and caricature?), but we may note that even Plato chooses, in the *Apology*, to present Socrates' actual accusers not as mendacious but as ignorant and muddled, and no doubt many ordinary Athenians had been at least as ignorant and muddled about him two decades before his trial. **609** H. attractively suggests (developing a hint of Dover's) that χαίρειν here is 'a jab at Cleon' who was apparently (cf. Σ and Eupolis fr. 331) the first Athenian to begin an official dispatch with this greeting. **1146** The gender of τουτονί shows that Strepsiades' gift cannot be a purse (βαλλάντιον). *Wasps* **753** H.'s rendering 'what I yearn for is over there' presumably implies, surely rightly (though as usual there is no stage direction), that Philokleon here points (repeatedly and frantically) in the direction representing the way to the courts (i.e. towards the *eisodos* opposite to that by which the chorus entered). **1418** 'Assault' is far too weak to translate ὕβρις, a crime for which the prosecutor might if he chose demand the death penalty; if we must have something that sounds like a modern criminal charge, I would suggest 'aggravated violence'. *Peace* **1193** Another gender point: ταυτηί shows that the object with which the tables are to be cleaned cannot be a helmet-crest (λόφος), whose appearance here would anyway weaken the effect of 1214ff. **1351** The noun to be supplied with μέγα καὶ παχύ is not τὸ σῦκον from the next line ('his fig is big and ripe' H.), but τὸ πέος from the joint evidence of the audience's eyes—for Trygaios, like Dikaiopolis, the Scythian Archer and Blepyros at the ends of three other plays, is ithyphallic (so tentatively but rightly Olson)—and of the phrase μέγα καὶ παχύ itself which, in comedy at least, only ever refers to one thing.

The completion of this edition will be eagerly awaited.

University of Nottingham ALAN H. SOMMERSTEIN

GREEK COMIC FRAGMENTS

A. M. Belardinelli, O. Imperio, G. Mastromarco, M. Pellegrino, P. Totaro: *Tessere. Frammenti della commedia greca: studi e commenti*. Pp. 383. Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1998. Paper, L. 45,000.

As the title of this collection indicates, its authors want to present some surviving 'tesserae' out of the grand, but largely destroyed, mosaic of ancient Greek Comedy. The book comprises two sections. First, two 'studi' provide diachronic surveys of certain comic figures: on pp. 9–42, Giuseppe Mastromarco outlines the development of the Cyclops from the *Odyssey* to his rôle in fifth-century drama (Epicharmus, Euripides, Cratinus, Callias, Aristias) and shows that Polyphemus, while fundamentally remaining the monstrous man-eater, nevertheless shows some 'cultural advancement', acquiring not only remarkable culinary, but also

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

geographical, poetical, and even philosophical lore. The Euripidean Cyclops even seems to develop certain 'aristocratic' traits (e.g. hunting and pederastic inclinations), but M. probably goes too far when he attributes these to the comic Cyclops as well; as far as I can see, there is no evidence in the comic fragments for a Polyphemus loving to hunt or pining for beautiful boys. On pp. 43–130, Olimpia Imperio deals with the comic portrayals of intellectuals, starting with the Homeric δημιοεργοί and arriving only on p. 51 at the various groups of σοφισταί presented in Aristophanes' *Clouds* (331–3), whose depiction in Old Comedy she then examines in detail: first, professional seers and oracle-mongers (pp. 54–63); second, physicians (pp. 63–75); third, dithyrambographers (pp. 75–95), where she reaffirms the widely accepted distinction of various phases in the comic poets' reactions against the 'new' dithyramb and rejects recent attempts to redraw that chronology and to detect 'gender polarity'. Two shorter sections treat the comic presentation of musicians like Socrates' music teacher Connus (pp. 95f.) and of astronomers like Meton (pp. 96–9), a longer one (pp. 99–114) discusses the comic Socrates (above all in *Clouds*) and similar 'sophists' (i.e. those in Eupolis' *Kolakes*); some pages on Euripides and his affiliation with sophists follow (pp. 114–16). A final section (starting a bit incongruously with remarks on the 'Socratic question', i.e. 'how historical is the Socrates of the *Clouds*?', pp. 118–20) assembles material about philosophers in Middle and New Comedy (pp. 120–9). All in all a useful survey, but it could have been more concise, and not much of the ground covered here is really new.

The second part of the book consists of 'commenti' (i.e. commentaries, with Greek text and Italian translation, on the fragments of some comic poets) on four 'minor' comic poets (three from Old and one from New Comedy). Here, Piero Totaro tackles Amipsias (pp. 133–94), Imperio, Callias (pp. 195–254), Anna Maria Belardinelli, Diodorus (the brother of Diphilus; pp. 255–89), and Matteo Pellegrino, Metagenes (pp. 291–339). Why these four? We are never told, but I assume that they were chosen because the quantity of fragments in each case made a treatment in 35–60 pages possible. Each of the commentators has taken great pains to do his job; still, it must be said that their efforts do not significantly advance our knowledge about the plays these fragments once belonged to, beyond what we already knew from *PCG*. The 'commenti' are strongest in elucidating the *realia* mentioned in the fragments, often nearly smothering the reader with a wealth of detail. Do we really need more than a page's documentation that the Greek loved to make spirited conversation at symposia (pp. 295f.), or two pages (pp. 226–8) on the meanings of σεμνός? Sometimes this leads to the really significant parallels being simply drowned in a welter of material that is only distantly related to the phenomenon in question (see e.g. the treatment on culinary metaphor in comedy on pp. 329f.). There are still other features which squander space: as a result of, apparently, too little internal coordination between the contributors, we get repeated treatments of the same matter (e.g. the mixing of wine and water on pp. 146f. and 261f., the pay for prostitutes on pp. 258 and 301f.), when one (with short cross-references at the other places) would have been enough. As there is no general bibliography, we get the same longish titles of articles and books (often a non-Italian original together with its Italian translation) taking up several lines several times. In apparently taking length of treatment as a worth in itself, these 'commenti' look like emulators of Arnott's *Alexis* which in many places might have profited, too, from being less prolix (see H. Lloyd-Jones, *ClJ* 93 [1997], 207 and my own review, forthcoming in *Gnomon*).

Unfortunately, the 'commenti' sometimes get things wrong which are right in *PCG*: discussing the attribution of the 'Grammatical tragedy' to Callias on p. 197, I.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mistakenly takes Kassel–Austin's (*PCG* 4.40) statement 'de comico actum est' (which, of course, means 'it is all over with . . .') to mean 'che fosse comunque opera di un commediografo . . . a parere di Kassel et Austin'. On p. 198 (n. 8) she scolds the *PCG* editors because they present *Ἔντ*]*ερα σιδηρᾶ* (*PCG* 4.42) and *Ὕπ*]*ερα σιδηρᾶ* (ibid. p. 49) 'come titoli di due distinte commedie'; Kassel and Austin, of course, do no such thing, but simply exhibit both titles, because both are possible. Equally unjustified seems her criticism (p. 250, on Call. fr. 35) of Kassel–Austin's (in *PCG* 7.140) comparison of *ἑλλεβοριᾶν* and *ὑοσκυαμᾶν* for the meaning of 'being mad'; the two verbs simply approach the same meaning from a different angle. Other flaws: on p. 217, she understands Ath. 15.667d *ὅτι δὲ ἆθλον προὔκειτο τῷ εὖ προεμένῳ τὸν κότταβον* ('that a prize was set for skilfully tossing the cottabos . . .') as 'siamo informati che il termine *κότταβος* designava . . . anche i premi assegnati ai vincitori'. On pp. 252f., she takes the wording of Call. fr. *40 (*Ἀριστοφῶν . . . αὐτὸς ἀπεδείχθη . . . ἐκ Χορηγίδος τῆς ἑταίρας παιδοποιησάμενος*, 'Aristophon . . . was himself shown . . . to have had children by the *hetaira* Choregis') to mean 'Aristofonte . . . fu attaccato . . . per essere egli stesso figlio di' un etera, di nome Coregis'. According to her, the idea that in fr. 15 a personification of Tragedy is present originates with Italo Gallo (p. 223); Kassel and Austin inform us that this was already proposed by Gottfried Hermann. On p. 242 (on Call. fr. 25) she cites Kühn's superannuated edition of Galen, while Kassel and Austin had already provided a more recent and better one. B. (on pp. 265f. n. 12) discusses the relationship of Menander's two *Ἐπίκληρος*-comedies, but does not refer to *PCG* 6,2.106. On p. 273 she gravely misrepresents my opinion (in *Lukians Parasitendialog*, p. 55), stating 'a parere di Nesselrath, modello del dialogo lucianeo non sarà la commedia, bensí la retorica, e in particolare Aristide'; what I really say is that one particular feature of Lucian's parasite derives not from comedy, but from rhetoric, and I refer not to Aristides, but to Pseudo-Aristides; nor do I say (*Parasitendialog*, p. 110) that Chaereas in Menander's *Dyskolos* is not a parasite (as B. hints on p. 278), but one with not very distinctive traits. On p. 282 she confuses Attic demes with phylai; on p. 283 she ascribes a Menander fragment to Kassel–Austin ('*Theophoroumene* . . . fr. 1 K.–A.') which they have not yet edited. On p. 323, P. contradicts his preferred translation of *ξενικὸν ἐμπορεύεται* ('traffica con truppe mercenarie') of Metag. fr. 10.3 K.–A. by explaining that this expression 'risulterebbe un richiamo all'accusa di *ξενία*' (p. 324), which cannot affect a man who only *deals with foreign troops*.

At times the rate of misprints is rather high; especially annoying are quotations distorted by omitted words or phrases (see Ar. *Nub.* 333 on p. 75; Philem. fr. 78.4–7 K.–A. on p. 75 n. 56; Ar. *Nub.* 969c–972 on p. 94; Cratin. fr. 167 K.–A. on p. 104 n. 115; Cratin. II fr. 7.3–5 K.–A. on p. 123; Ath. 4.140e on p. 209; Ath. 4.177a on p. 240; Ar. *Ran*. 1280 on p. 247; Nicostr. fr. 38 K.–A. on p. 251). Apart from a general bibliography (see above) I also missed a list of the many abbreviations which all contributors use extensively; not all readers will have acronyms like DAGR, DELG, DGE, GEW, LS, LSA, and others at their fingertips. The index section (provided by Mario Adreassi and Anna Tiziana Drago) is very uneven: there is a rather full 'Indice degli autori moderni' (pp. 343–54) and an ever fuller 'Indice dei passi citati' (pp. 355–75), but the 'Indice dei nomi e delle cose notevoli' (pp. 377–80) and the 'Indice dei termini greci' (p. 381) are much too short and therefore insufficient; I could easily fill another page by just listing the (in my view) necessary additions I pencilled in.

All in all, the book has its uses, but it is marred by editorial infelicities and by avoidable mistakes; I hesitate to call it an indispensable tool for working with Greek comic fragments.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

University of Bern HEINZ-GÜNTHER NESSELRATH

LYRIC REFLEX

C. KUGELMEIER: *Reflexe früher und zeitgenössischer Lyrik in der Alten attischen Komödie*. (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 80.) Pp. 379. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1996. Cased, DM 136. ISBN: 3-519-07629-2.

This revised version of a Cologne dissertation examines the various ways in which reflections of lyric poetry are found in Old Comedy. Lyric is understood to embrace choral lyric, monody, elegy, iambus, and dithyramb, here referred to in the term 'zeitgenössische Lyrik'; comedy, for the most part, naturally means Aristophanes, but room is also found for what we know of other poets.

In his largely programmatic introduction Kugelmeier explains the term 'Reflex', stressing that it is not confined to instances of parody, but covers the whole range of comedy's exploitation of lyric themes, wording, and rhythm. While particular instances of lyric Reflex have been treated elsewhere, this book aims to provide a comprehensive and systematic study of the topic. K. is aware that allusion is difficult to detect and his own procedure is judiciously cautious and distinguishes between verbatim quotation, reference, reminiscence, and more general allusion to an author and his work. An important feature of his investigation is to show how lyric allusion is embedded in a variety of structural contexts and that the effect of the allusion is by no means confined to the comic or even humorous.

K. has fulfilled his aim and I found this a useful book which brings together a great deal of material and discusses key problems of text and interpretation in a balanced way. It was not easy reading, since the marks of the dissertation are still there, especially in the mass of detail on peripheral issues.

K.'s opening discussion on the tradition of lyric in the texts of comedy begins with a consideration of the evidence for literacy and a *Buchkultur*. He comes to the conclusion that, while an oral tradition was retained, written texts were in wide circulation by the end of the fifth century. The evidence is ambiguous, but even if it points to a widespread basic literacy, this needs to be distinguished from a general facility in reading literary texts. In any case, K. exaggerates the degree of knowledge on which the effect of a literary joke in the theatre depends.

In his discussion of the form in which lyric texts are transmitted in comedy K. takes a number of passages illustrating divergent traditions in terms of phonology, vocabulary, and attribution. His discussion raises interesting issues about the relationship between the comic text, the original form of the words it quotes or recalls (often restored by later grammarians), and the form in which the lyric was generally circulating. The comic text can be an index, K. rightly points out, of the normalization of dialectal forms (in conformity with either Attic forms or those of the *Kunstsprache* of dramatic lyric); it can also reflect a generally held, if wrong, view of authorship (cf. *Frogs* 659, which belongs not to Hipponax but to Ananios).

Before turning to the symposium, the principal occasion for the performance of all kinds of lyric poetry, K. discusses two passages, *Peace* 1295ff. and *Clouds* 966ff., in respect of the education of the young. In each case his inferences seem to me too literal: the skills of the lads are manufactured to illustrate comically the passionate attachments of the older men. The bulk of the symposium discussion focuses on the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

comic handling of the *skolia*; particularly interesting is K.'s subtle treatment of *Frogs* 1302ff.

The central chapter is concerned with 'Zitate und Stilimitationen' of lyric in the different formal parts of comedy. The reflection of Stesichorus fr. 212 in the parabasis-ode *Peace* 796ff. is carefully analysed and taken, rightly, as an example of Aristophanes' turning to lyric associations for serious rather than parodic purposes. After treating the non-lyric sections of the parabasis (Simonides fr. 86W in *Peace* 736ff. illustrates Aristophanes' manipulation of the original's metre, theme, and language), K. turns to other choral sections and carefully shows how the three reflections of Pindar's praise of Athens (fr. 76 Snell) are used to generate verbal wit (*Acharnians* 636ff.) or, in different ways, a solemn tone (*Knights* 1329, *Clouds* 299). From the rest of the chapter I would single out the excellent treatment of the *amoibaion* between the frog-chorus and Dionysus (*Frogs* 209ff.), where K. shows that to see here only connections with dithyramb ignores the epic-lyric associations of the song.

The chapter on comedy and iambus opens with a discussion of the nature of comic ridicule. K. disagrees firmly with Rosen, who transfers to comedy the idea that the targets of iambus are stock characters, and sees a character like Cleon as a 'literary bête-noir'. Certainly Aristophanes' Cleon has more than a literary life, but K. himself admits that the picture of Cleon may be exaggerated, that characters like Cleisthenes have qualities which may be 'nur angedichtet' (p. 166), and that the persons of poets are principally analogues of their poetic creations. The chief interest of the chapter itself is the treatment of the fragments of Cratinus' *Archilochoi* (frs. 1–16 K.-A.) with an overview of the possible shape of the play as a whole.

In his longest chapter K. examines comedy's relationship with dithyramb, which he shows was ridiculed because of its vacuity and because it was seen as a serious break away from traditional poetry and music. K. shows in great detail how Kinesias' emaciated physique (to whatever degree real) is exploited to ridicule the insubstantial, airy-fairy art form he is taken to represent. Equally detailed are the treatments of *Frogs* 1309ff. and the opening of *Thes.*, where the dithyrambic qualities of the new tragedy are pilloried; I found K.'s analysis of the Agathon scene particularly useful.

The book closes with a summary of conclusions, an extensive bibliography (to which I would add R. Allison's discussion of the frog-chorus in *G&R* 30 [1983], 8–20), and three indexes: of names, subjects, and *loci.* The production is excellent and I found few misprints, none worthy of mention.

University of Sydney KEVIN LEE

HERO(N)DAS

L. Di Gregorio (ed.): *Eronda* Mimiambi (I–IV). Pp. xlii + 309. Milan: Università Cattolica, 1997. Paper, L. 60,000. ISBN: 88-343-1741-6.

Dr Di Gregorio (hereafter G.) has followed up a persuasive and well-argued paper on Herodas' first mime (*Studia classica I. Tarditi oblata* [Milan, 1997], 1.675–94) with the first half of a two-volume edition of this author, containing a sizeable introduction, text, full apparatus criticus, and Italian translation of, and commentary on, Mimes 1–4. The commentary has a double aim: to explain the text adopted, and to evaluate Herodas' position in Greek literature and his artistic personality.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The introduction is thorough and sound, basically conservative in its approach while lacking in innovation. G. opts for *Ἡρώνδας* as his author's name, here latching on to the persuasive arguments of D. Masson (*RPh* 48 [1974], 89–91), and for Cos as the main place of composition. He leaves open the question of whether Herodas wrote for stage presentation or only readers, even though his commentary acknowledges its debts to G. Mastromarco's *The Public of Herondas* (Amsterdam, 1984). The mimes are interpreted as essays in mannered realism, with the characters' language elevated above their social position but shot through with memorable details of emblematic significance.

The text too lacks new ideas (G.'s name never appears in his apparatus), but it is always defensible, and the apparatus, though over-full, seems generally accurate. G. appears to be a less experienced papyrologist than Cunningham, with a tendency to dot and at times bracket letters legible in the papyrus (e.g. 1.2 *τ̣*[*ις*] not [*τις*], 68 *κα̣τ̣-* not *κ̣α̣*[*τ*]-, 2.73 *φίλι*[*σ*]*τ̣ο̣ς* not *φίλισ̣τ̣*[*ο*]*ς*). He supports original readings in the papyrus rather than corrections by the first or another hand more often than Cunningham in the latter's three editions (Oxford, 1971; Leipzig, 1987; Cambridge, MA and London, 1993). On these occasions one normally sides with Cunningham; in questions of aspiration, however, G. will be generally welcomed for rejecting Cunningham's idiosyncratic practice.

The commentary has an almost Schweighaeuserian discursiveness. Selected points are discussed at length; contributions by other scholars are comprehensively presented and assessed; bibliographical backing on central matters is faultless, although there are a few important peripheral omissions. G.'s judgements are generally excellent, and his occasional use of new material (e.g. over the name Mandris, 1.23) then enables him to outdate earlier editions.

Details, however, are best discussed one by one. Mime 1: G. plausibly sticks to the view supported in his earlier paper, that Metrotime is a *hetaira* and not a married free woman. Introduction, pp. 39–40: on double titles see now my Alexis commentary (Cambridge, 1996), p. 51; p. 46: slaves in comedy banging on doors, add fr. com. adesp. 1147.50–6, 61 Kassel–Austin. 1.6: *παρουσαν* P, see Cunningham's Oxford edition ad loc. 27–31: G. gives July 270 as the date of Arsinoe's death, but see now E. Grzybek, *Du calendrier macédonien au calendrier ptolémaïque* (Basle, 1990), pp. 103ff., arguing for July 268. 45 and elsewhere: G. gives Körte's, not Sandbach's, line numberings for Menander. 50: add Pataikos in Menander's *Perikeiromene*. 61: *ὦ τέκνον*, see E. Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 65–9, 199–206. 79: on wine- measures see my Alexis pp. 650–1. 81: *καλῶς*, see J. H. Quincey, *JHS* 86 (1966), 136f., 139ff.

Mime 2: p. 134, *P.Cair.Zen.* 59004.12 and 59008.17 confirm the change of name to Ptolemaïs already in 259. 2.48: on Charondas see A. Szegedy-Maszak, *GRBS* 19 (1978), 199–209 and M. Gagarin, *Early Greek Law* (Berkeley, etc., 1986), pp. 64–6, 74–5, 129–30. 55: *οἶσθας*, see my commentary on Alexis fr. 15.11. 69 (p. 156): the reference should be to D. Bain, *LCM* 7 (1982), 7–10. 91: *βέλτιον*, see my Alexis p. 827.

Mime 3: 3.6: G. identifies *χαλκίνδα παίζειν* and *χαλκισμός*, but see my Alexis p. 811. 14–15: *κάμνω κηροῦσ'* is everyday Greek (LSJ s.v. *κάμνω* give examples from Attic tragedy, Aristophanes, and Plato), and so is unlikely to be modelled here on Homer. 51: G.'s text needs a comma after *θαλάσσῃ*. 52: *τὠμβλύ* is 'dullness', not 'il declinare'. 63–5: Cunningham rightly notes that 'these lines are more effective' as a question. 78: G. prints *ἔς μευ φορῆσαι* with the papyrus, but Rutherford's *ἔς μ' ἐμφορῆσαι* must here be right; *πληγὴν φορῶ* is unacceptable Greek, which rather uses *φέρω* and *ἐμφορῶ* (e.g. Polyb. 2.33.6, Diod. Sic. 19.70, Plut. *Pomp.* 3, *Ant.* 84) with the noun.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mime 4, in which G. (with S. M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos* [Göttingen, 1978], pp. 49–52 and in opposition to Cunningham) effectively argues for the sanctuary of Asclepius at Cos as the dramatic scene, identifies the two free women as Kynno and Kottale, and prints part-divisions very different from Cunningham's. 4.29: Rutherford's ψύξει<ν> is inescapable; D.'s ψύξει is ungrammatical. 31: the Egyptian goose is in fact larger than most other geese. 32: τι, cf. also E. W. Handley on Men. *Dysk.* 107–8. 49: G.'s treatment of ὡς as causal ('poiché') seems unnatural.

University of Leeds W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT

THUCYDIDES DIEGEMATIKOS

T. ROOD: *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation*. Pp. xi + 339. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-815256-6.

Modern historians often contrast narrative and analytical accounts of the past, and find the former wanting. Historical narratives are seen as merely telling stories about past events, rather than attempting to understand and explain them. Perhaps there is also a feeling that narrative is suspicious because it blurs the boundary between history and fiction. Nevertheless, historians can hardly escape narrative. Even the most fervently synchronic, analytical modern account is still dependent on other narratives for its context, and the ancient historians on whom we depend so heavily for our knowledge of past events were all writers of narrative. Moreover, while not every interpretation of the past is presented in the form of a narrative, every historical narrative is an interpretation; one which makes its case not through explicit argument but through the construction of a persuasive story. As Rood argues in this stimulating and provocative application of narratological theory to a work of ancient historiography, 'Thucydides explains more by narrating better' (p. 285).

R. is concerned both with the nature of the explanation that Thucydides offers and with the techniques he deploys to convey his version of events to the reader. These two strands are closely interwoven, so that R.'s reading of Thucydides' overall interpretation and intentions both informs and is derived from his readings of specific passages. To begin, for the sake of convenience, with the first strand: R.'s Thucydides is no proto-von Rankean positivist, concerned simply with showing the past 'as it really was', nor is he a mere apologist for one or the other side. Rather, the historian seeks to convey essential truths about human nature, and above all the cognitive and emotional constraints on action. He emphasizes the centrality of fear, expectations and perceptions, and perceptions of the perceptions of others, in the making of decisions, and explores the consequences of this for the course of human affairs in the future as well as in the past. The idea of Thucydides the psychologist may not be entirely new, but what is attractive about R.'s account is that he discerns this intent not only in the familiar 'set-pieces' of Corcyrean stasis and Athenian plague, but throughout the narrative. This is the first book which has left me with a positive sense of what Thucydides' history is about, rather than with merely a series of objections to the interpretations presented.

R. develops this idea through a series of detailed readings of key passages. His examination of Thucydidean narrative technique concentrates on certain 'underrated topics' suggested by narratological theory, especially the work of Genelle: focalization, pace, temporal manipulation. Thucydides is shown to limit the focus of his narrative to emphasize particular groups' limited understanding of events, rather than providing a

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

god's-eye view. He reveals information not in strict chronological sequence but when appropriate to explain the reasoning behind decisions or to emphasize links and congruences between different events. Space precludes a proper survey of R.'s original and often provocative interpretations; suffice it to say that future studies of Thucydides will be compelled to engage with them time and again. His brief study of the Pylos narrative (pp. 26–54) may be taken as typical; rejecting the widely accepted emphasis on the rôle of chance in this episode, he reads it instead as highlighting the dissonance between intentions and reality in the course of events, while the element of delay in the narrative recreates the limited perspective of a contemporary observer.

R. also deals in this section with possible objections to his approach: the question of the authenticity of the speeches, the suggestion that oddities in the narrative can be explained by reference to Thucydides' limited sources, and the related theory that these oddities are due to the fact that the work is unfinished. Such objections are rejected emphatically. Elsewhere, passages traditionally seen as confused or incomplete are now read as revealing superlative literary technique; in Book 5, for example, R.'s Thucydides seeks to show how the peace was war in all but name, and how peace itself created the fears that then brought about a return to war. R. often seems concerned to rescue Thucydides from criticism: 'Perceptions of awkwardness may succumb to interpretations founded on a better grasp of Thucydides' sophistication' (p. 53). In many cases it seems impossible to decide on textual grounds whether we should opt for cock-up or conspiracy, incomplete and ill-informed narrative or cunning literary strategy. However, R. does have a point in suggesting that his chosen questions (essentially, what is the rhetorical effect of a given passage?) are simply more interesting than those which treat Thucydides as if his intentions and methods were little different from those of a modern historian, eschewing all literary artifice in the quest to present 'what really happened' in the past.

'His portrayal of an Athens whose "greatness" is implicated in its defeat is intense, complex, poetic: we cannot disprove it; we can tell different stories' (p. 288). We might say something similar of R.'s reading of Thucydides—although we can hardly expect a book based on a doctoral thesis to be 'poetic'. As R. notes, any attempt to tell the story differently reveals much of the writer's underlying assumptions; about probability and causation in the case of those who wish to rewrite the Peloponnesian War, about the nature of (ancient) history in the case of those studying Thucydides. Can we take this parallel any further? Thucydides seeks through the study of one war to say something about all wars; what of R.'s compelling theory that the power of his interpretation of that war rests above all on his literary technique?

Applied to historiography in general, this is a radical and subversive suggestion, though R. seems determined to deny this. 'Narratology . . is no threat to the modern historian. Its exposure of the inescapable subjectivity of historical writing is not frivolous' (p. 9). It did strike me as curious that there is no mention here of Hayden White, a writer who, unlike the theorists cited by R., has actually applied narratological theory to historical rather than fictional narratives. Is this merely a matter of R.'s limited sources? Or is it in fact a deliberate strategy to present narratological theory as domesticated—not only safe but also useful, obscuring its more contentious implications? R.'s problem may be the fact that he needs to have something new to say to make his mark in the crowded world of Thucydidean scholarship, but wishes to avoid upsetting the sensitivities of his intended audience of Thucydidean specialists. If this is the case, I can sympathize, while still wishing that he had chosen a more assertive approach. It is also a shame that the book is quite so forbidding to the non-specialist; these ideas deserve to be discussed both more openly and much more widely. I shall just

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

have to hope that R.'s next book will be more to my taste; in the meantime, this is still a fascinating and important work.

University of Bristol NEVILLE MORLEY

THE *SYMPOSIUM*

L. Brisson (trans.): *Platon:* Le Banquet. Pp. 261. Paris: G. F. Flammarion, 1998. Paper, frs. 21. ISBN: 2-08070987-9.

C. J. Rowe: *Il* Symposio *di Platone. Cinque lezioni sul dialogo con un ulteriore contributo sul* Fedone *e una breve discussione con Maurizio Migliori e Arianna Fermani. A cura di Maurizio Migliori*. Pp. 115. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 3-89665-091-2.

C. J. Rowe: *Plato:* Symposium (Classical Texts). Pp. viii + 231. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1998. Paper, £16.50. ISBN: 0-85668-615-8.

Brisson provides an accurate, readable translation and detailed, helpful notes, introduction, and appendixes that will be particularly useful for French-speaking non-specialists with a serious interest in the dialogue within its cultural and historical context. The discussions of sexuality and education are especially noteworthy. Specialists as well as general readers will appreciate the excellent bibliography, primarily covering works since 1950, and the bibliographical references throughout the notes.

Rowe's *Symposio* is based on five lectures given at the University of Macerata in 1996. It represents the 'first step' towards the interpretation he presents in *Symposium* (noted in *Symposio*, p. 107; *Symposium*, p. viii), from which it differs in some interesting respects. For example, *Symposio* claims that *eros* is 'transformed' or 'transferred' from ordinary objects to philosophy (pp. 17, 54), while *Symposium* denies this (p. 7). The 'contributo sul *Fedone*' in *Symposio* is an abbreviated and slightly modified version of a 1993 article in English.

English-speaking readers will be most interested in *Symposium*. This volume aims to make Plato accessible to readers with little or no Greek, and to 'understand the *argument* which informs the dialogue' (p. vii). It also provides background material in a brief general introduction, a good, select bibliography emphasizing recent work, and occasional explanations of difficult Greek passages. This book will be of use to students of Greek, specialists in classics and ancient philosophy, and the general reader. It nearly always shows good judgement in including the right amount and kind of information for its multiple audiences.

R.'s translation is clear and accurate, showing careful attention to detail. For example, his note on *περί* at 203c4 defends the translation 'in relation to' as opposed to the usual 'of', and his 'po[i]ets' for *ποιηταί* (205c2) preserves both the wit and the sense of the original. R.'s sensitivity to philological and philosophical nuance is evident, for example, in his translation of 222b2–4 (*καὶ ἄλλους πάνυ πολλούς, οὓς οὗτος ἐξαπατῶν ὡς ἐραστὴς παιδικὰ μᾶλλον αὐτὸς καθίσταται ἀντ' ἐραστοῦ*): 'a great many others, whom this man deceives in the role of lover, becoming more of a beloved himself instead of a lover'. This neatly preserves the ambiguity of the Greek, leaving open the question of who is responsible for the deception. Other translators, in contrast, ascribe a deliberate deception to Socrates: ' beaucoup d'autres qu'il dupe en

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

se donnant l'air d'un amant, alors qu'il tient le rôle du bien-aimé' (Brisson); 'many another as well, whom he seduces as a lover and ends up himself as beloved instead of lover' (R. E. Allen, *The Dialogues of Plato*. Vol. II: *The Symposium* [New Haven, 1991]); 'He takes people in by pretending to be their lover, and then he swaps roles and becomes their beloved instead' (R. Waterfield, *Plato: Symposium* [Oxford, 1994]); 'He has deceived us all: he presents himself as your lover, and, before you know it, you're in love with him yourself!' (A. Nehamas and P. Woodruff, *Plato: Symposium* [Indianapolis, 1989]); 'he has pretended to be in love with them, when in fact he is himself the beloved rather than the lover' (W. Hamilton, *Plato. The Symposium* [Harmondsworth, 1951]). One might disagree with certain of R.'s choices; for example, to translate *ὑβριστής* as 'downright criminal' (175e7) may give too legalistic a flavour to the word. However, R. is careful to explain controversial terms, and he often provides literal translations in his notes. The English is less lively than the more impressionistic rendering of Nehamas and Woodruff, but is very readable, although there are occasional irritating colloquialisms in the translation or the notes. R.'s is unquestionably the most accurate of the six translations I compared. (I did not obtain Christopher Gill's new Penguin translation in time for this review.)

Symposium is particularly good at considering the dramatic context of the dialogue. For example, R. observes (on 209a3–4) that the reference to poets in Diotima's speech must be ironic, given the treatment of Agathon and Aristophanes in the rest of the dialogue, and he argues (on 206e8–207a2) that a discussion of the immortality of the soul would be out of place in the context of a symposium. His analyses of the speech of Agathon and of the first part of Diotima's speech are especially insightful, arguing for D.'s fictionality (p. 173), for the 'provisional' nature of her teachings (on 207c8–9), and noting numerous connections between her speech and that of Agathon.

Of the earlier commentaries, both K. J. Dover (*Plato: Symposium* [Cambridge, 1980]) and R. G. Bury (*The Symposium of Plato* [Cambridge, 1932]) concentrate on textual and philological points. One of the great virtues of R. is the detailed philosophical commentary, which takes account of recent scholarly work, provides basic information for students, and offers original interpretations of interest to specialists also.

Perhaps R.'s most controversial philosophical claim is that, according to Socrates, our erotic impulses towards individuals 'themselves represent a misdirection of our desires' away from philosophy, and that 'the *Symposium* is not about "love", or if it is, it is about highly specific aspects of it', namely, love of true beauty and caring for others to the extent of 'contributing to their intellectual improvement' (p. 7). R.'s emphasis on the intellect is a welcome counterbalance to readings of the dialogue primarily in terms of interpersonal relationships. However, in arguing that 'conversion away from the individual . . . is an epistemological process' (p. 197) R. risks undervaluing the emotional and erotic aspects of philo-sophia. Alcibiades and others are 'overwhelmed' (*ἐκπεπληγμένοι*: 215d5) at hearing the words of their beloved Socrates, and the lover who begins the Ascent is, like the Socrates addressed by Diotima, 'overwhelmed' (*ἐκπέπληξαι*; 211d5) by the sight of beautiful young men. Strong emotional impulses towards a beautiful individual are also a necessary first step up the ladder (210a6–7). R.'s account explains neither how this step is necessary to the final vision of Beauty, nor how *eros* in the ordinary sense is significantly similar to philosophical *eros*. Whether or not they agree with him, however, scholars will need to take into account R.'s original and well-argued interpretation.

R. bases his text on Burnet's OCT, from which he departs only rarely. He neglects to signal the differences on a few occasions, for example at 183b3, and at 216d4, where

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Burnet punctuates differently. A list of the differences would be helpful. My copy had three holes in pp. 173 and 174, and broken type on a number of pages (for example, 109, 192). I found only two typographical errors: p. vii, para. 2, and p. 213, on 222e11.

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities ELIZABETH BELFIORE

A NUMENIAN PLATONIST?

G. BECHTLE: *The Anonymous Commentary on Plato's* 'Parmenides'. Pp. 285. Bern, Stuttgart, and Vienna: Verlag Paul Haupt, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 3-258-05959-4.

This is a most useful volume, which I warmly welcome the appearance of, though it propounds a thesis which I have had difficulty in accepting. It consists of an edition, with text, translation, and commentary, of a most curious document, a fragmentary commentary on the *Parmenides* of Plato, first discovered in 1873 by the Italian philologist, B. Peyron, in a palimpsest in the University Library at Turin, of which he was the librarian, then published in 1892 by the distinguished German scholar Wilhelm Kroll, and subsequently (in 1904) destroyed in a fire which swept through the library—thus conferring on this document the dubious distinction of being a text without an original manuscript of any kind to back it.

The surviving text is short, fourteen pages in all, divided into six separate fragments, but it is full of interest. The first fragment seems to concern the introduction to the second part of the dialogue (137A–C); the second a part of the middle of the first hypothesis—139B–140B: the One cannot be either the same as or other than itself or anything else; the third comes from somewhat later in the first hypothesis—141A: the One cannot be younger or older or the same age as itself or anything else. The fourth fragment appears to be a sort of conclusion to the exegesis of the first hypothesis, commending the superiority of negative theology over positive when dealing with the One, and criticizing those (including, it would seem, the author(s) of the *Chaldaean Oracles*) who would like to grant some attributes to the One, such as power or intellection.

With the fifth, we move to the exegesis of the second hypothesis, which for Platonists after Plotinus, at least, concerned Intellect, as One-Being. It seems to be a comment on the first section (142B), where the One's participation in Being is being discussed. The sixth and final fragment arises from an exegesis of 143A, which sets up a contrast between the One and its Being, in order to establish a relation of difference between them. The fragment is concerned with the sort of intellection that can grasp this contrast, and so with the highest sort of consciousness, which can reflect on the more particular operations of intellect, and this would seem to be a level of intellection proper to the One itself.

Bechtle gives first a text (slightly improved from that of Pierre Hadot in his edition) and a very sound translation, with textual notes. He then embarks, in Part II, first on a detailed history of the interpretation of the dialogue, dwelling in particular on the Neopythagorean tradition, stemming ultimately (and I agree with him here) from Speusippus; and then on a discussion of the contents of each of the fragments; and thirdly, on a systematic study of the philosophical positions revealed in the commentary. He painstakingly analyses each element of doctrine, trying to estimate whether it must be post-Plotinian, or might rather be seen as pre-Plotinian. Then, lastly, in Part III, he directly addresses the question of chronology, once again going

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

through each fragment in turn, looking at significant doctrines and key turns of phrase. He ends with two useful appendices, one on Iamblichus' conception of Time, the other on the commentary's use of the term *hypostasis*.

What he is seeking to show is that the doctrine of the *Commentary*, while undeniably close to that of Plotinus, should be seen as being slightly less developed, rather than more developed, than his. The difficulty he is facing is that Porphyry, hitherto (since the equally painstaking study of Pierre Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus* [Paris, 1968]) the prime candidate for authorship, is agreed to have advanced a some- what less articulated metaphysic than his master, his first principle, or 'One', being also, according to Damascius, 'the Father (or highest element) of the (Chaldaean) noetic triad', and so could be seen as a plausible author of certain possible 'pre-Plotinian' features. Also, such features as reference to the *Chaldaean Oracles* (fr. 4), and the distinguishing of a triad of Being–Life–Mind within the hypostasis of *Nous* (fr. 6) have hitherto been thought not to antedate Porphyry.

However, some fascinating recent evidence has weighed in in favour of B.'s theory. Michel Tardieu, *Recherches sur la formation de l'Apocalypse de Zostrien et les sources de Marius Victorinus* (Bures-sur-Yvette, 1996), has demonstrated that there is at least a source common to two key chapters of Marius Victorinus' treatise *Adversus Arium* (I.9–50)—which Hadot had assumed to be solely influenced by Porphyry—and the Gnostic tractate *Zostrianus*, which we know to antedate Plotinus—and that document employs much terminology and many concepts (such as the triad Being–Life–Mind) previously thought Porphyrian. Zostrianus is almost certainly influenced by contemporary Platonism (probably of the Numenian variety), and this makes it possible to envisage such concepts having a Middle Platonic source.

I am also, I must say, much impressed by B.'s exegesis of the text of fr. 6, which seems to credit the first principle, or One in Itself, with a special kind of intellection which is far more Numenian than Plotinian (only appearing in Plotinus in the early, 'Numenian', tractate V.4). What we certainly seem to have here is a form of the Numenian 'intellect at rest', as opposed to the 'intellect in motion' of Numenius' secondary, demiurgic deity.

The only aspect of the argument in which B. appears to me to skimp somewhat is the analysis of details of language, an area in which Hadot is able to claim a good deal of similarity with Porphyry. But B.'s position would presumably be that, even if certain terminology and turns of phrase are found in Porphyry, it does not preclude their being earlier also. And I have to admit that he is justified in this.

So perhaps B. has after all managed to redraw the map of Middle Platonism. He should certainly be warmly commended for his efforts, and his work deserves to be widely discussed. He does have a residual problem, as to who precisely is to be accorded the honour of composing this commentary. He points us in the direction of the 'school of Numenius', without wishing to get more precise than that—but he is under no absolute compulsion to do so, after all. His main point has been well made.

Trinity College Dublin JOHN DILLON

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

DEMOSTHENES' RHETORIC

T. L. PAPILLON: *Rhetorical Studies in the Aristocratea of Demosthenes*. Pp. x + 157. New York, etc.: Peter Lang, 1998. Cased, £25. ISBN: 0-8204-3986-X.

Demosthenes' speech *Against Aristocrates* was written in 352 to be delivered by one Euthycles (thus Dion. Hal. *Amm.* 1.4), who was prosecuting Aristocrates for having illegally proposed that the mercenary commander Charidemos be granted special protection, such that anyone who killed him would be liable to extradition from allied states. The speech is of great interest to legal and political historians for the light that it throws both on the Athenian law of homicide and on Athens' foreign policy in the mid-fourth century, but has been comparatively neglected as a work of oratory. This neglect Papillon seeks to redress in this revision of his doctoral dissertation.

The book consists of six chapters and an appendix. Chapter I discusses various ancient and modern views of the speech (the ancients admired its style and arguments, the moderns mine it for historical data), sketches the political background, and introduces the main thesis of the book, that this judicial speech contains elements also of the other two species of oratory—deliberative and epideictic. Chapter II examines the structural organization of the speech and develops the main thesis by arguing that the arguments of the Proof—by far the longest section—can be divided into the judicial (the decree is illegal), the deliberative (the decree is not in Athens' interest), and the epideictic (Charidemos is a rogue). In the next two chapters P. discusses the use of *ethos* and *pathos*, and deals with two characteristics of style attributed to this speech by ancient critics: distinctness and abundance. In Chapter V and its appendix it is argued that the speech, although not delivered by Demosthenes, does reflect the political views that he held at the time. The final chapter offers a brief conclusion.

Studies of individual Demosthenic speeches are few, and P.'s book certainly helps to fill one of the larger gaps. He appears most at home in the rhetorical tradition, and sees the speech from this perspective. This is both a strength and a weakness. His main thesis, while not wholly original (see pp. 17–18), raises important questions about the rôle of genre in Greek oratory. P. claims to detect in this speech 'the creative use of mixture that goes beyond Aristotelian categories and creates for itself a genre of discourse most effective for its own context' (p. 2). His suggestion that Demosthenes was rewriting the rules is interesting, as is the comparison with the genre-blurring speeches of Isocrates (p. 15), and both points could profitably have been developed. However, one might question whether the three species of oratory had previously been as distinct as P. implies. Lysias 12, for example, is a judicial speech which contains a lengthy attack, which P. would presumably characterize as epideictic, on someone other than the defendant, namely Theramenes.

P. seeks to analyse the speech according to the standards of 'neo-classical' rhetoric. He refers frequently to rhetorical tradition, and seems to believe that it already existed, in outline at least, by the middle of the fourth century. Certainly to write that Demosthenes went 'beyond Aristotelian categories' suggests as much. But in that case we need a much fuller account of contemporary rhetorical theory than we are here given. One would hardly guess from P.'s words that this speech predates Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. It is indicative of his approach that he regularly uses Latin technical terms. It may have been true for Cicero or Quintilian that 'The three traditional elements of the proem are the processes of making the audience attentive (*attentio*),

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

teachable (*docilitas*), and capturing their good will (*benevolentia*)' (p. 21), but would Demosthenes and his contemporaries necessarily have agreed?

P. rightly emphasizes that the speech was written in response to a particular situation, but devotes little space to its historical context. His sketch of the immediate background (pp. 11–13) is too brief to be helpful. The reader gets little sense of the issues involved, of why the Athenians might have wished to grant protection to Charidemos, or indeed of the kinds of arguments that Aristocrates might have used in his own defence. If Demosthenes' speech failed, as Charidemos' election as general for 351/50 might incline us to believe, P. would attribute this to 'the dullness of the jury' or 'fear of the powerful Charidemus' (p. 116). The possibility that Aristocrates gave a better speech (either better delivered, or better written, or more in accord with the jurors' assessment of Athens' interest) is not considered. P.'s concentration on persuasion in the abstract blinds him to the particular problems of persuading an Athenian jury of the mid-fourth century. It is no coincidence, I think, that Josiah Ober's name is barely mentioned.

All Greek quotations that extend beyond a few words are translated, but the use of some untranslated and untransliterated rhetorical terms will make this book less accessible to Greekless students of rhetoric. It is, for example, unclear why *logos* is transliterated but *paradeigma* is not (the latter does not appear in the index, but 'example' does). Since there is little linguistic analysis, the quantity of Greek that is printed appears excessive.

To conclude, this is a sound piece of work, but its fundamentally unhistorical approach limits its usefulness as a guide either to the speech or to Demosthenes' development as a political orator.

York University, Toronto JEREMY TREVETT

ARISTOTLE ON 'MOTION'

D. W. GRAHAM (trans.): *Aristotle:* Physics *Book viii.* Pp. xvii + 209. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999. Paper, £14.99. ISBN: 0-19-824092-9.

This volume is a welcome addition to the Clarendon Aristotle Series. Books I–IV of the *Physics* were covered long ago, and it is good to see that the remaining books are not being ignored. The volume conforms to the high standards of the series: the translation is accurate and the commentary is always pertinent. Unsurprisingly, there are a few places where I found myself not completely satisfied, but they are very few in relation to the whole.

The translation. The topic of this book is what Aristotle calls κίνησις, and Graham consistently translates this as motion' (with κινεῖν as 'to move', and so on). It is debatable whether 'change' would be a better translation, but at any rate readers should be warned of the point, and they are not. They have to wait until the fifth page of the commentary (on 251a8–17) before they receive even a hint that 'motion' is here being used in a wider sense than they might have expected, and even that hint is not altogether clear. (It is mentioned that alteration, increase and decrease, coming to be and perishing, are reckoned as 'species of motion' in *Phys.* 3.1. But it is *not* mentioned that what we naturally call motion, i.e. locomotion, is also reckoned to be but one of the various 'species of motion'.) There should surely have been a general and explanatory note on this point, right at the beginning. Setting this aside, there were very few occasions where I felt that G.'s translation had misrepresented Aristotle's

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

thought. Here is one. At the end of Chapter I Aristotle's theme is that a thing is not explained just by the fact that it happens always. To illustrate, he says:

> καὶ γὰρ τὸ τρίγωνον ἔχει δυσὶν ὀρθαῖς ἀεὶ τὰς γωνίας ἴσας, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐστίν τι τῆς ἀϊδιότητος ταύτης ἕτερον αἴτιον. (252^{b}2–4).

G. translates

> For instance, a triangle always has its interior angles equal to 180 degrees, but all the same there is a further cause of its being everlasting.

This is awkward, for on first reading one is inclined to take the antecedent of 'it' in the phrase 'its being everlasting' as 'a triangle', until reflection shows that this cannot be what is meant. But reflection on G.'s translation cannot tell you that what Aristotle means is likely to be that there is a further cause of this fact about triangles, and not a further cause of the eternity of this fact. (So I would rather translate '. . . a further cause of this eternal truth', and gloss 'a further cause of this truth, even though it is eternal'.) But, as I have said, disagreements between us of this sort are very rare.

The translation, then, is accurate. Granted this, one might or might not like its style, and this is no doubt a matter of taste. It is natural to compare it with Robin Waterfield's translation of the *Physics*, as this is the most recent 'rival' translation into English (*Aristotle, Physics*, translated by R. Waterfield, with an introduction and notes by D. Bostock [Oxford, 1996]. G. apparently does not know of this translation; at any rate, he never refers to it). My taste is for Waterfield's, since it runs more smoothly as English (largely because it often supplements Aristotle's elliptical Greek) and is no less accurate. But that may well be dismissed as a predictable bias on my part, since I was myself associated with Waterfield's translation.

The commentary. Just occasionally I found G.'s analysis of Aristotle's arguments misleading. The most conspicuous example is in Chapter I. Here Aristotle is trying to argue that there always has been 'motion', and always will be, and he offers three main arguments. At 251a8–b10 he argues that motion could not start from a state in which nothing moves; at 251b28–252a5 he attempts to offer a symmetrical argument for saying that motion could not cease, to yield a state in which nothing moves; in between there is an argument from the nature of time, which plainly is symmetrical in rejecting the possibility of any time at which motion either starts or ceases. There is then a concluding section (252a5–b5) which offers further objections to both Empedocles and Anaxagoras, who had been introduced earlier (250b23–251a8) as each in their different ways denying what Aristotle wants to prove. This seems to me to be a perfectly clear structure for the chapter. But G. offers a summary (on p. 58) which pays attention only to the claim that motion has always existed, and ignores the symmetrical claim that it always will. He furthermore tries to construe the whole chapter as an *argumentum ad homines*, in which what I have called 'the three main arguments' (251a8–252a5) are construed as all directed solely against Anaxagoras, who had said that there was once a beginning of motion, coming after an infinite period in which nothing moved. (So far as we know, Anaxagoras said nothing about a possible end to motion.) So he then expects what I have called 'the concluding section' to be directed solely against Empedocles, who (according to Aristotle) had said that there is a regular alternation of periods of motion and periods in which nothing moves. Apparently G. does not recognize that the three main arguments have already destroyed Empedocles' position (and he takes 252a3–5 as a premature rejection of that position, not yet justified by argument). Naturally, it then puzzles him that this concluding section also contains remarks about infinity which clearly apply to Anaxagoras rather than Empedocles

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(252a11–19), and it should have puzzled him to note that the argument that is there offered against Empedocles is merely secondary, for it claims only that Empedocles' position is not adequately justified, and it does not follow from this that it is mistaken. All this would be rectified by a better reading of the structure of the chapter, recognizing that the three main arguments destroy all positions which conflict with Aristotle's own, whether or not anyone has ever held them.[1]

This was the only point where I felt that G.'s analysis of the overall structure of Aristotle's argument was badly wrong. But there were one or two particular passages where—as it seemed to me—he had failed to see how the argument was supposed to work. I take an example from Chapter VIII. The general theme of this chapter is that only circular motion can be continuous and eternal, and what is mainly argued is that a perpetual oscillation on a straight line, back and forth between the two endpoints, cannot be continuous. For the moving object must pause at each endpoint. Several distinguishable arguments are offered (all very unconvincing to us), and in one of these Aristotle generalizes the notion of 'motion' involved, and speaks of an object oscillating between being white and being not white (264b1–6). G. translates perfectly well, but it seems to me that he has not taken in what Aristotle actually asserts, and so has not seen the point of the argument. For what Aristotle claims is that at the same time as the object has ceased to be not white, at that time it has become white and has become not white. This he treats as an impossible conclusion, presumably because it implies that at the same time the object both is white and is not white, which is a contradiction. But how is it supposed to follow? My reconstruction is this. By hypothesis the changing object does not pause at either of the termini of its change (264b4), so, having become white, it does not remain white for any length of time, but ('immediately') ceases to be white. But that is to say that it has ('immediately') become not white. When? Well, there cannot be any gap between the time when it has become white and the time when it has become not white, for if there were then during that gap the object would stay white, which by hypothesis it never does. But if there is no gap between these times then they must be the same time (for any two distinct times are separated by a stretch of time). As I reconstruct it, then, the argument relies on the fact that 'white' and 'not white' are contradictories, so that whenever one does not apply the other does, and otherwise only on theses about time that Aristotle clearly accepts. It is, moreover, a good argument (though not very relevant to the overall theme of the chapter). Now my reconstruction may be wrong, for Aristotle does not give his argument, and I have supplied it for him. But what is G.'s reconstruction? Well, he gives none. His comment on the passage (p. 152) states that the argument 'does not work', but gives nothing that I can recognize as an account of what the argument is supposed to be. So far as I can see, he simply ignores the claim that, at the same time as the object has become white, it has also become not white; yet surely it was this that was supposed to do the damage. Here, then, is a brief passage where it seems to me that G. has not understood the argument at all. But it is an isolated example, quite untypical of his commentary as a whole.

A thought that I had rather more frequently is that G.'s own criticisms of Aristotle, though always relevant, were not always as sharp as they could be. The overall theme

[1]In this case confusion is worse confounded by what must be regarded as simply a slip of G.'s pen. For p. 59 refers us to Appendix I on p. 183 for 'the real structure of the argument', and there the whole of the chapter is represented as directed against Empedocles' position, so that Anaxagoras is never addressed! (Clause B on p. 183 should surely be 'motion after infinite rest is impossible', rather than 'intermittent motion is impossible'.)

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Chapter VIII, introduced at the beginning, will serve as an example. Aristotle claims that only circular motion can be eternal and continuous, though all that he in fact argues is that rectilinear motion cannot be. By what right does he ignore all other possible motions? The unstated reason is no doubt his background view that there are only two kinds of 'natural' motion, namely circular (round the centre) and rectilinear (to or from the centre), a point which G. never quite makes. The stated reason is:

> Everything that moves in place travels either in a circle or in a straight line or in a combination of the two, so that if one of the former is not continuous the combination of both cannot be continuous either. (261b28–31, tr.)

On this G. merely comments: 'To say that all curves can somehow be derived from the straight line and the circle is to make a bold claim which needs argument', and says no more (p. 135). Here one might better have said that it needs explanation, for Aristotle gives no account of what 'combinations' he has in mind. I remark that if he is thinking of combining movements by superimposing one on another—as he might be, since that is how Eudoxus' theory of planetary motion works—then we may reply that all movements in a plane may be represented as the result of superimposing one rectilinear movement on another (e.g. the vertical and horizontal components of the motion). No doubt he need not have been thinking in this way, but in any case this brings out the force of the main objection, which G. does not make at all: even supposing that all motions are compounded of straight and circular, and granting Aristotle's argument that motion on a single straight line cannot be continuous and eternal, it still remains to be shown that compound motions cannot be. To take a very simple example, what about motion round a triangle—or, to forestall some possible objections, round a triangle with rounded corners? To be sure, no one has ever supposed that any body moves 'naturally' in this way, but that is not relevant to the argument that Aristotle actually states.

A book such as G.'s is a book full of details. As I have indicated, some of these details do not seem to me to be right, but there are many more that do, and the book will certainly be of great assistance to all who study this complex work.

It is a worthy addition to the series.

Merton College, Oxford DAVID BOSTOCK

PYTHEAS OF MASSALIA

S. Bianchetti (ed.): *Pitea di Massalia: L'Oceano: Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento.* (Biblioteca di studi antichi 82.) Pp. XI + 227. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 1998. Cased, L. 60,000. ISBN: 88-8147-143-4.

Do we need, after the collections of H. J. Mette (*Pytheas von Massalia* [Berlin, 1952]) and Ch. H. Roseman (*Pytheas of Massalia: On the Ocean* [Chicago, 1994]), a third edition within half a century of the nearly forty ancient text passages concerning the lost *Περὶ ὠκεανοῦ* of Pytheas of Massalia? One looks at B.'s book with a certain scepticism, as the subtitle in essence proclaims the conventional triad of text, translation, and commentary. Yet the 'introduzione' offers nothing less than a monograph on the dating (pp. 27–39) and scientific classification of the Massaliote (pp. 39–47), on earlier voyages to the Northwest of Europe (pp. 47–52), and on the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

itinerary of his own expedition (pp. 52–67) as well as on the resulting work and its impact (pp. 68–80).

While we possess a reliable *terminus ante quem* in the last quarter of the fourth century with Dicaearchus' rejection of Pytheas' theories (Strab. 2.4.2, C 104), all previous attempts to determine more closely the date of *Περὶ ὠκεανοῦ* are purely tentative: neither Aristotle's evident unawareness of Pytheas' research furnishes any indication for a date after 322, nor does any real knowledge about Thule before 332 follow from the 'date' of the fictitious adventures of Deinias and Derkyllis before Alexander's capture of Tyre (Phot. *Bibl*. 166, p. 111b). Untenable also are speculations that Alexander ordered the expedition to the Northern edges of the earth. Only some reflexions of contemporary interest in the far north indicate, according to B., that in the twenties of the fourth century Pytheas' report was already known (pp. 33–7).

Thus, we find ourselves in a period of revolutionary scientific progress. Eudoxus' doctrine of the motion of the stars had put Greek astronomy on a new basis whose fundamental elements and effects down to Ptolemy B. summarizes concisely (pp. 39–45). This is, as the author convincingly points out, the *Sitz im Leben* of Pytheas' account. His expedition sought to verify Eudoxus' theory by an autopsy of the celestial phenomena in subpolar and polar latitudes (p. 45)—this seems to emerge clearly from Eratosthenes' and Hipparchus' adoption of Pytheas' results. Moreover, cartographical, i.e. primarily earth-focused, interest, described by B. as a kind of red thread through the entire Greek geography (pp. 46f.), undoubtedly played a rôle as well, as follows from some details of the expedition and from the title of the work.

It is this scientific approach in particular which distinguishes the enterprise of the Massaliote from all previous expeditions to the West and Northwest of Europe: judging from the sparse evidence available, the journeys of Colaeus, Midacritus, and Himilco were basically driven by economic interests. The presumably Massaliote sixth-century *periplus* used by Avienius was hardly anything more than an ordinary description of the coast. Individual correspondences between fragments of Pytheas and Avienius suggest that Pytheas directly or indirectly knew the older *periplus*. However, the supposition occasionally put forward that the fourth-century *Mittlerquelle* who translated this *periplus* might be Pytheas himself is highly improbable in view of significant textual discrepancies (pp. 50–2). The names of the author and the mediator of the text found in Avienius thus have to remain unknown.

The hypothesis recently revived by Luiselli that Pytheas reached the Atlantic by land may also be disposed of. In fact, the only plausible reason for this would be a total blockade of the Straits of Gibraltar by the Carthaginians, mentioned by Strabo (17.1.19, C 802), but hardly to be verified for the period in question on the basis of the wording of the second treaty between the Romans and Carthaginians (Polyb. 3.24.4; see B., pp. 27f., 52–4). Several references to the Mediterranean coast of Iberia and the Straits of Gibraltar itself, presumably going back to Pytheas even in Strabo's work, rather point to just that route, under normal circumstances the only reasonable one. Some stages of the subsequent voyage to the north may be reconstructed less unambiguously: whether Pytheas rounded the Gulf of Biscaya or directly set course for Brittany at the northwestern cape of Spain has to remain unanswered after all—the Massaliote himself might already have weighed the use of indigenous information against the quickest possible arrival at his destination. Anyhow, the assumption that later on he sailed along the British west coast and travelled the eastern and southern side on the return route (see B., pp. 60f.) is the easiest way to reconcile without strain both accounts in Strabo (2.4.1, C 104) that Pytheas 'visited all the accessible parts of Britain' (F 7b), and 'turning back sailed along the whole coast of Europe from Gades

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to the Tanaïs' (F 8d), unless one takes refuge in the problematic assumption of a second voyage referred to in the latter statement (see e.g. Mette, loc. cit., p. 7; O. A. W. Dilke, *Greek and Roman Maps* [London, 1985], pp. 136f.). Between the two legs of the journey there occurred a six-day crossing of the northern Atlantic, the impression of which on the Western Greeks is illustrated vividly by their helpless- ness in describing the phenomena encountered (F 8d: 'marine lung', 'suspension of the elements'). There is considerable evidence for localizing Thule, considered the northernmost of the British Isles by the ancient geographers, somewhere along the Norwegian coast (pp. 63f.). This is where autopsy obviously ended. Of the 'frozen sea' allegedly to be reached in one day's journey Pytheas gives only a second-hand description. After his previous observations the natives' accounts of the 'lying down of the sun' and the midnight sun were not in need of further verification.

Pytheas' studies may be considered a veritable example of the application of scientific method. However, the originality of his enterprise hardly allows any statement concerning the formal structure and character of the lost work. Even the existence of a map is pure speculation (p. 70). Yet, Pytheas' impact was remarkable. Not only Eratosthenes consulted him as an authority on the northern edge of the *oikoumene*; in Crates' commentary on Homer his observations also found their place (pp. 71f.). It is certainly no accident that Poseidonios named his geographical study *περὶ ὠκεανοῦ* as well, and Pytheas' influence on utopia and the travel-novel goes much further, as the few explicit references to Thule show at a glance (pp. 72–80). This very kind of adoption, however, discredited Pytheas with 'liberal arts scholars' such as Polybius or Strabo.

B. presents the fragments in a critical re-edition and arranges them by their respective contents (pp. 82–107): the celestial pole (F 1), the tides (F 2–3), the Atlantic coast (F 4–6), the British Isles (F 7), Thule and the midnight sun (F 8–14), the amber countries (F 15–17), the regions beyond the Rhine (F 18), the Lipari Isles (F 19), and finally the critique of Pytheas by later authors (F 20–3). The dismemberment of coherent passages such as Strab. 2.4.1–2, C 104 is somewhat inconvenient in individual cases, but appears justified with regard to the conceptual distinctness gained. B.'s principal merit, however, lies in the exceedingly rich commentary, the major part of her study (pp. 109–212). B. has collected the relevant material with much diligence and circumspection, and she competently discusses scientific and historical problems. Nevertheless, a slightly more transparent layout of the text and perhaps the use of footnotes in this section as well might have facilitated its perusal. Not least B.'s well-balanced opinion in details as well as in her overall judgement of the author will make this book an indispensable tool for all future research on ancient Greek geographical exploration.

Friedrich-Schiller-Universität, Jena K. ZIMMERMANN

TETRABIBLOS

W. HÜBNER (ed.): *Claudii Ptolemaei Opera quae exstant omnia. Volumen III, 1: ΑΠΟΤΕΛΕΣΜΑΤΙΚΑ* (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana). Pp. lxxv + 438. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998. Cased, DM 218. ISBN: 3-519-01746-6.

Hübner is well known to scholars for his investigations of ancient astrology. He now

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

publishes the new edition of the *Apotelesmatica* of Claudius Ptolemy, a work better known under the title of *Tetrabiblos* (the authenticity of the title *Apotelesmatica* is also defended by J. Mansfeld, *Prolegomena Mathematica* [Leiden, 1998], pp. 96–8).

The first modern critical edition of the text of the *Apotelesmatica*, begun by F. Boll, was brought to completion by E. Boer (1940 = 1957: Bibliotheca Teubneriana), in the same year as was published the edition by F. E. Robbins (1940: Loeb Classical Library). Less reliance may be placed on the edition (1985, 1989^2) by S. Feraboli (pp. vii–x, xxxi).

H. has re-examined the entire manuscript tradition of Ptolemy's work (thirty-three complete manuscripts and fourteen mutilated ones, all of fairly recent date: pp. xi–xviii), and he has reconstructed the text in a solidly reliable fashion. Inevitably, there are still some passages about which doubt remains (pp. 1–li), but on the whole this is an excellent work. Progress over previous editions is evident on virtually every page.

H. has based the text of his edition on three criteria (pp. xxvi–xxxii): (i) he has utilized the unpublished notes of Boer; (ii) he has taken into account the 'indirect' tradition represented by the *Apotelesmatica* of Hephaestion; and (iii) he has collated the two contemporary editions of Boer and Robbins.

On p. xxv of the 'Praefatio', H. traces, following Boer (p. xiv), a stemma of the relations between the manuscripts. All surviving manuscripts derive from one common archetype. Already in the fourth to sixth centuries, however, the tradition had become separated into several branches: on the one hand, the branch represented by the manuscripts of Hephaestion; on the other, that represented by the manuscripts of Ptolemy. H. divides the latter into four classes (ψ α β γ), which he supposes to descend from a common ancestor (ω = 'consensus codicum': p. lxxiv). The tradition is considerably contaminated (pp. xviii–xxv).

In his *Problemi di critica testuale* (Florence, 1979, pp. 41–3), a little-known book which has escaped the attention of H., G. B. Alberti had raised well-founded criticisms against the reconstruction of the relations between the manuscripts of Ptolemy proposed by Boer and, as a result, against his five-branched stemma (the three families α β γ and the two manuscripts VL supposedly derive from one archetype). From his examination of the apparatus of Book 1, Alberti not only showed that there is the same kinship between families β γ—demonstrated by a number of common errors—but he also pointed out the existence of errors common to α β γ. He deduced from this that α β γ constitute a single family, within which β γ represent a subgroup. The two manuscripts VL, moreover, are not related to the archetype independently from one another, as is shown by their numerous common errors. The stemma traced by Boer, Alberti concluded, is mistaken: not five, but two families derive from the archetype, one of which is represented by VL and the other by α β γ, and contamination is widespread. Alberti prudently renounced proposing his own stemma, either because he had not had the opportunity to re-examine the manuscripts or because of the contamination.

H. has also arrived at the correct conclusion that VL derive from a common model (ψ), and constitute an independent family; nevertheless, he has remained faithful to Boer in considering the three other families α β γ as mutually independent.

I had the impression that Alberti's objections are also valid, in part, for H.'s stemma. I have therefore applied Alberti's criteria to the apparatus of H.'s edition, extending my investigation to all four books of the *Apotelesmatica*. I here append a few examples (the citations are indicated according to the line numbers of H., preceded by the book number; the readings of the other manuscripts are in brackets):

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Errors common to $\beta\ \gamma$: 1.210 *ἀθετεῖν* (*ἀναιρεῖν*); 244 *συνεργεῖ* om.; 295 *οἱ δυνατοὶ σήμερον* (*ὅσοι δ. σημειοῦσθαι*); 402 *περιττῶν* (*περὶ τὴν γῆν*); 503 *παμπόλλους* (*παμπληθεῖς*); 2.74, 87 *ἀεὶ συνέχειαν* (*σ.*); 185 *κατὰ* (*κατ' αὐτὸ τὸ*); 3.36 *καθόλου* (*καθολικῶν*); 680 *ἑκάστας μοίρας* (*ἑκάστης μοίρας α* Procl., *ἑκάστη μοίρα* V); 4.423 *μὲν* om.; 448 *δωδεκατημορίοις* om.; 619 *ὅταν ἢ* (*ὅταν*);740 *τὸ καθ' ἥμισυ μέρος* (*τοῦ κ. ἥ. μέρους*).

It is interesting to note, furthermore, that especially in Book 3, $\beta\ \gamma$ often share their own errors with Σ: a significant sign of contamination with a branch of family α.

Errors common to $\alpha\ \beta\ \gamma$: 1.714 *διυγραίνεσθαι* (*ὑγραίνεσθαι*); 778 *τὰ δὲ ἴσα* (*ἓξ δὲ*); 796 *τὸν ἀπηλιώτην* (*τὸ ἀπηλιωτικώτερον* V Procl. *ἀφ. Γ*); 876 *πλάνητες* (*πλανῆται*); 995 *ἐκεῖνο μειοῦνται* (*τὸ ψυχρὸν αὔξεται*); 1167 *ἐφεξῆς* (*ἑξῆς*); 1226 *ὁμοφυοῦς* (*ὁμοφύλου* L, *ὁμοφίλου* V); 2.235 *ἀπέβησαν* (*ἀπεφάνθησαν*); 276 *ὑπεχθραίνουσι* (*ὑπερεχθαίρουσι*); 305 *συναλλακτικοί* (*συναλλακτικώτεροι*); 3.232 *βράδιον* (*βραδύτεροι*); 347 *μέγα* om.; 4.3 *α΄. προοίμιον* om.; 204 *νεκυομάντεις* (*νεκρομάντεις*).

In all honesty, it cannot be excluded that H. considers ω and Hephaestion as two 'subarchetypes', derived from a single model (the archetype), which is not indicated in the stemma, and that he therefore presupposes a two-part tradition; unless I am mistaken, however, this possibility is not considered in the 'Praefatio'. Be that as it may, what is important is the fact that H. is well aware of the considerable rôle played by contamination, and has not attempted to reconstruct the text of the *Apotelesmatica* in accordance with exclusively mechanical criteria. The 'constitutio textus' has greatly benefited therefrom.

Among the advantages of this edition, I would point out the presence of a triple apparatus (cf. pp. xl–xlviii)—the genuine apparatus criticus, the apparatus of *testimonia* (T), and the apparatus of 'loci similes' (S), and the rich *index verborum* (pp. xlix and 361–438).

This work has been carried out with *akribeia.* I noticed only one typographical error (p. lxi, 21: *lege* 1872), and suggest one bibliographical addendum to p. lxiii (Sudines): see now F. Decleva Caizzi and M. S. Funghi, 'Natura del cielo, astri, anima. Platonismo e Aristotelismo in una nuova interpretazione di PGen inv. 203', in *Papiri filosofici. Miscellanea di studi. II* (Florence, 1998), pp. 33–110.

National Centre for Scientific Research, Paris TIZIANO DORANDI

DAMASCIUS

P. Athanassiadi (ed., trans.): *Damascius:* The Philosophical History. Pp. 403, 6 pls, 1 map. Athens: The Apamea Cultural Association (distributed by Oxbow Books), 1999. Paper, £25. ISBN: 960-85325-2-3.

The patriarch Photius read and excerpted a *Life of Isidore* by Damascius, who was inspired by Isidore to leave rhetoric for philosophy in the later fifth century C.E. Photius observed that it was not really a biography: too discursive, too magisterial in tone, and about too many people. He classed D. with Lucian, Achilles Tatius, Heliodorus, and Iamblichus the novelist (A. finds an analogy with Proust), and went back over the text to excerpt further passages of unusual elegance. The Suda, which always refers to the work as the *Philosophic History*, provides further extracts, and includes some material now assigned, with varying confidence, to D. In 1909–11,

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

R. Asmus made the best attempt yet to reconstruct the text, as a philosophical biography strongly influenced by Marinus' *Life of Proclus* (D. disapproved of them both). Asmus was the foundation for C. Zintzen's *Damascii vita Isidori reliquiae* (Hildesheim, 1967), which provides a textual introduction, critical apparatus, and valuable notes, but does not make it easy for the reader to discover that D. is both fascinating and funny. Zintzen achieved a wider audience for some of D.'s characters, for instance the doctor Jacobus 'the Chiller' who talked his rich patients into paying for the poor ones, but there is much more to come.

A. reinterpreted the purpose and context of D.'s book in *JHS* 103 (1993), 1–29. Her *Damascius: the Philosophical History* now offers, at an affordable price, a new reconstruction of the text with a lively English translation; notes on philosophy, religion, and prosopography; a clearly produced map and six plates; and a perceptive introduction on the cultural and political life of Alexandria, Aphrodisias, and Athens in the late fifth and early sixth centuries. A. reads D. as the social historian of late antique Platonism, who wrote his *Philosophical History* as a history of philosophy and philosophers, and also as an enquiry into philosophy (pp. 39–41). He saw rhetoric and technical philosophy dominating the educational system and debasing lives. He was intensely critical of his colleagues because (p. 26) he was concerned to denounce heresy: deviations from true Platonist belief and virtuous lifestyle were a greater threat to Hellenism than outbreaks of Christian persecution. (A. perhaps underestimates, p. 39, the precedent of Porphyry. Very little remains of his *Philosophic History*, except the incomplete life of Pythagoras, but in other works he too defended the true Platonist faith against laxity, false interpretations, and unworthy texts.) D. revived the Academy, after a run of unsatisfactory appointments (p. 44), by systematically interpreting Plato according to Iamblichus (the philosopher) and rejecting the less exalted interpretations of Proclus, by importing the best Hellenic philosophers to Athens and (perhaps) by raising funds for a residential research and worship centre on the slope of the Areopagus (House C, excavated in 1970). This conspicuous success prompted Justinian's edict of 529 on teachers, aimed specifically at the Academy. (But if the Academy's chairs were funded from accumulated endowments, fr. 102, this edict, which removed public funding from teachers of any persuasion other than orthodox Christian, need not have affected the Academy.)

The *Philosophical History* is a delight to read. It demonstrates that the traditions of the Academy have indeed continued in our ancient seats of learning. When Marinus asked Isidore (fr. 38A) whether he should publish his extensive commentary on Plato's *Philebus*, Isidore said only that Proclus' commentary was quite sufficient. Marinus burned the book. (But Marinus was so uninspired as to argue that the *Parmenides* is about forms, not about transcendent henads, fr. 97I.) Proclus could not understand why, during Chaldaean rituals, Isidore would do his bird imitations (fr. 59F: is there a connection with Porphyry *V.Plot*. 10?). Theosebius (fr. 45A) took notes from Hierocles' class on the *Gorgias*, and when Hierocles returned to the passage, his notes were completely different from the first set. 'This showed how broad was the ocean of [Hierocles'] mind.' Asclepiodotus (fr. 87A) claimed to have explored the underground passage at Hierapolis that emitted lethal fumes, and later synthesized something very like them. What would he have made of the oracular self-moving baetyl (fr. 138), a story interspersed with disparaging comments from Photius? The childless wife of Hilarius (fr. 91) was caught *in flagrante*. He transferred her, together with his curial responsibilities, to the man concerned, and left for Athens and the philosophic life; but Proclus refused to accept him, because his concubines came too.

A.'s sympathetic understanding of 'pagan oecumenism' (her own memorable

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

phrase) is well known from her work on Julian (*Julian: an Intellectual History*, rev. edn [London, 1992]) and on Iamblichus (*JRS* 83 [1993], 115–30 and 85 [1995], 244–50). Like D., she readily accepts the 'spiritual tourism' and religious experiences of late antique Hellenes, and never misses an opportunity to retaliate against Christian hostility (e.g. nn. 68, 298, 325). Her guiding principle is that of the Iamblichan Platonism followed by D.: intuitive vision is superior to discursive and categorizing reason, so Greek and 'barbarian' theologies alike reflect perfection, and the true philosopher, the genuine (not just thyrsus-carrying) Platonic *bakkhos*, integrates philosophy and theurgy (*hieratikê*). Isidore, a bad lecturer (fr. 37B) and writer of hymns that did not quite scan (fr. 48A), personally contentious and apparently stingy (fr. 24C), not outstandingly perceptive, imaginative, fluent, or rich in memory (fr. 14), nevertheless advanced beyond conventional culture to this inspired state.

Debate will continue on A.'s interpretation of this text and its social context. For a more cautious account of the evidence for the lives of late Platonist commentators, especially for a Neoplatonic community at Harran, see H. J. Blumenthal, *Aristotle and Neoplatonism in Late Antiquity* (London, 1996). Beginning students who use A.'s book will need some background knowledge of late Platonism. Some footnotes (e.g. 107, 110, 255, 284) are rather sweeping, and there could have been a few more on matters not of immediate philosophical interest (e.g. sunstones and moonstones, fr. 7; a marriage contract validated by a pagan priest, fr. 44; how to make a public renunciation of Judaism, fr. 67). But both text and interpretation provide much interest and enjoyment, and A. deserves general gratitude for making them so accessible.

University of Liverpool GILLIAN CLARK

STEPHANUS IATROSOPHISTES

K. DICKSON: *Stephanus the Philosopher and Physician: Commentary on Galen's* Therapeutics to Glaucon. Pp. 309. Leiden, etc.: E. J. Brill, 1998. Cased, $122. ISBN: 90-04-10935-8.

The history of medicine and philosophy in the sixth and seventh centuries has become fashionable again, thanks in part to the editions and commentaries prepared by the late Leendert Westerink and his American pupils. This latest volume is a worthy tribute to a devoted teacher, and makes accessible again a medical commentary of considerable interest. Its author, Stephanus, philosopher and physician (so the heading in MS A), may well have been a native of Athens, and a pupil of Asclepius of Tralles at Alexandria in the middle of the sixth century. Whether, as Wanda Wolska-Conus has suggested, he is the author of extant philosophical as well as medical commentaries, and a writer on alchemy, is more controversial, and a fuller exposition of Dickson's views on the matter would have been welcome. His medical teaching followed a syllabus known from late antique Alexandria and Ravenna, but D.'s citation of 164.15 to prove that these lectures were delivered at Alexandria is unconvincing, since the passage is a reminiscence of one in Galen.

These lectures on the first book of Galen's *Method of Healing, for Glaucon*, were first edited in Greek by the Königsberg professor F. R. Dietz in 1834 on the basis of a manuscript from the Ambrosiana, L 110 sup. (= **A**), of the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century. However, almost 300 years earlier, the Modenese physician and editor Agostino Gadaldino (1515–92) had published a very fine Latin translation,

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and notes of this and other commentaries by Stephanus at Venice in 1554. He had used for his version a cognate Greek manuscript of similar age, Copenhagen, bibl. univ. e donatione variorum fol. 29 (= **C**), which bears corrections in a hand that may well be Gadaldino's. **C** is a slightly better witness than **A** but Gadaldino's annotations are frequently a great improvement. Three other manuscripts, Venice, Marcianus gr. V. 4 (= **M**), Leiden B.P.G. 2A (= **L**), and Leiden Vossianus misc. 6.1 (= **V**, a copy of **M**), form a related group. D. argues that **ML** derive from a copy of **C**, and thus that their readings can be disregarded, except when they appear to represent a Renaissance correction. But the harvest of such corrections is meagre, and since D. himself accepts in his text no reading from this source, none of these manuscripts should have appeared in the apparatus criticus. (The discussion of the readings of **L** on p. 12 is marred by misprints.)

Where I have been able to check D.'s transcriptions, they are accurate, and his text is an improvement over that of Dietz, not least in its use of **C** and Gadaldino's notes. His own emendations to the text of Stephanus are relatively few, but he makes far more to the Galenic lemmata, which are preserved in full by **C** and which often differ, usually for the better, from the text of Galen printed in Kühn's edition of Galen. It would have been valuable to have checked in some early Galenic manuscripts and in Palmieri's 1981 edition of a sixth- or seventh-century Ravenna Latin commentary on this same tract to see whether Stephanus' lemmata have parallels there. I note a misprint at 40.9: *ἀπεδείζαμεν* for *ἀπεδείξαμεν*.

The English translation reads well and is accurate. Any dissatisfaction I have is over trivialities; e.g. p. 73, 'constriction' corresponds to two different Greek words; p. 84.4, 'methodically' is better than 'scientifically', for the stress is on the organization of Galen's discussion of bathing. The notes are generally sound, although not everyone will accept that Erasistratus, p. 39, was born in 304 and trained in the school of Praxagoras, or that Angeleuas, p. 77, the name of an earlier commentator, is plausible Greek. Arabic authors know of an 'Anqilaus', who may be the same man, but there are other possibilities.

Stephanus in his lectures comes across as a clear and able expositor for students in the initial stages of a medical course. He is faithful to Galen's ideas, but adds much of his own, e.g. his comments on Mnesitheus' method of division, p. 36. In a discussion, pp. 88–90, on the value of giving a psychological boost to the patient by talking to him about his favourite pursuits, such as literature or moral philosophy, Stephanus repeats Galenic injunctions to allow the patient to visit the theatre, and says that 'we often send patients to the shows'. But he unusually declares that the doctor should not accompany his patient to the theatre or discuss matters theatrical, but instead provide others to do so. This is a curious prohibition, explained by D., probably rightly, as a matter of professional dignity. Literature and moral philosophy are more suitable to the status of an iatrosophist than attendance at shows.

This is a highly competent edition. It brings to wider notice an interesting text that has not been satisfactorily edited previously, and the discovery of **C** allows for the first time a full presentation of the Galenic lemmata, to the benefit of future editors of Galen. It is a fitting pendant to Westerink's own 1984 edition and translation of Stephanus' commentary on *Aphorisms*, which has just been reissued in the Berlin *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* series. Together they illuminate the process by which Galenism became the leading medical philosophy in Byzantium, the Arab world, and, later, the medieval West.

The Wellcome Institute, London VIVIAN NUTTON

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

IMAGE AND TEXT

L. BRUBAKER: *Vision and Meaning in Ninth-Century Byzantium: Image as Exegesis in the Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus*. Pp. xxiii + 489, ills. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Cased, £60. ISBN: 0-521-62153-4.

This hefty book marks the culmination of the author's long familiarity with its subject, an illuminated copy of the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus, Paris.gr. 510 (it was the topic of her 1983 PhD). The artefact demands attention. It was apparently produced as a gift for an emperor (Basil I, 867–86) by one of Byzantium's most famous sons (Photios), and it is an object of extreme luxury, richly ornamented and illustrated. The special concern of the book is the issue of text and image, or more exactly how images functioned. This issue is particularly salient for the manuscript since the link between the illustrations (46 surviving full page miniatures, most integrated, some inserted) and the texts of Gregory which they accompany can be obscure (e.g. scenes from the infancy of Christ are combined with 'To Julian the tax collector'), a problem addressed by Der Nersessian in a classic article (*DOP* [1962], 197–228) to which Brubaker's work is indebted.

B. identifies four ways in which the images work with their particular texts: they illustrate the historical circumstances of the delivery, they picture the main theme of the homily, they depict scenes selected from among the episodes mentioned in the accompanying text, and they parallel the theme(s) of the sermons exegetically, without relying on Gregory's words, so that they become visual commentaries rather than literal illustrations. These various functions can be combined within a single page. B. makes clear that other signifiers of meaning operate within the manuscript too, such as the painted initials, the composition of each page, the dialogue between different images, and the occasional appearance of text within the images. Throughout B. strives to demonstrate how the fourth-century texts were given meaning for a ninth- century context (e.g. iconoclasm, the Jews, the *filioque*).

How to structure the analysis must have been a major concern. An assessment image by image would be a user-unfriendly experience. Part of B.'s solution is to divide the miniatures into five thematic groups: biographical (Chapter III), visual panegyrics (Chapter IV), exegetical miniatures (Chapter V), saints and sinners (Chapter VI), and expressions of divinity (Chapter VII).

Other chapters expand the focus. A crucial Introduction is followed by Chapter I, which explores 'how the makers of images reproduced and reinforced patterns of ninth-century Byzantine society, and how they contributed to the production of those patterns' in order to provide 'a framework for ninth-century visual culture' within which the Paris.gr. 510 can be viewed. Chapter II asserts the ways in which the images functioned, provides paradigms of how the images could work exegetically, considers the problems that the inserted miniatures pose, and addresses the style of the miniatures. The long Chapter VIII focuses on iconography, shifting the focus from 'how images worked in Paris.gr.510' to 'what Paris.gr.510 tells us about other works'. This chapter in particular is marked by much back-referencing, as most of the miniatures have by this stage received their moment of fame. We end with reflections on the transmission of iconography, but also an impassioned plea to think of images in their own language.

The book concludes with Chapter IX. B. pulls various strands of her discussion together, some more familiar than others; the question of gender balance in

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

composition has been touched on but not elucidated until this point, whilst one may feel more *au fait* with the topic of Photios and Basil. A reprise is more like the conclusion one expects, and emphasizes the potency of art as not just mere pictorial supplement but visual exegesis, though by this stage one is firmly behind B., if one was not already from the beginning.

The chapters are supported not just by the reproduction of the surviving 46 miniatures of the manuscript in black and white at the front of the book, but by images of other works of art, three appendices, a bibliography, and an index.

Undoubtedly this book both succeeds in its purpose and secures its place as *the* reference work for this manuscript, whilst also dealing effectively with larger issues of Byzantine art and society. Its style is lucid and assured, engaging easily in academic and intellectual debate. It conveys masterfully the cultural context of the artefact. Yet certain aspects nag. Some issues are raised but not pursued; one would like to hear more about the scholia, as well as the questions of intentional damage and earlier illustrated homilies. One may feel that too much is being read in, or indeed not enough. I found the latter to be the case with Photios. Whilst B. devotes much attention to him with regard to the issue of audience and organization, and countenances that some images are more for Photios' benefit than Basil's (there is superiority as well as flattery), she does not always apply this. For example, the quitting of Constantinople by Gregory could allude to Photios' own history. Indeed, the puzzle as to why Photios chose *this* text as a gift may surely be clarified by the homily-writing patriarch finding a certain satisfaction in his undisputed holy and orthodox antitype. But this is of course speculation (p. 414)! Some problems cannot be solved, and sensibly B. accepts this (though one would like more thought on the evolution of the artefact).

A more serious concern regarding the book is its own complexity. One wonders if the organization is entirely successful. For instance, one has to take on trust that Photios was the mastermind before that argument is made, whilst the thematic division of some miniatures provokes puzzlement (could the Julian pages not be considered with the biographical miniatures, and why is the judgement of Solomon not considered under visual panegyric?). Occasionally one also forgets what text accompanies which miniature; perhaps that information could have been provided with the plates of each miniature. Ideally this book should have been accompanied by a colour (colour matters: e.g. p. 334) facsimile of the manuscript on CD-ROM.

Despite such concerns this is clearly a major book on a major (albeit often idiosyncratic) artefact.

Cardiff University SHAUN TOUGHER

EUNUCHUS

J. BARSBY (ed.): *Terence:* Eunuchus. Pp. viii + 336. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Paper, £15.95. ISBN: 0-521-45871-4.

Though there has been no edition in English of Terence's *Eunuchus* for ninety years, the play's problems have continued to engage the attention of scholars, more particularly since papyrus discoveries have so greatly expanded our knowledge of Menander during the last forty years. Professor Barsby, whose edition of Plautus' *Bacchides* (Warminster, 1986) has dealt admirably with the relationship between the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Latin play and its Menandrian original (*Dis Exapaton*), has now produced an exemplary edition of Terence's most Plautine play.

In the third of his five introductory sections ('Terence and his Greek Originals') a succinct account of the different natures of Menandrian and Plautine comedy lays down the parameters within which Terence will develop his own dramatic writing, while the next section ('Language and Style') summarizes the features that give the lie to the commonly held view that the characters of Terence, *puri sermonis amator*, speak the same undifferentiated Latin: terms of abuse and of endearment, Greek words, oaths and interjections (indexed s.v. exclamations), speech markers—especially those that distinguish female from male speech—all help to lend individuality to the characters in the *Eunuchus*. A short section on metrical structure is substantially amplified by an Appendix (pp. 290–304), where the enquiring reader is introduced to the subtleties of *loci Jacobsohniani* and the 'Laws' of Hermann, Luchs, Meyer, and Ritschl; there too there is a brief exposition of the dipodic analysis of iambic and trochaic rhythms as propounded by Gratwick (first in *CHCL* ii.86–93). More important is the way in which metrical features are indicated in the Latin text. The metre of each line or group of lines is discreetly indicated in the left hand margin; that is particularly helpful when there is a rapid change of metre from line to line (e.g. 207–31). In the text itself unobtrusive sublinear dots mark the putative ictus of each foot; it would be interesting to find out whether such a diacritical aid actually helps readers to read Terence accurately aloud. The Introduction is concluded by a brief section on the manuscript tradition, which is to be read in conjunction with the list of manuscripts given on p. 312. Since the text of Terence 'is relatively well established' (p. vii), B. dispenses with an apparatus criticus, but discusses the more significant variants in his notes.

The most important problems in the *Eunuchus* arise from the statement in the Prologue (30–2) that Terence has introduced into his translation or adaptation of Menander's *Eunouchos* two characters, a soldier and a parasite, from Menander's *Kolax*. B., who believes that Menander's *Eunouchos* 'must have had a rival and servant who fulfilled the same functions as the soldier and parasite do in Terence's play', includes as Appendix II the more important fragments (with English translation) of the two Menander plays—minimal for the *Eunouchos*, more extensive for the *Kolax*. B. here repeats the views he expressed in 'Problems of Adaptation in the *Eunuchus* of Terence' (in *Intertextualität in der griechisch–römischen Komödie*, edd. N. W. Slater, B. Zimmermann [Stuttgart, 1993], pp. 160–79). He also sides with those scholars who believe that the *Eunouchos* of Menander did *not* have a divine prologue: the expository material given by Thais in ll. 107–49, it is argued, must in essence have stood in the *Eunouchos*, and gives the audience all the information it needs to know; not everyone will agree.

Though some details could have been handled differently—and there is at least one misprint in the Latin text (*sceleste* for *scelesta* at 817)—the commentary could scarcely have been bettered; the extensive comparisons with, and cross-references to, Menander, Plautus, and the other plays of Terence are especially valuable. At 77–8, where a direct comparison is possible with the corresponding fragment of Menander, a good note distinguishes between the Greek's concept of love as a divine external force and Terence's view of love as a purely human impulse. A cross-reference might be added to 875, where Chaerea suggests (tongue-in-cheek? B. takes it at its face value) that some god may have driven him to rape Pamphila. At 193–5, when Phaedria agrees to stay away from Thais for two whole days and implores her not to forget him, he uses a seven-fold anaphora of *me*, which (B. notes) 'emphasises Phaedria's possessiveness'.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Though Chairestratos in the *Eunouchos* must have made a similar appeal, the anaphora—and hence the emphasis—is a markedly Latin feature (cf. J. Straus, *Terenz und Menander: Beitrag zu einer Stilvergleichung* [Zurich, 1955]). There are other passages too where Roman colouring or emphasis is a pointer to Terentian (rather than Menandrian) characterization, e.g. 864–6 (with B.'s notes), 880, and 886–7 (where Chaerea speaks of *fides* and *patrona* in relation to Thais). Among several excellent notes on stage movements, and exits and entrances are those affecting Dorias at 628 and 718–26, and the introductory note on 727–38, where B. suspects that 'T. has added the scene to the Greek original for the sake of its comic effect'. See also the note on eunuchs at 167, where the reader is reminded that Terence was writing to entertain his Roman audience by the outlandishness of the Greek scene. At pp. 185–6 B. notes the widely differing modern views on Chaerea's rape of Pamphila and adds a salutary warning against making a judgement based on modern attitudes. There are other good notes at 584–5 on the Danae picture, at p. 229 on the siege scene, and at 1046 on *fortuna* and *τύχη*. B. makes judicious use of the now generally accepted view that any four-actor scene must indicate Terentian intervention. That is of particular relevance in the final scene of the play, where a *ménage à trois* is arranged between Thais, Phaedria, and Thraso. Whether Menander's *Eunouchos* ended with a similar accommodation is one of the most hotly disputed problems of Terentian scholarship; B. gives a balanced discussion of the varying views, ending with the disturbing, but not impossible, suggestion that in the finale 'T. was deliberately sacrificing consistency [sc. of characterization] for dramatic effect': *quot homines tot sententiae*.

University of Leeds R. H. MARTIN

TERENCE'S *HECYRA*

E. Lefèvre: *Terenz' und Apollodors* Hecyra. (Zetemata 101.) Pp. 204. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1999. Paper, DM 88. ISBN: 3-406-45243-4.

This is the third monograph that Eckard Lefèvre has published in the Zetemata series (previously *Der Phormio des Terenz und der Epidikazomenos des Apollodor von Karystos*, 74 [1978]; *Terenz' und Menanders Heauton Timorumenos*, 91 [1994]), developing further some ideas outlined in his early *Die Expositionstechnik in den Komödien des Terenz* (Darmstadt, 1969). Like his extensive work on Plautus, the three Terentian volumes propagate a theory of greater departure in Roman comedy from its Greek models and more extensive indebtedness to Italian popular drama—written and unscripted—than has generally been assumed. L. parades his arguments with precise detail, shrewd evaluation of the evidence, imaginative novelty, and total command of previous work on the play (apart perhaps from David Sewart's excellent Leeds dissertation of 1971 on the play, mentioned in L.'s bibliography but little used), and this fact alone makes the study an invaluable companion to the *Hecyra.*

L. maintains that in the extant version of this play Terence virtually rewrites the Apollodoran original, partly for dramatic reasons of his own, partly under the influence of previous Roman comedy and contemporary *Stegreifspiel.* Like other scholars, L. takes as his starting point the probability that after dispensing with his model's divine prologue Terence inserted some of the exposition contained in that prologue sparingly at intervals throughout his version (e.g. 382–401, 566–71, 575–6,

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

831–2), thus creating major problems of comprehension for his Roman audience. L. goes on to maintain that Terence recast the opening scene with Syra and a newly invented Philotis replacing Bacchis and Parmenon in Apollodorus; that the Greek poet's oldies were limited to Laches and Sostrata (parents of Pamphilus), with Phidippus and Myrrina (parents of Philumena) added to the play by Terence in order to complicate the issues; that the character of Parmeno was changed from that of a caring slave in Apollodorus to an inquisitive lazybones in Terence; that the ἀναγνώρισις in the model was sparked off by a scene between Parmenon and Bacchis; and that Terence shortened the Greek ending by reducing the recognition scene to its bare outlines, and (possibly) cutting out a speech of self-acknowledgement by Pamphilos along with a scene in which Parmenon ribbed Laches just as Onesimos did Smikrines towards the end of Menander's *Epitrepontes*. L. argues further for the addition of whole scenes (III 2, IV 2) by Terence, for major rewriting in other scenes (II 1, III 3, 4, and 5, IV 2, V 1 and 2), and for the insertion of Parmeno as a character in III 1.

L. supports his case with perceptive and careful analyses of the dramatic action, but the foundations must at times be judged insecure. Our knowledge of unscripted Italian drama in Terence's time is very limited, as is that of his Greek model's qualities as a dramatist—especially if Terence's adaptations of Apollodorus' *Epidikazomenos* and *Hekyra* were as free as L. maintains. We have fewer than 60 iambic trimeters from 12 known plays by this Apollodorus, and these tell us little about the Greek poet's dramatic abilities. The script of Terence's *Hecyra* contains several contradictions and inconsistencies, and there appears to be no objective way of deciding whether they were severally introduced by Apollodorus or Terence. It is, however, worth remembering that the extant version of Donatus' commentary carefully notes changes made by Terence in his adaptation of Menander's *Andria*; is it not likely that he would have done the same when commenting on the *Hecyra*, provided that he had access to the text of the Apollodoran model?

There is room further for only a few comments on details, before one final appreciation. (i) In Apollodorus Syra, whether a mute or speaking character (cf. fr. 10 K.–A.), is likely to have been an elderly house slave, as elsewhere in Greco-Roman comedy (Menander *Mis.* 555 Arnott, Philemon fr. 17 K.–A.; cf. Plautus *Merc.* 790ff.). (ii) L. suspects a native Italian source for the attacks on wives in *Hecyra* II 1 and IV 1, but he should have noted that such attacks were also a commonplace in Greek comedy (e.g. Ar. *Nub.* 41ff., Alexis fr. 150 K.–A., Men. frs. 296, 297 and 298 K.–A.). (iii) L. argues that *(ut) aiunt* at *Hec.* 357, 393, and 452 in the sense of '(so) people say' is used in a particularly Roman way, but cf. especially Men. fr. 3 K.–A. (with Saekel's conjecture) and Apollodorus Car. fr. 29.1 K.–A.

It is, however, only fair to end this review by noting that L.'s monograph contains incidental discussions and information of high interest and value: e.g. on the influence of *Hecyra* on later dramas by Varchi in sixteenth-century Italy and Brooke in eighteenth-century Ireland, on the *odium* and *morbus* motifs in the play, on alliteration and polyptoton in Terence, and generally on details of plot and characterization.

University of Leeds W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LUCRETIUS

K. A. Algra, M. H. Koenen, P. H. Schrijvers (edd.): *Lucretius and his Intellectual Background.* Pp. ix + 265. Amsterdam, Oxford, New York, and Tokyo: Koninkligke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1997. Hfl. 90. ISBN: 0-444-85818-0.

It has become a commonplace of Lucretian scholarship that this poet is no longer as erratic (let alone lunatic) as he has often been described. Consequently, the contributors to the volume under review (listed a little like film credits on the front cover) try to evaluate Lucretius' intellectual background; the papers, in English and French, were given at a conference in Amsterdam in June 1996. The editors have done their work thoroughly (though a couple of misprints have not been detected; note that there does not exist, as the bibliography suggests, a scholar named C. Werner-Müller). The first nine of the eighteen chapters survey the intellectual influences of certain schools or thinkers on L. in a more general way ('L. and x'), the second half—called by the editors 'case studies'—examine more specific aspects or certain passages in L. For reasons of restricted space, I shall concentrate on the first group of essays.

The picture that emerges from this volume is in no way coherent—it changes between the poet with only Epicurus' *On Nature* in his (NB philosophical) library and taking no part in any contemporary philosophical or scientific debate, and, on the other hand, an active member of the Garden, sitting in Piso's villa at Herculaneum and chatting with Philodemus and others. The first position mentioned is that adopted by David Sedley, who in his opening paper reduces the philosophical background of L. to a single book, and so in a way counteracts the efforts of other contributors to describe contemporary influences on L.'s work. Sedley argues that Epicurus' *On Nature* is the only source for the main body of L.'s physical exposition, and he gives a quite detailed description of what he believes to be the poet's working method. Sedley has in the meantime published his theses on a much larger scale (*Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom* [Cambridge 1998]), including a thorough reconstruction of Epicurus' *On Nature*. This book will certainly refocus Lucretian scholarship in the near future, not only regarding philosophical influences on the *De rerum natura*, but also the still unresolved issue of the degree of completion of L.'s poem.

The other extreme position is that of Knut Kleve, who puts L. confidently in the setting of Philodemus' Epicurean circle at Herculaneum. Kleve relies mainly on his discovery of fragments of *DRN* in Herculaneum and on the (very faint) possibility of reading the name 'Lucretius' in two instances in Philodemus' work. It far transcends my papyrological competence to judge the validity of these findings, but the conclusions that are drawn from them cannot convince. In fact, except for the history of the text of *DRN*, Kleve's sensational discovery does not change very much: it never used to be very sound to deny categorically any connection between L. and Philodemus, and yet it is still by no means certain that one can assume any personal acquaintance.

Similar reservations are expressed by Graziano Arrighetti (p. 22), who is mainly concerned with the old problem of Epicurus' verdict on poetry. He stresses that his ban was restricted to poetry as a medium of philosophical discourse, not as a disturber of the sage's mind (which, as Arrighetti rightly points out, *per definitionem* cannot be disturbed). L. is regarded as a sort of exoteric counterpart to Philodemus, responsible

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for 'propaganda' among non-Epicureans, whereas Philodemus' writings reflect the more technical discussions inside the Epicurean school.

A very reluctant approach is chosen by Tiziano Dorandi ('Lucrèce et les Epicuriens de Campanie'): since L. cannot be linked beyond doubt with the Epicurean circles of his time, he does not figure much in this paper. Dorandi gives as clear a description as possible of the situation of the Garden in Italy in the first century B.C., and thereby plausibly contradicts the view that Epicureanism was an exceptionally static philosophy.

In dealing with Luciano Canfora's proposed redating of Diogenes of Oinoanda's inscription, M. F. Smith is utterly convincing in showing that the traditional dating is the more plausible one and that the 'wonderful Karos' mentioned in the inscription is not L. In contrast with most other contributors, Michael Erler depicts a more Roman background of *DRN*, namely the 'meditative' function of the poem. Like Horace in his first book of *Epistles* and Marcus Aurelius in his *Meditationes*, L. wants to support his readers (who are, as Erler justly reminds us, novices) in their efforts to cope with life. David Runia shows parallels between *DRN* and the doxographical tradition, parallels that according to him make a direct utilization of this material through L. probable. Lucienne Deschamps's answer to the question of direct intellectual dependencies between L. and Varro is mainly a 'réponse de Normand' (p. 113: peut- être . . . non, peut-être . . . oui); she stresses the identical intellectual background of both thinkers, but cannot establish any firm dependency. The same can be said about Carlos Levy's efforts to fix the relation between L. and Aenesidemus. But he traces instances in *DRN* that presumably show the influence of contemporary discussions of sceptical arguments on L.'s poem.

There are also very valuable and stimulating papers in the second part of the volume. No one working on Lucretius or Epicureanism could afford to neglect this book: just because of its diversity it outlines the agenda for further research.

University of the Saarland CHRISTOPH CATREIN

VIRGIL

C. MARTINDALE (ed.): *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil.* Pp. xvii + 370. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Cased, £40/$59.95 (Paper, £14.95/$19.95). ISBN: 0-521-49539-3 (0-521-49885-6 pbk).

P. HARDIE: *Virgil.* (*Greece and Rome* New Surveys in the Classics 28.) Pp. vi + 126. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 0-19-922342-4.

Few classical poets elicit such diverse responses from readers as Virgil. His ability to elude easy interpretation is an important element of his greatness, but it also poses a dilemma that anyone writing an introduction to the Virgilian corpus faces: which (approach to) Virgil to introduce? Two new 'answers' to this question are now available: *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* by Charles Martindale, and *Virgil* by Philip Hardie. While both books display Virgil's artistic complexity well, they provide very different introductions to his poetry. Given the wide range of current Virgilian interpretation, this review, instead of arguing for the value of one

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

particular approach over another, will aim to survey the contents of these new books and assess their relative merits.

M.'s volume is divided into four sections: 1. Translation and reception; 2. Genre and poetic career; 3. Contexts and production; 4. Contents and forms. Each section contains between four and six contributions with useful bibliographies for further reading. Introductory and concluding chapters round out the volume, while a timeline of dates relevant to Virgil and his reception, a twenty-page bibliography of works cited, and a twelve-page index help the reader navigate this nicely produced book.

What will immediately strike the reader is that Virgil's *Nachleben*, usually appearing last in survey volumes, comes first. This positioning is by no means accidental, as editor M. explains in the opening chapter. M. provides a spirited endorsement of reception theory, displays its particular relevance for the study of Virgil, and explains its influence on the conception, scope, and organization of the book (though it should be noted that reception theory does not represent the defining theoretical underpinning of every chapter).

Part 1 (Chapters II–VII), surveying readings of Virgil from antiquity to the twentieth century, opens with two essays on versions/appropriations in English. Colin Burrow shows how the same Virgil could be used by English translators (*c*. 1380 to present) to support conflicting political and literary agendas, and also explains how attitudes concerning the ideal translation of Virgil evolved. Duncan Kennedy then critiques T. S. Eliot's notion of tradition and use of the *Aeneid* as the 'classic', and explores the potential theoretical significance of the *Aeneid* for interpretation itself. The next three chapters survey in roughly chronological order readers of Virgil from his contemporaries to Milton. Richard Tarrant explores Virgil's pervasive presence in Roman culture and the responses that ancient commentators and writers gave his work. The nature of Servius' commentary is then discussed by Don Fowler, who points to its potential usefulness for modern readers. Colin Burrow follows with an examination of Virgil's significance for 'renovators' (Dante to Milton) who interpret and respond to Virgil according to their particular literary, political, and cultural concerns. Part 1 concludes with Michael Liversidge's exploration of the artistic reception of Virgil and his poetry from antiquity to the nineteenth century, illustrated with sixteen pages of black-and-white plates.

Part 2 (Chapters VIII–XI) begins with an essay by the volume's editor. M. puts forth reception theory-influenced arguments on the *Eclogues*' relationship to the pastoral genre, and argues that the divide between aesthetic and political readings that has marked the critical reception of the *Eclogues* needs to be bridged. William Batstone shows how Virgil manipulates the boundaries of traditional, authoritative didaxis in the *Georgics*, and suggests we read 'the poem as a field or a dynamic' that 'complicates our feelings and confounds our paradigms' (p. 142). Duncan Kennedy then explores how Virgil's use of repetition, *fatum*, and *telos* in the *Aeneid* have ramifications not only for narrative emplotment but also for genre, literary history, and the construction of political history. Finally, Elena Theodorakopoulos examines how Virgil's three canonical works, if read as 'the Book of Virgil', engage in closure, though they tell a tale that seems dissonant with 'the teleology of both the empire and the career-progress of its poet' (p. 164).

Part 3 (Chapters XII–XV) contains four essays that examine cultural contexts in which Virgil wrote. Richard Tarrant examines the complex and sometimes conflicting ways that Virgil engages with political issues, and argues that 'ambivalence', rather than optimism or pessimism, best reflects Virgil's outlook. James Zetzel shows that 'Virgil, by his emphasis throughout the *Aeneid* on perspective, on uncertainty, on error,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

discourages drawing a single conclusion either about Roman history itself or about his own interpretation of it' (pp. 201–2). Susanna Morton Braund then argues against schematic associations of Virgil with any single philosophy, and suggests that his contemporary literary and cultural contexts shed light on his religious and philosophical eclecticism. Part 3 ends with an essay by Joseph Farrell that explains how the study of intertextuality can enrich our understanding and enjoyment of Virgilian poetry.

Part 4 (Chapters XVI–XXI), treating a miscellany of topics, opens with James O'Hara's essay, which demonstrates 'that much is lost when Virgil is read only in translation or with insufficient attention to style' (p. 242), and how stylistic features can have interpretive and ideological implications. Don Fowler's chapter comments on various components of Virgil's narrative such as emplotment, segmentation, focalization, and ambiguity. Alessandro Barchiesi shows how Virgilian ecphrasis can involve competing poetics and politics, affects the development of the narrative, and underscores 'the importance of the viewing subject in the construction of visual meaning' (p. 275). Andrew Laird explains some elements of psychological characterization in Virgil, and how intertextuality and Virgil's reception influence the reader's construction of characters. Ellen Oliensis examines the complication of gender roles in Virgil, as well as the implications of sexuality and gender for the generic construction of his works. Philip Hardie suggests ways in which recent developments in the interpretation of Attic tragedy can help us re-evaluate the 'tragic' elements in Virgil's *Aeneid*. Fiona Cox then concludes the volume by exploring ways in which Broch' s novel *The Death of Virgil* (1945) deals with literary concerns antici- patory not only of later Virgilian criticism but also of modern critical theory.

M. has designed this *Cambridge Companion* 'for anyone, whether a classicist or not, who is seeking guidance and orientation for a fuller understanding of Virgil' and 'seeking intelligent and sophisticated comment' (p. xvii). By including chapters that move between introductory material, innovative interpretation, and critical theorizing, M. has indeed succeeded in creating a volume that can suit the needs of a relatively broad audience. In this respect, M.'s unconventional placement of Virgil's *Nachleben* first (see above) benefits the non-classicist by providing a diverse number of chronological points of entry into the study of Virgil, while it offers classicists an understanding of how Virgil developed into the author we know today.

What often emerges from M.'s book is a Virgil who employs contradiction and ambiguity as literary strategies to capture the complexity of Roman culture in the midst of terrible and momentous upheaval. This picture, while compelling, might not satisfy everyone; some will desire a still more wide-ranging sampling of interpretations. The *Companion*'s declared goal, however, is not to offer an overview of Virgilian studies today but to 'point to the shape of Virgilian scholarship and criticism to come' (p. xvii). The volume has indeed succeeded in identifying some suggestive avenues of inquiry for later studies. Students (especially advanced ones), teachers, and scholars will benefit from the *Companion*'s engaging readings.

In contrast to the *Cambridge Companion*, H.'s *Virgil* represents a very different type of introduction by offering a 'general survey' of Virgilian poetry as well as 'something approaching a representative account of Virgil at the end of the twentieth century' (p. iii). It comprises five sections: a brief introduction, individual chapters on the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid*, and a chapter on Virgil's style. A select bibliography, a general index, and an 'index of chief passages discussed' conclude this brief yet informative volume.

Chapter I lays out general historical and biographical material, as well as some basic

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

issues and approaches that have guided contemporary Virgilian interpretation. The three main chapters (II–IV) on Virgil's canonical works exhibit a rough pattern. Each opens with an introduction to the genre of the particular work and then moves on to consider first Greek poetic predecessors and then Latin. The chapters normally end with reflections on the structure and interpretation or 'meaning' of the work more generally. In between these sections, H. examines the political and historical significance of the works, issues of poetics, and other concerns specific to the particular poem. In the concluding chapter ('Style, Language, Metre'), H. offers a detailed examination of *Aeneid* 5.835–71 in order to display, among other things, how 'style cannot be separated from content' (p. 103).

H. provides a good balance of broad interpretation and focused readings of individual passages. While not loath to suggest his own particular views, H. continually presents a wide range of critical options, and provides numerous bibliographic leads to enable the reader to pursue individual interpretations. What results is an insightful introduction and guide to Virgilian criticism today.

Readers of Virgil are now offered two extremely useful survey volumes of very different character. For those who are studying Virgil for the first time or who want a useful summary of current approaches with helpful bibliography, H.'s volume will be rewarding. Those looking for more specialized essays will find M.'s volume appealing. Better still, the two can be used productively together, as H.'s book will very often refer the reader to specific chapters in M.'s. Thus the contemporary reader of Virgil has been given the best of both worlds. M. and H. show well where Virgilian studies have gone and where they might be headed.

Middlebury College RANDALL T. GANIBAN

DIE ALTE WEISE

R. CRAMER: *Vergils Weltsicht: Optimismus und Pessimismus in Vergils* Georgica. Pp. xii + 309. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998. Cloth, DM 198. ISBN: 3-11-015728-4.

The best-known issue in Virgilian studies is certainly the tired question of optimism and pessimism, particularly in the *Aeneid*, but to some extent in the poet's earlier works as well. In *Vergils Weltsicht*, R. Cramer attempts to decide the poet's outlook in the *Georgics*. The question as C. poses it is double: what fundamental attitude characterizes the poet's outlook in general, and more particularly, did he take a negative or positive view of his *princeps* Octavian? C. never tells us exactly what he means by the term *Optimismus*, but by *Pessimismus* he means the views of the so-called Harvard School, to which this book is largely a response.

For the first and fourth books, C. proceeds more or less comprehensively from beginning to end. For the second and third books, he chooses important passages and, with few exceptions, limits his remarks to them. Thus the chapter on Book 2 treats two passages: the *laudes Italiae* and the *laudes uitae rusticae* (though here we do get some discussion of grafting), while that on Book 3 covers the effects of love among the animals, the instructions on the prevention of illness, and finally the Noric plague. C.'s discussions are especially rich in cross-references and citations of parallels and sources. In many places C. confines himself to arguing against others, and readers will sometimes feel that they are reading a book-length review of R. F. Thomas's 1988 Cambridge commentary. This is especially true of the discussions of Book 2, where C.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

defends the positive outlook of passages which Thomas has tried to show are more ambivalent or even downright dark. C. rarely argues for his own new ideas about the poem, and indeed *Vergils Weltsicht* cannot be said to present any general interpretation of the *Georgics*, only an effort to find a positive side to certain crucial passages.

Among the passages C. does not discuss are unfortunately some of the best-known and most important in the poem: thus the storm at 1.316–37 gets little attention, while the fire at 2.303–14, the so-called *uituperatio uitis* at 2.454–8, and the proem to Book 3 all pass unremarked. These are passages which tend to work against a thoroughly optimistic reading of the poem—and for exactly that reason C. ought to have examined them. Elsewhere, C. tries, with mixed success, to rehabilitate passages in which Virgil paints in rather dark colors, for instance the description of civil war at the end of Book 1 and the finale of Book 3: the plague at Noricum and Tisiphone's 'harvest' of dead animals.

The *Schlußwort* summarizes the conclusions of each chapter, and it is here that C. most clearly states his views. The images of civil war in Book 1 are taken up by the description of Italy and the simple life in Book 2: civil war comes from greed and lust for power, while the self-sufficient life of the early Romans, the alternative which Virgil recommends, leads to greatness. There is an opposition between austere and self-sufficient Italy and the East, which is fabulously wealthy but also spawns terrifying monsters. Inasmuch as he fights in the farthest realms of the threatening East, Octavian is the savior of Rome and the representative of the way of life Virgil advocates. Furthermore, Virgil distinguishes himself from Lucretius throughout the poem. Whereas the earlier poet tried to dispel the fear of the gods in a universe which the gods do not govern, Virgil champions piety. *Todesfurcht*, Lucretius' other target, is aroused only to be brought under control by our wonder at the miracle of new life arising from death, and thus the darkness at the end of Book 3 (a plague without a cure) and in the story of Orpheus (the deaths of both Eurydice and Orpheus himself) is countered by the successful recovery of the bees at the end of Book 4.

I come now to the book's most disturbing feature. C. states in the *Vorwort* that the Virgilian text is not nearly as secure as we have all thought. Following (as yet unpublished) work by Otto Zwierlein, C. presents us with a text of the *Georgics* well over 200 lines shorter than that of the standard editions. The appendices (pp. 258–88) discuss some of the athetized passages at length, while the rest are discussed in the notes. Cuts range from numerous single lines to an astonishing twenty-three verses at once (3.525–47); this last example removes, among other things, the grief felt by an ox when his yoke-mate dies from the plague, and Virgil's troubled question, *quid labor aut benefacta iuuant?* Even those desperate to find a more positive Virgil in the *Georgics* are unlikely to approve of removing these lines.

C. does have useful things to say about the *Georgics*. His reaction to Thomas's ambivalent view of the *laudes Italiae* is worth reading, as is his discussion of the 'theodicy' of Book 1. The tendentious omissions, however, along with the frequent deletions from the text, weaken his case dramatically, as does the failure to address the poem's greater implications outside of the simplistic dichotomy, optimism or pessimism. In short, scholars will want to consult this book, but it will be most useful to those wishing to launch their own salvoes in this particular debate. Those interested in the big picture will not find it here.

University of Minnesota CHRISTOPHER NAPPA

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

VIRGIL'S *ECPHRASIS*

M. C. J. PUTNAM: *Virgil's Epic Designs. Ekphrasis in the* Aeneid. Pp. x + 257. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998. Cased, £25. ISBN: 0-300-07353-4.

Michael C. J. Putnam's intricately laced, often stunningly insightful readings of Virgil's epic in *The Poetry of the Aeneid* (Cambridge, 1965) and *Virgil's Aeneid: Interpretation and Influence* (Chapel Hill, 1995) have, in their thirty-year span, framed the thinking of a generation of Virgil scholars with arguments for an epic that looks more towards the cost of empire than its rewards. Violence and containment, memory and blindness, erotic love and erotic repulse have become central—and for many, definitive—themes in Virgil scholarship. P. now applies the *ultima manus* to his *oeuvre* in a work that newly stresses the lack of such a finishing touch for Virgil's own art, left in Daedalian incompleteness to accommodate a multiplicity of perspectives. Yet this final touch, for all its attention to the sub- jective participation of the viewer-outside-the-text, still declares its allegiance to the 'pessimistic school' of Virgil interpretation, setting up a suggestive tension between openness and closure in this volume's attentive analysis.

Virgil's Epic Designs is quintessential Putnam. It is a study that brings together close readings of six Virgilian ekphrases—Dido's murals, the cloak of Cloanthus, Daedalus' frieze, Silvia's stag, the shield of Aeneas, and Pallas' baldric—with their Virgilian intertext and with other works, both poetic and monumental. All these readings are informed by P.'s powerful central thesis: 'All of Virgil's notional ekphrases are in consequential ways metaphors for the larger text which they embellish. . . . [They] represent the poem itself and afford us deeper ways of reading which we may plumb only through the actuation of sight into insight' (pp. 2, 3). This depth is provided in part by a feature missing from simile, the viewer-in-the-text, whose insights and limitations P. explores to broaden our own perspective as readers. It is also provided by his attention to textual order and pattern, to the forward thrust of epic and teleology versus the circular, reflective material of the ekphrastic passages.

The space of this review renders impossible a summary of all six chapters of the book (readers should note, too, that the chapters on Cloanthus' cloak, Dido's murals, and Daedalus' doors have already appeared elsewhere), so I shall be perforce selective. The chapter on the shield of Aeneas, at sixty pages the longest in the book, provides a good starting point. Here P. explores the contrast between linear history and the rounded artefact that represents 'a circularity which encourages us to see the recurrence of certain constants in human life' (p. 158). The non-linear nature of the ekphrasis is highlighted by Virgil's use within it of repetition, duality, and ring composition—for example, Vulcan as 'haud ignarus' at 8.627 is echoed by Aeneas as 'ignarus' at 8.730, and the culminating indignation of the Araxes (8.728) recalls the early indignation of the antihero Porsenna at 8.649. P. reads these framing moments darkly, with implications for that other *vita indignata* at the poem's end. He goes on to explore the sexual undertones to the occasion of the shield's manufacture and delivery to Aeneas (pp. 167–80). In this poem, gifts and treachery (*dona*/*doli*) often go hand-in-hand with erotic deception, providing a problematic foundation for the destruction of Troy and the erection of Rome. So it is that Vulcan, in an echo of Virgil's treatment of the *munus* of the golden bough, hesitates before yielding the *munera* of his art to Venus' desire; other *dona*, like Aeneas' gifts to Dido, brought by Amor in the guise of Ascanius, charm and deceive simultaneously. The Trojan Horse

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

does so as well, and Sinon, who 'se obtulit ultro' to the Trojans in the same language as Venus meeting her son with the shield. An empire is destroyed by the offspring of the pregnant horse—and built on that of the pregnant she-wolf.

Let us turn to Daedalus' sculptures, crucial for P. because of the focus on *dolor* that drives both this ekphrasis and the frame of the epic, where Juno's *dolor* and Aeneas' are prominently linked to the foundation of empire. P. here proffers a rather structuralist claim that the sequence of images in the ekphrasis points to a tripartite division in the epic's treatment of the hero: the deceits of Books 1–4 are recalled by the exploits of Daedalus the artificer, the events of Books 5–8 evoke the artist/hero as a feeler of pity, and the grim Books 9–12 stress death, grief, and anger. More striking still, he suggests that the progression of the ekphrasis serves as a 'paradigm of the Virgilian career' (p. 82). The endpoint of this description of Daedalian artistry, as of Virgil's own work of art, is that the 'heroic–artistic–poetic fabrication' ends strikingly abruptly with Icarus' absence from the frieze: 'We will never know what Daedalian *dolor* within Virgil caused him to leave his epic so generically incomplete' (p. 94), but we do know that this abstention from the potential lie of art leaves us only with 'the final, perfecting deficiencies of anger and sorrow' (p. 96).

One quibble: we might contrast this view with statements P. makes elsewhere about art's potential for multivalence; his conclusion stresses that 'Ekphrasis of works of art, in Virgil's hands, also more often than not implies a multiplicity of interpretive perspectives. . . . [W]e must not expect to retrieve any incontrovertible, secure interpretation of the host poem' (pp. 209, 210). This orientation towards openness seems at odds with the generally pessimistic readings of the ekphrases, as with the masterful discussion of Cloanthus' cloak, where P. focuses on issues of loss and brutality by linking the lost Ganymede to Attis, Atys, Tumus, Pallas, and Iulus himself, or the chapter on Pallas' baldric, where P. notes that Aeneas' victim Haemonides shares an epithet with the Sibyl, and argues that 'In his rage at Pallas' death Aeneas . . . symbolically kills both the Sibyl, who receives and abets him as a suppliant' (pp. 203–4). Indeed, it is interesting to speculate on how it is that attention to detail, echo, and allusion in this poem consistently favors a darker reading (one might contrast recent interpretations that, in taking an approach informed by Hellenistic philosophy, have suggested different perspectives on Aeneas' final outburst): could such a method, brilliantly attentive as it is to repetition, nuance, and synchronic overview, inherently participate in the production of an anti-heroic reading by working against the forward thrust of epic?

Two minor points relating to bibliography. The chapter on the cloak of Cloanthus could cite J. Scheid and J. Svenbro's *The Craft of Zeus* (Cambridge and London, 1996) and P. R. Doob's *The Idea of the Labyrinth from Classical Antiquity through the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 1990); in the discussion of the similarities between Aeneas' biography and narrative and Dido's experiences I missed D. Biow, 'Epic Performance on Trial: Virgil's *Aeneid* and the Power of Eros in Song,' *Arethusa* 27 (1995), 223–46.

Finally, I hope to have given the reader some feel for the texture of this eloquent book, which provides us with the strongest possible argument for its author's view that 'Ekphrasis breaks the forward thrust of epic and reminds us that, in Virgil's brilliant hands, the plot of Rome has a repetitively tragic dimension' (p. 207). P.'s hands, too, after all, are those of a master artisan.

University of Chicago SHADI BARTSCH

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

HORACE MAKING FACES

E. OLIENSIS: *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Pp. xii + 241. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cased, £37.50. ISBN: 0-521-57315-7.

Horatian studies continue to follow the lines of Pindaric scholarship. G. Davis in *Polyhymnia: the Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse* (Berkeley, 1991) brought the rhetorical technique of E. Bundy's *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley 1986) to the *Odes*, and now Oliensis adds the needed dimension of social relations in the spirit of L. Kurke's rhetoric of economics (*The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* [Ithaca, 1991]). Like other recent critics cited on p. 4, O. uses the sociolinguistic theory of P. Brown and S. C. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage* (Cambridge, 1987) to describe how Horace constructs his 'face', a term adding social stake to persona (as in 'lose face', 'save face', 'in your face'). Unlike the others, O. pursues her topic across all Horace's works. This salutary move allows for comparison of the degrees to which Horace represents himself as socially powerful at different stages of his career and in different genres. O. disentangles H.'s conflicting desires for independence and approval, a clarification of social strategies that sometimes appear at cross purposes. Her overall story is one of increasing Horatian authority.

Extricating genre from chronology is the subject's major challenge, one O. faces practically by treating each genre together in roughly chronological order, and theoretically by her conception of the real: art intervenes in the world (p. 2). This formulation escapes from persona understood either as pure fiction or as transparent reflection of external reality. Horace's authority increases over time as a consequence of his self-representations in both world and art. Given the predominance she accords genre, however, we expect an explicit treatment of generic difference. O. sets the *Odes*' poetics of potency against the *Epodes*' posture of humiliation (pp. 102–3), and implies that the epistolary format of the *Epistles* affords the poet more independence than the *Sermones*' conversations (p. 154), but never asks why the divide between lyric meters and hexameters. This question matters for her topic, even if ultimately unanswerable. The rift between chronology and genre manifests itself in O.'s displacement of *Odes* 4.3 from its lyric peers to a climactic position. Her treatment of the dignified lyric boast of *Odes* 4 follows directly on the monstrous bear-leech ending the *Ars Poetica*. Since the relative chronology of Horace's later works remains murky, we expect an explanation according to genre: boast and leech are each an antithetical climax to the two strands of effacement and assertion O. pursues throughout; here, finally, threads previously interwoven in each genre diverge. The lack of such explanation puzzles. Does O. mean to privilege the decorous Horace over the breaker of poetic and social conventions? Does her argument of progressive self-assertion require Horace to end with a boast? Her own analysis leads me, at any rate, to prefer the uncontainable power of the ugly leech.

O.'s strengths are the individual aperçu (check marks litter my copy) and the summing up of each collection. She puts her finger on the contrary motions of Horatian satire: the poet ridicules social climbers and yet flaunts his own social advance (p. 17). The *Epodes* fight to stabilize a world disordered by the crisis of civil war: Horace defers to power and asserts his authority against the disenfranchized (p. 64), a strategy that trips him up with Canidia and makes the invective poet 'uncomfortably close' to his targets (p. 75). In the *Odes*, Horace claims the status of

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

princeps so long as he does not compete with Augustus (p. 106). O. establishes an ' "exclusionary rule": Horace asserts his authority in the absence of Augustus and effaces his authorial persona in the imperial presence' (p. 128). Consequently, the Roman Odes, where poet and *princeps* come (almost) face to face, dance around 'tactful evasion' and 'self-restraint' (p. 132). The *Epistles* and *Ars Poetica* reveal an established poet who can assert himself against powerful patrons like Maecenas and the Pisones, while, and indeed, even *by* deferring to them (p. 199). The *Ars* is the crown of O.'s analysis because here she shows how social lessons are packaged within an overtly aesthetic didacticism (p. 198).

What works for the *Ars*, however, seems thin for the *Odes*. Her method accounts for more of the poetic punch of the hexameters than of the lyrics: focusing on the 'social implications of Horace's aesthetic choices' (p. 15) misses too much in the *Odes*. But her method could press farther than it does by examining the different registers in which Horace speaks to addressees within the subtle hierarchies of the Roman male élite beyond the extremes of slaves or the imperial circle. Even without such prosopographical work, I would like to know how O. reads *Odes* 1.25. The put-down of Lydia belies the tactful lyrist O. describes. Similarly, O.'s rhetoric of social relations could illuminate the disputed phrase *iuuenum nobilium cliens*, addressed to (a) Vergil(ius) (*Odes* 4.12.15).

O. keeps the poet's position in society separate from his poems' aesthetic independence (p. 14). I would like to know how she thinks a poetry of social positioning works as poetry. The best of New Historicism incorporates both good old-fashioned historicism and the literary critical tools of post-structuralism. O.'s rhetorical approach shies away from history, and her exclusive interest in social representation leads to a narrow view of Horace on poetic grounds, however fine her readings.

New York University MICHÈLE LOWRIE

NASO MAGISTER

JULA WILDBERGER: *Ovids Schule der 'elegischen' Liebe: Erotodidaxe und Psychagogie in der* Ars amatoria. (Studien zur klassischen Philologie, 112.) Pp. xi + 449. Frankfurt am Main, etc.: Peter Lang, 1998. Paper, £47. ISBN: 3-631-33558-X.

The notion is not a new one, but this is its first appearance as the basis of a systematic analysis of Books 1 and 2 of the *Ars amatoria*: W. tries to demonstrate in a sort of running commentary that the *praeceptor amoris* is teaching young men how to experience 'elegiac love in a modified, happy form' (p. 13). Whereas the *amator* in classic Roman elegies suffers endlessly, takes *servitium amoris* lying down, and never even gets the *puella* as his faithful partner in a *foedus aeternum*, the pupil learns from his *praeceptor amoris* that modifying the elegiac lover's approach and avoiding the same's mistakes will lead to success: maybe not to an everlasting relationship, but to a long-term one that is based on mutual affection and a common need to satisfy sexual appetites. W. describes this new concept of elegiac love as set forth in Books 1 and 2—the seminar for young men—in great detail (pp. 1–342). Book 3, the girls' handbook, is only considered here in its significance for the lover's

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

practical application of the new concept (pp. 343–80), because—and this is not new either—the *praeceptor amoris* does not really offer the girls 'weapons' with which to tackle men (3.1ff.), but instead steers them away from typical *dura puella* behaviour in the interests, of course, of the elegiac lover who is to be made 'happy'.

Undeniably new are, by contrast, W.'s observations on the structure of Books 1 and 2 (which she rightly believes [pp. 344–7] to have been intended from the outset as parts of a tetralogy consisting of *Ars* 1–3 and the *Remedia*): she demonstrates very convincingly that the individual sections of the two books are all linked in a meticulously designed didactic and psychological plan. However, the notion that 'Ovid meant his teaching to be taken seriously' (p. 8), that this was to be a genuine manual for the art of love, written with academic aspirations—W. tries to demonstrate this with the text itself and a lengthy discussion of *Ars* literature (pp. 381–414)—well, I just don't buy it. She argues, for example, that in antiquity philosophers too wrote about the *τέχνη ἐρωτική* (pp. 392f.), but she does not say why Ovid, if he really was carrying on this tradition, did not lecture in prose, in the form, say, of a Socratic dialogue or a treatise like Plutarch's *Γαμικὰ παραγγέλματα*. The *Ars* is in reality but one of the poetic texts of Ovid's in which he tinkers with the 'elegiac system'—as many recent studies have shown, he did precisely this back in the *Amores*, in the *Epistulae Heroidum*, and then again in the works he wrote after the *Ars*, even in his exile poetry. Thus texts with different contents are linked by the principle of variation on motifs from the erotic elegy, and since Ovid actually characterized himself as a *tenerorum lusor amorum* (*Trist*. 3.3.73), it is quite clearly first and foremost his literary wit and playfulness which prompt his repeated modifications to the elegiac world here in the *Ars* and elsewhere. The arguments W. uses in her analysis to dismiss the possibility of literary prankishness all fail to convince, as in, for instance, her attempt to refute the view expressed by Hollis at *Ars* 1.55ff., that it is an 'amusing parody of a stock patriotic theme of the day—panegyric of Rome and Italy' (Comm. ad loc.). One reason for W. to disagree is that characteristic elements of such panegyric are missing in the text and so the parody could not work: 'Instead of lots of different qualities, Ovid only praises one—the large number of beautiful female inhabitants' (p. 34). But a typical *laus urbis* would not actually include the population as a crucial feature in the profile of an *urbs*; what counts is the inventory: temples, houses, towers, bridges, etc. (C. J. Classen, *Die Stadt im Spiegel der Descriptiones und Laudes urbium* [Hildesheim, 1980], p. 29). Thus in his praise of Rome, when the *praeceptor amoris* compares the city's women, who for him are the *materia* for his pupils' love (1.49), with fields of wheat, grape-vines, fish, birds, and stars, and divides them into different categories, then he is clearly not talking about Rome's population, but about its 'inventory', and more precisely about those features which he considers eminently mentionable and worth listing.

Even if W. does take her basic notion of 'schooling' in elegiac love a little too tenaciously to the point of eccentricity, in her textual analysis she proves herself a remarkably knowledgeable and astute scholar. She quotes almost all relevant literature (except Veyne's and Kennedy's elegy books, from which she could have learnt a lot about games with the 'elegiac system'), she broadens considerably our perception of the intertextuality of the *Ars* (e.g. pp. 256–9 in a comparison of 2.253ff. with Q. Cic. *Comm. Pet*. 41ff.), she offers plausible suggestions for the critical text (see Index, p. 428), and she contributes greatly to our understanding of various passages (cf. esp. pp. 77–81 on 1.231ff., where her interpretation takes the intoxicating effects of the mixture of alcohol and love into account). Whatever one may think of the ideas put forward in this book, as a running commentary to Books 1 and 2 of the *Ars* it will be indispensible for future studies on the text.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Munich NIKLAS HOLZBERG

MARTIAL BOOK VI

F. GREWING: *Martial, Buch VI (Ein Kommentar)*. (Hypomnemata: Untersuchungen zur Antike und zu ihrem Nachleben 115.) Pp. 592. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997. DM 160. ISBN: 3-525-25212-9.

Book 6 is the second shortest in Martial (ninety-four epigrams). Farouk Grewing's intelligent and very welcome commentary (based on his Göttingen dissertation of 1996) runs to 592 pages, but includes neither text nor translation. In his foreword he writes: 'Der nicht eben geringe Umfang des Kommentars irritiert nicht zuletzt den Verfasser selbst'. One can only wonder why, in that case, he did not shorten it. There is a good deal of repetition. For example, he (rightly) argues at pp. 33–4 that Garthwaite is mistaken in seeing intentional criticism of Domitian in the poems dealing with adultery, but repeats this at p. 78 and again at p. 86. Furthermore, it is not as if G. was in the position of M. Citroni when he published the first full commentary on an individual book: before G.'s, five commentaries had appeared, which means that much general material is already available.

It is unlikely that there would have been any great advantage in G.'s establishing a Latin text *de novo*, granted the comparatively good state of M.'s text, but, quite apart from the serious inconvenience to the user of not having a text printed, there is an absurdity in having the lemmata printed according to the text of Shackleton Bailey, when the commentary argues for a different reading. Examples include 16.1, 19.5, 44.3, 82.9, 86.1, 89.4, and 92.2. (At 43.6 G. sits on the fence, which is an inadmissible position for a commentator.) The absurdity is magnified by G.'s severe criticism of Shackleton Bailey (p. 17). Generally his judgement on textual matters is good, though he sometimes attaches too much weight to the *lectio difficilior* argument (e.g. at 92.2, preferring γ's *artes*).

G. attempts to justify the lack of a translation, but one of the greatest benefits of including one is that there is no way in which the commentator can make more clear to his reader (and sometimes to himself) exactly what he thinks a passage means. Take, for example, the long note on 3.1, or the note on 28.3 (does he think that *deliciae* has a sexual sense or not?). Once again, he would not be allowed the escape-route of sitting on the fence.

Each poem has an introduction, followed in each case by an analysis of the structure. These are well done, but they add substantially to the bulk, and it is questionable whether they need to be so detailed. Despite their presence, stylistic matters are not always fully considered. 61 is in the form of a dialogue, but nothing is said about this type of epigram. The short 55 is in an elevated style, but little is said about this.

In the preface to Book 1, M. tells us that he never attacks real people by name, or even under fictitious names. Some (including the reviewer) believe him, but G. is one of those who do not. See pp. 28 and 48, and his notes on 26.1, 61.1, 64, 88.2, and 91.2. The matter is not susceptible of proof, and must depend on the reader's judgement. With regard to M.'s choice of names, it is certainly odd that in 94 he should use a spondaic one.

G.'s wordiness can have the effect of causing him to lose sight of the wood for the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

trees. An example is his nine-page commentary on poem 13, where he says nothing about its highly poetical character (including the use of two Greek words). He also fails to explain *respondet* (p. 3) convincingly: Shackleton Bailey's 'corresponds to the original' looks right. G. disparages poem 79, but, when he makes such heavy weather of this distich, it sinks beneath the weight. (His suggestion that it may refer back to 78 does not convince: why did M. not use the same name?) In the discussion of poem 10 (pp. 118–27) nothing is said about whether M. really hoped for a gift from Domitian, nor are the parallels for such requests cited.

G.'s longwindedness is sometimes made worse by his deviation into irrelevance. The deadly rôle of doctors has nothing to do with 70.5. At 80.3 *Pharios* means simply 'Egyptian', and the Pharos itself is beside the point. On the other hand, G. does not always provide the reader with the information he requires. 19.7: there is no note on the names. Which Mucius is intended? See Shackleton Bailey's Loeb. 29.3: we wonder how often such young slaves were freed. 32: we want to know if it was true that Otho could have won. 68: presumably Castricus was drowned in the Lucrine lake, but there is no note on the pleasure-boating that went on there, nor any explanation that the lake is beside the sea (hence *Thetis*, l. 2). 70.15 is one of the most famous lines in M., but nothing is said about this. 72 deals with a marble statue of Priapus (cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 7.35), but we are not told about surviving examples. 78 deals with a man whose fondness for drink has made him blind: we want to know whether there is any medical basis for this. The commentary on 83 is seriously deficient. G. does not consider what sort of offence might cause Domitian to banish a man to Campania. But B. W. Jones's *The Emperor Domitian* (London, 1992—cited in the bibliography) refers to I. A. Carradice, 'The Banishment of the Father of Claudius Etruscus', *LCM* 4 (1979), 101–3, and see also Jones pp. 68–9.

G. is not always properly attuned to M.'s humour. The note on 3.6 is very stuffy, but 'spinning Phrixus's whole sheep' is comic. 42 is hardly an 'invective': the joke is that M. is boring Oppianus. Nor does M. intend any 'Luxus-Kritik': so as not to seem too smarmy, he undercuts his praise with his customary wit. G. describes the reference to the grieving Priam at 71.4 as 'ein wenig geschmacklos', but that is the whole point. Similarly at 7.2 he takes Juv. 6.306–12 excessively seriously (and perhaps underestimates the influence of M. upon Juvenal).

There are a couple of errors in reference to Petronius. 92.9 (cited on p. 258) refers to the penis of Ascyltos, not Giton. In the last line on p. 417, for 'Habinnas' read 'Hermeros'. G. is not always up to scratch on Realien. For topographical matters he refers to Platner-Ashby, rather than to L. Richardson's *New Topographical Dictionary of Rome* (Baltimore, 1992—in the bibliography), let alone the *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* (Rome, I–IV, 1993–6; ed. E. M. Steinby). For the temple of Minerva in the Forum Transitorium (p. 120), refer to *Lex. Top.* II.309; for the Temple of Flora (p. 204), refer to *Lex. Top.* II.254 (and for the Capitolium Vetus, *Lex. Top.* I.234). The discussion of baths, *re* 6.42, is unsatisfactory in several respects, and much would be gained by referring to modern books on baths, such as (now) J. DeLaine, *The Baths of Caracalla* (Portsmouth, RI, 1997).

The book is well produced and clearly printed, and on the whole remarkably accurate. There are a number of typographical errors, most of which pose no problem, but the reviewer spotted twenty errors in quotations of Greek and Latin authors.

This review has dwelt largely on negative points, but the book has many virtues, not least its excellent coverage of linguistic matters. G.'s comprehensive and perceptive commentary on Book 6 is a substantial contribution to Martial studies. It is regrettable that he did not produce a more disciplined work, which would have more

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

effectively fulfilled what must be the primary aim of any commentator—to help his readers to understand and to appreciate the work of his author.

Royal Holloway, London PETER HOWELL

VALERIUS FLACCUS

D. HERSHKOWITZ: *Valerius Flaccus'* Argonautica. *Abbreviated Voyages in Silver Latin Epic.* Pp. xi + 301. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-815098-9.

In Euripides' *Orestes*, just after Helen has miraculously disappeared, Orestes bursts wildly onstage in pursuit of her Phrygian slave. Orestes mendaciously demands of him: 'Was Helen justly killed?' (v. 1512). The slave replies: 'Most justly. Even if she had three throats for cutting.' The slave knows how to appease those in power in this melodramatic, comic scene. Like Orestes, he dissimulates. Debra Hershkowitz's new book on Valerius Flaccus claims for Valerius and Jason a similar strategy. For them dissimulation was conditioned by life in Domitianic Rome.

That conclusion, however, is prefaced by four very dense and interesting chapters. In the first ('Incompleteness: *me talia velle?*') H. argues that multiple possibilities are presented to Valerius through the means by which he may recapitulate, through intertextual recall, the events of the epic and mythological tradition (the *Aeneid* as much as Apollonius' epic) into which a writer has written himself. Rather ingeniously (and with a debt to critics such as Masters on Lucan) she suggests that the openness and, in the case of the *Argonautica*, the possibilities conferred by this rich prehistory are complemented by the 'openness' of the ending of the poem (breaking off with Jason and Medea only part way on their return to Iolcus) (p. 34). Chapter II ('Belatedness: Silver Linings') continues this argument. H. maintains that through intertextual reference the Silver Latin writer of epic is able to renew and reinvent his tale. The intertextual richness provided by coming at the end of a long tradition makes possible a depth and literary resonance which would not be possible for earlier writers. (Homer? The assertion may need more fully to countenance at least the possibility, argued for by Nagy and others, of interaction with the potentially infinite regress of an oral tradition.)

Chapters III ('Recuperation: Better, Stronger, Faster') and IV ('Digressions: The Road not Taken') provide a neat ensemble and, in many ways, will prove to be the most consulted and enduring part of H.'s work. In Chapter III she attempts to demonstrate how Jason, his colleagues, and some of the tasks they undergo are 'Romanized'. So Jason ceases to be the hapless, *amêchaniê*-bedevilled hero of Apollonius' poem and comes more to resemble the hero of the second half of the *Aeneid*. Aeson, Jason's father, becomes prominent in Valerius' version and, through his Stoic suicide, becomes a *vir Romanus*. Hercules is no longer the anachronistic figure of Apollonius' poem, but an individual in tune with his heroic, *virtus*-driven 'Roman' age. Medea too ceases to be Apollonius' passionate teenager. She resembles an older, more deeply passionate Dido. Chapter IV attempts to illustrate how digressions within the epic are sometimes expanded and sometimes contracted, and how these accordingly also 'Romanize' the poem and provide imperial significance to an otherwise romantic story. The seemingly intrusive Book 6, for example, provides a martial flavour to the poem which fits this 'Romanization' and introduces the topical theme of civil war. Jupiter's predictions in

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Book 1 concerning the shift of power East, missing in Apollonius' version, point to a Roman future and link Jason and his voyage to a Roman imperial future.

The core of the book is Chapters III and IV. Indeed, the 'Romanization' of Jason and his myth is so firmly demonstrated that it is as if another chapter is needed to rescue Valerius from the accusation of being an imperial propagandist. Chapter V ('Dissimulation: Unlearned in the World's False Subtleties') provides this: Jason's and other characters' ability to navigate deception (and the reader's collusion in this, p. 272) matches the adaptive strategies needed by Valerius' contemporaries for survival under emperors such as Domitian. So it is that Pelias dissimulates when he sends Jason off on his mission. But Jason, complicit in the dissimulation, accepts this out of a desire for glory. Valerius' characters, while 'recognizing or expecting someone or something to be deceptive, [know that] one must still shape one's response as if there were no dissimulation involved' (p. 264). But was it really that different for the Phrygian slave? He knew that Orestes was dissimulating and he played along. Perhaps dissimulation does not let Jason off the hook. It could be argued that this 'Romanized' hero and heroine act in a far less troubling manner than do those of the modernist Apollonius. Valerius' narrative reinstalls action and activity (group focused, to be fair) in place of Apollonian affect.

H.'s is a welcome production. The analytical mode is firmly intertextual (terms such as intertext, prolepsis, recuperation, and meta- rather abound). This mode, furthermore, can sometimes flatten the mythological texture, leaving one with a taste of a 'Jason goes to college' narrative. But intertextualism is the now dominant Anglo-American critical mode in Latin literary studies. One might also have wished for something on Valerius' Latin (can anyone who wrote hexameters such as his be expected to have finished his poem?). One might have wished for more close analysis directed towards an elucidation of Valerius' elusive 'voice'. That is to ask H. for a different book. Hers will provide an exceptionally stimulating basis for the future readings of Valerius' baffling poem.

University of Calgary PETER TOOHEY

GETTING A LIFE

J. HENDERSON: *A Roman Life. Rutilius Gallicus on Paper and in Stone.* Pp. xii + 155, ills. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1998. Paper, £12.99. ISBN: 0-85989-565-3.

In this slim volume, Henderson sets out to examine the 'life' of Rutilius Gallicus, urban prefect under Domitian, by juxtaposing the inscription from Ephesus (*ILS* 9499) that records his military career and the Statian poem that celebrates Gallicus' temporary recovery from illness (*Silv*. 1.4). The inscription, and thus the historical Gallicus, is treated in Chapters I–IV. Chapters V–XVIII present a close reading of the poem, each chapter treating successive sections, while Chapters XIX–XX discuss the poem's relationship to *Silvae* 1 as a whole. An appendix offers some comments on Pindar, *Pythian* 3, which H. sees as 'set[ting] the pace for Statius' soteria' (p. 118). It is H.'s conviction that both the inscription and the poem portray an unreal Gallicus, the written life surpassing the real life (p. 6), and throughout one finds Domitian's prefect undercut by the perceptive critic (e.g. p. 57).

Treated first is the inscription, which can serve as 'prompt and matrix for Statius' improvization of a poetic life for the Prefect' (p. 10), touchstones of Gallicus' public

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

identity that Statius incorporates into the poem. In this respect, each of Gallicus' recorded accomplishments is scrutinized with an eye toward how Statius' art will handle them (pp. 16–24), and the result is a compendium of correspondences between inscription and poem that shows Statius at his allusive best. A couple of examples will suffice: Gallicus was legate to the *legio XV Apollinaris*, and Apollo thus becomes the guiding deity behind the poem; he was from the Stellatina tribe, and the poem abounds in astral imagery. These playful allusions to Gallicus' life culminate in a string of poetic references that allude to his origins in Turin.

The main part of the book is devoted to a reading of the poem and how it portrays the life of Gallicus. But it is not H.'s concern to discover the historical Gallicus lurking behind Statius' poem (which would in any event be impossible), but to find out how Statius' art portrays this particular life and how this portrayal contributes to the literary picture of Domitian's Rome. The poem itself is one of the most intricately designed of the *Silvae*, the sometimes disparate sections finding a unity in the linking of images and allusions forward and backward within the text. H.'s argument is similarly intricate and must be read in its entirety. I hope an example will convey the tenor and direction of the argument.

H. fits the poem, and indeed all of Book 1, into the atmosphere of renewal that characterized Domitian's Rome and especially the holding of the Saecular Games in 88, the recovery of the prefect serving as a focal point for this renewal. Gallicus is throughout linguistically and conceptually tied to Rome's salvation. In the first instance, and in terms of political tradition, concern for him is equated with concern for the city as Romans of all classes are depicted as praying for his recovery. Set alongside Numa, Pompey, and Brutus at ll. 38–49, Gallicus is revered by all orders of Rome, and he is linguistically connected to the heroes of *Aeneid* 6 and to the man who quells revolution at *Aeneid* 1.151–3. In military terms, he, a Gallicus, is left to defend the city while Domitian and the armies fight beyond the Alps (pp. 34–6, 83–4), and in Apollo's *laudatio* Gallicus is imagined as completing the victories begun by Augustus and undoing the damage of Hannibal (1.4.86–8; pp. 84–6). Statius also portrays Gallicus as a second Maecenas, freely drawing on Horace and the *Elegiae in Maecenatem* (pp. 29–32, 111). Most important, Gallicus' health is early on tied to the health of Rome. The language of ll. 15–18, through which 'the health of Rome is condensed into the recovery of the Prefect' (p. 48), connects him to the Saecular Games, over which he presided, and the accompanying hoped-for renewal. The same point is brought out more forcefully by the appearance in the poem of Apollo as healer (pp. 73–4), his intercession resulting from Domitian's plea (1.4.95–7), Gallicus' own worth, and Statius' *carmen saeculare* (p. 88). This trio of emperor, prefect, and poet is mirrored on the divine plane by the trio of Jupiter, Apollo, and Aesculapius, which are brought together by a series of interrelationships posited by the poet (pp. 42, 52–3, 93–4).

Gallicus is cured by the god's timely intervention, and Statius presents us with a new beginning not only for the prefect, but also for the city and even for the poem, as the poem's ring structure returns us to the opening prayers (pp. 100–1). Thus the poem implicates the recovery of a Roman life with the renewal of the city. And finally, it is this theme of Domitianic renewal that connects *Silvae* 1.4 to the rest of the poems in the first book (pp. 108–14).

The argument is complex and repays a second reading. There are good comments on the function of the *Preface*, mediating between reader and poet and incorporating a temporality (pp. 102–7). Some will feel that H. at times reads too much into the poem, but the reader of Statius must be sensitive to a variety of levels of subtlety. The

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

text is relatively free from errors, although one might note the extra *-que* at l. 116 on p. 97 and the mislabeling of n. 229. The notes themselves provide a full accounting of the intertextual references that abound in any Statian poem. All Latin is translated in a style that is true to Statius' mixture of wit and hyperbole.

It would not be H. without some neat wordplay. My favourite? Commenting on Statius' account of Gallicus' cure at the hands of Apollo and Aesculapius, Henderson writes, 'Not dead, just Asclepe!' (p. 96). Well, Gallicus did die before the collection was published, a fact of which we are obliquely informed in Statius' *Preface*. And although the prefect's recovery was only temporary, *Silvae* 1.4 does indeed save Gallicus from obliteration, from an *oblivia vitae* (1.4.57), and H.'s account goes far in showing how Statius preserved this Roman life.

University of New Brunswick, Fredericton JOHN GEYSSEN

LACTANTIUS ON STATIUS

R. D. SWEENEY (ed.): *Lactantius Placidus in Statii Thebaida Commentum I; Anonymi in Statii Achilleida Commentum; Fulgentii ut fingitur Planciadis super Thebaiden Commentariolum* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana). Pp. lxxxviii + 704. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1997. Cased, DM 248. ISBN: 3-8154-1823-2.

The origins of this lifetime's work lie in a Harvard doctoral dissertation of 1965 followed, in 1969, by *Prolegomena to an Edition of the Scholia to Statius* (Leiden, 1969); the project eventually saw the light of day 99 years after its predecessor, the Teubner edition by R. Jahnke (Leipzig, 1898), whose strengths and shortcomings are fully rehearsed both in the *Prolegomena* and here. The promised volume of *Testimonia* is still awaited.

S. has closely re-examined the Renaissance editions and collated a very large number of manuscripts. He repeats, largely unchanged, the conclusions of his *Pro- legomena*: that all extant manuscripts and editions derive ultimately from a lost ω, but that some manuscripts (notably BMfmEHKWCV) have more or less direct and independent access to ω, and that all the others derive from a lost π through one of two intermediaries ϕ and ψ, also now lost. From the group more nearly related to S.'s ω, Jahnke relied only on M (Monacensis Clm. 19482), which he collated inaccurately, according to S., and five other manuscripts, for most of which he relied on others' collations and cited, at best, intermittently. From the group which S. calls π, Jahnke used only p (Parisinus 8063, which he called Pa), one of S.'s subgroup ϕ, and k (Parisinus 8064, which he called Pb), one of S.'s subgroup ψ. Both of them, according to S., are poor examples of their subgroup. Otherwise, Jahnke relied on the early printed editions.

Jahnke and S. agree that by far the best manuscript is M. Jahnke, however, had no strategy for evaluating the rest of the tradition. S., on the other hand, concludes that any reading that is restricted to his π, or which is found in only one of those manuscripts more nearly related to his ω, can be safely ignored. On this basis, he silently eliminates much to be found in Jahnke.

S. offers elaborate lists of common errors to establish the groups and subgroups alluded to above. I take at random a list on p. XXIII of places, said to be *inter alias*

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(sc. *cruces*?), where *codices* QFp *in erroribus contra id quod traditum est . . . congruunt*: 1.196 *timere* QfpO^2 (or is f an error for F?); 2.542–3 *humeri* mQFp; 3.559–61 *atque* fQFp; 4.570 *Zethum* QFpvek; 5.56 *insulas* Qfp (or is f an error for F?); 7.164–5 *aerane* QFp; 7.574 GRASSATA, QFp; 10.3–4 *utriusque* KWQFp; 10.491 *femineo* MfQFp; 12.622 *auxiliarum* QFp: *-ium* M^{2}AF$^2\psi$. It is disconcerting that of these ten alleged cases of agreement in error, S. accepts six (1.196, 2.542–3, 4.570, 5.56, 7.164–5, 574) into his text and rejects only four.

S.'s second main conclusion is that the tradition has been liable to much *disiectio*, '*sicut Hippolytum in Senecae Phaedra*' (p. XXXIII), and that this obliges an editor to reconsider the placing of notes throughout. I take a number of examples of S.'s treatment from early in book I:

12–4 Herculis *ex Myth. Vat. II 79 commendat anon. in Lit. Centralblatt 1899 347*: arcu uel ω, an excellent example of the fruits of S.'s undoubted diligence. 25 [PLAGA L(VCIDA) C(AELI) *hoc est orientalis*], which is clearly false; but S.'s laconic *seclusi* does not tell us whether that is his reason for excluding it. At 45, Jahnke offers:

> bene alio horrore, maiore impetu dictionis ut ipse alibi <Theb. V 585> de Capaneo 'grauioraque tela mereri' . . .

and S.:

> bene alio . . . horrore, maiore impetu dictionis ut ipse alibi <X 828> [he means 829]: <'non mihi tam [he means *iam*] solito uatum de more canendum.'> . . .

S.'s apparatus acknowledges that the quotation from Book 5 is in ω and all editions, and he accepts sole responsibility for substituting the quotation from Book 10 with the single word *scripsi*. His decision arises, presumably, from a judgement that the passage from Book 5 provides weaker support for Lactantius' *maiore impetu dictionis* as an explanation of Statius' *alio. . . horrore canendus* than the passage from Book 10 would. In defence of ω, one could say that at 1.45 Statius tells us that Capaneus is to be delayed *alio . . . horrore canendus* and that a similar warning is given at 5.585 where Capaneus' punishment is said to be awaiting *grauiora . . . tela.* Is that interpretation so absurd that we can be confident that Lactantius (described by S. himself on p. VII as *neque indoctus neque doctissimus*) could not have entertained it? At 57–9, it is clear from Jahnke that the MSS present the comment *nihil . . . uidere* in slightly different forms, some, including M, wrongly after FVNDO (57) and some correctly at the end of the note on 58. S., by following his usual practice of silently ignoring anything not in M, allows himself to claim that he has restored the comment to its correct place (even though all his predecessors and some MSS place it there), and that Jahnke excised it, which he did, but only from the wrong place. At 152–4, S. must be right to move *Cadmi . . . Thebas* from after *Boeotiam dicit* (152–3) to after *hoc est* (153–4). At 305, Jahnke reports that M omits *stella* from between *Saturni* and *est* as well as the two Virgilian illustrations (*G.* 1.336 and *Ecl.* 8.71); S.'s usual practice would be to omit all three; in fact, he silently omits *stella* and the second Virgilian illustration, but includes the first one without any reference to Jahnke's report.

S.'s lemmata consistently give the full words where Jahnke's, apparently following M, offer only the initial letter; a proliferation of round brackets record these adjustments in spite of S.'s judgement that the lemmata '*nec prisca sunt nec quicquam habent auctoritatis*' (p. XXXIII). S.'s belief that the lemmata are also hopelessly disordered has persuaded him to repair them *ut significationi congruant* and to

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lengthen or shorten them freely, indicating his supplements to M with round brackets and his deletions with square ones. Thus, at 18, S. expands the lemma SPERARE TRIVMPHOS by preceding it with (QVANDO ITALA NONDVM / SIGNA NEC ARCTOOS AVSIM). Similarly, at 99, where S., following Schindel, judges that the note is best seen as relating to the two words *dubia . . . ceruice*, the lemma ET DVBIA CAELVM C. R. becomes DVBIA [C(AELVM)] C(ERVICE) [R(EMISIT)]. Readers may feel that the proliferation of brackets is not justified by the pedantic benefits. In this particular case, pedants may wonder what happened to Jahnke's ET; Jahnke's apparatus reveals that ET is absent from M and is therefore silently omitted by S. A more extreme case, this time of expansion, is to be found at 32–3, where the one word lemma OESTRO becomes, in S., (TEMPVS ERIT CVM PIERIO TVA FORTIOR) OESTRO / (FACTA CANAM NVNC TENDO CHELYN; presumably a ')' should be supplied after CHELYN. More interestingly, at 43–4, Jahnke's:

> 43 VRGET ET HOSTILEM PROPELLENS CAEDIBVS AMNEM TVRBIDVS HIPPOMEDON compellit ad scribendum. 44 HIPPOMEDON Nesimachi et Nasicae filius. qui, dum in Ismeneta fluuio dimicaret, exstinctus est.

though not impossible, is certainly improved by S.:

> 43 VRGET compellit ad scribendum. 43–4 (ET) H(OSTILEM) P(ROPELLENS) C(AEDIBVS) A(MNEM) T(VRBIDVS) HIPPOMEDON nesimachi et Nasicae filius, qui, dum in Ismeno[nta] fluuio dimicaret, exstinctus est.

S. ends with the anonymous commentary on the *Achilleid*, also to be found in M and a few other MSS (S. is confident of the standard view that it is a late compilation), and the brief essay on the *Thebaid* attributed to Bishop Fulgentius, together with a reconsideration of the textual issues raised by Helm's work.

Editing a work of this kind is a formidable task. The sheer difficulty of reading the material would deter many. Added to that is the daunting question of deciding what is Lactantius Placidus and what is not. S.'s general policy of silently suppressing all that can be shown not to have been in his ω seems unlikely to have preserved all that is genuine and excised all that is accretion. Scholiast texts will inevitably attract accretion, and it would be impossible to establish definitively that the scribes of S.'s π, ϕ, and ψ had no independent access to genuine material not to be found in ω. Anyone wishing to reconsider his judgement will find the task unnecessarily difficult, as will those who might wish to study the accretions for their own sake, or for any insights they may offer, especially in view of the scarcity of Jahnke's edition (as he acknowledges on p. XXXII). S. has, however, performed a public service in producing this text (important both for Statius' readers and for students of Classical mythology), a text which has been for so long out of print. He has produced a far more readable version than Jahnke's, rendering much that was obscure perfectly plain; but he seems, from time to time, to have substituted his own view of what the scholiast should have written for what, in fact, he probably did write.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne D. E. HILL

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

FLAVIAN EPIC

DONALD T. MCGUIRE: *Acts of Silence: Civil War, Tyranny and Suicide in the Flavian Epics.* (Altertumswissenchaftliche Texte und Studien, 33.) Pp. xv + 256. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1997. Paper, DM 58. ISBN: 3-487-10334-6.

One of the more important issues in examining Roman literature of the first centuries B.C.E. and C.E. is how writers responded to political change in their works. Until the last decade, however, scholars writing about the literature of the Julio- Claudian and Flavian periods have usually steered clear of this issue for fear of having their ideas labelled as cavalier and fanciful, or having the notion dismissed that imperial poets utilized various rhetorical stratagems to comment critically upon the Principate. In recent years scholars such as Ahl, Garthwaite, Benker, Masters, Henderson, Dominik, and Bartsch have been giving increasing attention to these topics. Although Donald McGuire examines several of the issues treated by these scholars, *Acts of Silence* is the first book to offer a comparative treatment of Statius' *Thebaid*, Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*, and Silius Italicus' *Punica.*

M. argues that these poets concern themselves with specific types of political behaviour closely linked to their day. In each of their epics images of civil war, tyranny, suicide, and silence feature prominently, images that are used to reflect the type of conflict (civil war) that gives rise to or stems from a particular form of power (tyranny), which itself produces particular types of personal response (suicide and silence). The preoccupation with these images and issues is revealing not just because the parallels in subject matter and treatment suggest that all three poets were aware of and responding to each other's work, but especially because it demonstrates that these issues were major concerns in the literary and intellectual circles of Domitianic Rome.

In Chapter I (pp. 1–39) M. compares the political environment of some modern Soviet writers of the 1930s with the environment of Flavian Rome and examines verbal strategies such as *emphasis* and *schema* that are used by Statius, Valerius Flaccus, and Silius Italicus in their mythic and historical treatments of their themes. While M. declines to state specifically whether these epics are pro- or anti-Domitian, he maintains in Chapter II (pp. 42–87) that the prominence of civil war, tyranny, suicide, and silence in their narratives encourages the reader to reflect on the relevance of the episodes and events depicted to the historical, social, and political realities of the Flavian world.

Chapter III (pp. 88–146) examines the several means used by these poets to alter the mythic and historical traditions when introducing the issue of civil war into their epics. All three create important episodes that involve Roman paradigms of civil war. This emphasis reflects not only a strong awareness of Rome's own past experiences of civil war, but also suggests that a monarchical system such as the Principate necessarily entails the potential for further strife. In Chapter IV (pp. 147–84) M. argues that the poets' characterization of tyranny itself encourages a systematic reading of the political world contained in these epics. Not only do the three Flavian epics present a pervasive and consistent picture of tyranny (tyrants raging, plotting deadly crimes, and concealing intent behind silent façades), but also their composite portrait of tyranny constitutes a model for subsequent descriptions of Domitian, although the capacity of this portrait to allude specifically to this emperor is protected partly by the indirect nature of its commentary.

One of the by-products of tyranny in the Flavian epic is suicide, the subject of

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chapter V (pp. 185–229). Most of the suicides are represented as political acts of defiance and self-liberation in the face of oppression and tyranny. Statius, Valerius Flaccus, and Silius Italicus alter elements of these suicides from the mythic and historical traditions, and include new elements in their narratives. While the texts suggest their basic approval of the defiance that these suicides signify, M. argues in Chapter VI (pp. 230–48) that they call into question the ultimate validity of the effectiveness of suicide as an act of defiance, since self-destruction removes the opposition to tyranny and oppression. Ultimately these acts reflect the poets' own awareness about the limitations of their own poetic voices in recording such a self-destructive, self-silencing action. Suicide and the resultant exclamations of the poet's approval thus reflect the growing sense of despair that burdens the poets of the Flavian period in an era of increasing imperial control.

M. demonstrates that the *Thebaid*, *Argonautica*, and *Punica* collectively and individually have much of value to offer the modern scholar. Rather than being distant and isolated from their contemporary world, as many critics have maintained, these epics speak repeatedly to the issues of their day. In relating these works to the contemporary political world of Flavian Rome, M. fills a sizeable gap in the study of Latin literature. Commendably free of critical jargon, this book will not only be of general interest to scholars of the period but also should be of sufficiently broad interest to appeal to literary critics interested in the way that writers compose during times of political oppression.

University of Natal WILLIAM J. DOMINIK

CLAUDIAN'S CRAFT

K. S. AHLSCHWEIG: *Beobachtungen zur poetischen Technik und dichterischen Kunst des Claudius Claudianus, besonders in seinem Werk* De raptu Proserpinae. Pp. xiv + 312. Frankfurt am Main, etc.: Peter Lang, 1998. Paper, DM 36. ISBN: 3-631-32703-X.

Ahlschweig's study of the *De raptu Proserpinae* (hereafter *Rapt.*) derives from her 1997 Heidelberg dissertation, with some minor revisions. The work reviews in minute detail a range of stylistic features, with the aim of systematically documenting the special care the poet gave to the poem's composition, especially in the descriptive passages in which the *Rapt*. abounds.

A. begins with a comparative study of four broad stylistic categories: metaphor, *variatio*, word order, and abbreviation. She compares the use of these techniques in the *Rapt*. with their occurrence in other poems of Claudian (*Gigantomachia*, *Nupt.*, *III Cons*. *Hon*., *Gild.*), in Virgil, *Georgics* 1 and *Aeneid* 6, and in Ovid's account of the Rape of Proserpina in *Metamorphoses* 5 (341–50). The choice of *comparanda*, in the case of the classical poets, is dictated by similarity of subject matter. But it is a pity that she does not cast her net wider. Claudian's poetry shows affinities with other poets of the first century A.D. It would have been interesting to see whether these affinities extend to the techniques A. is studying, by adducing *comparanda* from Lucan and Statius. Similarly, A.'s procedures permit no comparisons with Claudian's contemporaries, the Christian poets Prudentius and Paulinus of Nola, or with his important predecessor Ausonius. As a result, it is difficult to know how to evaluate A.'s results or to set them in their literary-historical context.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

On the basis of comparative statistics for the frequency of her chosen stylistic categories, A. concludes that the *Rapt*. shows an unusually high degree of elaboration. Both in the more frequent use of particular features and in the overall frequency of all the features the poem stands alone. Accordingly, in the following chapter she studies in the *Rapt*. a loose group of narrative devices and thematic continuities as further aspects of the literary texture of the poem. She has some interesting remarks to make, about the variation in interpretative levels in the *Rapt*. or about the relation between narrative and description, but this discussion would benefit from a more refined narratological vocabulary.

In a further narrowing of focus A. demonstrates that Claudian uses the techniques she has studied in the first two chapters most often in the descriptive passages of the *Rapt*. It is these passages that show his most careful artistry. Consequently, in a lengthy final section, occupying about three-fifths of the book, she concentrates on these passages, producing a continuous interpretative commentary on the major descriptive passages of the poem, as well as on the council of the gods and Ceres' dream-vision in Book 3, both of which have significant visual elements.

As might be expected, given the emphases of A.'s study, she is strongest in formal observations about word order, metrical and clause structures, and patterns of language, as they organize Claudian's text. A.'s careful analysis of verb position and of the patterns of placement of noun + adjective combinations, when separated, as they often are, by an intervening verb, bears dividends in her detailed readings of descriptive passages. But again her critical vocabulary is limited. The postponement of a noun already anticipated by a preceding adjective creates 'tension' or 'suspense' or is 'emphatic', and variation or multiple interpretative levels lend 'liveliness' or 'realism' to the narrative. The judgements are somewhat formulaic. It is not always evident, for instance, why Claudian would want to emphasize a particular word or how the deferment of syntactic closure created by hyperbaton contributes to the meaning of any particular passage. A. is most perceptive and persuasive when she can identify a coincidence between word order and sense. In those cases her concluding argument that in Claudian's case stylistic virtuosity is not an end in itself but closely related to content is most persuasive.

In her interpretation A. often follows closely Gruzelier's *Rapt*. commentary (Oxford, 1993), to which she acknowledges a debt. At times she will take issue with her predecessor, though not always persuasively. (I do not believe, for instance, in 'singing snakes', as opposed to 'singing Furies', at 2.344–6.) Although much of A.'s commentary consists of discrete observations on the passages before her, in her discussion of Proserpina's 'peplopoeia' she proposes a more synoptic view of the passage, drawing attention to the manner in which Claudian, by multiple enjambements and the interweaving of semantic codes and levels of meaning, creates an equivalent in words to the web he is describing. Less successfully, A.'s discussion of Ceres' dream-vision of her daughter in Book 3 fails to take into account the likelihood that the episode is focalized through the mother, and the consequences that has for interpretation.

A.'s book, then, offers few new conclusions for the scholar of Claudian. It will come as little surprise that the *Rapt*. is the most carefully worked of Claudian's poems and that the descriptions are the most elaborated passages in the work. The value of this book lies in the systematic documentation of these judgements, and in its assessment and quantification of the formal qualities of the poem.

Wesleyan University MICHAEL ROBERTS

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TAKING CLAUDIAN SERIOUSLY

T. DUC: *Le* 'De Raptu Proserpinae' *de Claudien. Réflexions sur une actualisation de la mythologie.* Pp. xxvii + 307. Bern, etc.: Peter Lang, 1994. ISBN: 3-906753-09-7.

THOMAS KELLNER: *Die Göttergestalten in Claudians* De Raptu Proserpinae. *Polarität und Koinzidenz als anthropozentrische Dialektik mythologisch formulierter Weltvergewisserung.* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 106.) Pp. x + 341. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1997. Cased. ISBN: 3-519-07655-1.

Claudian is one of those authors who in recent years has begun to move with dizzying speed from the outlying districts of the canon to, if not quite the downtown core, then at least the inner suburbs. Interest, however, has so far been focused mainly on the panegyrics, while the unfinished epic *De Raptu Proserpinae* has usually been seen by English-speaking scholars as little more than a light if pleasant pastiche of earlier Latin epics whose glory it cannot hope to match. The epithet it has attracted perhaps more often than any other is 'charming'; and this is an adjective applied by classicists to poets whom they regard in much the same terms as ladies of the haute bourgeoisie do the 'sweet little men' who see to the garden. To some extent this state of affairs was remedied by Claire Gruzelier's fine commentary on the poem (Oxford, 1993), but in others it was made worse. Gruzelier, that is, took Claudian seriously enough to examine the whole poem in minute detail and pointed out its many linguistic and stylistic virtues. Having given him his chance to prove his worth, however, she reached the conclusion that Gibbon was right after all. 'Claudian', as she sums him up, 'is a poet with a sharp mind, not a great one. You will more easily find entertainment and amusement within his pages than profound thoughts or loftiness of vision' (p. xxi). The scholarship of continental Europe has tended to be more willing to see grandeur both of intention and of achievement in the poem, which Claudian himself characterizes as an *audax cantus* (1.3). These two new monographs build upon this tradition, above all the work of Kirsch and Potz, and basically see the poem as an elaborate allegory with much to say about the political situation of Claudian's time, and indeed about the human condition itself.

Duc begins in a lowish key, offering an examination of the poem in the light of previous extant treatments of the myth of the rape of Proserpina. The results, which extend for well over the first third of the book, include sensitive and useful studies of Claudian's adaptation not only of his most obvious sources (Ovid's two accounts of the tale in *Fast*. 4 and *Met*. 5, Virg. *G*. 1, Stat. *Theb.* 8 and *Ach*.) but also of such other texts as the *Aetna* and Nonnus. The format allows an examination that is more systematic and synthetic than is possible in a commentary, and this section of the book thus provides a welcome and generally useful supplement to the findings of Gruzelier, especially in the discussions of Ovid and Statius. It does not, however, produce many surprises, except (for some) in the persuasive argument that the Greek poet Nonnus knew the Latin work of his contemporary and compatriot (pp. 38–42). D. goes on to discuss 'éléments de composition', and well illustrates the core point that the poem's structure is linear and temporal (kinder words than 'loose' and 'diffuse'), and is dependent on no single hero, though it comes to concentrate on Ceres as it develops. It is, however, in the second section ('Historicité') that he shows his real originality, and his daring. A number of good detailed observations are made about contemporary

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

historical matters, not least the relationship between the poem's subject and the infamous corn-supply problems that bedevilled the tenure of the office of Praefectus Vrbi by its dedicatee Florentinus (pp. 173–80). But the really startling contribution comes in the suggestion that the conflict between the brother-rulers of heaven and the underworld, and the abduction of Proserpina, are an allegorical representation of the tension between the sons of Theodosius over the division of the Empire and its territory in the closing years of the fourth century. 'Proserpina', that is, stands for the disputed prefecture of Illyricum, and Claudian's poem is a recommendation of the virtues of diplomacy (p. 264). Debates between scholars on individual manifestations of the phenomenon, or even on its presence, are usually scarcely worth having. Allegory aspires to the condition of Calvinism: it hopes to become a closed intellectual system. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear, says one. And the band played 'Believe it if you like', says the other.

Kellner's book, like D.'s, began life as a doctoral thesis. Its origins are clear from the beginning, since the first sixty of its 300 pages are given over to a systematic doxography and a statement of methodology that neatly sums up ancient thought on the subject of allegory. The doxography is especially useful for the purposes of this review, in that it also neatly sums up D. (pp. 21–2, 34–5: see also pp. 235–42) and positions K.'s own work in relation to it. K. points out the difficulties of D.'s dogmatic approach which appear as soon as one presses the weaker analogies or supposed correspondences: if Theodosius in some sense 'is' Saturn, for example, does that mean that Honorius' reign is a 'ferrea aetas' as opposed to this lost golden one (p. 236)? And are we to imagine that Honorius deposed Theodosius? K., however, is even more firmly wedded to the allegorical approach than D., and accepts in general that the poem mirrors the tension between the courts of Arcadius and Honorius and the need for unity to be re-established through diplomacy. His belief is that rather than getting bogged down in a hunt for as many direct historical parallels as possible, the key to the poem's interpretation is to realize that D. has not in fact gone far enough in the other direction. For K., the poem is an ambitious allegory not just of contemporary politics but of the whole human condition and of the very nature of the universe. For him, apparent opposites can work in harmony to the same end, and those on either side of a dividing line can be as much alike as they are different. Perhaps the most impressive and convincing demonstration of this as a principle of the poem's articulation of both character and action is the discussion of Pluto and Ceres. Though they are opposites in terms of the narrative (Polarität)—one has abducted Proserpina, the other is determined to recover her—these children of Saturn are shown to be in fact much alike in character and attitude towards Jupiter's authority (Koinzidenz). Pluto is isolated from the usual life of the gods on Olympus and wants a wife, Ceres is similarly isolated and wants her daughter; Pluto revolts against the authority of Jupiter and the cosmos, and so in Book 3 does Ceres, who reaches the conclusion that she too has been dishonoured and disregarded (pp. 216f.). Holding them in balance, and directing them towards the same end, is their sibling Jupiter, who will reconcile heaven and the underworld, brother and brother, in a new disposition that creates agriculture and enacts the theodicy proclaimed by Virgil in the first *Georgic*. For all this represents the in-built duality of nature, with its alternating, but ultimately harmonious balancing of order and chaos (p. 262). Opposition and Identity coincide because the revolt of Ceres has in fact been engineered by Jupiter to balance the revolt of Pluto. Both revolts are thus subsumed within a greater cosmic providence, and the primary beneficiary is man, who is saved from the idleness of Saturn's Golden Age and the grim poverty of the Iron Age alike by the equally harmonious balancing of *labor* and plenty that

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

agriculture entails. The story of the abortive revolts of Pluto and Ceres thus reveals a fundamental cosmic dualism which is mysteriously dissolved, in the person of Proserpina, into a higher unity. In short, 'Die von Claudian diagnostizierte tragische Ambivalenz von Polarität und Koinzidenz wird . . . in einen optimistischen Anthropozentrismus aufgelöstet, der eine Theodizee impliziert' (p. 286).

This is a subtle reading to which the summary given here cannot do justice: though it may serve to explain something of the resonant subtitle of K.'s book. Even those who choose to reject it will find much to admire in the core of the book, some 150 pages of close analysis, almost line by line, of the most important passages of the poem. In dealing with micro-text K. has valuable things to say about individual scenes and speeches, above all in his analysis of the motives of Jupiter in his grand scheme for the articulation of cosmic order and of the reactions of other gods who fail fully to understand it. If there is a failing, it is in the occasional tendency to overinterpret by making assumptions about the psychology of the characters that far outstrip the direct evidence of the text. This is particularly true of the examination of the motivation of Ceres, who emerges from K.'s reading as a status-conscious single mother wary and envious of respectable matrons like Juno, and filled with sheer hate for the good-time girl Venus, but above all desperate to belong.

D., then, sees *De Raptu Proserpinae* as an attempt to create 'une nouvelle époque nationale' (p. 248) using Eleusis and its cult as a kind of rallying cry not so much to pagan religion in itself as to unity under the auspices of the venerable relics of traditional culture. K. sees it in similar terms, but also as a vast allegory that subsumes and completes Virgil's theodicy. Both authors are to be congratulated on taking Claudian's *audax cantus* seriously.

University of Toronto MICHAEL DEWAR

VENANTIUS

M. Reydellet (ed.): *Venance Fortunat:* Poèmes *Tome I* (Livres I–IV), *Tome II* (Livres V–VIII) (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'association Guillaume Budé). Pp. XCV + 207; 193 (text double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1994, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-01398-9 and 2-251-01406-3.

After publishing the works of Dracontius (cf. *CR* 48 [1998], 197), Les Belles Lettres have undertaken the deserving task of rendering accessible to a wider public the complete works of the very last of the Roman poets. The new Budé edition by now already contains eight out of the eleven books of Venantius' *Carmina miscellanea*, published in two volumes (on which I will comment now), and the *Vita Sancti Martini* (edited by S. Quesnel in 1996). Hitherto, the complete poems of Venantius Fortunatus have neither been edited in this century—the last edition dates from 1881 (F. Leo in the *MGH*)—nor translated into any modern language.

M. Reydellet gives a thorough introduction of almost 100 pages, discussing the poet's biography, the poems' themes and subjects, their 'intérêt historique' and 'littéraire', and their history of publication and transmission as a collection, as well as his own guiding principles as an editor. A select bibliography concludes this part.

About his text R. says that it varies only slightly from that of Leo (p. LXXXVII). This is an understatement. There is definite improvement, due not so much to R.'s use

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of manuscripts hitherto disregarded, but mostly to his taking account of research on late Latin and the late antique poets which has been done in the last decades. The editor justly names in the first place the studies by Sven Blomgren, the great expert on Venantius.

In numerous instances R. eliminates 'corrections abusives' of earlier editors, restoring the transmitted text (e.g. 1.13.12 *lassae*, 2.16.129 *sterilis* and *honesti*, 3.23a.23 *plus*, 4.6.11 *animo placidus*, 4.8.18 *fuit*, 5.9.1 *inuitans*, 6.1.115 *terrenis*, 7.12.20 *abit*, 8.19.7 *repleto*). Restitution could have gone further in some places, e.g. 2.9.46 *petenda* (cf. E. Löfstedt, *Vermischte Studien* [Lund, 1936], p. 194), 4.3.1 and 5.3.9 *sacerdotii* not *sacerdoti* (correption of *o* is proved by 2.7.11 *sacerdotio*), 8.8.15 *spectet* not *exspectet* (cf. 7.12.10 with n. 63 ad loc.!). R. is rather cautious with conjectures of his own, though some of those he makes are quite attractive, like 5.6.1 *lusus* for *usus*, 6.5.316 *ac si*, 6.8.47 *comis*. In three instances R. has included verses transmitted only by one single MS each: a *carmen figuratum* from cod. G, placed by Leo in the 'Carminum spuriorum appendix' (p. 381), now figures as *carm.* II 5a among the poems on the Holy Cross. In *carm.* IV 5 R. inserts a distich after v. 8, known only from cod. S (number 32 in Leo's 'Appendix carminum', p. 291). At *carm.* II 2, the famous hymn *Pange lingua*, R. follows the editorial tradition by confining five clearly spurious stanzas given by cod. F to the footnotes; one wonders why in the similar case of the hymn *Vexilla regis prodeunt* (*carm.* II 6) he accepts another dubious stanza of cod. F (bracketing it, but nevertheless including it in the numbering of verses), although in his own opinion 'la strophe n'appartient pas, selon toute vraisemblance, au *Vexilla Regis*'. Some other minor changes that cannot convince me: 1.15.101 *sensu moderamine* is hardly understandable, and Leo's decision for *sensus m.*, though poorly testified, is certainly a better choice. 2.9.27 *in medio Germanus adest*: Leo had rightly favoured the much better supported *in medios* (*adesse in* c. acc. occurs already in Cic. *Phil.* 5.19: cf. Hofmann–Szantyr, pp. 276f.). In 3.12.42 R. has decided in favour of the insignificant variant *flores* (nom. pl.) instead of the much more meaningful *floris* (gen. sg.) supported by most MSS, although there is no other instance of correption of plural *-es* in Venantius' works. I found the following misprints: 2.6.25 *epes* for *spes*, 2.10.11 *attolitur* for *attollitur*, 2.16.121 *profugas* for *profugos*, 3.9.21 full stop instead of comma at verse end. Misleading, at least, is 3.9.103 *saxo* for *Saxo*. At 1.14.3 *actus* and 6.5.367 *uoce*, one would expect entries in the apparatus criticus as Leo reads *aptus* and *dote* respectively without giving alternative readings.

In spite of these small warnings, R.'s new text is beyond all doubt valuable. The same and more goes for his translation, accompanied by copious notes which occasionally might almost pass for a running commentary. In these, R. gives lots of helpful information on the addressees' biography and the historic background. Whenever Venantius mentions sacral buildings, R. reports up-to-date results of archeological research. His exploration of the theological and spiritual dimension of the poems is often revealing, particularly with the poems on the Holy Cross, *carm.* II 1–6. In connection with cross imagery in general, which is also found in other poems, e.g. 8.3.398 *antemna crucis*, the fundamental studies by H. Rahner (collected in *Symbole der Kirche* [Salzburg, 1964]) ought to have been mentioned. Finally, throughout his notes R. draws attention to peculiarities of Venantius' language which have served to justify his constitution of the text and translation of problematic passages.

R. says that the aim of his translation is to 'rendre la rugosité du texte de Fortunat, en serrant le latin d'aussi près que possible' (p. LXXXIX). The closeness to the text will help many readers—and not only those unfamiliar with late sixth-century Latin—to trace the meaning in the poet's often obscure diction. In the following passages,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

though, I would propose a different interpretation: in 2.14.25–6 *erit* together with *locandus* forms the predicate of the main clause (*locandus erit* = *locabitur*: cf. Hofmann–Szantyr, pp. 312f.); the *cum*-clause ends with *arbiter orbis*, meaning Christ, not the *chorus* of the martyrs. 2.16.105 *uetus mulier, pariter nascente periclo, / uulnere naturae mortua membra tulit*: not 'par un accident dû à son âge' but 'through a congenital defect' (cf. 109 *secum nata* and in a comparable context Arator *act.* 2.158 *supplicio comitante satus*, 159–60 *pars coeperat aegri / se nascente mori*). In 4.11.13 *oracula* means 'precationes' (cf. *TLL* IX 2.875.41ff.).

But these are mere details. R. has made a most valuable contribution to our understanding of Venantius' difficult poetry, and leaves his grateful readers hoping for a third volume of the same quality to complete this fine edition soon.

University of Trier JOHANNES SCHWIND

THE SWIMMING POOL LIBRARY

S. BUSCH: *Versus Balnearum. Die antike Dichtung über Bäder und Baden im römischen Reich.* Pp. xiv + 616. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 3-519-07256-4.

The reliability of particulars concerning ancient lives and lifestyles gleaned from poetic writings can be questioned, and this is a problem which B. appreciates. In his interpretation of first- to sixth-century poems—mostly epigrams—on baths and bathing, he does not use the texts simply as mines of information about life in antiquity, but takes into account their fictional nature (cf. pp. 6f. and 379–84). His approach includes philological and critical methods, with the aim of extracting his sources' historical essence.

In the first and longest section of his study, B. discusses epigrams which describe public and private baths (pp. 31–376). The texts are from published books as well as inscriptions—often mutilated ones—and B.'s careful philological groundwork forms a solid basis for his study. He frequently offers interesting suggestions for the critical text (e.g. his discussion of the questionable unity of two North-African inscriptions [*AnnEpigr* (1937)], 31 on pp. 219–25). B. draws our attention to the similarities between the epigrams on baths and other epigrammatical literature, such as the funerary or the dedicatory epigram (cf. e.g. p. 101). He also points out interesting references to Callimachean poetics in epigrams which deal with small baths and highlight the affinity between the 'little' poetic genre and these establishments (pp. 306f.).

In general, however, B. is more interested in essential balneary facts than in the literary character of his sources, and his interpretations are often limited by the focus on the historical and archaeological facts. The combination of literary and historical approaches seems much more difficult than B. would have us believe. He often neglects his sources' literary contexts, without considering whether epigrams from ancient poetry books really can be properly understood when separated from the whole context and analysed in the same way as isolated verse inscriptions. B.'s interpretation of Mart. 6.42 on the baths of Claudius Etruscus as a parody of poetry on baths (pp. 35–57: B. does at least take Statius' praise of the same establishment *Silv*. 1.5 into account) might have benefited from the inclusion of the next epigram (6.43), which carries on with the themes of bathing and patronage. B.'s incuriosity as to the literary content of his sources is also evident in his tendency to run down sources from

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

late antiquity by measuring them against the ideal 'model' of classical literature. One case in point: B.'s finding that allusions to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in a fifth-century verse inscription by the Empress Eudokia (see J. Green, Y. Tsarir, *IEJ* 32 [1982], 77–91) betray her lack of originality (p. 97).

By concentrating on the history, style, and equipment of the baths, B. sometimes overlooks other aspects which are associated with the baths in his literary sources. For example, throughout his work (see, however, p. 506 n. 104), B. argues that whenever the town Baiae is mentioned, it denotes 'luxurious baths'. However, Baiae seems to have been associated not only with luxury in general, but also with sexual infidelity in particular (cf. Prop. 1.1.29f., Ov. *Ars* 1.255ff.). This aspect should have been considered, for example, in B.'s interpretation of Ausonius' comparison of baths at the river Mosel with Baiae (pp. 61f. on *Mos*. 345–8; cf. R. P. H. Green, *ICS* 14 [1989], 311; B. follows S. Schröder, *RhM* 141 [1998], 49f., whose refutation of Green's interpretation is to my mind unconvincing).

The second chapter, which deals with the social aspects of going to the baths (pp. 379–512), forms the most convincing part of this book. B. interprets epigrams (mainly from Martial, but also from the Greek Anthology) which depict scenes from the baths, and he distinguishes meticulously between literary handling and ancient reality. B.'s new interpretation of Mart. 7.34 deserves special mention (pp. 393–5). However, his study of the theme of nudity, even though epigrams on male and female figures in the baths are interpreted separately, does not produce a clear analysis of the differences between male-oriented and female-oriented voyeurism. What could have been a valuable contribution to the discussion on homosexual and heterosexual erotics in antiquity is merely a list of erotic epigrams and their interpretations (pp. 463–502).

B. finishes with two chapters on the rôle of baths in Roman life (pp. 515–54) and with miscellaneous balneary epigrams (pp. 557–72). On the whole, B.'s book is rather long and could have been condensed; the reconstruction of the life and education of the fourth-century architect Lampadius (pp. 138–44), descriptions of ancient sports facilities (pp. 404–7), and B.'s apologies for studying Martial's obscene epigrams (pp. 465f.) are just a few examples of unnecessary profuseness. The inclusion of the widely available texts of Stat. *Silv*. 1.5 and Sen. *Ep*. 86.1–13 in appendices does not seem justified either.

One might have wished that B.'s interpretations placed greater emphasis on the literary character of his sources, but this would have made the book even longer. B. focuses principally on the baths rather than on an interpretation of poetry about baths, and within the boundaries of this approach he has done an excellent job. He uses most of the relevant literature, although I see no sign of G. G. Fagan's dissertation *Three Studies in Roman Public Bathing: Origins, Growth, and Social Aspects* (McMaster University, 1993; see now by the same author *Bathing in Public in the Roman World* [Ann Arbor, 1999]). B.'s philological work is very thorough and he affords us easy access to some rather out-of-the-way epigraphical sources, furnishing them to boot with critical apparatus and German translations. Furthermore, all of the epigrams discussed can easily be traced by way of B.'s exhaustive indices. As a commentary on epigrammatical literature on baths and bathing, B.'s book will be indispensable for all scholars ready to take the plunge.

University of Munich SVEN LORENZ

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LATIN VERSES

N. Criniti: *'LEGE NVNC, VIATOR . . .' Vita e morte nei* carmina Latina epigraphica *della Padania centrale*. Pp. 207, 21 ills. Parma: La Pilotta Editrice, 1998 (1st edn 1996). Paper, L. 38,000. ISBN: 88-7532-080-2.

G. Focardi: *Il Carme del Pescatore Sacrilego (*Anth. Lat. *1, 21 Riese): una declamazione in versi*. Pp. 243. Bologna: Pàtron Editore, 1998. Paper, L. 26,000. ISBN: 88-555-2476-3.

Criniti's book arises from work done in the Department of History in the University of Parma, and contains contributions by eight others. It is intended for teaching, but is also addressed to cultivated 'Cisalpini' and their quest for 'propria identità originaria socio-culturale'. The core of the work is an edition (with introduction, commentary, translation, and indexes of names) of twelve metrical inscriptions from the area surrounding Reggio, Mantua, and Piacenza. Most of them are epitaphs. Nos 3 (*AE* 1982, 365), 7 (*AE* 1962, 161, etc.), 10 (*AE* 1946, 208), and 11 (*AE* 1933, 153, etc.) are not included in A. Riese's *Carmina Latina Epigraphica*. A few closely related inscriptions in prose are added. Photographs of indifferent quality are given of extant inscriptions. Around this nucleus there are gathered essays (i) on the idea of Death in the pagan Roman world (L. Magnani), (ii) on Roman Women and Death (L. Montanini), (iii) on the Latin Epitaphs composed at Parma under the Duchess Marie Louise (Napoleon's consort) from 1816 to 1847 (C. Tarasconi), (iv) a three- page bibliography on Death At Rome, and (v) a summary by C. of the history of Roman rule in the Po valley until the sixth century (with a bibliography of seven pages).

There is an interesting acrostic in No. 4 (= *CLE* 1550) dated 'alla prima età del II secolo d. C.'. This is stated to be the first datable and perhaps the earliest known from the Latin world. This may be true of epigraphic examples, but the generally accepted acrostics in the *Ilias Latina* are usually dated to the Julio-Claudian era, and Cicero (*Div.* 2.111) believed Ennius had used some. (See E. Courtney 'Greek and Latin Acrostichs,' *Philologus* 134 [1990], 3–13.) No. 11 (l. 21), dated saec. I–II, shows a rare *-aes* for the termination *-ae* of the first declension genitive singular in a common noun (*vitaes*). The commentary passes over many points of critical interest, and there are some surprising slips not detected by the team, e.g. Tibullus credited with the authorship of [Tib.] 3.2 (p. 26); **astrigerus* added to the dictionary (p. 94); the spelling *perpetuom* used 'per motivi metrici?' in prose (p. 125). The Latin abbreviation *C* is expanded as *C*(*aio*) rather than *C* (= *Gaio*) and left as 'C.' in the translation (p. 86). In no. 7 (lines 9–10) *ceu* and the added *s* in *vicinias* get no adequate comment. I found the format of the book with large pages of closely set heavy type on glossy paper tiring to the eye. There are some interesting things in this book. An index to the essays and the commentary on the inscriptions would have made them more easily accessible.

The curious work edited by Focardi is a *suasoria* written in 285 hexameter verses, preceded by a prose statement of the case and divided by headings (<*Prooemium*> . . . <*Narratio*> . . . *Excessus* . . ., etc.), most of which have been conjecturally restored by editors. F. translates some but not others. A fisherman is accused of stealing gold from a temple, and then from part of the proceeds dedicating a golden fish in that temple. His guilt is inferred largely from his opportunity (he prayed in the badly guarded temple) and bad character (fishermen practise a deceitful craft and being poor are disposed to crime). The verses (dated not before the fourth century by F., not before the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

late third by Shackleton Bailey [*HSCPh* 84 (1980), 177]) abound in reminiscences, especially from Virgil and Statius, but are in general turgid and contorted. Shackleton Bailey thinks they are humorous in intent: I find them hard to enjoy. They present many difficult problems both textual and interpretative: the author was capable of very strange writing. F.'s edition is a very useful collection of material, and has spared no effort to elucidate the text. Because it has contributed so much, it is with regret that I draw attention to defects. Some infelicities of presentation first: reference from the text to the translation is needlessly complicated by the allowing the Italian to run on, when the Latin has gone to the next page (the app. crit. for p. 48 has been completely lost); the lemmas for the commentary give the text first and then the line number, instead of the much handier reverse arrangement; the index to ancient parallels cited does not compensate for the lack of an *index rerum et verborum*, more especially as the commentary is short on cross-references, and the introduction does not give an adequate summary of the grammatical, stylistic, linguistic, and metrical features. We are told (p. 34) that non-classical quantities are remarked in the commentary (though there is no remark on *penitudo* [235] with a short first syllable), but are left to find them ourselves, and given no analysis of the significance of those that are found.

The labour and energy in the commentary are not always matched by critical judgement. The sentence *Natus ut, ignotum est* 'dei suoi natali non si sa nulla' (36) may be possible Latin for this author (Shackleton Bailey suggests *ubi* for *ut*), but is it reasonable to assert 'Sicura l'allusione dell'*incipit natus ut* a Ov. *Ib*. vv. 599–600 *Natus ut Althaeae flammis absentibus arsit, / sic . . .*'? At 253 it may be necessary to translate *leuior cum scanditur alnus* as 'quando . . . salgono su una barca leggera', but hardly to comment 'ALNUS: è frequente metonimia per «barca», (cfr. Verg. *georg*. 2, 451 . . . *torrentem undam* ***levis*** *innatat* ***alnus***; cfr. pure Val. Fl. 1, 203; Sil. 14, 379; Avien. *orb. terr.* 647)'. The Virgilian passage does not contain a metonymy, and here I should see a 'sicura allusione' to that passage. I see no comment on the fondness for long asyndeton (e.g. 107–9, where each of the three verses contains seven nouns); this tiresome trick that became popular in later times has modest antecedents in Classical Latin, cf. U. J. Stache on Corippus *Iust.* 1.169, with references.

University College Dublin J. A. RICHMOND

HENDERSONG

J. HENDERSON: *Writing Down Rome: Satire, Comedy, and other Offences in Latin Poetry.* Pp. xvii + 374. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. Cased, £48. ISBN: 0-19-815077-6.

Writing Down Rome dwells on the impossibility of criticism's ever being written 'simply', whether by a satirist in Rome then, or by a reviewer in Ohio now; even less 'simply judged' by readers who are always themselves deeply invested in the discourses of power that shape the Romes they fight for. These essays obsess over the complex processes of *our* sizing up ancient Rome; that is, the way we go about constructing Romans who are uncannily familiar to us across a divide that is now a full two millennia wide. Instead of down-playing the bridgework that is involved in our making of Rome, H. wants us to peer into the abyss and see just how rickety the bridge beneath us is; how it is not likely to take us any too far from where we started, let alone back in time.

H.'s essays flaunt themselves as provocations, dissatisfied with the critical boxes/

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

palaces (take your pick) that we have made for ourselves and kept to—not that they are worthless, he says; just not roomy enough. Take 'Suck It and See!', for example. This is not just the title of an exceptionally frank/crude (t.y.p.) article. It is the author's baiting of his readers, telling them what they are in for *in reading him*, what that will be like, whether they are into that sort of thing or not. Thus, many, perhaps most, who might read him do not. 'Suck this', an invitation easily refused. And there can be little wonder why. Others are willing to give it a try, but are quick to write off his style as difficult and obfuscatory. Which it is. Counter-generic by design. But assessing that readerly experience as either 'refreshing,' 'appalling', or some mixture of the two will depend on how much one has invested in, and believes in, the way we classicists have always talked. And therein slopes the slippery downside of H.'s chosen mode: not that it is wrong in itself, but that he is talking *to us*! And ours is a discipline that has no truck with shaggy ideas, especially the idea that shagginess is ever worth keeping or built into the way things are. We kill off burly Titans in this field, zapping them with our cosmogonic commentator-pens. Can it be any wonder, then, that eyebrows are raised when H. starts handing them day-passes to the upper world? Such a lack of conviction in what we have always done rankles. Thus, regrettably, H. is too easily written off as all shock, little substance. Which he is not.

Still, naming his chosen mode a downside is not to say that I believe H. ought to be less strident and more straightforward; that he could still mean the same thing, and be the same Henderson, in the standard, straightforward idiom that we have long preferred in classics as our mode for constituting and performing real Romans. For provoking a reaction is always H.'s way of operating and his point, whether that is in his reading of Latin for us or in his setting us up to react to him in certain ways. I must admit to being uncommonly befuddled by H.'s style of writing, always quite sure that I have missed a lot. But, because I so often value the things I do manage to understand, I see no point in regretting all that I have missed, let alone in insisting that H. is a charlatan and a showman (no to the former, yes to the latter) because he does not speak in the idiom I prefer. Am I really writing a review (this, by the way, is a review), or telling you something you did not know, if I say that H. is irreverent, punning, potty-humoured, and hard to decipher? Surely the performance is the thing. His meaning. And therein lies the scandal of Henderson, and the reason, I think, that we are generally predisposed to take offense: he lets us think that the whole of Classical criticism might be a performance, all writing down of Rome from Cato to K.F. and every critic in-between.

But if there is one thing that reading H. has taught me over the years, it is that his meaning, and this goes equally well for *any* meaning, is never a 'thing' clearly separate from all the sweating and swearing that goes into the making (specifically *not* 'the locating') of it. So instead of scolding him for making me sweat and doubt myself, I prefer to give him credit for the introspective work his performance has put me to, and for what that work has produced: a habit of critical introspection; of watching myself *make* sense of Rome. Put H.'s mess (or any mess) together, as you must. Fix it to your liking, or to your strong dislike, and you will always, inevitably, find something worth finding, though you may perhaps wish you had not found it: yourself.

These essays obsess annoyingly, poking at each individual essay's central idea from this angle, then that, then taking a different theoretical stick to it and poking at it all over again. Still, I do not believe that my being annoyed is without meaning, and that all of his probing amounts to so much self-indulgent stick-poking. Even less, that the idea in question can really be thought to stay the same without it. For the purpose of any given essay in this book is never simply to convey information and to deliver a

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

central idea, though these things do, in fact, happen, and one is extremely grateful when they do. Rather, it is to experiment with the making of ideas, and to get us into the habit of watching ourselves make them.

Each essay in *Writing Down Rome* has been published previously, so the question of the collection's holding together is worth asking. Each has been updated and given a clear-speaking introduction to tie it in with what goes before and what follows in the book. These introductions help tremendously, not by suturing every seam, but by handing readers a serviceable needle and thread. In the end, tying together H. is reader's work, so what follows is an interpretive summary not of the book H. assembled and glued, but of my making of it into that well-conceived book that I demand. The central argument I trace inside these essays is the idea that criticism tells on criticizers, both then and now, but only when we step back from the product of criticism far enough to view some of its processes.

Chapter I, 'Hanno's Punic Heirs' (punning 'Pubic Hairs' no doubt), treats the messiest of Plautus' extant plays, the *Poenulus*. The essay does not attempt to master the mess, but to probe into our long-standing fear of it. H. experiments with various discourses of mess-mastery, both ancient and modern, to show 'how implicated must be the comic reader's, audience's, student's, scholar's understanding of orderly positioning and matter out of place' (p. 5) in deigning to accredit the play, or to stigmatize it as unacceptable. Chapter II, 'Entertaining Arguments,' views Terence's *Adelphoe* as that well-ordered artefact that the *Poenulus* could never manage to be, a 'classic of national culture' (p. 41) that teaches good manners to Romans, making them well mannered and Roman, both then and now. But the grab-bag farce of Plautus is built into the play as its most impolite scene, staking its claim to being the preferred Roman mode of play and self-making. Thus, a culture war plays inside the play, with the poet framing our judgement of what makes good teaching and good Romans, only to have that judgement turn on us several times before the play's end. The idea that Romans can be taught into existence falters, as Terence's performance of polite, Attic *mores* does less to enlighten his audience than to expose the impossibility of their being enlightened.

Chapter III puts the question 'Who's Counting?', to which the answer is a split 'Catull'/'us'. The lyric poet's precise metrical schemes get us counting. Likewise his incessant tallyings of kisses and caresses. Lyric 'resistance to computability', the agent that makes his 'nothings' into 'somethings', turns out to be a version of the same old counting game. The severe old accountant, Catullus' preferred 'agelast', is found lurking in the poet's own soul. And in us.

Chapter IV, 'Suck It and See', treats the transgressive nastiness of Horace's eighth epode, where dirty talk is anything but good, macho fun. Readers who spew it out feel dirtied by it, and they are left to wonder whether such overkill derives from strength, or from inadequacy and cultural phobia. Thus, the curses doled out double back on us, in the round-mouthing of the poem's last lines: *ore allaborandum est* forces us into the fellator's rôle, even as we issue the parting 'suck this!' demand.

Chapter V, 'The Life of Meaning,' sends up Horace for improvising rituals and a rustic way of life, all from the comfort of his library chair, in Callimachean-styled verse that cannot quite hide its being hardwired into certain bookish, artificial, and decidedly 'Augustan' obsessions with calendars, rusticity, and the sacred. But the preachiness issuing from the pious scene of farmer versus pig is undone by bookishness itself, and by the very notion of 'farmer Horace'. Chapter VI, 'Virgil's Third *Eclogue*', is another look at an urban poet's reflections on rustics and their primeval ways, his feeding 'urban taste for alterity' (p. 145). The poem's singing contest features

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

an exchange of crudities between bumpkins. Who wins? The poem does not tell. Thus, bickering over who is best is not only what happens in the poem, it is what happens in us as we attempt to pass judgement on the poem and overleap its central impasse.

Chapter VII, 'Gendersong', Henderson's signature performance, attacks the once-standard (read 'mid-eighties, though still in vogue') practice of using the texts of Roman satire as documentary 'reports' on the position of women in Roman culture. Such 'privileged' and 'objective' knowledge of the category 'Roman women' never manages to be privileged or objective. It is always itself culturally engendered, constituting 'its knower *as* Roman' (p. 179). Thus, telling of 'women' always tells on the teller—and that, H. says, must go for H., too.

Chapter VIII, 'Be Alert', sorts through the irony of Horace's looking so much like 'The Pest' he grapples with in *Satires* 1.9. He shadow-boxes, H. clearly shows. Still, the encounter is commonly polarized as a contest between 'pest' and 'poet'. Thus, the joke is not just on Horace, but on our prejudicial attempts to see him free and clear of his pest-like offensiveness.

Chapter IX, 'Persius' Didactic Satire', describes Persius' *libellus* as a course in moral training, embedded in a specific cultural scene stressing control of the self, because Nero controls everything else. These satires both take up that project, and satirize it, by showing its institutional patterning (Persius *as* superbrat Nero) and by reminding us of the impossibility of one's achieving self-reliance by relying on someone else's script. Chapter X, 'Pump up the Volume', tells of the dangers of accommodating ourselves to the performer's *ego* in Juvenal 1, though that is precisely what the poem urges us to do. We assent to the idea that overdoing epic has been the undoing of good literature since Valerius and Statius. Yet, we quickly come to realize that Juvenal's strident denunciation of epic is itself overdone, and decidedly 'epic' in tone, proportion, and bookish-intertextual content. Thus, Juvenal lives up to the very belatedness he deplores. Again, the joke is on us.

Such is my rendering of (myself via) H., cheating him of his subtlest and best. If only to prove that I really do not get it. But, if the sky is really falling because of H., I do not get that either. I am rather grateful for the bump on the head, and the (non)sense he has knocked into me.

Ohio State University KIRK FREUDENBURG

CATO ON FARMING

A. DALBY: *Cato*, On Farming (De Agricultura). *A Modern Translation with Commentary.* Pp. 243, 11 ills. Totnes: Prospect Books, 1998. ISBN: 0907325-80-7.

Increasing interest in patterns of landholding and the use of land in the Roman world has brought greater recognition to the importance of the Roman agricultural writers, who have sometimes been rather neglected along with other technical writers. Dieter Flach has recently produced a very detailed commentary on Books 1 and 2 of Varro's *De Agri Cultura* (2 vols, Darmstadt, 1996–7), and now Andrew Dalby in this very accessible volume offers the first translation into English of Cato's *De Agricultura* since the Loeb edition containing the agricultural writings of Cato and Varro, published in 1934.

In a short introductory section D. discusses the historical context, Cato's life and

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

career, his other writings, and the nature and purpose of the *De Agricultura*, with a helpful analysis of Cato's train of thought (pp. 18–21). This is followed by a Latin text with corresponding translation on the opposite page. The text is that of R. Goujard (Paris, 1975), without the apparatus criticus, which will not be missed by the general reader, although it is useful to have the Latin text for reference. There is a short bibliography, an index, and some useful figures illustrating Cato's descriptions of buildings and farm equipment.

The translation is reliable, straightforward, and clear, and gives a readable, idiomatic version of what Cato was trying to say. D. prints in the margin the various section headings, which were added later when the manuscripts were being copied, but does not translate them. Brief footnotes explain technical terms and phrases and Roman farming practices, with useful cross-references to other agricultural writers; problems of translation are also discussed.

According to Columella, Cato first taught agriculture to speak Latin (*De Re Rustica* 1.1.12). The *De Agricultura* was a pioneering work and is important not only as evidence for Roman farming practice, and life and culture in the Republic, but also for the development of Latin prose writing. The purpose was ostensibly to give guidance for the running of an estate equipped with slaves, engaged in mixed farming and particularly the growing of vines and olives for profit. D. does his best to make sense of Cato's idiosyncratic approach, which includes specimen contracts, recipes, religious formulae, medical cures, and a curious panegyric on the beneficent properties of cabbage. According to D., part of this was not written by Cato but added by a later scribe. D. also produces important new interpretations of the text, e.g. at §150, on seasonal markets for luxury produce (pp. 212–4).

Cato remains an enigmatic character. Many fragments from his speeches and written works survive, and give a fascinating picture of the man who, starting as a *novus homo* from Tusculum, went on to have a distinguished war record, celebrate a triumph, become politically very influential, and, particularly as censor, support traditional Roman values and morality. But because so much of the evidence is fragmentary, it is often difficult to set Cato in a clear context. The *De Agricultura*, which is his only literary work that survives complete, could therefore be of great value in understanding the man. But despite D.'s attempt to make sense of the sequence of argument, the work remains a strange mixture of sound and intelligent advice, facts and figures, useful information apparently based on practical experience, but also odd prejudices and superstitions, such as the spell for curing dislocations (§160); Cato indeed had little time for Greek doctors—'They have sworn to kill all barbarians with medicine . . .' (Pliny, *NH* 29.13–14). He is also inconsistent in his attitude to slaves. We may contrast his seemingly callous advice that the farm owner should sell off a sick or elderly slave (2.7) with his humane treatment of his own slaves and his confidence in slave farm managers (see pp. 24, 61).

Cato's praise of farming in the preface—'as to farmers, their offspring are the strongest men and bravest soldiers; their profit is truest, safest, least envied; their cast of mind is the least dishonest of any'—suggests that it was a worthy literary subject, even though the references to *coloni* and soldiers are unrelated to the type of farming subsequently described. Perhaps Cato wanted to remind his audience of typical Roman qualities expressed through a farming context, because traditional farmers exemplified what he saw as the Roman way of life.

D.'s book will be valuable not only to the general reader, students, and those interested in ancient society and technology, but also to professional Roman historians, who will find much here to interest and intrigue them.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Queen's University of Belfast BRIAN CAMPBELL

CICERO'S LETTERS

G. O. HUTCHINSON: *Cicero's Correspondence: a Literary Study*. Pp. xv + 235. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-19-815066-0.

The over 900 letters in the four collections that make up what survives of Cicero's correspondence are not read as much as they deserve. Their historical importance is greater than that of most of his speeches, and their human interest far greater. They are difficult, however, to survey and discuss for a modern reader, if only because there are so many of them and by so many different writers. Nothing can take the place of reading them, as on the one hand a continuous commentary on the most eventful period of Roman history and the personalities involved in it, and on the other a reflection of private life and private friendships among highly educated and civilized men.

Hutchinson has made a rare attempt to present the letters to readers. Faced with the problem of selection, he decided to choose a small number of examples under six headings: three letters from Cicero's period of exile in 58 (*Fam*. 14.4, *Att*. 3.7, *QF* 1.3), four of consolation to the bereaved (*Fam*. 5.16, *Ad Brut*. 1.9, *Fam*. 5.14, *Fam*. 4.5), four containing vivid narratives (*Fam.* 10.30, *Fam.* 15.4, *Att*. 5.21, *Fam.* 10.32), three that present conversational dialogue (*Att*. 13.42, *Att*. 5.1, *Att*. 15.11), three under the rather forced category of 'Time', i.e. letters reflecting on the past and involving political decisions about the present and the future (*Fam.* 8.6, *Att*. 8.3, *Att*. 9.10), and three showing Cicero's wit and humour (*Fam.* 7.18, *QF* 2.9, *Fam.* 9.20)—twenty in all.

H.'s most impressive discussions are among the longest: *Fam.* 5.16, Cicero's letter of consolation to an unknown man called Titius who was mourning the death of children; *Att*. 8.3, in which he is consulting Atticus in 49 about what he should do if Pompey decides to leave Italy; and *Fam.* 7.18, a series of jokes with his intimate friend Trebatius. But H.'s breadth of understanding and scholarship in the treatment of all twenty letters cannot be praised too highly, and on the circumstances and interpretation of each he should become an acknowledged authority.

There is a considerable dichotomy between on the one hand the text of the book, apparently written for the general reader and probably for students, with all Latin translated, and on the other the footnotes, which display a phenomenal erudition, both in the byways of ancient literature and in modern practice and theory of epistolography. He quotes verbatim from Kleist and Pushkin, Tolstoy and Solzhenitsyn. These footnotes can only have been written for scholars, particularly as they are full of the most remote and allusive references and assume access to a well-stocked library. On occasion the parade of learning is a little oppressive, as at p. 108 n. 47, where he gives seventeen references to discussions of Pollio's relations with his quaestor Balbus.

Apart from the content of the letters, H. is interested in their style; and in the first chapter, on pp. 9–12, before starting on the six groups of letters, he makes statements about 'rhythmic' and 'unrhythmic' prose, assuming that these are mutually exclusive categories and can be distinguished at sight by the informed scholar. He tells us that Cicero almost always writes 'rhythmically', even in the letters, except to Atticus, Terentia, and Tiro, while most of his correspondents are quite 'unrhythmic', except

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(interestingly) Lucius Munatius Plancus, who does indeed give the impression of imitating Ciceronian style and claimed long years of family friendship and admiration. 'Rhythmic' implies primarily the use of a restricted number of 'clausulae', a word which H. seems to avoid, writing instead of 'rhythmic endings'. The difficulty for the reader here is that he makes no attempt to give the background to the discussion, and neither Zielinski nor, among recent writers, Nisbet (in *Owls to Athens* [Oxford, 1990], pp. 349–59) or Gotoff appears even in the Bibliography, though he does quote the admirable application by D. H. Berry in *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 9 (1996), 47–74. He claims that he has given his own 'basic approach' on this matter in *CQ* 45 (1995), 485–99, but those who look up that article will be disappointed, for there he expressly excludes reference to the letters, and his main purpose is to broaden our understanding of Cicero's use of rhythmic endings. As to the past, he says (p. 9) that there was 'a misleading attempt to investigate this crucial area of style almost a hundred years ago'; however, it appears from a note on the following page that he is referring not to the ground-breaking work of Zielinski but to a dissertation on the letters by Bornecque.

There can of course be no doubt that Cicero brilliantly employs rhythmic clausulae; but questions arise in the mind. Is one simply to count long and short syllables in scanning them, or does word accent have an effect, as it does in the verse of Plautus and at least the last two feet of the Latin hexameter? This would affect the acceptability of alternative word divisions within the clausula. And what about elision and prosodic hiatus, even iambic shortening, each of which was a feature of spoken Latin? Instead of offering any kind of elucidation, H. requires the reader to take his unsupported word for the facts, impressively saying (p. 9) that he has examined all of Cicero's prose for this purpose, and also all the prose of Cicero's contemporaries. He must be aware of these uncertainties, but he obviously feels that this book is not the place to discuss them.

University College London M. M. WILLCOCK

MORE, BUT DIFFERENT

W. C. SCHNEIDER: *Vom Handeln der Römer. Kommunikation und Interaktion der politischen Führungsschicht vor Ausbruch des Bürgerkriegs im Briefwechsel mit Cicero*. Pp. xv + 787. Zurich and New York: Georg Olms, 1998. Paper, DM 188. ISBN: 3487-10716-3.

Cicero's letters seem finally to be attracting monograph interest: now, in addition to Hutchinson's *Cicero's Correspondence: a Literary Study* (Oxford, 1998), comes Schneider's very different volume, which approaches the letters, particularly those *ad Familiares*, from a political and historical standpoint.

The object of S.'s study is how the political élite at Rome communicated and dealt with one another in the period before the outbreak of the Pompeius–Caesar civil war, and his approach is avowedly anthropological in inspiration (pp. 58–64), cast in terms of a search for the grammar ordering social relations. Cicero's letters are essential material for the enquiry, because they provide the only contemporary evidence (pp. 68–73); as S. rightly points out, Sallust's political career may have taken place at the end of the Republic, but his writing all belongs to the very different world after the death of Caesar (pp. 64–5). S. narrows down his study by focusing on Cicero's letters to

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

other magistrates, since he wants to study the politically active class, which has the important consequence of excluding the letters to Atticus, except for a few which illustrate other correspondences; and he also looks only at cases where there is either an exchange of letters or a sufficient run of Cicero's own letters to gain some idea of what he was responding to. In practice, this limits S. to four sets of letters: those between Cicero and the Metellus brothers, Celer and Nepos (*Fam.* 5.1–4); those to Lentulus Spinther in the mid-50s, including the long *apologia pro vita sua* of *Fam.* 1.9; those to Appius Claudius (*Fam.* 3.1–13), concerned largely with the rather fractious handover of the province of Cilicia; and the extensive exchange of letters between Cicero and Caelius (*Fam.* 2.8–16 and 8.1–17). The last set takes S. into the early phases of the civil war, with Caelius' final letter being written early in 48; but as he points out, Caelius' final letter, with its emphasis on the personal obligations which bind him to Caesar, is much more old fashioned than the cynical and self-seeking *persona* which Caelius displayed in his calculations before the conflict began (pp. 633–43).

S.'s methodological chapter is preceded by a survey of earlier historians' attempts to understand the late Republic (primarily those writing in German, though the views of Syme and Gruen receive analyses), and the meat of the book follows in Chapters III–VI, which offer immensely detailed discussions of the four sets of correspondence he has selected. The great strength of S.'s book is that he eschews any 'psychological' interpretation of the letters. Cicero is a politician, dealing with his peers in a language and conventions which are mutually comprehensible, and under S.'s patient examination the letters become explicable in terms of their operation.

A key factor in interpersonal relations is mutual service: this, for example, is shown to be Cicero's overriding concern when writing to Spinther. C. is unable to provide the concrete return, the command to restore Ptolemy, that Spinther wants, and the letters provide an extensive symbolic substitute. Indeed, they are in some senses more than symbolic, providing evidence of Cicero's efforts in Rome to maintain the absent Spinther's standing and reputation, which are valuable even without gaining the Egyptian command. Another recurrent theme is the mediation between the demands of family and state. C.'s exchanges with the Metelli provide an example of a quarrel and its resolution, where family ties and political disposition pull in different directions and Celer, however reluctantly, must support his brother. And C. uses the difference in his and Appius Claudius' family backgrounds to provide an elegant and face-saving explanation for the difference in their styles of provincial government (pp. 439–40). Especially interesting is S.'s examination of what it meant for C. to be a 'new man'. He turns accepted wisdom on its head, arguing that C.'s achievements and status were enhanced by his self-made position: that was why C.'s enemies made so much of his *nouitas* (pp. 341–4). S. takes this view as far as to say that it was C.'s position as a *princeps* which made his participation in the first triumvirate so important to Caesar (p. 344). This on its own I find frankly implausible: C.'s golden tongue needs to be taken into account, if not made the most important factor. But S.'s account of C.'s dealings with Caesar, Pompeius, and Crassus is in general convincing, particularly in his recognition that what is happening post-Luca is negotiation, not capitulation, and that C. is by no means without political resources during this period.

My chief reservation overall concerns the disappearance of an idiosyncratic Cicero. S. does not really consider C.'s skills as a letter writer, nor the extent to which the supreme orator also deployed his persuasion in the more intimate arena of his correspondence. Since three of the four exchanges S. looks at are between C. and men with whom his dealings were in some sense awkward, it would be valuable to examine how and to what extent he presents their relationships in a way that is personally

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

advantageous, particularly in comparison with the letters of other people preserved in the collection. A striking example of differences in styles of letter-writing is the exchange between Cicero and Cato about Cicero's triumph (*Fam.* 15.5–6), where most readers are left with a strong impression, albeit one that is difficult to articulate, that Cicero is by far the more competent manipulator of the epistolary medium. S. does discuss this exchange (pp. 536–8 and 541–4), but briefly and concentrating on the philosophical and religious context to Cato's remarks, and on the contrast between Bibulus and C.; it remains unclear what S. thinks Cato, or C., were trying to achieve by their letters, or whether they accomplished their aims. S. tends to assume in his discussions that C.'s own letters provide a good representation of the social system in action: that may be rather too innocent a reading.

The other problem with this volume is its length. S. allows himself 730 pages to discuss some fifty-odd letters; a generous allowance, particularly given the comparatively narrow focus of the work, without any discussion of rhetorical or literary matters. There is a lot of detail that does not relate particularly closely to the argument; a particular irritation is S.'s habit of summarizing the letter he is discussing, but without giving quite enough detail to be a substitute for consulting the text. I was left with a strong feeling that the really important arguments S. is putting forward could have been presented in 200 pages. This disparity is a pity: S. has written an interesting and important book which deserves readers, but many will, quite understandably, be put off by its sheer bulk and the long, and in places dauntingly technical, preliminaries to the central arguments.

University of Glasgow C. E. W. STEEL

CAESAR'S FIDES

G. Lieberg: *Caesars Politik in Gallien. Interpretationen zum* Bellum Gallicum. Pp. 186. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr N. Brockmeyer, 1998. Paper, DM 34.80. ISBN: 3-8196-0564-9.

G. Walser: *Bellum Helveticum. Studien zum Beginn der caesarischen Eroberung von Gallien.* (*Historia* Einzelschrift 118.) Pp. 192. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998. Paper, DM 76. ISBN: 3-515-07248-9.

No author presents challenges, at once historical and philological, more intricately intertwined than C[aesar]. The *Commentaries* raise questions ramifying from literature into history and vice versa, about date and manner of composition and publication, textual tradition and transmission, genre and style, sources, historical worth, and political and authorial *raisons d'écrire*. Despite which, historians have seldom confronted them squarely, while literary scholarship—tending, especially in the German-speaking world (as Walser in his confessional preface complains), towards schoolmasterly hagiography—has fallen short on historical and political issues. Even the commentary, magisterial of its kind, of Kraner/Dittenberger/Hoffmann/Meusel, disappoints here. More than any other antique texts, the *Commentaries* demand holistic textual, literary, and historical address.

This brace of studies arrives opportunely, after decades of undeserved neglect of C. *auctor* among anglophone scholars, amid signs of renascent interest (see e.g. Welch and Powell [edd.], *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter* [London, 1998] and the (electronic) review by Andrew M. Riggsby, *BMCR* 99-4.16, with bibliography at n. 1:

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

visit http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/1999/1999-04-16.html; Riggsby himself will imminently publish a book on *BG*). They neatly illustrate the gulf between literary and historical approaches, and much else that divides the mighty few contemporary C.-scholars. Both have some interesting things to say and both are engaged chiefly with the question of the truthfulness or reliability of C.'s narrative of his campaigns in 58. There the resemblance ends.

W. supplies a text of *BG* 1.1–29, reproducing H. Fuchs's 1944 *Editio Helvetica* (the usefulness of W.'s version is limited less by errors—two in 1.3, and others in 1.17 and 1.26, offset by a necessary correction at 1.2.1—than by the failure to explain typographical conventions needlessly fussy for a commentary which deals but little with textual matters; Fuchs's frontispiece note and *Additamentum* at pp. 211f. remain indispensible), and a German translation based on Deissmann's (1980), which I am not competent to evaluate. The substance is an 'historical commentary' (pp. 37–74), with two supplementary essays, 'Appraisal of Caesar's Book of 51 BC', summarizing the findings of the *Kommentar* (pp. 75–80) and 'The Helvetic Migration in the Context of Celtic History' (pp. 81–8), arguing that this 'migration' was a typical Celtic *Söldnerzug*, an expedition *πανδημεί* in quest of mercenary service with Gallic neighbours against Ariovistus, rather than the threat to the Province that C. claimed it was. Apart from bibliography, the remaining 100 pages present extracts lengthily illustrating positions W. rejects, from Mommsen's *Römische Geschichte*, Delbrock's *Geschichte der Kriegskunst* (1900), Ferrero's *Grandezza e Decadenza di Roma* (in the second edition of Pannwitz's German translation of 1914—why not the third, of 1922?), H. Rauchenstein's 1882 dissertation on the *Helvetierkrieg*, and Huber's 1931 book on C.'s *Glaubwürdigkeit*. L.'s opuscule (rather, concatenated *opuscula*, usually of a few pages apiece) consists of five main sections: (i) C.'s authorial habits and specific related issues, e.g. time of writing, title, serial vs. unitary composition (pp. 11–34); (ii) aspects of C.'s Helvetian war narrative (pp. 35–58); (iii) C.'s account of his dealings with Ariovistus (the core of the work), interspersed with 'stylistic analysis' of individual chapters (pp. 59–148); (iv) reflections on C.'s relations with Gaul following the hostilities of 58 (pp. 149–61); and (v) Appendices (whose relevance to L.'s main thesis is unclear) on (a) a notorious textual crux in Hirtius' preface to *BG* 8—*comparantibus* or *comparentibus*?—(p. 163) and (b) that book's authorship (pp. 164–6).

There are good things in both books. As a distinguished emeritus, W. possesses excellent command of the older bibliography (but Rice-Holmes's *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* is curiously missing); as an erstwhile staff-officer in the Swiss army he is particularly helpful on local military geography (pp. 45, 66, 70—but could not more modern and clearer maps have been found for pp. 48–50?), and an illuminating guide to byways such as the Gallo-Italian wine-trade (p. 38), though underrating there the importance politically of Roman cowboys' supply of 'fire-water' to Gallic 'Indians'. As a Latinist rather than historian, L. is well equipped to stress, rightly, the rhetorical sophistication of C.'s language, especially in transactions with Ariovistus (pp. 108, 118f., 128, 136), though some of his 'Stylistic Analyses' (pp. 104ff., 116ff., 126ff., 133ff.) are laboriously *nichtssagend*. His discussion of C.'s use of the third person (p. 81ff.), illuminated by a passage of Dio seldom adduced in this connexion (38.43.3, *μὴ γὰρ ὅτι ἐμοῦ τοῦ Καίσαρος . . . μηδ' ὅτι ἐμὲ τὸν Καίσαρα . . . ἀλλ' ὁ 'Ρωμαῖος, ὁ ἀνθύπατος κ.τ.λ.*), is notably worthwhile, and many will share his doubts about the usefulness of oversubtle 'narratological' approaches such as Görler's (pp. 24ff.).

On what is for both, however, the central issue, C.'s trustworthiness, W. and L. take stances of polar extremity, and are in the light of the present state of scholarship regrettably disappointing. For W. the *BG tout entière* is a defence, conceived and

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

written to forestall criticism at home, of C.'s promagisterial conduct, wherein the author practises multifarious deception on matters small and large. C. claims, for instance, that the Helvetians had burned their settlements ('oppida sua omnia . . . incendunt . . .', I.5.2f.): this 'ought' to have left archaeological traces but has not (pp. 44f.). C. makes out with insidious dishonesty (I.6–7) that the Helvetic migration was tantamount to an attack on the Province (p. 76), when they were actually coordinating themselves against Ariovistus—something which C. 'must have known', but deliberately veils (pp. 81f., cf. p. 42, '[C.] in den Kommentarien vieles verschweigt'), while designing from the outset to confront Ariovistus himself. C. disingenuously exploits Roman readers' geographical ignorance (pp. 46, 71), giving 'deliberately untrue geographical details' (p. 54, on 10.1), falsely claiming, in accordance with the 'iulische Familienlegende' which it was his main concern to propagate, credit for the victory over the Tigurini (12.3), when in fact it was Labienus' achievement (pp. 58f., 87f.)—as if it were not institutionally standard for proconsuls to take the credit for subordinates' successes. All this contributes to a *Kriegsschuldlegende* (pp. 58, 71 and *passim*), a systematic self-justification for his attacks on the Helvetians and 'free Gaul' (pp. 52–3). There is much more in similar, Rambaudesque, vein.

For L., on the other hand, the *BG* is not 'mere' propaganda, but (whatever this means) a 'feldherrliche Selbstdarstellung' and a 'work of high literary art' (p. 73), free from serious misrepresentation or apologetic distortion of the 'historical truth'. When C. says that he intervened against the Helvetii or Ariovistus only in response to real threats to Rome's allies or the Province he must be believed. Rather than intending to subjugate 'free Gaul', C. only reacted to circumstances as they arose. Similarly, Ariovistus' defeat only incidentally extended Roman territorial hegemony, since C. acknowledged Gallic aspirations to political independence and continued after 58 to respect that of the Aedui within the framework of their alliance with Rome; so when they came, hostilities were precipitated by alien aggressors rather than by C. himself; the 'conquest' of Gaul was therefore only an unintended consequence of the revolt of 52.

For both authors the question of C.'s truthfulness is closely tied to that of the date and manner of composition and publication. Unsurprisingly, W. adopts (without argument) the continental orthodoxy issuing from Mommsen and represented most illustriously by Rambaud, Gelzer, and Meier, that C. composed *BG* at a single thrust in 52/51—implausibly and persistently assuming that C.'s target readership was a 'senatorial reader' (pp. 46, 51, 55, 66, 75, 85, etc.)—as if supporters of Cato would be persuasible. L. argues (though but briefly, pp. 17ff.) for serial composition, a view which appears to be clawing back ground (see Wiseman in Welch and Powell [edd.], *Caesar* . . ., cited above). Neither can be regarded as either particularly new or convincing here, and there is more to be said.

The chief trouble for both writers is not only the old problem that for so much of what is narrated in *BG* there are no adequate controlling sources or criteria by which to estimate C.'s ingenuousness. It is more seriously the fact that discussion has moved on from direct confrontation between e.g. Rambaud's strenuously special pleading C. and Rice Holmes's honorable Indian Civil Servant, thanks to recognition that C. was an adept enough politician to use the truth wherever he could in his own case. L.'s almost ideally veracious C. is simply pushing at an open door, since apology or self-advertisement will operate through selection and omission or inclusion much more than through the deliberate falsehoods of which he is charged by various authors whom L. *seriatim* refutes. In any case in the *BG* C. hardly had a case to plead, except that he had been brilliantly successful in his conduct of military operations, thanks to

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which Rome's territorial dominions had been spectacularly extended (see e.g. Collins in *ANRW* 1.1 [1972], 922ff.); at the same time C. certainly had no need in the *BG* to defend himself (as W. seems to assume) against liberal-minded humanitarians at Rome keen to indict him for war-crimes.

Both works will have their uses as annotational stocking-fillers (and W.'s as rather more than that). But sadly neither can be regarded as altogether indispensible.

St Aloysius' College, Glasgow LINDSAY G. H. HALL

NOVUM LUMEN BRITANNICUM

S. P. Oakley: *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI–X: Volume II: Books VII and VIII*. Pp. xiii + 866. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £85. ISBN: 0-19-815226-4.

'The depth of Oakley's scholarship is astonishing. . . . It is an awe-inspiring feat' (James Davidson, *Times Literary Supplement*, 6 March 1998, 29). The reviewer who wrote that entirely just assessment ended with an attack on the whole project:

> What was the purpose of putting all these different approaches to Livy's text in one giant commentary? Does Oakley share Livy's *horror vacui*? Was he afraid of having nothing to say?
>
> Stephen Oakley has produced an impressive edifice, but one begins to wish that both he and Livy had been less inclined to impress and more anxious to be helpful.

More likely it was the reviewer who was afraid of having nothing to say. When faced with a really great work of traditional scholarship, something you would never have the patience, the stamina, or the learning to attempt yourself, dismissive irony does at least save you from having to be grateful. But gratitude is precisely the proper reaction to O.'s commentary; I cannot imagine how anyone could find it unhelpful.

What one wants from a commentator is judgement as well as thoroughness, insight as well as erudition. That is what O. provides: he has mastered all the technical and interpretative problems raised by Livy's text, and he sets out the issues with unfailingly judicious clarity. His essays on, for instance, the Carthage treaties (pp. 252–62), the Samnite Wars (pp. 274–84, with a magnificent fold-out map), the development of the legion (pp. 451–66), and the settlement of 338 B.C. (pp. 538–59) will be of permanent value for historians, while those more interested in the world of Roman legend will find exemplary discussions of Curtius and the chasm (pp. 96–8), Manlius and the Gaul (pp. 113–24), Valerius and the raven (pp. 230–2), and the *deuotio* of Decius Mus (pp. 477–86). Commentaries are best judged by constant use, but I think it is as certain as it can be that O.'s will prove as indispensable for the study of his author as those of Walbank and Shackleton Bailey have been for theirs.

One feature of O.'s work which contrasts strongly with that of R. M. Ogilvie on Books 1–5 is his caution in attributing Livian material to particular sources. The fact that Soltau in 1897 took the practice to a ludicrous extreme ('the fantasies of this scholar should nowhere have gained acceptance', vol. I p. 19 n. 21) does not mean that every attempt must be necessarily invalid. But O. prefers to deal with 'the annalistic tradition as a composite whole' (vol. I p. 21). He sees no reason, for instance, to attribute to Valerius Antias episodes in which Valerii are given improbable prominence (vol. I pp. 17, 91), though he does hedge his bets in a footnote: 'Though the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

evidential basis of the standard modern view of Antias is unsatisfactory, I do not wish to deny that there may be some truth in it' (vol. I p. 17 n. 13).

So when at 7.32–33 'the speech of Valerius Corvus and the *laus Corui* which follows contain many ideas which should be related in the first instance to the political slogans of late-republican *noui homines*, . . . [s]ince Corvus was no *nouus homo*, it may seem puzzling that L. should give him such sentiments' (p. 317). Not if he has borrowed them from a speech in Antias—but O. refers only to 'the annalistic portrayal of the Valerii as friends of the people' (p. 321, on 7.32.16), without venturing to attribute a name. He does say that 'the dictatorship of Valerius Corvus [in 342] is likely to be a fabrication, perhaps by Valerius Antias', but with an admonitory footnote that 'his responsibility cannot finally be demonstrated' (p. 363 and n. 2). Of course not, but it can reasonably be inferred.

At 7.42.3–4 Livy reports a version of the mutiny story in which Corvus was not dictator, the *multitudo coniuratorum* was in Rome itself, and the leader of the insurrection was called C. Manlius. 'The name C. Manlius is not the least problematic part of this alternative version of the story' (pp. 387–8)—but one might have expected a reference to the events of 63–62 B.C., which are surely the *terminus post quem* for the creation of this version. Tubero is a likely source, since he may have 'corrected' Valerius Antias on other matters too (T. P. Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics* [Leicester, 1979], pp. 113–21, 135–9; cf. vol. I p. 98 n. 292, where O. is sceptical but promises full treatment in vol. III). However, that is not the sort of hypothesis O. likes to make.

Similarly at 7.18.9, 'L. may here be abbreviating a speech which he had found in his sources; certainly the sentiments belong to the stock-in-trade of later republican oratory' (p. 194). But since this tribunician protest at the loss of the plebeian consulate, interpreted as *urbs capta atque oppressa regno patriciorum*, comes immediately after an honorific reference to the *uirtus* of C. Licinius Stolo (7.18.5), it is surely not an irresponsible conjecture to attribute it to Licinius Macer, whose own tribunician speech in Sallust is an attack on the *dominatio paucorum* (Sall. *Hist*. 3.48.6, etc.). One of the few disappointments in O.'s work is his lack of interest in Macer (pp. 112–3, cf. vol. I p. 92)—particularly regrettable since Siri Walt's otherwise admirable recent book comes to the conclusion that '[b]ei der Vorstellung, Macer habe ein "populares Geschichtswerk" verfasst, handelt es sich um ein modernes Konstruct, das sich nicht beweisen lässt' (S. Walt, *Der Historiker C. Licinius Macer* [Stuttgart, 1997], p. 105). Robert Ogilvie knew better (pp. 7–12 of his commentary on Books 1–5): an old-style Tory himself, he knew a radical when he saw one.

I pick out one other area where O.'s excellent treatment may perhaps be supplemented. Livy's famous excursus on the origins of Roman drama gives rise to a characteristically detailed and sensible discussion (pp. 40–58); but on the question of dramatic *satura* and its possible relevance to satyrs (7.2.7–8, cf. Diom. *Gramm. Lat.* 1.485K), O. does not do full justice to the iconographical evidence. The vase-paintings of Etruria, Campania, Lucania, and Apulia, and the engravings on 'Praenestine' mirrors and *cistae* show clearly that Dionysiac imagery was a universal common idiom in fourth-century Italy; they also suggest that various types of mythological performance were employed to honour the god of the satyrs, whose festival at Rome (the Liberalia) evidently featured *ludi scaenici*: see now the chapter on 'Liber' in Christer Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic: Politics, Religion and Historiography* c. *400–133 BC* (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 23, Rome, 1999).

I wonder too about O.'s interpretation of 7.2.13 on the theatre in Livy's own day: 'ut appararet quam ab sano initio res in hanc uix opulentis regnis tolerabilem insaniam uenerit'. Was it only the number of days involved and the increasing cost of the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

spectacle (p. 71)? The equivalent passage in Valerius Maximus (2.4.1) calls the theatre *urbana castra*, and complains about violence and bloodshed; Pylades was recalled in 18 B.C. after having been exiled for *stasis* (Dio 54.17.4). Perhaps the *insania* Livy had in mind was the rioting of fans?

Everyone will have something to add, or some detail to query. What matters is to welcome a splendid new contribution to a great tradition which has been one of the glories of British classical scholarship. It is a melancholy thought that it will probably be the last such commentary ever to be written in this country, now that the Higher Education Funding Council's five-yearly research assessments effectively discourage long-term projects.

University of Exeter T. P. WISEMAN

TACITUS MYTHISTORICUS

A. J. WOODMAN: *Tacitus Reviewed.* Pp. xii + 255. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £ 40. ISBN: 0-19-815258-2.

For more than two decades A. J. Woodman has been a leader of the scholarly movement to emphasize the literary and rhetorical aspects of Latin historical texts, and to subject those historians to extraordinarily close readings. While T. P. Wiseman has successfully pursued a similar agenda in reconstructing Roman republican history and myth, Woodman's project is more narrowly focused and more radical: commentaries and essays on Velleius Paterculus and Tacitus which attempt to clarify what is really being said. He often says that he is not concerned with 'what really happened' (pp. 24, 41), but only with what the ancient historian actually said.

Such a program sounds innocent enough, but those who have read W.'s papers or heard them delivered know how very subversive he can be. For in his careful readings—weighing a precise definition here and the exact force of a conjunction there, tracing subtle verbal allusions, and taking tenses and moods more seriously than historians are wont to do—he does no more than literary critics do in reading Horace or Propertius. But, he would argue, such a close reading sometimes under- mines the accepted historical interpretation and thus challenges some of the revered truisms of Julio-Claudian history.

For the book under review, W. has collected ten papers and book chapters on Tacitus published over the past twenty-five years and added two new essays. Though most of the papers are well known to Taciteans, a few were published in less accessible venues and it is useful to have them republished in convenient form. Their collection also makes clearer the methodological continuities throughout W.'s career.

The volume opens with W.'s 1983 Leeds inaugural lecture on the literature of war. It is a good place to begin, for in it W. argues his view that ancient historical writing is not 'history' in any modern sense; it is closer to journalism or even fiction. He examines the treatments of Hitler's accession by the historian Alan Bullock and the journalist William Shirer, and makes clear that Shirer's rhetorical approach is closer to that of an ancient 'historian'. Few would dissent. But he then proceeds to argue that landscapes in Livy and battle-scenes in Tacitus are not merely elaborations, but were completely invented. And the famous battle between brothers during the Civil War (*Hist.* 1.51) is a stock motif already in evidence in poems attributed to Seneca, and was included by Tacitus for literary effect alone. The argument here is convincing, as is his 1979 paper (#5), which shows that Tacitus adapted a passage from the *Histories* into

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

his account of Germanicus' viewing the remains of Varus' armies in the Teutoburg Forest (*Ann*. 1.61–65). W. calls this practice ' "substantive imitation", by which I mean the technique of giving substance to a poorly documented incident by the imitation of one which is much better documented' (p. 81). When Goodyear accepted this argument in his 1972 commentary, he expressed his concern about 'the implication'. That implication—that Tacitus would invent an entire episode for literary effect—is indeed serious, but is hardly as 'scandalous' as Woodman seems to think it must be to modern readers 'who evidently still regard him as a faithful historian'. At times he almost seems to suggest that readers expect to find real history in the literary texts produced by historians. That nineteenth-century positivism has been seriously undermined by historiographical theorists (e.g. Hayden White) of the past twenty years.

The overarching value of these essays is that they serve as a goad (or an inspiration) to historians to read their texts more closely. The essay on the death of Agrippa Postumus, 'A Death in the First Act (*Ann*. 1.6)', strikes me as almost wholly successful in this regard. Here W. shows against common scholarly opinion that Tacitus does not blame Tiberius for the murder of Postumus. He argues on textual grounds that Tiberius' initial response—that Augustus had given the order—was genuine, and it was only later, when he learned that Livia and Sallustius were responsible, that he was forced into a 'cover-up'. This reading, while presenting Tiberius as innocent of the crime, also shows him as dependent on others who were pulling strings behind the throne. The textual argument is persuasive, and the historical implications significant, in establishing the expectation of Tiberius' future manipulation.

On the other hand, a new long essay is less convincing in its reinterpretation of the 'accession debate' in *Ann*. 1.10.8–13.5. W. believes historians are captives of their expectations of the worst in Tiberius, and that the passage should be read as portraying a Tiberius who genuinely seeks to withdraw from power. That is indeed a radical reinterpretation. W. seems to expect that, if Tiberius had really desired imperial power, and since he had been chosen as successor by Augustus, he could have immediately proceeded to the Senate to claim the throne. Why then the delay, if Tiberius was not genuinely ambiguous? Another view is that this was the first peaceful transfer of power—Octavian had to fight for his legacy—and the perennially cautious Tiberius remained unsure how much weight Augustus' designation would carry in the real world of politics and the military, especially with the popular Germanicus at the head of an army in Gaul. Despite W.'s ingenuity and some real clarifications, he seems at times to struggle against the text; the traditional view of the hypocritical Tiberius requires less ingenuity.

Also included are reprints of W.'s two brilliant essays on Neronian Rome. The first (*Ann*. 15.36–7) examines the fabulous quality of Nero's 'marriage' to Pythagoras within the larger context of a Rome transformed into Alexandria. The second, 'Amateur Dramatics at the Court of Nero (*Annals* 15.48–74)', is a fine treatment of the theatrical elements in the Pisonian conspiracy. W. argues that we are so accustomed to the theatricality of Nero, that we tend to underestimate the 'amateur dramatics' of others at court, where many of the conspirators were more concerned with rôle-playing than with the actual goal of the plot.

The epilogue is a new essay which recapitulates W.'s arguments and emphasizes the literary qualities of the *Annals*. Here he details the word- and name-play, and, in Book 3 alone, sixty examples of chiasmus. He argues that the reader needs to be as sensitive to such stylistic nuances as if she were reading poetry. There is no question that W. is correct in identifying the many subtleties and literary tropes which have gone unnoticed, which thus make Tacitus' style less 'austere' than many have thought,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

though he may go too far when he implies that they make Tacitus less bleak in his overall vision. Still, W. has made his case well: historical texts are written with all the rhetorical and poetic tricks in the writers' arsenal and, if we are to understand them properly, we must read them in that light. If that argument seems less shocking than it might have thirty years ago, W. has contributed to that change in perception and to much of the vibrant new scholarship on the Latin historians.

University of California, Los Angeles RONALD MELLOR

AMMIANUS

T. D. BARNES: *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality*. Pp. xiv + 290. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1998. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-8014-3526-9.

'Dickensian London' is a dark, violent, vibrant, labyrinthine city, peopled by criminals, grotesques, lawyers, and innumerable equally colourful characters. It is a rich and beguiling world—and of course we are well aware as we read that it bears only a partial and problematic resemblance to anything that could be described as the 'real' London of the nineteenth century. Barnes's book, an expanded version of his 1994 Townsend Lectures at Cornell, provokes the thought that perhaps 'The Roman Empire of Ammianus' should be viewed in a similar light; not so much the world 'of the time of' Ammianus as the world of his imagination.

The surviving books of the *Res Gestae* provide the basis for all modern narrative accounts of the years 353–78, and have pervasively influenced all modern interpretations of this period. Modern writers have often celebrated the fact that they are able to draw on the detailed and perceptive account of one of the most impartial and reliable of historians. Edward Gibbon, on reaching the reign of Theodosius, remarked of Ammianus, 'It is not without the most sincere regret that I must now take leave of an accurate and faithful guide, who has composed the history of his own times without indulging the prejudices and passions which usually affect the mind of a contemporary', and this verdict has been endorsed by most subsequent writers. For B., however, this willing dependence on Ammianus' account is a serious problem. His title emphasizes the unavoidable gap between reality and its representation, even when the writer's aim is to reproduce reality as faithfully as possible—and there are ample grounds for questioning whether Ammianus was indeed such a faithful, impartial chronicler of his times.

B. offers a wide-ranging and detailed analysis of different aspects of the *Res Gestae*. Three chapters examine its narrative structure, arguing that it was arranged in groups of six books, and that the transmitted book numbers are erroneous; four chapters reconsider what is known about the background of its author and what this might tell us about his work (including the suggestion that Ammianus' language reveals him to have been, like Julian, an apostate Christian); four chapters survey Ammianus' techniques of characterization and his views of women, eunuchs, and emperors (including, of course, Julian; B.'s reading suggests that Ammianus' attitude to his hero was complex and perhaps confused, sometimes subtly undermining his claims to military prowess and sometimes concealing the more embarrassing and eccentric elements of his religious beliefs). In the last two chapters B. reconstructs Ammianus' overall conception of the course of Roman history, and compares his approach to writing history to that of Tacitus and of Macaulay.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The key to understanding the work is seen to be Ammianus' overt paganism and carefully concealed hostility to Christianity. He subtly denigrates men whom we know to have been Christians; above all, of course, the emperors before and after Julian: Constantius is compared to Caligula, Domitian, and Commodus, Jovian is portrayed as never really being emperor at all, and various minor characters are compared to snakes, dogs, and wild beasts. B. constantly compares Ammianus' version of events to those of other accounts, and identifies deliberate distortions. Equally significant are the omissions; he argues that Ammianus sets out to marginalize Christianity by underplaying the importance of its rôle in the course of events, completely ignoring the ecclesiastical controversies that dominated the reign of Constantius and the relevance of these for the success of Julian's rebellion. Finally, B. offers a theory of the overall conception and aim of the work. Ammianus presents an alternative version of history to that of Christian triumphalism; a deeply pessimistic interpretation, in which the old religion survives despite everything but is betrayed by the failure of Julian to heed the omens which warned against his expedition into Persia. Rome's decline, encapsulated in the disaster at Adrianople, is shown to be a direct consequence of the actions of Constantine in converting to Christianity and reviving hostilities with Persia.

This picture of Ammianus as anti-Christian polemicist, drawing on his literary talent to disguise his attacks and present the appearance of objectivity, is often persuasive and certainly thought-provoking. It is unfortunate that B. does not stick to arguing this case, but instead tries to offer a complete analysis of the *Res Gestae*. The resulting work is immensely learned, and makes contributions to numerous ongoing debates on Ammianus, but its most important argument is often obscured or neglected. Much more could surely be said, for example, about the structure of the narrative; B. seems content to have identified a structure without feeling the need to draw any conclusions about the ways that it might affect the reader's understanding of events. On the other hand, the attempts to extract solid biographical information about Ammianus from his text could surely be dispensed with, as could the efforts to defend him against the charge that he cribbed all his scientific material from encyclopaedias. Such topics might be relevant in considering the historian's rhetoric of authority, the ways in which he establishes his claim to be a trustworthy reporter—but that is not how they are presented here.

The title of this book might attract two different sets of readers. On the one hand, there are those who are specifically interested in Ammianus and his usefulness as a source for the history of the fourth century. If B.'s outline of the prevailing belief in Ammianus' veracity and impartiality is at all correct, then his book is undoubtedly a necessary (if not long overdue) corrective. The case could have been made more effectively if he had been less eager to cover every possible aspect of the subject, but it is still difficult to believe that anyone will henceforth be able to maintain an unqualified belief in the reliability of Ammianus' version of events.

Readers who are more interested in the techniques of ancient historiography in general will find this a frustrating and ultimately unsatisfying book. B. largely ignores the implications of his title (which seems to promise an investigation of the ways that Ammianus invents and evokes the world of the Roman Empire) in favour of a critique of Ammianus' factual reliability through comparison of his version of events with the 'reality' derived from other texts. B. concludes that, like Macaulay, Ammianus' claim to be a really great historian rests on his literary skill, but he offers little evidence and less discussion of this; despite the evocation of Erich Auerbach's *Mimesis* in the second

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

chapter, the emphasis throughout is on the content of the *Res Gestae* rather than their form or style.

Perhaps if B. had written for a wider audience than specialists in Ammianus, his book might have conveyed more of a sense of why his work should be worth reading regardless of its reliability. However, I suspect that the real problem is B.'s belief that there is a clear and unproblematic distinction between history and the novel. His characterization of Ammianus as essentially a novelist may seem dangerously radical to some, reminiscent of Veyne's idea of history as 'un vrai roman', but in fact this is a judgement on Ammianus alone rather than history in general. Heartening as it is to find a modern critic like Auerbach being discussed in a work like this, one looks in vain for mention of Hayden White or other writers on the philosophy and poetics of history. A proper appreciation of Ammianus' qualities as a writer and as a historian surely requires a view of history and the novel as equally rhetorical, equally literary, equally fictive.

University of Bristol NEVILLE MORLEY

THE MORAL HISTORIAN

A. BRANDT: *Moralische Werte in den* Res gestae *des Ammianus Marcellinus*. (Hypomnemata 122.) Pp. 447. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999. Paper, DM 150. ISBN: 3-525-25219-6.

In justifying his choice of subject B. rightly observes that Roman history is written in moral terms and with a moral purpose. His selection of concepts for detailed study concentrates on those virtues and vices mentioned in AM's imperial necrologies.

The first chapter examines each necrology in terms of a somewhat arbitrary series of categories. Little calls for comment in B.'s painstaking analysis. The interpretation of *studiosus cognitionum omnium* (25.4.7) suggested in n.78 is to be preferred to that given in the text, because of the proximity of *indeclinabilis aliquotiens iudex* and the implied cross-reference to the criticism of Constantius for his lack of interest in such matters (21.16.7). In the necrology of Valentinian AM is overtly didactic, expounding not merely what Valentinian did wrong but also how a ruler should behave.

The second chapter simply redeploys the same material by category rather than by emperor. It provides a convenient summary of the qualities which in AM's view made an emperor a good or bad ruler. But it is a pity that these two chapters, which merely prepare the ground for the third, could not have been somehow combined and condensed.

In the third chapter most of the book's considerable merits are to be found. B. begins with the roles of *physis* and *ethos* in determining character. Many qualities are inborn, but circumstances may prevent their coming to light, while education and the imitation of appropriate *exempla* can improve the naturally bad. AM is more interested in the ideas of imitation and emulation than any other author, and makes far greater use of moralizing examples. He employs *sapientia* and cognates primarily in philosophical and religious contexts; in comparison with Tacitus and the panegyrists his use of these words is infrequent and insignificant. But no other author approaches his interest in *prudentia*, which for him is empirical and pragmatic, and need not depend on education. *Prudentia* is closely linked with caution. *Temperantia* in the physical sphere is particularly applied to Julian. (At 21.16.5 B. is probably right to give *sobria* a broader meaning than I did in my treatment of this theme.) On the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

psychological level *temperantia* can moderate such vices as *acerbitas*, *aviditas*, and *invidia*. *Humanitas*, often linked with hospitality, may also connote philanthropic use of power. *Pietas* too is associated with the emperor's concern for the welfare of his subjects.

B. notes that the antonyms of these virtues, *acerbitas*, *asperitas*, and *crudelitas*, are applied almost exclusively to Romans: barbarians cannot be expected to live up to the standards of civilized behaviour against which these vices offend. He rightly stresses a profoundly pessimistic phenomenon almost exclusive to AM, the ascription to certain characters of a positive predilection for evil, expressed by such phrases as *propositum ad nocendum*, *cupiditas saeviendi*, or *irascendi* and the like.

Severitas is positive. B. claims that it can have the negative connotation of harshness, but his example (28.4.16) is surely a savagely ironic use of the positive sense of *severus*, not a straightforwardly negative one. *Clementia* and *lenitas* are regularly attributed only to Julian. The usual contexts are judicial and in the treatment of defeated enemies. B. rightly distinguishes 16.5.12, where Julian disregards the law, from 21.12.20, where he displays *aequitas*. (22.10.5 is rather akin to the latter: again Julian is concerned to be just despite the operation in the case of factors which might militate against this.)

Of terms denoting personal qualities, many are rare: *magnanimitas*, *popularitas*, *gravitas* (particularly in an ethical sense), *constantia* (the exceptional attribution of which to Macrianus in 30.3.6 serves to highlight the deficiencies of Romans), and *civilitas*. But arrogance is a major theme; again AM's picture of the powerful is drawn with striking pessimism. The context of *fides* is often military, between commanders and individual underlings or their troops; for AM it is markedly one-sided, with no reciprocity from the higher-ranking party. *Perfidia* is shown mostly by barbarians towards Romans, though AM felt uncomfortable with the massacre of the Saxons and the murder of Gabinius. *Amicitia* and *inimicitia* are both used most often of relations between an emperor and his subjects. The latter, like *odium*, is not necessarily negative, depending on the moral status of its target. *Amor* too is most common of relations between emperor and army; like *odium* and *invidia*, it is much rarer in AM than in Tacitus. Overall B. demonstrates clearly that, in contrast with his contemporaries and above all Tacitus, AM ruthlessly suppresses the emotional and especially sexual elements in personal relationships.

Justice is of prime importance. Its connotations are *suum cuique tribuere* and *suo contentum esse*—hence it is constantly contrasted with all forms of *pleonexia*. B. sees it as the most important moral value in AM. For AM, who is uninfluenced by juristic usage, *aequitas* is virtually synonymous with *iustitia*. *Licentia* is most often applied to actions damaging to the common good. It stems from lack of self-control or a *laissez-faire* attitude to the conduct of others. B. notes that Tacitus, unlike AM, uses it almost exclusively of collectives. This may be because AM is more concerned with the problem of supposedly civilized individuals behaving like barbarians.

Of military qualities *fortitudo* is restricted to Romans. The context of *utilitas publica* is also mainly military; AM is much less concerned with the tension between *honestum* and *utile* than Tacitus and the panegyrists. For him *auctoritas* is a social, not a moral, value. B. highlights his highly individual conception of an *auctoritas* that derives from *potestas*, as in the notorious phrase *pro potestatis auctoritate* (29.1.5). But surely AM realizes that Julian is desperate in appealing to the *auctoritas* of his troops (21.5.5) or of the restored republic (20.9.7) to justify his usurpation. B. cites Tac. *Hist*. 5.16.3 (the elevation of Galba *sextae legionis auctoritate*), but this is surely as bitterly ironic as Aristophanes' three cuckoos (*Ach*. 598). *Felicitas* has a moral dimension, while true

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

glory, though not moral, is closely linked with *virtus*. AM is yet again more pessimistic than Tacitus, who speaks of glory more often and much less critically.

AM is also less materialistic than Tacitus in his usage of *liberalitas*, which may refer to hospitality or liberal studies. *Parsimonia* too is not pecuniary. (25.4.17 on Julian's sacrifices is surely an ironic echo of the frequent use of *sine parsimonia* of slaughter in battle.) *Parcus* and cognates are used positively of moderation in eating and drinking. AM is more interested (though less so than Tacitus) in manifestations of greed and the desire for the property of others.

In conclusion B. reiterates that AM is far less concerned than Tacitus with the private and social worlds of his characters. The most important political touchstone is *salus communis* / *utilitas publica*. In military matters courage, caution, prudence, and *fides* rank highest; in the civil sphere *clementia* and *lenitas*. On the negative side, *fastus*, *tumor*, *crudelitas*, *acerbitas*, and *asperitas* bulk grimly large. Justice and equity are set against licence and greed. In the end AM's outlook is consistently moral: B.'s quotation of 20.8.8 is most apposite.

This is a book to quarry rather than to read, and B.'s methodical presentation makes quarrying easy. There are many convincing interpretations of individual passages, while B.'s work as a whole greatly advances our understanding of AM's purposes, preoccupations, and individuality.

Liverpool ROBIN SEAGER

ROMAN HISTORIANS

R. MELLOR: *The Historians of Ancient Rome. An Anthology of the Major Writings*. Pp. ix + 534. New York and London: Routledge, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 0-415-91268-7.

R. MELLOR: *The Roman Historians*. Pp. x + 212. New York and London: Routledge, 1999. Paper, £12.99. ISBN: 0-415-11774-7.

Teaching Roman historians is difficult. Long prose narratives are hard to relate to the close study of their intellectual and literary context, and do not readily yield up exciting critical strategies. So how will these two new textbooks from Ronald Mellor facilitate our task? One is a source book, the other a discursive introduction. Although they make no reference to each other, not even in bibliographies, they are clearly part of the same productive impulse, and while each volume has its virtues, they can reasonably be said to share faults. *The Roman Historians* is an easily read, generally reliable, and reasonably detailed introduction to the field, aimed at the general reader. It contains a short chapter on the origins of Roman historiography; Sallust, Livy, Tacitus, and Ammianus all have a chapter to themselves, while Caesar, Augustus' *Res Gestae*, Suetonius, and the *Historia Augusta* are explored along with other material in chapters on Roman Biography and Autobiography. Except in the chapter on Tacitus, where M.'s specialism leads to some incisive and memorable comments ('moral physiognomy is more important than baldness . . .' p. 102), the tone is in general one of lively exposition of the basics. The cultural context is firmly drawn, and the characterizations of each author are well judged and clearly presented. There are, however, no footnotes, and a number of questionable generalizations which would make me hesitate to recommend it to undergraduates. So, on p. 60 we read 'The Romans considered history to be a branch of rhetoric',

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which, even though part of a clearly argued account of the relationship between history and rhetoric which runs through the whole book, is nonetheless misleading as it stands. Likewise Lucian is periodically brought in as an authority on historiography, with no mention of the fact that, although writing in Greek, he comes from a world barely recognizable to the Hellenistic historians, let alone Herodotus, and has his own unique perceptions of both how to write history and how to write about it. Of a book of this kind, however, one must not only assess the potential damage, but also ask how well equipped newly informed readers will be for their own encounter with the Roman Historians. My main objection to M.'s approach is his lack of explicit discussion of how to read these writers. Instead we find an implicit set of critical criteria, applied without comment, that effectively assimilate these historians to the opinion-formers of the pre-war schoolroom. Petronius' death is 'worthy of an Oscar Wilde' (p. 97); the speech before a battle, whether in Homer, *Henry V*, or 'Lawrence of Arabia', 'convey[s] a psychological truth of the motivation that leads men to risk their lives in battle' (p. 189); 'Livy was not, and did not want to be considered, a court historian' (p. 71). These are transhistorical interpretations which do nothing to encourage the reader to come to terms with the text at first hand. There are also curious categorizations. A section entitled 'Livy as historian' turns out to be a potted history of reception from Machiavelli to Quintilian via Caligula, with an excursus on how archaeological finds have recently vindicated Livy's account of Tarquin's Rome. Although not dangerous to the informed reader, it does suggest a rather casual sense of how best to introduce the field to new ones. The book clearly communicates its author's learning and love of its subject, but it does not make it easy for someone with a different set of enthusiasms to imagine how Roman historiography might come alive for them.

M. has also edited an anthology of translations, with the explicit aim of providing a cheap one-volume collection for students of Roman History, as well as satisfying the needs of 'a growing interest in ancient history among the general population'. The translations, each preceded by a short introduction, are mostly reprints of works no longer under copyright. Extracts from Appian, Sallust, Suetonius, and the newly named 'Writers of Augustan History' are from Loeb editions. Tacitus is from Church and Brodribb's 1886 translation, reprinted unchanged; Polybius is a little older. Superannuated versions of Livy and Caesar have been adapted; M. has translated Augustus' *Res Gestae* himself. The initial introduction gives a brief account of the evolution of Roman historiography, places the writers included in their historical context, and under two headings, introduces students to the issues which have exercised modern historiographers: 'The Historian's Craft' and 'The Historian as Artist'. There is no comment on the problems of translation, and more seriously, nothing at all about the criteria of selection. Since any anthology is bound to invite criticism both for its omissions and its inclusions, such silence can only be interpreted in two ways. Either M. does not care to justify his selection and provide a statement of intentions which can be scrutinized by his colleagues, or he views the process of selection as so unproblematic that it requires no self-awareness and hence no comment. To judge from the humane tone of his writing, I have imagined that the latter is the case. As in his *The Roman Historians*, one does not have to look far to find the ramifications of this absence of self-scrutiny. The extract from Polybius VI, for example, omits the description of funeral rites and ancestor masks which makes it indispensable for anyone interested in how the Romans treated the past. On the question of proportion, Livy is represented by over 200 pages, while Tacitus merits slightly less than 100. If the reason is that Livy originally wrote so much, then one must assume that the aim of the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

anthology is to give a representative sample of each author. But these extracts are all short, most only a few chapters, so that readers have no opportunity for working independently on the authors. As an example, take the omission of Livy 1.50–5. The opening section of Tarquinius Superbus' reign, including the episode of Sextus at Gabii, falls into this lacuna. Even for general readers, the recurrence of a Herodotean narrative will be of interest, to say nothing of the antecedents to the Lucretia episode, which are here elided. In like manner, Tacitus, *Annals* 1.1–15 is followed by 1.33–53. Although it is plausible to argue that there is a natural break at 15, those who wish to judge Tacitus' organization for themselves are denied that opportunity.

'. . . I hope this book will provide a handy collection of what the Romans (and a few Greeks) themselves say over six hundred years about Roman history' (Preface). Roman historiography is a form of self-reflection, and simply to read what was written about the past is important, but it is hard to imagine a place in the curriculum for what is either a source-book for the whole of Roman history that has no Cicero, and no cross-referencing by date or place, or what is an arbitrary and incomplete representation of any part of the work of most of its authors. Routledge has, in bringing out these two volumes, found a hole in the market and filled it. In so doing, I fear it may prevent more ambitious work from finding a publisher. This would be a shame, since these volumes, while adequate to the opaque aims they seem to set themselves, still leave room for a basic presentation of Roman historiography that would encourage students to look for problems and to innovate.

University of Birmingham MATTHEW FOX

AUGUSTINE'S VIRGIL

S. MacCormack: *The Shadows of Poetry. Vergil in the Mind of Augustine*. Pp. xx + 258, 16 ills. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1998. Cased, £30. ISBN: 0-520-21187-1.

Everyone is familiar with Augustine's recollection in the *Confessions* of how he wept for the death of Dido as a benighted boy who did not realize that he should really have wept for the spiritual death of his own falling away from God, absorbed as he was in the wanderings of Aeneas and oblivious to his own *errores*. MacCormack follows Augustine's subsequent intellectual and spiritual journey in order to see how far the pagan poet accompanied the Christian bishop as a travelling companion. Not surprisingly, perhaps, Virgil turns out to be a constant point of reference, partly because an engagement with a poet elevated to something of the status of pagan saint was inevitable in Augustine's dialogues with his pagan audiences, but just as importantly because Virgil's poems were a deeply embedded part of his own mental furniture, and good to think with in engaging with a variety of problems. However, the claim (p. xv) that Augustine 'was undoubtedly Vergil's most intelligent and searching ancient reader' might provoke students of, say, Ovid or Lucan.

Augustine's references to Virgil are widely scattered (the basic collection of materials, on which M. bases her own interpretations, is K. H. Schelkle, *Virgil in der Deutung Augustins* [1939]), and M. organizes the book not according to groupings of Virgilian themes, but in the framework of major topics within Augustine's own thought: grammar and linguistics (Chapter II), psychology and the relation of soul to body (Chapter III), the nature of the pagan gods (Chapter IV), and the earthly and heavenly cities (Chapter V). The result is a book that is more a densely annotated

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

introduction to some basic aspects of Augustine's thought, with recurrent reference to Virgil where relevant, than a monograph on Augustine's dealings with Virgil; at times Virgil occupies a rather marginal or tangential place in the discussion.

The other major principle of organization is a recursive narrative that tells of Augustine's falling away from a carefree intercourse with the poet's works to a sterner view of the need to put pagan poetry and learning in its place. Cassiciacum in the autumn of 387, shortly after his conversion, is the transient pastoral pleasance where Augustine and friends can relax in the company of pagan writers, before the journey into the serious world of Christian politics and education.

The first chapter sets the scene with a brief 'life and works' of Virgil, aimed, one imagines, at students of late antiquity who have not spent much time with the poet, and with a selective survey of the later imperial and early Christian reception of Virgil, dwelling particularly on the fortunes of the fourth *Eclogue* and on the accommodations made with a poet poised uneasily between Christian truth and error. M. argues for a 'rupture of continuity' between the late antique pagan understanding of Virgil, open to the wider contexts and ambivalences of the texts, and a Christian reuse of Virgilian fragments in radically different structures. This perceived gap is partly the effect of comparing Christian doctrinal writings with the Virgilian commentary tradition: in other pagan genres Virgil had been exposed to reappropriations from his own lifetime; and M. risks over-generosity in her assessment of the unbiased openness of a Servius or Macrobius to the meanings of Virgil. She scarcely succeeds in demonstrating a pagan alertness to the ambivalences of Virgil. Interestingly, in a fascinating later discussion of Augustine's polemical engagement with the Virgilian view of a providential Roman history M. comes close to arguing that the Christian adopts a 'Harvard School' reading of the Parade of Heroes (p. 197 '. . . as Augustine correctly perceived, Vergil had described the glorious future that Aeneas beheld as being unthinkable without a heavy human cost.').

In Chapter II M. traces Augustine's movement from the topics of Varronian grammar and etymology to a science of signs and signification, and his diversion of the pagan encyclopaedia from the exegesis of Virgil to the interpretation of the Bible for an increasingly autonomous Christian speech community, in works such as the *De Doctrina Christiana.* The chapter concludes with an extended comparison and contrast of the Augustinian project with Macrobius' celebratory exegesis of Virgil in the *Saturnalia*, leaving it open, however, whether Macrobius self-consciously elevates Virgil to the position of a universal text to rival the Bible. Chapter III follows the development of Augustine's thinking on the relationship between soul and body, from the Stoic account of the passions, as transmitted by Cicero, to the fully developed Augustinian theory of the will, and to a non-Platonic view of the inseparability of body and soul. Questions and formulations about the nature and fate of the soul in *Aeneid* 6 are shown to trigger searching movements in Augustine's own thought.

As a schoolboy Augustine won a prize for an exercise speech expressing Juno's anger against the Trojans; at Cassiciacum he indulged in light-hearted allegorizations of the Virgilian gods. But he was soon engaged in the serious business of attacking pagan religion, reducing its gods to the status of fantasies, demons, or mortals euhemeristically accorded divine status. This was given new urgency after the Sack of Rome, for which Christians could be held responsible because of their neglect of the pagan gods. In the *City of God* 'Augustine treated Vergil as a tone-giving spokesman both for ancient Roman values and for the gods of the Roman state' (p. 159)—but perhaps not much more. A more thorough engagement with Virgil emerges only in the final chapter: Virgil's poetic elaboration of Roman history as *the* providential history is

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

put in perspective, both as being only a part of Augustine's longer view of the history of the earthly city, and as an imperfect and discordant history, in contrast to the destiny of the heavenly city. In a sermon Augustine unmasks Jupiter's promise of 'empire without end' (*Aen*. 1.279) as mere rhetoric (p. 190), put in the mouth of a fictional god, coming curiously close to some recent relativizations of Jupiter's long speech of prophecy. Augustine, M. reminds us, was no Roman himself.

New Hall, Cambridge PHILIP HARDIE

POETIC FICTION

MARGALIT FINKLELBERG: *The Birth of Literary Fiction in Ancient Greece*. Pp. xi + 222. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-19-815095-4.

This brilliant book charts the sea-change in Greek poetics between Homer and Aristotle, which emancipated the poet from divine inspiration and made his own art the source of his creation. Poetry could then be judged by its artistic effect, not by its truth-status, thus granting space to what we now conceptualize as fiction. This transition was a long process, with Plato and Aristophanes marking a cusp when the two poetics were more or less in balance.

Most of F.'s pages are devoted to analysis of Homeric theory and praxis. She begins by investigating the place of poetry within Homeric categories of human activity, the fundamental distinction being between 'given' actions, for which the agent is not responsible, and 'taught' actions, characterized by acquired knowledge, for which he is. In the epics, the poetic act is invariably motivated in a non-responsible way (i.e. inspired), but poetry overall is represented as a complex activity, with components in both categories: the singer is responsible for *οἶμη*, a basic unit of subject-matter which he must know and reproduce, but not for *ἀοιδή*, the act of improvised elaboration in performance, with which the Muses supply his ignorance. The singer thus has no creative freedom, and even the Muse is not the creator of song, but an authoritative eyewitness to the events narrated. Everything in the Homeric epics is invested with truth-status. The principle determining which events to perpetuate in song is basically one of historical importance. Although poetic performances are incidentally attended by pleasure, the function of poetry in general is to transmit historical information truthfully. However, although Homer never treats poetry as a craft, his representation of artefacts already implies an alternative creative paradigm of *τέχνη* producing objects with an autonomous reality, typically rather than specifically imitative, so foreshadowing Aristotle's view of poetry as a vehicle for general truths. Aristotle's concept of organic literary form presupposes that art can mould reality according to its own rules, whereas the characteristic form of traditional epic is an artlessly paratactic, chronologically ordered catalogue of events, a model embodied in Homeric formulae, where phrases like *κατὰ κόσμον* or *κατὰ μοῖραν* substitute for *ἀληθείην*. This conclusion is not too far away from that of the oralists, but F. follows it up with the intriguing possibility that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* do not in fact obey their own implicit poetics, but actively pursue organic form and artful effect, even to the extent of inventing new but generically plausible episodes. This radical shift to 'plausible fiction' is implicitly recognized in the *Odyssey* (4.235 ff.) when the formula *ἀληθείην καταλέξω* is unnecessarily subverted to *ἐοικότα γὰρ καταλέξω*. Hesiod (*Theog*. 27f.)

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

programmatically takes up the phrase *ψεύδεα . . . ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα* (from *Od.* 19.203) as a criticism of Homeric innovations which were transforming truthful heroic sagas into 'meta-epics'.

The final chapter traces a growing awareness of the poet's creative rôle, culminating in the fifth century, when *ποιεῖν* tellingly replaces *ἀείδειν* as the standard term for poetic creation. The sophists recognized artistic illusion as the source of poetic pleasure, and the idea of *μίμησις*, applied to dramatic impersonation, can be read as the first attempt to disentangle poetic fiction from the truth/lie axis. Aristotle's *Poetics* marks the final recognition of fiction as potentially of greater cognitive value than reality. A brief epilogue notes that nineteenth-century Romanticism re-introduced the idea of inspiration as the source of supreme authenticity in art, and ends with an unexpected plea for an Aristotelian reintegration of 'high' and 'popular' cultures.

F. choreographs her arguments with the intricate grace of classical ballet. Whatever one makes of its contents, her book is a salutary reminder of the beauty of rational critical discourse, and should be handed to every graduate student as an example of how to present a complex argument with perfect clarity. As for the contents, I think the book is slightly flawed by its positivism. To cast the confrontation of two irreconcilable poetics as a narrative of a clean cultural transition is altogether too neat and Whiggish. One wants to ask whether the Homeric apparatus of inspiration was meant literally or was a generically coded device for authentication, whether the first-order epic ever really existed except as a construct against which all specific realizations played. Above all I distrust the central assumption that there ever was such a thing as 'Homeric poetics', unified, consistent, systematic, and recoverable by taking the Homeric texts at their face value. In pursuit of this F. is driven to formulate important generalizations on minute and not necessarily representative samples. To give just one example, the sentence 'in all contexts, without exception, the Muses' gift to the poet is designated by the term *ἀοιδή*' (p. 52) is supported by just three lines, all from the same book of the *Odyssey*. F.'s desire to extrapolate a completely consistent poetics occasionally reduces itself to circular arguments and forced readings. To maintain the polarity between 'taught' and 'given', for instance, she adopts a perverse interpretation of *Od.* 22.345ff., which equates *αὐτοδίδακτος* with 'given' and *θεὸς . . . ἐνέφυσεν* with 'taught' (pp. 54–6). The truth surely is that the epic view of poetic creation was ragged, not to say incoherent, at the margins. Another difficulty arises with the identification of Homeric plausible fiction with Hesiod's 'lies like truth' (pp. 151ff.), which founders on F.'s own demonstration that 'fiction' is fundamentally unlike truth in the very form of its discourse. Nor am I convinced by F.'s treatment of Aristotle, which reduces him from an importantly innovative thinker to a formulator of already prevalent ideas. These objections notwithstanding, the intellectual power of her narrative, itself an Aristotelian fiction shorn of awkward contingencies, is compelling. Although the evidence is more duplicitous than she is inclined to allow, her picture is surely correct in its broad strokes. The issues raised by F.'s meticulous scholarship resonate in our own culture, dominated as it is by fiction. As so often, the Greeks can help us to get a purchase on an urgent aspect of our own world.

University of Wales Swansea J. R. MORGAN

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

VITAE

M. J. EDWARDS, S. SWAIN (edd.): *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire.* Pp. vii + 267. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-19-814937-9.

Those involved in the study of the canonical ancient historians have been aware for a while of the strong emphasis upon the life and achievements of individual men in the production of historical narratives, on the overlap between biography, memoir, and history, but there has been little work which directly addresses this theme. This collection of essays, admirably introduced by Simon Swain's survey of 'Biography and Biographic in the Literature of the Roman Empire', takes its task seriously and, though the result is idiosyncratic and inconsistent, this is not due to negligence so much as to a failure to realize the potential of the topic. It is true, however, that the editors, by their repeated defensiveness about the comprehensiveness of this volume, do invite the reader to equate comprehensiveness with success, or at any rate, fail to make a convincing case for the merits of this particular collection of papers. The essays derive from a term's seminars at Oxford, and no new contributions have been added to smooth out the unevenness of coverage. Editorial intervention has been deliberately kept to a minimum, and the individual essays are to be read, we are told, as stimuli to further work. Swain's does go some way to providing a framework within which the wide range of topics which follow can be understood, but it is a grand narrative that is likely to promote dispute as much as consensus. A unifying impulse would perhaps have been better served by insisting that individual contributors spend more time explicitly addressing the general themes of the volume. Instead they seem to have been subject to no restrictions, so that the articles lack the taughtness of journal contributions, while being only tangentially linked by topic. A vital opportunity for methodological innovation has been missed here. The individual contributions are written by leading figures in their own fields, who could surely bear the burden of generalizing. But more importantly, if we live in an age when generalizations are regarded with suspicion, a case does need to be made for a more refined understanding of the relationship between general and particular, and if this volume makes that case, it does so only in a most unexplicit manner. I agree with Edwards's closing comments that the formal genre of biography cannot act as a unifying force for such an exploration; the idea that genres themselves generate writing is being replaced by more fluid models of literary production. But if the individual studies themselves are to be seen as more than elegant case studies linked by an insubstantial thread, larger questions about the way in which we categorize our objects of study need to be posed, and the conventional way in which all these essays except Swain's focus on one author or text means that these larger questions are answered only by somewhat defensive editorial comments.

Nevertheless there is much remarkable erudition, much magisterial argument, much subtle analysis in the contributions to this volume, and given the list of eminent contributors, this is no surprise. Tessa Rajak writes on Jewish martyrs, relating the apocryphal Maccabees IV both to its Jewish and Hellenistic roots. Mark Edwards on Simon Magus from Acts occasionally struggles unnecessarily over issues of truth and fiction, but elegantly evaluates the ideological function of his hero as an Antichrist. Leofranc Holford-Strevens, on Gellius' technique of portraiture, sets up an entertaining distinction between visual and non-visual portraiture, which, although clearly

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

extraneous to the texts discussed, is used as a springboard for an eclectic exploration of his author's reading and techniques. Christopher Pelling, on Dio's account of the Early Principate, provides perhaps the most universally applicable methodology in the whole collection by articulating a principle of 'biostructuring' that could be applied to other historical narratives. Averil Cameron on Constantine and Robin Lane Fox on Daniel the Stylite both produce an imposing blend of scholarly specificity with energetic narrative to locate their chosen texts firmly within their historical settings, and in doing so once again shake the assumptions which underlie our current curricular canon. So diverse a selection of topics naturally works against coherence. One searches in vain for general insights into how the understanding of the meaning of the individual's life transformed itself into the written record. By focusing so closely on their chosen pieces of text, all of the essays perceive the issue of how each text was generated in terms primarily of literary forerunners. It is these that provide the language, terms of evaluation, and structural framework for the particular piece of biographical writing. The chosen text is evaluated for its development of its heritage, and that development is explored by looking at other contemporary texts, seen in their turn as evidence of the external world acting upon the particular author. This generates what the contributors are striving for: refined and penetrating accounts of their authors. It is left to the editors to impose a sense of common purpose, while simultaneously refuting the need to do so. Edwards's *Epilogue* foists on the reader a somewhat arbitrary view of what the proper remit of 'the biographical in literature' should be. This amounts to a polemic with R. A. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels?* (Cambridge, 1992); a caution not to treat this volume as an attempt to exhaust its subject (as if there were no difference between attempting to exhaust and aspiring to be even vaguely comprehensive); and finally a dismantling of the model which he himself has just assembled, of biography as a distinct genre with a definable influence, a model which, judging from the preceding essays, has little appeal to current scholars.

If I dwell on the matter of coherence, it is because the riches of this collection have been left latent by the failure to present them together. But important general insights do lie waiting to be discovered. One interesting feature of these essays is their particular negotiation of the relationship of literature to history. Outside Swain's introduction, there is little discussion of methodology, and his appeals to a rather churned Foucault are met in what follows by a distinctly un-Foucauldian polarity between historian and text. For Cameron, Lane Fox, and Edwards, slightly more than for Pelling and Rajak, explaining the sources for and political pressures on a text involves a clear demarcation between text and context, even if, like Cameron and Edwards, the result is to turn away from problems of historical reliability. Pelling, because of his clear historiographical interests, and Rajak, treating an undatable and probably multi-authored text, invite, albeit covertly, a less hierarchical view of the priorities of textual analysis. Perhaps here is the greatest potential for future research in this area. If the narrative of lives becomes the place where even distinctions between text and world fail, and where generic and narrative structures are likewise subject to endless variety, then 'the biographic' could be employed as a category for describing something that has often escaped the scholar: that commonplace attempt to entrap the spectre of subjectivity by writing, and in the process make it less spectral. Any idea of how human life should be described is bound to be as mutable as that life itself, but if ancient literature persists in using the individual character as a focus for competing versions of what a life ought to be in a moral sense, and ought to look like in a formal or aesthetic sense, then continuing the investigation along these lines will tell us more about how self-image, a vision of the social, and textual production work together.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There are many moments when these accomplished essays do in effect provide such an analysis, but the volume as a whole seems unclear about its own potential and virtues.

University of Birmingham MATTHEW FOX

THE HELLENISTIC THEATRE

B. Le Guen (ed.): *De la scène aux gradins. Théâtre et représentations dramatiques après Alexandre le Grand* (*Pallas*, Revue d'Études Antiques). Pp. xviii + 281, 62 ills. Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail, 1998. Paper, frs. 130. ISBN: 2-85816-342-1.

The subject of this volume is one in which there have long been few ideas, all of them received and quite firmly fixed. The editor has done much here and elsewhere to demonstrate that what the Hellenistic theatre lacks by comparison with its more admired and obsessively scrutinized classical predecessor in terms of preserved texts it makes up for with a wealth of under-studied historiographical, archaeological, and epigraphical material. Once the immobilizing paradigm of post-classical decline is sloughed off, this material reveals an immensely vibrant and rapidly developing institution across vast stretches of space and time. Historians of any colour need to take more account of the place the theatre occupied in this period, for its proximity to the centres of power—regal, civic and imperial—shows that it was very much more than a cultural fossil or diversion for the depoliticized.

The contributions are grouped in four parts: 'I: L'éspace scénique', 'II: Les acteurs de la vie théâtrale', 'III: Le repertoire dramatique et son traitement', and 'IV: Le sens du théâtre à l'époque héllenistique'. In I, the centres of debate are the stage used by the south-Italian *phlyakes* and the *proskenion.* Pöhlmann begins with a brief survey of the conditions of the post-classical theatre. Some will find the optimism excessive with which he goes on to calculate, from the vase-images, the physical specifications of the 'mobile stage' used in Magna Graecia (at *c.* 6 × 2 m); and his conclusion that no drama requiring a scene change could have been played on it improbable (not least because of the evident popularity of iconography plausibly interpreted as inspired by the *Eumenides*).

From his meticulous study of the *proskenion*, Moretti argues that its invention should be credited to the north-east Peloponnese (Epidauros being the first example and possibly the innovator), thus dissociating its appearance from the needs of Athenian New Comedy. He argues that the painting of the movable panels (*pinakes*) often accommodated between its intercolumniations was 'artisanal' (p. 22) rather than 'artistic'. A Hellenistic stage, then, with no illusionistic scene-painting; and with its actors performing in the 'orkhestral' space immediately in front of the *proskenion.* Moretti downplays the notion that there was a major rupture in theatrical space between the Classical and Hellenistic periods, a conclusion with ramifications for the familiar story of the shift to an emphasis on 'private' space and the domestic world.

Dumont tackles the venerable question of the 'Greekness' of the early Roman theatre, depriving it of one of the few authentically Roman contributions usually credited to it—the musical variety of its *cantica.* His stress on the continuity between Greek and Latin practice is welcome. However, in trying to explain the absence of a *khoros* from the Roman theatre he sets too much weight on the decision to have

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

front-row seats in the 'orkhestra' for senators and other dignitaries (a decision whose ideological ramifications are, however, well noted).

Part II includes two exemplary explications of 'terminological' issues with important implications. Anezieri shows how among the *Tekhnitai*, *synagonistes* refers to all those who 'helped compete for' the prize but were not themselves recipients of prizes (trainers, khoreuts, costumers, and so on). And, further, how these 'support artists' so developed a consciousness of their position and special needs as to form autonomous Unions of their own. Slater's close study of the changing terminology for the directors of *khoroi* throws a little more light on the elusive Hellenistic *khoros*. (The *hegemon* scrutinized by Slater turns out to be a hybrid lead singer and director.)

Le Guen untangles the complex status of a less well-known Union of *Tekhnitai* based in Pergamon, producing another nice example of *Tekhnitai* engaged in delicate acts of 'international relations' as well as celebratory performances for the powerful. Scheithauer studies theatrical *auletai*, a neglected group of performers about whom sufficient information exists to make meaningful sociological analysis possible, thanks to the magnificent work of I. Stephanis, *ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΑΚΟΙ ΤΕΧΝΙΤΑΙ* (Herakleion, 1988)—a book of whose prosopographical riches this volume is among the first to make extensive use. Scheithauer demonstrates how the theatrical musician, generally drawn from the lower socio-economic ranks of society, was a real beneficiary of the spread and increased professionalism of the Hellenistic theatre. To her useful appendix assembling the evidence for the date, name, provenance, parentage, and specialisms of *auletai* should now be added the Epigonos of Aigina who played for a dithyrambic *khoros* in Athens *c.* 350 (*SEG* 44, no. 129).

In Part III, Green has a brief but suggestive attempt to elucidate the acting styles of New Comedy—in particular, to ask whether there existed a style that might have been deemed 'naturalistic' in its own context. This throws up some interesting hypotheses: that the fatness of comic slaves was a sign of their non-civic status rather than a reflection of reality, for instance—a point that meshes with one of the conclusions of Boussac's survey of material probably unfamiliar to many students of ancient theatre. These are the large deposits of seals from Delos engraved with theatre-related images. In this impressive body of yet more evidence for the attachment to their theatre of the Hellenistic Greeks, comic images outnumber tragic by a factor of ten. The owners of the seals were by and large members of the trading community rather than a social élite, and it is striking that images of comic slaves are especially favoured. No doubt this is because '[l]'esclave incarne à lui seul la Comédie' (p. 154), but the possession and use of a seal with such an image may also imply some form of personal identification. Csapo presents a highly cogent interpretation of the intriguing Menander mosaics of the third or fourth century C.E. These images from a wealthy Mytilinean's triclinium are normally studied for the light they might throw on lost scenes of Menander, but Csapo argues that they are signs of prestige signifying the cultural aspirations of their owner, and quite disconnected from any living theatrical tradition. The fact that they echo older representations implies not a continuity of theatrical life (if that had existed one would expect more change) but rather a frozen transmission through a purely iconographic tradition.

The final part has a broad ambit: Handley offers an elegant discussion of 'New Comedy and its Public' which scans the long horizon of the genre's success for roughly a millenium and demonstrates the massive range of evidence for this success. Perrin's discussion of the continued importance of the theatre in Athens in the last three centuries B.C.E. does much to dispel the traditional image of decline. The stress is on continued dynamism (best seen in the care lavished on organization and

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

infrastructure) and on interaction with the political realm, in an age where we can best see the use of the theatre as part of an ambitious 'politique culturelle' (p. 201). That the Dionysia's contest of *new* tragedies remained the most prestigious throughout this period is a tantalizing sign that Athens was far from regarding its dramatic patrimony as its only cultural commodity. Lastly (barring a summation by Carrière), Chaniotis has an excellent and lavishly documented discussion of 'theatricality beyond the theater'—of the way drama, especially tragic drama, was so embedded in Hellenistic culture as to have become a natural means of expressing the vicissitudes of life beyond the theatre, and further of actually 'staging' important moments of public life. (Particularly memorable—partly because it broke down at the crucial moment—is the theatrical machinery designed by the Pergamenes to send a statue of Nike swooping down over Mithridates to place a crown on his head in 88 B.C.E.) The phenomenon is not one of 'literary convention', but emerges from a complex set of historical circumstances. Among these Chaniotis rightly stresses the increased importance of the skills of the actor to the politician, though he might have looked closer at the late classical context, where the careers of actors and politicians had also begun to overlap. This would have saved him from suggesting that acting and public oratory had to be demarcated to some extent 'in order to protect the public figure from the actors' bad reputation' (p. 227). 'Bad reputation' needs substantial qualification: unlike his Roman counterpart, the status of the actor in Greece is much less easily attacked (see now P. Easterling, 'Actors and Voices: Reading between the Lines in Aeschines and Demosthenes', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (edd.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* [Cambridge, 1999], pp. 154–66).

Though some of these essays might seem to deal in minutiae, they all contribute to the big picture of this subject we are much in need of seeing sketched.

Warwick University PETER WILSON

MYTH AND ETHNICITY

I. MALKIN: *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity.* Pp. xiii + 331, 6 maps. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1998. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0520-21185-5.

In this interesting and stimulating monograph, Malkin discusses the rôle of myth in history by considering the ways in which the myths of the Homeric *nostoi* were used by both Greeks and non-Greeks to make sense of their world and the peoples encountered within it. Focusing for the most part (although not exclusively) on what he terms the protocolonial period of the ninth and eighth centuries B.C., M. argues that the Greeks had the *nostoi* and their alternatives and sequels 'in their heads', using them to articulate their maritime journeys into the West, and to mediate the Greeks' contacts with non-Greeks and those who lived on the edges of the Greek world.

The early sections, which look specifically at the myth of Odysseus, are the most successful. Here M. discusses the ways in which the Greeks used the myth of Odysseus' return as told in the *Odyssey* to understand their own travels into the unknown and back again. M. argues that Odysseus fulfilled the function of a 'pan-Hellenic protocolonial hero', not least because for the Greeks Odysseus' island of Ithaca marked the end of the known and the beginning of the unknown. Early maritime wanderers (especially the Euboeans and Corinthians), who were exploring and trading

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in the Mediterranean before the colonization movement began, played out the myth by going and returning, marking the transition between the two worlds, just as Odysseus did, by stopping at Ithaca and making aristocratic dedications of tripods in Polis Bay.

Much of the rest of the book deals with the alternatives and sequels to the story of the *Odyssey* (although, as M. points out, they are sequels only in that they explain what comes next, not that they were composed later), and of the *nostoi* of other Homeric heroes. While in the *Odyssey* Odysseus travels to places which are 'monstrous and mythological', M. compares this to the other returns of Odysseus and the heroes whose 'dimensions are human and topographical', 'implying the familiarity of direct contact and absorption by native leaders or populations . . .'. In this real world, myth still serves the purpose of providing a frame of reference, but now in a more direct way, by providing a means of ethnically and geographically contextualizing the people with whom the Greeks came into peripheral (rather than direct) contact. For example, with Ithaca again as the central point of reference, M. argues that Thesprotia in the *Odyssey* (in Odysseus' lying alternative *nostos*) and Elis in the *Telegony* and the *Odyssey* seem 'to indicate both an allusion of the *Odyssey* to its sequels and alternatives and a reflection of Ithaca's multiple real-world connections with its various mainlands (Epirus and the Peloponnese)'.

M. then goes on to look at how the myths of Odysseus allowed the Greeks to mediate relations with the non-Greek Etruscans and dubiously Greek Epirotes by fitting them into their heroic genealogy and making Odysseus their ethnic progenitor. These myths were then internalized by their subjects: the Etruscans, for their part, M. claims, used them as a way of explaining their own 'colonial' contacts, while the Epirotes adopted them in order to negotiate local rivalries and hierarchies among communities.

In the final two chapters, M. turns to the *nostoi* of other heroes. In Chapter VII, he looks at how the *nostoi* of Nestor, Epeius, Philoctetes, and the Trojan Siris were used to play out 'inter-Greek' rivalries in Greek colonies in Italy. Chapter VIII, on the other hand, deals with and tries to make sense of the vast number of stories concerned with Diomedes. M. concludes that it is not possible to find a single answer to the question of his widespread diffusion, but claims that he fulfilled different functions at different times: an articulation of 'a maritime perspective and initial contacts with local populations'; a cultic response to 'new dangers from new "Italian" populations'; and a justification for the territorial expansion of Dionysius I.

The argument of this book is complex, wide-ranging, often perceptive, and worked out in considerable detail. Yet, while the broader points are generally persuasive and M. has finessed the conceptual framework of the discussion of ethnicity in the ancient world (particularly in the more nuanced view he provides of the 'Other'), the argumentation of finer points sometimes lacks the sensitivity towards the sources which M. shows for the myths themselves, and one sometimes feels M. finds the solutions he wants to find. The analysis of the alternative and non-Odyssean *nostoi* also lacks the energy of earlier chapters, and sometimes seems a little crude as M. sees (despite disclaimers) alarmingly direct correspondences between mythical and real-world encounters. Nevertheless, the final chapter on Diomedes, although in no sense a conclusion (which, the conclusions at the end of individual chapters notwithstanding, one feels one needs in order to draw the threads of this vast book back together), does return to some of the main themes, contrasting Diomedes and his mythical uses with that of Odysseus, and show how Diomedes opened the way for the Romans to use Greek myth for their own expansionist purposes.

Certainly provocative and often controversial, M.'s analysis of the *nostoi* and their

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

place in history is important for those wishing to understand not only myth in history, but also the thought-world of the early Greeks, and their conceptualization of the people and places they happened upon in their travels.

University of Exeter LYNETTE G. MITCHELL

THE COMMON PURSUIT

C. WATKINS: *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. Pp. xii + 613. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-508595-7.

Calvert Watkins's thesis is that the method by which Indo-European vocabulary and grammar have been reconstructed from the evidence of surviving languages can be applied to poetics as well. In fifty-nine chapters analyzing texts from Sanskrit and Hittite to modern English, W. elicits a variety of stylistic techniques that are, in his view, specific to the Indo-European tradition. The English round, 'oats, peas, beans, and barley grow', for example, is revealed to be 'a masterpiece of the Indo-European poet's formulaic verbal art' (p. 47), related, however distantly, to the Hittite expression for 'barley (and) spelt'. So too 'merisms', or combinations of words which, taken together, indicate a totality (e.g. 'land and sea' = 'world', or 'grain and grape' = 'food', as in Cato's lustration of the fields) are an Indo-European inheritance (p. 209).

Among the devices that W. considers particularly salient to Indo-European poetics are ring-composition, alliteration, stereotyped word order, and complex paronomasia. In the proem of Hesiod's *Works and Days*, for example, we read that Zeus *rhea men gar briaei, rhea de briaonta khaleptei* (v. 5). The two uses of *briao* constitute a rhetorical pair, like *aphatoi te phatoi te* in v. 3, but of a special kind, involving 'the antithesis of transitivity and intransitivity in what is taken to be the same verb' (p. 99); W. offers a Hittite parallel for this figure. In vv. 6–7, W. remarks on the chiasmus of *arizêlon minuthei* and *ithunei skolion*, each phrase punctuated by a caesura but with reversed verb/object order. But this is not all: 'The transposition of the order of the two pairs—separated by 10 syllables in the stream of speech—is indexed and thus perceptually cued for the listener by a phonetic figure in the two verbs: identical vowels (save for length) and identical but transposed consonants', i.e. mINUTHEI vs. ITHUNEI (p. 100). W. continues: 'The metaphorical opposition of "straight" and "crooked" and the antithetical metaphor in "straighten the crooked" probably belong to the realm of human universals.' But the more subtle wordplay across verses, integrated into a pattern that informs the entire proem, is, we understand, specific to the Greek and, more broadly, the Indo-European poetic tradition. So too, in the closing verse of the ten-line proem, Hesiod puns on etÊTUMA MUTHÊsaimên, 'an iconic palindrome of the elements TRUE and SPEAK' (p. 101), in which the final word also 'contains a Saussurian hypogram' of the opening word of the proem, MOUSAI (echoed by MuthêSAImên): once more, one supposes, a feature of Indo-European poetics.

I delight in these stylistic insights, and the crisp technical language with which W. identifies their features. W. provides hundreds of examples in numerous languages, always seeking, as in the 'anaphora of privative compounds' (e.g. *arrhêtôr athemistos anestios* in *Iliad* 9.63), cases where the 'figure can be securely posited for the poetic grammar of the protolanguage' (p. 113). A subtle example is the repetition of a verbal

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

form by a cognate noun and some other verb (p. 166), e.g. '(someone) loves' and 'love seizes one' (cf. Aeschylus fr. 44.1–2). Furthermore, stylistic devices at the level of the phrase combine to produce rhythmic effects that define what W. calls 'rhythmic prose' or 'strophic structure'. Here, again, similarities across Indo-European languages point to a coherence in compositional form that 'is not simply . . . based on universal characteristics of human speech', but points to a common inheritance (p. 264).

At the core of W.'s argument is the formula, an expression that survives in more or less fixed form. The formula is not just a stylized pattern. Rather, it contains lexical elements that preserve features of Indo-European ideology or culture. While this aspect of W.'s work is reminiscent of Benveniste's studies, W. focuses strictly on the embeddedness of ideological elements in their verbal setting: in W.'s comparative approach, poetic form and content are one and the same phenomenon.

By such means, W. recovers a ritual involving the public copulation of a royal couple (p. 276), although the evidence seems moot to me. But W.'s main paradigm is the hero who slays a monstrous serpent, which may represent chaos, death, or anything inimical to society. Again, W. is not concerned with the themes as such, but rather with 'their linguistic form' (p. 297), for it is in the diction that we can best identify the persistence of the pattern. The basic formula, according to W., is HERO SLAYS SERPENT (with WEAPON or with COMPANION, pp. 297–302). This formula may be reversed (serpent slays hero), made reciprocal (each slays the other, p. 325), the serpent may be replaced by an enemy of a different sort (e.g. an ANTI- HERO), all mortal parties may assume the form of gods, and so forth. The pattern, however, abides, and not only as a narrative vehicle. Rather, it is anchored in certain terms inherited from Indo-European which must, therefore, have been the original source of the formula. Thus, the word for SLAY (note the poetic register vs. prosaic KILL in modern English, p. 471), has as its archetype the Indo-European *$g^{u}hen$-, the root of Greek *pephne*, *phonos*, and *theinô*, and English 'bane'. Derivatives from this root turn up also in the Vedas, Avestan, and Hittite, in contexts which involve slaying a serpent or one of its surrogates. But the term itself is not decisive, and may be replaced by others with different Indo-European roots, e.g. **uedh*- (p. 330), or *$terh_2$- (p. 343), related, according to W., to English 'through', 'tar' in Greek *nektar* = 'surpassing death' (*nek*- ≈ Latin *nec*-), and Latin *tarentum* in the ancient formula preserved by Varro *LL* 6.23–4 and connected with the *Ludi Saeculares*. As W. explains: 'What is the ritual of the secular games for? The answer is furnished by Indo- European eschatology . . .: what is crossed over, overcome, is death' (p. 352).

In Greek, according to W., the term of art for slaying a monster is *pephne* and its variants (cf. *Iliad* 6.180, 183, 186, of Bellerophon and the Chimaera). This poetic verb is generally restricted to charged instances of slaughter (and to summations of such instances: pp. 472–4). Even when the verb itself does not appear (and there is no actual serpent to trigger the association), it may be summoned to mind by a nearby cognate like *phonios* or a termination like *-phontēs*. W. provides a large collection of examples with cunning interpretations. In Greek, as in other languages, the original Indo-European term may be replaced or 'renewed'. In the transformations of vocabulary and reference (hero or anti-hero, kind of weapon, etc.), however, the resemblances between different instances must be 'so numerous and so precise . . . that we must assume a common prototype' (p. 444).

I can no more than hint at the riches in this book, such as the suggestion that the lashing of Typhoeus (*himassas*, Hesiod *Theogony* 857) is a residue of the binding of the serpent in Hittite myth (pp. 452–5), or that the sequence HAIR, SKIN, FLESH,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

BONE, MARROW goes back to Indo-European (p. 534). Taken as a whole, however, what does this kaleidoscope of detail leave us with?

I am not remotely competent to evaluate the linguistic arguments. My interest is in what W.'s thesis implies for Greek and Latin poetics. To know that internal resonances and 'strophic' structures inform compositions in languages kindred to Greek and Latin helps us to identify archaic patterns that may be embedded in our texts. That these structures are uniquely characteristic of Indo-European traditions is beyond my ability to confirm; some seem to me to be present in Semitic and other traditions, but perhaps not in the requisite density in all branches to mark them as a common inheritance. While it is intriguing to speculate, with W., that *theinō* and its relatives represent vestiges of an age-old myth of dragon-slaying in the Polyphemus episode or the slaughter of the suitors in the *Odyssey*, or in a passage of Euripides' *Herakles*, we may wonder whether the Indo-European formula is any more relevant to understanding the poetry than is the ancestry of 'oats, peas, beans, and barley grow'. The flexibility of the basic formula, combined with free substitutions for key words, makes for a certain vagueness in the core conceit, which emerges only as a common denominator—if it is one—of the vast number of examples W. has accumulated. But the fun is just in the details.

Brown University DAVID KONSTAN

EASTWARD HO!

M. L. WEST: *The East Face of Helicon. West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Pp. xxvi + 662. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-19-815042-3.

This fascinating book examines the Near Eastern background to the literature of the ancient Greeks, a topic which has been studied before, but not with the comprehensiveness of the present work. In order to pursue it properly West immersed himself in the languages of the ancient Near East. In consequence of his wide reading of primary sources in Akkadian, Hebrew, Ugaritic, Hittite, and other languages, he is able to adduce a staggering body of evidence to illustrate the debt of Greek mythology and literature to the peoples of the east Meditenanean and beyond. Some of this evidence is a matter of parallels, some of it clear borrowings, and while it is not always absolutely certain that a given passage or expression is the one and not the other, the sheer quantity of data ultimately makes his point. No one can deny that there are real connections between the literary corpus in Greek and the often much older literatures of the Near East.

A review by a specialist in ancient Near Eastern languages will naturally be concerned with issues different from those that most absorb classical scholars. As an Assyriologist this reviewer has two main points of inquiry. One is whether W., a Hellenist, renders Akkadian faithfully and the second is how well he is informed about ancient Mesopotamia generally. Competence in these matters is more than just a question of mastering the languages concerned and absorbing the latest works of synthesis. Assyriologists are few in number and the primary material is immense, so that many of the aids to research that classicists take for granted in their own fields have yet to be written. Cuneiform studies are, as W. remarks, in 'a very undeveloped state' (p. xi). This makes it difficult for a newcomer to find the information he wants in an accessible form. More often than not such information is far from accessible.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

W.'s translations from Akkadian are always readable and usually reliable. Very occasionally he is led astray by the peculiar lapses of Assyriologists who should know better. For example, on p. 406 a line of the Gilgamesh epic that describes the progress of the eponymous hero and his ferryman over the ocean is badly misunderstood to represent a passage of eighteen days. In fact the verse, *mālak arhi u šapatti ina šalši ūmi ittal*[*kūnimma?*] (X.171), should be rendered 'A journey of a month and a half they came by the third day', i.e. they travelled with typically heroic speed, fifteen times as fast as ordinary mortals. Where W. does not fall under the wrong influence his mistakes are remarkably few. A rare example is his translation of *kī ša ina munatti idbubu* in Erra V.43 as 'just as he spoke it in his sleep' (pp. 287, 598); better is the consensus of previous translators, which W. reports in a footnote: 'when he recited it on waking'.

Assyriology has not yet generated convenient monographs on every aspect of Mesopotamian civilization. One big desideratum is a comprehensive study of the feeding of the gods in Babylonian and Assyrian temples. In summarizing the parallels between animal sacrifice among the Greeks and the 'Semitic peoples', W. remarks that 'the god was supposed to delight in the fatty smell of the burnt offering that went up with the smoke' (p. 42). The statement is supported by references to the *Iliad*, Aristophanes, biblical sources, an Ugaritic myth, and the Babylonian flood story. But the burning of sacrificial animals is not reported in the many thousands of clay tablets from ancient Mesopotamia. It seems instead that after presentation to the divine statue as a symbolic meal, meat from sacrificial carcasses was consumed by the temple personnel and others. What the Babylonian flood story tells of is the typically Mesopotamian practice of burning incense to release a sweet fragrance, which the gods were held to ingest as food. In this sense it is wrong to speak of 'Semitic' sacrifice, for Babylonian and Levantine (i.e. North-West Semitic) practices were quite different. For a recent discussion of this topic see W. G. Lambert, 'Donations of Food and Drink to the Gods in Ancient Mesopotamia', in J. Quaegebeur (ed.), *Ritual and Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East* (Leuven, 1993), pp. 191–201.

Not all Assyriologists are as careful as they should be, and errors of report also lie in wait for the unwary. In discussing the recitation of the Babylonian Creation Epic W. states that 'the poem was recited in the course of the New Year festival at Babylon and on the fourth day of other months elsewhere' (p. 68). The evidence we have to date is for recitation on the fourth day of the first month (New Year) and on the same day of the ninth month, on both occasions before the god Marduk in his temple at Babylon; see G. Çağıran and W. G. Lambert, 'The Late Babylonian *kislīmu* ritual for Esagil', *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 43–5 (1991–3), 89–106. Unfortunately, reports of the ritual tablet that appeared in the secondary Assyriological literature before its publication confused matters by carelessly mixing up the ninth month with the seventh.

Inevitably, in such a vast field of enquiry, W. has occasionally missed information that he could have used to bolster his arguments. For example, his discussion of the 'pillars of heaven and earth' compares the cosmic roles of Atlas and his pillars with the monstrous beings and pillars depicted in cosmic functions in Near Eastern iconography (pp. 148–9). It happens that Mesopotamia provides textual evidence, too, that illuminates this comparison, in the persons of the twin *lahmu*-monsters. These were commonly represented in art as standing at either side of monumental temple doorways, but the cosmic rôle which this function symbolized is clearly stated in the *Göttertypentext*, where they are said to grip heaven with their hands and earth with their feet. The identification of the *lahmu*s as 'pillars of the universe' was made by

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

W. G. Lambert, 'The Pair Lahmu–Lahamu in Cosmology', *Orientalia* 54 (1985), 189–202.

The cultural divide between Mesopotamia and Greece is reflected in the different assumptions and expectations that scholars bring to Assyriology and Greek studies. A case in point is authorship. Classical scholars are used, for the most part, to dealing with texts ascribed to an author, whether traditional or genuine. In literature written in cuneiform, attributions of texts to an author are very rare. This situation has been well described, for example by Benjamin R. Foster, 'On Authorship in Akkadian Literature', *Annali* 51/1 (Istituto Universitario Orientale, Naples, 1991), 17–32, and is a fact of which W. is well aware (e.g. p. 63). Nevertheless, on p. 139 he attributes a theological compendium to the seventh-century Assyrian exorcist who wrote the tablet (*KAR* 307). Kisir-Aššur himself reports that he wrote it out 'from an old master-copy'. How old the text in question is, we do not know. On Kisir-Aššur's activities and his family's library of clay tablets see Olof Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur* 2 (Uppsala, 1986), pp. 41–76.

Thanks to the discovery of tablets from many different centuries, Assyriologists enjoy the good fortune of knowing some traditional Babylonian compositions in versions that are widely separated in time. The complex development of these texts over more than two millennia has not been properly studied in the light of the most up-to-date evidence. We do not possess a modern history of Mesopotamian literature. This makes for misunderstandings. In concluding a comprehensive study of the parallels and similarities between the *Iliad* and the Gilgamesh epic, W. advocates that the former enjoyed a special relationship with the latter (p. 401). That indeed seems to be so. His attempt to identify which of the several known recensions of the Babylonian epic it was that is at issue here is informed by an old assumption, namely that the appended twelfth tablet (which offers Homeric parallels) was a later addition to the eleven-tablet poem. Some Assyriologists have unwisely imagined that Tablet XII was appended to the epic as late as the end of the eighth century, seemingly on the grounds that a copy of it survives from the hand of the well-known Assyrian master, Nabû-zuqup-kēna, who served kings Sargon II and Sennacherib. But Tablet XII holds very old material, a partial translation of one of the Sumerian poems of Gilgamesh, and though I would not count it part of the epic in literary terms, it is just as possible that it was attached to it in the Middle Babylonian period, for it was then that many of the traditional literary compositions were edited into the versions that were standard in first-millennium Assyrian and Babylonian libraries. This would widen from one century to perhaps half a millennium the 'window of opportunity' in which knowledge of a version of the epic incorporating the appendix somehow filtered into the Homeric consciousness.

The question of transmission is the subject of W.'s final chapter. This topic does not deal in certainties, for the evidence is only circumstantial. W. is right to point out that 'cultural influence spreads between adjacent peoples by many channels' (p. 606). The languages that were crucial in Levantine trade were Aramaic and Phoenician. While the literatures written in these languages are almost entirely lost we are unlikely to do better than suggest, as W. has done, a few possible such channels. The lines of communication that he puts forward are intriguing hypotheses which will not all find favour, but in the end W. places the question of transmission in the right perspective: 'the argument for pervasive West Asiatic influence on early Greek poetry does not stand or fall with explanations of how it came about. A corpse suffices to prove a death, even if the inquest is inconclusive.'

Some other minor points follow. The gatekeeper of the Babylonian netherworld is

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

now read Bidu, not Nedu (pp. 153, 157); see A. Cavigneaux and F. Al-Rawi, *Revue d'assyriologie* 76 (1982), 189–90: K. Deller, *Notes assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires* 1991/18. The Akkadain verb *šašû* does not have to mean 'to shout'. In the context of a god and his vizier (p. 197) it means 'to summon'. We now know that the Gilgamesh epic reveals the hero's name for the first time in l. 3, not in l. 26, which destroys the structural parallel with the *Odyssey* (p. 404); see T. Kwasman and the reviewer, *Notes assyriologiques* . . . 1998/99–100.

It is easy to list small errors of fact and minor misunderstandings. When these are set against the truly staggering quantity of good information amassed in this book they become insignificant. This is a masterly piece of work that will be required reading for decades.

School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London A. R. GEORGE

LITERATURE AND RELIGION

D. Feeney: *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts and Beliefs*. Pp. xli + 161. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Paper, £11.95 (Cased, £32.50). ISBN: 0-521-55921-9 (0-521-55104-8 hbk).

F. has written a timely and important work, providing a concise and stimulating guide to the major points of convergence between recent approaches to Latin literature and new directions in the study of Roman religion. It is rich in ideas, and includes striking formulations on almost every page; it is sure to be mined heavily for pithy quotations.

The book is polemical in the best sense of the word: its main thrust consists in a confrontation with a set of problematic assumptions that have shaped much traditional scholarship on both literature and religion in Rome. In a brief introduction, F. identifies the most sweeping of these assumptions and outlines his response. The body of the book consists of four chapters. In the first, 'Belief', F. tackles the idea that there was in Rome a single thing identifiable as 'religion' against which literature can be interpreted; he argues instead for a variety of religious discourses that interacted with each other and with various literary discourses in a multitude of ways. In the second chapter, 'Myth', he addresses the notion that myth is by definition organic and corporate, and loses social significance when handled in too literary or self-conscious a fashion, a notion that automatically excludes Roman material from the status of 'real myth'. Chapter III, 'Divinity', deals with the various conceptions of the gods in literature and cult, and the last chapter, 'Ritual', concerns the tendency to identify 'real' Roman religion with cult, leaving literature as something at best digressive and at worst irrelevant. The book concludes with a brief discussion of Roman religious knowledge.

F. touches on a wide range of questions and balances his general discussions with studies of particular topics, e.g. the *ludi saeculares* and Horace's *Carmen Saeculare* (pp. 28–38) in Chapter I. But two closely interwoven themes lie at the book's heart. One is a critique of the chronic if generally implicit comparison between Roman and (classical) Greek culture. For example, it is often assumed that the Romans, who lacked the sort of genuine myths that the Greeks enjoyed, naturally adopted Greek myths to fill the gap in their culture; in doing so, however, they deprived them of their social

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

significance and reduced them to mere literary exercises. Such assumptions have determined the perceived relationship between literary texts and religious life: it is for this reason that Homer and Hesiod, Pindar and Aeschylus are generally conceded to have a connection with actual religion that is denied to Catullus or Virgil, not to mention Ovid. In contrast, F. suggests that the absence of indigenous divine myths becomes a 'lack' only in modern eyes; the Roman adoption of Greek myths was more an act of appropriation than a response to a deficiency. Moreover, since the negotiation of 'Roman' and 'Greek' was a vital part of Roman culture in all its aspects, the characterization of a particular item as Greek does not *ipso facto* render it secondary and superficial.

The other recurring theme is the problem of locating real Roman religion in ritual alone; this tendency, combined with that of disallowing any Greek influence as inauthentic, has been largely responsible for the view that Roman literature is of only marginal importance to the study of Roman religion. F. insists instead on its centrality: literary 'exegesis and interpretative dialogues help constitute Roman religious practice, rather than being something extraneous or added on' (p. 38). This point is both valid and important, and as F. demonstrates, it allows for a much richer and more inclusive approach to Roman religion. Yet there remains a crucial distinction between ritual and exegesis, whether poetic, philosophical, or antiquarian: the former was controlled by civic authorities, the latter was not. This distinction has serious implications for the ways that different sorts of religious discourses were worked out in Roman society, and is one of the things that make the Roman tradition so different from the monotheistic traditions that shape our notions of what a 'religion' is.

Yet this is a book on religion and literature, not religion and society: F. provides abundant insights on the former topic, and more on the latter than one might expect. It deserves, and no doubt will find, a wide readership among all those interested in Roman religion, Latin poetry, and Roman culture more generally. Students of Greek literature and religion will also profit from it, since the assumptions that F. examines affect them as well. F. opens his preface by remarking that 'I had thought it would be easier to write a short book than a long one, but I was mistaken' (p. xi). Yet it actually is easier to write a short book, provided that it is bad: F.'s mistake lay in writing a good one.

York University, Toronto J. B. RIVES

POLITICIZING LATIN LITERATURE

T. N. Habinek: *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Pp. ix +234. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998. Cased, £27.50. ISBN: 0-691-06827-5.

In this collection of brilliant and provocative studies, Habinek seeks to combat the 'nostalgia and evasion' characteristic of the politics of most work on Latin literature: 'nostalgia for a realm of the aesthetic untainted by the vulgar concerns of social and material existence, and evasion of the exploitative political and economic practices that could bring such an ideal to realization, if only for the few' (p. 167). The key to his approach is a focus on Latin texts not merely as representations of society but as interventions in it, media through which members of the Roman élite sought to advance their interests over others. Every utterance (every text, every reading of a text) is interested, intended to serve a particular function on someone's behalf; as he

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

notes, 'what interests me at first glance about a literary utterance is not its truth value or its formal features so much as the question *cui bono*?' (pp. 8–9).

Taken as a whole, the book is slightly uneven; in part, at least, because the individual chapters seem so self-contained, despite their common theoretical assumptions. The first chapter offers a convincing critique of Gildersleeve's Romantic philhellenic approach to Latin literature, but fails in any broader purpose. H. appears to assume that contemporary 'canonization' of Gildersleeve demonstrates the complete acceptance of his ideas among American classicists, so that a limited exercise in iconoclasm will be sufficient to undermine the entire tradition and thus clear the way for his new approach. I suspect that this underestimates not so much the resilience of Gildersleeve's ideas as the sophistication of his successors. They are unlikely to be persuaded either by H.'s third chapter; his reading of Cicero's use of the rhetoric of banditry against Catiline is rich and persuasive, but it is scarcely a dramatic revelation that oratory needs to be read as an attempt to intervene in the course of events.

The originality and fruitfulness of H.'s approach become clearer when he examines other, more 'literary', genres. Poetry, for example, is too often read as if it has no purpose beyond the aesthetic and/or no reference to anything beyond itself and other literary texts; at most, it may be seen as 'reflecting' contemporary concerns and ideology. In contrast, H. offers a series of detailed readings intended to show how deeply implicated Latin poetry is in attempts by the Roman élite to establish and maintain its power: in the silencing and marginalization of women, in the unification of Italy through a shared aristocratic culture, in the negotiation of its relationship with the market, and in the ideological underpinning of Roman imperialism through the construction (in Ovid's poetry of exile) of the imperial subject. Other chapters consider the rôle of Seneca's philosophy in the competition between different modes of authorization under the early Principate, and, most excitingly, the 'invention' of Latin literature in the third and second centuries B.C.E. as part of a strategy of élite legitimation in response to the crisis of identity brought about by Rome's transformation from city-state to empire.

This particular chapter might be taken as a prime example of H.'s eclectic methodology, combining as it does a detailed philological investigation of the verb *existimo* in Cato, Terence, and the Roman funeral oration with Benedict Anderson's concept of the 'imagined community' and other works on culture and identity. H. is a theoretical magpie in the best possible sense, taking whatever suits his purpose from a wide range of writers on politics, culture, and economic history without feeling bound to accept their systems wholesale; thus he draws from Karl Polanyi the idea of the interchangeability of political, economic, social, and cultural power at Rome without taking on the crasser elements of Polanyi's primitivist view of preindustrial economies. He wears this learning lightly, and presents complex arguments and concepts with exemplary lucidity. Every chapter, even the two noted above as being less convincing, has something to offer almost any reader: readings of specific texts, ideas about how to read texts, even just the (all too brief) contextualizing comments at the beginning of each chapter, which often present old topics such as politics under the Principate or the nature of the Roman economy in entirely new, provocative, and stimulating ways.

Indeed, my main complaint about this book is that it is too short—not something that I would say about too many academic works. H.'s stated aim is to promote a new way of reading Latin literature, and the studies presented here, exciting and inspiring as they are, seem more than sufficient to make his case. At the same time, however, I was left with a feeling of frustration, wishing to hear what he might have to say about

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

yet more texts (it is refreshing, for example, to find a literary critic taking one of the agronomists seriously, but if Cato, why not Varro and Columella?), and wondering whether he might not be persuaded to become more of an ancient historian and to develop his tantalizing suggestions about Roman politics and economics. This is, of course, entirely unreasonable. The importance of this book, the reason why it should be required reading for anyone interested in Roman society and culture, lies not so much in the answers it offers as in the questions it provokes and the new lines of enquiry it suggests. Few of the studies which will surely be inspired by this blueprint are likely to match the original in subtlety, perceptiveness, or readability, and I am looking forward to seeing how H. develops his ideas in future. For the moment, however, he has done more than enough to earn our gratitude and, more importantly, to change the way that we think about Latin literature.

University of Bristol NEVILLE MORLEY

FUROR POETICUS

D. HERSHKOWITZ: *The Madness of Epic. Reading Insanity from Homer to Statius.* Pp. xiii + 346. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-815245-0.

As German troops invaded Poland on the evening of 1 September 1939, Hitler is said by a living eyewitness to have stared out with a crazed expression at the unnaturally yellow skies over the Berghof and to have retreated speechless when a Hungarian lady was moved to speak of the 'blood, blood, blood . . . and blood' which was to come. This quasi-mystical anticipation of the Götterdämmerung could have graced the opening book of a Roman epic; and a Roman poet would perhaps have characterized both Magyar prophetess and German Führer as touched, in different ways, by *furor*: 'madness'. Some biographers have dismissed Hitler in two-dimensional terms as a 'lunatic' or 'raving maniac' (I. Kershaw, *Hitler* [London, 1998], p. xxii): so what does ancient epic have to say about madness in leaders? Is 'the madness of epic' also two-dimensional? H.'s book suggests not. As she tells us by way of introduction, 'madness' in any age will not yield to any single, universally valid definition of its field of reference; and H.'s method, on this chaotic campus, is to accentuate the variety of readings, and to concentrate on 'poetics', steering her course between 'historicism' and 'modernism'.

The book is primarily about Roman epic. Homer's inclusion in the title and his (subtle) placing in the third chapter serves to highlight the restricted rôle of madness in early Greek epic, in contrast to what we find in Virgil and his successors. H. sees the *Aeneid* as the creative interface between Greek and Roman literary ideas of madness, and as the focal point for the Roman transfer of Greek tragic paradigms of madness (Io, Orestes, and others) to a new, epic 'model'. Her account of this process (no doubt part of the contemporary phenomenon of mixing genres) is persuasive. She might, however, have referred to the loss of Ennius' *Annales*; and looking outside the tragi-epic paradigms, we have Servius' suggestion that *furentibus Austris* (*Aen.* 1.51), that is, Virgil's first intimation of elemental *furor*, modifies Ennius' *furentibus ventis* (fr. 601 Sk.). We do not know the context of Ennius' 'raging winds'; but Lucretius' juxtaposition (6.366–7) of meteorological *discordia* with *furibundus aer* suggests that elemental *furor* and its discordant concomitants were known to Roman poetry before Virgil.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

H. eschews set piece historical analysis of the Roman fascination with *furor*, although her account of Lucan's *Bellum Civile* refers briefly (p. 204) to madness as a topic of political invective (not, of course, exclusively Roman in that respect). More expansive treatment might have included Cicero's contrast, articulated in January 49, between *concordia* and the *mirus furor* which drew *boni* as well as *improbi* into love of battle (*Fam.* 16.12.2). The passage sits well with H.'s enlightening exploration of the impact of bellicose *furor* on Roman moral exemplars; and it is a striking antecedent for the fundamental Roman epic confrontation between cosmic order and harmony, and the madness of war. H. reminds us (p. 248) that the *Aeneid* and the *Thebaid* as well as the *Bellum Civile* were concerned with civil war. And for Horace, at least, civil war was *furor civilis* (*Odes* 4.15.17–18).

H. delineates a Roman epic tradition of madness with some success. But her treatment of intertextual connections within this tradition must be treated with care. She repeatedly asserts that a given passage 'recalls' a passage in an epic predecessor. Among the unpersuasive juxtapositions are *Aen*. 6.669 and *Il.* 17.649–50 (p. 76); *Aen*. 12.665–6 and *Il.* 16.805–6 (p. 157: cf. more pertinently *Il.* 24.360?); Luc. 1.72–80 and *Aen*. 1.148–53 (pp. 200–2); and Stat. *Theb.* 8.625–35 and Ov. *Met*. 9.495–6 (p. 287). There is some lack of rigour here; and H. does not establish her claimed 'intertextual interactions' between the Homeric epics and Roman epic (p. 126).

H. is good on the developing rôle of *furor poeticus*. The delineation of the evil madness of *discordia* and (civil) war is articulated through the mad *vates*, an ambiguous theme which H. draws out splendidly, and which is well reflected in her title. She overdoes the metapoetics in suggesting that at *Met*. 15.878 *legar* signifies Ovid's climactic metamorphosis into a book (compare Ov. *Am*. 1.15.38 with McKeown's note; Luc. 9.985). But her insights should stimulate further enquiry into madness and the Muse-inspired articulation of truth: Roman epic embraces cosmic revelation, including the interrelationship of man, his terrestrial context and the impact upon him of celestial and infernal powers (interactions which emerge with clarity from H.'s reading of patterns of human and divine madness in the *Thebaid*). In that revelatory sense, we should not lose sight of the primary ritual selling for the understanding of madness, revelation, and enlightenment—the Greek Mysteries. In this context, H.'s discussion of the dispelling of clouds/darkness as a function of intellectual enlightenment (pp. 70–85) might be extended into the mystic symbolism of dark/light contrasts.

H. offers a provocative 'Laingian' reading of the *Metamorphoses*, suggesting that transformations are 'the physical manifestation of mental states' (p. 164). There must be some truth in this. But the grounds on which H. argues her case, and her juxtaposition of R. D. Laing's 'petrification' as a type of ontological insecurity with Ovid's physical petrification scenes, are problematic: at the most basic level, Niobe's physical petrification cannot, surely, be read as a realization of a 'hard-hearted' reaction to the killing of her seven sons, for Ovid tells us (6.250–85) that she was grief stricken at that intermediate point in her punishment. Ovid certainly plays on mental states here, and on motion/emotion/immobility; and Niobe may herself be 'mad'. But it is difficult to see how Laing's classification of psychotic defence mechanisms and dream patterns might usefully illuminate Niobe's inability to hold her tongue. Newcomers to the influence of ancient madness on modern terminology will find it easier to absorb the relevant pages of Ruth Padel's *Whom Gods Destroy* (Princeton, 1995) before turning to H.'s more challenging methodology.

H.'s central achievement is her articulation of the rich ambiguities of human emotion and motivation, as portrayed in Roman epic. She has made an important

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contribution to the breaking down of stereotypical characterizations, character contrasts, and their cosmic projections. Implicit in her discussion of the interconnections of *fata* and *furor* in the *Aeneid* is the reader's responsibility for sorting out where the truth may lie in the shifting relationship between cosmos and human microcosm; and her analysis of Turnus in madness (and sanity: p. 94) interwoven with her analysis of Homeric madness (pp. 155–7) suggests a nuanced relationship with the concluding anger and 'madness' of Aeneas (but we miss reference to F. Cairns's treatment of Virgilian *furor*, *furiae*, and Aeneas [*Virgil's Augustan Epic* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 82–4]). Again, she gives a subtle account of the madness of Lucan's Caesar, as the focal point for the *Romanus furor* of the civil war and for the destabilizing impact of madness on the ordinary meanings of words (Caesar as elemental force of nature [pp. 221–3] can be illustrated further from praises of Hercules, and from imperial panegyric [suggesting satire?]: cf. e.g. Pind. fr. 33a Ma.; Stat. *Silv*. 4.3.135). She rightly asks whether the prevailing *furor* embraces the virtuous Cato himself, and while her reading of Cato as *furens* (pp. 231–46) does not quite persuade, she has put her finger on some telling ambiguities in his leadership (which might be extended to the scene at the temple of Jupiter Ammon [9.544–86]: is Cato's revelatory declaration 'inspired' by the location or not?). Yet a further dimension is added in her treatment of madness and sexuality in the *Thebaid* (though again, her reading of Theseus as a leader overtaken by *furor* goes beyond the text).

H.'s strategy (particularly her projection of literary and conceptual 'models' back to earlier texts) will no doubt encounter disagreement. But her book is full of insights: like the epics it describes, it will encourage her readers to think, and it will certainly inspire new thinking on this fascinating subject. It is, however, disfigured by too many misprints.

Royal Holloway London/FCO ALEX HARDIE

STILSTUDIEN

M. LANDFESTER: *Einführung in die Stilistik der griechischen und lateinischen Literatursprachen.* Pp. xi + 178. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1997. Paper, DM 39.80. ISBN: 3-534-10458-7.

Here is a breath of fresh air in a branch of literary studies. Landfester sets out to write a comprehensive survey of Greek and Latin style with the aid of approaches borrowed from modern linguistics.

Taking the two languages together was enterprising, and in a modest compass he covers an impressive amount of ground. After an introduction and a definition of style (Chapters I–II), he sketches a background of pronunciation, dialects, registers, and periods (Chapters III, V–VI); distinguishes four functions of communication, 'cognitive', 'expressive', 'directive', and 'aesthetic' (Chapter IV); contrasts ancient systems of classification with his own, which will move from the smallest unit, the phoneme, to the largest, the text, and at each level distinguish between 'paradigmatic' forms (forms interchangeable with others that have the same meaning or function) and 'syntagmatic' forms (forms that combine at least two 'linguistic signs') (Chapter VII); and then fits into this framework a selection of familiar things like onomatopoeia, collective singulars, polysyndeton, and *praeteritio*, which he connects with the four functions of communication (Chapters VIII–XIII).

Anyone who fears a spate of jargon will be glad to read that 'lexeme' has no

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

advantage over 'word' (p. 18 n. 25). The section hardest to understand is the very traditional one on enthymemes (pp. 144–5), and the tradition must bear the blame; see M. F. Burnyeat, 'Enthymeme: Aristotle on the Logic of Persuasion', in D. J. Furley and A. Nehamas (edd.), *Aristotle's* Rhetoric*: Philosophical Essays* (Princeton, 1994), pp. 3–55. With clarity goes sober judgement. Most of the reservations that follow concern details.

What comes in from linguistics seems less conspicuous than what is displaced: above all, an account of previous approaches to ancient style. In the text L. mentions only H. Lausberg's *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*; Hofmann–Szantyr reach the notes and the bibliography, but readers who may wonder why they began with hyperbaton when their predecessor J. H. Schmalz in 1885 began with nouns will have to work out the answer for themselves. As recently as 1963, L.'s publisher reprinted the ninth edition (1905) of Nägelsbach's *Lateinische Stilistik* (1846), and in 1965 Hofmann–Szantyr in their own section on *Stilistik* recommended its 942 pages for use in schools (ah, those were the schools); but L. ignores this prescriptive tradition, which goes back to Valla's *Elegantiae.* That seems harsh treatment for earlier scholarship when its findings have sometimes been 'differenzierter' than any in modern linguistics (p. 2). For a survey with reference to Latin see I. Mariotti, 'Stilistica latina (Rassegna bibliografica)', *Atene e Roma* n.s. 3 (1958), 65–76.

L.'s contention that all specimens of language have style pits him against ancient theory, which concentrated on what it could regard as a veneer and analyse as 'tropes' and 'figures' (pp. 3–4, 49). The contention is easier to maintain in principle than in practice. Saying that 'die sprachliche Form der "Hellenika" Xenophons und der "Commentarii" Caesars ist als ganzes keine *Kunst*prosa' (p. 36), or that the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* has 'geringe literarische Stilisierung' (p. 48), does not seem very different from saying that they have few if any stylistic features. L. himself adopts the concept of deviation from a standard, not least in defining 'das Ästhetische' (pp. 5, 23, 29), and reinforces it by using expressions like 'der sprachliche Normalfall' (p. 127) or 'nicht im "eigentlichen"/"wörtlichen", sondern im übertragenen Sinn' (p. 88, with inverted commas that betray unease).

Many statements, for instance that Seneca uses poetic words in his prose (p. 46), are neither illustrated nor documented. Perhaps the Greek author who comes up most often is Thucydides (only topics are indexed), but little is quoted, and the four-page bibliography, which consists mostly of works in German, includes nothing specifically about him. In general, neither it nor the annotation sufficiently guides the reader to controversies or fuller studies. R. Coleman, 'Vulgar Latin and the Diversity of Christian Latin', in J. Herman (ed.), *Latin vulgaire–latin tardif* (Tübingen, 1987), pp. 37–52, contests the views of Chr. Mohrmann on Christian Latin (L. p. 48) and concludes that 'the concept of a Christian Latin Sondersprache or langue spéciale is . . . a fiction of modern philologists' (p. 51). It goes unmentioned that some Latin poets avoid homoeoteleuton in adjacent words, and there is no reference to D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Homoeoteleuton in Latin Dactylic Verse* (Stuttgart, 1994). On repetition in Latin see Claudia Facchini Tosi, *La ripetizione lessicale nei poeti latini: vent'anni di studi (1960–1980)* (Bologna, 1983), and J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion* (Oxford, 1996). On the language of Latin poetry see for instance A. Lunelli, *La lingua poetica latina* (Bologna, 1980^2), pp. xix–lxxv, and F. Giordano, 'La lingua poetica latina: problemi e ricerche', *Boll. di Studi Lat.* 25 (1995), 189–205. Not a single work by J. N. Adams is cited; with R. Mayer he has now edited 'Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry', *Proc. Brit. Acad.* 93 (1999). The chapter on prose rhythm, contributed by Barbara Kuhn, drops no hint of historical change or of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

any problem beyond the relationship between the end of a colon and the rest of it, and the few references given do not lead far; for Latin see now G. Orlandi, 'Le statistiche sulle clausole della prosa. Problemi e proposte', *Filologia Mediolatina* 5 (1998), 1–35.

Some explanations are too sketchy. Aesch. *Cho*. 235–6 serves as an example of 'nominale Ausdrucksweise' (p. 97), and five of the nine words quoted are indeed nouns; but they all come in a vocatival phrase, and the sentence has a perfectly good verb, *ἀνακτήσῃ*. Under 'Epanalepse/Anadiplose' (p. 101) it might have been mentioned that the subject of the verbs in *quamvis sint sub aqua, sub aqua maledicere temptant* is people turned into frogs. That the numerous long syllables lend dignity and weight to Demosthenes' prayer at 18.141 (pp. 167–8) sounds very plausible until one counts the proportion or looks for runs of them. Corruption has often been suspected, to my mind rightly, in Eur. *Hec.* 504 *Ἀγαμέμνονος πέμψαντος . . . μέτα* (p. 114; Diggle deletes the line with Jenni) and Tac. *Dial.* 41.5 *vitas ac vestra tempora* (p. 136; [*vestra*] Halm and Winterbottom).

There are also mistakes and distracting misprints. Whatever may be convenient for everyday purposes, does anyone even in Germany believe that *ευ* was pronounced like German *eu* (p. 9)? Neither *Τρωες* nor *ἥρωες* occurs in Homer (p. 53), and I do not know where *ἡ Γλαυκῶπις* means Athena (p. 93; it occurs at *Il.* 8.406 without the article). Horace's *ridiculus mus* does not rhyme (p. 57), because the *u* of *mus* is long. Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.177 *timide nec leviter* (p. 109) barely resembles *γνωτὰ κοὐκ ἄγνωτα* even on the surface, let alone in the sentence *non reperietis hominem timide nec leviter haec improbissima lucra ligurrientem*; the example has been lifted unchecked from H.-S. 728. At Enn. fr. 163 *nomen* means not 'word' (p. 115) but 'name'; at Sen. *Ep.* 1.1 'etwas anderes tun' (p. 143) is too literal a rendering of *aliud agere* (see *OLD alius* B6c); at Caes. *B.G.* 7.71.1 the subjunctive requires 'würden', not 'wurden'; and 'ich verschweige' is not *silentio* (p. 145). The places where Virgil writes *Italiam* do not include *Aen.* 7.464 (p. 53, an anticipation), and the Latin example on pp. 135–6 has lost its attribution (Sall. *Cat.* 48.6). At *Ecl.* 1.60 (p. 96) read not *destinent* but *destituent*, at Cic. *Mil.* 10 (p. 125) *<di>dicimus*, at Sall. *Cat.* 5.4 (p. 132) *eloquentia<e>*, at Pind. *Pyth.* 3.21 (p. 138) *ἀνθρώποισι[ν]*, at Plaut. *Rud.* 91 (p. 159) *le<n>onem*.

This is one in a series of 'Introductions' to various branches of classical scholarship, and my pleas for fuller treatment may be thought unfair. Though details need revision, it is a considerable achievement.

Pembroke College, Cambridge MICHAEL D. REEVE

GRUB STREET

O. Pecere, A. Stramaglia (edd.): *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino. Atti del convegno intemazionale, Cassino, 14–17 September 1994*. Pp. 547, 10 ills. Cassino: Università degli studi di Cassino, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 088-7949-139-3.

All literature is consumed by its readers, so what is 'consumer literature'? Italian *letteratura di consumo* and French *paralittérature* are labels for the kinds of modern publication that aim for a less cultured readership. It turns out to have been a fruitful idea to transfer this concept into classical literary criticism and to convene a Convegno whose speakers would survey the state of research on the popular literature of the classical world.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There is difficulty in defining the boundaries of the field. The most assiduous contributors have dealt with the difficulty by relating everything that they possibly can to their themes. These long papers with their exhaustive references and comprehensive bibliographies will be mined by scholars for some years to come. Antonio Stramaglia, who animated the event, writes on narratives that were used in education or may possibly have emerged from the schoolroom—*progymnasmata*, *hermeneumata* (bilingual school texts), the 'Letters of Alexander', some novels, rhetorical exercises taken from novels, and even Milesian tales. He gives a new edition of *OEdfu 306*, a short fragment apparently inspired by the *Ninus Romance*. Guglielmo Cavallo's illustrated paper discusses the conclusions as to readership that can be drawn from physical and palaeographical features of the papyrus fragments of ancient fiction. Gian Franco Gianotti's title is 'Forme di consumo teatrale: mimo e spettacoli affini': he covers the field down to Nonnus but not Procopius, *Historia Arcana* 9. Francesco De Martino provides all the materials for a history of the pornographic 'genre'—actually, as far as Greek and Latin are concerned, he is talking about several very minor genres and the sexy bits out of some others. On Philaenis, as on most of her colleagues, he says all that can be said. Guido Schepens and Kris Delcroix collaborate on 'Ancient Paradoxography'. Their English ought to have been corrected before publication. Their very thorough paper takes as its starting point Aulus Gellius' reminiscence of buying second-hand wonder books from a *bouquiniste* at Brundisium (*Noctes Atticae* 9.4). After discussing all known texts of pure paradoxography, they end, quite justifiably, with Pliny, Augustine (*De Civitate Dei*), and Isidore of Seville. They doubt that the paradoxographical texts are aimed at a popular audience.

The most useful of the shorter papers are these. Enrico Livrea, 'La *Visione* di Dorotheos come prodotto di consumo'. Livrea, who has already written on the *Vision*, gives us his developed opinions, with snippets from the unpublished poems by Dorotheos that lurk in the same manuscript, *PBodmer 29*. Stefan Merkle, 'Fable, Anecdote and Novella in the *Vita Aesopi*', by contrast with earlier scholars, who found no structure in the *Vita* but managed to extract overall themes, finds pervasive structure but no definite message. Marco Dorati and Giulio Guidorizzi, 'La letteratura incubatoria', write on the *iamata*, the records of dreams at Epidaurus. Raffaella Cribiore, in 'Gli esercizi scolastici dell'Egitto greco-romano: cultura letteraria e cultura popolare nella scuola', includes a study of the 'Hymn to the Nile' of which she published a new edition in 1995.

Although several papers deal at length with the ancient novel, two ancient novels are mentioned only occasionally. This has, I think, something to do with the definition of 'popular literature': perhaps Longus is too good to be popular? Perhaps Apuleius is too literary to be popular? Now both of these authors embed their work in oral literature: Longus in the episode, not cited by any author in the present book, in which Philetas tells a love story to Daphnis and Chloe (2.3–8); the *Metamorphoses* both in the story-telling in the cave (4.26–7) and in the introduction (1.1). The latter passage is cited here once, but not with reference to story-telling. There is just one paper here concerning a limited field of oral literature, Francisca Pordomingo on the *Carmina Popularia*. Other contributors show little awareness that 'popular literature' must cross the oral/written boundary. De Martino is at home with written transmission only: he seriously describes *Od.* 8.266–369 as a 'possibile rifacimento dei satireschi *Amori di Ares ed Afrodite* del citarodo Demodoco di Corcira'. On sources of the Alexander Romance, Stramaglia deals well with the 'Letters', which evidently originated in writing: for the rest of it, he assumes, following Merkelbach, that Pseudo-Callisthenes selected a pre-existing written history and copied it in. The possibility that stories of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Alexander were transmitted orally, perhaps even to Ps.-Call.'s ears, could be of interest as an aspect of the popular literature of the Roman Empire, but Stramaglia is not interested.

To sum up: some papers are not clearly about 'popular literature'; oral literature needed to be embraced more enthusiastically; but the standard is high, the bibliographical apparatus good. There is an index of cited passages. This conference volume will be really useful for reference.

Lezay ANDREW DALBY

'LIBRO, DEJAME LIBRE'

J. PUCCI: *The Full-Knowing Reader: Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the Western Literary Tradition*. Pp. xxii + 263. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998. Cased, £25. ISBN: 0-300-07152-3.

At face value, this is a study of intertextuality in Western literature from Catullus down to hip-hop, but the unity of the project easily breaks down to a fragmented diary by a time-travelling lover and reader of poetry. The difference from a masterpiece of tight, rational argument and step-by-step on-line guidance like Stephen Hinds's *Allusion and Intertext* (similarly written over a long period of time) is impressive. Yet the material chosen by Pucci is exciting: time-travelling from the Augustan poets to Augustine, Baudelaire, Goethe, and Neruda is not only fun but a formative exercise, and the discussion of changing approaches to intertextuality in the 1980s and 1990s is helpful and updates Farrell's useful how-to approach (he had been covering the 1970s and early 1980s of commerce between classics and literary theory in the area of poetic memory). So I am not discouraging readers from using this book; the introductory chapters cover a good amount of critical approaches in a lively style, and the choice of texts is simply riveting; Catullus echoes Callimachus, Augustine reverts to Horace, Abelard meditates on Lucan, Ovid pops up in Dante, and Baudelaire's *Le cygne* is a must in this kind of essay. The author, a Classicist and Medievalst at Brown, with a rich background in Comp. Lit. and Romance, is clearly enthusiastic about teaching and discussing poetry, and concerned that the twin clouds of cultural studies and self-reflexive postmodernism will eventually obscure his panorama of poetic tradition. His situation becomes clearer when he avers, late in the book, at p. 224, that Pound represents for him 'the apogee of allusive writing in the West', and when the final quote at p. 257 is from a poem central to education in the United States, 'all are written to me, and I must get what that writing means'. The real object of the book is, I suspect, the experience of teaching literature in the contemporary USA—successfully teaching, one would imagine from the often contagious and energetic flow of ideas. Considering that P. is quoting a number of texts in ancient or exotic languages, Greek, Latin, Medieval French and Italian, Spanish, Pound, etc., a certain amount of misprints was to be expected, but the short section on allusion in pop music at p. 254 has a much more recent one (read 'Spandau Ballet'). But this is not going to be that kind of detailed review: every text discussed by P. has its specialist tradition, and it is unnecessary to point out how many times specialists will disagree, e.g. Hellenistic scholars on the assumption that Callimachus' hymn to Apollo is a critique of Apollonius, and so on. More seriously, the structure

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the book requires a great number of daring generalizations, e.g. on the difference between Classical and Christian approaches to intertextuality and interpretation. The search for ancient rhetorical equivalents or precursors of 'allusion' is at times surprisingly literal (discussions of individual words like *adludere* and even *prospaizein*) or strained (P. suggests the semantic area of *deinon* and *deinotes* as an ancestor of modern ideas of intertextual implication).

Should one attempt (as I am tempted to do some day) a typology and prosopography of implied readers and model readers in contemporary criticism, P.'s 'full-knowing reader' will come out as one of the nicest people in this booming profession. Regularly referred to as 'she', this reader is well-read and cares about literature, but is never pedantic or encyclopaedic; likes to spot allusions and meditate on them, avoids reading against the grain, prefers the big picture, gently refuses to be simply a mouthpiece of the critic, and accepts the constraints of theory. As a result, the book does not succeed in proposing a significantly new theory of poetic allusion, but makes helpful comparisons between critical idioms and displays meaningful examples of intertextuality. It is hard to disagree on the choice and coupling of texts: for example, the claims made on Dante and Ovid not only bear inspection but would invite further speculation. The full-knowing reader is clearly right that

> Taccia di Cadmo e d'Aretusa Ovidio . . .
> (*Inferno* XXV.97, cf. pp. 210–11)

is an important pointer. More could be made of the context which prompts this reference to the *Metamorphoses*, and I am not convinced that the main problem is Dante's evaluation of Ovidian metamorphosis as 'grotesque'; the basic question 'Why Cadmus and Arethusa in this context, out of so many Ovidian examples of metamorphosis?' could be answered in more specific terms and tell us something about ways of reading Ovid. But certainly my own full-knowing reader is as partial and biased as P.'s counterpart, and the important thing is that they can continue an intelligible conversation in the future.

University of Verona ALESSANDRO BARCHIESI

THE WATERSHED

BERNHARD BISCHOFF: *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigothischen), Teil I: Aachen–Lambach*. Pp. xix + 495. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998. Cloth. No price given. ISBN: 3-447-03196-4.

The twelve volumes of *Codices Latini Antiquiores* run to A.D. 800. Bernhard Bischoff collaborated on them from 1933 and shared responsibility for the addenda published in *Mediaeval Studies* 47 (1985) and 54 (1992). In 1955 he announced a plan for equally systematic coverage of the ninth century, 'der für die Überlieferung der klassischen und patristischen Literatur wichtigsten Epoche', and at his death in 1991 he had listed alphabetically by shelfmark, and described in varying detail, some 7000 manuscripts.

About a third of his material had gone into proof, but there were still things to check, improvements in presentation to devise, and bibliography and indices to compile. Birgit Ebersperger must be thanked for discharging these tasks efficiently and

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

expeditiously; her decision not to index the contents of the manuscripts has doubtless saved years. She reports that the rest of the material, which can be consulted in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, falls into two sections: one, which runs from Laon to Paris (though not right through Paris), exists in longhand and can be published without serious difficulty, but the other, which covers the rest of the alphabet, remained little more than a list, and no decision has yet been taken on what to do with it, or for that matter with the notes on manuscripts in private collections.

The entries in this first volume are numbered to 2038, but it includes older manuscripts annotated in the ninth century, which receive a number with the suffix 'a', and manuscripts that B. had some reason for explicitly dissociating from the ninth century, which receive a symbol. He speaks of 'Hunderte von Fehldatierungen' in catalogues but does not disclose his strategy for finding ninth-century manuscripts among those that had been put too late. One missing from this volume is Copenhagen Gl. Kgl. S. 444, N of Solinus, on which see V. von Büren, *Scriptorium* 50 (1996), 40–2; the published catalogue of the collection (1926) assigned it to the eleventh century.

The many fragments that he brought to light or quickly got wind of include important ones of classical texts, for instance no. 1531, two leaves of Quintilian's *Minor Declamations* that Michael McCormick found in the Jesuit library at Heverlee near Louvain; see M. Winterbottom's edition (Berlin, 1984) pp. xxii–xxiii. No editor of any text that goes by the name of *Aratea* has mentioned no. 1279, Freiburg Erzbisch. Archiv 35 (the catalogue of 1988 stops at 32), and fifty-two small pieces of Solinus at the Stadtarchiv in Frankfurt, no. 1255 (not to be confused with no. 1273, two leaves at the Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek), await investigation.

Classicists wlll not be surprised to find high totals for Bern, Bamberg, and the Laurenziana, but I defy them to guess which library in Italy has the highest after the Laurenziana or which has the highest of all (see below for the answers). Only about one manuscript in ten is classical by a generous definition, and almost half of those are accounted for by Priscian's *Institutiones*, other grammatical texts, commentaries on Virgil, Latin versions of Josephus (including 'Hegesippus'), and Martianus Capella. One merit of such a book, however, is that it widens horizons. Vat. Pal. Lat. 1547 is the archetype of Seneca's *De beneficiis* and *De clementia*, but a hand 'echt [eng?] verwandt' occurs in a manuscript of 'Ascetica', Einsiedeln 27, where B. notes of another hand 'Orthogr.: $e \sim i$, $o \sim u$, $b \sim v$, $c \sim g$'. Exploring such avenues can bring editorial as well as historical benefit.

By no means all the attributions that B. proposes here will be new to the world. He published many himself, especially in his books on Lorsch and southern Germany and in the articles assembled as *Mittelalterliche Studien* (Stuttgart, 1966–81). Furthermore, classicists in particular exploited him mercilessly, and his opinions have often been cited, for instance in L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission* (Oxford, 1983), or by B. Munk Olsen in volumes that for most authors lead more quickly to the earliest manuscripts, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e et XII^e siècles* (Paris, 1982–9), supplemented in *R.H.T.* 21 (1991), 37–76, 24 (1994), 199–249, and 27 (1997), 29–85. Now, though, he often gives reasons, or at least picks out features, and references to published plates may allow one to follow them up. He also changed his mind on some manuscripts, for instance no. 1984, which includes the fragments of Lucretius in Copenhagen and Vienna. A battery of abbreviations leaves room for more discursive comments, such as that there is no conclusive objection to identifying the Cremona fragment of Cicero's *Brutus*, no. 968, as part of the Laudensis discovered in 1421 and soon lost, or that the names written on some quires of Cambridge Pembroke 308, no. 834, belong not to the scribes but to 'die Träger der Materialkosten (Kanoniker?)'.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Some of the attributions are broad, qualified, or both: 'Frankreich (?)', 'wohl Deutschland', 'Frankreich (Umkreis von Paris?)'. Entries such as 839 and 870 reveal that 'Westfrankreich' includes Tours, but in the index of 'Schreiborte und Schriftprovinzen' Tours appears under 'Loiregebiet', and I have not yet worked out whether 'Westfrankreich' includes 'Nordwestfrankreich', any of 'Loiregebiet', or any of 'Südfrankreich'; moreover, as Ernesto Stagni observes in a forthcoming study of Bern 276, the Loire is a long river. A more fundamental problem, not just about B.'s results but about paleographical localization in general, is betrayed by attributions like those of 578 and 667: 'wahrscheinlich Auxerre (oder wenigstens teilweise von in Auxerre ausgebildeten Schreibern)', 'Frankreich, unter Beteiligung einer in Auxerre geschulten Hand'. Marco Palma, 'Classico, piccolo e quadrato. Dati per un'indagine su una tipologia libraria nell'Europa carolingia', in A. Ferrari (ed.), *Filologia classica e filologia romanza: esperienze ecdotiche a confronto* (Spoleto, 1998), pp. 399–408, after combing Munk Olsen's volumes and bringing together several manuscripts of unusual format (small and square), among them B.'s nos 579, 598, 1234, remarks with some justice that where they were written matters less than 'le menti degli itineranti dotti carolingi che cosi li hanno voluti e fatti realizzare'. Of course, these 'itineranti dotti carolingi' also appear in B.'s entries.

No other paleographer has done such minute work on so grand a scale, and B., awarded an honorary degree at Oxford in 1963, commanded personal as well as professional respect. It will never be easy to disagree with him. He himself, though, regarded the catalogue of ninth-century manuscripts as a preparatory *Hilfsmittel* for such things as studies of scriptoria, and treating it as a bible will not be the best way of honouring his memory. Nevertheless, for the publication of the next volume, and preferably successors, much breath is rightly bated—or already, perhaps, more feet have been tramping along Ludwigstrasse.

Oh yes, the answers to the quiz: the Biblioteca Capitolare, Ivrea (which has begun to occupy Mirella Ferrari and colleagues in Milan); the Badische Landesbibliothek, Karlsruhe (by some distance).

Pembroke College, Cambridge MICHAEL D. REEVE

EXPERIENTIA DOES IT

G. W. Most (ed.): *Editing Texts*, *Texte edieren.* (Aporemata: Kritische Studien zur Philologiegeschichte, 2.) Pp. xvi + 268. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998. Paper, DM 98. ISBN: 3-525-25901-8.

In his preface to this book Most suggests that 'many Classicists seem not yet to have publicly admitted just how fascinatingly complex one of their most cherished activities, the edition of texts, really is' (p. ix). Perhaps 'fully appreciated' rather than 'publicly admitted' would be nearer the mark, but the point is well taken, and is sufficiently illustrated by the very heterogeneous contributions to the discussion that follow. What does not seem to me to emerge is that theory, which 'Classicists' also apparently stand accused of neglecting, has much, in any wider sense of the term, to offer an editor confronted with the particular and practical problem: what do I do with *this* text? Curiously enough, if he will not mind my saying so, the nearest thing to a theoretical proposition enunciated in the book is R. D. Dawe's definition of 'a

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

text produced today' as 'a discussion document, a scientific hypothesis to hold the field until something better comes along' (p. 120). Dawe's piece, '*EI KAI TPIT' EΣTI* . . . Editing Sophocles for the Third Time', is one of the liveliest in the volume, drawing enlightening analogies from the modern stage and musical performance. In the main, however, the discussion is essentially pragmatic, tending to document established truths, central among them that all cases are special. This is especially well exemplified by Ann Ellis Hanson's piece, 'Galen: Author and Critic', a study of Galen's manipulation of his own texts and through them of his image—a spin-doctor *ante litteram*! The same applies to the very special circumstances in which the text of Philodemus' *Rhetoric* has come down to us, discussed by David Blank, 'Versionen oder Zwillinge? Zu den Handschriften von Philodems *Rhetorik*'—though this might also perhaps be seen as a cautionary tale for hunters of *Doppelfassungen* in the *Metamorphoses*.

Two contributions explore at some length the problems of editing 'modern'—in this case sixteenth-century—Latin for today's readers. In the courteously polemical exchange between Luc Deitz and Helga Köhler I am with Köhler: the specialist should be offered the text in as nearly as possible its original guise, the non-specialist a translation. The route to this simple—I am inclined to say obvious—conclusion is thickly strewn, by Deitz in particular, with largely superfluous complications, many of them due to the use, in my opinion a mistake, of classical editing practice as a point of departure. (In parenthesis, I am amused and indeed touched, remembering Housman's acid appraisal, to find Deitz putting in a good word for Caspar Barth [p. 157 n. 57].) Two contributions do belated justice to, respectively, a neglected class of worthies and a neglected editor. Anthony Grafton, 'Correctores Corruptores? Notes on the Social History of Editing', explores the activities over the centuries of correctors of the press, often reviled, more often overlooked. Alas, where are they now when we need them? Pockets of highly professional copy-editing survive here and there, as I know to my great profit, but by and large publishers and printers more and more expect authors to do much of their work for them. Michael D. Reeve, 'John Wallis, Editor of Greek Mathematical Texts', fills a lacuna of some importance in my own discussion of these matters in *The Classical Text*. Wallis's editions of Archimedes and even more strikingly of Ptolemy evince a grasp of stemmatics and a style of presentation for which Reeve can find no precedent, and, as is the way, the lead that he gave to editors of literary texts was not followed. Reeve ends with a characteristic one-liner: after remarking that Wallis was 'a splendid example of . . . the encyclopedic bent of 17th-century scholarship', he adds: 'Someone should write [a] book about how it differs from that great pride of the late 20th century, the interdisciplinary approach' (p. 93). Ouch.

Other contributions may be more summarily noticed. Franco Montanari, 'Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the *Ekdosis* of Homer', sketches a speculative maze which had better be left to specialists to thread. Martin L. West, 'The Textual Criticism of Homer', is sober, lucid, and practical. Few should quarrel with his conclusion that the editor's position should be one of compromise. Pierre Petitmengin, 'Le texte dans tous les états: Simples remarques sur les éditions multiples', is largely concerned with patristic and modern vernacular (Montaigne, Hölderlin, Flaubert) texts. He too exposes a lacuna in *The Classical Text*: since the book is in my own library I ought certainly to have noticed Salmasius' remarkable edition of the *De Pallio*, in which he presents the text twice, first as he found it in the existing editions and then as constituted by himself, 'Ex veteribus libris emendata'; not in general a practical solution, but an interesting and apparently unexampled experiment in presentation.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

On Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, 'Play your Roles Tactfully! About the Pragmatics of Text-editing, the Desire for Identification, and the Resistance to Theory', I remark only that comprehension of the need for 'taste and tact' as an essential part of the editor's equipment somewhat antedates 1996 (p. 241 n. 7): witness Housman again, on critics who follow the dictates of their own taste without staying to consider what was the taste of Propertius.

I reserve for last mention of what was for me the most striking piece in the book, Patricia Parker's 'Murals and Morals: *A Midsummer Night's Dream*'. Her minute dissection of the layers of punning and associative wordplay that must be understood by an editor trying to contend seriously with the notorious crux at *MND* V.i.210 is a real eye-opener which left me breathless. Critics of ancient poetry who think that Virgil and Ovid asked a lot of their *docti lectores* may be staggered to discover what apparently was expected of the groundlings in Shakespeare's Globe.

To sum up, there are a number of interesting *aperçus* here, but the book as a whole does not seem to me to offer as much interest and enlightenment to the editor and critic as O. Pecere and M. D. Reeve's *Formative Stages of Classical Traditions: Latin Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Spoleto, 1995), noticed by me elsewhere (*JRS* 89 [1999], 223–4). Both volumes are the product of conferences, and a conference needs to be carefully engineered, perhaps even with a degree of ruthlessness, if its proceedings are to make a good book.

Cambridge E. J. KENNEY

CASE STUDIES

G. SERBAT: *Grammaire fondamentale du latin*, Tome VI: *L'emploi des cas en latin*, *1: Nominatif*, *Vocatif*, *Accusatif*, *Génitif*, *Datif* (Bibliotheque d'Études Classiques). Pp. 616. Louvain and Paris: Peeters, 1996. Paper. ISBN: (France) 2-87723-316-2; (Belgium) 90-6831-895-0.

The assumption, which it is natural to make on receiving Part 6 of a multi-volume work, that Parts 1–5 must either already have appeared or at least have been planned in sufficient detail to allow advance information about them to reach the public, would in this case apparently be wrong. Only one volume of this *Grammaire fondamentale* has, it seems, so far appeared (*Le signifié du verbe*, by S. Mellet, M.-D. Joffre, and G. Serbat); and it carries no volume number. It was reviewed by David Langslow in *CR* 48 (1998), 361–4. Neither there nor in the volume now under review is there any clear allusion to the scope of the project as a whole; we are, however, at least promised a second volume, comparable to this one, on the ablative and prepositional phrases.

The work itself combines the features of a comprehensive descriptive syntax of the Latin cases ('j'ai privilégié les faits', p. 3) and a work of linguistic analysis at a comparatively high level of abstraction. In the former volume, Langslow observed 'a constant to-and-fro between linguistic theory and minute examination of texts'; the same may be said in the present instance too. On the one hand, the classification of case usages by syntactic and semantic criteria, and their detailed exemplification from Latin texts, together with the clear sensitivity to change over time and variations of register and genre, is not essentially very different from what one would expect from a traditionally conceived grammar in the mould of Kühner–Stegmann or Hofmann–

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Szantyr. Viewed as a work of reference, it will to some extent duplicate, but in many respects complement, the existing grammars (and, at this level of detail, will obviously fill a gap for francophones in particular). On the other hand, there is a constant striving to impose a system on the facts. S. announces at the outset: 'je crois qu'à *une* forme donnée correspond *une* valeur unitaire' (his italics). This doctrine, which may be encountered throughout the work of S. and his disciples (cf. my review of M.-D. Joffre on the Latin passive, *CR* 49 [1999], 143–5), is in view throughout the discussion and is sometimes pressed with little short of evangelical fervour.

Perhaps the best way to enable readers of *CR* to decide whether they are likely to find S.'s approach fruitful is to quote the definitions offered for the 'values' of the Latin cases—always with the caveat that these are obviously easier to understand in the context of the full analysis. They are as follows:

Nom.: 'annonce la *non-dépendance* du nominal' (p. 32);

Voc.: 'le cas du contact énonciatif *immédiat*' (p. 90: incidentally, the question of whether the vocative is really a case or not is here answered very strongly in the affirmative);

Acc.: 'le concept du nominal 2 est considéré par le locuteur comme coïncidant avec tout ou partie du concept 1' (p. 120);

Gen.: 'un morphème signifiant inclusion dans G d'une propriété X' (p. 260), replaced on p. 424 by the idea of 'extraction', which is supposed to suit the Partitive Genitive better;

Dat.: 'un nominal qui fonctionne dans l'énoncé comme *repère de visée*' (p. 436).

For the ablative, we must wait until Volume II, although we are given a preview on p. 5 to the effect that the normal tripartite description of the Abl., under the headings of the three original Indo-European cases whose functions it continues (true ablative, instrumental, and locative), is 'une démarche paresseusement diachronique'.

There is perhaps no serious reason to quarrel in general with the descriptions given for the nominative, vocative, and dative. Certainly there is room for a more generalized definition of the dative than is provided by the traditional grammars with their miscellany of usages (datives of advantage and of disadvantage, and so on), and this way of expressing it seems reasonable if one is looking for a highly general formulation, though the question might arise whether the definition is also sufficient to exclude those areas of meaning that are not expressed by the dative in Latin (e.g. that of motion towards a goal, which might—might it not?—equally be regarded as a 'repère de visée'). But it is more difficult to know what to make of the definitions offered for the accusative and genitive. The problem is not the high degree of abstraction *per se* (though some may find this baffling), but the difficulty of relating the definitions to many of the examples given. For instance, S. objects strongly to the characterization of one set of usages of the genitive as 'possessive': 'L'appellation «Possessivus» . . . est radicalement fausse'; he has little difficulty in supplying examples where literal 'possession' is not in question. But is the idea of 'inclusion' any more helpful? Of course, in e.g. *pala anuli* the bezel is a constituent part of the ring viewed as a whole. But in *liber Ciceronis* is the idea of the book 'included' in that of its author? Or, in *commentarii rerum gestarum*, is the idea of the commentaries 'included' in that of the events they describe? Some might be inclined to dismiss this kind of thing as simply bizarre; I content myself with remarking that the kind of arguments used by S. against other people's definitions (arguments which are, after all, based firmly in the ordinary usage and meaning of Latin phrases) seem to work equally well against his

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

own. While acknowledging the justice of some of S.'s criticisms of traditional empirical approaches, this reader at least is left with a considerable residue of scepticism about the whole enterprise.

None of this detracts from the value of the detailed linguistic material which S. has gathered and classified: it is a great merit of this work that even those who have reservations about the central theory will still be able to profit from its rich store of examples and observations. Nor is this material confined to mainstream classical Latin; S. has cast his net widely, and although he is above all a synchronist, a significant part is also played in this work by historical and comparative (both derivational and typological) studies, and account is often taken of special registers of Latin. To quote just three examples, there are interesting notes on the ergative (pp. 81–3), on the development of the vocative in Romanian (p. 92), on internal accusatives in older juridical and later Christian language (p. 124).

There is a detailed *table des matières* at the end, but from the more occasional user's point of view the book badly needs an alphabetical index, both of topics and of passages cited. Perhaps this will appear in Volume II.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne J. G. F. POWELL

PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE

M. DILLON: *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece*. Pp. xxix + 308. London and New York: Routledge, 1997. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-415-12775-0.

This book is a first step at mapping out the much neglected phenomenon of pilgrimage in the ancient world. Despite limitations of scope and methodology, it is an important work which demands the attention of all scholars seriously interested in ancient religion.

Some might fault the use of the terms 'pilgrim' and 'pilgrimage' in the title, because they carry with them the self-penitential associations of Christian pilgrimage, which is alien to the ancient world. I think that the terminology is acceptable, and it is difficult to see what other English word could be used for the general phenomenon. I differ with D., however, when he asserts that ancient Greek knows no technical term for 'pilgrim' (p. xvi); surely θεωρός comes close, at least for state-pilgrimage; healing- pilgrimage, which is a matter for private individuals, has a different vocabulary of course, as does all pilgrimage by individuals not acting for the state. But that hardly matters, because as far as classical Greece is concerned, state-sponsored *theoria* is the driving paradigm. The issue of why state-pilgrims should be called 'watchers' is one of the most challenging in the whole subject: is the original metaphor one of watching the games (cf. p. 20)? Or that of seeing the gods?

D.'s scope seems to be pilgrimage in classical Greece, principally in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.E. He does not attempt to deal systematically with the Hellenistic or Roman period (from when some of the best-documented pilgrimage-traditions originate, e.g. the rich bank of data from Roman Claros). Nor is he interested in pilgrimage to or within Hellenistic and Roman Egypt, another rich area; nor in Egyptian data from the fifth century which may record pilgrimage, e.g. graffiti from the Memnonion at Abydos. A longer diachronic perspective might also perhaps have allowed D. space to confront the all-important issue of how, if it all, early Christian pilgrimage is related to Greek pilgrimage.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Another limitation in scope concerns methodology. Pilgrimage traditions have received much attention from anthropologists recently (one thinks of Victor Turner, E. A. Morinis, and J. Sallnow). A chapter situating Greek pilgrimage traditions within recent anthropological work would have been useful. An example of a theoretical model that might have been useful is that of the 'catchment area', rightly taken as fundamental to the study of pilgrimage in the work of Turner and S. M. Bhardwaj, *Hindu Places of Pilgrimage in India* (Berkeley, 1973); the sixth chapter touches on this aspect, but no model is systematically applied.

After a short introduction, the chapters are the following: I. Official Pilgrimage Invitations and Sacred Truces; II. The Sanctity of Greek Pilgrims; III. Pilgrimage Destinations I: Mystery Cults, Healing Sanctuaries and Oracles; IV. Pilgrimage Destinations II: Contests at Panhellenic Festivals; V. Pilgrimages by Ethnic Groups; VI. Cult Regulation at Sanctuaries; VII. The Female Pilgrims; VIII. Organizational Requirements at Pilgrimage Sites. The chapters have numerous subsections introduced by subtitles (not listed in the table of contents, unfortunately). We move rapidly from topic to topic, now drawing on inscriptional data, where D. seems most at home (e.g. in dealing with the nitty-gritty of cultic regulations in Chapters VI and VIII), now on literary sources, where I sometimes felt that the issue of the reliability of literature as a source for religious history might have been raised (e.g. on the Wagon-Rollers: p. 56; on Xouthos' double consultation: p. 94; Plutarch on Nicias: p. 127; on Ion's tent: p. 460).

Most of the subjects of the chapters are well chosen, and the sequence is smooth. I was, however, puzzled by the choice of the process of announcing festivals or ἐπαγγελία as the topic for a first chapter. The rationale for this ordering is that the announcement of the festival precedes the pilgrimage itself. But ἐπαγγελία is best attested from Hellenistic festivals, and much pilgrimage in classical Greece was probably not solicited by announcers: it is attested at no period for Delos, and it spread gradually through the Peloponnese only during the fourth century. Much state-pilgrimage in the classical period was probably not 'invited', but motivated by a sense of tradition or obligation (ἀπάγειν θεωρίαν means 'pay the due of a pilgrimage'). So perhaps ἐπαγγελία was not such a good place to start, especially since the evidence for it is complex and rather indigestible; it might have been better in an appendix.

Considering the book as a whole, I was concerned by the absence of a diachronic perspective. D.'s main concern is to sketch a picture of pilgrimage in the Classical period. However, chronologically, it is easy to see that pilgrimage changes as the centuries go on: in particular there is a major dividing line between the Classical and the Hellenistic periods, when sanctuary visitation arguably loses some of its religious dimension and gains in political significance as states set up new festivals for the purpose of obtaining *asulia* (discussed briefly by D. on pp. 57–8). This should make us cautious about using evidence from the Hellenistic period to illuminate classical pilgrimage. Yet this is what D. does, e.g. apropos of the Koinon of the Ilians (pp. 133–4: 'the emphasis of the inscription on celebrating the festival as in previous centuries implies that, despite its first-century date, it presents an accurate guide to the organisation of the festival in previous centuries'). Where he does take a diachronic perspective, it is to argue that things stay the same, e.g. apropos of Ionian pilgrimage to the Panionion at Mycale, making the case for survival during the Persian occupa- tion (pp. 128–32); very interesting, if true, but even then one misses a discussion of how the new political circumstances might have changed the significance of the Panionion-pilgrimage.

Though D. touches on most of the important aspects of the subject, a few seem to

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

have escaped him. For example, I was struck by the absence of consideration of the rôle played by social groups within the *polis*: the participants in Athenian θεωρίαι mentioned in the Hellenistic *Puthais* inscriptions include members of several special γένη; other γένη supervised the Athenian sacred ships; γένη seem to have organized pilgrimage in Kos (LSCGI 56b) and in Sicilian Naxos (cf. *ZPE* 122 [1998], 81–9). Such cases may provide clues about the development of state-pilgrimage (the diachronic perspective again), and in a full treatment of the subject they deserve a prominent place. Again, much more could have been made of the function of pilgrimage as a *rite de passage* for young people; he touches on this apropos of Brauron (pp. 197–9, reproducing a discredited interpretation of the ῥάκη), but much more could be said (the discussion of 'Children as Pilgrims' on pp. 200–1 is where I would have expected it). Finally, apropos of the discussion of Athenian pilgrimage (p. 24), it should be pointed out that the Delian Puthais has turned out to be a mirage (see S. V. Tracy *HSCP* 83 [1979]).

In the end, it is perhaps unfair to fault a book as rich as this for its omissions, and it is its merits that linger in the mind: well researched, well organized, and accessible, it succeeds in opening up an unexplored area for a general readership.

University of Reading IAN RUTHERFORD

SEARCH FOR A SAVIOUR

JON D. MIKALSON: *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*. (Hellenistic Culture and Society, 29.) Pp. xii + 364. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1998. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-520-21023-9.

Studies of Greek religion have tended to be all-embracing, such as those of Burkert or Nilsson, or to isolate and explore a particular theme, perhaps a god, a sanctuary, or a festival. Yet Greek religion was primarily communal; to extract it from its communal context (*deme*, *polis*, federation, etc.) is to lose part of its meaning and to make it less intelligible than it would otherwise be. Citizens shared in the rituals and traditions of *their* city, which may have been very different from those of a neighbouring city. A glance at any encyclopaedic work on Greek religion is enough to reveal the tremendous variety that exists within the Greek world in spite of, or even because of, its great homogeneity. An appropriate context for the study of religion, therefore, would be the single city, but few cities have left us sufficient evidence to make such an investigation possible. Athens is perhaps the only city to allow religion to be considered in its proper civic and social environment. It must be some sign of current trends that in quick succession two books have appeared on the subject, first Robert Parker's *Athenian Religion: a History* (Oxford, 1996), and now Mikalson's *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*, which begins as Parker is fading out.

Whereas Parker could rely on the remarkably rich source-material of Classical Athens, M. is compelled to draw on more limited resources. This is a book that makes extensive and expert use of the epigraphic evidence for Hellenistic Athens (with sizeable passages quoted in translation). Plentiful as that evidence is, however, it can still offer only a partial picture, without the drama, philosophy, histories, and oratory of the earlier period. For many scholars the Hellenistic age saw the demise of traditional state religion and the rise of more personal cults, thus leaving the Greeks vulnerable to the missionary zeal of Christianity. M. convincingly rejects this view, stressing instead the vitality and continuity of Athenian religious life. Inevitably,

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of course, a book which takes a narrative approach, beginning with Chaeronea and ending with Sulla's sack of Athens, tends to draw more attention to change than continuity.

M. rather neatly starts with Lycurgus and his religious revival in the years after Chaeronea, which he suggests became a model for later Athenians as they emerged from one crisis after another. In this chapter M. makes effective use of Lycurgus' one surviving speech, *Against Leocrates*. Less satisfactory is the treatment of Stratocles' decree in honour of Lycurgus. This decree, passed almost twenty years after Lycurgus' death, surely says more about Athens in the aftermath of Demetrius Poliorcetes' 'liberation' of the city than it does about Lycurgus. As Demetrius receives divine honours in Athens, Stratocles, his leading supporter, makes the radical acceptable by associating the new regime with the cautious conservatism of Lycurgus. In the ensuing chapters M. charts the way Athenian religious practice was affected by repeated changes in circumstances, the Macedonia-backed 'tyranny' of Demetrius of Phaleron, the intermittent rule of the Antigonids, the loss of the Piraeus, the arrival of Rome, the acquisition of Delos. This heavy emphasis on political events (apparent also in the chapter titles) may be a consequence of the limitations of the evidence.

When the geographer Heraclides of Crete visited Athens in the third century, what impressed him was the number of festivals. He would have had in mind festivals such as the City Dionysia and the Panathenaea, both prominent features of the religious calendar of Classical Athens, which continued into Hellenistic times. Yet they were not unchanged. M. argues that the Dionysia became increasingly 'a source of entertainment rather than of religious feeling', as changes in the means of financing the productions together with the development of professional performers and poets created a distance between citizen and festival (pp. 118–19; for an alternative view, see Parker, *Athenian Religion*, p. 273). Athena's poor performance as a protecting deity (even of herself) may have led to a temporary decline in her prestige in the first half of the third century. M. points to the decreasing use of the epithet 'Polias' and the failure to hold the Great Panathenaea in 286 and perhaps even in 282.

One of the more striking innovations of the Hellenistic period was the emergence of 'ruler-cult', a phenomenon which was readily seized upon by those wishing to prove religious degeneration. M. tries to play down its importance in Athens, although not always successfully (pp. 161, 300–1). It is true that the extreme and dramatic elevation of Demetrius Poliorcetes was never repeated, but such cult remained a constant presence in the city. The tribes established in honour of Demetrius and his father Antigonus survived over 100 years, Antigonus Gonatas was honoured with a state cult, Ptolemy III received a priest and a festival, the Ptolemaea, which was to be celebrated for at least 100 years, and both Attalus I and Ptolemy III had tribes named after them. The strength of the ruler-cult mentality in Athens is clearly signalled by the vigour with which all honours for the accursed Antigonid dynasty were revoked at the time of the break with Philip V (Livy, 31.44). M. is also unhappy with the suggestion that the Romans may have received cult honours before Sulla (as in C. Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony* [Cambridge, MA, 1997], pp. 273–4). He rejects the restoration of a sacrifice 'to the demos of the Romans' in *Agora* XV.180 and shifts the Romaea festival of *IG* II^2 1938 to Delos, both of which are dated to the mid-second century (M. pp. 274–5).

M. has some interesting observations to make about the way in which religion reflected Athens' changed political status. When Athens was an imperial power in the fifth century, it was responsible for its own security, but now must look elsewhere for its saviours, to gods such as Zeus Soter or divine rulers such as Demetrius

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Soter. It is a sign of this dependence that the Athenians begin to sacrifice regularly 'for the health and safety of the Boule and Demos' (pp. 43, 132–4). So too is the establishment of a cult of Demos and Charites, in the sanctuary of which a grateful Athens could express her thanks to foreign benefactors (although M. argues that for the Athenians themselves Charites had stronger associations with agricultural prosperity than gratitude). Moreover, the pattern of religious office-holding mirrored its political counterpart. Describing the early first century, M. writes, 'the assumption of so many religious responsibilities, just as of so many political offices, by a small group of individuals reveals how small and closed the group in authority had become' (p. 280). Roman rule thus offered a stark contrast to the democracy of the fifth century.

University College Dublin ANDREW ERSKINE

MESSENIAN RELIGION

M. L. ZUNINO: *Hiera Messeniaka. La storia religiosa della Messenia dall'età micenea all'età ellenistica.* Pp. 379, maps. Udine: Forum, 1997. Paper, L. 60,000. ISBN: 88-86756-30-5.

It is extremely interesting whenever one comes across a work—either a detailed journal article or monograph—which is devoted to some aspect of the religion of a particular non-Athenian locality in ancient Greece. Much work on Greek religion is necessarily syncretic in a geographical sense, with material on the cult of a particular deity being drawn from all over the Greek world in an effort to understand the cult in question. Treatments of Athenian religion will, of course, always abound, as the unique nature of Athens preserves so much written and artistic material. But it is interesting to see just how much information there is available on non-Athenian Greek religion. Certainly M. Jost in *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie* (Paris, 1985) is proof of this, if it is needed. Now Z. has made the scholarship of Greek religion so much richer with this detailed account of religion in Messenia, covering a broad chronological span, from the Mycenean to the Hellenistic period.

The book is in two parts, the first (in eight chapters) dealing with the gods and goddesses worshipped in Messenia, and the second (in four chapters), the heroes. Part I covers Artemis and Dionysos (Chapter I, pp. 33–82), Zeus, Diwia, and Hera (Chapter II, pp. 83–116), Demeter, Kore, and Poseidon (Chapter III, pp. 117–38), Athena, Apollo, and Asklepios (Chapter IV, pp. 139–89), the Dioskouroi, Kouretes, Eileithyia, and the Kaloi Daimones (Chapter V, pp. 191–7), Pan and Hermes (Chapter VI, pp. 199–214), and for those Greek deities not included in the previous chapters, Chapter VII, including the Linear B material not yet covered, Aphrodite, Hephaistos, Thetis, Leukothea, Tyche, Acheloos, Pamisos, and dedications 'to the gods' generically (pp. 215–39). Chapter VIII (pp. 241–8) nets the 'oriental' cults present in Messenia. This chapter includes the 'Mother of the Gods', but to what extent she is 'oriental' is not clear. Sarapis, Isis, and the Syrian Goddess are also discussed. The second part covers the 'national' heroes ('Eroi nazionale') Messene, Dainophon, Leukippos, Ides, Aristomenes, and Saithidas (Chapter IX, pp. 257–74); other heroes are also dealt with: Herakles (Chapter X, pp. 275–9), Asklepios (Chapter XI, pp. 281–4), and Tityros (Chapter XII, pp. 285–6). Each chapter begins with the testimonia for the deity or deities considered, and then Z. discusses them (except in Chapter VII, where each deity

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

has its testimonia individually presented, then discussed). The testimonies are numbered individually within chapters, which is a bit of a nuisance, as an overall numeration for them throughout the work would have made for ease of referring to Z.'s material.

A conclusion (pp. 287–98) brings all of the material together with a brief synopsis of the character of Messenian religion. There are two appendices, the first of which, on the Mysteries of Andania (pp. 301–34), is not as lengthy as it seems, as most of this is the Greek text and a translation of the Andanian inscription, which has yet to receive the full commentary it deserves (see further below); the second appendix concerns *pa-ki-ja-* (pp. 335–42). Both appendices have relevant testimonia, as well as a discussion.

Z. has made the sources accessible by including a Greek text and translation (Italian) of the source material. The many texts and translations of Pausanias included as testimonia were probably not necessary, being so accessible (and transla- tions of Pausanias in any case are not needed), but it is convenient to have the various inscriptions collected in one place, so that one's desk is not littered with volumes of *SEG*, *IG*, and *Ergon*; even having the *FGrHist* fragments collected is useful. The transliterations and translations of the Linear B material will be appreciated, and will make the information they contain accessible for those not accustomed to making use of it. I felt, however, that the references to the inscriptions needed to be fuller. The well-known Andanian inscription of 92/1 B.C. appears as T7 (testimony 7 for the Andanian Mysteries) on pp. 304–15. It is referred to as *IG* V 1, 1390; most scholars will know this more readily from Sokolowski's text in *LSCG* 65. In addition, the more important *SEG* citations to the various inscriptions dealt with by Z. could have been included. The Greek text of the Andanian inscription is that of *IG* V, and perhaps the more recent *LSCG* text should have been used. But as Z. is not editing the inscription, the lack of comments on possible restorations and alternative readings here (and elsewhere)—and the Andanian inscription is well preserved—is not a concern. While numismatic evidence is treated, archaeological material does not receive the emphasis that it deserves.

There is both an abbreviations list (pp. 9–18) and a bibliography (pp. 345–63), and the amount of scholarship covered is impressive, in all the major European languages, unlike some recent works on Greek religion in English which tend to be extremely anglophone with respect to the scholarship discussed. There are maps to help locate cult sites, and plans of the cult sites themselves. The material available for cults in Messenia is presented in an accessible way, with the relevant documents both in the original Greek and translated, with sound discussions of all the material presented. It is certainly one of the more useful books on Greek religion to have been published recently, and anyone dealing with the cults of any of the gods, goddesses, and heroes of Messenia will need to consult it.

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CAMPANIAN CULTS

S. Adamo Muscetola, G. Greco, L. Licala (edd.): *I culti della Campania antica. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi in recordo di Nazarena Valenza Mele.* (Pubblicazioni scientifiche del Centro di Studi della Magna Grecia dell'Università degli Studi di Napoli «Federico II», 3.) Pp. xviii + 302, ills. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1998. Paper, L. 280,000. ISBN: 88-7689-133-1.

The proceedings of a conference held in Naples, May 1995, organized by the Università di Napoli—Frederico II, this publication provides fitting tribute to the late Nazarena Valenza Mele, whose academic interests lay in the study of the cults, myths, and mentality of the peoples of Magna Graecia and of Campania in particular. Contributions, accompanied by a wealth of good-quality illustrations, are made by Italian and French scholars of the highest calibre, though not all can be discussed here. The division of the volume into three sections—the first and most substantial on the Greek colonies, followed by one on the Etrusco-Italic area and another on the Roman Age—is a useful guide to content, though perhaps deceptive since many of the contributors seek to illustrate the interaction of these elements.

Zevi sensibly interprets developments of the Archaic period, not as the result of ethnic conflict but rather of Greco-Etruscan accord, highlighting the mediating rôle played by Delphic Apollo, Poseidonia, and the *Athenaion* of Punta della Campanella in this cultural, political, and economic *entente*. However, the details of this model are not a certainty—his assertion of a permanent Etruscan presence at a Pompeii undergoing a 'Servian' moment is not entirely uncontroversial, and Breglia interprets the *Athenaion* in an Archaic but primarily Chalcidian Cumaean context of Aristodemean propaganda.

More contributions focus on continuity and innovation of cults, on cultural cross-fertilization, in later periods of Oscan/Lucanian and of Roman domination. Rescigno and De La Genière note retention of archaic architectural features for the fifth and fourth centuries. But the latter also stresses new structural innovations at the *Heraion* on the Sele, and F. Greco the construction of the Poseidonian '*Asklepion*', in the Lucanian phase. Scatozza illustrates the continuity of Italic cults that were, nonetheless, infiltrated by a variety of Greek and indeed Roman cultural and artistic influences. Torelli insightfully illustrates how the imperial period inaugurated a servile, but inventive reproduction of the imperial cult, Roman monuments, and priesthoods at Pompeii. Cristofani and Miranda illustrate continuity of non-Roman cults, alongside new introductions in the period of Roman dominance.

Some particular themes do emerge. Methodological problems of reconstructing origins, and influences on and characteristics of cults are both unconsciously betrayed and consciously discussed in the volume. D'Agostino and Cerchiai develop the idea of Apollo as mediator of Etrusco-Italic cultural identity in the Greek Campanian sphere; Morel speculates on a Campanian–Etruscan connection for cult to Juno Populonia, and Coarelli hypothesizes on the introduction of the Italic goddess Mefitis into a Roman context. Such contributions, and the concluding debate, highlight how approaches towards understanding the complexities of transmission and assimilation of cult figures from one people to another, and the rôle which they played in mediation between cultures, are constantly being negotiated. The problems of interpreting votive material and visual images also become apparent. Potrandolfo

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

highlights the dangers of generalizing about the characteristics of a deity from one site to another and is sceptical of G. Greco's treatment of Hera. She advocates a more context-specific approach, which integrates archaeological and literary material, explaining the late-fifth century Poseidonian promotion of Hera and Argonaut myth as a conscious Lucanian effort to reinvigorate Achaean tradition, thus fitting themselves into the Greek thought world. Morel highlights the problems of his own attempts, and those of others, to attribute a cult site to a particular deity based on votive material and inscriptions, since these may suggest attributes too generic to be specific. Parise uses the example of Hera Lacinia on fifth-century Campanian coinage to illustrate the danger of assuming that numismatic images always relate to obvious political incidents and propaganda messages.

The tributes cover a wide chronological span and range of interests and, given the nature of the volume, it is unsurprising if the result is not an entirely coherent whole. Certain cults (Hera, Apollo) and sites (Poseidonia, Pompeii, Cumae) appear to be prioritized over others and a few contributions stray geographically beyond the confines of *Campania Antica*. But these are fitting in the circumstances—they tie in with the emphasis of M.'s own work and illustrate the wider nexus of social, cultural, economic, and political influences within which one needs to consider Campanian cults. The weighting of contributions in favour of Greek colonial and Roman imperial as opposed to Italic cults is inevitable and hardly unique to this volume. To its credit, it provides a valuable synthesis of earlier archaeological evidence and theories from the end of the last century with more recent research, giving a relatively complete and up-to-date knowledge of many sites and issues. Moreover, it explores the problems and possibilities of different methodological approaches that ought to be of interest to anyone concerned to understand mediation of identity and interaction between the Greek, Roman, and Italic peoples of Italy.

Brasenose College, Oxford ANGELA POULTER

'AM I A JEW?'

S. J. D. Cohen: *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Pp. xv + 426. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1999. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-520-21141-3.

For us it is a platitude that 'Jew' is both an ethnic and a religious designation, in modern times more usually the former. It is, or ought to be, another platitude that religion and ethnicity are concepts that we apply more readily than we can define them. In this learned, clear, and cautious study, Cohen reveals that words like *Ioudaizein* and *Ioudaios* were even more at the mercy of the speaker in the Roman world, where no one thought it possible to detect a Jew by garb, by accent, or by cast of features. A person could be called a Jew, regardless of his parentage or religion, if his home was in Judaea, and a gentile who elected to call himself a Jew was seldom asked for proof of circumcision, even though both Jews and Romans looked on this as an essential rite of passage (p. 48, etc.). One might object that people do not always fail to notice what they fail to mention—Greeks and Italians must have seen, but rarely say, that Africans had darker skins than they did, for example—but the evidence collected from papyri on p. 29 suffices to show that Jews were

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

inconspicuous, at least in Mediterranean lands, where 'honey-coloured skin' is a common trait. On the other hand, C. is perhaps inclined to make too much of the ease with which a canny gentile passes for a Jew in rabbinic anecdotes (pp. 37–9, 62–4). Verisimilitude is a safer canon in the 'English novel' than in 'Jewish fiction', yet we do not form any conjectures about the ugliness of Edwardian washerwomen from the failure of the human characters in the *Wind in the Willows* to penetrate the disguise of Mr Toad.

Although for the most part C. himself exemplifies the scrupulous precision which he shows to be necessary to his subject, he occasionally stumbles into lazy infelicities of expression that are characteristic of less thoughtful colleagues. In Chapter 2 he shows that Herod was sometimes styled a Jew because he ruled Judaea and patronized the Temple, and sometimes reckoned not to be a Jew because of his sinful conduct or his Idumaean ancestry. He deduces that the term 'Jew' was ambiguous (pp. 24, 342), when in fact he is entitled to argue only that, like any word that inhabits a living language, it had acquired a range of senses. Ambiguity occurs when the meaning of a word *in a given context* is uncertain; as C.'s own discussion tells us, whatever ancient writers said of Herod, each of them knew, and his readers saw, exactly what he under- stood by 'Jew'. It is equally inaccurate to assert that they lacked 'objective and empirical criteria' (p. 342); what C. intends to say is that none of these 'objective and empirical' statements was acknowledged universally as a test of Jewishness. The one such test in Roman times, of course, was circumcision; the striking central thesis of this book is that the formality of conversion by this rite was an innovation of the Maccabean period (second century B.C.). It was when the Jews became conscious of religion as a patrimony that marked them off from Greeks that they were willing to entertain the possibility that a person might become a Jew by embracing the religion, even without professing ties of blood. The conversion of the Idumaeans (pp. 110ff.) marks the transition of Judaism from a race to a commonwealth or *politeia*—more properly, on the author's own showing, from a Hellenic to a Hellenistic *politeia*, which implies not so much descent as the adoption of a certain way of life and permits the enfranchisement of deserving foreigners (pp. 125–9). The rule of circumcision, in the same way, was designed for inclusion rather than exclusion, making possible (if difficult) what had hitherto been sanctioned by no law.

The revival of the ethnic definition through the matrilineal principle is, as C. shows, not ancient and was not accepted even by all the rabbis of antiquity (pp. 286–9). I see little reason to quarrel with the theory that it was an illegitimate inference from an oversight in the legislation of Ezra (pp. 267, 290); C.'s attempt to demonstrate an analogy with Roman laws of inheritance leaves more doubt in my mind. The earliest Roman laws decree that the son of a freeborn woman and a man of lesser status is a citizen, but as C. observes, by the time that Rome had conquered Judah, subsequent enactments had produced the more symmetrical position that the status of the lesser partner, regardless of sex, is passed on to the offspring (p. 294). It is futile to suggest that there was a theoretical bias toward the mother; many of C.'s arguments rest on the indisputable premiss that the theory of legislation is the law. Furthermore, a version of the matrilineal principle was extended by certain rabbis to the children of Jewish women even when they made no profession of Judaism, and it was therefore a test of eligibility rather than of membership; the citizenship conferred by Rome did not depend on choice. Choice (or *hairesis*) was the beginning of philosophy in the ancient world, and without consideration of this term (which was applied to Jews of the Empire by themselves and by the gentiles), I do not think it possible, even for an outstanding work of scholarship like the present one, to determine with exactitude what it meant to be a Jew.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Christ Church, Oxford M. J. EDWARDS

THE JEWS AMONG THE ALIENS

M. GOODMAN (ed.): *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*. Pp. ix + 293. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-19-815078-4.

The last ten years have seen a stream, threatening to become a torrent, of books tackling the issue encapsulated within the title of this collection of essays. The tale behind this new interest is readily told: on the one hand, the Jewish communities of the Diaspora have been brought out of the shadow cast by the earlier tendency to see rabbinic Judaism as historically and ideologically normative, and have claimed their place within the burgeoning focus on the complexities of the cities of the Graeco-Roman world; on the other, Palestinian Judaism, both before and into the rabbinic period, has itself been rescued from a supposedly hermetically sealed idiosyncrasy—and academic responsibility—and located more firmly in that same world. At the same time, the contemporary fascination with the problem of 'identity', in the ancient no less than in the modern world, has found a congenial home in the study of Jewish communities, where, through a wealth of sources, there intersect numerous lines of continuity and discontinuity, sameness and difference, such as constitute that problem. This collection of essays takes this process a step further, even suggesting in the introductory essay by M. Goodman, a major contributor to these trends, that it is not simply a case of the Jewish minority being helpfully illuminated by awareness of the wider context: rather, if, as he argues, similarity outweighs difference, the abundance of sources on the Jews may allow them to illuminate their neighbours, minorities or not, within 'the varied tapestry of society in this region and period' (pp. 4–5).

Yet the book does not provide a 'grand narrative' explicating the parameters within which similarity and difference are held together, nor even a graph on which they might be plotted. Rather, it consists of close analyses of specific issues, most of which could easily have appeared under other umbrellas, and whose authors often give little more than a sidelong glance at the overarching issue. Their relevance to the latter is achieved in three ways: by G.'s introduction, which emphasizes the goal of interdisciplinary awareness and cooperation; by the subtitles of the four parts, three of which bear question marks (II: Social Integration? III: Similarities? IV: Differences?); and by the stimulus provided for the reader to realize how it is in attention to detail and to the variabilities and specificities of historical events, social experience, archaeological remains, documentary survivals, and literary sources that we can move beyond simplistic generalizations to a sense of the complexity of that tapestry.

This is best illustrated by a survey of the contributions: under 'I: The Hellenistic and Roman World: Jewish Perspectives', following G.'s introductory 'Jews, Greeks, and Romans', E. Gruen challenges prevailing assumptions about the context of the *Third Sibylline Oracle*, arguing that while the Romans appear as the villains, the sense of cultural continuities with the Greek world is positive; in 'The Hellenization of Jerusalem and Shechem' S. Schwartz uses the public–private divide to interpret and to understand the coexistence between 'Hellenization' and the preservation of native culture; starting from Josephus' account of the Tobiads, D. Schwartz endeavours to unravel the complexities regarding Seleucid and Ptolemaic control of Coele-Syria

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at the beginning of the second century B.C.E. Addressing the question of 'Social Integration' (II), B. Isaac argues from Eusebius' *Onomasticon*, correlated with other sources, for a predominant pattern of villages with mixed (pagan, Jewish, Christian) populations in Palestine at that time; asking 'Where Were the Jews of the Diaspora Buried?', D. Noy argues that the development of Jewish catacombs in Rome reflects the acquisition of the 'epigraphic habit', a need to differentiate themselves as inhumation gained popularity, and communal responses to limited land availability. Exploring 'Similarities' (III), A. Baumgarten uses a comparison of Graeco-Roman voluntary associations with ancient Jewish sects to explore the reasons for the development of the latter, noting in particular the significance of disorientation consequent upon the move to the cities; W. Horbury argues that in the 'Antichrist' figure we find a convergence of both Jewish expectations of a Messianic arch-opponent and corresponding Greek notions of attempted usurpation of the deity's sovereign power by an evil opponent: M. Satlow shows how rabbinic views about sexuality and masculinity may be differently expressed from, and yet share the same cultural presuppositions as, those of Greeks and Romans; J. Schwartz finds greater difference in his exploration of rabbinic views on gambling and the corresponding sparsity of archaeological survivals in Palestine, tentatively suggesting that the latter testifies to the influence of the rabbis' views of society; by contrast, H. Cotton's detailed study of legal documents from the Judaean desert finds few traces of rabbinic halachic influence, but rather evidence for a complex society with a rich cultural and legal inheritance; a counter to that argument is reiterated by A. Oppenheimer, drawing on rabbinic sources, that alongside the Roman judicial system Jewish courts and their decisions were actively supported by the Roman authorities, offering clients a choice of system. Perhaps surprisingly, three of the essays under 'IV: Differences?' focus on the Diaspora: L. Levine counters some recent studies of the 'archisynagogue', returning to a view that this was a leading and re- presentative rôle, encompassing religious, financial, and other functions, and that while adopted from the Graeco-Roman environment it was also distinctively adapted for the needs of the Jewish communities; M. Williams also rejects conventional wisdom, defending the view that the Jewish community at Rome had a central conciliar authority; T. Rajak looks for ways in which the Jewish community at Sardis adopted and yet redirected contemporary conventions as a way of affirming their own identity; finally, S. Stern, returning to rabbinic sources, suggests how different symbolic politico-cultural codes may have provoked misunderstanding between Romans and Jews (rabbis).

As indicated, the individual essays are themselves part of other conversations: the indeterminacy of the title is surely deliberate, a reminder that, despite all that has been, and is being, written, this is 'work-in-progress'. This collection is an important contribution to that work, as well as to those other conversations, but no less to the methodological and interdisciplinary enquiry in which any student of the ancient world is engaged.

King's College London JUDITH M. LIEU

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

REDEFINING JEWISHNESS

E. S. GRUEN: *Heritage and Hellenism. The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. (Hellenistic Culture and Society 30.) Pp. xx + 336. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1998. Cased, $27.50. ISBN: 0-520-21052-2.

For obvious reasons, the study of the history of the Jewish people in classical antiquity has tended to live a life separate from the study of Greek and Roman history and culture, except in those moments where the two intersect dramatically, as in the revolt of 66–70 C.E. Happily, this tendency has recently been changing with the appearance of books like Lee I. Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity. Conflict or Confluence?* (Seattle and London, 1998), Louis Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World. Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton, 1993), the collection of articles edited by Martin Goodman, *Jews in a Greco-Roman World* (Oxford, 1998), and the reader *Jewish Life and Thought among Greeks and Romans*, edited by Louis H. Feldman and Meyer Reinhold (Minneapolis, 1996), to name only a few recent publications in English. To this impressive collection Erich Gruen has now contributed a new study of the relations between Jews and Greek culture in the Hellenistic period.

G. approaches the fundamental question of his study 'how did Jews accommodate themselves to the larger cultural world of the Mediterranean while at the same time reasserting the character of their own heritage within it?' (p. xiv) through a series of essays on various aspects of Jewish heritage, mostly as captured in literary works written in Greek. The exception comes in the first chapter, in which he engages the problem of defining how far the Maccabean movement of the second century B.C.E. should be seen as consciously anti-Greek. G.'s answer is 'not much'. He arrives at this view through a thorough and careful re-examination of *I* and *II Maccabees* and the other main sources for the revolt, and shows successfully that there is very little in them that can be used to paint the Hasmonaeans or their movement as anti-Greek. The rôle the Seleukids played in supporting the newly created kingdom in its later phases turns out to be crucial, and helps to explain the lack of any explicitly anti- Greek 'policy'. G. places less stress on another aspect of the situation that played another crucial rôle to my mind, that is the ways in which the Hasmonaeans relied on typically Hellenistic institutions to run and expand their kingdom, just like any other petty Hellenistic dynasty.

The main impact of the Hasmonaeans on Jews was to push toward redefining Jewishness, a process that (G. argues) plays itself out over the next couple of centuries. He explores this process in the following chapters, which all deal with various themes in Jewish literature. G. sees in the Exodus story and its elaborations as recounted in Manetho and other later non-Jewish writers reflections not of Greek anti-Semitism but of Jewish reworkings of these stories to make Jews the conquerors of Egypt and to legitimate their place in Hellenistic Egyptian society; the 'return' to Palestine becomes a kind of *apoikia* tale, a mythology of colonizing like those created by so many Greek cities for themselves in the same period. Joseph stories, widely reworked in this period, are interpreted as assertions of Jewish superiority to locals in situations where Jews were living among non-Jews—one thinks again especially of Egypt.

In all this—and G. covers much more ground than can be noted in a short review—his primary method is close, skeptical reading of the sources. This serves him best when he is dealing with the more historical material, like the sources for

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Hasmonaeans or the literature that treats the relationship between Jews and Hellenistic kings. It can be less effective when he must deal with a hodgepodge of writers who reworked scriptural material. Problems of date and authorship are legion (as in trying to separate Eupolemos from Ps.-Eupolemos as quoted by Alexander Polyhistor as quoted by Eusebius), surviving fragments few; and G. is sometimes reduced by circumstances to a rather thin analysis, all that the evidence can support.

G. insists on seeing this material not through the lens of the Greeks but through that of the Jews who produced and read it. He demonstrates for much of this literature that its intended audience was other Jews, not gentiles; it was therefore neither apologia nor counterattacks to anti-Semitism, but something much more complex and interesting: an internal dialogue on what it meant to be a Jew. G. helps us see the disagreements; the fact that the various strands do not cohere results from the lack of a single overarching purpose, and in some cases the view of Jewishness expressed in one work contradicts or conflicts with that expressed in another. G.'s sensitivity to these differences and his care in elucidating them might serve as a model for historians trying to get at the ways in which ethnic identities were constructed in the Greco- Roman world, and he surely shows us how underappreciated sources can be deployed in this search. He is also refreshingly open to the humor in the products of this Greco-Jewish world—something that seems all too often to escape the serious scholar of the ancient world.

No doubt experts will find matters of dating and interpretation to disagree with. (I was not convinced by his attempt to interpret the account of the banquet in Ps.-Aristeas' Letter as a spoof of philosophers [pp. 218–19].) But the great range of material with which G. deals and the clarity and depth of his analysis make *Heritage and Hellenism* an excellent introduction to a complex and poorly understood body of literature crucial to unraveling the place Jews made for themselves in the Hellenistic world.

Trinity College, Hartford G. REGER

JEWS, CHRISTIANS, AND SOME OTHERS

J. F. A. SAWYER: *Sacred Languages and Sacred Texts. Religion in the First Christian Centuries*. Pp. x + 190. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. Paper, £16.99. ISBN: 0-415-12547-2.

K. P. DONFRIED, P. RICHARDSON (edd.): *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*. Pp. xiv + 329, 6 ills. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 1998. Paper, £15.99. ISBN: 0-8028-4266-8.

S. FINE (ed.): *Jews, Christians and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period*. Pp. xviii + 253, ills. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-415-18247-6.

Of the three books reviewed here, all concerned in some way with the influence of Judaism, Sawyer's is the shortest, but in scope the most ambitious. Its thesis is that, as

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

religions differ in their notions of the sanctity of language, so they have different goals in the preservation and distribution of sacred texts. Zoroastrians cherished their unintelligible *Avesta*; Christians multiplied converts by their readiness to turn their scriptures into the vernacular; Jews took a middle way by keeping up the use of Hebrew in religion while they renounced it in every other sphere of life. The breadth of S.'s erudition is on display, not only in his profuse citation of colleagues from a variety of disciplines, but by perspicacious inferences from ancient texts that yield their evidence only to those who read them with attention. In a larger volume certain claims would require defence: can one deny that the letters of Paul were canonized by the primitive Church when the second epistle of Peter already ranks them with 'other scriptures'? Can one assume that the Maccabean books existed only in Greek (p. 66) when Origen knows them by a Hebrew title? Even here, one sometimes feels that a little more annotation would have satisfied the expert without fatiguing other readers: evidence should (and can) be supplied for dating Zoroaster to '*c*. 1000 B.C.E.' (p. 39), for treating the Council of Yavneh as an historical occasion, and for saying that Christians started to designate scripture by the word 'canon' in the fourth century (p. 62), rather than (as readers of Eusebius on Clement sometimes argue) at the beginning of the third. I doubt S.'s conjecture that the Jewish computation of twenty-four books in the Hebrew canon owes anything to the division of Homer's epics in the Alexandrian editions: Homer was not a text of religious value in the Hellenistic era, and twenty-four is both a handy and an important number for other reasons. I also fear that S. puts too much weight on the Nicene Council of 325, which did not define the canon of the New Testament, and marked neither the beginning of Roman dominance nor a great enhancement of it. But such bagatelles are easily forgiven to a book that seems to be almost as up to date in its anthropology as in its survey of grammatical variation in the Old Testament, a book in which one learns that our word 'dragoman' comes from the Aramaic *targum* (p. 80), and that English can provide a thousand candidates for the number of the Beast (p. 163).

Donfried and Richardson's *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome* is a collection of original essays, presented in three sections. The archaeological studies in the first section cannot fail to be of value and interest to the general reader, as they decant into a cheaper form the results of excavations that might otherwise lie hidden in obscure and costly volumes. As is so often the case, however, the lapidary evidence tells us little more than we knew or guessed. Richardson adds synagogues of Volumnius and Herod to those that bore the names of Augustus and Agrippa; White observes that Jews in the capital showed 'a high degree of acculturation'; Snyder suggests that Christianity acted as a vector for both Jewish and pagan symbols (the latter perhaps being sometimes classed as pagan simply for want of a Jewish prototype). In the second section, on the setting of the Epistle to the Romans, and the third, on the development of the Roman Church, the authors appeal so frequently to Donfried's earlier volume, *The Romans Debate* (Edinburgh, 1991), as to give the effect of watching the same day's news on all five channels after having already heard it on the radio. One loses count of the number of times that riots provoked by Chrestus and their aftermath are cited, with occasional but unsignalled variation or contradiction, as the cause of dissension in the Roman Church. Much that needed argument is taken as proved, like the questionable assumption of Brandle and Stegemann that the gentiles of the congregation were god-fearers who imbibed their Christianity from Jews. Jeffers on the Jewish family comes to the lame and impotent conclusion that there was little to distinguish Jews or Christians in their domestic lives. The most original

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

piece in Section 2 is that of Osiek on the orality of Hermas, but it would have been more instructive had she kept to one definition of orality. The *Shepherd* is an oral composition in the sense that it was orally distributed; but this, being true of almost every ancient work, sheds no light on the inconsequential structure or rambling idiom of the treatise. If it were an oral work in the sense of being dictated by the Spirit, it would not evince so many signs of human fallibility; as a work of putative inspiration, it belongs less to an oral than to a literary vein that runs from Ezekiel to the Apocalypse. In the third section I would award the palm to Caragounis' dissolution of the arguments purporting to show that the Church in Rome was a loose confederation of private meetings. Donfried's introduction seems to prefer the previous article by Lane, who is no more disposed to meddle with the assumptions of his colleagues than to mitigate the Suetonian caricatures of Nero and Domitian. In praise of the collection, it must be said that all the articles are clearly written and amply documented; anyone who approaches it as a handbook to the discoveries and conjectures of recent scholarship will not be misinformed.

Few collections boast such a tessellation of authorities as Fine's *Jews, Christians and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue*; and anyone who reads the book will see how necessary it was to write it. Unfortunately, the brevity of the articles leaves little opportunity for preparing intellectual foundations or for testing disagreements between contributors. Sanders lists the common traits of Judaism under Roman government; but in this age when anyone from Judaea was a *Ioudaios*, we cannot be sure that what was normative in Judaism was normal practice for a Jew. Van der Horst takes issue with Helen Mackay's attempt to show that there was no Sabbath-worship in the early synagogue; I wonder, however, whether his flawless inventory of the evidence proves more than that there was worship on his definition but may have been none on hers. He feels obliged to vindicate Luke's testimony to the reading of the Torah in the synagogue, whereas Schiffman merely adds this text as a datum to rabbinic sayings of even more disputable historicity. Baumgarten guesses that pagan and syncretistic art in synagogues, tolerated by indulgent rabbis, was promoted by 'wealthy patrons, close to patriarchal families'; Levine, on the other hand, holds that there is not sufficient evidence to show that the patriarchs exercised hegemony in religion, though he admits that many 'enigmas' would be resolved if this were so. Most of the contributors uphold Josephus' picture of the synagogue; but Miller, putting more faith in epigraphy than in literature, contends that there were many kinds of rabbi and a variety of synagogal customs. From two poems which convey the admoni- tions of the people to priests and rabbis H. Schwartz derives the temerarious inference that the poet was superior to either of these officials, a wielder of something known as 'cosmically efficacious speech'. Some characteristics of the Jewish synagogue are thrown into relief by Plummer's candid and comprehensive survey of Samaritan relics, yet none of the other articles contains a single reference to this people. Rajak finds that donors to the synagogue not merely imitated, but sometimes were, religious and civic luminaries of the gentile world. Crawford detects in Sardis only 'evidence of tolerance'—which, as the Jews survived there for centuries, could have been predicted. Fine, by contrast, dwells on the Jews' suspicion of pagan donors and their manifest antipathy to Christian persecutors. Jensen opines that the decorated synagogue at Dura-Europos may be a more original work than is commonly acknowledged; is his case supported or impaired by Meyer's comment that the Torah shrine is too small to contain the usual library of scrolls? More collusion might have produced more controversy, or else a more coherent book; as it is, the reader must be content with

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

thirteen articles, on interesting but disparate subjects, handled with exquisite circumspection and meticulous attention to the facts.

Christ Church, Oxford M. J. EDWARDS

THE PEOPLE'S FRIEND

J. J. MEGGITT: *Paul, Poverty and Survival* (Studies of the New Testament and its World). Pp. xiv + 268; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 0-567-08604-6.

Blandly described on the dust jacket as an examination of the economic and social life of Pauline churches, Meggitt's study turns out to be a calculated assault upon the generally accepted view, based primarily on the work of G. Theissen (*The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity* [Philadelphia, 1982]) and W. Meeks (*The First Urban Christians* [New Haven, 1983]), that the membership of the early Christian churches covered a broad social spectrum, some converts being not only affluent but even socially elevated. M. will have none of this. For him the Pauline churches were comprised entirely of the poor and destitute (among whom even Paul himself is to be numbered). M.'s mission is to champion their cause and rescue them, the oppressed non-élite, from the 'enormous condescension of posterity' (E. P. Thompson's words, quoted approvingly more than once). M. knows that he is being provocative and he concludes his introduction thus: 'there is much in the following pages at which various specialists (particularly ancient historians) will, no doubt, balk.' If my own reaction to this work is at all typical, that prediction will almost certainly be fulfilled. There are a great many things in this highly polemical work that many, probably most, ancient historians will find hard to swallow. Only a few can be mentioned in this brief review.

The first thing on which I gagged was the view propounded of Roman society. M. will admit of no middle-range economic group and simply denies, despite an abundance of evidence to the contrary, that upward mobility through thrift, enterprise, or hard work took place. His Roman society has but two strata—a rich, exploitative élite comprising around 1% of the population and a vast, virtually undifferentiated underclass, its members' brief lives marked by insecurity, grinding poverty, and disease. (If Columella says that the lives of urban slaves were easier than those of rural ones, then Columella is not to be believed [p. 54 n. 65].) Nor will M. admit to the efficacy of any of the mechanisms and institutions usually credited with alleviating the lot of the poorer members of Graeco-Roman society. Euergetism was created and practised solely for the benefit of the élite, not the poor. Patronage was purely exploitative—to believe otherwise is to be taken in by 'the mythology which élite writers such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Seneca or Plutarch sought to disseminate' or to be guilty of reading Martial and Juvenal naively (p. 168).

Equally hard for me to take is M.'s contention that the Christian church was filled exclusively with people from the bottom layer of Roman society. This is no more than an assertion and there is good evidence against it. Pliny, for instance, says quite explicitly in his letter to Trajan about the Christian cult in Bithynia that persons of all ages, all ranks (*omnis ordinis*), and both sexes were involved (*Epist.* 10.96). M. does not bother to engage with Pliny on this point but merely heaps abuse upon those scholars who have made use of this text (pp. 99–100). The author of Acts even names some of early Christianity's more affluent converts, e.g. Crispus, former leader of the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Jewish community (*archisynagogos*) at Corinth (Acts 18.8). M.'s tactic for dealing with this awkward reference is to assert against an abundance of evidence to the contrary (presented and discussed in detail by Rajak and Noy in *JRS* 83 [1993], 75–93) that *archisynagogoi* cannot be assumed to have been rich and socially significant. As for the words δυνατοί and εὐγενεῖς in 1 Corinthians 1.26, usually taken to imply the presence in the Corinthian congregation of the powerful and well-born, well, they cannot mean powerful and well-born here. 'Such words', M. airily asserts, 'were substantially more equivocal than has been assumed. As emotive labels which had a long history of élite use, they were open to ongoing appropriation and "transgressive rescription". They ceased (if they had ever been) to be lexically monosemous' (pp. 103–4). All of which, and there is more I could quote, does not enlighten us at all as to what M. thinks these words actually do mean in this text.

M. sharply attacks the 'debilitating myopia' of others who write about the social history of the New Testament, but his own treatment of the composition of the Pauline churches lacks any sense of historical perspective. Christianity was not a unique phenomenon in the early Roman empire. The first century was a growth period for many cults of eastern Mediterranean origin. Their attraction was not just to the poor and destitute; the empire's better-off inhabitants frequently became adherents too. This can be documented easily for Judaism. A whole host of texts, some literary, others epigraphic, reveals among the patrons, sympathizers, and converts of that cult gentiles of the highest social standing. One (Poppaea Sabina) was even an empress! Given that the cradle and early home of Christianity was the synagogue, common sense suggests that the appeal of the Christian cult is unlikely to have been significantly narrower than that of Judaism. Common sense, unfortunately, is a quality conspicuous by its absence in this perverse, ideologically driven study.

The Open University MARGARET H. WILLIAMS

DESCRIBING ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY

K. F. JOHANSEN: *A History of Ancient Philosophy: from the Beginnings to Augustine*. (trans. H. Rosenmeier.) Pp. xii + 685. London and New York: Routledge, 1998 (first published in Danish, 1991). Cased, £85. ISBN: 0-415-12738-6.

The history of philosophy can be presented as a protracted debate, a progression of positions arising in reaction to errors and shortcomings perceived in its earlier practitioners; or, again, it can be presented through what it maintains in common, the questions it has constantly before it, and the common ground at the heart of the answers it gives. J. adopts the latter approach, aiming to show ancient thought as 'a coherent whole, albeit one with many variations' (p. xi); and the choice has a pervasive effect on the style and nature of his description. Most importantly, perhaps, this *is* essentially a work of description—description, that is, of *what* (according to J.) the various philosophers propounded, presumably because to speculate about why someone believes what they do inevitably involves talking about why they *disagree* with alternatives. This approach will not be to everyone's taste: it is (at least in J.'s hands) urbane, but it can also be woolly; it avoids implausible speculation, but not disingenuous generalization; it reduces the complex diversity of the subject, but it also, well, reduces the complex diversity of the subject. In particular, it can act as a

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

straitjacket for the reconstruction of more fragmentary philosophers. The Presocratics, for example, look on the whole much thinner here than they would placed in a more polemical context: the earliest surviving philo- sophical quotation, the fragment of Anaximander, J. is able to pass over with the dismissive claim that it 'does not argue—it postulates something' (p. 24).

But J.'s descriptive approach does not at all confine him to banality: on the contrary, his discussion is characterized throughout by a high level of philosophical sophistication. Apart from anything else, description becomes more interestingly tendentious the greater the scope of the material it is required to synthesize—as is soon demonstrated in his chapters on Plato. Having committed himself to playing down disagreement between philosophers, J. here eliminates internal disagreement as well, rejecting the traditional developmental account of Plato's philosophy (cf. pp. 144, 164; the 'late' dialogues are, to be sure, considered as a distinct period in Plato's thought, but even then as giving us differences in perspective rather than of belief). The pugilist will feel the lack of, for example, the debate over the nature of the soul played out between dialogues such as the *Protagoras*, *Gorgias*, and *Republic*: even if Plato's own position on the question never changed (cf. pp. 68–9 on the *Protagoras*), the arguments here would nevertheless provide important background to an under- standing of later developments in psychology and ethics. Nevertheless, the approach works remarkably well as a reading of Plato—not least because it allows J. to group together and outline the contents of a good spread of the dialogues according to topic (an artful incorporation of précis into thematic discussion which is not really equalled elsewhere in the book).

Equally controversial, though arguably less successful, is J.'s reading of Aristotle. Once again he denies the possibility of internal development (cf. p. 276): he does, for example, seem to believe that the *Categories* is an earlier work than the *Metaphysics* (pp. 351, 354), but he does not allow that we can trace a shift in Aristotle's meta- physical thought between the two works (again, it is the perspective rather than the theory that is supposed to have changed: p. 388; cf. p. 351). J.'s explication is not always easy to follow; but, guided throughout by the *Categories*, it works towards the conclusion that Aristotelian 'forms' are to be treated not so much as (meta)physical entities, but rather as 'limiting concepts' in a basically empirical analysis of nature (cf. esp. p. 319 on teleology)—a conclusion which leads J. to regret that 'Aristotle cannot be wholly absolved from reifying his concept of god' (p. 361). There is a whiff of Kant about this Aristotle—which may be no accident, as the title to an introductory section ('The Copernican Turning Point': p. 276) suggests. Indeed, quite generally, J. seems to play to an assumed Kantian prejudice in his readers. It is a deliberate mark of his style that he highlights similarities between different philosophers (backwards, forwards, and sideways in time), and Kant is not the only modern philosopher enlisted in this wider network of comparisons; but he is invoked with unusual frequency. The Epicurean notion of time (p. 2), for example, and the Stoic notions of place, void, and time (p. 439) are compared to Kantian 'forms of intuition'—although the comparison is immediately undermined in the case of the Stoics, with the qualification that they are 'given with the existence of the world, rather than with consciousness' (leaving us to wonder in some confusion if perhaps they are, like Platonic forms, transcendental, but 'not in Kant's sense': p. 180).

The discursive section of J.'s book is a little over 600 pages long, but we only leave Aristotle on p. 400, so that just one-third of the book is devoted to covering almost four-fifths of its chronological brief. This foreshortening presumably reflects J.'s sense of his audience: philosophers are accorded space roughly in proportion to their

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

popular fame in the modern world. And there are some real advantages gained from the brisker pace. The discussions of Stoicism and Epicureanism are a touch romanticized (cf. p. 423 on Epicurus' Garden, and his rôle as 'psycho-therapist' in which 'he surely cannot be overrated'); but they are also very clear and very sound. The relative concision of J.'s discussions of Plotinus (who turns out to be very well suited to J.'s style of treatment) and of Augustine (whose philosophy is discussed with a pleasing sense of its historical setting) also bring a welcome clarity to subjects who can all too easily be made to intimidate. But the concision is abetted by a more sinister excision as well. The Sceptical Academy barely musters as many pages (four, to be exact) as Philo of Alexandria on his own; and the whole period from the death of Carneades to the rise of Plotinus (almost four centuries) is treated as one of a rather dull eclecticism (cf. pp. 477, 484, 492, 513–4), in which Alcinous appears as 'Albinus' (not apparently in opposition to, but certainly in overt disregard of, the trend in more recent scholarship: p. 514 n. 1), and in which Plutarch stands in tacit opposition to something called 'official middle Platonism' (p. 520) whose archetypal representative is Antiochus of Ascalon (e.g. p. 514). It is telling that the bibliography to this section of the book contains only three discursive works as recent as the 1980s, and one of those on Gnosticism. Something similar might be said for the discussion of early Christian philosophy as well. It is nothing but good to find people like Justin and Clement and (especially) Origen invited into a work on ancient philosophy; but they are worth more than five pages and a bibliography that stops in 1967. It is also a shame that the Christians are considered together in a chapter which is (uniquely) fenced off from the chronological structure of the work as a whole. There are, of course, aspects of Christian philosophical identity which are unique to the religion as such; but a focus on its assimilation of and historical engagement with pagan thought might be more valuable in a history of philosophy (not to mention the importance of Christian evidence for understanding later pagan philosophy, and not to mention J.'s avowed attempt to make a 'coherent whole' of his subjects).

J.'s work is conservative in its scope and sometimes ahistorical in its analysis; but it makes no pretence at being a guide to the study of Ancient Philosophy as such. It presents a way of viewing, not of doing, the subject, a book that *can* be read in parallel with the philosophers it describes (their works are fairly systematically referenced), but which really expects to be read *instead* of them, and read by an audience whose main point of entry will be the topics of early modern and modern philosophy. It is, seen from this point of view, a successful and impressive book: however one reacts to his views or approach, J. is undoubtedly a master of his subject, and writes in an uncomplicated manner that suggests confidence and enthusiasm about it.

University of Durham GEORGE BOYS-STONES

DESCRIBING GREEK PHILOSOPHY

HELMUT FLASHAR (ed.): *Die Philosophie der Antike 2/1: Sophistik, Sokrates, Sokratik, Mathematik, Medizin.* Pp. xiv + 540. Basel: Schwabe & Co., 1998. Cased, DM 156. ISBN: 3-7965-1036-1.

This is the fourth part to appear of the complete revision of the ancient philosophy section of Ueberweg's *Grundriss*, which is proceeding under the general editorship of Helmut Flashar. Volume III, covering the Old Academy, Aristotle, and the Lyceum, appeared in 1983, and Volume IV, covering Hellenistic Philosophy, appeared in two

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

parts in 1994. This volume, which will eventually fill the gap between the Presocratics and Plato, comprises sections on the Sophists (a collaborative revision by several German scholars of an original English text by the late G. B. Kerferd), on 'Socrates, the Socratics and their Tradition' by Klaus Döring, on mathematical writers by Hans-Joachim Waschkies, and on medical writers by Carolin Oser-Grote.

The sections on the sophists and on Socrates and the Socratics make up the greater part of the work, approximately 360 pages compared with the total of approximately 120 pages on mathematics and medicine. The two larger sections are broadly similar in character. That on the sophists begins with a chapter in which a brief general characterization of the sophists is followed by short sections on the ancient sources, on the history of modern discussions, and on the influence of the sophists in antiquity and later. This is followed by a chapter on 'basic themes', setting out general aspects of the sophists' treatment of topics including the *nomos–phusis* contrast, rhetoric, epistemology, religion, and the development of civilization, and by chapters on the principal individual sophists, each containing a brief statement of the available information on biography, works, doctrines, and later influence. The section is completed by an omnibus chapter compiling all the available information on lesser sophists, a chapter on anonymous works including the *Dissoi Logoi* and the *Anonymus Iamblichi*, and a comprehensive bibliography running to thirty double-columned pages. Those familiar with Kerferd's work on the sophists will find here what they would expect. The available information is presented with admirable clarity and conciseness, and where appropriate (e.g. with reference to Protagoras' 'Homo-Mensura-Satz') the different interpretations to be found in the literature are mentioned, but there is little or no attempt to engage with interpretative problems at first hand. Occasionally contentious issues are glossed over; thus it is surprising, in view of the scepticism expressed by Dover and others about the alleged series of impiety trials at Athens in the late fifth century, to find the traditional account repeated without any indication that it is controversial (pp. 24–5, 29), and still more surprising to find Dover's 1975 article cited among the relevant literature (p. 24) without any indication that he takes a contrary view.

Döring begins his section with a chapter on Socrates, starting with a brief survey (one and a half pages) of the current state of the 'Socratic problem', followed by sections on sources, biography, doctrines, and later influence. Assuming that the various writers of Socratic dialogues were responding to an actual historical individual, he seeks (sensibly) to identify the views of that individual by looking for convergence in what remains of those writings, and believes (more controversially) that that convergence is to be found in Plato's *Apology*, which he treats as the canonical expression of Socrates' views (p. 156). In the biographical section he takes the ancient stories of Socrates' second 'marriage' more seriously than most, pointing to Plato's evidence of the substantial gap between the ages of his eldest son (a *meirakion* at the time of Socrates' death) and of his two younger children (*paidia* at the same time) as evidence that they may have had different mothers, and making the intriguing suggestion that the two little ones may have been the children of Myrto, not Xanthippe (p. 148). (If the latter was in fact running a household containing her husband's second wife or concubine and their children, that might throw an interesting light on the stories of her bad temper, to say nothing of its relevance to our view of Socrates' sexuality.) The section on later influence is full of fascinating information, e.g. that Socrates was the subject of comic operas by Telemann and Paisiello (p. 174). After a brief general introduction to the Socratics, the section continues with chapters on individuals on the same model as those for the sophists, except that, when an

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

individual was regarded by the ancients as the founder of a school, the chapter includes the later members of the school, e.g. Aristippus and the Cyrenaics, Antisthenes and the Cynics. There is a one-page concluding section on anonymous Socratic dialogues, including papyrus fragments, and another magnificent bibliography. As in the section on the sophists, the aim is primarily expository; different interpretations are mentioned, but in general critical discussion 'muss dahingestellt werden'.

It goes beyond my competence to discuss the content of the sections on mathematical and medical writers. I must be content to note that they are very different in scope. The section on mathematics contains an essay on sources and substantial discussions of the work of Euclid, Archimedes, Apollonius of Perga, Pappus, and Diophantus. Running to over fifty double-columned pages, plus twenty-seven of bibliography, it is a substantial piece of work. The medical section, by contrast, consists (after the briefest of introductions to the Hippocratic Corpus and to Hippocratic ethics) of short descriptions of eight Hippocratic works, some less than a page long and none longer than three and a half. It amounts to no more than a collection of encyclopedia articles, plus a five-page bibliography.

Overall, this is an extremely useful handbook. Though one should not look to it for in-depth discussion, it contains a vast amount of information presented in a clear and extremely accessible form. It would be worth having for the sake of the bibliographies alone.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford C. C. W. TAYLOR

THE SUN OF HERACLITUS

C. L. J. Schönbeck: *Sunbowl or Symbol. Models for the Interpretation of Heraclitus' Sun Notion.* Pp. xlvi + 439, ills. Amsterdam: Elixir Press, 1998. Cased, Hfl. 275. ISBN: 90-71409-03-1.

This big, strange, and beautiful book is in origin a doctoral thesis, which after many years' labours in the composition was approved by the University of Amsterdam in the summer of 1998. It is a kind of monument not only to a certain conception of scholarship, but also to the book as the physical object we used to know.

Sunbowl or Symbol, though in the end the outcome mostly of electronic processes, looks and feels like the product of one of the fine art presses which flourished in Britain during the inter-war period. It is printed in a limited edition (each copy with its own handwritten number) on 80 g Caxton, with huge margins, book markers, hand-pasted ornamented initials, and illustrations, and such a combination of elegance and intricate complexity in the typography that the author was awarded the Max Reneman Prize for this aspect of the book. As well as a general introduction, there is a separate prefatory section on 'notations and typography'. S. uses a great variety of typographical conventions, including various symbols in the margins to indicate items in the text corresponding to an inventory of key topics (almost all wholly neglected in previous scholarship, in his opinion) presented as one of six appendices. All this is in service of his conviction that explicitness and ways of exhibiting explicitness are prime desiderata in Heraclitus scholarship, once again barely appreciated by previous workers in the field. Needless to say, there are excellent tables of contents, and the book is superbly indexed.

S.'s project is indicated in his subtitle: this is not a study of Heraclitus in general, but

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of one particular theme in his philosophy. There are among the generally acknowledged fragments of Heraclitus a handful about the sun, e.g. (to list those which most preoccupy S.) 'The sun is new every day' (fr. 6 DK); it has the 'breadth of a human's foot' (fr. 3 DK); 'The sun will not overstep its measures; otherwise the Erinyes, helpers of justice, will find it out' (fr. 94 DK). In recent years we have become aware that in the Derveni Papyrus the last two are recalled together, which has prompted further debate on their original form. In the gappy text of col. IV, as restored by K. Tsantsanoglou (see *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus*, edd. A. Laks and G. W. Most [Oxford, 1997], Chapter VI), the Derveni writer says that Heraclitus says: 'The sun according to its own nature is a human foot in width, not exceeding its boundaries. For if it goes outside its width, the Erinyes, helpers of justice, will find it out.' But S. investigates not just the bearing of the Derveni evidence on the question. Not the least of his contributions to the study of Heraclitus is another appendix in which he gathers together a larger collection of testimonia on the entire body of sun fragments than we have ever had before.

S. evidently thinks that in order to come to terms with these sayings we need at least three attributes. First, we need classical scholarship, i.e. the panoply of knowledge of Greek literature, philosophy, philology, history, art, and archaeology, especially in the archaic period but ranging well beyond that. But reconstructing an archaic Heraclitus, even if feasible, would not be enough. Second, we approach the material seriously underequipped if we do so without a knowledge of science and the history of science, especially astronomy and psychology—for how big the sun appears, e.g. at the horizon vs. in the meridian, is a question pre-eminently for psychology. Third, and above all else, we need to be aware that nothing about these sayings of Heraclitus is self-evident. In fact in every dimension each is multiply problematical. And for every question we can think to ask there are a host of prior methodological issues to be raised and explored. Few earlier writers, in S.'s view, have begun to see the necessity for doing so. One exception to which he frequently recurs is Karl Popper, in 'Back to the Presocratics', and subsequently in his debate with G. S. Kirk. But he thinks Popper's work succeeds only in alerting us to the need to take questions of methodology seriously.

S.'s enquiry is really a meta-enquiry. It is divided into three parts, devoted to a 'characterization' of the material, its problems, and the possibility of solutions. The division makes it sound as though there might have been progress: as though by the end one might perhaps have got a bit closer than at the outset to understanding how one might go about making sense of Heraclitus' remarks about the sun. In the event, this expectation is not fulfilled. The fundamental reason for its non-fulfilment is that S. is a sceptic. He is driven not by a sense of how despite all the difficulties an understanding of what Heraclitus meant might be achieved, but by a deep and apparently irrefragable conviction that there are always more difficulties to be negotiated than one is yet in a position to see one's way through, and that there is always more ground-clearing work to be done before building can begin. S.'s book contains immense and varied learning, and his ingenuity and perspicacity in formulating problematics is boundless: anybody thinking of thinking about Heraclitus on the sun will want to consult him. But in the end the experience of reading *Sunbowl or Symbol* was for me dispiriting: sustained and inconclusive meta-enquiry leaves one weary as well as hungry.

St John's College, Cambridge MALCOLM SCHOFIELD

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

SUI SIMILIS

A. NEHAMAS: *The Art of Living. Socratic Reflections from Plato to Foucault.* (Sather Classical Lectures, 61.) Pp. xi + 283. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1998. Cased, $29.95. ISBN: 0-520-21173-1.

'In relation to [Socrates], we are both gods and victims' (p. 91). Gods, because as readers of texts about Socrates we can stand back and survey his image; victims, because Plato artfully positions his readers in the same shoes as the hapless interlocutors of Socrates, whom he depicts. N.'s beautifully lucid account of philosophy as the art of constructing a unified self (rescuing this as one, but not the only, kind of philosophy) has the problem of our access to Socrates at its heart. Its first part, 'Silence', includes a ground-breaking chapter on Platonic Irony and two on Socratic Irony; its second part, 'Voices', discusses Montaigne, Nietzsche, and Foucault on Socrates in three chapters titled by punning on the links between Socrates' face, reason, and fate. Throughout, N. seeks to explore the paradoxes of modelling one's own life as a unique work of art on that of another, especially when that other is as silent, and as opaque, as Socrates.

N.'s reading of Socratic irony shows just how that opacity is created by the Platonic text (and compares this effect with the straightforward moralistic Socrates presented by Xenophon, a source who, as N. shows, remained important or even decisive for scholars until the German Romantics put irony, and so Plato, centre stage). Arguing persuasively against Vlastos that an ironic statement need not encode the opposite of what is said as a straightforward truth, but may rather mean something simply 'different' (with Cicero and Quintilian) from the literal statement made, N. builds a picture of a Socrates who may be no more than a mask, a surface, which promises but may conceal no depths. (For N.'s criticisms of his admired teacher Vlastos, readers can now profitably consult *Virtues of Authenticity: Essays on Plato and Socrates* [Princeton, 1999], which collects N.'s essays on these topics.)

But Socrates' disavowal of knowledge then poses a conundrum: how can Socrates always have acted well without possessing the *sine qua non* of his own axiom, virtue is knowledge? N. thinks that Plato found in his experience of Socrates no answer to this question, and that the early dialogues reflect the Socrates whom Plato saw and who was as opaque to his disciple as these texts make him appear to us. In the middle dialogues Plato made it his business to supply Socrates with the requisite depth and to prove that his life of philosophy held universal value and significance.

I think that N. himself provides materials for a more straightforward answer to the conundrum: Socrates acted well not by doing extraordinary or novel things but by being impervious to mob frenzy and refusing to engage in manifest injustice. As N. himself observes (p. 146), one need not have a definition of truth, or of justice, to be able to identify individual truths or falsehoods, cases of justice or injustice, and so Socrates need not have had knowledge to the standard of a craftsman of justice in order to live well. Nor must one agree with N.'s rather odd view that Socrates' ongoing questioning of others (once he had refuted the oracle to his own satisfaction by showing that no one was wiser than he) was due to his desire to prove that he was good, on the grounds that 'only one good human being can recognize another' (p. 82). Socrates' desire to find a good person can be explained by his desire to gain the genuine knowledge of virtue which only such a person could provide, a desire rooted in the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

attractiveness of the good which underpins the Socratic paradoxes no less than it structures the middle-period *Republic*.

All these points and many other acute observations are, however, in the service of N.'s overriding interest in the problem and phenomenon of imitation. N.'s thesis is that one can only imitate an exemplary achievement of self-fashioning by fashioning oneself. Since one could not imitate uniqueness by doing or being exactly the same as the unique person imitated, the imitation of uniqueness can only be higher-order: by becoming unique oneself in one's own way.

N. traces the subtle dynamics of this higher-order imitation of Socrates in each of his three great moderns. His reading of Montaigne is sensitive to the literary contradictions and perturbations of his 'Of Physiognomy' and shows how the title itself grows out of the ancient preoccupation with the significance of Socratic ugliness. His reading of Nietzsche, continuing and in part correcting an earlier book on him, argues that Nietzsche was maddened by Socrates because he modelled (and so pre-empted) the unique self-fashioning to which the later-born philosopher aspired. N.'s argument here makes one wonder whether Nietzsche did not also resent Socrates for not having had to write, for having found a disciple who could make him immortal. Indeed, the fact that N.'s three chosen moderns, and N. himself, all consider writing as indispensable to the task of self-creation seems to me to deserve more scrutiny than it here receives. N. makes two points on behalf of writing (p. 8). The first, that creating a unified self and life is so complex that writing is indispensable, is falsified by Socrates and rather historically relative anyway; the second, that a written life is the only kind that can be passed on to others as a model, begs the question of why one should need to intend to be an example in order to be(come) exemplary. After all, the self-conscious desire to serve as a model for others is exactly what N. argues that Socrates did not have. This same question could be asked of N.'s treatment of Foucault, which rejects the latter's this-worldly reading of the *Phaedo* but endorses his general understanding of Socrates as engaged in a project of care for the self.

A final note of dissent in my appreciation of this marvellous book. While suggesting that Montaigne and Foucault, at least, intuitively understood the peculiar demands of higher-order imitation, N. seems to believe that Plato did not: instead, he responded to the peerless Socrates by seeking in the *Republic* a foolproof method for creating identikit philosopher-kings. I think in fact that Plato was very much aware of these deep problems raised by imitation and example (and have argued this in M. S. Lane, *Method and Politics in Plato's Statesman* [Cambridge, 1998], pp.75–97 and 155–60). The underlying logic of similarity is problematized in *Protagoras* 331d2–e4, while the *Statesman* offers division and example as systematic methods for distinguishing false from genuine similarities, and prescribes higher-order imitation as the best way for second-best laws to imitate the political ideal. Recognition of this would only bolster N.'s case that Plato was the first, and perhaps the greatest, reflecter on Socrates as well as reflector of him.

King's College, Cambridge MELISSA LANE

HOW TO READ PLATO

T. A. SZLEZÁK: *Reading Plato.* Pp. xii + 137. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. Paper, £12.99. ISBN: 0-415-18984-5.

Plato is one of the most approachable of philosophical writers; yet he is also one of

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the most difficult subjects for exegesis. Even before we consider the content of his dialogues, their purpose remains hotly debated: they have been read as full-blown accounts of his philosophical development, as advertisement for the teaching of the Academy, or as exoteric reflexions of a 'secret doctrine' supposed to lie at the heart of his belief. *Reading Plato* looks again at the nature of Platonic dialectic in an attempt to tread a clearer path through these *endoxa*.

S. takes as his theoretical starting-point the critique of writing in the *Phaedrus* which, he argues, represents Plato's mature reflection on the nature of philosophical publication (pp. 39–46, 84). Crucial is Plato's assertion there that the true dialectician will always keep in reserve 'more valuable' arguments (τιμιώτερα: *Phaedrus* 278d8) than he reveals—not because there are aspects of his thought that are meant to be kept *secret* as such, but because the theories he does expound must always be capable of defence by (in the first place) reference to higher principles. The danger with written philosophy is that its static response to the reader can suggest that no further defence is possible (cf. p. 44 with *Phaedrus* 275e3–5); but S. argues that Plato circumvents this danger by deliberately leaving 'gaps' in the theories described in his dialogues (cf. pp. 19, 103) to signal the availability of further support outside of them. Such a strategy could not be used to protect the highest principles of all, however, so these the dialectician will only reveal in oral discussion, when he is on hand to defend them in person.

S.'s thesis is extremely fruitful in suggesting an approach to both content and form of the dialogues. It explains, just for example, the procedure of the discussion-leader (usually Socrates) in testing the theses of his opponents, pushing them for the kind of support he has in reserve for his own positions, and ironically accusing them, when none is forthcoming, of *withholding* it (as, again, he does himself); it explains the different limits of discussion reached in each dialogue as a function of the prejudices exemplified by the interlocutors. Above all, it explains that we should not expect too little from Socrates' discussions, but also why we should not expect too much: S. reserves most of his polemic for the democratic but ahistorical expectation that a philosopher will reveal all that he thinks he can tell us. 'Modern' scholarship (as characterized by S.) is warned to learn from the failings of Alcibiades, whose interpretation of Socratic dialectic as something that can be 'opened up' as it stands to reveal the truth (pp. 91–3 with *Symposium* 221d—222a) is undermined by his own appearance at the party too late to hear the dialectical *ascent* (a paradigm for Platonic dialectic) played out in the speech of Diotima.

In providing not so much a reading *of* Plato as a suggestion for *how* to read him, this study avoids the usual pitfalls of introductions to Plato: the narrow focus on one or two dialogues which is either dogmatic or bland; the broader survey of the corpus which is inevitably superficial or blurred. S. is none of these things. At the same time, his approach inevitably challenges the reader with 'gaps' of its own. Some naturally coincide with gaps identified in Plato's own work: the nature of the highest principles themselves (we will need to turn back here to Aristotle: pp. 61–2). But there are others which are more about the consequences of S.'s own approach. Our very ability to identify 'gaps' in the dialogues is one: S. argues, for example, that the bipartite account of human psychology in the *Gorgias* is not to be taken as a transitional phase from Socratic monism to the mature tripartite psychology of the *Republic*, but is rather a deliberately incomplete account which looks forward to the support of the fuller argument given in that work (pp. 69–70; compare also his remarks on the *Euthydemus*, which is taken to hint at the theory of *anamnesis*: pp. 76–7). This is a suggestive approach, but it offers no real reasons to prefer it to the traditional developmental

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

account of Plato's work. And the developmental account has the advantage of explaining why Plato published both works (the *Gorgias* as well as the *Republic*) at all. On S.'s more unified theory there would seem to be little purpose in this—unless, perhaps, Plato hoped to lead his readers through the dialectical ascent played out between these dialogues: intended, in this case, that we should read the *Gorgias* first. The trouble, of course, is that it is precisely Plato's lack of guidance on the ordering of his dialogues that has, since antiquity, proved the most difficult stumbling-block in his exegesis.

The difficulty is, however, by no means fatal to S.'s thesis (the question might, for example, be pursued now through the 'ingressive' interpretation of Charles Kahn): in the end it is only to say that Plato remains and presumably will always remain a difficult author. Much more important is S.'s success in cutting through a lot of the exegetical deadweight and prejudice that has threatened his approachability. There is not a single dull page in this book; and, while not everyone will accept all of the conclusions implied by S.'s approach, the clarity and breadth of his exposition makes it a model of its genre, and a really excellent and stimulating introduction to Plato.

University of Durham GEORGE BOYS-STONES

HOMONYMY

C. SHIELDS: *Order in Multiplicity. Homonymy in the Philosophy of Aristotle*. Pp. xiv + 290. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-19-82371-5.

Shields chooses an important topic: homonymy as a principle that introduces order, via a core meaning, into multiplicity. He claims that according to Aristotle a number of important concepts, including goodness and being, are homonymous; thus he will 'examine the framework Aristotle develops for adjudicating disputes about homonymy by setting out its general features . . .', because for him homonymy is 'a sort of lens through which we must view Aristotle's philosophy and in terms of which we must judge its ultimate success' (p. 3).

S.'s analysis consists of two parts. First, he examines 'the uncontroversial cases upon which Aristotle himself relies when trying to explicate and motivate homonymy' (pp. 3, 11–127). Relying largely on the *Categories* and *Topics*, he distinguishes between Discrete Homonymy [DH] (two things have a name in common but 'their definitions have nothing in common and so do not overlap in any way') and Comprehensive Homonymy [CH] (two things have a name in common and 'their definitions do not completely overlap', p. 11), and reaches several conclusions: (1) DH is all but trivial and cannot represent Aristotle's general doctrine (pp. 19, 21, 22); (2) CH is 'of greater philosophical interest' (p. 35), and underlies his general account of homonymy (pp. 20, 40); (3) homonymy and synonomy are mutually exhaustive and there is no *tertium quid*, e.g. 'multivocals' may appear to be neither homonymous nor synonymous but are always cases of homonymy (pp. 22–8, 41–2). Therefore, if Aristotle can use homonymy successfully to develop 'core-dependent' meaning, then he will be able to account for science, specifically a science of being *qua* being, without (*contra* Plato) requiring univocity (pp. 70–2). S. concludes that core-dependent homonyms are primitive, i.e. cannot be further reduced, and that Aristotle's four causes define the relations of every instance to the core (p. 126).

Part II concerns 'Homonymy at Work' (p. 129). S. examines 'The Body'

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(pp. 131–54), 'Oneness, Sameness and Referential Opacity' (pp. 155–75), 'The Meaning of Life (pp. 176–93), 'Goodness' (pp. 194–216), and 'The Homonymy of Being' (pp. 217–67). He reaches three conclusions: (1) that Aristotle's 'account of the homonymy of life provides a clear and compelling illustration of the fruitfulness of the methodology of homonymy'; (2) 'that Aristotle is correct to argue [*contra* Plato] for the homonymy of goodness'; and (3) 'Aristotle cannot show that being is homonymous': however plausible it may seem, 'the doctrine is false' (p. 266). But S. concludes (p. 5) that even though Aristotle fails to make the case for homonymy in respect to being, nonetheless much can be said for it and he ends with an Afterword, 'Homonymy's Promise Reconsidered' (pp. 268–70). A bibliography (pp. 271–80), an index of passages cited (pp. 281–6), and a general index (pp. 287–90) complete this volume.

But there is something very disturbing here: Aristotle explicitly denies that being is homonymous. Indeed, being and the good contrast in this crucial respect: there is a science of being *qua* being because being is not homonymous, but its various senses are 'toward a one' [πρὸς ἕν] (*Metaphysics* 4.2, 1003a34), but there is no one science of the good because the good is found in every category (*EN* 1.6, 1096a30–b1). What is going on?

S.'s analysis of homonymy as a logical tool is powerful, persuasive (and very well written). As he himself argues, the methodological motive behind homonymy is to find real differences behind apparent sameness: one word, two meanings (whether discrete or comprehensive). The point of *Metaphysics* 4.2, however, is to find real unity sufficient for a science, behind apparent differences, 'being spoken of in many ways'. Hence Aristotle denies that being is homonymous and asserts that it is πρὸς ἕν. The problem lies here: ontology is not logic and an analysis of homonymy derived from the *Organon*, insofar as it is a tool for establishing real differences behind apparent sameness, will never explain the coherence of the project of a unified science of being.

S. dismisses Aristotle's assertion, 'being is not homonymous', at *Metaphysics* 4.2, by saying that 'he clearly intends to deny only that being is a discrete homonym' (p. 220). But even on S.'s own account, this reading makes Aristotle's unequivocal denial trivial; furthermore, it violates the point of the denial, i.e. being is sufficiently unified to serve as the object of a science. S. must dismiss Aristotle here because of his own account of homonymy and synonymy: they are exhaustive, and therefore multivocals, including being, must be a form of homonymy. In short, despite its purpose and apparent meaning, the claim about being in *Metaphysics* 4.2 is made to conform to S.'s account of homonymy as he interprets the *Organon.* Thus he produces a systematic Aristotle. It is excellent S. and an interesting account of the methodological force of homonymy; but it is not Aristotle, at least not the Aristotle of *Metaphysics* 4.

Trinity College, Hartford HELEN S. LANG

THEOPHRASTUS

J. M. VAN OPHUIJSEN, M. VAN RAALTE (edd.): *Theophrastus. Reappraising the Sources.* (Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 8.) Pp. ix + 410. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 1998. Cased, $54.95. ISBN: 1-56000-328-6.

In this collection of essays, which is a product of the Project Theophrastus

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

conference held in Leiden, in 1993, a group of distinguished scholars set for themselves the twin tasks of reappraising the sources and of reassessing the question of Theophrastus' stature as a philosopher. The collection includes seventeen essays (fourteen are in English, two in French, and two in Italian).

Regarding the sources, the discussion focuses on the new edition of fragments, *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence* (edd. W. Fortenbaugh et al., 2 vols, Leiden, 1992). It is argued that this edition is a substantial improvement over earlier ones: it contains a greater number of Latin texts than are found in the Wimmer edition, and it includes Arabic texts that are otherwise unavailable in any modern edition. Further, an English translation accompanies each fragment. Minor questions are raised regarding the arrangement of certain fragments under the headings of 'rhetoric' and 'doxography of nature', but the consensus is that the new edition is a major step forward.

Most of the essays in this collection deal with the question of Theophrastus' stature as a philosopher. These essays, which are uniformly of high philosophical quality, focus on issues of originality and influence. First, it is asked whether Theophrastus was an original thinker, a thinker who challenged and even contradicted certain of Aristotle's views. Second, it is asked whether Theophrastus anticipated specific elements within Epicurean and Stoic thought, and thereby served as a catalyst in the development of these Hellenistic schools. Judgements vary. In some essays, Theophrastus is praised as an original and influential thinker. In others, he is marked as an innovator who, to his discredit, has a limited grasp of important conceptual possibilities. And in others, he is represented either as a thinker who fails to go substantially beyond the foundations of Aristotle's teachings or as one who fails (in specific ways) to be influential in the development of Hellenistic thought. In what follows, I offer a brief overview of selected essays, which I group under three headings.

1. Theophrastus as an Original or Influential Thinker

Mario Mignucci argues that Theophrastus altered Aristotle's system of modal logic in a way that reveals a profound and original insight into the nature of modal operators. On the view that Mignucci defends, Aristotle's own theory of modal syllogisms is inconsistent, for Aristotle vacillates between two incompatible intuitions about modal propositions. To explain the conversion rules for modal propositions he needs a *de dicto* reading of the operator, but he also accepts AaB, □BaC ⊢ AaC, and this requires a *de re* reading. Theophrastus rejects AaB, □BaC ⊢ AaC, and in so doing resists his mentor's tendency to vacillate between two readings of the operator. Since he employs a *de dicto* reading throughout, Theophrastus presents a consistent theory of the modal syllogism.

Richard Sorabji discusses Theophrastus' treatment of vegetarianism. Theophrastus argues that animals are akin to humans in respect to their tissues and fluids, their appetites, reasoning, and above all their senses. In addition, he contends, on the grounds of kinship, that it would be an injustice for us to eat animals. Sorabji argues that Theophrastus' position is more subtle than those advanced by Pythagoras and Empedocles (who believed that animals were reincarnated humans), that it marks a major departure from Aristotelian psychology and ethics (for Aristotle denies that animals have reason, and thus denies that there can be justice between humans and animals), and that it provides a powerful retort to the still popular anti-vegetarian attack 'you'll have to avoid vegetables'. (Whether Theophrastus contradicts Aristotle

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

when he claims that animals have reason remains unclear. The text could be governed by the implicit caveat [as is sometimes explicit in Aristotle] that [certain] animals possess a capacity that is analogous to human reasoning.)

David Sedley argues that Theophrastus was both a source and a catalyst for certain Epicurean arguments for the world's impermanence, preserved by Lucretius. Sedley maintains that Theophrastus' own attacks on earlier arguments for impermanence are taken into account and turned to Epicurus' advantage. These attacks are in accord with the Aristotelian view, but they are novel insofar as they rest on a dialectical treatment of material drawn from non-Aristotelian sources. Sedley judges Theophrastus to be influential on the grounds that Epicurus recognized his objections 'as ones which must either be accepted or answered' (p. 354).

2. Theophrastus as an Innovator of Limited Talent

Trevor Saunders argues that, while Aristotle did little more than propose some ground rules for resolving dilemmas involving the competing claims of 'morality' and 'expediency', Theophrastus attempts to provide a model for the commen- surability of these competing claims. He proposes that they can be weighed on a common scale of 'value'. Saunders maintains that Theophrastus' contribution, while innovative, adds little to his stature as a philosopher, since the model itself 'seems to assume the commensurability it is designed to establish' (p. 92).

C. M. J. Sicking discusses Theophrastus' contribution to the ancient theory of music, a comprehensive attack on 'quantitativism'. He rejects any theory which suggests that differences in pitch are differences in quantity. Sicking protests that, in rejecting all 'quantitativism', Theophrastus has in effect 'thrown out the baby with the bathwater' (p. 138). For Sicking finds it difficult to understand why Theophrastus 'refused to see that there is nothing against defining sound as a movement of the air and ascribing pitch-difference to difference of frequency of vibration of the moving air' (p. 139). (Here Theophrastus' rationale might be wholly Aristotelian. According to one interpretation, Aristotle thinks that the 'transmission' of sound does not involve a material change in the medium. He thinks that sound is not a movement of the air and it is not [in the strict sense] a movement in the air. If Theophrastus holds such a view, it would make good sense for him to reject any theory which attaches quantitative differences to movements that, to his mind, do not actually exist.)

3. Theophrastus as Predominantly Unoriginal or not Specifically Influential

Hans Gottschalk argues that Theophrastus' work is, for the most part, a continuation and development of Aristotle's. He suggests that Theophrastus did not reject the theory of the Unmoved Mover and that at least some of his work in logic was anticipated in Aristotle's writings. He marks the theory of microvoid as one of Theophrastus' few legitimate innovations.

A. A. Long argues that the Stoic doctrine of *oikeiosis* was not foreshadowed by Theophrastus. He argues this on the grounds that Theophrastus did not have a normative conception of nature and that his '. . . *oikeites* has nothing to do with the instinctual and self-regarding behavior of newly born creatures' (p. 373).

College of William and Mary JOHN E. SISKO

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CYRENAIC EPISTEMOLOGY

V. TSOUNA: *The Epistemology of the Cyrenaic School*. Pp. xix + 180. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cased, £30. ISBN: 0-521-62207-7.

The Cyrenaics are best known for their hedonism, which in its mainstream version takes bodily pleasure of the moment to be the goal of life. Less generally familiar, but actually better documented, is the school's epistemology, summed up in the formula that 'only the *pathē* are knowable (*katalēpta*)'. This thesis, together with the Cyrenaics' distinctive vocabulary for expressing empirical awareness, has attracted some attention of late, but T.'s study is the first book-length treatment of the material. Much of her research is original, closely studying texts that have hardly been analysed before, and she ably discusses the distinctive features of Cyrenaic epistemology both in its ancient context and in its bearing on such modern issues as the problems of other minds and the external world.

As she indicates at the beginning, our evidence for her topic is largely drawn from authors who wrote centuries after the Cyrenaic school had ceased to exist—principally Cicero, Plutarch, Sextus Empiricus, and Eusebius drawing on Aristocles of Messenia. These and other sources are presented in translation in an appendix. The main body of the book is organized in three parts: Subjectivism, Scepticism, and a third part that compares the Cyrenaics as subjectivists with the 'empirical' Epicureans and the 'relativist' Protagoreans.

In 'Subjectivism', the longest of her three parts, T. focuses upon the Cyrenaic conception of *pathē*. Under this term, which she prefers to leave untranslated, members of the school counted not only pleasures and pains but also what most Greek philosophers call perceptions. T. shows how the Cyrenaics opt instead for 'subjectivist' descriptions, not saying 'Here is' (or 'I see') 'something white', but 'I' (or 'we') 'are whitened', or 'One is disposed whitely'. As to why they do this, T. is no doubt right to say that their neologisms were intended to describe perceptual states without making reference to anything beyond the perceiving subject' (p. 30). She deftly explores the way Cyrenaic epistemology denies cognitive access to a world outside our individual *pathē*, such that we can draw secure inferences about either their (external) causes or about experience we share with other people. But the motivations for this sceptical- sounding thesis are a major puzzle, especially because the challenges of formal scepticism were hardly encountered by the Cyrenaics themselves. Since the formal sceptic Sextus Empiricus is their most sympathetic reporter, this is a fact it is easy to forget.

On the whole, however, T. remains duly sensitive to historical constraints. Although she is primarily interested in assessing the philosophical significance of Cyrenaic epistemology, she does not make the mistake of detaching this topic from the school's principal goals. The Cyrenaics, as she emphasizes, were Socratics. Epistemology mattered to them instrumentally rather than *per se*; and it is this status, subordinate to hedonism as the good life, that she convincingly takes to explain why their epistemology, even when it seems to approach modern concerns, stops short of pressing points that a contemporary philosopher would be likely to ask.

One of the most important results of this book is the light it casts on the Cyrenaics' Socratic identity. This has regularly puzzled scholars accustomed to viewing Aristippus as a figure so different from the Socrates in Platonic and Xenophontic representations. In the final chapter of her book T. makes a number of acute sugges- tions by way of linking Cyrenaic epistemology to Socrates. These include the Socratic injunction to

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

know oneself, Socrates' disavowals of objective knowledge, and his eth- ical intellectualism. I like T.'s proposal of relating these famous Socratic traits to the Cyrenaic thesis that only one's own *pathē* are knowable. (Hence it was a mistake for me to exclude a Cyrenaic interest in Socrates' disavowal of knowledge in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, edd. K. Algra et al. [Cambridge, 1999], p. 639.)

In her philosophical analysis of details, T. achieves a nice blend of caution and imagination. Given the limitations of the evidence, much remains inevitably conjectural and susceptible to more than one interpretation. One such issue is whether such *pathē* as 'my being whitened' can occur independently of pleasure or pain. T. (pp. 14–15) takes this to be so, but I think the other view is a better way of interpreting the evidence and more inherently plausible. (It is worth noting how closely Aristotle ties perception to pleasure and pain [*De an.* 2.3.413b23]). As regards the differences between the Cyrenaics and Sextus, T. seems to overstate her case when she writes (p. 57): '[The Sceptic] does not report how he is affected himself when he is receiving an appearance'; against this, cf. *PH* 1.19–20, a context in which Sextus actually glosses *φαίνεται ἡμῖν γλυκάζειν τὸ μέλι* with the Cyrenaic expression *γλυκαζόμεθα αἰσθητικῶς*.

On the main general issue, too, T. leaves me somewhat unclear about where she stands. She rightly gives no support to the idea that the Cyrenaics' subjectivism made them into solipsists, and she even suggests that they could defend themselves against an ancient objection by noting that 'in many cases, we can see that there is a distortion between the particular *pathos* affecting an individual person and the object productive of it as perceived by normal perceivers' (p. 65). If such a reply is available to the Cyrenaics, how does it affect their claim that only one's individual *pathē* are knowable? Notwithstanding their apparent anticipations of modern subjectivism and the essential privacy of experience, they may have wanted not to deny that we can form reasonable beliefs about the world beyond our *pathē*, but only to privilege the *pathē* as the sole basis for what we can know and hold to be certainly true. I think T. prefers the second alternative (see pp. 2–4), but her book would have been easier to use if she had sometimes adopted a sharper division between historical reconstruction and philosophical rumination.

In general, though, she has served her readers admirably in both respects. Ancient philosophy is an exciting field at present because forgotten seams are being mined with great effectiveness. This book is an excellent example of what intelligent excavation can bring to light.

University of California, Berkeley A. A. LONG

PHILODEMEA

M. GIGANTE: *Altre ricerche Filodemee*. Pp. 191. Naples: Gaetano Macchiaroli, 1998. Paper, L. 30,000. ISBN: 88-85823-23-8.

C. MILITELLO: *Memorie Epicuree (PHerc 1418 e 310)*. Pp. 319. Naples: Bibliopolis,1997. cased. ISBN: 88-7088-343-4.

In the preface to his 1969 collection of essays, *Ricerche Filodemee*, Marcello Gigante spoke of his work as part of an attempt to build up a systematic profile of Philodemus (P.), for whose intellectual life the library preserved in Piso's villa at Herculaneum provides us with such an unparalleled quality of evidence. What he has also continued to demonstrate is how much wider the significance of this project is,

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and in exploring the thought of P., the ten papers that make up the *Altre ricerche Filodemee* (selected this time as a birthday tribute by G.'s pupils) also shed a great deal of light on the context in which he worked. They devote relatively little space to P.'s rôle as a philosopher; indeed, no single paper is *about* his philosophy at all (even the anomalously inconsequential paper on 'Filodemo e Ierocle' with which the collection opens is rather about the style than the content of those two thinkers). The volume focuses more on those aspects of P.'s thought which extend beyond the narrow limits suggested by his affiliation to Epicurus (cf. esp. 'Filodemo e la storia')—and, in particular, on P.'s rôle in the study of classical literature. P. is examined as a source for fragments of older poetry ('Filodemo e Archiloco'), as himself a prolific writer of epigrams ('Filodemo tra poesia e prosa', 'Filodemo e l'epigramma'), as a friend of such poetic luminaries as Horace, Virgil, Plotius, and Varius ('La brigata virgiliana a Ercolano', 'Virgilio e i suoi amici tra Napoli e Ercolano', 'Lucio Vario Rufo e Virgilio'), and, perhaps most boldly, as an *influence*, through them, on Augustan literature (e.g. 'Varrone, Furio Bibaculo e Cleante'—but the topic recurs in other papers). And not just an influence: at p. 122 he briefly becomes 'un modello nello stessa misura di Callimaco'. Appropriately enough, given G.'s concern to locate his own work in a vision of scholarly progress towards a synoptic understanding of his subject, the collection ends with his study of Augusto Rostagni's work from the 1920s on the poetics of P., 'Filodemo nella ricerca di A. Rostagni'. These articles have all been published before (although footnotes and references have occasionally been updated); but together they make a coherent and invigorating study of P. which will speak—in example as much as in content—to philosophers and philologists alike.

Meanwhile, the *Scuola di Epicuro* series, founded and directed by G. for the publication of Herculaneum papyri, has reached Volume XVI with Militello's excellent new text of P.'s *Πραγματεῖαι*. Preserved in the hopelessly lacunose PHerc 310 and the rather more helpful PHerc 1418, the treatise has little of philosophical interest to tell us (though the phrase *μανία κατὰ φύσιν* in col. II clearly provides material for speculation), but provides some fascinating insights into the membership and organization of Epicurus' school (cf. esp. col. XXX with 275–7 on the levy of a subscription fee). It has obvious similarities with an earlier, non-Philodemian work, PHerc 176: both present us with character-sketches of individual Epicureans, woven out of extracts from contemporary letters. But whereas PHerc 176 treats of major players in the circle of Epicurus (including Leonteus, Idomeneus, Batis, and Polyaenus), P.'s work seems to have dealt with figures who, at least in philosophical terms, were relatively peripheral: an Epicurean convert called Cronius (coll. XIX–XXIII) and Mithras, the one-time finance minister of Lysimachus (coll. XXIV–XXXVI; cf. D.L. 10.3, 28, etc.). Others were included as well, but coll. I–VI are beyond reconstruction, and M. rightly urges caution on any attempt to identify the subject or subjects of coll. VII–XVIII. It is likely (as M. suggests: p. 56) that the *Πραγματεῖαι* was written to *complement* PHerc 176, and that its very intention was to present a more rounded picture of the Garden and the nature of its association to the outside world (cf. p. 60 for the esoteric character of the work). But, apart from its content, its composition raises interesting literary questions for us as well: M. suggests that P.'s character-sketches follow the 'method of Chamaeleon' (pp. 62–4) and ultimately look back to Aristotle's account of Solon in *Athenian Constitution* 12—though we need not agree that P. had his eye on Aristotle himself (p. 64), especially since M. has argued that PHerc 176 provides his immediate model. I balk too at the suggestion that P. based his researches on anthologies of Epicurean epistles

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(pp. 96–7): this smacks a little of an over-reductive *Quellenforschung* (and the existence of school-text epitomes of the letters of Epicurus, discussed at p. 74, does little to assuage my scepticism). However, this quibble hardly does justice to the commentary as a whole, which imposes a reassuring restraint on wilder speculation by the very wealth of its supporting material and the level-headed clarity with which it is presented. The result is a comprehensive and—at least for now—definitive resource of tremendous value, and worthy of the hope repeated by G. in an article from 1988 (see *Altre ricerche* p. 42): 'Sono convinto,' he said, 'che quando l'opera globale di Filodemo sarà stata compiutamente indagata, come abbiamo cominciato a fare, si potrà finalmente scrivere quel profilo di Filodemo che finora è stato solo abbozzato in misura diversa dal Philippson o dal De Lacy.'

University of Bristol GEORGE BOYS-STONES

THE ETHICS OF THE STOIC EPICTETUS

A. F. BONHÖFFER: *The Ethics of the Stoic Epictetus.* (An English translation by W. O. Stephens.) Pp. xix + 335. New York, etc.: Peter Lang, 1996. Cased, £37. ISBN: 0-8204-3027-7.

R. DOBBIN: *Epictetus:* Discourses *Book 1*. Pp. xxiv + 256. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £37.50. ISBN: 0-19-823664-6.

The publication of *Epictet und die Stoa* (Stuttgart, 1890) by Adolf Bonhöffer marked a turning-point in the study of Stoicism. Against the received view of Epictetus (E.) as an 'eclectic' philosopher, B. argued that his work actually contained a systematic and faithful reflection of early Stoic doctrine—a thesis which established the philosophical credentials of E., and also opened up new avenues of research into the thought of his school. B.'s sequel to this study, *Die Ethik des Stoikers Epiktet* (Stuttgart, 1894), applied this conviction to the field of ethics in particular; and both works have remained essential reading for students of Stoicism. Not everyone has agreed with the rigorous conformity that B. posited between E. and the Early Stoa however, and a greater openness to the possibility of independence in E.'s thought is one of the starting-points for the commentary accompanying Dobbin's new translation of Book 1 of E.'s *Discourses* (cf. esp. pp. xiv–xviii). But although this sounds like a sober enough approach, it is remarkable what little fruit it bears. Some of the arguments that D. advances for the gap between E. and the Early Stoa add little to observations already taken into account by B. (who had, for example, already noted E.'s distinctive use of the term προαίρεσις and his trigradal system of philosophical *topoi*); and, although D. is surely right to stress E.'s interest in Plato and the Cynical elements in his philosophy—the latter especially having been suppressed in B.'s representation of Stoic ethics as Christian *avant la Parole*—this is scarcely enough to turn E. back into an 'eclectic' (as at pp. xvii–xviii: but for Plato's use in the Stoa, see already Antipater fr. 56 [von Arnim]; for Cynicism, D.L. 7.121, etc.). Doctrinal innovations ascribed to E. are not always well-enough supported to carry conviction—the claim, for example, that E. is in 'partial retreat from traditional Stoic empiricism' in referring to preconceptions as 'innate' (p. 190; cf. p. 206) needs to take into account passages such as Cicero, *TD* 1.57 and Plutarch, *Stoic. rep.* 17, 1041E; and it is not clear that when E. refers to man as a 'rational animal' (at 1.19.13) he is making a special appeal to his need for 'the primary things according to nature', or

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

differing from earlier Stoic accounts in doing so (p. 178). This may be symptomatic of a reluctance shown throughout the commentary to engage seriously with the more interesting philosophical questions. The intention may be to keep the work at an introductory level, but the result is often a lack of clarity which can lead to confusion and misdirection. D.'s gloss of παρακολούθησις as 'self-consciousness' (p. 108), for example, is inadequately explicated by a very tendentious appeal to 8.276; the claim that the rudiments of the Stoics' 'emphasis on god's concern for mankind' can be traced to Aristotle (p. 102) is not well phrased (implying as it does the equation of providence and teleology); and Simplicius gives a much clearer and more sympathetic account of the (admittedly thorny) subject of Stoic compatibilism (*comm. in Encheiridon* 40.9–42.20 Schweighäuser; cf. D. at pp. 5–8). But this lack of clarity is not endemic: for the broader issues of the work, D.'s commentary (which is unusually good-humoured and readable for its genre) provides a sensitive, helpful and rich introduction to E.'s thought—and indeed to Stoicism as a whole. His beautifully easy prose style makes for a first-rate translation in between as well—and in this last point, at least, a greater contrast could not be imagined than with Stephen's (S.'s) translation of *Die Ethik des Stoikers Epiktet.*

It is, of course, a very good thing that B. should be made as widely available as possible and, although *Epictet und die Stoa* might have had a better claim to receive the honour first, S. has rendered an important service in translating its successor. But in making this work available to the anglophone, S. has hardly made it attractive: from his absurdly literal preservation of definite articles (at p. 152 the *De officiis* becomes 'Cicero's book about the duties') to his barbarous inflation of the lexicon (offering us words like 'superficializing', 'ideality', 'unfortunateness', 'honorableness', 'considerateness', and innumerable other -nesses), there is scarcely a line in this book that conforms to English idiom, and many which fall short of basic grammatical requirements. At times it is hard to believe that the translation has been framed by an English speaker at all—as when we are told that 'Panaetius also always runs off at the mouth about Plato' (p. 142; cf. p. 212) or that god has 'so to speak, intense to-be-for-himself' (p. 306). The work is redeemed only by the fact that it inflicts rather less damage on the German: true, S. will give us a comical indicative where B. intended a first person imperative (e.g. at p. 245: 'Now we test it more closely!'); and at one point logical nonsense is made of B.'s meaning when the phrase 'schließen lassen auf' is taken to mean 'be able to infer from' rather than 'suggest' (p. 299). But, on the whole, B.'s train of thought is not misrepresented or irretrievably obscured, and anyone whose love for English is not so great as their ignorance of German will welcome the access provided to it. 'Stoic intellectualism,' after all, 'forbids the assumption that the beauty of the body, thus anything accidental and external, creates a great aptitude for virtue' (p. 93).

University of Bristol GEORGE BOYS-STONES

SCEPTICISM

R. J. HANKINSON: *The Sceptics.* Pp. viii + 376. London and New York: Routledge, 1998 (first published 1995). Paper, £17.99. ISBN: 0-415-18446-0.

The publication of *The Sceptics* in 1995 in many ways marked the subject's coming-of-age, representing the first synoptic introduction to ancient Scepticism: an excellent springboard and reference point which has now earned its transition

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(modestly revised) into paperback. But if it is born of the subject's maturity, it is also nourished by prejudices which it might have helped to overcome. The first part of the book is a historical survey of Greek Scepticism from its Presocratic 'Precursors', through an extended discussion of the Academy, up to 'The Sceptics of the Early Empire'. But it is H. himself who calls this survey 'historical': 'chronological' might be more accurate. One of the most frustrating aspects of this study is its refusal (or failure) to locate the various players in a plausible historical narrative, so that one gets the impression throughout that all of this is merely preparation for the 'splendours' (p. 155: and here the old prejudices surface) of Pyrrhonism, which are discussed in Part II. It is, for example, S[extus] E[mpiricus]' appropriation of Xenophanes, Anacharsis, Parmenides, Empedocles, Anaxagoras, and Heraclitus for the Sceptical tradition that drives the discussion of their thought; Philo of Larissa, one of the most controversial and important figures of the later Academy, merits barely four pages (pp. 116–20) and seems to be significant to H. only as a foil to Aenesidemus' revival of Pyrrhonism; Plutarch and Favorinus are treated merely as sources for an earlier form of Academic Scepticism that might be thought influential for Pyrrhonism. One or two of the entries have no bearing on the development of Scepticism at all (esp. pp. 55–6 on the Cynics), and seem to be included only to provide cross-referencing for allusions later on. If the examination of Pyrrhonism *is* intended to provide the frame of reference, it does at least encourage a serious and thought-provoking discussion of Arcesilaus and Carneades, on whose theoretical shoulders so much of the Pyrrhonist revival is ultimately taken to rest; but again there are historical problems. It is very clear that the epistemology (and ethics) of the Middle Academy evolved through debate with the Stoa—as H. makes his readers fully aware (although he argues convincingly against the view that they were merely formulated as dialectical positions against the Stoics). But his treatment of the Stoics is breathtakingly cavalier. The Stoics did not, for example, say that the virtues were identical (*pace* H. at p. 97), nor did they think that the virtuous feel no pain (as H. suggests at p. 291); and not even Aristo thought that no indifferent thing should be pursued (p. 99: but H.'s own references make clear that Aristo simply believed that the objects of our pursuit will differ according to circumstance). Little of this directly undermines H.'s position on the Academy, but it can lead to unnecessary complications. At p. 87, for example, H. claims that Arcesilaus' definition of κατόρθωμα in terms of 'reasonable' action makes it more akin to the Stoics' 'quite different' notion of καθῆκον. But in fact the Stoics think that κατορθώματα are a *subset* of καθήκοντα, and to this extent Arcesilaus' definition would, *a fortiori*, do for either (as e.g. at *SVF* 3.494). Furthermore, Arcesilaus presumably does think that his definition of κατορθώματα is the same as the Stoics': both believe that these are actions performed by someone who steadfastly withholds assent to non-cataleptic impressions—Arcesilaus differing from the Stoics only (as usual) in his belief that *all* impressions are non-cataleptic. H.'s confusion apparently arises because he believes (again, quite erroneously: cf. esp. *SVF* 1.624–5) that the impressions of the Stoic sage are all cataleptic impressions (p. 82), that he knows everything there is to know about the world (p. 79), and that his actions (i.e. all κατορθώματα) must therefore be based on knowledge rather than the absence of false belief (and cf. p. 82 for the additional claim that the sage would never set out to do something that could not be achieved). Sadly, the sense of confusion persists into Part II of the work as well, which is billed as a 'topically-ordered exposition and analysis of Sextan Scepticism' (p. 155).Whatever this promises, it never in fact becomes quite clear whether the focus of H.'s interest lies in SE's writings, in his philosophical position, or in Pyrrhonism at

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

large. H. argues (plausibly) that, despite occasional forays into Dogmatically Sceptical, or even Relativist, language, SE was a radical Sceptic— that is, that he assented not even to the claim that he knew nothing (pp. 271–2). But H. makes no attempt to reconcile this with SE's problematic assertion that the Empiricists *affirm* the inapprehensibility of things (pp. 233, 234: SE was, of course, himself an Empiricist): nor, quite generally, does he exploit the exegetical possibilities suggested by the relationship between medical and philosophical Scepticism (medical Scepticism being packaged off into a chapter of its own). Again, while H. depicts Aenesidemus (the founder of Pyrrhonism) as a Dogmatic Sceptic (pp. 120–36), he never picks up the contrast thus created with SE, and leaves unexamined the story this suggests about the development (or flexibility) of Pyrrhonism. SE may well be 'our best and most complete source for Greek scepticism' (p. 155): but all of this makes it clear that we cannot unquestioningly take his view of Pyrrhonism to be definitive—as we should not take Pyrrhonism itself to be definitive of Greek Scepticism more generally. The Sceptics to whom H. himself introduces us in this book embrace a field of thought which is very much broader and richer than this.

University of Bristol GEORGE BOYS-STONES

LATE PLATONISM

H. J. Blumenthal, J. F. Finamore (edd.): *Syllecta Classica Vol. 8. Iamblichus: The Philosopher.* Pp. xv + 254. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1997. Paper. ISSN: 1040–3612.

The elegant *Syllecta Classica* cover gives no clue to the contents, but students of Late Platonism (a resolute lot) will discover inside papers from the second international Iamblichus conference (1995), co-edited by John Finamore and the much-missed Henry Blumenthal. Iamblichus (I.) was regarded (by some) with awe, but his contribution is difficult to assess because it survives mostly in fragments of quotation or paraphrase. Participants at the first conference (1990, published as *The Divine Iamblichus*) wanted to make the attempt. This volume follows B.'s preference for 'hard' (p. vii) philosophy, that is, for the structures of logic and metaphysics rather than any fuzzier implications for human life and religion. The contributors, fortunately, are not so austere, and B.'s own introductory paper manifests the cheerful trenchancy he brought to muddled evidence.

B.'s strong European principles forbade the translation into English of three papers in Italian, one in French, and one in Spanish, from a total of fifteen. Greek is often, but not always, translated or paraphrased. There is an *index locorum* as well as an *index rerum*. The impersonal introduction, ascribed to both editors, helpfully sum- marizes the papers but refrains from using editorial privilege to comment or draw conclusions. This high-mindedness is characteristic of B., but regrettable when both editors could have contributed so much.

The first three papers are on I. as interpreter of Plato and Aristotle. Commentary was often used by late Platonists as a way of doing philosophy. I. was credited with inventing their curriculum, and B. suggests that he planned to write commentaries on all the relevant works (unlike I., he discounts the Chaldaean Oracles). C. Steel discusses I.'s *Parmenides* commentary, which has to be reconstructed from Proclus, especially on the first and second hypotheses and the location of intelligibles and henads. G. van Riel considers interpretations of Plato's *Philebus*: is it concerned with

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the good beyond being or the good in existing things? He suggests that I. thought the central concern of the *Philebus* was the One as cause of multiplicity, immediately above the dyad of limit and unlimited.

F. Romano asks what in I. would count as metaphysics (a word not used by ancient philosophers). His answer deals with the intelligible and with mathematics as concerned with the intelligible and therefore capable of purifying the soul. Next come three papers on I.'s treatment of Aristotle's *Categories*: logic transformed into metaphysics? Simplicius said that I. imposed the 'intellectual interpretation' (*noera theôria*) on Porphyry's long (now lost) commentary. John Dillon characterizes this interpretation as ontological, not logical, tending to find the same features at different levels of reality, so that the *Categories* becomes 'a coherent description of reality in the Neoplatonic sense' (p. 77). He comments especially on I.'s treatment of time. L. Cardullo focuses on the categories 'having' and 'where', and compares I. with Syrianus. D. Taormina focuses on 'acting and being acted on', and on I.'s account, contrasted with Plotinus and Porphyry, of act in relation to movement; she translates some of Simplicius' commentary on *Categories*.

The next group of papers is concerned with the soul. Anne Sheppard asks whether I. originated the argument for 'mathematical projection' found in Proclus and Syrianus: that mathematical objects, as well as the objects of sense-perception, are reflected as images in the faculty of *phantasia*. Annick Charles-Saget characterizes, with special reference to the *De Anima*, I.'s kind of philosophy. She concludes, subversively, that he moves away from 'hard' philosophy to myth and invocation of ancient authority. F. García Bazán considers I. in relation to Gnostics, who sometimes benefit from the argument that they are doing philosophy in the guise of myth. This is the first of four papers on I.'s distinctive teaching that the soul fully descends from the intelligible to the material world. How then does it return to the intelligible?

R. van den Berg discusses a section of Proclus' commentary on the *Timaeus*, which presents arguments, some perhaps from I., against Plotinus' doctrine that part of the intellectual soul does not descend. John Finamore reaches different conclusions, and helpfully engages in dialogue in a long footnote and an appendix. He interprets I. as saying that souls of theurgists may transcend the body; others may sometimes actualize intellect, but only with spiritual preparation and with the help of the gods. Greg Shaw goes furthest of all the contributors in thinking what it would mean to live by I.'s teaching. He invokes Buddha and Rumi (I. would surely have approved) to expound how the Iamblichean soul, made mortal by embodiment, can achieve immortality only by the death of the individual self.

Mark Edwards argues for I., not the Chaldaean Oracles or Porphyry or Plotinus or Gnostics, as originator of the triad being, life, and mind; he also argues against a clear line of descent for the Trinitarian theology of Marius Victorinus and Augustine. Finally, E. Tempelis uses commentaries on the *De Interpretatione* to trace the influence of I.'s doctrine of knowledge on sixth-century debate about free will: as the knower can be inferior or superior to things known, and knowledge is affected by this difference, so God's knowledge of temporal events is timeless and different from our knowledge.

This, then, is a collection chiefly for specialists, but it also demonstrates that complex Neoplatonist structures and exegesis have far-reaching implications for human life and religion.

University of Liverpool GILLIAN CLARK

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ASPASIUS

A. Alberti, R. W. Sharples (edd.): *Aspasius: The Earliest Extant Commentary on Aristotle's* Ethics. (Peripatoi 17.) Pp. 208. Berlin and New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 3-11-016081-1.

This volume is the outcome of a summer-school on Aspasius, whose commentary on the *EN* is the earliest on any work of Aristotle to survive, at least in part. The first two chapters discuss general questions about Aspasius, the remaining six his treatment of particular topics.

The introductory chapter (pp. 1–50), by Jonathan Barnes, falls into two parts, the first (pp. 1–32) summing up what is known about A.'s date, writings and outlook; B. makes no claim to originality here, and the evidence, such as it is, gives him much scope for scepticism. But the last section (pp. 32–50), entitled 'A. and the text of Aristotle', breaks new ground. Here B. considers some passages where a close study may lead to improvements in the text of the commentator or his subject, or both. But he never loses sight of the difficulties this involves, and claims no more for his suggestions than that they are possible.

Chapter II (pp. 51–84), by R. Wittwer, entitled 'A.'s lemmatology' (do we really need this word?) begins badly with a mistranslation of Sophonias *In De anima* 1.4 which is taken back on p. 57 (was it intended as a joke?). But it then turns out to be a well-researched paper on the origin and character of A.'s lemmata. W. concludes that A.'s commentary probably always included lemmata which reflected the natural divisions of the text, but it is not certain that they have been transmitted in their original form. As to their evidence for Aristotle's text, W.'s only positive finding is that the transitional lines at the end of *EN* 7 (1154b32–4) were probably not in the text used by A.

In Chapter III (pp. 85–95) R. Sharples collects and discusses A.'s comments on *eudaimonia*. He shows that A. generally followed Aristotle's line (although his text of Aristotle differed from ours in some places), but his treatment sometimes reflects later controversies on doctrine or the interpretation of Aristotle's words. Much the same conclusion emerges from Chapter IV (pp. 96–106), by R. Sorabji, on A.'s treatment of the emotions, but here we are helped by the fact that many of the ideas A. mentions can be attributed to known protagonists. One of the writers A. criticizes is Andronicus of Rhodes, whose theory of emotion included a Stoicizing element A. was unwilling to accept.

In Chapter V (pp. 107–41), 'Il volontario e la scelta', A. Alberti claims to find substantial differences between A.'s and Aristotle's views on *τὸ ἑκούσιον* and *προαίρεσις*, which bring A. close to the Stoic position but also enabled him to go further than they in anticipating modern notions of freewill. These are large claims, not borne out by the evidence. Aristotle's language about *τὸ ἑκούσιον* is much closer to A.'s than she would admit, and while it is true that in his discussion of *prohairesis* he sometimes uses formulations different from any found in Aristotle's text, the sentences on which she relies are embedded in long stretches of pure exegesis, much of it consisting of quotations of Aristotle's own words. A. gives no sign of having any ulterior motive, whether to improve on Aristotle's teaching or to tackle problems that Aristotle had not dealt with.

In Chapter VI (pp. 142–61) K. Ierodiakonou considers A.'s attempts to explain the distinction between perfect and imperfect virtue. She presents much parallel material,

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but does not succeed in defining his position clearly. One reason may be her failure to grasp the meaning of A.'s only positive statement on the subject (pp. 40.13–15): those who have imperfect virtue have a λόγος δοξαστικός, but not ἀποδεικτικός, of what should be done or not done, τὸ μέν ὅτι παρειληφότες, τὸ δὲ διότι ἀγνοοῦντες, which she translates (p. 147), 'On the one hand accepting it, on the other in ignorance'.

In Chapter VII (pp. 162–75) D. Sedley gives a subtle account of A.'s comments on *akrasia*, explaining his divergences from Aristotle as an attempt to demarcate more clearly the functions of the rational and irrational 'parts' of the soul in determining acratic behaviour. He also makes some interesting suggestions about the text of both A. and Aristotle. The last chapter (pp. 176–90) is entitled 'Amicizia e "focal meaning" '. Here E. Berti shows how A. tried to clarify the relationship between Aristotle's three kinds of friendship by extending the notion of homonymity in a way which Aristotle might have sanctioned but never stated explicitly. In doing so, A. used material from other Aristotelian treatises and especially the *EE*, which he regarded as the work of Eudemus; he was also influenced by Platonic concepts, and may have pointed the way to some Neoplatonist and medieval developments.

While this book provides no startling novelties, it is an attractive introduction to a neglected writer and provides some useful insights into the methods of an early commentator on Aristotle.

University of Leeds H. B. GOTTSCHALK

POLITICAL THINKING

M. Schofield: *Saving the City: Philosopher-Kings and Other Classical Paradigms*. Pp. x + 242. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-415-18467-3.

Few Classical scholars, presumably, are Names in the Lloyd's sense, but some are more than just names in their own household, and Malcolm Schofield—he of the 'Kirk–Raven–Schofield' trinity—is one of those élite few. The early part of his career was largely Presocratic, focused around his 1980 study of Anaxagoras. Latterly, he has been preoccupied in a consciously comparative and interdisciplinary way with Classical and Hellenistic (including Roman) political thought. He is the author notably of *The Stoic Idea of the City* (1991, reissued 1999; rev. *CR* 43 [1993], 92–3), and most recently co-editor, with Christopher Rowe, of *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2000).

The present volume, which appears in his own 'Issues in Ancient Philosophy' series, is somewhat of an *omnium gatherum* of critical engagements with ancient Greek and modern political thinking, and thinkers from Homer to Julia Annas by way of Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Diogenes of Babylon (teacher of Panaetius), Cicero, and Moses Finley. The title given to the collection seems to have caused some flutters at the publishers and elsewhere, but stands up in light of important passages in Plato (*Rep*. 416–17, 463ab, 502cd), Aristotle (*Pol*. 1261a30–2), and Cicero (*De rep*. 1.51) that employ just this terminology. The city that stands *ex hypothesi* in need of salvation is typically the Greek *polis*, whether utopian, ideal, or actual, but also includes the Roman *res publica*, which is something else again. Neither, as S. robustly observes in comparativist spirit (p. 181), qualifies as a 'State' in its peculiar early-modern and contemporary significations.

Two of the ten papers here are new, two others are reprinted with important

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

addenda to take account of a different readership. The earliest of the reprinted pieces appeared originally in 1986, the most recent in 1998. A standard argumentative and expository technique, or strategy, employed by S. is to engage with one or more influential or would-be influential modern interpreters. Two chapters in fact started life as extended book reviews, an art form of which S. is quite a master. Annotation varies from the null or minimal to the sort of parallel running commentary that Anthony Grafton's *The Footnote* (London, 1997) so learnedly and wittily dis- cussed—though here the notes are printed or reprinted as endnotes (pp. 195–229). Bibliography is very sparing (consolidated at pp. 230–7), the index almost miserly, and there is no *index locorum*.

Aristotle's repeated methodological advice when classifying or analysing was to look first to goals, purposes, and forms. Since S. is generally chary of *ex cathedra* pronouncements on what he thinks doing political thought is or ought to be, the two main exceptions to that rule in this volume stand out. In the first he considers how to read the *Politics*, and specifically the three main ways in which it is read today: by contemporary political philosophers, by ancient historians, and by what he revealingly calls 'the ancient philosophical community' (p. 101). How, he asks, can Aristotle be both timeless and yet crucially of his own, *polis*-specific time? The other explicit methodological discussion is provoked by Fred Miller's attempted appropriation of Aristotle for a continuous 'western' history of 'rights' theory. In rebuttal S. invokes the authority of two luminaries of the (his) 'Cambridge School' of historical political theorists, John Pocock and Quentin Skinner, to the effect that 'the significance of Aristotelian political theory is the *distinctiveness* of its vocabulary and idiom' (p. 158, italics in the original), which props up and is propped up by the contemporary (late fourth-century B.C.) social fabric. What counts, therefore, for purposes of exegesis and explanation is the way an idea 'functions within the whole matrix of concepts, analyses and theses' which make up Aristotle's (or whoever's) political philosophy (p. 141). *Pace* the blessed Margaret Thatcher (as S. might have added), it was not the ancient Greeks who invented human rights, any more than it was they who invented the State.

The first and longest chapter, '*Euboulia* in the *Iliad*' (pp. 3–30), is an extended argument with Moses Finley, who died before he could respond publicly in kind. As if to disarm a critic who might hold that the chapter is not really of a piece with the rest of the collection, S. claims to be offering an Aristotelian reading of the *Iliad*: the Homeric ideal of the hero is said to prefigure the *phronimos* of Aristotle. But actually the essay reads better as a forceful critique of Finley's primitivist-leaning representation of the Homeric code of values as excluding the possibility of rational discussion and debate. Although success is the overriding criterion for judging a hero's mettle, success, as S. demonstrates, did sometimes require the performance of reasoned oratorical argument.

Chapter II, 'The Disappearing Philosopher-King' (pp. 31–50), challenges, with André Laks, the developmental view of the relation between Plato's *Republic*, *Statesman*, and *Laws*. *Republic* and *Laws* on this persuasive account are more two sides of the same coin than different projects; indeed, *Laws* simply is the approximation to the paradigm of Kallipolis that is all the *Republic* allowed for anyhow (with the exception of *Laws* 4.708e–712a, which does mark a change of mind, and heart). The *Statesman*, on this reading, *is* a different project, more a theoretical examination of the nature of political expertise than a pragmatic discussion of how to construct legislatively the good city or the best possible scheme of political order. The broad hints S. drops that Plato may have been responding here to criticism from a pre-Lyceum Aristotle would be well worth developing further.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chapter III, 'Zeno of Citium's Anti-Utopianism' (pp. 51–68), began as a review–discussion of Doyne Dawson's *Cities of the Gods. Communist Utopias in Greek Thought* (New York and Oxford, 1992). In its reincarnation it has acquired a new second part, 'Zeno and Sparta', which revisits and somewhat revises *The Stoic Idea of the City*. S. proffers two main objections to Dawson's schema for classifying utopias: first, the typology of 'high' = impracticable and 'low' = practicable utopias is in itself defective; second, Dawson's own application of it is flawed. Thus, to take S.'s chief counter-example, Zeno's *Politeia* when evaluated against Dawson's criterion for a 'high' utopia must be adjudged non- or even anti-utopian. Confused? I was. But as S. sagely remarks, 'utopian writing and thinking . . . are notoriously difficult phenomena to come to terms with' (p. 54).

Chapter IV, 'Plato on the Economy' (pp. 69–81), is left unannotated, as it was when first published in 1993, because it is 'essentially ruminative'. It focuses on the construction of the first 'economic' city, the city of pigs, in *Republic* II, hailing this as a 'dazzling and dazz[l]ingly original piece of theorizing'. Yet the point of the theory was not itself economic; it ultimately formed part of an overarching moral argument linked, for example, to Plato's proto-Marxist condemnation of money in *Republic* VIII as the root of all evil, especially the evil of class-hatred. S.'s insight is as keen as ever, but the argument perhaps remains a little too insubstantial to bear the weight of interpretation placed upon it.

The next four, Aristotle-related chapters form the core of the book. Chapter V, 'Political Friendship and the Ideology of Reciprocity' (pp. 82–99), compares and contrasts the treatments of friendship in respectively the *Nicomachean Ethics* (*EN*) and the *Eudemian Ethics* (*EE*), sniffing out—S. has a nose for such things—'the distinctiveness and extraordinary interest of the *EE* account' (p. 87), which focuses on friendship between equals and especially on the variety it calls 'political friendship'. Since the two accounts diverge so significantly, either they must be different written recensions of a common oral archetype or—the alternative S. strongly favours and backs with solid arguments—they were written at different times and for different audiences, the more democratic *EE* (designed for the Athens-based *idiotês*) coming after the more top-down *EN* (aimed at the *politikos*, or practical politician).

The section on 'Hierarchy and Equality' in Chapter V (pp. 87–91) points forward directly to the new Chapter VI, 'Equality and Hierarchy in Aristotle's Thought' (pp. 100–114). Despite S.'s disclaimer, this is an ambitious, perhaps inordinately so, attempt to map the entire *Politics* by dividing it up into, as it were, three continents, or what he labels 'models' of analysis—the 'rational', the 'political', and the 'sociological'. S. himself recognizes that this way of representing the *Politics* under-emphasizes Aristotle's own preoccupation with the dynamics of political change, and his consequent attempts to promote a stable social and political order. I myself found it odd that S.'s application of 'political' denied the specifically ancient, Greek, and Aristotelian significations of this *polis*-derived adjective. On the other hand, S.'s tripartition does highlight the stitched-together quality of the *Politics*, and does bring out how, when forced to choose between equality and hierarchy, Aristotle regularly went for hierarchy; or, to put that another way, how hierarchical Aristotle's notion of equality was. Citation of David Harvey's powerful 'Two Kinds of Equality' article (*Classica et Mediaevalia* 1966) would have reinforced the point.

In Chapter VII, 'Ideology and Philosophy in Aristotle's Theory of Slavery' (pp. 115–40), S. is not concerned to apportion praise or blame but rather to understand 'the theoretical framework within which the theory of natural slavery might come to seem inevitable' (p. 216 n. 43). S. is able to discover such a framework in Aristotle's

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

theory of natural hierarchy, and he is especially helpful in explaining why and how Aristotle sought to distinguish (in opposition to Plato's unitarian conception of rule) 'political' rule from 'mastership'. But the effect of thus disjoining the philosophy from the ideology is, paradoxically, to emphasize just how bad the philosophy can sometimes be. Granted that Aristotle opposed merely conventional, legal slavery, why was his commitment to the continued existence of slavery in some form as a necessary underpinning for the good political life quite so dogmatically unshakeable?

Chapter VIII, 'Sharing the Constitution' (pp. 141–59), concludes the Aristotelian quartet with a persuasive demonstration of the method of contrastive comparison. 'For us' X is the case, is taken for granted, is second nature; for them, the Greeks, not. Here Aristotle's thought is taken by S., surely legitimately, to stand for Greek thought more generally, as, for example, in the statement that 'Central to Aristotle's thinking are the notions of participation, honour and honours—not that of a right' (p. 146). (See further above.)

The final two chapters move from Greece to Rome via a mid-second century in-school Stoic dispute. In the new Chapter IX, 'Morality and the Law. The Case of Diogenes of Babylon' (pp. 160–77), S. challenges Annas's reading of a quarrel between Diogenes and Antipater as being one between the claims of legality and those of moral duty. The pursuit of self-interest need not be incompatible with the practice of honesty and justice—so S. reads Diogenes as, not implausibly, arguing.

The ninth chapter's concluding observation, that the Stoics were political reactionaries committed to the inviolability and invincibility of private property, provides a bridge to the tenth and last chapter, 'Cicero's Definition of the *Res Publica*' (pp. 178–94). The aim of this is comparable to that of Chapter VII, namely to rehabilitate a doctrine in the reader's esteem on the grounds that it is philosophically more defensible than usually supposed. The specifically Roman quality of Cicero's understanding of popular sovereignty as a property-like *res* to be entrusted to the management of others is very well brought out, but interpretative charity is surely taken too far in S.'s applauding 'as simple and persuasive an explanation as one could hope to find of why an elected aristocracy of men of energy and judgement is the best way for a sovereign people to manage its affairs' (p. 193). At all events, no Greek democrat could have been persuaded of that.

In conclusion: the dialogues that S. has prosecuted so vigorously with contemporary scholars as well as some of the past masters are eminently worth continuing. As one of S.'s principal interlocutors, alas no longer with us, once crisply observed, the dead past does not bury its dead.

Clare College, Cambridge PAUL CARTLEDGE

TRANSPARENCY

A. VASILIU: *Du diaphane. Image, milieu, lumière dans la pensée antique et médiévale*. Pp. 320. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1997. Paper, frs. 225. ISBN: 2-7116-1341-0.

One of the difficulties in giving a satisfactory account of vision is to explain why colours are not visible without the aid of light. Aristotle's explanation relies on the existence in all bodies of a nature or power for which he reserves the expression *to diaphanes*, usually translated in English as 'the transparent'. This nature is most obviously present in transparent media such as air and water, but it is also present in

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

opaque bodies. When one sees an opaque body as coloured this is because, on the Aristotelian account, the colour of that body is acting upon the transparent nature in the air that stands between the eye and the opaque body. The colours only act in this way when the transparent nature of the air is itself active, and since light is the activity of the transparent when in the presence of fire, this explains why the colours of bodies are not visible without light. This is the story Aristotle tells in his *De Anima*, and later in the *De Sensu* he adds a further refinement: it is the different proportions of the transparent nature present in the opaque bodies that give them their different colours.

Madame Vasiliu's book, based on her Ph.D. dissertation, is, I think, the first modern study dedicated exclusively to Aristotle's theory of the transparent and provides a comprehensive guide to his discussions of the concept. But her interests are not confined to the physical explanation of sense-perception. She is also concerned to show that the transparent has a more ambitious rôle. Much of her discussion presents the transparent against the background of a contrast with Plato, Aristotle's conception being intended on this view as a riposte to Platonic cosmology and metaphysics. Plato had described in the *Timaeus* how the world as we experience it came about. It is the product of a divine craftsman using the Platonic Forms as his model. As well as the model (the Forms of the intelligible world) and the recipient (the sensible world we perceive), Plato postulates a third entity, namely the receptacle which arises between the other two. The manifestation of sensible qualities is attributed to the receptacle's participation in some unexplained way in the intelligible realm of the Forms. It is this notion of participation which V. sets up as a rival to Aristotle's concept of the transparent. V. maintains that Plato's participation and Aristotle's transparent both represent forms of engendering images, and in both cases what is engendered is problematic. The image engendered is, as she puts it, 'image d'une absence ontologique' (p. 274). In Aristotle's case the ontological absence is luminous, the image being a precise expression of what is seen, whereas in Plato's case the absence is dark and the image is a poor imitation. The contrast between Aristotle's transparent and Plato's participation becomes a recurrent theme in V.'s book. In some ways this provides an attractive perspective on Aristotle's theory: V. is certainly justified in seeking to relate Aristotle's physical theories to their wider metaphysical background and she is surely right to recognize the linkage of Aristotle's writings on vision with Plato's *Timaeus*. There are nevertheless a number of problems with the approach which V. has adopted.

First, while it is true that Aristotle is hostile to the Platonic theory that perceptibles participate in the Forms, this is because, as he makes clear in the first book of the *Metaphysics*, he is hostile to the theory of Forms for a number of reasons, notably their lack of explanatory power. It is a distortion of his position to treat his theory of the transparent as an attack on the theory of Forms. His theory of the transparent is integral to his theory of vision, and this theory was certainly anti-Platonic. But it is anti-Platonic because of what he sees as defects in Plato's theory of vision, not Plato's theory of Forms, the chief defect being the idea discussed in the *De Sensu* that the eye emits fire.

Another problem is that V. describes both Plato's theory of participation and Aristotle's theory of the transparent as philosophical fictions. The idea is repeated a number of times, though never with an explanation of what it involves. If it is taken at face value, the choice is simply between competing fictional accounts. This means that any preference on philosophical grounds will appear arbitrary and trivial. This is connected with a further difficulty: although the contrast of the participation theory

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with the theory of the transparent leads one to expect that V. will provide us with a philosophical distinction between the two, the expectation is not fulfilled. Beneath the rhetoric the argument is short on analysis and reliant on aesthetic rather than philosophical intuitions. The passage quoted earlier is a good illustration of this: to differentiate the Platonic and Aristotelian accounts of engendering images all V. can point to finally is that in the one case the image is luminous and in the other it is dark. This is dismayingly vacuous as a philosophical insight.

V.'s book is to be recommended to any reader looking for a provocative view of Aristotle, but anyone expecting careful philosophical analysis of the type that characterizes Aristotelian studies in English is likely to be disappointed. The implication in the title that the book encompasses ancient and medieval thought in equal measure is misleading since the focus is on Aristotle throughout.

Lamberhurst J. A. TOWEY

MEDICAL TEXTS

K.-D. FISCHER, D. NICKEL, P. POTTER (edd.): *Text and Tradition. Studies in Ancient Medicine and its Transmission.* Presented to Jutta Kollesch. (Studies in Ancient Medicine, 18.) Pp. xii + 340, 5 ills. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 90-04-11052-6.

This Festschrift for the classicist, medical historian, and editor of Greek and Latin texts J. Kollesch on the occasion of her sixty-fifth birthday contains thirteen contributions in German, English, Italian, and (one) in French, as well as a catalogue of the publications of J. Kollesch and G. Harig (her late husband). Only five of the contributors deal with the medicine of antiquity in a narrow sense, the majority being concerned with the transmission and later reception of ancient medical texts.

K.-D. Fischer's contribution bridges the two fields of study: although much of his discussion of the Pseudo-Soranic *Quaestiones medicinales* is about questions of textual transmission, he also looks at the structure and content of the work. It was V. Rose who gave the work its title when he published an untitled text, supposedly by Soranus, in 1868. F. explains that the MS used by Rose, the thirteenth-century Cottonianus Galba E IV (G), is now known to be the youngest of three extant sources. The other two MSS are the twelfth-century Lincoloniensis 220 (L) and the tenth- century Carnotensis 62 (C). Only C and G contain the beginning of the text and only C and L the end. The sequence of questions in C differs in places from that of L and G, and F. points out that definitions from the Pseudo-Galenic *Definitiones medicae* have been added in the latter. He discusses the structure of the work as well as various parallel passages, e.g. in Paul of Nicea (recently edited by A. M. Ieraci Bio), and argues convincingly that this little-known text would merit further research.

A. Ellis Hanson's 'In the Shadow of Galen: . . .' introduces two papyri, or rather one scrap of papyrus (*BKT* IX 80) and a group of three fragments belonging to another papyrus (81). Despite their fragmentary condition, H. has managed to identify a quotation from Galen's *De naturalibus facultatibus* on 81, an impressive feat, considering its state. The larger fragment (80) is apparently part of an anonymous medical text and, as H. points out, another reminder of how much of Greek and Roman medical writing has been lost.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

J. Jouanna examines the interpretation of dreams in the Hippocratic *Vict*. in its relation to a theory of microcosm and macrocosm, i.e. of the human body imitating Earth. In particular, the theory is of importance for determining the meaning of dreams about the sun, moon, stars, etc., in their relation to the dreamer's health. J. investigates aspects of *Vict*. that are not usually much written about, defending its author against the charge of being a mere compiler.

C. W. Müller intends his contribution as an incentive to re-examine the question of the authorship of the Hippocratic treatises, *De natura pueri*, *De genitura*, and *De morbis* IV. (M. suggests abandoning the use of the second title, since it was 'an ancient editor's caprice' that made it an independent work separate from *Nat.puer.*) It is often assumed, because of cross-references, that the authors of *Nat.puer.* and *Morb*. IV are identical, but M. suggests that their similarities and quotations are the result of a deliberate effort made by the author of *Morb*.

In his discussion of Caelius Aurelianus' views on contagion and the transmission of disease, V. Nutton questions the general assumption that notions of contagion or infection were rare in antiquity compared with prevailing ideas of humoral imbalance. In particular, N. investigates a passage (*Chron.* 4.13) in Caelius Aurelianus mentioning quarantine for lepers, possibly taken from Soranus.

M. Vegetti writes about the earliest reference to Empedocles, in the Hippocratic *De vetere medicina*, where it is accompanied by the earliest occurrence of the noun *philosophiê* and the phrase 'both doctors and sophists'. V. postulates that the attack of *VM* against Empedocles was bound to be unsuccessful, and that elements of Empedoclean iatrosophistics found their way into later works in the Hippocratic collection such as *De carnibus* or *De victu.*

Because of lack of space I have only discussed the authors writing about antiquity strictly speaking, but the contributions about MS tradition or the later use of texts, of high academic standard, may also be of interest to classicists as well as to medievalists.

University of Cambridge C. F. SALAZAR

THINKING WITH DIAGRAMS

R. NETZ: *The Shaping of Deduction in Greek Mathematics: a Study in Cognitive History*. Pp. xvii + 327, ills. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-521-62279-4.

This book's subtitle is an accurate, and important, description of its project, and in a way more informative than the main title. It might be even truer to say that the book is an exercise in the cognitive *archaeology* of the mathematical text. Do not expect a diachronic history of the emergence of Greek mathematics. Chronological aspects play a minimal rôle, and N. is not interested in changes so much as in what remains constant throughout the near-millennium during which his source texts were composed. What he does is scrutinize the texts themselves, digging far below their surface in order to unearth the presuppositions and practices which have given rise to them and which, to just as great an extent, keep them in their present form. No sharp distinction is imposed between the origin of a mathematical practice and its enduring motivation. Nor is the book an analysis, historical or mathematical, of the actual content of these texts taken in its own right. Its concern is to explain the form of Greek mathematical thinking, and content plays no more than an illustrative rôle.

The result is, quite simply, a masterpiece, nearly every page of it illuminating. If

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

often conjectural, it is always illuminatingly so, and never without full recognition of the fact that it is being conjectural. It uses statistical analyses creatively and flexibly, without any unsustainable pretensions to rigour. Like all the best work in intellectual history, it shuns oversimplification yet does not try to dress up as complicated things which are essentially simple. Unpretentious wit and a refreshing directness are further merits throughout.

The central focus of the story is geometry, and its real hero the lettered diagram. N. initially exploits the mathematicians' practices in the construction and lettering of their diagrams, and in the continuing interaction between text and diagram in their proofs, to illuminate the underlying cognitive processes. The opening two chapters are a very fine contribution to the semiotics and pragmatics of mathematical thought. But their importance for intellectual history is also considerable. One of their achievements is to shed light on the rôle of visual aids in ancient intellectual practices more generally.

This picture is then taken forward by close examination of mathematical vocabulary, both syntactic and terminological, including mathematicians' use of repeated formulae, which enable N. to chart the interplay of the written and the oral, the rule-bound and the creative. Greek mathematical texts, as he demonstrates, constitute a closely circumscribed body of literature, with its own highly developed practices and conventions, yet all done with a surprisingly small vocabulary, which can therefore be studied virtually in its entirety as a closed system.

The crowning pair of chapters (V–VI), in the light of the findings accumulated in the preceding four, sets out to show how mathematical proofs are inferentially structured, what they presuppose and what they supply, and how they acquire and display their impressively high degree of cogency and generality. The statistical data drawn from a body of focal texts are elegantly tabulated and exploited, with the structure and flow of individual arguments diagrammatically represented in a form which few readers would find too technical. N. does a marvellous job of explaining to us why Greek mathematical practice manages to be so satisfactory—and satisfying—without ever having to theorize about its own metaphysical or logical presuppositions.

The final chapter (VII) is the only one with a genuinely historical focus. In it N. explains well—if controversially—why he regards a developmental account of his subject as relatively unilluminating. This is done partly by arguing for the rather sudden appearance of a developed professional mathematics on the scene in the later fifth century B.C., and the smallness and exclusiveness of the mathematical community which preserved and deepened it in subsequent centuries. This does, for once, take him into the sociological (and even socio-economic) aspects of his story, and it too is done with great dexterity and insight.

It would be a pity if the book's mathematical subject-matter were to deter readers. It is a truly significant contribution to the history of thought, and deserves to be widely read and cited, not just for its contribution to the understanding of ancient mathematics, but also as a model for future research. Its techniques would undoubtedly repay application to other bodies of texts and other disciplines.

Christ's College, Cambridge DAVID SEDLEY

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

DIABOLUS IN MUSICA

JOHN G. LANDELS: *Music in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Pp. xii + 296, ills. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-415-16776-0.

Not long ago, the tally of modern, book-length studies in English, dealing broadly with Greek (let alone Roman) music, stood at exactly zero. Michaelides's *Encyclopedia* appeared in 1978; then, in short order, came two volumes of annotated translations (Barker, 1984 and 1989), Maas and Snyder on stringed instruments (1989), and monographs by Comotti (translated 1989), West (1992), and Anderson (1994). Now we have Landels too. A battery of comparable works has been published in French, German, and Italian over the same period, and there is a burgeoning crop of shorter essays in journals and edited collections. It all adds up to a respectable shelf-full. The subject, it seems, has come in from the cold; and perhaps one day some historian of scholarship will explain how it happened.

L. presents his book neither as a challenge for specialists nor as a definitive textbook, but as an 'introduction' for students and general readers. There are ten chapters: I, on the roles of music in Greek culture; II, on instruments (sixty-two pages, divided into three sections); III, on scales, intervals, and tunings; IV, on music, words, and rhythm; V, on acoustical science; VI, on music and myth; VII, on the Hellenistic period; VIII, on music in the Roman world; IX, on notation and pitch; X, on a selection of the surviving scores. L. also provides three appendices, discussing the quantitative analysis of intervals, the *hydraulis*, and the Brauron *aulos*. It is a pity that he decided (for rather questionable reasons, p. x) to give no bibliography; the very brief suggestions for further reading with which he prefaces the notes to each chapter, and the scattering of additional references in the notes themselves, are scarcely an adequate substitute.

The clarity of L.'s writing, even on complex matters, is a real virtue. Sometimes it lapses into oversimplification; and for this reader at least, the pervasive, faintly patronizing tone of colloquial jocularity soon became tiresome. So far as the content is concerned, at his best (on some of the instruments, on acoustical theories and their applications, and on certain aspects of the notations, for instance), L. is very good indeed. But leaving aside esoteric issues over which specialists might wrangle, the book is distinctly uneven. I can give only a representative selection of its more unsettling features. L. is very perfunctory, for instance, on harps (pp. 73–7); his account includes several mistakes, and his claim (p. 76) that no surviving illustration shows the tuning apparatus of these instruments suggests that he cannot have looked far. I know of no good evidence that *skindapsos* is the name of a kind of lute (p. 78). L.'s evident dislike of Aristoxenus (e.g. 'tedious and pedantic', p. 87) is repeatedly obstructive, and he seems not to have understood Aristoxenus' reasons for rejecting 'mathematical' forms of harmonic analysis of the sort that L. prefers; the symptoms of this rejection are merely 'shortcomings' (p. 91). Aristoxenus' claims about contemporary treatments of the enharmonic are misconstrued (p. 92: Aristoxenus does not say that it is 'rarely heard nowadays', but that it is rarely performed with exactly the right intonations), and his 'rule' about consecutive intervals is incorrectly stated (p. 103: the rule is not that 'any three consecutive intervals should add up to a fourth', but that in any continuous scalar sequence, either the fourth note in order should stand at the interval of a fourth from the first, or the fifth note in order should stand at a fifth from the first, or both). In his comments on Plato's apparent approval of the Phrygian *harmonia*, in

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the *Republic* (p. 102), L. strangely omits any reference to Aristotle's trenchant criticisms of Plato on this issue (*Pol.* 1342a–b).

Moving to a different part of the book, L.'s confidence in Chapter IX about the allegedly fifth-century origins of the notations is (I think) misplaced, and certainly he addresses none of the vexing difficulties that this dating must face. Here and in Chapter X he gives no evidence for his claims about the uses to which these notations were initially put; throughout the book, indeed, citations of material to support his various contentions are often vague and sometimes missing altogether. His discussion of the workings of the notations is remarkably clear and helpful, in some respects the best I have seen. But it leaves strange gaps; why, for instance, after so careful an examination of the notations for enharmonic and chromatic tetrachords (pp. 214–17), does he give no guidance on the notation for corresponding elements of diatonic sequences? His discussion of surviving scores (Chapter X) is similarly patchy. There are valuable passages on the physical remains, especially in connection with the Delphic paeans, but very slight comments on the pieces' musical qualities; and some of the structural analysis is unclear. What, for instance, is the relation between the 'frame-note' of Athenaios' paean and its apparent 'key' (p. 230), and between these and the quite different 'keynote' (p. 236)? Students at an 'introductory' level may well be puzzled.

I do not want to go on quibbling about details and complaining about omissions. My main unease about the book is different, and has to do with L.'s selection and arrangement of his materials. A glance at the sequence of chapter-topics, which I listed above, will suggest a degree of randomness, and the contents of some individual chapters seem genuinely haphazard. Thus Chapter VII, on the Hellenistic period, falls into two sections. The first gives a general account of Alexandria, a brief discussion of the character of the texts collected there and of the 'myth' of the burning of the Library, two desultory paragraphs on Theocritus, and then two paragraphs on a Hellenistic form of the kithara. It is hard to see any design in this; and as for the last two paragraphs, since the evidence for this instrument comes mainly from Southern Italy, as L. says, they seem really to belong to the next section, in which the focus shifts to that geographical area. Here (p. 169) we find a brief introduction to Magna Graecia and a passage on '*phlyax* drama'. That is all. I cannot for the life of me imagine how L. arrived at his choice of topics for the chapter, or how he can offer it as an adequate account of music in what he calls 'The Years Between'. Again, despite some excellent passages on Plautus and Terence, and a first-rate discussion of Vitruvius, the chapter on Rome (Chapter VIII), too, seems bewilderingly lacking in principles of selection and arrangement. One consequence of this fragmented approach is that we are left with very little sense of historical development. Even in the case of archaic and classical Greece, the evolutions and revolutions of whose musical practices have been closely studied by other scholars, L. makes no detectable attempt to provide a map of their progressive transformations within which his observations could be framed.

The book is attractively printed and presented. The decision to reproduce vase-paintings with line-drawings instead of photographs was wise, and they are skilfully done. There are not many failures of proof-reading, but some of those I noticed are serious. At least three times (pp. 74, 75, 79) we are unhelpfully referred to that old favourite 'p. 000'. On p. 186 a recalcitrant computer has made mincemeat of a stretch of metrical notation. In the score of Athenaios' paean (pp. 229–34) the square brackets we are promised (p. 228) to indicate conjectural restorations are not in fact provided, and incautious readers may be misled into taking guesswork for authenticated reality.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There are too many gaps, both in the subjects treated and in the evidence offered to support L.'s statements, too little attention to the organization of materials, and too many weak passages and unreliable assertions for this book to be fully satisfactory. Even where what is said is more or less uncontroversial, L. does not always make the most of his opportunities. In the chapter on musical myths, for example (Chapter VI), he hardly goes beyond the elementary project of retelling a selection of the stories and sorting them roughly into narrative types. Here, as too often elsewhere, L. seems merely to be going through the motions, and gives his readers no reason to be more interested in the 'facts' he presents than he apparently is himself. Those stretches of the book in which his enthusiasm is evidently engaged, by contrast, would be very hard to beat. Despite the volume's shortcomings, the bulk of Chapters II and V and parts of Chapters VIII–X, just by themselves, will earn it an honourable place on that rapidly filling bookshelf.

University of Birmingham ANDREW BARKER

ZETTELKASTEN

R. MERKELBACH, J. STAUBER: *Steinepigramme aus dem Griechischen Osten. Band I. Die Westküste Kleinasiens von Knidos bis Ilion*. Pp. xv + 647, ills, maps. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 3-519-07446-X.

The present volume is intended to be the first of three which will collect all the epigrams on stone from the Greek east. 'Steinepigramm' denotes all inscriptions wholly in verse, in whatever meter, not only those known from inscriptions discovered or lost since the revival of learning, but also those recorded by ancient authors or collectors (notably, in the *Greek Anthology*). It also includes fragments. The 'Greek East' is intended to mean Asia in the fullest sense, stretching from the western coast of Anatolia as far as Bactria, but excluding Egypt and the rest of Africa.

The first volume covers 'the west coast of Asia Minor from Knidos to Ilium'. We are not told why the order goes from south to north, or how 'coast' is defined: in particular, all of Caria is included as far east as Colossae. The geographical coverage reflects two recent undertakings with which the volume corresponds very closely, the 'Princeton Epigraphical Project' of Donald McCabe and his collaborators, and Peter Herrmann's *Tituli Asiae Minoris* V. In general, the editors do not claim to have sought out new inscriptions, or even to have verified the texts in accessible museums or archives. It would not be unfair to say that this book is largely parasitic.

The texts are arranged, not sequentially through the volume, but with three numbers, the first indicating general area, the second the city or territory thereof, while the third is sometimes chronological, but not consistently. Thus the last inscription of Caunos (p. 32) is assigned a date earlier than all the others; similarly at Halicarnassus (pp. 37–63), a group of Hellenistic inscriptions, with one of the fifth century B.C.E. stuck among them (p. 47), is followed by a disorderly series ranging in date from the Hellenistic era down to the Byzantine. This confusion is partly compensated by the lists of cities at the beginning of the work, and the list of subjects (e.g. 'Statue des Hermes in Knidos-Neustadt') which precedes each city.

The work is supplied with a large number of useful sketch-maps, though sometimes the editors seem not to have consulted them. Thus their index (p. ix) places Nysa 'am

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Marsyas und Umgebung' and Tabae 'am Mäander-Tal', whereas the relevant map (p. 179) correctly places the first in the valley of the Meander and the second well to the south-south-east of Aphrodisias. Similarly (though here the map on p. 289 is misleading) Hypaipa is in Lydia and not in Ionia. There is some photographic illustration, which seems to be rather random. There is no concordance to previous publications, and no index of names or words, nor is one promised in a later volume.

The general procedure is to give a text, including any prose inscription that accompanies it; a German translation; a commentary, usually confined to questions of meter and language; a brief bibliography; and a note of published photograph (where existing), date, find spot, and present preservation. Sometimes one or more of these last items are omitted, with no reason given; sometimes a general date is supplied ('Kaiserzeit,' 'wohl 5. Jahrh. n. Chr.'), with no indication of its basis (e.g. versification, letter-forms, nomenclature). There is no apparatus criticus, nor, in a departure from the traditional and useful practice, is there any systematic indication of direct wit- nesses to the stone, or of original as opposed to derivative editions.

The work has some positive advantages. It is good to have in one place all (or almost all, since there are inevitably one or two omissions) of the epigrams from the areas covered, and supplied with an up-to-date if not complete bibliography. This is particularly true of the epigrams of the late empire discussed in Louis Robert's *Hellenica* IV. Unlike Peek's *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*, the texts are not deformed by arbitrary supplements, and their comprehension is greatly assisted by accurate and clear translations and by the commentaries. These, it is true, sometimes give the impression of jottings: why, for example, do we have next to nothing on *diogmitai* on p. 411 but four lines about paranormal phenomena on p. 418?

At the same time, the reader cannot escape the sense that haste and lack of planning have spoiled the whole enterprise. The editors justify the use of German rather than Latin on the ground that those who do otherwise 'labor over Latin, waste time, and give only the skeleton of a commentary' (*mühen sich mit dem Latein ab*, *verlieren Zeit und geben nur das Skelett eines Kommentars*, p. viii). Apart from the question whether German is really a better-known language among potential users than Latin (certainly not in the USA), more time might have improved this volume immensely, just as it would have improved many volumes in the otherwise very useful series of *Griechische Inschriften Kleinasiens*.

Apart from the instances implied in the above discussion, I give one or two in detail. The editors say they have not included Byzantine inscriptions, but 'indicated [them] bibliographically' (*bibliographisch verzeichnet*, p. vii). In fact, such inscriptions are treated in exactly the same way as all others. Thus 01/12/12 (p. 53), from the territory of Halicarnassus, is flanked by two crosses, was allegedly inscribed on a Romanesque column-capital, and has the text σ[τα]υροῦ [παρόντος] οὐδὲν ἠσ[χύ]ει φθόνος. These indications suggest a date not before the twelfth century or so; since there is a copy in the Vienna archives, would it not have been worth consulting?

More egregiously, 04/02/07 from Sardis (p. 405) is clearly late antique, and honors a certain Vocontius. The editors date it *c*. 260, and comment: 'Vocontius ist wahrscheinlich identisch mit A. Vocontius Zeno, der in Adana in Kilikien in der Zeit des Gallienus (260/268) als praeses bezeugt ist', with reference to *PLRE* I 993, Zeno no. 9. The 'Adana' inscription was first published by Paribeni and Romanelli in *Monumenti Antichi* 23 (1914), 168, no. 115, which the editors do not cite. If they had consulted it, they would have found that the person there is in fact a Voconius, not a 'Vocontius', and in addition that the text was not copied in Adana but the modern village of Adanda, which is far to the west in Rough Cilicia, and probably to be identified with

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lamos (cf. L. Robert, *Documents de l'Asie mineure méridionale* [Geneva, 1966], pp. 71–2). *PLRE*, though giving the name correctly as 'Voconius', made the same confusion of Adana and Adanda, and the present editors have all too evidently taken over its references without checking.

Instead of a dedication, the volume has a programmatic statement, which is addressed to those responsible for maintaining the *Inscriptiones G.* This program suggests that the volume is meant to serve as a lesson in the editing of inscriptions according to modern needs and criteria. But on the contrary, both in its less-than-careful execution and in its presentation, with many pages left half- or more blank (e.g. pp. 5, 7, 14, etc.), the book gives the impression of nothing so much as a photographed assemblage of large index-cards. If the series is to continue, the editors might do well to learn a few lessons in humility, and not only in epigraphic method.

Harvard University CHRISTOPHER P. JONES

TAX FARMING

R. S. STROUD: *The Athenian Grain-Tax Law of 374/3 B.C.* (*Hesperia* Supplement 29.) Pp. xiv + 140, 7 ills. Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1998. Paper, $35. ISBN: 0-87661-529-9.

The recipe was excellent. Take the most important long Athenian text to be discovered for years, which potentially revolutionizes our understanding of Athenian taxes, Athenian relations with Lemnos, Imbros, and Skyros, and the Athenian grain trade in the early fourth century. Put it in the hands of the most skilled and sage of living Athenian epigraphers. The result is disappointing: an ill-organized and slightly irritable commentary that fails to make clear what the inscription is all about.

Found in the Agora in 1986, this is the second earliest fourth-century Athenian law surviving on stone. On the proposal of Agyrrhios, revealed here active fourteen years after the latest literary mention of him, the Athenians decide to sell the one-twelfth tax (which Stroud unhelpfully calls the 8 1/3% tax) from Lemnos, Imbros, and Skyros, and the 2% tax, 'in terms of grain'. 'Each portion will consist of 500 medimnoi, 100 of wheat and 400 of barley'. Those who 'buy' the tax have to transport the grain to the Aiakeion at Athens at their own expense. The city elects ten men to look after the grain from its delivery not later than Maimakterion (November, though S. never says so) until at least Anthesterion (February/March) and then to sell it at a price fixed by the city. The proceeds go to the stratiotic fund (making its earliest appearance here, as does the *dioikesis* as a general fund).

What is happening here? The law opens, in a sort of miniature anticipation of the prefaces of Plato's *Laws*, by stating its purpose: 'In order that there may be grain for the people in the public domain' (S.'s translation of ἐν τῶι κοινῶι). On S.'s rough calculation (see below) the law would have brought in perhaps 31,000 medimnoi a year of grain (i.e. enough to feed the fourth-century citizen families for a month). It would also bring in revenue (S. hazards 'roughly more than 18 talents', but we have no idea whether in setting the sale price the Athenian people preferred high income or cheap grain). So much is clear.

What is not clear is why anyone would bid for the right to bring the grain tax to Athens. S. acknowledges this as one of the most puzzling aspects of the inscription, and his own discussion is inadequate. S. suggests and then dismisses that Athens paid the tax farmers; then he suggests that 'it might be best to begin with the period after

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the grain reaches Athens' in looking for a profit; then, still on the same page (p. 113), he says 'the most likely occasion for profit would have been before, rather than after, the grain was transported to Athens'. He proceeds to suggest that the tax-farmer was attracted by the prospect either of negotiating favourable purchase prices on non-tax grain from the farmers he was taxing or of collecting more tax-grain than the 500 medimnoi portion or portions that he had contracted for. 'All this is pure guesswork', S. writes, and he returns to speculating about how contact with producers may have given the tax farmers a 'competitive edge' over other merchants, about the profits they may have made on what they took on their ships when they went to Lemnos, Imbros, and Skyros, and how they might have tapped into 'a lively passenger trade' to and from Athens.

The financial attractions of farming the tax cannot have been merely incidental profits. The attraction of farming the 2% harbour tax at Athens, as Agyrrhios himself had done, lay in 2% of imports and exports proving to be greater than the amount bid. The attractions of farming this one-twelfth produce tax ought to be that one-twelfth of the harvest proved greater than the amount pledged. The complexity here lies in the manner of the bidding. Although bidders have to pay 20 dr. of sales tax and herald's fee, bids are in terms of grain: tax-farmers bid to deliver a certain number of 500 medimnoi portions. The law allows for the possibility of joint bids: 'the portion (*meris*) held by a group of six men will consist of 3000 medimnoi'; S. remarks (p. 40) that the law 'does not say . . . and perhaps may not imply, "only one *meris* per customer" ', but this is too weak. Since we have an auction, and since bids are 'in terms of grain', the bidding must be in terms of those 500 medimnoi portions. Individuals or symmories put in bids to deliver a certain number of portions of tax-grain from each of the three islands. The person bidding to deliver the highest number of portions wins. In the absence of any evidence for subdivision of the islands into regions (Clinton's suggestion on p. 112), we should believe that there is only one successful bidder per tax per island. The tax-farmer expects to profit by finding that one-twelfth of the grain from 'his' island exceeds the number of 500 medimnoi portions that he has contracted to deliver. S. sufficiently misunderstands what is going on to 'see no reason to doubt that the *boule* and the *poletai* established first how many *merides* of grain would be presented for sale (p. 64, cf. p. 41)!

It is not simply S.'s failure to understand the basic mechanism at work here that makes it hard for the reader to fathom what is going on. The exposition is poorly organized. S.'s section, 'The Purpose, Nature and Implementation of the Law', comes at the end, rather than the beginning, of the book. The bulk of the book is made up of commentary on the inscription, done on chunks of lines. Comments relevant to one line are very frequently found under other lines: so, the crucial term 'the buyer (of the tax)' occurs first in ll. 11–12, but S. deals with 'Who, then, is "the buyer", and what is he buying?' in his commentary on ll. 14–15 ('He will heap up the grain in the Aiakeion'). Comments on features that run through the inscription get buried in the commentary on a particular line: S. is very interesting on the (contract-like) syntax of the inscription ('the remarkable string of twelve consecutive future clauses'), but his comments on it are buried in discussion of ll. 8–10 and can only be traced by a reader who has the prescience to look up 'future indicative tense' in the index. Epigraphers interested in the continuing occurrence of 'Attic' orthography after 403 have to read attentively enough to pick up a footnote to the commentary on an Ionic form in ll. 6–7. Within the commentary S. regularly offers wrong answers first, even when he knows the right ones: so on p. 51 he speculates on grain capacity of pack animals before admitting that carts are more likely; he then explores the problems with regarding the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'buyers' as buyers of grain before admitting that they are in fact buyers of the tax. This habit leads to the better solutions being inadequately investigated: the most notable thing about one-twelfth is that it seems to have been a frequent, if not standard, rate of rent. That the Athenians seem effectively to be charging the residents of the three islands rent for their land casts a fascinating light on how Athens regarded them, but although S. acknowledged one-twelfth as a regular rent, he only does so five pages after stating that 'the present law is our first and only evidence for an Athenian tax at the rate of 8 1/3%' (p. 27), and he never explores the implications of this law for Athenian relations with these islands at all.

Throughout the book there is a certain irritability. S. has no time for the use of parallels from modern Greece or from anthropology in order to model possible ancient behaviour in the absence of evidence (pp. 36, 47). He tilts at Garnsey's careful arguments on the basis of the first-fruits returns in *IG* II^2 1672, which successfully show that one has a choice between believing either that the percentage of land cultivated in cereals or the fertility of Lemnos was very different from that of Attica, or that this was a very bad year in Attica. He makes fun of Sallares for failing to practise what he preaches. But he goes on to assume that production in the three islands was normal, and not subject to understatement, in *IG* II^2 1672 in order to calculate a figure for how much grain this law brought to Athens.

There is much that is fascinating in the inscription, and there is one fundamental contribution in S.'s publication. S. persuasively identifies the enclosure at the south-west corner of the Agora, which has sometimes been identified as the Heliaia, as the Aiakeion. Once more we find a major monument which did not attract the attention of Athenian authors: although Herodotus records the foundation of the shrine, subsequent references are limited to one epigraphic and three lexicographic. S. takes this topographic opportunity well; it is a pity that he does not make as much of his other opportunities.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford ROBIN OSBORNE

MONTANIST INSCRIPTIONS

W. TABBERNEE: *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia: Epigraphic Sources Illustrating the History of Montanism*. (Patristic Monograph Series 16.) Pp. xi + 722, 106 ills, 12 maps, 42 pls. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997. Cased, $45. ISBN: 0-86554-521-9.

A book of over 700 pages on Montanist inscriptions may encourage the unwary to think that there is a lot of evidence. Unfortunately, of the ninety-five inscriptions which have their own entries, only eighteen are labelled by T. as 'definitely Montanist'. The others come in classifications (usefully tabulated in Appendix 3) from 'likely Montanist' to 'definitely not Montanist', but are included here because some reputable authority has previously claimed them as Montanist. T. sets out (pp. 6–10) the various criteria which are used to identify epigraphic Montanism (some of which he proves to be much more doubtful about than he admits at this point), but also acknowledges that some Montanist inscriptions must go unidentified. He takes what he defines as a minimalist approach to accepting inscriptions as Montanist, and the book's ultimate effect is to reduce rather than extend the amount of epigraphic evidence which can be associated with Montanism.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

All attempts to collect inscriptions belonging to a particular group in antiquity tend to assume that people either were or were not members of the group. This is straightforward enough when soldiers or women are being studied, but more problematic when dealing with a religious or ethnic group. Some people definitely were Montanist/Jewish/Donatist/Syrian and some definitely were not, but there were also people on the fringes who create special problems of identification (and the identification can be hard enough anyway). Being a Montanist did not necessarily mean breaking with the orthodox church, as T. acknowledges for Carthage. If there is still room for doubt about whether Perpetua should be classified as a Montanist despite the substantial literary evidence about her, then the problems inherent in labelling someone who is only known from a few lines of an inscription must be substantially greater, as many of T.'s discussions make clear.

Apart from studying each inscription comprehensively, T. also provides a brief history of Montanism, something which will make the book accessible to people with little or no previous knowledge of the religion. The inscriptions have been arranged in chronological sections, in periods which have significance for Montanist history. This makes sense but creates some epigraphic problems: there is no way of deciding whether an inscription without an internal date comes from 175 or 185. Some inscriptions seem to be in the wrong section anyway: no. 13, apparently assigned to the second half of the third century, comes under 'c.180–224', as does no. 15, which is eventually decided to be late fourth- or early fifth-century. Within each period, the entries are arranged geographically, and not according to the probability of their being Montanist. It is to be hoped that users of the book will be careful to read all of T.'s comments, since his discussion of whether or not an inscription is Montanist usually comes right at the end of an entry, which may be of considerable length. The comments themselves could at times have been made clearer: according to Appendix 3, no. 9 is 'definitely not Montanist' and no. 90 is 'unlikely Montanist', but this is not entirely obvious from the comments ad loc.

Anyone without previous knowledge of Latin onomastics may be somewhat confused by T.'s references to the name Aurelius. People who received Roman citizenship under the Constitutio Antoniniana automatically acquired the *praenomen* and *gentilicium* M. Aurelius if male, or the *gentilicium* Aurelia if female: it is not the case that 'many provincials took the name Aurelius or Aurelia in honor of the emperor who had granted them citizenship' (p. 74). Aurelius was not a *praenomen*, as claimed on p. 92 and elsewhere—it just came at the beginning of people's names when the *praenomen* fell out of use. The designation of it on p.557 and elsewhere as a *quasi-gentilicium* is more appropriate. Names cause further confusion later: people called Iulius in the fourth century did not 'belong to the influential *gens* of the *Iulii*' (p. 558), but were simply descendants of someone who acquired citizenship from a Iulius.

Some comments on individual inscriptions: 11: The man who built the tomb is surely Ammianos, son of Diokles, grandson of Menandros, not 'Ammianos Diokles, the son of Menandros'. 21: Mundana (Moundane) appears to be a completely different name from Montane. 49: It would be useful to be told that 'Sam Fogg, London' is a rare books and manuscripts dealer. The names of the children are nominative, not dative as the translation implies. 53: 'Sweetest' applies to all the people referred to in the dative, not just to the brother. It seems unnecessary to say that the age given as nineteen really means 'a little short of 20 years'—some people must have died at nineteen! 57: l. 2 of the text should read μνῆ(μης). 58: The names in the genitive may in this case indicate ownership rather than commemoration, so the translation '(In memory of)' is potentially misleading. 60: The soldier Domnos is nowhere in the epitaph said to have been a Christian, although his children clearly were. 64: The translation

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

does not make clear that the names, particularly Proklos, are based on very tentative restorations ('by way of example only'). Dating the inscription on the basis of an entirely restored [*Αὐρ.*] seems rather hazardous. 69: The tomb-builder's father is a *βουλευτής*, correctly translated as 'city-councillor', yet on p. 562 he has become 'a senator—probably of the city council at Laodikeia, rather than of the Roman senate', and on p. 565 'a (provincial?) senator'. 72: Someone who was buried in a catacomb on the Via Aurelia at Rome did not necessarily live on the Via Aurelia. If there really was a Montanist section of the catacomb, a very debatable assertion in itself, it is more likely that Montanists from all over Rome would have been buried there. Ablabes, commemorated in this epitaph, is the only person who can be identified both as a Montanist and as originating from Asia Minor (Galatia); the existence of 'a thriving Montanist congregation of immigrants from Asia Minor resident in Rome' (p. 546) is therefore entirely hypothetical. 90: The monogram seems more likely to be an elaborately decorated *D(is) M(anibus)* than anything to do with *Dominus Muntanus*.

The book achieves high epigraphic standards, with full critical apparatus, bibliographies, photographs where possible, and (particularly useful) line-drawings; one small criticism is that it is not always obvious whether T. has seen an inscription himself, and whether the location given is the current one or the last known one. The gathering together of inscriptions from a wide variety of original publications will be very useful, and it is not T.'s fault that so few of the inscriptions are 'definitely Montanist'.

University of Wales, Lampeter DAVID NOY

GREEK HISTORY

S. B. Pomeroy, S. M. Burstein, W. Donlan, J. T. Roberts: *Ancient Greece: a Political, Social, and Cultural History.* Pp. xxx + 512, ills, maps. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. Cased, £25. ISBN: 0-19-509742-4.

This is an attractively produced compendious textbook. It is likely to sell well and deserves to do so. It fills a glaring gap in the market for a modern, narrative-based Greek History textbook. It approaches the scale and authority of a Bury and Meiggs or a Hammond (perhaps these books should have been mentioned), but balances its politico-military coverage with equal amounts of social and cultural material, and reflects the massive shift in research interests in the field over the last three decades. Full marks here. It also claims distinction for including the Hellenistic period in its purview (p. xiii), but the narrative is in fact abandoned with the Diadochi (p. 443), and the social and cultural discussion of the period is comparatively thin.

Chapters are devoted to: Early Greece and the Bronze Age; The 'Dark Age' of Greece and the Eighth-Century 'Renaissance'; Archaic Greece; Sparta; The Growth of Athens and the Persian Wars; The Rivalries of the Greek City-States and the Growth of Athenian Democracy; Greece on the Eve of the Peloponnesian War; The Peloponnesian War; The Crisis of the Polis and the Age of Shifting Hegemonies; Philip II and the Rise of Macedon; Alexander the Great; Alexander's Successors; and The Cosmopolis. Heavy subdivision, reflected also on the contents pages, makes it easy to find one's way around. Each chapter begins with a brief introduction and this is immediately followed by a review of the relevant ancient sources. Chapters close with a bibliography of around eight items for further reading. Here the authors have evidently

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

limited themselves to monographs of a general nature in English. Within such constraints a degree of arbitrariness in selection is inevitable, but even so some of the choices made are curious. In the chapter devoted to Old Macedon and Philip II there is room for Martin's numismatic study of relations between Macedon and Thessaly, but not, it seems, for the Hammond and Griffith *History of Macedonia* ii (Oxford, 1978). And readers of the Alexander chapter should surely have been directed to Lane Fox. Brief comments are attached to each bibliographical item. The description of Pomeroy's own book on *Women in Hellenistic Egypt* as 'excellent' (p. 470), as it may well be, was doubtless penned by a co-author.

Amongst the paraphernalia is a nine-page 'Time line' within which entries are distributed amongst columns headed 'Military Events', 'Political/Social Events', and 'Cultural Development' (pp. xix–xxvii). The entries appropriately reflect the subjects upon which the text focuses. There is also a fourteen-page glossary of terms (mainly Greek), presumably designed to help those dipping into the book without reading it through (pp. 476–89). I suspect it will occur to few to look for the entries on 'currency', 'democracy', 'freedom of the Greeks', and 'myth'. The book bristles with maps and photographs. The former are attractive and clear, with the exception of the map of Syracuse (p. 308). The varied photographs imaginatively include Degas's 'Young Spartans' (Fig. 4.4), the reconstructed trireme (Fig. 5.9), and the Nashville Athena (Fig. 7.8). The photograph of 'Pylos and Sphacteria' (Fig. 8.3), reproduced from Schoder's handy *Ancient Greece from the Air* (London, 1974), has transferred so poorly into black and white that the island has disappeared.

On the whole the book is well-balanced in its treatment of topics. Amongst major social-historical subjects religion alone strikes me as a little under-represented. Given the book's agenda and Pomeroy's leadership, one would expect to hear much of women, and indeed one does so, but the emphasis is achieved less through the devotion of sections to them than through the integration of material with a women-interest across the board. Thus Hippocratic writing is exemplified through a gynaecological treatise (p. 259), Euripides' work through one of Medea's laments about the difficulty of being a woman (p. 264), the Funeral Oration through its postscript to women (p. 292), and Plato's philosophy through the *Republic*'s discussion of female guardians (pp. 357–8).

The book is said to be aimed at (sc. American) college students (p. xiii), for 'Class. Civ. 101' I assume, and its authors will know their market. In a British context it still seems more appropriate to A-level (but perhaps not for much longer!). Careful thought has been given to how one should introduce unfamiliar students to the complexities of Greek History, and many of the sections are at once engaging, lucid, and concise. The Dark Age section in particular contrives to bring a spark to the dismal archaeology of the period (pp. 41–81); the summary of the phases of archaic colonization is skilful (pp. 90–5); the discussion of 'colligation' and the historiography of the Peloponnesian war is interestingly provocative. Only occasionally does the attempt to give quick and easy access to a complex issue result in misjudgement: one of the treatments of homosexuality in its haste speaks dangerously of its 'origins' (p. 145); without further explanation a phrase like 'the average age of death in Classical Athens for adult females was 36.2 years' (p. 235) will tell many students that there were no old women in Athens; the discussion of Macedonian ethnicity will please Skopje (pp. 373–6). Some of the book's explicit negotiations between antiquity and the modern world will work better inside America than outside it: the repeated hand-wringing over the Greek practice of slavery (e.g. p. 63); the contrived comparison between Thermopylae and Vietnam (p. 196); and the harsh comparison of Philip II to Hitler (p. 393). Whether the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

book will encourage students to manipulate the ancient sources for themselves is unclear. There is occasional quotation and there are some scarce bracketed references, but the sources are primarily laid before the reader in the form of translated 'Documents', which are enclosed within key-pattern dividers and which are germane to but not formally integrated into the associated narrative (*à la* Osborne).

There is little point in singling out for criticism in a book of this sort assertions or generalizations I consider questionable if they reflect, as they do, the *communis opinio* or at least the views of significant numbers of scholars. I confine myself therefore to minor complaints. The archaic period begins in 776, not 750 (p. xx). The assertion that no tyranny lasted more than three generations (p. 107) ignores Sicyon. Hesiod's *Works* can hardly be described as a 'long epic poem' (p. 99). The Linear B antecedent of *basileus* is not *pa-* but *qa-si-re-u* (pp. 29, 47). *Apologia* does not mean 'refutation' (pp. 24–5). Macrons are variously applied to, misapplied to, and withheld from transliterated terms (*axônes*, p. 169; *eromenos*, p. 269). Numerous proper names are stranded between transliteration and Latinization, e.g. Peisistratus (*passim*), Ouranus (p. 64), and Triparadeisus (p. 436). Demetrius is derived from Phaleron and Phalerum on the same page (p. xxvi). Massalia mutates into Massilia without explanation (p. 94). The book will not wean students from their cherished spelling of 'Phillip' (p. x); typographical errors are admittedly few, however (but Cyprusim, p. 214; of onto, p. 327). The punctuation of 'do's and don'ts' (p. 101) baffles. A nonkin turns out not to be a creature from Oz, but an unrelated person (p. 68).

On the plus side, the use of B.C./A.D. throughout in a book of this nature invites hopes that the B.C.E./C.E. insanity is coming to an end.

University of Wales, Swansea DANIEL OGDEN

MINOAN POLITICAL STRUCTURE

R. HÄGG: *The Function of the 'Minoan Villa'. Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 6–8 June, 1992*. Pp. 245, ills, maps. Stockholm: Paul Åströms Forlag, 1997. SEK 450. ISBN: 91-7916-034-4.

A major research focus in Minoan studies over the last fifteen years has been political structure in the 'palatial' period (twentieth-to-fifteenth centuries B.C.), expressed in the definition of territories and of political organization, hierarchical or otherwise, within and between them. Buildings conventionally called villas have an important place in these structures. The 1992 Athens conference, published in 1997 to the exemplary standards of the Swedish Institute at Athens, tackled the function of 'villas', in part as a sequel to the highly successful 1984 conference on the function of the palaces. Such difficulty was experienced with the term 'villa' as a useful overall concept that I would urge its withdrawal. The research presented at the conference (especially the overview papers of H. and M. van Effenterre and of Betancourt and Marinatos, with useful observations by Whitelaw) and elsewhere might permit the following broad organizational scheme to be proposed for the Neopalatial Period (seventeenth-to-fifteenth centuries B.C.). Nearly all the examples given below have been called villas.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1. *Settlements with a main building, possibly exercising a controlling function*. (a) A palace if it meets appropriate architectural criteria, including a central court; (b) a main building if it does not meet such criteria. Examples or possible examples of (b): Akhladhia Riza, Amnisos, Makrygialos, Myrtos Pyrgos, Nirou Khani, Praisos (Tourtouloi), Prophetes Elias (Aghios Georghios), Vathypetro (manorial villas of Betancourt and Marinatos).
2. *Settlements with houses ranging from 'grand' to 'normal'*. Examples: Mochlos, Tylissos (urban villas of Betancourt and Marinatos).
3. *Country estates with a main building and no or one or more dependent or subsidiary buildings*. Examples or possible examples: Nerokourou, Seteia Klimataria (though this perhaps not with an estate), Sklavokampos (domanial and country villas of Betancourt and Marinatos).
4. *Small farm buildings (*metókhia*)*. Example: bay of Seteia.

Category 2 shades into 3, but there are essentially two categories. That functions can differ within a category is shown by several papers. Arkhanes Tourkogeitonia and Haghia Triadha are, for different reasons, unique buildings and fulfil many palace criteria. Khania is at the moment category 2, but could very well have had a palace. Kommos was clearly a main port town; its Building T was clearly large and dominant, with a central court, and it may have functioned as a palace. In LM I the site seems at least on a par with neighbouring Haghia Triadha and Phaistos, and it may have served as the southern port for Knossos. At the conference many contributors saw category 3 sites and some of 1(b) as to some degree (mostly to a strong degree) dependent on the palace building (1(a)) of their region. The origins of 1(b) and 3 sites are sought by Niemeier in the protopalatial period (nineteenth-to-seventeenth centuries B.C.), though few supporting sites were agreed on by participants. Several contributors found a strong religious dimension in specific buildings, with a priestly class and even theocracy at state level. At the same time the main buildings of 1(b) and 3, the country estates, *υποστατικά* (terms unmentioned in the publication until the final General Discussion), organized and centralized local agricultural production for their own requirements, as well as for any requirements of the palace centres.

Within the above structural scheme it is important to recognize the notion of *scale*. There were several political regions or territories, all with a capital and palace centre, settlements, and buildings as in the scheme above, together with sacred sites, port towns, natural resource points, and other types of site. Galatas, Gournia, and Petras exercised the same functions for their territories as the large palace centres did for theirs. Only the scale differed. That leaves the question whether smaller territories were themselves dependent on larger. Many researchers accept that in the Neopalatial Period (Late Minoan 1) Knossos controlled all central Crete (north and south) and Zakros may have been its far eastern port. Knossian control elsewhere is not easy to determine; the Versailles effect of M. Wiener (in whose honour the conference was held), whereby Knossian architectural and other features are imitated without political dependence, is at least as plausibly argued.

The conference volume has substantial achievements, notably the presentation of a wealth of highly interesting information on and illustration of specific sites by Chryssoulaki (Nerokourou), Davaras (Makrygialos), Driessen and Sakellarakis (Vathypetro), Fotou (Knossos, Nirou Khani, and Sklavokampos), L. Platon (Seteia valley), La Rosa (Haghia Triadha), and Tsipopoulou and Papacostapoulou (Seteia valley sites in their regional context), these latter for the most part relatively little

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

known outside preliminary reports by S. Marinatos and N. Platon, and recent treatment by Macdonald and Driessen in *The Troubled Island* (*Aegaeum* 17 [Université de Liège, 1997]). Kannia, presented at the conference, was alas unavailable for the publication.

There is also a series of papers of interest and value in themselves, but only rather loosely related to the question of 'villas', on a Minoan origin for the *andreion*, with reference to possible locations at Haghia Triadha and Nirou Khani, on Minoan halls (architectural unit within buildings), on the wall paintings of Haghia Triadha Room 14, and on ceramic exchanges within and beyond territories, established by thin-section ceramic petrography (Day). Discussion sessions include the functional analysis of architecture, with a most perceptive theoretical introduction (getting from form to function or to general Minoan conceptions of built space) by Palyvou, applied in Fotou's paper, and on political geography, including 'villas', derivable from Linear A tablets, seals, and sealings. In the latter there is a neat contrast between the exposition of Hallager—Knossian control, and of Driessen—local central controls and political fragmentation.

This is a stimulating and informative volume, and it will be much referred to. A theoretical dimension is present but not large. Indeed, the publication might have benefited from reorganization of the conference papers on a more thematic basis. But the frameworks proposed, there and above, are relatively young and the current Minoan scene is replete with even richer new data, accumulating since 1992.

University of Bristol P. M. WARREN

ARCHAIC GREECE

N. Fisher, H. van Wees (edd.): *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*. Pp. xvi + 464, ills, maps, tables. London: Duckworth, 1998. Cased, £48. ISBN: 0-7156-2809-7.

This volume of essays is the result of what must have been an extremely stimulating conference. As the organizers remark in the introduction, the conference was called *Archaic Greece: the Evidence and its Limitations*, but the papers showed that 'this was an unduly negative title: for every limitation exposed in the sources, a new direction for research has opened up' (p. xv). The book is organized in three sections: the first concentrates on archaeological evidence for different regions of Greece, the second has a more literary focus, and the third examines topics of 'power, status, exchange, and state-formation' (p. vi).

In 'Archaeology and Archaic Greek History', I. Morris asks 'what role for archaeology in the writing of archaic Greek history?' (p. 1), and answers: 'there will be no proper cultural, social, and economic histories of archaic Greece until archaeologists become historians, and historians become archaeologists' (p. 79). He divides the archaeological evidence not by the material from which it is made, but into 'categories of graves, sanctuaries, and settlements' (p. 8), because these enable us to study the contexts in which the objects and buildings appeared. Then he surveys Greece by region, summarizing the archaeological evidence for each of his three categories. M.'s essay provides a framework for many of the other papers and will be valuable to anyone wishing to gain an introduction to this era. (It might be worthwhile to compare Morris's map of the regions of Greece with a map of Greek dialects and to see whether they correspond.)

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the first of two essays on Sparta, 'Lakonian Artistic Production and the Problem of Spartan Austerity', S. Hodkinson puts aside the literary evidence to examine the physical remains. He does so by studying artefacts in groupings—pottery, bronzes, lead figurines—rejected by Morris in the previous essay, then notes that there are few excavated burials and no complete house from Sparta, so that the finds from sanctuaries alone must provide his evidence. H. concludes that, were it not for literary sources, the rise and fall in the numbers of Spartan artefacts would not be surprising when compared with other cities, and emphasizes that we should study not 'Lakonian artistic *production*', but 'Spartiate *expenditure* on material goods' (p. 111), in order to understand Spartan wealth or austerity.

A. Powell's attempt to understand Spartan culture before the Lycurgan revolution is hampered by his evidence ('Sixth-century Lakonian Vase-painting: Continuities and Discontinuities with the "Lykourgan" Ethos'). He observes that the majority of those which survive are found not in Sparta but on Samos (almost all from sanctuaries), but he proceeds anyway, dependent on comparisons with Corinthian vases. The Laconian vases share some qualities with Lycurgan Sparta—the reluctance to write, the absence of athletic scenes, the presence of religious themes, and music. Several qualities are seemingly at odds, including a lack of interest in warfare, *symposion* and *komos* scenes showing the wealthy at play, and sexual matters. P. rightly concludes that it is too simplistic merely to invert Lycurgan ideals and retroject them into the past, seeing too much apparent continuity in religion, music, and homosexuality.

A. Villing studies the iconography of Athena in western Asia Minor and nearby islands ('Athena as *Ergane* and *Promachos*: the Iconography of Athena in Archaic East Greece'). She distinguishes between the attributes of Athena as *ergane* (seated, with spindle and/or distaff) and as *promachos* (striding forward, with spear). She suggests that while Athena *promachos* appears across archaic Greece, east Greece may have been the origin of Athena *ergane*.

K. Raaflaub has two goals in his essay on the historicity of Homeric society ('A Historian's Headache: How to Read "Homeric Society"?'), first to show 'that the social background description in the epics is sufficiently consistent to reflect elements of a historical society', then to use the epics 'as valuable literary evidence to illuminate a period for which we would otherwise have to rely almost entirely on archaeological sources' (p. 170). His second goal is dependent on his first, so R. argues that in much of Greece there was discontinuity between the Mycenaean and archaic ages, and that Homeric society is anthropologically realistic and is to be dated to the late eighth or early seventh century. He suggests: 'the social background of heroic epic needed to be "modern" enough to be understandable but archaic enough to be believable' (p. 181).

Like Raaflaub, A. Dalby is interested in comprehending the social conditions in which the Homeric epics were composed, but with very different assumptions and approach ('Homer's Enemies: Lyric and Epic in the Seventh Century'). D. is more convinced of a seventh-century date for the Homeric epics, which means there is virtually no chronological gap between these poems and the genres of archaic Greek literature. He searches through the epics to find references to occasions at which singers might perform and also to discover genres used by these poets.

D. Ogden's essay—'What Was in Pandora's Box?'—is by far the most literary and most narrowly focused. He suggests that Hesiod's audience would have expected the box to contain a *teras*-baby, 'the source, the cause and the embodiment of evils' (p. 214). Although the Pandora myth may have been borrowed by Greeks from Mespotamia, when told by Hesiod, it reflected Greek mythological thought.

D. Boedeker concentrates on what the fragments of Simonides' Plataia elegy reveal

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

about contemporaries' attitudes toward those who died on the battlefield ('The New Simonides and Heroization at Plataia'). She emphasizes the presence of the poet and the poet's invocation of Achilles by his matronymic, offering a new kind of immortality for the warrior. She surveys other honors given to the Plataia dead and suggests that Simonides' poem may give to Greeks the sense that the honors attained by Trojan War heroes may belong also to those of the Persian Wars.

R. Osborne's concluding sentence is provocative, but convincing, in light of his essay, 'Early Greek Colonization? The Nature of Greek Settlement in the West' (p. 269): 'a proper understanding of archaic Greek history can only come when chapters on "Colonization" are eradicated from books on early Greece.' He arrives at this by distinguishing the nature of early Greek colonies from those of the fifth century on, arguing that the evidence suggests the classical colony, led by the state to a selected site, with military and/or agricultural goals, was not the pattern of the archaic era. O. argues (pp. 264–5): 'becoming a Greek settlement . . . may often have been a gradual process; becoming a colony more to do with the invention of a past than with a historical moment of invention.'

P. de Souza surveys the evidence for Greek naval affairs, discussing the design of warships, naval facilities, and thalassocracy lists ('Towards Thalassocracy? Archaic Greek Naval Developments'). He concludes that Greek navies were a product of the second half of the sixth century, developed to protect cities and islands against enemies, chiefly Persia or Carthage, and to gain, then keep, power across the seas. Any earlier thalassocracies were created by Greek historians using unclear sources and working to flesh out some historical framework of their imagination.

With the goal of studying the nature of trade in the tenth-to-fifth centuries ('Cargoes of the Heart's Desire: the Character of Trade in the Archaic Mediterranean World'), L. Foxhall draws on 'theories of consumption and material cultural studies' (p. 295), because 'with consumption, the starting point is not demand, but desire, on which the textual evidence is especially explicit' (p. 297). Delicacies to eat and textiles were among the most popular items which cities might import and export simultaneously, and part of their value lay in the importance of display, whether in entertainment or ritual.

J. Whitley, in 'Literacy and Lawmaking: the Case of Archaic Crete', argues that the difference in the evidence for Cretan and Attic literacy reveals something about the uses of writing in those places and is not due simply to the accidents of archaeology. In Attica, the number and variety of inscriptions show that low-level literacy was widespread and 'almost obsessively concerned with naming and with commemorating the actions and achievements of named individuals'; literacy was also linked with images, both mythological scenes on vases and statues of humans (p. 316). On Crete, the lack of inscribed dedications and tombstones, graffiti, and dipinti suggests little interest in naming and commemoration. The inscription of laws was the chief use of writing on the island, although it did not lead to the widespread adoption of democracy, as some have suggested writing fosters.

H. van Wees's essay, 'Greeks Bearing Arms: the State, the Leisure Class, and the Display of Weapons in Archaic Greece', is a lengthy analysis of the iconography of weapons and its relation to the culture. Using graves and vases as evidence, he plots a gradual change in how the upper classes in Athens distinguished themselves from others. Between approximately 735 and 500, they went from defining themselves by carrying or displaying weapons to portraying themselves as men of leisure, carrying only a staff or parasol and wearing clothing incompatible with a sword. If iconography generally reflects reality, as W. argues in these instances, he has sketched an

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

important development. (In one area, W. argues the reverse: as *symposia* appear on vases, the display of weapons on the walls disappears, but he points to literary evidence which contradicts the vases.) What relationship there may be between state formation and attitudes towards weapons is a question which interests W., but he does not make his opinion entirely clear, perhaps due to the complexity of his arguments and limitations of space.

P. Cartledge uses his essay—'Writing the History of Archaic Greek Political Thought'—to set out the methodological preliminaries to the section on the archaic era of his forthcoming book, *Political Thought in Ancient Greece: Élite and Mass from Homer to Plutarch*, particularly the relation between political theory and practice. The Persian Wars, he suggests, really follow the archaic era rather than end it, as the crucial intellectual breakthroughs occur by 500. These include 'from myth to *logos*, from gift-exchange to instituted political exchange, from divine to human understanding, from concrete to abstract reasoning, from unwritten to written law—in sum: from a city of gods to the city of reason' (p. 388). C. briefly comments on tragedy as a democratic genre, and the reputations of Solon and Clisthenes, in both ancient and modern thought. Although he speaks broadly of archaic Greece, his focus is exclusively Athens.

This collection is sure to stimulate debate about the uses of evidence, the topics to which archaeological material can be applied, and how to frame questions. Some of the essays are more convincing than others, but all invite further examination.

SUNY Buffalo C. HIGBIE

A CHARMER

D. GRIBBLE: *Alcibiades and Athens. A Study in Literary Presentation*. Pp. xii + 304. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-815267-1.

This book is a meticulous, thoughtful, nuanced, and largely persuasive investigation into the literary representation of one of antiquity's most intriguing figures. It is a revised and expanded version of Gribble's 1994 Oxford D.Phil. thesis. It is emphatically not another history or biography of Alcibiades (as the inclusion of 'Athens' in the title may initially suggest). At no point are we given a chronological account of Alcibiades' life. Rather, the book traces the development and transformation of the ideas and themes associated with the figure of Alcibiades in a limited but well chosen series of literary texts. G. is not primarily interested in the salutary historical implications of his study, although he is well aware of them (pp. 30, 43). Almost every last one of the cherished anecdotes upon which we rely for an insight into the character of Alcibiades is shown to be a rhetorical or literary construct.

For G. the chief articulation of these literary representations is the notion that the outstandingly powerful but morally precarious Alcibiades (is his bite that of a woman or a lion? Plut. *Alc.* 2.2) could not easily be incorporated within the civic community of democratic Athens (pp. vii, 23, 265–6, etc.). The first chapter attempts to reconstruct the perceptions of Alcibiades formed by his contemporaries. The moral world within which these perceptions are located is largely taken over from that tricked out in James Davidson's *Courtesans and Fishcakes* (London, 1997). The second chapter considers the ways in which these perceptions were taken up into and 'polarized' (a favourite

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

word) within the debates of the rhetorical tradition: was Alcibiades the saviour or destroyer of the city? Although much of the rhetorical material considered here post-dates Thucydides, G. reviews it before turning to the historian because he regards it as derivative of debates about Alcibiades with which Thucydides was already familiar and to which he responded in his own presentation of Alcibiades (p. 90). In the third chapter we learn that Thucydides had a complex opinion of Alcibiades, and was not simply charmed by him; G. has little time here for the detection of compositional layers in Thucydides' text, a project often associated with the issue of Thucydides' attitude to Alcibiades. The fourth chapter, a particu- larly good one, examines the Socratic literature's presentation of Alcibiades and his relationship with Socrates in such a way as to deny the fatal charge that Socrates had corrupted the young. Although entitled 'Conclusion', the final twenty-page section is in effect a further chapter, focusing on Plutarch's *Alcibiades*. The treatment of Plutarch is apparently differentiated in this way because of his distance from the other texts under consideration, which all form part of a tight, continuous, classical Athenian tradition. G. effectively demonstrates the impact of the various classical sources upon Plutarch's text, with the result that his book is not out of place among the recent slew of commentaries upon Plutarch's *Lives*. He argues that Plutarch makes particular use of the Platonic representation of Alcibiades as a means of 'integrating or at least comprehending the complexities of his character' (p. 265).

There are three philological appendices. The first appendix to the Rhetoric chapter argues that none of the fragmentary speeches about Alcibiades derives directly from litigation in his lifetime. The second revisits the author's *CQ* (1997) article to identify [Andocides] 4 as a composition of the early Hellenistic period by someone like Demetrius of Phaleron (cf. pp. 3–4). The appendix to the Plato chapter campaigns against the authenticity of the Platonic *Alcibiades* I.

Efforts are repaid, but the book is often challenging to read. G.'s style is concise to the point where one must sometimes re-read sentences to unpack all their meaning (an outstanding example at p. 102, 'What is missing . . . political interest'). A high degree of familiarity with the 'biography' of Alcibiades (or what we used to think of as such) is assumed on the part of the reader, first, I imagine, because the historical Alcibiades is not at all the subject, and secondly perhaps to save space. But this does mean that one must often scurry back to Hatzfeld for context. And much of the discussion is of a rather abstract nature. This is partly because of the elimination of the historical Alcibiades from the proceedings, but the author does also have a taste for the philosophical. There is much agonizing, for example, over equivocations within the English word 'individual' (pp. 7, 169, and *passim*). Footnotes sometimes refer one to further scholarship for source citations ostensibly important enough to have been reproduced (e.g. p. 92 n. 5). One feels that G. could comfortably have written a book of twice the length.

The dust jacket promises that the approximation of Alcibiades to the 'archetype' of the scapegoat will be a major theme of the book, but in the text the notion is merely glanced over (p. 21); a pity, for there is surely a good deal to be said here. G.'s discussion of the 'city-threatening great individual' (p. 5) would have been enriched by consideration of Theognis 39–52. And the discussion of the remark about Alcibiades at [Andocides] 4.24 ('no man such as this has ever even been born before') could have been profitably connected with the puzzling and much discussed remark of Theopompus about Philip ('Europe had never yet borne such a man as Philip son of Amyntas', *FGH* 115 F27), particularly in view of the fact that such an interest is taken in Theopompus' attitude to Alcibiades (pp. 10, 22, 34–6). It would have been good

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to know to what extent G. thinks Alcibiades is to be identified with the speaker of Thucydides' Melian dialogue.

I noticed few errors. We are twice wrongly told, however, that Cylon died in the course of his failed coup (pp. 4, 49). Heavily Athenocentric generalizations are made about the nature of 'Greek citizenship' (p. 11). Nor did I notice any typographical errors, although the recurring semi-Latinized 'Peisistratus' (p. 6, etc.) irritates. Greek words within the syntax of the English text are usually (but not always) transliterated and usually (but not always) explained for the Greekless reader; macrons are not used, except in the case of *timê* (pp. 11, 49), perhaps to avoid confusion. 'Intertextuality' is several times substituted for 'allusion'.

University of Wales, Swansea DANIEL OGDEN

A READY RECKONER

W. T. Loomis: *Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation in Classical Athens.* Pp. xvii + 403. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1999. Cased, £32.50. ISBN: 0-472-40803-4.

Collecting Athenian wages, transport costs, travel expenses, and welfare allowances was one of many things Boeckh did in his *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener* (1886). Epigraphic discoveries, the mechanical thoroughness of computer-based searches, and the assumption that readers lack historical training mean that Loomis's collection fills a whole book. The introduction justifies the limited range of monetary figures here collected (other price figures cannot be compared directly one to another) and discusses the relative reliability of sources: inscriptions are best, followed by contemporary historians; comic writers, orators and later historians have to be treated with care. . . . Thirteen chapters discuss the individual items of evidence for the wages of public officers, soldiers and sailors, doctors, lawyers and professors, priests, oracles and seers, actors, artists, musicians and writers, overseers, architects and other salaried construction personnel, construction and other manual workers, inscribers, prostitutes and pimps, and miscellaneous workers, and for the costs of transport, travel allowances, and welfare and support allowances and distributions. Three further chapters (twenty-two pages in total) discuss whether there was a standard Athenian wage (there was not), inflation and deflation (each detected at different periods), and whether the economy was embedded or market-oriented (the latter). The burden of the book is efficiently summarized in three sides of conclusions. One appendix lists all the items of evidence discussed in the chapters, a second lists non-Athenian labour, and transport and welfare costs, as culled from literary sources alone. The evidence in this second appendix is nowhere used in the book.

The book is unsatisfactory. The numbered entries in each chapter give the date, price, and what it is for, and discuss the reliability of the evidence (often without mention of the author involved). So, ' "Actors, Artists, Musicians and Writers" #20' reads:

> c.300–250. 7 dr. to 'philosopher' (i.e. actor) hired for one show. This figure (which obviously has nothing to do with philosophers) has a certain plausibility, but, in the absence of much other wage and price information for the third century, it is hard to evaluate.

A footnote usually gives the reference to the Greek text (Lucian *Icar*. 29) and quotes that text in Greek; in this case the footnote adds, without further discussion, 'I assign

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the narrator Menippos' dates of c.300–250 to this entry', and cross-refers to the chapter on philosophers in which this text also appears so that L. can deny that it is relevant. Appendix 1 gives the important information again, listing date, price, item, and reference in four neat columns. For most who consult the book this appendix will be the place to go to, since the presentation here of the chronological series of prices in a separate column enables items to be detected, and interesting trends or anomalies to be isolated, at a glance. But the numbering used in the body of the book is not given in the appendix. To move from appendix to text involves finding the relevant chapter and matching up the item by finding the entry at the relevant date. One cannot move directly from cross-reference (e.g. ' "Soldiers and Sailors" #16–18') to appendix; one has first to find the chapter and the relevant numbered entry, going to the footnote to find what the ancient source actually is. L. evidently assumes that readers most want to discover his own comments; the quality of the comments, as illustrated above, suggests otherwise.

The computer has had a pernicious influence. It is also presumably responsible for the repeated appearance of worthless items from comedy because they *might* be held to belong to more than one category. Amphitheos from *Acharnians* appears on p. 186 in a list of 'Miscellaneous workers', with a little discussion of what his 8 dr. might be for; we meet him again on pp. 206–7 under 'Travel allowances', where more than half a side is devoted to discussion of whether the 8 dr. is a travel allowance and why Aristophanes chose '8 drachmas' rather than 5 or 10, concluding 'it is difficult to evaluate this 8 dr. figure'. That one cannot take this figure from *Acharnians* in isolation, but must see it in relation to the other allowances, etc. referred to in that play, is acknowledged only in a footnote—to acknowledge it in the text would under- mine the rationale of the book's organization. . . .

Appendix 2 shows the extent of the computer disease. If a Greek or Latin source gives a figure in drachmas or talents L. includes it, even if it relates to Rome; any price given by a Greek or Latin source in asses, denarii, sestertii, etc. is excluded, even if it relates to Greece. It cannot make any sense to look at these drachma/talent figures for Rome in isolation from the as/denarius, etc. figures; it *would* have made sense to include any figures for Greece Romanized by Latin writers.

If L.'s economic conclusions are correct, then his enterprise itself is mistaken. If 'Athens had more of a market economy that the modern orthodoxy has held' (p. 258) it makes no sense, particularly when reliable data are so very thin (and for many of L.'s categories he concludes that none of the evidence is really reliable), to treat Athens in isolation from the rest of Greece. Supply and demand elsewhere in the Greek world will have affected wage rates at Athens (something directly illustrated by our literary texts in the case of the wage rates of soldiers and sailors). Equally, if wages and prices respond to market forces then looking at wage inflation without making any but the most passing and impressionistic attempt (p. 246) to look at the fluctuation of that most important ingredient in the cost of living, grain prices, also makes no sense: the wages at any particular point in time might be temporarily inflated or deflated in relationship to those of another time by the current grain price. Just how little L. has taken on board the implications of embracing a market model is revealed in the ordering of his chapters: his discussion of inflation and deflation precedes his discussion of whether the economy was embedded—as if the interpretation of the figures with regard to inflation or deflation was not affected by the model adopted for the economy as a whole.

L. ends with a purely market model, explaining the way that construction workers and some public office-holders were paid more in the 320s than in the late fifth century,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

while dikasts and soldiers were not, by the law of supply and demand, saying of the latter that 'supply evidently exceeded the demand for their services' (p. 258). One does not need to be a rabid primitivist to think that non-monetary factors might also play a part, one only has to read Demosthenes. His speeches reveal the moral pressures on individuals, and not just on Athenian citizens, to fight, pressures that did not apply to building workers at Eleusis. Roll on the day when computers can read and understand Demosthenes!

Corpus Christi College, Oxford ROBIN OSBORNE

Ω ΚΛΕΙΝΑ ΣΑΛΑΜΙΣ

M. C. TAYLOR: *Salamis and the Salaminioi. The History of an Unofficial Athenian Demos*. Pp. xiv + 344. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1997. Cased, Hfl. 140. ISBN: 90-5063-197-5.

Much of the argument of this lucid and thoughtful study is implicit in its subtitle. Taylor's 'Salaminians' are Athenians, the supposed 'native population' which appears here and there in much earlier scholarship on the island being a figment neither attested nor plausible. They are a *demos* because in the third century they so describe themselves, and because earlier too they engaged in communal activities. But they are 'unofficial' because in formal political terms each Salaminian belonged to a Clisthenic deme and might indeed serve it (as T. well shows, pp. 138–41) as a councillor or in some comparable way. A cleruchy too was a collective entity whose members were separately registered in Clisthenic demes. One of T.'s main theses, however, is that Salamis was not a cleruchy, and the point of 'unofficial *demos*' is to be a different way of describing Salamis' unusual position.

All this is persuasive except, perhaps, the final point. The weakness in T.'s position is not so much that a different view appears to be attested in *IG* II^2 11960, a fourth/third-century epitaph for an individual who died *ἀνχιάλου Σαλαμῖνος . . . κλήροισιν ἀμύνων*, as that she fails to make plain what she conceives a cleruchy to be, and thus what is the force of insisting that Salamis was something different. Very bracing in this regard, whether right or wrong, is the recent argument of Nicoletta Salomon, *Le cleruchie di Atene* (Pisa, 1997—of course not available to T.), that cleruchies were always in effect garrisons with transient populations, the permanent Athenian populations attested on cleruchic islands such as Lemnos being distinct groups. (Her case is briefly discussed by Gauthier in *Bull. Épig*. [1998], no. 146.) Salomon's revival of the military interpretation also, incidentally, makes one wish that T. had said more about the strategic significance of Salamis and about the military obligations laid on its inhabitants in *IG* I^3 1, where she wishes to find no allusion to a cleruchy. An important discussion that is semi-independent of the main thesis is that of the bronze 'Salaminian' coinage of the fourth century, often taken as further proof of 'cleruchic' status. This coinage was in fact, T. suggests, Salaminian in name, Athenian in reality.

The subtitle also speaks of 'history'. Here it is something of a misnomer, since very little is known for sure about the island's history, and T. is rightly not in quest of spurious certainties. She reviews the traditions about the Megarian–Athenian conflict for the island, but concludes that the overlay of fable is too thick for even a chronology to be recoverable; as for the famous Attic *genos* of *Salaminioi*, she argues (contrary, for instance, to Stephen Lambert's recent interpretation, *ZPE* 119 [1997]) that their real connection with the island's history is very slight. This is not wholly convincing,

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ferguson's theory that the *genos* are Athenians in Salaminian disguise having always had something contorted about it, but it is true that we cannot recover the circumstances of their transfer to the mainland. Under the democracy the island has no history separate from that of Athens. Thereafter T. has to consider the report of Pausanias (1.35.2) that 'the Athenians expelled the Salaminioi, accusing them of deliberate cowardice in the war against Kassandros and of giving up their city to the Macedonians by design'. The date of this incident is problematic; so too, T. points out, is the logic, given that Salamis would have been garrisoned not by Salaminian but by Athenian forces. She doubts, therefore, that the islanders were expelled *en masse*. In the third century, the extent of Macedonian presence in and off Attica from the 280s to the end of the Chremonidean war is controversial. T. follows Habicht in having Salamis continuously subject to a Macedonian garrison from 295 to 229, but doubts (against Gauthier) whether this would necessarily have meant a total severance of ties with Athens in the period when the city itself was free.

Textual evidence is, in the main, very thoroughly treated. But the possibility that *SEG* 29.116.18 might attest a 'procession for Democracy' on the island is not considered. And more might have been made of the story that the assassins of Myrrhine, the daughter-in-law of Pisistratus, were granted land on the island, with its implication that settlement was in process in the immediate post-tyrannical period. How much more might have usefully been said about the archaeology, ecology, and environment of Salamis I am not competent to say. But in a work of 344 pages on a very restricted topic by a pupil of M. H. Jameson it is certainly surprising to find 'the setting of the *demos*' cramped into eighteen rather conventional pages. As a place, Salamis is strangely absent from the book.

New College, Oxford ROBERT PARKER

THE POWER OF ALEXANDER

C. W. Blackwell: *In the Absence of Alexander: Harpalus and the Failure of Macedonian Authority*. (Lang Classical Studies 12.) Pp. 185. New York, etc.: Peter Lang, 1999. Cased, £27. ISBN: 0-8204-3987-8.

Blackwell tells us in his preface that this book does not merely recount the notorious Harpalus affair of 324/3 but is concerned with the Greek attitude to the Macedonian hegemony while Alexander was alive and upon his death. He tells us in the first chapter that he will apply concepts such as hegemony, power, and authority to the events of this period, and argue that the Macedonian hegemony of Greece was 'hollow' (p. 9).

One of his key arguments (Chapter II, and again in VI) is that three embassies were sent to Athens by Antipater, Olympias, and Philoxenus to demand Harpalus' surrender, and that all were rejected. He uses this rejection, and the subsequent Athenian embassy to Alexander over Harpalus, as evidence that the Macedonian power-structure was divided, that the Athenians saw none of these three as being in a position of authority in Greece, and thus that Macedonian rule was not as secure or seamless as it might seem.

The number of embassies is controversial, and B. argues against the opinion of many scholars that Antipater, Olympias, and Philoxenus each sent embassies to Athens (pp. 17–31). I do not always find his arguments convincing. For example, Dinarchus and Hyperides, our contemporary sources, did not refer to embassies from Antipater

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

or Olympias because they were 'not under pressure to provide their audience with a full historical account' (p. 24). B. is right to doubt the orators' reliability, but he does not fully take into account how well multiple high-level Macedonian embassies would have served their cases. More importantly, I think B. has overestimated the importance of the embassies: regardless of the number, the Athenians would not have surrendered Harpalus to anyone. This was not because they were confused as to who had more power, or realized how hollow the Macedonian power structure was (as B. argues), but because they knew that final authority rested with Alexander himself, and they needed Harpalus as a bargaining tool in their negotiations over the Exiles Decree. Although B. discusses the Exiles Decree in Chapter VI, he does not connect the Athenian refusal with the diplomatic missions from many *poleis* to Alexander over that decree. The surrender of Harpalus would mean the loss of a vital diplomatic playing card, and the Athenians' refusal had nothing to do with how they viewed Macedonian rule. Thus, one of B.'s key arguments for his thesis may be countered. Chapters on Antipater (III) and on Olympias (IV) trace the activities and power of these two individuals to show how divisive their actions were, and a distinction is drawn between power and authority. Thus, while Antipater held great power as Alexander's *epitropos* (B. incorrectly translates this as 'general': e.g. p. 77), he had little authority over the Greeks. As evidence, B. cites the war against Agis III, in which Antipater was unable to call on the other Greeks for help and referred the punishment of Sparta to Alexander. However, Sparta was technically not a member of the Common Peace; Antipater probably knew that it would have been hard to enlist Greek support in the first place. Moreover, Sparta had been allowed to stay aloof from the League by both Philip II and Alexander, so the decision as to its fate does not imply that Antipater was disregarded, merely that Sparta's fortunes were decided by the Macedonian king. B. rightly stresses Olympias' importance within the Macedonian hierarchy; however, he makes too much of the conflict between her and Antipater. When conflicts occurred, given the personalities involved, personal reasons rather than political were at their heart. B. is right to blame Alexander's absence for the often divergent actions of Antipater and Olympias, although whether this led to competition between the two of them for power (or authority) is another matter.

The fifth chapter is essentially a narrative of events from 330 to 324, including Alexander's return from the east. B. boldly states that the Athenians 'had by no means unanimously resigned themselves to domination by Macedonia' (p. 113). Several of his points do not bear scrutiny; for example, why Aeschines lost his case against Ctesiphon/Demosthenes in 330 has no bearing on the Macedonian question. Moreover, the paucity of events and interactions between the *poleis* do not necessarily show the stranglehold exerted by Antipater but are a sign that the Greeks were enjoying the peace and prosperity which Macedonian rule provided. I have made thisargument elsewhere ('The Harpalus Affair and the Greek Response to the Macedonian Hegemony', *Ventures into Greek History. Essays . . . Hammond* [Oxford, 1994], pp. 307–30); surprisingly, B. does not refute it, nor even cite it, although he elsewhere refers to this volume.

In the final chapter (VI), B. reiterates previous arguments, and he also connects the Exiles Decree to the 'impotence' of Macedonian hegemony (p. 150). Yet, the number of *poleis* sending embassies to Alexander over the decree and the fact that there was no immediate rebellion suggest the opposite. The same is true in B.'s discussion of Alexander's deification. The Greeks recognized him as a god for political reasons (as B. asserts), but this was not bound up with their attitude to Macedonian rule but rather their reaction to the Exiles Decree.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This book raises important questions for Macedonian rule of Greece, but I am not convinced that it was as hollow or as fragile as B. makes it.

University of Missouri—Columbia IAN WORTHINGTON

HELLENISTIC EVOLUTIONS

R. W. WALLACE, E. M. HARRIS (edd.): *Transitions to Empire: Essays in Greco-Roman History 360–146 BC in Honor of E. Badian* (Oklahoma Series in Classical Culture). Pp. x + 498. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1997. Cased, £39.95. ISBN: 0-8061-2863-1.

J. J. GABBERT: *Antigonus II Gonatas: a Political Biography.* Pp. viii + 88. London and New York: Routledge, 1997. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-415-01899-4.

G. M. COHEN: *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands and Asia Minor.* (Hellenistic Culture and Society, 17.) Pp. xiii + 481, 12 maps. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford: University of California Press, 1995. Cased, $65/£55. ISBN: 0-520-08329-6.

K. J. RIGSBY: *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World.* (Hellenistic Culture and Society, 22.) Pp. xvii + 672, 9 ills. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1996. Cased, $90/£65. ISBN: 0-520-20098-5.

Hellenistic history is entering a fertile period and our understanding is evolving rapidly. Four works here reveal a mixture of perspectives, some of which look back to more traditional treatments, while others look forward. Their range is broad: crucial to all of them is how we see the transitions from the *polis*-dominated Greek world to worlds dominated by Hellenistic dynasties and ultimately Rome. Each of these studies has things to say about the survival of the Greek *polis* after Alexander, but that picture is not always consistent.

The volume in honour of Badian reflects B.'s own work on the fourth century B.C. (Part I, Chapters I–IX) and Roman Republic (Part III, Chapters XV–XXI). Part I deals with the rise of Macedon and its impact on the Eastern Mediterranean. For Cawkwell one of the most momentous results of Philip II's reign was the ending of Greek liberty at the hands of a superior army and leader at Chaeronea (Chapter V). Chapters I–IV offer viewpoints on Philip's rise: Green (Chapter I) studies Panhellenism in the fourth century; ideology at Athens saw a tension in the identification of the common enemy of the Greeks. For Isokrates it remained Persia, for Demosthenes it was now Philip. Either way, Green argues, Panhellenism still cloaked Athenian self-interest. Lack of unity among the Greeks is selected by Buckler (Chapter IV) as a major weakness: factiousness enabled Philip to dominate Greece. Philip's main target was always Athens; no plan to conquer all of Greece was ever generated, but pursuit of the conflict with Athens alerted Philip to 'the feasibility of seizing the mastery of Greece' (p. 91).

Empire was not a predetermined goal of either Macedon or (Raaflaub: Chapter

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

XVI) Rome. Indeed, Heskel (Chapter II) shows just how tenuous Philip's succession was. History might have turned out differently if Athenian support of Argaios' attempt at the Macedonian crown in 360/359 had succeeded. Here perhaps lie the origins of Philip's campaign against Athens. It is common to point to the greater resources of Philip as a reason for his success. Military finance was a fundamental issue in fourth-century Athens, not least in the speeches of Demosthenes, and Philip's success is often attributed to his greater resources. Harris (Chapter III) argues that Demosthenes did not consider the Theoric fund as a drain on Athens' resources, but was concerned chiefly with the proper use of the military fund.

The remaining chapters examine more closely Alexander and his successors. The divine associations of Alexander are notorious, and the subject of one of Badian's best known articles ('The Deification of Alexander the Great', see p. 469, no. 128). The identification with Dionysus developed in 329, according to Bosworth (Chapter VII), for rational reasons. Alexander sought to follow in the footsteps of Dionysus, and surpass him by conquering India (pp. 147f.) and then Arabia (p. 157). Borza confirms that the sources for the time of Alexander the Great offer a consistent antipathy between Greeks and Macedonians (Chapter VI). Eumenes of Cardia's downfall was caused as much by his power as his Greekness, but his origins still interested the ancient sources. The late fourth-century inscription from Seuthopolis in Thrace (*IGBR* 183) reflects Greek language and political organization at this short-lived Thracian city, and reveals its deliberate investment in Greek culture, a phenomenon identified as a feature of the Hellenistic era (Chapter VIII).

Epigraphical evidence is central to the reconstruction of Hellenistic history (see below, Rigsby's *Asylia*). A fragmentary Athenian decree studied by Martin and Badian (p. 471, no. 152) is typical of the honorific inscriptions used to explore interstate relations (Chapter IX). Martin proposes that the honorand, Adeimantos of Lampsakos, was given special rewards for his recent rôle in offering peace and protection to Athens. The League of Corinth allows us to see how relations between Greek cities and a Hellenistic ruler developed. The cultural legacies of the *poleis* dominate the contributions on the Hellenistic period when 'Greece often served as a model or beacon for other Mediterranean civilizations' (p. 192). Chambers proceeds from the 320s to the activity of Aristotle's pupils in the third century (Chapter XI), and Pomeroy considers family organization in Hellenistic Egypt based on papyro- logical sources (Chapter XIII). Ptolemaic censuses may stem indirectly from the peripatetic Demetrius of Phalerum, who had fled from Athens to Alexandria. The cultural beacon was also seen by the Jews who invented ties of kinship with the Spartans. They were inspired, according to Gruen (Chapter XIV), by the success of King Areus of Sparta (*c*. 309/308–265 B.C.).

In many studies of the Hellenistic era, periodization becomes a problem, but Hansen (Chapter X) considers the *polis* from the viewpoint of the smaller community and argues that their development in the fifth and fourth centuries illustrate in some ways patterns of behaviour in the Hellenistic period. The contribution by Hansen has a broad perspective. What disappeared, argues Hansen, 'was not the *polis* but the hegemonic *polis* such as Athens, Sparta, or Thebes' (p. 206): these now had to participate in confederations as smaller *poleis* had long been doing. Wallace (Chapter XII) also looks back and compares the attempt to remove the philosophers from Athens in 307/306 to the anti-intellectual reaction in Athens at the end of the fifth century.

The third part of the collection contrasts the Greek *polis* and Rome, examining their evolution during the late Classical and Hellenistic periods. Raaflaub (Chapter XVI)

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

argues that Rome became an imperial power by reacting to situations and opportunities (p. 299). Openness, integration, and the absorption of élite families all contributed to Rome's developments during the fourth century, when Athens appeared relatively blinkered. Rome's transition to Empire, like that of Macedon's, was not predetermined. The rise to world power is identified by Loomis as the backdrop for the introduction of the denarius sometime between 215 and 211 B.C. (Chapter XVII). Crucial to Rome's success were political negotiations and military achievements. Diplomacy in the first half of the second century saw Greek com- munities trying to negotiate between local Hellenistic rulers and the rising stars of Roman politics. Linderski (Chapter XIX) examines the Elder Cato's involvement with Aetolia, the major federal power of Greece in the second century B.C., illustrating the complex political rivalries at Rome and showing how nimble Greek communities had to be as they manoeuvred from one power to another. These complexities shine through in Hallett's examination of the political background of the 190s and 180s B.C. (Chapter XX), while rivalry between Rome's élite is the subject of Brennan's study of the triumph (Chapter XVI).

Rome's transition to Empire was marked by military success cloaked in diplomacy, as Warrior finds in Livy's account of events prior to the war with Antiochus III in the late 190s (Chapter XVIII). But for a sweeping explanation of the reasons underlying the transition, the final chapter by Eder nods at one of Badian's (p. 470, no. 139) most famous contributions (Chapter XXI). Rome's constitution and institutions creaked under the growing weight of Empire, whose complex evolutions strained the oscillating tensions between public and private life. These strains highlighted the innate vulnerabilities of Rome's small-state origins, which were ultimately resolved in the evolution from Republic to Principate.

The editors of this Festschrift attempt to tie together the contributions with introductions to each part. The essays display a high level of scholarship and complement the honorand's own work, which is listed at pp. 463–75. For the student of Hellenistic history, the evolution of Macedon and Rome is fundamental, and this collection elucidates aspects of their growth.

One figure who helped to consolidate Macedonia in the third century B.C. was Antigonus Gonatas, the subject of Janice Gabbert's biography. The 'deliberately narrow' focus (p. vi) is sometimes too restrictive. Historical problems may not be fully explained: G. believes the Chremonidean war runs from 265 to 262 (p. viii, p. 46 with n. 43), repeating arguments from an earlier article (*Classical Journal* 82 [1986–87], 230–5), but this approach gives insufficient weight to Pausanias, who said that Athens had held out against Antigonus 'for a very long time' (3.6.6); the notes do not adequately acknowledge the alternative chronology (268/267–263/262). There are surprising omissions from notes and bibliography, e.g. J. Briscoe, 'Antigonus and the Greek States, 276–196 B.C.', in Garnsey and Whittaker (edd.), *Imperialism in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, 1978). Overall, the treatment of Gonatas is shallow, especially when compared with other recent Antigonid biographies (R. A. Billows, *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State* [Berkeley, 1990]; S. Le Bohec, *Antigone Dôsôn* [Nancy, 1993]).

Antigonus Gonatas was perhaps less well known for his foundations; it is likely that he founded two settlements, Antigoneia and Stratonikeia in Chalcidice. Both feature in Cohen's excellent study of the foundations made by kings and federal powers in the Hellenistic period (pp. 91f. and pp. 100f.). C.'s book is the first of two volumes, which will present and analyse the evidence for new foundations or re-foundations in the Hellenistic period. It will replace Tschericower's *Die hellenistischen Städtegründungen*

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1927), and incorporates rural foundations in addition to cities. The first volume, devoted to Europe and Asia Minor, organizes entries into nineteen geographical areas. For each foundation, the evidence is summarized and discussed. C. has drawn on the varied literary, epigraphical, numismatic, and archaeological sources to produce an essential reference work.

Rigsby's *Asylia* assembles evidence for places (not persons) declared 'sacred and inviolable', with most examples dating from 260 B.C. to A.D. 22–23, when the Roman Senate ended new declarations. This status could be given, accepted, or approved, but was rarely bought (p. 18). *Asylia* was sought for a temple alone if it stood outside the city, but for the whole city and territory when the temple was inside (p. 20 with n. 73 for exceptions). Whether *asylia* brought real benefits is difficult to establish: although a defensive alliance was a more useful tool for self-preservation, R. suggests that *asylia* was used to limit war (p. 5).

The corpus consists largely of epigraphical evidence; some places, significantly, produce few or no examples at all, such as Athens and Rhodes (p. 27 n. 90). From the 260s to the 180s B.C. we find inscriptions in the Aegean area, and in the East from the 140s B.C. coins declare the title 'sacred and inviolable' (p. 21). This thick book includes selective translation of some or parts of texts, many of which are formulaic (p. 40), and a number of very useful indices (grantors, recipients, geographical and personal names, Greek words, etc.). Interstate relationships lie at the heart of the political developments in the Hellenistic period and *Asylia* requires the student to look at the historical developments from the perspective of the Greek city or federal state, as well as the Hellenistic and/or Roman ruler.

The books reviewed here show that Hellenistic history is both evolving and thriving. The studies by Cohen and, in particular, Rigsby, both in the Hellenistic Culture and Society series produced by the University of California, are important advances in Hellenistic history. They offer a broader perspective, and help one realize that the Greek *polis* itself did not die out at the end of the fourth century but continued to evolve, indeed flourish (cf. e.g. W. G. Runciman in Murray and Price, *The Greek City*). The Hellenistic period is as much about the persistence of the *polis* as it is about the political successes of Hellenistic monarchs and the birth of the Roman empire.

University of Liverpool G. J. OLIVER

FRIENDS INDEED?

I. SAVALLI-LESTRADE: *Les Philoi Royaux dans l'Asie Hellénistique*. (École Pratique des Hautes Études. Hautes Études du Monde Gréco-Romain 25.) Pp. XVII + 453. Geneva: Droz, 1998. Price not given. ISBN: 2-600-00290-1. ISSN: 1016-7005.

The considerable rôle played by the 'friends' of Hellenistic kings in the functioning of the monarchies was a commonplace in the Hellenistic world, abundantly attested in the epigraphic and literary evidence. Hence the topic continues to receive much attention in modern scholarship. This scholarly study, which owes its inception to a suggestion by Philippe Gauthier, adds a substantial building block to a growing edifice.

The work is in two parts and has a double function (cf. the Introduction, pp. ix–xv). Part I is a series of prosopographies of the known or probable friends of the Seleucids,

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Attalids (for them cf. already *Chiron* 26 [1996], 149–81), the kings of Pontus, and other minor monarchies in Asia (not included are the Antigonids and Ptolemies, already covered in previous studies). Collective references to the friends as a group are included in addition to particular individuals. Predictably the lion's share goes to the Seleucids, followed in that order by the Attalids and the kings of Pontus, while the other monarchies are known only very sketchily. Part II is a general study of the institution of the royal 'friends', based on the material in Part I but also taking into account the other monarchies of the age. Chapter I studies recruitment, origins, numbers, and family connections for the monarchies covered in Part I. Chapter II is devoted to an examination of vocabulary: the titles and designations used to refer to the individuals concerned. Chapter III, the longest, widens the scope and gives a survey of the institution of royal friends and its chronological evolution, from the Argeads and Achaemenids to the age of the Successors and beyond. Successively examined are the theoretical foundations of *philia*, the roles of friends in royal service, and the development and significance of court titles.

The cut-off date for bibliography is 1996; missing therefore are among others A. B. Bosworth *CP* 91(1996), 113–27 on Megasthenes (no. 6, pp. 8f.); J. Grainger, *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer* (Leiden, 1997; not a reliable work); G. Herman, 'The Court Society of the Hellenistic Age', in P. Cartledge, P. Garnsey, and E. Gruen (edd.), *Hellenistic Constructs* (Berkeley, 1997), pp. 199–224; G. Weber, 'Interaktion, Repräsentation und Herrschaft. Der Königshof im Hellenismus', in A. Winterling (ed.), *Zwischen 'Haus' und 'Staat'. Antike Höfe im Vergleich* (*Hist. Zeits.* Beiheft 23, 1997), pp. 27–71. Some earlier titles of relevance have also been omitted: J. Seibert *Die politischen Flüchtlinge und Verbannten in der griechischen Geschichte* (2 vols, Darmstadt, 1979), cf. pp. 334–6; C. Habicht, *ZPE* 74 (1988), 211–14 on Philonides (no. 72, pp. 71–3); P. McKechnie, *Outsiders in the Greek Cities in the Fourth Century BC* (London, 1989), Chapter VIII (general).

Indexing and cross-referencing could have been more developed and would have greatly increased the practical usefulness of this book. The index of individuals (pp. 399–408) only covers the prosopographies in Part I, not Part II, and there is no attempt in Part I to cross-reference the individuals mentioned with Part II. The index of keywords (pp. 427–9) is all too brief, and a more developed general index would have been of help. Geographical names, for example, are not included (there is thus no shortcut to the interesting observation on pp. 222f. about the limited number of royal friends of Athenian origin). In other ways too the presentation of the material could have been clarified. In Part I friends are listed chronologically under the king for whom they are attested, with the result that those individuals who served successive kings are included and numbered more than once, which artificially swells the total. It is only later that one discovers what the true figures actually are (pp. 235 for the Seleucids, 240f. for the Attalids, 243f. for the kings of Pontus).

One problem that any collection of this kind faces is that given the patchiness of the source material, literary and epigraphic, only a minority of individuals are specifically attested as royal friends and the resulting picture is necessarily incomplete (cf. on this point pp. 216, 256 n. 16, 266). For example, Zeuxis, the right-hand man of Antiochus III in Asia Minor from 214/13 to 190, well known from literary sources and a profusion of inscriptions (no. 39, pp. 36–8), is only attested as a friend of the king once, in Josephus *AJ* 12.147. The criteria for inclusion thus have to be elastic (pp. xiii–xiv), and the number of probable friends who are not explicitly attested as such is much higher than the definite cases (the probable cases are identified in the prosopographies with an *asterisk). But there remain surprising omissions: why, for

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

example, have Diodotus, satrap of Bactria in the mid-third century (Strabo 11.9.3; Justin 31.5), Molon, satrap of Media under Antiochus III, and his brother Alexandros, satrap of Persis (Polybius 5.40–3, 45–54), and Hermeias, the minister of the same king (Polybius 5.40–3, 45–56), not been included? They were all of them major figures and unlikely not to have been among the royal friends (Molon gets a casual mention on p. 390 among the *philoi* of the Seleucids who revolted from them).

Given the central rôle of the friends of kings in political, military, social, and cultural life (cf. pp. 355–68 on their functions), the range of subjects covered is wide, and this work will take its place as a significant contribution to the study of Hellenistic monarchy. Only a few points can be mentioned here. On the question of recruitment and origins, Habicht's well-known view that the highest levels of the governing circles were recruited chiefly from Greeks and Macedonians emerges strengthened, despite challenges such as that of S. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt, *From Samarkhand to Sardis* (1993), pp. 121f., 150–3; cf. pp. 216–34 on the Seleucids, with a detailed critique of C. Carsana, *Le dirigenze cittadine nello stato dei Seleucidi* (1996), on which see already *REG* 111 (1998), 308–22. On contemporary Greek attitudes to royal friends the author takes issue with G. Herman's view in *Talanta* 12–13 (1980–1), 103–49 that in the early Hellenistic period they were the object of prejudice on the part of Greek cities (pp. 347–50); but the discussion omits a passage in Plutarch *Cleomenes* 13, which draws a contrast between true friends and the friends of kings, and presumably reflects contemporary debates. On the wider question of the impact of the institution on the character and functioning of the monarchies different views seem to be given. At one point emphasis is laid on the genuine personal content of the relationship between friend and king (pp. 334–54), but later the rôle of deserters from one monarchy to another is mentioned (pp. 364–8), and at the end stress is laid on the risk of betrayal of kings by their friends (pp. 388–93; cf. briefly on all this *CQ* 36 [1986], 462f.). Compare Polybius 5.26 on the ambivalent relations between kings and friends. The question thus arises: Were the friends a force for stability or for instability?

University of St Andrews M. M. AUSTIN

ALEXANDRIA AND ROME

G. Grimm: *Alexandria. Die erste Königsstadt der hellenistischen Welt*. Pp. 168, 152 ills, maps. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1998. Cased, DM 68. ISBN: 3-8053-2337-9.

A. Lampela: *Rome and the Ptolemies of Egypt. The Development of their Political Relations 273–80 B.C.* Pp. 301. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 951-653-295-0.

The study of Ptolemaic history and, especially, the city of Alexandria is very much *en vogue*. These two volumes have much to offer: the first, a colourful and vivid portrait of Alexandria for the non-specialist, joins a cohort of similar volumes published recently in the light of new archaeological discoveries in the ancient harbour; the second, an uncompromisingly scholarly approach to the history of diplomatic relations between Rome and the Ptolemies, will be useful to all Hellenistic historians, but baffling perhaps to non-specialists.

Grimm's large-format guide to the history and cultural topography of Alexandria is part of a series of similar volumes dedicated to historical sites of great importance.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There are a large number of colour and monochrome plates, including artistic reconstructions of temples and palaces, and, of course, the Pharos lighthouse. While reconstructions are based on ultimately meagre evidence and modern interpretation, I found these useful. The result is a sound representation of Alexandrian art and architecture in this most important of cultural centres of the Hellenistic world, and of the effect of traditional Egyptian art and architecture on Hellenistic art—a curiously beautiful cultural amalgam.

The text is clear and introduces the Ptolemaic kings in chronological order, discussing the artistic and architectural features of each reign, from Alexander the Great as Pharoah to Augustus. Also discussed are important cultural developments: for example, the foundation of the Alexandrian Museum and Library (pp. 45–51), ruler cult, and temples dedicated to the kings and queens (pp. 70–81), and the new cult of Sarapis (pp. 70–3). Not surprisingly there is relatively little attention given to the period 196–51 B.C. Evidence for it is slim, but one could have expected a fuller treatment of internal problems. The treatment of Cleopatra VII is full, and there is an extensive selection of material on relations between Cleopatra and Rome, and of the final Roman annexation of Egypt under Augustus. The impression given is that, although there was a dramatic influence of Hellenistic culture in Alexandria, there was a reciprocal Egyptianizing influence on Alexandrian art and Ptolemaic architecture in general. Overall, this is an excellent book, beautifully illustrated with many surprises for those not familiar with Alexandrian art, or those who too readily dismiss Egyptian artistic influence on Hellensitic and Roman culture.

Lampela's volume is a study of relations between Rome and the Ptolemaic kings in a period characterized by the extension of Roman power in the Eastern Mediterranean and the decline of the Hellenistic monarchies. It is important not only to our understanding of the growth of Rome as an international power, but also of the complicated issue of international relations in a period where there developed a growing dependency on diplomacy as an alternative to warfare.

A useful introduction and first chapter set the scene, and provide introductions to the main scholarly arguments concerning Roman imperialism and to the complicated issue of our primary sources, principally Polybius and Livy. L. proceeds to argue forcibly against the idea of war being driven by a small political élite within Rome, and brings out the difficulties in interpreting our sources' statements about treaties between Rome and the Ptolemies due to vagueness in terminology (pp. 22–8). There follows a thorough treatment of relations between the states to 80 B.C. Firstly, the development of friendship, initiated by Ptolemy II Philadelphus, had important results. It may have kept Pyrrhus out of Italy, helped to strengthen Roman control of Southern Italy, and weakened Pyrrhus' propaganda; he did not represent a united Greek front against Rome (pp. 51ff.) There follows a discussion of Ptolemaic neutrality in the Punic Wars. The second main issue is the crucial embassy to Egypt of 201/200 B.C. and relations between Rome and Philip V of Macedon. L. argues that an embassy was sent in 201 to sound out Ptolemaic attitudes to Rome's intervention in Greece, and that Livy's account of this should be accepted. Although relations between Rome and Egypt cooled off, Rome was forced to intervene in the Syrian War against Antiochus IV. L. argues that Livy's account of the embassy of C. Popillius Laenas, and Justin's of the embassy from the Ptolemies to Rome in 168, should not be so heavily questioned. Indeed, one of her central arguments is that our literary sources are more reliable than they are often held to be.

From the time of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II, relations between Rome and the Ptolemies appear to have remained largely unchanged, although there is a growing

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Roman interest in the economic importance of Egypt and intolerance in Rome for the declining Ptolemaic dynasty. This was to become the focus of ambition amongst leading figures in the late Republic.

L.'s book provides a comprehensive and reliable treatment of her subject, which presents historical issues squarely, taking account of modern theories and offering new interpretations. The footnotes are copious and accurate throughout, and although there are quite a few misprints and oddities of expression, there is nothing to mislead the scholarly reader. This volume will be of interest to historians working in the field of Hellenistic history and Roman imperialism, but is certainly intended for the scholar rather than interested amateur.

Both volumes, in their different ways, provide a welcome contribution to our understanding of how the history and culture of the Hellenistic and Roman worlds met.

University of Warwick COLIN ADAMS

ETERNAL ROME

HINNERK BRUHNS, JEAN-MICHEL DAVID, WILFRIED NIPPEL (edd.): *Die späte römische Republik/La fin de la république romaine: un débat franco-allemand d'histoire et d'historiographie.* Rome: École française de Rome, 1997. ISBN: 2-7283-0389-4. ISSN: 0223-5099.

The bilingual nature of this book's title and the subtitle which follows are far more significant than what is advertised as the main theme. The volume originated at a colloquium at Strasbourg in June 1994 which concerned the differing traditions of scholarship and scholarly training in France and Germany in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The papers fall into two groups. The first surveys national historiography in the period, covering such subjects as the institutions and different professional formation of ancient historians in France and Germany, the links between French and German scholars from 1870 to the time of the First World War, the reception of each other's work in schoolbooks, and the comparative reception of Mommsen's work in France and French scholarship in Germany. These papers include J. von Ungern-Sternberg ('Deutsche und französische Altertumswissenschaftler vor und während des Ersten Weltkrieges'), E. Erdmann ('Der Einfluss der historischen Forschung in deutschen und französischen Schulbüchern am Ende des 19. und zu Beginn des 20. Jahr- hunderts'), K.-J. Hölkeskamp ('Zwischen "System" und "Geschichte". Theodor Mommsen's Staatsrecht und die römische "Verfassung" in Frankreich und Deutschland').

The second group of papers analyses specific topics as they were studied in the neighbouring country. Each paper is followed by a response to provide the perspective of a different scholarly tradition and encourage fruitful reflection on different methodological approaches. Thus Yan Thomas ('La romantistique allemande et l'État depuis les pandectistes') is answered by W. Nippel; J. Scheid ('La religion romaine à la fin de la République et au début de l'Empire: un problème généralement mal posé') by J. Martin; M. Humbert ('La romanization de l'Italie, de Beloch à Rudolph') by T. Hantos; J. Andreau ('Le rôle de l'économie dans le passage de la République à l'Empire') by H. Bruhns; J.-M. David ('La clientèle, d'une forme de l'analyse à l'autre') by J. von Ungern-Sternberg; J.-L. Ferrary ('Optimate et Populares. Le problème du rôle de l'idéologie dans la politique') by K.-J. Holkeskamp; W. Nippel ('Die plebs

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

urbana und die politische Gewalt in der späten Republik im Spiegel der jüngeren französischen und deutschen Forschung') by J.-M. David. J. Martin ('Die französische Forschung zur römischen Familie-Einige Anmerkungen') is without a commentator. There is a lengthy introduction by Bruhns on the project's scope and aim, and a concluding overview written by Ch. Meier.

This is a formidable collection of papers, but the concept is even more significant. The project highlights the different ways in which each country has produced its own type of history and how the different history of each country has affected its studies of the past. There have been different formative processes for scholars: French scholars are more aware of the impact of archaeological studies partly because during their training they were more accustomed to spend time in Greece or Rome than scholars raised in German (or English) traditions (Bruhns and Andreau). The different standing of classical studies in nineteenth-century universities has also made a broad impact: their high status in German institutions was not matched in France.

Nippel' s review of recent work on the *plebs urbana* (pp. 238–57) demonstrates the relevance of considering distinctive national traditions—a topical one in view of F. Millar's recent *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic* (Ann Arbor, 1998). The essay begins with references to Brunt and Yavetz ('pathbreaking': Nippel, *Public Order in Ancient Rome* [Cambridge 1995], p. 124), but then leads us through recent German and French works, examining, among many others, the contributions of Bleicken and Nicolet, Flambard and Veyne. However, the essay is not simply about individuals. Nippel discusses the very different bases from which the two language groups start, especially the influence of social and economic history on French studies and the contrasting influence of political–prosopographical history in German. The fact that Marxism received more attention in France, along with the national tendency to pay greater attention to archaeological material, has produced a very different scholarship, even though scholars are using similar evidence to study the same historical period. Nippel's essay is a delicate exploration of the history of ideas within the two cultures in our supposedly global landscape, and demonstrates that such insights are perhaps as important to our understanding of 'our' Roman history as the texts we use to gain our information.

Another purpose of the book is to promote international intellectual exchange, which, on the authors' own admission, has often been lacking, with German scholars engaging more often with English language literature than French scholarship in recent times. The French have more usually engaged with German scholarship than the other way around, especially in the nineteenth century.

This book could fall between two stools. While offering substantial and interesting papers on the history of the historical profession in the two countries, it inevitably does not provide a comprehensive account, and leaves questions unresolved. The scholarly interaction of the two countries since 1918, for example, and especially the difficulties caused for scholarship by the Second World War are themes left largely untouched. Nor is the coverage of late Republican history complete: Meier's conclu- sion points to a few areas omitted in the colloquium. On the other hand, this book is an excellent model for promoting productive dialogue between the historiographies of the two countries. It proves in a fascinating way how true is the maxim, 'All history is a history of the present'. It is of interest to the classical scholar, the historian of ideas, and, moreover, the scholar specializing in nineteenth- and twentieth-century history. In the light of the references to the different ways in which the work of English- language historians has been read in France and Germany, the challenge remains for similar

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

colloquia to be arranged between English-speaking historians and colleagues from other national and/or linguistic backgrounds.

University of Sydney KATHRYN WELCH

University of Queensland ANDREW BONNELL

LATE-ROMAN RESILIENCE

M. GRANT: *The Collapse and Recovery of the Roman Empire*. Pp. xviii + 121, 27 ills. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. Cased, £20. ISBN: 0-415-17323-X.

A. WATSON: *Aurelian and the Third Century.* Pp. xvi + 303, maps, pls. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-415-07248-4.

M. J. NICASIE: *Twilight of Empire: the Roman Army from the Reign of Diocletian until the Battle of Adrianople.* Pp. 321, ills. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1998. Cased, Hfl. 140. ISBN: 90-5063-448-6.

Two Routledge volumes on the third century present a stark contrast. G.'s survey is, even by his particular standards, self-referential and lightweight: it is a pity that an academic publisher should offer such material to scholars, but G.'s name presumably still sells books, and he will continue to find publishers as long as the public succumbs to promotional blurb. Avoid this, and turn to W. for a sensible analysis of the context of Aurelian's important reign. W.'s 1991 London thesis is updated to include such important items as Paschoud's 1996 Budé edition of the *HA* life of Aurelian (T. Kotula, *Aurélien et Zénobie* [Warsaw, 1997], was too recent to be cited). One of W.'s merits is clarity. Part I narrates Aurelian's achievement as 'restorer of the world', while Part II looks thematically at key aspects of the empire's internal development: economy, administration, senate, armies, religion. There follow two appendices on sources and chronology which permit the serious reader to appreciate the problems and understand the basis for W.'s reconstruction, but without the complex arguments distracting attention from the previous presentation. W. balances scepticism about the 'unsubstantiated waffle' of much of the *HA* life (p. 153) with recognition that Aurelian's considerable achievement in reuniting the Empire has to be understood: what was he doing, why did he secure varying success in different areas.

Two basic observations by W. are of particular use in reinterpreting accepted wisdom about the 'third century crisis'. One concerns the unbalanced nature of our evidence. Most of the literary sources were produced in western senatorial circles in the late fourth century, and reflect contemporary beliefs: a traditional interpretation of Roman history as a process of continual decline is augmented by emphasis on a clash between thuggish military rulers and the senate as guardian of constitutional rule. Riots at Rome in 271 brought imperial retribution, but this does not make Aurelian an anti-senatorial monster. Tetrarchic panegyrics are also relevant to such re-evaluation, since it was convenient for these orators to highlight previous chaos, which the energy of Diocletian, Maximian, and Constantius overcame. The other, more general observation concerns the 'tunnel effect' of the third-century 'Dark Age': too often the Julio-Claudian, Flavian, or Antonine world is treated as a different animal from the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

late Empire of the fourth and fifth centuries, exaggerated contrasts are drawn, and the lesser-known third century is posited as the key period of change. W. points to underlying continuities, whether in the emperor as military dynast and companion of a favoured divinity or in the variable quality of imperial administration.

On occasions, however, W. subscribes to traditional views. Aurelian is credited with 'a number of subtle but significant military reforms' (p. 169), even though the argument adopts the 'tunnel' approach. The Aurelianic walls of Rome are presented as eloquent testimony to the Empire's changed military situation (p. 205). This is right to an extent, but Kotula's observation (p. 165) that the walls also symbolized Rome's eternity deserves consideration. Walls focused local pride as well as reflected concerns for safety, and the sheer size of Rome's circuit and the impracticality of an organized defence elevated that city above all temporary imperial rivals. Not till the construction of the Theodosian walls at Constantinople was the might of Rome challenged.

On military matters N.'s study of the fourth-century Roman army deserves serious thought. He surveys the post-Severan period: the third century is a time of near stagnation in military development (p. 3), and key changes are variously attributed to the Tetrarchs, Constantine, and Constantius II. Individual chapters treat the creation and organization of the fourth-century army, recruitment, barbarization, Grand Strategy, and the army at war with specific studies of the battles of Strasburg and Adrianople. Numerous sensible observations contribute to a more positive assessment of the military capacity of the late Roman state. The separation of armies into central and provincial, *comitatus* and *limitanei*, does not demonstrate a decline in the quality of the latter (p. 21). Cavalry are put firmly in place: though tactically more mobile than infantry, in strategic terms the need to protect horses from the destructive effects of prolonged marches meant that a cavalry force could not function as a central rapid-response unit (p. 36), an observation which has profound implications for theories about the Empire's defensive strategies; infantry remained the army's backbone and there may not have been any great increase in cavalry numbers (pp. 194–7). Barbarians are kept in perspective: they were perhaps more common among senior officers than ordinary troops, and the army retained the capacity to Romanize these recruits in contrast to standard views of increasing barbarization and indiscipline (pp. 101–3). The small size of field armies cannot be used as a basis for postulating a reduced overall military establishment (pp. 202–3). Discipline was not perfect, but this had always been the case (p. 218).

Some issues will continue to be discussed. N.'s approach to Grand Strategy (Chapter V), essentially modified Luttwak, scores points against the sceptical Whittaker and Isaac (e.g. on imperial concern for frontiers: pp. 126, 174), but may appear too positive in assumptions about what a Roman emperor could know and achieve. On recruitment (Chapter III), N. makes sensible use of Brunt's work on the early imperial system, but does not differentiate sufficiently between the texts cited in the law codes. Here it is vital to consider the precise context of each individual law (see, for example, Zuckerman in *Revue des Études Byzantines*, 1998). N.'s discussion of the *seniores iuniores* units pushes their creation back into the Tetrarchic period, to be linked with the development of field armies (pp. 27–34); he may not be right to postulate a single creative act, so that the military division between Valentinian and Valens in 364 may still have contributed to their diffusion. But such specific areas for continuing debate in no way detract from the importance of this volume in contributing to a more reasoned assessment of late Roman military power.

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

THE COLONATE

E. Lo Cascio (ed.): *Terre, proprietari e contadini dell'impero romano. Dall'affitto agrario al colonato tardoantico.* Pp. 351. Rome: La Nuova Italia Scientifica, 1997. Paper, L. 38,500. ISBN: 88-430-0560-X.

What was the 'colonate', and where did it come from? In October 1995, Elio Lo Cascio convened a fittingly international group of experts from nine countries to tackle these questions under the heading, 'Dall'affitto agrario al colonato tardoantico: continuità o frattura?'. The resulting volume of fourteen essays opens with lucid surveys of recent developments in pertinent scholarship by Lo Cascio and Capogrossi Colognesi. Continuity proves an elusive issue. Kolendo, musing over 'La continuità delle strutture agrarie in Africa romana?', candidly admits that, given the poor state of the evidence and the importance of local variation, we are unable to arrive at conclusive answers; archaeology may shed light on agrarian change but does not elucidate the status of *coloni*.

The looming impasse encourages diversity in investigative method and perspective. Hence, the core of the volume is formed by three very different papers by Carrié, Vera, and Banaji. Carrié goes to great lengths in defending his sceptical views on the modern historiography of the 'colonate' first put forward in *Opus* in 1982/83. Vera above all emphasizes regional variety, questioning the notion of a homogeneous 'colonate', stressing the resilience of classical *locatio conductio*, and considering the possible persistence of contractual relationships even within the framework of the 'colonate'. The first part of his chapter in particular deserves attention as a model survey of interpretative pitfalls and misconceptions that deals a heavy blow to traditional uniformitarian perspectives. Others concur: Whittaker dismisses the 'myth' that agrarian *locatio conductio* declined. Drawing on Augustine's new letters and other literary 'snapshots', he contrasts the letter of the laws with what he terms, perhaps boldly, 'reality'. Marcone, in another of his trademark historiographical surveys, discusses 'open questions' again with reference to regionality and its merits. Both he and Sirks (on the *patrocinium vicorum*) ask whether the third-century A.D. Heroninos archive explored by Rathbone might provide a 'missing link' to the later 'colonate'. Aubert also seeks to assess the relevance of papyrological material.

Banaji, in a strikingly original paper that stands out for its explicitly comparative perspective and breadth, proposes an alternative model of the 'colonate' which cannot be discussed here in requisite detail (see my remarks in *JRA*, forthcoming). In his view, the fiscal phenomenon of *adscriptio* must have been preceded and facilitated by landlords' existing powers of control over their labourers (both free and unfree). Thus, the fiscal powers conferred upon landlords by the late Roman state merely extended the remit of their jurisdiction. He is surely right in denouncing the anachronistic dichotomy of free labour and coercion that informs modern scholarship, but fails to do justice to the character of pre-modern labour relations. His conclusion that *coloni* may have been some kind of paid labourers rather than dependent tenants of the *fermage* variety will seem less compelling, all the more so as the comparative evidence from Latin America and other parts of the world he so impressively marshals is also consistent with alternative models. All the same, his insistence on the unexceptional character of social and legal constraints of 'free' labour challenges our eagerness to address the 'colonate' as some peculiar institution. From this perspective, *locatio conductio*-style farm-tenancy and genuinely free hired labour are phenomena much more in need in explanation than the 'colonate' and dependence.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rosafio, in a discussion of the *precarium*, provides a counterpoint to these three contributions through his stolidly conservative and, indeed, reactionary, 'evolutionist' approach, anchored in the 'fatto che i coloni tardoantichi derivano dagli affituari liberi dell'età precedente' (p. 247)—a claim which for most of the other contributors is precisely the open question they have been invited to address, not an obvious and uncontroversial starting point! By contrast, continuity is not much of an issue in the papers of Carlsen and Kehoe, which focus on the period of the Principate and have little bearing on the overarching theme. In a final summing up, Giardina dismisses the notion of the historical inevitability of the rise of the late Roman 'colonate'.

As the editor himself points out (p. 25), most contributors discuss farm-tenancy in *either* the early *or* the late Empire. He sanguinely takes this fact to be suggestive not merely of the rigidity of scholarly specialization but also of the existence of a genuine break between these periods, and thus as part of an answer to the question posed by the title of his colloquium. While this may well be true, alternative paths remain to be explored: one might wish for an analysis of the differences between early and late imperial tenancy in terms of the available sources (e.g. Digest vs. Codices, earlier Italocentric vs. later provincial authors), or for the injection of additional comparative data into the debate, following Banaji's lead. Nevertheless, this volume will be required reading for anyone interested in the 'colonate'. Lo Cascio deserves our thanks for amassing so much food for thought between two covers.

Darwin College, Cambridge WALTER SCHEIDEL

ROMAN GAUL

G. WOOLF: *Becoming Roman: the Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul.* Pp. xv + 296, 17 ills, 3 maps. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-521-41445-8.

In recent decades our understanding of the Greco-Roman world has made great advances on several independent fronts. Greg Woolf applies recent advances in two separate areas to describe and analyse how Gaul 'became Roman' between the late second century B.C. and the late third century A.D. W. shows a greater theoretical sophistication of approach than can be discovered in existing studies of Roman Gaul. Although he never utters the names of Michel Foucault and Edward Said, he has understood some of their most important lessons: in particular, he realizes that 'power is a slippery concept' (p. 24), and that modern imperialism and modern colonialism have deeply affected the way that modern historians of Rome have thought about their subject. W. also synthesizes a vast amount of recent archaeological research on ancient Gaul: as he candidly states, 'it would have been impossible to write a book of this sort twenty years ago' (p. x).

W.'s book is rich and versatile. An introductory chapter explains why the predominant paradigm of 'Romanization' is 'fundamentally flawed as a heuristic tool'—and he realizes that, if the nineteenth-century term 'Romanization' is suspect, then its twentieth-century antithesis 'resistance' must also be discarded. W. adopts cultural relativism as 'the best working hypothesis available' (p. 5), using a broad definition of Roman and Gallic culture which comprehends the whole range of objects, beliefs, and practices of those who were Roman and Gallic (p. 11). Moreover, he is rightly more interested in describing and understanding cultural change than in trying to explain it (pp. 13–16). Seven main chapters describe successively the impact

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Roman power on Gallic society, Gallic adoption of Roman concepts of civilization, cultural change reflected in epigraphy, the creation of Gallo-Roman cities in what had been a country of villages, the culture of the countryside outside the cities, changes in the scale and patterns of material consumption measured primarily through ceramic evidence, and the evolution of a distinctively Gallo-Roman religion. A briefer concluding chapter indicates how Gaul may serve as a model for understanding cultural change elsewhere in the Roman Empire.

The book combines an enormous amount of detailed research with a decade of profound reflection. The two best and most original chapters derive important historical conclusions from the distribution, density, and clustering of material finds (with figures depicting the distribution). The chapter entitled 'Consuming Rome' uses 'the vast quantity of bric-à-brac that comprises the most tangible and common traces of the everyday experiences of the mass of the Gallo-Roman population' as a means of 'viewing Romanisation as a change in patterns of consumption' (pp. 169–205). Precise description of this process has been rendered possible by an excavation under the town hall of Besançon. This not only revealed the urban development of a section of Vesontio, but also produced 837 small objects besides the standard pottery, glass, coins, and iron nails. The results of this well-conducted excavation provide W. with a matrix for analysing cultural change. Before the conquest, Roman imports were used in traditional ways characteristic of late Iron Age Europe. During the settled conditions of the reign of Augustus came a 'consumer revolution' in which 'a new imperial culture' produced new tastes, new values, and new patterns of consumption. These changes are of course most evident in what W. styles 'the consumer revolution in ceramics'. W. detects 'new varieties of ceramics', and studies the spread of the mass production of *terra sigillata* to centres throughout Gaul and its regional distribution. His main conclusion is that, after the Iron Age cultures of Gaul had been 'rapidly remodelled and drawn into an empire-wide system of structured differences', regional traditions re-emerged—not only in pottery, but also, as he argues elsewhere in the book, in the styles of the rural *villae* in which Gallo-Roman élites lived and of the tombs in which they were buried.

The chapter which sets out 'to establish a provisional outline of the cultural geography of Roman Gaul' from the evidence of inscriptions alone (pp. 76–105) is equally illuminating, even if its conclusions are largely predictable. Figures showing 'epigraphic density in the western provinces' and clusters of inscriptions within Gaul are used to argue the importance of physical geography, of the network of Roman roads and Roman military camps, and of colonies of retired soldiers. W. also shows that the spread of the epigraphic habit correlates completely with the expansion of a new social order, that 'the social range of epigraphy' changed over time, and that epigraphy thus traces the shape of Roman power in Gaul.

Even in this chapter, however, there are lapses from the highest standards. W. quotes two inscriptions in full in order to comment on their significance as individual documents (pp. 78–81). The first (*CIL* 13.1695) he describes as an 'honorific inscription, set up at the sanctuary of the imperial cult at Lyon'. It originally stood beneath a statue of the honorand. In several important articles (none of which W. cites), Werner Eck has demonstrated that such inscriptions cannot be fully understood unless their original material context is taken into account. Eck has aptly observed that, strictly speaking, the category of 'honorific inscription' did not exist in the Roman world, since inscriptions honouring individuals were not self-contained texts, like modern commemorative plaques, but were designed to accompany some material commemoration, usually a statue. W. mistranslates the inscription because he does not

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

take account of its function, which was both to identify the man beneath whose statue it was inscribed and to tell all who saw the statue why this man deserved to be so honoured. He omits what the text assumes but did not need to tell those who read it *in situ*, namely that 'the three Gallic provinces <decreed/dedicated/erected this statue> to Q. Julius Severinus', etc. In the second inscription, which is an epitaph (*CIL* 13.2669), W. prints the illogical and ungrammatical DEDICAVERAT instead of Hirschfeld's DEDICAVER(unt), and then translates it as 'set up'.

The treatment of literary texts is sometimes careless. It creates a very bad impression when the opening sentence of any book contains errors of fact, citation, and judgement. According to W., 'at some point in the late 290s', Eumenius delivered his speech *Pro instaurandis scholis*, numbered '9 (5)' in Galletier's Budé, 'before an imperial governor, perhaps the Prefect of the province of Lugdunensis I' (p. 1, with n. 1). In fact, the speech *Panegyrici Latini* 9 (4), to which Galletier assigned the idiosyncratic number V, addresses a *vir perfectissimus* who must be either the *praeses* of the province of Lugdunensis Prima, as is normally assumed, or the *vicarius* of the diocese of Galliae, since Egypt was the only Roman province governed by a prefect in the 290s. The orator's references to the activities of the four jointly reigning emperors allow the date of the speech to be firmly established as 298 (see, briefly, *JRA* 9 [1996], 541, in comment on C. E. V. Nixon and B. S. Rodgers, *In Praise of Roman Emperors* [Berkeley, 1994], pp. 145–50, 172–7, to whom W. unwisely appeals). Admittedly, such a concatenation of mistakes never recurs, while incomplete and vague references (e.g. p. 21 n. 67, p. 44 n. 75) and inconsistencies over titles (the *Periochae* of Livy are usually, but not always, cited as *Epitomae*) are more annoying than seriously misleading. But W.'s discussion of pre-Roman Gaul overlooks one of the extant witnesses to what Posidonius, whose work is lost, said about the structure of the Celtic society which he visited early in the first century B.C. Although W. duly cites Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, and Athenaeus, he does not mention Ammianus Marcellinus. Yet Ammianus is universally acknowledged to have copied the Augustan writer Timagenes, and it seems that Timagenes reproduced his source Posidonius more accurately than either Diodorus or Strabo (*FGrH* 88 F 1, 14, 15). As a result, Ammianus alone appears to preserve the Celtic name of one of the three categories of learned men among the Gauls (*Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality* [Ithaca, 1998], p. 97).

University of Toronto T. D. BARNES

HITTITES

T. BRYCE: *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Pp. xiv + 464, 4 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-814095-9.

It is only in the course of the present century that the Hittites have been rescued from obscurity and assigned their rightful place as a (and at times the) dominant force in the Middle East during the Bronze Age. The publication and translation of the upward of 5000 clay cuneiform tablets discovered in the Hittite capital of Hattusa was the stimulus to the rediscovery of both the cultural and political history of a people, for so long known mainly from occasional biblical references and viewed, if at all, as a small and obscure tribe of Palestine. It is therefore appropriate that this century should end with this impressive survey of the current state of our knowledge of the political and military history of the kingdom of Hatti, and few scholars

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

are better placed to furnish such a survey than Bryce, as author previously of *The Major Historical Texts of Early Hittite History* (1983) and *The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources* (Copenhagen, 1986), and a variety of papers particularly on the Hittite kingship and overseas relations.

The book is structured along straightforward chronological lines, with chapters devoted to the reign of one or more of the Hittite kings. B. follows the convention of dividing the king list into Old Kingdom, starting with Labarna in the mid-seventeenth century down to Muwatalli I at the end of the fifteenth, and the New Kingdom beginning with Tudhaliya I and ending with Suppiluliuma and the destruction at the close of the thirteenth. In his first chapter, on origins, B. discusses the evidence for the three Indo-European-language-speaking peoples in Anatolia in the third millennium—the Luwians, the Palaians, and the Nesites—and he tends towards the view that the similarities between the three languages probably suggest that they arrived, and developed, in fairly close proximity, and that this arrival of Indo-European speakers occurred during the third millennium B.C. Nevertheless they were separate languages and, along with non-Indo-European Hattian and Hurrian, they bear witness to the many different ethnic elements which made up the people inhabiting the land of Hatti, and which in some measure account for its history of chronic conflict.

B.'s third chapter reflects the substantial advances which the texts have enabled in reconstructing the map of of the Hittite world and the political forces by which that world was controlled (pp. 46f.). At the centre lay the capital Hattusa, with direct control over a homeland covering northern Anatolia within the curve of the (later) river Halys. Around the homeland the Hittites tried to maintain a series of buffer zones to protect a territory with no natural protection of its own, and the need to do so in the northeast, southeast, and south accounted in no small measure for the almost continuous state of war which B. chronicles exhaustively in the following chapters. Beyond, as far as northern Syria, lay the vassal states, whose obligations to the ruler in Hattusa might include annual tribute as well as military support; again, the history is punctuated with campaigns under successive kings to rein in errant vassal rulers. Finally there were the two viceregal kingdoms of Aleppo and Carchemish, established by Suppiluliuma I and ruled by his sons, and then by subsequent Hittite kings. Beyond the immediate, and the devolved, sphere of Hittite influence, they were in regular, and not infrequently hostile, contact with the other major kingdoms of the Middle East—the Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Babylonians—and, notoriously, the land of Ahhiyawa. Surprisingly, perhaps, the Ahhiyawa question receives only limited attention: on balance B. is inclined to accept the equation with Mycenaean Greece; and on the famous problem of the erasure of the name of the king of Ahhiyawa from the treaty of Tudhaliya IV, he makes a good case for the suggestion that it is indicative of the loss of Ahhiyawan authority in Anatolia following the return of Milawata to the Hittites (pp. 343–4).

The impact which recent discoveries have made is nowhere more evident than in Chapter XIII, 'The Fall of the Kingdom and its Aftermath'. Whilst not dismissing the recent suggestion of Drews that the wave of destruction of civilizations, including that of the Hittites, towards the end of the Bronze Age resulted from new techniques of warfare, he argues that the kingdoms must already have been severely weakened to succumb to those techniques, and that documents such as the bronze tablet excavated at Hattusa in 1986 give some indication of how that weakening occurred. In particular he points to the evidence of constant challenge to both Tudhaliya IV and Suppiluliuma II from elements even within the extended royal family (p. 377). It is hard

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to resist the notion that a similar picture for Mycenaean Greece too would not be unrealistic.

This is a comprehensive, and highly authoritative, treatment of the history of the Hittites, which will appeal to the general reader as well as to the scholar. Both perhaps will be disappointed with the brevity of the final chapter on 'The Trojan War: Myth or Reality?', which actually devotes a mere seven pages to the impact on our understanding of the war made by the Hittite documents, and falls short by a distance of the standard set by the previous chapters. Both too will feel disadvantaged by the almost complete absence of cross-referencing, a significant omission in a text as detailed and, at times, complex as this, and by the paucity of maps and plans provided. B. has nevertheless given us an exceptional work of scholarship, and provided the book which his subject richly deserves.

University of Exeter N. POSTLETHWAITE

THRACE

Z. H. ARCHIBALD: *The Odrysian Kingdom of Thrace: Orpheus Unmasked* (Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology). Pp. xxiii + 370, ills, tables, 49 pls. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £80. ISBN: 0-19-815047-4.

This handsome volume attempts to do for the Odrysian kingdom of Thrace what Nicholas Hammond began for Macedonia 25 years ago: to produce a first synthesis of the history and the archaeology of a major ancient Balkan state. The time-range covered here is shorter, but for the classical period Thrace is a major theme. There can be no doubt that A.'s synthesis marks a milestone in the development of the history of ancient Thrace. The book is divided into three chronological sections: the pre-Odrysian Thracian background; the rise of the Odrysian kingdom; and the Odrysian kingdom in the fourth century until Philip II's conquest. Each section contains a historical survey of 'events', followed by systematic accounts of the different kinds of archaeological and, where relevant, numismatic evidence.

There are many distribution maps and tables; I missed, however, a general map of the area with all the little find-spots mentioned in the text. A catalogue of metal objects from Thrace dating from the fifth and fourth centuries, and a gazetteer of archaeological sites as appendices round off the book.

A. is refreshingly candid from the first about the limits of knowledge and the problems presented by the diverse evidence in this under-researched area with a history of ideologically coloured find-presentation. Her refusal to accept the simplistic identification of characteristic material culture with 'peoples' is a healthy reaction to much Balkan archaeology for this period of ethnogenesis. That the culture, settlement, and population structure of Thrace was more complex than has often been assumed is a welcome post-nationalistic modernization of interpretative parameters, particularly for the archaic period. For the development of the Odrysian kingdom the experience of the Persian invasion was, according to A.'s reasonable assumption, the critical impulse which stimulated a certain unity of interest, and allowed and encouraged the development of a centralized state. The parallel with Macedonia is clear, and it is no improbable suggestion that Teres and Sitalkes played for the Odrysians the rôle of Alexander I in Macedonia. In this respect her analysis of the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

vision of Thracians in fifth-century Attic literature is interesting in emphasizing how little actual knowledge was available to (or, at least, demonstrated by) classical writers, and that an immediate historical or thematic stimulus merely rolled out the cliché of the constructed barbarian.

The archaeological evidence listed, described, and discussed in scrupulous detail shows growing wealth, increasing contact with the Aegean World, and, when combined with hints in the ancient writers, increasing social differentiation, as the centralized court began to dominate political and social life. The spread of conspicuous wealth, demonstrated by the spectacular silverware, A. relates to gift-exchange, which would adequately explain how such exceptional objects came into the possession of their ultimate owners. Most importantly, however, A. emphasizes that the expression of status-difference by the inclusion of such prominent gifts in the burials is not just a Thracian phenomenon but part of a N.-Aegean model of status- expression. Also of importance is A.'s emphasis on the prime function of the Greek N.-Aegean and Black Sea cities for trade and contact rather than Athens, despite the ubiquitous presence of Attic pottery. The new fourth-century inscription from Vetren (*SEG* 43,486, also inadequately reproduced in an appendix here) shows this clearly enough, since contacts of the *emporion* Pistiros with Maroneia, Thasos, and Apollonia are explicitly protected, and she fits this well into anecdotal evidence on Thracian grain production (p. 226).

A.'s primary interest is in the archaeological material, and it is there that she shows her surest hand. She has been served scandalously badly by the OUP's Greek typesetter, who apparently had no final sigma available, and shows an astonishingly casual hand with diacritical marks—an earlier OUP would have been ashamed to issue a volume in this condition, with the Greek text mauled into incomprehensibility, but today, it seems, anything goes. And that at £80. It also becomes clear, however, that Greek language is not A.'s own strongpoint. A mistranslation even of the motto passage in the preface is a bad omen (ἤρεσκεν τῷ πλήθει means 'he pleased the people', not 'he was pleased to be amongst a crowd of them'); p. 176: Arist. F611,58 does not speak of dowry, but its opposite, bride-price, which had to be returned by the parents on the divorce of their daughter; on p. 209 A. seems to imply that Αὐλωνείτης as an epithet for Heros has something to do with lyre-playing: it means 'hero of the glen' (see also Robert, *BE* [1970], 381); p. 218 n.2 and text suggests that the (unique) money-exchange at Thasos (ἀργυραμοιβήιον, typically wrongly copied and accented by A.) might have something to do with Ketriporis' imitating Thasian coin types; on pp. 226–7 A. misinterprets the inscription from Vetren: the text has no prohibition on the *emporitai* garrisoning themselves: the subject of the verb is the king, and he promises not to introduce a garrison or to instruct anybody else to do so (so correctly Tybout at *SEG* 43,486 ad loc.). Moreover, the inscription should not be used to argue (as on p. 311) that Odrysian rulers were keen on inscriptions. Most stones containing privileges for communities were set up by the recipients of the benefits—here therefore most likely by Pistiros, not by the unknown king.

This is only a sample of such mistakes, and they are rather alarming, suggesting that users of the book, at least in its non-archaeological sections, will have to be extremely cautious in relying on it. The amount of material presented, however, remains massive and impressive, and the critical survey of inaccessibly published archaeological material will provide a base for all future studies in this fascinat- ing area, where techniques and practices of acculturation can be observed at close quarters.

Philipps-Universität, Marburg R. MALCOLM ERRINGTON

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ANCIENT IRAN

E. DABROWA (ed.): *Ancient Iran and the Mediterranean World. Studies in Ancient History. Proceedings of an international conference in honour of Prof. Józef Wolski held at the Jagiellonian University, Cracow, in September 1996*. Pp. 236, figs, ills. Cracow: Jagiellonian University Press, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 83-233-1140-4.

Almost simultaneously two volumes of collected papers on ancient Iran have appeared. The one, a substantial volume from an international workshop in Germany in June 1996, bears the title *Das Partherreich und seine Zeugnisse/The Arsacid Empire: Sources and Documentation* (*Historia* Einzelschriften 122, ed. Josef Wiesehöfer [Stuttgart, 1998]). It focuses on the various sources—literary (Graeco- Roman, Parthian, Armenian, and Chinese), archaeological, numismatic—and other testimonies which are available for a reconstruction of the Parthian empire and its culture. The other, the one under review here, is likewise the result of an international meeting. The colloquium was organized in honour of Professor Józef Wolski's eighty-fifth birthday. Wolski is of course well-known for his studies on the history of ancient Iran, especially those on the Arsacid period. Whereas the German volume has a central theme and period, this unfortunately cannot be said of the Polish one. Each of the fourteen contributions, whether written in English, German, French, or Italian, differs greatly one from the other. Moreover, they cover a long period of time—from Greece in the fifth century B.C.E. to the Sasanid empire in *c.* 600 C.E.—and are of uneven length, the shortest being only five and the longest thirty-seven pages. Given such inequalities of form and content, the editor might have grouped the papers chronologically and/or by discipline (history, archaeology) in order to give the collection some sense of coherence. The only coherence the book now displays, however, is the grouping of the papers in alphabetical order by each author's name. Other questionable decisions by the editor include the lack of an index; some contributions contain annoying printing errors.

These criticisms aside, the book includes several fine contributions. The three archaeological papers deal with funerary buildings in Hatra (Donna Metzger), the until now neglected pictorial graffiti also at Hatra (Venco Ricciardi), and the material evidence for a possible long-term Roman occupation at Niniveh (Eiland). Not surprisingly, there is no solid evidence presented for such an occupation, but there is some archaeological material which demonstrates Roman–Parthian interaction at Niniveh.

Of the historical articles two deal with Greek–Persian relations in the fifth century B.C.E. In his stimulating piece on Aeschylus' *Persae* Harrison argues against the prevailing view that the play lacks Athenian patriotic fervour. He convincingly demonstrates that this tragedy, which was first performed in 472, is clearly anti-Persian, and displays the patriotic feeling and sense of supremacy of the Athenians. In a no less stimulating piece Michael Whitby presents a new interpretation of and view on fr. 27 of Ion of Chios (preserved in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* 11.463). The poem is generally reckoned to reflect a Spartan royal context, but Whitby presents arguments which make it likely that it must be seen in the context of the Demaratid court, and that it was probably meant to express the wish for a bond between Ion (and Chios) and the pro-Persian Demaratids. The poem thus enhances the impression that wealthy Greeks, in spite of their *polis*' commitment to the Delian league, wanted to maintain good relations with their Persian neighbours.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Three papers in the volume concentrate on the Seleucid period. In the shortest paper of the collection Mielczarek discusses the introduction of cataphracts into the Seleucid army. The relations between the Seleucids and the Mauryan empire in India in the third century B.C.E. are the subject of Wiesehöfer's paper. Finally, Invernizzi presents some observations on the meeting of Greek and Mesopotamian religious forms and ideas, and demonstrates the profound complexities of what is so easily called syncretism.

The Arsacid period is represented by four contributions. Dabrowa discusses the philhellenism of the Parthian king Mithridates I (171–138 B.C.E.). Arnaud concentrates on the Parthian wars of Gabinius and Crassus in relation to Parthian policy towards Rome between 70 and 53 B.C.E. In his interesting contribution Nikonorov suggests a new date for the composition of the *Parthica* of Apollodorus of Artemita. Not avoiding the presentation of hypotheses as reliable evidence, Nikonorov suggests that the *Parthica* was written between the years 53 and 40 B.C.E. It remains to be seen whether this date will be generally accepted. The longest article is by Olbrycht, who presents a useful political history of the Arsacid empire between 50 and 147 C.E. This period is often considered as one of internal strife and instability, but Olbrycht presents a different picture: an Arsacid empire which, apart from the second decade of the second century, was far more stable thanks to the policy of integration of Vologases I, Pacorus II, and Vologases II.

The two remaining papers are concerned with the Sasanid period. The presentation of the Roman empire in the *Res Gestae Divi Saporis* is discussed by Rubin, who concludes that the Roman emperor, although officially considered an enemy and a subordinate in the propaganda of the Sasanid kings, nevertheless enjoyed a special position different from other enemies and vassals. In short, political realities could also not be overlooked by the Sasanid king. Finally, Riedlberger presents a detailed reconstruction of the Byzantine military expedition in the summer of 591 which restored Chosroes II to the Sasanid throne.

On the whole, this very uneven collection of papers is useful for the contributions of high quality and interest it contains. It is to be hoped that the views expressed in them, some of them alternative and novel, will find their way into the scholarly debate.

University of Groningen JAN WILLEM DRIJVERS

GREEK ETHNICITY

J. M. HALL: *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Pp. xviii + 228, maps, 27 ills. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-521-58017-X.

As H. makes clear from the outset, this book is not about concepts of Greekness, but about what he terms 'intrahellenic' identities (p. xiii), of which the idea of being Dorian and identities within the Argolid are his major case studies. The emphasis is strongly on theoretical approaches to ethnicity and the contextualization of these approaches within the history of scholarship in his chosen field, and the chronological sweep is broad, ranging from the bronze to the classical age. The first chapter sets the scene, exploring the complex strands of romantic, positivist, and racist approaches to the idea of Dorian identity in the nineteenth and earlier twentieth centuries. Chapter II sets out modern anthropological approaches to issues of ethnicity, stressing the importance of a belief in a common descent and an

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

association with a particular territory, both of which may be fictive or mythical, as the distinguishing, subjective criterion of a specifically ethnic group. The third and fourth chapters explore issues raised by Chapter II within the specifics of Greek terminology and Greek expression. The emphasis here is on genealogies and descent-groups expressed within Greek literature: H. sees literature as a prime source for studying the 'discursive' nature of ethnicity. Chapters V and VI, dealing with archaeology and language respectively, explore the problems of using material culture and dialect in any objective way when dealing with questions of ethnic identity: while language and culture may certainly be used consciously in certain situations to articulate a distinctive identity, it is extremely difficult to recover such usage within ancient societies.

It will probably already be clear that this is a dense and difficult book, and one which raises questions and issues that need to be taken seriously. H. is, however, worryingly over-dismissive of contemporary classical scholarship, and a non-classicist might be forgiven for supposing that there was very little interest in issues of ethnicity and identity amongst contemporary classicists, or indeed that the field was still dominated by frameworks of thought grounded in racial theories of the later nineteenth century. Given the impact on classical scholarship over the last decade or so of works such as Edith Hall's *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition Through Tragedy* (Oxford, 1989), Paul Cartledge's *The Greeks: a Portrait of Self and Others* (Oxford, 1993), and above all the debate over Martin Bernal's *Black Athena: the Afro-Asiatic Roots of Classical Civilization* (New Brunswick, Volume I, 1987; Volume II, 1991), it is extremely misleading to say that 'many classicists' do not understand that ethnicity is 'socially constructed and subjectively perceived' (p. 19). It is nevertheless true that H. offers a great deal more detail on modern anthropological theories of the construction and perception of ethnicity than we have seen before in works concerned with the classical world, and that he has more systematically applied such theories to a wider range of ancient evidence than we have seen before in classical case studies.

While the use of modern anthropological theories undoubtedly helps us to ask interesting questions about issues of ethnicity in antiquity, and while the degree of self-awareness—and sometimes relativism—that we may gain from such models can rid us of acceptance of, for example, insidious ideas of biologically determined race, excessive obedience to such models can itself raise problems. These models are, after all, drawn from a range of historically and socially specific individual situations, and it is important not to lose sight of the fact that we have, in the ancient world, a range of historically and socially specific individual situations on which we ourselves can—and should—draw in order to create our own models. On a superficial level, H.'s arrangement of his material, and particularly the extremely detailed discussion in Chapter II of modern anthropological approaches to ethnicity, with examples drawn from dozens of modern situations, may, ironically, deter the classical readership that he wishes to educate. While the discussion is perfectly lucid and extremely well informed, the problem is that no links are made within this chapter to the specifics of the ancient Greek world, and in fact explicit references back to this material in later chapters are thin on the ground. For those who do not already know the basics of these anthropological theories—precisely the audience to whom H. professes to speak—the temptation may well be to skip this chapter. On a rather more profound level, as the anthropological models are largely applied rather than tested on the ancient material, there are a number of missed opportunities to point up some of the really distinctive aspects of Greek conceptualization of identity. Most notably, given the fluid and often—from a modern anthropological point of view—messily imprecise use of the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Greek term *ethnos*, and the broad notion of descent implied by the term *genos*, discussed by the author himself (pp. 35–8), it seems perverse to be so narrowly precise about what counts as *ethnic* identity, as opposed to other social identities, such as 'family' and 'civic' identities, which are summarily discarded on the grounds of being outside the scope of his study. To give a specific example, if we want to understand the idea of Attic autochthony, Daniel Ogden's discussion in his *Greek Bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods* (Oxford, 1996) provides a more nuanced discussion, precisely because he contextualizes such 'ethnic' ideas within messier Athenian ideas of descent in a much more general sense.

As we have seen, H. privileges literary evidence over other kinds of source material, because of its 'discursive' nature. In his central chapters (III and IV) he mines Greek literature for the genealogical material that is crucial to his theory about the importance of a belief in a shared descent within notions of specifically ethnic identity. H. maps his genealogical tables from literary sources ranging chronologically and geographically from Homer to Pausanias. One of his main tactics is to uncover fault-lines—tensions and inconsistencies—in order to create a stratigraphy and a sense of the original lines that had subsequently been fused together. His conclusions are at times highly suggestive, such as his arguments for a shift from an 'aggregative' notion of Greekness during the archaic period to the more familiar 'oppositional' notion in the aftermath of the Persian Wars (p. 47), but there are obviously extreme methodological difficulties here. One surprising aspect of these chapters, given H.'s emphasis elsewhere on the need to understand evidence within very specific contexts, such as in his careful and sophisticated discussion of modern approaches to the 'Dorian question', is that so little weight is given to the individual ancient *literary* contexts. Although there are some nods to questions of what might more broadly be going on in Herodotus' or Pausanias' account, many contemporary classicists will be alarmed by the assumption that one can simply pool such a broad range of extracts from literary texts and then work on this as a body of evidence.

Despite these problems, the book has real merits, particularly the impressive range of material discussed and the elucidation of problems raised by traditional approaches. Not the least of H.'s achievements is to offer a discussion of questions of Greek ethnicity that is not based exclusively on Athenian literary evidence.

Birkbeck College, London EMMA DENCH

GYMNASIARCHS

G. CORDIANO: *La Ginnasiarchia nelle 'Poleis' dell'Occidente Mediterraneo antico.* (Studi e testi di Storia antica 7.) Pp. 168. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 1997. ISBN: 88-467-0026-0.

A work in two parts: the first begins with an overview of the *gymnasion*, and its supporting office of the *gymnasiarkhia*, as a defining institution of Greek culture. It then assembles the evidence for its presence in the western Greek cities. The second focuses on two regions: the Syracusan *epikrateia* under Hieron II and Rhegion in the late Hellenistic and Roman periods.

The overview is admirably clear, the emphasis being on the *gymnasion*'s rôle in ephebic training. Abundant material is prudently harvested, although the focus on Athens (in other ways understandable) is unfortunate, since the arrangements there were strikingly unlike those studied by C. More might have been made here (and else-

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where) of the rich material in the *nomos gymnasiarkhikos* from Beroia, fully published by P. Gauthier and M. Hatzopoulos, *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroia* (Athens, 1993). On the other hand, a little more about an Athenian precursor—namely, the classical leitourgic *gymnasiarkhia* which supported teams of 'torch-racers'—would have further illuminated what C. dubs the 'degenerative transformation' (p. 23) of the *arkhe* into a quasi-*leitourgia* over the period under study (broadly third century B.C.E. to first century C.E.).

The documentation assembles the epigraphical material for eighteen places, sometimes no more than a single fragmentary inscription, adding, where possible, links to literary sources. There is little editorial intervention or original commentary, but generous and judicious guidance through current bibliography. Nonetheless, some important things have escaped the author's notice that a hasty search in *SEG* revealed to the reviewer.

A single example: one of the two inscriptions for Massalia—*IG* XIV.2444—resurfaced in the 1970s and its erroneous ascription to Massalia (followed by C.) was corrected. G. Barroul and M. Py ('Recherches récentes sur la ville antique d'Espeyran à Saint-Gilles-du-Gard', *RAN* 11 [1978], 99) date it to the Imperial period, in a study which makes the site of Rhodanousia, itself probably a Massaliote foundation, the likely provenance. From their photograph it also appears that the name should read 'Damas' rather than '[Kleu?]damas', since there are no apparent traces in the space before the initial delta of the first line. Some doubt must attend C.'s interpretation of the terms *geraiteros*, used of the ex-*gymnasiarkhos* in the genuine Massaliote inscription (*IG* XIV.2445), and of *[pres]buteros*, used of Damas the ex-*khoregos* in 2444, as indicating simply an age-class: 'un . . . ultra-trentenne'. A relation to the political usage—'member of a council of elders' *vel sim.*—seems inescapable. I suspect this unusual marker of an age and political status in the context of leitourgical service should be referred to the extremely hierarchical constitution of Massalia itself. It seems that (some four centuries previously!—but cf. Cic. *Rep.* 1.27) the hereditary oligarchy maintained so tight a grip on power that pressure from the *euporoi* led to the admission of older (and later of younger) brothers of those in power to *arkhai* (and probably *leitourgiai*) (Arist. *Pol*. 5.1305b2–12, 6.1321a30–43; cf. Strabo 4.1.5).

C.'s analysis is at its most interesting when his discussion of this largely unpromising evidence helps trace the tenacious maintenance of these institutions to support a culture under threat in the West—as most famously in Neapolis, where resistance to transformation into a *municipium* was expressed through the continued support of a vigorous *Helleniké agogé.* This theme is pursued in the broader historical treatment of Part Two, where C. argues that the evidence for the *gymnasiarkhia* from four cities under the Syracusan *epikrateia* implies a coherent organizing principle, and detects in it the hand of Hieron II. C.'s main support derives from the fact that the *gymnasiarkhia* in these cities was 'diarchic', held simultaneously, and with no apparent distinction, by two men. That the Rhegine *gymnasiarkhia* was also diarchic raises some doubt as to the force of this point. His interpretation of the term *νεανίσκοι Ἱερώνειο*[*ι*] in a dedicatory inscription from Neeton *IG* XIV.240 also takes on special importance. C. argues persuasively that the epithet 'Hieronian' derives from the monarch directly, rather than via the use of the term *Hieroneion* of the local *gymnasion*. C. assembles further evidence for Hieron's promotion of gymnastic insti- tutions, including most spectacularly the construction of a *gymnasion* with gardens on his massive propagandistic 'display ship' *Syrakosia*, which toured the Greek world, patrolled by a band of *neaniskoi*, before ending in Alexandria. The broader historical explanation for this is Hieron's appreciation of the importance of assuring greater homogeneity and

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cohesion in the Syracusan civic–military corps—all to avert the 'tramonto della Grecità in Occidente' (p. 120). The adoption of a *diarchic* form C. interprets as a precautionary measure, introducing an element of reciprocal control, one aim of which was to neutralize the potential for subversion that such bands of organized élite youth at times demonstrated.

The discussion of Rhegion focuses on elucidating a change in the second century which apparently saw the abandonment of a unique form of political *gymnasiarkhia*, a true *arkhe* in which the officers had their own secretary. The picture of a city in which the *gymnasiarkhia* was the principal magistracy is tantalizingly illuminated by evidence for a Rhegine constitution called '*Gymnasiarkhike*'.

C.'s historical picture is compelling. However, some reservations must remain as to the strength of the evidential base supporting its central argument for a systematic Hieronian policy. Moreover, C. is rather too confident in the claim that this policy was centred specifically on ephebes. This depends on an assumption that the term '*neaniskoi*' systematically refers to '*epheboi*', for which C. relies on the work of G. Sacco, 'Sui neaniskoi d'età ellenistica', *RIFC* 107 (1979), 39–49. She, however, is careful to stress 'l'ampiezza e la genericità della parola' (p. 47). In Athens, for instance, while the fourth-century epigraphic evidence shows a general equation of the terms, in the second and later centuries *neaniskoi* is used of an agonistic age-category older than both *epheboi* and *exepheboi*.

This is a welcome contribution to a recently established, well-produced series which it is hoped will receive ample diffusion and reception in the Anglophone world.

University of Warwick PETER WILSON

THE SOCIOLOGY OF GREEK SPORT

MARK GOLDEN: *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece* (Key Themes in Ancient History). Pp. xiii + 216, 3 ills, 6 tables, 9 pls. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Paper, £13.95. ISBN: 0-521-49790-6.

What do Boris Yeltsin's disco dancing and 'a brontosaurus on valium' have in common? No snide remarks, please: the correct answer is that both have somehow found their way into Mark Golden's lively study of Greek sport (pp. 31, 52). Lightness of tone is one of this book's attractive features, as is its unusual focus on sport as 'a discourse of difference', that is to say, on the rôle of sport in creating distinctions not only between winners and losers, but also between Greeks and barbarians, men and women, men and boys, rich and poor. This is a stimulating approach, which raises a series of interesting questions about class, gender, and age, but it is also rather oblique, since the creation or representation of 'difference' is surely *a*, but hardly *the*, social function of sport. (Not that I would claim to know what *the* function is, or was; for a brief survey of theories, see pp. 6–7.) Although G. does not rigidly confine himself to his main agenda but skilfully manages to weave many other aspects of sport into his account, his treatment does remain a little more selective than one might have expected from a book in the Key Themes series.

In the opening chapter, G. briefly tackles several of the big questions. In his view, 'it is a mistake to make too much' of the rôle of religion in sport (p. 23), which was not significantly more important than in most other areas of Greek life. He aims for a

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

compromise position on the issue of the relation between sport and warfare, arguing that the development of athletic exercise was indeed, as some say, a response to the rise of the hoplite phalanx, while also arguing, as others do, that it was an élite phenomenon. He does point out, however, that 'the usual sports . . . were just not very well designed as preparation for hoplite warfare' (p. 27), and that the 'peaceable' Minoans went in for combat sports, while the citizens of notably non-peacable Rome hardly engaged in sport at all (p. 32). A survey of Phoenician, Egyptian, and Minoan evidence suggests that the Greeks' widespread participation in competitive sport was indeed unusual (pp. 28–33). The chapter closes with a couple of instances of the 'discourse of difference' in action: most strikingly, Hippias of Elis' claim that Olympic horse races were introduced only after almost a century of athletic competitions, a contention which may reflect an ongoing ideological battle about the status and legitimacy of equestrian events, which were strictly wealth-based (pp. 37–45).

The second chapter sets out the nature of the sources, with the aid of several case studies. The result—that we do not know how the Greeks performed the jump or how they scored the pentathlon, that we cannot be sure of the date of the first Olympiad, and that we cannot tell why the Greeks competed naked—is clearly meant to teach students a useful lesson about the limitations of the evidence, but is perhaps a bit more demoralizing than it need have been. This is followed by a chapter on 'reflections of victory in literature and art', with sections on epinician poetry, victory statues, games in Homer, and the representation of Orestes as an athlete ('champion and chump', p. 95).

The discourse of difference comes into its own in the final two chapters. Boys' age classes, the status of boys' victories, the predominantly local origins of winners in the boys' contests, and athletes' career structures are treated in detail, as is the evidence for women's sport, about which ancient authors get excited every so often ('Propertius . . . seems to need a cold dip in the Eurotas', p. 128), and the rare hints of women competing against men, primarily Atalanta, of course ('the odd woman out in one of the great testosterone tests in Greek mythology', p. 134), but just possibly also the historical Tryphosa, daughter of Hermesianax (p. 138). It is suggested that separate boys' competitions were introduced to prevent fathers from being beaten by their sons (pp. 139, 177), and that women's competitions merely reinforced 'a discourse (conscious or not) of male supremacy', since their participation was confined to 'contests at which they (predictably) do less well than men' (pp. 131–2). I wonder. The age of marriage for men was *c*. 30, so their sons would hardly begin to pose an athletic threat to them before their mid-forties, when very few of them would still be actively competing. Again, no times or distances were recorded and comparison was thus possible only between those who directly competed against one another, so it is not easy to see how *separate* competitions for women can have served to reinforce male supremacy.

The best is saved for last, as the concluding chapter offers insightful perspectives on the class dimensions of sport, via such topics as the social origins of athletes, the ancient version of the modern medals-or-money dilemma (as reflected in the myths of Herakles, pp. 146–57), and the place of sport in democratic Athens. Here as elsewhere the emphasis is almost exclusively on competitive sport, and it may be worth noting that recreational athletics, which gets only a passing mention, was surely even more significant in the creation of class distinctions, and indeed of social mobility (see Nick Fisher's excellent chapter on the subject in *Kosmos*, edd. Paul Cartledge et al. [Cambridge, 1998]).

Sport and Society may be lacking a little in comprehensiveness, but its originality and panache amply make up for that. Both specialists and students will want to read

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

this book—and not just find out what on earth Boris and the other dinosaur are doing in it.

University College London HANS VAN WEES

AGRIBUSINESS

P. N. KARDULIAS, M. T. SHUTES (edd.): *Aegean Strategies: Studies of Culture and Environment on the European Fringe*. Pp. xx + 313. Lanham, etc.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998. Paper, £19.95 (Cased, £50). ISBN: 0-8476-8657-4 (0-8476-8656-6 hbk).

Although I can agree that Greece is on the physical fringe of Europe, I can hardly agree with its being marginal to Europe. This is not the only apparent contradiction which causes the reader to pause, and perhaps to understand better what had been implicitly assumed. 'Studies of Culture and Environment' could refer to agriculture, and though some of the contributions do, this volume has a wider appeal, to archaeologists, anthropologists, ethnographers, and perhaps most appropriately to those in Brussels who wish to see 'development' of the 'poorer' countries on the fringe of the Union. The reason for the wide range of appropriateness is that the contributions are varied, but also within most there is a little for everyone; once again it is up to readers to draw from the papers the data which will be apposite to their own interest. Such a synthesis is something that the volume editors could perhaps have handled better in their final discussion. For example, whereas van Andel refers to the paucity of data on the Little Ice Age for Argolid, Moody, in the next chapter, refers at length to this very period in Crete. As the chapter authors may not have been aware of such coincidences, the editors should comment. In fact there are a number of commentaries; from the series editor, an unknown prefacer, and an introduction by the editors. I must agree with George Nagy, the series editor, that the contribution by Halstead and Jones is a wonderful semi-quantitative discourse on island agriculture; a quantification that is so often missing, though several contributors here offer us more than generalities. Sadly, the paper referred to has already been published elsewhere, but in this reprinted version it may be more accessible. The other reprint is van Andel's description of the changes in the land of the Southern Argolid. This is a somewhat elderly paper, published in one form or another twice before, and it is a pity that it was not updated by the addition of more than one recent reference. In contrast, several contributions have emerged from the piles of paper which embarrass us all and which contain results of valuable fieldwork completed longer ago than we would care to remember. The preface does give an effective summary of the content of the papers but also raises the unanswered question, appropriate to the anthropologists perhaps, though others may find the 'four-field approach' needs more, in fact some, explanation. The editors' introduction provides a valuable consideration of the thorny issue of determinism. There is also discussion of the risk management and stability of systems, though I am not convinced by arguments that peasants are inherently short termist! It is perhaps not surprising that the anthropologists feel that it is the archaeologists who have had control of much of the ecological research within the Greek environment.

Is this volume worth consulting? If you are interested in Greece, or even in the Mediterranean, then the answer is probably yes. Even if your only contact is with the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

beaches and tavernas, then you might at least learn something of the impacts that you are having on the environment and indigenous population. In a country where classical ethnography can still provide us with insights into the management of the land in the past, we have an equivalent of rescue archaeology, where we must dig now or lose the information for ever. For those of us involved with fieldwork in Greece, these papers, especially those based on older fieldwork, provide us with insights into the use and management of the land which will help us to make more realistic reconstructions of the lifestyle and economy of the people. There are papers here from work at Troy, Argolid, Crete, Nemea, Korinthia, Grevana, Methana, Mani, Karpathos, and Omorgos, together with more general papers which do not restrict themselves to specific locations. The papers all have full bibliographies, and refer to other major landscape projects, such as Aetolia and Boeotia, which are not represented.

Of the issues raised in the contributions a recurrent one is that of fallow land. Was the fallow bare? Athanossopoulos offers both bare and cropped (with beans), whereas Chang, in considering stock-farming, indicates that fallows were grazed. In fact, the excellent index contains twenty references to fallow, and this is a topic that could have been discussed more generally in relation to its effect on animal feeding, soil erosion, and soil fertility, to mention only a few of the related issues.

Partible inheritance of land is another issue that raises its ugly (or is it?) head in several papers. Shutes considers it at length, but its general relevance means that it appears in several contributions. It is a truly unifying concept, for it can be argued to have risk-minimization value, to prevent anyone taking control of the landscape, to prevent agricultural development, and to result in inefficiency. This time the main contribution is from one of the editors, but a synthesis of the disparate views would be valuable.

The use of the wild landscape for primitive hunter-gathering (or permaculture *à la* Mollison?) is put into context by Forbes, who describes the range of products from the wilderness, though not always quantitatively. The harvesting of oregano from the uncultivated land and field edges in Clark's paper demonstrates how this part of the landscape provides the opportunity for the peasant to enter the cash economy, and as a result rise from the subsistence level. The range of non-money transactions is substantial—the glue that binds communities together?

The issues of settlement distribution and of the type of grain grown provide fertile ground for a range of views to be expressed. Do people disperse when it is safe (Kardulias)? Or is it when population density becomes too high (Athanassopoulos)? Do they grow barley because it is more reliable, or wheat for prestige or for sale? If your wheat contains some barley, will you be able to sell it (Clark)? Does sale of grain refer to a general surplus or an abundant harvest (Halstead and Jones)? There is food (*sic*) here for thought! Read this volume; it is good value and will probably provoke as well as inform.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne ROBERT S. SHIEL

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

GRAECIA CAPTA

C. P. Jones, C. Segal, R. J. Tarrant, R. F. Thomas (edd.): *Greece in Rome: Influence*, *Integration*, *Resistance*. (*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 97.) Pp. 293, ills. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1995. Cased, £27.95. ISBN: 0-674-37945-4.

Horace's famous claim, 'Captive Greece captured her rugged victor and, armed with arts, invaded rustic Latium' (*Epist*. 2.1.156–7), well encapsulates some of the tensions characterizing Roman responses to Greek culture. Greece submits to the superior strength of Rome, but captivates and beguiles, a feminine 'other' against which Rome defines itself. Yet if Rome's conquest of Greece is double-edged, then so too is Greece's captivation of Rome; the poem itself asserts Rome's capacity to appropriate those Greek arts (while also betraying a nagging anxiety of influence).

No collection of essays could offer comprehensive treatment of such a vast and complex topic as the dynamics of Roman responses to Greek culture. The fourteen essays assembled here engage nevertheless with a broad range of themes (religious, philosophical, art-historical, literary, cultural) over a long time-span, though with a focus on the Augustan age.

Glen Bowersock's essay, 'The Barbarism of the Greeks', looks at the hybrid Greco-Roman culture of the cities of Southern Italy, focusing particularly on the establishment of new Hellenic religious institutions in the Augustan period. These, he suggestively argues, may be seen as part of 'the formation of a new Hellenism', something 'rooted in the past but addressed to the present and the future'. Also relating to religion, John Scheid's piece on *ritus Graecus* elegantly demonstrates that this term was not applied to imported religious ceremonies, but rather denoted a Roman ceremony with certain modifications. Such terminology, he suggests, should be seen as reflecting a Roman concern to emphasize the heterogeneous origins of the cults they observed. This stress on the presence of the 'foreign' at the heart of Roman culture served to legitimate the incorporation of the foreign through Roman imperialism. Calvert Watkins's discussion of some of the earliest written texts found in Italy is in itself of interest (part of his argument is developed further in Thomas's piece on the *Georgics*). But, while the inhabitants of Italy may have learnt writing from Greeks, it is not clear how far an awareness of this informed Italian perceptions of Greek culture.

Two essays focus particularly on Roman responses to Hellenistic philosophy. Gisela Striker provides a helpful contextualization of Cicero's philosophical writings, which were, she suggests, intended rather to offer a framework in which Roman readers could situate more technical writings than to constitute a replacement for such works. Brad Inwood's stimulating discussion of 'Seneca in his philosophical milieu' argues that for Seneca (in contrast to earlier Romans), philosophy was not something essen- tially Greek. Much more so than Cicero, he argues, Seneca can be found thinking philosophically in Latin.

The next three essays on Greek art in Rome complement one another nicely. Bettina Bergmann rightly emphasizes the difficulties associated with using Roman wall-paintings to reconstruct lost Greek masterpieces and argues that we should focus instead on interpreting the elements selected by Roman artists to form decorative schemes for specific Roman contexts, schemes which were often deliberately eclectic. Similarly Elaine Gazda problematizes the category of Roman 'copies' of Greek originals in the field of sculpture. Rather than seeing many Roman sculptures as (often

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

rather incompetent) attempts to replicate Greek masterpieces, it could be helpful, she argues, to treat such works analogously to portraits, which we expect to see reproduced and adapted for a wide variety of purposes and contexts. Ann Kuttner offers a case study in the Roman reception of Hellenistic art, effectively demonstrating the extent to which Romans even of the mid-Republic would have been familiar with aspects of Pergamene art.

The next three essays examine literary links. Cynthia Damon's discussion of the figure of the parasite in Roman texts well illustrates some of the ways in which the originally Greek 'type' of the parasite might be deployed to serve particular forensic or satirical ends in a range of Roman contexts. Richard Thomas's essay analyses the interaction of 'Greek' and 'Italian' elements in Virgil's *Georgics*, ending with the suggestive observation that even (or especially?) when offering literary representations of rustic Italian songs, Virgil could be seen as situating himself in a Hellenistic tradition. Richard Tarrant's persuasive discussion of Senecan tragedy emphasizes particularly the ways in which Seneca's works in what modern scholars have often wanted to see as a quintessentially Greek genre situated themselves in relation to a complex Roman literary tradition.

The final three essays explore more general cultural links. Christopher Jones analyses patterns of kinship relations in the *Aeneid*, playing down contrasts between the Greek and the Italian in the poem, which he suggests places greater importance on ancestry than ethnicity. Albert Heinrichs's discussion of 'Roman views of Greek culture' returns to some familiar passages from Cato, Virgil, and Cicero. While he rightly emphasizes the diversity of Roman responses, his discussion is not always sufficiently sensitive to nuances of context. In the final essay, Sarolta Takács explores some of the ways in which Romans responded to the synthesis of Greek and Egyptian which they associated with Alexandria.

On the whole this is a stimulating collection. Some essays gain particularly from their juxtaposition (though others, such as Watkins's, relate only tangentially to the main themes of the volume). Some cross-references are included and the volume's full index is admirable. It is a pity, however, that the editors chose not to offer any introduction (beyond a one-page foreword) which could have drawn together the numerous insights offered here, as well as highlighting some contrasting perspectives.

Some essays perhaps overemphasize the fusion of Greek and Roman elements; Heinrichs, for instance, writes of Greeks and Romans being 'blended in a melting pot' by the time of Augustus. The emperor may, when in Campania, have invited Greeks and Romans to exchange their forms of dress to mark his gratification at the homage paid him by some Alexandrian sailors (Suet. *Aug*. 98.3), but he is also said to have insisted that Romans without togas should be banned from the Forum (ibid. 40.5)—in some contexts, at least, Roman identity was not to be tampered with. Other pieces, while acknowledging that by, for instance, Seneca's day competition with Greek models was no longer so central an issue for Roman writers, emphasize that the 'other' world of Greece remained 'good to think with' precisely because it was removed from Rome. What emerges most forcefully from these essays is the complexity of Roman conceptions of the Greek. It was perhaps this very complexity, this plurality of Greeces, which made Greek culture ultimately so irresistible for so many Romans.

University of Bristol CATHARINE EDWARDS

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LITERATE EDUCATION

T. MORGAN: *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Pp. xv + 364, 2 maps, 24 tables. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-521-58466-3.

In this intelligently conceived and lucidly executed study, Teresa Morgan set herself to write a revisionary account of both the ideology and the practices of a central aspect of ancient education, based on close analysis of papyrus texts deriving from the schoolroom on the one hand and a careful re-reading of some key works of ancient educational literature (above all Quintilian's *Instituto*) on the other; the discussion is informed throughout by a keen interest in educational strategies and their (intended and actual) outcomes, and an equally keen awareness of the extra-educational interests in play. M. argues for both divergence and convergence between her two sets of data: convergence in overall ideology, and in the general style of exercises prescribed, divergence in the sophistication and thoroughness with which the exercises were pursued, and in the gains made by the pupil by the end of his period of education. On the evidence of the papyri (real remains of actual education), most pupils most of the time experienced only a fraction of the instruction and exercises catalogued in the élite texts, and reproduced in modern studies as the standard ancient 'curriculum', and left with a much less sophisticated set of competences; indeed, M.'s examination leads her to question the very notion of a curriculum, and to substitute that of a 'core' and a 'periphery' of exercises. At the same time, M. explores the role of literate education at both levels in creating social hierarchies, by allowing both the basic distinction between the literate few and the illiterate many, and the marking of degrees of cultivation within the élite; this exploration involves looking both at the overall thrust of the education received (or recommended by the theorists) and at the presumed effect of individual exercises. Seven chapters move from an overview of the development of ancient education and of the available data to a consideration of individual elements (learning to read and write, *gnomai*, the reading of poetry, formal grammar, basic rhetoric) and ideas about educational development. Fifty pages of tables at the end of the book classify and illustrate the papyrus data in various supplementary ways.

There is a good deal to admire and enjoy here, and the book as a whole, though not in any sense a full replacement for the old standard surveys of ancient education, is a valuable corrective commentary on them. M. is not alone in wanting to take a cool, suspicious look at what ancient schools really did, nor exactly a pioneer, but in the specific area she has chosen to examine, her discussion is intelligent and often original, and either raises or refines important questions. What it is not (in most cases) is tentative and reticent. M. is out for large and clear-cut conclusions, and pursues them with an ambition and a confidence that verge on impatience, and a heavy reliance on strong, simple models. She has a clear appreciation of the complexity of the case she has to argue and of the range of considerations that must come into play, but the very range of the resulting discussion—the number of plates that must be set spinning—stretches her, and opens the way to a whole range of potential disagreements and dissatisfactions.

Raffaella Cribiore, in her review in *BMCR* (99.5.22), has already entered some important qualifications about the use M. makes of the papyrus data, questioning both the very grudging criteria she uses to establish which the strictly scholastic documents are, and the assumptions she makes about the relationship between events

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and procedures in the classroom and their surviving written precipitate. These are admittedly tricky areas, and it is by no means clear who has them right; but a great deal of the value of the overall conclusions reached depends on the validity of the decisions made at this level. Equally discussible are many of the analyses M. offers of the effects on the pupil of individual exercises and forms of instruction, and the links drawn between them and the overall effect of education in producing individuals suited to a specific social status and role. The general idea that literate education began by disempowering the student, initially making him into a passive receptacle and only reconverting him into an active manipulator in the long run, is a plausible one; so too the suggestion that in its sub-élite version the process was normally not fully completed, thus leaving the student at 'middle-manager' level, disposed both to command the less and to defer to the more cultivated. But how far this can confidently be seen happening via surviving documents is more open to debate.

The last two chapters, on rhetoric and on ideas of the educational process, give the strongest sense of M. reaching the edge of her depth. While still intelligent both in detail and in general direction, they do not range widely enough and (disconcertingly, at this late stage in the discussion) contain some shaky Greek and Latin. In the latter, the philosophical background to the dominant images for educational development is largely ignored, promising observations about élite attitudes to the un(der)educated are dropped before they can be pursued through the imperial period authors (chiefly Plutarch and Dio) to whom they are most relevant, and the Latin verb *erudo* makes an unwelcome appearance. In the former, the ideas connecting rhetorical training with reason and virtue are thinly handled, Maud Gleason's discussion of declamation and training in voice and gesture in *Making Men* (Princeton, 1995) is passed over in silence, the relationship of individual exercises to the target of rhetorical education is imperfectly understood, Gorgias' *Helen* is identified as a speech in character, and there is a mistake or a large awkwardness in every substantial piece of translation from Greek.

This is a book that tries to do a great deal, and to some extent has not quite decided what it is most importantly about; even so, it sets a very promising agenda for further discussion.

King's College London M. B. TRAPP

HORTI

L. Farrar: *Ancient Roman Gardens*. Pp. xviii + 237, ills, 14 colour pls. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1998. ISBN: 00-7509-1725-3.

In the wider history of gardens and gardening, the Roman era emerges as one of the more neglected fields of study, despite its rich potential. Few modern authors have written exclusively on Roman gardens, with the exception of Grimal and Jashemski, and much of the relevant material remains scattered in volumes devoted to art history, sculpture, water supply, and houses, as well as in numerous archaeological reports. This volume seeks to redress this imbalance by providing what is claimed to be the first comprehensive account of such gardens from their humblest origins through to the ornate examples of the Empire. To achieve this the author draws on an extensive repertoire of source material, much of it inter-disciplinary in nature; in the process she shows herself equally at home with the literary and agricultural texts, the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

wealth of ancient frescoes and mosaics, and the diversity of the archaeological and environmental data.

For convenience the book is divided into a series of chapters, each devoted to a discrete topic. It begins with an historical overview of garden traditions in the East, in areas like Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Persia, and the extent to which these influenced Hellenistic gardens and, thereby, the Roman tradition in Italy and beyond. This forms the basis for a survey of the Roman garden from its earliest origins as a horticultural plot through to its elaboration as an ornamental feature of urban and rural housing by the imperial era. What becomes clear is that, irrespective of its different forms, the Roman *hortus* was an essential element of practically every type of property, large or small. Equally clear is the realization that the Romans were not simply the passive recipients of earlier traditions, but created their own innovative approaches to garden design, in line with the tastes and aspirations of their respective owners.

With the ubiquity and importance of the garden fully established, the book moves on to describe those features which contributed to the overall design and appearance. First to be discussed are the various architectural elements, including pergolas, garden furniture, aediculae, and belvederes, which the gardener could use to create an appropriate setting. This leads on to the importance of water as an integral element in garden design, in terms of ornamental pools, fountains, and fountain figures, not least with the increasing availability of a piped water supply. Last, but not least, attention is focused on the wealth of decorative sculpture, the creative use of which is one of the distinctive features of Roman gardens. Overall, a vivid picture emerges as to how the gardener sought to combine the different elements, natural and man-made, to create a rich garden landscape suited to each and every setting. This picture is reinforced by the numerous examples derived from the surviving remains in Italy and the provinces.

Much also depends upon what was actually grown in the garden. Relying on various sources of evidence, not least recent environmental research, the book describes the range of flora available to the gardener, in terms of their aesthetic and functional qualities. Attention also focuses on the fauna likely to have inhabited the ancient garden, many of them well-represented on ancient frescoes. This is followed by a review of the workforce, especially the role of the *topiarius* in the creation of pleasure gardens, and the available tools and techniques. A final chapter reminds us that gardens also existed outside the domestic context, in public parks, funerary gardens, and various inns and drinking establishments.

After much that is descriptive, the conclusion seeks to draw some of the principal threads together. In particular, it emphasizes the diversity of surviving gardens, each one dependent upon its historical context, the presence/absence of a water supply, and the predilections, tastes, and aspirations of the respective owners. It also recognizes the critical importance of more refined archaeological dating, as well as the potential for further environmental research. Moreover, it touches on the central role which gardens played within society, partly as an element of *rus in urbe* and partly as a status symbol, to be elaborated, enlarged, and adorned to maximum effect. What is perhaps missing, however, is a willingness to explore the implications of this, given recent research into contemporary house design, the use of space in public and private contexts, and wider social issues.

Overall, the volume provides a coherent, descriptive synthesis of the available evidence for *Ancient Roman Gardens*, which should be of interest to both a specialist and non-specialist readership. For the former there is much to reflect upon, while the extensive bibliography should provide a sound foundation for further research; for the latter, especially those interested in the wider history of gardening, it will fill a

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

significant gap in the literature. The principal frustration lies in the absence of any numbered sequence of illustrations, whether colour or black and white. This makes cross-referencing almost impossible, unless text and illustration are side by side, and irritates when searching further afield; such an omission seems slipshod. Some will find the system of footnotes equally frustrating, though the enhanced readability of the resulting text is a bonus. I was, however, surprised to find that the author omitted her own Ph.D. thesis from the bibliography, despite explicitly referring to it on p. 155 (n. 102)!

University of Wales, Lampeter BARRY C. BURNHAM

THE ROMAN FAMILY

B. Rawson, P. Weaver (edd.): *The Roman Family in Italy: Status, Sentiment, Space*. Pp. xvi + 378, ills. Canberra and Oxford: Humanities Research Centre, Clarendon Press, 1997. ISBN: 0-19-815052-0.

The fourteen papers collected here, the product of a conference at the Australian National University in 1994, treat mainly of family and kinship in what the editors call 'the sub-élite classes' (p. 2), and, unlike the proceedings of the two conferences on the Roman family held previously at Canberra (the first in 1981), also consider provincial society, at least in a few instances.

There is much that is both new and compelling. Students of the Roman family, and historians generally, will profit from reading Peter Garnsey's carefully nuanced account of the relation of slave and son in Christian theology ('Sons, Slaves and Christians', pp. 101–21), Werner Eck's wonderfully wide-ranging inquiry into senators' sense of place ('Rome and the Outside World: Senatorial Families and the World They Lived In', pp. 73–99), or Richard Saller's meticulous exposition of the language and practice of extended kinship ('Roman Kinship: Structure and Sentiment', pp. 7–34), which demolishes, one hopes once and for all, the tired, old, anthropological paradigm, according to which Roman society insisted on sharply differentiated rôles for paternal and maternal kin.

Other contributors' handling of the sources, and especially of the epigraphic and iconographic evidence, is sometimes less expert. It can hardly be agreed, for example, that Cato the Elder's characteristically self-satisfied pronouncement (Plutarch, *Cato maior* 20), that men who beat their wives and children harm their most precious possession, implies that such behaviour was 'standard' (Suzanne Dixon, 'Conflict in the Roman Family', p. 150). That the epithet *dulcissimus* was used more frequently to describe children and siblings than husbands or wives on epitaphs at Rome cannot be taken to indicate 'more restricted expectations and less closeness in the relationship between spouses than between blood relations' (Hanne Sigismund Nielsen, 'Interpreting Epithets in Roman Epitaphs', p. 191), because we know almost nothing at all about why commemorators chose one epithet over another (if indeed they were always the ones who did the choosing), or what meaning they intended it to convey.

In some ways the most ambitious essay is Paul Gallivan's and Peter Wilkins's attempt to determine the size and 'gender balance' of families in Italy in the period between about 31 B.C. and A.D. 305 ('Familial Structures in Roman Italy: A Regional Approach', pp. 239–79). Drawing on a wide range of mostly epigraphic material, including epitaphs and ex-voto inscriptions, they calculate, among other things, that a little over ninety per cent of the more than 4,000 parents who are attested are recorded

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with two or fewer children (p. 241). I suspect that what their data are actually describing are patterns of commemoration, not the size of families. For one thing, it cannot be assumed that parents routinely commemorated (or were commemorated by) all of their children, or that they will have recorded all of their other children when commemorating one of them. In any case, epitaphs tell us, as John Mann has put it, only about that part of the population that used stone inscriptions, and really, I would add, only about that part of the stone-using population which both could afford a permanent memorial and was thought, or considered itself, to deserve one. The authors claim also (p. 241) that families with one child were 'considerably more common' in 'the South' (Augustan regions II and III—Apulia, Calabria, Lucania, Bruttium), where seventy-nine per cent (813/1,028) of families are recorded with one child, than in 'the North' (regions IX and XI—Liguria, Transpadana), where sixty-seven per cent of parents (583/870) are attested with a single child. It might be supposed that the difference, which is really not so very large, is a consequence of regional variations in habits of commemoration, or of accidental variations in preservation or in the pattern of excavation. Much the same could be said of their finding, which they deem 'not altogether surprising' (p. 242), that families recorded with sons, but not daughters, outnumber those with only daughters by a margin of more than two to one.

Inadequacies of the historical record also impede Beryl Rawson's analysis of artistic representations of children and childhood in Italy from the period of the Late Republic to that of the Antonine emperors ('The Iconography of Roman Childhood', pp. 205–32). Her position appears to be twofold: that artists developed over time, in Janet Huskinson's words ('Iconography: Another Perspective', p. 233), 'a visible and sympathetically differentiated stage of childhood', and that children's visibility in art 'reflects an active consciousness and high valuation' of them in Roman society (p. 206). She argues, for example, that legal reform in the time of Hadrian and of the Antonines paid 'particular attention' to children's interests (p. 227), and that 'something of this atmosphere' is reflected in a second-century bust dedicated to a slave boy, now in the Getty Museum (85.AA.352). The problem is that there is no way, in the present state of the evidence, to connect an artefact like the bust of the slave boy to a specific set of historical circumstances, to demonstrate, in other words, that it could not have been executed at any time before the legal reforms of the second century.

Having taken issue with some of its conclusions, I want to emphasize that the book as a whole is both important and valuable, a significant contribution to the increasingly sophisticated body of scholarship that seeks to define the Roman family, and one from which I learned a great deal.

Montana State University, Bozeman DAVID CHERRY

AURIGAE

GERHARD HORSMANN: *Die Wagenlenker der römischen Kaiserzeit*. (Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei, 29.). Pp. vii + 339. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998. Paper, DM 96. ISBN: 3-515-07234-9.

This book is built around a prosopography of western charioteers from the first to the fourth century A.D. From this basis the author argues that the charioteers were almost all either slaves or freedmen. Slaves were trained and started racing in their

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

teens, and if successful might expect to be manumitted in their thirties. Sons might follow fathers in the profession. The calling of professional charioteer carried *infamia*. H. argues convincingly that the exclusion of *Dig*. 3.2.4 only applies to performers in the sacred games of the East. The discrimination between performers in 'sacred games' and others is justified in *Dip*. 3.2.4 on the grounds that participants in the 'sacred games' compete *virtutis gratia*, while those in others do so *quaestus causa*. This is very much like the distinction between gentlemen and players. Pliny *NH* 21.7 tells us that formerly masters, as well as slaves, used to compete in the chariot races. It follows that charioteers had not always been classified as followers of a dishonourable profession. H. suggests that it was the advantage given to competitors by professional training from an early age that made racing into a slave activity. He further argues that it was Augustus who branded it with *infamia*, in order to discourage upper-class Romans from displaying themselves in the public spectacles, and thus lowering the prestige of their rank in society. H. argues from *Dig*. 3.2.2.5 that the phrase *in scaenam prodire*, when it is used as a ground for the legal disabilities of *infamia*, refers not only to performance specifically on the stage of a theatre, but to any situation in which a person appears in public, *spectaculum sui praebiturus*. The legal disabilities incurred by *infamia* seem to have varied between different occupations designated as dishonourable, but in the case of performers included disqualification from entering the decurionate and holding local magistracies, and also deprivation of, for instance, the *ius accusandi*, the right to represent others in court, and the protection against magisterial *coercitio* afforded by *provocatio*. These deprivations would have meant nothing to slaves, who did not have these rights in any case. They might have mattered to some freedmen, but they were obviously of much greater importance to civic notables, knights, and senators. In this respect the disabilities incurred by performers as a result of their *infamia* resemble the penalties for childlessness laid down in the Augustan marriage laws. Roman literature shows that charioteers had a bad moral reputation to match their legal status. In particular they were said to be in the habit of employing magic to fix races, and subsequently for other criminal purposes. But during a race a famous charioteer would be cheered on by a huge fan-following, and in everyday life he would enjoy the adulation of men and especially women, drawn from all classes, often including the emperor himself. A charioteer might earn huge sums in prize money, though if he was a slave he would have to surrender much of this to his master. At his death he might receive a conspicuous monument inscribed with his victories, like a great public figure. The ambiguity of status of the successful charioteer and other public entertainers at Rome bears some resemblance to that of modern pop-stars, but it was heightened by the prevalence of slavery. A comparable combination of low social status with wealth and influence was enjoyed, if that is the right word, by imperial freedmen.

H.'s book is published in a series dedicated to the investigation of ancient slavery, and this concern gives direction to his study of the legal status and social position of charioteers. H. is therefore less concerned with tracing the changing organization of the games, the rôle of the factions, and their political significance, the themes of the two well-known books of Alan Cameron. He suggests that the position of the charioteer, or at least of some charioteers, in the Greek world was different in important respects from that in the West, but he has not attempted a full comparison. So it is not made clear how far the situation described by H. applies to the East, and to what extent the chariot races in the West shared in the developments discussed by C. Roueché in her *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias in the Roman and*

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Late Roman Periods (London, 1993), which is incidentally not mentioned in H.'s bibliography.

Nottingham W. LIEBESCHUETZ

PROCURATORES

C. SCHÄFER: *Spitzenmanagement in Republik und Kaiserzeit. Die Prokuratoren von Privatpersonen im Imperium Romanum vom 2. Jh. v.Chr. bis zum 3. Jh. n.Chr*. Pp. x + 287. St Katharinen: Scripta Mercaturae Verlag, 1998. Paper, DM 54. ISBN: 3-89590-063-X.

In this revision of his Regensburg thesis, Christoph Schäfer develops the suggestion of O. Behrends (*ZRG* 1971) that there were two basic types of private procurator recognized in Roman law of the classical period. One, a general procurator (*procurator omnium rerum*), acted solely to protect the interests of the *dominus*, who was absent outside Italy or engaged in public business, and possessed only restricted economic powers. The other procurator was specifically instructed (technically, acting under mandate—*mandatum*) and allowed greater freedom of agency in his business capacity. S. believes that the first type was instituted by legislation following the development of Roman imperium in the Mediterranean, while the second came about as a response to the increasing complexity of economic activity in the later Republic. While the capacities of the instructed procurator were extended by the recognition of guarantees from the agent and the possibility of the employer ratifying his agent's decisions after the fact (as documented in the *Digest*), the general procuratorship became obsolete in the imperial period.

Not all will be convinced that there was as strong a legal distinction between these two types as S. argues, but his investigation of the development of the powers of the procurator in the legal sources is useful. The dating of the establishment of the procuratorship at Rome is surely not advanced by the use of Valerius Maximus' anecdote about Regulus' concern for his family at the extension of his command in Africa (4.4.6) as evidence that in the mid-third century B.C. a general agent could not yet be appointed in one's absence. Nevertheless, from literary sources it appears that the use of such agents increased markedly in the late Republic. Cicero's works provide abundant evidence for both general agents and procurators acting under instruction. S. clearly shows that it was useful for those who were away from Italy to have high- status Romans acting on their behalf to offer general protection for their interests, and that those in the top echelons of society were very willing to undertake such duties. Given the political confusion of the late Republic, it is not surprising that this type of procuratorship is well-attested for this period. Here Cicero's friend Atticus figures prominently. But where long-term specialized economic activity was involved, particularly in agriculture and investment, freedmen from the *dominus*' household were more likely to be chosen, as both more familiar with the economic consequences of their actions and more directly answerable to their master. The evidence from the imperial period, mainly inscriptional material, suggests that it was this type of procuratorship which became dominant. S.'s study is particularly valuable in locating the origin of the imperial procuratorships (excluded from the thesis as already thoroughly investigated) in the activities of the agents of the enormously wealthy Roman households of the late Republic, both inside Italy and in the provinces.

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

While agents of servile background would retain their close bonds with their former masters, S. argues that they benefited from the high status associated with general procurators to raise their own position in society. There may be some truth in this, but it should be noted that the first literary evidence for the use of procurators (Plaut. *Pseud*. 608) suggests that not all agents were regarded as so reputable. Indeed, the lack of legal development of the general procuratorship could be explained by the reliance on *fides*, rather than legal action, in upper-class Roman society to iron out difficulties (cf. Atticus' belief that his actions on others' behalf affected his own *existimatio*: Nep. *Att*. 15.2).

There is much in this diligently researched and carefully argued study which will be suggestive to those interested in social and economic problems in the ancient world. S. himself begins with a quotation from Seneca (*Ep*. 14.18) that the man who takes too much interest in his own business affairs changes from a master into his own agent (*fit ex domino procurator*). Many would have wished to avoid the minutiae of personally involving themselves in daily management, and it was often physically impossible to supervise distant and separated land-holdings or investments overseas. In such cases procurators were essential. Whether this should be considered the sign of the development of a system of 'upper level management' as S.'s title might suggest is more questionable. It is perhaps the greatest service of S.'s study that it shows there was often a lack of clear lines of delegation. This arose both from the wish of some masters to intervene in their own affairs and from the legal difficulties which surrounded the capacities of agents. The Romans, never having completed courses in management studies, were required to adapt their own value systems, which regulated relations between social equals and those of different status. The use made of agents in their day-to-day business interests indicates how social values might transcend those of economic rationalism.

Victoria University of Wellington ARTHUR J. POMEROY

UNTHINKING MEN

L. Foxhall, J. Salmon (edd.): *Thinking Men. Masculinity and its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*. Pp. xi + 217, 14 pls. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. Cased, £55. ISBN: 0-415-14635-6.

A disappointment. Few of the papers have anything to do with the subject. The collection shows no awareness of the work done on masculinity in anthropology and other historical disciplines. 'Homosexual' and 'heterosexual' are tossed about with gay abandon. The publishers have placed a severe limitation on documentation, rendering the articles even less useful. The introduction fails to orient readers to the theoretical background or to provide a guide to the articles themselves. So:

Walters's 'Juvenal, *Satire* 2: Putting Male Sexual Deviants on Show' is the only reason to buy this ridiculously expensive book. In five pages he (together with Braund) sets out a theory of satire as *flagitatio* and *supplicium* that sets a highly productive agenda for the study of the genre.

Foxhall's 'Natural Sex: the Attribution of Sex and Gender to Plants' is interesting, but surprisingly ignores the Pythagorean table of opposites and Hippocrates in looking at the pairs of wild/domesticated, rough/smooth, dry/wet, dense/loose. Two

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

classic articles are germane: Ortner's 'Is Female to Male as Nature is to Culture?' (now in Sherry B. Ortner, *Making Gender: the Politics and Erotics of Gender* [Boston, 1996]) and Martin's 'The Egg and the Sperm' (now in Evelyn Fox Keller, Helen F. Longino (edd.), *Feminism and Science* [Oxford, 1996]).

Williamson ('Eros the Blacksmith') argues that Anacreon never shows 'any indication of control or domination on the part of the singer . . . when the beloved is a named individual' (p. 75), i.e. an aristocratic youth. This is a huge generalization to be made from five fragments totaling twenty-eight lines (by my count) and almost certainly false (cf. *PMG* 445). W. next argues that there is a division between poems with a fictive setting (which may contain a metaphor of domination) and those with a sympotic setting (which lack horse-taming, etc.). Again, I count only one *certain* example of a sympotic setting with any mention of a beloved (*PMG* 357). Further, could Anacreon not complain to his friends that he is not getting any without losing his masculinity (p. 79)?

Sommerstein provides a good overview of 'Rape and Young Manhood in Athenian Comedy', with valuable remarks on Aristophanes. Add G. Doblhofer, *Vergewaltigung in der Antike* (Stuttgart, 1994).

Clark offers brief observations on selected Church fathers. She discusses the 'unmaking of masculinity: that is, Christian asceticism' (p. 176), but underplays the continuity with pagan notions of manly self-control (no mention of Foucault) and ignores the *andreia* of martyrdom (to limit ourselves to Eusebius, cf. *HE* 1.4.7, 5 praef., and his portrait of Origen).

The remaining papers are inadequate where they are not inaccurate.

Fox launches an opaque attack on Winkler and Foucault, whom he largely misunderstands. There follows a reading of Prodicus' choice of Herakles as a 'libertarian' exhortation to 'free-will' (p. 19). He ends with a call to write Lacanian history. Like most Lacanians, he never cites Lacan.

Osborne suggests that 'both the private display of classical tombstones, and the public sculpture of the Athenian Parthenon, negotiate a new image of masculinity which emphasises collaborative virtues' (p. 41). The first is contradicted by numerous examples, the second is hardly surprising. More idiosyncratic interpretations abound. O. (following Taplin) argues that ancient Greek 'homosexuals' found Riace bronze B the hunkier on the basis of museum exit polls and pornographic comic strips. (I'm not making this up.) Apparently all 'homosexuals' at all times have been attracted by the same body type; the same goes for 'heterosexuals' (Betty Grable, Kate Moss?).

That grammatical gender does not tell us anything about sex rôles should be clear from *ψωλή* and *κύσθος*, *mentula* and *cunnus*. Stafford confuses personifications and abstractions, while ignoring obvious sources such as Hesiod.

Hawley's aim in 'The Male Body as Spectacle in Attic Drama' is 'to subject familiar material to new treatment', namely film criticism. This is not as new as he thinks (search the Diotima web site for 'gaze'). He seems uninformed by most of the important critics: Burston, Caughie, Evans, Gamman, de Lauretis, et al., not even citing Kaplan's 'Is the Gaze Male?'. He fails to say anything we did not know before about cross-dressing in *Lysistrata* or death in tragedy. H. acknowledges that most of his examples of 'spectacle' take place offstage. He shows no awareness until the final page that the women on stage were *men*.

Heap suggests unexceptionably that 'social history might help in our literary appreciation of [Menander's] social comedies' (p. 124) but reaches no conclusions.

Pierce addresses the topic in 'Ideals of Masculinity in New Comedy'. She delineates two models of manhood: youthful wastrel vs. married citizen, but reconstructs Greek

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ideals on the basis of Plautus and Terence, and misunderstands both ancient sexuality and the changing social role of the soldier. Her conclusion that 'the masculinity of men'—much the best idea—'in New Comedy revolved around women: impressing women, subduing women and keeping women' does not follow from her own evidence.

Harlow points out that Mariolaters still devalued women. She presents simplistic discussions of theories of conception, Roman law, and the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. She confuses virginity, chastity, and sexual renunciation. She also has never heard of Ortner and wishes to attribute the Pythagorean table of opposites to Hélène Cixous. Despite the impression given on p. 166, the New Testament was not written in Latin.

Rosslyn rehashes 'The Hero' in O'Neill, Miller, Strindberg, and Ibsen (hint: women are scary).

University of Cincinnati HOLT N. PARKER

POST-MINOAN CRETE

W. G. Cavanagh, M. Curtis (edd.): *Post-Minoan Crete. Proceedings of the First Colloquium on Post-Minoan Crete.* (British School at Athens Studies 2.) Pp. 134, 16 ills. Athens: British School at Athens, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 0-904887-29-4.

In the minds of many Crete conjures up images of palaces, bare-breasted priestesses, and wasp-waisted youths, popular icons of its rich Minoan culture. The history and archaeology of the island in the Post-Minoan periods is equally rich and deserving of scholarly attention, and has stimulated a large, if dispersed, scholarly literature. The volume under review contains sixteen of the twenty-four papers presented at a colloquium held at the Institute of Archaeology, University College London in November 1995, attended by an international group of seventy-three delegates. It goes some way to redressing the Bronze Age bias, although it represents a somewhat uneven coverage of the period's major issues.

Despite the fact that the volume deals with the post-Minoan period, the first nine contributions (nearly seventy pages) cluster in the early Iron Age (*c.* 1100–700 B.C.). The collection begins in east Crete. Whitley, in a paper on Eteocretan ethnicity that ultimately concludes that there is nothing in the material culture of the Praisos region that can be isolated as peculiarly 'Eteocretan', gives an overview of his regional studies project in the vicinity of Praisos. He suggests that Praisos' predecessor was a large 'refuge' site (Kalamafki *Kipia*) occupied from LM IIIB until *c.* 900 B.C. Three contributions have Kavousi *Kastro* on the Ierapetra isthmus as their focus. Coulson offers a brief overview of the site's occupation; Mook a detailed examination of the architecture of a small section of the site, the Northwest area or the 'False Peak'. (See now *Hesperia* 66 [1997], 315–90 for more details.) The third Kavousi paper, by Turner, presents a single object: a seventh-century B.C. lead ring pendant with a 'Daedalic' head from Building B.

Central Crete is represented by the key sites of Knossos, Ayia Triada, and Phaistos. Coldstream, in a summary of a contribution published elsewhere (*Praktika tis Akadimias Athinon* 71 [1996], B 236–62), examines the pattern of re-use of Minoan tombs by its ninth-century inhabitants and Moignard's witty paper explores the principles on which Orientalizing potters whose work is attested in the Knossos North Cemetery constructed both decoration and pots. (Both draw on the recent four-

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

volume publication: J. N. Coldstream, H. W. Catling [edd.], *Knossos North Cemetery. Early Greek Tombs* [London, 1996].) D'Agata reviews the results of her restudy of material excavated at the beginning of the century in the sanctuary at Ayia Triada (to appear in the *Annuario della scuola archeologica di Atene*). She isolates three phases of use: LM IIIC–Sub-Minoan, among the visible ruins of Minoan buildings; Protogeometric B–Early Orientalizing, perhaps ending as Gortyn and its cult of Athena came to dominate the region in the seventh century B.C.; and Hellenistic. Cucuzza reviews the evidence for settlement and burial in and around Phaistos from Sub-Minoan to *c*. 700 B.C. After the earliest reoccupation, in LM IIIC–Early Protogeometric on the 'acropoli mediana', settlement spread in all directions. He proposes ritual functions for two Geometric rooms west of the Minoan palace, functions that were superseded by the construction of the temple of Rhea at the end of the seventh century, an action that he would associate with the formation of the *polis* of Phaistos. Watrous's paper deals only with Temple A at Prinias. He argues that its sculpture, reflecting Egyptian, Near Eastern, and indigenous elements, precociously depicts characters from a myth associated with the temple: Artemis and the nine Kouretes, who, he believes, 'oversaw' a rite of passage for youths at the site.

The next seven papers span almost a millennium in forty-seven pages. Two broader contributions bracket a group of narrower ones on Hellenistic and Roman Crete. Moody, Nixon, Price, and Rackham (co-directors of the Sfakia survey), in a paper on the issues surrounding how regional studies projects should handle 'large sites', discuss four Archaic to Roman *poleis* in Southwest Crete (Tarrha, Araden, Anopolis, and Phoinix) and their territories as they are now understood thanks to the Sfakia project's research. In addition to providing specific information about the sites, they emphasize the fact that such sites can shift location, that their territories vary from period to period, and that it is important to provide evidence—comparable between projects—to assess their changing size and functions through time. Harrison ends the volume with an 'ordinary' overview of 700 years of Crete's Roman history.

Stefanakis, as part of his Ph.D. dissertation on Cretan coinages, proposes a location at the bay of Sises in west central Crete for the ephemeral fourth-century B.C. *polis* of Kytaion on the basis of three surviving coins resembling the coinage of Axos with 'K-Y' on their reverse. These coins, he suggests, represent an alliance coinage of the mid-fourth century B.C. Fortunately his identification of Kytaion with Sises does not require one to accept his further identification of Kytaion with the *ku-ta-to* attested among the Knossos Linear B tablets. Karafotias examines Cretan relations with Nabis of Sparta, outlining why *poleis* on Crete might have been of interest and identifying those most likely to have been pro-Nabis. Two papers on the Metellan conquest follow: de Souza proposes that the reasons for the conquest were more commercial than punitive, while Metenidis offers an explanation for the iconography of a limited group of Gortynian coins minted between 66 and 63 B.C. bearing a cult image of Artemis Ephesia on their reverses. This image, unique on Crete, he argues, functioned as a reminder of the large numbers killed twenty years earlier on orders issued by Mithridates from Ephesos. Paton returns us to Knossos, summarizing the evidence she has gathered from original excavation reports for the Villa Dionysus. In addition to clarifying its archaeological phasing, she questions Gough's interpretation of the Roman building as a cult site.

The papers are all in English, arranged chronologically, with English and Greek abstracts (pp. 8–16). For a group of short papers, the lack of an index is not crucial, but it is disappointing not to have a list of contributors and institutional affiliations. The book is tolerably well edited, although there are a few errors, including a cross-

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reference (p. 33 n. 6) to a paper by Nowicki delivered at the colloquium but not published in the volume. In gathering a group of papers relating to Crete after its Minoan 'heyday', the collection is of value, even if there is a bias towards the earlier periods. For Crete, a region for which literary-historical references are scarce prior to the Hellenistic period, the contributions accent the importance of archaeological data, but references to the island's rich epigraphical record are surprisingly rare and some key problems (such as the puzzling sixth-century B.C. 'gap' in the island's material culture) are not represented among the published versions. The fact that a second colloquium was held in 1998 in Crete gives some indication of the success of this first gathering.

Institute of Archaeology, University of Oxford JOHN BENNET

KNOSSOS POTTERY

J. A. MacGillivray: *Knossos: Pottery Groups of the Old Palace Period.* (BSA Studies Series 5.) Pp. 195, 46 ills, 156 pls. London: The British School at Athens, 1999. Cased, £49 (£40 to Individual Subscribers and Friends of the BSA). ISBN: 0-904887-32-4.

The aim of this volume is to re-examine Evans's pottery sequence at Protopalatial Knossos or, to use the author's words, '. . . to place the ceramics from the first major period of the palace's history in a relative and continuous sequence, based on their immediate archaeological context . . .' (p. 16).

Although this volume is not (and was not meant to be) a complete publication of all the Protopalatial ceramic deposits from Evans's excavations, many are effectively published here for the first time. Evans illustrated his Protopalatial phases using fewer than 100 vases and a few groups of sherds: MacGillivray has brought this number up to 1049. This in itself is no small achievement, especially considering the difficulties inherent in the study of material from old excavations.

Although the value of this volume largely lies in the publication of a substantial body of Knossian ceramics, it is much more than a mere pottery catalogue. The first chapter, 'Re-investigation of Archaeological Contexts', is a discussion of about forty Protopalatial deposits in the Palace area and surrounding town. This survey, though not exhaustive, is a mine of useful information on the history of Protopalatial Knossos, and the only detailed study of this topic that has appeared since Evans's *Palace of Minos.* The reconstructions of the archaeological contexts, however, are not always satisfactory. For example, M.'s revised version of Mackenzie's West Court section (p. 22 Fig. 1.4), in which a rich MM IB floor deposit at 1.75 m (the 'Early Chamber beneath the West Court') undercuts a supposedly MM IA structure at 1.50 m stratified, in turn, below an MM III house, is unconvincing. Later levels can cut into earlier ones, but a later floor deposit is unlikely to be stratified underneath an earlier wall. This anomaly prompted me to check the original excavation records, with the following results: M.'s reconstruction overlooks crucial stratigraphic observations made by Mackenzie (1904 'Day-book', pp. 32–5) and repeated by Evans in his preliminary report (*BSA* 10 [1903–4], pp. 14 n. 1 and 16 n. 2), such as the fact that the three walls forming M.'s MM IA 'Structure 2'—erroneously equated with 'House C'—are not contemporary and that the easternmost wall is related to a floor with polychrome pottery at 1.50 m, which Mackenzie assigned to MM II. In other words,

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mackenzie recorded the existence of two 'polychrome' floor levels, one with a rich ceramic deposit at 1.75 and the other at 1.50 (both originally dated to MM II, but the lower one later assigned to MM IB), and chose to illustrate only the higher one in his section because this, unlike the lower, though poor in ceramic finds, was associated with architectural features. Thus, Mackenzie's original records provide excellent evidence for an MM IB, MM II, and MM III sequence, but not for M.'s odd reconstruction.

Of the forty deposits discussed in the first chapter, M. selected sixteen (groups A–P) to form the basis of his second chapter, 'Pottery Fabrics, Wares and Styles', which, as the title suggests, is a discussion of the most common fabrics (clay pastes), wares (defined as techniques of manufacture and decoration), and styles (defined as content of designs or repeated use of similar motifs), also providing a most useful typology of forms commonly found in Knossian deposits. One should remember, however, that within this smaller group of deposits some have not been thoroughly studied and illustrated (e.g. groups I, M, N), and that the pottery presented in this volume is a selection of Evans's and Mackenzie's selection.

The third and last chapter, 'Historical Implications', begins with a discussion of the main 'events' in the palace at Knossos as attested by the deposits previously discussed: the foundation of the Old Palace at the beginning of MM IB; an 'event' of unclear nature at the end of MM IB; a burnt destruction at the end of MM IIA; and a seismic destruction at the end of MM IIB—the latter taken as a convenient landmark for the end of the Old Palace, with MM IIIA marking the beginning of the New Palace period. This is followed by an attempt to correlate Protopalatial Knossian ceramic phases with deposits from other sites in central Crete, such as Juktas, Archanes, and, of course, Phaistos. The chapter concludes with a useful reappraisal of Minoica in Egypt and the Levant, and of the absolute chronology for the Protopalatial period, but one might question M.'s rigid linkage of Minoan ceramic phases '. . . to specific Egyptian reigns where possible . . . because . . . significant changes in the rule of the most powerful state in the region must have had some effect on neighbouring states' (p. 106). This non-parochial view of Minoan developments has, undoubtedly, many merits, but one could almost gain the impression that changes in Minoan ceramic styles are closely linked to the rise of Egyptian Pharaohs—which they were certainly not!

The three chapters are followed by seven appendices, including a catalogue of the 1049 vases and sherds selected to illustrate the ceramic phases of Protopalatial Knossos, and various museum lists and concordances.

There are some minor errors in the text and captions (e.g. Pls 23 and 24 have been swapped; the caption of Pl. 102 reads 'Group F' but vases 674 and 675 are from Group G; at p. 37 the reference should be to Pls 111–17, not 121–7, and the quality of the photographic plates (which is due to the system of reproduction employed by the publisher, not to the original prints) is disappointing.

In spite of some inaccuracies and other shortcomings, M.'s volume offers a sound reappraisal and definition of the ceramic sequence at Protopalatial Knossos in its wider context: it is a most valuable and timely contribution to the long-overdue publication of Evans's excavations at Knossos, and to the study of a crucial period in Aegean Prehistory.

University of Bristol NICOLETTA MOMIGLIANO

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

THE DORIAN INVASION

B. EDER: *Argolis Lakonien Messenien. Vom Ende der mykenischen Palastzeit bis zur Einwanderung der Dorier*. Pp. 236, 25 ills. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 3-70001-2736-7.

This study examines the transition to the Early Iron Age in the Argolid, Laconia, and Messenia. Chronologically, it covers the Late Helladic IIIC, Submycenaean, and Protogeometric periods. The main aim of the book is to examine the archaeological evidence and the written sources in order to shed light on a hotly debated problem of Greek history: the Dorian invasion.

The book opens with a useful introduction which presents the state of the debate. The evidence for each region, both archaeological and written, is presented in a separate chapter. The archaeological discussion starts with some general observations on the settlement pattern and continues with a detailed discussion of each site.

The conclusion reached in this study is that a major discontinuity occurred after the end of LH IIIC. The main indications in the archaeological record are: changes in the density and pattern of habitation, i.e. a general depopulation and a shift in settlement occupation with earlier habitation areas used for burial; changes in mortuary practices, namely the adoption of single burials in cists; and changes in material culture, mainly the use of handmade wares. From the linguistic point of view, a change from Mycenaean Greek to a Doric dialect can be inferred in all three regions. The conclusion reached by Eder is that the archaeological and linguistic changes should be attributed to the arrival of Doric-speaking pastoralists, who either invaded or infiltrated the southern mainland after the gradual disintegration of the Mycenaean system.

The study provides a very clear historical synthesis of a complex and still imperfectly understood period. But the question is whether the evidence does support a neat break. To start with, the rate of depopulation and abandonment differs between regions, and even between sites in the same region. Already during LH IIIC, but primarily during the Submycenaean period, different destruction and abandonment horizons can be observed. Moreover, the practice of burying in abandoned houses is seen only in the Argolid (*already* in LH IIIC, e.g. in the Cyclopean Terrace House in Mycenae, and in the Tiryns Unterburg), a region where intramural burial was practised throughout the Mycenaean period.

Secondly, the change in burial customs can be said to be more gradual and spatially uneven than presented in the study. Single burial in cists and pits persists throughout the Mycenaean period, even in some central regions (e.g. in the Argolid in the Deiras and Kokla) and certainly in some more peripheral areas (e.g. Thessaly). In Messenia cists are not used in the Mycenaean period nor in the early Iron Age, while small rudimentary tholoi containing several burials are still built in the PG period. Cists are not found in Laconia either. It is therefore impossible to identify a new population element on the basis of this one grave type. The change to single burials in cists should be considered as one among several regressive features, such as the use of tumuli (e.g. Khania, Kafkani), pithos burials (Mycenae, Nichoria), horseshoe-shaped graves (Nichoria), and intramural burials (Lefkandi), which appear at different times in different regions.

The changes in material culture can also be said to be gradual. As E. herself points out, Handmade Burnished wares are sometimes associated with the 'new' elements,

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but they are found already in late LH IIIB and throughout LH IIIC. The continuity in wheel-made pottery is noticed, and attributed to the partial persistence of a local population alongside the new arrivals. But this begs the question: can we really equate pots with ethnic groups?

The evidence discussed under written sources consists of a rather more eclectic mix, including topographic references in the Homeric epics and later legends, the origins of cults of the historical period, etc. It is questionable, however, whether we can use later myths, legends, or cults to make secure inferences about the prehistoric period. E. points out that the historical sources on the Messenian past are not reliable, as Messenian history was rewritten in the light of Spartan territorial claims or Messenian resistance. But this holds for all historical sources, which were often formulated with contemporary concerns in mind.

At the end, some underlying methodological and interpretive problems are not discussed: how should we integrate linguistic and archaeological data? How do we recognize migrations and invasions in the archaeological record? Is there a neat correspondence between language, material culture, mortuary practices, and ethnic identity? These questions are now at the centre of archaeological debates which we cannot afford to ignore.

This is a brave attempt to shed some light on the Dark Ages, but the evidence still refuses to fit a neat explanation. The linguistic change from Mycenaean Greek to Doric is indisputable, but the archaeological evidence shows the changes to be much more diffuse, gradual, and spatially uneven than they are made out to be in this study. There is no question that we are dealing with a fluid and unstable situation and with movements of population, perhaps from the fringes of the Mycenaean world. The question is whether we should still be thinking of a monolithic Dorian invasion that happened in all regions at the same time and had the same effects everywhere.

Faculty of Classics, University of Cambridge SOFIA VOUTSAKI

GREEK GOLD

D. WILLIAMS (ed.): *The Art of the Greek Goldsmith.* Pp. 160, 20 ills. London: British Museum Press, 1998. Paper, £35. ISBN: 0-7141-2211-4.

The British Museum exhibition *Greek Gold: Jewellery of the Classical World* (1994) was a spectacular reminder of the real wealth of the ancient world. The high level of craftsmanship, and indeed the bullion value, made a powerful statement about luxury. A single gold earring from Kul Oba, weighing 22.35 g (*Greek Gold* no. 89) and worth the equivalent of just under three darics, puts even the finest Athenian red-figure pots—which cost obols—into their proper place (see M. Vickers and D. Gill, *Artful Crafts: Ancient Greek Silverware and Pottery* [Oxford, 1994]). This volume contains twenty-one papers from the related colloquium covering six different areas: Surveys and Historical Aspects; New and Old Finds; Typology; Goldsmiths and Workshops; Technology; and Conservation.

Some of the most significant papers are from those discussing craft and technology of jewellery. Jack Ogden, an accomplished goldsmith and co-organizer of the exhibition, makes the important observation that gold fibulae from the Greek Early Iron Age do not have 'clear links' with the East (p. 15). Granulation, although absent from Egypt at this time (Third Intermediate Period), may have come from the eastern

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mediterranean. A pendant from Lefkandi (Fig. 2.1) is linked to material from Ebla and Dilbat, emphasizing a Syrian connection. Jewellery analysed for the exhibition showed that ancient goldwork could range 'from pure gold to 51.7% gold' (p. 137).

The pursuit of the artist has appealed to Dyfri Williams in his paper on 'Identifying Greek Jewellers and Goldsmiths'. His discussion of the gold from Kul Oba and Great Bliznitza reflects the methodology of Beazleyism: 'I now suspect that these two master jewellers were teacher and pupil, perhaps even one might guess, father and son' (p. 103). Attributions to anonymous metalsmiths are now beginning to emerge (e.g. the 'Chertomlyk Master': p. 104 n. 28), and it is perhaps unfortunate that a limited range of questions about crafts(wo)men is forming the research agenda for this important aspect of material culture.

Archaeological ethics are the subject of the paper by M. Pfrommer. It is perhaps instructive to realise that 'almost all the Herakles knots from important regions such as Greece, Italy or Ptolemaic Egypt reached our collections only by way of the art market' (p. 79). Although he may have grasped the material consequences of looting which destroys archaeological contexts, he has failed to grasp the more important intellectual implications of discussing jewellery—and for that matter other antiquities which are devoid of context. It is perhaps important to note that the Lydian jewellery, the subject of a paper by J. Öztürk, was looted from tombs and acquired by a museum which remains unnamed in the text; for a helpful discussion of the case, see L. M. Kaye and C. T. Main, in K. W. Tubb (ed.): *Antiquities Trade or Betrayed: Legal, Ethical and Conservation Issues* (London, 1995). W. Rudolph even suggests new language to define the reliability of the provenance of such material (p. 109 n. 10); however, his framework is too simplistic to be useful, as it fails to take in the nuances of 'allegedly', 'said to be' (e.g. p. 108, no. 21), 'perhaps' or just a general affinity with a site or region. The use of connoisseurship to try and guess where the looters had dug up these treasures is highlighted in a paper by A. Oliver which discusses jewellery from the Shelby White and Leon Levy collection (D. von Bothmer [ed.], *Glories of the Past: Ancient Art from the Shelby White and Leon Levy Collection* [New York, 1990], no. 141). Oliver reveals how this material arrived in the hands of these collectors: 'this set of jewellery . . . was first brought to my attention by a dealer in the spring of 1975 together with a mass of broken glass, all in a cardboard box' (p. 89). A former director of the British Museum, David Wilson (*The British Museum: Purpose and Politics* [1989], 34), showed the damage caused to British archaeological heritage through the looting of the Icklingham bronzes, which passed through the market to a North American private collection. It is ironic that Shelby White and Leon Levy are found acceptable by a department of the same museum as financial backers of this particular project on Greek jewellery (p. 7). No doubt the acceptance of such patronage will mute voices in the debate about the impact of looting.

There is clearly scope for further research in the area of Greek gold and in particular jewellery. Stella G. Miller-Collet draws attention to the untapped resources available through the study of figure-decorated Athenian pottery as well as archaic sculpture (pp. 22, 26–7). I. Touratsoglou provides a helpful chronological framework for Macedonian jewellery (pp. 32–3), though more work needs to be done on the range of material from excavated archaeological contexts. The issue of patronage is touched on by W. Rudolph for material associated with Ephesos (pp. 105–9). No doubt the positivist fallacy will be used to argue that the distribution pattern of surviving jewellery reflects the range of use. Yet it is clear that jewellery was produced in locations where jewellery itself is a rare find, as is hinted at the discovery of a late classical Greek jewellery mould from Euesperides in Cyrenaica (M. Treister and

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

M. Vickers, *Colloquia Pontica* 1 [1996], 135–41). Members of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities of the British Museum should be congratulated on a stimulating volume which will put precious metal in the spotlight of Greek archaeological research and restore it to its rightful place in the scale of ancient values.

University of Wales Swansea DAVID W. J. GILL

METAPONTUM

J. C. Carter (ed.): *The Chora of Metaponto: The Necropoleis, Vols I & II.* Pp. 495 (Vol. I), 414 (Vol. II), 875 figs, 675 b & w ills, 10 maps, 100 tables. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998. Cased, $125. ISBN: 0-292-71211-1.

This book represents a significant event in the archaeology of Southern Italy. With it, we glimpse the future of funerary studies in the region. It is a distant future, perhaps. Not everyone will have access to the resources which C. has used to produce this series of studies, particularly in the hard-pressed Superintendencies with their many rescue excavations. But a new standard has been set for Mediterranean archae- ology. The generosity towards foreign archaeologists which distinguishes Italy from some of its neighbours has paid a rich dividend in Basilicata (and more is to come).

The main subject of the book is the Pantanello necropolis, just over 3 km from the Achaean colony of Metaponto. The 359 burials date between *c*. 580 and 280 B.C. (or later), and their arrangement around a crossroads proves that the features identified by aerial photography since the 1950s have been correctly interpreted as division lines in the *chora* of Metaponto. The main road leading back from the colony was in place by the early sixth century; the crossroad (at 10° off the perpendicular) cannot be certainly dated before *c*. 470 B.C., but is very probably earlier.

The description of the burials is scrupulous. A short appendix (p. 475) discusses the advantages and disadvantages of the book having been produced 'in-house'. For the reader, it would appear to have been a significant advantage, since the descriptive part of the book, just over 200 pages, is a model of clarity in which text, plans, and photographs are combined efficiently, and at appropriate scales. Much of the second volume is taken up with specialist studies on the various classes of grave-goods (figured pottery, metal objects, terracotta figurines, etc.). The quality of the documentation is uniformly high. Archaeometric techniques are applied as appropriate, such as the petrographic analyses of the storage amphorae which marked a number of the burials. Some classes of material, like the banded and dipped pottery and the alabastra, have scarcely been studied before, so here the basic typologies and other observations are particularly welcome.

A long chapter by Jon Hall attempts to synthesize this information to produce a general account of burial practices in the territory of Metaponto. The value of this section is enhanced by the fact that the cemetery was almost intact when discovered, and excavated in something approaching its entirety. This does not, of course, necessarily equate to the recovery of a complete sample of those living nearby over the course of 300 years; the fact that females outnumber males by a ratio of about 2:1 leaves one in little doubt about that. Factors such as age, gender, status, family organization, eschatology, and even personality are considered by H. The discussion draws heavily on the sections on human remains, which are what most clearly set the

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

book apart from other worthy publications of necropoleis in Southern Italy (e.g. *Porentum I* and *II* [Venosa, 1988, 1991]). Sex, age at death, and stature were estimated, where possible; the bones were not always in good condition. Attempts were made to check the proposed family grouping of burials (proposed on the basis of their arrangement on the ground) by studies of teeth and stature. I am in no position to comment on the details of this method, nor of those used to identify blood groups and pathologies. The presence of malaria is perhaps not surprising, given what we know of the environmental changes in the territory of Metaponto in the Archaic and Classical periods, but it is useful to have it (apparently) confirmed. The presence of a form of syphilis is rather more eye-catching, particularly to those of us who had previously associated its arrival in the Old World with the date A.D. 1492. One might be sceptical about the identification of the disease based on the bones, since this is not an exact science (especially when dealing with old, often weathered bone) and a number of other diseases can produce some of the observed transformations. Treponemal antigens were not identified (Appendix 11A.5). The debate about the antiquity of syphilis in the Old World is briefly discussed on pp. 532–3. If the disease is correctly identified at Pantanello, it was apparently endemic in the population. The possibility that Greek colonists introduced diseases to Southern Italy has some potentially important implications. Without the proper study of an indigenous necropolis which spans the period of the arrival of Greek colonists no conclusions are possible, and the isolation of Southern Italy in the early first millennium B.C. can hardly be compared with that of the New World at the appearance of Europeans.

All this prepares the way for C.'s important synthetic chapter, 'Historical Development' (pp. 167–263). It is refreshing to read a study of burial remains in the Classical world where the search for the origins of a known historical development (the rise of the *polis*, the appearance of the *gens*, etc.) does not weigh too heavily on the discussion. This lack of an agenda, perhaps, is what allows C. to be more than usually candid about his methods and aims; what 'worked' and what is speculative is clearly flagged. This book will inevitably form the starting point for many new studies on aspects of the archaeology of Southern Italy, since for once the context of objects, pictures, burial rites (and so on) has been fully presented.

All this whets the appetite for a final publication of some of the farmhouses, sanctuaries, and factories which C. has excavated nearby. One also looks forward to a definitive publication of the survey data, which has come out in dribs and drabs as the project has developed. I sometimes wonder how seriously to take the neat graphs and distribution maps produced by surveyors on the basis of battered surface fragments, rarely described or illustrated in detail. How precisely are the ceramic sequences (in particular) really known? With the experience of extensive cemetery and settlement sequences in the region behind him, C. will be able to set many of these doubts aside. On the evidence of this volume, no chronological or methodological stone will be left unturned. The fruits of this long-term, multidisciplinary project will continue to appear, and to inspire, for some time.

University of Sydney E. G. D. ROBINSON

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

THE EUXINE SEA

J. M. Fossey (ed.): *Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Archaeology and History of the Black Sea (McGill University, 22–23 November 1994)*. Pp. xi + 167, ills, 16 pls. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1997. Paper, Hfl. 145. ISBN: 90-5063-478-8.

G. R. Tsetskhladze (ed.): *The Greek Colonisation of the Black Sea Area. Historical Interpretation of Archaeology*. (*Historia* Einzelschrift 121.) Pp. 336. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998. Paper, DM 148. ISBN: 3-515-07302-7.

To most students of Classical antiquity the Black Sea is a pretty remote place. Is this the fault of dull modern authors or has it something to do with the subject itself? Scholarly convention dictates that at this point some reference be made to the fact that much of the literature is to be found in inaccessible periodicals and written in obscure languages, to say nothing of the obstacles placed on scholarship by political regimes inimical to western institutions. . . . These hurdles have not yet been entirely swept away. However, a great deal of progress has been achieved, thanks largely to a small group of dedicated individuals who have made it their business to plead, persuade, and cajole potential contributors and sponsors to create new monograph series and new journals which would present the enormous backlog of unpublished data as well as new findings in an attractive, accessible manner to western Europeans/north Americans/English speakers in general. Two of the contributors to T., Professor Sir John Boardman and Gocha Tseteskhladze (who also contributes to the volume edited by F.) have been in the forefront of this missionary activity. The *Historia* monograph is a worthy tribute to their efforts.

It is a humdinger of a book. Scholars in search of a serious, wide-ranging, well referenced, and very well researched source on Greek Black Sea colonies need look no further. An introductory essay, by T. (pp. 9–68), the longest in the book, sets the scene and explores many fundamental issues. Although readers may choose to disagree with interpretations of individual sites and topics, the breadth of his coverage will make this paper a primary tool for anyone considering the area as a whole. There are useful surveys of the western coast settlements (M. Lazarov, pp. 85–95), the Megarian offshoots in the same direction, including Tauric Chersonesus (J. Hind, pp. 131–52; and cf. S. Y. Saprikin, pp. 227–48), Berezan (S. Solovyov, whose monograph *Ancient Berezan. The Architecture, History and Culture of the First Greek Colony in the Northern Black Sea* [Leiden, 1999] has just appeared in print), the sites either side of the Cimmerian Bosporus (G. A. Koshelenko and V. D. Kuznetsov, pp. 249–63), and Sinope (A. Ivantchik, pp. 297–330). Three contributions (A. Fol on the cult of Sabazios, M. Vassileva on perceptions of Pontic geography, and D. Asheri on the rhetorical topos 'the Achaeans and Heniochi', pp. 265–85) explore more abstract themes which nevertheless raise the important issue of self-perception. K. Panayotova provides the best up-to-date survey of post-war excavations at Apollonia (pp. 97–113), and A. Avram explores, with exemplary clarity, the beginnings of colonial negotiation with Roman authorities through a set of first-century B.C. inscriptions at Kallatis (pp. 115–29).

The low-key format of Franz Steiner, with the plain, bichrome cover characteristic of this series, denuded of any visual impact, hugely undersells the importance of many individual contributions and of the volume as a whole. The forty-four figures are

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

almost lost in the closely typed text and yards of footnotes. The quality of the photographs is high, particularly those illustrating Michael Treister's brief study of zoomorphic motifs on the northern Black Sea littoral, which reveal Ephesian and perhaps Lydian, as well as the expected Milesian connections (pp. 179–99). No one writes about Pontic toreutics as well as Treister. Equally, no one can match Yurij Vinogradov's knowledge of Black Sea epigraphy, palaeography, and syntax. His contribution presents four new inscribed lead tablets from Berezan, Olbia, Phanagoria, and Zhivakov hill on the Gulf of Odessa, with a new (and persuasive) interpretation of the similar tablet from Pech Maho, Aude, in southern France. V. wants us to believe that commercial–financial transactions conducted at remote locations and reflected in such documents were as complex as the activities 'more familiar to us from the Demosthenic corpus' (pp. 153–70, citation p.170). On-going debates about (the) ancient econom(y)ies need to put material like this at the centre of discussion.

I feel less certain about the historical models which Vinogradov has made his own. Primarily a philologist, he writes with great confidence on historical and archaeological topics. Western readers may be slightly perplexed by the polemic between ancient historians and archaeologists alluded to by a number of contributors (pp. 9, 21, 69, 85, 205, 235–6) and at times quite personal in tone (p. 153). The reasons for such differences of view surely deserve more attention. John Boardman alone takes the ambiguity of views as his starting point ('Olbia and Berezan: the Early Pottery', pp. 201–4) and states clearly what these issues are. Koshelenko and Kuznetsov adopt a more radical approach than other contributors by examining the context in which Greek colonists found themselves, then proceeding to assess critically the nature of the evidence before turning to written sources. D. Braund recognizes the crucial difficulty of using 'foundation stories' as though they were history (pp. 287–96).

This is the nub of the 'colonization' problem and was wittily encapsulated by N. Purcell: 'an archaeology of a suspect concept constructed out of an outdated synthesis of texts which are now quite differently interpreted is the shadow of a phantom of a chimaera . . . the . . . irony is that the . . . essays prove beyond any doubt that what archaeology illuminates so strikingly . . . is immeasurably more complex and more fascinating that "Greek colonization"!' (review of G. Tsetskhladze and F. de Angelis, *The Archaeology of Greek Colonization: Essays Dedicated to Sir John Boardman* [Oxford, 1994], *Antiquity* 71/272 [1997], 501). The question which badly needs to be addressed is, what is the phenomenon we are observing? The framework within which research proceeds in future will need to be much more broadly drawn.

T.'s book is nevertheless extremely successful because it provides the considered views, distilled over many years, of a large number of heavyweight experts. Western scholars will not find it easy to join this charmed circle. Just how difficult this can be is reflected in the McGill University Black Sea Archaeology Project, whose preliminary findings are published by F. This is still a very young project, initiated only in the early 1990s, and its early fortunes need not necessarily reflect how things might develop in future. Its Bulgarian branch lacked wider acquaintance with individual working members of the Institute of Archaeology in Sofia, and fieldwork was less successful than anticipated following the sudden death of Prof. V. Velkov, at that time Director of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences as well as Director of the Institute of Archaeology, Sofia (see G. Gauvin's survey of the Strandja region, pp. 67–79, and F.'s note, pp. 29–31). Its Georgian branch, working since 1988 at three sites, Atskouri, Tsnisi, and Mzetamze in the central Samtskhe region west of Tbilisi, has also had its difficulties (J. Morin, pp. 155–67). The principal objective of studying 'the Greek presence along the coast . . . (of) identifying and quantifying the presence of elements

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Greek influence' (p. 155) had disappointing results from the initial excavations at Atskouri in 1988 and 1993, while the burials at Mzetamze are rather earlier (seventh century B.C.) than the target period and no settlement has yet been located at Tsnisi alongside chance finds of graves. The Georgian archaeologists V. Licheli (on Phrygian *fibulae* in the Caucasus, pp. 33–43; on a preliminary survey of sites in the Samsun region, pp. 109–19; and on black glazed pottery distributions, pp. 147–53), G. Tsetskhladze (on how the Greeks adapted to life in Colchis, pp. 121–36; see now T.'s *Die Griechen in der Kolchis (historisch-archäologischer Abriss)* [Amsterdam, 1998]), and D. Kacharava (on Graeco-Colchian trade connections, pp. 137–46) provide the bulk of the contributions. There are additional papers by K. Tuite on the semiotics of Caucasian myths (pp. 11–28), S. Krebs on Greeks in the Dobrudja (pp. 47–65), R. Doneva on toponymy in eastern Rhodope (pp. 81–93), and L. Kamperidis on Greek appointments to senior administrative posts under the Ottoman Turks (pp. 95–106), which provide material deserving further consideration.

The Georgian contributions to the second volume under review re-emphasize the fact that the topographical, geological, ecological, and social situations on the various coasts of the Black Sea were all profoundly different. These differences continued to play a major rôle in the life of local communities, whatever their origin. At the same time, the Sea itself has been underestimated as an agent of change. Pontic specialists have not considered the possibility that what made interaction both possible and significant in the long term (something which writers were less aware of) was the opportunity to move people and objects from one region to another rather than the setting down of new ideas or institutions. If the idea of 'Greek colonization' is now seen to be something other than a 'movement', if it is, as Purcell suggests, a suspect concept, then some other scheme or, more likely, schemes, need to be put in its place.

Both these books provide plenty of material on which a new model or models can arise.

University of Liverpool ZOFIA HALINA ARCHIBALD

NEW VIEW

R. OSBORNE: *Archaic and Classical Greek Art* (Oxford History of Art). Pp. vii + 270, maps, 142 ills. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. Cased, £30 (Paper, £9.99). ISBN: 0-19-284264-1 (0-19-284202-1 pbk).

The ambitious new series 'Oxford History of Art' promises to run to sixty-eight volumes with up-to-date introductions to art history written by leading experts, and to look at the subject 'from a fresh perspective'. Osborne's volume is among the first dozen to appear and covers roughly 500 years (800–300 B.C.). Over the past decade or so the emphasis in the academic study of Greek art has become more determinedly sociological. Consequently, what O. sets out to do in this introductory volume is to place the history of archaic and classical Greek art firmly in the context of the society that produced it. However, in taking the reader from Geometric to Late Classical, O. has not jettisoned the more traditional approaches altogether. In fact, the book has a curiously conservative feel to it in many parts, e.g. emotive responses to specific works, acceptance of the existence and output of individual vase-painters.

The chapters, whilst set on an historical course, are shaped to avoid the traditional

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

divisions, and O. is always careful to set the artefacts in the context of their creation (e.g. political developments, status, social strains) and purpose (e.g. dedications in a sanctuary, depositions in a tomb), drawing general conclusions from the small selection of pieces on which he has wisely chosen to concentrate. For instance, he emphasizes how the individual monsters of the archaic period give way to 'the monstrous hordes of Giants, Centaurs and Amazons' in the classical. To demonstrate how myths took over subject-matter and how the viewer (a favourite figure in modern art historical writings) is drawn into the action of stories that concerned a world beyond human control, O. devotes Chapter IV to looking at four big seventh-century vases: the Mykonos relief pithos, the Polyphemos amphora from Eleusis, the Cycladic amphora with the Hyperborean Maidens (?), and the Nessos amphora. Chapter V brings large-scale sculpture into view, and O. explores the emotive effect that the construction of temples and the provision of cult statues, and architectural sculpture and painting, created. A return to vase-painting in the following chapter involves O. in some descriptive prose in the traditional manner, but is also concerned with such non-aesthetic matters as packaging and markets, the increase in literacy, the self-advertisement of potters and painters, and the search for foreign buyers. One of the main innovative changes that has been affecting the study of Greek art has been the transfer of interest from the makers to the commissioners and purchasers of the items, and this involves a consideration of politics in a wide sense. So the following chapter deals with individual sculptural works that can be fairly said to have had specific political implications: the temples at Selinus, the Siphnian and Athenian treasuries at Delphi, and the temple of Aphaia on Aigina. This leads to 'politics' in a personal context, and scenes of the élite at the symposium and gymnasium are considered in the period that sees the change of technique at Athens from black-figure to red-figure. O. lays this change not at the door of 'technical restlessness' but as a consequence of new iconography and the markets.

The classical period has O. concerned with the body (the Riace bronzes, the Motya youth) and with the differences between the early classical sculptures of the Zeus temple at Olympia and the idealizing decoration of the Parthenon under the totalitarian empire of Athens. The later fifth century returns us to the cemetery with its white-ground lekythoi and their innovation in technique and iconography, with the same imagery for rich and poor alike, and its carved funerary stelai with their emphasis on domestic subjects and on women. The influence that Athenian style and workmanship had on the fourth century is highlighted by a consideration of sculptures from various sanctuaries and by focusing on the entry of the big men (Mausolos of Halikarnassos and Philip of Macedon) and the rise of portraiture. The fourth century explored action and passion in a different way from the fifth, and it is in the fourth century that O. sees individual craftsmen undergoing a change from wonder-maker to 'the sensational artist of the modern world'.

Here follow some particular comments and corrections. P. 46, Fig. 20: O. describes Boston 95.11 in his text but illustrates Boston 95.10. P. 46: 'below. p. 16' should read 'below, pp. 47–51'. P. 60: I find the comment that the merging of the stake held by Odysseus and his companions with the frame of the picture as 'the threat to pull the picture off the pot and end all sight of the scene' far too clever a notion. P. 63, Fig. 27: I fail to see the 'extraneous head' among the horses. P. 68, detail of Fig. 110: the image is printed in reverse and is hardly apposite in its location. P. 71: O. finds the subtleties of painting on the Thermon metopes 'considerably in excess' of the painted pots; I am not persuaded. P. 75: I know of no evidence that places a gorgon between lions on the mid-sixth century temple on the Athenian Acropolis. P. 107: I do not see how the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'power of Exekias' image' of Achilles and Ajax dicing is likely to have led to the making of a sculptural group. P. 121, Fig. 60: I think there is no evidence for setting a frontal chariot scene in the middle of the west pediment of the Siphnian treasury. P. 134: The suggestion that the absence of feet on the interior figures of the Bomford cup is intended to draw attention to the male member as the foot of the actual cup is too recherché. P. 136: I do not understand why bulging calves and frontal faces are said not to work in painting. P. 146: Must we assume that the Ganymede holding a cockerel and pursued by Zeus must have had a previous admirer? The bird simply identifies him as Zeus' catamite. P. 174, Fig. 100: The Lapith woman illustrated from the west pediment of the Zeus temple at Olympia is made of Pentelic marble and is considered a later replacement. P. 182: I know of no pediments (or indeed sculptural compositions) earlier than the Parthenon that figured the birth of Athena. On p. 249 '*ARV* 115, 2' has perhaps been left over from a previous draft; Beazley's lists have no place elsewhere. Finally, on pp. 114–15 I find a selection of the profiles from my *Red and Black*, but sadly no acknowledgement.

All in all, the book has a fresh feel to it. O. has managed to merge old and new in an engaging way, moving the balance from aesthetic to social considerations. It is a lively treatment that raises new questions and takes fresh approaches, but starts some hares that may not run. The illustrations are superb, with the author being attacked by his critics on the front cover!

University of Southampton BRIAN A. SPARKES

LATER ROMAN ART

J. ELSNER: *Imperial Rome and Christian Triumph: The Art of the Roman Empire AD 100–450* (Oxford History of Art). Pp. xvi + 297, 163 ills, 16 plans, 3 maps. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. 1998. Paper, £8.99. ISBN: 0-19-284201-3.

Elsner covers the period from A.D. 100 to 450, rejects a chronological for a synchronic organization of his material, places the visual arts within their social, political, and religious contexts, and privileges literary descriptions of works of art and rituals. The result is hardly a standard text book on Roman art. Does it work? Not entirely.

E. justifies his start date by insisting on the importance of the Second Sophistic: the Roman world became more directly philhellene, its cultural system based largely on Greek *paideia* and unified by Graeco-Roman mythology. This is seen in the 'antiquarian examination of the canonical Greek past', as manifested in Hadrian's 'imperial theme-park' at Tivoli, or even the change from cremation to inhumation, interpreted (along with Greek mythology in the funerary repertoire) as enthusiasm for things Greek. To my mind this overemphasizes and simplifies the cultural changes from first to second century. The decision to continue to 450 (and beyond) is more productive. E. asserts that there were 'profound continuities' between the post-Constantinian Christian empire and its pagan ancestor. The sections on this later period are more convincing and original than his analysis of the second and third centuries, whose major monuments receive quite scant treatment, with some inaccuracies (e.g. E. makes much of the nudity of the *victimarii* on the Tetrarchic

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

suovetaurilia relief, but in fact they are clearly wearing the usual kilt-like garment). Discussing the decoration of sarcophagi, he raises briefly, but fails to explore adequately, the question of how it was interpreted; for example, he asks of Dionysus finding Ariadne, 'does this theme have an allegorical message?'—a good question which he does not answer beyond suggesting that meaning might depend on the viewer. By comparison, his thoughts on the Christian use of 'typological exegesis' seem more carefully developed.

E. hopes that an extensive timeline at the end will compensate for the lack of a chronological structure, but I doubt this would be adequate for readers unfamiliar with the Roman world. His alternative structure of interconnecting themes is complex and difficult to follow, jumping around in time. Occasionally this produces good insights—such as the juxtaposition of an ivory panel showing the translation of the relics of St Stephen to Constantinople, the *adventus* of Galerius on his arch at Salonica, and Herodian's description of the entry of Baal to Rome under Elagabalus. But more often it is confusing rather than helpful. One theme is 'change and continuity': both Roman and Christian worlds looked to the past (Greek mythology, past emperors, the Old Testament) to construct the present, and Christian late antiquity in particular felt the need to assert its difference from the pagan past while insisting on its Roman heritage. Another theme concerns the shifting relationship between Rome and the Empire's periphery. This touches on Romanization and the assertion of Roman identity through local styles (nicely illustrated by portraits from the Fayum and Palmyra). E. suggests there was an element of resistance to, or denial of, Romanization here, but I cannot agree with his view that the Adamklissi monument was 'barbarian art', giving the conquered a voice and dignity (it surely rather addresses Roman soldiers and glories in their ability to avenge their dead). Juxtaposed with Romanization is Christianization, the dissemination of a Christian identity initially fashioned in the funerary art of the catacombs and sarcophagi, which ultimately resulted in the 'Christian triumph' of the fourth century, a systematic attempt to exclude all that was pagan and heretical, and to create a canonical Christian iconography.

E. throws out sweeping, often seductive, generalizations and challenges. Mystery religions are described as characterized by competitive self-definition but also by syncretism, which E. cheerfully acknowledges to be diametrically opposed tendencies; Christianity is 'in many ways a typical mystery religion', except in that it is monotheistic and scriptural, giving primacy to text over images. Rome, by contrast, was a 'visual culture', though *ekphraseis* are as important for the history of ancient arts as the objects themselves (I remain unconvinced!). Such provocative statements are aimed at the academic establishment, not at the (probably puzzled) general reader. E. implies that the traditional approach to art in late antiquity as 'the narrative of a radical transformation in the *forms* and *style* of visual images' is old hat, yet he himself shows considerable preoccupation with the move away from naturalism and describes the third and fourth centuries as the 'crucible' that produced the 'more abstract' forms of medieval art. Yet he nowhere defines this abstract quality. A bronze bust of a Celtic goddess from Cirencester which he describes as 'uninfluenced by Graeco-Roman naturalism' could not have been made without Roman influence, and is far from being abstract.

As is evident from the above, E. writes with verve and enthusiasm, presenting a very personal vision of Roman, late antique, and early Christian art and society. He can be insightful, challenging, and occasionally wrong. He writes fluently, sometimes finding just the right phrase (e.g. on Hadrian's retaining Agrippa's name on the Pantheon 'the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

rhetoric of modesty'), sometimes using a plethora of buzzwords and pretentious phraseology which leaves the reader baffled (e.g. 'that fluid public space between home and the world . . . where an individual's self-identity met with images, views and representations of others'). Above all he writes as a cultural historian who sees the visual culture of Rome as pre-eminent, not as a traditional art historian. Ironic for a series entitled the Oxford History of Art?

University of Edinburgh GLENYS DAVIES

ARCHITECTURAL DICTIONARY

R. GINOUVÈS (ed.): *Dictionnaire méthodique de l'architecture grecque et romaine.* Tome III. *Espaces architectureaux, bâtiments et ensembles.* (Collection de l'École française de Rome 84.3.) Pp. 352, 115 b & w pls, with multiple figures on each plate. Rome: École française de Rome, 1998. ISBN: 2-7283-0529-3.

This is the last volume of an authoritative comparative dictionary of architectural terminology for the ancient Greek and Roman period in French, German, English, Italian, modern Greek, ancient Greek, and Latin. Volume I, covering materials and their utilization, was published in 1985; Volume II, covering architectural elements from the foundations to the roof, followed in 1992. This one is dedicated to the spaces and ensembles created by means of the constructional materials and elements defined earlier, and is divided into three main sections: firstly on the basic architectural volumes and their conception, secondly on buildings organized by type, and thirdly on built form in town and country. It has been compiled by an expert team, in part the same as for the earlier volumes (R. Ginouvès, J. J. Coulton, P. Gros, A.-M. Guimier-Sorbets, V. Hadjimichali), with the addition of C. Bouras, M. Kohl, Y. Morizot, F. Pesando, and M.-C. Hellmann, who directed the completion of work since the death of Ginouvès himself in 1994, and assembled the illustrations along with J.-P. Adam. The scope and organization of the project have been described in previous reviews in *CR* by R. Ling (37 [1987], 72–3 and 44 [1994], 415); I can but echo his high endorsement, and confirm that the final volume maintains the same format and excellent quality of its predecessors. If anything the illustrations, a judicious mix of photographs, plans, elevations, and three-dimen- sional views, are more generous. The *Dictionnaire* is an invaluable resource—as indeed is evident by the well-worn condition of the first two volumes on the shelves of many a library.

That said, it is fair to warn the reader of certain limitations particular to this third volume. In treating whole buildings and complexes, it embraces cultural as well as technical factors, which introduces glosses of meaning that are not easy to address in a dictionary/thesaurus format. In the section on sacred architecture, for example, the ancient Greek word *naos* (*ναός*) is naturally defined under 'Temples', but under 'Treasuries' there is no clue that *naos could* refer to them too (G. Roux, 'Trésors, temples, tholos,' in G. Roux [ed.], *Temples et sanctuaires. Séminaire de recherche 1981–1983* [Lyon, 1984], pp. 153–71). The logical organization of the entries according to functional typology inevitably hampers consultation as regards abstract or formal

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

entities, such as column displays (cf. W. MacDonald, *The Architecture of the Roman Empire, II* [New Haven, 1986], Chapter VII).

The use of examples to elucidate meaning, a welcome component of any good dictionary, lies at the root of an editorial dilemma, as acknowledged in the Introduction (p. 2): unless the explanatory notes—already copious—were to grow to cumbersome proportions, the examples given are bound to be partial and to some extent arbitrary. But some of the examples could have been utilized with more discretion. I cite two landmark buildings which do not fit comfortably into the categories they illustrate, the Parthenon and the Pantheon. Both are referred to exclusively under the section on 'Temples', but while this is certainly the best place to begin, the problem is this exclusivity. Mention is made of the idea that the Parthenon can be interpreted as a treasury-temple (p. 35 n. 24), but it would have been useful to have been made aware of the distinction between the chryselphantine statue of Athena Parthenos and the cult image of Athena housed in the Erechtheion, as well perhaps of 'alternative' interpretations of the Parthenon, as war memorial or as votive (most recently, B. Fehr, in *Hephaistos* 14 [1996], 165–91). There is no mention of the debate surrounding the purpose of the Pantheon, and the possibility that it was not really a temple in the narrow sense of the term (i.e. a house for a cult statue or statues), but a dynastic monument, audience hall, or something more elusive. The *Dictionnaire* might have been expanded to tackle such points, perhaps at the expense of the generous typeface and margins used for the indices.

Since the title embraces architectural spaces and ensembles, it is a pity that more attention was not given to assorted 'urban furniture' and space-defining elements. There is an ample section on altars—which are justly noted to be, unlike temples, essential for a sanctuary (pp. 48–53), but the lack of an entry on tripods, for example, does not reflect their reduced but nonetheless significant impact in this context. There is mention of 'trepieds' under votive and honorific monuments (p. 67), but such passing references appear only in the French index. Perhaps the middle section could have been expanded to include more on such things, while transferring the concluding section on urbanism—itself too short for such an ample brief—to a fourth volume on its own. All of the above, however, amounts to quibbles; the *Dictionnaire* is such a very welcome resource that of course one wants more of it (or indeed all of it on compact disc). Its authors have already made a weighty contribution to modern scholarship, and for this they should be thanked wholeheartedly.

Rome MARK WILSON JONES

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ETRUSCAN RELIGION AND ART

E. SIMON: *Schriften zur etruskischen und italischen Kunst und Religion.* (Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main. Geisteswissenschaftliche Reihe 11.) Pp. 227, 27 ills, frontispiece and 40 pls. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996. ISBN: 3-515-06941-0. ISSN: 0512-1507.

D. STEUERNAGEL: *Menschenopfer und Mord am Altar. Griechische Mythen in etruskischen Gräbern.* (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Rom. Palilia 3.) Pp. 222, 50 pls. Wiesbaden: Dr Ludwig Reichert, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 3-89500-051-5.

Simon's (hereafter E.S.) collection contains sixteen papers originally published between 1964 and 1996, preceded by an unpublished lecture of 1980. The variety of subjects and monuments treated can be gauged from the titles of the four sections into which they are grouped: Gods and Demons (seven items), Etruscan Vase-painting (three), Greek Myths on Central Italian Mirrors and Cistas (five), and Central Italian Sculpture (two). The approach is essentially art-historical, and more precisely iconographic: gods and heroes, and the many winged Etruscan 'in-betweens', with their cults and their myths, are invariably discussed on the basis of their material representations. By applying to the latter her acute power of observation, coupled with a profound but lively familiarity with all aspects of the Classical world, E.S. has been able to propose satisfactory readings for numerous works that had previously eluded interpretation. These range from the Capitoline She-Wolf ('among the most famous statues of animals preserved to us from antiquity': pp. 197–200, 1966), the Romano-Praenestine Cista Ficoroni (pp. 161–72, 1972), and the Tarquinian Tomb of the Bulls (pp. 55–70, 1973), to Etruscan Orientalizing and Pontic amphoras (pp. 99–104, 1995: Orpheus playing his heptachord to the armed dance of the Argonauts, and pp. 105–14, 1964: the quarrel of the goddesses at the wedding of Peleus), architectural terracottas from Veii and Pyrgi (pp. 71–8, 1993), various engraved mirrors, and more besides.

All these analyses have undoubtedly stood the test of time, and contributed much to their author's renown as one of the best-respected classical scholars of our time. If we were to look for a leitmotiv, I would single out the concept of significance. Faced with images that do not conform to standard Greek iconography, E.S. endeavours to find the unusual literary source behind them, or to identify the local cults and beliefs that explain the unexpected 'deviations'—e.g. the wolf-demon symbol of death, attendant on such gods of the underworld as Hades/*Aita* or Apollo/*Suri*/*Soranus* (pp. 55–70 and 197–200 [see above], and see pp. 87–95, 1996 for the Sisyphos story on late urns; etc.). The successful results of such a method concur in attributing to the Etruscan and Latin customers and their craftsmen a more pervasive level of acculturation than that admitted by the followers of the 'banalization' school, who explain any alterations in terms of sheer misunderstanding, arising from ignorance, on the part of the Italian artists and their patrons. This appears to represent, for true classicists, the only acceptable justification for dealing with the products of such awkward barbarians as the pre-Roman peoples of central Italy. It remains a strictly Hellenocentric point of view, that virtually ignores the individuality of the *Italian* 'producers and customers',

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and fails to illuminate *their* specific and well-founded interest in adopting and adapting particular versions of certain myths.

Precisely the question of why the Etruscans chose and deployed those myths is, on the contrary, the one that Steuernagel (hereafter D.S.) set out to answer in his dense and amply illustrated iconological study. His gruesome subject was carefully chosen: representations of human sacrifice, murder at the altar, and general violence in (and out of) sacred places are as frequent on Etruscan late funerary monuments as they are scarce in Greek art, so that, irrespective of their origin, they can be regarded as particularly representative of specifically Etruscan feelings and beliefs; also, scenes less faithful to the Greek models will thus be more informative than the 'correct' ones. The catalogue (pp. 189–218) comprises 305 entries, almost all alabaster or limestone urns with relief decoration produced at Chiusi, Volterra, and Perugia between *c*. 200 and 75/50 B.C. After the Introduction (pp. 11–18), Chapter I (pp. 19–104) contains detailed iconographic analysis of the material, divided into fifteen sections according to individual stories and motifs. Besides the sacrifice of Trojan prisoners (two late examples, plus four early ones from Southern Etruria: see below), we find the recognition of Paris (61 examples), the murder of Myrtilos (46), and Telephos in the Greek camp (25) mainly at Volterra; the sacrifice of Iphigenia (37) at Perugia; the sack of the Gauls and battles near a tomb, altar, or temple (*c*. 50) prevalent at Chiusi; the murder of Troilos and the fight over his corpse (21); Orestes' matricide (9), flight from the Erinyes (16) and arrival with Pylades in Tauris (24); some other stories; and less readily identifiable (although specific) variations. Chapter II (pp. 105–18) examines chronological, regional, and social differences; here, I question the wisdom of including the seven items from Southern Etruria in the catalogue and analysis—they differ from all the rest in chronology, social context, subject matter, and medium (no. 1 is the wall painting of the François Tomb!), and seem to me to distort the picture that D.S. is trying to reconstruct.

The function of Greek myths in Etruria is considered in Chapter III (pp. 119–40) by assessing the elaboration of the models and the semantic value of 'banalizations' and 'generalizations'. Fear, hope, and visions of death and the afterlife are treated in Chapter IV (pp. 141–8); the question of real human sacrifices in Etruscan funerary cult practice is asked, and answered in the negative, in Chapter V (pp. 149–66). In Chapter VI (pp. 167–80) the monuments discussed are interpreted as didactic illustrations of *religio* and *sacrilegium*, designed to preserve the traditional aristocracy's privileges, rooted in the possession of the *Etrusca disciplina*; during the Romanization process, the latter also became the means through which (with increasing emphasis on ritualism and superstition) the middle classes sought to advance.

After so much informative and original analysis, it seems a pity that D.S. should in the end revert to the well-worn notion of the late Etruscans' pervasive pessimism, brought about by their loss of political power and their alleged collective precognition of impending national doom. This book does, however, provide an essential tool for all future research in the field; in particular its attempt to understand the *Etruscans'* point of view when they were selecting certain Greek myths and models for repres- entation constitutes a step in the right direction, and it is very much to be hoped that it will soon be followed by others.

University of Edinburgh F. R. SERRA RIDGWAY

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ETRUSCO-CORINTHIAN FIGURED VASES, II

J. G. SZILÁGYI: *Ceramica etrusco-corinzia figurata. Parte II: 590/580–550 a.C.* (Istituto Nazionale di Studi Etruschi ed Italici: Monumenti Etruschi, 8.) Pp. 267–767, pls 114–261, ills 40–182. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1998. Cased, L. 590,000. ISBN: 88-222-4655-1.

ECF II completes the story begun in *ECF* I (*CR* 47 [1997], 169–70), with the 'third generation' of the Vulci school (pp. 289–426), the Tarquinia school (pp. 427–502), their contemporaries *di localizzazione dubbia* (pp. 503–17), their successors (pp. 519–76), the *grandi cicli tardivi* (pp. 577–676) and a final list of 106 unclassified vases (pp. 677–84). The period (590/580–550 B.C.) covered by this imposing second volume is inevitably richer in Etrusco-Corinthian than its immediate and somewhat longer predecessor (630–580): according to the synoptic table facing p. 760, *ECF* I accounted for 604 pieces and *ECF* II adds 2,798 (making a grand total of 3,402 vases, not counting the new pieces in the list of *Addenda e Corrigenda* on pp. 705–18); the 'second generation' of the Vulci school (*ECF* I, 175–258) comprises 180 vases, while the 'third' has 792. Sz.'s impeccable application of the ceramic specialist's standard procedures continues in the new volume: but since there is much more material available for processing, the challenge is correspondingly greater—and so is the achievement, inevitably expressed in the form of well-referenced lists. As before, the composition of these is explained with exemplary lucidity, and so are the increasingly complex considerations that prompt their subdivision.

We can thus understand why, for example, Sz. has divided the 1,050 vases he assigns to the *grandi cicli tardivi* into three main categories, and why he has divided them further: 1, the Human Mask Group (pp. 577–96; 201 vases, nearly half of them *kylikes*, not further divided); 2, the Facing Cocks Cycle (pp. 596–647; 483 vases, nearly half of them *alabastra*), subdivided into the Michigan (223 pieces), Hermitage (79), Toronto (69), Pitigliano (28), and Matsch (56) Groups, with 28 more unclassified; 3, the Birds Cycle (pp. 648–69; 366 vases), further divided into A, the Albizzati sequence (171 pieces, subdivided into the Albizzati [55], Calatia [44], Cetona [20], Hildesheim [17], Santa Monica [13], Capodimonte [5], and Poggione [11] Groups, and the Knackfuss Painter's *alabastra* [6]); B, the Fol sequence (134 pieces, subdivided into the Fol [61], Pavia [39], and Palazzetta [34] Groups); C, the Santa Cecilia Group (14 pieces, not subdivided); and 47 further oddments in D, E, and F.

The volume is completed, and both volumes are rendered accessible to those who need them most, by a series of indexes in the manner of *ABV* and *ARV*: museums and collections (pp. 719–49), ancient provenances (pp. 751–2), Painters and Groups (pp. 753–4), and finally 'analitico' (pp. 755–60: motifs and other subjects represented in the lists or discussed in the text).

It is possible that some classical art-historians will feel that *ECF* deserves the kind of compliment that C. M. Robertson paid *EVP* 50 years ago: 'Etruscan [vases] are rarely fine works of art, and one is tempted at first to regret the transfer to such inferior material of Professor Beazley's unparalleled sense of style' (*JHS* 69 [1949], 93). These days, however, the values that underpinned this attitude are sternly disputed (see the exchange between J. Whitley, *Antiquity* 71 [1997], 40–7 and J. H. Oakley, ibid. 72 [1998], 209–13). And there is in fact very much more to Sz.'s *oeuvre* than the attribution of unprovenanced pots—important though attribution is here, and devoid of context though many (certainly not all) Etrusco-Corinthian vases are. The first sentence of

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ECF II (p. 289) refers to the indications provided by 'scavi' and their exegesis for a turning point around 580 in the history of Etruria in its wider setting. 'Real' archaeology is thus the basis for a wide-ranging discussion (pp. 414–26) of the social and economic implications of the greatly increased demand for Etrusco- Corinthian tableware that distinguished the Vulcentine 'third generation' from the 'second', and prompted a decided tendency to cut corners ('soluzioni facili') on the part of its painters. Proper attention is accorded (p. 423) to the fact that the two largest classes of their products have significantly different distributions: to judge from the known provenances, the 251 pieces assigned to the Olpai Cycle (pp. 290–334) come mainly from Vulci itself, while the most important clients for the 279 products of the Rosoni Painter (pp. 334–71) resided in the minor centres (e.g. Poggio Buco) of the surrounding territory. And so on: this is only one example of the extent to which Sz.'s lifework has brought his material into the mainstream of Etruscan studies. In a very real sense, he has done for Etrusco-Corinthian figured vases not only what Beazley did for Attic (and Etruscan) b.f. and r.f., but also what G. Bagnasco Gianni (cf. *CR* 48 [1998], 141–2) and S. Marchesini (cf. *JRA* 12 [1999], 448–50) have done more recently for Etruscan epigraphy, onomastics, and sociolinguistics.

ECF is a welcome and extraordinary achievement, and gives us all the chance to be much wiser about the Etruscans themselves as well as their vases.

University of Edinburgh DAVID RIDGWAY

LIPARI, CAPRI, PISA, SPINA

LUIGI BERNABÒ BREA, MADELEINE CAVALIER: *Topografia di Lipari in età greca e romana.* (Meligunìs Lipára, 9.) 2 vols. *Parte I* (with F. VILLARD): *L'Acropoli*. Pp. 265, 132 pls, 47 ills. *Parte II: La città bassa*. Pp. 421, pls 133–236, 69 ills. Palermo: Publisicula/Regione Siciliana, 1998.

EDUARDO FEDERICO, ELENA MIRANDA (edd.): *Capri antica dalla preistoria alla fine dell'età romana*. Pp. 578, ills. Capri: Edizioni La Conchiglia, 1998. L. 110,000.

STEFANO BRUNI: *Pisa etrusca: anatomia di una città scomparsa.* (Biblioteca di Archeologia, 26.) Pp. viii + 304, 64 pls, 19 ills. Milan: Longanesi, 1998. L. 65,000. ISBN: 88-304-1411-5.

FERNANDO REBECCHI (ed.): *Spina e il delta padano. Riflessioni sul catalogo e sulla mostra ferrarese. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi 'Spina: due civiltà a confronto', Ferrara 1994*. (Studia archaeologica, 90.) Pp. 358, ills. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1998. L. 380,000. ISBN: 88-7062-983-X.

These four titles afford an instructive cross-section of current Italian archaeological activity. Regrettably, only the first item listed above contains the definitive presentation of archaeological evidence. As such, it should be added to the bibliographical references that appear s.v. *Aeoliae Insulae* in *OCD*[3]; the entry itself should be revised, too. The entries ibid. ss.vv. *Capreae*, *Pisae*, and *Spina* are similarly

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

affected by the other three books, for they each provide—in different formats prompted by different practical considerations—the latest conspectus of their respective centres. In all four cases, it will be interesting to see what else will be deemed worthy of citation when the time comes to compile *OCD*[4].

Virtually everything that is known about the archaeology of the islands in the Aeolian or Lipari group is derived from half a century of hard work and exemplary publication by the late L. Bernabò Brea (1910–99) and his colleague M. Cavalier, whose joint expertise has famously ranged over a broad chronological and cultural spectrum (of which the Bronze Age is undoubtedly the most crucially informative: cf. R. Leighton, *Sicily before History* [London, 1999]). Their latest monograph is occasioned by the establishment of the Cnidian–Rhodian colony of Lipara between 580 and 576 (Diod. Sic. 5.9.1–4), and by its subsequent decline to the level of a Roman provincial town. In the latter connection, English readers will be sorry to learn (II, pp. 56–7) that by 1950 it was no longer possible to uncover much of the 'highly interesting Bath' and its mosaics described and illustrated over a century earlier by Captain W. H. Smyth RN FRS FSA (*Archaeologia* 23 [1830], 98–102; reproduced here at pp. 48–55; cf. P. Orsi, *NSc* 1929, 62). For the rest, these two imposing volumes contain the final reports for specialists on a series of more productive excavations conducted at intervals over the following four decades on the formidable *rocca* of Lipari ('il Castello': I) and in the extension of it inevitably known as the *città bassa* (II); they add a wealth of detail and illustration to the relevant sections of the excellent synthesis prepared by the same authors s.v. *Lipari (isola)* for *BTCGI* (ix [1991], 81–164; with bibliography to 1988, 164–85). In the earlier period, the sophisticated use of architectural terracotta decoration and the sources of the imported pottery alike bear witness to the smooth working of the contemporary Mediterranean network. At the end of his careful treatment of the sixth- and fifth-century potsherds (I, pp. 221–65; pls 65–132), F. Villard rightly notes a certain 'absence de richesse', but he is also able to point to the quantity and quality both of imported Attic black glaze and of the remarkable local production it inspired; both come to a somewhat abrupt end late in the fifth century, and it is hard not to see this as a direct result of the dramatic events of 427 (Diod. Sic. 12.54.4).

Clearly, the Graeco-Roman period was hardly the most glorious in Aeolian history: there is not much here in the way of 'goodies'. This archaeological record, presented (as it should be consulted) in terms of reliably retrieved and hence informative assemblages in context, satisfies 'the appetite, entirely justifiable and indeed desirable, for new *knowledge*' (A. M. Snodgrass, *An Archaeology of Greece* [Berkeley, 1987], p. 98). The consummate efficiency with which the excavator's basic obligation has been met, now and in the past, by the two principal authors of the *Meligunìs Lipára* series is more than a legend: it has set a standard of professional practice that is unsurpassed elsewhere in the Mediterranean, and unmatched in any of the other small but archaeologically significant Italian islands.

Of these, Capri on the Bay of Naples is probably the most famous for many reasons, modern as well as ancient; among the latter, the scandalous stories about Tiberius, the island's most illustrious resident, are the most familiar and least credible. In sharp contrast, the 18 contributors, mostly from the 'Federico II' University of Naples and the Naples Archaeological Superintendency, to the substantial and scholarly volume edited by E. Federico (F.) and E. Miranda (M.), incorporate much that is unfamiliar into a rigorous and wholly reliable exposition of the island's story. It is set out in the following sections: prehistory and protohistory, from geological times to the shorter Neolithic to Early Iron Age span reviewed by C. Giardino (pp. 67–105); toponomastic

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

problems, skilfully stated by D. Silvestri, who proposes an Oscan origin for the island's name (pp. 109–22, esp. 112–13); archaeology, predictably the longest section, and incorporating the 'schede M[onumenti]A[rcheologici] e C[omplessi] A[rcheologici]', compiled between 1985 and 1990 for the Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo e la Documentazione in Rome (pp. 129–223), followed by accounts of the Villa Jovis (C. Krause; pp. 225–40), the *arredo* of the imperial villas (S. Adamo Muscettola; pp. 241–74), and various private collections assembled on the island (V. Sampaolo; pp. 275–90); epigraphy, Greek (P. Lombardi; pp. 299–342) and Latin (M.; pp. 343–71); history, from the seventh-century expansion of Cumae to the *foedus Neapolitanum* of 326 (F.; pp. 375–415), and on via Augustus and Tiberius to the sixth century A.D. (E. Savino; pp. 417–48); cults (F.; pp. 451–68), illustrating a fine Mithraic *taurobolium* relief (p. 457, Fig. 15.5), here attributed to the presence of merchants rather than of soldiers; the ancient written sources, from Hecataeus to the tenth century A.D., listed in alphabetical order (F. and Savino: transcriptions, translations, and notes, pp. 479–522; thematic index, pp. 525–31). All these good things are preceded by a *schizzo storiografico* (F.; pp. 21–36), and followed by a *carta archeologica* (with 118 spots on seven sheets), to which constant reference is made in the appropriate earlier chapters, and by an exceptionally user-friendly set of indexes.

In other words, this is now *the* book about ancient Capri: it should be in every private and public archaeological library worthy of the name. There is no point in emphasizing the extent to which opportunities have hitherto been missed: in his introduction (pp. 125–7) to the archaeology section, the present *soprintendente archeologo*, S. De Caro, points firmly to the future and to the ever-present problems of *tutela* (guardianship) in the widest sense, which for him includes the provision of a modern Museo dell'Isola. Whatever is in store, this book, handsomely produced by a Caprese publisher, is an eloquent and authoritative statement of the claims of the past on the present, and of the commitment of the university community in Naples to the needs of its local area. The ground has at last been cleared, and must not be overgrown again by the lethal combination of weeds that characterized less robust ages than our own.

Further up the Tyrrhenian seaboard, it is only very recently that the words 'Etruscan Pisa' have come to acquire a clear reflection in the archaeological record. Hitherto, Pisa's status as a major centre of Northern Etruria has been based largely on references by an impressive range of ancient authors regarding e.g. its position (*quam cingunt geminis Arnus et Ausur* [mod. Serchio] *aquis*: Rut. Namat. 1.566), the assistance rendered to Aeneas by the Pisan seer and leader Asilas (Virg. *Aen.* 10.175–80), intimate early connections with Epeios (Serv. *ad Aen.* loc. cit.) and hence with the South (P. Zancani Montuoro, *ASMG* 15–17 [1974–6], 93–106), and the invention by one Pisaeus Tyrreni of both the *tuba* and the *rostra* (Plin. *HN* 7.56.201; 209). On the other hand, George Dennis's brief chapter in *Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria*[3] (London, 1883), ii, pp. 69–73 needed remarkably little revision a century later: see R. E. A. Palmer's telling remark on the possible Pisan origin of M. Vipsanius Agrippa, one of Octavian's most significant 'Etruscan' supporters ('Pisa would conform to a sense of shame for obscurity': *Athenaeum* 61 [1983], 350).

Had matters remained like this, with little or nothing at Pisa apparently antedating the third century B.C., there would obviously not have been enough material for a new book. In the event, Bruni is able to provide a series of solidly learned chapters that combine an exhaustive commentary on the literary evidence (and on the findings of earlier commentators from Flavio Biondo [1474] to G. Pugliese Carratelli and D. Briquel) with a detailed account of the discoveries for which he himself has been

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

responsible since his appointment as the *ispettore di zona* for the Tuscan Archaeological Superintendency; for good measure, he also re-assesses what little Pisan archaeology there was before. The new evidence includes the *abitazioni* of the late eighth and early seventh centuries revealed by excavation in the Piazza del Duomo and Piazza Dante; *la necropoli arcaica e classica della città*; and most notably the remains of an immense Orientalizing tumulus, once surmounted by an iron trident and engagingly interpreted here as the setting for the *funus imaginarium* of an Etruscan prince who had died at sea. Thanks to Bruni's series of patient *letture in filigrana* (a highly appropriate metaphor that he employs more than once: 'detecting watermarks in paper'), Etruscan Pisa has at last acquired a rôle on the pan- Mediterranean stage resembling nothing so much as that of its medieval descendant: there is much, for example, that recalls the revelations at M. Torelli's Gravisca nearly thirty years ago (*CAH*^{2} iv.668–70), including two *aree sacre* frequented by Greek merchants (in the Piazza dei Cavalieri and the Prato dei Miracoli).

The implications are considerable for Etruria as a whole, and no less so for Pisa's still seriously enigmatic neighbours in Liguria. The unremitting technical and allusive language of this book and its dauntingly massive bibliographical apparatus (pp. 243–80) inevitably mean that those who are only familiar with some recent English Etruscans (see *JRA* 12 [1999], 450–2) will need a great deal of stamina: but they will be amply rewarded, and properly braced for the further advances in main- stream Etrusco-Italic studies that may confidently be expected at Pisa in the future.

Turning to the head of the Adriatic, Spina (like Lipari, and unlike Capri and Pisa) is best known for its ancient rather than for its modern identity. The last item listed above contains the proceedings of a conference associated with an exhibition and its catalogue (F. Berti and P. G. Guzzo [edd.], *Spina. Storia di una città tra Greci ed Etruschi* [Ferrara, 1993])—a formula already applied at Spina to Dionysos (*CR* 43 [1993], 389–90). It is good to learn that *si stanno . . . ultimando i lavori* designed to enable the Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Spina to re-open after a grievously long interval (p. 16; cf. p. 325), and that a *comitato scientifico* has been constituted (p. 15) to oversee the long-awaited publication of the notorious backlog of excavation reports. The overwhelming need for the latter is repeatedly demonstrated in the eight main conference papers (*relazioni*, pp. 41–110) and in the twenty-three other items (*interventi*, pp. 113–76; *contributi*, pp. 179–321). The point at issue is that Spina is an Etruscan foundation defined by Strabo as *νῦν μὲν κωμίον, πάλαι δὲ Ἑλληνὶς πόλις ἔνδοξος* (5.1.7; cf. already Ps.-Scyl. 17).

The scene is set with admirable lucidity by D. Briquel ('Aspetti politici', pp. 41–52). Spina cannot be isolated from an Etruscan hinterland that includes Felsina (mod. Bologna) and the anonymous city at Marzabotto: it shares a carefully oriented *pianta ortogonale* with the latter, and shows other (mainly epigraphic) signs of having been established *Etrusco ritu* around the third quarter of the sixth century. Its importance as a clearing house for commerce between the Greek world, Etruria Padana, and the Celts has long been appreciated: Briquel now argues strongly, and I think convincingly, for its status as a politically autonomous entity rather than as some kind of *ἐπίνειον* in relation to Felsina. The appearance of fragmentary iron rods, i.e. a *fasces*, in a rich *corredo* (Fig. 31 from Valle Trebba tomb 128; p. 45) is redolent of local magistrates, and hence of city life: but, with no agricultural resources of its own, Spina will have needed to combine its unique frontier status with crucial local Etruscan relationships—recalling Virgil's definition of Etruscan Mantua as *dives aves* (*Aen.* 10.201), and suggesting that *Ἑλληνὶς πόλις* means no more than 'a city where Greek was spoken' (cf. pp. 127–30 [G. Colonna]: Greek is the language of sixteen out of the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nearly sixty available inscriptions of the fifth and early fourth centuries). This is precisely the kind of hypothesis that needs to be tested by analysis of the funerary evidence and of the indications it can provide not only for age, gender, and rank but also for ethnicity and family groupings. As matters stand, alas, B. d'Agostino ('L'immagine della città attraverso le necropoli', pp. 53–6) can do little more than comment briefly, though usefully, on the tomb types shown on a plan of the Valle Trebba (pl. vii) and wonder if the area it covers has been completely investigated.

The rest of the main papers are devoted to various *aspetti commerciali* (M. Gras; pp. 57–65), *iconographiques* (F. Lissarrague; pp. 67–75), *storici* (A. Mastrocinque; pp. 77–84), and *ceramologici* (J.-P. Morel; pp. 85–99); Daidalos and Spina (F. Prayon; pp. 101–5; cf. L. Braccesi, pp. 119–21); and the Roman period (S. Rinaldi Tufi; pp. 107–10; cf. G. Sena Chiesa, pp. 171–6). These themes are energetically discussed in the *interventi*; others are usefully introduced in the *contributi*, e.g. a quantitative analysis of Spina's Attic pottery (M. P. Guermandi; pp. 179–202); recent discoveries in the Polesine (R. Perretto and L. Salzani; pp. 235–40) and at Cabriolo di Fidenza (M. Catarsi Dall'Aglio; pp. 247–51); the Celts and Spina (D. Vitali; pp. 253–73); and more besides. The overall quality of these *Atti* is higher than is usual on such occasions, and the threads are drawn together in Torelli's characteristically stimulating *Introduzione* (pp. 33–7). As in the case of *Capri* and *Pisa*, however, it is very much to be hoped that *Spina* will soon be superseded by new discoveries, and in this case more particularly by the proper publication of old ones. We would all be much wiser if the *Meligunìs Lipára* volumes on our bookshelves had been joined *pari passu* by a similar *Spina* series.

Here then are nearly 2000 extensively illustrated pages of information, exegesis, and debate: a mere fraction of one year's Italian output in the fields of Greek, Roman, and Etruscan studies. No *fin de siècle* reflections are required by the appearance of these four items in 1998. Sadly, a more significant watershed in the history of Italian archaeology is signalled by the recent deaths of two of the authors listed above (L. Bernabò Brea and F. Rebecchi), of two other scholars whose names are indissolubly linked with Spina (N. Alfieri and P. E. Arias), and, in recent years too, of as many again whose achievements have long been universally familiar on a wide range of Italian fronts (M. Cristofani, M. Pallottino, A. D. Trendall, and G. Vallet). Theirs are all hard acts to follow: but the quality of these accounts of four very different and widely separated centres suggests that, though worrying in many ways, the outlook is far from gloomy. *Vedremo.*

University of Edinburgh DAVID RIDGWAY

RÔLE MODEL

PHILIP AYRES: *Classical Culture and the Idea of Rome in Eighteenth-Century England.* Pp. xix + 245, 30 pls. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Cased, £35/$54.95. ISBN: 0-521-58490-6.

This is the first extensive enquiry into the cultural phenomenon of Roman self-imaging in eighteenth-century England. It is yet another product of the increasing interest in the study of classical tradition and of classical scholarship. What marks this work out is its focus on eighteenth-century England, rather than the usually explored periods of the end of the eighteenth-century (the French and American Revolutions) and the various European traditions of the nineteenth

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

century. While Carmine Ampolo (*Storie Greche* [Turin, 1997]; rev. M. Humphries, *CR* 49 [1999], 174) claimed that the French Revolution was the first example of the use of ancient republican models, A. persuasively shows that we should go back to the 1688 Revolution for a key stimulus to the adoption of Roman republican models in the following century.

A. argues that the nobility and the gentry—the main beneficiaries of the 1688 settlement—formed a new oligarchy and created a new political discourse of which the pivotal terms were 'civic virtue' and 'liberty' as modelled on Cicero, Brutus, Cato—the heroes of the late Roman Republic. Chapter I sets the historical and political context, exemplifying the use of classical references in the political speeches and literary works of the time. Arguments for or against a standing army were formulated with reference to Roman antecedents. Some of the most successful plays of the time had Roman subjects and drew explicit political analogies with the present (e.g. Addison's *Cato*). Although A.'s starting point (and speciality) is eighteenth-century English literature, he then proceeds to show the Roman self-imaging process at work in other cultural areas. In this his approach differs markedly from Zera Fink's *The Classical Republicans* (Evanston, 1946), which limited its analysis to seventeenth-century political and literary works. Chapter II focuses on how the development of a political discourse centred on liberty and virtue was paralleled by the formulation of personal codes of behaviour which promoted moderation and propriety, for which Roman *gravitas* was again the model. This virtue of character was furthermore 'made visible' in busts, statues, and monuments of Roman inspiration, as portraits in Roman style, previously limited to princes, became common for nobility and gentry, and Roman elements decorated the new eighteenth-century *jardins à l'anglais.* Chapter III illustrates how the analogy with the Roman Republic was turned into reality by the uncovering of Roman Britain by archaeologists, and explains thus the willing patronage of members of the oligarchy of the archaeological projects. Lord Burlington, archaeologist and architect, provides the link to Chapter IV, which focuses on the construction by Neo-Palladian eighteenth-century architects of a new classical Britannia along the remains of the ancient one. The final chapter shows the importance of Rome in the works of Hume and the other free-thinkers.

In his introduction A. acknowledges the intrinsically complex and subtle nature of the English eighteenth-century identification with the past, but occasionally he does not convey precisely how subtle it was. In fact the strength of his analogy between the Roman late-republican oligarchy and the English political and cultural élite, which assimilated the Roman habits of mind, runs the risk of naturalizing the image of Rome and its politics. A less 'oligarchic' Roman Republic has emerged from recent work, and the traditional view can now be historicized—from the representations of the few surviving oligarchic ancient sources to the vicissitudes of modern classical scholarship (M. Beard, 'An Open Forum?', *TLS* 5017 [1999], 3–4). In such a perspective A.'s study would represent an important episode for the development of the modern interpretation of ancient Rome. Furthermore, for the chapter on the discovery of Roman Britain, a different picture might emerge in the broader context of recent research into the history of archaeology (A. Schnapp, *The Discovery of the Past* [London, 1996]). One could problematize further the relationship of Stukeley and other antiquarians to the Roman past. For example, Alain Schnapp illustrates how Stukeley's later turning to the Druidic past was itself an ideological commitment to the primordial nation under the auspices of the Church; on the other hand his identification of Stonehenge as pre-Roman was an important step in the development of archaeology.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Interdisciplinary books such as this inevitably problematize issues of ideological identification, relationships between cultures, and advances of knowledge. This is seen most effectively in A.'s discussion of the diffusion of the Roman-style portrait statues in England. Here A.'s close iconographical reading prompts some of the most interesting questions for further research, for the Romans themselves had adopted the artistic language of another culture. Does it make a difference that an Englishman imitates and dresses as a Roman who is imitating a Greek? If some complexities are lost in A.'s attempt to account for the phenomenon in so many different areas of cultural life, the dissonances are among the greatest joys of the book and are a challenge to further enquiry. Roman self-imaging defies the simple identification with Whig politics; Shaftesbury after all ridiculed the Roman mania. These instances, which emerge so well from A.'s research, illustrate the complexities and subtleties of the self-imaging process itself, and help to place this book among the most interesting recently published works on the history of the classical tradition.

St Johns College, Cambridge GIOVANNA CESERANI

THE MYTH-KITTY RESTORED

G. MILES (ed.): *Classical Mythology in English Literature: a Critical Anthology*. Pp. xiii + 456. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. Paper, £15.99. ISBN: 0-415-14755-7.

The physical properties of this anthology are indicative of the vast nature of its subject. Offer an editor over 450 pages to produce a text book on the classical mythological tradition in just one modern European language, and the remarkable result is a narrowing down of the subject range to just three myths (Orpheus; Venus and Adonis; and Pygmalion). The content of the book will disappoint any unwary reader who looks no further than the cover title and might therefore justifiably expect to find a broadly representative collection of different mythological tales. In recompense, however, we are treated to a rich and balanced collection of versions of the three myths ranging from antiquity to the present day.

M. writes in an unashamedly direct and racy style aimed at the enlightenment of a (youthful) undergraduate readership. This is commendable in an area of classical studies which tends to attract pedantry and difficult jargon, and means that the book is accessible not only to the classicist but also to the general reader and to students of other potentially interested disciplines such as English Literature, and Film and Theatre Studies (M.'s own subject areas). Sometimes, however, M.'s Promethean approach deconstructs itself as in: 'Why, at the start of the twenty-first century, should writers, readers, or students of English literature still be taking an interest in the fantastic tales told by Greek peasants [*sic*!] three millennia ago?' (p. 3).

The book is in two parts. Part 1 is introductory and its three trendy section-headings might worry the traditional classicist brought up on Rose, Kirk, or even Graves.

Chapter I, 'The Myth-kitty' (pp. 3–19), argues persuasively against Philip Larkin's notorious dismissal (in 1983) of the relevance of a 'common myth-kitty' of classical mythology in the modern world. M.'s very brief, but convincing, *apologia* (pp. 3–5) avoids the adoption of a narrow academic methodology and prefers a broadly semiotic but simplified modern theory of reception: 'Hence mythological references can work as a language, a "code", to communicate instant and vivid meaning' (p. 4). The rest of

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

this section (pp. 5–19) provides a concise but readable guide to the main sources in both ancient and modern literature. M.'s references are, like his own style of writing, both popularizing and right up-to-date, referring for example to Ted Hughes's recent *Tales from Ovid* (London, 1997): 'surely *Metamorphoses: The Movie* cannot be far off?' (p. 19).

Chapters II and III (pp. 20–58), 'A Rough Guide to the Gods' and 'A Mythical History of the World in One Chapter', continue the popularizing approach, but again provide sufficient and accessible background material for students approaching the subject from other disciplines.

Part 2 consists of three substantial chapters for the mythological literary tradition of Orpheus (IV, pp. 61–195), Venus and Adonis (V, pp. 196–331), and Pygmalion (VI, pp. 332–449). Each chapter begins with an introduction to the myth and its heritage. These are concise (13–14 pages), but sufficiently comprehensive for cross-disciplinary students, and allow M. to include as many mythological texts as is reasonably possible (*c*. 75% of the whole book).

Several general observations may be made on M.'s presentation of all three myths. Most controversially perhaps, M. modernizes the spelling of all the post-medieval texts. This will particularly upset those purists who enjoy Spencer's intentional archaisms, but is probably the correct decision for an editor aiming the book at the non-specialist in English literature (students can always be directed to the original versions if poetic form rather than content is considered an important issue).

Secondly, M. is to be congratulated on his choice of texts. There is no traditional aesthetic bias in favour of the Renaissance tradition, petering out in the early twentieth century with a couple of embarrassing Late Romantic versions. M.'s introductions demonstrate his unprejudiced interest in the entire tradition. His reception theory approach and his interest in film and theatre studies lead to a refreshingly contemporary discussion of the texts and their contexts. There is, however, a slight anomaly in the selection of the Graeco-Roman texts for each myth. Although the introductory discussion of the sources begins with Homer and archaic and classical literature (pp. 6–8), the earliest texts in the anthology are from the Hellenistic and Augustan periods. This indicates the Hellenistic bias inherent in these particular mythological traditions, but a more chronologically comprehensive anthology would have resulted by opening with the (albeit brief) references to Orpheus in Euripides *Alcestis*, 357–64 and Plato *Symposium*, 179D–E, and to Adonis in Aristophanes *Lysistrata*, 387–98.

There is a generous selection of medieval and modern texts, with several from each century for each myth. Some of these texts are well known, such as the Shakespearean versions of all three myths. Others are not only obscure, but unavailable in modern editions, making their collected presence in a single volume invaluable. A welcome (though perhaps unwitting) side-effect of juxtaposing the unknown alongside the famous is that the accepted western literary canon is both challenged and revitalized. There is, for example, a relatively strong representation of women writers: eight out of the fifty-two Orpheus and five out of the twenty-nine Pygmalion texts; Adonis surprisingly has no female interpreters amongst its thirty texts, though versions by Aphra Benn (1685) and Carol Orlock (1987) are listed in the useful supplementary bibliography. Likewise the twentieth-century selections are representative of the growing international reception of classical mythology in the modern world, with writers of both prose and poetry from North America, Australia, Canada, England, Germany, Ireland, New Zealand, Scotland, and South Africa; genres range from the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

magical anthropology of James Frazer on Adonis (1906) to the magic realism of Angela Carter's references to Pygmalion in 'The Loves of Lady Purple' (1974).

At this end of the chronological spectrum it is interesting to witness the continuing popularity of the Orpheus myth over the last twenty years, with seven texts included here, compared with only one text for Pygmalion and none for Adonis. The above statistics are of course based on M.'s own selection criteria, but this in itself will prove significant to the reception theorist studying academic textual selection procedures at the time of the millennium. Each text is provided with a brief but informative contextualizing preface and explanatory footnotes.

M. is to be congratulated for providing a much-needed, indeed unique, sourcebook for teachers of the classical heritage in literature. There is a problem in the limited choice of the myths themselves, but this is more than compensated by the kaleidoscopic range of different versions of each story. We must also hope that M.'s promise to produce further anthologies 'if this volume finds a market among teachers and students' (p. xii) is fulfilled both for his sake and for ours.

Sotheby's Institute, London DAVID BELLINGHAM

CLASSICS IN ENGLAND

CHRISTOPHER STRAY: *Classics Transformed. Schools, Universities, and Society in England, 1830–1960*. Pp. xiv + 336. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-815013-X.

Chris Stray has produced a wonderfully rich and deeply researched study of the teaching of the Classics in English schools and universities from 1830 to 1960; his book is full of new discoveries, and his mastery of the material can be illustrated by a single example: if the files of the committee on Classics set up by the Board of Education in 1916 are missing from the official archives, an almost complete set survives in the papers of Gilbert Murray in the Bodleian (p. 267 n. 86).

The surprises are many. It is indeed salutary to be informed that *The Classical Review* was once intended to concentrate on 'general articles accessible to a wide readership', and that the Classical Association was originally founded (like JACT) in 1903 by two pioneers of new language teaching techniques, V. A. Sonnenschein and J. P. Postgate, in reaction to Balfour's Education Act of 1902. Perhaps JACT should take warning from the fact that already by 1919 there were pleas for the Association to be 'brought in touch with the humble men and women, especially in municipal schools, who want to work for the classics in their schools'.

S. has uncovered a mass of material relating to the development of school grammar books (then as now a source of huge profits to both publishers and authors), curriculum reform, new teaching methods, and more or less transitory classical journals and societies. Here you will find evidence on 'the Greek play bishops' and a photograph of the first classical computer, the Eureka, designed by a Quaker inventor and exhibited in 1845, which still apparently produces by clockwork Latin hexameter lines, 'some of dubious sense, mostly portentous in tone'—like the many defences of the Classics, both good and bad, which S. records.

This material is set within a sociological framework of struggles for power, élite

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

formation, and social differentiation. The formulation works well in relation to schools, and helps to avoid the usual concentration on the activities of great and often eccentric schoolmasters. The period begins with a few major schools for a gentlemanly élite, teaching only Latin and Greek, and preparing schoolboys for Oxford and Cambridge (which also effectively taught only the Classics) and subsequently for a clerical or professional career. Even as late as 1864 the Taunton Commission could divide all secondary schools into three 'grades', those teaching Greek and Latin to pupils up to the age of 18, those teaching Latin only up to 16, and those teaching neither with a leaving age of 14. From this basis, Classics, in the full sense of both languages, survived the gradual spread of effective secondary education as the distinctive badge of a small number of élite schools, though the subject also managed to strengthen itself through the rules established for grant-aided schools, which classified Classics alongside 'Science and Maths' and 'Modern Studies' as one of the three subject areas which made schools eligible for Advanced Course Grants from the Government. The Board of Education tended to favour the *status quo*, being committed to a belief in pluralism and gradualism, and preferring advice to regulations; it was anyway dominated by figures like J. W. Mackail (Balliol classical scholar, poet, essayist, socialist son-in-law of Burne-Jones, biographer of William Morris, Oxford Professor of Poetry, O.M., author of translations of Homer and Virgil, and the once famous *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology* [1890]) and James Headlam (Sir James Headlam-Morley, later professor of Greek at Queen's College London, historical adviser to the Foreign Office and delegate to the Peace Conference of 1919, and author of the still fundamental *Election by Lot in Classical Athens* [1891]). But, despite this powerful advocacy, it is clear that Greek was never strong outside the Headmasters' Conference schools: in 1920, even before the effect of the abolition of compulsory Greek for entry to Oxford and Cambridge, only 4.4% of boys and 0.4% of girls in secondary schools were learning Greek, while 44.3 and 27.5% respectively were learning Latin. This disparity was recognized in the curricula of the new civic universities from the start; and, in the democratization of education, Greek was increasingly abandoned in favour of the wider establishment of Latin. The aboli- tion by Oxford and Cambridge first of compulsory Greek for entrance in 1920 and then of compulsory Latin in 1960 can be seen, indeed, not as causes (as they seemed at the time), but as minor and long-delayed effects of this gradual acceptance of a modern pluralist education. It was not until the advent of comprehensive schools that the world of classical education once again responded with radical reforms and a new association, with the founding in 1962 of the Joint Association of Classical Teachers.

S.'s account of classical education in the universities seems to me less successful. The basic problem is that his sociological model focuses on the function of universities in educating an élite, but ignores the development of classical studies as a research discipline. The emergence of a professional class of university teachers (perhaps best described for Oxford by A. J. Engel, *From Clergyman to Don* [Oxford, 1983]) was legitimated and justified against the traditions and rights of the Established Church, which could be held in a sense to own the two English universities both as property and as seminaries for the clergy, by an appeal to abstract standards of scholarship and research. These were found first in the emulation of German historical and philological classical research, then in the discoveries of Mediterranean archaeology. S. pays little attention to this international process, and concentrates mainly on the institutional aspects of university reform. He is also selective in his coverage of institutions: although the civic universities receive some attention, the intellectual scene in London (and especially University College) is far more important than he

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

allows: neither Leonhard Schmitz, the German immigrant who introduced Niebuhr to England, and became headmaster of Edinburgh High School and tutor to members of the Royal Family, nor Sir William Smith, whose 'name will always be associated with a revival of classical teaching in this country' (*DNB*), are mentioned.

Instead, S. concentrates on Oxford and especially Cambridge; but even here his picture seems to me flawed. His image of 'archaeology' fails to distinguish between art history and field archaeology. He makes much of Percy Gardner's inability to win recognition for art history at Oxford (and Gardner, 'the Gracchus of Oxford' with his fundamentalist Christianity and belief that only sculpture was important, was his own worst enemy); but in fact throughout this period there was at Oxford widespread use of archaeological evidence provided by the great travellers from Henry Rawlinson, Henry Tozer, William Ramsay, and A. H. Sayce through G. B. Grundy and Arnold Toynbee to Alan Blakeway and T. J. Dunbabin; from 1910 the Professors of both Greek and Roman History, John Myres and Francis Haverfield, were famous practising archaeologists. I would argue that the difficulties in establishing a formal 'faculty' of classical archaeology at Oxford lay precisely in the success of field archae- ology within ancient history, and the fact that the 'archaeology' on offer from Gardner to Beazley and Robertson was essentially art history. Cambridge, with its failure to develop a strong tradition of ancient history after the expulsion of Connop Thirlwall from Trinity in 1834 (for opposing compulsory chapel), and its emphasis on philology and literature, was in contrast more receptive to the bellelettristic appeal of museum- based art history.

S.'s picture is indeed largely based on Cambridge, which in the nineteenth century remained far more conservative and dominated by college teaching. Oxford had established the basis for joint lectures by 1850, reformed its classical honour school four times between 1800 and 1872, and by the latter date already possessed a modern faculty structure. The great period of classical scholarship and teaching took place at Oxford in Ancient History between 1880 and 1910, when the production of scholarly books and teaching aids reached a peak under Henry Francis Pelham, Professor of Ancient History, and perhaps the most effective liberal reformer that the Classics has ever seen before Moses Finley: he is associated with the foundations of the Hellenic Society and the British Schools at Athens and Rome (as well as the establishment of Somerville College for women, and the introduction of science, geography, and modern languages in Oxford), and was prevented only by death from being the first president of the Roman Society. In contrast, Cambridge kept its tripos system, allowing Part One to count as a full degree for another seventy years after Oxford. If the Royal Commission of 1920 came down more heavily on Cambridge than on Oxford, it was not because the Oxford college system was more powerful, but because Oxford had already long possessed most of the instruments that the Asquith Commission was trying to impose on the two universities. There was of course a price to be paid: those who reform late often reform more completely, and the Oxford colleges have never therefore needed to cede to the University the crucial right of determining faculty appointments. Cambridge is in consequence now a more centralized and normal university.

The strength of S.'s book therefore rests on his account of education in the schools; it would indeed be an important extension to continue his story over the subsequent forty years after 1960, as figures such as John Sharwood Smith and Moses Finley revolutionized Classics with the Cambridge Latin Course, the JACT Ancient History syllabuses, the Cambridge Greek course, and the development of Classical Civilization into one of the most successful modern subjects both at A-level and in universities. The

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

story told by Chris Stray is fortunately one which as yet has no ending, and one thing we can all learn from his account is the need for continuing change in the teaching of the Classics.

Balliol College, Oxford OSWYN MURRAY

FESTSCHRIFT FOR GREEN

F. B. TITCHENER, R. F. MOORTON (edd.): *The Eye Expanded. Life and the Arts in Greco-Roman Antiquity.* Pp. xiii + 294, ills. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1999. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-520-21029-8.

Peter Green has made a remarkable contribution to classical studies over forty years and more. His scholarly work is well known, of course, especially his monographs on Alexander the Great and on aspects of Hellenistic history and culture. But he has also published distinguished translations from the much reprinted version of Juvenal in 1967 to the *Argonautica* of Apollonius of Rhodes in 1997. He has also translated other scholars' and poets' work from French, Italian, and Greek—including Yannis Ritsos—into English. Beyond this, he has published historical novels with classical frameworks (*The Laughter of Aphrodite*, although written in 1963, was recently [1993] reprinted); studies of modern writers with less classical purchase (a biography of Kenneth Grahame, for example); and travel writing from around the Mediterranean. What is more, there has been a steady stream of articles in journals which reach a far wider public than the classical or general academic audience, on subjects from sex to film to the classical tradition. He is also unafraid of polemic, and fights for the corner of classics with verve and forthrightness. The selected bibliography of his varied output here covers nearly five pages of close print. It is not my style of encomium to call his career, as this volume does, 'one of the cultural wonders of the age'; but it does demonstrate an extraordinary range and success, towards which most could only vainly aspire.

It is suitable indeed, then, that a Festschrift from his former pupils should have been prepared, and the California Press have put out a handsome volume. It is more than usually disappointing, then, that this book makes almost every mistake that a Festschrift can. It claims, first of all, that the project has a coherent subject, namely, 'life and the arts in Greco-Roman antiquity'—by which is meant, it seems, that 'filtered diffusions from life to art and art to life were continual in the classical world', and that 'classical culture held at its heart a dynamic interplay between the life of human beings and the aesthetic objects they created to incarnate their aspirations, terror and joys'. Its aim is to survey 'in a single book ranging throughout antiquity and modernity the interaction between human life and the literary and plastic arts'.

It is certainly admirable to have a coherent project for a Festschrift. Yet this agenda is barely evident in a large number of the chapters, which have taken the remit in the most weak and general form at best. So there is an article by Alan Samuel on whether it is useful to use models of growth or models of steady states in looking at ancient economies, while Donald Engels comments on the production of surplus wealth in the classical city. Similarly, Philip Spanns attempts to reconstruct what really happened when Alexander decided not to cross the river Beas, and Alan Boeghold glosses

© Oxford University Press, 2000

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Sophocles' *Antigone* l. 411 to claim that her bowed head is a sign of wilful assent, not shame or humility as is sometimes suggested, particularly in translations of the play. Nor is there any justification why these particular moments of antiquity are chosen for the survey, or what may have been excluded or why. It is almost as if a general theme was developed by the editors after the event to connect a few of the pieces, and then promoted as the project's agenda. Certainly there is no sign that any of the authors have read any of the other chapters or the introduction, nor is there any attempt to link any particular piece to this central theme—except to note, in the last chapter, the lack of any such easy link!

Secondly, several chapters are very uneasily related to already published work. Erich Gruen offers one of the best and longest chapters on Hellenistic images of Joseph—but this has recently been published in only very slightly different form in *Heritage and Hellenism* (Berkeley, 1998)—from the same publishers. So too Karl Galinsky offers what must have been a sparky lecture entitled 'Augustan Classicism'—a subject he has treated at greater length and with more detailed scholarship in *Augustan Culture* (Princeton, 1996), Chapter VII. Boeghold's chapter (interesting, though brief and somewhat undeveloped) will need to be read against his forthcoming book, *A Gesture Was Expected*; Holt's insightful summary treatment of the language of Greek on Bactrian coins follows hard on his recently published history of Greek Bactria, *Thundering Zeus*, also published by the California Press. It is always regrettable if a Festschrift is home to too much 'second hand' or subsidiary material in this way.

Thirdly, many of the chapters are extremely brief and often very narrowly focused. It is not clear that they merit publication in book form. So Diana Delia justifies the reading of a single contested word in Strabo (quoting Polybius). She glosses it in an interesting and general enough fashion in her five pages of text and two and a half pages of footnotes, but it is still a note for a journal rather than a book chapter. Titchener, one of the editors, tries to comment on the whole of development and understanding of autobiography in the Hellenistic age—in nine pages. Burstein, in an eight-page note, argues that one source for the *Book of Judith* is the lost historian Clitarchus. It is hard to justify the book-length collection of such diverse material, even if each article were interesting in its own right.

Fourthly, the book makes grand, but quite unrealized, claims for its own scope—'to survey [its theme] from the time of archaic Greece right down to our own times'. There are two chapters on modern material. One is on the response of D. H. Lawrence and Norman Douglas to their own (and others') tourism in the Mediterranean, a neat and amusing piece by Robert Eisner. The other is on an encounter with, and attempt to understand, Macedonian nationalism in Steelton, USA. There is no significant discussion of any material between Livy and these snapshots of the twentieth century. This does not constitute a survey under even the most generous understanding of the term.

The other chapters, which I have not mentioned yet, consist in a brief discussion by Frank Frost of how Pisistratus the tyrant may have manipulated stories and symbols to suggest his birth was heralded by a divine sign, authorized by privileged mythic models. Ernst Badian—in what may be his first foray into art history—considers the Alexander mosaic. He is particularly interested in the symbolic and narrative prospects of the tree that rises in the background behind Bucephalus' head. Richard Moorton, the other editor, argues in one of the longest pieces that Aristophanes' *Acharnians* has a complex argument about peace, attempting to prepare the citizens for a negotiated settlement without allowing the Empire to be given up. There is perhaps too little

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press

consideration here of how comedy can or cannot deliver political messages, even political messages of a carefully weighted doubleness.

This book does not match its own self-description (*caveat emptor*), and is deeply flawed in its conception and execution. At least in its variety and in the sentiments of its contributors a measure of tribute is paid to its distinguished honorand.

King's College, Cambridge SIMON GOLDHILL

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/50.1.15 Published online by Cambridge University Press