A CAMBRIDGE VIEW OF THE SECOND SOPHISTIC

S. GOLDHILL (ed.): *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Pp. viii + 395. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-521-66317-2.

Studies of the Second Sophistic have flourished at the University of Cambridge in recent years, and this new volume of essays assembled by Simon Goldhill is an almost entirely Cambridge product, as Goldhill himself announces at the beginning: 'All the contributors worked at King's College, Cambridge at periods during the 1980s and 1990s except for Maud Gleason (whom we wish had done so), and Onno van Nijf who stayed up the road at Churchill College' (p. viii). But scholars at Cambridge represent only a part of the international enthusiasm for this once marginal topic. It is now much in vogue at many universities in Europe and North America. Current research draws its inspiration from contemporary interest in ethnic identity, multiculturalism, and self-representation, as opposed to earlier work on the Second Sophistic that was preoccupied with political implications and responses to the ruling power. Bourdieu's famous *habitus* now turns up as a *passe-partout* for the latest interpretations. Current work has successfully and mercifully broken away from the tired debate about Greek assimilation or resistance in the Roman Empire. The corpus of pertinent texts on the Second Sophistic has now been enlarged to accommodate such writers as Pausanias, Athenaeus, and all the Greek novelists. Galen, who was actually there from the start of the revival of Second Sophistic studies, has curiously not been much appreciated by the new generation, and it may not be altogether ungenerous to attribute this strange gap to the unavailability of English translations of most of his work. The only significant contribution to the study of Galen in the Second Sophistic was a brilliant paper by Heinrich von Staden, who is a specialist on ancient Greek science and medicine: 'Galen and the Second Sophistic', in R. Sorabji (ed.), *Aristotle and After* (London, 1997), pp. 33–54. This is a work that appears nowhere in this volume.

The Cambridge group, while full of ideas, shares two conspicuous characteristics. The first is a predilection for walking readers through an exemplary text with interesting or often lively *aperçus* along the way. In the new volume Henderson takes up Polybius, Elsner the Lucianic *De Dea Syria*, Preston Plutarch's *Greek and Roman Questions*, Goldhill Clement's *Protrepticus* and Lucian's *Pro Imaginibus*, Zeitlin the same work of Lucian and Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius*, and Whitmarsh the exile tracts of Musonius Rufus, Dio Chrysostom, and Favorinus. Only an admirable paper on athletic competitions by van Nijf avoids leaning on the crutch of a text that is paraphrased at length, and this is because his is the only paper in the book that is not fundamentally confined to literary sources.The second conspicuous characteristic is a disquieting ignorance of major scholarly work outside the anglophone world. Two major omissions can illustrate this point. Although Lucian is repeatedly and lengthily invoked, most notably by Goldhill and Zeitlin, the seminal study of Lucian in the context of his time by Louis Robert is completely left out of account: 'Lucien en son temps', in *A travers l'Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1980), pp. 393–436. Zeitlin's treatment of the *True History* suffers particularly from this omission. Similarly the excellent and, in its way, pioneering work for the new generation of research in this field, Thomas Schmitz's *Bildung und Macht: Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit* (Munich, 1997), does not appear once

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.329 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in a book published in 2001. The Cambridge team would probably have found much of interest in Schmitz's work. He quotes Bourdieu with the best of them, but of course he writes in German. These two characteristics, shared by most of the contributors except van Nijf, conspire to foster an atmosphere of self-congratulatory hermeticism that can sometimes become stifling.

The structure of the volume is somewhat aleatory despite the valiant efforts of Goldhill to provide coherence in his prefatory summary. Beginning with Henderson on Polybius would be a rational opener in a treatment of the Second Sophistic only in the sense that beginning with another scholar on Homer would also have been. Both authors are relevant to the subject but rather remote from it. It would have made far more sense to start with a chapter on Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who explicitly addressed the issues of Greek and Roman identity that were to preoccupy the sophists and their contemporaries, and he did so within the early Roman imperial context. A second chapter by Maud Gleason on Josephus brings us into the earliest years of the Second Sophistic. Although Gleason is always interesting and her remarkable book, *Making Men*, was fundamental in establishing new directions for scholarship on the sophists, she seems a little adrift here on the subject of body language in Josephus. She seems not to see a great difference between statements that are made through the use of one's own body and those that depend on the use, often cruel, of someone else's. The volume ends with a chapter on Judaism, which fits much better into the structure of the whole work. Seth Schwartz has valuable things to say about the marginality of the rabbis. But what he says here he had already said earlier in a 1998 book on Yerushalmi and was going to say again (better, by his own acknowledgement) in his new book *Imperialism and Jewish Society* (Princeton, 2001).

It is odd to see so much importance attached to visual material in a book that includes so little of it. Talk of vision and modes of seeing in the Goldhill and Zeitlin chapters depends almost entirely on descriptions in literature. Goldhill imports from art history the long overworked concept of the gaze, and with the help of Clement, Lucian, and the novelists he describes the power of looking at erotic objects or paintings. There is no doubt about this. Maurizio Bettini wrote a whole book about it not long ago, but in the King's style Goldhill approaches it through what he calls 'benchmark texts' (p. 167). In commenting on Achilles Tatius he compares Heliodorus and yet amazingly fails to mention what is surely the most astonishing testimony in any novel to the power of an image (*Aeth.* 10.14)—the fair skin and features of the Ethiopian girl Charicleia as a result of her mother's staring at a painting of Andromeda during the copulation by which she was conceived. We hear about the impact of viewing pictures in art galleries, but without any reference to the most vivid ancient account of an art gallery used for sexual cruising, Encolpius' encounter with Eumolpus in Petronius (*Satyr.* 83). The benchmark texts tend to crowd out apposite citation of other texts.

The long piece by Froma Zeitlin on 'visions and revisions' of Homer takes on a fascinating and important subject, but, apart from a brief discussion of the famous Archelaus relief in the British Museum, this paper, which emphasizes 'visual culture', includes nothing visual apart from references in literary texts. Even with that restriction, the *Tabula Cebetis* fails to elicit even a passing citation. Perhaps it was a deliberate choice to omit the statues of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in Athens, presumably flanking a lost statue of Homer himself (*Hesperia* 23 [1954], 62–5), and perhaps C. Julius Nicanor, proclaimed 'the New Homer' (*IG* II^2.3786–9), was deemed irrelevant. But we might at least have heard about the visions and revisions of Homer in the mimes. Aelius Aristides wrote a famous speech about mime and pantomimes

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.329 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*On the Dancers*). It is lost, but we have a great deal of information about it from Libanius *Orat.* 64, where we hear, for example, that Aristides mockingly invoked the corrupting influence of Homer on the Greek world (§73). He disapproved of the dancers and what they did with Homer, although we know his admiring view of the poet himself. Surely this kind of dissonance has a place in a study of second-century visions of Homer. Zeitlin tells us something about Homeric revisionism in the *Heroikos* of Philostratus, which has rightly become a fashionable topic of late: it has recently received a seriously flawed translation and commentary from Ellen Aitken. (A much better one, in German, is forthcoming from Peter Grossardt.) But there is not a word in Zeitlin's paper about the Homeric revisionism of Dares of Phrygia and Dictys of Crete.

This volume would have been much better if it had been shorter. One has the feeling that the authors of most of the articles are ebulliently sharing with the reader the thrill of discovering some interesting texts. But this thrill should properly accompany the preparation of an article rather than the writing of it, in which the discovery should be distilled and interpreted. Much that is here could have been drastically cut back, and much that is not could have been brought in for comparative purposes. Attention to the rudiments of Greek grammar would have cleared out some embarrassing lapses (such as *archetypon mimēmenē* for *pros to archetypon memimēmenē* on p. 228). The most disciplined and therefore the most authoritative of the papers in this volume are those by Whitmarsh and van Nijf. The former has set up a good problem (discourses on exile) and probed it within the framework of circumambient Hellenic culture. The latter worked largely with epigraphy, and in that realm it is impossible to find a literary crutch upon which to lean.

Princeton, NJ G. W. BOWERSOCK

ANCIENT TECHNICAL LITERATURE

B. MEISSNER: *Die technologische Fachliteratur der Antike. Struktur, Überlieferung und Wirkung technischen Wissens in der Antike (ca. 400 v. Chr.–ca. 500 n. Chr.)*. Pp. 419. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 3-05-003194-8.

From historiography, M. turned to ancient technology for his *Habilitationsschrift*, submitted at Halle in 1996, of which this densely printed book is a revised and shortened version. In what he offers as the first survey of all the technical treatises that have survived from antiquity he sets himself two questions: did ancient technology ignore the twin principles of economic rationality, namely achieving a given output with the least possible input and achieving the greatest possible output with a given input? And were technological innovations in antiquity confined to the Hellenistic period? His answer to both questions is 'no'. On the way to reaching it, he develops a third contention, that technical literature encouraged technical progress by spreading awareness of the concept.

Among the τέχναι recognized in antiquity, M. discusses some of those that many writers called 'practical' but none of those that they called 'verbal'. Despite citing Galen's remark that recipes in verse are easier to remember, he also leaves out didactic poems, even when they deal with subjects that he includes, such as pharmacology; and it never emerges how he classifies, for instance, music, hunting, astrology, magic, or

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.329 Published online by Cambridge University Press