PHTHONOS

D. KONSTAN, N. K. RUTTER (edd.): *Envy, Spite and Jealousy. The Rivalrous Emotions in Ancient Greece*. (Edinburgh Leventis Studies 2.) Pp. xiv + 305. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-7846-1603-9.

These twelve papers, which include a substantial discussion of the gamut of envious emotions in Rome, are based on those offered at a conference in March 2001 organized by Leventis Professor David Konstan, with the head of the Edinburgh Classics Department. Konstan's opening paper, 'Before Jealousy', arguing the issue of lexical and conceptual discrepancy between ancient Greek and modern sexual jealousy, demonstrates on a topic relatively marginal to the volume the problems of semantic shifts through Greek cultural history and non-equivalence between Greek and English which complicate (but do not falsify) argument in each of these papers.

To list the remaining papers: four on philosophers, 'Is Rivalry a Virtue or a Vice?' by Christopher Gill; '*Phthonos* in the World of Plato's *Timaeus*' by F. G. Herrmann; 'Competitive Emotions and *Thumos* in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*', by Cristina Viano; and 'Aristotle on Emotions towards the Fortunes of Others', by Aaron Ben-Ze'ev. Next, three on literature before the fourth century: 'Epinician Envies', by Glenn Most (focused on Pindar, with brief surveys of *phthonos* and *zelos* in Homer and Hesiod); 'The Cause of Things; Envy and the Emotions in Herodotus' *Histories*', by Thomas Harrison (in which envy is rather lost among rival causalities); and Simon Goldhill on 'Tragic Emotions; the Pettiness of Envy and the Politics of Pitilessness' (largely explaining the non-recognition of envy in tragedy).

Three papers focus on aspects of envy in fourth century Athenian society: 'Let Envy be Absent: Envy, Liturgies and Reciprocity in Athens', by Nick Fisher; 'Envy and Emulation in Isocrates', by Suzanne Said; and D. L. Cairns's 'The Politics of Envy: Envy and Equality in Ancient Greece', with closure provided by the one Roman study, 'Invidia, *nemesis, phthonos* and the Roman Emotional Economy', by Robert A. Kaster.

Several frameworks for thinking are used singly or together: (i) the context of envy: personal contestation in the athletic and dramatic *agon* and for political leadership (Rawls's 'particular envy'), where there seems to be a zero-sum game, or the 'general envy' of the mass for the élite; (ii) the persons envied; rivalry between peers, or envy of privileged superiors; (iii) the goods, material or spiritual, which are the object of envy; and (iv) the contrast of envy and emulation, usually distinguished as wishing to deprive the envied person, or to share their advantages. Add to these (v) a dichotomy of levels between analysis of envy as a psychological phenomenon, and of the exploitation by Attic politicians and orators of other men's capacity for envy.

Because my interests incline to fourth-century society and rhetoric, I limit myself to the papers from which I learned most, with discussion of three issues which arose across many of the contributions. As often, Gill provides an admirably systematic account of philosophical judgement on envy, opposing the Peripatetic acceptance of some envy (like some anger) as a virtue, to its overall condemnation by Plato, Stoics and Epicureans. He uses the Platonic dichotomy between material goods (power, wealth, and to some extent honour) and goods of the soul and intellect to show that since the former are not worth envying, while the latter are inexhaustible and available to all who seek them correctly, there can be no justification for envy (this is echoed by Said's argument that while Isocrates as public figure aimed to exonerate his wealth from popular envy, as teacher he aimed to divert students from material to higher and

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

more spiritual goals.) It looks as though Fisher, Said, and Cairns really collaborated in sharing and separating aspects of their common material. Fisher offers the richest social context (and the widest range of ancient evidence from Aristophanes and Xenophon to Plutarch) for the political issues arising from liturgies. On the relationship they imply between mass and élite, he argues (pp. 192–3) against Wilson's study *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia* for a more positive picture of the relationship between *philotimia* and the Demos on three grounds: the existence of a body of 'middling people' who were potential bearers of liturgies, the goodwill arising from collaboration between *choregos* and citizen chorus, and the claim that reciprocity was not a strictly aristocratic value.

If some students of Athenian society are not convinced, this will most likely arise from their negative perception of the behaviour of the underprivileged: but the paper offers a vivid picture of the workings of hands-on democratic society which should not be missed. In contrast, Said writes from Isocrates' point of view, and I found her most useful in clarifying the use of *zelos*/*aemulatio*/emulation to distinguish from examples closer to envy cited by earlier papers, the sense of emulation as imitating the admired achievements of others, 'the polar opposite of envy', 'striving for greater goods in socially beneficial ways'. Surely this is what most of us understand by emulation? In Cairns's paper, whose starting point, the socially destructive British politics of the 1980s, may make it less accessible to North American readers, the striking innovation is his stress on the *phthonos* of the privileged. This unwillingness to share privilege is most blatant in the context of extending the franchise—whether of Athenians begrudging the citizenship to loyal metics, or Romans denying it to Italian allies, of nineteenth-century exclusion of non-property owners from voting rights, or the denial less than a century ago of suffrage to women. The Athenian demos, with political equality but social inequality, will feel but never admit to envy, and when Demosthenes declares to a large popular jury that the Demos has abstained from envy towards the rich, because envy is the mark of a bad nature (*Against Leptines* 137–42, cf. 10) we may suspect him of disguising exhortation as compliment (like Seneca congratulating Nero on his clemency).

Cairns moves from the 'top-down' *phthonos* of kings in Herodotus to an issue touched on by about half the papers: the *phthonos* of the gods (also Herodotean, cf. Harrison, pp. 158–9); Most (p. 125) considers the Olympians' jealousy, not of human prosperity, but of worship given to others, compared with the Old Testament's Jealous Yahweh; Herrmann naturally argues that Plato's god/creator in *Timaeus* or *Phaedrus* would be immune from envy. Cairns (pp. 249–51) concurs with Fisher (p. 182) in seeing divine *phthonos* against the misuse or display of wealth and power as a compensatory belief of the masses who invert the human top-down relationship by setting the élite beneath the control of the immortals.

The gods are not the exponents of envy/*invidia*, but its objects, in Kaster's marvellously economical paper. His starting point is Cicero's perception that Latin has no verbal distinction between spiteful envy and righteous indignation (Gk *nemesis*); hence he substitutes for lexical argument the need for 'scripts' (scenarios that set the emotional reaction in full context), and offers a taxonomy of four levels of resentment at another's advantage, opposing general spite to two levels of personal envy and what the emotional agent feels as indignation: but the distinguishing aspect of Latin *invidia* is its application to unpopularity or passive ill-will. As Kaster shows, generating ill-will was a technique practised both by Roman orators (especially in the *contio*) and by the people of Rome, from the putting on of mourning on behalf of a defendant (mourning was also exploited against opponents in Greek culture, like the display of

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mourning by next of kin after Arginusae) to the collective naming and shaming (*flagitatio*) at your enemy's or debtor's house door. Here too the gods are implicated, whether used in supplication of an enemy or accused by mourning and lamentation. These rituals carry righteous indignation beyond human targets: and they may have intensified under autocracy, when it became safer to direct one's indignation against Fortuna.

Lack of space (and expertise) prevents me from doing justice to other papers: all are admirably edited and proofread, with individual bibliographies. There is a full *index locorum* and a consolidated general index that is unusually detailed and helpful.

Princeton University ELAINE FANTHAM
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni100

SICILIES OF THE MIND

G. Avezzù, E. Pianezzola (edd.): *Sicilia e Magna Grecia. Spazio reale e spazio immaginario nella letteratura greca e latina.* (Studi Testi Documenti 10.) Pp. x + 238. Padova: Imprimitur, 1999. Paper.

This group of six papers from the University of Padua focuses on the literary treatment mainly of Sicily and Magna Graecia, in a specific range of ancient literary texts from Cicero to Claudian. The project produces some illuminating contrasts and raises worthwhile further questions, though there are some limitations built into the particular choice of texts, so that there is seldom the prospect of comparing like with like.

This is shown in particular in the case of the two novelists who happen to deal with Sicily. Chariton (A. Zinato) is able to evoke the Sicily of classical Greek history by making Callirhoe the daughter of Hermocrates of Syracuse, and have the hero's ship make a dramatic entrance at the end to the Harbour (8.6): Callirhoe's longing for home keeps Sicily in the foreground even without any need for grandiose description. By contrast, Xenophon's Sicily and Magna Graecia (D. Susanetti) offer something of a non-subject: any adventures that do happen there, including people-trafficking and mummification (!), could just as well have been placed anywhere else by the writer's sticking a pin in the map. Yet the point can be drawn: how little need it take to evoke a place, and how much material in Xenophon's case can be squandered by a writer still failing to do so?

There is a great deal more to go on in the two papers (G. Baldo, C. Moro) focused on the allusion to Henna in Cicero's *Verrines* 2.4.105–15, and on the mythological landscape of Claudian's *De raptu*. Cicero has a very obvious tactical purpose in evoking a myth of rape in the local legend of Sicily to serve as a counterpoint to the depredations of Verres, a latter-day raptor on a colossal scale; while the study of Claudian stresses the rôle of Aetna as a metaphor for the subterranean might of Proserpina's kidnapper. The lavish quotation in the latter paper might serve to underline the rather incidental appearance of the areas in question elsewhere in the volume.

Unfortunately the treatment of both regions by both Livy and ps.-Apollodorus (N. Vidale, P. Scarpi) is at the mercy of limited survival of both authors, though interesting details do emerge: one notes a certain romanocentrism, unsurprisingly, in Livy's handling of Greek cities (in fact none of the authors used belong in the area under

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni100 Published online by Cambridge University Press