Greece & Rome, Vol. 58, No. 1, © The Classical Association, 2011. All rights reserved

SUBJECT REVIEWS

Greek Literature

Since I have sometimes said disparaging things about collective volumes as a genre, I should in fairness begin by acknowledging two outstanding examples. The quality of the individual contributions is, of course, always crucial: but something more is needed. In *Plato and Hesiod*,[1] the secret of success is a topic of well-defined scope (though not without broader consequences) that has received surprisingly little attention. The seven chapters of Part I give overviews of Plato's relationship to Hesiod, and place this in the context of Hesiod's reception in the period. The eight chapters of Part II study individual dialogues in more detail, the highlight of this section being an extremely rich quartet of papers on *Timaeus; Symposium, Republic*, and *Politicus* also receive attention. The editors deserve credit for the editorial care that has evidently been invested in the volume, as well as for the fruitful choice of topic. In *Galen and the World of Knowledge*,[2] a different approach is needed to achieve success. Galen himself is a topic of considerable scope, considering both the quantity and the diversity of his productions; the project of situating someone who pursued such wide-ranging intellectual interests in a larger cultural and philosophical context increases the scope of the topic alarmingly. Moreover, Galen and the intellectual and cultural world in which he operated have increasingly not been neglected in recent decades. Even so, this collection is a timely intervention, coming as it does when there is an increasing need for works of synthesis that will draw together the fruits of different lines of research. The papers collected here all make a worthwhile contribution to this goal, even if the result is bound to be a volume more disparate in content and less integrated than Plato and Hesiod. I commend both these collections warmly. Opinions differ about collections that simply repackage previously published papers. Many such anthologies one could certainly live without, but the unusually hefty volume of *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies* devoted to Xenophon[3] provides a definite service in helping to get a broad perspective on this author's diverse and (as Vivienne Gray stresses in her introduction) innovative corpus. The twenty chapters (six newly translated) are divided into five sections: gender, democracy, Socrates, *Cyropaedia*, and historical writing. The five papers on *Cyropaedia* (by Pierre Carlier, Philip Stadter, Eckard Lefèvre, Michael Reichel, and Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg) struck me as an especially rewarding group, and there is also an instructive juxtaposition of Ben Morrison's and Andreas Patzer's contrasting views on Xenophon's Socrates. This is a well-conceived collection, though the index (defensively

[1] *Plato and Hesiod*. Edited by G. R. Boys-Stones and J. H. Haubold. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010. Pp. ix + 362. Hardback £60, ISBN: 978-0-19-921634-3.

[2] *Galen and the World of Knowledge*. Edited by Christopher Gill, Tim Whitmarsh, and John Wilkins. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009. Pp. xviii + 327. Hardback £60, ISBN: 978-0-521-76751-4.

[3] *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Xenophon*. Edited by Vivienne J. Gray. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010. Pp.ix + 606. Hardback £95, ISBN: 978-0-19-921617-8; paperback £45, ISBN: 978-0-19-921618-5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

headed 'summary index of topics') is a grossly inadequate guide to the riches it contains – a recurrent fault in this series. I am less impressed by *Apolline Politics and Poetics*.[4] Some of the contributions are good – Mark Griffith on Teiresias and the 'politics of tragic prophecy' stood out, for example, as did Fritz Graf on possession and prophecy. But the better the contribution, the less it deserves to be entombed in a collection as misconceived as this one: thirty-three very disparate papers, loosely related to a very broad theme, published six years after the conference in which they originated. Collective publication here does nothing to serve collaborative enquiry or efficient communication. *Theorising Performance*[5] looks more worthwhile in principle, but for the most part disappoints. Combining performance with theory virtually guarantees a mix of mysticism and gobbledegook: emanating energies and vital forces cohabit with collapsing binary postulates and ambulating bifurcations. Some contributors confuse theorizing with generalizing from a few superficially discussed examples. Edith Hall's magpie-like 'eclecticism' (26) is also unsatisfactory. Combining cultural materialism with idealist philosophy raises issues of conceptual coherence that demand serious intellectual effort: simply labelling it a 'dialectical irony' (13) is a flippant evasion of theoretical responsibility. The best theorizing in the volume is undertaken by Felix Budelmann, who bravely addresses the question of nature and culture with the resources of cognitive science – duly acknowledging the speculative character of much current cognitive theory. His interactionist model seeks to do justice to cultural specificity without precluding cross-cultural accessibility; the notion of 'translatability' (112) will need a lot more unpacking, but points in a promising direction. The exchange between Simon Goldhill and Charles Martindale needs to be read alertly. Is Goldhill's excursus on Victorian England a question-begging display of erudition? Even if the story it tells is true (Martindale raises plausible objections), it simply takes for granted that 'the current construction of reception theory' (57) is individualistic in focus. To show that there is such a focus, and to help us decide whether that is a bad thing or not, would require an analysis of recent reception theory. But the only gesture towards that is a denunciation of 150 decontextualized words from a handbook: 'the paragraph is unwilling to ask any of the relevant questions' (61; relevant to … ?). In fact, the paragraph transparently describes a social process ('Italian theorists … a vast series … publication … mediated … shaped …'), allowing readers to ask questions about the process that could not be formulated intelligently without the information it summarizes, and could not be adequately addressed in 150 words. As for individualism, Goldhill's own discussion of the 1910 London performance of Strauss's *Electra*, designed to show that it was 'the work of many *individuals* interacting' (67, my emphasis), briefly describes five high-profile individuals. It is unwilling to recognize the contributions of orchestra, stage crew, and front of house team, and thus expresses a mindset both individualistic and elitist. (You see how easy this game is, and how pointless?) Martindale denies the charge of individualism levelled against him (73).

[4] *Apolline Politics and Poetics*. Edited by Lucia Athanassaki, Richard P. Martin, and John F. Miller. Athens, European Culture Centre of Delphi, 2009. Pp. xxxv + 702. Paperback 40, ISBN: 978-960-885204-4.

[5] *Theorising Performance. Greek Drama, Cultural History and Critical Practice*. Edited by Edith Hall and Stephe Harrop. London, Duckworth, 2010. Pp. xiii + 305. Paperback £25, ISBN: 978-0-715-63826-2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

But asserting (rightly) that anti-essentialism is consistent with a commitment to aesthetic value (81 f.) sidesteps Goldhill's more specific criticism, which questioned the consistency of anti-essentialism with 'the unique aesthetic character of an artwork' (65). Still, *Latin Poetry and the Judgement of Taste* shows how the criticism could have been rebutted (note, for example, the relativization in 'the special quality that for her makes it what it is', 171: we are, after all, talking about *reception*). Goldhill is also wrong to suggest that denying anything 'fixed and integral to a text' conflicts with recognizing that a text may be world-changing (65): world-changing potential may be context-contingent. One can only boggle at Goldhill's astonishing leap from abhorrence of poetry celebrating the Holocaust to a dildo theory of non-political art: 'One might ask in reply why one should care at all about something that aims to be no more than a sophisticated self-pleasuring' (65). This is in reply to Martindale, who 'wonders why we should care about particular works of art if we do not believe they have special aesthetic qualities' (64). But we are not told where Martindale wonders this, and it is easy to find evidence that he does not. He is open about his own interests, and has been known to criticize the limitations of cultural or ideological criticism as sometimes practised; but he does not deny their legitimacy in principle. Goldhill operates with a narrower sense of possible relevances. On the other hand, I suspect that the jokes edited out of his paper (70) were better than the one that remains in Martindale (83, n. 8). Martindale would not, I imagine, wholeheartedly approve of Niall Livingstone and Gideon Nisbet's *Epigram*.[6] The chapter on reception, which puzzlingly introduces an apparent tautology with dramatic emphasis ('epigram's history of meaning is nothing but reception', 141) and hesitation ('and always will be?'), focuses on late nineteenth-century Britain, with an almost exclusive emphasis on ideological responses to homoerotic epigrams. Given the variety of epigrammatic themes, this is an astonishingly narrow focus. The only suggestion that there was any element of aesthetic appreciation in the reception of epigram is a sneering reference to 'the "here's another pretty one" approach' (158). The underlying assumption means that the book as whole, though informative, gives little sense that epigrams are worth reading for any purpose other than social and cultural history. That reservation aside, however, this is a readable and scholarly survey that can be recommended as an introduction to the subject. There was also a point in Stefan Tilg's study of Chariton[7] where I doubted the sense of priority and proportion: 'the origin of the Greek love novel easily poses the single most important question ever asked in the history of scholarship on the ancient novel' (4). There are surely many other things about the novel with at least an equal claim on our attention. Tilg rightly warns that ignoring questions of relative date can trap us into thinking of the genre as a timeless abstract entity (see, for example, 299). But one could also point to numerous precedents for mistaken conjectures about the development of this and other genres, and associated misdatings, leading interpretation astray. Given the hair-raising fragility of dating criteria for the novel, such precedents are particularly worrying. But Tilg, with admirable caution and methodological sensitivity, constructs

[6] *Epigram*. By Niall Livingstone and Gideon Nisbet. New Surveys in the Classics 38. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2010. Pp. xviii + 327. Paperback £12.99, ISBN: 978-0-521-14570-1.

[7] *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel*. By Stefan Tilg. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010. Pp. xii + 343. Hardback £60, ISBN: 978-0-19-957694-4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a plausible case for Chariton's priority by linking the question of date to an investigation of his poetics – what he was doing, or wanted to present himself as doing. The link is that Chariton's 'particular effort of self-definition' (vii), and especially his emphasis on innovation, make sense if he was establishing a new genre. I found Tilg's treatment of Chariton's poetics generally persuasive (I'm not convinced that *καθάρσιον* in 8.1.4 is an Aristotelian allusion, but that has no bearing on the date). I am also open to the suggestion that Chariton knew the *Aeneid* through a Greek prose translation – though I wonder why someone capable of inventing a whole new literary genre should not have been able to create his own, 'fundamentally new' (270), image of Rumour without Virgil's indirect assistance. Chariton appears, accompanied by Xenophon of Ephesus, in a new translation by Stephen Trzaskoma.[8] The versions are very readable, though they do not convey much of a sense of the difference of stylistic level between the two novels and at times are a little too colloquial (in Chariton 8.8.10, for example, the throwaway 'could've' does not capture the force of *ἐδυνάμην* at the very start of a sentence). The translations are effectively annotated (separate endnotes address textual issues, including Trzaskoma's own conjectures), and the introduction does a good job of briefly summarizing the issues concerning the ancient novel in general, and these two novels in particular, prudently not committing itself where things are uncertain – which is almost everywhere. The progressive consolidation of the series 'Greek Tragedy in New Translations' (*G&R* 57 [2010], 127 f.) has reached Sophocles' un-Theban plays.[9] Since the translations, spread over twenty-five years, share no single voice, one need not abandon the whole volume in despair on coming across a translator whose stylistic sensitivity is capable of this:

> Perhaps we can further postulate that the function of the musical chorus in Greek tragedy…is to offer a chance for us to come to ourselves, as it were, to the other end, the source, the body, in order to gather the entire organism's resources to go on with this. (110)

But all four versions share the incapacity for articulate intensity that is an endemic failure in modern translations of tragedy: *Electra* 1103–18 (lines known to the rest of the world as 813–22) is broken down into fifteen fragments. Without syntax. Indistinguishable from the following lyric. You will be better served by Raeburn (*G&R* 56 [2009], 102) or Meineck and Woodruff (*G&R* 55 [2008], 279). Alan Sommerstein's *Tangled Ways of Zeus*[10] has the same format as *Talking About Laughter* (*G&R* 57 [2010], 124 f.), and the same praiseworthy bias in selection towards improving the availability of items first published in relatively inaccessible venues (five of the nineteen papers are previously unpublished). The subtitle, 'In and Around Greek Tragedy', reflects the fact that the chapters on titles and violence in Greek

[8] *Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus. Two Novels from Ancient Greece*. Translated by Stephen Trzaskoma. Indianapolis, IN, Hackett, 2010. Pp. xl + 195. Hardback £29.95, ISBN: 978-1-60384-193-1; paperback £10.95, ISBN: 978-1-60384-192-4.

[9] *The Complete Sophocles. Volume II. Electra and Other Plays*. Edited by Peter Burian and Alan Shapiro. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009. Pp. 430. Hardback £65, ISBN: 978-0-19-538782-7; paperback £8.99, ISBN: 978-0-19-537330-1.

[10] *The Tangled Ways of Zeus and Other Studies in and around Greek Tragedy*. By Alan H. Sommerstein. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010. Pp. x + 342. Hardback £65, ISBN: 978-0-19-956831-4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

drama range beyond tragedy. That shows the precision characteristic of a scholar whose attention to detail and respect for evidence commands admiration, even when a different framing of the question, or a different set of premises, prompts disagreement about where the evidence leads. Sommerstein always provides a welcome stimulus to hard thinking. Another senior scholar, Donald Mastronarde, synthesizes a distinguished career of scholarship and reflection in *The Art of Euripides*.[11] After an introductory guide to approaching Euripides, and tragedy more generally, the chapters cover genre, dramatic structures, the chorus, gods, rhetoric and character, women, and 'males and the limits of autonomy'. Adopting an approach that is 'eclectic, flexible, and wary of totalizing interpretations' (4), Mastronarde emphasizes variety, divergent and shifting positions, indeterminacy and uncertainty (307). His eight initial axioms (25–7) are unlikely to stir up radical dissent for what they say. But what they leave unsaid should not be overlooked. Tragedy's emotional impact on its audience, for example, is neither axiomatic nor one of the topics that strike Mastronarde as 'important and challenging' (vii, 307). That, to my mind, omits something without which Euripides' art cannot be properly understood. With that reservation, I can recommend this learned and level-headed book as a sound, though not especially challenging, advanced introduction to Euripides. *The Hidden Chorus*[12] is the work of a comparative newcomer. Laura Swift studies the ways in which tragedians use allusions, not to specific songs, but to types of song: 'when tragedy alludes to lyric genres, it evokes a whole set of cultural and normative assumptions involved in them, and the tragedians use this to enhance the themes, motifs, and imagery of their own work' (2–3). Introductory chapters set out an understanding of genre and discuss the place of choral lyric in Athenian culture. In the remaining chapters, five genres (*paian*, *epinikion*, *partheneia*, *hymenaios*, *thrēnos*) are examined in detail: each chapter starts with a characterization of the genre itself and then gives case studies of its use in tragedy. The book is supplemented by an online searchable database of lyric allusions in tragedy.[13] Swift's most general thesis is that

> generic interaction reminds the audience that what they are seeing is a poetic world, governed by its own conventions, and separated from their own world. The lyric genre evoked is a different poetic form, yet it also represents the ritual normality of the real world. By superimposing this onto a tragic landscape, and by seeing how lyric and tragic values stand in contrast, the audience is reminded of the distance between the tragic and non-tragic worlds. (376)

The conclusion of the chapter on *paian* provides a convenient illustration:

> What we expect to be shown in tragedy is not the same as what we expect in state religion, and thus we can hold a variety of separate beliefs. In the tragedies discussed here, however, *paianes* are used as a link between these two worlds, and a challenge for their audience to face them both simultaneously. (103)

[11] *The Art of Euripides. Dramatic Technique and Social Context*. By Donald J. Mastronarde. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2010. Pp. xiii + 361. Hardback £60, ISBN: 978-0-521-76839-9.

[12] *The Hidden Chorus. Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric*. By L. A. Swift. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010. Pp. xiii + 451. Hardback £75, ISBN: 978-0-19-957784-2.

[13] *Database of Lyric Allusions in Greek Tragedy*, <http://lyricallusions.classics.ox.ac.uk/>, accessed 22 October 2010.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This is a very illuminating way of thinking about the phenomenon of generic interaction. But what is the point of making audiences face such dissonances? On Swift's favoured formulation, they provide tragedy with a way of 'exploring' differences between worlds or systems of beliefs or values (102, 373–5). 'Explore' is a vague word, but seems to imply that ideological content is tragedy's target. We might see it (instead, or in addition) as a tool, with the dissonances being exploited to achieve some other kind of effect. But it would be unrealistic to expect Swift's work to resolve basic questions about the poetics of Greek tragedy: she has undoubtedly provided us with an invaluable resource for thinking about those basic questions, as well as enhancing our detailed appreciation of particular tragic contexts. In Robin Mitchell-Boyask's *Eumenides*,[14] background chapters on Aeschylus, mythology, and theatre, and discussions on political issues and reception (gender being incorporated in the latter), frame a long central chapter analysing the play. That chapter's unusually strong emphasis on staging is repeatedly baffled by the unconventional nature of the play's dramaturgy: questions of staging again and again end in *aporia*. That would be deeply problematic if, as is claimed, 'these uncertainties have no small effect on how we understand the meaning of the action' (78). But, as I was reading the chapter, I was surprised to find how inconsequential the uncertainties proved to be. An obvious test case is the number of jurors: a 'small detail' initially described as 'essential' (78), though the conclusion that there is an odd number is later weakened to 'thematically appropriate, if not necessary' (94). The argument assumes that the audience sees how each juror votes, so that when Athene speaks at 734, it is already obvious that the mortal majority is against Orestes. But that makes nonsense of 742–51. Elsewhere, Mitchell-Boyask says that 'matricide has provoked' the crisis of the play (49). That formulation ignores crucial features of the situation: Orestes would have no defence for matricide if his mother had not killed her husband, and she would not have been secure against less troubling social sanctions for adultery and murder had she not been party to a *coup d'état*. Interpreters of tragedy should not allow generalizing terms to blur the crucial specifics of tragic situations. Adrian Kelly's *Oedipus at Colonus*[15] begins with a brisk introduction and synopsis, followed by a series of thematic chapters. These pack in a lot of material, and some of the target audience may find the compression demanding. But they should be encouraged to persevere, because the interpretation is intelligent and rewarding. One of the high points is the analysis of Oedipus' self-defences, which lays bare their confusions and inconsistencies, and does so without losing sight of the crucial specifics of the situation: 'Sophocles allows his audience to see the difficulties and inaccuracies in Oedipus' self-justifications and criticisms of others, but these problems inhere in his situation and character' (64). There is also a persistent and salutary critique of 'the *post eventum* clarity so characteristic in modern treatments of Athenian history during the period' (105): 'we have become accustomed to seeing the play's issues with too modern … a set of presuppositions about the nature of empire, and a view of Athenian prospects which

[14] *Aeschylus. Eumenides*. By Robin Mitchell-Boyask. Duckworth Companions to Greek and Roman Tragedy. London, Duckworth, 2009. Pp. 157. Paperback £12.99, ISBN: 978-0-715-63642-8.

[15] *Sophocles. Oedipus at Colonus*. By Adrian Kelly. Duckworth Companions to Greek and Roman Tragedy. London, Duckworth, 2009. Pp. 176. Paperback £12.99, ISBN: 978-0-715-63713-5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

has the benefit of hindsight' (106). Reception is allocated three and a half pages, grudgingly introduced ('No discussion of Athenian tragedy these days seems to be complete without …'). But many volumes in this series, though less perfunctory in treating reception, have been no less inadequate; perhaps making no serious attempt to do the impossible is not such a bad solution to the problem. Edith Hall makes a second appearance as the author of what will probably, by the time you read this, no longer be the latest entrant in the ever more crowded field of introductions to Greek tragedy.[16] She emphasizes performance, of course, and the socially embedded character of tragedy. She writes with characteristic zest but has not always thought carefully enough about what she says. There are bafflingly inconsequential observations ('jurors seem to have taken their seats, as they did at the theatre, in rows at varying distance from the rostra', 63). She writes as if the outcome of a competition between three tetralogies in performance must be explicable in terms of things observable in the script of a single play (102, 244). She reports Aristotle as saying that 'tragedy developed out of hymns sung to Dionysus', and adds that these hymns are known as dithyrambs (49 f.), which is precisely the wrong way round: Aristotle says that tragedy developed out of dithyrambs, and feels no need to remark on their being sung to Dionysus. Having been told that modern readers think of thought and feeling 'as something which takes place entirely in the physical head' (entirely? what's your gut feeling about that?), while 'the Greeks had not yet split the mind from the material body' (183: so physical heads aren't parts of material bodies?), one may be surprised to read that 'according to ancient Greek men, female *brains* … can only operate safely under male supervision' (192, my emphasis). 'Ontology' is not, as Hall seems to think, an ancient term (177). And so on. But the book's design raises deeper worries: thematic chapters are followed by chapters on Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, giving brief accounts of every extant play. An average of around 1300 words per play doesn't give much scope for illuminating comment. Was that a sensible strategy? James Robson's introduction to Aristophanes,[17] though it has a smaller corpus to deal with, more sensibly adopts a consistently thematic approach, drawing illustrations from the plays as needed. One drawback is that the plays do not get adequate attention as organized wholes – but nor do the tragedies in Hall's short essays. Robson's style is clear and engaging, and he is strikingly fair-minded: he sustains to a surprising degree his admirable commitment to presenting problems and uncertainties as such. I was able to read even the politics chapter without strong dissent, but could imagine scholars with views very different from mine doing so, too. This would be a good book to put in the hands of students. But it is very much a book about Aristophanes: 'Old Comedy' is generally no more than a stylistic variant for Aristophanes (e.g. 90), and references to other Old Comedians are few and fleeting. Placing Aristophanes in his generic context would help readers to a better appreciation of what he was doing. Proper contextualization of Aristophanes will not happen if we read comic fragments primarily for that purpose: that will produce an Aristophanocentrically distorted picture. Other comedians deserve to be understood in their own right. But their fragmentary state makes that a dangerous

[16] *Greek Tragedy. Suffering Under the Sun*. By Edith Hall. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010. Pp. xiv + 413. Hardback £30, ISBN: 978-0-19-92351-2.

[17] *Aristophanes. An Introduction*. By James Robson. London, Duckworth, 2009. Pp. xi + 244. Paperback £14.99, ISBN: 978-0-715-63452-3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

enterprise. Emmanuela Bakola's awareness of the dangers does not make her *Cratinus*[18] immune to the risks, and cautious readers will not rush to endorse every interpretation she proposes. That does not detract, however, from the importance of her contribution: everything she says must be taken seriously, a great deal of it is convincing, and even where you hesitate you will find that your sense of the possibilities has been stretch and enriched. Ian Storey approached Eupolis play by play (*G&R* 52 [2005], 103 f.); Bakola's discussions of the plays, though original and illuminating, are subordinated to a thematically organized investigation of the nature of Cratinus' comedy. She shows a poet who is inventive in the presentation of his poetic persona; who interacts with a wide range of literary genres – satyr play and tragedy (especially Aeschylus), but also *iambos*, lyric, and epic; whose plots are multilayered constructions, interacting with myth, cult, drama, and politics; who is innovative in his stagecraft; and who possesses a brilliantly creative imagination. This is a very fine book indeed. Andrea Rotstein's *Idea of Iambos*[19] impressed me, too. The title alludes to Aristotle's expression *iambikē idea* (on the interpretation of which Rotstein is very sound), while also encapsulating the book's purpose: 'to unfold the process of conceptualization of *iambos* as a genre rather than the development of the genre itself' (vii). Rotstein begins by setting out a concept of genre, outlining modern scholarship, and delineating the core-and-periphery structure of the 'received' iambic corpus ('the works of poets who have been explicitly linked to *iambos* at some point in antiquity', 26). She then examines how *iambos* was understood by Aristotle (making what seems to me an unrealistically sharp division between theoretical and empirical elements in *Poetics* 4) and in post-Aristotelian ancient scholarship. This is followed by studies of occurrences of *iambos* and cognate terms in the archaic and classical periods, and of evidence for musical and public performances. The argument for Rotstein's main thesis – that 'there was a shift from a concept of a class that depends primarily on rhythm and on its archetypical representative, Archilochus, towards *iambos* as a genre defined mainly by invective as a dominant feature' (vii) – is brought to completion in the concluding chapters. This thoroughly researched, systematically argued, and conceptually sophisticated study is bound to become a standard work. I conclude, briefly, with some recent work on Greek oratory. The inception of Mervin Dilts's Oxford Classical Text of Demosthenes was favourably noticed in this journal (*G&R* [2003], 105 f.); the fourth volume brings the project to its conclusion.[20] I regret the absence of the hypotheses, pieces of ancient scholarship that surely should be the responsibility of someone – if not Demosthenes' editor, then the editor of his scholia. Dilts has passed them over in both capacities. But this is a minor shortcoming in a pair of major achievements. Judson Herrman[21] provides a new critical edition of Hyperides' *Funeral Oration* (with extensive apparatus), accompanied by a clear and

[18] *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy*. By Emmanuela Bakola. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010. Pp. xiv + 380. Hardback £68, ISBN: 978-0-19-956935-9.

[19] *The Idea of Iambos*. By Andrea Rotstein. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009. Pp. xviii + 388. Hardback £79, ISBN: 978-0-19-928627-0.

[20] *Demosthenis Orationes. Tomus IV*. Edited by M. R. Dilts. Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009. Pp. xix + 366. Hardback £47.50, ISBN: 978-0-19-872171-0.

[21] *Hyperides. Funeral Oration*. Edited with introduction, translation, and commentary by Judson Herrman. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009. Pp. xiv + 148. Hardback £40, ISBN: 978-0-19-538865-7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

unpretentious translation. The introduction is informative (the explanation of the historical background is so luminous that it left me wondering why I had ever found it confusing). The commentary ranges from papyrological and linguistic detail to historical and ideological content. The book is also a visual delight: since it was designed and typeset by the author, Herrman merits an unusually comprehensive encomium. And finally, a pleasing surprise – as Donald Russell once described the declamations of Choricius of Gaza. Robert Penella, adding to his already considerable contributions to the dissemination of late antique orations, has recruited a team of translators to produce a complete translation (declaration of interest: I was one of the recruits).[22] Penella himself translates Choricius' informal introductory talks and supplies the introduction; an epilogue by Eugenio Amato gives an account of the declamations' Byzantine and Renaissance reception. I note that we don't yet have a complete translation of Libanius' declamations: may we have a volunteer, please?

MALCOLM HEATH
M.F.Heath@leeds.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0017383510000550

Latin Literature

A recurrent theme in this batch of new publications is the attempt at synthesis between the study of classical literature and the study of its later reception. In one way or another, many of the works here are seeking to come to a better understanding of Latin texts by examining the ways in which they have subsequently been interpreted, labelled, chopped about by editors, imitated, plundered, and canonized, and to see them as forming part of a continuous intellectual and literary history unrolling to the present day. A most successful exponent of this approach is Aude Doody's impressive and illuminating study,[23] which traces various aspects of the reception of Pliny's *Natural History* and argues that, as a result of accidents of interpretation along the way, the work has been radically misunderstood. To modern eyes, the *Natural History* looks so instantly recognizable as a modern encyclopaedia – complete with *summarium* as user-friendly table of contents – that it is hard for us to appreciate how innovative and quirky it was in its own time. Moreover, modern scholars have considerable investment in conceptualizing the work as a repository of facts and knowledge about, say, ancient art or science, upon which they may draw. In a study that ranges from technical detail of textual criticism and *mise-en-livre* in sixteenth-century editions to the broad sweep of intellectual history, encompassing along the way Francis Bacon, Diderot, and the French enlightenment, Doody unpicks the story of how we have come to our modern conception of Pliny's work, in a way that challenges us to rethink this conception. Her aim is partly to defamiliarize a *Natural History* that we accept too easily as an encyclopaedia, and offer instead 'the alarming possibility of a radical Pliny' (4). The book is scholarly, wide-ranging, and theoretically

[22] *Thetorical Exercises from Late Antiquity. A Translation of Choricius of Gaza's Preliminary Talks and Declamations*. Edited by Robert J. Penella. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009. Pp. xii + 323. Hardback £65, ISBN: 978-0-521-84873-2.

[23] *Pliny's Encyclopedia. The Reception of the* Natural History. By Aude Doody. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2010. Pp. viii + 194. Hardback £55, ISBN: 978-0-521-49103-7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000550 Published online by Cambridge University Press