The Classical Review

NEW SERIES VOLUME XLIX NO. 2

(VOLUME CXIII OF THE CONTINUOUS SERIES)

1999

HOMER FOR THE NEW MILLENNIUM

I. MORRIS, B. POWELL (edd.): *A New Companion to Homer.* (*Mnemosyne* Supplement 163.) Pp. xviii + 755. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997. Cased, $266.50. ISBN: 90-04-09989-1; ISSN: 0169-9858.

The reviewer's first duty must be to utter maledictions against the publishers, who have produced this monumental volume at a truly monstrous price. Teaching in an institution where most classicists are obliged to study the *Iliad*, I did not even consider ordering this volume for my college library, which has a distinguished classics collection, until Brill in desperation dropped the price by 50% in a recent sale. Even so, it is beyond the scope of most individuals. Both editors and publishers should have thought much harder about what a book like this really needs to contain. In what follows, however, I shall assume that the reader has easy access to a copy: what does (s)he get for the money?

The *New Companion* is billed as (in a sense) a replacement for the Wace–Stubbings *Companion* (London, 1962, but mostly written or conceived much earlier). It contains thirty essays arranged in four sections: Transmission and History of Interpretation; Homer's Language; Homer as Literature; and Homer's Worlds (the last group a hold-all of eight essays, ranging from pure archaeology to social analysis of the poems). By contrast, in Wace–Stubbings the first 266 pages were concerned with the poems and their transmission, and the rest, by far the greater part of the book, dealt with the sites, the material setting, and the reconstruction of 'the Homeric world', seeking to unite the evidence of the poems with the archaeological record. A fundamental theme of the *New Companion* is that this close correlation between Mycenae and Homer is misguided, and there is much more awareness that the poems may reflect a later reality—even, that they may sometimes not be realistic or historical at all. My own impression is that even now most of the contributors to Section 4 are still too inclined to bring reality and imaginative poetry into direct contact.

For the most part these essays offer a clear and informative resumé of the current scholarly state of play. Many are the work of scholars who have published books on the same theme (e.g. Powell on writing, de Jong on narratology, Snodgrass on Homeric scenes in art, Clay on the Homeric Hymns, van Wees on warfare), or who are known already for their expertise in these fields (M. L. West on Metre, Willcock on Neoanalysis, Horrocks on Homeric Dialect, F. Turner on the Homeric Question in the Nineteenth Century).

Space forbids discussion of all the contributions, but some stand out as exceptionally good. Powell gets the volume off to a splendid start with a wide-ranging and highly intelligent essay embracing the nature of an alphabet, the adaptation of the West Semitic script, and the location of Homer (in Euboea): even if some parts may

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

perplex, we are carried along by the sheer interest Powell's writing generates. Another star item is Haslam on 'Homeric Papyri and the Transmission of the Text'—at forty-six pages, the longest essay in the book, but the editorial indulgence here benefits the reader as well as the contributor: more than anywhere else in the volume, one really feels the writer is at the cutting edge of research. Mark Edwards on 'Homeric Style and Oral Poetics' shows his usual ability to allow technical observation to bear interpretative fruit. I also enjoyed A. Ford on 'Epic as Genre': he has thought carefully about the defining characteristics of the form (notably how to distinguish epic from didactic), and even attempts a definition (pp. 411–12).

Other essays are distinctly less satisfactory. The piece by Nagy on 'The Homeric Scholia' is misleadingly titled: it is in fact a further broadside in his campaign to establish that the epic texts were more fluid, at a far later stage, than is usually thought. It gives no idea of the character of the different scholia (hardly a phrase is quoted from them), and despite the odd casual reference, the uninformed reader would inevitably assume that the sole interest of the scholia lies in their value in reconstructing the history of the text. Anyone who has read N. J. Richardson's densely informative paper in *CQ* 30 (1980), pp. 265–87 or R. Meijering, *Literary and Rhetorical Theories in Greek Scholia* (Groningen, 1987), will find this ludicrous. Elsewhere contributors seem hampered by constrictions of space: thus Kahane's essay on statistical work ('Quantifying Epic') makes interesting points but has little room to go beyond negative arguments, while Bakker, on 'The Study of Homeric Discourse', suffers by using as his 'typical' example of spoken language a passage of such banality (pp. 289f.) that it amounts almost to parody. I presume that this approach shows to better advantage in his book-length treatment.

I turn now to the more literary material. The section divisions are of course artificial, and there is much helpful material for readers of Homer as poetry in Willcock on Neonalysis or de Jong on Narratology, neither of which is in the 'Literature' section. But the individual essays allocated to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, which should have been central to the book's conception, are flimsy. S. Schein admits that his fifteen-page essay is partly based on Chapter I of his 1984 book on the *Iliad*: it is lucid and innocuous, but there are no surprises. Nowhere is the nature of Achilles' dilemma in Book IX adequately discussed, and the fruitful debate inspired by Adam Parry's 'The Language of Achilles' goes unmentioned in the volume. S. V. Tracy on the *Odyssey* deals mainly with structural patterns, again drawing heavily on his earlier book: despite flashes of enthusiasm, we are given little sense of the subtlety and scope of the poem. When it comes to a particular scholarly problem, the end of the *Odyssey*, Tracy permits himself a laxness of argument that he would never countenance in his own epigraphic sphere (p. 367); and his bibliography here is twenty years out of date, omitting the essential paper by S. West, *PCPS* 35 (1989), 113ff., and other works cited in my *Homer* (*G&R New Surveys* 26 [1996], 81 nn. 69, 74–5). More positively, there are useful essays by W. Hansen on Folk-tale (a very informative overview, with examples old and new), L. Edmunds on Myth (though his account of the Meleager paradigm does not wholly satisfy), and R. Rosen on the relation between Homer and Hesiod.

Another missed opportunity is Peradotto on 'Modern Theoretical Approaches to Homer'. This could have been one of the most important essays in the book, but in fact it is one of the feeblest. Peradotto has simply not thought hard enough about what is needed. Having devoted eight of his sixteen pages to tedious generalizations about the assault which postmodernism has launched against the epistemology quaintly called 'Standard Average European' language and thought, he turns to particulars by giving a brief review of five recent books on Homer representing

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Marxist, feminist, and intertextualist standpoints. The choice of books for discussion is heavily biased towards the *Odyssey*, because (as he revealingly admits), 'its own preoccupation with. . . the concerns of postmodernism are [*sic*] more patent'. He deliberately excludes discussion of any works which do not explicitly adopt a theoretical posture. But how can we assess the value of these allegedly new approaches except by confronting them with the best of what traditional scholarship and criticism have done and seeing how they measure up? There are any number of ways in which P. could have done this and provided a valuable *συγκρίσις* of methods: he might have studied the reading of *Il.* 24 in Lynn-George's ambitious book and set it alongside the careful and deeply considered treatment by Macleod in his commentary (a work ignored throughout this volume); he might have taken a classic passage of Homer andanalysed it using a number of different methodologies, as Christopher Butler did with 'Leda and the Swan' in *Interpretation, Deconstruction and Ideology* (Oxford, 1984), pp.36–46, or L. Edmunds with Hor. *Odes* 1.9 in *From a Sabine Jar* (Chapel Hill, 1992). Again, an examination from a sceptical postmodern standpoint of the unspoken theoretical assumptions of the different Cambridge commentators (some of whom have ventured their own explicit methodological statements) might have been genuinely instructive, all the more so as the very form of the commentary has classical roots, particularly in Homeric exegesis (as Nagy's chapter signally fails to show). As it is, Peradotto's sneers at New Criticism come ill from a critic who is not prepared to grapple with any specific passage of the epic. In fact, the strengths of this volume are in the treatment of matters which concern the historian (including the historian of language and of oral poetry) rather than the critic.

Some duplication was perhaps inevitable. Russo and Edwards on formulae cover a lot of the same ground; the latter is superior. Similarly I would be content to keep Raaflaub on 'Society' (itself overlapping with at least three essays of his published elsewhere) and drop Donlan on 'Economy'. I thought the best of the historical contributions was S. Morris's fascinating survey of Homer and the Near East, which covers both influences on the poems and Easterners as portrayed within them. J. Bennet's 'Homer and the Bronze Age' is intelligent and informative, making very clear how frail (though not non-existent) are the links between Homer and the world of Linear B. It is paradoxical that I. Morris's companion essay on the Iron Age actually makes *less* connection between the poems and the material record. An expert survey of the material evidence from 1100–700 is enclosed within a preamble and a finale which both assert that Homer and the monuments represent two different ways in which the Greeks conceptualized their relationship with the past. In these highly generalized terms, the claim is hardly refutable. But nothing is done to compare or contrast these ways, even in areas where Morris's discussion would provide a starting point (e.g. with hero-cult, p. 543). When we read that 'Epirote contacts with the Aegean strengthened. . . Imports were probably more valued in the mountains. . . But Macedonia remained strongly Balkan. . .' (p. 554), the suspicion grows stronger that this is the wrong essay for this volume.

Only reviewers will read Morris–Powell cover to cover, and even they will use it largely as a work of reference. It is no minor complaint, therefore, that the indexing is appallingly inadequate. There is no *index locorum* (even 'potiorum'), no index of Greek words (both provided by Wace–Stubbings), and the existing index constantly disappoints. Where entries exist they are sometimes incomplete (e.g. for Virgil add at least pp. 132, 331; for Indo-European, add pp. 235, 600; for *demiourgoi*, add p. 651) or undifferentiated, as when we are told the seventy different places where Achilles is discussed. There being no entry for Homer, *Iliad*, or *Odyssey*, it is not easy to find the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

various places where the date, location, or literacy of Homer are treated (see pp. 18–22, 28–32, 79–83). There are no entries for allegory (e.g. pp. 42–3), assembly (p. 642), book-division (p. 58), catalogue-poetry (p. 408), epithets (pp. 276, 280), expurgation (p. 144), gifts (pp. 637f., 663f), *hapax legomena* (p. 271), ideology (pp. 292–3), iron (pp.532, 542), justice (p. 644), paradigms (p. 309), slaves and *thetes* (pp. 638f., 662), typical scenes (pp. 154f., 169), or 'women'(!!) (e.g. pp. 639f.). Indexing of scholars' names is notoriously a problem, but here we have Fränkel but not Snell, Bentley butnot Bernal, and most incredibly of all, Aristophanes of Byzantium but not Aristarchus (pp. 71ff. *passim*, 276, etc.). It is understandable that the editors did notfeel they had the time to do the job thoroughly themselves, but in that case a professional indexer should have been paid to do it, as has been done with outstanding success for *CAH*.

I have said nothing yet of cases where an entry does not exist because the book does not discuss a subject at all. The following areas are particularly surprising: nothing onstyle, speeches, rhetoric, and characterization (the last noted as a desideratum by de Jong, p. 324); nothing on similes (and the bibliography lacks even the most fundamental references); and no discussion of religion, either as represented in the poem or the realities of archaic cult (no entries even for 'temples', let alone prayer, sacrifice, afterlife, shame, guilt, or pollution). It is saddening that Dodds's *Greeks and the Irrational*, seminal in this as in so many fields and still fresher and more stimulating than a dozen more recent works, should remain unmentioned in this book, as it was(for chronological reasons, apparently) in Wace–Stubbings. Finally, nothing on 'reception' except the treatment of the ancient critics by Lamberton. This is a retrograde step compared with Wace–Stubbings, who included an introductory chapter by J. A. K. Thomson, 'Homer and his Influence'; that brief account naturally looks antique to modern reception-theorists, but still provides a useful broad-brush sketch. Contrast the admirable emphasis on this aspect of our studies in the recent *Cambridge Companions to Virgil* and to *Greek Tragedy*. What all this suggests is that a *Companion* concerned with a poet should have had at least one editor whose prime scholarly concern is with literary criticism.

The volume is dedicated to the memory of Arthur Adkins. The editors have done him a disservice, however, by including an essay from his last years on 'Homeric Ethics'. This adds little or nothing to his earlier work, and the neglect of passages which do not suit his argument, and of the many opposed voices among modern scholars, greatly limits its usefulness. Not even Long and Lloyd-Jones are confronted, still less the recent contributions by Yamagata, Cairns, and B. Williams's *Shame and Necessity* (this is listed in the bibliography, but I have been unable to find any contributor referring to it).

There are thirteen plates, all relating to Snodgrass's essay (I would have welcomed an illustration of the Theran fresco discussed by Bennet on p. 527). These are unhelpfully presented without even captions, and with no indication of their provenance or present location (sometimes Snodgrass provides this, but we should not have to search in his text).

The book is sometimes hard reading: the freshness of the papers by Powell, Turner, and S. Morris makes a welcome change from the generally stolid academic prose. But at least the contributors write in intelligible English (though I wince at p. 619 'a brief but vivid window' and p. 543 'This package of rites'!). Only Peradotto descends to the nonsensical (p. 391). Misprints: p. 495 l. 12, for '1975' read '1795'; p. 530 l. 4, for ἀοιδά read ἀοιδοί; on pp. 17 and 498 the references to Quintilian should read 1.1.24–5 and 4.1.2; p. xviii l. 5, 'complementary' not 'complimentary'; on p. 402 'Bowra 1925'

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

should be '1952'. The bibliography omits West 1992 (cited on p. 219), an unspecified paper by Race (p. 324), and even Reinhardt 1961 (p. 359); it also gives the wrong title for Woodman 1988.

This volume will certainly be useful, and in some areas indispensable. Haslam's paper, though technical, is of the first importance for anyone concerned with the textual tradition and many related topics. The essays by Powell, J. Foley (on 'Oral Tradition'), Edwards, Bennet, and S. Morris would catch the interest of any reader. Most of the rest are likely to turn up regularly on undergraduate reading lists. But on the whole the book is a disappointment: I expected to learn from it far more than I did. Wace–Stubbings will undoubtedly be consulted less, but Morris–Powell is not a book which can be relied on to answer all the questions which a reader of Homer in the early 2000s may want to ask.

Christ Church, Oxford R. B. RUTHERFORD

ORAL STYLE

M. Clark: *Out of Line. Homeric Composition beyond the Hexameter*. Pp. xi + 264. Lanham, etc.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998. Cased, £46 (Paper, £18.95). ISBN: 0-8476-8697-3 (0-8476-8698-1 pbk).

C. begins with a bold statement of his credentials: he is a Parryist, and his starting point is that the epic style is an oral style. If that is now unfashionable in some quarters on grounds of its supposed aridity, let us grant the premiss, that the epic manner of composition displays certain highly characteristic features, and leave aside the inference, that it is oral. The manner of composition is responsible for some of the most striking qualities of the epic style, those praised by Arnold long ago, its swiftness, its nobility, its clarity, its simplicity, and its directness. There is nothing arid about the attempt to understand how these qualities were maintained for thousands of lines on end, and C. has made a useful, and agreeably written, contribution to our yet incomplete understanding. He begins by discussing the merits, and demerits, of several models of 'formular composition'. C. finds it difficult to devise a model that is both distinctive and comprehensive, but he makes the attempt and comes up tentatively with what he calls a 'deep-structure model': habitual word-associations in the depths, and their realization in an appropriate place and rhythm at the surface. It would be helpful, I think, if the mantra of 'formular composition' could be stripped of its talismanic character and restricted to the very narrow area where it is genuinely applicable. Attempts to define what is formular tend to founder either because the definition covers too small a part of the diction to be the key to its qualities, or because comprehensiveness is bought at the cost of vacuity. Part of the difficulty is that the deep structure may be, as Nagler has argued, pre-verbal, and tightness of the nexus where it is verbal is a variable factor.

However, C.'s model serves his purpose, namely, to build on Higbie's description of enjambment in epic versification and integrate those word-associations that are realized across verse boundaries. A few examples show that the 'same metrical conditions' have no relevance to this type of word-association. C. speaks of a lexical

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'trigger' in the leading verse prompting associated language in the following, often inorganic, verse.

Already, the data cited put the concept of formularity under some strain. After noting that repetitions arising, for example, from the reporting of messages are not formular, C. cites as instances of the trigger effect two (*Il.* 1.207–8, and 17.692 with 18.20–21) arising from such a report, and two (*Il.* 4.502-3 and *Od.* 17.4734) where the leading passage precedes by relatively few lines—the phenomenon of clustering or agglomeration rather than strict formularity—out of six examples (on p. 220 C. notes the clustering factor but attributes to it an artistic motivation). The strain tightens when it is noted that the trigger may be a synonym of a usual word, as a runover triggered by ἔντεα rather than the usual τεύχεα. Indeed, a 'wild card' of suitable sense and metrics may be triggered, as when Δαναῶν and ὄχεσφιν at *Il.* 13.1–3 replace the Τρώων and νηυσίν of *Il.* 8.343–5, the trigger being the participle φεύγοντες. C. then proceeds to examine the effects of a pause at the bucolic diaeresis. The result is a necessary enjambement and an organically integrated subsequent verse, sometimes, but by no means always, formular. This kind of arrangement illustrates, in my view, how a regular integration of verse and sentence structure can prompt an apparently formular sequence of words across the verse-end. The same point applies to larger constructions extending over several lines.

C. is sensitive, perhaps unduly so, to a feeling that his research sheds no light on the poetry of Homer, and devotes a chapter to criticism of suggestions that Homeric repetitions either must have artistic significance or are necessarily without it. This is an area where logic and theory are confounded by common sense. C. approaches this question by making a distinction between formulas expressing a single idea, which he links to metrical utility or necessity, and those expressing more complicated thought, whose use is determined by their sense. This permits the repetition of the latter to have significance, but does not require it, and the critic must beware of overinterpretation. (Yet even at the level of formular epithets sooner or later the force of the expression will come vividly alive.) One must bear in mind also that in a traditional style the first occurrence in a poem of a formula, long or short, is itself a repetition of its use elsewhere, and therefore with potentially important implications.

New College, Oxford J. B. HAINSWORTH

BURNING SAPPHO

P. Du Bois: *Sappho is Burning*. Pp. xii + 206. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995. $24.95/£19.95. ISBN: 0-226-16755-0.

Sappho studies have undergone a veritable renaissance in the last few years, with books by Williamson (*Sappho's Immortal Daughters* [Cambridge, MA, 1995]), Hatherly Wilson (*Sappho's Sweet Bitter Songs* [London, 1996]), and two provocative volumes edited by Greene (*Reading Sappho* and *Re-Reading Sappho* [both New York, 1997]). In contrast toWilliamson's otherwise valuable study published at the same time as this volume, Du Bois offers a deeper reading of Sappho, more suited to advanced academics and postgraduate students. D. engages soundly with Sappho's

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tortured reception, charting phases and trends of classical scholarship via the medium of Sapphic interpretation.

D. is at pains to stress the personal nature of her, and of our own, interpretations and readings. She cautiously approaches Sappho without a cultural agenda, be it literary, historical, or socio-sexual. She wants the texts to speak for themselves, and so offers introductory chapters (Chapters I and II) on the methodological problems of the interpretation of so tantalizing a series of fragments. Chapter III focuses upon the attitude towards the female body as glimpsed in Sappho's fragments, where literary fragments echo the fetishistic fragmentation of the body of the subject of the poetry. Thus we see how Sappho prefigures the developed fragmentation of female body partsin the erotic discourse of, for example, Hellenistic epigram. Sappho's concepts ofdesire are compared with those offered by Plato in Chapter IV (with discussion of*Phaedrus*, *Phaedo*, and *Symposium*). Here D. analyses the 'feminine' in Plato andoffers a forceful plea to consider more sanely than, for example, Halperin or Saxonhouse the rôle of exclusion of women in philosophy. Sappho's ideas or definitions of being are illustrated and evaluated in Chapter V, through the figure ofHelen. Here D. observes the relationship between Sappho and her Homeric predecessors, analysing and defining Sappho's use of philosophical concepts such as *to agathon*, *to kalon*, *to ariston*, etc. Here D. places Sappho in her historical and social context, suggesting that the upheavals of her contemporary society may have allowed her and women of her class a new social identity. Chapters VI and VII discuss Sappho's reception, with detailed critiques especially of Foucault, who plays down or ignores the importance of Sappho. D. argues that Sappho requires a place in any history of sexuality, as a woman narrator, desiring other women, in an exclusively masculine domain. In these chapters, and especially in VII, D. questions the essentialist approach of modern-day lesbians to claim Sappho as their ancestor. Is her desire for women more important than her aristocratic freedom to 'speak', or vice versa? Sappho's poetry may not always support views of oppressed, passive women inantiquity: she problematizes such simplistic readings. As such, D.'s critique of Foucault and his followers complements the similar criticism of his ideas by other scholars recently, e.g. in D. Larmour, P. Miller, C. Platter (edd.) *Rethinkimg Sexuality. Foucault and Classical Antiquity* (Princeton, 1998).

The final chapter interestingly discusses Sappho as a precursor of Asianism in classical literature, with her interests in the East, in luxury, and in exotic, sensual beauty. Again D. situates Sappho in the history of scholarship, discussing the works of scholars both ancient (e.g. Herodotus) and modern (e.g. Page). D.'s own style complements the personal, lyrical quality of the fragments she so lovingly admires andinvestigates, and as such may not be to the taste of all academic readers. However,there are many sane questions asked about our blithe, culturally weighted appreciations of this enigmatic figure whom D. wishes to remain an enigma. D.'s detailed linguistic analysis, which runs throughout the book, will interest scholars of Sappho and of Greek language in general. It is perhaps not a book for those reading Sappho for the first time, but is nonetheless a serious wave in Sapphic scholarship, which rocks many a methodological boat *en route*.

The volume has a very good, modern bibliography and general index, but would have benefited from an index of passages discussed.

Royal Holloway, London RICHARD HAWLEY

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PLECTRA DOLORE TACENT

E. GREENE (ed.): *Reading Sappho. Contemporary Approaches*. Pp. xiii + 303. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1998. Cased, £32/$40. ISBN: 0-520-20195-7.

E. GREENE (ed.): *Re-reading Sappho. Reception and Transmission*. Pp.xiii + 254. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1998. Cased, £32/$40. ISBN: 0-520-20602-9.

What effects Sappho has on her readers! The views expressed in these two volumes of twenty-four essays (five published for the first time, the rest revised reprints) range from interesting and credible, to jejune, bizarre, and incredible. But interpretation, especially of poetry, inevitably involves subjectivity, so I report largely without comment.

Lanata kicks off the first volume, telling us in 'Sappho's Amatory Language' that 'in Sapphic lyric one can isolate the elements of a series of amatory representations articulated in a language in which Homeric, Hesiodic, and Archilochean precedents are yoked together to characterize a new situation' (p. 18). So ὡς γὰρ ἔς σ' ἴδω (31.7)'has a precedent' (p. 22) in *Il.* 14.294: ὡς δ' ἴδεν, ὥς μιν ἔρως πυκινὰς φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν.

But what is the situation that poem 31 describes? For Lefkowitz (cf. Most below) itis illusory: 'There is nothing specifically stated in the poem about jealousy of a rival.... The deliberate generality of the poem, the absence of proper names and specific references to time and place, indicate that this poem is meant to bring to mind no particular place or occasion' (pp. 33–4). So the poem is not autobiographical.

Nagy, too, looks at what we can and cannot learn about S.'s life, and considers inparticular the biographical tradition that says S. leapt off the White Rock of Leukasout of love for Phaon. We are told that the fall is a metaphor for a fall from consciousness to unconsciousness under the intoxication of love. Moreover, 'The very name *Pháon*, just like *Phaéthon*, suggests a solar theme' (p. 53), and when Aphrodite mates with Phaethon in the *Theogony* (988–91) 'the setting sun mates with the goddess of regeneration so that the rising sun may be reborn' (pp. 47–8). Returning in the light of this to S.'s love for Phaon, which N. (following Wilamowitz) believes was a theme ina Sapphic poem no longer extant, 'The implicit hope is retrieved youth' (p. 57). Perhaps.

Segal, noting that the Homeric bard 'charms' his audience, applies this observation to S.: 'The magical *thelxis* of her words seeks to create—or recreate—the magical *thelxis* of love' (p. 63), and (in one of the two most extraordinary sentences in either of the two volumes) on 31.8–15, 'The recurrence of the conjunction δέ, seven times in eight lines, contributes to the ritualising, incantatory effect' (p. 64).

Further bizarre suggestions are made by du Bois: 'The third stanza [of poem 16] begins with καλλίποισ'... .The first letters of the participle echo the καλλ- of κάλλος, and link the leaving behind, her act of desertion, with her beauty' (p. 81). And, according to the second of the two most extraordinary sentences, in the poem as a whole, 'Sappho is progressing toward analytical language, toward the notion of definition, of logical classes, of subordination and hypotactic structure' (p. 84).

More plausibly, Winkler uncovers sexual undertones in S.'s vocabulary, suggesting that the sensuous contexts surrounding μῆλον (105a), νύμφη, and even the name of

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

her 'daughter' Kleis indicate that these words beneath the surface allude to the clitoris (pp. 102–8; cf. Andreadis below).

Carson reinterprets 1.21–4: S. is not saying that the other girl will one day change her mind and love S., but that one day she will suffer by falling in love with someone against her will: Sappho 'is not praying to Aphrodite for a reconciliation with her beloved. She is praying for Justice' (p. 232).

Who sang S.'s songs? Lardinois argues for choral, not monodic, performance of most of the poems. Even 5, about her brother Charaxus, 'was sung by Sappho (or someone impersonating her) in public, while her chorus danced' (p. 166).

Calame, Hallett, Stehle, and Skinner ponder S.'s rôle in her contemporary Lesbian society. C.: 'Sappho's circle looks like a sort of school for femininity destined to make the young pupils into accomplished women' (p. 118; cf. Parker below); H.: S.'s function was 'that of instilling sensual awareness and sexual self-esteem and of facilitating role adjustment in young females coming of age in a sexually segregated society' (p. 128). Skinner believes that, 'Through imaginative identification with the first-person speaker, a girl would have absorbed survival tricks for living within a patriarchal culture.. . . The ultimate purpose of Sapphic song, we may conclude, was to encode strategies for perpetuating women's culture' (p. 189).

But Stehle believes S.'s poetry has a different purpose, citing poem 94 where 'The whole movement of the recollection is toward erotic culmination' (p. 147); and in a another essay that considers the way Sappho 'gazes' on female beauty we learn from Stehle that, 'Through her use of the gaze to dissolve hierarchy, Sappho creates the same kind of open space for imagining unscripted sexual relations that the mythic pattern of goddess with young man makes possible. By this means Sappho can represent an alternative for women to the cultural norms' (p. 221). One wonders what S. herself would have thought of all this.

Social implications of S.'s poetry are also considered by Greene and Williamson: both illustrate how the dominance of lover over beloved in male relationships is absent from S.'s female relationships. G. focuses on the ways in which S.'s use of apostrophe bridges the distance between addresser and addressed, and thus contributes (in 94) to a picture in which, 'Boundaries of person, object, and place seem to break down as everything in the environment dissolves into a totality of sensation' (p. 241). W. takes this 'elision' of rôles a stage further, arguing that Helen in poem 16 is both a desiring subject and a desired object; moreover, when she sails to Troy leaving behind her family she is both imitating the action of male Homeric heroes and at the same time enacting the female speaker's erotic impulse: 'The elision of subject and object results, then, in the confounding of mythical categories of gender' (pp. 262–3).

And so on to the second volume. The crux of Most's essay rests on a reminder that τό in line 5 of poem 31 is neuter, and the recommendation that ὤς γὰρ <ἔς> σ' ἴδω (31.7) be replaced by ὤς γὰρ εἰσίδω, an emendation which has 'the decided advantage. . . of not creating a false impression of specificity that is not supported by the rest of the poem (p. 31): S. is no longer responding to 'straightforward homoerotic sexual passion' (p. 30) but to more general and objective reflection on her feelings; this poem and others remain personal but emerge 'less bound to specific and unrepeatable occasions' (p. 34).

Prins also has things to say about the enigmatic τό in 31: 'What τό means is less significant than how it functions in the poem: it marks a decisive break that reduces 'he' and 'you' of stanza 1 to mere pretext, and produces [*sic*] the remaining text as a discontinuous utterance that cannot be referred back to 'I' without interruption' (p.42). Moreover, accepting the reading γλῶσσα ἔαγε, she tells us that, 'The

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

prosopopoeia of fragment 31 therefore produces a speaker whose utterance points to the impossibility of a speaker' (p. 46); and so the poem is a literary riddle.

O'Higgins, like Prins, follows Nagy in believing the hiatus in γλῶσσα ἔαγε to be important, 'intended audially to reproduce the "catch" in the poet's voice; Sappho dramatically represents herself as being almost at the point she describes—losing hervoice altogether' (p. 71); and πὰν τόλματον (17) is not simply an exhortation to endure, but 'a call to arms providing a dramatic peripeteia within the poem itself. The poem, which ironically records the poet's own near-death, repeated in the past and again imminent, now reveals itself as a lethal weapon' (p. 73).

Harvey considers Donne's 'Sappho to Philaenis' and Ovid's 'Sappho to Phaon', and the implications of male poets reconstructing a female voice, something she calls 'ventriloquism': 'the suppression of actual feminine speaking enables and authorizes the fictional reconstruction of the (other) feminine voice, and ventriloquism thus functions as a poetic enactment of the mechanism of censorship at work within the broader cultural context' (p. 96). So Donne 'borrows the feminine voice as a way ofacting out his rivalry with Ovid, but he controls its dangerous plenitude by domesticating its alterity and ultimately turning it into a version of himself' (p. 96). There may be a good point lurking somewhere in this essay, but it is not easy to discern amid the bombast.

Andreadis examines references to S. in English literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and in particular the indebtedness of anatomical writers to S. for their observations on the clitoris.

DeJean looks at 'the sexologists' position on homosexuality' (p. 131), and emphasizes how those who in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries argued for S.'s chastity were dependent on the views of their own times and 'The inability on the part of its proponents to deal with the issue of female homosexuality' (p. 145). Parker focuses on the idea of S. as schoolmistress or sex-educator, in his view a fiction created by the false application to S.'s poetry of the male ἐράστης–ἐρώμενος model: 'What I find curious about this reconstruction is that its origins so clearly lie in the products of masculine fantasy' (p. 172).

Both Rohrbach and Gubar write on S.'s influence on the American poet Hilda Dolittle and her contemporaries.

University College London STEPHEN INSTONE

NEMEAN IX

B. K. Braswell: *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine*. Pp. xvi + 204. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1998. Cased, DM 188. ISBN: 3-11-016124-9.

A select bibliography of 583 items completes this commentary on the fifty-five lines of Pindar's *Ninth Nemean*. But those who have read B.'s two other Pindar commentaries (on *P*. 4 and *N*. 1), and are familiar with his methods, will not be surprised at this, since meticulous examination of Pindar's language, full discussion of competing interpretations, long etymological notes, and huge bibliographies are the hallmarks of a Braswell commentary.

Nemean Nine was composed in honour of a chariot-race victory by Chromius, a

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Sicilian general, in the games at Sicyon, that were founded (according to Pindar) by Adrastus. In the mythical part of the poem Pindar tells firstly of the exile and restoration of Adrastus by Amphiaraus, then of their disastrous assault on Thebes; he then turns to contemporary events and in particular Chromius' own military career. It is natural to see the myth as offering heroic analogies to Chromius' own achievements, as is the case in Pindar's other poem for Chromius, *Nemean One*, where Herakles' miraculous strength, and his subsequent attainment of glorious repose, extol Chromius' career. The trouble is that in *N*. 9 Pindar highlights not only Amphiaraus' horribly sticky end—death from a spear in the back—but also how his expedition was without propitious omens: *φαινομέναν δ' ἄρ' ἐς ἄταν σπεῦδεν ὅμιλος ἱκέσθαι* (21). It is hard to see why Pindar should link Chromius with these deeds from the past. B.tries to get round this problem by claiming that 'the Argive expedition against Thebes... provides a negative exemplum of what Pindar prays may not happen any time soon to Chromios' city Aitna in the form of a Carthaginian attack' (p. 41 n. 50), and that 'To lead an expedition in the absence of propitious omens would be a sign of[commendable] boldness' (p. 82), not of irresponsible rashness. Not everyone will agree with these interpretations. One is reminded of *Pythian Eleven* where Pindar's meander through an abbreviated version of the *Oresteia* serves no very obvious laudatory purpose.

Whereas with B.'s first Pindar commentary, on *P*. 4, the metrical analysis amounted to no more than the naming of the metrical elements, we now have several pages of speculative comment on the relevance of the metre to the sense of the poem. For example, B. thinks that the 'running dactylic rhythm' of l. 1 of *N*. 9 'admirably fits the pressing invitation to the Muses to join in the imaginary *komos*' (p. 4). while the ending of the ode 'with its slow epitritic rhythm would seem to reflect the balanced stance of the poet as he prepares to hurl his figurative javelin at the Muses' mark'. Has B. ever thrown a javelin, one wonders? Even if one believes that the initial dactyls of the first strophe and the final epitrites of the last fit the sense in those places, it is hard to make out a case for metre matching sense at either the beginning or end of any of the other nine strophes.

B. has examined microfilm copies of all three main MSS of the poem. His text varies significantly from the 1987 Snell–Maehler Teubner edition at 17 where Boeckh's *δὴ τόθεν* fills S.–M.'s lacuna, 41 where he prefers *ἔνθα Ῥέας* (cf. [A.] *P.V*. 837 *μέγας κόλπος Ῥέας*) to S.–M.'s 'unexplainable' *ἔνθ' Ἀρείας*, and 47 where *οὐκέτ' ἔστι πόρσω* replaces S.–M.'s *οὐκ ἔστι πρόσωθεν*; this last change, as B. admits, is unlikely to be right as it leaves the sentence with repeated *ἔτι* (twice in the space of five words), and does not deserve a place in the text.

Although in the commentary B. concentrates on elucidating the literal meaning ofwhat Pindar is saying, there are many helpful notes too where, in paragraphs summarizing the gist of what follows, he explains the point of what is being said. It is odd, though, that having rightly rejected verbal repetition as being of no significance (cf. on 37 *θυμὸν αἰχματὰν*, and 41 *ἄνθρωποι*), he should think it worth saying on *κώμου* (50) that 'the noun placed near the end of the ode recalls the summons to the revel (*κώμασομεν*) at the very beginning'.

Lengthy notes on *κλυτός* (pp. 61–2), and compounds ending *-ανθής* (pp. 88–90), aretolerable, if not wholly relevant to *N*. 9, but some notes are too long and not sufficiently clear (pp. 71–3 on *κρέσσων. . . μέγιστοι*, 139–41 *παρὰ κρατῆρα*), and the often lengthy refutations of rejected interpretations (as on pp. 52, 58, 60, 82, 109–10) become tedious.

One greatly admires B.'s industry, and as always he has thrown much light on

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pindar; but greater use of the pruning-hook to cut out matter not relevant to elucidation of the text would have made the commentary even better. One is left with the feeling that what should have been part of a book has been unduly spun out to become a whole book.

University College London STEPHEN INSTONE

REVENGE

A. P. BURNETT: *Revenge in Attic and Later Tragedy.* (Sather Classical Lectures, 62.) Pp. xviii + 306. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1998. Cased, £30. ISBN: 0-520-21096-4.

Retributivism has been fashionable in moral and legal philosophy for at least twenty years, and classical scholars have become correspondingly more enthusiastic about the Greek injunction to harm your enemies as well as help your friends. A glance at recent interpretations of Euripides' *Hecuba*, for example, reveals that B. may be wrong to suggest that modern (post-Stoic, post-Christian) condemnation of retaliation is still being imported into the interpretation of Greek tragedy. It is striking that she turns to Jebb and Kitto for examples of this mistake (pp. xv–xvi). She herself thinks that the overcivilized Athenians of the mid-fifth century needed periodically to be reminded that vengeance was not only 'an honorable imperative' (p. 6), but the foundation of the cosmic and social order. She stresses the carnivalesque and transgressive nature of Attic tragedy. 'Athenians maintained their strength because in their city symbolic transgressions, wrought by spectacular figures, annually charged the air with a passionate and healthy extremity of violent action' (p. xv). Revenge should aim for 'an ideal restitution of honor' (p. 143), not for self-defence or material advantage; 'the avenger must have no ignoble motives, norshould he seek anything beyond his own return to the same position in the hierarchy of honors that he held before' (p. 138). Revenge stories, however, 'were fundamentally antitragical because the sufferings their avengers inflicted were deserved' (p. 65). Revenge tragedy thus faced the problem of a 'radical opposition between an essentially reassuring subject and a form meant to disturb' (p. 80). Tragedians needed to apply 'disruptive dodges' (p. xviii) and 'saving perversities' (p.99) to make revenge stories fit the genre. B. illustrates these views with detailed interpretations of ten plays in which 'a principal character performs a deed of vengeance that constitutes his play's major action' (p. xviii). The plays are: Aeschylus' *Choephoroe*; Sophocles' *Ajax*, *Electra*, and *Tereus*; and Euripides' *Cyclops*, *Medea*, *Heraclidae*, *Hecuba*, *Electra*, and *Orestes.*

B.'s account of the psychosocial function of Attic tragedy rests more on assertion than on argument, and does not convincingly explain the ambivalence of its treatment of retaliation. It is revealing that she treats Odysseus in the *Odyssey* as the 'inaugural and preeminent practitioner of Greek revenge' (p. 34), but has virtually nothing to say about Achilles in the *Iliad.* Achilles' failure to find satisfaction in his revenge on Hector suggests that the ethical and psychic balance supposedly achieved by revenge is illusory. The thirst for revenge tends in tragedy to be gendered as female, one of those dangerous passions which the Athenian male citizen viewed as 'other' inside the theatre, and channelled through rigorous social structures outside it. Male avengers in

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tragedy usually go mad. Problems with revenge in tragedy are essential to the act, not merely incidental to the genre. B. writes as if crimes that are unjust and open to revenge can readily be distinguished from 'acts that restore balance and therefore are not to be returned' (p. 41), a belief surely questioned by Aeschylus' *Oresteia.* These are difficulties intrinsic to any act of retaliation, even before one considers the likelihood in practice of avengers responding in an exaggerated fashion (e.g. S. *Aj.*), mistaking the identity of their supposed enemies (e.g. E. *I. T., Ion*), or involving innocent victims in their revenge (e.g. E. *Med.*).

B.'s theory has the most obvious difficulty with *Heraclidae*, where the Athenians have prohibited the killing of the defeated prisoner Eurystheus, but Alcmena decides to kill him anyway. B. comments: 'the masculine world is so hampered by its own pompous civility that it cannot rid itself of an egregious evil, and consequently a woman has to do the job' (p. 145). She argues that Eurystheus must be killed before the Athenians can get the predicted benefit of his corpse, but fails to observe that this benefit will be at the expense of Alcmena's own descendants. She takes a somewhat similar line on *Hecuba*, arguing that the Greeks need to be reminded by a woman of the *nomos* of revenge. Polymestor is certainly a villain who deserves to be punished, but Hecuba's revenge on him has disturbing features which cannot easily be explained away. Euripides repeatedly treats child-murder as barbaric, and it is troubling to read B.'s dismissive references to 'the small corpses' of Polymestor's sons (p. 170). She alsohas to gloze over the implications of Hecuba's prophesied metamorphosis into 'abitchwith fiery eyes' (E. *Hec.*1265). Both *Heraclidae* and *Hecuba* demonstrate the essentially imitative quality of revenge, which leads avengers to replicate the brutality of their enemies.

B. detects a changed attitude to revenge in Euripides' *Electra* and *Orestes*. 'After Syracuse. .. Civic disorder was actual, and consequently the deed of violent self-assertion began to lose its poetic attractions' (p. 225). In *Electra*, Orestes' killing of Aegisthus is 'true to tragic models' (p. 235), but Electra's vengeance is 'sordidly misconceived' (p. 242), and she 'adds error and feminine resentment to the old patriarchal revenge' (p. 243). B. would prefer *Electra* to be later than it is usually thought to be ('*Electra* is generally placed between 420 and 410 B.C.', she announces optimistically at p. 226 n. 3), but this Kantian insistence on purity of motive in any case exaggerates the change of mood from earlier revenge plays. One would welcome some argument for the radical change which she postulates in Athenian attitudes to revenge around 413 B.C. It is certainly not supported by the evidence of Thucydides, who dates the evil effects of revenge in Greek politics to an earlier period.

This is a dense and learned book, lacking something of the sparkle of B.'s earlier work, but always stimulating and full of rewarding insights. There are also many points of detail with which to disagree (including the translation of Euripides, fr. 718 on p. 276). B. is a formidable opponent for those who are too quick to condemn retaliation in Greek tragedy, such as the (unnamed) scholar whom she amusingly ridicules for describing Aegisthus in Euripides' *Electra* as 'a respectably generous host, properly sacrificing to the Nymphs' (p. 34). Future discussions of revenge tragedy willnot be able to ignore this book, but there is still room for a treatment of the subject that does a little more justice to the complexity of Athenian views of retaliation.

University College Dublin MICHAEL LLOYD

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

COWARDICE

J. WISSMANN: *Motivation und Schmähung: Feigheit in der Ilias und inder griechischen Tragödie*. Pp. 398. Stuttgart: M & P Verlag für Wissenschaft und Forschung, 1997. Paper, DM 55. ISBN: 3-476-45189-5.

This (a 'leicht überarbeitete Fassung' of the author's Hamburg dissertation) is a worthwhile and interesting study, but a difficult one to review; for while its general thesis is easily summarized, the minuteness of its specific argumentation defies brief evaluation.

Wißmann's position is that, in the literary works under consideration, 'cowardice' is to be construed in terms not of its reference to particular forms of behaviour, but of its argumentative or rhetorical function. This is broken down into three categories: (a) paraenesis, (b) invective, and (c) consideration of one's own actions (e.g. justification, deliberation). W. thus focuses above all on the speaker's intention to produce a certain effect. This is a reasonable procedure; but W.'s apparent lack of acquaintance with speech-act theory means that she is forced to spend a certain amount of time reinventing the wheel. (In Searle's terms she is concerned with the rôle of 'cowardice' in illocutionary and perlocutionary acts; her categories correspond to directives, expressives, and commissives in speech-act theory.) However that may be, W. makes good use of her theoretical framework: she recognizes that the three categories may overlap, and that some cases may be difficult to classify; she is right to observe that the use of 'cowardice' in these different argumentative strategies testifies to the notion's flexibility; but it is questionable whether this flexibility quite renders the concept 'indefinable' (p. 363). On p. 161 she appears to argue that a 'purely tactical' use of the charge of cowardice excludes a specific conception of what cowardice is. But it is difficult to see how the term could have any 'tactical' function if its meaning were not established. One consequence of W.'s method is that she does not pay sufficient attention to the reference of the various terms for cowardice; there are some passing acknowledgements of non-martial or 'moral' uses (e.g. pp. 277, 284), but no systematic investigation of the states of mind and forms of behaviour to which 'cowardice' may be applied.

The introduction (Chapter I) is followed by a chapter on the *Iliad*, discussing 'cowardice' in Homeric 'flyting', in positive and negative paraeneses, and in deliberative/justificatory monologues or dialogues. After an interlude (Chapter III) on Callinus and Tyrtaeus, W. comes to her main subject, the rôle of 'cowardice' as an argument and a motive in tragedy. In four chapters she examines 'cowardice' as a motive for Sophocles' Ajax and Euripides' Medea and Herakles (Chapter IV); in the male–female dialectic of Euripides' *Supplices* and the two *Electra*-plays (Chapter V); in plays in which it is a consideration for a character confronted with a life or death decision (A. *Sept*., E. *Alc*., *Hcld*., *Hec*., *Erecth*., *Pho*., and *IA*; Chapter VI); and in the stereotype of the 'cowardly barbarian' in *Persians* and Euripides' *Orestes* (Chapter VII). Throughout, the three functional applications of 'cowardice' are distinguished, but a further guiding principle is provided by focus on the interaction of the categories 'brave'/'cowardly' and 'male'/'female'.

Chapter II is a useful contribution to the study of Homeric rhetoric, exhibiting sound knowledge of previous work on direct speech in the *Iliad*. Especially good, too, is W.'s discussion of Euripides' *Opfertragödien*, particularly in its focus on the sex of the victim and its significance in dramatic, thematic, and cultural terms. W. discusses

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the female victims' appropriation of male arguments, but also how their usurpation of the male rôle ultimately conforms to feminine norms: they actively choose to support patriarchal objectives by allowing themselves to be killed by men. In this they contrast with *Phoenissae*'s Menoeceus, who kills himself; and whereas Macaria, Polyxena, and Iphigeneia advert to the father's principles and distance themselves from the mother, Menoeceus distances himself from his father and identifies, as a warrior, with the defenders of Thebes. The female victims return to the female rôle not only in the manner, but also in the external circumstances of their deaths (e.g. the emphasis on Polyxena's desirable sexuality, but also her modesty in death at *Hec.* 557–70; Iphigeneia's sacrificial marriage).

W. has a talent for taxonomy and typology. She certainly masters her primary sources and the scholarship thereon, and she makes her own contribution to scholarship with a competent, sure touch; where her arguments are debatable, they areusually at least tenable. There are, however, traces of 'progressivist' assumptions about the nature of Greek culture which ought, at least, to be defended explicitly, given recent and powerful challenges to this sort of approach. On the terminology of cowardice, W. seems to be on to something with her claim that δειλία is normally reserved for male behaviour (pp. 332–4 and *passim*), but the accompanying claim that the description φιλοψυχεῖν is consistently regarded as more appropriate to female behaviour seems dubious in the light of Tyrtaeus 10.18 West; the argument that φιλοψυχεῖν is regularly neutral in force likewise seems to me to involve strained interpretation of that passage, as well as of others such as Euripides' *Hecuba* 315 (pp.281–3).

This is a good dissertation, but it exhibits some of the weaknesses of its genre: there is a tendency to set the boundaries of discussion rather too inclusively; too many general interpretative issues are rehearsed; and W. sometimes allows previous discussions of particular controversies temporarily to derail her own project. The practice of publishing without extensive revision has deprived us of a better-focused (and shorter) work which would have conveyed the author's central points with greater impact and immediacy.

University of Leeds DOUGLAS L. CAIRNS

SOPHOCLEAN METATHEATRE

M. RINGER: *Electra and the Empty Urn. Metatheater and Role Playing in Sophocles*. Pp. xi + 253. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1998. Paper, £13.95. ISBN: 0-8078-4697-X.

Perhaps the most important and most fascinating of the many developments that can be traced in late twentieth-century scholarship on Greek tragedy (and, of course, on much else) is the ever-growing emphasis on performance. Performance, it has turned out, has enough facets to allow critics with very different interests to make their very different contributions. Among the facets which have produced a particularly large number of publications is the theatrical self-consciousness or meta-theatricality that is displayed in many of the plays. Mark Ringer's *Electra and the Empty Urn* is the latest of these publications.

R. is concerned specifically with Sophocles. He discusses each of the surviving plays in a section or chapter of its own, the last and longest being devoted to *Electra.* Before launching into the individual discussions, R. uses two introductory chapters to set the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scene. In the first, he sets out his aims and assumptions, and surveys relevant studies not only by classicists but—usefully—also by students of Shakespeare and other kinds of drama. In the second, he places the theatrical self-consciousness of Greek tragedy in its historical context, arguing that texts by Solon, Herodotus, Gorgias, and others show that an interest in rôle-playing and in 'the layering of fiction upon fact' (p.27) was a general cultural phenomenon.

R.'s interest in historically specific detail bears fruit when he asks how the practice of using only three actors would have affected the perception of each of the plays. R. justifies studying this so-called three-actor rule together in one book with theatrical self-consciousness by arguing that Sophoclean tragedy employs the spectators' awareness of the same actors' reappearance in new rôles to good effect. Critics have often pointed out the significance of the fact that Odysseus, the False Merchant, and Heracles are played by one actor. Ringer adds various other meaningful groupings. Two examples: in *Ajax*, the protagonist plays first Ajax and then Teucer, who not onlyis Ajax's half-brother but also repeats Ajax's ἰώ μοί μοι (333, 974) when he is confronted with his corpse (enacted presumably by an extra) and exclaims that 'by seeing him, I am myself destroyed' (1001). In *Antigone*, Antigone, who claims divine support, is transformed as it were into Tiresias, who reports the disruption of the city's sacrifices to the gods. Not all of R.'s suggestions are equally persuasive. To stay with the last example, one might doubt whether it is really significant that the same actor changes rôles again, so as to play the Messenger or Eurydice (and, a possibility R. does not mention, perhaps even Creon). One would, moreover, have liked R. to go further in his attention to historical detail and to discuss in this context the rise of star actors and the various possible rationales that may have governed the distribution of the parts between protagonist, deuteragonist, and tritagonist. Even so, however, the suggestions concerning the 'three-actor rule' are among the most interesting in the book.

R. also makes valid observations about more explicitly self-conscious aspects of Sophoclean tragedy. This is true especially for the chapter on *Electra*, in which he allows himself enough space to go through the play from beginning to end, producing what amounts at times to a close reading. The sum total of details R. analyses, such as the play on the urn, which is empty for spectators but full of significance for Electra, and the language of showing and reporting that surrounds the presentation of Clytemnestra's body, should be able to convince readers who were not convinced before that *Electra* is a highly self-conscious kind of play.

Unfortunately, however, there is much in R.'s discussion of both *Electra* and the other tragedies that is problematic. Many of the problems are caused by an awkward focus on illusion and deception. R. speaks repeatedly of the 'double vision' of the theatre experience. This is a useful concept. Spectators may regard the man on stage both as Orestes and as Hegelochos. Yet at the same time, R. treats theatre as something which deceptively denies that the man is Hegelochos, trying to make spectators believe that he is just Orestes. As a result, theatre becomes too rigidly associated with deception and the unreal throughout the book. Sophoclean choruses, to give an example, sometimes draw attention to their being choruses. R. interprets this as signals that they are deluded (p. 43 and *passim*). This interpretation is not out of the question, but as it stands, it is too narrow. As A. Henrichs and others have shown, choruses refer to their own dancing as early as Alcman. Self-deception cannot be the only meaning of such references. Vice versa, not every instance of deception is an instance of theatrical self-consciousness. It is true that Creon in *Oedipus at Colonus* tries to deceive Oedipus, but does that justify speaking of his ' "theatricalized" nature'

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(p. 96)? R.'s interpretation of *Electra* raises a similar question on a larger scale. Yes, this is a play about deception; yes, this is a highly self-conscious play; yes, there is much that is disconcerting in this play. But is that to say that with *Electra* 'Sophocles has created a dark critique of his art' (p. 207)? On balance, it seems, R. has written abook which makes many suggestions that are illuminating, many that are thought-provoking, but even more perhaps which make one desire a more nuanced treatment.

University of Manchester FELIX BUDELMANN

ION

K. H. LEE: *Euripides:* Ion (Classical Texts). Pp. vi + 330. Warminster: Aris & Phillips. Cased, £35/$49.95 (Paper, £16.95/$28). ISBN: 0-85668-244-6 (0-85668-245-4 pbk).

Lee's *Ion* is a scholarly and very reliable addition to the already extensive list of Aris & Phillips commentaries on individual plays of Euripides. The *Ion* has recently been the object of intense thematic analysis, and our understanding of such issues as Athenian autochthony and the literary handling of the rôle of the female in human reproduction has been greatly advanced by the work of N. Loraux and others. This has rendered A. S. Owen's 1939 edition very antiquated at the broader interpretative levels. L.'s edition is therefore particularly welcome.

The drawbacks of L.'s book are the price of its virtues. He integrates discussion ofmetre and textual problems into the body of the commentary. This makes textual criticism more accessible, but there is perhaps too much of it. My experience of using L.'s edition with students shows that for teaching purposes L. is a vast improvement on Owen; but it also makes me suspect that, for such readers, his commentary may be over-hospitable to textual discussion as compared with more general thematic comment (the imbalance is somewhat reduced by the fuller introduction). For instance, the treatment of the language with which Ion addresses Kreousa and Xouthos (note his use of the adjective 'stranger') is uncomfortably distributed over a number of separate notes (e.g. nn. on pp. 238, 339, 520), and does not quite do justice to all the nuances (the use of the same adjective in ll. 415 and 429 is not commented upon), while p. 25 of the introduction is too terse; here L. maintains that 'the movements towards and away from each other are marked by the extensive use of stichomythia', but he never discusses how these movements are signified by changes in the manner of address. Again the discussion of Athena's closing speech, with its prediction about the four pre-Kleisthenic tribes, is very succinctly treated in the commentary and introduction (p. 34). The foregrounding by Euripides of the old Ionian tribes has a particular imperial point in *c.* 413/2, the probable date of the play, when the loyalty of the East Aegean allies was in serious doubt. In some of these cities, such as Miletos, Erythrai, and Samos, the old Ionian tribe names survived (though not necessarily at tribal level), so that the emphasis on the old four tribes can be seen as conciliatory in intention.

But generally L. is a safe and helpful guide, always clear and even-handed, though occasionally hyper-cautious. On the interesting question of what many have seen as the comic elements in the *Ion*, L.'s conclusion (p. 37) is 'whether all this adds up to a "full-fledged comedy" as Knox thinks. . . is uncertain' (see also the end of the note on 112–83). I have argued elsewhere (in Jäkel & Timonen [edd.], *Laughter down the*

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Centuries [Turku, 1995] that despite everything, justice can be done to *Ion* only if it is accorded its proper status as tragedy. But my objection is that L. is non-committal where readers have a right to be given a lead. The crucial issue, perhaps, is the handlingof Loraux. No commentary on the *Ion*, thematic or lemmatic, can sidestep *The Invention of Athens.* L. can certainly not be accused of neglecting Loraux. But heevidently feels no enthusiasm on the one hand ('far-fetched', l. 453 n.), nor on the other hand does he refute her properly. The result is that he steers an uncharacteristically hesitant and rudderless course through waters he admits to finding 'difficult' (his word about Loraux's arguments, p. 36).

The scholarly quality of L.'s commentary produces special problems within the user-friendly Aris & Phillips format, according to which lemmata have to be in English. Often the notes cry out for the inclusion of the relevant Greek word or phrase. L.'s commentary in fact has much in common with the traditional Oxford commentaries or with the Cambridge 'green-and-yellow' series, both of which tackle the Greek directly. The real issue, then, is the lack of clarity about the audience both L.'s book and the Aris & Phillips series in general seeks to address.

The discussions of the Delphic evocations, and of the staging and scenery are in my view the least convincing parts of the commentary. L. usually relies on accepted scholarly views to explain matters pertaining to the practice of oracular consultation in Delphi. Thus, he inherits such misconceptions as the argument that women were not allowed into the temple (see n. 221b), though there is no such indication in the text: the issue at ll. 226–9 is that visitors, irrespective of gender, can gain access to the inner part of the temple, but only if they have performed the necessary sacrifices. On Euripidean stagecraft L. tends to follow Hourmouziades and Halleran. He accepts Halleran's unlikely suggestion that Hermes exits 'behind a panel. . . painted to represent greenery' (note on l. 76): the better view is that there was no scene-painting in the fifth century. He also uncritically accepts Hourmouziades' problematic view that Ion's first entrance is from the temple door, and does not discuss the existence ofIon's attendants. Cf. also his assumption, unjustified by anything in the text, that Xouthos has an 'entourage' (p. 40).

L. says (p. 41) that his translation has 'no pretensions to elegance or performability', and that its chief purpose is 'to make clear the meaning and structure of the Greek'. In this aim it succeeds almost everywhere: the only somewhat misleading rendering is the description of Kreousa's rape at l. 11, where *βίαι* surely calls for something a good deal stronger than 'against her will'. On the other hand the disclaimer about elegance is too modest: at ll. 1157–8 (*ἦ τε φωσφόρος Ἕως διώκουσ' ἄστρα*), L.'s 'light-bearing Dawn put the stars to flight' is a felicitous borrowing from the opening of Fitzgerald's Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam: 'Awake! for Morning in the Bowl of Night/ Has Flung the Stone which Puts the Stars to Flight'.

University College London KATERINA ZACHARIA

ASPIS

J. -M. JACQUES (ed.): *Ménandre*. Vol. 1[3]. Le Bouclier (Collection des Universités de France, dite Guillaume Budé). Pp. cxxii + 50 (text double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-00461-0.

Some twenty-seven years separate this latest addition to the Budé Menander volumes from the last (*Samia*), a remarkable gap by any reckoning and explained by J. as a

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reaction to the experience of earlier editors of Menander, who often found their work overtaken by the discovery of new fragments of text, fragments which owed their existence simply to being separated in modern times from the very papyrus that formed the archetype. For this reason J. hoped that by delaying publication in the case of *Aspis* he could ensure the inclusion of all relevant material that might turn up as scholarly institutes worked through their stocks of acquisitions. As a result he has been able to take advantage of the emergence both of P. Robinson inv. 38, once in Duke University and now in Cologne, where it has been reunited with P. Colon. 904 (itself part of the original Bodmer MS), and P. Oxy. 4094, published by Handley in 1995. Whether, on the other hand, the quantity of totally new material revealed or its quality is seen to justify the delay remains open to question. But, that said, the appearance of J.'s *Aspis* provides a welcome opportunity to revisit a play delightfully simple in many features of its structure and characterization, yet dramatically significant in displaying to the full the potential of a deferred prologue.

As usual with the Budé series the text and translation are prefaced by an introduction rich in detail and insight which develops such topics as the stages in the play's rediscovery, the development of its plot and characters (the latter both as standard types and as specific individuals within the action of the play), the question of a possible alternative title on the analogy of *Dyskolos* (*Misanthropos*) or *Samia* (*Kedeia*), its date, and finally the composition of the text itself.

To do proper justice to the scale of J.'s copious introduction is beyond the scope of this review, and only a few remarks must suffice on what is undoubtedly the best treatment of the work to date. In terms of structure J. brings out well the alternation of comic and quasi-tragic themes, seen especially in Act I. The initial funereal entry, relieved by the expository prologue from Tyche which follows, the threat to the marriage arranged for Kleostratos' sister and its replacement by another to her odious and predatory uncle Smikrines, balanced by the closing comic scenes of the cook and waiter, all indicate a masterly ability to control audience reaction and appreciation. The development of character on the other hand has aroused criticism in the past forbeing too black-and-white or, in some cases, lacking in depth (Sandbach, *Commentary*, 1973, p. 62; Arnott, *Menander I*, 1979, p. 5). Yet, as J. demonstrates, this is in many ways too simplistic a verdict; rather, the supposed weakness of figures like Chairestratos and Chaireas is deliberately engineered to emphasize the forceful baseness of Smikrines' plans and the reliance upon Daos, but all within a context where the audience knows that Smikrines is doomed to failure. This may be melodrama suffused with an element of farce seen in the rôles of the cook and false doctor, but it is highly effective and not without an element of irony in the picture of a slave, and a Phrygian at that, reacting cogently and with intelligence to a situation which allows him to criticize Athenian law while yet having natural justice clearly on his side, and ultimately to triumph over a citizen.

From characters J. passes to a lengthy discussion of the law on *epikleroi* and the possibility that *Aspis* is the same play as one of the two produced by Menander under the title *Epikleros*. One of these can immediately be ruled out by indications of its plot which have come down to us in the context of its adaptation by Sextus Turpilius. The other J. regards as a possibility in that the first three of the nine fragments which survive from both plays would not be out-of-place in the context of *Aspis*, though, as J. admits (p. lxxxi), there is nothing in this that comes remotely close to constituting proof of connection.

As to the play's date, J. argues that there is little in the action that points to a specific event. Kleostratos' military service in Lycia, as described by Daos, seems more akin to

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

freebooting than any known campaign, and thus more at home in the years immediately following the death of Alexander the Great. Internal criteria, which have been used in the past to indicate a certain youthful lack of mastery on the part of Menander, J. rightly considers too subjective to be of much use, though his own equally subjective conclusion (p. lxxxvii) continues to place the work early within the playwright's career.

Following a discussion of the MSS, their relative merits, and their orthographic characteristics, J. presents the text itself, renumbered to provide a more realistic indication of the play's overall length than has been the case in the past: now 781 lines rather than the 544 before. It displays all the sureness of touch and persuasiveness of reading one has come to expect from the editor, while his translation is accompanied by notes that would not be out of place in a full commentary. To round off the volume J. appends the usual fragments attributed to the play but of uncertain position within the action, the text of P. Berol. 21145, which some have wanted to associate with *Aspis*, and the fragments and testimonia of Menander's two *Epikleros* plays. All in all, then, this is a most welcome addition to the corpus of Menandrian editions. One might niggle at the superfluity of this or that item in the introduction (the space devoted, for example, to Herzog's reconstruction of the play from the eighty-four lines of the *Comoedia Florentina*, which now provides no more than a cautionary tale of the pitfalls that await the fatal combination of shortage of evidence and intellectual conceit), but this is not to detract from what is an eminently satisfing piece of work.

University of Warwick STANLEY IRELAND

NO JOKE

G. W. Dobrov (ed.): *The City as Comedy. Society and Representation in Athenian Drama.* Pp. xix + 355. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998. Cased, £49.40 (Paper, £18.96). ISBN: 0-8078-2337-6 (0-8078-4645-7 pbk).

This is a book with ambitions. '[It] finds its raison d'être in comedy's relative neglect and the lack of a readily available and up-to-date collection devoted exclusively to the genre that integrates new and diverse critical approaches' (p. xi). While I applaud the principles, the practice is disappointing. It is a motley collection of mainstream material on (mostly) Aristophanes and the *polis*. At best, it is a statement of the *status quo*, but if the thinking seems rather stale, some pieces are well past their sell-by date. There is too much reprinting or recycling, not always acknowledged.

Part One, 'The Theory and Practice of Utopia,' offers five readings of *Birds*, as usual taken as the exemplar of comic utopianism. Despite minor variations, all contributors in this section share an identikit ironist–intentionalist approach. F. E. Romer makes the most vigorous case here, focusing on the ironies in the moral exemplars of myth. Thus Peisetairos claims, but fails, to reverse the Hesiodic cosmos; is pro-human; abuses women; sacrifices his bird-peers; undoes the foundational Olympian sacrifice only to reinscribe it; and is generally revealed as cannibal and tyrant. The audience are dupes (as a 'reflective' minority recognize). Niall Slater offers a similar reading from the performance angle. Opinion will divide on the plausibility of his metatheatrical suggestions, but two had me positively alarmed. The audience address at 27–48 is hardly 'remarkable' for Old Comedy (or much modern comedy).

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Prometheus-and-umbrella gag (*Birds*, 1494–1551) is reinterpreted metatheatrically by Slater solely on the grounds that (i) we cannot assume that Greeks thought their gods looked down from above (ἄνωθεν, 1509 etc.), and (ii) 'this is surely a joke for adults' (p. 86)! Slater's exegetical analysis does not actually lead anywhere. He tries to negotiate a happy ending amid the 'monstrosity' of *Birds*—an interesting proposition, but it does not follow, nor is such contradiction explained. For the rest, Thomas Hubbard re-works *The Mask of Comedy*, pp. 158–82; Dobrov reprises two earlier pieces (*AJP* 114 [1993], 189–234; *Arethusa* 23 [1990], 209–33) in a medley ofpostmodern postures that lack any intellectual rigour; by contrast, David Konstan'sdeservedly well-known piece (*Arethusa* 23 [1990], 183–207 ~ *Greek Comedy and Ideology*, pp. 29–44) stands out, with its coherent theoretical perspective and engagement with the concept of utopia itself.

Part Two, 'Treading the Faultlines', raises the exciting prospect of rampant cultural materialism and queer theory. Instead, Malcolm Heath and Jeffrey Henderson restate their own well-known positions and settle scores. Both make valuable, if too brief, points—Henderson on the violent *assumptions* of fifth-century democracy, Heath on similarities in *ad hominem* attacks in comedy and oratory. This is complemented by four articles from a vaguely (old or new) historicist position. Ralph Rosen considers personifications of the *polis*, notably in Eupolis' *Poleis*. He observes that Old Comedy figures subject allies as sexual objects (although he maintains they are presented as women 'worthy of respect' on the dubious basis of fr. 223 K-A). Athens, on the other hand, is represented as *metropolis*. So no surprises there, then. Elizabeth Bobrick, meanwhile, tackles gender in *Thesmophoriazousai*. Her central point is that men become (act as) women and vice versa in order to repress them. She is unsatisfied, though, with this narrative of repression, and ends with the claim that all this cross-dressing is metatheatrical and hence deconstructive. This (like other pieces) begs huge questions about comic metatheatricality. But it also flattens huge differences in the details and modes of cross-dressing: the different ways of playing the rôles—and how explicitly—the different language used of the various partly/fully/incongruously/conventionally cross-dressed characters, and how the audience response is otherwise manipulated. Bobrick could have profitably devoted more attention to the wider subversion-containment debate in the humanities and Judith Butler's work on gender (especially drag) as performance. This piece adds little to Froma Zeitlin's classic article on the play.

The two remaining papers are by Gregory Crane and John Wilkins. Wilkins's paperis a breathless survey of food in the comic *polis* (cf. *LCM* 18.5 [1993], 66–74), with an excursus on the figurative and thematic uses of food in *Knights* (cf. H. D. Jocelyn & H.Hurt (edd.), *Tria Lustra* [Liverpool, 1993], pp. 119–26). This is a turkey with far too much stuffing, obscuring individual flavours. Crane looks at *oikos* and *agora* in*Wasps*, in the most interesting, provocative, and, indeed, historicist essay of the collection. He argues that the relationship between Kleon and Philokleon is, for thelatter, 'affective' (Bourdieu) and for Bdelukleon 'economic'. He links Bdelukleon's economic anxieties to upper-class idealizing of the *agora* and attempts to divorce civic and economic space (Xenophon, Aristotle); he ties this further to oppositions between the empty archaic (here, = Homeric) and chaotic classical (democratic) *agoras*, and between the *agora* and the central Persian civic spaces (i.e. palaces). The oppositions come too readily here: the historicizing of the *agora* is far too pat, and archaeologically dubious. Moreover Philokleon explicitly constructs the relationship in terms of power (as Crane admits) and self-sufficiency. Crane has good material on the*oikos* as withdrawal from the *polis*, not so good material on Philokleon at the symposium.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

He canvasses the possibility of lack of resolution, but unhappily seeks closure in the dance-finale, which is a 'transgression against literary form' and 'rejecting the reading public'—thus showing a profound misunderstanding of ancient genre, form, performance, and audience.

Part Three offers two tokenistic pieces on Middle and New Comedy. Heinz-Gunther Nesselrath informs us that politics did not die out with Aristophanes—but little more. He does not ask whether such continuity undermines his notion of a coherent 'Middle Comedy'. Timothy Hofmeister does much the same for Menander, making the rather uninteresting point that there *is* a *polis*, on or off-stage. He elides, though, the non-Athenian context of *Perikeiromene* and the crucial extra-*polis* world in *Aspis* and *Misoumenos*. Hofmeister argues, from Onesimos' attack on Smikrines in *Epitrepontes*, that Menander did not espouse a post-Alexandrian *oikoumene* over the classical *polis* on the fragile grounds that Act V is unrelated to the plot and Onesimos earlier is a weak character. More worrying is his treatment of class. *Samia*, for Hofmeister, is a lesson in tolerance, that the rich should conciliate the poor—hardly anargument against a bourgeois, reactionary Menander. Meanwhile, Stratophanes in*Sikuonios* combines the Aristotelian 'better sort' persuading the *demos* and the Ober-esque élite sharing its interests: an ideological tension if ever I saw one, not that H. appears to notice. In general, the piece is marred by subjectivism and ideological naiveté.

As a whole, the collection is poorly edited, not just in terms of misprints, chaotic conventions for quotations, and no unified bibliography, but for a general lack of coherence. It is a real opportunity missed to treat anew the relationships between comedy, reality, and politics. Its silences are telling. Where is the attempt to tackle the problems of comic form, let alone the politics of comic form? Where are the pieces that openly dare speak the names of Marxism, cultural materialism, or queer theory, all of which ask questions that might jolt the contributors out of their cosy pre-millennial academic ironies? 'If nothing else, postmodernism has allowed us to rethink the opposition between serious criticism and apolitical humor' (Crane, p. 199). Not on the evidence presented here.

The Queen's College, Oxford ISABEL RUFFELL

DIGGING THEOCRITUS

R. L. HUNTER: *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*. Pp. xii + 207. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-521-56040-3.

This study offers an unusual perspective on the poetry of Theocritus: instead of looking forward from Theocritus to pastoral, H. looks behind Theocritus to his archaic models. H.'s Theocritus is above all a 'reader' working in an Alexandrian tradition of reception and reaction more normally associated with scholarly figures such as Callimachus and Apollonius. The pastoral poems are, in fact, largely ignored (with the exception of 7), and the result is not only a valuable study of Theocritus' relationship with earlier Greek poetry, but a new vision of the poetic program of the *Idylls*. It is as though H. provides corrective lenses which shrink the pastoral poems back down to their proportional place in the corpus.

H. titles his first chapter 'Locating the Site', and the figure of archaeological excavation, applicable both to Theocritus and his modern interpreter, links the various

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

essays in the book. H. begins by describing the intellectual setting which shaped Theocritus' response to archaic lyric and epic: on the one hand, a world in which the diminishing rôle of music and the rise of writing separate Theocritus irrevocably from poets such as Sappho and Pindar; on the other hand, a world where the Alexandrian poets (and pre-Alexandrian figures such as Philitas) can experiment with new metrical forms, artificial dialects, and bizarre recombinations of earlier literary modes. H. guides the reader through *Idyll* 7, a notoriously programmatic poem which H. calls 'a kind of echoing chamber of poetic allusion' (p. 23), stuffed with references to archaic epic, iamb, and monody. Yet H. also rightly emphasizes metre and dialect as important tools for the Theocritean project of poetic recovery; this requires a lengthy and somewhat technical discussion of dialect and manuscript transmission (pp. 31–45), which is not easy to read but is fundamental to the argument of several later chapters.

The remaining chapters offer readings of seven idylls representative of various poetic strains adapted by Theocritus to this new setting. Hymn is represented by 22, the hymn to the Dioscuri (Chapter II), and, in combination with epithalamium, by *Idyll* 18, the marriage-song of Helen and Menelaus (Chapter V). Encomium, although of a problematic sort, figures in *Idyll* 16, the poet's quest for a patron (Chapter III). Mime and comedy stand behind *Idyll* 15, a description of housewives at the Adonis festival (Chapter IV). Finally, paederastic poetry from several different sources re-emerges in *Idylls* 12, 29, and 30 (Chapter VI). In each case H. concentrates his attention on the strategies deployed to exploit archaic models; even *Idyll* 15, which appears the odd woman out (since mime and comedy are relatively recent genres), produces an archaic surprise embedded in the Adonis-song which the women hear at the Ptolemies' palace.

The above summary is somewhat simplistic, since several chapters contain extended sections which are only loosely tied to the poem announced as the subject; Chapter IV, for instance, discusses *Idyll* 14 in its relation to comedy before turning to 15. Even in the chapters which remain focused on one poem, H. tends to advance his argument in separate, parallel discussions which may or may not suggest a unified reading. The individual chapters can therefore seem disjointed, but the complexity of the material justifies some caution with respect to the temptations of synthesis. My one substantial complaint is that the 'index of passages discussed' is dangerously inadequate. For example, a reader who looked up Pindar in this index would find only one reference (to fr. 123), and would have no idea that there are discussions of *Nemean* 1, *Olympian* 14, and *Pythian* 1. However, Pindar fares better than Sappho, who is not even listed. In a book on such a topic readers will find this especially frustrating, and I can picture them cursing as they struggle through the nineteen different page numbers listed under 'Pindar' in the general index.

H.'s treatment of *Idyll* 18 is a good example of his approach. This poem, which represents itself as a wedding-song sung by maidens outside the bridal chamber of Helen and Menelaus, has been neglected by modern scholars, and H. has an embarrassment of riches at his disposal. He begins not with 18 itself, but with a more general discussion of the image of choral performance in Alexandrian texts (notably the *Argonautica*). Here he argues that an allusion to choral song and dance is frequently 'a marker of the archaic' (p. 140), and associated with aetiological tales of heroes. He then examines the complex literary heritage of *Idyll* 18, which includes Alcman's *Partheneion*, Sapphic epithalamium, and Stesichorean narrative lyric. H. shows that the reader's natural inclination towards irony (that is, to undercut the praise of the couple by supplying the rest of the Helen story) is itself undercut by Theocritus' use of dialect and metrical organization: the emphasis on 'Dorian' speech

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and the patterning of the hexameters into stanza-like units reinforces the allusion to aSpartan cult of Helen by emphasizing the archaic, ritual nature of the choral wedding-song. This 'Spartan' Helen can function as an appropriate and positive figure in a marriage-song, and even as an analogue of Arsinoe. (Using different evidence, Pantelia comes to a similar conclusion in an article published as H. went to press [*Hermes* 123.76–81].)

The archaeological metaphor employed by H. is quite appropriate for a study of Hellenistic poetry. Theocritus and his colleagues frequently use multiple models from different periods, sometimes directly, sometimes filtered through intervening texts. Then, too, in Hellenistic poetry as in Hellenistic architecture, something which looks archaic may in fact be archaizing—be it theme, meter, or dialect. H.'s careful stratigraphy untangles the jumbled layers of Theocritus' literary world in a persuasive fashion.

University of Minnesota N. KREVANS

THEOCRITUS 22

A. SENS: *Theocritus: Dioscuri* (Idyll 22). Introduction, Text, and Commentary. Pp. 251. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997. Paper, DM 72. ISBN: 3-525-25211-0.

Theocritus' Hymn to the Dioscuri, *Idyll* 22, has long been regarded as somewhat unsatisfactory. The poem falls into four parts: (i) an Alexandrian version (without the twins' theophany) of the thirty-third Homeric hymn portraying the Dioscuri as guardians of sailors; (ii) the boxing match between Polydeuces and Amycus, which is also treated by A.R. (2.1–97); (iii) the twins' rape of the Leucippidae and Castor's duel with Lynceus (the story of the quarrel between the Dioscuri and the Apharidae was told in the *Cypria* and in Pind. *Nem.* 10); and (iv) the epilogue written in the manner of a Homeric hymn. Although part i is generally considered accomplished enough, and part ii truly excellent, parts iii and iv are seen as problematic. The main objections to part iii are usually that it lacks atmosphere and characterization, is carelessly written, and contains both a duel scene which is largely a pastiche from the *Iliad* and a portrayal of the Dioscuri as brutal aggressors which is unsuitable for a work of their glorification. A supposed lacuna (by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *TGB* [Berlin, 1906], pp. 191–3) after verse 170, which entailed a change of speaker, does not help matters. Part iv is also condemned as hastily written, and the poem as a whole is deemed unsatisfactory with poor transition between the parts.

Any even half-serious commentator on Theocritus must first deal with A. S. F. Gow's *magnum opus* (Cambridge, 1950). Gow, who followed Wilamowitz regarding the lacuna (ad loc.), believed that the four parts of *Idyll* 22 must be considered separately. Further, he thought that the third part was itself a patchwork of separate compositions (the quarrel between the Dioscuri and the Apharidae, Castor's speech, and the duel from the *Iliad*). Sens at once argues the case for a poem of integration and unity. He appears convinced that the verses linking the main narratives, 25–6, 135–6, and 214–23 (epilogue), work effectively to unify the whole, whereas, to me at least, they still seem weak in that regard. More convincing, however, is his catalogue, and reiteration after several recent scholars, of verbal and thematic parallels between the central narratives and between the proem and the epilogue (pp. 14–15). Yet in the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

epilogue itself I still cannot find any thoroughly compelling reason for Theocritus' seemingly preposterous comment that Homer wrote the *Iliad* specifically to glorify the Dioscuri. I find unconvincing S.'s argument that this was a Theocritean literary game which provides the audience with a lighthearted and ironic revision of literary history and which serves well 'to accentuate the difference between the Theocritean and Homeric treatments' (p. 23). At least S. is sensible in not committing himself to A. Cameron's assertion (*Callimachus and his Critics* [Princeton, 1995], pp. 431–6) that Theocritus was staking a claim for the Ptolemies through this earlier pair of *Theoi Adelphoi*; he simply leaves open this possibility. S.'s monographic commentary is based on four previous articles: his persuasive argument for allusion to Aratus' *Phaenomena* in the proem (*CQ* 44 [1994], 66–74); his less than convincing theory of a Theocritean literary game where he introduces the idea that Lynceus' monologue recalls in character, diction, theme, and structure, the duel between Paris and Menelaus in *Iliad* 3 and 4 (which is the one occasion in the *Iliad* when the Dioscuri are mentioned, although not seen because they are already dead), as well as the Achilles–Hector duel and other Iliadic echoes (*TAPA* 122 [1992], 335–50); his discussion of Irus (*Od.* 18.1f.) as a possible model for Amycus (*HSCP* 96 [1994], 123–6); and, lastly, his discussion of Lynceus' speech, pregnant as it is with examples of intertextual identification and at the same time full of discrepancies (in [edd.] Harder–Regtuit–Wakker, *Theocritus*, Hellenistica Groningana, 2 [Groningen, 1996], pp. 187–204).

There has been a recent, and brilliant, independent discussion of *Idyll* 22 by R.Hunter in a chapter entitled 'All the Twos' (*Theocritus and the Archaeology of GreekPoetry* [Cambridge, 1996], pp. 46–76) which can happily be read in concert withS.'s work. Hunter provides a plausible answer to the problem of Castor's brutal aggression in suggesting that it is a typical example of divine power and retribution inthe hymnic context and has parallels in the cases of Actaeon, Teiresias, and Erysichthon in Callimachus' fifth and sixth hymns. S. agrees with this view and generally concurs with Hunter's hymnic reading of the Castor episode. S. (pp. 190–1) also follows Hunter (*TAGP*, pp. 70–3), and, indeed, of other modern scholars, F.T.Griffiths (*GRBS* 17 [1976], 353–67), H. White (*Emerita* 44 [1976], 403–6), and A.Kurz (*MH* 48 [1991], 237–47), in arguing against the lacuna and change of speaker after verse 170.

Other important points to consider are: in his second chapter (pp. 24–36) S. collatesthe fullest amount yet of intertextual evidence to support the view that Theocritus was adapting Apollonius in the Polydeuces–Amycus scenario and not the other way round. In his fifth chapter S. updates the transmission of the text, paying due attention to recent papyri and to P. G. B. Hicks's valuable work (*Studies in theManuscript Tradition of Theocritus*, diss. [Cambridge, 1993]). In his editing of the verses S. differs from Gow in eleven places, including, most importantly, the supposed lacuna after verse 170. The volume is well indexed, with a particularly good subject index.

In a word, S.'s book is welcome: it updates, summarizes, and expands the theorieson this very difficult poem. But, for this reader at least, many of the problemsremain while new ones have been created, and Theocritus' *Idyll* 22 remains an unsatisfactory composition. This opinion, however, is not a criticism of either Theocritus' poetry as a whole or S.'s monographic commentary, which is an excellent piece of scholarship.

University of Natal STEVEN JACKSON

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

MEDEAS

JAMES J. CLAUSS, SARAH ILES JOHNSTON (edd.): *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy and Art.* Pp. xv + 374. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997. Cased, $55/£45 (Paper, $17.95/£14.95). ISBN: 0-691-04377-9 (0-691-04376-0 pbk).

This collection of essays is very welcome, focusing as it does on one of the most fascinating and influential figures in all mythology. Twelve contributors together provide a comprehensive coverage of all aspects of Medea: we have four papers on her general mythological career (Fritz Graf, Sarah Iles Johnston, Nita Krevans, JanBremmer), four on her literary rôles (Dolores O'Higgins, Deborah Boedeker, James Clauss, Carole Newlands), two on her influence on philosophers (John Dillon,Martha Nussbaum), one on her appearance in vase-paintings (Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood), and one on her reappearance on the modern stage (Marianne McDonald).

There is much here to praise. Nussbaum's essay on Seneca's *Medea*, 'Serpents in the Soul', is a splendid *tour de force*. Clauss and Newlands illuminate the presentation ofMedea in, respectively, Apollonius' *Argonautica* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Claussby examining the allusions to Odysseus' encounter with Nausicaa in *Odyssey* Book 5, and Newlands by considering the women whose stories surround Medea's: Procne, Procris, Scylla, and Orythia. McDonald is excellent on the character of Medea, as well as on its reworking in two contemporary revivals of her story: a play by Brendan Kennelly, in which she is the victim who fights back, and an opera by Mikis Theodorakis, in which she is the victim who suffers.

There are two good essays on the Euripidean Medea: Boedeker examines to fine effect some of the poetic mechanisms that Euripides uses to create his powerful protagonist; and Sourvinou-Inwood's analysis of vase-paintings leads to the interesting conclusion that Euripides probably presented Medea in normal Greek women's costume until the final scene of his tragedy, when she appeared in her dragon-chariot wearing oriental dress as a powerful iconographic symbol of her utter abandonment of Greek mores.

Certainly it was Euripides in his tragedy of 431 B.C. who gave Medea her canonical identity, that of the woman who kills her children to avenge her husband's desertion; and one of the most tantalizing questions regarding Medea is whether this murderous mother was the creation of Euripides himself. Johnston, in 'Corinthian Medea and theCult of Hera Akraia', argues that the fifth-century authors inherited an infanticidal Medea from myth, a Medea developed from the folkloric paradigm of the 'reproductive demon' who jealously kills other women's children after losing her own offspring. Because Hera failed to immortalize Medea's children and they died, Johnston contends, the bereft Medea became such a demon, with the result that the death of her children was later blamed on Medea herself. This simply does not work. Medea never kills other women's children, and even when she murders her own in Euripides, she is an all-too-human mother who grieves even as she kills them. Nevertheless, Johnston's approach is one of the most interesting (and the fact that it finally fails to convince makes it no less so), since she—and she alone—attempts to answer the question of when and why Medea first deliberately killed her children.

The first section of the book turns out to be the least convincing. Krevans, in 'Medea as Foundation-heroine', fails on her basic premiss, since Medea was not a founder of cities, being merely (and all too distantly) connected with certain

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

foundation myths. Bremmer analyses Greek sibling relationships in an attempt to show that Medea' s murder of her brother Apsyrtus was more abominable than if she had killed, say, her sister or her cousin: by choosing to kill a brother, he suggests, she severs her ties to her natal home and demonstrates her independence of her family. This is not at all persuasive, for any kin-murder would have had the same effect; moreover, the significance of Apsyrtus' murder was not only that he was Medea's brother, but that he was Aeetes' only son.

Finally, although Graf gives a useful overview of the five individual episodes in Medea's mythic biography, he is far less successful when he tries to argue that initiation ritual is the unifying theme that ties together all the episodes in Medea's mythical career. He connects initiation with Medea where it does not exist, suggesting, for instance, that it was Medea's murder attempt against Theseus which enabled Aegeus to recognize his son, thus bringing about Theseus' initiation into the rôle of crown prince; whereas in fact her murderous intentions threatened this happy outcome, and the recognition was brought about simply by the token of Aegeus' sword (as, indeed, it would have done had not Medea intervened). With his fixation on initiation ritual, Graf finds it a paradox that in Iolcus—where, he thinks, the myth began—there was no later ritual to which the early myth could be connected, and he suggests that the story had 'long ago moved away from any possible ritual context in order to become the stuff of Panhellenic epic'. A simpler explanation would be that it was never tied to a ritual context, and that initiation ritual for Graf has become a rather unfortunate King Charles's head.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford JENNIFER R. MARCH

INVIDIA

THOMAS RAKOCZY: *Böser Blick, Macht des Auges und Neid der Götter: Eine Untersuchung zur Kraft des Blickes in der griechischen Literatur*. (Classica Monacensia, 13.) Pp. x + 309. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 3-8233-4872-8.

It is a great pleasure to read a doctoral dissertation whose author has had the courage to tackle a major topic and who does not shrink from presenting a comprehensive and original explanation for a complex constellation of ideas. Rakoczy in his Munich thesis of 1994 takes on two themes that loom large in Classical Antiquity: the envy of the gods and the Evil Eye. There never has been an adequate full-scale study of the notion of divine envy. As for the Evil Eye, Otto Jahn's classic treatment of that subject was published in 1855 and has not been superseded. R. not only deals with both subjects, but also shows that they cannot be fully understood in isolation from each other.

R. argues that the gods of Pindar, Aeschylus, and Herodotus are indeed jealous of human good fortune and are wont to destroy it. The *φθόνος* of the gods is on this view full-blown envy or jealousy and not just resentment or indignation aroused by men's failing to remember the limits of their mortal condition. R. now asks how the gods were imagined to destroy good fortune. His answer is that the Evil Eye is the instrument which the gods were believed to employ to bring to naught whatever had aroused their envious ill-will. Here his prize exhibits are Aesch. *Ag*. 468–71 and 947 (*μή τις πρόσωθεν ὄμματος βάλοι φθόνος*). The envy of the gods on this view is just

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

one manifestation of the Evil Eye. It is R.'s contention that the Evil Eye was already known to the poet of the *Iliad* and to Hesiod, although the belief in the case of the former has to be inferred from those verbs of seeing that govern a neuter plural object such as δεινά, κακά, or ὑπόδρα. R. would have it that these are not adverbial or internal accusatives, but the direct objects of causative verbs. They are so because the eyes are thought of as active agents sending forth emanations of anger or hatred that affect the external world and not as passive receptors of what comes before them. On this understanding of the Greek, Agamemnon in his wrath at *Il.* 1.105 casts harmful looks at Calchas (Κάλχαντα πρώτιστα κακ' ὀσσόμενος προσέειπε). R. is of the opinion that the Evil Eye came to Greece from elsewhere, most likely Egypt, and had taken root in its new home before there is any record of it in literature. It was only inLate Antiquity that people came to question its existence. Until then its reality hadbeen very much taken for granted. It did not, accordingly, have the status of a superstition in classical antiquity, but was an accepted part of a world picture to whicheverybody subscribed. Such in rough outline is R.'s thesis. There is, in addi- tion, a valuable discussion of the ancient theories that sought to account for the phenomenon.

I have a number of reservations about the tale told by R., prompted by the feeling that there was good deal less uniformity to the phenomena he describes than he allows for. First of all, Aeschylus' mentioning on two occasions the envious eye of the gods when speaking of divine jealousy does not give us warrant for supposing that Greeks and Romans always imagined that divine envy or envious fortune did its work through the agency of the Evil Eye. For the most part, so far as we can see, they gave no more thought than a modern Christian does to the way in which the divine worked its will. This brings me to a second and related concern: it is by no means certain that when a Greek or a Roman attributed some misfortune to the action of βασκανία, φθόνος, *fascinatio*, *invidia*, or *livor*, he invariably imagined that the harm done had been effected by the eyes of the envious party. There is no room for doubt that the Greeks, followed by the Romans, believed that the eyes of certain persons had the power to harm. That the idea came from abroad, probably during the Orientalizing Period from Mesopotamia, where the belief is much better attested, rather than at an earlier date from Egypt, is also likely, though not susceptible of strict proof. Whatever its origins may have been, belief in the Evil Eye underwent a considerable transformation when it reached the Greek-speaking world, since at that point it came to be closely, though not exclusively, associated with a force to whose rôle in human affairs the Greeks were exceptionally sensitive. This is φθόνος, a notion encompassing both envy and jealousy. We must be careful not to assume that what arose out of the combination of φθόνος with belief in the Evil Eye was an amalgam in which the notion of the power of the eyes to harm was always to the fore. Something rather less tightly defined seems to have come into existence.

University of Illinois at Chicago M. W. DICKIE

THE HALICARNASSIAN PATIENT

J. Romm: *Herodotus* (Hermes). Pp. xv + 212. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999. Cased, £20. ISBN: 0-300-07229-5.

The purpose of the *Hermes* series, to which this book belongs, is (in the words of its

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Founding Editor, the late John Herington) to direct the general reader past the 'industrial complex' of modern scholarship through to the 'living faces of the writersthemselves' (pp. ix–x). Those men and women sought out as the authors of suchvolumes must reveal, we are told, a 'rare combination of qualities': 'a love ofliterature in other languages', 'a vision that extends beyond academe to contemporary life itself', a clear English free of 'parochial jargon', and lastly the ability to communicate 'authoritatively and vividly, their personal sense of why agiven classical author's writings have excited people for centuries and why they cancontinue to do so'. R. fulfils his mission both by a relentless battery of cross-cultural allusion—to (amongst many others) *Gone with the Wind*, *Ulysses*, sepia-tone photography, American GIs' graffiti, Mozart opera, Garrison Keillor, and Harpo Marx—and through a tone of almost uninterrupted rapture. R.'s Herodotus is a'newsman' with a 'passion for the great story' (p. 115); his work is 'a voyage of discovery, on the order of Columbus's crossing of the Atlantic' (p. 18).

R.'s hyperbole is often empty of meaning: 'both sides [in the Persian War] appear to be caught up in a single paroxysm of historical change, a violent and unexpected turning of the tide' (p. 156). His prose is sometimes glutinous: the Persians' sense ofcultural superiority is 'the ethnologic concomitant of their program of world conquest' (p. 103). Nevertheless, this is not a book that would be without its uses for the first-time reader. Though in his effort to present Herodotus as revolutionary, R. is perhaps unfair on his prose predecessors (who chose such 'mundane' [geddit?] topics as 'the earth itself and the surrounding cosmos' [p. 14]), the general reader would learn a fair amount about those writers. He or she would also benefit from sensible introductions to the scope of the *Histories*, to the meaning of *aitiai*, the Solonian philosophy of the 'downfall of greatness', 'mythic geography', and the representation of foreign peoples. R. makes some interesting observations, noting that Herodotus is not unfailingly critical of engineering projects (p. 88), or (p. 193) that his descriptions of warfare are—like old war movies—largely sanitized (a less sanitized analogy would be the reporting of the Gulf War).

R.'s account is often thinly grounded, however. Recent criticisms of Herodotus' veracity (or 'veraciousness', p. 8) he finds to be incapable of proof or refutation (p. 7). R. opts then for the optimistic line that 'those who investigate his information thoroughly. . . often find themselves amazed at how much he gets *right*' (p. 8): Herodotus' gold-digging ants have been discovered in the marmots that inhabit the 'highlands of Pakistan' (p. 78). Herodotus' travels are taken for granted (p. 50). Tomyris' message to Cyrus 'should be regarded as the composition of Herodotus', we are told, for he 'could not have known what was really said in such a distant place, long before his birth' (p. 107). R. rejects the presence of later fifth-century resonances in the *Histories* on the insufficient grounds that there are so few explicit references toevents after the Persian wars and that Herodotus does not indulge in 'the very particular moralizing or pattern-drawing of. . . the Hebrew prophets' (p. 54; cf. p.189): subtlety and nuance are excluded. R. is happier than many today in seeing evidence of Herodotean 'splicing' of his text (p. 56). He regularly underestimates Herodotus' narrative patterning (contrast C. Dewald's excellent introduction to Robin Waterfield's translation): but for the 'mythic' value of the Croesus narrative, we are told, for example, 'it would have been easier and more natural to start book 1 with Cyrus' (p.64). R. casually espouses a view of Old Comedy as the vehicle for the poet's viewpoint: beneath the banner of the *Marathonomachai*, Aristophanes 'rallies all the social values that he felt that Athens was in danger of losing' (p. 201). After portraying Herodotus as tiptoeing around others' religious sensibilities in his account of the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Peneius gorge (p. 141), R. concludes puzzlingly that one 'senses little in his work of the growing tension between reason and faith' (p. 147).

In general, R. avoids 'what really happened'. He provides only two chapters of reasonably accurate historical summary. He is too trusting, however, in Darius' Achaemenid genealogy (pp. 38, 44; see A. Kuhrt, *The Ancient Near East* [London, 1995], p. 665; M. Waters, 'Darius and the Achaemenid Line', *AHB* 10 [1996], 11–18),and too confident, surely, in his assertion of the same king's introduction of Zoroastrianism (see e.g. J. Wiesehöfer, *Ancient Persia* [London, 1996], pp. 94–101). In describing Xerxes' empire as 'a colossus that bestrides the world but stumbles and reels when it takes a step' (p. 47; cf. p. 152), R. appears blithely to adopt a clichéd Greek view of Persia. The assertion that Roman imperial rule was 'in large part simply an adaptation of that of Darius' (p. 45) is mystifying.

Ultimately, however, it is the flavour of this book rather than its contents that stay with you. Rarely do R.'s analogies serve to elucidate, to lead the reader to a more accurate, historically grounded understanding of Herodotus. Rather they seem to convey the message that he and the Greeks are like us, that the reader unburdened by scholarship (or knowledge) may be emboldened in his or her first subjective responses. Herodotus has, 'one feels, a warm affection for the "little people" ' (p. 165). It is his 'very lack of polish that wins the affection of readers' (p. 19). Herodotus is your friend.

University College London THOMAS HARRISON

THUCYDIDES LOGOPŌLĒS

JUNE W. ALLISON: *Word and Concept in Thucydides*. (American Classical Studies, 41.) Pp. xvi + 278. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997. Cased, $27.95. ISBN: 0-7885-0363-4.

This valuable study of Thucydides' linguistic innovativeness is not for beginners. The more strictly Thucydidean parts are closely argued and present some of the material in tabulated form, which readers who are not Thucydidean enthusiasts may occasionally find rebarbative; elsewhere, in the epistemological sections, the book draws on some well known, but dense and difficult, modern philosophical works. W.V. Quine's *Word and Object* (Cambridge, 1960) makes an appearance in the text as early as p. 12 (but see already p. 8 n. 17); and A.'s own title is presumably in part a gesture of homage to this 'indispensable work'.

The main thesis is that Th. had the concept of a concept, and created a new and special sort of language in which to talk about concepts. He has in fact (p. xi) a 'metalinguistic vocabulary'. Thucydides 'for the first time in Greek thought made it clear to his reader that he was stating propositions, not simply describing events, being, or utterances' (p. 16).

Chapter I takes over Quine's notion of 'semantic ascent' and applies it to Th. By semantic ascent is meant such transitions as 'ships'–'navy' (as in 'the Athenian navy put out from Piraeus')–'navy' (as in 'Athens was powerful by virtue of her navy'); cp.p.101.

This leads naturally to the subject of Chapter II, 'Abstracts', which is particularly concerned with the many *hapax legomena* in this department, especially nouns in *-sis*, which are relatively more numerous in Thucydides (by comparison with nouns in *-ia*)

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

than they are in other writers. Predictably, the speeches turn out to contain more abstracts than the narrative, but (less predictably, perhaps) Athenian speeches are no fuller of abstracts than are Spartan or Corinthian. However, the Athenians in general and Pericles in particular are especially fond of *-sis* nouns.

The fascinating Chapter III could and perhaps should have been split into two. The first section examines some key concepts and the way Th. rings the changes on them linguistically; then in the second section A. concentrates, in a rather different manner, on the plague passage, then on Diodotus' speech in Book 3, and finally on Book 8. The first section begins by examining *χωρεῖν*, with special reference to 4.127ff. from the 'Brasidas' narrative. A. shows how the *hapax προαναχώρησις* is 'flanked and picked out' by a whole cluster of related and simpler forms of the operative word. Then comes *τείχισις* and a discussion of the near-*hapax ἀποτείχισις* at 1.65.2, which A. suggests is both shorthand (by now we know which wall is meant) and closure ('the unusual abstract in the concluding statement rounds off this piece of narrative. . .'). Naturally, there is discussion of the walling and counter-walling in the latter part of Book 6 and the early part of Book 7. But note that when he gets to the crucial moment when the Syracusans build their wall past the Athenian one, Th. does not use a *τειχ*-compound, but *παροικοδομέω*, significantly picked up at 7.11.3. Other words explored are *καταφρόνησις*, *σωτηρία*, and *ἔκπληξις*. In connection with the last of these, A. makes the good point that Th. is a relativist in that 'every event is viewed by virtue of its dimensions in relation to something else, whether of size, length of time, or intensity, to name but a few'. (Does he have a binary mind? A. pp. 154f. has reservations). The second section broadens things out; it explores the epistemological language used about the plague, and the way Diodotus operates with words like *ἄνοια*, and the unusual *ἀπαιδευσία*. These words pick up Periclean, and look forward toAlcibiadean, usages (Pericles' *παίδευσις* at the famous 2.41.1 and Diodotus' *ἀπαιδευσία* are both *hapax legomena* in the *History*). In other words 'links are, asoften before, made initially through the use of significant abstracts' (p. 80). 'In anyinstance he is likely to place these abstracts in an apical position, whether central or final. When the usage seems most self-conscious, the abstract form is frequently ofthe *-sis* variety' (p. 100). This seems fine. A. now makes the further move that Th.'s use of abstract forms requires of him some kind of notion about what abstraction is(p. 101).

Chapter IV has an excellent section on words in *-mos* and *-sis*, and Th.'s reasons for choosing between these endings (including a discussion at pp. 123f. of *agonisis* in the remarkable expression at 5.50.4, *κατὰ τὴν οὐκ ἐξουσίαν τῆς ἀγωνίσεως*). Section C, on Th.'s language of comparison, is one of the most illuminating in the book; for A. (p. 147) 'comparison is basic to Thucydides' process of composing', and helps explain both the 'proliferation of actual terms for size and number in the History' and also Th.'s fondness for expressions employing e.g. *μᾶλλον*.

Chapter V turns at last to what was obviously all along going to be a crucial passage for A., the material in the Corcyran stasis section about language, especially the *εἰωθυῖα ἀξίωσις* sentence at 3.82.4. A. well compares the way *ἀλόγιστος τόλμα* features both in this section and again at 6.59.1, in the Pisistratid excursus. She moves on to a tabulated discussion of various 'words on words', i.e. expressions Thucydides uses to refer to language. Note in particular p. 201 with its remarks on the language Th. uses at 7.48 to express Nikias' indecisive and secretive state of mind. The chapter closes with a section on *aletheia*.

Some of the most challenging general remarks on Th.'s working methods, and ontheir relation to those of Herodotus, are to be found in the ten-page Conclusion. Atp.240 with n. 6 A. argues provocatively that 'Th. availed himself of the luxury of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

more complex composing [than Herodotus] because the stylistic complexities he enjoyed, that Herodotus avoided, could be effected (to judge from the layers of composition) by writing and by the apparently fairly easy use of the rewrite'. The footnote says that 'cutting and pasting is not a new invention, just one which the computer now seems to be rendering extinct as a mechanical act. Papyrus roles [*sic*: read 'rolls'] were made up of sheets pasted together and overlapping sheets could easily have been changed, inserted and deleted'. This is food for thought, whatever one thinks of that 'easily'.

To sum up, an admirable book, a product of what (despite the remarks at the end of the preceding paragraph) is the essentially unitarian modern search for correspondences and cross-references within Th.'s work. In the end there is an imaginative and perhaps illegitimate leap from what is happening on the page to what was going on in Th.'s head and heart (see most obviously p. 109 where we read that 'Thucydides dabbles with and then seems to have been pleased with the discovery of how easily his language was willing to countenance existential and attributive statements consisting entirely of abstractions'). I would hesitate to say what, if anything, pleased Thucydides himself, but his admirers can certainly afford to be pleased with this account of A.'s researches.

University College London SIMON HORNBLOWER

THUCYDIDES' REALISM

G. CRANE: *Thucydides and the Ancient Simplicity. The Limits of Political Realism*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1998. Pp. xii + 348. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-520-20789-0.

Crane is concerned in this work with Thucydides as a political thinker and writer. The book is divided into eleven chapters: the first three essentially discuss Thucydides and his political 'realisms', and compare and contrast him to Herodotus and Xenophon, especially in his attitudes to political power and social matters (Chapter I, with its constant analogy to General Sherman and the American Civil War, and so really only of interest to an American readership, was overdone). Chapters IV–IX, the central part of the book, deal with incidents in Thucydides' *History* (the Corcyraean affair, the Archaeology, the Mytilene debate, the debate atSparta over war, the Melian dialogue). The final two chapters (Chapter XI is aconclusion) have more on Thucydides' 'realism' in his *History* as well as the Athenians' political viewpoints and their position/rôle as leaders in the Greek world. This was not an easy book to read, and I found myself in no small disagreement with much of what C. has to say and especially how he arrives at his conclusions.

C. accepts Thucydides' account of the Peloponnesian War as a 'classic of realist analysis' (e.g. p. 4), but then he attempts to analyse and so determine Thucydides' own political realism, and by extension his objectivity and veracity. C.'s arguments are based on factors such as the speeches Thucydides gives and the incidents he describes, which form the central chapters of this book. Foucault unfortunately rears his head during C.'s analyses of Thucydides, and as a result we have some drastic and at times misguided interpretations of the text.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

To C., Thucydides' historical method is based on the single assumption that human nature is unchanging, and that the political power of Athens and the importance of itsdemocracy in the Greek world are not only central to Thucydides' work but emphasized by that historian at all times. As C. admits, these are not new ideas. Thucydides' problem, we are told, is why the Athenians lost the Peloponnesian War when they ought to have been the victors, given their constitution, power, and resources at its start. It is to this end, argues C., that Thucydides adopts a different exploitation of the above ideas, especially on human nature, and so gives a 'revisionist' view of Athenian past and present history. This apparently explains why in his Archeology, for example, the Trojan War is depicted as a primitive affair, and why Thucydides left Book 8, dealing with the oligarchy of 411, unfinished because he found the material too unsatisfactory. Does the same argument apply to the events of 411 to 404, which explains why Thucydides does not record them? Some historian if so! The Athenians are much like the Achaeans, or rather the times in which they live have not changed much since the days of the Trojan War: Agamemnon depended on intimidation, not loyalty; so too does Athenian hegemony of the Delian League. Human nature remains eternal. Decline over time, argues C., is a major theme of Thucydides' world, around which he bases his narrative of the war: Alcibiades is worse than Pericles, Melos is worse than Mytilene, and so on. And the moral decline of each period becomes an accepted standard. Hence, by the time we get to Book 8 (the oligarchic coup), the infighting and then the overthrow of democracy do not constitute a sudden decline, because Thucydides apparently says these are now normal standards.

I agree with C.'s analysis of such incidents as the plague and the Corcyraean stasis as being worked by Thucydides to show how something devastating can override the accepted mores of society and lead to the decline in the moral behaviour of citizens. However, the belief that Athens lost the war and fell from its influential position in international affairs because of Pericles' death and the fact that no one of the right intellectual power or moral vision was around to lead the city is erroneous. C. needs to be more critical of Thucydides' belief here: Athens did not lose the war for such reasons. Indeed, is this the message that Thucydides is peddling? After all, while Thucydides follows his class prejudices (the 'ancient simplicity' of the title is the belief in the ideology of the élite or nobles, from which background Thucydides came), Alcibiades, like Pericles, came from the nobility, but Thucydides treats him very differently from Pericles. He is like a tyrant (a Cleon after all?), subordinating the interests of the state to his own. But then Thucydides ties himself in a knot since he likens Pericles to a tyrant when he tells us at 2.65 that 'in what was nominally a democracy power was in the hands of one man [Pericles]'. Thucydides' personal biases are at work here, not some carefully crafted narrative or speech which serves as a political treatise.

There is a huge Thucydides industry already, and I wonder whether we need another book on that historian, even though C.'s is not meant to be a historical work. To those working on Thucydides this book will probably need to be read, but it is not always convincing.

University of Missouri—Columbia IAN WORTHINGTON

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

XENOPHON'S SOCRATES

VIVIENNE J. GRAY: *The Framing of Socrates: The Literary Interpretation of Xenophon's* Memorabilia. (*Hermes* Einzelschriften, 79.) Pp. 202. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998. Paper, DM 76. ISBN: 3-525-07313-2.

The 'framing' conceived in this monograph is 'in the tradition of wisdom literature' (pp. 8, 194), but only in the ninth chapter and part of the fourth (pp. 68–73) is this tradition examined in any detail. Isocrates figures largely in those parts, but attempts to relate the writings of these two men of similar mental capacity but different characters and careers are surely incomplete without some examination of chronology, however limited this is made by the available evidence. Did Xenophon write a draft of *Memorabilia* I and II while his memories of Socrates were still relatively fresh, say, around 381, as suggested by Delebecque (whose *Essai sur la vie de Xénophon* finds no place in the bibliography)? Opinion about this would affect opinion about the historicity of Xenophon's Socrates; but this is of less interest to G. than the discovery of the nature and extent of Xenophon's literary invention.

This is a wholly respectable aim, realized in the main with skill and finesse. Notwithstanding her disavowal in the Preface, G. offers material which would serve admirably for a literary commentary, with some rearrangement and removal of repetition. Xenophon himself is, of course, responsible for some of the latter, and G.'s positive and sympathetic approach is continually confronted by the looseness and randomness which previous critics have found. She interprets these characteristics in what she understands to be rhetorical terms—amplification, emphasis, and chiastic arrangement. 'Rhetoric' appears in six out of eleven chapter titles, yet it is debatable towhat extent the *Memorabilia* can be regarded as a rhetorical work. Illustrative dialogues and conversations are seen to amplify earlier summary statements of Socrates' position, and G. is able to show how these become more sophisticated. But progress is not linear; no clear pattern emerges; and incidence of devices that are technically rhetorical is sparse. On the other hand, in the chapter entitled 'The Conversations as Rhetorical Proofs' (p. 7), G. is able to draw a parallel with the χρεῖαι of the rhetorical schools, taking care to trace their origins to the fifth century.

According to G.'s overall plan, the *Memorabilia* unfold from a quasi-forensic defence (using general probability argument) of Socrates against the accusations of his enemies into an account of his instruction, which not only turns his pupils away from wrong ideas to right ideas by logically refuting their position (protreptic), but uses positive arguments and exhortation to lead them along the right path (proagic). This technique reaches its high point of refinement in the *Oeconomicus* and the *Hiero*, two of Xenophon's best works. Some indication of the difficulty of crediting the *Memorabilia* with structural consistency is to be found in the treatment of the structure of 1.4–4.8 in a single chapter (VIII). Here G. summarizes the topics covered—family, friends, fellow-citizens—and pauses occasionally to deal with interesting topics, such as Socrates' allegedly undemocratic opinions. She finds certain key characters, such asEuthydemus and Critobulus, framing the whole work, and prefers to describe as 'self-contained blocks' (p. 157) sections whose arrangement Xenophon's critics have seen as unorganized. She concludes that 'he seems to have thought quite carefully about the shape of his work overall' (p. 158), and her final claim that his image ofSocrates is coherent (p. 178) has been justified by her detailed analysis of its components.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Some might misread the following sentence (p. 5): 'He claims friendship with the Theban Proxenus in his *Anabasis*; he was a pupil of Gorgias of Leontini'. The reviewer is misquoted on p. 168 as finding the *Nicocles* of Isocrates baffling. Otherwise there are few errors and obscurities. G. has added a significant contribution to her own Xenophontine bibliography.

Royal Holloway, London S. USHER

PAUSANIAS

M. Casevitz, M. Jost, J. Marcadé (edd.): *Pausanias:* Description de la Grèce, Livre VIII (Collection Budé). Pp. xlii + 319, 4maps, 1 plan. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1998. ISBN: 2-251-00465-3.

This volume, on Arkadia, is the second to appear of the Budé Pausanias (and is published before the equivalent volume of the Italian *Pausania, Guida della Grecia*). Casevitz is primarily responsible for the Greek text and comment on it, and Jost forthe translation, introduction, and commentary, but they worked in consultation with each other and with Marcadé. The volume is substantial, more so than the page-numbering as printed suggests, since in the section containing text and facing translation (pp. 14–147) left- and right-hand pages bear the same number.

The Greek text follows the principles set out in the Budé volume of Pausanias I. Ithas an extensive apparatus criticus and, where appropriate, citations of ancient testimonia; and there are also eleven pages of textual notes. In general the edition defends MS readings so far as reasonably possible, frequently rejecting earlier suggested emendations. For proper names account is taken of references by Stephanus Byzantius to Pausanias' text, set out in Appendix I, while Appendices II and III give passages from the *Suda* based on Pausanias.

The French translation is straightforward and readable. It deliberately (p. xxxviii) seeks to reproduce any stylistic flaws—repetition, awkwardness, or obscurity—apparent in the original Greek. Conventional terminology used in the commentary is listed and explained on p. xlii: for some terms set translations have been adopted, e.g. *idole* for *xoanon*, *effigie* for *andrias*, *statue* for *eikon*, and *statue (de culte)* for *agalma.*

The commentary is very full—133 pages, besides an introduction of thirty-four pages and an eleven-page summary of contents. Jost, whose *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie* and numerous other publications have made a very major contribution to our understanding of both ancient Arcadia and what Pausanias says about it, is admirably qualified to comment on the text. For a full list of earlier texts with commentary the reader is referred back (p. xxxviii) to the first volume, but significantly the two singled out here for mention are those of Frazer (excellent, but a century old) and Papahatzis (1980, very useful if you read modern Greek). Pausanias' coverage of Arcadia is unusually full, with—as Jost notes (p. xi)—a balance among his various interests rarely found in the rest of his work, and a new and full commentary is very welcome, the more so because of the considerable recent scholarly interest in Pausanias' work (to which pp. ix–xi offer a convenient introduction).

As a general principle (p. xl) the commentary gives preference to citing relevant ancient texts over citations of modern work, a principle which the reader might otherwise not have suspected given the numerous and up-to-date modern references. Clearly not every modern publication could be mentioned, and opinions will differ onwhat else might reasonably have been included—e.g. doubts by N. Robertson

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Festivals and Legends* [Toronto, 1992]) on the Oresthasians' aid to Phigaleia (39.3–5), or K. Trampedach (*Platon, die Akademie und die zeitgenössische Politik* [Stuttgart, 1994]) on the Arkadian confederacy of the 360s (e.g. at 32.1), but it is misleading to dwell on occasional omissions when the commentary explicitly disavows any intention of giving complete modern bibliography and is in any case so full and up-to-date. Modern views are treated with caution, as e.g. (p. xxii) those for and against accepting Pausanias' account of eighth- and seventh-century kings ruling all Arkadia (though reference back to p. xxii would help in the comment on 5.11–12). The only error noted is the statement (p. 207 on 24.3–4) that the River Erymanthos flows into the River Ladon, clearly a slip of the pen, since a few lines later it is said correctly to run into the Alpheios. Altogether this commentary is a most valuable piece of work, bringing together clearly and carefully what is currently known about the topics covered in thetext. In addition, the excellent map originally published in *Sanctuaires et cultes* reappears in reduced but entirely legible format.

Altogether this is a book to be warmly welcomed, indispensable to anyone working on Pausanias VIII. It is well produced, and rare misprints are trivial, even (p. 266) R. Roy.

University of Nottigham J. ROY

LUCIAN

U. RÜTTEN: *Phantasie und Lachkultur. Lukians* "Wahre Geschichten". Pp. 142. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1997. Paper, DM 56. ISBN: 3-8233-4875-2.

A. GEORGIADOU, D. H. J. LARMOUR: *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel* True Histories. *Interpretation and Commentary*. Pp. 254. Leiden,Boston, and Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1998. Cased, $93. ISBN: 90-04-10667-7.

P. GRÖßLEIN: *Untersuchungen zum* Juppiter Confutatus *Lukians*. Pp. viii + 114. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, New York, Paris, and Vienna: Peter Lang, 1998. Paper, £20. ISBN: 3-631-31952-2.

When is a joke not a joke? When it's explained. . .

Comedy has in the past been a notoriously difficult subject for scholars trained in northern European classical studies, it being extremely difficult to account for elusive elasticity within a tradition that prizes rigour, hard fact, and objectivity. What would Lucian, the scathing critic of humourless scholarship, have made of (one of the best examples of the genre) Fraenkel's *Plautinisches im Plautus*? In the present critical climate, however, the membrane separating 'hard' methodology from the ludic poetics of 'soft' literature is more than semi-permeable, and the consequent osmosis promises a new start for comic studies. In the case of Lucian, Bracht Branham's exemplary study, *Unruly Eloquence* (Cambridge, MA, 1989) has already pointed the way towards a more sensitive and sophisticated understanding of this most devious of satirists.

Two of the texts under review focus upon Lucian's *Verae Historiae*, the fantastic

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

travel-narrative that inspired writers from Rabelais to Swift to Raspe. The monograph by Rütten, *Phantasie und Lachkultur*, is to my mind the more successful. This is a sophisticated, sometimes dense, multidisciplinary approach to the text. What R. shares with Branham is a belief that comedy is not necessarily an unsystematic attempt to get a laugh by any means possible; it is, rather, a subtle system offering opportunities for thoughtful exploration. Lucian's comedy has, we read, a 'philosophical' character (pp. 114, 131–3), the narrator characterizing himself as a kind of anti-Socrates (pp. 30–1), and Lucian here turns away from the 'aggressive' satire of his other texts (pp. 38, 42, 63) towards a creative experimentation with intellectual and cultural categories (e.g. pp. 51–3, 78–9). Balancing broader investigation of the aim of the *VH* with nuanced discussions of individual passages, R. shows how Lucian consistently (indeed, almost systematically) transposes familiar frameworks onto unfamiliar settings, and thus requires the reader to interrogate his or her own values and norms. R. argues that the interplay between the fantasy world of the text and the reality of the reader is central to the meaning of the text.

R. draws methodological inspiration primarily from the German phenomenological tradition that produced (amongst others) Iser and Jauss, and so his primary object of inquiry is the comic *effect*, the *Kommunikationsprozesse*. Yet R.'s methods produce results that also engage readers whose interests do not stretch to *Rezeptionstheorie*: every discussion yields important insights about the dynamics of the *VH*. If R. has a weakness, it is a tendency to cling rather uncompromisingly to theoretical principles at the expense of a more flexible interpretation of the text. For example, theoft-repeated claim that Lucian is not aggressively satirical in the *VH* does not necessarily convince when we encounter the philosophers in the underworld (*pace* pp.74–5). For similar reasons, the chapter on Menippean satire (pp. 111–30) is somewhat disappointing: after some initially interesting comments, R. resorts to ticking and crossing against a checklist of elements drawn from Bakhtin. These occasional wooden sections notwithstanding, *Phantasie und Lachkultur* is an important publication that deserves to have a profound effect upon scholarship on the *VH*.

Georgiadou and Larmour offer an introductory essay together with commentary upon (but no text of) the *VH* in its entirety. There is little discussion here of problems of linguistic interpretation, and none of textual issues: instead, both introduction and commentary focus primarily upon locating the objects of Lucian's satire. A competent literary commentary (which this certainly is) has long been a *desideratum* in studies of the *VH*, a text which from the very start (1.2) invites its readers to spot references and allusions. G. & L. display an impressively broad knowledge of ancient literary genres, and one could not ask for more enthusiastic searchers after the various *arcana* which may or may not be alluded to by Lucian.

G. & L.'s central argument is that the *VH* is a parody of an allegorical journey forphilosophical knowledge (pp. 5–22). Consequently, much of the commentary isdevoted to finding echoes of philosophical material: the sky represents the philosophers' *meteora*, the whale's belly represents Plato's cave, and so forth. A typical example of this approach: 'the Nephelocentaurs who come out to the ship, presumably in their role of border-guards, may represent the philosophers who have developed theories about the sun' (p. 149). Few readers will agree with all of their suggestions for parallels, and some are provocatively tendentious in the extreme. When the travellers hear the barking of dogs as they approach Scintharus' hut (an echo, asG. & L. point out, of Odysseus' encounter with Eumaeus), are we really to think ofthe Cynics (p. 162)? When the hut is described as *αὐτάρκη* ('big enough'), are we necessarily to think of philosophical *αὐτάρκεια* (p. 164)? (And, if so, does the use of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the same word to describe a wall at Achilles Tatius 1.15.1 equally invite a philosophical interpretation?) G. & L. also have a trick of signalling the philosophical import ofwords by referring readers to a lemma elsewhere as though the entry there, which isitself invariably speculative, proved the issue. An amusing example, glossing a reference to cheese: 'See n. on 2.3 below on the suggestive meanings of the verbs *τυρόω* and *τυρεύω*, connected with trickery and deceit; the connection with the philosophers and their arguments would be obvious' (p. 138). A neat, but hardly deft, attempt to demonstrate a self-evident connection between cheese and philosophy!

The problem is not that this kind of allusion-spotting is not part of the pleasure of the *VH*; nor, indeed, is it even that these references are not 'there in the text' (how could such a proposition be proven or refuted?). The major disadvantage of this approach, rather, is its (strongly normative) implication that this 'interpretive key' (p.5) can unlock the mysteries of the *VH* and decode it correctly into a coherent, meaningful whole. If every bizarre apparition is a cipher for an entity wholly familiar to an audience of *pepaideumenoi*, then interpretation strips the text of all that is alienand other. Yet this is a narrative which explicitly refers to the 'foreignness' of its content (*τὸ ξένον*, 1.2; cf. *τὸ ἀλλόκοτον*, 2.41). Part of Lucian's strategy is (as R. sees) to invite dynamic, analogical explorations of sameness and difference between these strange worlds and the one in which we live; and to underplay the *θαῦμα* inspired by the Cork-feet and their various colleagues is to iron out a crucial part of the textual play.

G. & L. can be extremely enlightening in their analyses. They are alert to the Odyssean background, and to Lucian's complex and playful use of his Homeric models (e.g. p. 160), and strong on 'metaliterary' aspects (e.g. the whirlwind at 1.9–10, cf. p. 80; and the ending, p. 232). On the other hand, they can be prolix and unfocused. For example: p. 128 recaps material from p. 104 on acorns; pp. 166–7 summarizes the *Piscator* (a well-known Lucianic text) for no reason other than that the *Piscator* is about fish and philosophers (which is supposed to show that fish in the *VH* have a philosophical significance). At times, the entries in the commentary are simply lists that fail to show how or why these parallels are relevant to the interpretation of the lemma (e.g. pp. 95–6 on vultures; p. 190 on cinnamon; p. 135 on beards); or parallels are introduced by 'cf.', with no suggestion as to what a comparison might yield (e.g. p.135 on nails). Moreover, there are sections where aspects of the argument are obscure, to me at any rate (the discussion of the lighthouse at Pharos, p. 31; the association of Heracles and Dionysus with 'initiation into comedy', p. 68; Lucian as 'corrector' of Homer, p. 209). Still, there is much that is valuable in this book, which goes some way towards filling an embarassing gap in Lucianic studies.

The third text in this bundle, a study of *Iuppiter Confutatus* (a dialogue on fate and free will between Zeus and the Cynic philosopher Cyniscus) by Größlein, is, on the other hand, a prime example of how to miss the joke almost entirely. G. works throughthe text sequentially, seeking to place the arguments in philosophical (and mostly Stoic) context. G. provides a wealth of detail showing the provenance of the arguments, and for this laborious undertaking at least he deserves gratitude. But to what end does Lucian marshall this philosophical material? Where does the comedy lie? Why the dialogue form? On such issues of interpretation G. is best when silent, which he often is; when he does pronounce, there are signs of extraordinary naiveté. At the outset, he states that no educated man in Lucian's times believed in the gods, and so the figure of Zeus is simply a vehicle for philosophical exploration (p. 2). 'Belief' is too complicated an issue to be invoked and rejected so quickly, and to dismiss it like this is to close too many interpretative doors. G. shows some interest in

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

establishing the setting of the dialogue (pp. 5–8), but without ever stating what relevance this might have to any reading of the text. He seems to assume that Cyniscus the character is to be identified directly with Lucian the author, often (e.g. pp. 32, 53, 69) attributing the philosophical argument to 'Lucian' and thus implying the interchangeability of the two. Occasionally, G. acknowledges the comic nature of the text: Lucian is not to be taken seriously, we read, since *er ist Satiriker* (pp. 53, 91). But how the satire works we are never told. Instead, G. meanders through the text, shooting off at tangents willy-nilly (e.g. the bizarre and unresolved excursus on Helm's theory of the text at pp. 76–7, and the unfocused comparison with Kant and Leibnitz on p. 78). It is a shame that the considerable energies which have gone into collating so much of the philosophical background have not yielded a more convincing argument as to why the text itself is of any interest.

St John's College, Cambridge TIM WHITMARSH

IDEA-THEORY

I. RUTHERFORD: *Canons of Style in the Antonine Age: Idea-Theory and its Literary Context*. Pp. viii + 168. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £30. ISBN: 0-19-814729-5.

This book, based on R.'s 1986 doctoral thesis, seeks to relate the kind of stylistic analysis found in its most sophisticated form in Hermogenes *On Ideas* to its literary context, paying special attention to the rôle of stylistic models ('canons of style') both in the literary practice of the second sophistic and in contemporary theory. After a brief survey of the main theoretical texts, R. discusses possible sophistic influences on the development of *idea*-theory. He then turns to Hermogenes' reading-list (devoting a separate chapter to the unusually limited place that is given to poetry); the remaining chapters focus on Xenophon, Demosthenes, and Aelius Aristides. In addition, R. provides the first English translation of Pseudo-Aristides' treatise on the plain (ἀφελής) style. The result is an important and stimulating book, from which I have learned a lot.

Good use is made of Philostratus in mapping the second-century roots of *idea*-theory. The implied criticism (pp. 125f.) of Philostratus' 'bipolar' approach tostyle (the grand sophistic style vs. a mixed bag of everything else) is perhaps unfair,given the sharpness with which R.'s own discussion singles out declamation within the rhetorical culture of the day (an exaggerated sharpness, I feel: though Philostratus' focus was on star declaimers, it is clear even from his slanted presentation that many of the sophists were also successful practical orators). And while R. argues persuasively for the origin of some of the distinctive terms of *idea*-theory in sophistic declamation (pp. 25–31), the model proposed (sophistic terms absorbed into a classicizing stylistic theory) rests on an unwarranted assumption that *idea*-theory is inherently classicizing (pp. 22f.). Why should those who practised 'more modern and more outlandish' effects not have used the framework of *idea*-theory to analyse them? After all, the technique which R. cites to illustrate the sort of thing that *idea*-theorists could not have approved of (finishing a declamation with an ᾠδή) is attributed to Hadrian of Tyre—who wrote *On Ideas* in five books (*Suda* A528).

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The confrontation (p. 35 n. 27) of Hermogenes and the author of *On Sublimity* (in my view, Longinus) is stimulating. But Hermogenes is writing a technical treatise, and that fact limits the significance of what he says (he has a motive to talk up the importance of his subject) and fails to say (if it is not relevant to his purposes). Technique for Hermogenes is essential (213.14–214.6), and may perhaps (*τάχα*) makeup for deficiency in talent (214.8–12); but he recognizes the importance of talentaswell (214.6–8). So I do not think Hermogenes would accept the view whichR. attributes to him, that rhetoric is 'purely a matter of technical rules' (surelyinconsistent, in any case, with what R. says later [p. 87] about his attitude to Demosthenes). Hermogenes' opening paragraph speaks of the critical evaluation of classical and modern authors (213.8f.), but of the imitation and emulation only of classical authors (213.13, 214.5: the point is relevant to the exclusion of Aristides from Hermogenes' canon, discussed at pp. 103f.). We cannot know whether he reflected, as Longinus did (Chapter XLIV), on the reasons for this asymmetry: if he did, he had no reason to discuss it in *Id*. It should not be overlooked, either, that the author of *On Sublimity* himself emphatically rejects the position of those who decry *τέχνη* (Chapter II; cf. Longinus *ap*. Proclus *In Tim*. 1.59.10–60.1).

R. provocatively suggests (pp. 52f.) that the logic of Hermogenes' position is that 'Demosthenes is the only author that a student would need to know', and that a study of *Id*. might make reading even Demosthenes unnecessary. But Hermogenes is clear about the importance of imitation, and reasonably so: students need to be able to see how the techniques taught by theory work in practice; the rôle of theory is to help them understand what is worth imitating, and how it works. Moreover, theory's analysis of the phenomena of practical composition is inevitably provisional and incomplete. This is why Hermogenes' rules turn out to have, as R. points out (p. 20), somany exceptions (*Σ* Dem. 19.101 maintains at length that technical handbooks areless authoritative than the practice of the classical orators). Furthermore, Demosthenes' complexity itself may make him a difficult model to understand and imitate, especially for less advanced students. Dio identifies Demosthenes and Lysias as the greatest of the orators, but recommends the study of Hyperides and Aeschines, whose qualities are simpler and easier to grasp (18.11). The important distinction which R. makes elsewhere (p. 61) between 'the absolute value of an author and his value as a model in rhetorical education' is relevant here too. Precisely because Demosthenes is the supreme model he may not be the most educationally useful one for all students at all stages.

Appendix A establishes that Book 4 of Ps.-Hermogenes' *On Invention* stems fromsame tradition as *Id.*, and presents *idea*-theory in a less developed form; direct dependence is not proven, however. We should be cautious, I think, even in assuming that *Inv*. is earlier: Hermogenes' exceptionally sophisticated treatment may have been too far ahead of the field for other teachers to absorb into their teaching practice atonce (perhaps reflected in the work's delayed reception: see below); see further myspeculations at *AJP* 119 (1998), 110 n. 51. The intrusion of style into a work oninvention is perhaps not as surprising as R. finds it (p. 105 and n. 2). The new formtaken by *stasis*-theory in the second century changed the structure of the rhetorical system: the analysis of argumentative strategies (*On Issues*) is now separated from and precedes instruction on how those strategies are to be embodied in a speech (though the traditional title *On Invention* continued to be used, the variant *On the Parts of the Political Speech* is more precise). The latter may (as in Ps.-Hermogenes) analyse the microstructure of the presentation of narrative and argument, and advice on style is no great step beyond that; compare the stylistic recommendations in the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Anonymus Seguerianus. The apology for the stylistic poverty of the examples at the beginning of the work (*Inv.* 94.22–95.1) need not have programmatic significance for the whole.

So far, my dissent does no discredit to the book, but is an index of its fruitfulness: in each case, it is R.'s discussion that has prompted me to further thought. It will not, I hope, eclipse the book's very real merits if I conclude by pointing out some blemishes.

The survey of Hermogenes' commentators (p. 9) is inaccurate. Syrianus' commentary covers *Stas.* and *Id.*, not 'all of Hermogenes and Ps. Hermogenes'; and he was the earliest commentator only on *Id.*—there were many earlier commentators on*Stas.*, including the partially extant Sopater and Marcellinus (missing from the catalogue in n. 4). It is surely significant of something (but I am not sure what) that*Stas.* attracted commentators already in the third century, but *Id.* not until the fifth, and that the earliest known commentator on *Stas.*, Metrophanes of Eucarpia, wrote an *On Ideas* of his own. But Metrophanes' *On Ideas* is not mentioned; nor are those of Hadrian (see above), Aelius Harpocration, or Tiberius. Passing reference is made to Basilicus and Zeno (p. 7 n. 3), but the latter is a Byzantine phantom, arising from a misinterpretation of Syrianus' reference to Zeno's attested commentary on Demosthenes. This (admittedly elusive) evidence for the history of *idea*-theory surely merited some attention. I would have welcomed, too, an attempt to clarify the relationship of the two works falsely attributed to Aristides (are they, as Schmid argued, by different authors?), and of the first of them to Hermogenes (the relationship of the second, on *ἀφέλεια*, to Hermogenes is examined in Appendix C).

R., always incisive, sometimes takes conciseness to excess. Technical details are not always explained in a way that a non-expert will find intelligible. For example (p. 14): '*Μέθοδος* can also have to do with linking stylemes, for example the *μέθοδος* of *ἀφήγησις* discussed in the section on *καθαρότης*'—and on to another point without further explanation. And I am seemingly not alone in finding the discussion of *ἐνδιάθετος λόγος* (p. 17) confusing: the muddling of 'former' and 'latter' that results in attributing expressive language to animals suggests that R. got lost, too.

Strangely, perhaps, in a book so long in the making, signs of haste are discernible also in a lack of attention to detail. Misprints, mainly trivial, are numerous, especially in Greek and in the bibliography. The sophist whose Greek name is *Σκοπελιανός* morethan once appears as 'Scopelion'; Metrophanes of Eucarpia is exiled to 'Epicarpia' and conflated with the Metrophanes of Lebadea who wrote on exponents of the plain style (p. 72: see *Suda* M1009–10). The treatment of titles is capricious and inconsistent: Aristides, *Peri Tou Paraphthegmatos*, sits next to Lucian, *Quomodo Historia Conscribenda Sit* (p. 2), a.k.a. *How to Write History* (p. 3 n. 4); *Peri Ideon* rubs shoulders with *On Ideas* (p. 7); and so on. Statements about ancient sources are not always supplied with a reference; and R. is inclined to cite whole books without specifying the relevant pages. The bibliography is not always up to date: on the history of *idea*-theory L. Pernot, *La rhétorique de l'élogé* (Paris, 1993), 1.333–94 deserves notice; on the canon of ten orators (p. 38) see now I. Worthington in *Persuasion* (London, 1994), pp. 244–63 and R. M. Smith, *Mnemosyne* 48 (1995), 66–79; on poetry in the Antonine age see E. L. Bowie in D. A. Russell (ed.), *Antonine Literature* (Oxford, 1990). The indexes are meagre and incomplete.

University of Leeds MALCOLM HEATH

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PARADOXOGRAPHI GRAECI

W. HANSEN: *Phlegon of Tralles'* Book of Marvels: Translated with an Introduction and Commentary (Exeter Studies in History). Pp. xvi + 215. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1996. Paper, £11.95. ISBN: 0-85989-425-8.

J. STERN: *Palaephatus ΠΕΡΙ ΑΠΙΣΤΩΝ:* On Unbelievable Tales: Translation, Introduction and Commentary with notes and Greek textfrom the 1902 B. G. Teubner edition. Pp. 167. Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1996. Cased, $40. (Paper, $20). ISBN: 0-86516-310-3 (0-86516-320-0 pbk).

It is a coincidence worthy of a paradoxographer that the same year should produce translations of and commentaries on two of the most interesting extant texts from a tradition that was so extraordinarily popular in antiquity. The phenomenon of the literary collection of stories on the same theme which really came into its own in the Hellenistic period grew out of a certain strand of earlier historiographical thought. Marvellous tales, of course, derive from literature as old as Homeric epic and are a recognizable feature of Herodotean historiography. However, with the social and literary changes of the Hellenistic and early imperial Roman periods, the audience's appetite for escapist, bizarre stories multiplied: witness the Greek Romances, for example. Although both are examples of Greek paradoxography, Palaephatus and Phlegon represent different approaches to the genre.

Palaephatus offers brief versions of famous classical Greek myths which he attempts to rationalize, in the belief (stated in his preface) that such incredible stories, which counter the eternal, unchanging rules of nature, are explicable if one interprets the myth as a misunderstanding of a perfectly rational, natural occurrence. Hence many of the monsters of Greek mythology, such as dragons or bulls, were in reality human males with names such as Drako or Tauros, whom later tradition transmuted into the animals their names recalled. Palaephatus probably dates from the time of Aristotle and appears to have written five books on incredible tales, of which our extant version is a crude epitome with some spurious additions at the end. His rationalizing approach is mechanical, repetitive, and rather naive in its simplicity. Much reliance is placed upon puns, and upon metaphors which later tradition misunderstands as literal: for example, 'flying' was not literally flying, but rather a metaphorical way of describing a swift journey by sea (e.g. Daedalus and Icarus); being 'devoured' by animals was originally a metaphorical way of describing how someone's fortune was used up in their maintenance (e.g. Actaeon). This rationalism was inherited from and developed upon earlier historiography. As part of his introduction to Palaephatus (pp. 10–16), Stern charts the tradition of such rationalism within the genre from its extant beginnings through to Plutarch. The introduction as a whole is very sound and thorough, with discussions of the epitomization, date, and authorship, as well as comments on the structure, or lack of it, within the work. S. reprints at the back of the book Festa's 1902 Teubner text, with F.'s full apparatus and notes. This in itself is a service to scholars as the text has long been out of print. Separate from this is S.'s very clear translation of Palaephatus' dry Greek; he appends at the end of each section any relevant notes on content. These are, for the most part, few. Fuller are his very useful references to additional versions of the stories. His notes

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

regrettably contain little if anything on the Greek text or on Palaephatus' style (e.g. comparisons with that of, say, Apollodorus). Nothing is said, for example, of the interesting way in which Palaephatus' rationalizing explanations often climax with reported direct speech, as if charting the growth of the myth from antique reality to later misunderstanding as encapsulated by the words we utter 'today'. Nor does S.comment on the variety of ways in which Palaephatus introduces his incredible tales: sometimes objective comment, sometimes an emotive rhetorical question or exclamation to highlight the absurdity, thus deploying a common rhetorical device to win his reader over immediately to his side. Nevertheless the edition is extremely welcome and excellent value, especially in paperback. There is a bibliography but thereare no indices at all. Any work on Greek mythology or mythography surely requires this.

Phlegon's compilation smacks of an altogether different flavour. Composed in the second century A.D., this collection of bizarre events found great popularity not only in antiquity but also in the later Western tradition, becoming a 'respected' ancient source for books on ghosts, gothic horror, and demonology. This volume is of a greater depth than that on Palaephatus above. Hansen does not print the original Greek text, which is hard to obtain, but his volume otherwise is exemplary. Not only does this book contain a good translation of Phlegon's *Book of Marvels*, but H. has also added translations of fragments of two other works by Phlegon, *Olympiads* (recounting the foundation of the Olympic Games), and *Long-Lived Persons* (which uses Roman census documents). As such we get a truly representative feel for the literary output of this Greek freedman which certainly seems to have had an eager market. The *Book of Marvels* is organized by theme, including subjects such as ghosts, hermaphrodites and sex changers, monstrous births, abnormal rapid human development, and live centaurs. It is not a long work. In its current state it comprises thirty-five brief sections that take up only twenty-five pages of well-spaced translation. Nevertheless its importance both literary and historical is not to be underestimated, as section ten comprises lengthy, unique quotations from the *Sibylline Books*. H.'s commentary is superb for a book of the scale of the Exeter Studies in History series. Each section is sanely analysed, with references to the Greek vocabulary chosen, parallel versions and their differences, and helpful modern bibliography. The commentary makes interesting reading and reminds one of how immensely popular such collections were in the early empire. We have long been familiar with works such as Aelian's *Historical Miscellany* or Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists*, which are now themselves in the process of scholarly 'rediscovery'. It is timely that Phlegon can now join their ranks and be more fully appreciated with this highly affordable and useful volume. Unlike the Palaephatus, this book contains a solid index of names. As added icing on the cake, three valuable appendices are added, which offer translations of Proclus on people who died and came back to life, Philostratus on Achilles' ghost, and Goethe's vampire ballad *The Bride of Corinth*. Exeter University Press are to be commended for supporting the publication of what might appear at first sight a risky text with limited appeal. I trust that its affordability and clear presentation will garner it wider attention.

Royal Holloway, London RICHARD HAWLEY

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

HELIODORUS

R. HUNTER (ed.): *Studies in Heliodorus*. (Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, suppl. vol. 21.) Pp. 232. Cambridge: The Cambridge Philological Society, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 0-906014-19-0.

With a title as unassuming as its pale covers, this book brings together nine new essays on the *Aithiopika*, all but one first presented to a Cambridge 'Laurence Seminar' in 1996. The diversity of approaches appears from the three main headings under which they are sorted: 'Narrative Technique', 'The Construction of Culture', and 'Reception'.

'In her left hand carrying the flame of a lighted torch (*lampadion*), and in her other hand holding out a shoot of palm (*phoinix*)'—these two symbolic items in Charikleia's hands at Delphi (4.1.2) constitute hitherto unnoticed leitmotifs in the novel, according to Ewen Bowie ('Phoenician Games in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*'). In particular, he sets out to uncover the 'Phoenician' novelist's intricate play on the various meanings oftheword *phoenix*. Philip Hardie ('A Reading of Heliodorus, *Aithiopika* 3.4.1-5.2'), underthe headings 'Digression', '*Enargeia*', and '*Ekphrasis*', demonstrates important characteristics of Heliodorus' narrative style by analysing part of Kalasiris' narration to Knemon about the Pythian spectacle. Knemon's simple account of his Athenian misfortunes, in turn, is used by Richard Hunter ('The *Aithiopika* of Heliodorus: Beyond Interpretation?') to illuminate, by contrast, the sophistication of the other narrators, Kalasiris and 'Heliodorus'; Chariton's novel provides another foil, to goodeffect. John Morgan ('Narrative Doublets in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*', pp. 60–78) compares recurrences of similar motifs or structures in the course of the narrative, arguing that such 'repetitions, in Heliodorus' case at least, are meaningful and deliberate' (p. 64); consequently, the second of such 'doublets' may be fully appreciated only if its mate is recognized and remembered in some detail.

All four pay tribute to Jack Winkler's seminal study of 1982 on 'The Mendacity of Kalasiris', and have obviously greatly enjoyed this particular game, letting their imagination loose and happily leaving it to the reader to distinguish between the credible and the fanciful. Hunter, perhaps the soberest among them, still does not let the doubt intimated in his title and first paragraph prevail over the temptation to join the game. The danger, of cause, does not lie in what this star quartet is presenting uswith—their learning, ingenuity, and rhetorical brilliance vouch for much entertainment and considerable enlightment—but in what kind of scholarly model they are setting up for others in the profession.

The two contributors to the middle section are newcomers to the field, each with arecent dissertation on the *Aithiopika* among his credentials. John Hilton ('An Ethiopian Paradox: Heliodorus, *Aithiopika* 4.8') takes the narrative of Charikleia's birth that her mother embroidered on the baby's swaddling band as his point of departure for a study of 'the central paradox' of the novel, the heroine's white skin. There is much of interest here; but the insistence on albinism as an explanation seems misconceived (this is no African legend), and it is curiously denied (p. 86) that her whiteness is in fact essential for most of the construction of the plot. Tim Whitmarsh ('The Birth of a Prodigy: Heliodorus and the Genealogy of Hellenism') likewise discusses Charikleia's birth: she is the 'prodigy' of the title, or rather one of them, for the novel itself is also—it is argued more forcefully than convincingly—a wonder and a hybrid in its author's eyes, because it 'violates the canons of art with its bold generic

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cross-contaminations' (p. 118). This, however, is just one strand in the article which also provides important and persuasive treatment of Heliodorus' 'foreignness' vs. his 'Hellenism', of his intertextual dialogue with the *Odyssey* and of the rôle played by his 'Egyptian' Homer. Bakhtin's 'heteroglossia' concept is fruitfully applied, but one of his several false generalizations concerning the Greek novels rightly condemned ('almost exactly wrong', p. 95 n. 8).

Finally, we are offered three (very different) examples of the 'creative reception' (p.157) of Heliodorus' novel. Panagiotis Agapitos ('Narrative, Rhetoric, and "Drama" Rediscovered: Scholars and Poets in Byzantium Interpret Heliodorus') shows what may be gained, in terms of precision and novel perspectives, when a trained Byzantinist tackles the complexities of reception and revival. Starting withPhotius' and Psellos' comments on Heliodorus, Agapitos discusses the true significance of their and later Byzantine writers' theatrical vocabulary *(drama*, *tragôdia*, etc.) in a theatreless society. The article culminates in a deft analysis of thetwelfth-century 'Heliodoran' verse novels of Prodromos and Eugeneianos, demonstrating the latter's dual use of Heliodorus and Prodromos and the shift from narrative fiction to rhetoricized drama that characterizes both. Clotilde Bertoni and Massimo Fusillo ('Heliodorus Parthenopaeus: The *Aithiopika* in Baroque Naples') open another window: alongside Byzantium's 'Charikleia' there now appears 'Teagene', 'a martial and passionate hero of melodrama' (p. 168) as depicted in Giambattista Basile's (1565–1632) huge epic poem by that name. It follows the novel closely, but exhibits various kinds of amplification and interpolation that are analysed here with exemplary clarity and ample illustration. The 'complex dialectic between epic and novel' (p. 181), with the *eros* of the model 'corroding' the heroic demands of epic canons, is subtly displayed. The last contributor, Daniel Selden ('*Aithiopika* and Ethiopianism'), takes us to the nineteenth- and twentieth-century USA and presents avivid and dedicated account of the historical development of Ethiopianism and Afrocentrism, and the part that the *Aithiopika*, on and off, has played in that process.

Hunter and his sub-editor, Mary Whitby, deserve full credit for an expeditious and diligent job. The book ends with a common bibliography, but there is regrettably noindex.

University of Bergen TOMAS HÄGG

THE REASON OF MYTH

A. GIGANDET: *Fama Deum. Lucrèce et les raisons du mythe*. Pp. 447. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1998. Paper, frs. 198. ISBN: 2-7116-1276-7.

Why does Lucretius begin his poem with a lengthy hymn to Venus, when he is shortly to dismiss all the gods of the traditional pantheon to the *intermundia* and deny them any influence over the natural or human worlds? Why does he allude to myth at all, rather than steer clear of it altogether, given Epicurus' apparent hostility and the rationalistic basis of his philosophy? These are problems which have plagued interpreters of the *De Rerum Natura* since at least the end of the nineteenth century, when Patin infamously proclaimed the existence of an *anti-Lucrèce chez Lucrèce*, arguing that the poet felt a reluctant attraction to certain aspects of mythology and traditional cult.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In this comprehensive study of Lucretius' use of myth, Gigandet argues that the mythological passages are not, in fact, in contradiction with the poet's rationalist world-view. On the contrary, if everything in the universe is subject to rational explanation, the same must apply to myth. Despite the apparent heterogeneity of the mythological passages (the excursuses on Cybele and Phaethon serve a primarily illustrative function, whereas the underworld myths at the end of Book 3 are introduced for ethical/exemplary purposes; invocation of the Muses can be seen asanod towards the conventions of didactic epic; and so forth), G. argues that anunderlying consistency of approach can be detected: 'les divers usages du mythe... sont logiquement subordonnés à un ensemble de conditions, d'opérations effectuées sur ses figures et sa forme... on peut définir, au total, une raison des mythes, une "mytho-logie" lucrétienne' (pp. 12–14). G. stresses the close connexion between Lucretius' theorization of myth and his anti-religious polemic; it was also imperative for the poet to combat philosophical appropriation of the mythological narratives, particularly the method of allegorical interpretation associated mainly with the Stoics.

The first part of G.'s discussion deals, however, not with the overtly mythological passages, but with the poet's demythologization of the natural world. The culture-history at the end of Book 5 and the meteorology of Book 6 can be read as implicit attacks on the mythological world-view: Lucretius' materialist account of natural phenomena excludes the Olympian gods from both their traditional rôles, as benefactors of humanity and as punishers of human wrongdoing. G. is particularly good on the uniformity of the explanations in Book 6 (the same basic principles can explain all natural phenomena) and on the poet's systematic rejection of the idea that there is anything strange about the phenomena he discusses (pp. 90–5, 107–10). The poet's rhetorical strategy here may be more complicated than G. suggests, however: the*noli mirari* theme is complemented by a corresponding *encouragement* of *miratio* insuch passages as 6.121–9. Lucretius wants us to be impressed by the 'wonders of nature', without falling into the trap of attributing them to supernatural causes.

Part 2 deals with Lucretius' account of the origins of religious belief in 5.1161–1240, and with the theme of illusion (ghosts, echoes, cloud-pictures, etc.). G. suggests that the subjects of myth can be placed in three separate categories: stories about the gods are at least based on the observation of real simulacra, though these are, of course, open to misinterpretation; monsters such as the centaur, on the other hand, are completely unreal; whereas ghosts and metamorphoses are illusions produced by real objects. This typology seems somewhat over-schematic: the image of a centaur is, after all, produced by real objects (a man and a horse), according to the explanation given by the poet in 4.739–43. More helpful is the distinction G. draws on pp. 217–18 between imagination and belief: we can imagine non-existent objects only by virtue of simulacra, which are in some sense real; it is only the belief that such simulacra are emitted directly from real objects that leads us into error.

Part 3 focuses on three specific myths: the Gigantomachy: the digression on the cultof Cybele in 2.600–60; and the 'allegorization' of posthumous punishments in 3.978–1023. G. stresses the fact that Lucretius does not interpret the myths as philosophical truths concealed beneath the veil of allegory: the poet's own brief version of the Phaethon myth can in fact be read as an attack on Platonic and Stoic allegorizations, and he also rejects allegorical as well as literal readings of Cybele and her cult. Rather, we should seek to understand myth 'sur le terrain. . . de la ratio épicurienne' (p. 392)—explanations not just for the underworld punishments but for all myths are to be found *in vita nobis*.

The concluding chapter deals briefly with Venus and the plague. Venus gets

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

surprisingly short shrift here: the proem is surely crucial to any discussion of Lucretius' use of myth, but G. does not really explain adequately why Lucretius might have chosen to take the risk of misleading his reader at the outset. He stresses the juxtaposition of myth with the *vera ratio* of 44–9; but the textual problem presented by the lines is not fully discussed. C. might have benefited here from Diskin Clay's discussion of the 'eclipse' of Venus in his *Lucretius and Epicurus* (Ithaca and London, 1983), which is not listed in either the notes or the bibliography.

This omission is symptomatic of a neglect of foreign (particularly English-language) scholarship throughout (there is no mention, for example, of C. P. Segal's *Lucretius on Death and Anxiety* [Princeton, 1990], and D. Konstan's important discussion of the underworld punishments, *Some Aspects of Epicurean Psychology* [Leiden, 1983], receives only the barest of acknowledgements). G. sometimes wastes space going over very well-trodden ground where a reference to discussion elsewhere would have sufficed. In several places, the discussion seems unnecessarily long-winded, and G.'s rather flowery prose is at times almost impenetrable. This is unfortunate, because he does have genuinely interesting and important things to say; but the book would have benefited greatly from a considerable reduction in scale.

G. also fails to give much impression of the *De Rerum Natura* as *poetry*: his discussion tends to remain on a rather abstract level, without really getting to grips with the detail of the text (a notable exception is the excellent analysis of the underworld punishments, pp. 359–85). Sometimes, too, his hypotheses lack adequate textual support: I can see no justification for finding a reference to the nymph Echo in 4.580–94 (p. 291), for example; nor does anything in the poem support G.'s suggestion (pp. 236–7) that the Epicureans attributed our ability to visualize long-dead or imaginary figures to stories about those characters, rather than to the impact of simulacra.

In sum, this is a flawed but still useful book. The volume is, fortunately, well indexed; I suspect that most readers will find it more profitable to dip into G.'s discussion of particular points or passages than to pursue his rather ponderous argument through all ten chapters.

Trinity College, Dublin MONICA R. GALE

LUCIDA TELA

N. HORSFALL (ed.): *A Companion to the Study of Virgil.* (*Mnemosyne* Supplement 151.) Pp. xvi + 326. Leiden, etc.: E. J. Brill, 1995. Cased, $87. ISBN: 90-04-09559-4.

This is a most beneficial book. Horsfall writes the lion's share of it, but he has assembled an impressive cast of scholars to assist him. Horsfall himself writes on 'Virgil: his Life and Times' (Chapter I), on *Georgics* (III), *Aeneid* (IV), 'Style, Language and Metre' (V), and 'Virgil's Impact at Rome: the Non-literary Evidence' (VI). A. Perutelli writes on *Bucolics* (II); W. R. Barnes writes on 'Virgil: the Literary Impact' (VII—Virgil's impact on Ovid, and the Silver Epicists); M. Geymonat surveys 'The Transmission of Virgil's Works in Antiquity and the Middle Ages' (VIII); and there is an appendix by W. V. Clausen on 'The "Harvard School" '.

The book is not intended as an 'impersonal manual', but neither does it pursue systematic polemic, as H. explains in his introduction. 'At most I try to react, and have

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

urged my colleagues to do the same, with due discretion, against what I (and not I alone) see as in some ways a loss of equilibrium and proportion' (p. viii). The book succeeds most refreshingly in this laudable aim, and the chapters on the main poems offer balanced and plausible interpretation, setting themselves against rival views without aggression. For me personally, Chapter V will be the most useful, and Chapter VI is the most entertaining and interesting. But all the chapters are first rate. It was humbling, for example, to find out how much of G.'s Chapter VIII I simply did not know.

Besides the book's balanced attitude towards interpretation of the poems, I wouldselect the following as its most salient virtues. (i) The contributors' ability toweigh, judge, and provide facts—such a welcome commodity in these abstract days.See not only H. on Virgil's life, but P. on *Bucolics* (e.g. on Arcadia, pp. 45f.; on allegorical interpretations in the ancient commentaries, pp. 58f.), H. on *Georgics* (e.g.on the range of farm sizes, pp. 68f.; on Virgil's sources, prose, and poetry, pp.77ff.), H. on 'Virgil's impact at Rome' throughout, likewise G. throughout. (ii) Thecolossal mastery of secondary material that H. in particular displays (he even pops up in square brackets in P.'s chapter, denouncing with justifiable wrath—and with bibliography—the view that Gallus fr. 2 Courtney is a modern forgery). (iii) Profitable, justified succinctness: e.g. P. on *Ecl*. 4 in a page and a half (pp. 60f.). (iv) Good questions are asked, of very different sorts: e.g. P. asks what sort of edition of Theocritus Virgil used (p. 38); H. in postmodern mode asks—very pertinently—'What is truth?', in the context of the *laudes Italiae* in *Georg*. (p. 77); G. asks (p. 297) 'what, physically, happened to the autograph text?' of *Aen*. (v) Clarity of style. Critics serve poets and surely ought not to be obscure in their expression. H. & co. are models of humane writing. What a favour critics do themselves when they write like this! The reader can understand, and is in a position and mood to be persuaded.

I found much to agree with in the chapters of interpretation. I enjoyed much of H.'s account of *Georg.* and *Aen*., though of course we do not always concur. But, among other big topics, H.'s account of Book 4 (pp. 123–34) will force me to think again; likewise his account of Book 12 (pp. 192–216). It is very pleasing to find oneself persuaded into rethinking one's position by clear writing, and this is (as I say above) how it ought to be. Even when I persisted in disagreeing with H., it was a productive experience. To read a clear and intelligent account that comes to very different conclusions from one's own makes one at least uneasy about the ground one stands on. As for P.'s chapter on *Bucolics*, I was largely persuaded (for example) by his conclusion that 'the *Bucolics* are revealed as a collection of poems and not as a strongly defined unit' (p. 57). As for B.'s chapter, I am not over-fond of some of the Silver Epic writers, but I shall read them with greater illumination now. Many of us write too much; the admirable B. writes too little. H. is to be congratulated on getting him to give us some of his wisdom.

This is a book for teachers to recommend to their students. More senior scholars too must have this book on their shelves. They will appreciate the clear and balanced surveys—and the huge quantity of useful information. There is, I should add, a very full index, another *sine qua non* of a secondary work in the modern world.

Balliol College, Oxford R. O. A. M. LYNE

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

INTERPRETATIO GERMANICA

J. DINGEL: *Kommentar zum 9. Buch der Aeneis Vergils*. Pp. 297. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1997. Cased. ISBN: 3-8253-0622-4.

Norden's great commentary on *Aeneid* 6 did not start a fashion in Germany. Here at last is another substantial German commentary on an individual book, on roughly the same scale as the commentaries by Austin, Williams, Eden, and Harrison, and on a somewhat larger scale than Hardie (hereafter H.) on the same book (Cambridge, 1994). From the foreword it appears that H. was not available to Dingel (hereafter D.) until the completion of his first draft. Inevitably in a genre as tralatitious as Virgilian commentary there is considerable overlap between D. and H., but there arealso marked differences in focus. In a substantial introduction D. approaches *Aeneid* 9 via a mainly traditional set of topics: content and structure of the book, chronology of events within Books 8–10, relative priority of episodes and books in the poem (these days an interest largely restricted to Germany, and the topic of a number of D.'s individual notes), sources and models of individual episodes (with an unaccustomed speculative burst on the reasons for the choice of the names Nisus, Euryalus, and Hyrtacides), reception (sparing), models of heroism (largely an engagement with R. F. Glei's version of the old failure-of-traditional-heroism thesis), and heroes and gods. Here, in a manner typical of the prevailing positivism of German classical scholarship, D. argues that the reason why the gods do not appear as actors in the Nisus and Euryalus episode is that the Olympians cannot be present at the deaths of their mortal favourites, in polemic with H., who, in keeping with prevailing fashions in anglophone criticism, sees in this reticence a problematization of issues to do with religion and knowledge. But Virgil could very well have explicitly told the reader that Diana did hear Nisus' prayer at 403–9 *without* staining her with mortality, and the inclusion of the scene between Jupiter and Hercules at 10.464–73 (see p. 33) makes for a stark contrast between the handling of the gap between man and god in that episode and the twilight uncertainties of the Nisus and Euryalus episode.

Whatever the verdict in this specific case, the general difference in approach characterizes the detailed conduct of the two commentaries (D. publishes no text with his). D. has a sharp analytic nose for the logic of narrative structures, and is full and illuminating on linguistic detail, alert to the nuances of Virgilian usage and to stylistic register, with heavy but usually discriminating application of *TLL*. For example, the observation (on 348) that Virgil first uses *condo* of 'burying' a weapon in a body sharpens one's sense of the importance of the choice of this word at 12.950; on 593f. *thalamo sociatus* D. notes that *socio* normally has a female as a personal object, implying a negative comment on the social status of the pretentious Numanus. In some cases D. tacitly or otherwise corrects slips or imprecisions in H. (on 609 *omne aeuum*, 699f. *stomacho*, 707 *duplici squama*). D. does not sow parallel passages by the sack, and those selected are usually telling; he is particularly helpful with parallels from historians and other prose authors, confirming the sense that in general these have been underexploited by Virgilian commentators (with the exception of de la Cerda), Caesar being of particular use. Virgil takes pains to give a historical flavour to his legendary battle narratives.

H., on the other hand, is far more concerned to pursue wider interpretative contextsthrough the detail of the text, the result of a self-conscious decision to write a

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

commentary that is more 'literary' than some. D., no doubt equally self-consciously, eschews a wide range of imagistic, thematic, and allusive filters that might trap the commentator's lemmata in larger structures. Examples of the difference in interests: on 186–7 *aliquid iamdudum inuadere magnum | mens agitat mihi* D. has a purely linguistic note, observing that *mens* is rarely the subject of *agitare*; H. notes '**mens agitat** = 6.727, in the course of Anchises' lofty speech on the nature of the world-soul', an echo that, he claims, reinforces the 'philosophically-tinged self-analysis' undertaken by Nisus in his speech. On 116 f. *uos ite solutae, | ite deae pelagi* D. has a long note with parallels to argue that *deae pelagi* is vocative rather than predicative nominative; H. chooses to see in the repeated *ite* the suggestion of 'a ritual command to devotees of the goddess', and cross-refers to a longer note on 617–18 *ite per alta | Dindyma*. The present reviewer detects a certain unadventurousness and lack of suggestiveness in D.'s average note—but then he would, wouldn't he! D. does occasionally indulge a streak of ingenuity, for example when in 137 *sceleratam exscindere gentem* he sees an alternative meaning 'uproot an accursed family' (Turnus' own): Turnus tries to control the meaning of the omen, but is trapped himself into an utterance of oracular ambiguity. In other cases D.'s judgement is not so sure: the solution to the point of the difficult phrase at 140–1 *penitus modo non genus omne perosos | femineum* that, since in Turnus' eyes the 'Phrygians' are as good as women, they therefore hate only '*almost* the whole race of women' because they make an exception for themselves is one twist too many. Similarly the solution to the notorious textual and interpretative problem at 241–3 that *moenia Pallantea* means 'men of Pallanteum' ('you will soon see here the Aeneas you seek and the men of Pallanteum') proposes too bold a metonym, which D.'s cunning parallels hardly support.

These are exceptions. D. is usually a safe and authoritative guide to the problems and nuances of the text. This is a very worthy addition to the shelf of commentaries on individual books of the *Aeneid*, and will become a standard work of reference.

New Hall, Cambridge PHILIP HARDIE

HORACE, FIN DE SIÈCLE

W. LUDWIG (ed.): *Horace. L'oeuvre et les imitations: un siècle d'interprétation.* (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 39.) Pp. 439. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1996. Sw. frs. 70.

The topics of this volume honoring the bimillenary of Horace's death cover all the bases: textual history; Horace as a moral, political, and aesthetic poet; his literary criticism; the unity of his work; and reception. But somehow this complex and elusive poet escapes the grasp of the comprehensive view. The volume aims to review the scholarship of the last hundred years, but American scholarship is hardly mentioned and the Horace who emerged in the wake of the New Criticism consequently keeps a low profile. Two areas make an appeal for future advances: textual criticism and reception. These are also the areas which have least to do with the reconstruction of Horace's person, a preoccupation running through too many of the volume's essays. Perhaps it is the retrospective nature of the volume that makes the most technical pieces the most forward-looking.

Tränkle's textual history is a must-read for anyone starting (or continuing) serious work on Horace. It clarifies the problems with all the modern editions and demonstrates that we still lack an adequate text. He explains that Keller–Holder's

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

assessment of the essential *contaminatio* of the manuscripts basically went ignored (and generated much useless work) until Shackleton Bailey's 'elegant' and 'definitive' clarification of the sigla: besides indicating individual manuscripts, Shackleton Bailey uses the siglum Ψ to indicate a true group of manuscripts with shared characteristics, rather than as an archetype. T. appreciates Shackleton Bailey's attempts to find solutions to the problems outlined by Maas and Brink, but thinks the edition is vitiated by sloppiness, inconsistency, and excessive confidence in the editor's own emendations. Borzsák's edition merits only passing mention, until the discussion, where T. excoriates its conservatism.

Schrijvers correctly identifies 'Horace moraliste' as a pragmatist. His introduction of two modern versions of pragmatism, philosophical and linguistic, meets a certain resistance in the discussion, but I would locate the difficulty in S.'s insufficient integration of the Horatian material with the theories rather than in any essential incompatibility with the theories on Horace's part.

Cremona begins with a useful survey of the divergent views about Horace as a political poet. He himself advances the reasonable position: by the end of his career, Horace supports Augustus without any diminution of his independence or apologies for his republican past. This is essentially, as the title 'Orazio poeta civile' indicates, a judgement of the person, not of the poetry. Although C. argues against the possibility of separating the 'poetic' from the 'unpoetic' aspects of the work, his actual treatment of texts isolates the political from the rest without explaining its poetic nature.

Harrison tackles generic allusion in the *Odes* by filling a gap left by W. Kroll (*Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* [Stuttgart, 1924], pp. 202–24): epic and tragedy in *Carm*. 1.6, 3.3, 3.27, and 4.2. This work needed to be done, though H. stays too close to Kroll's framework of *Kreuzung der Gattungen*, despite citing G. Davis (*Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse* [Berkeley, 1991]), who redefines genre as a rhetorical strategy. H. skirts the question posed repeatedly in the discussion of how Horace's procedure differed from that of the Greek lyrists in, say, the allusions to Homer in Sappho. How do you separate an allusion to a genre from an allusion to a text? More problematic is that his method depends on understanding genres as closed entities, while his definitions—epic includes 'all lengthy and serious hexameter verse'—reveal a struggle with the fact of generic openness. This paradox cannot be erased, but needs acknowledgment.

Fuhrmann shows that C. Becker (*Das Spätwerk des Horaz* [Göttingen, 1963], pp.64–112) and C. O. Brink (*Horace on Poetry: Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles* [Cambridge, 1963], pp. 1–150, 213–71) misapprehended the first forty lines of the *Ars poetica* as an introduction: the poem begins *in medias res.* Becker's subsequent structure of a Greek half followed by a Roman half founders on the presence of the only known citations from Neoptolemus in the Roman half. The literary critical material already in the so-called introduction upsets Brink's understanding of the overall structure of the *Ars* as dependent on Neoptolemus' distinctions between form, content, and poet. The poem's structure depends on its hybrid identity as didactic poem and verse epistle.

The title of Syndikus's essay, 'Die Einheit des Horazischen Lebenswerks', reveals his location of unity in Horace's life. Fuhrmann's question in the discussion about the relation of the choice of genre to the historic person of the poet shows one (of many) other ways to ask the unity question. S.'s desire for coherence overlooks Horace's deliberate construction of a dilemma: how can a poet committed to an Epicurean and aestheticizing forgetting of cares take on the mantle of *vates*?

The last three essays devoted to reception amount to a whole greater than the sum

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of its parts. Friis-Jensen dismantles the view that the medieval understanding of Horace was as mere moralist. The commentaries make Horace's works (assumed to have been composed in their manuscript order) representative of the stages of life. Pleasure, the province of the supposedly youthful *Odes*, turns out to be an important medieval reason for reading Horace apart from the poetry's moral value. Ludwig writes a masterful reception history that shows that Horace's Renaissance Latin imitators were engaging among themselves in the *aemulatio* familiar from the Augustan poets. Horace comes to life again in a series of poems either by direct address or by speaking from the grave. Full texts are included—the beauty of the Latin should attract more attention to this neglected field. Thill presents two Jesuit imitators of Horace who wrote entire collections of Latin lyrics covering roughly the same ground as their predecessor. The difference in religion matters more here than in the renaissance imitators. *Parodia sacra* allows for the uncanny replacement of Lydia and the like with Mary or Mary Magdalen in poems closely evoking their models. More extensive citation of Latin texts would better convey the passion of these neo-Horatians.

New York University MICHÈLE LOWRIE

ET MIHI SUNT VIRES

P. LEE-STECUM: *Powerplay in Tibullus: Reading* Elegies *Book One*. Pp. xii + 328. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-521-63083-5.

In the course of a linear reading of the ten poems in their published sequence Lee-Stecum discusses Tibullus I with regard to its implications about power and also its ultimate unintelligibility. She points to various 'power relationships' (between lover and beloved, poet and patron, etc.) and maintains that 'the ways in which conceptions of power are constructed, exploited and transformed in the text are of vital significance to an understanding of Tibullus Book one' (p. 19). She also sees a power struggle between the reader and the poet (or his text) in which the former's attempts to control meaning are constantly destabilized.

In line with much modern critical practice, there is a lot of theorizing, logic-chopping, and discussion of topics like slippage and hermeneutic spirals. For those who like that sort of thing, that is the sort of thing they like. I must confess that my more practical tastes are for concrete findings and solid insights, and I am afraid that there are not enough of those here to satisfy me. But in any case there are flaws in L.-S.'s methodology and whole approach.

Her linear reading with close attention to contrasts and correspondences between elegies is certainly meticulous but does not allow for the fact that ordinary readers (as opposed to Ph.D. students) tend to dip into collections, perusing just a poem or so, to return later, and a lot will not retain such a detailed knowledge of earlier pieces as to spot many of the links and contradictions that she sees, and some will realize that various contradictions can be explained by the fact that the published order need not correspond to the order of composition. Her reading is also undermined by fanciful speculation (e.g. on p. 87 *de caelo ducentem sidera* may suggest the witch's power overthe gods), misinterpretation (e.g. on p. 128 Delia's dishevelled appearance on Tibullus' return at 1.3.91f. might imply violation, meaning that he plays Tarquin to her Lucretia), and mistakes (e.g. p. 39 I did not transpose 1.1.25 between 1.1.6 and 7, p. 63

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

levis est tractanda Venus does not mean that Venus must be mastered and this is light work, p. 84 *parcite luminibus* at 1.2.35 cannot have the sense 'spare the poet').

With regard to power L.-S.'s basic premise seems unexceptionable (love *can* be viewed as a relationship of domination and subordination similar to various power structures in Roman society), and it is industriously pursued, but unfortunately her conclusions are either questionable (e.g. the reappearance of war in 1.10 after the triumph in 1.7 intimates that war fails to bring Rome power or security) or rather obvious (e.g. the lover is dominated by the beloved, in a relationship similar to that between farmer and gods, soldier and general, etc.; but whereas the farmer gives veneration and receives prosperity, this Roman exchange process breaks down for the lover when his abasement does not enable him to achieve his desires).

L.-S. nowhere explains why the consideration of power structures is *vital* to the understanding of Tibullus I, why an elegist should be so obsessed with such a topic (I might believe it of other authors, such as Tacitus), or why a love poet would compose a whole collection largely concerned with power and repeat again and again the somewhat banal and superficial remarks about it that L.-S. perceives. Nor does she say whether such remarks are confined to Tibullus I or are also found in II and the other elegists. Actually one could equally well argue that all ancient (and modern) writing isconcerned with power, when you press into service as a manifestation of it just about everything (ploughing, swimming, rowing, embracing, the use of the legalistic imperative, etc.). As I compose this review I am in a position of power over L.-S. and over pen and paper, but also in the power of my thoughts and attitudes, and my head of department (who has just interrupted me). But is this a significant observation or mere waffle?

As for unintelligibility and the power struggle between the reader and the poet/text(rather a strained connection with the other power structures considered), her arguments that the book fails to resolve itself into something comprehensible (because of ambiguities, contradictions, changing directions, undermined expectations, etc.) do not convince me and would doubtless surprise the thousands of earlier readers who have clearly felt that they could follow enough (nobody expects to understand everything in an ancient book of poetry). I had thought that this kind of criticism was past its sell-by date now. In any case too often her claims of uncertainty and inconsistency in the text are doubtful (e.g. on pp. 112, 144, 155, 166, 209) and the destabilizing effect of ignorance is exaggerated (e.g. is the exact identity of Titius in 1.4 so important?). And I wonder whether L.-S. is really in a position to pronounce onintelligibility when she glosses over or ignores numerous problems of text and interpretation, and frequently misquotes the Latin (p. 45 *potuisque*, p. 93 *recubere*, p.102 *Mors atra precor* and *his*, p. 117 *hac* and pentameter not indented, p. 144 *subisse*, p. 192 *sic fieri iubet deus*, p. 220 *sic venias hodierne*, p. 257 *baccho*, p. 266 *acres* and *possem*, p. 267 *at*, p. 274 *quis*, p. 276 *agros*). I also wonder how she can use a text that is unintelligible as a basis for conclusions on its implications about power.

On the positive side, L.-S. has read widely in Tibullan scholarship (and usefully provides a brief overview of critical approaches to the individual poems), and she doesproduce some insights (e.g. on p. 173 the curse of 1.5 reflecting Tibullus' own situation, on p. 187 the humour at 1.6.31–2, on pp. 239–41 the references back to 1.4.81f. in 1.8).

McMaster University P. MURGATROYD

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

OVID

L. GALASSO (ed.): *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum ex Ponto II*. (Biblioteca nazionale serie dei classici greci e latini: testi con commento filologico, 2.) Pp. 489. Firenze: Felice le Monnier; Università degli Studi di Trieste, Dipartimento di Scienze dell' Antichità, 1995. Paper, L. 60,000. ISBN: 88-00-81278-3.

S. CASALI (ed.): *P Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum: Epistula IX: Deianira Herculi*. (Biblioteca nazionale serie dei classici greci e latini: testi con commento filologico, 3.) Pp. 262. Firenze: Felice le Monnier, 1995. Paper, L. 60,000. ISBN: 88-00-81279-1.

Associated alike by ties of publisher, series, author, scope, format, and friendship (seethe two sets of acknowledgements), these volumes continue the tradition of Ovidian exegesis begun by Alessandro Barchiesi in his 1992 edition of *Heroides* 1–3. In their respective assignments, however, the present editors move within different parameters of difficulty, G. having to contend primarily with individual textual problems (those at 2.31ff. and 8.70 being particularly nasty) but C. committed tojourneying through a jungle of dubious authenticity and textual corruption. G.moreover has to do with a book which everybody agrees was written by P. OvidiusNaso; C., on the other hand, may be editing and commenting on a poem by an impostor.

Or so some scholars have said, and still say; and it is presumptuous of C. to pretend otherwise. To entitle Appendix IV 'Lo pseudoproblema dell' autenticità' (see also p. 11 n. 3) is not going to make the problem (a word now set in inverted commas, now not)go away: it will only put people's backs up (see E. Courtney in *CJ* 93.2 [1998], 157ff.), especially when the sceptics are charged with 'insensatezza' (p. 228) and theformulation of arguments 'di una debolezza imbarazzante' (p. 232). The cause ofauthenticity espoused by C., along with many others, is otherwise not unfairly represented, in the appendix and in the commentary, but in the absence of new evidence it is hard to imagine how this debate will ever be brought to a conclusion.

Both C. and G., unlike Barchiesi, offer the results of their own inspections of manuscripts as the basis of their recensions, C. using seventeen (plus two now lost) for Deianira, G. nineteen (plus three cited once apiece, Basil. F. IV.26 at 1.50, Diuion. 497 at 5.15, and Gud. 228 at 8.27) for *Ex Ponto*. I have checked C.'s collation of the glorious little Puteaneus (P) and Frankfurt Barth. 110 (F for him), and G.'s of just the Frankfurt (f for him). G. omits only 2.15 *cure* not *carum*, 6.25 *et* superscript, and 8.53 *tuta* before correction; otherwise his reports of f are accurate. C., on the other hand, omits a goodly number of readings of F and P which should have been mentioned: 15 *si* Pac, 18 *sidere* P, 29 *ueniant* Pac, 38 *haesuros* F^2ul, 41 *murmure* Ppc, 47 *mihi* to *me* Fpc, 52 *tua* P with *tibi est* superscript, 67 *succurret* Pac, 70 *eras* to *erat* P, 72 *neu* Pac?, 82 *minus* Pac, 95 *qui-* F, 98 *pergraue* F, 104 *a capto* Pac, 106 *quam* F, 111 *costis* F^2ul, 126 *uultum* F definitely (*uultu* pc), *uultus... suos* Pac, *falso* P^2, 134 *iungit* F (*-et* ul) P, 138 *nec* F, 139 *ripis* is clear in P, 142 after 143 P initially, 143 *scribendo* Pac, 145 *ne* F^h*eu*P, 150 *coniungi* P^2, 153 *acrior* F *acrius* P, 157 *mater. . . ferrum* F, 160 *ne uideare tuis* (*ratis* ul) *inuidiosa thoris* F. At 141, finally, P originally had *in letifero eueneno*. Whatever one thinks about F, P is by far the most important MS for the *Heroides*, and its readings should be faithfully recorded. Untrustworthy though Dörrie certainly is (see C. p. 19

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'Nota di presentazione del testo'), he did get it right for F at 47 (*parum est*), 56, 81 (by implication), 96, 97, 123, 128, 130, 131, 134 (*formosus*), 140, 143, and 147, and for P at 40, 63–4, 87, and 148.

Regrettably both editors mention below their texts only those conjectures which are accepted as true, all others—and they are very many, especially in Deianira—being relegated to the commentary, where they do not readily stand out. Thus, C. prints conjectures and records them in the apparatus at 15, 20, 38, 55, 103, 126, and 141, all certain except 55 *errator* (Heinsius's confection, which I should pronounce portentous for an Ovidian Meander) and 141 in *letifero Eueno* (here *letifer* is curious as a permanent characteristic of the river). G. prints conjectures at 1.39, 50 (but Naugerius in fact writes 'In nonnullis, *isse tui* & rectius'), 55, 2.89, 3.84 (*Aethalis Ilua* by Heinsius's uncle Rutgersius is very nice), 5.52, 67 *bis*, 6.6, 7.55 (but Heinsius's *quis* in fact is in Bodl. Rawl. G. 109), 8.11, 26, 9.21, 60, and 10.25. Of all these conjectures only three are by moderns (5.67 *bis* Rothmaler, 8.11 Ehwald); most of the rest were snapped up by the ubiquitous Heinsius. Finally, because of the need to make subtractions of sigla in the apparatuses to determine the evidence for the reading of the text, there are places where inferences are not certain: for example, in G. at 3.51 (whence *resistis*?), 5.24, 10.43 (whence *cum*?), and 50 (*iussus*), in C. at 12 (*humili*), 20 (*cumulas*), and 126 (*tegendo*).

On the manuscript tradition of the *Heroides* C. is wisely silent (so much has already been inconclusively written), but G. devotes pp. 47–53 of his introduction to the subject. The Wolfenbüttel fragment of the *Ex Ponto* is indeed the oldest surviving witness to Ovid's *oeuvre* (saec.v), but it offers no more than twenty lines (not all complete) from Book 4, and no particularly significant lections. For G. then to say that 'Si può dunque concludere che deriva dall'archetipo del resto della tradizione, senza essere l'archetipo stesso' is decidedly rash. More often than not, in Book 2 as in the other books, A, B, and C (recollated by G.) give the true reading (with or without company). In practice, however, G., like other editors, admits as true a number of readings from outside the charmed trio (e.g. at 1.7, 34, 4.2, 5.52, and 72), and other books add other such readings. Richmond was not explicit about the relationships of A and BC to the rest of the surviving manuscripts, but G. has no doubts: 'Abbiamo perciò la seguente situazione: dall'archetipo derivano, attraverso una serie di intermediari, A, il modello di BC, e quindi la tradizione della vulgata' (p. 50). That 'quindi' begs a lot of questions. One small point: MS D does indeed belong to the Forschungsbibliothek, but in Gotha (p. 61) not Göttingen (p. 51).

'Le *Heroides* sono in primo luogo transcodificazioni di testi: il loro senso sta negli effetti che nascono dalla traduzione di testi epici o tragici o comunque "altri" nel codice elegiaco' (p. 11). C.'s introductory note prettily discourses on the paradoxicalities made possible by the refashioning of Sophoclean tragedy as epistolary love elegy. Nothing new here, and a more extensive treatment would be worth having. The literary portion of G.'s introduction is more extensive, discussing chronology, addressees (in welcome detail), structure, and themes. Unlike C., G. offers no translation but instead furnishes each poem with its own 'Nota introduttiva'.

Both commentaries deserve commendation for the clarity of their layout and the thoroughness with which the secondary literature has been distilled into an orderly sequence of notes. Many points of detail invite comment; I take examples first from C. 0 a–b 'Il goffo distico introduttivo. . . non ha la minima probabilità di essere autentico'—such impulsive dogmatism contrasts strangely with (same page) 'i distici introduttivi di 8, 13 e 14. . . sono ben lungi dall'essere sicuramente spuri'. **1** '. . . *nostris* è sicuramente giusto': does not *uictorem uictae* immediately following tell for *uestris*?

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

9–10 The explanation of *tanti* ('una sola notte non aveva abbastanza valore per il concepimento di Ercole') strikes me as strained: there is real merit in Sligtenhorst's *satis*. **33** For *hospes* Heyworth is recorded as advancing *hostis*—the corruption is common enough—but *hostis* imports a double change of subject. **120** *mollis dolor* puzzles C. as it has puzzled others. Conceivably *nullus dolor*? **143–8** The complete change of epistolary situation has been advanced as an argument for inauthenticity, 'ma l'argomento è, naturalmente, di scarsissimo peso'—such words are not calculated to win friends and influence people.

A not dissimilar impatience is there also in G. **1.16** Richmond had recorded Heinsius's *nempe* with the comment '*fortasse recte*': G. neither mentions the conjecture in his apparatus nor discusses it at all in his commentary. **1.17** Heinsius's *gentis* is brusquely passed over in favour of the manuscripts' *mentis*, and thus the poet is made to say that 'the joys of Caesar's mind are to the best of my ability my own'. **3.33** *exacto* is rightly obelized after a searching discussion. Has nobody proposed *ex animo*? **3.44**'Forse non necessaria la congettura *sors* di Heinsius' is quaintly uncertain. In **42**Ovid's life is *instar mortis*, so what place is there here for *mors mea* when distance from the Styx is in question? **5.67** G. favours *gustata et*, but *gustataque* is there to be pieced together from the manuscripts. **7.5** If *timor* is right, how is *malorum* to be explained? G. does not tell us. **7.24** In discussing this line G. scouts all readings other than that of A and BC, but when he elsewhere prints readings from manuscripts otherthan ABC, one may wonder what is 'metodico' about ignoring them here (see introduction, p. 50).

Sheffield J. B. HALL

NONUM SUPERANS ANNUM ALBANUS

J. C. McKeown: *Ovid:* Amores. *Text, Prolegomena and Commentary. Vol. III: A Commentary on Book Two*. Pp. xxxiii + 433. Leeds: Francis Cairns Publications, 1998. Cased, £55. ISBN: 0-905205-92-8.

Orphans no longer, Ovid's *Amores* have been adopted by scholars and critics—not to imply a distinction—with increasing frequency since the publication in 1987 of the first volume of J. C. McKeown's edition and commentary. M.'s work is fundamental for all students of the *Amores.* His commentary has been compared to Nisbet and Hubbard on Horace and Bömer on the *Metamorphoses*, in a blurb duly reproduced by the publisher on the dust jacket. The comparison is apt, for like those works whichbulk large, very large, on the shelves of a Latinist's reference library, M.'s commentary is a resource to which students of Augustan poetry frequently turn. On M.'s general conception of his task as commentator I have little to add to my remarks on the first two volumes of this massive undertaking (*C. Ph.* 86 [1991], 239–48). I confine myself here to M.'s execution of his plan in this, the third installment on Book 2, which appears after nine summers and nine winters of exacting labor.

Notes in this volume occasionally indicate second thoughts on the text printed in the first. For example, at 2.39 M. now prefers *alta* to Burman's *arta*, rightly to my mind. And at 10.17 he offers reasonable grounds for accepting *uacuo.* Elsewhere, M.'s commentary offers a spirited defense of his earlier editorial choices, with mixed success. The argument for transposing 6.27–8 to follow 6.32 breaks no new ground

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and few will be convinced. The most vigorous advocate for this transposition, G. P. Goold, invoked by M., did not adopt it in his Loeb edition. At 2.6.30 M. defends *poteras* as *lectio difficilior*, but cites no parallels for the problematic accusative of respect, referring instead to two grammars, where the reader will look in vain for support. The scepticism voiced on this point by J. Booth in her more modest commentary on Book 2 still seems warranted. The defense of *operata* at 7.23 is labored and does not take into account Booth's objections to its sense here. On the other side of the ledger, M. is convincing in his defense at 9.1 *prore . . . indignande*, and at 2.23–4 he presents a cogent case for interpolation.

The introductions to individual elegies provide abundant background material, sometimes amounting to short essays on the poems. The introduction to 2.4 is representative of M.'s greatest strengths in this regard. The setting is outlined with well-chosen passages from contemporary elegy and helpful discussion of the poem's rhetorical aspects. Least successful is the introduction to 18. Like many commentators ancient and modern—Servius on *Eclogue* 6 comes to mind—M. cannot resist trying to attach an historical event to a literary fiction. He takes it for granted that 13–18 refer to a real tragedy composed by Ovid and assumes it to be the *Medea*. He also accepts the view that 19 refers to the *Ars Amatoria*, and accordingly joins the consensus that this poem was a new composition for the second edition of the *Amores*. Fair enough. It is disappointing, however, that M. did not adopt a more sceptical frame of mind in confronting this material, nor bring to bear upon it his considerable awareness of literary history.

Even more disappointing is M.'s apparent reluctance to report competing views. Cameron, not cited here, long ago pointed out that the phrase *artes profitemur amoris*, which a reader might easily relate to the *Ars* once that poem had been 'published', has a different and entirely comprehensible point of reference if the phrase was penned before the appearance of the *Ars.* Likewise, the reference to an aborted tragedy is as likely to imply a work on the Alban kings as the *Medea*, the composition of which, as we know, Amor did not succeed in preventing. M. accepts the unsupported assertion of Hinds, repeated by T. Heinze, that in 21–6 Ovid did not aim 'doggedly for a full tally' of the *Heroides*, in the spirit of other catalogs. One would have welcomed a less dogmatic approach to this question from a scholar with M.'s access to the stores of literary precedent, since this list has more in common with the form and tradition of the *sphragis* than catalogs of rivers.

The scale of the notes is very luxurious, allowing for more than an occasional intrusion of less relevant observations. We learn about antiquity, for example, that 'then, as now, it was customary to remove rings while washing or bathing' (15.23), while at 11.13–16 we are treated to a curious digression on seashell gathering by Scipio and Caligula. As in the earlier volume, there is copious accumulation of lexical statistics, although M. is not always very clear in indicating why he thinks they are relevant. A simple comparison may illustrate the problem. At 5.55 M. dutifully records attestations of *addiscere* without comment; on the same word, Booth delivers the relevant point that the unusual word is 'here admitted for the extra meaning conveyed by the prefix'. Who can count the trees that laid down their lives that M. might thoroughly document such dubious lexical categories as '*mittere* used of dispatching thunderbolts' (1.14) or '*culpare* used of criticizing a person's physical appearance' (7.8)? M.'s commentary will long be mined for its copious supply of passages adduced to illustrate the meaning of Ovid's words. In citing parallels, M. remains true to the generosity of spirit displayed in the first two volumes, often attributing to mere verbal parallels the status of intertextual referents—'models' or

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'sources' in M.'s welcome adherence to an earlier vocabulary. In general, M. prefers to quote in full rather than to provide a bare list of citations. Readers who do not have to hand their copies of Aelian or Nonnus will be particularly grateful to the publisher, who has allowed his commentator free rein and unlimited space. It should be noted, however, that parallels from Nonnus, for example, while nice to have, can be multiplied without end, and so it is incumbent upon the commentator to provide some indication of the reason for his selection. Too often, however, his judgement on what constitutes a 'model' or a 'source' for Ovid seems to me to confuse the issue. Can *saucius arcu* in 1.7 really stimulate a recollection of *Aen*. 4.1? What is it about the adjective *Mycenaeo* in 8.12, which leads us to connect it with Prop. 2.22A.32 and conclude that 'Ovid hasthe Propertian passage in mind?' And how does this assist interpretation? The number of instances where M. detects such intertextual contact is legion, and one mayhope that before Volume IV appears he will have absorbed some of the salutary admonitions recently issued on this subject by B. W. Boyd (*Ovid's Literary Loves: Influence and Innovation in the* Amores [Ann Arbor, 1997], esp. pp. 19–48).

Considerations of space conspire with the natural tendency of reviews to focus on perceived lapses rather than the manifold qualities of a new commentary. M.'s note on 16.8 *rarus ager* is a fine example of how he often sheds new light on Ovid's meaning in these poems. Suffice to say, there is an abundance of new information to be gleaned on almost every page.

What follows is a selection, illustrative not exhaustive, of passages where I still have reservations. **2.27** On *honores*, it would be more appropriate to elucidate the meaning here of 'a return for services rendered', as at *Fam*. 16.9.3 (cited by Booth). **2.63** M. misses the point, ably picked up by Booth, that the word order represents the sexual undertones. **4.35** *utraque* is adverbial. **5.17** *Pont.* 2.9.73 *conscripsimus* escaped the notice of M. **5.33** On the ellipse of the verb, a reference to J. H. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache* (Heidelberg, 1951), p. 169 would be more helpful than a bare list of parallels. **5.35–40** Here and at 14.23–4 the absence of any reference to B. Axelson, 'Lygdamus und Ovid. Zur Methodik der literarischen Prioritätsbestimmung', *Eranos* 58 (1960), 92–111 (= *Kleine Schriften* [Lund, 1987], pp. 283–97) is striking. **5.38** M. persists in retaining commas around *Luna* in defiance of Goold: resistance is futile (cf. OCT^2). **7.13** M. misses that *insimulas* is a legal term, with consequences for the interpretation. **9.4** This is *not* similar to the thought of Tib 1.2.98. Murgatroyd, to whom M. refers, might have been helped by reference to Otto s.v. *messis*. Sen. *Con*. 9.1.13 strikes me as an adequate parallel: add Val. Max. 8.5.5 (cf. *Nachträge zu A. Otto*, p. 264). **9.6** *erat* is not 'a more emphatic equivalent to *est*'; contrast Booth ad loc. **9.25–6** The promised discussion of this poem's unity is missing (cf. Vol. I, p. 92). **9.43** It is pointless to try to pin down the apparently intentional ambiguity in *uoces*. **9.52** M.'s list of privative adjectives with *in-* is a convenience to readers, but F. T. Cooper, *Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius* (New York, 1895), pp. 250–1 would have helped M. to avoid calling these formations 'elevated'. **14.39** The hair is unbound because the deceased is also a mourner (of the aborted child). *Fertur* ≠ *effertur*, but rather 'rests on the pyre' with a play on *fero* used of pregnant women (*OLD* s.v. 10). **15.20** The plural is not so remarkable, since the singular will not scan. **16.22** *non aequis* avoids the elision that would occur with *iniquis*. **18.17** *iniquae* has nothing to do with the form of elegy. **18.23** The suggestion that *male gratus Iason* refers uniquely to two epistles is most implausible; on this point Booth displays more common sense. **18.26** It would be helpful if M. gave parallels for the brachylogy he posits here. **18.38–9** It strains credibility to see in this couplet a reference to *Her.* 8 and 14. Clearly these are topics from the Trojan war *not* dealt with by Ovid in the *Heroides* and thus offering possibilities for Macer as he takes up that theme.

In the preface to his first volume, M. remarks upon the contrast between his 'dull pedantry and the delightfully subtle artistry of the poems themselves'. Readers of Ovid and students of Latin poetry can be grateful that in this latest installment M. has remained true to his vow of pedantry. When M. is wrong, he more often than not supplies the information needed to confute himself. Such honesty is a commentator's

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

first obligation. The product is a work of reference of lasting value to Latinists of all persuasions. The final volume (with an index?) will be worth the wait.

University of Colorado, Boulder PETER E. KNOX

TEMPORA CUM CAUSIS

E. FANTHAM (ed.): *Ovid:* Fasti*, Book IV* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics). Pp. x + 291. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-521-44538-8.

In the ebb and flow of the currents of fashion in Roman poetry the tide is 'in' for Ovid's *Fasti*. Major critical studies have become almost annual events and the journals are under siege, but it is probably fair to say that the critical discussion of the poem now underway is rather more esoteric than even the norm in our discipline. Language, style, and treatment pose challenges to the first-time reader of the *Fasti*, especially the undergraduate or graduate student whose interests are always close tothe hearts of editors of the 'Green and Yellow'. But the calendrical framework and recondite subject matter of this poem will give pause also to scholars. The useable resources available to any category of reader have long been limited to the commentaries of Frazer, for whom the *Fasti* is a convenient peg upon which to hang some marvelous yarns, and Bömer, whose crabbed style conceals a great store of undigested erudition. Elaine Fantham's modest entry on Book 4 offers any new reader a reliable guide to the salient problems of interpretation and is a splendid introduction to the poem.

The introductory sections present a judicious summary of the historical and literary background against which the *Fasti* took shape. F. integrates recent research on the Hellenistic elegists into a coherent context for Ovid's aetiological narrative. This marks a major advance on earlier studies, which fail to take into account the vastamount of Hellenistic poetry that clearly served as important sources of inspiration for Ovid. This includes Callimachus of course, but also other figures such as Philetas and Eratosthenes, whose significance is not diminished by the accidents oftransmission. F.'s treatment of genre is informed by recent criticism without beingoverwhelmed by it. Her discussion under the heading 'The transformation of Roman elegy' in particular is lucid, balanced, and compelling. F. sets the table for the commentary with a workmanlike survey of the relevant details of the Roman religious calendar. On the relationship of Ovid's poem to contemporary Augustan ideology, she presents a balanced survey of the current interpretative antipodes, represented on theone hand by critics, e.g. Hinds and Barchiesi, with a penchant for an ironic or polyphonic reading of Ovid's encomia, and on the other by historically minded sceptics such as Herbert-Brown. F.'s ability to represent fairly the conflicting currents of scholarship without suppressing her own view is perhaps her most admirable attribute as a commentator. The paragraph at the end of this section (p. 42) deserves to be read carefully and taken to heart.

The introduction ends with a succinct survey of Ovidian style and diction in the *Fasti* and a note on the text. F. prints a text without apparatus, which is appropriate for this series, and indicates where she deviates from Bömer's edition and the Teubner text of Alton, Wormell, and Courtney. For the most part she does so to restore a reading preferred by Heinsius—almost always a good policy. The commentary attached to this text occupies nearly 200 pages, by no means excessive for a book of

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

over 950 lines. It is marked by only occasional appearances of the ghost of commentaries past, as at 657, where we learn that 'salad greens and mushrooms (not *tartufi bianchi*) are still gathered by Italian peasants for food'. In general the commentary is distinguished by great learning, which F. presents in a highly readable fashion. From this abundance of finely tuned interpretations it would be churlish to isolate a few areas of discontent, which is why reviews of such volumes are commonly written by churls.

My principal reservations about F.'s approach in the commentary center upon the needs of the 'undergraduate and graduate' to whom it is primarily addressed. In many instances I fear that they will find less help here on points of detail than they will need. For example, while F. is generally attentive to meter, in the explanation of the 'metrical awkwardness of *Romulus*' (56) perhaps the student, even the advanced student, will need to be reminded of how the poets treat elided cretics. In this late stage of the Age of Iron many students will need at least some guidance with unfamiliar Latin, such asthe extensive (and helpful) citations of inscribed calendars (e.g. 179–372). Word-order is at once an important aspect of the aesthetic appeal of Roman poetry and a stumbling block to students whose native tongue is uninflected English. It would be desirable to offer some guidance on Ovidian brachylogy at, for example, 72, 170, or 210, or on the uses of patterned lines to punctuate the narrative. It cannot be assumed that proper names are familiar; for example, *Berecynthia* (181) and *Sagaritide* (229) are unexplained, and the incautious will come away from the note on 279 with the impression that *Rhoeteum* is the name of a strait. Grammatical explanations are usually clear and effective, but there are lapses. For example, the accusative governed by *posceris* at 670 is not explained, while there is a note on this usage at 721. At 134 there is no note on *quis*, nor is it cross-referenced to 365. Rhetorical and verbal figures are noted, but not often explained. F. detects a 'zeugma' at 615 in *uultumque. . . animumque recepit*, without explaining what she means by the term (and not all would include this as an example). The same can be said of the appearance of 'anadiplosis' (136) and 'enallage' (216). The treatment of poetic plurals might leave the impression that they are a completely random phenomenon: *rores* at 741 stands in need of explanation, while at 417 *raptus*, needed to avoid elision, is called 'unprecedented'. At 143 F. refers to 160 n., seemingly for an explanation of 'poetic plurals', but none is offered there. The experienced consumer of commentaries will have little reason to complain, because F. provides enough information for the determined student to find the answers elsewhere to most unresolved or partially resolved questions. The difficulty of writing a commentary in these days (*experto credite*) is that at almost every level of instruction, the student who matches that description is exceedingly rare. For the novice one more commonly encounters, 'cf.' alone will not suffice; some stated grounds for the reference is essential.

Any commentary—especially a good one—is an open invitation to marginalia: p. 8: It is more likely that the *Smyrneis*, not the *Nanno*, is Mimnermus' 'big lady' (cf. A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* [Princeton, 1995], pp. 310–12). P. 9: It seems highly unlikely that Philetas' works were lost even by the time of Quintilian (cf. *PLLS* 7 [1993], 61–83). P. 19: It would probably have been useful to point out that O. offers a version of this theme in the narrative of Hyricus in Book 5. **12** This is not an instance of polysyndetic *-que... -que*, 'an imitation of Homeric τε. . . τε, since the first *-que* makes the connection with the first object *tempora* in the preceding line. A reference to e.g. Austin on *Aen*. 1.18 as an English equivalent to Norden on *Aen*. 6.336 would be more helpful to anglophone students of poetry than G–L, where they will find little help or explanation. **61** *Graius* is not simply 'a poetic equivalent' of *Graecus.* More helpful than the seven parallels listed would be a condensed version of the information provided by Austin on *Aen*. 2.148. **135** In a description of a statue, *marmoreo* is more likely to mean what it means than 'to

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

denote the pale (white?) colour of the statue'; cf. Cic. *Ver*. 4.135 *marmorea Venus*. **211** The note on *imitamen* obscures the status of such Ovidian formations: like many nouns in *-tio*, *imitatio* cannot scan in hexameter or elegiac verse. Hence O.'s poetic coinage, while Tacitus employs a more colloquial form in *-mentum*. A pointer to F. T. Cooper, *Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius* would be helpful to students interested in Ovidian lexis. F. covers the same ground at 731. **224** F. creates the misleading impression that Attis in Cat. 63 is the mythical figure. **305–12** It strikes me as extraordinarily unlikely (litotes) that anyone would recognize a reference to Julia in this passage. **310** The reference to *TLL* s.v. *obesse* 266.15–19 is a detour since the construction is *lingua ad rigidos senes prompta*. **318** *genetrix fecunda deorum* evokes Cybele's cult title, *mater deum magna*, rather than Venus. **395** Readers may want to know why *panis* 'would shock O.'s readers' and some reference to ancient notions of lexical decorum would be in order, assisted by citation of Servius on *Aen*. 1.77 and Norden, p. 115, n. 1. For the metonymy *Ceres*, it would help to cite Quint. *Inst*. 8.6.24. **452** *chorus* does not quite have the force of a collective subject with *ministrae* in apposition. Perhaps consider *cumulatis*. . . *canistris* of the recc. and earlier editors (not registered by A-W-C)'? **499** F. takes O. too seriously: the conflation of the monster with the daughter of Nisus is deliberate and acknowledged as such by O. at *Am*. 3.12.21–2 (cited by F.), where the conflation appears in a list of monstrosities invented by poets. **581** F. occasionally calls attention to O.'s use of legal terminology, but while she points out the relevance of *crimen* in this context, she misses the tone of *uacuus* (cf. *OLD* s.v. 7a). This note is resumed in 589–90, where the play on legal language (cf. *OLD* s.v. *cognosco* 4), not 'knowledge', is at issue. Likewise at 818, F. passes over the legal associations of the idiom *pacto statur* (cf. Bömer on *Met*. 2.818) in the same context as *arbitrium* (E. J. Kenney, *YCS* 21 [1969], 253). **625** F.'s note on the 'dactylic variant' *nauita* misses the point that O. uses this form in the nominative and *nauta* in the oblique cases: cf. Bömer on *Met*. 1.133. **675** If F. knows a parallel for *cum primum* in this sense, she should provide it; otherwise she should explain it. **755** The prefix in *degrandinat* cannot mean 'to stop' because of the mood and tense of the *dum* clause. And note that *depluit* does not mean 'to stop raining'. **819** Discussion of *dies* (f.) could have been enriched by reference to E. Fraenkel, *Kleine Beiträge* (Rome, 1964), pp. 27–72. **821** To illustrate the idiom in *fossa ad solidum*, *Met*. 2.648 *solida*. . . *humo* seems a less helpful parallel than e.g. Vitr. 1.51 *fundamenta*. . . *uti fodiantur*. . . *ad solidum*. **866** *multa* is unexplained; perhaps return to Heinsius's *culta*?

Misprints are few and minor: this is an attractively produced volume. Scholars of Roman poetry will want to own it. Teachers interested in enticing their students onto one of the less frequented narrow roads of Latin literature will be tempted to try it. Both categories of readers will be amply rewarded.

University of Colorado, Boulder PETER E. KNOX

IMPONITE LUSIBUS ARTEM

J. AMAT (ed.): *Consolation à Livie, Élégies à Mécène, Bucoliques d'Einsiedeln* (Collection des Universités de France sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. 229 (texts double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1997. ISBN: 2-251-01404-7.

On p. 52 Amat tells us that 'il ne nous appartient pas de prendre position sur une question' [the establishment of relationships between the manuscripts of *CL*] 'qui exige des compétences spécifiques'. If she does not think herself possessed of editorial competence, why is she editing texts? And whence then comes the stemma on p. 50? The stemma for *EM* on p. 110 includes two manuscript sources designated by L, one of which is the 'Iuvenalis Ludi Libellus' which does not contain these poems; it is there because A. has unthinkingly incorporated it from stemmata of the whole *Appendix Vergiliana*. Similarly S in this stemma does not mean what her own

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

siglum S means, but the Stavelot manuscript, which also does not contain *EM*. That is not all that is wrong with these stemmata. Again on p. 150, with reference to *BE*(which one would have thought better placed in the Budé Calpurnius Siculus, also edited by A.), we read 'les corrections. . . adoptent toujours la leçon paléographiquement la plus proche de celle du manuscrit'; not a word, you notice, about their appropriateness in sense, style, or metre.

The quality of the editing is as poor as all this would lead us to expect, quite apart from some bad misprints (*CL* 186 *tot<o>*, 238 *sed <tamen>*, 255 *Hercul<e>ae* [since this, absent from the *index nominum*, also appears in the note on p. 180, one must assume that A. really thinks it the correct form], 327 *temptas<que>*, *EM* 1.95 *uictus<que>*, *BE* 2.14 *quae <sit tibi>*); and n. 57 on p. 162 is missing. This is a tiny selection of blunders. As for editorial technique, it is not recorded in *EM* 1.20 that the authoritative manuscripts read *quam*; *ibid*. 1.45 the reading of one branch of the tradition is called (p. 202 n. 39) 'une correction', and it is attributed to F and P, the former of which stopped at 24 and the latter at 43 (nevertheless these manuscripts continue to be sporadically quoted). At *CL* 43 *bonarum* is reported as part of a conjecture when in fact it is the reading of four of A.'s manuscripts.

As for metre, the prize goes to spondaic *etiam* at *EM* 1.3, but *Astraea* as a dactyl (*BE* 2.23) comes close; at *EM* 1.93 A. reads *poetatur* or *poetetur* in B (where the reliable Vollmer reports *pociatur*; her palaeographical skill may be gauged by her statement that $\overline{n}\,\overline{n}$ in the manuscript of *BE* 2.7 means *nec non*), and adopts the latter scanned as an antibacchius. Even where she makes the right choice, she hankers after the wrong, as at *CL* 93, where she rightly adopts *natantia* but cannot refrain from putting in a word for *nutantia* (p. 169 n. 40, cf. p. 20 n. 4), quite unaware that it is unmetrical. Similarly on p. 190 we are told that *Appulus* in *CL* 388, which she herself marks as corrupt, should perhaps be accepted as an alternative form of *appulsus*!

As for Latinity, we are introduced to the noun *fidus* 'treaty' in *EM* 1.11 (backed up with a reference to Varro, who does not mean what A. thinks). *Ibid*. 1.89 *maturo digna lovi* is translated 'promptement à Jupiter quelque objet digne', and the note on p. 190 refers us for the adverb *maturo* to Cat. 20.205, a reference of which I can make nothing. See too *EM* 1.110 *omne perita* 'habile en tout', *CL* 236 *funera causa latet* 'quant aux funérailles', *EM* 1.8 *sed repetitque* 'mais pourtant elle vient aussi' (*que* = 'aussi'!). Inconvenient words do not appear in the translation at *CL* 161 *hoc*, 172 *que* (but the note shows awareness of the correct translation), 404 *et*. Some of the translations amaze, e.g. *EM* 1.62 *bracchia purpurea candidiora nive* 'tes bras rendus plus blancs que neige par la tunique de pourpre', 205 *praefertur imagine maesta* 'devant la triste image. . . on porte'. One of the worst is *CL* 303 *tu filia Caesaris illi* 'toi que César tenait pour sa fille', with n. 138 on p. 183, which apparently states that *illi* means 'to Caesar'; the correct interpretation is given by Schoonhoven p. 25 (refuting my own conjecture *alti*).

For a few effects of dismal choice of reading, see *CL* 43, where in an absurd attempt to salvage the corrupt tradition *inviolata* is made to agree with a *tibi* which has to be carried on from the preceding couplet, or 362, where Lucretius is spun out of thin air as subject of *vaticinatur* (p. 187 n. 165), or *EM* 1.44, where we are told that Maecenas is *nunc* (after his death!) *tener*, or 1.81–2, where we have the novel syntax *cum iam premit. . . cumve meteret*.

The notes and introductions give some useful information among all the errors, but show a strong tendency to explain the simple and ignore the difficult (e.g. how in *CL* 219 *te* can mean Drusus when in 215 it meant Livia, or whether the name Glyceranus can be justified as either Greek or Latin). Those who know about metre will be

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

surprised to hear (pp. 24, 31, 33; one is reminded of Housman's quotation from Lewis Carroll in *Classical Papers* 904) that that of *CL* is 'entirely regular, and the author shows Ovid's habits', so that one may conclude that the poem is by the young Ovid. It is no surprise to find that to this scholar the adverb *hapax* has a plural *hapaces* (p. 90). P. 26 n. 27 is a welter of confusion. *Anth. Lat*. 462 R she knows only from Wernsdorf (p. 203 n. 33). She confuses anaphora with polyptoton (p. 174 n. 72). At *CL* 6 *posito nomine* is correctly translated 'quand on prononce le nom', but the note then informs us that the phrase means ' "donner" ou "proposer un nom" ', and backs up this statement with a non-existent reference to Terence and an irrelevant one to Cicero.

As for A.'s own conjectures, *enisus* at *CL* 445 has merit; the rest are either execrable or in fact belong to others. False attributions abound, and she pays little attention to anything that has not been adopted by some editor (e.g. Housman's <*avis*> [*CQ* 4 (1910), 47] at *BE* 2.34 is ignored).

Rarely does one encounter a work of such colossal incompetence. It is a disgrace to the Budé series, and should be withdrawn at once.

University of Virginia E. COURTNEY

PERSIUS

D. M. HOOLEY: *The Knotted Thong. Structures of Mimesis in Persius*. Pp. xi + 286. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997. Cased, $39.50. ISBN: 0-472-10792-5.

This substantial new reading of Persius is the product of concentrated and mature critical reflection through a couple of decades; the writing is studied, elaborately turned, even overcooked; in a word, this intelligent book has *heart*. (Cf. p. 11. 'Aver' is both stylistic tic and modal cue.) Like the version of Persius he projects, Hooley 'cares deeply about poetry, its manners, character, and purpose' (p. 25; cf. esp. p. x, blushing to feel P.'s 'real presence' in his writing). He gives a chapter to each of the *Satires* (for no evident reason—except that H. has already written memorably on 6?—4 and 6 must modestly share a brisk chapter). It is not clear that the chosen order 1–5–(4 + 6)–2–3 pays off: the reader is halfway through the book before 1 and 5 are done, so the rest of the discussions are bound to come across as rather perfunctory; perhaps poet, critic, and reader are reckoned to flag on the home leg, and need an easy run in? Devotees of 3 will not find this most compelling of Roman meditations held back in order to provide a grandstand finish. (The *prologus* takes little more than a bow, in Chapter 6, 'Conclusions', pp. 230–41; it is not given anything like the full H. treatment.)

The introduction peps up its review of Persius' indelible 'difficulty' with a row of cranky scholars and their quaintnesses (pp. 1–25). You soon realise that—inclusivity being a sign of care invested—H. is no sectarian. If anything, he would rather pay undeserved dues than fall out with anyone (yes, including this reviewer). In particular, the old duffer Fiske gets oodles of unwonted respect (presumably for Uncle Sam? Try pp. 30–3, but see p. 73 n. 29). And grizzly Gildersleeve, ditto, but not so unwonted. (It is true, his Persius was the American stand-by for ever so long.) For no good reason, H. hacks his book's welt of a title from a Gildersleeve speculation, which originally set the phrase over against 'a smooth horsewhip' (in a paraphrase of Horace); H. has to perform contortions to get the *aperçu* ('diagnosis') halfways licked into shape to fit his wordsmith: a 'knottedness' of 'rough-edged plainness', etc. (pp. 10–11). But this

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

smooth-running introduction makes it plain that H.'s Persius is no scourge—no scourge of society (no moralist: p. 104); indeed, his abstention from society, his acts of abstention, withdrawal, and impeachment of Rome, are so successful that Caesars never intrude, Nero never was (at p. 169 Gaius gets to break one more rule—this rule). So too, if Persius had beliefs, they were 'Stoic doctrine', no doubt, but 'on a broad scale'; but he 'was not a philosophical thinker or a writer to offer guidance on difficult issues' (p. 3 n. 4). That is to say, H. means to bracket off the socio-political conditions of Persius' writing, dissemination, and reception: he has poetics to fry. And who can complain at the textualist purism of *The Knitted Thing*, when Persius' logodaedaly is so rewarding, yet its analysis requires such strenuous labour and its realization demands such intense love? (Lost historians, even cultural historians, need another book—even to wonder what reading Horace may have meant in the Rome of the early sixties.)

A polished yet pellucid Appendix invites newcomers and novices into the classical culture of textual imitation (pp. 242–67). H. adroitly seizes on precious moments in ancient criticism of subtle and multi-layered appreciation of the dynamics and potentialities of creativity channelled within intertextually imbricated and generically profiled stemmata. He dovetails these with sharp and smart insights gleaned from modern/contemporary theory. The (modest) ambition is to jolly and stiffen readers into allowing 'classical poets themselves' to have produced no less writerly 'a potent magic of words' than any hero from our world. This quality essay spotlights under-exposed gems (such as Seneca's *Epistle* 84) and (in particular) lays bare crises ofintentionality lurking behind our variety show of intertextualities. Obviously inclusion in the margins of the book will decimate the Appendix's readership: H. is determined to reach out to the general reader of poetry (as in his winsome book on paraphrase from the classical canon); no question, he sees in Persius a writer for today. The body of *The Knotted Thong*, however, is an intricately engaged close-reading ofsymptomatic and core instances of Persius' conceptual/verbal finesse: with H.'s guidance, we get into this poets' poet at work mashing up the Horace he has by heart;to tie his vivid knots of compacted logopoeia, Persius was forever reading *through* the considerable expanse of Horace's slippery-sly hexameter poetry, and perhaps especially his endlessly ambitious dash at poetic creativity in Roman culture after Actium, *Epistles* 2.1 (only *surfacing* at pp. 99–101). However courteous and considerate H.'s exegesis, who can really join in the game? (*uel duo uel nemo*.) No, as a package, the book cannot work; instead, it will be there for advanced graduate courses on Satire, in Classics and Comp. Lit.—and, more's the pity, the Appendix will go unnoticed, unless some of you. . .

H. presents thorough-going modernist—*neo*-modernist—scrutiny of the literariness ('real poetry' p. 144, 'poems are creatures of language...' p. 221, 'what poetry does' p. 226) of the *Satires*, searching out exciting new parallels (esp. p. 40, *Sat*. 1.15–23 ~ *Ars poetica* 202–17), and working through particular combinatory allusions, catachreses, matrices, and topoi, to seize the intellection of the nature of Poetry which is performed in, and explored with, them. 1 is paradigm for poetrywriting as self-enacting refraction of the 'praetext' (apology for this beauty at p. 25 n. 51): ~ Hor. *Serm*. 2.1, *Ars*; *Sat*. 2 ~ *Carm*. 3.23, *Serm*. 2.1, 2.6; 3 ~ *Serm*. 2.3, 2.7; 4 ~ *Epp*. 1.16, [Plat.] *Alcib. A*; 5 ~ *Serm*. 2.7; 6 ~ *Epp.* 1.5, 1.6, 2.2; *Prol*. ~ *tout le monde*.

Anyone who claims to care about Latin Literature should make sure they read Chapter II, on poetry's hundred(s) of tongues—though, if Persius' *mille hominum species* founds his metapoetics in 'a setting of human inclusiveness', the next line's *uelle suum cuique est nec. . . uno* surely points not to an ambition of 'forming these multiple yearnings into a coherent desire for the right sort of thraldom', but to the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

exponential dissemination in social intercourse, to the 'liberty' to put and find our personal meanings in play—common language, common sense, common pursuit notwithstanding (p. 118, on 5.52–3).

H.'s olive-branch axiom on classical textuality as creative imitation runs: 'at bottom, there is deep reverence for accomplished art' (p. 236). If his Persius includes the fibres of his own self, mind, person in his critique along with all the rest of ours (esp. pp. 134f.), yet he is always, at bottom, Poet of Satire, not Satirist of Poetry. For H. both writes satire out of the practice of his own creative re-reading of Persius and enshrines Poetry clean above the reach of Satire's corrosion: ultimately, less flagellant laceration of the self, more ministrant post-Horatian resell: *The Noted Song.*

King's College, Cambridge JOHN HENDERSON

THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING EARNEST

S. BARTSCH: *Ideology in Cold Blood: a Reading of Lucan's* Civil War. Pp. x + 224. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1998. Cased, £29.95. ISBN: 0-674-44291-1.

Is Lucan an idealist or a cynic? Is the *Bellum Civile* the testament of a sincere republican urging resistance to the tyranny of Nero, or a satirical deconstruction of the possibility of believing in any political ideal? Both interpretations have had, and indeed still have, their supporters, and it is to this scholarly divide that Bartsch addresses herself, in the rôle of mediator. Her answer: a bit of both.

Her first two chapters, which make a forceful (and broadly post-structuralist) case for Lucan the despairing cynic, present the first half of this answer, and at the same time function as an effective *captatio benevolentiae* for those admirers of the 'cynical' Lucan who may be resistant to the later stages of her argument. Her discussion of boundary-violation in its various forms, and its reflection in the idiosyncrasies of Lucan's language, are excellent—the terrain is familiar, but the presentation is attractive, detailed, and compelling. The same can be said for her account of Pompey inChapter III, which illustrates the sharp opposition between 'objective' narration, showing Pompey up as a bungling fraud, and the poet's 'subjective' outbursts, which become increasingly fanatical in their hero-worship. As an analysis of the symptoms it is impeccable; we will differ over the diagnosis.

That we should differ is no surprise: my own work is often cited by B. as a point of reference from which she respectfully departs, and it is evident that though we see eyeto eye on many issues, we have profoundly different agendas. Consequently, where her contribution is most provocative and original, I find myself increasingly out of sympathy with her conclusions. Even as early as Chapter II, as she applies to Lucan's tortured poetics the perspective of modern political writing on (among other things) Nazi Germany and the Holocaust, I find my hackles rising. B. claims that the resonances between the *Bellum Civile* and the horrors of twentieth-century totalitarian regimes are self-evident ('it is difficult for readers of Lucan not to be struck by parallel after parallel', p. 67), and without further apology draws a comparison between Caesar and Hitler, between the victims of the Roman civil war and the victims of the Nazi concentration camps (the workings of which are lengthily described). This line of argument is, at best, glib, and such parallels as there are strike me as superficial. But for the purposes of her larger argument, B. needs Lucan to be 'serious': the Nazi regime is *that at which we cannot laugh*, and by drawing comparisons with that regime

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and its abuses, she paves the way for a vision of the *Bellum Civile* as a genuinely horrified response to ultimate evil. Here we part company. In the first place, B. takes Lucan's assessment of the evils of the civil war as if it reflected the real state of affairs: Caesar *was* a power-crazed despot; the early principate *was* an intolerable tyranny; and despair or resistance *were* the only choices for the poet of conscience. That thereality was more complex—that Lucan's vision of history is not so much an exaggeration as a travesty—is not a possibility that she ever airs. In the second place, the humour and sick sense of fun that I see as the poem's defining characteristic is virtually erased. Not that B. is unaware of Lucan's humour, but at an early stage she disables it by subsuming it into her theoretical discussion of the 'grotesque'; and as things go on it becomes increasingly clear that she is uncomfortable with any reading that would, as mine does, 'reduce the whole poem, and the years of effort that went into it, to the level of an educated prank' (p. 92), as if it simply went without saying that an epic poem could not be tongue-in-cheek.

As the last two chapters now explain, B. sees Lucan as a 'political ironist', a term which she carefully defines. If a 'moral ironist' is one who intellectually accepts that moral codes are not absolute, but chooses to abide by them anyway, Lucan, as a 'political ironist', both perceives the impossibility of making the right political choice and, none the less, chooses; as if any action, no matter how inadequately justified, would be better than paralysis. Hence B.'s title, 'Ideology in Cold Blood'—a deliberate, cool-headed decision to believe in something, however questionable. But for all that 'political irony' may be a coherent, sympathetic position, B. never, to my satisfaction, demonstrates that Lucan held it; or, more particularly, that his portrayal of Cato, who does indeed advocate active participation in the war despite deep misgivings about the party he chooses to support, is anything but a mockery of misdirected philosophical virtue. That B. should privilege this stance as the expression of Lucan's real message is perplexing, for there are many stances available in the poem, and she herself points them out. So why should not even the noble hope-against-hope of the 'political ironist' turn out to be a tragicomic delusion, the last beautiful victim of the poem's ruthless sarcasm?

B.'s book is passionate, articulate, and intelligent, and commands respect. But at its heart lie assumptions which I simply do not share. For B., Lucan's participation in the Pisonian conspiracy is decisive, for here the poet himself chose action over cynicism. I, for my part, am distrustful of the insistence that the *Bellum Civile* should explain or even so much as shed light on that choice, which was made, it seems to me, as a practical response to a particular problem, and cannot be regarded as the defining moment of Lucan's life and thought. So be it: some will disagree, and will welcome B.'s contribution with open arms. For the rest of us, admiration for the considerable strengths will be tempered by disappointment at her conclusions.

King's College London JAMIE MASTERS

MARTIAL

F. GREWING (ed.): *Toto Notus in Orbe: Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation.* (Palingenesia, 65.) Pp. 364. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998. Paper, DM 148. ISBN: 3-515-07381-7.

This volume contains sixteen new studies (ten in English and six in German), an introduction, and a useful bibliography with its main focus on recent publications on

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Martial. The editor's brief, but excellent introduction on twentieth-century Martial scholarship outlines how the epigrammatist has often been viewed solely as the writer either of embarrassingly servile flattery or of immoral obscenities—an approach which has resulted chiefly in attacks against or exculpations of the poet that have impeded our understanding of Martial's works.

However, although none of the contributions in this volume display such outdated tendencies (except for some unduly apologetic remarks concerning Martial's flattery of Domitian in T. J. Leary's essay on the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*), the character of this collection is clearly conservative. E. O'Connor assimilates feminist ideas in his article on 'Priapic Motifs', A. L. Spisak uses socioanthropological theory to analyse 'Gift-giving in Martial', and narratological influence is evident in M. A. P. Greenwood's approach to the 'Language of Rumour'. On the whole, however, modern theories, or their application, are virtually absent from this volume. This is most noticeable in the treatment of the epigrams featuring a first-person narrator. Unreflective identification of the speaker of the epigrams with their author is criticized by F. Grewing inhisintroduction, yet, with the exception of Greenwood and Grewing himself, allcontributors follow that line of biographical interpretation. And it is even more striking that, apart from Greenwood and Grewing, only O'Connor, Spisak, and M. Kleijwegt ('Martial on Friendship') actually mention the possibility of scepticism towards the biographical approach. Whether or not modern theories can be useful for our understanding of ancient texts may be an endless source of debate, but they do exist and should be included in a volume which claims to provide new approaches.

However, the contributors' conservatism does not mean that they cannot trigger new discussions. J. Scherf, E. Merli, and J. Garthwaite all tackle the problem of the structure of Martial's *Epigrammaton Libri*, which has been unduly neglected so far, and their articles should inspire further studies on this aspect. These three articles dooverlap in part (as is also the case with Spisak and Kleijwegt), but this does notdiminish their value, especially as they also contradict each other, reflecting aninteresting discussion. Another widely neglected subject, Martial's *Liber Spectaculorum*, is reconsidered here by K. M. Coleman (who is currently writing a commentary on the *Spectacles*) with a very readable introduction and also some new interpretations of individual poems. A really new and inspiring approach is offered by Grewing in his helpful article on 'Etymologische Wortspiele'; this may enhance our appreciation of Martial's Roman humour. R. A. Pitcher notes interesting references to Ovid's exile poetry, and one further merit of this volume that deserves specific mention is the rearrangement of the text of epigram 12.5, this a mere by-product of P. Howell's article on 'Martial's Return to Spain'; this proves Immisch's (*Hermes* 46 [1911], 481–517) fusion of two poems into one to be wrong, an illogical blending which has nonetheless remained prevalent in the editions. Finally, W. Heilmann's contribution on the topic of life and death in the epigrams is a convincing follow-up to his earlier article on philosophical thought in Martial (*A&A* 30 [1984], 47–61).

One would have welcomed an *index locorum*, since the merit of most of the contributions lies in their interpretations of particular poems. It ought to be noted here, however, that the procedure whereby individual poems on the same topic are singled out and analysed without an eye to the greater context of Martial's *oeuvre* doesraise problems, and the studies here on book structure make this clear. The problematic nature of this approach is most evident in C. Hendriksén's article, where a lengthy collection of passages is compiled in order to ascertain whether there was apoetic and personal rivalry between Martial and Statius or not. Similarly, B. W. Swann, in an excerpt from his monograph *Martial's Catullus: The Reception of an*

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Epigrammatic Rival (Hildesheim, 1994), simply lists passages where Martial refers to Catullus as an epigrammatist, but does not illustrate the relationship between such terms as *iambi* and *epigrammata*. Also, U. Walter's article on social norms in the epigrams only presents a selection of examples showing that Martial was propagating a rather moralistic socio-ethical position, but does not take into account the epigrams in which the poet's intention may have been a very different one, e.g. the obscene poems or those presenting the speaker as a legacy-hunter. Thus, unlike Heilmann and O'Connor in their meticulous studies, Walter fails to show the contradictions in Martial's poetry.

The articles in this volume differ greatly in their approaches, and also in quality, buta collection of studies dedicated exclusively to the interpretation of Martial fills what has been a lamentable gap (the *Actas del simposio sobre Marco Valerio Marcial, poeta de Bilbilis y de Roma, Calatayud, mayo 1986* [Zaragoza, 1987] are not wholly satisfying). However, rather than opening up new perspectives, this collection taken as a whole seems to be suggesting that traditional methods can, of course, still lead to valuable insights. But it also clearly shows that the exclusion of modern approaches can be very limiting.

University of Munich SVEN LORENZ

AVITUS

GEORGE W. SHEA: *The Poems of Alcimus Ecdicius Avitus.* (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 172.) Pp. ix + 154. Tempe: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997.

Shea's new translation of Avitus' *De spiritalis historiae gestis* (*SHG*) and *De consolatoria castitatis laude* (*CCL*) with both their dedicatory epistles includes an introduction to Avitus' life and works, and a longer chapter covering selected points of interest in both poems. Historical context and prosopography could be improved. S. telescopes Tertullian and Avitus into 'this age' (p. 68 n. 56), and (p. 1) rashly assumes Gundobad's allegiance to Arianism—a great oversimplification. Gaius Sollius Sidonius Apollinaris (*PLRE* 2 Apollinaris 6) is confused with Apollinaris of Valence, Avitus' brother and the dedicatee of the *SHG*, *PLRE* 2 Apollinaris 5 (pp. 1 and 11). (Avitus also had a cousin called Apollinaris [*PLRE* 2 Apollinaris 3, son of Sidonius Apollinaris].) The bibliography omits various crucial twentieth-century Avitiana, particularly Max Burckhardt, *Die Briefsammlung des Bischofs Avitus von Vienne* (Berlin, 1938 = *Abhandlungen zur mittleren und neueren Geschichte* 81), and the unpublished but indispensable I. N. Wood, *Avitus of Vienne: Religion and Culture in the Auvergne and the Rhône Valley, 470–530* (D.Phil. Oxford, 1979). But Avitans work in parallel tracks: Luca Morisi recently published a text, Italian translation, and commentary on Book 1 of the *SHG* (*Alcimi Aviti De mundi initio* [Bologna, 1996], for which see *CR* 48 [1998], 198–9). S. misses comparisons from Avitus' letters (even *Epp*. 43 and 51, both relevant to the publication of the *SHG*), tracts, and sermons; for example, Avitus on the death of the good thief (*SHG* 3.41–8), with rhetorical witticisms about the thief's 'breaking and entering heaven', is closely parallelled in *Contra Eutychen et Nestorium* 2, p. 25.30. One might have confronted A.'s luscious description of Dives' groaning board (*SHG* 3.222–32) with the comic tour-de-force in *Ep*. 86, chilled wine and all.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In literary matters S. is on firmer ground. Nonetheless he treats the *SHG* not as one long hexameter poem in five books (*libri*), but as five 'poems' (p. 2 n. 2). He regards the *CCL* as part of the *SHG*, even though it is clearly a personal and occasional piece of quite a different sort from the biblical epic (p. 3 and also p. 66, where he implies that the *CCL* is a 'scriptural paraphrase'). Avitus' dedication to Apollinaris (ed. Peiper, *MGH* AA 6.2, pp. 274–5) clarifies the differing natures, audiences, and discontinuity between the two works.

S. avoids issues of rhetoric, genre, and sources. Given how infrequently such textsare translated, sources as well as discussions of problematic passages should besupplied for the critical and curious reader. For the *SHG* and the *CCL*, this would have required little additional effort, because Peiper pp. 302–8 provided numerous *fontes* and *similia.* Whatever his protestations about pagan literature, Avitus drew heavily onVirgil, even in occasionally amusing fashions, e.g. the injunction to Adam and Evein *SHG* 1.174–5 *Non annis numerus vitae nec terminus esto/ Progeniem sine fine dedi*, echoing *Aen*. 1.279, and *SHG* 1.191–2, which unconsciously evokes the cosmic nuptials of Dido and Aeneas in *Aen*. 4.167–8. The hexaemeral material in the*SHG* depends on Augustine's *De Genesi ad litteram* (Wood, *Avitus of Vienne*, pp.76–84, and Angelo Roncoroni, 'L'epica biblica di Avito di Vienne', *Vetera Christianorum* 9 [1972], 311–12). All this is worth stating: Miltonians may be unfamiliar with the sources.

Concerning *CCL*, we hear nothing of virgins in Avitus' family. Inaccuracies of translation mar prosopographical issues at *CCL* 95, where Avitus is making an etymological point: his virgin relative's name in Greek (?Eusebia?) translates as 'pietate potens'—she did not assume a Greek name. S. (pp. 59 and 136) misunderstood vv. 104–8 where Avitus alludes to the mother of seven martyrs in 2 Macc. 7.1–41, not to a relative, 'Machabaea', who 'rejoiced in the death of a child'. Avitus knew the pain occasioned by such losses (*CCL* 161–2). The poem should be read with other later Roman ecclesiastical authors who celebrated family saints, specifically religious sisters dedicated to virginity, e.g. Ambrose and Marcella, and Gregory of Nyssa and Macrina (for Ambrose and Avitus's *CCL*, see A. Roncoroni, 'Note al *De Virginitate* di Avito di Vienne', *Athenaeum* 51 [1973], 122–34). In its canny consolatory *dissuasiones* (hence *consolatoria laude*) against sex, marriage, and childbirth, it avoids the shrill andunhealthy notes of Jerome's *Ep*. 22 to Eustochium. Avitus consoled Gundobad on the death of his daughter (*Ep*. 5) and he also wrote personal letters to his brother Apollinaris about the annual commemoration of the death of a sister of theirs (*Epp*.13–14), who may have been the virgin Fuscina (Wood, pp. 90–1). If the identification is correct, then *Epp*. 13 and 14 must postdate both the *CCL* and its preface (itself to be dated after 506/7, since it follows the preface to the *SHG*). Fuscina seems to have been alive at the time the preface to the *CCL* was written. If S. (p. 65) had investigated the legend of Eugenia (*CCL* 503–33), he would have seen that it featured an Avitus and an Apollinaris (Wood, p. 87 n. 5). Avitus also adjudicated the calculus of sin and human costs of various types of forbidden sexual activities. (For the rape ofa perhaps previously debauched nun, see *Ep*. 55.) All are relevant to his work on sacred virgins.

My criticisms are largely regrets for missed opportunities to connect the epistolary Avitus to his less rebarbative alter ego, the poet, to understand what conventions governed his sense of generic proprieties, what evoked *SHG* 4.506 *omne resistens/ si flecti nescit, metuat vel pondere frangi* and *Ep*. 5, p. 32.31 *Et nesciebamus illud tunc frangi tantummodo quod deinceps nesciret inflecti.* Mt. 12.20? Why are his letters so dismally devoid of classical leaven? As one who has worked on Avitus' prose, I can

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

feelingly thank S. for providing us with a readable and often fine translation of the *SHG* and the *CCL*.

Cornell University D. R. SHANZER

CAESAR'S ART

K. Welch, A. Powell (edd.): *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter. The War Commentaries as Political Instruments.* Pp. xii + 225. London: Duckworth, 1998. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-7156-2859-3.

In the past, perhaps, historians might have looked to the reporter as a model for their work: passionately concerned with uncovering the truth and yet always objective, eschewing commentary and interpretation, presenting just the simple facts. Today, quite apart from the fact that few historians would wish to restrict the scope of their investigations to such an extent, we are rather more cynical about journalism. It is clear that all reporters are, to a greater or lesser extent, artful. They present us with partial, subjective interpretations, seeking to persuade us of the truth of their version of reality not through explicit argument but through the selection of material, the techniques of representation, and the rhetoric of the absence of rhetoric, the plain, simple description.

The description 'artful reporter', which seeks to establish a distinction between the carefully contrived appearance of objectivity and the reality of covert interpretation and bias, was applied to Thucydides in Virginia Hunter's book of 1973. The papers in this collection, deriving from a 1996 conference, suggest that Caesar is an even better candidate for such an approach. His accounts are so apparently artless, plain, and straightforward that many commentators have regarded them not as works of history in their own right but as the raw materials intended to form the basis of a suitably laudatory account in future. Yet Caesar was acknowledged as a fine orator; how far can we trust that the qualities of simplicity and clarity which we find in his prose style are equally qualities of the work as a whole? Certainly there was good reason for him to exercise his literary skill. All the writers here agree with the argument of Wiseman's paper that the *Commentaries* on the Gallic War were published in instalments and their contents somehow disseminated not only to the Senate but to the Roman People as a whole. Caesar's intention was to continue to influence public opinion (or, as Welch puts it in her introduction, to seek to dominate the imagination of Romans of all classes) even during his absence from the city; the *Commentaries* should be seen as political instruments in his long rivalry with Pompey.

The best papers here offer intriguing glimpses of a new image of Caesar, as a sophisticated, manipulative writer whose accounts can never be taken at face value. Hall examines the way that Caesar's 'unusually strict' control over diction, morphology, and syntax, 'the creation of an almost artificially pure Latinity' (p. 23), emphasizes his identity as a rational, self-controlled Roman, in contrast to Pompey's Eastern leanings. Torigian shows how the conquest of Gaul is presented as being entirely natural, and suggests that Caesar's use of the third person is intended to minimize his individuality and emphasize his rôle as a mere agent of Rome. Powell offers an explicit comparison between the portrayal of massacres in the Gallic War and the techniques (and clichés) of modern journalism, arguing that the accounts of bloodshed and severity are intended in part to intimidate his domestic opponents.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Inevitably, most of the papers here are concerned, implicitly or explicitly, with the relationship between representation and 'reality': Caesar's version of events and 'what really happened'. It is a little disappointing that none of the contributors takes the obvious step of considering how far the Gallic War is invented (rather than simply described) in Caesar's text. It is much more disappointing that so many of them clearly regard Caesar's rhetorical and literary technique as something which must be stripped away so that they can get at the truth of what really happened, rather than as something of interest in its own right. Thus Rawlings seems to be chiefly interested in whether Caesar is a reliable source for the Gauls' performance in battle (R. suggests that for the most part he was simply confused by their behaviour and tried to rationalize it), while Goldsworthy moves as quickly as possible from discussion of Caesar's presentation of himself as the ideal Roman general to the much less interesting question of whether in reality his actions lived up to this ideal.

Two things seem to unite the papers in this rather miscellaneous volume. The first is the shared belief that Caesar's works do not offer simple, transparent descriptions of reality; the second is an abiding fondness for the idea that events in the *Commentaries* prefigure later developments in Caesar's career. The fractious Gauls unite only whenoppressed by Caesar (nor will the Romans endure the dictator: pp. 58–9); Caesar's legates are sidelined in his account (just as the senatorial class will be sidelined under his rule: pp. 102–3); ironic that, at the time of the conquest, the Gauls had been taking steps to deal with over-mighty individuals (p. 86). If these papers similarly point forwards to the way that Caesar's work will be studied in future, there seems to be some cause for optimism. We can expect still more attempts to use the *Commentaries* simply as a source of information, while making a few gestures towards the problems of representation and rhetoric. We can, however, also look forward to more interesting studies of Caesar's artfulness, which may yet demonstrate that he deserves to be considered alongside such equally rhetorical historians as Sallust and Tacitus.

University of Bristol NEVILLE MORLEY

THE TURNING POINT IN THE SECOND PUNIC WAR

P. Jal (ed., trans.): *Tite-Live.* Histoire Romaine, *Tome XVII,* Livre XXVII. (Collection des Universités de France). Pp. lxvii + 138 (doubleenumeration), 5 maps. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1998. ISBN: 2-251-01409-8.

In an ideal world, Livy 27 would be frequently prescribed for undergraduate and 'A'-level courses. It covers the years 210–207, when the tide of the Second Punic War is slowly turning in Rome's favour. With consummate artistry Livy devotes the centre of the book to the contrasting achievements of the three Roman leaders: Claudius Marcellus, the hard man of the war, his confidence in confronting Hannibal in the open field betrayed by his impetuosity; Fabius Maximus Cunctator, by contrast a prudent operator, who in this book recaptures Tarentum by the guile characteristic of his foe (who remarks 'Et Romani suum Hannibalem habent'); and Scipio Africanus, combining the best of both worlds, whose victories in Spain are to lead to

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the expulsion of the Carthaginians, and whose diplomacy gains him regal recognition from Spaniards (but lasting suspicion from fellow-Romans). Nor is this all; the climax of the book recounts the great victory at the Metaurus; the prior Roman apprehensions at the imminent arrival of Hasdrubal, and the subsequent exultation at the news of the victory of Claudius Nero and Livius Salinator, are recounted in the dramatic narrative at which Livy excels.

Professor Jal has rendered signal service to the Budé series of Livy texts; having earlier edited Books 41–4, he has more recently turned his attention to the third decade, in which his editions of Books 21, 26, and 28 have appeared. Moreover, he has provided editorial supervision or assistance for editions published by other French scholars. It therefore goes without saying that the appearance of Book 27 is a welcome addition to the series. Its elegant publication makes it a pleasure to handle and to read. Since the editions of Books 26 and 28 have already appeared, J.'s introduction is naturally briefer than the norm for a Budé text; after a short survey of the source-problems, there is extended discussion of Livy's influence on later authors, of the chronological problems (on which Livy is notoriously fallible), and on the historical, institutional, religious, and literary aspects of the book.

Not surprisingly, J.'s text differs at many points from the OCT and from my Teubner edition; as is well-known, in the second half of the third decade the divergent tradition of the Spirensis from the Puteaneus makes heavy demands on the subjective judgement of an editor in the choice of readings. Moreover, J. is a more conservative textual critic than I am, which some will regard as a virtue. I offer these suggestions for the improvement of the text in the event of a revised edition. Misprints occur at 18.13 *adsuetutine*; 31.3 *Naupactam*; 32.1 *acies* should read *acie*; 39.2 *trasngresso*; 50.9 *ud*. 4.5, 7.3 The form *fere* is preferred to *ferme*, which appears subsequently throughout the book, and which Livy seems to favour at this stage. 6.14, 7.14 Standardization of *Vulso*/*Volso* is desirable. 7.9 The supplement <Q.> is surely required since all other names in the section are cited with *praenomina*. 11.12 The reading of the *codd*., *princeps in senatu* (not recorded in the *app. crit.*) is supported by 38.28.2, whereas Riemann's *princeps in senatum* has no parallel elsewhere in Livy. 15.18: the *app. crit.* seems to support *proxima*, but the text reads *et proxima*. 16.7 *ab caede* has no parallel elsewhere, whereas *a caede* is frequent. 20.12, 25.2, 34.3 *Claudii*, *Acilii*, *Liuii*: genitive in single *-i* is to be preferred, as elsewhere in the book. 30.5 *ferociori*: though other reputable scholars besides J. believe that Livy may have used this form for the ablative of the comparative, his usage elsewhere argues against it. 32.3 *Flamen*: I find it hard to give credence to this as a *cognomen*, for it is unattested elsewhere and absent in citation of Q. Claudius earlier at 21.5.

J.'s *app. crit.* is certainly less fussy than that of the OCT, and more spare than mine (in which I sought to demonstrate the superiority of the Spirensis tradition over the Puteaneus). But the streamlining has in places gone too far, when he fails to record acceptable manuscript-readings. Thus at 33.7 he prints *ita quod* in his text with no indication that this is an emendation of Weissenborn's, and omits mention of *id quod*, the defensible reading of the *codd*. Similarly at 38.9 Conway's *traducendos* appears in the text without attribution to him and without mention in the *app. crit.* of *traducendi* (*codd*.), which seems to me clearly right. The same thing happens at 45.11, where the emendation of Frob. 2, *absistere*, appears in the text without any indication that the reading of the *codd*. is *subsistere*.

It goes without saying that these details do not detract from the usefulness of the edition for the audience for whom it is intended. The translation where I have checked it is accurate and readable; the annotations, primarily historical, are adequate. The

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

regularity with which the Budé Livy volumes are appearing deserves our appreciation; they are a boon to the ancient historian.

University of Glasgow P. G. WALSH

MON SEMBLABLE, MON FRÈRE

A. JOHNER: *La violence chez Tite-Live: Mythographie et historiographie*. (Groupe de recherche d'histoire romaine de l'Université des Sciences humaines de Strasbourg, Études et travaux, 9.) Pp. viii + 309. Strasbourg: AECR, 1996. ISBN: 2-904337-20-2.

Often perceived as being on the border of history and myth, particularly (though notexclusively) in the early books, Livy lends himself to many different types of reading. J. uses a multiple approach of historical linguistics (especially the work of Benveniste), history of religion, comparative anthropology, and the Girardian sacrificial crisis to illuminate the historian's narratives of conflict and resolution. She is particularly interested in stories involving doubles, either brothers—as in the archetypal Remus–Romulus dyad—or simply pairs in conflict (Fabius Cunctator and Scipio, Camillus and Furius), which represent in miniature the violence of the group. The thematics of violence is not simply a mythographical preoccupation for Livy, however: it reflects the experience and anxieties of the late Republic, Triumvirate, and early Empire. As Jacqueline Dangel says in her Introduction, in undertaking his project of telling the history of Rome *de primordio* Livy 'va fixer pour longtemps l'image d'un monde qui semble se défaire sous ses yeux' (p. 1). In violence, J. finds both destructive and constructive forces: 'L'Ordre, la Ville naissent en se dégageant de l'univers pastoral précivique que représente Remus, en détruisant un stade préculturel perçu comme chaotique et négatif: Rome ne semble pouvoir se définir, se construire, qu'en s'opposant. La fondation se déroule ici suivant un schéma de dualité qu'on retrouvera périodiquement dans l'oeuvre' (p. 291). Like Sargon, Cyrus, or Oedipus, Romulus, at first marginalized outside the city, enables the founding of Rome by the murder of his all-too-similar twin.

Part I sets up the 'schéma conflictuel', concentrating on such episodes as Remus, Cacus (in whom J. finds analogous themes, particularly the anti-civilizing forces of the wild), the Sabines (who threaten Rome's development in time, by refusing to allow it to reproduce, as Remus does in space, by challenging its walls), Tarquinius Superbus, and Manlius Capitolinus. Opposing the 'bad energy' of *ferocia* and *audacia* to the 'positive energy' of *ferocia*, *audacia*, and *consilium*, she investigates the essential kinship with characters like Manlius of figures such as Brutus or Fabius Cunctator, who transfigure *ferocia* by means of self-control and *consilium*. The discussion then opens up to the group, particularly young men, the crowd, and women, each of whom represents the threat of barbarism to the established/establishing Roman order, but each of whom is equally necessary to its self-definition. She has good remarks on the narrative intersection between the long period of history which Livy is telling and the 'chocs temporels' marked by the introduction of violence and showing Livy's 'volonté de stylisation dramatique' (p. 75), and on the way the Roman concepts of *exempla* and *imitatio* can be seen functioning diachronically (e.g. in Manlius' desire to imitate his precursors Cassius and Maclius) and synchronically (the rivalry between Manlius and Camillus), each of which she assimilates to an aspect of Girard's mimetic desire.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Part II moves on to 'modes d'affrontement', investigating the means by which the conflicts which J. sees defining the Livian text are resolved, either by elimination of one of the two opponents (pp. 129–90) or by a kind of synthetic consensus between them (pp. 191–220). Examples of the latter include the story of Manlius Capitolinus, in which Manlius' threat to the civic order is dispelled by a collective resolution (the curious circumstance of the plebeian tribunes who turn against their leader), and that of Fabius and Minucius in the second Punic War. She then moves on to consider non-Roman episodes, the first involving the Macedonian royal house, in which the elimination of Demetrius shows 'les structures les plus archaïques du schéma victimaire' (p. 222). The tragic narrative uses the sacral not to mask but to uncover its'charactère scandaleux et sacrilège', with which, J. argues, Livy situates the Macedonian royal house 'comme le lieu où tout règlement consensuel et raisonnable d'un conflit est impossible'. This particular representation has a historiographic purpose: 'Son rapport à la violence, au conflit, au désir de pouvoir doit être barbare et monstrueux pour justifier la conquête romaine' (p. 237).

Returning to the stories of Romulus and the Tarquins, Part III analyses the 'fonction royale' in the *Ab urbe condita*. For Rome, J. maintains, royalty is less a form of government than 'une fonction mythique de l'imaginaire collectif' (p. 248). Adducing cross-cultural parallels to illustrate the anarchy that follows the death of the king, she identifies the Livian foundation legend, the death of Romulus, and royalty itself as sites of 'profound anxiety', occasions of collective violence which threaten the city with barbarism and the wild (p. 283). The trick is to channel the violence into consensus, into something of benefit to the city; but it remains always a threat, with particular resonances for Livy's own day, in which the historian's fundamental goal was to create an acceptable representation of violence (p. 294).

There is much of interest in this treatment, which deploys a range of structuralist, anthropological, and sociological approaches in its reading of selected episodes from Livy. The mytho-historical strand of the Livian narrative which J. discusses both unifies some aspects of the text and suggests ways (not all of them new) in which one can illuminate the history through an understanding of sonic contemporary anxieties. That said, however, I must confess that I found the analysis relatively simplistic; a kind of relentless binary logic built into J.'s approach tends to reduce complex episodes to conflicts between opposites, with little room for manoeuvre and no shades of grey. The rich documentation in the notes will be of help for those who wish to broaden J.'sperspective by means of the studies from which her own takes its starting point—though the bibliography, for obscure reasons, contains nothing after the date of the thesis defence (December, 1992).

Oriel College, Oxford CHRISTINA S. KRAUS

THE BUDÉ HYGINUS

J.-Y. Boriaud (ed.): *Hygin*. Fables (Collection Budé). Pp. xxxiii + 230. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1997. ISBN: 2-251-01403-9.

An editor of Hyginus' *Fabulae* faces many problems, to be sure, but the methodology involved is reasonably straightforward. A solitary manuscript (ϕ) survived the Middle Ages, to be used in 1535 for the *editio princeps* of Micyllus (F). Almost immediately thereafter the late ninth-century Beneventan codex was discarded, and

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

only two sets of fragments have since come to light, both now in Munich, one in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (discovered by Halm and published in 1870), the other in the Erzbischöfliches Ordinariatsarchiv (discovered by Bischoff and published by Lehmann in 1944). Coupled with the fifth-century fragments of a clearly variant version of the text (N) in Vat. Pal. lat. 24, ϕ gives us a tantalizing glimpse of what might have been: unfortunately, for the greater part of the *Fabulae* we are totally dependent on the printed F, which shows all too clearly that frequently Micyllus simply could not read what was in front of him. (It is incomprehensible that Boriaud says [p. xvi] 'J. Micyllus a travaillé trés consciencieusement'.) To help strengthen thisweak text, an editor must therefore pay particular attention to all available testimonia, such as the frequent use of Hyginus made by Lactantius Placidus, and the so-called Scholia Vallicelliana. Other than this, the fairly extensive scholarly literature must be weighed, both editions of the text and separate studies, to sift out the most valuable conjectures.

Alas, Boriaud simply has not done his homework in any of these areas. Despite a publication date of 1997, he is totally unaware of this reviewer's 1993 Teubner text, which (despite its all too many slips and inaccuracies—a corrected edition is much needed) would have saved B. from many an error. To begin with, he is completely ignorant of the fragments of ϕ discovered in 1944, and this despite not merely the Teubner, but also the pellucid articles by M. D. Reeve in *Texts and Transmission*, ed. L.D. Reynolds (Oxford, 1983) and B. Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e^ et XII^e^ siècles* (Paris, 1982), i.525–6. Note 12 on p. xiii tells us that B. examined the set of fragments of ϕ in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek and of N in the Vatican, but he seems not to have noticed the slips in the transcriptions of Halm and Niebuhr, and even manages to add errors of his own (e.g. *Fab.* XXI, 2 ϕ has *phrysi* not *phrisi*; XXV, 1 *Marcerum* is not to be found in ϕ at all; also *ac* is at least partially legible in ϕ and should not be cited as an emendation of Rose; XXVI, 1 ϕ has *filium* not *filiam*; XXVII, 3 ϕ has *ementita est* not *ementita esset*).

Furthermore, B. seems to have no clue of the importance of testimonia: time and again he misses opportunities to show how the text can be supported or emended fromthese outside sources. He never acknowledges, for example, the importance of Lactantius Placidus' scholia on Statius' *Thebaid* on so many occasions. Thus for *Fab.* XXXIII B. simply notes that Rose bracketed the final section *Item aliis. . . interierunt*. Yet (as Rose clearly knew) these words are to be found in Lact. Plac. *ad* Stat. *Theb.* 5.263 together with the rest of Hyginus' *Fabula.* Should not this important fact at least be put before the reader? It hardly need be said that Boriaud appears never to have heard of the Scholia Vallicelliana, and (although he has heard of him) he has little idea of how to use the evidence of Pseudo-Dositheus (*CGL* 3.56–69).

Modern scholarly literature is given remarkably scanty attention. There is less than one page devoted to a 'Conspectus Philologorum', with entries running from 1624 to 1983, and one is forced to wonder if B. has read anything since that last date. Even within the limits he set himself, he misses much of value. Two scholars out of a very large number would be Castiglioni, in his trenchant review of Rose's edition (*Athenaeum* N.S. 12 [1934], 174–81), and a remarkably useful series of four articles by van Krevelen in *Philologus* from 1959 to 1972.

In short, this text is a disaster, and one can only wonder what readers and editors at Budé were doing to accept it. Even the introduction compares most unfavourably with earlier volumes in this series (e.g. Jal's lengthy and most valuable introduction to his Florus, 1967), devoting a lacklustre twenty-four pages to a discussion of the author (about whom he gives remarkably little guidance, despite R. Kaster's incisive remarks

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in *Suetonius De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* [Oxford, 1995], pp. 205–8), the manuscripts (enough said), the 'témoignages extérieurs' (but, as already remarked, he just does not understand testimonia), the editions, and so on. At least he has gone through the early printed editions, but here again his citations are constantly blighted by error. For example, *Fab.* XC, scarcely ten lines long, contains three mistaken attributions to F. The brief notes tend to be devoted to a small number of other texts which give versions of the same myth, but they make no pretence at being exhaustive and could be added to easily.

Amherst College PETER K. MARSHALL

A NOVEL INTERPRETATION

G. G. GAMBA: *Petronio Arbitro e i Cristiani. Ipotesi per una lettura contestuale del* Satyricon. Pp. 411. Rome: Las, 1998. Paper, L. 45,000. ISBN: 88-213-0384-5.

This is an extraordinary book. Its structure is highly commendable, its argumentation is extremely clear, its footnotes are impressively learned, albeit excessively long, its 400 pages are virtually free of misprints, and its bibliography is almost up todate (one misses Glen Bowersock's *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian* [Berkeley, 1994]). However, the thesis forcefully presented in this elegant volume is so far-fetched that I feel amused rather than irritated by it.

Unlike most Petronian and New Testament scholars, G. both identifies Petronius the author with Encolpius the narrator, thus regarding the *Satyricon* as Petronius' 'Apologia pro vita sua', and arbitrarily believes in the authenticity of the brief correspondence between Seneca and Saint Paul. Led by the similarity, admittedly striking, between some principles of Stoic philosophy and certain aspects of Christian religion, as well as the steadily growing influence of Peter and Paul in Rome, G. argues that the worthy philosopher and tragedian Seneca, after his recall from exile at Rome in A.D. 49 to tutor Nero, became seriously interested in the Christian faith, introduced Nero to it, and even nearly caused the future Emperor's conversion into this powerful religion (until A.D. 54, the year of Claudius' death, Nero is, according to G., the obedient pupil of the virtuous Seneca). Likewise, G. imagines Petronius to be seriously flirting with the idea of becoming a true Christian, not only out of well-intentioned curiosity, but also because he wants to please his close friend, Nero. Thus in his early years at Rome the 'young' and 'innocent' Petronius meets important people in the Christian community, becomes very familiar with practices of the new religion, and studies carefully the Gospels.

However, both the unruly Emperor and his 'arbiter of elegance' do not remain virtuous for long; after he became an Emperor and was no longer under Seneca's moral control, Nero gives vent to his lustful passions (his rage against his former fellow-believers, the Christians, is intensified through his intimacy with unworthy persons like Tigellinus, who, according to G., sets Rome on fire), while Petronius, whose luxurious habits are incompatible with the precepts of Jesus, chooses a style of life which suits him better: he becomes an Epicurean, and perceives religion in general, and Christianity in particular, in Epicurean terms. The intimacy between Nero and Petronius does not last long. The latter cannot endure the domineering character of the former, and the former is unwilling to tolerate courtiers, who would not yield to his

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

whims (in fact, G. takes the famous elegiacs in *Sat*. 132.15 as Petronius' message to Nero that, due to his Christian faith, he is strong enough not to fear death!). When, therefore, Petronius receives the order to commit suicide, he decides both to die in an 'Epicurean style', which echoes, according to G., Jesus' death, and to take revenge on his former friend by writing the *Satyricon* for Nero alone; thus Petronius avenges not only himself, but also all the others who, because of Nero, were refused the privilege of having proper funeral rites! G. believes that his scenario answers satisfactorily the controversial issue of the generic identity of this novel: we are not meant to look for a literary label for this text: it is Petronius' autobiography, which is mainly sketching, in an allegorical fashion, the description of his friendship with Nero and his court, and his experience within the Christian community, and has been composed solely 'in odium Neronis'. According to this imaginative scenario, Nero, the former Christian and sole recipient of this text, is supposed to decodify the real identity of the fictional characters of the *Satyricon*, and to figure out the true meaning of Encolpius' adventures. I regret to say that, in spite of repeated efforts, I have been unable to find even the slightest trace of supporting evidence for this reconstruction.

G.'s next methodological error is to force his fanciful theory upon the extant novel; ironically, he does this in an admirably thorough way by examining even the slightest detail of every episode of the surviving *Satyricon* from an 'allegorical' point of view. In its extant form the novel can be divided into three parts: §§1.1–26.6 (Petronius' life before his experience of Christianity), §§26.7–78.8 (Trimalchio's dinner as an allegory of Petronius' near conversion to Christianity), and §§79.1–141.11 (Petronius' life after he abandoned the idea of becoming a Christian); in its original form the novel would have also contained an introductory section.

The fictional characters represent historical persons: Petronius is called Encolpius (the Greek pseudonym *Ἐγκόλπιος* has religious connotations: *ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*); Ascyltus is Nero, Petronius' former friend; Giton (*γείτων* = *φίλος* in the Christian sense of the word) is probably the morally dissolute Sporus; Agamemnon (the leader of the Greeks) represents Seneca (the leading figure in Neronian Rome); it is also important that Seneca wrote a tragedy called *Agamemnon* (!); Quartilla is Agrippina, the 'fourth' child of Germanicus; Trimalchio ('Thrice Lord') is Saint Peter (the lord of the Christians); Eumolpus is probably Lucan's and Persius' tutor, L. Annaeus Cornutus; Lichas is Theophilus (*Luke* 1.1–4), while his luxurious passenger is the biblical Tryphaena (*Romans* 16.12); it is not explained who Circe, Proselenos, Oenothea, and Philomela are supposed to represent. Likewise, ignoring the dense literary texture of the *Satyricon*, G. attributes an 'allegorical' meaning to the incidents of Encolpius' life: the episode at the school of rhetoric is meant to symbolize the period of Seneca's influence over Petronius and Nero; Encolpius losing his way and finding himself at the brothel is supposed to echo young Jesus losing his way in the temple; the dirty tunic in the incident at the marketplace is meant to allude to the tunic mentioned by Jesus in *Matthew* 5.40, 9.16, and 10.9; the sudden entry of Quartilla's maid at the heroes' lodgings is supposedly based on the appearance of the angels in Bethlehem.

Shortage of space prevents me from listing more (unconvincing) examples of G.'singenious interpretation, which is too subtle for me. Others should decide for themselves.

University of Glasgow COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ALLUSIVE APULEIUS

E. D. FINKELPEARL: *Metamorphosis of Language in Apuleius: A Study of Allusion in the Novel*. Pp. vii + 241. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 0-472-10889-1.

This important contribution to Apuleian studies breaks new ground in studies inthenovel, by arguing for a sustained and programmatic allusiveness in the *Metamorphoses* to match that found in the Augustan poets. F.'s central argument is that Apuleius' struggle to define the inchoate genre of the novel involves an ongoing engagement with literary tradition, both with the plurality of literary 'voices' which seek to make themselves heard and (the overwhelming focus of the book) with the canonical authority of the masters, especially Vergil. F.'s reference in her title to 'thenovel' suggests an even grander ambition to deal with the vexed question of novelistic genre in the absolute, and there are interesting pointers in her discussions of Bakhtin et al. to ways in which this methodology might profitably be applied to other prose fictions.

Although, as will become clear, this book impressed me considerably, it was not somuch for its contribution to the study of allusion. When compared with Stephen Hinds's impressive *Allusion and Intertext* (Cambridge, 1998), which F. cites, the methodological conclusions drawn here seem somewhat underwhelming. F. defends a theory of allusion based upon 'the author's intention' (pp. 5–7), although apparently aware of the problems thereby raised. Although she is right that the substitution bycertain (though certainly not all) literary theorists of 'the text' for 'the author' isglib and superficial, F.'s language of intentionalism is extremely problematic. Anystatement about what the author intended is inevitably premised upon prior assumptions about the sort of thing s/he *would have* intended, *given the sort of author s/he is*: the self-justifying hermeneutic circle is closed. In the course of the discussions, F.'s examples are often incontrovertible; but at times she seems to assert the presence of allusion on the grounds that it 'must' be there (e.g. at p. 130, where the link between *Met*. 8.13.4–5 and *Aeneid* 4.653–6 is identified linguistically on the grounds that 'after two imperatives, each begins with a verb in the perfect tense'! Or contrast p. 208, where we read that Apuleius is 'clearly not thinking of Propertius here'). Clearly, no two scholars will agree on the presence or absence of allusion in every such instance, but Hinds's anti-intentionalist approach is more accommodating than F.'s.

The subtle disingenuousness of the rhetoric of intentionalism allows F. to restrict the range of 'alluded texts' to those which fit her conceptions of the novel's project. Greek texts are almost all excluded (but cf. pp. 117–20 on Plutarch). This would be anodd omission in respect of any text so thoroughly saturated with Hellenism, but inthe case of a (quasi-)translation from the Greek, the theme of cross-cultural 'metamorphosis' surely deserves more considertion. Although F. is more catholic in her treatment of Latin texts, her primary interest lies in Apuleius' relationship with the *Aeneid*. The reason for this is clear (see below), but some readers will nevertheless crave a less narrow focus. In particular, the relationship between Ovid's and Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* (assuming that to have been its original title) requires further investigation.

This focus upon the epic is intended to support her main thesis, that Apuleius constructs the novel as a distorted mirror image of the foundation text of Augustan Rome. This point is argued for with great subtlety. Apuleius 'never merely defaces or satirizes' (p. 51, actually apropos of Sallust); rather, he engages with his master-text

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with a range of techniques, varying from bathos (e.g. p. 95), through 'correction' (e.g.pp. 131–48), to 'completion' (e.g. p. 166). Indeed, pluralism is the keynote of F.'s interpretation. Like Bakhtin, F. sees the novel as an essentially polyphonic genre, self-consciously opposing itself to epic monoliths. In a strong concluding chapter (pp.184–217), F. argues for a metatextual reading of the Isiac eleventh book: Isis, theinventor of writing (in some traditions), represents for Apuleius a 'sort of Muse'(p.208), a cipher for the metamorphosis of the Graeco-Roman tradition into Egyptian multiplicity, exoticism, and heterogeneity. F. also has some good comments on Apuleius' own self-conscious exoticism as an African writing Latin from the margins of the Empire (pp. 134–5; cf. pp. 216–7).

This is an intriguing and important interpretation of the *Metamorphoses*, which deserves to be read and contemplated by all scholars interested in ancient fiction. (A shame, then, that the Latin is not translated for non-linguists.) As will be clear, I was more impressed by the overall 'plotting' of the book than its claims to contribute to the study of allusion. Ultimately, though, F.'s thoughtfulness and sensitivity to literary texture win out. After all, any author who can come up with the phrase 'lest she moo' (p. 192) clearly has a firm grasp upon Apuleius' aesthetics.

St John's College, Cambridge TIM WHITMARSH

PHILOLOGIA PERENNIS

D. R. Shackleton Bailey: *Selected Classical Papers*. Pp. xii + 462. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997. Cased, $52.50. ISBN: 0-472-10816-6.

Professor Shackleton Bailey is a Latin scholar of the greatest distinction, and in viewof his association with Ann Arbor it is appropriate that the University of Michigan Press should have published a selection of his articles. Most of these will be appreciated only by hardened classical scholars, and though some slighter pieces are included, only a few are suitable for the average undergraduate or the general reader. S. B. can illuminate the larger issues when he chooses, as is shown especially by his biography of Cicero, but like Housman he is usually reluctant to display thistalent.

The most important part of the volume consists of *adversaria* on the text and interpretation of a wide range of Latin authors; here, among others of lesser note, we find discussions on Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, Cicero's speeches, Horace, Lucan, Manilius, Martial, Petronius, Sidonius Apollinaris (both poems and letters), Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and Valerius Flaccus. Selection from S. B.'s extensive writings must have been difficult; one particularly misses some of the papers on authors that he himself has edited, on Horace at *HSCP* 89 (1985), 153ff., on Lucan at *PCPS* 28 (1982), 91ff., and on Martial at *AJP* 110 (1989), 131ff. (S. B.'s contributions on this difficult poet, including both the Teubner text and the Loeb translation, form one of his most notable achievements.) It is impossible within a short review to give more than a general impression of these *adversaria*, and a random selection for praise or criticism could only be capricious. S. B. combines a very precise knowledge of Latin (note the paper on *num*) with a formidably logical mind; though he produces palmary

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

emendations from time to time, most of his proposals are less spectacular attempts to restore coherence and Latinity to an author. His writing is crisp and economical, and those unfamiliar with a passage sometimes have to look up the context; he is not so entertaining as Housman, perhaps because he is less rhetorical. Like other textual critics he probably tries to emend too much, but usually one ends up either by assenting or by admitting that there is a case to answer. He has upheld outstandingly the empirical English tradition that derives from Bentley and Housman.

Other papers deal with various aspects of the history of Latin scholarship. There isan interesting account of S. B.'s own 'Ciceronian Odyssey': we glimpse him at the age of twelve when a list of republican consuls 'afforded many hours of childish entertainment' (p. 366). There is an informative article on Emil Baehrens, though curiously S. B. claims not to have used his commentary on Catullus; a discussion of problems here would be particularly rewarding, but he thinks that a textual critic, like a doctor, should be indifferent to the merits of the patient (p. 322). There are several general accounts of the editing of ancient texts, all very sensible and salutary: the onlyprinciple is to have no principle and to examine each case on its merits. There are three judicious papers on Housman: S. B. is ready now to admit that his hero could sometimes be wrong (cf. p. 236 on Lucan), a conclusion that some of us have reached over Juvenal; but his admiration for the *Manilius* is difficult to dispute, even if few could call its study the most memorable intellectual experience of their life (p. 320). He is on less sure ground when he tries to condone Housman's arrogance and offensiveness (cf. p. 322 on Robinson Ellis). He claims too much for his own speciality when he says that 'a bad reading in Manilius and a world war can spring from the same moral and intellectual roots'; this seems particularly unconvincing when one considers the uncompromising temperament of Bentley and Housman.

A few articles deal with Roman prosopography, where S. B.'s expertise is well known from his commentaries on Cicero's letters. Here is the famous paper showing that the henchman of P. Clodius was Sex. Cloelius (not Clodius), and a rejoinder to those whe appealed to the consensus of editors when those editors were unaware of the manuscript evidence. Here is the important article on the meaning of *nobiles* (descendants of consuls) and *novi homines*, and a demonstration that *frater* in the sense of 'cousin' is only applicable to the sons of a paternal uncle. The review of E. S. Gruen's *Last Generation of the Roman Republic* shows S. B.'s remarkable mastery of detail.

The volume contains an index of numerous passages that S. B. has discussed inarticles elsewhere; when his books are also included, he claims to have originated two or three thousand conjectures (p. 365). He does not record here notes on Propertius prior to his *Propertiana* (Cambridge, 1956), on Cicero's letters prior to his commentaries, or on the sixty passages in Horace discussed in his *Profile of Horace* (London, 1982); rather tiresomely the passages dealt with in the present volume are not listed individually. There is an updated bibliography of the author's works containing well over 200 items. The 'Index Philological and Historical' refers not just to the present volume but to the author's other periodical writings; Latin specialists will need to be aware of it.

It remains only to thank the author and the publisher for providing so much nourishing food for thought.

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

SPEECH IN SPEECH

V. BERS: *Speech in Speech: Studies in Incorporated* Oratio Recta *inAttic Drama and Oratory* (Greek Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches). Pp. xv + 249. Lanham, Boulder, New York, and London: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997. Cased, $62.50 (Paper, $23.95). ISBN: 0-8476-8499-0 (0-8476-8450-4 pbk).

Studies of speech in ancient literature are legion. Monologues in classical epic, tragedy, comedy, and historiography have been catalogued in Europe and the English-speaking world for nearly two centuries. However, an overwhelming majority of accounts has tended to concentrate on *rheseis* in specific authors or genres. So whilst the data available about speeches will always serve those concerned with a specific author or genre, such data will be of little use for anyone who wants to comprehend the rôle and function of direct discourse as a whole in, say, the corpus of fifth-century Athenian literature (and, by implication, in Athenian culture at the time).

Bers's study is important for its relative breadth. It combines the thoroughness of traditional Teutonic studies of *Reden* in a single author with a more cosmopolitan erudition and an element of theoretical caution. So this book will be of enduring benefit to literary historians. Although there is no claim to deal fully with historiography, the concluding discussion (pp. 220–3) involves Herodotus, Xenophon, Thucydides, Ephorus, and Polybius. Besides, the coverage of oratory given in Chapter II is probably far more crucial.

The introduction outlines the compass of this study—'to put the intuition that *oratio recta* tends to promise an accurate report to as rigorous a test as the nature of the material allows' (p. 1). B. explains that he concentrates on genres that were performed, because they provide *oratio recta* (OR) as a *mimesis* of live speech within the context of live speech. A promising rationale, but the fact that speech reported is in the same medium (spoken language) as the speech reporting it is fraught with theoretical problems: it makes the essentialization of the independent status of an utterance reported in OR a more hazardous business than B. wants to acknowledge. Hence (i) the claim that 'little needs to be said by way of defining OR' (p. 5) and (ii) subscription to the view (pp. 12–13) that Socrates' use of the word *lexis* in Plato *Republic* 392–3 (of Homer adapting his *lexis* to the person he announces as about to speak) might have something to do with 'word choice' or 'lexicon'. B., who has already shown that Homeric narrative and direct discourse have largely the same registers, notes that if Socrates did mean 'lexicon', he would be wrong, and on the basis of *Apology* 17d–18a, suggests the word has something to do with style and performance in a more general sense. In fact, *lexis* in the *Republic* should be understood as 'telling' (compare Genette's notion of *récit*): Socrates never forgets that when Homer 'quotes' Achilles, it is still Homer speaking; neither should we. But even if B.'s discussion of Homer's OR is embedded in a (mis-?)apprehension of Plato, it by no means detracts from the importance of the material to follow.

There are numerous highlights in the long chapter on drama: B. is sensitive to problems of demarcating OR in drama, and there are some fascinating individual observations: for example, it is astounding that there is no OR in *Oedipus Tyrannus*, given that the action of the play hinges on three embedded narratives; it is also interesting to note how many quotations in tragedy are hypotheses about what people could or would say, or else what B. calls 'virtual OR'. The fact that Oedipus' last words

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in *Oedipus Coloneus* are given in the messenger's speech after Oedipus' final exit brings still more to bear on the problems of closure in this play. The treatment of Euripides provides a valuable contextualization of De Jong's work on the messenger scene narratives. Finally, observations on Aristophanes are presented in a useful tabular format, after some initial discussion.

B.'s approach to oratory (on which it is harder to be comprehensive) is fine-tuned. The relation between orations-as-delivered and orations as we have them transcribed will never be established (see e.g. p. 129). This problem—by no means unique to classical studies—is likely to have little or no bearing on the way direct discourse is presented within those orations. The discussion of 'documentary' OR (pp. 149f.), which considers the levels of reliability of reports, as well as methods of indicating that reliability, is particularly important, and has big implications for the vexed question of speech presentation in historiography, Greek and Roman, which should not be ignored.

In his conclusion, B. allows others 'room for deeper theoretical speculation on the phenomenon of speech in speech'. This is unduly modest: the author has made ample use of contemporary studies in speech presentation, pragmatics, and narrative theory: numerous lengthy footnotes point to the broader questions raised by this field of study. But theory is about presuppositions, not about adornment. This book, in line with the whole tradition of philology, linguistics, and poetics which informs it, views the presentation of speech in speech from the top of an edifice founded by the celebrated discussion in Plato *Republic* 392–5. But once the (effectively categorical) distinction between direct and indirect discourse derived from Plato is challenged, all kinds of interesting questions—and answers—lie ahead.

University of Warwick ANDREW LAIRD

LATIN ORALITY

J. DANGEL, C. MOUSSY (edd.): *Les structures de l'oralité en latin* (Recherches linguistiques du Centre Alfred Ernout). Pp. 314. Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1996. frs. 150. ISBN: 2-84050-073-6.

The twenty-six papers that make up this volume have been divided into four sections. In the first, 'Diachronie et sémantique,' Michèle Fruyt applies the concept of orality to Latin. The written record fails in several ways to do justice to the richness of the oral tradition. It does not distinguish, for example, long and short vowels or differences in tonality. The spoken language (Saussure's *parole*) precedes and influences what is written in any *langue*. The letter kills, or at any rate arrests the vital functions of, language: what is needed is a form of mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. This is whatMichel Banniard, along with others, has been engaged in for some time. Here heputsforward what he claims is a new hypothesis to illustrate the transition from classicalLatin forms to those of Proto-French, located in the eighth century and distinguished from Old French. The pattern normally begins with the emergence of new syntactical forms in the spoken Latin of the third to fifth centuries (Late Spoken Latin 1), and, after a second phase when old and new forms coexist (Late Spoken Latin 2, 'Merovingian', sixth and seventh centuries), issues in Proto-French, the classical forms having been submerged. Elsewhere Claude Moussy discusses the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

distinction made by Cicero, within the context of *oratio*, between *sermo* (conversation) and *contentio* (public speaking); he goes on to analyse the etymology ofeach term. Marc Baratin, taking the definition of *oratio* as his starting point, helpsto explain why we find relatively few references to the spoken language in the grammarians. Most of the remaining papers in the first section focus on individual works or categories. Guy Serbat, in a study of Anthimus' *De observatione ciborum*, makes clear how vividly its text reveals the actual processes of language-change in the early sixth century. Inspired planning has brought together two papers on the *De miraculis sancti Stephani*, written in Africa *c*. 425. Jean Meyers gives a general survey of its linguistic usage, while Michel Griffe devotes a detailed study to the author's useof *ut* to introduce subordination, a 'classical' form of expression that displays a remarkable vitality, as attested both by this text and later by Gregory of Tours.

In the second section, 'Niveaux d'oralité', Jürgen Blänsdorf gives a wide-ranging review of various aspects of orality and the ways in which they affect the written record. He also concludes his paper with a reference to Gregory of Tours, who can be considered, in contrast to the classical historians, as the author of a kind of 'oral historiography'—'il a ravivé l'oralité'. Two papers are concerned specifically with Plautus. Monique Crampon centres her discussion of wordplay upon the expression *volucrem vocem* in *Amph*. 326. Lyliane Sznajder's contribution is much more broadly based. She examines paratactic constructions in Plautus where a governing verb introduces a subordinate clause without the use of a conjunction, and shows how they reflect the patterns of everyday speech (*sermo cotidianus*). Colette Bodelot's survey of the use of the indicative in indirect questions embraces a wide range of genres, both prose and verse. Marie Dominique Joffre plots a stage in the evolution of *habere* into an auxiliary verb.

With the remaining sections, 'Oralité et littérarité' and 'Métrique et formulaires', we are for the most part back on familiar 'classical' territory. Alain Michel writes about 'oral' features in Cicero with his customary elegance. Jean-Marie André highlights the vein of vulgar abuse that marks late-republican philosophical controversy at Rome. Anne Videau's discussion of *parole* in the Roman elegists leads up to a re-examination of Catullus 65. Dominique Longrée sets out the evidence to show that Tacitus makesmuch greater use of expressions in the first person singular, as opposed to the plural, in the *Annals* than in the *Histories* (can this not be explained as an indication ofhis increasing confidence in his own ability and stature as an historian?). Jean Bouquetdocuments the influence of declamation on the poetry of Dracontius; this, however,seems to be stretching the definition of 'orality' to breaking-point. The final contribution comes from Jacqueline Dangel, who examines Quintilian's treatment of the spoken word.

Several of the papers in this volume should provide a stimulus to further investigation, particularly those of Banniard, Blänsdorf, Fruyt, and Sznajder. The first paper in the collection, however (it happens also to be the longest), would have been better omitted. It is concerned with the Indo-European origins of expressions for 'word' and 'communication'. Its connexion with Latin is no more than tangential. Two passages are quoted in transliterated Sanskrit: the uninitiated reader needs to refer to the author's bibliography to deduce that they come from the *Rig Veda*. This paper should have been published elsewhere. The volume as a whole, however, contains much that both Latinists and Romance philologists will be able to profit from.

University of Leeds S. F. RYLE

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

AUTHORITY AND TRADITION

J. MARINCOLA: *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Pp. xiii + 361. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Cased, £45/$64.95. ISBN: 0-521-48019-1.

This is a book of extraordinary scope and ambition. It sets out to map the ways in which historians from Herodotus to Ammianus 'claim the authority to narrate the deeds encompassed in their works' (p. 1). Marincola limits himself largely to narrative history, 'Great Historiography' as he calls it; he also confines his inquiry tothe explicit comments of historians, to what 'ancient historians tell us about themselves' (p. xi). The frequent recurrence of such claims led M. to the judgement that the themes of authority and tradition were inseparable.

M. tackles his subject by theme. Chapter I, 'The Call to History', traces the reasonswhy historians claim to have been drawn to their subjects: dreams and other 'divine incidents', personal dedications—avoided in 'Great Historiography' for fear ofsuggesting personal favour—and the motive of glory or renown. 'The ancient historian', he concludes, 'was concerned with his own renown and wrote history to achieve renown', but no tradition developed of claiming such glory explicitly, still lessof presenting personal glory as a reason for writing history. Chapter II, 'The Historian's Inquiry', details the claims made concerning historical method: of the value of autopsy, of being close to the source of power, or of having privileged access to information, the approach to non-contemporary history, and to myth and history. Chapter III, 'The Historian's Character', considers claims of military, political, or other experience, of effort (tireless years spent in research), and of impartiality. Chapter IV, 'The Historian's Deeds', then turns to the historian's manner of describing events in which he was himself a participant. The question, he argues, should not be reduced to mere 'issues of person' but should be treated more broadly as also a matter of the perspective or focalization of the narrative (pp. 179–80). He then looks at more specific techniques of self-presentation: for example, the motif of divine aid, a device for lessening '*invidia* towards the main character' (p. 207), or the emphasis on the historian's actions as part of a larger, group endeavour. Chapter V, 'The "Lonely" Historian', examines the ways in which historians positioned themselves either inopposition to or as the inheritors of their predecessors. Polemic, he suggests, wasaparticular feature of non-contemporary history (p. 224). To declare yourself thecontinuator of a former Great Master was a way of 'making a claim' about theimportance of your work without 'overt self-advertisement' (p. 241). The book concludes with a summary of its 'findings' by chapter-topic, and with a comparison of the procedures of contemporary and non-contemporary, and of Greek and Roman historians. There are seven appendices: a table of historians, family trees of Greek andRoman continuators, and brief discussions of, for example, the different ways in which historians present (or withhold) their names and places of origin. The book, exquisitely produced, also includes an excellent general index (as well as an index of Greek words and *index locorum*), allowing the reader to track individual historians across the chapter divisions.

The scale and structure of such a project inevitably beg questions. Why should narrative history be treated apart from bastard genres such as epitome or biography? Once we have tidied up the tradition of 'Great Historiography', do the patchy remains (with the great lacuna, for example, between Tacitus and Ammianus) really constitute a single tradition? Why treat a historian's explicit comments on his method or purpose

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

apart from his practice? M. is aware of all these questions. Explicit statements cannot be the whole story of how a historian 'compels belief' (p. xii). There were other ways of finding out about the past than through narrative history (p. 20). M. also resists crude, schematic distinctions such as that between a Thucydidean political history and a 'pleasure-oriented, highly artificial "rhetorical" historiography, whose. . . patron saint was Isocrates' (pp. 2–3). At times, however, the reader comes up against some fairly rigid distinctions beween sub-genres: Ammianus' famous story of his escape from Amida is seen as a pastiche of elements of memoir and of the 'narrative of exciting adventure and escape' (p. 203). M.'s procedure of treating explicit statements in isolation from their implementation has also, I suspect, the unintended consequence of enhancing the similarities between historians.

Ammianus was very conscious of his place in a tradition. As T. D. Barnes has put it, he 'intended his *Res Gestae* to sum up the whole of Greco-Roman historiography'. But were all historians equally aware of the weight of tradition? M's approach, inparticular his thematic structure, succeeds in unearthing a number of interesting links between historians—Ammianus' description of himself as 'miles quondam et Graecus', for example, is seen as a nod to the tradition of the Greek soldier-historian (pp. 256–7)—but many other connections are rather less concrete. How is it, for example, that Ctesias shows 'an immediate appreciation and grasp of the possibilities opened up by Thucydides' (p. 186), except in so far as both claimed to write from experience? It is important to distinguish, moreover, between degrees or types of reference. M.'s Ammianus 'cites' and makes 'a clear reference to' Herodotus (p. 255), but, as Fornara has argued in an article cited by M. (p. 257 n. 208), Ammianus' knowledge of the Greek historians was, by contrast to his knowledge of Latin writers, 'not substantial', indeed largely second-hand. Terms such as 'reference' and 'citation' are too blunt. Similarities between historians—the pattern, for example, whereby they assure readers of their evidence before praising a man (p. 173)—are not always the subject of conscious emulation, or of a sense of tradition.

Such a broad focus will inevitably reduce the complexities of any single historian in a way that will be painful to those of narrower scope. I cannot believe that Herodotus 'seems to refer to effort only once', at 3.115.2 (p. 148): what, for starters, of his travels in search of Herakles at 2.44? The statement that the Egyptian priests' appeal to the authority of Menelaus (as opposed to Homer) 'may symbolically represent the superiority of inquiry over inspiration, the triumph of history over poetry' (p. 226) or the three-sentence summary of Herodotus' historical procedure (p. 67) shout out for qualification. There are ample references to more thorough accounts. (How can one expect more in the context of such a broad survey?) But there is an extraordinary optimism in such generalizations, an optimism that underlies M.'s project as a whole. What does it mean to compare Ammianus with Herodotus, or to seek to distil from both together the practice of 'the ancient historian'? M., of course, does not paint out the individual. Indeed, his stress on the 'individual within the continuity and development of the tradition' is an important plank of his differentiation of his project from those of previous scholars (p. xi). Nor does he exclude the pressures of social context: a particular theme of the book is the way in which, especially Roman, historians learnt to exist in a monarchical world where the 'belief that all historians wrote out of fear and favour must have become deeply ingrained' (p. 166). But his summations of the procedure of 'the ancient historian' are often banal. M. unfailingly notes variant procedures—statements of autopsy, for example, can act as 'a voucher' for a marvel or they can underline splendour or number (pp. 82–3)—but the classificatory zeal seems Procrustean. Shifts in historiographical practice are presented

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as the result of clear choices, as if the historian went about his task with the help of a handbook: historians after Thucydides had three ways, we are told, of dealing with 'myths': avoid them, rationalize them, or include them and leave the reader to make his own judgement (p. 118).

It is all, surely, more problematic. It is hard not to question whether the themes of authority and tradition might more rewardingly be pursued through the close analysis of particular authors (or relationships between authors). M. undoubtedly has done much of the groundwork for such closer studies. He has provided an enormously useful, enormously learned guide to many of the most central questions of ancient historiography. But in attempting to survey this vast landscape, I sense that he has flattened it.

University College London THOMAS HARRISON

THE END (. . .)

D. H. ROBERTS, F. M. DUNN, D. FOWLER (edd.): *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Pp. xvi + 311. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997. Cased, $39.50/£30. ISBN: 0-691-04452-X.

This impressive collection demonstrates that there is ample justification for the continued study of closure. Don Fowler's opening chapter, which serves as an introduction to the volume, shows the centrality of closure for the interpretation of all kinds of literary texts, as well as its importance for politics, gender, and the very understanding of textuality. Mainstream Greek and Roman literature is well covered not only by this assembly of essays, but often within some essays themselves. Philip Hardie (chiefly on the epics of Virgil, Statius, and Silius) and Massimo Fusillo (onancient novels) are examples of this cosmopolitanism across genres, but Peta Fowler's discussion of the transposition of the end of *De Rerum Natura* also has implications for other philosophical texts, and Alessandro Barchiesi's account of theends of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* should in itself become a standard contribution to Augustan literary history.

Sheila Murnaghan's reading of the *Iliad* against its own programme is a specific treatment which shows how heroic anger and Zeus' 'plotting' ensure that closure is systematically deferred. This close examination of competing themes in the poem, read against mythological paradigms, allows a nuanced account of what *Dios boulé* can mean. Another success is Carolyn Dewald's account of the significance of the end of Herodotus: the *Histories* do not appear to provide any satisfactory thematic closure. Their ending is open because it is up to us to determine, in the light of our hindsight, the full consequence and significance of the events Herodotus describes. This is generally salutary for broader considerations about the relation between historiography and historicism. Two other studies of single texts, however, risk putting too many eggs in one basket. W. R. Johnson's flamboyant treatment of Propertius 4.11verges on the fluffy at times, but, even so, it rewards patient readers with a contextualization of Cornelia in Propertius' *oeuvre* as a whole. Francis Dunn begins by surveying the crucial junctures of Euripides' Herakles (though his claim that the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

prospective death of Herakles' family by Lycus is a 'premature end' might seem otiose) before looking helpfully at some of the contexts that determine the shape of the text and its difficulties. However, the characterization of Herakles as a 'perfect Bakhtinian hero' needs more development: where and how does Bakhtin's 'Epic and the Novel' essay reclaim for Herakles 'individual control over. . . his own ends', and what is the textual basis for this?

Closure bears on unity, as many contributors attest. The question of whether Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* count as one work or as many, or as many pairs, is not fully addressed by Christopher Pelling, but this is a substantial contribution on many counts. The assessment of death in Plutarch, almost as a form of narrative punctuation, bears some comparison with Roland Barthes's 'Tacitus and the Funerary Baroque' (though that similarity diminishes as Pelling's battery of bibliography and referential resources accumulates). A major emergent feature is the way the dual biographical technique and the varying employment of *synkrisis* serve to characterize Plutarch as author. Ian Rutherford's coverage of closure in Greek lyric also shows how the study of endings is a useful heuristic tool. This comprehensive treatment could serve as a stimulating general introduction to some central features of the genre: concluding prayers and references to seals and crowns, for example, provide some vital indications about performance and reception.

I have meant to give the impression that most studies in this volume will be a significant resource for specialists in the various areas of ancient literature to whichthey are devoted. The *à la mode* appeal of this study will certainly be eclipsed byitsperennial usefulness. From that perspective, fuller indexing (and perhaps a separate *index locorum*) would have been desirable: instances of some crucial categories are not listed fully (e.g. 'orality'); others (e.g. 'fiction' or 'fictionality') are not listed at all. Useful books can also have unwelome side-effects: to read a whole book on closure, however well orchestrated, is hard going. To my chagrin, I found myself able to predict the way the arguments of some chapters would go. (One example: Dewald on Herodotus enables one to divine that Lucretius ends with the plague to test the reader's capacity to apply Epicurean principles to the poem's close.) But perhaps this sort of thing is a tribute to the coherence either of the subject or of this particular assembly of contributions—and maybe that coherence makes it hard to take issue with them. Still, it is interesting that, given the abundance of material preceding it, Deborah Roberts's final chapter manages to offer some refreshing advances.

It would be churlish to complain about omissions from a collection that in twelve chapters covers a decent range of ancient authors and genres. Instead, one could note positively that there are further areas for this kind of enquiry: Hellenistic poetry and Roman historiography spring to mind—although the former is given passing discussion in Fusillo's treatment of the ancient novel here, and John Marincola, among others, is currently engaged on a study of the latter. New Comedy will also prove a fertile domain. Consideration of how the emergence of Christianity bears on closure in the literature of late antiquity—writing which itself risks being read as a coda to Classical literature—also raises interesting possibilities. The editors are right to note in the preface that their subject is 'endless'.

University of Warwick ANDREW LAIRD

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

GREEK RHETORIC

J. POULAKOS: *Sophistical Rhetoric in Classical Greece*. Pp. xiv + 220. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995. ISBN: 0-872-49899-9.

R. WARDY: *The Birth of Rhetoric: Gorgias, Plato and their Successors*. Pp. viii + 197. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-415-14642-9.

Wardy seeks a key to the perennial question, What is rhetoric?, in the 'bitter controversy' from which Greek rhetoric emerged: 'to learn about Gorgias is to learn about what continues to matter in rhetoric' (p. 3). His book is built on the antithesis between Gorgias' picture of undifferentiated, irresistibly powerful *logos* and the insistence of Plato's Socrates in *Gorgias* that philosophical *logos* is crucially distinct from other kinds. This antithesis encapsulates 'the Gorgias/*Gorgias* problematic' (pp.86f.): what makes an argument 'compelling'? Can we identify speech which should persuade us? Or are persuasion and belief beyond reason's control?

Chapter I examines Gorgias' *On What is Not* (*OWIN*). For Parmenides, truth compels belief. But Parmenides admits human error (and if truth compels, how can falsehood deceive?); moreover, his thesis (that what is, is one and changeless) itself seems unbelievable. Gorgias uses 'Parmenidean' reasoning to demonstrate that (i) nothing exists; (ii) if anything did, it could not be known; and (iii) if it were known, it could not be communicated. W. sees this as defying *sophoi* who would reduce *logos* to a link in a chain: reality–language–belief. He finds, however, that in undermining philosophical *logos* Gorgias robs the concept of *logos* itself of its coherence. And what kind of *logos* is *OWIN* itself? Is it philosophy—taking the 'path of not-being' rejected by Parmenides? Or parody with a serious point—that philosophical reasoning results in absurdity, or is itself absurdly arrogant? Or 'just' a joke? W.'s conclusion, inevitable but frustrating, is that this indeterminacy is itself part of the message/non-message. The *Encomium of Helen* (Chapter II) continues Gorgias' attempt 'to wrest the *logos* from philosophical control' (p. 29), and W. provides an exhilarating tour of this festival of subversion. Any link between *logos* and truth is contingent at most; the essential connections of *logos* are with pleasure, passion, delusion, and coercive power. Gorgias' *logos* is an unruly, dominating force, threatening us with psychic rape.

Chapter III shows Plato's *Gorgias* reconstructing the hierarchies of *logos* which have collapsed in Gorgias' discourses. Against the orator's domination of the masses Socrates sets dialectic, a collaborative enterprise whose participants are 'willingly compelled' by the truth. But if Gorgias' *logos* is tyrannical, dialectic too seems inimical to democracy: W. considers the radical implications, then and now, of the perception that mass persuasion cannot be truly instructive. Yet, if Socrates' critique of *logos* is correct, dialectic is the only guarantee of personal intellectual autonomy, and thus in fact (as W. does not quite say, pp. 65–9) the only basis for real democracy. Socrates rehabilitates the Parmenidean impersonal *logos*, a *logos* which we do not wield but strive to apprehend.

The next chapters review ancient thinkers who respond to, or 'evade', the Gorgias/*Gorgias* problematic. The discussion of Aristotle is particularly interesting. W. tracks from the *Rhetoric* into the *Topics* the philosopher's 'shocking' readiness toset pragmatically aside the quest for impersonal truth/good; applying pressure to Aristotle's distinction between dialectic, eristic, and rhetoric, he finds premonitions of

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

collapse. Can truth be allowed to prevail by underhand means? Is Aristotle 'in cahoots with Gorgias', selling out his dialectical principles (p. 137)? W. finds it hard to avoid the answers 'no' and 'yes' respectively.

The epilogue, 'Does Philosophy Have a Gender?', argues 'no'. Philosophy must attend to women's experience, but there is no feminine/feminist philosophical procedure *per se*: the *logos* is (as 'Socrates' argued) impersonal, and therefore genderless. W.'s account is convincing as far as it goes. Argument requires procedures, which cannot themselves be perspectival; only an extreme, essentialist assessment of sex differences would require separate philosophies. But, granted that rationality is not gendered, may feminism transform it? Patriarchy has let irrational modes of thought pass as rational: could there be rational modes which patriarchy has occluded? W. does not address this question, nor does he subject his own notion of rationality to serious examination.

Where W.'s own rhetoric leaves no doubt that his sympathies are with *Gorgias*, not Gorgias, Poulakos is an enthusiast for the sophists. To characterize the sophist as opposed to the philosopher, he builds on Deleuze's distinction between 'nomadic' and 'despotic' modes of thought using a model borrowed from Michel de Certeau: thephilosopher is a strategist, seeking to control conceptual space; the sophist, Certeau's *bricoleur*, is a tactician, an exploiter of time (i.e. *kairos*). The sophists' literal itinerancy is matched by their intellectual nomadism: travelling idea-merchants disrupt local 'economies of thought' (p. 31). In P.'s model of sophistical rhetoric, itskey components are the discourses of opportunity, playfulness, and possibility, each of which is a subversive response to a central Greek cultural institution and corresponding conceptual polarity (p. 57). P. applies this model to a series of sophistic fragments (pp. 58–71), then surveys the strategies of three 'despotic' thinkers, Plato, Isocrates, and Aristotle, who simultaneously marginalize and appropriate the discourse of their sophistic opponents.

Schematism leads to some artificiality. The concept of *kairos* can perhaps liberatespeakers from precedent, but does it 'overturn' the πρέπον/ἀπρεπές polarity (pp.60–4)? Again, the category of 'the ideal'—introduced to form, with 'the actual', a binary opposition which 'possibility' will deconstruct—is ill-defined. There are signs of material being forced to fit, e.g. the claim that Prodicus' *Herakles* 'ends with no sign of decision' (p. 59): we do not have Prodicus' complete ἐπίδειξις, but *Mem*. 2.i.34 and*Symp*. 177b strongly suggest that Herakles *was* shown making the 'right' decision. The most serious problem, though, arises from tension between the book's status as'areception of receptions' (p. 5) and P.'s will to reconstitute a distinct sophistic subject-position. Description of how Plato and others *use* the sophists as oppositional figures slides into characterization of the sophists themselves as inherently oppositional, marginal, elusive, etc. This procedure—celebrating qualities which writers antagonistic to the sophists condemned—risks constructing a kind of 'noble sophist', a mythic intellectual 'wild man' untainted by ideology. It is symptomatic that P. makes no distinction between a 'sophist' who may be a Platonic invention (Callicles) and well-attested figures such as Antiphon and Hippias (p. 26, cf. p. 87 with n. 24), andthat he shows little interest in the sophists' activity as teachers, recruiting and instructing students—for which purposes they surely did not cast themselves as marginal and elusive.

The Birth of Rhetoric is essential reading for students of intellectual history, and its clarity makes it a valuable protreptic (to philosophy, and perhaps to rhetoric!) for non-specialists. P.'s book, though less approachable and less dependable (e.g. p. 166, misreading a passage of *Rhet*.), is a challenging contribution to debate, and contains

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

much of interest which has not been discussed here. Neither work should leave readers in any doubt of the value, and excitement, of studying the intellectual mêlée in which Greek rhetoric was born.

Wadham College, Oxford N. R. LIVINGSTONE

PLATO ON PRINCIPLES

M. HOFFMANN: *Die Entstehung von Ordnung: Zur Bestimmung vonSein, Erkennen und Handeln in der späteren Philosophie Platons.* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 81.) Pp. 348. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1996. ISBN: 3-519-07630-6.

Hoffmann's book attempts a task that many seem to find irresistible: making some kind of unified sense of that portion of the Platonic corpus generally labelled as 'late'. Probably at least as many would be sceptical, not just about the possibility of success in such a task, but even about its viability in the first place. After all, why should we suppose that there is any single key, or single combination of keys, to so apparently diverse a body of work, which *prima facie* is connected only or mainly by the fact—if it is a fact—that it was all written in the same artificially determined 'period'? If we do suppose it, the apparent failure of all previous attempts ought to be enough to warn off any newcomers. H., however, in this reworked version of a dissertation, unworriedly goes for broke. Starting from the different functions attributed to the form of the good in the *Republic* (i.e. the political, the 'erkennt-nis-ermöglichende', and the 'sein-konstituierende', p. 13), he looks for and finds a single 'Grundgedanke' underlying Plato's treatment of the three spheres respectively of being, knowledge, and action in the later dialogues. He thinks it can be shown that 'der in der *Politeia* angedeutete Entwurf eines systematischen Zusammenhanges der Begründung von Sein, Erkennen und Handeln in den späteren Dialogen weiter ausgearbeitet wird. Statt einer Aufteilung des philosophischen Denkens in die verschiedenen Disziplinen, wie wir sie seit Aristoteles gewohnt sind, bleibt es dasAnliegen Platons, für die verschiedenen Themenbereiche einen umfassenden theoretischen Ansatz zu entwickeln' (pp. 14–15).

The key idea is the 'Entstehung von Ordnung' of the book's title. 'Ordering' is fundamental in all three spheres, and its possibility depends on the working together of four 'principles': 'In einem vorgegebenen Unbestimmten, das am deutlichsten im*Philebos* mit dem Begriff des ἄπειρον vorgestellt wird (= 1.), erfolgt durch das Wirken einer zur Selbstbewegung fähigen "Seele" (= 2.) eine Bestimmung durch das,was im *Philebos* mit dem Begriff des πέρας eingeführt wird, and was hier verkürzend als formen- und zahlenmässige Bestimmtheit bezeichnet werden kann (=3.). Diese Bestimmung des Unbestimmten erreicht ihre Vollendung und Beständigkeit jedoch nur unter der "Hinzunahme" von Vernunft (= 4.), das heisst, wenn sich der Bestimmungsprozess als Ordnungsprozess vollzieht. . . . Ordnung besteht in der auf Beständigkeit angelegten regelhaften Koordination einer Vielheit von durch Zahlen und Formen bestimmten Teilen' (p. 313: part of H.'s short closing summary).

Such a conclusion is based on commentary mainly on the *Theaetetus* ('Theorie desErkennens', Chapter I), parts of the *Philebus* ('Theorie des Seins', Chapter II), andparts of *Laws* X ('Theorie politischen Handelns', Chapter III), with support

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

respectively from *Sophist*, *Epinomis*, and *Timaeus*. H.'s method consists in selective commentary on his favoured texts, from which he gradually assembles the constituent parts of the key idea. So the successive movements of the *Theaetetus* are made to deliver up the various stages in the '*Akt der Bestimmung des Unbestimmten*' (p. 110), which represents the coming-into-being of knowledge (or 'dialectical understanding' as portrayed by the *Sophist*: a conception beyond the interlocutors of the *Theaetetus*); the *Philebus* is read essentially as a work of ontology, or pivoting on ontological issues, with *πέρας*, *ἄπειρον*, and *γένεσις εἰς οὐσίαν* (26d8) unsurprisingly playing the big rôles, but with a guest appearance from *Epinomis* 990c–991b to fill in some gaps; while the treatment of the *Laws* takes its cue from a phrase translated as 'Wirkmacht desgemeinsamen Werdens', i.e. of the world and of human beings: 903d3 (*κατὰ*) *δύναμιν τὴν τῆς κοινῆς γενέσεως*: '(thanks to) your common origin', in Saunders's translation.

H.'s view of Plato bears some resemblance to that of the 'Tübingen school' of interpretation (p. 16), but claims to go beyond it. H. J. Krämer proposed the basic insights on which H. himself means to build, but failed to show how exactly these were supposed to work (p. 19). If this is the criterion by which H. asks us to judge the success of his project, the jury is unlikely to rush to a favourable verdict. One special problem is that, despite all H.'s efforts, it still remains unclear what the relationship is between the various principles as they operate in the different spheres. So far as I can see, H. thinks they are actually an identical set of principles; but so long as, for example, the process of coming to understand things is different from, even if it (somehow) follows the order of, the 'coming-into-being' of the things themselves, theprinciples operating in the two spheres appear actually only to be the same by analogy—which seems to leave us without the unifying account we seemed to be promised (nor can H., given his preferred account of forms in late Plato, easily unite the four 'Prinzipien' at some higher level). However, even if H. had provided us with such an account, it would still in my view remain questionable how much further on that would have taken us: merely having a smaller number of explanatory principles does not by itself make them more illuminating. (M. M. McCabe's *Plato's Individuals* [Princeton, 1994], which is missing from H.'s bibliography, might have provided the impetus to deeper reflection on some of the issues he discusses.)

Perhaps, nevertheless, that is the direction in which Plato was headed, and I should swallow my doubts. But was it? If the external evidence makes it look so (or is capable of being taken as making it look so), the internal evidence is more consistent with a different message: that a reading of the type represented in H.'s book leaves rather more untouched than it manages to explain. Whatever else one may say about H.'s method (on which his explicit remarks are fairly limited), it certainly raises some questions. Why, if the outcome of the *Theaetetus* is as H. presents it, should Plato have written the dialogue in the richly inventive, suggestive, and complex way he did? Why should he have buried his *Prinzipienlehre* quite so deeply? And exactly how should wedivide our attention between that and the more explicit (and apparently more philosophically interesting) contents of works like the *Theaetetus*, *Philebus*, and *Laws*? Insofar as it fails to answer such questions (to which answers are forthcoming from Tübingen), H.'s treatment is—at least to this disappointed diner, who admittedly is used to different fare—another course short of a full meal.

University of Durham CHRISTOPHER ROWE

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PLATO'S SOCRATIC DIALOGUES

CHARLES H. KAHN: *Plato and the Socratic Dialogue: the Philosophical Use of a Literary Form*. Pp. xxi + 431. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998 (first published 1996). Paper, £17.95. ISBN: 0-521-64830-0.

With this paperback edition, Charles Kahn's important study can reach the wider readership it deserves. Independent-minded, learned, suggestive, and stimulating, it will influence Plato scholarship for the next generation, mostly for the good.

K.'s main thesis is anti-developmentalism. The topics with which Plato struggles in his Socratic dialogues are often given a definitive treatment in Plato's *Republic*. How to explain this? Is it because Plato's purpose in these Socratic dialogues was to expound the philosophy of Socrates, whereas his purpose in *Republic* and other 'mature' works was to expound the new philosophy which he had developed in the meantime? This developmental story (a nineteenth-century hermeneutical approach recently practised by Vlastos and others who came under his influence) is rejected by K. in favour of a more subtle one: in writing these apparently inconclusive Socratic dialogues, Plato is hinting at the approach he adopts in his philosophy as a whole, a philosophy whose most complete revelation is his *Republic*, together with *Phaedo* and *Symposium*. Onthis reading, all Plato's works hang together: Plato wrote his Socratic dialogues toget his readers to think in terms of the philosophy of Plato, not to expound the philosophy of Socrates. Of this K.'s book has convinced me completely, for indeed the hints are thick on the ground.

But we must suspend judgement, I think, about unitarianism, the thesis that all ofPlato's work expresses a 'unified world view, consistent throughout his life' (p. xiv), an ancient hermeneutical approach that K. urges in place of developmentalism. It ispossible, indeed probable, that Plato changed his mind on certain subjects or developed new ideas in the course of his long writing career, but we can hardly hope toidentify many of these modifications, for two reasons: (1) we lack any independent chronology, either absolute or relative, determined either by internal evidence or stylometry, of Plato's works (except for a few late ones); and (2) Plato's way of writing philosophy often conceals his commitments, in order that his readers can exercise their own minds in wrestling with the problems to which Plato may (or may not) have solutions.

Interesting comments are to be found on virtually every page of this wide-ranging book, which offers acute analyses of *Ion*, *Lesser Hippias*, *Gorgias*, *Laches*, *Meno*, *Charmides*, *Protagoras*, and *Lysis*, as well as comments on: the genre of Socratic dialogue; the historiography of Socrates; dialectic in *Meno*, *Euthydemus*, *Phaedo*, and *Republic*; Platonic forms in *Symposium*, *Phaedo*, *Republic*, *Cratylus*, and *Phaedrus*; and Plato's attitude to writing in his *Phaedrus*. Very valuable is the index of passages cited, and the bibliography contains much that was new to me and obviously worth reading. (A notable omission: Gower and Stokes [edd.], *Socratic Questions* [London, 1992], which contains Malcolm Schofield's fine essay 'Socrates Versus Protagoras'.)

The excellent chapter on *Charmides*, for example, includes suggestive remarks (pp.155–7) about the family connections between Plato and the interlocutors of the dialogue, and a fine discussion (pp. 195–6) of Plato's exploration at 167b–169c of thelogic of reflexive and irreflexive relations. I am convinced by K.'s remarks (pp.197–203) that at 169e–172c the dialogue explores deep territory that lies underneath the plausible surface of Socratic elenchus as depicted in Plato's *Apology*. I

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

agreewith K.'s conclusion (p. 209) that the master knowledge (174b–d) which an ideal statesman would enjoy is the knowledge of the Good which is discussed in the central books of the *Republic*.

But the chapter contains implausible suggestions as well; for instance, K. supposes that when Socrates rejects the definition of *sophrosune* as everybody doing their own work (161b–162b), Plato 'prefigures, in reverse' a similar doctrine in *Republic*; in other words, Plato is making a playful use of an idea to allude to an inverted form of it in a dialogue he has not yet written (pp. 203–5). More likely is that both *Charmides* and *Republic* take up, in different ways, a familiar idea that social harmony is promoted byeverybody doing their own work, an idea so familiar that it even occurred to Alcibiades in [Plato], *Alcibiades* (127b–d).

K. rejects the dogmatic grip of the developmental story in its modern post- or sub-Vlastos version, but his own interpretation is occasionally handcuffed by unprovable assumptions about the relative chronology of the dialogues. Certainly *Republic* does play a central rôle and contains answers to many of the questions raised in many of Plato's Socratic dialogues; but it does not follow that *Charmides* and *Euthydemus* (and other such dialogues) were written in order to suggest the ideas of *Republic* and prepare his first readers to receive his great revelation, a revelation, says K., they may have heard about but could not have read about, for the *Republic* was not yet written (pp. 208–9). But there is no independent evidence for the posteriority of *Republic*, and I find it quite easy to imagine *Charmides* and especially *Lysis* and *Euthydemus* being written later; we just do not know.

My only systematic complaint is about method: how to reach conclusions about the views of Socrates. It simply will not do, as K. attempts (pp. 75–9, 393–401), to sweep away the entire testimony of Xenophon on the grounds that one or two passages probably indicate that he derives some ideas or formulations from Plato (the others K. adduces are unconvincing); he could not have got *everything* from Plato (the entirety of whose written works we possess), and the numerous passages where there are parallel ideas in the two authors are usually better explained by common reference to an earlier version of the Socratic legend, sometimes perhaps to the living legend himself. And there were other authors of surviving Socratic dialogues besides Plato and Xenophon: the authors of the Socratic dialogues included in the Plato corpus, especially *Alcibiades*, *Rival Lovers*, *Second Alcibiades*, *Clitophon*, *Theages*, and *Eryxias*. K. virtually ignores all of these, despite the light they shed on the shape of the early Socratic legend and Plato's response to it. (These dialogues have now become more accessible in *Plato: Complete Works*, ed. Cooper [Indianapolis and Cambridge, 1997], which provides recent or new translations of the entire Platonic corpus.) Instead of working from the widest possible base of evidence, K. seems to prefer a narrow one: detach and discard all non-Platonic evidence; assume the historical accuracy of Plato's *Apology* (pp. 88–9), but without any awareness on K.'s part of the rhetorical genre to which Plato's speech belongs, nor even a single reference to Xenophon's *Apology*, or any work of any Attic orator. Yet his first chapter rightly draws attention to the wider genre of 'Socratic dialogue', in which Plato participated with unrivalled creativity. He is right: the big picture makes a difference.

Throughout the book I find insights to applaud nonetheless, and even when I think that K. has missed something I think that his reading, a reading more open than that of the developmentalists, has been partly responsible for allowing me to see further into the text.

Trinity College, University of Toronto D. S. HUTCHINSON

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

SOUL IN THE TIMAEUS

MISCHA VON PERGER: *Die Allseele in Platons Timaios.* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 96.) Pp. 299. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1997. Cased, DM 98. ISBN: 3-519-07645-4.

This monograph focuses on the construction of the world-soul in Plato's *Timaeus*, itsrelation to body, motion, and spatial extension, and thinking. It also takes into account Aristotle's criticism of Plato's notion of soul.

Having carefully read the advice contained in Timaeus' *prooemium*, von Perger firstsets out some hermeneutical rules. (1) Myth should not be rationalized. Plato explicitly says that what is narrated in the likely, mythical account cannot be dealt with otherwise. Hence it is illicit to try to treat this account as allegorical and abolish the metaphors by translating them back. Earlier the author argued that 29C3 is to be understood as drawing an analogy between types of discourse (and not epistemic states) and their objects: 'what being is to becoming, truth is to convincingness'. The world-soul cannot be assigned unambiguously to one of the two realms. For, contrary to the body of the universe, soul is not merely an image. The conception of soul emerges rather from the attempt to grasp the very nature of the relation between model and copy. (2) There should be no reduction of the elements of the narrative (thedemiurge is not the world-soul). (3) The idea of a world-soul should not be marginalized; it is neither ridiculous nor mere *Spielerei*.

These seem to me to be sound methodological principles for interpreting the *Timaeus*. What they come down to is that the *Timaeus* should be read on its own terms; its interpretation should not be clouded by anachronistic conceptions of 'the mythical', or about what is absurd and what is not.

The central chapters are an accurate retelling of Timaeus' narrative about the γένεσις of the soul, and a lucid analysis of the theorems contained in it. It is remarkable for its clarity and detail in the explanation of the mathematical aspects. Philological problems are discussed with the same precision. The philosophical points are carefully argued, but the discussion is sometimes hard to follow for lack of clearly marked summaries. It is impossible to do justice to the intricacies of the author's arguments, so I confine myself to some general points and apologize for simplifications which may render von Perger's arguments weaker or more trivial than they really are.

The author argues that the perfect tense γέγονεν indicates an intermediary between unchanging being and mere becoming; the universe that has come about is a result, a *status quo* that has been reached. This remark should contain the answer to the old controversy of whether the cosmogonic narrative is to be taken literally, or as a mere didactic device. The creation of a beautiful, dynamic order is an intermediary between ceaseless becoming and the immutable beauty of the model. According to Timaeus the origin of the universe 'happened' at a specific point (not *in* time, but constitutive *of* time). Moreover it is not immutable. Therefore it was not sufficient for the demiurge to impose order; he also needed to impart to the world an innate ability to preserve its order through change. Were it not for his goodness (an ultimately religious motive), he could have decided to make the world a rationally designed mechanism; instead he wanted the world to be a god, i.e. a being endowed with a principle of intelligence of its own. This idea is implemented by the concept of the world-soul, which makes the world an intelligent living being.

Soul is that which imparts intellection to that which is characterized by

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

perceptibility and motion. The latter are characteristics of what in this universe is called body. When we try to conceive of a perceptible and moving mass at the *precosmic* stage, we inevitably fall back on the notion of body. Now the creation of soul is not structurally different from that of body, claims v. P. Just as there is no creation of body *ex nihilo*, there had to be something before the creation of soul; protocorporeal moments are parallelled by protopsychic. With this interpretation the author recycles an idea upheld by Plutarch. v. P. develops an elaborate reasoning to explain the systemic need for and the nature of these protopsychic elements.

The soul is a blend of intermediate forms of Being, Sameness, and Difference (the latter two are needed to explain soul's cognitive function); these components are intermediate, because they themselves are the result of a process by which indivisible Being, Sameness, and Difference are mixed with their divisible counterparts. Soul then *participates* in both realms. The author takes this to mean not just that soul has a relation to unchangeable being, but that indivisible being *enters* the soul and assumes a form that is in some way analogous to the bodily mode of existence. But divisible being also enters the soul, in the form of spatial extension. v. P. specifies that divisible Being, Sameness, and Difference are not themselves corporeal, but the principles of body. From all this follows that the soul is something that is thinking as well as spatially extended. Plato further claims that the soul's rotation *is* its thinking. Moreover, the soul's extension and rotation are the prefiguration of and the condition for the extension and motion of body, since soul is 'the elder'. But then the motion of the receptacle prior to the creation of the world-soul seems to require the presence of precosmic soul-like elements. Whereas the receptacle itself is characterized by its stable identity as that which is able to receive different forms, its motion is indeed the result of the presence of Sameness and Difference, which as protopsychic elements are intimately connected to the receptacle's extension and motion.

In the last part of the book the author assesses Aristotle's criticism of Plato's concept of a world-soul. Against Taylor and Cherniss, v. P. does not dismiss Aristotle's criticism as irrelevant; Aristotle did understand what Plato meant and his objections are to be taken seriously. v. P. admits that the notions of extension, circularity, and motion are alien to that of thought, but defends Plato by explaining that what Plato has in mind in the *Timaeus* is not 'thinking as such', but the thinking that goes on inside a living being with a body. Nothing rules out that Plato admits another kind of thinking, a pure intellection that is free of spatial determination. This may indeed be the kind of thinking that constitutes the essence of the demiurge.

The caution with which the author develops his own analyses may explain his indignation over the fanciful constructions of K. Gaiser. v. P. has included an appendix in which he convincingly refutes Gaiser's view of the world-soul on quite a few points. The lesson to be learnt is that even those who are guided by a higher insight into the truth of the unwritten doctrines should make an honest attempt to understand what the written texts themselves really say. There can be no doubt that v. P.'s reading of the *Timaeus*, though it will be contested, is infinitely more valuable than Gaiser's.

K. U. Leuven–FWO-Flanders, Belgium JAN OPSOMER

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CRAFTY SOCRATES

D. ROOCHNIK: *Of Art and Wisdom: Plato's Understanding of Techne*. Pp. xii + 300. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania University Press, 1996. Cased, $40/£35.95. ISBN: 0-271001563-2.

Roochnik offers a reinterpretation of the rôle of the concept of τέχνη in the philosophy of the Platonic Socrates. At no time, he argues, is it to be construed as Socrates' model for 'moral knowledge'. In his hands the 'techne analogy' does not amount to a doctrine; it is a dialectical instrument, designed to draw his respondents into the quest for a knowledge that will underpin a good life, but which will ultimately turn out to be of a quite different, 'nontechnical' sort. The willingness with which most respondents accept the lure of the analogy is in fact precisely what enables Socrates to refute them, since the analogy is not sustainable; the few who do not (on R.'s account, Callicles and Protagoras) cannot, for that reason, be disposed of through the elenchus in the same way. This approach serves, *inter alia*, to narrow the gap between 'early' and 'middle' dialogues, since it rejects the contrast between conversations in which Socrates embraces the techne analogy (he never does) and those in which he abandons it.

The book contains an introduction, four chapters (three of them very long), four substantial appendices, a good bibliography, and a useful index. All Greek is translated or transliterated. Chapter I is a study of the concept of τέχνη as it appears inpre-Platonic literature. It analyses the criteria by which something is to be adjudged a τέχνη in writings from Homer onwards, recording these criteria and marking theirshifts and developments in a series of eight lists; it ends with an excursus on Isocrates. Two themes are especially important for the sequel. One is the progressive development of a distinction between two sorts of τέχνη, one maximally precise and determinate, modelled principally on mathematics, the other 'stochastic'—looser, less determinate in its subject matter, less fully reliable. 'Some measure of chance may interfere with the workings of a stochastic techne, and proper exercise of its function is compatible with failure' (p. 55). The second is a growing perception of the τέχναι as value-neutral, capable of being used for good or ill. With this come the seeds of fifth- and fourth-century enquiries into whether virtue, which is not value-neutral, can be a τέχνη or be made into one, or can be a branch of knowledge that is teachable. One need not accept every detail of this wide-ranging and thoughtful chapter to find much in it that is original and enlightening.

The remaining chapters deal directly with Plato. Chapter II examines five 'early' dialogues, *Laches*, *Charmides*, *Euthyphro*, *Republic* (Book 1, but drawing out consequences for the rest), and *Euthydemus.* By arguing that in every case the use of the techne analogy underlies the conduct of the elenchus and is a prime source of the confusions it generates, R. seeks to challenge the 'conventional wisdom' that τέχνη is intended to function here 'as a positive theoretical model for moral knowledge' (p. 89).

Chapter III focuses on *Gorgias* and *Protagoras*. It seems to have three principal aims. The first is to reinforce R.'s view that Socrates deploys his analogy primarily as a dialectical instrument, by pointing to inconsistencies between its uses in the arguments with Gorgias and with Polus. Secondly, it seeks to show that despite appearances, the'nontechnical conception of moral knowledge' he attributes to Plato can still be marked off in significant ways from his conception of the 'enemy', rhetoric. R.'s treatment of the problem is too ramified to be summarized here; but I should record that I found his attempt to reinterpret the distinction unsatisfactorily nebulous.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thirdly, it offers Callicles and Protagoras as examples (apparently the only examples) of respondents who refuse to follow Socrates' invitation to discuss virtue as if it were, or could be, a τέχνη, and hence cannot be refuted in the familiar way. It is an enticing idea, though I cannot see R.'s treatment of the key passages as uniformly plausible (I offer a few comments below).

In Chapter IV, R. seeks to supplement and modify Vlastos' account of Socrates' claims to both knowledge and ignorance, and of the 'complex irony' that these claims involve. For R., Socrates reckons himself to possess no precise, 'technical' knowledge of the subjects of his enquiries, but has a 'nontechnical' knowledge best represented by his claim, at *Symp*. 177d8, to knowledge of τὰ ἐρωτικά. It is a knowledge of lack, specifically a lack of moral understanding; and it is a knowledge of an inherent, essentially human desire to overcome it. It is 'an understanding of what it means to be in a constant state of striving for objects' (pp. 239–40). Armed with this idea (which hetreats [p. 242] as equivalent to Socrates' famous statement about the 'unexamined life', *Apol*. 38a5–6), R. offers interpretations of a string of key passages from early dialogues, sometimes with promising if perhaps over-generalized results (as on *Meno* 86b, 98b [pp. 243–4]), sometimes, I think, most unpersuasively (as on *Apol*. 21b, 29b [pp. 240–2]). The chapter ends with schematic suggestions for an extension of his approach to cover Plato's strategy in dialogues that draw on the theory of Forms, in a section (pp. 246–51) that serves also as an admirable summary of main conclusions of R.'s study as a whole.

It is an ingenious and stimulating book, fascinating and infuriating by turns. The most hardened Platonic scholars will find genuinely worthwhile insights scattered among its analyses. Some may even be convinced by the general tendency of its conclusions, though they may find, as I did, that the positive content of those conclusions is too impressionistically drawn. R.'s conception of 'nontechnical knowledge' is not well equipped, I suspect, to prevent itself from collapsing under critical scrutiny into a set of vague aspirations. His account of Socrates' uses of the techne analogy in the conduct of his arguments, by contrast, offers serious food for thought; and the suggestion that his approach partially dissolves the familiar barrier between 'early' and 'middle' dialogues is unquestionably worth pursuing.

There is one major issue which R., rather surprisingly, does not pursue explicitly, and one might wish that he had. Whatever Socrates knows or does not know, the intellectual accomplishment that most vividly distinguishes him from Plato's other characters is his 'skill' in conducting an argument, and his ability (signally lacking inPolus, for example) to ask penetrating, appropriate, and strategically connected questions. How, then, does this particular kind of expertise in λόγοι relate to R.'s two categories of τέχνη and his conception of nontechnical knowledge? Perhaps R. will tackle this mesmerizing issue on another occasion.

Two particular features of the book are likely to undermine readers' confidence. One is R.'s reliance, more than once, on large claims and assumptions which are givenno explicit support. The other is the distressing frequency with which question-begging or implausible readings of texts intrude upon more persuasive interpretations. Many of these perverse readings (as I perceive them) seem unnecessary to his project.

I can give only a handful of examples. First a large claim. At the beginning of Chapter II, R. specifies two assumptions which, in his view, govern the procedures of the early dialogues. One is that every virtue is a kind of knowledge; and (he insists), this assumption must stand, since without it these dialogues 'become unintelligible' (p.89). I happen to think that this is false; even if the Socrates of these dialogues is to

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

be construed as believing the proposition, the procedures of the dialogues, which are what R. is concerned with here, are perfectly intelligible without it. Whether one accepts R.'s view or mine on this issue, however, the fact is that he does nothing whatever to support his position. The nearest he gets is to imply that when the assumption functions as part of a refutation (as e.g. at *Laches* 198–9, sketched on R.'s pp. 102–3), it is an assumption to which the Socrates of the relevant dialogue is committed—a view which in this case, and others, could cogently be challenged. (In the *Laches* it is at least as plausible to treat it as an implication of the posture adopted by the interlocutor, Nicias, and by no one else.)

Secondly, let me mention a few cases in which R. seems to me trip over his own anxiety to read every passage he comes across as evidence for his position. In Chapter I, he takes Aesch. *PV* 441–506 as implying, through its treatment of 'numbering' as *ἔξοχον σοφισμάτων*, that determinacy, clarity, and precision are fundamental to genuine *τέχνη*. That does not sound like an outrageous diagnosis, but there is nothing in the passage itself to support it; it depends heavily on the surely implausible contention (p. 37) that what is 'implicit in Aeschylus' can be brought out by reflection on a statement in the *Republic* (522c5–8) and a pair of fragments of Philolaus. Later in the chapter he claims that Soph. *Antig*. 332–75 point to the question 'Can there be a techne to teach us to live a good life?' (p. 60); yet the passage itself seems precisely not to invite that question, but rather unambiguously to close it off. In Chapter III R.'s treatment of Protagoras (in the *Protag*.) requires the sophist to equivocate, during his initial exchanges with Socrates and in the 'Great Speech', and to refuse to be pinned down on the question of whether what he himself professes amounts to a *τέχνη*. But to sustain this view R. has to offer (pp. 213–24) labyrinthine readings of a series of passages which, if read 'straight', would seem to put Protagoras' claim to a *τέχνη* beyond doubt (notably 316d–e, 319a, 322b). As to his argument for the proposition that Socrates' 'invocation of the "measuring techne" ' is 'a dialectical device meant toaddress Hippocrates', where Hippocrates is construed as a 'fledgling hedonist' (pp.229–30), I confess myself lost for words.

The book is attractively designed and well produced. I noticed only the following slips. The significant word 'not' is omitted from l. 4 of the Philodemus passage (p. 83); *techniteis* appears for *technitai* (p. 110), *musike* for *mousike* (p. 141), *empouron* for *empuron* (p. 219); and even the egregious brothers Euthydemus and Dionysodorus might have been startled to find themselves credited with a 'pancreatic techne' (p. 155).

University of Birmingham ANDREW BARKER

CHARMIDES

W. T. SCHMID: *Plato's* Charmides *and the Socratic Ideal of Rationality*. Pp. xv + 225. New York: State University of New York Press, 1998. Paper, $19.95. ISBN: 0-7914-3764-7.

This is a lucid and thoughtful study of Plato's *Charmides* based on three main assumptions. One is that you should work through the argument of a given Platonic dialogue in its own terms rather than in the light of a supposed development of Platonic philosophy. The second is that a dialogue constitutes a seamless web of argument and dramatic action, each strand of which needs to be understood in relation to the other. The third is a conception of Socratic dialectic as an unending shared search directed at the goal of understanding objective truth. All three

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

assumptions are inherently credible and one or more of them underlies much current (especially Anglo-American) research on Plato. They are worked out here in a remarkably clear and systematic way that makes these lines of approach available to a wide circle of readers.

The *Charmides* is a short and supposedly early Platonic dialogue on the subject of *sôphrosunê*, 'moderation' or 'self-control'. However, it introduces some surprisingly complex arguments, especially about self-knowledge and knowledge of knowledge. Ithas not been much examined, the main works inEnglish being Tuckey's 1951 commentary and an interpretative study by Drew Hyland. It was one of three dialogues chosen for the Fifth *Symposium Platonicum* (Toronto, 1998); some of the papers there explored themes similar to Schmid's. Acommon view is that the early part of the dialogue involves evident interplay between characterization and dialectic, and that the later part is mainly devoted to analysing the philosophical basis of Socratic enquiry, conceived as a search for 'self-knowledge', in the sense of under- standing what you do and do not know.

S. goes much further than this in reading the work as a unified dialectical drama. A central feature of his interpretation is the contrast between Critias and Socrates, both in character and in ideas. S. also suggests that Critias represents a certain way of understanding some typically Socratic themes. In particular, Critias represents a philosophically (and politically) dubious way of understanding what is meant by self-knowledge and knowledge of knowledge. The key contrast is between Critias' 'epistemic absolutism' and Socrates' 'epistemic self-criticism' (p. 50), a contrast which emerges progressively in the course of the dialogue. Critias uncritically embraces the idea of a second-order knowledge (self-knowledge or knowledge of knowledge) which enables authoritative mastery of one's life and (in principle) of society as a whole. Socrates' contrasted rôle is expressed both in his critical examination of these ideas and in the philosophical method expressed through this critique. The method is that of truth-directed shared search, which provides the only basis for understanding what you do and do not know, and which always leaves open the possibility of further search.

What is the basis for S.'s contrast between Critias and Socrates? It relies, partly, on the differentiation between their personal styles in argument (Critias' competitive and defensive style contrasted with Socrates' co-operative and persistent one). But this type of contrasted characterization can be found in dialogues other than the *Charmides.* S.'s view also depends on linking this contrast with certain, more or less well-marked, features of the argument. For instance, S. underlines the significance ofthe fact that Socrates, rather than Critias, introduces and pursues the idea that self-knowledge must be analysed as knowledge of ignorance as well as of knowledge (166e). Also, he highlights Critias' enthusiasm for an ideal form of society which depends on an authoritative, 'top-down' knowledge shaping other kinds of knowledge (171e–172a, 173b–d). This leads to one of the book's most striking suggestions. This isthat Plato, in this way, identifies the kind of thinking that led Critias, together withCharmides, to set out on the misguided political experiment of reforming Athenian democracy, as members of the 'thirty tyrants' after the Peloponnesian War (pp. 129–30). Also important is S.'s specification of the philosophical outcome of a dialogue such as the *Charmides.* This inheres not, as has sometimes been claimed, in a residual core of ideas which are left intact by, or implied in, the argument, but rather in Socratic methodology itself, as a form of co-operative, truth-directed enquiry. This point applies with special force to the final idea of *sôphrosunê* as knowledge of good

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and bad (174b–c), which T. Irwin, for instance, has seen as the residual core idea of the dialogue.

There is, obviously, room for argument about whether S.'s reading of the interplay between drama and argument can be sustained, especially as it depends on attaching significance to unemphatic gaps and details of argumentation, as well as to characterization. There is also scope for debate about S.'s conception of the Socratic method. What is unquestioned, however, is the combination of philosophical seriousness and clarity of explanation with which he unfolds his way of reading the dialogue. This serves to make this book a valuable starting point for readers wanting to explore the different kinds of questions (philosophical, literary, socio-political) raised by Plato's early dialogues, as well as a stimulating study of the dialogue for Plato scholars.

University of Exeter CHRISTOPHER GILL

CRITO

R. WEISS: *Socrates Dissatisfied. An Analysis of Plato's* Crito. Pp. xii + 187. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-19-511684-4.

This remarkable book has a challenging title and argument. Socrates is dissatisfied in the *Crito*, it seems from Weiss's interesting analysis, for several reasons: first, with Crito for failing to 'understand' (*ennoô*: 50a5) Socrates' argument and reasons for refusing to escape from prison. Chapter VIII, 'A Fool Satisfied', is directed at Crito: 'not to say that Crito is a bad man or worse than most; he surely means well. Yet Crito is indifferent to the claims of principle and law' (p. 156). Secondly, Socrates is dissatisfied with leaving Crito unconvinced of the rightness of his argument and conclusion. So he must resort ('a very last resort', p. 6) to a 'noble lie' and 'deception' (p. 73) in the form of 'a coercive kind of persuasion' (p. 147); i.e. the rhetorical speech of the Laws, of whose arguments Socrates 'strongly disapproves' (p. 6). Thirdly, he could be dissatisfied with himself and us if we considered him in agreement with the Laws in any way other than with their conclusion. If we did we would apparently be as foolish as Crito, and as 'unphilosophical' (pp. 43–9). Fourthly, and perhaps most importantly for W., Socrates is dissatisfied with any attempt, like that of the Laws, to 'set the state above the individual' and compromise the 'independence and authority of the rule of reason—that is, of the rule of justice as determined by individual persons through the exercise of their own best thinking' (p. 6).

W. may consider I take her own rhetoric too literally. Her epigraph explains the choice of title and theme: Mill's claim that 'It is better to be. . . Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied'. This is a remarkable elision of a famous contrast between a human and a pig, and what follows: Mill's reason that, if fools or pigs disagree, they only know their own side of the question. Socrates wondered what all sides knew, and who was not a fool. W. quotes Grote on Socrates: 'an isolated and eccentric individual, a dissenter certain to incur dangerous antipathy, in so far as he publicly proclaimed what he was' (p. 169). According to W., he was a philosopher whose 'god' was 'human reason in pursuit of justice' (p. 23). His *daimonion* is itself 'a voice inspired by Socrates' thinking and intuition' (p. 19). Just one problem here is how to reconcile his reasoning against the use of deception and stealth in attempting an escape, with his subsequent use of deception to coercively persuade Crito with an argument he is 'strongly opposed to'. Why is the latter deception just and noble, and the former not? How

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

would this duplicity improve Crito's soul? Apparent agreement in the end does not justify any means to that end.

W. considers Crito's behaviour in the *Phaedo* as evidence that Socrates has succeeded in persuading him, and yet 'he has not changed' (p. 158), and Socrates thinks he 'seem[s] to have spoken in vain to [Crito]' (*Phaedo* 115d5). So he no longer engages with him in inquiry. He, like Xanthippe, is excluded from serious discussion. Yet this is not so. Socrates tries to draw him into the discussion (*Phaedo* 63d5ff.), and surely includes Crito as one of his 'judges' (63e8) alongside Simmias and Cebes, who earlier, Crito says, had offered money for an escape (*Crito* 45b). It is Crito who seems to have excluded himself. But in *Phaedo* Socrates is arguing *for* an escape, not against it. At the end he is still responding to Crito's human attitudes with some argument (115bff.), and Crito will finally be asking if he has anything more to say (118a10). Socrates never treats him as a fool—no more than he treats himself as one.

A radical Socrates does engage in 'the exercise of reason for the end of attaining truth—particularly. . . moral truth' (p. 13), but the central moral truth he has found,which his god confirms, is that his wisdom is not worth much, but is, when acknowledged as such, greater than that of any other human being he has met. So hetoo is a fool, not wise, about most things, but wise to his folly. Crito does not understand (*ennoô*) how Socrates would be harming those he least should harm by escaping. It is not immediately obvious to anyone who 'those' are. When Socrates explains that he means 'the Laws and the Communal Interest of the City' (*tò koinòn tês póleôs*, 50a8), Crito apparently does understand, or at least has got the notion into his mind (*ennoô*). He seems satisfied, as does Socrates, in the end, as much as they can be. If they are more than two fools satisfied, why not one wiser, and a friend both humanly and justly satisfied and dissatisfied? Despite some reservations, this is a very satisfying and searching Socratic study.

Murdoch University MARTIN McAVOY

A MODERN GNOMOLOGY

D. M. Searby: *Aristotle in the Greek Gnomological Tradition* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis: Studia Graeca Upsaliensia, 19.) Pp. 314. Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 91-554-4167-X.

This is the published version of S.'s Ph.D. thesis and, as such, retains many characteristics of the genre: it is intended for a learned readership, and it displays, rather than disguises, the amount of research on which it is based. S. says in the preface: 'The present study aims, to some extent at least, to fill the gap in Düring's work (*Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition* [Göteborg, 1957])' and 'my primary aim has been to make a systematic collection of all the known sayings linked with Aristotle in the Greek gnomological sources, a project that has not been previously attempted' (p. 11).

The first four chapters introduce the collection. S. begins by defining some central terms such as *gnome*, apophthegm, and *chreia*. Though this is never explicitly acknowledged, S.'s definitions do not reflect ancient usage, but are rather a guide to S.'s ownstricter employment of the ancient terms. He then attempts to define which sources belong to the Greek gnomological tradition: since the criteria for inclusion are necessarily arbitrary, S.'s claim to completeness (cf. p. 11, quoted above) loses some of its force. In Chapter III, S. discusses the selected sources and tries to establish their

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interdependence almost entirely on the basis of their treatment of Aristotle, although he is only one of the many wise men to whom the collected maxims are attributed. Chapter IV focuses on Aristotle in the gnomological tradition. Here S. draws our attention to the fact that Stobaeus includes in his anthology nine maxims by authors other than Aristotle, but claims that they come ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Χρειῶν. S. explains this strange occurrence by postulating the existence of a collection of maxims that was, as a collection, attributed to Aristotle. (An alternative explanation was proposed by Hense, who suggested that the sayings of Aristotle may have headed a collection arranged alphabetically, and that, as a result, the collection as a whole was at some point called the *Chreiae of Aristotle*. S. praises this explanation at pp. 79–80, but proceeds to ignore it.) Armed with his own theory about the *Chreiae of Aristotle*, S. then tackles the problem of double attribution. The majority of the maxims attributed to Aristotle are also attributed to other wise men within the gnomological tradition, and S. argues that the maxims collected in the *Chreiae of Aristotle* may have been attributed to Aristotle by mistake. In fact, S.'s only contribution to the interesting feature of double attribution is an appeal to his theory concerning the nature of the *Chreiae of Aristotle*.

Pp. 97–139 are devoted to the collection and edition of the maxims linked to Aristotle. The texts are not organized by theme, but according to the source in which they appear. The typography is accurate, the apparatus and the list of parallels very helpful.

A translation and commentary on the individual sayings follow at pp. 143–264. Thetranslations are admirable, especially given the difficulty of rendering the morecompressed and idiomatic *gnomai*. The commentary focuses on the sayings' attribution to Aristotle and their possible resemblance to extant Aristotelian works. Every time a saying is deemed less 'appropriate' to Aristotle than to a rival author (the criteria for appropriateness are never defined), S. suggests that it originally belonged to the *Chreiae of Aristotle*. In the commentary too the editing is admirable, although Pindar's First *Olympian* does become his first *Olynthian* at p. 146.

The commentary is supplemented by a series of notes on individual themes explored in the maxims, such as education, beauty, and old age (pp. 264–77). These notes are designed to explore some thematic connections that S.'s arrangement by source may otherwise obscure.

The weaknesses of the book can be seen as deriving from a mismatch between S.'sproject and the nature of the gnomological tradition. S.'s work stems from the desire to complete earlier collections of texts attributed to Aristotle. The concept of *oeuvre* thus lies at the heart of S.'s work, whereas it is alien to the gnomological tradition. While multiple attributions unsettle S., they are a standard feature of the gnomological tradition, and often speak of the different contexts in which a maxim may be used. For example, S.'s maxim 15, 'Education's roots are bitter, but its fruit issweet', is attributed either to Aristotle or to Demosthenes. Now, in a general discussion about education, the attribution to Aristotle would be quite effective, but a schoolteacher exhorting his pupils to memorize a speech by Demosthenes may find it expedient to attribute the maxim to him. More generally, Aristotle's great authority and the broadness of the subjects discussed in his works must have acted as magnets attracting maxims otherwise attached to less well-known authors. This fact alone may account for the high proportion of double attributions in the collection, without any appeal to the mysterious *Chreiae*.

Despite its shortcomings, S.'s book should be welcomed as a useful and learned collection of important material concerning the reception of Aristotle. In S.'s sources,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Aristotle does not emerge as a well-defined character, such as the greedy Simonides or the absent-minded Thales, but remains powerfully and simply ὁ φιλόσοφος.

Magdalene College, Cambridge BARBARA GRAZIOSI

THE PHILOSOPHER AND POLITICS

P. SCHOLZ: *Der Philosoph und die Politik. Die Ausbildung der philosophischen Lebensform und die Entwicklung des Verhältnisses von Philosophie und Politik im 4. und 3. Jh. v. Chr*. Pp. x + 434. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998. DM 136. ISBN: 3-515-07054-0.

This book is derived from a dissertation presented at Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main in 1996, and shows the strengths and weaknesses of its origin. It treats the rise and development of the philosophical lifestyle, as distinct from the political life, in the fourth century and the early Hellenistic period. Socrates is covered as the originator of a distinct philosophical lifestyle, but S. does not consider the sophists.

S. is thorough in his coverage of evidence on the philosophers, but is not so strong in his knowledge of the political background to the events he treats. He can also generalize his conclusions more than is wise. He makes an interesting case that philosophers tended to be metics rather than citizens, and their lifestyle was that of outsiders. But he does not really discuss that the founders of the philosophic lifestyle, Socrates and Plato, were citizens voluntarily adopting the rôle of outsiders. S. cites a passage of Teles *On Exile* to support his views, but fails to recognize that the examples Teles uses are all political exiles, not philosophers.

S. argues that Plato, although remaining outside the political life of Athens, saw himself as primarily a political reformer, whose work would be applied to everyday politics by his pupils, who would adapt his teaching to improve the nature of their owncommunities. He quotes passages of the *Republic* which support such a view, butignores Plato's progression to the position that the ideal state may exist only inthemind of men (R. C. Cross & A. D. Woozley, *Plato's Republic: A Philosophical Commentary* [London, 1964], p. 199). S. makes an interesting argument that the change between the rule of the philosopher-king in the *Republic* and that of the laws in the *Laws* is due to Plato's experience in Sicily, citing *Ep*. 7.334 as the first instance of the change. But S., like Plato, does not consider the extent of Dion's failure in Sicily or the involvement of other members of the Academy in that failure. S. also cites the fact that the Eleian constitutional reformer Phormion was a companion of Plato's as proof of Plato's effect on practical politics. The evidence that Phormion was a radical democrat is cited in a footnote (158 on p. 119), but its significance is not discussed.

Aristotle is seen as making a move away from the Platonic association with practical reform: S. argues that Aristotle saw himself as an advisor to practical politicians, rather than an initiator of political reform. However, one of S.'s strongest pieces of evidence, Philip's abandonment of a seige of Eresos at Aristotle's request, has no clear historical context. Since an alternate version (also cited by Rose in fr. 655) refers to an unspecified wrong to Eresos contemplated by Alexander, S. should have considered whether this was the better tradition.

The writings on kingship by Aristole's pupil Theophrastus should not be seen as a closer relationship with political leaders. S. argues that Theophrastus' disapproval of

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Alexander's execution of Callisthenes means that he wrote on ideal kinghip, not on the illegitimate kingship of Alexander and his successors.

The Epicureans mark a further step away from involvement in political life, beginning a process of emancipation of the philosopher from the political sphere. However, S. argues that we should see the Epicureans, not as apolitical, but as conducting an 'Antipolitik'. S. cites the evidence for the connection of Epicureans, such as Metrodoros, with the kings of their time, but shows that the Epicureans wished to live their own lifestyle as philosophers, increasing their distance from the community in which they lived, rather than seeking to determine the politics of the outside world.

S. argues that the Stoics should be seen as making an even stronger break from the political world around them, and turning the lifestyle of the philosopher to that of a teacher of morals and not of the conduct of political life. He thinks that works on kingship were not of great importance to the Stoics and that most of our evidence on the association of Stoics with kings comes from the *Sympotic Memoirs* of Persaeus, and may be unreliable. However, we should note that Persaeus' own connection withroyalty is well attested: he was Antigonus Gonatas' governor of the Acrocorinth in 243 B.C.

S. argues that fewer philosophers were associates of kings than later hagiographical tradition would have us believe. This scepticism is welcome, but should perhaps also have been applied to some of the evidence on Plato's involvement with the outside world. S. has also left off his list Menedemus of Eretria, the associate of Antigonus Gonatas in his youth, and mentions Demetrius of Phaleron only as Cassander's governor of Athens and not at the court of Ptolemy I, where his support for the unsuccessful heir proved fatal to the philosopher. This book is stimulating and thought-provoking, although I believe that its conclusions will not meet with universal acceptance. It will be of greater value to the student of philosophy than the historian, understandably in view of its chosen focus, but can be read with profit by both.

University of Sydney JAMES O'NEIL

PLOTINUS

L. P. GERSON (ed.): *The Cambridge Companion to Plotinus*. Pp. xiii + 462. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. Cased, £40/$59.95 (Paper, £14.95/$18.95). ISBN: 0-521-47093-5 (0-521-47676-3 pbk).

L. P. GERSON: *Plotinus* (Arguments of the Philosophers). Pp. xiii + 338. London: Routledge, 1998 (first published 1994). Paper, £16.99. ISBN: 0-415-17409-0.

The recent outpouring of English language scholarship on Plotinus continues unabated. Specialized commentaries on individual tracts of the Enneads (Atkinson on Volume I [Oxford, 1983] and more recently Fleet on III.6 [Oxford, 1995]) have given way to more general works such as O'Meara's *Introduction to the Enneads* (Oxford, 1993) and L. P. Gerson's monograph on Plotinus (see below). With MacKenna's masterful translation now available in Penguin (abridged by J. Dillon), it now seems an opportune time for CUP to include Plotinus in its Companion series.

Gerson, the editor of the *Companion*, acknowledges that Plotinus (P.) must be understood in the context of a long and weighty philosophical tradition, and

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

structures the sixteen contributions to that end. We are given first, by the editor, a brief context for and outline of P.'s philosophy. The first essay, by M. L. Gatti, expands on P.'s place in the philosophical tradition and shows that he was as much an innovator as an exegete of Plato. The following three essays (Bussanich, O'Meara, and Blumenthal) attempt to present a coherent picture of the metaphysical structure of his world and our place in it. The next six essays (Corrigan, Wagner, O'Brien, Smith, Emilsson, and Rappe) focus on specific philosophical problems which emerge from his metaphysics. There follow three essays (Clark, Leroux, and Dillon) which concern themselves more with our ontological status as human beings and how we might be expected to live in P.'s world. To non-specialists this will probably be the most interesting part of the book. One essay (Schroeder) is devoted to P.'s use of language, before the collection terminates with two final essays (D'Ancona Costa and Rist) which attempt to assess the later history of Neoplatonism and its clash with Christianity. Overall, the scope of the volume is impressive, beginning as it does with P.'s philosophical sources and concluding with P.'s influence on Augustine. Yet the reader should not be misled; most of the book is devoted to explaining what exactly it is that Plotinus is saying in the *Enneads*.

Every complex topic presents its own special difficulties when one tries to give a somewhat simple view of it. P. is no exception. Apart from linguistic difficulties, his Greek is notoriously difficult; there is also the problem of finding a consistent point of view on any particular topic. A. H. Armstrong pointed to the 'tensions' in P.'s thought, while S. MacKenna, according to E. R. Dodds, was blunter when he wondered 'how much of the obscurity in the *Enneads* was due to the subtlety of the thought and how much to the general human idiocy from which philosophers are not immune'. All the more difficult then for a team of specialist scholars to keep the arguments simple and clear. By and large they are successful. In most cases the topics assigned to each of the specialists is in an area that they have worked on for a number of years. The reader thus benefits in that s/he receives heavily considered opinions on various aspects of P.'s philosophy.

This is particularly true of essays two to four, where P.'s metaphysics is examined. A description of the One, Intellect, and Soul is presented and the derivation of Intellect and Soul from the One is assessed. Blumenthal's essay on Soul and Intellect is particularly lucid and thus very helpful for the beginner. It should also be noted that in general the contributors quote reasonable amounts of the text, which gives the reader an opportunity to assess the strength of the arguments presented. Bussanich in particular, in his essay on the One, allows the reader to witness the sometimes forced exegesis necessary to allow P. to maintain a consistent argument. The order of these three essays is also clever, in that O'Meara and Blumenthal's essays complement well Bussanich's account of the One, in that they focus on what the One produces.

The next six essays examine specific issues in the *Enneads*. The essays by Corrigan on 'Essence and Existence', Wagner on 'The Nature of Physical Reality', Smith on 'Eternity and Time', Emilsson on 'Cognition and its Object', and Rappe on 'Self-knowledge and Subjectivity' are well written but perhaps over-detailed for a book of this sort. O'Brien is an exception here in that his essay seems to me, at least, to be pitched at just the right level. His account of 'Matter and Evil' displays a long acquaintance with this topic, and the reader benefits from a clear and lucid consideration of the evidence.

The next three essays, by Clark, Leroux, and Dillon, focus on the position of the human being in the philosophy of the *Enneads*. Clark discusses the technical aspects of the relationship between body and soul. In an interesting discussion, he attempts to

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

isolate what we are and how we are related to body. He does give due attention to the idea of a guiding 'daimon', a much neglected topic in most work on P., but does not, in my opinion, treat sufficiently the area of human consciousness. We exist at whatever conscious level we choose to operate on. Leroux's essay ties in well with this topic, in that it is concerned with just this idea: how free are we? How free is our actual descent into body? Leroux rightly notes that this is a problem inherited from Plato, made more difficult by the addition of vocabulary from Aristotle's *Ethics*, such as voluntary and involuntary, willed and not willed. Interesting material indeed. This is valuable background for Dillon's critique of P.'s ethical theory, a stimulating essay on a much neglected aspect of P.'s philosophy. Dillon makes many valuable points, but fails in my view to reconcile the ethical theory that one finds in the *Enneads* with that practised by P. We have a vivid description of the way P. acted from Porphyry's 'Life of Plotinus', but this *modus vivendi* does not tally with the prescriptions in the *Enneads*. If the main task of the philosopher is to return to the One, why should s/he bother with anyone else? Yet P. certainly did.

The final two essays look at P.'s impact on later philosophy and the subsequent development of Neoplatonic thought. D'Ancona Costa pursues a narrower focus than Rist when she examines later problems associated with the causality of the First Principle. Proclus is her main interest here. Rist's essay roams further afield as he presents a masterful survey of P.'s influence on later Christian thinkers. Interestingly enough he concludes that the specific influence of P. on Greek Christian thought down to the late fourth century was rather limited. This changed, however, with the arrival of Augustine, a figure that Rist has recently written about at some length (*Augustine: Ancient Thought Baptized* [Cambridge, 1994]). Augustine's sources for Neoplatonism and its subsequent impact on his thinking are clearly presented.

On the *Companion*, then, I finish on a note I sounded earlier—that is, that its strength lies in the fact that the contributors are specialists who are able to clarify the main problems and present the issues in a clear manner. On a critical note, I am uncertain what 'unwritten writings' means on p. 24 and I noticed misprints on pp. 98, 254, 275, 286, 300, and 396.

In contrast to the *Companion*, Gerson's *Plotinus* in the Arguments of the Philosophers Series is definitely not for the beginner. G. admits (p. 225) 'that this is a difficult book' and sensibly tries to apportion some of the blame for this to P. He failsto make clear where he contributes to this difficulty himself. In my opinion, it liesin his use of an unnecessarily wide range of difficult vocabulary. 'Asymptotically' (p. 201) was one of a number of words that drove me to a dictionary. This serves onlyto obscure P.'s already tangled thought. That aside, the reader of this book will besuitably rewarded. G. presents a very stimulating analysis of P.'s philosophy, supporting his arguments with substantial notes. These are conveniently located at the end of the book (pp. 227–93), which helps preserve the fluency of the text itself.

The book is divided into two parts. The first generally concerns itself with the structure of P.'s metaphysical hierarchy, while the second part focuses on the place of the human being in that structure. This book on P. is not a systematic treatment of the usual kind, but rather a selection of particular topics thoroughly discussed. G.'s stated objective has been to focus on the philosophy of P., and as a result the book presents a series of highly specialized essays concentrating on what he considers are the most philosophically significant arguments. By his own admission he has omitted the more exotic areas in the *Enneads*, but in a series entitled *Arguments of the Philosophers* this is a reasonable approach. The result is a fairly eclectic study of P., and anyone looking

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for a general appraisal of the life and work of the man from Lycopolis should look elsewhere.

Having chosen his parameters, G. delivers a heavily considered view of the important philosophical issues at the heart of the *Enneads*. Although he acknowledges that P.is primarily a Platonist and not simply an anti-Aristotelian, he suggests that much can be gained from reading the *Enneads* as 'a paradigm of anti-Aristotelianism' (p.225), and thus he explores P.'s philosophy as Platonism reconstructed in the light of Aristotelian critique. G. suggests that P.'s very originality lies in this reconstruction of Plato in the face of criticism from other philosophical schools. Chief amongst the critics was Aristotle, and G. believes P.'s school studied the commentaries on Aristotle in part for what they could tell him about Plato. What is beyond doubt is that even though P. sought to interpret Plato in the light of Aristotelian criticism, he had no compunction in using Aristotelian ideas to help structure that revision. Because G. believes that P. was helped in his understanding of Plato through the criticisms of Aristotle, in many instances his methodology consists in beginning with an assessment of P.'s response to Aristotle's critique of Plato.

Because of its subject matter, essentially the three hypostases, the first part of the book is reasonably technical and the non-specialist will probably find the second half of the book more accessible. In this second section G. tries to establish the place and rôle of the human being in P.'s ontology. The technical vocabulary in this section might be less daunting, but G. demonstrates that it is still quite difficult at times to establish with certainty P.'s position regarding the endowed self. The strength of this book lies in G.'s insistence on the necessity of understanding P.'s place in his philosophical tradition, but, for the general reader, this is also its weakness.

National University of Ireland, Maynooth KIERAN McGROARTY

MAGIC

J. Rabinowitz: *The Rotting Goddess: The Origin of the Witch in Classical Antiquity's Demonization of Fertility Religion*. Pp. 153. New York: Autonomedia, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 1-57027-035-X.

F. Graf: *Magic in the Ancient World*. Pp. vi + 313. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: Harvard University Press, 1998 (first published 1994 as *Idéologie et pratique de la magie dans l'antiquité gréco-romaine*). Cased, £23.50. ISBN: 0-674-54151-0.

The biggest puzzle of R.'s book is the identity of the audience to which it is aimed. There is a vaguely New Age appeal in the terminology used—'agricultural Great Mother', 'fertility goddess', 'universal tree'—as well as in the dedicatory poem to Hekate, but there are also academic pretensions in the pursuit of an argument ofkinds, as well as in the authority-claiming (but cavalier) dismissal of previous scholarship in the introduction (pp. 13–14). The book's main plot is the 'degeneration' of the fragrant figure of Hekate into the 'rotted goddess who is the Graeco-Roman witch' (p. 107). This 'degenerate' or 'demonized' image is rooted in aconflict between 'indigenous-Mediterranean and Indo-Aryan invader cultures' (p.116). Besides the difficulties raised by an uncritical use of such outdated theories of cultural change and oppositions, the argument is problematic at every turn. In

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

brief, failure to define the terms used results in a misleadingly selective genealogy of exclusively female witches, while there is no proper discussion of the different sources and the ways in which one might read them. Clumsy 'turning points' are introduced, such as a particular fascination with witchcraft in the second to fourth centuries C.E., due to an atmosphere of *fin de siècle* doom and 'religious dissatisfaction' (p. 107): once again, no account seems to have been taken of even comparatively recent modern scholarship. What exactly the frequent juxtaposition of Hekate with Voodoo and Native American traditions is supposed to show, other than something misguided about the universalism of 'primitive' religion, is unclear. 'Arguments' such as these are set against allegations of classicists' conspiracies of which I am not aware. All in all, this is a deeply unsatisfactory book on any level. Problems are compounded by an extraordinarily gappy bibliography, by spelling mistakes, and pretentious neologisms and language use (references to 'interpretation Graeca' [*sic*, p. 43], 'cultus' [e.g. p. 5], and 'noxiousities' [p. 7] are among the most irritating).

Both the general reader and the informed ancient historian should instead go straight to G.'s book for its careful methodology and extremely interesting material. The English translation will be especially helpful for the general reader or university student: one would expect a particularly high readership in the USA, where a recent history of pioneering research has made the study of Graeco-Roman magic a mainstream activity. Framed by a brief but useful introduction to evidence and approaches, and a conclusion summarizing the problems of characterizing magic in the Graeco-Roman world, the middle five chapters take a thematic approach to the ancient evidence. Chapter II is an examination of ancient terminology and a discussion based on these findings of definitions within the specific terms of individual societies of the Graeco-Roman world. Chapters III and VI are largely based on casestudies: Apuleius' *Apologia* is the primary basis of the former, which looks atwhat is supposed to constitute magic in this instance; the basis of Chapter VI is Theocritus' *Idyll* 2 and Lucan's portrayal of Erictho in his *Pharsalia*, and the problem of the relationship between literary treatments and 'reality' as represented by epigraphical evidence. Chapters IV and V are based thematically on aspects of the practice of magic: initiation rituals in the former, and the motif of 'binding' in the latter. Throughout, G. emphasizes the difficulty of making any clear and rigid distinction between magic and religion, and some problems are therefore inherent in a work that has taken 'magic' as its subject. It is in general desperately hard, and perhapsultimately misguided, to pin down 'magic', and, despite the admirable sense of control that G. exercises over his material, it is revealing that undertaking broad studies of Graeco-Roman magic with a vast geographical and chronological scope does not occasion the same reluctance amongst scholars that such a study of Graeco-Roman religion probably would, and certainly should. In fact, G. hints tantalizingly at what could be another book entirely: a later history of the construction of the notion of ancient magic as a unified entity, and one that is so frequently challenged by the ancient evidence. The case of Albert Dieterich, the Heidelberg professor who, in 1905, felt constrained to publicize his seminar on the magical papyri under the anodyne title of 'Selection of Greek papyri' (p. 11), hints at some of the processes that contributed to the modern creation of a now huge category of magic to catch everything that fell foul of perceptions of what 'religion'—or, indeed, 'classical culture'—should contain. When there are no satisfactory unifying modern definitions of magic, and when ancient definitions are so slippery and tightly sociospecific, it is perhaps time to integrate fully the study of magic with that of religion, and to think more holistically when we undertake individual case studies of Graeco-Roman religion.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Birkbeck College, London EMMA DENCH

ROMAN RELIGION

M. Beard, J. North, S. Price: *Religions of Rome* (Vol. I: *A History*. Vol. II: *A Sourcebook*). Pp. xxiv + 454, 8 ills; xiv + 416. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Paper, £15.95 each (Cased, £45). ISBN: Vol.1: 0-521-31682-0; Vol. II: 0-521-45646-0.

A modern survey of Roman religion at a level accessible to undergraduates has long been needed, and these two books will undoubtedly receive a warm welcome. Readers at all levels will find them stimulating and easy to use. In Volume I, the History, previous scholarship is surveyed succinctly, new ideas are put forward in many areas, and the source material (both literary and archaeological) is analysed carefully. Christianization is treated as another stage in Rome's religious history rather than as an isolated phenomenon. By beginning with a Christian complaint against the celebration of the Lupercalia in A.D. 495, the authors neatly illustrate the extraordinary amount of continuity in some Roman festivals.

The arrangement of the chapters is basically chronological, with the first to third centuries A.D. subdivided thematically. Chapter I, 'Early Rome', addresses the problem of reconstructing the religious history of a period for which there are no contemporary written sources. The theories of some of the great names of the field (Warde Fowler, Dumézil) are debunked. The authors suggest the existence from a very early date of a system in which the political and the religious were not differentiated (much later, Jesus's distinction between 'God's' and 'Caesar's' was startling to Roman ears), and with little scope for individual religious choice beyond emphasizing some deities more than others. Humans communicated with the gods by interpreting signs and by making ritualized exchanges, not by direct contact. They hoped to make the gods benevolent, but could not oblige them to be so.

Chapter II looks at the third and second centuries B.C. During Rome's expansion, religion helped the acculturation of its new citizens. Religious experimentation in the third century may have been followed by a degree of hellenophobia in the second, although towards the end of the century new temples were being built under strong Greek influence. The Romans perhaps got more than they bargained for when they brought the cult of Cybele from Phrygia. The puzzling suppression of the Bacchanalia in 186 is seen as action against a cult which had previously been tolerated but was ultimately felt to be unacceptable because of the threat it posed to the social structure, particularly to the family. The same considerations may have led to the attacks on the Isis cult in the first century. Official priesthoods were monopolized by the élite families, and shared among them by unwritten rules. Religious controversies could therefore easily overlap with political ones, something which became even more the case in the period of the late Republic discussed in Chapter III. This could be represented by Augustus and his spokesmen as leading to religious and then political failure, but the authors stress instead the consensus concerning religious ideology: no public figure is recorded as openly rejecting the traditional religious system. Julius Caesar's deification can be seen as placing him at one extreme of the continuous spectrum between the human and divine which was always felt to exist in the case of the dead.

Chapter IV, 'The Place of Religion: Rome in the Early Empire', looks at the time of

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Augustus. One notable feature was the transfer of the private cults of Augustus and his family into the public domain. At the same time, some aspects of public religion were relocated on the fringes of his private world: his residence on the Palatine was part of the same complex as the shrine of Vesta and temple of Apollo. The imperial family also took over the construction of temples in Rome, something which enabled women to become patrons of religious building for the first time.

In Chapter V, 'The Boundaries of Roman Religion', there is a careful analysis of the difference between *religio* (good) and *superstitio* (bad); the two categories did not have a universal or permanent definition, and *superstitio* was not necessarily false but could sometimes be powerful and threatening. The system was not as tolerant as is often claimed, and there was no belief in religious liberty as such. Some religious activities existed on the fringe of the acceptable; others, such as Christianity, were defined as clearly beyond it. Ironically, Christianity eventually reversed the definitions and turned traditional practice into *superstitio*.

Chapter VI concentrates on the religions of the city of Rome. The authors reject the term 'oriental religions' because it implies a nonexistent homogeneity among a group of cults of different backgrounds and different degrees of actual foreignness. The cults of the deified emperors were as important as the worship of Mithras and Isis, at leastin terms of the effect they had on Rome's architectural appearance. Mithraism was, in any case, not so much a genuine oriental religion as a western construct, as hasbeen maintained by Gordon and Beck in many recent publications. Modern reconstructions of Isis temples may have given them a much more 'Egyptian' style than they ever had in reality. Commendable scepticism is expressed about assuming that the cults were dominated by easterners and their descendants simply on the basis of worshippers' names. Some attention is paid to the rôle of women in the cults, and it is argued that they were not as prominent as contemporary literature claimed they were—a claim based partly on misogynistic assumptions and partly on the fact that upper-class women were more likely than upper-class men to become involved. It is correctly stated on p. 71 that 'the presence of separate groups of women in festivals, normal practice in Greek civic festivals, seems not to have been the normal Roman way at any date'. This does, however, ignore the worship of Bona Dea, a state-sponsored women-only cult which receives very little attention anywhere in the book.

One possible complaint about this section is the relative lack of attention to Judaism and the dubious validity of some of the statements made about it. It was the religion of perhaps as much as five per cent of the population of the city of Rome, and the remark on p. 266 that the Jewish community numbered 'several thousand' in the Augustan period is a gross understatement on even the most conservative estimate. The suggestion (p. 269) that seven of the known synagogues were probably in Trastevere has no basis beyond general probability. A throwaway remark on p. 270 that catacombs were first developed by 'ordinary Romans' in the second century A.D. and then taken over by Christians (and presumably Jews) is not substantiated by any evidence, and contradicts the more plausible view that the catacombs began as an equivalent of columbaria for people who had religious objections to cremation. The Jews of Rome were not 'seen primarily as an ethnic group' (p. 272), but were very much identified by the state as a religious group.

Chapter VII looks at the impact of Roman religion in the provinces. The authors emphasize that the imperial cult operated differently in different places, although the traditional distinction between East and West may be less important than that between communities of different statuses. The rôle of the *Augustales* also varied from place to place, and was not necessarily bound up with the imperial cult. The

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

establishment of Roman *coloniae* and *municipia* was in itself another force for religious transfomation, as were the army, and the local élites which deliberately adopted Roman rites. Conversely, Roman religion was sometimes seen by rebels (no doubt correctly) as one of the tools of Roman imperialism.

Chapter VIII surveys the fourth and fifth centuries. Constantine recognized the advantages of harnessing the church to the state, and the concomitant requirement for uniformity among Christians. At Rome, church-building gave the non-imperial élite a rôle in religious patronage which they had been denied since temple-building became the preserve of the imperial house. In the fourth century, male aristocrats began to take a prominent part in the cults of Isis and Mithras for the first time, apparently assimilating them to the more traditional cults. Many people who became Christian did not feel obliged to give up pagan religious practices altogether. Rome's religious heritage was too fundamental a part of Roman identity to be discarded easily.

Volume II, the Sourcebook, has the potential to be used independently, since it has a different structure (synchronic rather than diachronic) and gives summaries of the main arguments, but most people will use it in conjunction with Volume I, which is comprehensively cross-referenced to it. An obvious advantage over most classical sourcebooks is the authors' recognition that sources are not all written texts. There are numerous plans of buildings and illustrations of artefacts, usually with very helpful labels. Inscriptions and papyri are also used, as well as Jewish and Christian writings. Each entry has an introduction and bibliography, along with explanatory notes when necessary. There are frequent reminders that the literature, while giving much information about the religious practices and ideas of the élite, is fairly uninformative about how the masses felt. The volume is completed by a glossary of Latin technical terms. A total of seventy pages of bibliography provides ample material for those encouraged to take the subject further, as most readers surely will be.

University of Wales, Lampeter DAVID NOY

TETHERED GODS

V. ROSENBERGER: *Gezähmte Götter. Der Prodigienwesen der römischen Republik*. Pp. 287. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998. Paper, DM 68. ISBN: 3-515-07199-7.

The title is a whimsical veil drawn over a thoroughly researched monograph on the nature of prodigies and techniques of divination in the Roman Republic. Ranging beyond the geographic and chronological limits of the subtitle, it is especially useful to generalists concerned with mankind's ubiquitous preoccupation with the supra-rational (or irrational).

With sound grasp of the immense amount of published research, Rosenberger systematically presents the Romans' well-known beliefs and reactions to prodigies.

The first chapter, 'Dealing with Prodigies: Mentalities and Control', is a succinct, methodological summary of Rome's unique vision of otherworldly powers, the exclusive supporters of the state. The alleged signs, *prodigia*, *portenta*, and *auspicia*, appear as forewarnings; the rituals aim to appease divinities and move them to cooperate, and supposedly sustain or retrieve the community's existing *status quo*. Without chasing modern fads, R. uses ancient and modern models, anthropological observations, and sociological and psychological speculations to illustrate and discuss postulates for prodigies that could be interpreted according to individual needs,

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

prejudices, and aims. The prodigies were especially important when the Roman oligarchy's 'command mentality' accepted and controlled them as prognostications ofimpending crises, or personal gain. The Senate decided which signs were to be accepted; their significance and interpretation were left to members of the priestly colleges.

The Roman priests were members of the 'oligarchy', many of them ex-magistrates and senators. As guardians of the sacred books, they were in 'professional' contact with the gods, interpreted signs, and observed rites of expiation. As long as the senate and the priests controlled the politically expedient interpretation and expiation of signs—regardless of apparent doubt and rejection—the *res publica* flourished. R. chooses Cicero's well-known, tongue-in-cheek assertion of the signs' validity, the exigency of the institutionalized prodigy system, and Terentius Varro's indispensable classification of *theologia tripertita* to illustrate the individual Roman's 'mentality', that of the littérateur, the philosopher, and the official.

The following chapters deal with the signs' meaning, especially those that appeared to have disturbed the *pax deorum*, and the resultant anxiety or fear that these signs caused. The list of possibilities is enormous: natural disasters, military defeats, anxiety created by analogous phenomena that predicated war, breakdown in the natural order of reproduction, and, finally, warning signs, such as *ἀδύνατα*, and other marginal cases that extended beyond presumed limits of human understanding. Also, there are common parameters in the wide variety of propitiation rites, such as scapegoat rituals, exposition or immolation of images, and items recognized as prodigies, ritual meals, processions, games, etc. In each of these, certain constituent features were identical: sacrifice for one or more gods, ritual killing of young or mature animals and, on occasion, of humans. Nevertheless, moderation and control of overzealous excesses remained a characteristic of Roman rites. A listing of other common denominators follows: offerings, rather than sacrifices, to a god, or gods, public performance of rituals that supposedly restored the sacred boundaries' inviolability within and without Rome, and the separating line between men and gods. Observability of the rituals was an important element in retaining the Senate's control of the city, neighbors, allies, and foreigners alike. In a most interesting paragraph the author treats the socio-political implications of misfortune, and finishes with a brief survey of the women's status in the prodigy system.

The brief final chapter treats the origin and transformation of ideas, beliefs, and differences that might be observed in the thought processes, i.e. the 'mentalities', in Roman society through the last two centuries of the Republic. Throughout the Middle and the Late Republic, incorporation of new cults, trends of Hellenistic philosophy, and the resultant uncertainty and disbelief appeared to have diminished the oligarchy's interest in ancient cultic practices, which, nonetheless, with great practical mindedness they continued to maintain. By adhering to tradition, they strengthened and unified society, and expanded Rome's influence over the entire Mediterranean Basin. Regrettably, not unlike others who deal with the same topic, R. does not fully explain the uneducated masses 'mentalities', fears, anxieties, and beliefs that remained outside the pale of influential literati. He is content to show, however indirectly, that no disciplinary or ideological perspective, an all-too-common tendency to aggrandize one's specialty at the expense of others, could give satisfactory solutions to assumed and unsolvable problems. Apparently, observation, combined with reflection, will lead to the recognition that the universe must be the product of a greater intelligence than that of humans.

Inevitably, the reader will find in this tightly written, easily readable work points

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ofomissions and references touching on one's studies and preoccupations. To take a number of instances:

The refreshingly consistent adherence to *religio*, rather than the all-too-frequent substitutional term 'religion', could have been strengthened by a summary reflection on the term's significance, conveniently collected by A. Kirsopp Michels ('The Versatility of Religio', in T. E. W. Wind [ed.], *The Mediterranean World. Papers Presented in Honor of G. Bagnani* [Petersborough, Ontario, 1975], pp. 36–77, esp. pp.41ff.). A greater emphasis on historical perspectives could have eliminated small yet significant weaknesses. By necessity, most of the data come from an abundance of astonishing phenomena reported during the Second Punic War. In the procedures connected with expiations, R. properly emphasizes the division of responsibility between the senate and priestly groups. Nevertheless, such a strict separation is not as obvious as some of his *Gewährsleute* suggest.

In the deliberations and the decisions concerning *prodigia* the difference between the decision makers, interpreters of the signs, and performers of the rites of expiation were a mere technicality when the senators or magistrates were priests (*Hermes* 104 [1976], 58). Claudius Marcellus, for example, was consul five times, and member of the augural college; similarly, Fabius Maximus, twice dictator, consul five times, augur and pontifex, and, beside his other honors, *princeps senatus* in 209 and 204. It is inconceivable that they, and others, did not exercise extraordinary influence and swayed, or outright dominated, the senate in their deliberations and decisions.

The symbiotic relationship between annually changing magistracies and tenured lifelong priesthoods, two mutually beneficial, but technically different functions, easily suggests why the regulation of magistracies and the restriction of the priesthoods evolved simultaneously at the end of the third century with the *lex Metilia* of 217, the *lex Villia annalis*, that was probably in effect as early as 197.

Ultimately, Roman gods were not 'tethered'; rather, changing Roman 'mentalities' realigned them according to changing conditions. The system of prodigies continued. There was no *Untergang* in Roman cultic practices in the outgoing Republic, as R. concludes correctly. Whoever governed, sustained continuity; change occurred only in the evolving political system.

Lake Bluff, IL G. J. SZEMLER

CHRISTIAN MYSTERIES

J. Alvar, J. M. Blázquez, S. F. Ardanaz, G. L. Monteagudo, A. Lozano, C. M. Maza, A. Piñero: *Cristianismo primitivo y religiones mistéricas* (Colección historia «serie mayor»). Pp. 546, ills. Madrid: Catedra, 1995. Paper. ISBN: 84-376-1346-9.

The church of the Virgin *Panaghia Speliotissa* in Athens occupied long-hallowed ground. Here Christians gathered to celebrate the religious festivals associated with the Mother of God. The church's walls openly displayed a number of carefully salvaged inscriptions whose deeply felt sentiments must have touched many who came to pray to Mary—even if their original dedicants had intended them for the Egyptian goddess Isis. A shrine to Isis had perhaps once stood nearby. Even demol-

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ished, it continued to offer devout Athenians the raw material (both architectural and theological) from which they could construct their understandings of the divine.

This striking example of the intimate relationship between an ancient mystery cult and late-antique Christianity helps frame the closing sections of *Cristianismo primitivo y religiones mistéricas* (p. 534). The authors of this final chapter (Clelia Martínez Maza and Jaime Alvar) are keen to emphasize the similarities and parallels between the ritual practices, the salvific theology, the religious vocabulary, and the festive calendars of Christianity and the principal ancient mystery cults (Demeter-Kore, Isis-Osiris, Adonis, Mithras, and Attis). This is an account whose themes of connection and assimilation are consciously aimed at displacing a more traditional version of the end of paganism first skilfully advocated by ecclesiastical historians in the fifth century A.D. These writers were keen to foster an image of a radically distinct and victorious Christianity whose difference was most dramatically displayed in the violent destruction of temples. But as Martínez Maza and Alvar set out to show, by explicitly placing Christianity in a wider religious context, it is possible to present a less clear-cut version of this loudly self-proclaimed triumph.

Like the *New Testament*, *Cristianismo primitivo* opens with a discussion of the Gospels. A series of compact and informative chapters—by José María Blázquez—follow. These clearly set out current scholarly thinking on an impressive range of subjects, including Judaism and the Essenes at Qumran (Chapter III), the relationship between Christianity and Judaism (Chapter XII), the historical Jesus (Chapter IV),the organization of early Christianity (Chapter V), Neoplatonism (Chapter XI), Christianity and the state in the fourth century (Chapter XV), Christianity and military service (Chapter XVIII), the *New Testament* canon (Chapter XIX), sacraments and liturgy (Chapter XX), and Christian sexual morality (Chapter XXIV). This orthodox series of chapters on the rise of Christianity is significantly interrupted by a discussion on Gnosticism (Chapter IX by Antonio Piñero), which helps to emphasize the fluidity of early Christian belief, by a perceptive account of early Christian art (Chapter XXVII by Guadalupe López Monteagudo), which shows how classically pagan much of its iconography remained, by a short series of exemplary introductory essays on mystery cults (Chapters XXIX–XXXII by Jaime Alvar), and by an elegant overview of the religious beliefs and practices of the Hellenistic and Roman cities of Asia Minor (Chapter VI by Arminda Lozano).

The last is an important contribution to this book. It demonstrates the vitality andvariety of urban-centred religion in the centuries after Christ and stresses the intimate link between religious practice and a city's own self-identity, in relation bothto other cities and to a far-distant emperor. A final section (pp. 149–55) on thefirst-century B.C. monuments of Antiochus I of Commagene at Nemrut Dag—which boldly combined elements from both Greek and Persian religion—offers a timely reminder that Roman emperors were not the only rulers in the Mediterranean world to take advantage of religion as a means of promoting their claims to divinely approved legitimacy.

The breaking of the long run of chapters by Blázquez on the inexorable rise of Christianity has an important effect on the overall shape of this book and its argument. Most significantly, the setting of Christianity in a wider religious context and the careful drawing of the close parallels and associations between Christianity and other contemporary beliefs makes it less easy to be satisfied with a version of its triumph which rests substantially on the moral inferiority or spiritual inadequacy of paganism. Such a crude distinction now seems more difficult to sustain. Apparently sensing such dissatisfaction, Blázquez—in his briefest and most interesting chapter,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'Causas del triunfo del cristanismo' (pp. 403–4)—strongly emphasizes both the solidarity which episcopal authority gave the church as an organization and the importance of imperial support (particularly the conversion of the emperor Constantine) as primary factors in Christianity's success. That attempt to move away from a principally 'religious explanation' for the rise of Christianity deserves to be noted—and applauded.

But (regrettably) there remain tenacious traces of an older dispensation. 'La religión pagana había entrado en una fase de decadencia y no satisfacía las necesidades espirituales de sus devotos' (p. 403). In this version, an effete upper-class, over-academic paganism, hidebound by repeated ritual, collapses against a vital andbroadly based Christianity. The battle is chiefly played out before emperors whoseattitude is seen as a significant register of Christianity's progress. Chapter XIV,for example, offers short consecutive sections on 'Política de intolerancia de Maximino Tracio', 'Tolerancia de los emperadores Gordiano III y Filipo el Árabe', 'La intolerancia de Decio', 'La legislación anticristiana de Valeriano', and so on (pp.261–3). Such a version of the third century would no doubt have delighted many Christian contemporaries of Constantine. Both Eusebius and Lactantius in their histories of the rise of Christianity were keen to emphasize its moral and philosophical superiority. Eusebius in his *Chronological Tables* sought to show that the Old Testament patriarchs clearly antedated both Plato and Socrates, who had merely plagiarized an older, superior wisdom. Both writers too stressed the importance of the connection between the Church and the state. The insistent theme of Lactantius' *On the Deaths of the Persecutors* was the ignominious fate suffered by those emperors who had rashly dared oppose Christianity.

It is easy to see why these issues might dominate in the decades following Constantine's promotion of Christianity. It is not so easy to see why these same concerns should necessarily be thought to be so pressing in the early church. There is an increasing awareness—as noted by Martínez Maza and Alvar (pp. 528–33)—that the history of Christianity in the fourth century A.D. needs to be carefully separated from the Catholic triumphalist narratives imposed upon it by fifth-century ecclesiastical historians. These writers must not be allowed to force a sense of closure on 'a wavering century'; to create the impression that the eventual dominance of particular beliefs and practices was inevitable or divinely ordained. That should give long pause for thought for those seeking to understand the history of early Christianity. It may be that, in writing about the Church in the first three centuries after Christ, a similar care needs to be exercised in distinguishing contemporary priorities and uncertainties from the convictions and suffocating enthusiasms of those Christian historians writing after the conversion of Constantine.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge CHRISTOPHER KELLY

VIRGINS OF GOD

S. ELM: *'Virgins of God'. The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity.* Pp. xvii + 444. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994. ISBN: 0-19-814920-4.

In this fine study, Susanna Elm aims to chart the early evolution of ascetic practices in the fourth-century East. In doing so, she is concerned to travel back beyond the normative rules and institutions that became established during the second half of the fourth century, to the earlier and more fluid phases of ascetic experimentation

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

whose traces can still be discerned. The vehicle she uses for this journey is the investigation of female asceticism, pursued along parallel trajectories in two key regions—Asia Minor and Egypt. The result is a stimulating exposition which negotiates the complexities of the source materials and subject matter with skill and assurance.

The introduction sets out important contextual data for what follows, not merelyabout the geography, economy, and society of Asia Minor and Egypt, but more importantly about the historiography of the subject and the methodological issues itraises, the discussion of which is intelligent and sophisticated. Weber's ideas on institutionalization are singled out for special attention. It is only a pity that thebody of the study contains so little in the way of explicit reference back to this discussion.

The six chapters of Part I focus on Asia Minor and show how the common image of Basil of Caesarea as the founder of Anatolian monasticism requires significant revision. Through careful probing into a wide range of sources, a rich diversity ofmodels for the practice of female asceticism is delineated in Asia Minor during thecentury or more before Basil's impact made itself felt. One finds examples of women living alone, like the virgin Juliana, who sheltered Origen in Cappadocian Caesarea during a period of persecution in the 230s; some pursuing an ascetic lifestyle in the context of their natural family, as Basil's own sister Macrina did; others formingsmall communities, such as the virgins martyred by Maximinus Daia at Ancyra in the early fourth century; still others entering into 'spiritual marriages' wherethey shared living quarters with male ascetics (an arrangement condemned bythe Council of Ancyra in 314, but one whose mutual advantages ensured its continuing attractiveness [pp. 162–4]); and even instances of holy women who seemed intent onflouting social boundaries completely, like the unnamed wandering prophetess whose presence in Cappadocia is reported in the 230s. In due course, someof these models became casualties of doctrinal controversies, particularly thoseassociated with 'Arianism', and were designated as heretical, while those that were not were gradually institutionalized and brought under ecclesiastical control. The key figure in this process was Basil, who emerges here as 'the first great reformer of communal ascetic life' (p. 211), seeking to ' "domesticate" former enthusiasts' (p.220). These chapters make for interesting reading alongside the relevant portions of two other important books published at about the same time—Stephen Mitchell's *Anatolia*(Oxford, 1993), Chapter XVIII.1, and Philip Rousseau's *Basil of Caesarea* (Berkeley,1994), Chapters III and VI; neither focuses specifically on female asceticism, but their independent conclusions are broadly similar to E.'s, although M. is, of necessity, much briefer, while R. understandably approaches the subject from quite a different angle.

In the five chapters of Part II, the focus shifts to Egypt, where a diversity of models can also be delineated: 'Women are mentioned as practising ascetic life in villages andin the desert, alone, with their mothers, as partners in a *mariage blanc*, in communities, as anchorites, and as wandering ascetics' (p. 330). Once again, however, the vicissitudes of theological conflict led ecclesiastical authorities to condemn some practices and to encourage the institutionalization of others. The result was that 'variety was slowly limited, while the broader concepts of individual perfection tightened into far more stringent views of Christian community and the rôle of men and women within it' (p. 384). All this provides a welcome nuancing of the traditional emphasis on the two basic models of asceticism represented by Antony and Pachomius.

Throughout these later chapters, there is regular cross-referencing back to Part I,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sometimes highlighting differences, but more often emphasizing similarities. Of the two parts, I found Part I on Asia Minor had the greater cohesion, whereas Part II seemed to lose momentum in its earlier stages, though this may reflect the more intractable nature of the source materials discussed there. Certainly, one of the manystrengths of the study is E.'s exploitation of little-known sources such as an anonymous treatise *On Virginity* (pp. 34–9) and Athanasius' *Letter to the Virgins Who Went to Jerusalem* (pp. 331–6). On the other hand, the book's origins in a doctoral dissertation are still apparent in the unnecessarily heavy annotation which sometimes clogs the footnotes. This is a minor irritant, however, in the overall context of the achievement of this book, perhaps best summed up in terms of its restoring an awareness of possibilities and of what might have been—the 'experimental vigour' (p.372) of early asceticism—and of its elucidating the causal links between the doctrinal disagreements of the fourth century and the 'narrowing down' of those possibilities.

University of Wales, Lampeter A. D. LEE

LENTEN FARE

V. E. Grimm: *From Feasting to Fasting, the Evolution of a Sin: Attitudes to Food in Late Antiquity*. Pp. x + 294. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-415-13595-8.

'Since starvation is universally dreaded, the spectacle of self-imposed starvation usually strikes the beholder with awe. This fact was well recognized and exploited by the tellers of these miraculous tales, as it is still recognized by those who resort to hunger strikes as political [*sic*] weapon' (p. 160). Grimm's observation on Jerome's more extreme and possibly fictional ascetics identifies the power that can be deployed by fasting, as was shown in Maud Ellmann's study of anorexia, the IRA hunger strikers, and Richardson's *Clarissa* (*The Hunger Artists* [London, 1993]). There ismore fasting than feasting in this work, which follows the literary high road. Twochapters chart the Jewish and Graeco-Roman background, while Christian teaching on eating is divided into chapters on the Pauline *Epistles*, *Acts*, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen and Eusebius, Jerome, and Augustine. Emphasis on major authors is strengthened by summaries of biography where known (rarely) and surveys of studies on the Christian texts. G. does not accept Pauline authorship of *Acts*, for example.

G. establishes (with much use of Arbesmann) that long-term fasting was not a feature of Jewish or Graeco-Roman culture, nor indeed of the early Christians. Many texts within G.'s period (Philo, Clement, and Porphyry) and before (the Stoics and the Cynics) urged the disciplining of the body through simplicity and restraint in eating in order to promote purity of soul or belief, but not sustained fasting. A few Greek and Roman exceptions are listed (p. 57). Jews may have fasted more after they were separated from sacrifice in the temple after the Diaspora. The stormtroopers of fasting were Tertullian, Eusebius, and Jerome, only the last two of whom made firm links between fasting and the restraint of sexual desire. These three authors sought to justify their claims by tendentious readings of the Old and New Testaments. Eusebius

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

appears, further, to have claimed Origen as a supporter without justification. Jerome's siting of his male ascetics in the desert and of his female virgins in rooms apart from their family mealtimes indicates his extreme position and his distance from those who considered the continuation of Christian society in the long term, as did Augustine. G. takes Jerome to task for his misrepresentation of both the testaments and pagan authors such as Porphyry; she also challenges recent work on Jerome's proposals for female fasting: 'there must be something psychologically very satisfying in these stories, for even some modern writers seem to want to suspend belief' (p. 254 n. 30). Aline Rousselle is corrected for her misuse of a scientific paper on starvation.

Extreme proposals are linked with tensions in Christian communities caused by theofficial toleration and then acceptance of Christianity. The desire for militant distinctiveness may have been more important than the expectation of the Day ofJudgement imminently. There is some reference to militant sects such as the Manichaeans, the Gnostics, the Ebionites, the Essenes, the Egyptian monks, and smaller groups, but concentration on the major texts leaves little space for full consideration of such groups. The text-based format displaces others such as an anthropological approach—Mary Douglas is only brought in, for example, in the conclusion. Major foods are not considered as such, e.g. meat or fish. Did Christian texts identify fish as a luxury, as many pagan texts had done? G. concentrates on Alexandria as the focus for Philo, Clement, and Athenaeus but does not comment on the last's concentration on fish as a luxury in more than three of his fifteen books. Athenaeus also uses the phrase 'the belly and the parts beneath the belly' (3.116f.), to which G. refers more than once in relation to the Christian texts on physiology.

G. was formally a professor of psychology and approaches her topic with useful biological knowledge. Even though Jerome may have distorted Galen to justify the self-starvation of young women (p. 165), he was not mistaken in linking calorie intake with sexuality; he was, however, preaching the incredible in claiming that Paul subsisted in the desert for long periods on five dried figs a day (fewer than 250 calories: p. 254 n. 27). The doctor in G. cannot accept the 'long and woeful line of orthodox Christian "holy" men and women who will starve, abuse and mutilate their bodies in search of salvation' (p. 141). Her approach to these ideologically charged texts is balanced but not dispassionate: criticism is to be found in particular in a number of telling footnotes: p. 252 n. 6 on Jerome's problems with his family, p. 255 n. 35 on Jerome's claims on sexual fantasies in the desert, and p. 257 n. 55 on his projection of his fantasies on to female virgins. G.'s approach to these texts through food is fully justified since she extends far beyond the moralizing discourse of luxury. She successfully brings a different perspective to texts dominated by theological and gender studies.

There are minor errors. Greek is misprinted on pp. 65, 142, and 262. Menander is quoted on sacrifice without context (p. 37)—*Methe* fr. 224 is a comment on the cultural complexity of sacrifice. Gulick's mistranslation (note b on Athenaeus 7.308a–b) of Aristotle *HA* 591b2 is copied out, making the vegetarian grey mullet into an eater of carrion (p. 40 and n. 36).

University of Exeter JOHN WILKINS

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

GREEK LAW

O. Behrends, W. Sellert (edd.): *Nomos und Gesetz: Ursprünge und Wirkungen des griechischen Gesetzesdenkens* (6. Symposion der Kommission 'Die Funktion des Gesetzes in Geschichte und Gegenwart'). (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, 3. Folge, 209.) Pp. 261. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995. Paper, DM 124. ISBN: 3-525-82597-8.

It is a commonplace that, in the area of law, the Greeks have left hardly any legacy to the modern world. The present volume challenges this assumption. It contains four contributions to a symposion the aim of which was to discuss the origins and later influence of Greek legal thought. In his introduction, Wolfgang Sellert formulates the objective of the volume, to provide a preliminary impression of the sophistication of Greek legal thinking, as well as a demonstration of how Greek legal culture hasinfluenced later legal philosophy, both indirectly through Roman adoption and adaptation of Greek ideas, and directly through the scholastic continuation of the Greek legal tradition in a Christian context.

This ambitious aim has resulted in a volume which spans the disciplines of philosophy from Heraclitus to Augustine and beyond, of Greek legal history, and of Roman law. The four contributions are accompanied by summaries of the discussions that followed each of the presentations. Such summaries give the non-specialist a clear idea of precisely which points are the most controversial and of the kinds of objection that may be raised by other specialists in each discipline.

The origins of the Greek concept of law and of its operation in the context of the archaic and Classical *polis* are discussed by Hans-Joachim Gehrke in 'Der Nomosbegriff der Polis'. The first half of his contribution is concerned with the establishment of the rule of law (Gesetzesherrschaft) in the archaic *polis*, for which the most important sources are surviving law texts dating from the seventh to the early fifth century.

G.'s analysis of the archaic material is followed by a discussion of the Athenian concept of law in the Classical period. His discussion takes its starting point in Dem. 24 *Against Timokrates*, a speech delivered in a *graphe nomon me epitedeion theinai*. In this speech, G. finds plenty of evidence for an Athenian *nomos*-concept which was far more sophisticated than ancient (and modern) critics of the Athenian democracy have wanted us to believe. The Athenian perception of their *nomoi* and of the way in which the *nomoi* were enforced by their courts is placed by G. in a wider political, ethical, and religious context. The *nomoi* were perceived above all as an expression and a measure of the character and *ethos* of the *polis*. As noted by Bleicken in the discussion (p. 113), Dem. 24 lends itself to such an analysis, precisely because of the original procedural context of the speech, which called for an elaborate defence of existing legislation. In fact, G.'s main line of argument is supported by numerous passages in speeches delivered in other types of legal action, and G. could have strengthened his case even further by adducing parallels from these texts.

G.'s contribution is the only one in this volume to focus on the evidence for how Greek law operated in practice and on the popular concept of law as expressed in inscriptions and, later, in forensic oratory composed for mass audiences. The two

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

papers which follow G.'s contribution concentrate on the *nomos*-concept primarily as expressed in the works of philosophers.

In 'Antike Vorstufen des modernen Begriffs des Naturgesetzes', Wolfgang Kullmann traces the development of a concept of 'law of nature' (not to be confused with 'natural justice'). K.'s investigation includes material from authors as diverse as Homer, Aristotle, Lucretius, and Augustine, in whose works the metaphor is used in different ways. According to K., the use of the metaphor 'law of nature' implies a belief in the existence of a divine lawgiver, and this premise shapes his subsequent account of the development of the concept. Although K.'s initial definition of what constitutes a 'law of nature' is open to debate, the result of his investigation is an erudite and thought-provoking treatise which will, hopefully, stimulate further discussion.

To a certain extent, Albrecht Dihle's contribution, 'Der Begriff des Nomos in der griechischen Philosophie', acts as a complement to K.'s contribution. He discusses the opposition between *nomos* and *physis* as expressed in fifth-century philosophy, and discusses the conflict between a relativistic concept of *nomoi* as the creation of man and a perception of them as universally valid and immutable, sanctioned either by the gods or by nature. The different, yet coexisting, connotations of the word *nomos* is then traced via Plato and Aristotle to later philosophers of the Hellenistic and Roman periods. According to D., the different and fundamentally incompatible concepts of *nomos* and the conflicts generated by them persisted in later philosophical and political thought.

In the final contribution, 'Gesetz und Sprache: Das römische Gesetz unter dem Einfluß der hellenistischen Philosophie', Okko Behrends discusses the influence ofHellenistic philosophy on the development of Roman law, and how methods of interpretation of legal texts were influenced by different philosophical theories of language. B.'s argumentation is wide-ranging and the documentation very detailed, with a wealth of specific examples. However, B.'s paper presupposes that the reader is well versed in Roman law, and Hellenists without such training could have done with more explanation of Roman legal concepts. For, as an important discussion of the link between Greek philosophy and Roman law, this article ought also to attract the attention of scholars other than Roman legal historians.

Despite the very diverse subject matters discussed by each of the contributors, thevolume has a clear and consistent theme. Between them, the papers approach a number of well-defined central issues from different angles. It will no doubt appeal to scholars interested in Greek philosophy as much as to legal historians, and it is to be hoped that the issues raised in the symposion will continue to attract debate.

Royal Holloway, London LENE RUBINSTEIN

HOMICIDE COURTS

E. CARAWAN: *Rhetoric and the Law of Draco*. Pp. xx + 408. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-19-815086-5.

A considerable amount of research into Athenian homicide law has been undertaken since the publication of Douglas MacDowell's seminal book on the subject, *Athenian Homicide Law in the Age of the Orators* (Manchester, 1963); and despite the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

continuing and undoubted value of *AHL*, there has for some time been a need for a comprehensive review of the many controversial aspects of the subject. Edwin Carawan, one of the leading contributors to the debate, now offers the fruits of his research in an extensive, thought-provoking study of the law, its development, and application in the homicide speeches of Antiphon and Lysias.

The book falls into two main parts. In the first C. attempts an *Historical Reconstruction of the Homicide Law*, examining archaic procedure, Draco's law, the functions of the five homicide courts, and the various stages of proceedings in homicide trials. He reaches some controversial conclusions. Arguing cogently against the so-called 'Areopagite model' (in which the Areopagus is seen as the original site of all homicide trials), he contends that the earliest court consisted of the tribal *basileis* under the presidency of the *archon basileus*, who gave judgement (*dikazein*) by means of oath-challenge or demand for other proof test (vestiges of this court were preserved in the Prytaneum court). Draco then established the body of fifty-one *ephetai*, who decided (*diagnonai*) liability without determining intent or justification, except when no kinsmen of the victim survived (vestiges of the latter procedure were preserved in the Phreatto court); and it was Solon who assigned intentional killing of an Athenian citizen to the Areopagus, with state execution and confiscation of part of the killer's property (the other part going to the victim's family). The *ephetai*, a committee of the Areopagus, henceforth heard cases where strict liability was the issue to be decided, sitting at the Palladium, while cases in which the accused pleaded legal justification were heard at the Delphinium. Later, the restriction under the amnesty of 403 of prosecutions for killings in civil conflict to cases of direct agency (*autocheiria*) led to the permanent devaluing of the concept of planning (*bouleusis*) and the superseding of trial before the *ephetai* by summary methods. Throughout their history *dikai phonou* were mainly concerned not with questions of fact but with processual acts, the content and function of the oaths of the litigants and their witnesses being the decisive factors in the trials.

In Part II, C. applies the principles he has expounded on the nature of the *dike phonou* in a *Commentary on the Homicide Speeches*. Again, his conclusions are provocative. Beginning with the *Tetralogies*, he argues forcefully for a marked difference in outlook (as over *miasma* doctrine) and rhetorical method from the court speeches, with the conclusions that these were not at all practice exercises and were written not by Antiphon, but later. Antiphon 1 centres on the ambiguous concept of recklessness, the unwitting commission of a fatal act that is nonetheless culpable, for which C. finds a parallel in Sophocles' *Trachiniae*. Antiphon 6, on the other hand, shows how intervening factors (in this case the absence of the defendant at the time when the fatal drug was administered to the choirboy) negate the aims of the accused and break the causal sequence leading to the boy's death. The case is examined from the viewpoint of Anglo-American tort law, and the principles of 'fair choice' (the defendant was left no fair choice by his other civic duty but to delegate his duties as *choregos*) and 'last clear chance' (the victim's family had the last clear chance to avoid the risk to him posed by the potion). Lysias 1 is explored in connection with *Tetralogy* 3 for its approach to the concept of justifiable homicide through the notion of retributive justice (the victim's wrongdoing caused his death); and C. rightly emphasizes how the defendant, Euphiletus, uses the laws not only to justify his actions, but as a 'prescriptive source of moral certainty'. Antiphon 5 and Lysias 13 are interpreted to show that *apagoge kakourgon* was used as a regular alternative to the *dike phonou*, the former being the first instance of a case where the defendant was accused of complicity, not the murder itself. Finally, Lysias 12, which for C. was not

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

actually delivered, explores new attitudes in the post-restoration era to the religious consequences of homicide (the only instance outside the *Tetralogies* of *miasma* threatening the community as a whole) and the imputation of guilt by 'planning' (guilt is measured by the experience and expectations of 'any reasonable person').

C. argues his many contentious theses with great authority (if occasionally with more of an element of *ipse dixit* than supporting evidence), but I remain unpersuaded by a number of them. Thus, C.'s emphasis on the crucial rôle of the oath in homicide trials at times seems to me overdone (did defendants never try to prove positively that they were innocent?), and I do not share his confidence that the *dike phonou* became somuch less important in the fourth century, or that the use of *apagoge kakourgon* became prominent. On the rhetorical side (where I find C. generally less secure), I disagree with the theory that the endings of Antiphon 1 and 6 reflect what was said in the second speeches; and with the interpretation from what the slave supposedly said under torture in Antiphon 5 that Euxitheus was not accused of personal involvement in the alleged killing (C. on pp. 344–5 might have acknowledged my own arguments in*Greek Orators I* over Euxitheus' distortion of the wording of the slave's confession). Such disagreements, of course, need to be argued in greater detail—and this isone of the great merits of C.'s book, that it will undoubtedly provoke intense scholarlydebate. I therefore welcome this excellent study as an extremely important contribution to the field of Athenian homicide law—but I shall not be discarding my MacDowell just yet.

It seems churlish to note that in a work of this length I detected a small number of typographical errors, but I cannot refrain from pointing out that Mark W. Edwards was not responsible for *Greek Orators I*, nor was my collaborator surnamed 'Ussher'. If this observation appears vain, I might add that C.'s teacher did not include the word 'Ancient' in the title of his brilliant *Art of Persuasion in Greece.*

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

FAMILIA

JANE F. GARDNER: *Family and* Familia *in Roman Law and Life.* Pp.x+ 305. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-815217-5.

G.'s stated purpose, to 'investigate the interrelationship of family and *familia*', is discharged across three groups who were normally treated as having no place in the (narrowly) legal concept of *familia: '*those removed from it (emancipated), those taken into it (adopted), and those never in it but linked by blood and affection (mothers and natural kin)' (p. 4). Her ambitious agenda is twofold: to 'unravel' the relevant law, and to describe 'the actual human behaviour' that can be understood to have shaped it. It is, in G.'s words, 'a book about law', mostly about property and its transmission, intended 'for Roman social historians' (p. v), some of whom no doubt will be surprised to learn that legal writing is 'by far our largest single body of evidence for Roman behaviour' (p. 3). It might be agreed, I suppose, that the legal sources are 'uniquely revelatory' of how people were expected to act. It is far less certain that they tell us very much about 'how people actually behaved' (p. 268).

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the end, I imagine, historians of the family (and of the law) will be won over by G.'s sophisticated and (painstakingly) detailed analysis of the ways in which 'family law' and, in particular, the rules that governed intestate succession, were gradually modified, in a piecemeal sort of way, to accommodate what seems to have been an increasingly widespread understanding of family 'as biological kin' (pp. 39–40). It can hardly be disputed, for example, that the introduction of the clause *unde liberi* in the praetorian edict (in the second half of the first century B.C.?), which dramatically improved emancipated children's prospects of claiming at least a share of their (biological) father's property on intestacy, demonstrates a 'decreasing emphasis upon the legal rules of the *familia*, and more concern with the family relationships between persons related by blood' (p. 25). Anyone who has spent some time with Cicero will not need to be persuaded that 'the Roman élite of the late Republic attached as much importance to "family" connections, whether paternal or maternal, as to *familia* alone' (p. 244).

G. has much else to say about the law and its application that is both new and compelling. She argues convincingly, for example, against the weight of scholarly opinion, that the emancipation of children ought not to be 'equated with expulsion from the *family* group' (p. 10, her italics), but understood instead to have been a device intended to safeguard the economic well-being of the family as a whole, and to promote the financial interests of certain of its members.

Unfortunately, some at least of what the 'social historian' might really want to know is, often by G.'s own admission, unrecoverable. How often were children actuallyemancipated? It might be supposed that, because of increased prosperity and 'expansion of economic opportunities', the practice will have become more common from about the second century B.C. It might also be agreed with G. that the improved position of emancipated children in the rules which governed intestate succession implies a 'certain frequency of emancipation' (p. 19). But, as G. herself readily admits (pp. 19, 104), there are almost no certain cases in the Republican era, and very few altogether from any period. It is impossible to determine even whether fathers who left wills normally favored (or discriminated against) those of their children who had been emancipated (p. 100). It is characteristic of the inadequacy of the historical record that, in trying to determine how fathers might have provided for their emancipated children ('Provision for the Present: Maintenance', at pp. 74–6), G. is forced to rely almost entirely on comparisons drawn from accounts (themselves often difficult to interpret) of relations between patrons and their freedmen. What little survives to describe the practice hardly justifies G.'s uncharacteristically unguarded conclusion that 'a lot of emancipation appears to have been going on' (p. 104).

Much the same can be said of adoption, several features of which G. examines at length (e.g. 'procedures', pp. 126–32; 'consent', pp. 175–9). That a great deal is said about it in the legal sources (especially in the *Digest*) is, as G. shrewdly remarks (p.116), evidence not of the practice, but of the complexities of its legal consequences. Very few actual cases are recorded, even counting those that were intended merely to order the imperial succession.

It would be churlish, I suppose, to complain that the book actually has a great deal more to say about law than about life, especially in light of G.'s efforts to distinguish between them. She is surely right, for example, in thinking that 'the priorities of the Roman man in the street were not bound up with preserving the *familia*, but with doing the best for his family' (p. 4), and that the Romans' abiding determination to uphold the institution of the *familia* ought not to be taken to mean that it actually governed the 'conduct of their lives' (p. 5). G.'s position, which no one is likely to

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dispute, is that historians of the law have generally paid too little attention to 'extralegal developments' (p. 275). It is all the more disappointing then that she has almost nothing to say about those Romans who, ignorant of the law, or expecting its application to be unfair, are likely to have adopted extra-legal methods of arranging their affairs (including the posthumous distribution of their belongings).

It is to G.'s credit that she has made the law both intelligible and readily accessible to the non-specialist. I note only that Valerius Maximus' account (8.6.3) of how C. Licinius Stolo (consul in 364 or 361 B.C.) tried to evade the terms of a law that he himself had enacted in 367, according to which no one was to possess more than 500 *iugera* of public land—*ipse mille comparavit, dissimulandique criminis gratia dimidiam partem filio emancipavit*—is to be understood to mean that, in order to conceal his wrongdoing, he made over half his land to his son, and not, as G. would have it (p.111), that 'to conceal his offence he emancipated his son'.

Montana State University, Bozeman DAVID CHERRY

THE KOINE

C. BRIXHE (ed.): *La koiné grecque antique: II: La concurrence* (Collection études anciennes). Pp. 212. Nancy: Association pour la diffusion de la Recherche sur l'Antiquité, 1996. Paper, frs. 180. ISBN: 2-9509726-2-4.

Classics courses in the UK, as in the USA, do not typically make available an option in the history of the Greek language, and in the few British universities where students can pursue such an interest, the emphasis has traditionally been on the epigraphic evidence for the history of the ancient dialects (from Mycenaean down to about the third or second century B.C.), and on the implications that can be drawn from the evidence about gaps in the early history of the language or about its prehistory. In this connection, to the extent that much of the relevant material is 'late', the *koine* has often been seen as a rather irritating source of interference in dialect inscriptions that must, accordingly, be abstracted away from.

In the context of the history of the language as a whole, however, the *koine* cannot be so easily dismissed. In its higher, more systematized registers it was after all the 'standard' form of Greek, subject to more or less natural evolution, from the fourth century B.C. to the Middle Ages and beyond, and all other forms of the language, including even belletristic 'Attic', came eventually to be perceived as varieties falling beneath, and deriving their identity from, its unrivalled overarching status. Taking the broader (and longer) view, therefore, it is also important to place the *koine* centre stage, and to ask *inter alia* how and why it arose and spread, how it affected people's attitudes towards, and use of, local dialects and other languages (or, indeed, how the *koine* in turn was affected regionally by local dialects and other languages), why it largely failed as a 'literary' language, and how the advent of Atticism interfered with its development. Such Koineforschung is not, of course, a new discipline, especially in continental Europe, but the three recent volumes of conference papers edited by Claude Brixhe (*La koiné grecque antique I, II and III*) will contribute significantly to the stimulation of fresh interest in what is undoubtedly one of the central issues of

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Greek historical linguistics, raising as it does the key sociolinguistic questions of power, prestige, and identity.

The second of these volumes, as its subtitle implies, follows on from the first by tackling not so much the issues of origin and early development (though the first paper—see below—does elaborate on aspects of these themes raised in Volume I), but rather the impact of the *koine* as a written and spoken standard on other forms of Greek that remained in parallel use in different parts of the Greek-speaking world before such varieties were finally swept from the written record (and eventually out ofexistence, even as spoken *patois*). There are seven chapters in all, preceded by a briefgeneral introduction and followed by a subject index: (I) Antonio López Eire, 'L'influence de l'ionien-attique sur les autres dialectes épigraphiques'; (II) Guy Vottéro, 'Koinés et koinas en Béotie à l'époque dialectale'; (III) Claude Brixhe, 'Le II^{e} et III^{er} siècles dans l'histoire linguistique de la Laconie'; (IV) Carlo Consani, 'Koinai et koiné dans la documentation épigraphique de l'Italie méridionale'; (V) Monique Bile, 'Une koina est-égéenne?'; (VI) Albio Cesare Cassio, 'La prose ionienne post-classique et la culture de l'Asie Mineure à l'époque hellénistique'; and (VII) Paul Goukowsky, 'Un imitateur tardif d'Hérodote: Eusèbe, historien des Césars'. The absence of contributors from the English-speaking world is, as in the other two volumes, eloquent testimony to the instinctive orientation of most anglophone historians of Greek towards the dialects *per se*, and it is surely no accident that the most recent major discussion in English of the dialects in relation to the *koine* is by a Czech currently working in Canada (V. Bubenik, *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a Sociolinguistic Area* [Amsterdam, 1989]).

The principal points confirmed here are that the *koine* originated with the use of Attic as an imperial, administrative, and cultural language in the Athenian empire and beyond during the fifth century, though increasingly in a form influenced by Ionic, both from above, given the prestige of that dialect as a medium for 'scientific' and literary writing, and below, given the Ionic-speaking character of much of the territory administered from Athens. The resulting 'Great Attic' was adopted by the Macedonian élite, who were anxious to appropriate such a prestigious linguistic vehicle both to assert their Hellenic credentials and to equip themselves with a medium to match their imperial ambitions. This deparochialized variety was naturally imposed top-down in the new Macedonian kingdoms as an official language, where it shaped the rapid convergence of the different varieties spoken by Greek immigrants and determined the form of Greek learned, with varying degrees of success, by sections of the native populations.

By contrast, what we see in the territories of 'old Greece', the principal focus of Volume II, is a situation of increasing diglossia, in which the tension between the prestige and international standing of the *koine* and the need to assert one's local identity through the written use of dialect, whether a truly local variety or a dialectally coloured regional *koina* incorporating features of the Attic-based standard, was progressively resolved in favour of the former, a process evidenced both by the adoption over time of pure *koine* for an ever wider range of functions and by the use of ever more koineized forms even in supposedly dialect texts. The principal interest, as expected, lies in the detailed analysis of the surviving epigraphic material and the tracing of subtly different patterns, motivations, and chronologies for *koine* penetration in different regions, the written 'Doric' *koinai* being particularly clear, if rather artificial, expressions of the would-be political power of temporary confederations (Achaean, Aetolian, Rhodian) in the face of the growth of Macedonian power. It also transpires (Chapter VI) that a literary Ionic of Herodotean type continued to be used,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

again as an expression of local pride, for the writing of purely regional histories in Asia Minor in the Hellenistic period, even though such use of Ionic became something of a literary fad in imperial times with the disappearance of true dialect speech (Chapter VII).

There is clearly much still to be learned from the juxtaposition of meticulous analyses of surviving documents with detailed knowledge of the political and social circumstances obtaining at particular times in particular places, and Brixhe and his co-authors have done sterling work in making the relevant bibliography so readily available (including information about new editions and recently published inscriptions/fragments), together with a range of important new findings. It is, of course, true that there is relatively little in this collection which could fairly be called surprising, butit is perhaps in the nature of such work at the turn of the millennium that new discoveries in this field will almost inevitably be of details that flesh out or illuminate particular aspects of an already well-established overall framework rather than provide the impetus for any radically 'original' reinterpretations of the evidence overall.

Faculty of Classics, Cambridge GEOFFREY HORROCKS

THE ARCHAIC *POLIS*

LYNETTE G. MITCHELL, P. J. RHODES (edd.): *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*. Pp. xiii + 232. London and New York: Routledge, 1997. Cased. ISBN: 0-415-14752-2.

Much of the most interesting work in ancient history is currently appearing not in journals but in edited volumes derived from symposiums, where attention is collectively focused on specific problems and an overview of a topic defined before papers are rewritten for publication. Typically, because a book has to sell, the authors avoid an excess of scholarly detail and write accessibly for non-specialists. The present volume had its origins in a symposium held in Durham in September 1995, and was published less than two years later. Six speakers were invited to coverpredetermined themes; their longer papers appear in revised forms and are generallythe strongest. Other contributors offered their own topics, and nine of their contributions appear as short papers, of which the most successful are those with finite aims. As Rhodes's excellent introduction (pp. 1–8) makes clear, the volume offers a well-grounded rethinking of certain aspects of the Archaic city-state—or, perhaps, a drawing together of new consensuses of recent years that have been tested in the fire of university teaching as well as in research seminars.

Mogens Hansen (pp. 9–23) handily restates the aims and methods of the Copenhagen Polis Centre and the rule whose jocose appellation, *lex Hafniensis de civitate*, is now familiar to all adherents and critics of the CPC approach. To simplifysomewhat, it is the observation that classical sources use *polis* of a given townonly if it is the political centre of a certain kind of state; conversely, and moreloosely, one might say that a *polis* has to have an urban centre. On another question of definition, John-Paul Wilson (pp. 199–207) argues that, though by thefourth century *emporion* meant (at least in Athens) a defined trading area,

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Herodotos does not use it to mean something different from a *polis*; we may be wrong to suppose that an Archaic *emporion* differed from an *apoikia* in not having a formal foundation and oikist.

John Davies, in a characteristically wide-ranging and thought-provoking study (pp.24–38), surveys work on the early *polis* since 1845, emphasizing the new-found autonomy of archaeological data and our 'emancipation from Aristotle'. He urges theuse of 'microstate' (translating 'Kleinstaat') rather than the problematic *polis*, so as to include all early polities without begging questions. Reviewing recent work onethnicity, the distinct processes of town, state, and *polis* formation, social segmentation (e.g. tribes, phratries, and *genê*), religious change, and the content of citizenship, he suggests that not only cultural but also political forms such as monarchy and town councils (but not necessarily the assembly) may have been adopted and adapted from the Near East. His paper deserves careful reading by all who study and teach this period. One of those political forms, tyranny, is examined by John Salmon (pp. 60–73), who gives a sane assessment of the tyrants' rise and fall, noting the tension between their undoubted achievements on behalf of their *poleis* (demonstrable for Athens and Corinth, inferred in Sikyon, Lesbos, and Samos) and the incompatibility between their personal power (and the violence to which they often had recourse) and the political conventions of their communities. The process oftown formation is also scrutinized by Christopher Smith (pp. 208–16), who suggeststhat urbanization in central Italy took place not in imitation of Greece but asaresponse to similar circumstances, and compares the sixth-century Servian reforms—the creation of gentilitial rural tribes and the incorporation of rural élites into a Latium-wide civic structure—to those of Kleisthenes in Attica, a region of similar size.

On Attica itself, Lin Foxhall (pp. 113–36) argues that the problem facing Solon wasnot mass poverty but the contention surrounding land ownership as a prerequisitefor effective membership of the *polis*. She uses field survey data from Attica and central Greece to disprove absolute overpopulation, and to date the extension of agriculture into marginal lands no earlier than the late sixth century. From data on agricultural productivity she calculates that members of the top three Solonian *telê*, including the *zeugitai* (perhaps the hoplite class), were all, in fact, rich.*Thêtes* were the mass of the population, but not all were poor (except from an élite perspective); they occupied a broad spectrum of landholding and some were probably hoplites. Edward M. Harris (pp. 103–12) also moves away from land as the key issue; the Solonic *seisachtheia* was the abolition of a system whereby *hektêmoroi* paid protection money to nobles (paralleled in early poetry), and was aimed at weakening local power-bases. For Lynette Mitchell (pp. 137–47), Solon sought to maintain an older social order rather than create a new one; his poems set limits to the rights of the *demos*, and imply that the highest good (*aretê*) can only be exercised by nobles (*agathoi*). *Aretê* in the general sense of 'virtue', claimed by aristocrats at least from the *Theognidea* on, reappears in George Robertson's short paper (pp. 148–57). Though poets exalt the idea that one should sacrifice oneself for the *polis*, no Archaic verse epitaph states that the dead man gave his life for his city; they celebrate individual prowess and the survival of memory. Attic epigrams are more likely than those in other regions to invoke *sôphrosynê* (before the Persian wars; it disappears thereafter, perhaps because of aristocratic connotations). More generally, Robin Osborne (pp. 74–82) examines early inscribed laws and lawgivers, and plausibly revives the idea that there was a process of standardization, even 'codification', across Greece as a whole.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Sparta, the traditional contrast to Athens, is the focus of Stephen Hodkinson's paper (pp. 83–102). He examines its peculiar institutions, and though he is cautious about the sources, he finds enough that is securely attested to show that Sparta was dynamic, not static. Statistical data for votives in Laconian sanctuaries force us to recognize, not for the first time, that, while some Spartan institutions militated against private wealth, in many ways Sparta was a typical Greek community until well into the sixth century.

Religion was one of the most important expressions of the developing Greek communities. Catherine Morgan (pp. 168–98) draws together archaeological evidence for sanctuaries in the territories of *ethnê*, and dismantles the notion of a crude division between *polis* and *ethnos*. She studies cult sites at Pherai in Thessaly and Kalapódi on the border of Phokis and Lokris, and shows that in Arkadia 'there is no correlation between the existence or date of shrines, the presence of Geometric settlement, and the date of appearance of city ethnics' (p. 192). The overall picture of diversity cannot be made to fit simple models, and reveals the complexity of the processes underlying the development of *ethnos* religion. On one aspect of *polis* religion, Emma Stafford (pp. 158–67) examines personification cults, specifically Themis. At Rhamnous she is linked with Nemesis, which S. reads as the introduction of a cult of civic order into the liminal territory of the *polis*; one might add that the deme of Rhamnous was itself a flourishing political community. Tantalizing hints of Themis' presence link her to oracles (*themistes*) at Delphi and to Ge/Gaia (Earth) at Athens, suggesting that Ge was increasingly associated with Themis as the latter acquired connotations of social order.

An apparently strict editorial policy has kept all the short papers to between nine and eleven pages, which makes it hard for a wide-ranging or theoretical treatment to be presented convincingly. Walter Donlan's study (pp. 39–48) of changes in power relations is too general, in this form, to sustain his controversial case for the emergence of social stratification in the eighth century and the rise of a 'middle class' of hoplite farmers who, in the seventh, restrained irresponsible rulers and kept alive collectivist traditions; his case rests on the presumption that Homer portrays an actual society of *c.* 800 B.C. More convincingly, Kurt Raaflaub (pp. 49–59), who dates the historical Homeric society later, sees the people's rôle in Homeric fighting as reflecting an eighth-century evolution of the phalanx rather than an overnight seventh-century 'hoplite revolution'; it was social crisis, not their military contribution, that led to the formal integration of the now well-practised farmer-hoplites into the *polis*.

The editing and copy-editing of the volume are outstandingly good (I spotted almost no misprints, though Donlan's transliteration *plethus* is at best inelegant; the solecism is repeated in the otherwise excellent index, which covers both common and proper nouns, and is mostly well broken up with subheadings). Though some contributions are tantalizingly brief, this is likely to become a standard collection of papers for those who already have a grounding in Archaic history.

University of Leicester/British School at Athens GRAHAM SHIPLEY

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LAYING DOWN *POLIS* LAW

T. H. NIELSEN (ed.): *Yet More Studies in the Ancient Greek* Polis. (*Papers of the Copenhagen Polis Centre* Vol. 4 = *Historia* Einzelschriften, 117.) Pp. 258. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1997. ISBN: 3-515-072222-5.

M. H. HANSEN (ed.): *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community*. Symposium, 29–31 August 1996. (*Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre* Vol. 4 = The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser, 75.) Pp. 547. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1997. Cased, DKK 600. ISBN: 87-7304-291-9.

M. H. HANSEN: *Polis and City-State. An Ancient Concept and itsModern Equivalent*. Symposium, 9 January 1998. (*Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre* Vol. 5 = The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser, 76.) Pp. 217. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1998. Price not stated. ISBN: 87-7304-293-5.

I

'Yet more studies' may possibly convey a certain staleness and weariness, if the reader happens to be unaware that the title is simply an internal reference to M. H. Hansen and K. A. Raaflaub (edd.) *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, which constitutes the immediately preceding (1996) volume in the Copenhagen Polis Centre (CPC) Papers series (rev. *BMCR* 8.8 [1997], 726–38). But can there now be any reader of *CR* left who is still unaware of the existence, and ever-increasing impact, of the CPC, a multinational and multilingual project handsomely funded by the National Carlsberg Foundation of Basic Research under the aegis of the Royal Danish Academy of Science and Letters? If so, the Centre's begetter, inspirer, and enforcer, the redoubtable Mogens Herman Hansen, wants to know who and where you are, and why. Certainly, it is not his fault if the Centre's nine published volumes so far, produced within the space of only a lustrum, are not firmly within the purview—I do not say on the shelves: the cost would be prohibitive for most of us—of all those interested in the nature, workings, and impact of that most protean of concepts and substances, the ancient Greek *polis*.

Inevitably, any such ambitious scheme of collaborative research will find its detractors. There are those who moan that sticking to what the extant ancient sources—pretty much any old ancient sources—happen to call (a) 'polis' is an unsound criterion for potential inclusion in the project's (eventual) database. There are those who believe that restricting the chronological focus of the enquiry to the late Archaic and Classical periods, or *c*. 600–323 B.C.E., is, well, restrictive. There are those, again, who criticize the project mainly for the sake of appearing to be in the best sense critical. Two replies to such objections seem to me crushing, and crushingly obvious. The project simply has to have some definitional and temporal parameters—and H.'s seem to offer a judicious and defensible combination of flexibility and practicality. Secondly, even if one were legitimately to take principled issue with the project's overall conception, it is impossible fairly to deny that it has had and will continue to have a multitude of more or less incidental benefits for scholars (archaeologists as well

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as text-workers) labouring in one or other area of this giant scholarly terrain—giant both in its scope and in its implications for historical and historiographical understanding, modern as well as ancient.

A review such as this can only scratch the surface of a few ploughed fields that the reviewer considers unusually important or interesting. Four, partially intersecting, fields that I would particularly commend for detailed (re)investigation are: (i) *polis* terminology as opposed to, or as combined with, *ethnos* terminology; (ii) the distinction between *polis* as 'state' (or political community of some sort) and *polis* as 'urban' (in some sense) centre; (iii) the distinction between independent and dependent *poleis*; and (iv) the proper characterization or classification of the *polis* within a modern technical political vocabulary. (For readers' convenience the full contents of CPC Papers 4 and CPC Acts 4 are listed in an appendix at the end of this review. These volumes, like H.'s solo CPC Acts 5, come equipped with indexes of sources and names compiled variously by Tobias Fischer-Hansen, Pernille Flensted-Jensen, Thomas Heine Nielsen, and Carsten Weber-Nielsen.)

(i) *Polis* vs. *Ethnos*

The time is long past, it is be hoped, when *ethnos* communities were automatically marked down as in some sense primitive entities or at any rate politically more primitive than *poleis*. At all events, a fatal blow was dealt to the idea that *ethnos* communities were somehow 'tribal' and so pre-'state' when D. Roussel observed (1976) that the language of 'tribalism' in political arrangements was a peculiarity of the *polis* not the *ethnos* sphere. P. Funke, in his wide-ranging discussion of the Aitolian *ethnos*, to which we shall return in (ii), nevertheless feels it necessary to place special emphasis upon the allegedly unappreciated complexity of its constitutional and legal structures. The term *ethnos* itself, however, remains open for further analysis, and here (CPC Papers 4: 11–12) H. offers the helpful demonstration that it was a portmanteau term, with at least three distinct senses. Useful explorations of practical *ethnos* politics in Triphylia (CPC Papers 4, Heine Nielsen) and Elis (CPC Acts 4, J. Roy) are also highly recommended.

(ii) Urban Centre and/or Political Community?

This is one of the two informing problematics of CPC Acts 4 (the other being [in]dependence—see (iii), below). A *polis* 'in the strict sense' is indeed defined by theCPC, according to the so-called 'Lex Hafniensis de Civitate', as a 'small self-governing community of citizens living in an urban centre and its hinterland' (CPC Papers 4: 13); more fully (CPC Acts 4: 54), 'A *polis* (in the sense of urban centre) was a town which was also the political centre of a *polis* (in the sense ofstate)'. Of course, there is room allowed for argument over the precise applicability of 'urban' (e.g. CPC Acts 4: 89, 91–128), but there is no quarter given to the disjunction of the political community aspect from the urban centre aspect. When therefore Peter Funke (CPC Acts 4), discussing the 'fringe zone' of Aitolia and emphasizing the classificatory problems posed by federal structures such as that of Aitolia for the Copenhagen Project as a whole (p. 146), then had the temerity to suggest that at Thucydides 3.97.2 *polis* was being used of Aigition in the urban sense only (pp. 153–4 and 179 n. 36), H. felt obliged to intervene editorially, on the grounds that this contravened the 'Lex Hafniensis'. The exchange, and the compromise, between the two speak louder than many tomes for the inherent tensions as well as multiple strengths of the Project.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(iii) Independent and Dependent *Poleis*

Post-*ATL* (*The Athenian Tribute Lists*, esp. Volume III, 1950) orthodoxy held that a *polis* should by definition be free in a twofold sense, both externally and internally. If *autonomia* meant, (etymo)logically, the freedom to make one's own laws and conduct legal justice as one wished—and there was plenty of evidence that *poleis* did stake a great deal on their perception and possession of freedom in that sense—then *eleutheria* must mean the independence in foreign relations that naturally complemented internal sovereignty. It was admitted that the Greeks themselves had an unfortunate tendency to be vague and inconsistent in their application of this *ex hypothesi* nicely judged terminology, but still the dogma of autonomy = internal freedom (freedom *to*, in Isaiah Berlin's usage) held general sway—until H. took his hatchet to it, first inCPC Papers 2 (1995), 21–43, 'The "Autonomous City-State". Ancient Fact or Modern Fiction?'. That *autonomia* in fact meant more or less the opposite of what *ATL* orthodoxy had dictated has vital practical implications for their—and our—understanding of the ancient Greeks' *polis*: there were an awful lot of *poleis* that enjoyed or suffered a state or status of dependency. H. himself offers a fourteenfold typology of dependence, though his types overlap considerably. One concrete illustration, with fascinating ramifications, that is discussed at length in these volumes (CPC Acts 4, G. Shipley) is the case of the Perioikoi of Lakonia and Messenia. On the one hand, they, like the Spartiates, were called 'Lakedaimonioi', at any rate in military contexts outside the borders of Lakedaimon. On the other hand, their *poleis* were clearly not 'autonomous' from Sparta. Within, and of, their own *poleis* the Perioikoi were citizens (though probably, as in, say, oligarchic Boiotia, citizenship was of more than one grade), but were they also in any sense citizens of the 'state' of Lakedaimon?

(iv) Characterization of the *Polis*

That depends, partly, on what one means by 'state', and that, in brief, is the burden of H.'s single-authored *Polis and City-State*, which, whether or not one agrees with its main contentions, must surely be rated one of the most important books to have appeared in all ancient Greek history since, say, G. E. M. de Ste. Croix's *Class Struggle* (London and Ithaca, 1981). Of course, the relation between words and things, as we did not needDerrida to tell us, can be or maybe just is systematically unstable, and the understanding of *polis* is more than a matter of translation in thetechnical sense: see H.'s sage remarks on this problem in his useful summary paper 'The Copenhagen Inventory of Poleis and the Lex Hafniensis de Civitate' in L.G. Mitchell and P. J. Rhodes (edd.), *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece* (London, 1997), pp. 9–23, esp. 11. But there is yet more at stake in the decision to translate, as opposed to transliterate, *polis* than just which precise English word or words—City? State? City-state?—to use. In one sense, H. is perfectly justified in calling *polis* 'the generic term for state' (CPC Papers 4: 9–15), but in another sense—and this is surely themore interesting issue—we may still legitimately ask whether the Greeks of *c*.600–323 had, or knew, the State (capital S) as we know and (sometimes learn to) love it.

Moses Finley observed—correctly, in my view, though there are others who will dispute some or all of these observations—that the ancient world did not have our notions of capital, investment, and labour, or our instituted practices of money markets, labour markets, and business cycles. The ancient economy, or the ancients' economy, was therefore, necessarily, a different order of thing or being from our (any)

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

modern economy. The same reasoning applies, but rather less obviously so, to ancient politics and the ancient Greek *polis*. H.'s bibliographic command and range are immense, but one item that, understandably, he has not noticed here is the as yet unpublished 1994 Cambridge doctoral thesis of Moshe Berent, the title of which, 'The Stateless Polis', encapsulates the opposite interpretation to his, and I believe does so persuasively. The State, an entity distinct from both the civic community as a whole and its chosen rulers or government, cannot be found either in ancient Greek actuality or in ancient Greek terminology. Yet the modern practice and theory of, for instance, representative democracy and human rights are premised upon the State's (far from entirely benign) existence. Thus whereas H. prefers to accentuate that which ancient and modern politics and polities have in common, Berent, who like H. also invokes Hobbes and Machiavelli, places the emphasis crucially on difference, as I would too. This dissonance, or absence, has profound implications for our understanding both of'the political' and of practical politics in ancient Greece, since it affects the construction in theory as well as practice of such fundamental notions as freedom, equality, civil society, and the private sphere.

II

Political theory, as opposed to political terminology and description, does not rate all that highly in the priority table of the CPC, but almost buried at the end of CPC Acts 4 is a paper that seeks to combine theory with practice. The marked use of 'Rationality' in the title of Oswyn Murray's 'Rationality and the Greek City' is meant to recall two earlier papers of his, in which he argued plausibly that the application of reason to political arrangements was a distinguishing feature of Greek political practice as well as more abstract theory. The new evidence that he adduces are thepublic *tesserae* discovered in the temple of Athena at Kamarina in 1987 and promptly published by Federica Cordano in 1992. Not everyone will agree with Murray's precise analysis and reinterpretation of the meanings and applications ofthe tokens in fifth-century Kamarina, let alone with the tentative suggestion that the Kamarinaians borrowed the rudiments of their political system, with quite remarkable dispatch, from post-Ephialtic Athens. But the article is a nice reminder nevertheless that contextualization is all: Greek political thought or theory must be placed within its practical institutional contexts, and so, dialectically, vice versa for Greek practical politics. The fruits of the Copenhagen Polis Project will be savoured not least by those who believe such dialectical contextualization to be a high scholarly priority, with powerful implications for contemporary understandings of politics both modern and ancient.

APPENDIX

CPC Papers 4

Preface (M. H. Hansen) 5–6; '*Πόλις* the Generic Term for State' (Hansen) 9–15; 'Hekataios' Use of the Word *Polis* in His *Periegesis*' (Hansen) 17–27; 'A Typology ofDependent *Poleis*' (Hansen) 29–37; 'A Survey of the Major Urban Settlements inthe Kimmerian Bosporos (With a Discussion of Their Status as *Poleis*)' (G. R. Tsetskhladze) 39–81; '*Emporion*. A Study of the Use and Meaning of the Term in the Archaic and Classical Periods' (Hansen) 83–105; 'Colonies and Ports-of-Trade on the Northern Shores of the Black Sea: Borysthenes, Kremnoi and the "Other Pontic *Emporia*" in Herodotos' (J. Hind) 107–16; 'Some Problems in Polis Identification in the Chalkidic Peninsula' (P. Flensted-Jensen) 117–28; '*Triphylia*. An Experiment in

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ethnic Construction and Political Organisation' (T. H. Nielsen) 129–62; 'The *Polis* of Asea. A Case-Study of How Archaeology Can Expand Our Knowledge of the History of a *Polis*' (J. Forsen & B. Forsen) 163–76.

CPC Acts 4

'The *Polis* as an Urban Centre. The Literary and Epigraphical Evidence' (Hansen) 9–86; 'The *Polis* as a Physical Entity' (C. Morgan & J. Coulton) 87–144; '*Polis*genese und Urbanisierung in Aitolien im 5. und 4. Jh. v. Chr.' (P. Funke) 145–88; ' "The Other Lakedaimonians": The Dependent Perioikic *Poleis* of Laconia and Messenia' (G. Shipley) 189–281; 'The Perioikoi of Elis' (J. Roy) 282–320; 'L'attitude d'Argos à l'égard des autres cités d'Argolide' (M. Piérart) 321–51; 'Le territoire d'Erétrie et l'organisation politique de la cité (*dêmoi*, *chôroi*, *phylai*)' (D. Knoepfler) 352–449; 'Islands with One *Polis* versus Islands with Several *Poleis*' (G. Reger) 450–92; 'Rationality and the Greek City: the Evidence from Kamarina' (O. Murray) 493–504.

Clare College, Cambridge PAUL CARTLEDGE

DOWNHILL ALL THE WAY

B. BLECKMANN: *Athens Weg in die Niederlage. Die letzten Jahre des Peloponnesischen Kriegs*. (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 99.) Pp. 675. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998. Cased, DM 168. ISBN: 3-519-07648-9.

The Decelean War is one of those periods of Greek history bedevilled by the contradictory nature of its sources and difficulties of interpretation. The various monographs and articles dealing with aspects of the war have not settled on themerits of Xenophon, Ephorus, and the author of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* (referred to here as P for convenience) and the later authors dependent on them.Bleckmann has re-examined all this material, methodically and carefully evaluating the sources and the chronological cruces before writing new historical reconstruction. There are three main sections to his book. The most important, on which all else is based, is the first, on the literary sources (pp. 17–266). B. carries out a close analysis of the battles of the Decelean War, comparing Xenophon and Diodorus, and, when available, the version in the fragments of P. He argues, following Meyer and Lehmann, that P is Theopompus, against the modern belief inCratippus, and he makes a very strong, if not iron-clad, case. He argues that there are really two basic traditions, Xenophon and the Alternate, which is ultimately based on P.

B. follows Gray and Tuplin (without giving them much credit) in denying any historical value to what results from Ephorus' (and Diodorus') use of P. In fact, he argues very cogently that P., as a mid- to late-fourth-century, historian based himself on Xenophon, and most variations in his version come from rhetorical tropes or dubious sources of no merit (pp. 131f.). Additional descriptions were added to Xenophon and in some cases were taken over from the reports of other battles. Occasionally on topics where Xenophon was completely silent, such as the fall of Pylos, P may provide some information drawn from other sources, such as Atthidographers or special histories. But all this means that Xenophon remains the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

principal source for the history of the period. Whatever his faults, he is the best literary source we have.

This close analysis of the battles brings out some interesting material, as on p. 184 in regard to P. 'Even detailed knowledge of topography and localizing of trophy sites, though they may go back to authentic reports, do not permit us to conclude that Hell. Oxy. was deploying his own topographical knowledge and that any of his battle descriptions are built on this knowledge.'

An important chapter (pp. 199–266) examines P as a continuator and competitor ofThucydides, and it comes to the conclusion that P resembles Theopompus most closely in his treatment of incidents that link or overlap with Thucydides.

Perhaps less satisfactory is the section on chronology (pp. 267–314), where B. comes down firmly in support of the dating of Haack, rejecting the usually accepted version of Dodwell. For the visit of Alcibiades to Athens B. prefers the year of Euctemon, 408/7, and dates the return to 408. He relies on the date (408) of a prisoner exchange, deeming it was brought about by Alcibiades. B. follows Haack in having Andros fallin408, before the Ionian campaign of 408/7. The defeat at Notium happened latein408/7, close to the expiry of Alcibiades' term in midsummer 407. Dodwell's chronology, exiling Alcibiades in the spring of 406, crowds everything too close toArginusae. Time is also needed for the erosion of Athenian naval superiority and the enlargement of the Peloponnesian fleet. Haack spreads out events to Arginusae somewhat better than Dodwell.

The third section is a history from the Constitution of the Four Hundred to the collapse of Athenian sea-power (pp. 315–614), utilizing the findings of the first two sections, and it is not too widely different from the usual version. Thucydides did not regard the defeat of Athens as inevitable, but rather the product of internal discord and disunity.

The efforts of Sparta and Persia were secondary to Athens' own difficulties from internal squabbling. As in Sicily, the disunity of the Athenian leaders was instrumental in Athenian defeat. Even in the winter of 411/10 Athens still had a good chance of winning the war. Here the legend of the stab in the back may have had some merit (p.326).

Many scholars have roughly equated the moderates, i.e. those critical of democracy, and the radical democrats with the peace and war factions respectively. This oversimplifies. The opposition between οἱ πολλοί and οἱ ὀλίγοι in contemporary sources is closer to reality. Xenophon is usually not so much interested in internal Athenian politics as in the course of the fighting (p. 336). There is no evidence of big groups or parties under politicians with programs to push.

There are no particularly rigid positions, but politicians shift around considerably; for example, Aristocrates, a member of the Four Hundred, ends up executed as a democratic general; Eratosthenes of the Thirty was among the moderates before the capitulation. Alcibiades was not in any programmatic position. All this indicates that Beloch's tripartite divisions did not really exist, but that personal differences were important, as Xenophon emphasizes. The existence of 'moderates' as a faction must be doubted. Ideology played some part in the disputes between groups of democrats, but ideology was always very secondary to personalities (pp. 356f.).

The portrait of Theramenes as a 'moderate' democrat, protecting the interests of the rich and advocating a hoplite-style constitution like the Five Thousand is largely the product of later fourth-century writers of the Isocratean circle whose ideas were taken over by Ephorus, Aristotle, P, and so Diodorus. His casting as a leader of the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

γνῶριμοι is of the same sort. His despatch to the northern Aegean was an effort by the Five Thousand to link with the democratic fleet.

This is a formidable work, with a thorough bibliography, complete and careful annotation, full indices, one that successfully carries out what it intended. Not all his points will be accepted, but B.'s cogent arguments will have to be considered seriously. A valuable and important tool for the study of the Decelean War, one which will have great influence.

University of Alberta ROBERT J. BUCK

KOSMOS

P. CARTLEDGE, P. MILLETT, S. VON REDEN (edd.): *Kosmos: Essays in Order, Conflict and Community in Classical Athens*. Pp.xvi+268. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. ISBN: 0-521-57081-6.

Eight years after *Nomos: Essays in Athenian Law, Society and Politics* comes another collection of Athenian essays, dealing with aspects of that 'social order' for which *kosmos* is said to be a possible Greek translation.

Osborne contrasts the Hirschfeld Crater's static, non-individualized funeral exsequies with the Nessos Painter's name vase, which challenges the viewer to comprehend the juxtaposition of Herakles/Nessos and Perseus/Gorgon, and concludes that in 740 'all you need to know in order to relate to someone in eighth-century Athens [is]their rank and gender', whereas in 620 'even knowing precisely what a[n] . . . individual has done is not enough to enable a relationship to be struck up'. Three later famous vases show that, once the world had become one of questions, itstayed that way—hardly a novel insight, and the observation that Phoenician silver-gilt bowls from 725–675 reveal 'an approach to inter-personal relationships in which power predominates and morality does not enter the picture' is ill-articulated with the Athenian material. Schofield deals with a bit of the *Eudemian Ethics* which aspires tocategorize interaction of citizens *qua* citizens as a form of *philia*—albeit a form which is a fall-back from something of higher moral pretensions. The elucidation iselegant—but this is one for Aristotelian afficionados. From Foxhall we learn that Athenian friendships were not only instrumental but (sometimes) affective. This isprobably true. Yet, although it had never struck me that the pragmatism of Greek texts meant people did not (sometimes) like one another, proving they did is anothermatter, and this chapter almost manages unintentionally to create doubts: the(presented) evidential base is small, the danger of question-begging assumption substantial. Arnaoutoglou sees religious associations as socio-political constructs, and suggests their inscriptional use of the 'discourse of Athenian democracy' fostered integration of non-Athenians into Athenian society. Since the religious aspect is unaddressed and we must 'disengage from any investigation of moral or immoral elements', the picture remains partial; and some will feel aliens joined to compensate for non-integration. (Recategorizing the associations as 'peripheral' rather than 'marginal' still leaves them outside.) Democracy liked to colonize the aristocratic value-world, and Fisher examines an example in a chapter which attractively conjures up an environment of athletic ambition and erotic complications from texts that are all individually quite familiar but not commonly brought into such clear common focus.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Goldhill is entertained by Socrates' conversation with Theodote and hastens to share the experience with those (still too numerous) for whom Xenophon's *Memorabilia* remains an unopened book. His style of thought may threaten to overload the delicate charms of Socratic banter, but far worse things have come out of King's College, Cambridge, and it is better to take Xenophon too seriously than not seriously enough. The next chapter, Rubinstein on the *idiotes*, may give political specialists some useful dotted 'i' s, and crossed 't's', but offers few thrills for other consumers (though neophytes will learn from it no doubt); and Rhodes on enmity in fourth-century Athens is little different, though he manages to describe the Athenian judicial system as (I paraphrase) the scene of conflicts pursued according to the law of the jungle in the measured tones appropriate to delineation of a state under the rule of law. (Todd's appended response warns that when litigants deny previous familiarity with or enmity towards their opponents they may sometimes be lying. Who would have thought it?) More interesting is von Reden's discussion of 'topographies of civic space', in which she draws attention to the ideological implications of rejection of an actual historical synoecism of Attica, and examines the topographic ideologies of *Oedipus Coloneus* and *Acharnians*—both potentially subversive by synoecistic standards: the strand of *campanilismo* is perhaps nostalgia for an age before empire created the danger of war. The strong interconnection of synoecism and empire is important, and emerges in other ways not mentioned here, e.g. the inclination to assimilate Athens/*poleis* to Athens/demes. (Some brief comments on Piraeus, another subversive region, are expanded in an appended response by Roy.) Finally Millett explores the Agora—a place of physical, functional, and (some thought) ideological clutter, but also the premier space of civic interaction in a city where private houses were (theoretically) comparatively modest: there are no real surprises in his account, but it provides a defence against the tendency to abstract 'the courts' or 'the council', 'the assembly', and 'the Agora' from physically real locations.

Cartledge's introduction endeavours to contextualize the papers within a 'theme and problematic', and perhaps the whole is more than the sum of its parts. But there remains a whiff of the curate's egg; and the incidence of editorial imperfections is surprisingly high.

University of Liverpool CHRISTOPHER TUPLIN

ATHENS & ELEUSIS

M. B. CAVANAUGH: *Eleusis and Athens: Documents in Finance, Religion and Politics in the Fifth Century B.C.* (APA American Classical Studies, 35.) Pp. xxii + 238, 2 pls. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996. Paper, $29.95. ISBN: 0-7885-0032-5.

L. M. L'HOMME-WÉRY: *La perspective éleusinienne dans la politique de Solon*. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, 268.) Pp. 391. Liège: Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège (distributed by Libraire Droz), 1996. Paper. ISBN: 2-87019-268-1 (2-87019-068-9 pbk).

The nature of the relationship between Athens and Eleusis was an issue of considerable interest in antiquity, where it was the subject of myth as well as politics,

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and continues to exercise scholars today. Athens is not mentioned at all in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* (discussed briefly by L'H.-W.), which relates the origins of the Eleusinian Mysteries to Eleusis alone, while the Athenian First Fruits decree (one of C.'s documents) uses the panhellenic importance of the sanctuary at Eleusis to glorify the city. Both these works, albeit in very different ways, and concentrating on different periods, focus on the relationship between the city and the deme that houses what is arguably its most important sanctuary.

C.'s book, a revision of her Ph.D. thesis of 1980, has two primary aims: to provide a date for *IG* I^3 78, the 'First Fruits' decree, and to produce a new text of and commentary on *IG* I^3 386–7, an account-inventory issued by the *epistatai* of Eleusis in 408/7 B.C. C. argues that the date of *IG* I^3 78 can be established by putting it in the right place in a sequence of inscriptions which mention the officials in charge of the sanctuary. These indicate that in the period from *c*. 460 to 408 B.C., responsibility for the sanctuary shifted from a board of *hieropoioi* to a board of *epistatai*. *IG* I^3 78 belongs to the period before the establishment of the *epistatai*, which is referred to in another inscription of questionable date, *IG* I^3 32. C. argues convincingly for a date of 432 for *IG* I^3 32, despite the use in it of the three-barred sigma, and consequently for a date a little earlier—'the early- to mid-430s' (p. 88); '*c*. 435' (p. 89)—for *IG* I^3 78. Older opinion, which tended to put *IG* I^3 32 at *c*. 450 and *IG* I^3 78 at *c*. 422 or even later, isthoroughly discussed before being rejected, and each stage of the argument is established independently. C.'s date must therefore be accepted as definitive, putting an end to a long-running and vigorous debate (C. lists sixty-seven articles relating to the date of *IG* I^3 78 between 1880 and 1987). A date of *c*. 435 places the 'First Fruits' decree in the high point of Periclean influence in Athens: C. emphasizes its confidence and its Athens-focused panhellenism, which she likens to the tone of the abortive Congress decree.

The second part of the book concentrates on two linked inscriptions of knowndate, and as well as providing a new text, clearly laid out on fold-out pages atthe end of the volume, C. uses the account-inventory of 408/7 to paint a picture ofthe workings of the sanctuary in the later fifth century. The quantity and variety ofitems owned by the Two Goddesses is of considerable interest, including as it doesmuch utilitarian equipment for building works and general maintenance, as wellas material necessary for cult activities. From a statement of money given by initiates C. calculates that at least 2200 people were initiated in 408 (p. 189). Like itspredecessor in the APA series, Rosivach's *The System of Public Sacrifice in Fourth- century Athens*, this book casts considerable light on the practical realities of classical Athenian religion.

Like C., L'H.-W. is also attempting to give a new interpretation to a much analysed text, in this case Solon fr. 30 Gentili and Prato (= fr. 36 West), the most famous fragment which refers to Solon's liberation of the earth by removing the *horoi* planted in it. Following the view of H. van Effenterre, L'H.-W. rejects the notion, found in both the *Ath. Pol.* and *Plutarch*, that these *horoi* were related to debt and debt-bondage, and instead suggests that Solon is describing a military liberation, specifically of the land of Eleusis, after a period of foreign, specifically Megarian, control. L'H.-W.'s case isbuilt on a considerable amount of rather fragmentary material. He postulates a Megarian invasion of Attica, which resulted in the annexation by Megara of Eleusis, as a response to the failed coup of Cylon, son-in-law of Theagenes of Megara, and thus adds a specifically Megarian dimension to the 'Cylonian curse', which continued to be an issue at Athens in the later fifth century. Eleusis was recaptured by Athens in the same war that saw the Athenians gain control of Salamis, and aspects of the myth of the war between Athens and Eleusis may refer to the war between Athens and

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Megara *over* Eleusis. Once started on this route, L'H.-W. can find more traces of this deliberately suppressed episode in seventh-century Attic history: the *ahoristos* land (the land without *horoi*) of the Sacred *Orgas* on the border between Athens and Megara to the west of Eleusis, which was the cause of dispute between the two *poleis* in the fifth and fourth centuries, was established in contrast to the *horoi* which haddefaced the soil when the border lay to the east of Eleusis. The fact that the Bouleuterion in the Athenian Agora was also the Metroon is taken as evidence of an Eleusinian dimension to Solon's constitutional reforms.

It is certainly the case that the generally accepted interpretations of Solon fr. 30 are contradictory and unsatisfactory, and L'H.-W. does us a considerable service in his thorough discussion of the problems. However, his own thesis raises problems of its own. In order to explain why his central events are not actually mentioned by any surviving historian, he suggests that the truth was too accursed to discuss. The loss of Eleusis was the result of the sacrilegious treatment of the Cylonian suppliants, and the consequences of that sacrilege were still a live issue at the time of the Peloponnesian War—even after 200 years it was too soon to assess their significance. And then came Thucydides, who rejected all such religious ideas of causality and produced his own alternative explanation for the outbreak of the war. But this is surely too much toswallow. Herodotus, a non-Athenian, might be expected to show some signs of knowledge about these key events, and rumours of it might have reached Plutarch somehow.

If, ultimately, L'H.-W. fails to convince, it is in part because our evidence for seventh-century Athens is so slight that no argument is likely to be completely convincing. Nonetheless, he offers a refreshing alternative to treatments of early Athenian history which suggest that Solon was nothing more than a modern political theorist before his time. If C. is to be praised for bringing out some of the political and practical aspects of Eleusinian religion, L'H.-W. is to be thanked for emphasizing the importance of the religious dimension of early Athenian politics and history.

King's College London HUGH BOWDEN

ATHENS IN TRANSITION

J. FRÖSÉN (ed.): *Early Hellenistic Athens. Symptoms of a Change.* (Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens, 6.) Pp. iv + 226, 20 figs. Athens: Finnish Institute at Athens, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 951-95295-7-8.

This attractively produced monograph, the sixth of a new series which began in 1994, is a welcome addition to the post-Classical history of Athens as well as to Hellenistic studies in general. Archaeological research, particularly in Athens, has lagged behind historical and epigraphic work for this period. There is still a great need to balance text-based studies with field research which is not primarily textually inspired. The present volume, based on a group research project set up in 1988, presents a number of starting points for new directions of enquiry. The contributors were clearly perplexed by the continuing perception of Athens as a rather static society, despite clear evidence to the contrary in cultural and institutional spheres.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Each chapter combines different sources (literary, epigraphic, material) to explore one aspect of Athenian Hellenistic society in some detail. Mika Hakkarainen looks at the phenomenon of *philotimia*—the good reputation gained by individuals from expending private money for the public good (pp. 1–32). The term is a symptom of the changing relationship between institutional and private rôles. As H. says, this is still a much under-explored topic, which has nonetheless generated questionable assumptions about the relative political and economic power of non-elected individuals. H. does not do sufficient justice to the work of Philippe Gauthier on the pre-Macedonian antecedents of the citizen as benefactor. I would also have liked more appreciation of the impact of a new tier of super benefactors, namely the kings, whose real power sooutstripped that of ordinary individuals as to require categories of their own. TuaKorhonen's article on philosophers (pp. 33–101) shows that we know very little about how those so inclined actually performed their teaching rôle in the third century B.C. Using a wide range of specific biographies, she explores, with considerable acuteness, the philosophers' experience of public rôles and popular responses to such prominence. The paper which follows, by Martti Leiwo, on private associations, links the theme of private wealth with 'interest group' politics (pp. 103–17). L. argues that the religious element of such associations probably masks more practical needs—for mutual self-help and support, financial or economic as well as social. Common ownership also provided a useful means of tax avoidance (p. 108). (For *orgeones* and *thiasotai* see also R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* [Oxford, 1996], pp. 109–21 and App. 4). Voluntary associations became more significant as time progressed, asisdemonstrated by a new collection of essays which begin more or less where L.leaves off (J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (edd.), *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* [London, 1996]).

Having been one of the largest producers of coined money from the 470s to the mid-third century B.C., Athens seems to have had a much reduced output thereafter, particularly in the period *c*. 270–220 B.C. In a fundamental review of the problem, Kenneth Lönnqvist examines the ratio of Athenian to Macedonian coins within the city itself, on the basis of J. Kroll's recently published monograph for the Athenian Agora and of hitherto unpublished coins from the Asklepieion and Kerameikos (pp.119–45). He concludes that there is no reason to believe that the Athenians stopped or were prevented from minting their own coins during the third century B.C., but the reason for the dramatic fall in output may well have been economic.

Minna Lönnqvist surveys 'Tanagra'-style terracottas in a contextual study whichclarifies not only the evolution, character, and variety of local products but their specific cult purposes, notably in connection with the Eleusinian goddesses (pp.147–82). Erja Salmenkivi rounds off the volume with a look at the relevance of Menander's comedies to Athenian society (pp. 183–94). The papers have been translated into highly readable English, there are good indexes and a selection of excellent photographs. In all, this is a clear, balanced, coherent set of studies. Although the contributors felt that they had made only tentative moves towards a new framework for Hellenistic Athens, this is a good start and will, I hope, encourage conceptually more ambitious projects. May the series continue to flourish!

University of Liverpool ZOFIA HALINA ARCHIBALD

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ROME AND ATHENS FROM SULLA TO AUGUSTUS

MICHAEL C. HOFF, SUSAN I. ROTROFF (edd.): *The Romanization of Athens. Proceedings of an international conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska* (*April 1996*). (Oxbow monograph, 94.) Pp. x + 208, 42 figs. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1997. Paper, £24. ISBN: 1-900188-51-1.

This collection of conference papers is a welcome addition to the growing scholarly literature on Greece under Roman rule. Interest in the subject has grown from several directions, among them a reassessment of the literary value and cultural significance of later Greek literature—especially the works of Pausanias and Plutarch—and also the realization that the rich evidence from Roman Achaea makes it one of the most promising provinces in which to investigate the impact of Roman imperialism on everything from settlement patterns to cultural identity. Many of these papers derive from the long-standing American excavations in the Athenian Agora, and the rich finds of ceramic, epigraphic, numismatic, and architectural evidence made there. But other national and intellectual traditions are also represented, and the collection as a whole gives a flavour of how much may be learned about Rome from what it did to Greece.

Despite the title, most of the papers are not concerned with putting the evidence from Roman Athens in touch with current debates about Romanization. Alcock's deftintroduction provides a bibliographic starting point for those attracted by that project,as well as providing a shrewd appreciation of the strengths of this volume. Inparticular, she (rightly) points out how the richness of the Athenian evidence shouldremind historians and archaeologists with less data just how complex the consequences of Roman imperialism might be.

The real focus of the collection is on the impact of Rome on Athens during the stormy period that began with the Mithridatic Wars and the Sullan sack of 86 B.C. and ended with the Athenian rebellion against Rome in A.D. 13. Lamberton on Plutarch's Athenocentrism aside, there is little discussion here of the Athens of Hadrian and Herodes Atticus. Habicht's masterly survey of Roman visitors to Athens during the Republic begins with the Macedonian Wars, and Clinton's interesting study of Eleusis extends to the reign of Marcus, but the greater part of the volume is devoted to the decades that historians see as the collapse of the Republic into the chaos of civil war, and classical archaeologists as the transition from 'Hellenistic' to 'Roman'.

The tone in which these transitions are assessed varies according to the evidence used. For Hoff, in a racey narrative of the sack and its aftermath, the picture is grim: the city centre littered for decades with burnt-out buildings, and the population traumatized. Literary accounts are highly impressionistic, of course, and much depends on the precision with which the destruction layers and rebuilding around the Agora can be dated, a subject which I am not qualified to judge. Geagan's subtle and thoughtful prosopographical survey sees pro- and anti-Roman factions repositioning themselves constantly in response to the chaotic political context, another group always ready to step (often back) into the limelight according to the progress of civil wars or palace intrigues. Rotroff, looking with an archaeologist's eyes, sees no correlation between political crises and shifts in ceramic style.

That latter conclusion will surprise few readers familiar with other provinces, but it is valuable to have it stated so clearly. Equally the impressive demonstrations, by Kroll and Walker respectively, that the crucial period of cultural change in numismatics and architecture begins just after the middle of the last century B.C. will ring bells with

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

students of other provincial archaeologies. One of the merits of both those papers (and also of Habicht's contribution, and of that of Spawforth on the early imperial cult) is that the Athenian experience is set in the context of wider Achaean and Mediterranean patterns. Only that perspective makes it possible to see what was specific to Athens and to ask why. Several contributors (among them Habicht, Spawforth, and Kroll) cautiously suggest an Athenian ambivalence towards Rome. The implications of that view need to be teased out. Some Athenian peculiarities of cult and coinage may simply reflect the latitude allowed to a free city. Other Athenian responses to Rome look less like ambivalence, more like fierce local disagreements: Athena spitting blood on the one hand, and on the other the promotion of the imperial cult by the Eumolpidai and Kerkyres at Eleusis. 'No simple model of stony rejection or easy accommodation fits this case', as Alcock puts it.

No short review of a collection of papers ever allows enough space to discuss all the contributions as thoroughly as might be wished. The only real disappointment is Will on amphorae and the Athenian economy, in which few hard data are offered to back up sometimes fierce polemic against other scholars. It is to be hoped the publication of her long-awaited report on the amphorae from the Agora excavations, together with full details of her idiosyncratic typology, will rectify this. But Kienast's careful reassessment of the Tower of the Winds and Palagia's study of the Eleusis cistophoroi both deserve wide readerships. The collection as a whole provides a valuable survey of the state of debate on Roman Athens in this period, and one that should provoke new questions and inspire further research.

University of St Andrews GREG WOOLF

THE SPARTAN CONSTITUTION

L. THOMMEN: *Lakedaimonion Politeia: Die Entstehung der Spartanischen Verfassung.* (*Historia* Einzelschrift 103.) Pp. 170. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996. Paper, DM 76. ISBN: 3-515-069186-8.

It is probably indisputable that Sparta became a rather odd place. Xenophon and Aristotle affirm as much; and the inclination to idealize Sparta guarantees there was something socio-politically unusual about Sparta. There may be argument about which aspects were *really* peculiar, but the big question is when they arose. Antiquity said it happened far in the past and was the work of Lycurgus. Modern scholarship has modified or abandoned this view, and there is no better training in the criticism of sources and pseudo-sources than exhaustive contemplation of the last 150 years of engagement with this problem. Fortunately (for the human frame can only take somuch self-improvement) the present volume is no such thing: in Thommen's viewthere is no Lycurgus and no point in laboriously dissecting putative evidence about him.

His positive contentions amount to this. (1) The (genuine) Rhetra simply combats tyrannical revolution: the contrast between Alcman and Tyrtaeus does not prove that a closed society appeared in the seventh century whose emergence is to be associated with the Rhetra. (2) Development of the ephorate reflects the political business generated by the Peloponnesian League, Sparta's external military undertakings

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(including war with Xerxes) and the behaviour of Cleomenes (and Pausanias), not deliberate political revolution. (3) Shared adversity in 480–479 fostered shared ideology (and collective leadership: *ta tele*), but it took the Great Earthquake to prompt full-scale helot suppression, Spartan 'education', army reform, austerity, and xenophobia.

Institutional reform is thus the product of circumstances, not of a lawgiver, and T. not only eliminates Lycurgus and Chilon (Ehrenberg's Ersatz-Lycurgus) but refuses to postulate any other lawgiver. This is understandable (the sources offer no appropriate name); yet lawgivers reflect circumstances too, and someone must be responsible even for piecemeal institutional reform. Since T.'s dating brings distinctive innovation into what should be the full light of history, one wants to hear not only when the Lycurgus myth was created, but how it was done so successfuly. T.'s account stops at the era of definitive change. Subsequent events are implied when he asks what opportunities the system gave ambitious individuals (the subtext is Lysander and Xen. *RL* 14) but, apart from an allusion to Pausanias' pamphlet, the observation that disagreement about the origins of Lycurgus' reforms (Delphi? Crete?) discloses manipulative controversy, and an undeveloped suggestion that Herodotus' Spartan history revolves round 'leading families' which needed to legitimate their position in the fifth century, there is little on the process of historical misrepresentation.

T. is perhaps right that Alcman and Tyrtaeus are inconclusive, so the crucial chronological arguments are that (1) Sparta only 'shut down' in terms of cultural artefacts and participation in the Panhellenic Games in the early classical period, and (2) the contrasting Herodotean and Thucydidean pictures of Sparta show significant change occurred between 480/479 and 431. The former seems to me at least as selective a description of the evidence as a reading which makes 'austerity' start a century earlier. The latter *is* seductive: Herodotus' Spartans are brave, respect law, disdain manual labour, and eat plain food, but on the whole do not seem all that peculiar. (They have kings, but that is unconnected with the Lycurgus myth.) Thucydides' Spartans confront a 'helot problem', undergo rigorous training in bravery when young, but disdain intellectualism, are secretive and expel foreigners, have a generally conservative cast of mind, benefit from orderliness (*to eukosmon*), and trust in their *politeia* and ancestral *meletai*. But is the contrast reliable? Thucydides arguably overdoes the helot point; and much of the picture only appears because speakers have political reasons to comment on Sparta's distinctive character. Herodotus' picture is not really inconsistent with sixth-century Sparta having, for example, trained its children in a distinctive way or espoused lifestyle values modest by contemporary Greek standards, so the issue is only whether absence of evidence constitutes evidence of absence. He knows about, for example, *syssitia* (ascribed to Lycurgus: T. is vague about their actual origins) and marriage-by-rape, but lays no stress on them. Can we assume his interest in odd customs was so strong that he was bound to have described other odd Spartan customs (as he describes royal prerogatives) if there already were any? Well, no—because even on T.'s view by the time he was writing Sparta did have odd customs—indeed had only just acquired them. So we come back to the problem raised before: if Sparta only became 'Spartan' just before 450 B.C., how did she persuade the rest of the world not to reveal this fact? Only if T. can answer that is his case more than specious.

University of Liverpool CHRISTOPHER TUPLIN

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

SYRACUSAN IMPERIALISM

S. N. C. LANGHER: *Un imperialismo tra democrazia e tirannide. Siracusa nei secoli V e IV a.C.* Pp. xxxii + 285, 159 figs. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 88-7689-131-5.

This study offers a thorough and well-documented narrative of political history at Syracuse from Gelon to Agathocles, in pursuit of the theory that the particular social, economic, and political circumstances of Sicily enabled Syracuse to create a political structure which transcended the idea of the *polis* to form a 'territorial state'. It is accepted that Dionysius I created the prototype territorial state, styling himself 'archon of Sicily' according to Athenian inscriptions, but Langher argues that the desire and imagination to create a supra-*polis* state was a feature of Sicilian (specifically Syracusan) governments whatever their nature, from as early as the time of Phalaris. While there are differences between traditional tyrannical alliances forged through marriage, and long-term territorial conquest, the parallels drawn between the tyrants of the fifth and fourth centuries are salutary; the appeals made by fourth- (and indeed third-) century rulers to the policies of their predecessors were more than propaganda. L.'s emphasis on continuity is hence valuable, although her theory includes both the democratic government of the fifth century and the constitution of Timoleon in the expansionist schema too.

It is certainly true that the ethnic and geographical character of Sicily created the conditions for the growth of the city beyond the *polis* template—the need for strength to counter external attack, and the mixed nature of the populations—although by the mid-fourth century this was also beginning to happen in mainland Greece: to say that such supra-*polis* structures were unknown elsewhere is inaccurate, as the profusion of federal states and leagues in fourth-century Greece was a similar kind of answer to the problem of threatening external powers. The tyrannies of fourth-century Syracuse had their counterparts in Thessaly and the Peloponnese, where older political forms became newly powerful. For this reason, it is disappointing that L.'s study should treat Syracuse within something of a vacuum; not only are comparisons with mainland Greek states neglected, but she also offers little on the attitudes or policies of other Sicilian states, where there are interesting questions about self-definition to be raised:for instance, the rivalry of Selinous with Syracuse in the fifth century, or the motivation of pro- and anti-Syracusan feeling in 415. L. emphasizes the desire of the Hellenized Sicel states such as Morgantina for independence during the campaigns of Ducetius: if Hellenism equated to a desire for autonomy, one could ask exactly what it meant to the other Greek states for Dionysius I to claim *arche* over the whole island.

L. seems ultimately undecided about the rôle of external threat as the mechanism driving Syracusan expansion: her desire to trace the concept of *arche* further back than Gelon requires her to argue that social and economic needs could cause this kind of expansion; the argument is unsuccessful in that the desire to expand which she ascribes to Syracuse holds true for most other cities, Sicilian and mainland, too, and resulted in attempts at conquest and the formation of empires in many places at different times. While tyrants of all periods desired expansion, and set up institutions which differed from those of the *polis*, I am not so convinced that identical motivations can be traced in the democratic and Timoleontic periods. For the post-Dionysian period in particular, it is not clear that 'influence' is the same thing asdomination; one might see a closer parallel with the Athenian empire than the Agathoclean kingdom. It is not clear that the wish to expand the state was a uniquely

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Syracusan mode of thought. Nor is L.'s conclusion quite as radical as she initially suggests; although the attribution of expansionist motives to Phalaris and pre-fifth-century tyrants is attempted, it cannot be securely documented, and finally she is unable to rule out the influence of external threats as the reason for distinctive political forms. There is a tantalizing reference to the theory of Calderone that Sicilian political forms were influenced by their Italian neighbours in areas such as the granting of citizenship, and this merits greater consideration.

More unusual is the attention devoted to numismatic evidence: each chapter illustrates a broad range of contemporary coinage, and L. discusses interpretations of the coins in the light of modern theories. The growing similarity of Agathocles' coin types to those of the Successors, for instance, is well demonstrated, and Dionysius' purposes in minting bronze as well as silver are expounded. The discussions on other topics, however, are disappointingly short: given the profusion of illustrations, more could have been made of the coinage of other states, and of patterns of distribution.

The most problematic aspect of the study is its apparent status as a synthesis based on other books; most discussions are referred in the notes to previous works of L.'s, and often we are asked to accept a conclusion without seeing the reasoning behind it, which frustrates the reader who wishes to follow up particular interpretations or arguments. The production quality of the book could be better: there are many mistakes and inaccuracies, both in notes and bibliography (including some grievous mangling of names).

Despite this, the study draws some very worthwhile comparisons between early and later Syracusan tyrannies, and although there may be few surprises in the historical narrative, this and the numismatic focus make it a valuable contribution to the debate.

University of Wales, Cardiff SIAN LEWIS

ALEXANDER'S MARSHALS

WALDEMAR HECKEL: *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire*. Pp. xxv + 416, 3 maps. London and New York: Routledge, 1992. Cased. ISBN: 0-415-05053-7.

This important book is more than a work of reference: it takes account of the sea-change in Alexander studies over the past two generations, and combines scholarly authority with accessibility. (I apologize for the delay in the appearance of this review.)

Heckel has made the prosopography of the late fourth century his special preserve, and here offers, in a reworking of his 1978 doctoral thesis, a revision of part of Berve's *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (1926). That still fundamental work comprised a volume of essays on the structure and operation of Alexander's court, army, and administration, and a volume of prosopographical lemmata, the main body of which (ii.1–410) dealt with no fewer than 834 'persons who demonstrably came into contact with Alexander', arranged by alphabetical order of their names in Greek. H. casts his net less widely but differently. He aims to make available to non-specialists short biographies of 153 of the principal officers of Alexander, including eight who were not treated, or were not regarded as real persons, by Berve: the *somatophylakes* Iolaos and Philippos (*IG* II^2 561), the royal pages Aphthonetos and Archedamos (Ael. *V.H.* 14.48) and Aphthonios ('Elaptonius', Curt. 8.6.9), the pentakosiarchs Amyntas and Antigonos (Curt. 5.2.5), and Pausanias the hypaspist

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and lover of Philip II (Diod. 16.93.3–6). H. also has a different historical agenda: tofocus on the men (and they are all men) who are arguably the real authors of Alexander's success, and to straddle the divide between Alexander's reign and the early years of the Successors, who owed their positions to having served the king.

The book is organized into two parts. The first part (Chapters I–IV) is arranged by relationship to Alexander (the 'old guard', 'new men', casualties of the succession, and alleged boyhood friends of Alexander), the second (Chapters V–IX) by military function (*somatophylakes* and commanders of regular hypaspists, of Argyraspids, ofinfantry, and of cavalry). Each individual is treated in a numbered subsection; Parmenion is i.2.1, Hephaistion ii.1.2, Ptolemy iv.3, Meleagros ix.2.4, and so on. Sometimes an extra section letter is used, as with minor figures like Iolaos the *somatophylax*, v.B.5.2. The complexity of these references may discourage their use as a standard form of citation in place of Berve's continuous numeration (in which the commanders named above are simply nos 606, 357, 668, and 494), but after using the book for a while one quickly absorbs the significance of the roman digit. (It would have made the book far easier to use, however, if these numbers, or at least the section numbers, had been repeated in running heads. A concordance lists the 153 subjects alphabetically by romanized spelling, but it would have been helpful to have an index—promised in the preface—which could have included other names such as patronymics.)

To make the book attractive to a wider audience, H. entertains the reader to extended essays on selected figures, somewhat populistically characterized in his section titles: the fascinating Hephaistion (*omnium amicorum carissimus*) receives twenty-six pages (pp. 65–90), and is credibly characterized as 'the most influential man in the newly-won empire' (p. 65), 'a skilful manipulator of the King's power of command' (p. 71), and 'quarrelsome, deliberately incompatible' (p. 83). Where Berve devoted less space to events after Alexander's death, H. presents a more rounded picture, less dependent on the accident of historical periodization, by taking the stories of leading men down beyond 323. Thus Krateros (φιλοβασιλεύς) receives twenty-seven pages (pp. 107–33), and is fully covered down to his death in 320. Perdikkas ('successor and failure') receives thirty pages (pp. 134–63), Polyperchon ('a jackal among lions') seventeen (pp. 188–204). Substantial subsections are devoted to Parmenion, Philotas, Antipatros, Leonnatos, Harpalos, and Nearchos; but H. modestly eschews a full treatment of some leading figures on the ground, stated in the preface, that other scholars had produced, or were then about to produce, comprehensive monographs. Thus Antigonos, Ptolemy, Seleukos, and Lysimachos almost evade notice, for only their careers under Alexander are treated fully. They have indeed been the focuses of recent books by R. A. Billows, W. M. Ellis, J. D. Grainger, and H. S. Lund, but given the variability of those treatments it would have been good to have systematic accounts in H.'s incisive style to set beside them.

In the second part, Antigenes and Teutamos (the only listed commanders of the Argyraspids) almost emerge as personalities, but inevitably the minor figures, often attested but once in the sources, barely have time to speak before they leave the stage (twenty-seven royal pages and hypaspists come and go in ten pages, for example). Nevertheless, a wide selection of individuals will make it clear to Greekless (and Germanless) readers what a range of Macedonian talent Alexander was playing with.

The Greekless reader, indeed, will find the whole book eminently usable, since direct quotations are mostly reserved for the notes, which are full and scholarly. The extensive bibliography will be useful to students and researchers alike, and contains many gems unfamiliar to those not deeply immersed in the period. Not the least

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

helpful element in the book is the clear maps, showing Alexander's campaigns (adjusted to take account of later coastline changes), Nearchos' voyage, and the naval campaigns of the Lamian war of 323–322 B.C., the last accompanying one of several specialized appendixes.

H.'s organization of his material, more flexible than Berve's, if less ambitious, andhis use of functional categories allow him to preface and conclude the prosopographical sections with authoritative discussions, such as those of recruitment and promotion of élite youths through the Macedonian military hierarchy (pp.237–59) and of terms such as *archihypaspistês* (p. 299), *argyraspidai* (pp. 307–8), and *pezhetairoi* (pp. 320–1). These passages, no less than the detailed essays on individuals, draw together a mass of expertise and demonstrate H.'s mastery of hisfield. This book, though detailed enough to satisfy the expert, will also inform students and entertain the many general readers for whom Alexander remains the most fascinating figure in antiquity.

University of Leicester/British School at Athens GRAHAM SHIPLEY

THE ACHAEMENID 'EMPIRE'

C. TANCK: *Arche–Ethnos–Polis. Untersuchungen zur begrifflichen Erfassung des Achämenidenreiches in zeitgenössischen griechischen Quellen*. (Europäische Hochschulschriften III, 761.) Pp. 262. Frankfurt am Main, etc.: Peter Lang, 1997. £29. ISBN: 3-631-31846-4.

Tanck discusses the Greek concept of the Achaemenid empire as a political state (*Staatstypus*). Focusing on the terms *polis*, *arche*, *ethnos*, *basileia*, *genos*, and *chora*, T. analyses the contemporary Greek sources. By her own admission, the text is more a compilation and analysis of fifth- and fourth-century Greek sources than a historical discussion of the subject (p. 7).

By concluding that Greek references to Persia varied, referring either to the person of the king, to the satraps, the satrapies, the peoples, or the empire, T.'s result is that nodefinite term for 'empire' as a reference to Persia can be recognized in the Greek sources. Principally *arche* is used to refer to the power of the king; an extended meaning includes the geographical space of the empire over which the king rules. *Basileia* refers mainly to the power of the king, and *polis* to political institutions of thePersians. The terms *ethnos* and *genos* are not used in a political sense, but refer topeople. Useful as the discussion of the individual passages may be, it is doubtfulwhether T.'s investigation advances our knowledge of the Greek idea of the Achaemenid empire. The discussion contains an element of stating the obvious, and is not helped by several discrepancies and shortcomings in T.'s argument.

By focusing on the discussion of the above terms in relation to the Achaemenid empire, the implication is that these were predominantly used in reference to Persia. Yet it ought to be considered to what extent the term *arche* first described the political power of fifth-century Athens, and then was used in Greek texts to refer to the power of the Persian king. The term *basileia* was used in the fourth century, when Philip II rose to power in Macedon and Dionysius I was tyrant of Sicily. T. briefly hints at this fact, but by failing to discuss this issue further, it is not made sufficiently clear that the terms under investigation were by no means limited to describing the Persian king or the Persian empire. It is slightly astonishing that P. Barcello's study of precisely these

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

terms (*Basileia, Monarchia, Tyrannis. Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung und Beurteilung von Alleinherrschaft im vorhellenistischen Griechenland* [Stuttgart, 1993]; HZ 79) is excluded from T.'s discussion.

Beginning the present topic with the Greek sources seems logical, yet it leads to theparadox that the Persian terminology is ranked as 'second' to the Greek sources (p.77) in an investigation which centres on the idea of the Achaemenid 'empire'. Byfirst establishing whether the primary Persian sources reveal a name for 'empire', or even a concept of 'state' or *Staatstypus*, one would clarify that the lack of Persianterminology might be reflected in the Greek references. This problem has been summarized in P. Briant's *Histoire de l'empire perse* (Paris, 1996), a monograph not included in T.'s discussion. As T. rightly points out, Greek sources focus on the person of the king, reflecting the description of his central rôle in the Persian royal inscriptions. Greek borrowing of the Persian term 'satrapy' might indicate that political terms outside their own sphere could be adopted from another society. Thus, the lack of a Persian term for 'state' may account for its absence in the Greek sources.

In the extensive discussion of the term *polis* T. suggests a similarity between Greek tyrants and Near Eastern kings by comparing the need of Greek tyrants to build cities with the city-building of Sargon II and Darius I, regarding it as an act to legitimize their claim to the throne (pp. 50–1). This narrow view fails to recognize that the civilization of the ancient Near East is defined to a large extent by the foundation of cities (cf. M. van de Mieroop, *The Ancient Mesopotamian City* [Oxford, 1997]). The urbanization of the Near East is attested from the fourth millennium B.C. and continues throughout the Persian periods. It can hardly be associated with the need to legitimize kingship. Much could be contributed to the discussion by a comparison between the Greek idea of *polis* and the Near Eastern idea of the city. Limiting the discussion to the Greek terminology, T.'s investigation thus sometimes arrives at erroneous conclusions which seem to lack a more detailed and differentiated investigation.

In her extensive discussion of Plato (*Leg.* 695c; *Ep*. 7.332a–b) on the number of Persian satrapies T. apparently credits the historicity of Plato's statements without reservation. Accepting B. Jacob's argument on the division of the empire into seven parts, because it provides an explanation for the order in which the satrapies are listed in the Persian documents (p. 73), she fails to recognize that the order of the list of lands varies considerably in the Persian royal inscriptions. Scholars have long recognized that Persian lands (OP *dahyava*) and satrapies may not necessarily be identical (J. Wiesehöfer, *Das antike Persien* [Zurich, 1993], pp. 94–7; Briant, pp. 185–8).

Another distortion caused by the lack of familiarity with the secondary literature on Achaemenid Persia relates to the question of tax exemption for Persis. Persian evidence demonstrates that Persis paid a tax called *baziš*, and was exempted only from paying *phoros*, the tribute paid by dependent, subject peoples of the empire (cf. R. T. Hallock, *Persepolis Fortification Texts* [Chicago, 1969], p. 16; the collection of articles in P. Briant & C. Herrenschmidt (edd.), *Le tribut dans l'empire perse* [Paris and Leuven, 1989]; Wiesehöfer, pp. 98–100).

Amongst several editorial errors which occur in this monograph, the reduplication of an entire paragraph on pp. 42 and 43–4, and the contradiction in the identification of the 'City of the Persians' as Persepolis and as Pasargadae on p. 182 and n. 88 ought to be pointed out in particular. The volume provides an index of the primary sources, but no subject index, and a six-page bibliography.

Centre for the Study of Ancient Documents, Oxford MARIA BROSIUS

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

HEROES

S. MILLS: *Theseus, Tragedy and the Athenian Empire* (Oxford Classical Monographs). Pp. ix + 293. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-815063-6.

U. HUTTNER: *Die politische Rolle der Heraklesgestalt im griechischen Herrschertum*. (*Historia* Einzelschrift 112.) Pp. ix + 385. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1997. DM 144. ISBN: 3-515-07039-7.

Herakles was 'short in stature' (Pindar *I.* 4.57) and the young Theseus looked so delicate that he was wolf-whistled by builders (Pausanias 1.19.1), but a lot of hard bull-wrestling and ox-throwing made these unlikely lads two of the biggest names in Greek myth, put their faces on every other vase painted in archaic Athens, and ultimately turned them into icons of power. Their careers as political symbols are now the subject of substantial and thorough monographs by Sophie Mills and Ulrich Huttner.

Mills demonstrates that the image of Theseus, as portrayed in tragedy, corresponds quite closely to the idealized image of Athens as an imperial power which one finds inFuneral Orations. These speeches praise Athens for its intelligent, moderate, and generous use of power in 'selfless intervention for the common good on behalf of the weaker' (p. 66). M. offers reasons for thinking that most Athenians, and perhaps even some of their allies (p. 85), did indeed subscribe to this view, rather than to Thucydides' bleak vision of tyrannical and 'interfering' rule ('a conscious attempt to distance himself from conventional Athenian ideology which he saw as irrelevant, given the realities of Athenian power', p. 83). Accordingly, as the next three chapters show, Euripides' *Suppliants* and *The Madness of Herakles*, and Sophocles' *Oedipus atColonus* all credit Theseus, 'essentially a secondary character' (p. 234), with a vital intervention in which he displays just the kind of spontaneous and generous risk-taking on behalf of those in trouble on which the Athenian state prided itself. That Theseus should have been made to play such a noble rôle in the latter two plays is a remarkable form of 'mythological expansionism' (p. 160), since he appears not to have played a traditional part in these stories at all. A further chapter is devoted to a fourth play, Euripides' *Hippolytus* with its angry Theseus, which does not fit this neat pattern. M. plausibly argues that the poet here presents the hero as sympathetically as the plot will allow while taking care not to suggest that Theseus' rash behaviour reflects on his country: 'the city of Athens and its ideals is [*sic*] excluded from this tale of the power of Aphrodite' (p. 194). Finally, M. scrutinizes the scrappy fragments of other plays in the hope of catching glimpses of other tragic Theseuses, but without much luck.

The discussion is nicely balanced throughout: oversimplification is avoided and overly subtle interpretations are challenged, most notably the idea that *Suppliants* is bitterly ironic in its treatment of Theseus, the conventions of warfare, and democracy (pp. 87–104). In conclusion, the notion that our hero was an 'ambivalent figure' with a 'darker side' is politely dismissed as 'somewhat overstated' (p. 264). This may make him less interesting as a dramatic character, but M.'s readings are well-supported and, to my mind, inherently plausible. Moreover, as her opening chapter shows, the Theseus legend was increasingly 'sanitized' (p. 6) even before the tragedians got their hands on it. Theseus thus emerges as a straightforward and clean-cut kind of national hero: a caped crusader, one might say, in the mould of Superman, not Batman.

Herakles, of course, resembles no one so much as the Incredible Hulk, wandering

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

far and wide after a tragic accident, performing muscular deeds with his bare hands. In his isolation, he is hardly an obvious figure to represent legitimate domination, and it is therefore not really surprising that Huttner's exhaustive study of his rôle 'in Greek rulership' finds few kings who adopted him as their patron or rôle model although there were plenty who appealed to their descent from the great hero.

In some 200 pages, H. sets out the literary, artistic, numismatic, and epigraphic evidence dynasty by dynasty, then, in just under 100 pages, he develops his analysis ofHerakles' symbolic functions. The catalogue of rulers is headed by Peisistratus, whoisacquitted of manipulating Herakles-symbolism on the grounds of insufficient evidence (pp. 25–42). Much the same is said about Philip II (pp. 65–85), the Ptolemies (pp. 124–45), and all the Antigonids except Philip V (pp. 163–74). Reservations seem appropriate in the case of Lysimachus, too, but H.'s assessment of the flimsy evidence here is remarkably positive (pp. 146–52). On the other hand, there is no denying that descent from Herakles mattered a great deal in Sparta (pp. 43–64), that Alexander and Pyrrhus are credited with making him one of their rôle models (pp. 86–123, 153–62), or that he played some part in Attalid propaganda (pp. 175–90).

The most striking evidence, however, relates to the latest and most exotic of Hellenistic monarchs: Mithradates VI Eupator, portrayed as Herakles on his coins (pp. 191–7); Antiochus of Commagene, shaking hands with the hero in monumental sculpture (pp. 198–210); and a descendant of Herakles and the widow of Antaios, Iuba II of Mauretania, whose first wife, Kleopatra Selene, was descended from Herakles via her father, Mark Antony, and whose second wife Glaphyra also traced her ancestry back to Herakles on her father's side—she claimed Dareios on her mother's side for good measure (pp. 211–20). H. does not say so, but his survey creates the distinct impression that by the late Hellenistic period Herakles played a more important rôle than he ever had before. If so, it is possible that some of the stories about Alexander and Pyrrhus cultivating and emulating this hero are late Hellenistic embroidery; perhaps we need to be more sceptical of their historicity than H. tends to be.

The analytical part of the book asks all the right and difficult questions about what functions the different kinds of legitimation served, how effective they were, and whatwere the respective rôles of rulers and subjects in propagating associations with Herakles. Often, H. is forced to argue from general principles and probabilities rather than from specific evidence, and sometimes his conclusions are a little lame, but he is never less than conscientious and always lucid. Most convincing, it seems to me, is his argument that descent from Herakles was not a cynically manipulated fiction, but a genuinely held belief which could have a real impact on a ruler's self-image, his image in the eyes of others, and even his policies in choosing allies or staking territorial claims (esp. pp. 239–49). H. is surely right to treat Plato's scoffing at stories of ancestral ties with Herakles as unrepresentative (p. 251), and it may be worth adding that even Plato does not say that these tales are untrue: he merely rejects even the most heroic descent as too trivial to mention in the grand philosophical scheme of things (*Theaetetus* 175ab; *Lysis* 205cd).

Both books, valuable as they are, would have been even better if they had been shorter. This applies especially to H.'s study, which is lengthy not only because it covers a wide range of material, but also because—to give but two examples—it spins ten lines out of the observation that it is possible, but 'almost banal', to compare someone with Herakles in size (p. 276), and devotes a footnote to complaining about the 'misleading' title of a certain article which turned out to be of no relevance to H. (p. 281 n. 40). M. keeps a tighter rein on herself, but even so one wonders whether the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

largely negative conclusions of her last couple of chapters, which do not contribute a great deal to the argument, really needed to be developed in quite so much detail.

Both authors further seem a little too keen to credit their heroes with more intellectual forms of heroism than monster- and villain-bashing. M. continually refers to Theseus as a 'civilizing hero' ('benefiting humanity', p. 25) and Athens as 'an active, civilizing city' (p. 34), which is surely an overstatement. Of course the Athenians liked to claim that they stopped their enemies from committing 'injustice', as Theseus did in myth, but that hardly amounts to a mission to spread civilization. As for Herakles, it is true that Prodicus had him face the choice between a life of indulgence and a life of self-control, and that one Herodoros imaginatively explained the club as a symbol of mental strength and the lion skin as an emblem of high morals (pp. 290–4), but there is painfully little evidence to support H.'s contention that Spartan and other rulers adopted *Hercules ethicus* as a rôle model (pp. 53–5, 282).

Otherwise, these are fine studies, which take after their subjects in much the same way that dog owners take after their pets: for Herakles, a chunky, no-nonsense volume, ranging all over of the Mediterranean world; for Theseus, something sleeker and subtler which is almost entirely confined to Athens.

University College London HANS VAN WEES

TRAJAN

J. BENNETT: *Trajan: Optimus Princeps: a Life and Times*. Pp. xviii + 317, 11 figs, 16 maps. London and New York: Routledge, 1997. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-415-13595-8.

The appearance of a new biography in English of the emperor, Trajan, is indeed tobewelcomed; on the whole, Bennett does not disappoint. Trajan's reputation in antiquity and in the Middle Ages is well-known, although passing judgement uponthat reputation is a none-too-easy task, because of the paucity of ancient source-material. The emperor's biographer has, therefore, to make the best of what there is; to this B. does full justice—a chapter (VI) devoted to the views of Pliny and Dio Chrysostom, an appendix citing Dio Cassius' treatment of the Dacian Wars, together with a chapter (VIII) on those wars which leans heavily on the evidence ofthe Column. Besides this, there is a close discussion (Chapter XIV) of the presentation of Trajan's 'virtues' on the Arch at Beneventum, as well as an ample collection of photographic plates illustrating aspects of the Trajanic coinage and monuments; particularly powerful and poignant is the late bronze bust from Ankara (plate 2D), showing clearly how the exercise of power had taken its toll of the *princeps*; this in its way provides graphic 'explanation' of, for example, Trajan's obsessive attitude to the Parthian War.

A discussion of the early principate contains a few odd assertions—for example, concerning the real significance of Augustus' 'resignation' in 27 B.C., which surely was intended to do no more than to recognize the Senate and people as the legal source of power, and thus to legitimize his own position (p. 3). Strange, too, is the implication that the Senate had been the Republic's chief legislative body (p. 6). A citation of Murison's excellent essays on the events of A.D. 68–9 (pp. 16f.) would have been helpful, as would an explanation of the assertion (p. 17) that Vitellius committed suicide in 69 (*contra* Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio Cassius).

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The discussion of the careers of Trajan's father and of the *princeps* himself, although admittedly speculative in parts, sets both the family and Trajan firmly into a context of imperial favour in the Flavian period. But was it that odd for a man in Trajan's position to become *legatus legionis*? Further, it is questionable how much (if any) stigma would still have attached to VII *Gemina* for its early history (pp. 25–6). A strength of this part of the discussion is the full acceptance of Waters's dictum regarding Domitian's reign, cited on p. 26. Although B. alludes to the possible alternative scenarios by which Trajan may have come to power, he evidently does not accept the indications of pressure brought to bear on Nerva, which are implicit in some of the coin-evidence (e.g. *RIC* [Nerva], 32; *RIC* [Trajan], 28), nor the fact that Pliny, in the *Panegyricus*, appears to expend little sympathy on the plight of Trajan's predecessor. It may be significant, too, that the pronouncement on the coinage of Nerva's deification had to wait until the 'convenient moment' of the deification of Trajan's own father (p. 183). In fact, a number of the indications of Trajan's view ofhis adoptive father do not carry an overwhelming sense of the *princeps*' admiration; indeed, B. rightly observes (p. 73) that Trajan's own choice of coin-types may suggest that he, like Fronto in A.D. 96, thought that *libertas* under Nerva had come too close to *licentia*.

Politically, Trajan is shown, both through the works of Pliny and Dio Chrysostom and through his own activities, to have been at least as autocratic as Domitian, if not more so, yet able through his personal demeanour to appear to behave as the partner of his aristocratic peers. This ability is implied in Tacitus' observation regarding Nerva's reconciliation of *principatus* and *libertas*, which also has as one of its cornerstones a recognition of the fact that the *princeps* had risen through the senatorial career-structure, not through a dynastic process. Nor is there any pressing reason, withB., to believe that Tacitus was being 'wry' about Trajan. This, in fact, was a consideration that stressed an important link in Tacitus' mind (*Hist*. 1.15–16) between the events of A.D. 68–9 and 96–8. This theme is brought to a persuasive conclusion through the depictions on the Beneventum Arch (Chapter XIV).

Reasonably enough, a good deal of space is devoted to the major campaign-areas of Trajan's reign—the Danube and the East, both of which are made much easier to follow, as is the chapter (XII) on the organization of Dacia and Arabia, by clear maps and diagrams. B.'s archaeological background is put to very good use in the way in which strategies and campaigns are elucidated using the combination of the different source-types available to place them on the ground. The narrative in these sections is detailed and tight, and provides an account that is admirably clear for the reader to follow.

Nevertheless, the reader of B. will be frequently affected by a sense of paradox, perhaps the paradox implicit in the emperor himself. The author plainly, like the ancients, has great admiration for the *optimus princeps*; yet he gives us a range of reasons not to feel thus—inefficiencies in campaigning, the gratuitous and ill-judged provocation of the Parthians, as well as an administration that was not an obvious improvement upon Domitian's. Overall, though, B. demonstrates the significance of Pliny to Trajan's image; and it is a cry that has been heard in more recent times: 'It is not the substance that matters, but the style'. The substance alone might have left Trajan wanting for popularity; the style dominated all. Indeed, whether or not he realized it, Pliny expressed the central paradox when he said, 'You bid us to be free: so free we shall be'. Freedom had ceased to be a right, and had become, like everything else, an imperial gift that could be taken away as easily as it was given.

This book is certainly a valuable addition to the burgeoning collection of imperial

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

biographies, coming along shortly before Birley's *Hadrian*. Indeed, questions relating to Hadrian's relationship both with Trajan and with Trajan's friends might have been expected to bulk rather larger in B.'s book than they do.

There are a number of oddities, errors, and misprints: surely *Pudicitia* should be inthe genitive case after *Ara* (p. 150); equally it was Trajan who was *felix* rather than his rebuilt harbour at Ostia (p. 140); and *milliaria* and *quingenaria* (p. 166) should be plural. Pompey's friend and *legatus* was Gabin*i*us (p. 187); similarly, one can argue thecase for Crassus having been a megalomaniac, but he was certainly not consul in 54 B.C. (p. 187). Finally, supporters of Hadrian might not be overenthusiastic about B.'s unquestioning assumption that Trajan's heir was responsible for the murder of the four consulars (p. 213). Such matters as these need to be revisited in the event of a reprint.

That, however, does not basically detract from the value of a book which provides the reader in the English language his/her first chance at a full biography of an emperor of great significance and charisma.

University of Lancaster DAVID SHOTTER

THE ROMANIZATION OF ITALY

A. GIARDINA: *L'Italia romana. Storie di un'identità incompiuta*. Pp.xv + 442. Rome: Editori Laterza, 1997. Cased, L. 45,000. ISBN: 88-420-5236-1.

This richly textured book is, in its essentials, an enquiry into the nature and extent of romanization in Italy during the Imperial period. Most of the essays have been previously published (and are not generally updated), and represent research carried out over the past twenty years or so. They cohere together well, and display a magisterial grasp of, in particular, the literary and epigraphic sources, Empire-wide. The learning is, in fact, formidable, but also underlines how the study of Imperial Roman Italy has now finally come centre stage. Furthermore, Giardina integrates this with absorbing historiographical observations, not least how the recent history of the *Mezzogiorno* of Italy has echoes of a Roman past. Himself born in Palermo, he tellingly remarks (p. x) that 'non trascuro. . . l'influsso delle mie origini siciliane'. How refreshingly honest!

The central themes, as the title of the book makes clear, are the patchy and incomplete nature of romanization in Italy and the sheer complexity of the picture—hence the plural, '*storie*'. The inhabitants of the peninsula formed a variegated mixture of peoples, of diverse ethnicity and speaking many different languages. Italywas thus not a unified country of 'Italians'; instead, individuals expressed their identity in terms of allegiance to Rome and to their own town or city in Italy. It is striking that the same phenomenon continues to this day, down to the smallest unit of urban settlement; as in antiquity, the concept of an Italian nationality is a view that ismuch more commonly recognized outside Italy than within the peninsula. Sicily, however much an ethnic hotch-potch, was—and remains—in effect a separate, but much more united, country.

G.'s exploration of these themes is fascinating. Shepherds and transhumance;

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

brigands; the contrast between life in the mountains and that on the lowlands; and the consequences of deforestation and flooding—all play a part in his unfolding narrative. So, too, does the gradual provincializing of 'Roman Italy' during the later Empire; and the supposed decline and collapse of the slave-run *Latifundia*. Cracco Ruggini, Finley, Gabba, Gramsci, Lo Cascio, Mazzarino, Rostovtzeff, and Weber are amongst those most frequently cited, the work of archaeologists more actively involved in fieldwork very much less so (and here the citation of articles on dendrochronology [1977] and radiocarbon dating [1970], at p. 180 n.77, are disconcerting by their out-of-dateness). Whilst the use of geomorphological evidence is welcome and important, and amphora studies put in an obligatory, and necessary, appearance, the neglect of the results of landscape surveys and, indeed, excavation reports is worrying. Have those of us practising classical archaeology in Italy failed to make an appropriate intellectual breakthrough with our labours? Is the study of 'Roman Italy' entirely a matter of'consumer cities', and 'tax-producing' and 'tax-consuming' regions? Has the dichotomy of approach between ancient historians and archaeologists, that those like Martin Frederiksen (cited just once) and John Ward-Perkins (cited not at all) have tried to bridge over the past forty years or so, made no impact whatsoever?

'Landscape archaeology' is indeed at a momentous stage. The current re-evaluation of the finds from the South Etruria survey, at a time when our knowledge of ceramics dating has been transformed, promises fundamental new perspectives. The use of novel techniques of geophysical investigation, likewise part of the British School at Rome's Tiber Valley Project, is already yielding settlement plans (e.g. of Falerii Novi, Forum Novum, and Portus) of unparalleled quality. Excavations like the investigation that Professor Anthony King and I carried out on a villa to the north of Rome (now fully published as *Excavations at the Mola di Monte Gelato*, Archaeological Monographs of the British School at Rome 11, 1997) have disclosed results which fit not at all with currently fashionable models (hence my question mark over the supposed universal decline of the 'slave-mode of production' in the second century A.D.). Inshort, there is a wealth of evidence pouring forth from the ground which goes farbeyond the current debates of some of the ancient historians. Paul Arthur's highlyinnovative study of amphorae from Monte Gelato, which adds an entirely new perspective on the nature of wine production in the vicinity of Rome in the early Imperial period, is but one illustration of this.

To sum up, I approached G.'s book with excitement. Volumes on, for example, Roman Britain are commonplace; a Roman [Imperial] Italy is not. I found that there was much that was invigorating in this monograph, and learnt much from its ideas and scholarship. It also had perspectives which made me deeply thoughtful. But it is not the book which, for me, reflects the fundamental contribution that archaeology has been attempting to make to the subject's study; the debate, informed by outstanding scholars such as John Ward-Perkins (and now by his son, Bryan, whose major work is also not cited: *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages. Urban Public Building inNorthern and Central Italy, AD 300–850* [Oxford, 1984]) will assuredly continue: that practising archaeologists must clearly learn to speak with much louder voices. The British School at Rome's Tiber Valley Project, an intensely stimulating develop- ment out of John Ward-Perkins's South Etruria survey, provides one—albeit very conspicuous—opportunity.

The British Museum T. W. POTTER

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CAMPANILISMO

M. C. Spadoni Cerroni, A. M. Reggiani Massarini: *Reate*. (Biblioteca di Studi Antichi, 68.) Pp. 207, 5 tavole, 112 figs. Pisa: Giardini, 1992. Paper.

The dangerous half-truth that all history is local history has long stimulated the writing of histories of the communities of *Italia Romana*. Within this tradition, Messrs Giardini have established a notable presence. This is not the place to list their or others' titles or to evaluate the genre as a whole. Yet, as the present volume well illustrates, there may be need of such an evaluation, for the genre has its limitations.

The volume comprises two wholly independent parts. The first part (pp. 13–124), by Spadoni Cerroni, is a historical and institutional sketch, much influenced by Emilio Gabba and the Pisa–Pavia–Perugia seminar. Its sections cover the literary evidence for the pre-Roman ethnography of the area, narrative history from the 290s onwards, administrative organization, society and economy, prosopography, and cults. Relevant literary sources are printed out, as are texts of the fifty-six new inscriptions discovered since *CIL* IX. There are five *tavole* (maps and family trees). The lavishly illustrated second part (pp. 127–90), by the archaeologist Reggiani Massarini, sketches the physical and social geography of the region, explores the links between Sabines and early Rome, describes the road system in its relation to saltways, drove roads, and cult centres, surveys the major known sites in the *ager Reatinus*, and summarizes the known layout, monuments, and buildings of classical Reate itself. There is an *index nominum* and a brief contents list, but no list of figures.

There is much of value here. The debate over the profiles of the Sabines in classical sources is usefully presented, as are the materials on the administrative organization of republican Italy. The analysis of communications is lucid and meaty, and the discussion of land use is sensible so far as it goes, though no locational analysis of *vici* or *villae* is given (yet the absence of sites away from the *via Salaria* tempts comment). However, my overall reaction is dissatisfaction. Some aspects are trivial, such as missing cross-references, the repetition of material (p. 154 ~ p. 157), and the way in which the two authors' lists of abbreviations (pp. 57f. and 191–3) overlap in content but differ in format. Less trivial are the lack of a properly assembled bibliography, which would have both cut some notes by half and been a valuable research tool, or the poor quality of many of the illustrations: the latter forgivable, perhaps, with fuzzy grey reproductions of the only visual record of this or that excavation, but less so with maps so reduced in scale that place- or street-names cannot be read (e.g. Figs 1, 5, 10, 57, and 106). While *Tav*. 1 and Fig. 17, reproduced from the IGM map, are passable (albeit antique, without scales, and covering only the immediate vicinity of Rieti), the only map which embraces the whole *ager Reatinus* (*Tav.* 4) is taken from the Touring Club's 1:200,000, fails to reproduce the very elements—the rivers and lakes—which were Rieti's territorial spine, and is not used to delineate its likely boundaries or the find-spots of classical material.

Worse, though Polverini's introduction (pp. 7–8) defends the division of labour, thetwo parts show no connexion or logical sequence. Instead, physical geography (pp.127–32) should palpably have come first, with onomastics (pp. 57–89) and cult (pp. 91–103) at or near the end. Important topics are covered twice, such as centuriation (p. 32 n. 19 ~ p. 150), Curius Dentatus' initiation of the drainage of the *lacus Velinus* (p. 32 n.15 ~ pp. 129f.), cults and deities (pp. 91ff. ~ pp. 151ff.), or the earlySabine–Roman relationship (pp. 13ff. ~ pp. 133ff.). Authors and editor have regrettably ducked the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

essential task of devising a framework which could integrate the literary–documentary evidence with the topography and the archaeology. Relevant models do exist (e.g. Patterson, *JRS* 83 [1993], 189–93): they are our future.

One final comment. The 'campanilistic' genre runs the risk of neglecting macro-regional or thematic concerns. Space permits two examples only. First, the decision to turn Reate into *ager Romanus* as part of the *limes* of Roman citizen settlement which came to separate Samnites from Gauls and Etruscans surfaces only in a brief footnote (p. 30 n. 7), though its consequences were profound for Italy as a whole. Similarly, the (linked?) decision to drain the Veline basin (p. 32 nn.15 and 19) was not just a local matter but also a crucial step in the history of that sadly under-researched subject, Roman drainage technology. Local history should never be just local history.

University of Liverpool JOHN K. DAVIES

TRADE AND EXCHANGE IN ROMAN GAUL AND GERMANY

GURLI JACOBSEN: *Primitiver Austauch oder Freier Markt? Untersuchungen zum Handel in den gallisch-germanischen Provinzen während der römischen Kaiserzeit*. (Pharos, Studien zur griechisch-römischen Antike, 5.) Pp. 237. St Katherinen: Scripta Mercaturae Verlag, 1995. Paper, DM 54. ISBN: 3-89590-003-6.

Jacobsen sets out in this concise and impressive monograph to revisit the central debates on the nature of the ancient economy through an examination of the evidence from one (large) part of the Roman empire. As is well known, a lack of consensus over what precisely is at issue in those debates has confused, and arguably stultified, much subsequent investigation of ancient economics. In particular, arguments about quantitative matters (the level of surplus production, the volume of trade) have become confused with debates over qualitative issues (was the ancient economy embedded in social and political structures?). J. is admirably clear that he is concerned with the latter issues, and in particular with how trade was organized.

The Gallic and German provinces were a good choice for this investigation. Literary sources and epigraphy both contribute to the understanding of economic activity there, while archaeological research in the area has long made the investigation of exchange a priority. Nevertheless, no thorough survey of the economy of the region has appeared since Albert Grenier's (1937) contribution to the third volume of Tenney Frank's *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, and despite influential recent discussions by Goudineau in the first volume of the *Histoire de la France Urbaine* (1980) and by Kneißl in the *Festschrift* for Karl Christ (1988), J. has effectively had to produce a new synthesis. That task has been accomplished with remarkable success. The pace of archaeological work, especially the study of transport amphorae, is currently very rapid and the research for this study was substantially completed in 1989 (although some later bibliographic items have been added), yet there are surprisingly few gaps.

J. begins with a fair summary of the debate over ancient trade and transport. Substantive chapters then deal with individual products, with the personnel of trade and then (in the largest section) with a series of case studies, mostly of the larger cities

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Gaul. Although all categories of material are used, the most original analyses areessentially epigraphic, and some useful appendices gather those inscriptions that mention traders. All this now needs to be read alongside L. Wierschowski's (1995) *Die regionale Mobilität in Gallien nach den Inschriften des 1. bis 3. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. Quantitative Studien zur Social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der westlichen Provinzen des römischen Reiches* in the *Historia* Einzelschriften series. A final chapter draws together the results and returns to the original problem.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, J. concludes that neither the ideas of Rostovtzeff nor those of Finley offer wholly convincing interpretations of trade in the Gallic and German provinces. Instead free-market trade coexisted with less commoditized exchanges generated by the demands of military supply; patronage was important in structuring trade organizations, yet in some areas traditional Roman prejudices against commerce seem not to have prevented even *decuriones* advertising their involvement, and so on.The reality of commerce was a good deal more complex, in short, than either modernizing or primitivist orthodoxies would suggest.

J.'s view of the nature of trade in the Roman northwest provinces has a great deal torecommend it. But it would be fair to admit that the plausibility of some aspects derives mainly from *a priori* considerations. It is easier to use the small number of relevant inscriptions to falsify hypotheses than to build new models of the organization of trade. It is to J.'s credit that he is well aware of these limitations. He is, in fact, at his best when spotting awkward complications, when teasing out differences between the economic orientation of different Gallic regions, for instance, or in drawing attention to the evident significance of land transport despite its well-known expense. Other high points are the careful discussions of inland shipping, and of the apparent lack of any sign that internal tariff regions made much difference to exchange patterns.

All this takes J. far from the stark terms in which the debate over the nature of theancient economy has so often been conducted. His courage in departing so far from his original research design is to be applauded, and ought to encourage others togo even further in evading those rather sterile controversies. After all, it was J.'s choice to approach the economy of these regions in these terms that led him to concentrate on long-distance trade over other kinds of exchange, to say little about monetarization, to choose big cities (with inscriptions) as his case studies, rather than the small centres with their lively but locally oriented economies (on which see now theproceedings of the Bliesbruck conference on *Agglomérations secondaires*). It is tobe hoped that J.'s successors will take seriously not only his many constructive observations but also his conclusion that both primitivist and modernizing models are in their own ways too lacking in nuance to provide a fair account of the reality of ancient commercial life.

University of St Andrews GREG WOOLF

IN LAUDEM CONSTANTINI

T. G. ELLIOTT: *The Christianity of Constantine the Great*. Pp. x + 366. Scranton: University of Scranton Press, 1997. Cased, $24.95 (Paper, $19.95). ISBN: 0-940866-58-7 (0-940866-59-5 pbk).

Edward Gibbon was open in his dislike of Constantine. Here was an emperor whose

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

character flaws were clearly exposed in his declining years when he was all too willing to 'sacrifice without reluctance the laws of justice, and the feelings of nature, to the dictates either of his passions or of his interest' (*The History of the Decline and Fall* II [London, 1781], p. 78). Thomas Elliott is more forgiving. He is unashamed in his liking for an emperor whom he is keen to heroize as 'a great warrior and an able administrator who carried out his extraordinary mission with deliberate speed, indefatigable industry, and great generosity of spirit' (p. 336).

This is a new Constantine the late twentieth century can more easily admire. Not a fanatic, not converted as the result of a miraculous experience involving a cross in the sky before the Battle of the Milvian Bridge, not a man endlessly badgered by his ecclesiastical advisers at court, not an emperor who sought to subordinate the church to the empire, not a ruler seeking to dominate proceedings at the Council of Nicaea ('he was just trying to be helpful, and he succeeded in being helpful' [p. 335]), not asuperstitious man with an infirm grasp on the intellectual intricacies of Christian theology, not a confused monarch who slid into Arianism in his old age.

E., of course, realizes that such an account of Constantine is one which requires (on all the points listed above) considerable argument. On most issues, as he recognizes, it is also difficult to reach any firm conclusions. But he contends that his version of Constantine has the important intellectual virtue of 'economy of explanation' to recommend it (p. 328). On balance, this is a fair claim, but, in many cases, the costs of E.'s economy may be more than many are prepared to pay.

To take one example. E., building on a series of his own articles, argues that both Constantine and his father Constantius I were Christians in the 290s, right through the Great Persecution and long before any miracle in 312. The economy of this explanation (which can at least for Constantius be supported by Eusebius) also requires the complete devaluing both of the overtly non-Christian imagery of Constantius' coins and of the surviving panegyrics delivered prior to 312. 'The propaganda of Constantius and Constantine proves only what they wanted their propaganda to say, and nothing whatever about their personal belief' (p. 23). After all,the army had to be kept loyal and pagan subjects happy. The corollary is neat: 'inspite of unchristian things which he [Constantine] did, he really was a Christian' (p.25). The chief economy of this circular argument—as E. fleetingly recognizes at p.25 n. 43—is that on its own terms it is unfalsifiable.

But this kind of argument is important to E. On grounds of economy, Constantine must always have been a committed Christian with touches of public paganism just to keep everyone on side. Faced with the Panegyrist of 310 who claimed that Constantine made lavish gifts to a temple of Apollo in Gaul, E. contends that this action might be accepted as true: 'however, if it is true it would not prove that Constantine... was a pagan. A Christian in his circumstances in 310 might have made gifts [to Apollo]' (p.52). Similarly, faced with a less than Christian foundation ceremony for Constantinople, E. remarks: 'I take it that it is a mistake to look for an accurate reflection of Constantine's religious views in the ceremony with which the city was founded' (p. 256). Again, the statue of Constantine as Sol Helios which dominated the forum of his new capital would (in E.'s view) 'gradually make the point that paganism was decorative only' (p. 259). Of course, in each case E. may be right. But that would require (and some might find this a bankrupt argument) that Constantine recognized the same virtues of consistency and economy as E.

And that is clearly not the case. Constantine was not always as nice, nor as honest, nor as predictable as E. would wish. He did, after all, have both his wife and son executed. E. is undaunted, suggesting that the story of the couple's incestuous

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

relationship 'could be right'. 'It is not altogether easy for many people to feel comfortable with Constantine after that, in spite of the possibility, which must be acknowledged, that he had good reasons' (p. 234). Nor did Constantine always tell the truth. In his letter to Alexander and Arius written in late 324 he claimed to have no view on the Arian heresy and to be innocent of complex matters of theology. Such a view does not accord with Constantine's more partisan pronouncements, nor his rôle the following year at the Council of Nicaea. Confronted by this seeming shift in Constantine's views, E. prefers to see the letter to Alexander and Arius as 'insincere' (p. 179) rather than as indecisive or the result of a change in imperial policy. That is unfortunate. These moments of imperial wavering should not simply be flattened out on the iron ground of consistency. Rather, they could be allowed to stand as examples of Constantine's confusion, or of his uncertainty, or of his ability to change his mind.Exploring these possibilities might have resulted in the portrayal of a more humane and sympathetic (perhaps even a more Christian) emperor. But economy of explanation does not allow great men such untidiness.

That is regrettable. And it seems largely the product of a confusion between economy and simplicity. The lesson of scholarship since Gibbon is surely that interpretations of Constantine's policy and religion should be based on something more than a series of well-worn alternatives: pagan or Christian, cynic or believer, subtle politician or lucky opportunist, domineering caesaropapist or true son of the church. E.'s imaginary opponent who would argue (almost with E.-like economy) that 'Constantine was a wily and ruthless politician who masqueraded as a devout Christian for fun and profit' (p. 328) is a straw man. The choices and conclusions offered by those who are unconvinced by E.'s consistently Christian Constantine arealways likely to be more subtle and more sophisticated. Indeed, it is a mark of Constantine's achievement and his fascination that he resists simple categorization. His very political and religious success will always demand complex and unashamedly complicated historical explanations.

Polemicists have, of course, a more clear-cut set of priorities. In his *Life of Constantine* Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, claimed that Constantine's Christianity was the direct result of a conversion experience at the Milvian Bridge as dramatic as St Paul's on the road to Damascus. As E. suggests, we do not have to believe this account. Equally, Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, set out to implicate Constantine in his anti-Arian polemics, which deliberately fostered an image of a vacillating emperor under the influence of unscrupulous bishops. Again, as E. persuasively points out, we do not have to believe that story either. Against such highly charged narratives, E. himself has claimed that Constantine's policy and religion 'were much more ordinary and consistent' (p. 327) and that the 'the overwhelming impression' is 'of a man who spent his life in excellent service to God and to his fellow men, to whom he was always trying to bring the blessings of peace' (p. 336). Perhaps. Certainly simplicity is an attractive virtue—in both an emperor and a historian. But, as with other too neatly packaged versions of Constantine 'the Great', it is hard ever to be convinced. In the end, the unhappy (and somewhat ironic) truth is that belief in E.'s own hagiographical vision of Constantine must itself remain more a matter of faith than of economical argument.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge CHRISTOPHER KELLY

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ENIGMA

S. N. C. Lieu, D. Montserrat (edd.): *Constantine. History, Historiography and Legend*. Pp. xix + 238. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-415-10747-4.

The result of a conference held at the University of Warwick in 1993, this book contains nine articles about the emperor Constantine the Great. It consists of two parts: the first on history and historiography, the second on legend. In her short introduction to the volume, Averil Cameron rightly observes that Constantine is a historical figure of major importance but also an emperor of major controversy among historians of all ages. In their uneven length and subject matter, the collected essays themselves seem to reflect this disagreement and thus reinforce Cameron's view.

In the opening paper of Part I Timothy Barnes focuses on the relationship between emperors and the Church. Barnes uses the rôle of emperors with regard to Church councils as an example to argue that there was no such thing as what is sometimes called 'imperialized Christianity'. The part played by Constantine and his successors at these Church gatherings was a minor one: they did not convene them, hardly took part in their discussions, and kept to and executed the decisions taken by the bishops. It remains to be seen whether the view Barnes offers will effectively replace that of previous scholarship, which favoured the notion of a Church dominated by the state. Roger Tomlin discusses the impact on the late Roman army of the Christianizing of the Empire in the period between 312 and 410. Exploiting a wide range of source material to make his case, Tomlin demonstrates that the army was conservative, that it in general showed indifference to religious changes, that it was slow to Christianize, and that the emperors did not follow a policy of converting soldiers to Christianity. In a most interesting contribution Stephen Mitchell makes it clear that major changes with regard to, for example, administration (smaller provinces, more imperial officials) and tax reform in the cities of Asia Minor did not take place, as is generally thought, during the tetrarchy and the reign of Constantine, but had already occurred some 100 years earlier. This reworking of chronology means that there was continuity between the third and fourth centuries and no breach. Perhaps even more important, in Mitchell's view, is that no Constantinian revolution is attestable in the cities. Constantine's support of Christianity seems to have had no impact on local beliefs and practices, and, in spite of what Eusebius wants us to believe, there is hardly any evidence for church building. Bill Leadbetter's contribution is about the alleged illegitimacy of the reign of Constantine in view of his status as a son born of a concubine. To assert his legitimacy over his half-brothers, it is argued, Constantine nominated his mother Helena *Augusta*. Stuart Hall discusses some Constantinian documents in the *Vita Constantini*. He ingeniously and convincingly argues that Constantine's letter to Alexander and Arius (*VC* 2.64ff.) was not addressed to the bishop of Alexandria and one of his priests, respectively, but in fact to the synod atAntioch which took place at the beginning of 325. Furthermore, Hall discusses thepassages *VC* 2.20–1 and 2.30–41 about Constantine's law restoring rights to Christians after the defeat of Licinius, and *VC* 4.18.2 on the sabbath question. Withregard to the latter, Hall suggests that Constantine reaffirmed the long-standing rights of the Jews to keep the sabbath but that Eusebius gave the emperor's action a Christian interpretation.

Part II of the volume continues with a piece by Anna Wilson about biographical

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

models which were available for the new genre of hagiobiography of which the *Vita Constantini* is a fine example. For Christian writers of the fourth century the relationship between the Christian Church and the now Christian emperors provided new literary opportunities. The biblical life of Moses was taken as a model not only byEusebius, but also by Athanasius and the Cappadocian Fathers. In the *Vita Constantini* there is a running *synkresis* with Moses: Constantine is being compared with this famous Old Testament figure and his opponents with Pharaoh. Since it isvital to understand how and why Eusebius composed the *Vita Constantini* before itcan be used as a source for Constantine and his reign, it is a pity that this volume does not contain Averil Cameron's important article, 'Eusebius' *Vita Constantini* andthe Construction of Constantine' (in M. J. Edwards & S. Swain [edd.], *Portraits. Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire* [Oxford, 1997]), which was originally given as a paper in the Warwick conference. The *Vita Constantini* was not widely read and seems hardly to have been used as a source for all the legends which sprang up about Constantine in Late Antiquity and the Byzantine and Western Middle Ages. In a very useful contribution Samuel Lieu deals with this legendary material, such as the *Donatio Constantini*, a fourteenth-century medieval Constantine romance, and especially the main Byzantine *vitae* of the ninth to eleventh centuries where Constantine is presented as the model Christian emperor. Lieu presents not only an overview of these Byzantine lives but also discusses a number of aspects of the *vitae*, among them the birth and childhood of Constantine and his Persian wars. The wars against the Sassanians, which of course have no historical foundation (there are strong parallels here with Heraclius' struggles against the Persians), also figure in the few Coptic sources on Constantine, along with the story of the discovery of the True Cross. Constantine in the Coptic sources is Terry Wilfong's contribution to this volume. It appears that in these sources Constantine was overshadowed by Diocletian, who had made a far greater impression on the Egyptians. Constantine was not a prominent figure in early English lore either, as appears from Jane Stevenson's contribution, which concludes the volume and deals with Constantine in the *De Virginitate* by St Aldhelm. According to Stevenson, the passage on Constantine and Sylvester in this treatise more probably goes back to an old Irish story than to the *Vita Sylvestri*.

This book makes interesting reading and is a valuable contribution to Constantinian studies. Amongst other things it makes clear again how obscured the 'historical' Constantine has become by the vast legendary material which presents him as the model Christian emperor, something with which Constantine himself probably would have been more than pleased.

University of Groningen JAN WILLEM DRIJVERS

THE LATE IMPERIAL SENATE

D. SCHLINKERT: *ordo senatorius und nobilitas: Die Konstitution des Senatsadels in der Spätantike. Mit einem Appendix über den praepositus sacri cubiculi, den 'allmächtigen' Eunuchen am kaiserlichen Hof.* (*Hermes* Einzelschrift 72.) Pp. xi + 311. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996. Paper, DM 128. ISBN: 3-515-06975-5.

S.'s study seeks to attain a socio-historical definition of the senatorial aristocracy of

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the later Roman Empire with reference to the Theodosian and Justinianic Codes, and to Ammianus Marcellinus. The major part of the monograph consists of an extended study of the terms in which the aristocracy is described in these sources (Chapters III–V). S.'s main argument is that, while there may be differences in emphasis and terminology between the sources, there are four common elements to their understanding of the nature of the senatorial aristocracy: the centrality of birth and origin; the close link between social esteem of the aristocracy and its political rôle; a particular lifestyle considered appropriate to the class; and the possession of a suitable *patrimonium* (pp. 234–6).

The study opens with a review of modern understandings of the aristocracy (Chapter I), including the studies of Stroheker, Demandt, Jones, and Matthews. Chapter II provides a theoretical grounding to the subsequent discussion: S. argues firstly that the sources should be seen as constructs of social reality, which are to besubject to comparative analysis (pp. 42–5), and secondly that the study of the senatorial aristocracy must be grounded in an understanding of the theory of social class (pp. 46–54).

The importance of the aristocracy in the promulgation of individual laws and in thepublication of the codes is noted. The codes do not, however, present a uniform picture of the aristocracy in all respects, for there were significant changes with regard to the formal titles between the codes. A relatively small number of laws were directed to the senatorial aristocracy as such, in comparison to the legislation concerning the decurions. The key term used in the codes to denote the senatorial aristocracy was *ordo senatorius*. The *ordo* was defined in terms both of its individual members and of the institution of the Senate.

Senatorial status was either inherited through birth or was received as the gift of the emperor. The bestowal of *dignitas* and *honor* remained the exclusive right of the emperor, and the usurpation of such privileges was therefore seen as both a threat to the social order and an attack on the position of the emperor himself, and was punishable by the removal of the perpetrator's social status. S. considers that *C. Th.* 15.14.4 (326), in which Constantius gave the Senate the right to reintegrate the senators deposed by Licinius, represents an astute act of diplomacy rather than an abrogation of imperial privilege (pp. 78–80). The emperors also employed legislation to control the upward mobility of decurions into the senatorial class. In contrast, no laws regulated the inheritance of social status through aristocratic parents; practice in this respect was defined by custom and tradition. The gift of status by the emperor was not a wholly arbitrary decision but was closely correlated to the performance of *meritum*, which was also subject to legal definition and clarification. In respect of those who had inherited senatorial status, the central rôle of the emperor was primarily manifested in the bestowal of those offices which were the exclusive privilege of the senators, in the formation of laws which separated them from the decurions, and in the bestowal of particular privileges.

The law codes also defined several aspects of the conduct and lifestyle required of the senators. The possession of senatorial status was contingent on the possession of certain wealth. The senators' *patrimonia* were subject to assessment and monitoring by the *censuales*. Emperors were also concerned to secure the continuity of senatorial families by ensuring that there would be suitable offspring to inherit their fathers' *patrimonia*. Legal restrictions and requirements were imposed in relation to marriage and to the inheritance of social status by daughters. Senators were exempted from *munera sordida*, and the *defensor senatus* was responsible for protecting them from illegal demands, but the ban on senatorial participation in trade was eased by

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

concessions in terms of the appointment of intermediaries (*C. Th*. 13.1.5 [364]). The public appearance of senators was subject to controls including their use of chariots, and the wearing of the *toga candida*. The toga promoted a uniform and dignified appearance, in which movement was restricted and the ideal of *quies* was satisfied.

S.'s discussion of Ammianus focuses primarily on the two excursuses (14.6.7–24 and 28.4.6–27), which are shown to be of general significance for the work as a whole beyond their immediate context. The key terms in A.'s account are *nobilis* and *nobilitas*, but *ordo* is not used of the senators. For A., the main defining criterion of senatorial identity was the inheritance of birth. Members of old aristocratic families were favourably contrasted with those raised to the order by the usurper Procopius (26.10.14). The inheritance also brought with it norms and expectations in terms of conduct. A. considered that the senators of his time had violated this inheritance, for instance in Petronius Probus' political ambitions, but that the origins of such actions lay not in individual choices but in the pressure of the families on the leaders of their houses (27.11.2–4). A.'s criticism also extended to the ostentatious and overly competitive exploitation by the senators of their *patrimonia*. The excessive reliance placed on the importance of statues was contrasted by A. with the self-denying example of Cato (14.6.8). A. refers to the senators' misuse of their chariots and their ungainly deportment in public, and emphasizes the violations of the norms of *amicitia* both between senators and between senators and others. S. concludes that A. criticizes the senatorial aristocracy according to its own terms and criteria. He writes as one who has become an insider within their social circle, even if not the possessor of senatorial status himself (pp. 215–17).

In a lengthy appendix, S. considers the rôle in the imperial court of the *praepositus sacri cubiculi*. His discussion focuses on three eunuchs: Eusebius, Eutherius, and Eutropius. It is suggested that the hostility of the senatorial aristocracy towards them originated in their perception that the eunuchs had usurped the exclusive access to the emperor which was uniquely their preserve.

University of Wales, Aberystwyth IAN G. TOMPKINS

CARRY ON CAESAR

S. WILLIAMS, G. FRIELL: *The Rome That Did Not Fall: the Survivalof the East in the Fifth Century*. Pp. xii + 282, 21 figs, 4 maps. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-415-15403-0.

After disposing of Theodosius I, W. & F. advance through late Roman history to investigate why the Eastern Roman Empire survived during the fifth century while its Western counterpart was replaced by a variety of successor states. Of the fifteen chapters, ten offer a narrative based on a selection of recent scholarly work, while the remaining five are more analytical; the focus is predominantly eastern, though the basic shape of western history down to 491 is reported, and the chronological scope correctly creates a long fifth century, from the death of Theodosius I in 395 to that ofAnastasius in 518. As a work of synthesis, the presentation can only be as good asits underlying sources. Chapter VI on the Huns deserves praise, even though it surprisingly ignores Heather's article in *EHR* 1995 on the Huns and so antedates

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

their arrival in Europe *en masse*. On the other hand the scattered treatment of the fifth-century Gothic groups in the Balkans is vitiated by its repeated failure to engage with Heather's work (*The Goths* [Oxford, 1996]; *Goths and Romans* [Oxford, 1991], of which the former is not cited); as a result discredited views about loyalties to the Amal dynasty are used to explain the success of Theoderic the Ostrogoth. Failure toconsult Cameron and Long, *Barbarians and Politics at the Court of Arcadius* (Berkeley, 1993), means that this interesting reinterpretation of the Gainas episode is not considered. Another area where W. & F.'s grasp is weak concerns Anastasius, for whom they rely on Treadgold's hypothesis of a massive increase in military pay and Crow's anti-Justinianic interpretations of the archaeological evidence to construct apicture of a grand reformer of the empire. There is no doubt that Anastasius achieved much in his long reign and established the conditions for Justinian's later achievements, but it is a pity to find careless theories being elevated to the status of fact and confidently presented in what will be a basic text for students of the period. Here W. & F.'s reluctance to engage with the primary evidence devalues their presentation.

In general the narrative chapters are sounder than the analytical ones, partly because there are not yet adequate specialist studies for the latter. There is no reliable study of the eastern army in late antiquity, since Southern & Dixon's *Late Roman Army* has little to say about the east and the complex calculations in Treadgold's *Byzantium and its Army* are erratic, at least for the early period. Imperial finances are an even greater problem and are not likely to be clarified until a detailed study of the whole operation of the imperial administration is undertaken. While the growing disparity between eastern wealth and western poverty is an obvious factor in the divergent fates of the two parts of the empire, W. & F. become confused over the details: at p. 258 nn. 21 and 22 the western contribution to the costs of the 468 Vandal campaign is said to represent Anthemius' accessional donative, but then conclusions are drawn about the revenue surplus implied by the availability of so much cash; at p.134 *adaeratio* in the east is said to imply the existence of strong cash reserves, while it is admitted that it was introduced in the west by a ruler who proclaimed that he lacked the resources even to feed and clothe his troops. Religion, where the secondary literature should have provided a safer guide, is a surprisingly weak area (Chapter XI), and W. & F. are not secure in their handling of intellectual and spiritual topics: Eunapius is dubious evidence for the actions of Pulcheria, the standard-bearer of imperial Christian devotion, Nestorius advocated the formula *Christotokos* not *anthropotokos*, Patriarch John of Antioch did not depose both Nestorius and Cyril at the First Council of Ephesus (pp. 47–50); it is over twenty years since Alan Cameron demolished the speculations about links between the circus factions and religious issues, but *Circus Factions* is cited as if it supported this heresy (p. 47 n. 10).

There are problems for those intending to use the volume as the starting point for further investigations. Source references are frequently incomplete, perhaps because they have been lifted from intermediary texts, and when complete they may not substantiate the discussion: the passages from Procopius' *Buildings* adduced at p. 258 n. 29 do not support the statements in the text at p. 138, since Procopius' figures for the silver decoration on S. Sophia's altar are transformed into the value in gold of a year's work on the whole building. The bibliography is erratic about providing pagination for articles cited, and there are some surprising gaps, noted above; *Cambridge Ancient History* XIII, which could have strengthened the analytical chapters, was too recent to be exploited. The volume is generally well produced, though a more elegant substitute for 'officialise' (p. 10) should have been found, and authors with a knowledge of the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ancient languages might have corrected *chrysargon* for the Constantinian tax on services (p. 127).

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

ANCIENT POLITICS

A. DEMANDT: *Antike Staatsformen: Eine vergleichende Verfassungsgeschichte der Alten Welt*. Pp. 672, 42 ills. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995. Cased, DM 132 (Paper, DM 63). ISBN: 3-05-002794-0 (3-05-002541-7 pbk).

I read this book with admiration mixed with regret: admiration for the stupefying range of concentrated information which it contains, regret that the incompatible agendas of ancient historian and political theorist have claimed another victim. It is doubly Aristotelian, both in distilling a course given over many years (p. 7) and in that its remorselessly descriptive content is a propaedeutic means to an analytical–evaluative end. As a Handbuch of Praxis it is meant to serve as the counterpart of his 1993 book, *Der Idealstaat. Die politischen Theorien der Antike*, and is best read against that background: pragmatic anglophone readers used to Sabine or Skinner who surmount its dense-packed pages will be constructively exposed to the very different tradition of German humanism, wherein the names of Schiller, Herder, Hegel, or Schlegel repeatedly recur.

Its format is simple. The frame—an initial chapter, 'Staatsbegriff und Lebensform', and a final chapter, 'Leistung und Wirkung'—encompasses twenty chapters, each sketching the essential structural components of a major polity or group of polities. In rough chronological sequence they cover Mycenaean–Minoan palace culture, the Israelite, Achaemenid, and Spartan kingdoms, Greek tyranny, Athenian democracy, the Greek federal states, the Alexanderreich, the Hellenistic monarchies, Etruria, Carthage, the Roman republic, the Celtic 'Stammeswesen', the Augustan Principate, the early German kingdoms, Sassanid Persia, the Alamannic, Frankish, and Saxon coagulations, the Late Roman Dominate, the Gothic and Vandal regimes, and finally Merovingian Francia. Chapters mostly share a common form, starting with sections on terminology, sources, and sometimes an outline narrative, continuing with sections typically entitled 'Königtum', 'Gesellschaft', 'Völker und Sprachen', 'Verwaltung', 'Satrapien und Städte', and 'Religion' (thus IV on the Achaemenid Empire), and ending with sections entitled 'Ende und Ausblick' or 'Bedeutung'. Other recurrent section-titles are 'Institutionen', 'Verfassung', 'Heer', 'Wirtschaft', 'Hof', and in the later chapters 'Kirche' or 'Christentum'. The 'comparative' aspect of the book resides mainly in the uniformity of these descriptive categories. The style throughout is rapid and staccato, comprising an endless sequence of short sentences, each adding a brief, firm brushstroke to the portrait and each being buttressed by a single minimalist reference to primary sources. The illustrations, mostly diagrams or maps, vary in quality and in relevance to the text. There is no index.

Such an approach, heroic in its scope and architecture, inevitably carries gains andlosses. One gain is palmary. Any scholar or student who needs an instant access-route into, or a guided tour through, any of the polities, periods, or areas which D. covers will find a one-stop compendium of information, lucidly and crisply laid out.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Moreover, though reference to modern scholarship is rare in the notes, the two-page bibliographies which follow each chapter provide guidance towards further or more detailed study. True, they compare poorly with the bibliographies provided in *CAH*^{2},and (understandably for a German student readership) concentrate on titles inGerman, but they mostly provide an essential minimum. A second gain is to have offered the student a far fuller conspectus of the range of polities which should come within the ancient historian's purview than tired syllabuses all too often offer. The best chapters in this respect are those on 'barbarian' Europe, which both assemble and distil recondite information from little-read sources and give each monarchy or polity a recognizable individuality. Partly no doubt because D.'s own previous work has focused mostly on the Late Empire, these chapters are luminous and authoritative. A third gain is to have helped to redirect ancient historical discourse from the narrative to the analytic mode. Here indeed 'gain' is to be written cautiously, for implicitly throughout, and explicitly in the final chapter, D. asks by which criteria we are to compare the relative merits and achievements of different regimes. Degree of freedom, the balance between individual and collective, wealth distribution, distributive justice, religious tolerance, effective protection against enemies, stability: all these are offered (pp. 651–7). This is not just analytic; it is also judgemental, and will be salutary, though uncomfortable, for those who emphasize the 'otherness' of a safely remote antiquity and are less concerned than D. with how since the Renaissance the study of ancient polities has been a formative component of political theory, practice, and values.

Yet I have doubts. Some stem from compression. Source-material which needed careful transformational analysis is used 'straight' (e.g. Herodotos on Sparta and tyranny, pp. 139–88, or Livy on Etruscans, pp. 341–3); major debates are elided (e.g.the origins of Greek tyranny, pp. 169–71); the Celts get a section on religion (pp.421–3), but the Roman Republic does not (pp. 377–408). There are gaps. Temple states are noticed briefly (p. 309), but needed explicit chapter-length survey to include absentees such as post-exilic Judah, Labraunda, Pessinous, or even Babylon. Indeed, only Chapters III and IV breach the old-fashioned boundary between 'Classical' and 'Oriental', sadly leaving out such fundamental Staatsformen as the North Syrian city-states, the Anatolian and Assyrian monarchies, the Mesopotamian city-states, Saba, and—most conspicuously of all—Egypt. Fortunately, Amélie Kuhrt's *The Ancient Near East* I–II (London, 1995) covers most of the missing polities in comparable format and scale. Terminology arouses qualms. Few today will use terms such as 'Randkulturen' without qualification, or agree that 'Der Stamm ist die früheste Verfassungsform' (p. 35), or see Cretan–Mycenaean culture as the product of a synthesis between 'nordischem Volkstum und orientalischem Formensinn' (p. 72). Indeed, the whole book has a seriously old-fashioned air about it. Lastly and fundamentally, the portraits are largely synchronic, of static, stable polities. One has to wait until p. 655 for the admission that 'mehrere Staatsformen sind nicht anderes als Lösungsversuche sozialer Gegensätze', and in vain for recognition that such compromises are perpetually being renegotiated in real time.

D. has bravely tried to combine the diachronic specificity of the ancient historian with the classifying and judgemental tendencies of the political theorist. Regrettably, I fear he has fallen between two stools.

University of Liverpool JOHN K. DAVIES

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ANCIENT MARITIME CULTURE

P. JANNI: *Il mare degli antichi*. (Storia e Civiltà, 40.) Pp. 506, 79 figs. Bari: Dedalo, 1996. L. 50,000. ISBN: 88-220-0540-6.

Although the author of this book is probably best known for his popular study of Hellenisms in modern Italian (*Il nostro greco quotidiano* [Rome and Bari, 1986]), his considerable scholarly reputation derives from his work on ancient ethnography, geography, and, more recently, nautical history. He is well qualified to produce the first ever general study of ancient maritime culture by an Italian.

J.'s approach to his subject is rather ambiguous. He repeatedly asserts the centrality of the sea and seafaring in Graeco-Roman life, but he also emphasizes its marginality in Classical culture, especially as represented by Greek and Latin literature. In his prologue, entitled 'The Ancients and their Sea' (pp. 7–26), J. attempts to describe the nature of Greek and Roman maritime culture. The result is a rather disappointing sketch of naval history from Homer to Imperial Rome, followed by some observations on the predominantly poor image of seafarers in Classical literature, which J. traces back to Homer, although he maintains that there exists a concurrent theme of romantic longing for the sea, beginning with the Odyssey, which surfaces regularly inboth poetry and prose. I am uncertain what effect J.'s comments might have on a reader who does not know all the works he refers to here, but they seem as likely to confuse as to illuminate. It is also difficult to understand why he lays stress on the significance of works like Xenophon's *Poroi* and such historical events as the naval conflict between Sextus Pompeius and the triumvirs, when neither of them receives more than a passing mention in the rest of the book.

The first chapter, 'How Much We Know and How We Know It', is sound and sensible, establishing J. as a reliable guide to the interpretation of literary and visual sources. Yet here, too, there is a sense of conflicting agendas. The reader is told that inscriptions, especially from Classical Athens, are a uniquely important source of information, yet none are quoted or cited in the rest of the book. Why not exploit a multifaceted text like the well-known extract from the naval curators' records for the archonship of Anticles (325/4 B.C.), which includes the establishment of a colony in the Adriatic (M. N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* II [Oxford, 1948], no. 200; *IG* II^2 1629, ll. 145–271)? Similarly, the Roman legal texts are accorded some prominence in this chapter but ignored in the rest of the book. The overemphasis on literary evidence becomes apparent when J. bemoans the loss of supposed manuals on shipbuilding in antiquity (pp. 28–9). It is debatable whether such works as he envisages ever existed. Shipbuilding was so basic a craft that, like housebuilding, as opposed to 'architecture', it did not merit scholarly attention. Archaeological research has largely compensated for this, however, enabling modern scholars to study the techniques of shipbuilding from surviving examples, several of which J. has included.

The seventeen main chapters are arranged in a roughly chronological order, fromthe Greek Archaic Period to the second century A.D. They are built around extracts of varying length from Homer (two chapters), Hesiod, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Pseudo-Demosthenes (Apollodorus), Diodorus, Polybius, Caesar, Cassius Dio, The Acts of the Apostles, Josephus, Petronius, Lucian, Athenaeus, and Strabo. Each has a brief, scene-setting introduction, followed by the translation and then an excursus on some relevant topics. For example, the longest extract, roughly half of [Demosthenes] *50 Against Polycles* (pp. 209–14), which deals with a mid-fourth-century Athenian trierarch's attempts to recover additional costs

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from his reluctant successor, is followed by a discussion of Athenian naval resources and organization. The translations are clear and accurate, with poetry rendered in prose. J. has taken careful account of recent discussions of the texts and their interpretation in order to produce up-to-date and reliable versions. As with any sourcebook, the choice of texts and subjects is idiosyncratic, with the emphasis on naval history and the technology of seafaring. I was particularly disappointed at the lack of attention to fishing and the absence of material from Late Antiquity.

Each chapter is annotated in some detail with references to modern scholarship andfurther ancient sources. The latter are fully indexed and the former make up a bibliography of fifteen pages, which is wide-ranging but has some serious omissions, e.g. V. Gabrielsen, *Financing the Athenian Fleet: Public Taxation and Social Relations* (Baltimore, 1994) and A. J. Parker, *Ancient Shipwrecks of the Mediterranean & theRoman Provinces* (Oxford, 1992). The selective analytical index is too brief, comprising a mere ninety-eight entries. The seventy-nine illustrations, twenty of them in glorious colour, are one of this book's major strengths. They are clear, they are well integrated with the text through cross-references, and they represent an excellent selection of ancient artefacts and modern reconstructions. The general view and the close-up picture of a sheave-block which illustrate the *Fortuna maris* ship (Figs 25 and30) are good examples of how the use of colour enhances the illustration of archaeological sources.

The preface points out that this book is aimed at those Italian readers who are more or less ignorant of its subject matter, whether they are familiar with other aspects ofthe ancient world or not, and who have previously had to rely on translations of foreign works, e.g. L. Casson, *Ships and Seafaring in the Ancient World* (Princeton, 1971), O. Höckmann, *Antike Seefahrt* (Munich, 1985). It must be said, however, that J. does not really succeed in providing an alternative to such books for the student or scholar of antiquity. The limits of his selection are too narrow and the lack of a full index renders the book almost useless as a work of reference. For the general reader, however, it is an attractive and thought-provoking way into the fascinating world of ancient seafaring.

St Mary's, Strawberry Hill PHILIP DE SOUZA

EARTHQUAKES

G. H. Waldherr: *Erdbeben. Das aussergewöhnliche Normale. Zur Rezeption seismischer Aktivitäten in literarischen Quellen vom 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr.* (Geographica Historica, 9.) Pp. 270 + [i]. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1997. Paper, DM 96. ISBN: 3-515-07070-2.

This is a useful study of important aspects of the treatment of earthquakes in classical writers from the fourth century B.C. to the fourth century A.D. Waldherr focuses principally on scientific writers and historians, and confines himself to pagan writers. His main argument is that these writers cannot be reliably used to extract information of the sort that modern scientists collect, but they can be used to showhow earthquakes were viewed by people in the ancient world, and how they interacted with this dangerous aspect of their environment.

The first chapter surveys the history of modern scientific study of earthquakes,

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

particularly the many efforts to catalogue the earthquakes recorded in classical sources. W. shows the pitfalls of such catalogues, with inaccurate or ill-founded 'facts' often being passed on from one list to another. Drawing on comparative material, he shows how what counts as an earthquake or a natural catastrophe varies from one society to another, and he looks at the rôle of religion in managing the fears aroused by natural catastrophes. The second chapter briefly describes modern accounts of the causes and varieties of earthquakes, and gives a useful survey of the relative frequency of seismic activity in different regions of the Mediterranean basin.

Chapter III surveys ancient earthquake-theories, from Aristotle to Ammianus Marcellinus (glancing back, with Aristotle, to the Presocratics). The list of writers surveyed includes not just Aristotle, Theophrastus, Posidonius, Lucretius, Arius Didymus, Seneca, the elder Pliny, *Peri Kosmou*, and [Plutarch] *De Placitis*, but also Strabo, Pausanias, and Ammianus.

Chapter IV looks at the treatment of earthquakes in a series of (mainly) historical writers: Herodotus, Thucydides, Cicero, Livy, Tacitus, Suetonius, Cassius Dio, and—again—Ammianus Marcellinus. W. deftly shows the various concerns these writers had—none of them primarily interested in giving an objective account of an earthquake for its own sake, but interested in earthquakes as divine signs, or in their effects on human society, politics, and warfare. In the Roman sphere there is a development in the republic from treating earthquakes (like other prodigies) as signs that the *pax deorum* is disturbed and in need of restoration by suitable religious means to treating them as signs of coming events. In the imperial period, the focus is often on the emperor's reaction to earthquakes, which provided an opportunity for display of imperial *liberalitas* towards afflicted communities. Earthquakes can still be regarded as signs, but usually as signs concerning the emperor's future, so that emperors want either to control the interpretation of such signs or to deny that they are signs at all. W.notes that in Dio and Ammianus one finds more detailed accounts of particular earthquakes than in earlier historians. He is cautious about seeing here a genuine development in ancient writing about earthquakes, for he thinks the greater detail can be adequately explained by the political significance or symbolism that the particular earthquakes have. But earlier historians, as W. shows, included descriptions of earthquakes because of their political significance or symbolism, yet did not go into as much detail as Dio and Ammianus. There does seem to be a new interest in detail (and, more speculatively, one may wonder whether Pliny's descriptions of the eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79 [*Epist*. 6.16, 20], perhaps mediated through the lost books of Tacitus' *Histories*, set new standards of detail for such 'disaster narratives').

Chapter V looks at earthquakes as communications between gods and men, contrasting the Greek world, where Poseidon was the earthquake-god *par excellence*, and the Roman world, where no particular god was responsible for earthquakes, but the *si deo si deae* formula was used in expiations (Gell. 2.28). W. notes that it is a general feature of Roman prodigies that they are not attributed to a specific deity.

Chapter VI summarizes the argument, stressing again that, since ancient writers are not primarily interested in giving a factual account of earthquakes, there is a limit to the reliable information that can be extracted from them. But the ancient accounts can tell us about people's perceptions of, and interactions with, this feature of their environment. There is a one-page English summary at the end.

W. has produced an extremely useful survey of the topics and authors he selects, and has made it easily accessible by full indexes of passages cited, proper names, andtopics. He is up to date and well versed in the modern literature, scientific and classical. However, given his justified complaint that seismologists and classical

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scholars have often been unaware of each other's work, it is a pity that he regularly quotes passages of Greek and Latin without translation. His book should stimulate further questions. For example, his chapter on ancient scientific approaches seems rather detached from the rest of his argument, for there is no general discussion of theinteraction between rationalizing and religious approaches, although W. notes, forinstance, that Thucydides records religious attitudes to earthquakes without subscribing to them himself (though W. does not adopt such a nuanced approach to Tacitus or Ammianus), and that religious and scientific attitudes are both to be found in Cicero and Pausanias. One would like to see further discussion that situates attitudes to earthquakes in a broader picture of the interaction between rationalizing and religious attitudes in antiquity.

University of St Andrews HARRY M. HINE

JUDAEA

DOV GERA: *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics, 219–161 B.C.E.* (Brill's Series in Jewish Studies, 8.) Pp. xii + 362. Leiden, New York, and Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1998. Cased, $114.50. ISBN: 90-04-09441-5.

Gera's aim is to use 'a study of the international scene of the period. . . as a backdrop' for the understanding of the Maccabean revolt and the differing biases found in 1 and 2 Maccabees respectively. In fact, apart from Chapters II (the Tobiads) and VI (the Maccabean revolt between 168 and the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes), the book is largely concerned with the 'backdrop', with particular emphasis on the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, and it has enabled me to revisit many of the problems associated with Rome's acquisition of hegemony over the Hellenistic world in the first third of the second century B.C., especially those with which I was concerned some 30 years ago (cf. *JRS* [1964], 66ff.; *CR* [1968], 82 ff.; *Historia* [1969], 49ff.). Much of G.'s case concerning the Jews—e.g. the rejection of a large part of the story of the Tobiads as modelled on biblical episodes, the argument that Epiphanes attacked Jerusalem only once, in the winter of 169/8, following his first withdrawal from Egypt, the analysis of the four letters in 2 Macc. 11.16–38, the championing of the authenticity of the treaty between Rome and the Jews in 1 Macc. 8.23–30—I findconvincing, and I therefore propose to concentrate on two matters on which I disagree with him.

Firstly, the events of the initial campaign of the Sixth Syrian War (169). We know that in the autumn of 170 a joint rule of Ptolemy VI Philometor, his brother Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II, and his sister Cleopatra II was established; G. argues that since Antiochus claimed that 'his sole purpose was to defend the rights of Philometor' (cf. Polybius 28.23.4), it follows that this joint rule was not abolished after Antiochus' initial military success, as Skeat believed. But Epiphanes' claim comes after the Alexandrians had deposed Philometor in favour of his siblings following the latter's negotiations with Antiochus and subsequent move to Memphis (Pol. 29.23.4). G. nextargues that Antiochus' first withdrawal from Egypt followed an agreement establishing an armistice and a framework for future negotiations between the three siblings (I suspect that G.'s conception has been influenced by the current Middle East peace process), brokered by the Roman ambassador T. Numisius. This depends on a crucial misinterpretation of Pol. 28.23.4: *βουλομένων τῶν ἐν τῆι πόλει κατάγειν τοῦτον* is conditional, not causal. What is more, Livy 45.11.1, deriving from Polybius,

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

makes it clear that the eventual reconciliation of the three siblings was due to the initiative of Philometor, not Roman intervention. G. now has to explain Polybius' statement at 29.25.1 that Numisius was unsuccessful; he argues implausibly that Polybius saw the 'day of Eleusis' as of far greater significance than Numisius' 'ephemeral success' and wanted to show that Q. Marcius Philippus had been insincere in quoting Numisius as a precedent when urging the Achaeans to mediate between Antiochus and Egypt, since he knew that Numisius' armistice was close to collapse.

In the final chapter G. displays an impressive grasp of Seleucid prosopography, which enables him to argue that Polybius' support for Demetrius I led him to make misleading statements about Apollonius the elder and Ptolemy Macron. With Roman prosopography he seems less at home. He does not believe, probably rightly, Polybius' story (30.1) that some leading Romans, described as ἐπιφανεῖς and ἀξιολόγοι, instigated Attalus II to ask the Senate to divide the Pergamene kingdom between himself and Eumenes, but thinks that the men referred to were the 'circle of Aemilius Paullus'; they wanted to break the link between the Seleucid and Attalid kingdoms which had been in place since the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes, and to this endthey also instigated the escape of Demetrius I from Rome, in which, of course, Polybius was involved. Since, however, Ti. Sempronius Gracchus displayed goodwill towards Pergamum and is portrayed by Polybius as naive (Pol. 30.27.2, 30.7), G. concludes that I was wrong to regard Gracchus as a friend of the Scipios. He seems to be unaware that Gracchus, whether or not he was hostile to the Scipios when younger, was married to the daughter of Africanus. Polybius' critical remarks may have been written after 137, when Gracchus' elder son, the tribune of 133, quarelled with Scipio Aemilianus (cf. *JRS* [1974], 125–7).

G. has a good knowledge of secondary literature, though I miss references to Rich, *PCPhS* (1984), 126ff. on the First Macedonian War and Heubner's commentary onTacitus' *Histories*, relevant on p. 219. (Warrior's *The Initiation of the Second Macedonian War* no doubt appeared too late for G. to take account of it.) He refers to a number of my own writings, including my commentary on Livy 31–3, but ignores that on books 34–7, which is relevant to his discussion on pp. 85–7 and 97.

The book is based on G.'s doctoral dissertation in Hebrew, translated for him into English; there a number of infelicities, particularly the use of a comma before a subordinate clause which is necessary to complete the sense (e.g. p. 277 'we have already encountered. . . members of the Seleucid court, whose function is later taken up by their sons').

University of Manchester JOHN BRISCOE

DIASPORAN SOURCES

M. H. WILLIAMS: *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans. A Diasporan Sourcebook*. Pp. xii + 236. London: Duckworth, 1998. Cased, £40 (Paper, £14.99). ISBN: 0-7156-2811-9 (0-7156-2812-7 pbk).

The publication of Lester Grabbe's *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (Minneapolis, 1992) provided an ideal textbook for ancient history courses on the Jews, setting outthe events, personalities, and evidence clearly for students with no previous knowledge in the field. It left the problem of how to get them to use the sourcematerial for themselves. Josephus and the New Testament are accessible enough, but much of the important material on Diasporan Jews is in papyri or

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

inscriptions—some of the latter with no published English translation available anywhere. Margaret Williams's *Diasporan Sourcebook* has solved the problem admirably, by making accessible in one affordable place a wealth of material written by Jews and Gentiles, on stone or papyrus, and in a variety of literary genres from law-codes to Roman philosophy.

W. gives a brief introduction to each chapter, section, and in some cases individual entry. Much information is also given in the endnotes, and it is perhaps unfortunate that this form was used rather than footnotes, as the book's less assiduous users may miss some of the important points to be found at the back. Bibliographical references are given to interpretations which differ from W.'s, such as the view that her inscription II.82 is not Jewish. The traditional interpretation of II.144 (Suetonius, *Claudius* 25) followed by W. has, however, been strongly challenged in a book too recent for her to include: H. D. Slingerland, *Claudian Policymaking and the Early Imperial Repression of Judaism at Rome* (Atlanta, 1997).

The appendix of chronological tables will be very helpful to beginners. Another appendix with a brief introduction to each of the ancient writers quoted might also have been useful, although most of the required information can be found in the endnotes, or in Grabbe. It will not be immediately obvious how reliable different sources are: in I.17, Josephus claims that Ptolemy I entrusted the defence of all Egypt to the Jews, a remark which really needs a warning about the overstatements to which Josephus and Philo are prone. Some personal names will also have to be looked up in Grabbe: Demetrios the Alexandrian librarian appears in I.104 without explanation of who he is (although there is an explanation at V.41), and he is not in the index of names, although three other people called Demetrios are.

Determining the Jewishness of epigraphic sources is not always straightforward, as W. acknowledges (p. xii). 'Jewish' names, which are clearly an important criterion, can become part of a circular argument: Iuda (VI.22) may be a Jewish name normally, but it is not attested anywhere else as a Jewish female name. A justification seems particularly necessary for the inclusion of VII.42, an inscription from Pergamum recording the dedication of an altar: it is included in a section on 'ambiguous dedicatory language', but a private altar seems unambiguously non-Jewish. VI.21 is not a Jewish inscription, despite my erroneous inclusion of it in *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe* i, no. 15—see *JIWE* ii, p. 571 for a correction.

W. has adopted a policy of transliterating names rather than latinizing them. This is admirably consistent, and is aided by a glossary of names, but it may confuse readers with no knowledge of Greek. The exotic-looking Loukios Lollios Iousstos (I.109; not in the glossary) is nothing more than the perfectly ordinary Roman name L. Lollius Iustus. The original language of each passage has not been indicated: this can easily be worked out for the literary sources, but not for the epigraphic ones.

Chapter I collects evidence on the nature of the Diaspora. It would perhaps be worth emphasizing that most Diasporan Jews were not themselves emigrants, but the descendants of emigrants, perhaps many generations removed from their ancestors' arrival. Philo discusses their divided loyalties at *In Flaccum* 46 (the only surprising omission from the book): Jerusalem is the 'mother city' (*mētropolis*), but the place where their ancestors have lived for generations is their 'fatherland' (*patris*).

Chapter II, on life in the Diasporan community, focuses on the synagogue: its organization, leadership, and practices. This is the area where W.'s interpretations may be most questionable, although the good selection of source material will enable readers to make up their own minds. The statement on p. 37 that 'Diasporan synagogues, whatever their date and precise location, seem to have been run in broadly

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the same way' goes considerably beyond anything the evidence actually shows. To say that the number of archons at Berenice 'steadily increased over time' (p. 39) is not a safe inference from the two surviving lists of archons (V.35 and V.36), which name seven and nine archons respectively, but without it being certain which inscription is earlier, or whether the difference represents any sort of trend. *Presbyteroi* are defined (p. 43) as 'non-executive council members', and yet one of the inscriptions (II.52) shows a *presbyteros* as a synagogue-builder, hardly evidence for a 'non-executive' rôle.

Chapter III considers relations between the Diaspora and 'the Jewish homeland'. The importance of the homeland for the Diaspora is clear; the extent to which it could exercise influence over the Diaspora much less so. Chapter IV is about 'Jewish interaction with Greek and Roman authorities'. Thanks primarily to Josephus, the picture is largely a positive one, but there is enough material to show that it was not only Christian emperors who placed Jews at a legal disadvantage. Chapters V and VI look at Jews among Greeks and Romans respectively, especially their rôle in their cities and the extent to which they absorbed influences from their pagan surroundings. Chapter VII, 'Pagans and Judaism', follows a rather more thoroughly trodden path, but adds new material on God-fearers not available in previous collections.

W. has made her selections judiciously, providing easy access to sources of very varied origin. Everyone who teaches about Jews in the Graeco-Roman world will bedelighted to have this book available, and it is so comprehensive that people researching in the area will almost certainly find unfamiliar material in it too.

University of Wales, Lampeter DAVID NOY

ΧΕΙΡ ΧΕΙΡΑ ΝΙΠΤΕΙ

C. Gill, N. Postlethwaite, R. Seaford (edd.): *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*. Pp. x + 370. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. Cased, £48. ISBN: 0-19-814997-2.

The heyday of reciprocity studies in its natal discipline of Anthropology was *c*. 1960 (van Wees, p. 16). Four decades later, right on cue, reciprocity is brought ashore at the intellectual world's remotest outpost, Classics.

This volume is the fruit of a 1993 conference of the same title held in Exeter, home of the three editors, and also of the contributor David Braund. The authors of its fourteen papers include starry names, and some of the essays are very good. Much thought has been given to the ordering of the papers: a substantial introduction by Richard Seaford (presumably the chief instigator of the project, in view of his *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State* [Oxford, 1994]) is followed by Hans van Wees's clear and sensible digest of the rôle played by reciprocity in anthropological theory for the benefit of classicists. In the final paper Christopher Gill contends that in Greek ethical philosophy the motivation to benefit others is usually an outgrowth of the thinking of reciprocity rather than of that of altruism, but he elegantly contrives to draw the conclusions of the foregoing papers into his argument. The intervening papers are arranged in chronological order, and sometimes fall into pairs.

Is the book greater than the sum of its parts? Does it establish Greek reciprocity as a meaningful and fecund area for further study? I fear not. While van Wees establishes that some 'anthropological' societies are structured in accordance with a strict ethic of reciprocity, none of the papers here persuades that this was true of any part of ancient

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Greece. Indeed, not all of them seek to do so. The Maoris may have a word for reciprocity (*utu*, p. 20), but the fact that the Greeks did not find a word from their vast lexicon for a concept supposedly so fundamental to them is unnerving. The lack of fit between reciprocity theory and Greek culture is economically illustrated by the fact that Robert Parker can identify *charis* as the most relevant Greek word to reciprocity (p. 106), while Graham Zanker reads it as akin to altruism and antithetical to reciprocity (p. 79).

The least successful papers in the collection are accordingly those that take reciprocity seriously, and attempt to force aspects of Greek culture through the grid of its sub-categories, the crudeness of which is barely disguised by grandiose terminology: giving becomes 'generalized reciprocity', swapping 'balanced reciprocity', and stealing 'negative reciprocity'. Such are the three Homeric papers, those of Zanker, Norman Postlethwaite, and Walter Donlan, the last scholar returning to the themes ofhis article 'Reciprocities in Homer', *CW* 75 (1981–2), 137–75. The diametrically opposed interpretations of the Achilles–Priam scene by Zanker and by Postlethwaite do not so much open up the hermeneutic possibilities of reciprocity theory as demonstrate its inadequacy to the task in hand.

The best papers here begin with lip-service to the reciprocity theme before developing a subject genuinely founded in Greek language and literature. Parker gives us an authoritative treatment of the rôle of *charis* in Greek religion. Elizabeth Belfiore persuasively demonstrates the centrality to tragedy of the theme of harm between *philoi*. David Konstan also investigates the development of the concept of friendship: equality in status between friends was integral to the concept in the classical period, but less so in the Hellenistic. In a fascinating analysis Braund shows how Herodotus repeatedly presents imperialism as arising from one culture's misunderstanding of another. Paul Millet discusses the curious contradictions in the conceptualization of liturgies in classical Athens.

Other papers are interesting if, to my mind, less persuasive. In a highly abstract essay Sitta von Reden argues that in the fragments of Menander's plays (consideration of Plautine and Terentian versions is excluded) 'commodification' is presented as bad for the city, and reciprocity as good for it. The argument depends upon the view that Menander's concentration on family life is inherently anti-democratic (p. 257). I do not see why such a focus should of itself imply any political view, but the case can bemade that the ideals about family organization on display in New Comedy are intensely democratic in nature: see my *Greek Bastardy* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 174–80. (And the Greek for 'commodification' would be. . .?) Gabriel Herman's identification of the syndrome in accordance with which Athenian plaintiffs claimed to be turning to the courts only after suffering earlier wrongs by their opponents without retaliation is supported by an intriguing discussion of a 'prisoner's dilemma' game as played by computers.

Of the remaining papers Jan-Maarten Bremer argues that, despite what some have thought, the Greeks did indeed have prayers and hymns of thanksgiving. Anna Missiou argues that a diplomatic rhetoric of reciprocal generosity was used by monarchs, tyrants, aristocrats, and oligarchs, but that it was incompatible with democracy.

The preface announces but does not defend the practice of ousting the familiar Latinate forms of Greek proper names with transliterated forms, although *y* is to be retained for upsilon. I suppose a sympathetically anthropological project to present Greek culture as alien lurks here. The principle is applied with a vigour which is sufficient to secure the offence of the reader, but which falls far short of achieving any sort of consistency. Alongside the monstrous form of the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'Kyklops' (p. 60), we find 'Akhaians' at war with 'Trojans' (p. 148), 'Akhilleus' debating with 'Priam' (p. 72), and the biformed 'Erekhtheus' jostling with 'Erechtheus' on the same page (p. 136). The *y*-rule is more honoured in the breech: *turannis* (p. 71), *kudos* (p. 88), *hubris* (p. 245), *prothumia* (p. 247), *Duskolos* (p. 262), *kurios* (p. 271), *epirhumiais* (p. 292). As I opened my copy of the book an errata slip documenting twelve errors in Bremer's paper (ten of them in the Greek text) fluttered to the ground. Several pages are badly smudged (e.g. pp. 131, 147, and 179).

University of Wales, Swansea DANIEL OGDEN

ROMAN PARASITOLOGY

C. DAMON: *The Mask of the Parasite. A Pathology of Roman Patronage*. Pp. viii + 307. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997. Cased, $42.50. ISBN: 0-472-10760-7.

The thesis of this book is that Roman writers used the Comic figure of the parasite as 'a symbol for unhealthy aspects of patronage relationships in their own real world'. Damon's method is to establish first the characteristics especially associated with this stock character in the Greek Comedians and their Roman successors and then to demonstrate how these traits are exhibited in depictions of the client in a variety of authors, in particular in Satire and Epigram, as well as the speeches of Cicero. She aims to show how clients are portrayed negatively as parasites from the viewpoint of the hard-pressed patron, or occasionally from that of the resentful client of long standing who feels his own position threatened by newcomers. In Horace and in the satiric epigrams of Martial, the mask of the parasite is also donned by the dependent poet to express dissatisfaction with the patronage system.

In an introductory chapter, D. discusses the concept of the parasite, observing that, after Comedy, it is not a precise description of a person's status but a coloured way of alluding to the flattering dependent: the client from a negative perspective. Most importantly for her argument, she makes the point that the word *parasitus* itself is not employed with any great frequency (all occurrences of the word in Latin apart from Comedy are conveniently discussed in an appendix)—rather, the stock type is evoked by reference to his chief characteristics, such as flattery and subservience, as well as his obsession with food.

Part I develops a picture of the parasite retrieved largely from the Greek comic fragments. Two chapters are next devoted to a very full and useful discussion of the parasites who appear in the plays of Plautus and Terence, demonstrating how typical character traits are manifested in individual cases.

In the second part D. discusses the parasite as a symbol for the *cliens* in Satire andEpigram with particular concentration on Horace, Martial, and Juvenal. She successfully demonstrates how problems with the patronage system are frequently expressed in convivial contexts, so that the client who pays court to his patron in the hope of a dinner invitation is in effect a modern day version of the Comic parasite. Given the theme of the book, D. not unsurprisingly privileges the figure of the parasite, but mention might have been made of other characters who are used to highlight deficiencies in the patronage relationship. In particular, just as the parasite may represent the client seen from the patron's viewpoint, so the Satiric character of the 'stingy host' might be regarded as the patron from the client's viewpoint. Further, in Martial especially, the client, though certainly often depicted as preoccupied with

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dinner invitations, is also shown as eager for other types of remuneration, e.g. clothing and Saturnalia gifts, which included items other than food.

The concept of the parasite is widened by D. to include the figure of the legacy-hunter, e.g. in Horace, *Sat*. 2.5. This is unconvincing: though the two certainly have much in common, the legacy-hunter lacks the most dominant trait of the comic parasite: an obsession with his belly.

The final section is devoted to several speeches of Cicero (e.g. *Pro Quinctio*, *Pro Caecina*, and the *Verrines*) in which, D. argues, the figure of the parasite is evoked for purposes of negative characterization. This is the least persuasive part of the book. In the case of Aebutius, for instance, who preys on the widow Caesennia, though his subservient dependence is a parasitic trait (as with Horace's legacy-hunter), the only allusion cited by D. to the all-important food theme is the metaphorical use of *alere* ('Aebutius... qui... Caesenniae viduitate... aleretur'): hardly enough to turn him into a Comic parasite. Where Cicero alludes to comic stereotypes, e.g. in the *Pro Caelio*, he does so overtly.

The book is well written. Accessibility is also enhanced by translations of all passages into an English style which is lively and for the most part accurate, though there are errors and infelicities from time to time. A few examples: p. 112 'tristi' [versu] = 'harsh, bitter' rather than 'depressing'; p. 151 'debet. . . conviva recumbere' does not mean 'must have been a guest'; p. 156 'vector lascive' (of Jupiter in bull form carrying off Europa) is mistranslated as 'lusty *traveler*'; p. 173 surely 'veteres clientes' are clients of long standing rather than 'clients who have grown old hoping'.

In conclusion, D.'s discussion offers a useful insight into one of the chief methods by which the patronage system is held up to criticism, particularly in satiric writers.

University of Sydney PAT WATSON

DEATH'S LITTLE LUXURIES

J. ENGELS: *Funerum sepulcrorumque magnificentia. Begräbnis und Grabluxusgesetze in der griechisch-römischen Welt mit einigen Ausblicken auf Einschränkungen des funeralen und sepulkralen Luxus im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit*. Pp. 272. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998. Paper, DM 96. ISBN: 3-515-07236-5.

Life's little luxuries can pervade death. The burial and commemoration of the dead have the potential to become a showy affair; huge processions behind the hearse and grandiose funerary monuments aim to impress and to perpetuate the status of both the deceased and their survivors. But in some cases the opportunities for display presented by the rituals of death have not been left unrestricted. Engels explores how in the Graeco-Roman world laws were introduced which aimed to control aspects of the burial and commemoration of the dead.

The greater part of the book, seven out of ten chapters, focuses on the Greek world. Athens has unusually good literary and epigraphic sources and rich archaeological finds relevant to the subject, and several chapters discuss, in chronological order, thelegislation put forward which affected the nature and scale of funeral rituals inAthens and Attica. The legislation of Solon, the so-called post-*aliquanto* law, and thelegislation of Demetrios of Phaleron are all thoroughly addressed. The relative political and economic situation of the *polis*, and the dating, nature, and impact of

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

these laws form a vital part of the survey. The Athenian experience is also placed in the broader Greek context by a chapter that examines evidence for funerary sumptuary legislation from other Greek settlements.

Parallel legislation from the Roman world is the focus of a single chapter. The final two chapters move beyond the Graeco-Roman world, providing a brief summary ofboth funerary practices and state intervention in the funerary sphere up to and including the modern period.

Many aspects of the burial and the commemoration of the dead could be perceived as transgressing acceptable norms and thus suitable for limitation. The laying out of the corpse, the extent of mourning, the scale of the funeral procession, the number of the mourners, the gender of those present, the decoration and size of the monument, and the frequency of visits to the grave could become the target of legal restrictions. Clearly self-regulation in these areas was not always regarded as sufficient. From the earliest Greek legislation to the end of antiquity, at different places and times and in differing constitutional forms, laws were passed to control the splendour of funerals and graves. What motivated the legislators to intervene and dictate how the dead should be buried and remembered? And what does this tell us about the societies involved? It is these broader issues that E. seeks to address. E. acknowledges parallels between societies, but is a little sceptical of the application of sociological and anthropological models. Instead, E. prefers to analyse closely the motivation of individual legislators. Political, economic, social, religious, and philosophical factors are all explored as possible influences. Emphasis repeatedly falls upon constitutional forms, and the impact of aristocratic and democratic tensions and interests upon the legislation.

One of the great strengths of the book is its detailed analysis of diverse evidence. It skilfully unites literary, epigraphic, and archaeological sources to produce a thorough impression of funerary rituals and their restriction in the ancient Greek world. Moreover, it considers these not only alongside practices in the Roman world but looks beyond this to find parallels from across the historical spectrum. The breadth of this view is both informative and creative. There is, however, a risk of losing sight of the overall arguments, which would have been clarified by a final concluding chapter to pull the multiple threads together and to complement the introduction. It is also unfortunate that it was not possible to illustrate the book. At least some of the discussion draws upon detailed descriptions of monuments and also images from tombstones, pictures of which would have been a helpful addition. Nevertheless, by uniting varied evidence, this comprehensive survey is an impressive contribution to the understanding of the rituals of death and their regulation.

The Open University VALERIE HOPE

FACTS OF LIFE?

W. SCHEIDEL: *Measuring Sex, Age and Death in the Roman Empire: Explorations in Ancient Demography*. (*Journal of American Archaeology*, Supplementary Series, 21.) Pp. 184, figs. Ann Arbor: *Journal of American Archaeology*, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 1-887829-21-0.

This book consists of four loosely linked studies, on brother–sister marriage (Chapter I), reported ages in Roman Egypt (Chapter II), the Roman imperial army

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Chapter III), and seasonal mortality (Chapter IV). I will comment briefly on the two central chapters before turning to the perhaps more radical chapters that frame the study.

According to ancient funerary monuments, as is well known, a disproportionate number of ancients attained a number of years at death with the terminal digits 0 or 5. Such observations have been used to cast doubt on the reporting of age in funerary contexts and to question the levels of literacy of the population in which age was reported so loosely. S. demonstrates statistically that in census returns and tax lists from Roman Egypt these 'adjustments' or inaccuracies were remarkably rare, though attested, but that in other kinds of evidence, mummy labels, the epigraphic record, and contracts, such patterns were much stronger. There was also a consistent avoidance of the final digit 7. In contexts in which age matters financially and where ages could be checked against previous declarations, the Egyptians tended to be consistent, but in contexts in which a general description of age was required (such as when age is used as a descriptor on contracts) approximations were more common. I am unsure whether this demonstrates that most Egyptians knew how old they were or the qualities of the bureaucratic system.

S. turns to the Roman army of the early principate in Chapter III and examines what the likely patterns of mortality imply for Roman finances and recruitment patterns. S. points out that extending military service from twenty to twenty-five years produced substantial savings for the *fiscus*. He also attempts to use the various inscriptions enumerating those discharged from particular legions in particular years to estimate the size of the legion, and concludes that the resulting legions appear rather small, suggesting that early discharge or promotion out of the legion explains this. I remain unconvinced, believing that irregularities in recruitment offer the most likely explanation. S. argues that even after the Augustan reforms between fifteen and twenty per cent of Roman males must have joined the army aged twenty. This depends on accepting the traditional 'low' estimate of the Roman population in the face of the 'high' estimate proposed by E. Lo Cascio.

Chapters I and IV raise more substantial problems. Chapter IV concerns seasonality of death, and should be read in conjunction with Brent D. Shaw 'Seasons of Death: Aspects of Mortality in Imperial Rome', *JRS* 86 (1996), 100–38. S. argues that the pattern of seasonal mortality in Rome (particularly high in the summer months) results from the peculiar disease regime of the capital, and is, therefore, different from the mortality patterns of Egypt. Further, the seasonality of mortality in Egypt looks different from that of other regions, such as North Africa, conclusions broadly confirmed by Shaw, though the latter is more cautious. The differences in seasonality of mortality suggest that mortality patterns were localized and it must, therefore, follow that the resultant population structures were different.

The first chapter is the most methodologically innovative, using the insights of socio-biology to investigate the implications of brother–sister marriage which, if we accept S.'s view, are shocking. The chances of *serious* disability increase tenfold, IQ falls dramatically, and perinatal infant mortality (presumably massively increased in antiquity by infanticide) also increases by at least 200–300 per cent. S. concludes that sibling marriage put 'the very survival of any given family at a considerable and easily avoidable risk, in a manner that must eventually have dawned on all but the most benighted contemporary observers' (p. 38). Furthermore, he argues that studies of unrelated young children brought up together suggest an absence of mutual sexual desire when the children reach maturity. The evaluation of this depends at least in part on the credence one places in socio-biology, a discipline with a rather shady

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

background, and although I am not equipped to offer a proper critique, I have a few doubts. Firstly, S. can offer no explanation for the phenomenon of sibling marriage. Yet, without a convincing explanation, it strains belief that large numbers of Egyptians willingly imposed such burdens on their children, and it may be easier to conclude that the science is misleading. S. also shows that some inbred (but not incestuous) populations do not show the debilitating characteristics outlined. Another concern is the applicability and scientific basis of modern studies of children of incestuous unions. Modern incest is abusive and linked to other forms of physical and psychological violence. Certainly, anecdotal evidence would suggest that children of incestuous unions suffer IQ reduction, but abuse is often recognized through the manifestation of other forms of anti-social behaviour which may lead to a bundle of psychological and social problems that effectively limit the abused's social opportunities and ability to escape from the influence of the abuser, possibly condemning them to the margins of society. The secretive nature of abuse means that the known population of children born from incestuous unions is small and their family histories murky; abusers are often themselves victims of abuse that may be perpetuated over generations. How could one strip out the social factors from the biological, a problem which has particularly beset studies of intelligence? Also, the patterns of modern abusive activity would suggest that we ought to be very cautious in looking for biologically determined psychological taboos. The parallels adduced by S., kibbutzim and *sim pua* marriages (marriage of couples brought up together from early childhood), demonstrate the reluctance of what one might term 'fictive' siblings to marry, but both phenomena occur in societies which have incest taboos. It is not clear that the attested psychological distress can be transposed to Romano-Egyptian individuals.

S.'s study is a fascinating and thought-provoking contribution to our understanding of what Brent Shaw calls 'the basic facts of life, and death, in the Roman world'. The difficulties of the material are exposed and there is no attempt to obscure the many remaining problems. Once one adds topics we know so little about—macrodemography (population of regions), patterns and ages at marriage, management of fertility, population control, and local and chronological variants in fertility strategies, as well as mortality regimes—one can see how far we are from a proper understanding of these complex basics of ancient societies.

Royal Holloway, London RICHARD ALSTON

SOMATICS

M. WYKE (ed.): *Parchments of Gender: Deciphering the Body in Antiquity.* Pp. x + 291, figs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-19-815080-6.

This is a rich and rewarding collection of articles on gender, a companion volume to a special edition of the journal *Gender and History* (9.3 [1997]), entitled 'Gender and the Body in the Ancient Mediterranean', which itself contained much excellent material: a major article on Greek nudes by Robin Osborne, an extremely sceptical treatment of 'oriental' temple prostitution by Mary Beard and John Henderson, several articles on gendered bodies in the Near East, and a slew of reviews. The request for submissions to that volume, made originally by Edith Hall, produced such a response that a second volume was needed to contain them. Here it is.

There are eleven articles in all, ranging from a study of satyr-plays to an analysis of

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Derek Jarman's *Sebastiane*. There is plenty of theory for those who like theory, but also plenty of interesting texts and images for those who like their facts. Moreover, those who think the study of gender and sexuality is something they can safely ignore should be aware that it has begun to encroach on areas traditionally considered moremainstream. An extremely ambitious essay by Emma Dench surveys tropes ofdecadence in geo-personal politics from the Greeks to the Augustan Age, and MaryBeard and John Henderson present a comprehensive overview of the imagery ofapotheosis from Caesar to Marcus Aurelius. There is an emphasis on complexity and specificity, and most of the essays are more easily summarized as studies of or commentaries on a body of material or a theme, rather than as closely argued theses with conclusions 'to go'.

Edith Hall sees satyr-plays as a macho antidote for womanish tragedies with all their lovelorn anguish and pathos, so the male viewer could leave the theatre feeling jolly and cocky rather than traumatized and unmanned. Men playing women are playing the other, the author argues; men playing bestial satyrs are playing their own natural selves. The author is clearly onto something when she points out the gendered contrast between tragedy and satyr-plays, but this conclusion seems far too simple and must be taken as only provisional. Why did male actors bother to strap on phalluses over their penises? Why bother to put on woolly leggings at all?

Helene Foley sees an untypical emphasis on reciprocity in the erotic relations outlined in *Phaedrus* which may derive from the influence on Plato of Sappho, who is not as bodily as some suggest. Ann Ellis Hanson, in an extremely detailed, intelligent, and careful piece, tries to discover shifts and changes in gynaecological recipes in the medical writers and examines what they imply about changes in the construction of the bodies of women over time. Sarah Currie looks at the art of poisoning and manages not unpersuasively to draw a link between poisoned bodies and the effigies produced by visual art. Emma Dench's broad survey focuses on the conflict between the discourses of effeminacy and the discourses of pomp and splendour, urbanity, and power. Erik Gunderson, similarly, reflects on the problems of being urbane and finds a struggle, a special anxiety of new intensity, in Quintilian's efforts to be a good man. The performing body is supposed to reveal true nature, but the labour of controlling its multifarious readings destabilizes nature and truth. There is much more at stake in oratory than trying most effectively to get a message across. Performing well and being good are inevitably at odds.

After wrestling with such an ontological aporia, the article on apotheosis by Beardand Henderson brings us down to earth, taking an ironic look at how emperors got toheaven and the tendency to make sure their wives, mother-in-laws, and dead babies were waiting to welcome them when they arrived. They examine the problems of gendered apotheoses, of activity and passivity, the metaphysical and the mundane in images of transport, and wonder if iconographic parallels with sex-slaves such as Ganymede and Tithonus or disasters such as Icarus may have served to undermine the image. Cynthia Baker examines the treatment of female bodies as houses in Jewish texts and finds an 'anopticism' which contrasts with Quintilian's orator on display. Maria Wyke looks at Jarman's *Sebastiane* as a gay icon who refuses his homoerotic status, at the same time a homosexual martyr and a closet-case 'doolally Christian' in Jarman's words, who got what he deserved. Discussions of disease, sado-masochism, and penetration are also included. This is a peculiar film, however, interestingly terrible, and the author seemed only to touch on its peculiarity. As a gay film with anexplicitly gay theme, made by a famous gay man, it plays interesting games with therelationship between those in front of and those behind the camera, actors,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

filmmakers, and audience. It has a desert-island feel, like a video of an amateur holiday or *Lord of the Flies*. It is partly soft porn, with some bad (as well as some good) acting, and in Latin with subtitles, but it is also a film made for its community, a film both unusually objectifying and alienating but also very intimate, a film which unusually dramatizes the making of it, as if here on this outlaw island, sequestered in time and space, the opposition between shooters and shot-at can be eliminated with all playing on the same team.

Two other articles attempt more dangerously to get beyond discourses and images to the 'real'. Jon Berquist places the 'misogyny' of the Jewish Book of Sirach in the context of cultural changes in Hellenistic Palestine. The insistence on austere patriarchal control over daughters reflects a response to an incest anxiety produced by the logic of seclusion, which by keeping women away from those outside the household implies they are available for those inside. He prefers a Lacanian analysis which sees the daughter's desire for the father transposed into obedience to the law, rather than the theories of some feminist psychoanalysts who see the daughter's desire for the outside transposed onto the body of the father: 'To refer to the father's attractiveness is to continue Sirach's fantasy of female desire for the male...'. At the same time, keeping daughters pure is a way of keeping Jewish culture pure from the intrusions ofthe Greeks. The author has little faith in the efficacy of these cultural and psychoanalytic transpositions, however, and incest keeps re-emerging. 'Does Sirach touch thedaughter's forbidden body? One never knows.' In fact it makes no difference. Through the logic of seclusion, 'Incest, whether emotional or physical, results'. By being translated into Greek the text too touches the forbidden and is therefore 'rhetorically incestuous' as well. Finally Caroline Dougherty wonders if the link between rape and conquest in ancient writing is necessarily only symbolic. After all, the rape of women was both real and metaphorical in Bosnia and the First World War.

As these last two examples indicate, there are some assertions in this collection which are not only unproven but impossible to prove, and there are many arguments which impress less by their cogency than by a kind of abstract neatness of conception, theoretical panache. It is fine to use the ancient world as something to think with, but there is a danger of fetishizing mere ideas, a danger, that is, of meta-scholarship in which suggestions respond to suggestions with less and less relevance to what actually went on in the ancient world, and less energy is spent on painstaking assessments of evidence and proof. It is unlikely that intellectual cadenzas on their own will be able to transport us to the truly exotic territory that was antiquity. Ancient bodies would undoubtedly amaze us and it is worth trying to piece together, with all the difficulty and controversy that implies, what traces of them we have.

In fact occasionally one begins to doubt how culturally situated these bodies really are. In some cases they are clearly transcendent and universal bodies, the bodies of sex and psychoanalysis, ahistorical bodies with walk-on parts. A key moment here was Hall's reading of the satyrs' vision of Helen seduced by Paris wearing a gold necklace around his neck and multi-coloured pantaloons. Neck means erect penis, claims Hall,and the trousers are really his scrotum. She is only following Richard Seaford, who in turn is following Jeffrey Henderson, at least in part, but this seems typical of the way the discovery of sex and gender in the seventies, as a Foucauldian insistence on confessing what had been covered or repressed, still grips the subject today. Theancient body is stripped bare of its own peculiar significations and reduced (reductively) to a naked truth of sex.

This an interesting and useful collection, but some of the bodies found here are decidedly unsituated and less than real. They are not the bodies that wandered around

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the agora or the forum, or sat at home, bodies full of their own peculiar signification, bodies adorned and dressed, but abstract bodies on which timeless sex wars are reflected or fought. Only Beard and Henderson seem to give us a proper phenomenal somatics, cultural bodies that moved through space. There is much more work along these lines to be done. Those who think it might be time to move on from the Body had better be warned. This need only be the start.

University of Warwick JAMES DAVIDSON

ΔΙΚΑΣΤΗΡΙΑ

A. L. BOEGEHOLD (ed.): *The Athenian Agora: Results of Excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Vol. XXVIII: The Lawcourts at Athens: Sites, Buildings, Equipment, Procedure and Testimonia.* Pp. xxviii + 256,10 figs, 23 pls. Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1995. $100. ISBN: 0-87661-288-1.

As one would expect, the latest volume in this indispensable series, devoted to a crucial aspect of the political functions of the Agora, fully conforms to the standards of its predecessors: full, meticulously thorough, and attractively presented. Whereas other volumes have focused on specific buildings in the Agora or on specific categories of finds (pottery, inscriptions, coins etc.), here Alan Boegehold, who has been working on this material for more than forty years, and his well-appointed supporting cast, collect and analyse the material remains and the literary and epigraphic testimonia for all Athenian courts (including those, such as the Areopagos, the Palladion, and the court in the Peiraeus, which were not part of the Agora). Hence this volume is above all a discussion of major aspects of the practical workings of thecourt system as a whole. But it is also a detailed review of those major Agora building complexes which are likely to have had dikastic use (where John Camp and Rhys Townsend make substantial contributions). Further, it contains a complete andinvaluable collection of the textual testimonia (originally prepared by Margaret Crosby, and equipped with very welcome translations); and definitive publications and catalogues of a number of small finds (mostly presented by Mabel Lang), namely (i) a fourth-century curse tablet (published by David Jordan) directed against one Menekrates and his *synegoroi*, found in 1972 along with others in a well by the Panathenaic Way; (ii) a new fragment of a *kleroterion* (but the full publication of allthe *kleroteria* pieces, being prepared by Sterling Dow, remains to be completed after Dow's death in 1995); (iii) twenty-four bronze *pinakia* which were found in theAgora; Kroll's 1972 study remains the full publication, but Lang here suggests some important modifications to some of Kroll's views; (iv) nine bronze balls, someinscribed, whose precise use in an allotment procedure remains unclear; (v) forty-four bronze tokens, those which can plausibly be seen as dikastic on grounds ofcontext and their inscribed letters, classified in twelve chronological series; (vi) a lid of a document-container (*echinos*); and (vii) fifty-four voting ballots which were apparently the property of the tribes and used for voting in the courts. The combination of B.'s interpretative essays, including a most useful one which offers a synoptic view of different courts and their operations at different periods, with other chapters presenting site reports, publications of finds, and testimonia, has produced a certain

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

amount of repetition, both of material and of arguments, and a sequence of exposition which can be somewhat baffling (and not always helped by cross-referencing). On at least one issue, the assignation of the appropriate homicide court, a serious inconsistency results. In Part A (pp. 18, 46, 48–9) the prosecutor's claim is said in all cases to determine the court; but in the Testimonia (p. 133) it is suggested that the trial of Euphiletos (Lysias 1) could have been held at the Delphinion, since the *defendant* claimed justification. This must be right (cf. now Carawan, *Rhetoric and the Law of Drako* [Oxford, 1998], pp. 120–1): the prosecutor's claim must havebeen determinative when the issue was whether the killing was deliberate orunintentional (i.e. Areopagos or Palladion), but the defendant's where the issue was of justifiable homicide (Areopagos or Delphinion). As usual, the volume is sumptuously fitted out with glossaries, lists, catalogues, illustrations, plans, indexes, and even a guide to new interpretations (on p. viii), all of which help readers find their way around.

Despite the relatively copious material, certain identification of courts has been elusive, because names of individual courts evidently changed over time, courts hearing particular types of cases may have moved, while site-remains and associated finds often suggest or impose judicial use without revealing which cases were heard there; the open-air homicide courts are naturally especially hard to locate. The scrupulous presentation and discussion of all the evidence found here marks a major advance, though uncertainties and problems remain (honestly acknowledged throughout). For example, Townsend's descriptions of the areas now buried under the northern portion of the Stoa of Attalos, known as Buildings A–D (more fully presented in *Agora* XXVII), with their dikastic finds, are brought, in their later fourth-century developments, into convincing connection with the descriptions of court allocations in Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 63–9, all of which makes clear the increasing concerns for enclosed, carefully demarcated court structures and ever more complex ingenious devices to avoid manipulation and corruption. On the other hand, important individual courts cannot be sited with certainty there (or anywhere else). B.is strongly tempted to see the large general court referred to as the *Heliaia* as Building A, and the *Parabyston* (which may later become labelled the *Trigonon*, on B.'sconvincing restoration of the MS readings of Paus. 1.28), where the Eleven supposedly tried *kakourgoi*, as Building B, 'squeezed in' between Building A and the Panathenaic Way (pp. 14–20). One might comment that if the so-called *poros* building just beyond the SW corner of the Agora was, as Vanderpool and Camp have thought, the prison where *kakourgoi* and others were held, one ought perhaps not rule out asitefor the *Parabyston* in that area, i.e. close to or identical with the stepped and walled area at the SW corner of the Agora, which is still labelled on the ground as the'Heliaea?', and which is called here the 'Rectangular Peribolos' and held to be (probably) a court. This would not, it must be admitted, help with the problem of why Pausanias' description states that this court was 'in an obscure part of the city' (ἐν ἀφανεῖ τῆς πόλεως). The next clause, however, which B. also finds baffling, 'where men gathered for the least important of occasions' (ἐπ' ἐλαχιστοῖς), may reflect (at whatever distance) a belief that most offenders tried in the Eleven's court would have been low-status criminals.

Another conclusion which emerges clearly from a varied range of epigraphic, archaeological, and literary evidence is that the extent of vigorous and at least notionally democratic activity in the courts in the early Hellenistic period should not be underestimated. Much varied evidence datable to the late fourth or the third century—lead tokens, voting ballots, a couple of honorific inscriptions (*test*. 93, 94),

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

puns in Machon and references in comedy (for which see also the extended study by B.'s colleague Adèle Scafuro, *The Forensic Stage* [Cambridge, 1997], esp. pp. 14–16), perhaps the inscribed late-fourth-century *echinos*-lid (Chapter XII), and above all the elaborate, but never completed, building complex which replaced Buildings A–D, now dated *c*. 300 B.C. and called the 'Square Peristyle'—combines to counter the view that an alleged abolition of the courts by Antipater or Demetrios of Phaleron (Suda s.v. *Demades*) constituted a systematic and lasting destruction of the Athenian system of popular courts and jury-pay. All in all, this is a welcome and worthy addition to the series.

Cardiff University NICK FISHER

THE SHRINE OF PANKRATES

E. VIKELA: *Die Weihreliefs aus dem Athener Pankrates-Heiligtum am Ilissos: religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung und Typologie.* (Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung, 16.) Pp. xiii + 248, 40 pls. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1994. ISBN: 3-7861-1720-1.

This monograph represents the first major publication of an important shrine of thegod Pankrates at Ilissos. Excavated in rescue excavations from 1953–4, the site has hitherto been known only through preliminary reports. The focus of this revised dissertation is a series of fifty-eight votive reliefs from the sanctuary. The reliefs date from the second half of the fourth century to the first half of the third century B.C.; the sole exception is an anatomical votive relief (S4) of the second century A.D. Vikela refers only in passing to the other material from the site, as yet largely unpublished, that includes inscriptions, sculpture in the round, three cult protomes, the crowning member of an altar, as well as pottery and lamps (see *SEG* 41.247 for a synopsis of the finds). Based on a decree found on the site, the earliest activity at the sanctuary seems to date from the fifth century; the dating of one anatomical relief to the second century A.D. argues for continuous use of the shrine for more than six centuries.

V. is strongest in her discussion of the iconography (Chapters II and III) and typology (Chapter V) of the reliefs, which she divides into two main groups associated with Zeus Meilichios and Herakles respectively. In the first group (A1–A22), the deity is represented in the guise of an older bearded man holding a cornucopia and phiale or sceptre. The deity of the other group (B1–B21) is a youthful Herakles type complete with lion's skin and club; he too sometimes holds a cornucopia. Two further groups include fragmentary reliefs on which only the dedicators are preserved (F1–F11) and anatomical reliefs (S1–S4).

Positioned in the middle of this discussion (Chapter IV) is a long discourse on theorigins of the cult of Pankrates. Here V. is on weaker ground as she attempts tointerpret the presence in the sanctuary of the god Palaimon, which she associates with the Phoenician god Melkart and thus as an equivalent of the hero Herakles. AsR. Parker notes (*Athenian Religion. A History* [Oxford, 1996], p. 345), V.'s case fora significant foreign element is not convincing. The difficulty remains of how to reconcile the two different forms of the deity worshipped in the sanctuary.

Inscriptions provide further clues as to the dangers inherent in attributing a monolithic meaning to these reliefs. Inscriptions survive on twenty-four of the fifty-eight

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reliefs. The older bearded god is named in inscriptions as Palaimon (twice), Plouton (once), Pankrates (once), or even just Theos ('god', once). The Herakles figure is identified as Pankrates in six inscriptions; a seventh adds the name Herakles. Thus thesame name can be given to figures with quite different iconography; conversely, thesame iconographical type can be used to represent a range of different deities. Asimilar issue is raised by V.'s identification of the prototype of one of the Zeus Meilichios figures with the cult statue of Asklepios from Thrasymedes. If the same image can serve a series of multivalent meanings, perhaps one needs more caution in using the iconography of the reliefs as a source for specific cult practice.

It would be worth asking how these reliefs fit within the larger context of votive reliefs in general. No major study has yet been undertaken of them as a genre. The early reliefs are treated in E. Mitropoulou's *Corpus I. Attic Votive Reliefs of the 6th and 5th centuries BC* (1977). Individual types of reliefs, such as the Nymph and Pan reliefs, have been considered by C. Edwards and others. For a more synthetic treatment of the entire form, however, one must turn to the brief 'essays' of U. Hausmann (*Griechische Weihreliefs* [1960]) and G. Neumann (*Probleme des griechischen Weihreliefs* [1979]).

Scholars tend to mine votive reliefs for quotations of lost Greek originals without considering how this relates to workshop practice and artistic production in the Greek world. The low quality of these reliefs as well as the obvious difficulties inherent in thetranslation of free-standing sculpture to two-dimensional form should give rise to caution. Yet, V. identifies eight different prototypes for the Herakles type; a similar precision is brought to bear on the Zeus Meilichios.

The answer might be found by turning to Attic document reliefs that, much like votive reliefs, have long served as sources for lost Greek originals (e.g. M. Meyer, *Diegriechischen Urkundenreliefs*, AM BH 13 [1989]). However, C. Lawton (*Attic Document Reliefs: Art and Politics in Ancient Athens* [1995], esp. pp. 39–40) has argued convincingly that '[t]here is, in fact, little evidence for direct connections between the figures in relief and known statues'. If she is correct, it may well be time to abandon the often-futile exercise of identifying prototypes and turn instead to asking new questions of the material. For example, what is the significance of the mutability of the iconography of the Greek gods and what can it reveal about religious practice?

British School at Rome LORI-ANN TOUCHETTE

CYPRIOT FIGURINES

V. Karageorghis: *The Coroplastic Art of Ancient Cyprus: VA. The Cypro-Archaic Period Small Female Figurines: Handmade/Wheelmade Figurines*. Pp. xiii + 93, 1 map, 35 figs, 58 pls. Nicosia: A. G. Leventis Foundation, 1998. Cased, £25. ISBN: 9963-560-25-3.

V. Karageorghis: *The Coroplastic Art of Ancient Cyprus: VI. The Cypro-Archaic Period: Monsters, Animals and Miscellanea*. Pp. xiii + 111, 50 pls, 1 map, figs. Nicosia: A. G. Leventis Foundation, 1996. ISBN: 9963-560-27-X.

Volume V(A) in the seven volume series is devoted to the small female figurines of the Cypro-Archaic period. While the large- and medium-sized sculpture (Volume III) and the small male figurines (Volume IV) each merited a single volume, the female

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

figurines have been allotted two volumes, V(A) and V(B), on the grounds of the greater quantity of material. Method of manufacture dictates the division of the material; thus mould-made figurines will be presented separately by Jacqueline Karageorghis in the final volume, V(B).

K. emphasizes (as in earlier volumes) the difficulties of dating the material. A short consolidated review of the limited archaeological evidence available for dating would have been helpful, although such information is provided in relation to the relevant catalogue entries. The volume is generously illustrated with high-quality photographs, which greatly add to its value as a lasting work of reference. The illustration of material from a single group at different scales (e.g. Pl. XXII uses 1:2 and 1:3 for uplifted arm figurines from Lapithos) sometimes hinders the close study and comparison of style and details which the thematic layout invites. More drawings would have been welcome as they offer an excellent medium for communicating details of manufacture and painted decoration, which do not show up well in photographs.

Volume V(A) is internally organized according to manufacturing methods with hand- and wheel-made figurines in Chapter I, and those with only the faces mould-made in Chapter II. Within these chapters the material is arranged thematically, e.g. figurines with uplifted arms (Chapters I(i), II(i)), lyre players (Chapters I(ix), II(xiv)), so that the range of figurine types and the relative frequency of different gestures and activities are clear. Given the lack of a provenance for a substantial number of the figurines (many published here for the first time), the thematic typology seems a pragmatic and necessary choice. It divorces, however, some of the material from its archaeological context and obscures the degree of stylistic coherence at both site and regional level. Indeed, for the Lapithos figurines K. overrides his own thematic classification in favour of a unified presentation which highlights the 'variety and liveliness' of this particular workshop.

K. is forthright in acknowledging problems in categorizing some figurines as definitely male or female, with the result that some pieces have migrated from Volume IV (male) to V(A) (female)—for example, the 'tambourine players' from Volume IV, I(vii) are now considered to be female together with V(A), I(ix); and Volume IV, I(i)33 and 38 goes with Volume V(A), p. 26, I(v)e.14. Presence/absence of breasts is less clear-cut as a gender criterion than might be assumed: absence of breasts might, for example, reflect simplification of form by the figurine maker. In some cases lack of breasts is regarded as unimportant by K. where other features such as 'tiaras' and necklaces are present (pp. 14–15: I(i)67–71), yet other closely similar groups are split between the volumes on this very criterion (e.g. Volume IV, I(ii)21 and V(A), I(i)35). An intriguing case, which surely defies classification by gender, is Catalogue I(viii)5: 'acylindrical–conical projection between her legs looks like male genitalia, but the prominent breasts and the infant she holds suggest otherwise' (pp. 29–30). A careful, comprehensive study of gender in relation both to gesture and activity and to workshop conventions would be a useful and rewarding project.

Volume VI presents the non-human figurines which range from fantastic or supernatural creatures (Chapter I) to animals (Chapters II–III) and inanimate objects (Chapter IV), and should be used with the earlier volumes I–II for a sense of the long-term changes and continuities in this area of Cypriot coroplastic art. The volume is clearly organized into thematic categories and is well illustrated with both photographs and drawings. There is an informative appendix by Richard Steffy on the structural details depicted in the boat models and their relationship to physical remains such as the Kyrenia wreck.

By bringing together individual pieces scattered throughout the world's museums,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the volume highlights the wide range of creatures in the Cypriot coroplast's repertoire. It also presents the simple but effective modelling—such as the woolly coats of therams or the pinched pig snouts—through which the different animals are, on the whole, easily recognizable. Many of the figurines are unprovenanced, but those with contexts come largely from tombs, with only the bull also regularly offered in rural sanctuaries.

The discussion of the centaurs and other fantastic creatures draws attention both to their distinctive Cypriot elements and to Cyprus as a catalyst for the transmission of mythic ideas and images between East and West. K. usefully updates his earlier discussions of the *naiskoi* (Chapter IV, T), giving greater attention to the importance of Near Eastern traditions in the development of the type and relating the material to the later, well-known aniconic (baetylic) representations of Aphrodite.

With all but one of the series, *The Coroplastic Art of Ancient Cyprus*, now published, it is appropriate to reflect on the future of Cypriot figurine studies. K. hascreated an invaluable work of reference by making available a vast body of material spread in museums and private collections throughout the world and by publishing it in an accessible and well-illustrated format. This should now inspire others to follow up some of the important issues he touches upon. For example, K. includes some figurines from larger (unpublished) bodies of material, such as those from Yeroskipou-Monagri and Saittas-Livadhia, which would surely repay study as coherent groups. K. comments on the pressing need to learn more about production centres. Here only continued study of provenanced figurines and more importantly assemblages from excavated contexts can offer the necessary framework for the study of workshop production and organization, and its dynamic relationship with the needs of specific sanctuaries and regions.

Trinity College, Dublin CHRISTINE MORRIS

METHANA

CHRISTOPHER MEE, HAMISH FORBES (edd.): *A Rough and Rocky Place: The Landscape and Settlement History of the Methana Peninsula, Greece (Results of the Methana Project sponsored by the British School at Athens and the University of Liverpool)* (Liverpool Monographs in Archaeology and Oriental Studies). Pp. xi + 370, 236 drawings and b&w photographs, 23 tables. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997. Cased. ISBN: 0-85323-741-7.

A roughly triangular peninsula, some 50 km^2 in extent, projects from the north coast of the Argolid, to which it is joined by a narrow isthmus. On its west side lay the ancient *polis* of Methana, a Spartan possession briefly garrisoned by the Athenians in 425–421 B.C. and later by the Ptolemies. The peninsula is in fact an extinct volcano (740 m high) whose flanks are deeply terraced to a considerable altitude; Strabo and Pausanias describe its last eruption in the third century B.C. This may not be a typical southern Greek landscape, but anthropological fieldwork carried out here in the 1970s has been important for our understanding of ancient and modern agricultural

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

systems. Between 1981 and 1987 this was followed up with archaeological fieldwork (full field seasons took place in 1984–6), the results of which are now presented in ahandsome, large-format volume by the editors, Christopher Mee and Hamish Forbes, and their ten co-authors (principally H. Bowden, L. Foxhall, D. Gill, T. Koukoulis, and G. Taylor).

After the editors' brief introduction to the project and the history of Methana (pp.1–5), P. James and four co-authors (M. Atherton, A. Harvey, A. Firmin, and A.Morrow) give an authoritative account of the geology and physical geography (pp.6–32), showing why the existing land surface and soils are well suited to terracing for olives and vines. There has been limited long-term erosion, in contrast to islands like Melos. The most significant changes were the presumed deforestation in the early Bronze Age and the construction of terraces in classical times or later.

The editors' account of survey methodology (pp. 33–41) is a cautionary tale to those who would wish to impose theoretically ideal sampling techniques in heavily dissected or scrub-covered landscapes. Given limitations imposed by time and permits, a sensible decision was taken to concentrate on less steep areas near coasts, together with a sample of upland areas. Although only 21% of the peninsula was intensively surveyed (with field-walkers spaced only 10 m apart), M. & F. demonstrate that more work would have yielded sharply diminishing returns. The survey designated 103 sites (eighty-eight of them new), and statistical tests confirmed a clear distinction between these and the background areas. A useful discussion of manuring as a generator of 'background noise' is included.

There follow seven period chapters (pp. 42–117) by various combinations of hands, summarizing the results in a consistent style and benefiting from mutual awareness of other periods and aspects of the project. There are only six neolithic sherds and no definite sites. Early Helladic settlement, with pottery from FN–EH I to EH III and over 1,400 chipped stone fragments, includes four possible villages and a number of farmsteads; no settlement hierarchy can be established. The Middle Helladic is a period of retrenchment rather than nucleation; its sites survive alongside new Late Helladic ones, but despite a slight rise in numbers no effects of the rise of Mycenae are seen. No LH III C or Submycenaean material is found, though some LH sites survived in the early Iron Age when Methana was culturally part of the Argolid. Unusually for the eastern Argolid, early Geometric pottery is found, but no eighth-century 'rise of the *polis*' is seen.

In the Archaic period, nucleation and a population increase took place, though the site of the classical *polis*, occupied since neolithic times, was smaller than Kypseli on the east coast, which had the earliest sanctuary near it. By the classical period Methana had emerged as the only *polis*, with two subordinate settlements and signs of cultic networking between three sanctuaries, but it may at times have been dependent on Troizen.

In the Hellenistic period (defined here as 323–100 B.C.) we start to see still more detail. The city's fortifications were rebuilt, perhaps by the Ptolemaic garrison; other fortifications may be contemporary. Three cult sites are known, at least one of which may have been disused by Roman times. The *polis* (renamed Arsinoë) issued coins and flourished, perhaps because of the presence of Ptolemaic troops; it was assertive enough for its boundary disputes to be recorded. Rural settlement remained high, in contrast to some other areas, despite the volcanic eruption which must have affected the north. Small processing sites appeared, while larger sites may prefigure Roman and late Roman villa-farmsteads; less intensively farmed land may have been developed

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

through royal patronage, in a mixed pattern of landholding reflecting friendly relations with the occupying power.

The early Roman period (here 100 B.C.–A.D. 100) saw a substantial fall in site numbers and in the size of the *polis*, with no recovery in the first two centuries A.D., perhaps because of piracy and large-scale grazing of élite-owned flocks. Local patronage may explain the erection of one of the earliest bath complexes in Roman Achaea, at the hot spring created by the volcanic eruption. The middle Roman period (A.D. 100–300) brought settlement dispersal, possible slave-run or tenant-farmed estates with substantial architecture, and an increase in permanent agricultural equipment. The city continued to be endowed with fine architecture and was important enough to join the Panhellenion. The peninsula may have suffered indirectly from the Herulian invasion, perhaps through disruption of trade; temporary abandonment of sites took place after 300. There may now have been more intensive agriculture bytenant farmers, which continued in late Roman times when many classical and Hellenistic sites were reoccupied but the harbour at Vathy was temporarily disused. Many churches were built during A.D. 400–600, and the settlement hierarchy persisted on a reduced scale; only after the early seventh century did piracy drive settlement inland for 200 years.

At least three late medieval upland villages existed and had access to good land, though the total population of the peninsula was probably hundreds rather than thousands. Koukoulis's generously illustrated catalogue of twenty-seven pre-1900 churches still in use (pp. 211–56), including early Christian and Byzantine constructions, is an important complement to the archaeological data. For the period after the incorporation of the Damalas region into the Ottoman empire in 1460, modern settlement and oral tradition are partial guides. Safety from attack remained a priority in choices of settlement location, but the Turkish fleet bases later provided security, compensating for a lack of commercial contact with the outside world. Thissecurity in turn attracted immigration in times of conflict, such as the war of independence. Modern Methana has been part of the Saronic market economy, and mechanization has undermined its agricultural advantages, bringing population loss.

The reader is allowed direct access to the entire body of primary data, through the comprehensive catalogue of sites (pp. 118–210), which ends with thirty-six pages of pottery profiles (arranged by site rather than period), the small-type printout of the artefact database (pp. 282–343), and the epigraphic and numismatic appendixes. Foxhall's essay on farmstead sites and agricultural equipment (pp. 257–68) is an important study in its own right, making a major contribution to the study of ancient technology.

The editing and layout of the volume are excellent; only the site catalogue might have benefited from more typographic variety. A particular asset is the plentiful use oftables and figures, particularly maps (though the electronically generated Fig. 2.3 has a disfiguring flaw) and, in the site catalogue, the consistent use of bar-charts of pottery counts by period for each site (readers should be alert to the fact that the vertical scales differ). The index is admirably full; site numbers are helpfully used as headwords, though some long strings of page numbers are left undivided.

A perennial problem facing those who publish surveys is what to include and what to leave out. Each day of field-walking generates many days' study and editing; yet, since sometimes a handful of sherds or artefacts are the only basis for positing the existence of a given site at a given period, the totality of the data should always be made accessible. The debate about survey design goes on, and no reading of any data-set is final, but it is greatly to the credit of the Methana team that they have

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

enabled the interpretation and reinterpretation of the landscape history of the Methana peninsula to begin under such favourable auspices. This volume is a model of lucidity and concision, and a demonstration of how, in a truly collaborative research project, every part of the operation benefits every other.

University of Leicester/British School at Athens GRAHAM SHIPLEY

ARCHAEOLOGY AT THE CROSSROADS

S. L. DYSON: *Ancient Marbles to American Shores: Classical Archaeology in the United States*. Pp. xiv + 323, 20 figs. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998. Cased, £33.50. ISBN: 0-8122-3446-4.

Stephen Dyson has as good credentials as anyone to write this book. An archaeologist of broad range with a specialization in Rome and Italy, known as an opponent of establishment attitudes, he has also just finished his term as President of the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA)—an institution which of course figures prominently in his own narrative. Such a career gives him an unrivalled vantage-point from which to criticize a system both from without and from within.

For the outsider, the subject promises an intriguing enquiry. How has it come about that the USA, home of some of the most progressive movements in world archaeology in recent decades, has simultaneously generated a version of classical archaeology which has claims (though against strong competition) to be the most traditionalist to be found in any major modern nation today? The most obvious symptom, the widespread breakdown of communication within American academe between the classical archaeologists, mostly housed in departments of art history or classics, and the other archaeologists who mainly work in departments of anthropology, has long been recognized, and is merely a more acute form of a separation that is familiar in Europe too. But it is a symptom, not a cause, and its historical American roots are by no means so obvious.

The first two chapters, which take the story down to the foundation of the AIA in 1879 and that of its precocious offspring the American School in Athens in 1882, are suffused with one major influential factor: the appeal of romantic Hellenism to American taste. This was to continue strongly into the twentieth century; but then the same is true of several European nations. In so far as distinctively American biases emerge from the story, the earliest and most important is perhaps the preoccupationwith Greek architecture. This began with the work of the art historian Allan Marquand, whose *Handbook of Greek Architecture* appeared in 1909; was sustained for decades by the major names of Bert Hodge Hill, Gorham Phillips Stevens, and the elder Dinsmoor; and has continued more or less ever since. In Europe only Germany can offer a tradition of comparable strength, and there is a very palpable contrast with Britain. Of all classical artefacts the Greek temple has the widest aesthetic appeal but, at least as traditionally studied, is perhaps the least assimilable to the concerns of non-classical archaeologists.

A second factor is the one which forms the subject of D.'s fourth chapter, 'The formation of the museum tradition'. Here again, it was a revelation to me that those twin, giant pillars of the American scene, the Boston Museum of Fine Arts (opened in 1876) and the Metropolitan Museum of Art (1880), exercised quite such a powerful

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

influence over the profession and its research priorities. The main title of the book, at first sight rather idiosyncratic, is here revealed in all its appropriateness. Here again, itwould be hard to make out a parallel case, extending so strongly into the later twentieth century, for (say) the Louvre or the British Museum. Elsewhere, in Chapter III, another all-pervasive influence, that of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, is well brought out.

A recurrent theme of the book is the at times excessive deference of American archaeologists to European scholarship. For a brief period after World War II, the prestige of Britain and the consequent adoption of its traditional subordination of archaeology to philology are identified (p. 218) as an inhibiting influence on the progress of the former discipline in America. But it is the German influence, so strong in early American classics generally, which is singled out for a more specific comment by D. in one of his most suggestive passages (p. 228). The context is the influx of refugees from Nazism before World War II, supplemented afterwards by deliberate appointments of Germans and other Europeans to American chairs. This, he writes, has not only 'helped foster a sense of inferiority among American classical archaeologists', but has had other unfortunate consequences in that 'the Germans came out of an intellectual culture that had become more timid and conventional as a result of the war experience'. There is much food for thought here; and it is surely true that, to this day, it is the German scene in classical archaeology which most closely recalls the American. In neither country, for example, has Aegean prehistory acted as the catalyst for change which it proved to be in Britain; and it is rather briefly handled here, withjustified stress on the achievements of Carl Blegen, Bill McDonald, and Tom Jacobsen, but little or nothing on John Caskey or Emily Vermeule.

The title of Chapter V, on the interwar years, is 'The Triumph of the Establishment', which promises a more provocative treatment than actually emerges from its content. The sixth chapter covers the post-war decades down to the 1970s, and a brief afterword looks to the future of the subject. Throughout, the building blocks of D.'s text are the biographical sketches of individuals and their achievement: I counted roughly a hundred of these summaries, ranging in length from a paragraph to a couple of pages (and with a number of briefer references excluded). The main text runs to 285 pages, so simple arithmetic can show what a prominent component these biographies represent. They are judicious and very thoroughly researched: almost without fail, the dates of the subject are included. All of this contributes to making the book an invaluable future work of reference.

Two things, it seems to me, prevent this book from being a true companion-volume to Suzanne Marchand's more sophisticated culture-historical study of the discipline in Germany, *Down from Olympus* (Princeton, 1996). The first is a visible uncertainty of touch when it moves from the American scene to the European. The second is the fact that D. writes with such unexpected reticence. His judgements have to some extent to be supplied by the reader from a close scrutiny of his text; neither heroes nor villains stand out, and there is at times a sensation of cats not being let out of bags; occasionally the mewing is almost audible. Gradually, the reader detects an authorial resistance to East-coast élitism and patronizing European attitudes; to academic traditionalism in general; to the long-standing primacy of Greek over Roman archaeology in the USA; to nostalgia for the 'glory days' of the great excavations. The clearest statement is in the final paragraphs of the book, where D. offers American classical archaeology a stark choice between, on the one hand, a reversion to its old ways, which in an era ofdrastic reductions in funding means a return to the exclusivity of the rich universities—never again a venture like the Olynthus excavation, or the Minnesota

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and Indiana programmes; and, on the other, 'a major rethinking of the education and field training of the next generation'. All of these are surely healthy attitudes, and they help to make the book more than welcome as a contribution on its own terms.

University of Cambridge A. M. SNODGRASS

READING GREEK ART

N. HIMMELMANN: *Reading Greek Art.* Pp. xxi + 317, 116 ills. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998. Paper, £19.95. ISBN: 0-691-05826-1.

Nikolaus Himmelmann is an important interpreter of Greek and Roman art andofits reception since the eighteenth century. His work has frequently been translatedfrom the original German, but not previously into English. This makes the appearance of this collection of essays timely: H.'s style is complex, even for the German reader, and his work, long influential through diffusion, should now be much more more accessible directly.

The book falls into two sections; the first consists of a collection of essays on issues of form and content in sculpture and painting, and the second of more discursive writing on approaches and methodology, and on the impact of antiquity on modern society. Updated footnotes and additional illustrations add to their impact, and they are introduced by a critical overview by William Childs.

The first essay, on the plastic arts in Homeric society, seems initially the least promising conceptually and factually. It should, however, become a much more widely used starting point for exploration of, among other issues, ancient concepts of what constitutes art, and the perennially fascinating disjunction between the value put in antiquity on the individual art object and that assigned to its maker. The Homeric poems turn out to have plenty to contribute to a framework within which H. can enter into the art-versus-craft controversy, and reflect on art as a commodity, a social construct, and the product of a transferable skill. Just how should we view the Shield of Achilles?

'Archaic Narrative and Figure' expands on Carl Robert's fundamental theories of techniques of visual narrative; this piece dates from 1966, before Snodgrass's several expositions of aspects of the same topic, and even some of the same scenes, particularly the Boston Circe cup, which presents as a unified picture events which the Odyssey predisposes us to expect to be shown serially. The essay goes on to discuss the constructive use of attributes, body language, and gesture in a visual world which operates independently of textual narrative. Specialists will be aware that much of this is now fundamental to the study of Archaic Greek art; the *aperçus* on the narrative value of the individual figure, and the signficance of Geometric scenes and figures are more complex and perhaps less immediately obvious excursions into familiar territory.

'Thc Gods in Classical Art' and 'The Divine Assembly on the Sosias Cup' think about aspects of the transition from Archaic representations of gods identified by inscriptions, attributes, or context, or not at all, to the classical ones which show them 'enjoying, or rather enduring' their own powers. Archaic gods appear in narrative contexts, not on their own; there is a transitional period in which we find representations of single deities (*Daseinsbilder*) engaged in isolated activity, libation-pouring, hunting, making music. Classical gods represent a conceptual change, which includes spatial adjustments in which the gods begin to operate in a different sphere from the mortals

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

whose lives they affect. H. illustrates this with a discussion of the evolution of the iconography of the Judgement of Paris; in Archaic representations this is a scene inwhich Paris reacts to an epiphany by trying to flee. H. argues convincingly that bythe mid-fifth century the parade is in his mind's eye, and the goddesses no longerappear defined by narrative or action. Before long gods generally occupy a sphere of their own in which they do little more than convey their own sanctity. Visualrepresentations of them move away from a concept of the divine which echoes the Homeric towards a quality of timelessness which H. would like to view as proto-Platonic.

The essays on the Polykleitan Diadumenos and the Knidian Aphrodite explore two well-worn art-historical topoi. The Polykleitan statue, as represented by the surviving copies, depicts its subject in a posture which is often held to imply walking, and, according to Furtwängler, is therefore inappropriate for a man tying a ribbon round his head. H. explores the contexts, both glyptic and graphic, in which mainly male figures show one leg displaced to the side, in a rather anodyne developmental discussion of the implications of the stance in conjunction with the use of *contrapposto*. Praxiteles, by virtue of the Aphrodite of Knidos, is still often cited as the first representer of the goddess naked; H. is able to assemble plenty of earlier examples inred-figure, and a splendid plastic lekythos in Boston which shows her in her shell attended by Erotes. Another myth bites the dust.

The second section of the book contains two cautionary tales attached to the work of H.'s heroes, Winckelmann and Robert. Robert's interpretation of a 'sarcophagus' from Megiste founders on an inadequate sense of its context; if properly interpreted as an ossuary for an adult burial, the discontinuous subject matter on its carved sides becomes explicable. Winckelmann, on the other hand, was one of the few scholars of his day to recognize that many Roman sarcophagi had identifiable Greek subject matter. Ironically, his methodology made it impossible for him to identify one of the few Roman scenes well known in his day, and his view of representation as divorced from its immediate context led him to interpret much that is specific to its occasion as allegorical or generic.

The tailpiece is a wide-ranging selection from what was originally a longer essay about antiquity as a conceptual landscape haunted by tourists, artists, and critics, and the reception of ancient art as a commodity, which allows H. to enjoy Winckelmann, Dada, and archaeological reconstructions all in one greedy bite.

University of Glasgow ELIZABETH MOIGNARD

THE ARA PACIS

D. A. Conlin: *The Artists of the Ara Pacis. The Process of Hellenization in Roman Relief Sculpture*. Pp. 145, 247 figs. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1997. $65. ISBN: 0-8078-2343-0.

Based on her 1993 doctoral thesis, C.'s book is concerned only with the Altar's two great processional friezes and her contention that they were not carved by immigrant Greek sculptors (as most would probably assume) but by local Italians trained in a local Italian tradition, under some Greek influence.

In Chapter I, 'The Greek Master Theory', C. suspects generations of philhellene scholars of conspiring to deny local Roman artists their due regarding the author-

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ship of the friezes, compounded in the immediate post-War period by anti-Fascist sentiment. In C.'s view the habit of comparing the Ara Pacis processions with the Parthenon frieze is particularly misguided; not nearly enough weight has been given to the much closer similarities observed between its processions and those painted in Etruscan tombs or carved on Etruscan cinerary urns of the second–first century B.C.; she believes they constitute evidence of an 'internal Italian development not dependent on Greek sources'.

Chapter II, 'Roman Relief Production', is a slim and diffuse account of the origins,training, and workshop organization of Roman sculptors, with much (largely irrelevant) reference to Classical Greece, Persepolis, and medieval Europe, followed bysome brief speculation as to the procedures for public commissions. The fact that the vast majority of ancient sculptors remain anonymous is taken as a licence to discount the documentary evidence for the presence of Greek sculptors in Rome and central Italy from the second century B.C. onwards, and to propose that most workshops producing relief sculpture in Rome in the late first century B.C. were actually 'local'. A tentative model is offered, wherein these local workshops, inheritors of a (hypothetical) tradition of sculpture originally rooted in tufa and travertine, sent apprentices off to Luni (modern Carrara, 300 km away) to be trained in their 'local' Italian marble. Some admitted foreign-trained craftsmen to their ranks, while large-scale projects like the Ara Pacis might bring in whole foreign workshops, giving the locals the opportunity to exchange ideas and techniques.

Chapter III postulates that scholars who see a strongly Classical style in the carving of the friezes may have been misled by the amount of reworking that the reliefs havebeen subjected to, not only since their rediscovery—especially by F. Carradori in1784—but also in antiquity. The ancient interventions consist most obviously in theincising of pupils and/or irises on the eyes, and perhaps some of the rasping on flesh and drapery surfaces, for which C. (having previously dated most of it to the Tetrarchic period, as would N. Hannestad, *Tradition in Late Antique Sculpture* [Aarhus, 1994]), is now rather more in favour of a Hadrianic date (as others have argued in the past).

Chapter IV returns to the main theme and proceeds from the assumption that Hellenic and Italian stone-carving traditions must have been two separate entities and that they were still distinct from one another in the Augustan period. C. interprets the figural style and relief carving on the Ara Pacis as an expression of a local Etrusco-Italian workshop experimenting with Greek techniques.

A final chapter, 'Contemporary Figural Relief Carving', is intended to show that the carvers of the Ara Pacis friezes were 'following a long-standing yet constantly changing local, Italian tradition of carving the human figure in relief'. The examples chosen for comparison are the fragmentary 'Lictor' relief in the ex-Lateran collection (two-thirds lifesize and distinctly unfinished), the Via Druso monument (technically very similar to the 'Lictor' frieze, but not to the Ara Pacis friezes, which it does not resemble compositionally either), and two grave reliefs: the 'Mattei' (very weathered) and the 'Sepolcro del Frontispizio', both consisting of frontal busts.

At various points in her argument, C. remarks that many more equivalent studies are needed before any conclusions can be drawn about the Ara Pacis sculptors, and one can only agree. She raises interesting questions, but the credibility of her answers is constantly undermined by her limited perspective. No account is given of Greek sculptural techniques during the last two centuries B.C., nor is anything made of the(very slight) evidence of Luna marble being worked in northern Etruria before the Roman period. Indeed, as far as we know, substantial quarrying only started in the 50s

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

B.C. (at the earliest, and presumably with the benefit of Greek advice), and good-quality marble did not reach Rome in any quantity until the 20s B.C.; the Ara Pacis is one of the first examples of its use on a monumental scale for sculpture. Thus C.'s putative Italian workshops will have had to have developed their independent tradition of working Italian marble in less than one generation. Perhaps they could have, but the characteristics ascribed to them (block-like forms, a lack of anatomical knowledge, predilection for linear surface detail instead of plastic modelling of form, shaping left at chisel stage, not finished off with rasps and abrasives) are general symptoms of clumsy or hasty workmanship, not a different technical background. Some of C.'s other assertions are equally troubling: that any sensible Roman would prefer to see a 'local' rather than a Greek at work on a monument in Rome, that only 'Italic' workshops would have carved the freedmen grave reliefs of Rome, that the influences at work in the processional friezes in the tombs of (a by then heavily Romanized) Etruria can only have flowed from Etruria to Rome not vice versa.

The book is attractively designed and produced, with a huge number of detailed photographs of the friezes.

Institute of Archaeology, Oxford AMANDA CLARIDGE

ETRURIA

MARIA BONGHI JOVINO, CHRISTINA CHIARAMONTE TRERÉ (edd.): *Tarquinia. Testimonianze archeologiche e ricostruzione storica. Scavi sistematici nell'abitato. Campagne 1982–1988.* (TARCHNA, 1.) Pp. 253, 149 pls, 14 plans. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1997.

G. CAMPOREALE (ed.): *L'abitato etrusco dell'Accesa. Il quartiere B.* Pp. XXV + 441, 31 figs, 44 pls. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 88-7689-129-3.

The 1982–5 campaigns on the central Civita site of Tarquinia have already been treated in more summary fashion in M. Bonghi Jovino (ed.), *Gli etruschi di Tarquinia* (Modena, 1986), pp. 81–140 (see *CR* 39.1 [1989], 317–19); see also *Tarquinia: ricerche, scavi e scoperte* (1987, by the same editors as here). The present volume is the final report up to 1988, adding full context to the discoveries that are now well known: the burial of the child with cranial abnormalities, now judged to be male and around eight years old, who was interred in the late ninth century; the four neonate (or foetus) remains also found in the vicinity; the shrine with the votive deposit of three ceremonial bronzes (axe, shield, trumpet); the road laid down across the sanctuary area in the early fifth century. One later find (of 1991) is the skeletal remains of another human, a mature male who apparently came to a violent end, buried with a Euboean pottery jar; discussion of this is due to appear shortly.

The book has three main sections: an extremely dense description of the excavation as it proceeded; an evaluation of the same in terms of stratigraphic sequence and interpretation; and a historical synthesis. Although there are plentiful cross-references between the sections, and the separate site plans in chronological sequence are excellent and invaluable, it has to be said that the book is certainly not easy to read, and anyone coming to it to extract its main conclusions quickly will have to quarry hard. The great complexity of the site makes this almost inevitable, given that it is an

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

open-area excavation with an average depth of stratigraphy of only 70–80 cm, within which the very fragmentary material record concerns major human interventions from between the tenth and second centuries B.C. Almost inevitably, too, there were bound to be some inconsistencies in presentation. On p. 41 and on Plan 10 one of the neonates is numbered 180C but is not to be found in the catalogue of human remains on pp. 100–1 (unless it is the no. 59A there); and the neonate from building β is not shown on Plan 8, though the *fossa* in which it was found is indicated—no. 351. For the sequence of these infant burials see p. 159.

Although much of the book is necessarily descriptive, the two principal authors (and editors) do not shy away from interpretation and personal opinion. The monumentalizing of a major sanctuary, its entrance sanctified with a votive deposit of fine bronzes, is indicative of a 'potere politico di stampo regale' (p. 172); the use of stone walls and their construction technique at this early date (in the early seventh century) also points to a 'precisa volontà politicamente sovrana' (p. 219). Later, thefifth-century regularization of road and water/drainage systems in the excavated zone suggests a collective effort and decisions made by an oligarchic regime (p. 223). Attention is also given to the wider area of the Civita plateau. Linington's conclusions and hypotheses about early road layouts, as extrapolated from geophysical surveys, are discussed on pp. xiii, 1–5, and 206 by different authors with rather different views as to how they should now be modified or rejected. Attention is also paid to the 8 km city wall, which is now drawn in plan with greater detail at its west end than before. But perhaps the most impressive aspect of this whole research programme is the logistical one of systematizing a vast mass of archaeological data in a thoroughly integrated way. To give one example (which may at first confuse the reader): as pottery and other finds are referred to in the description of the excavation, the numbers they are given are those of the boxes in which they are stored, together with their sequence within the box. One has the welcome feeling that the objects can be easily retrieved and examined over and again as the project develops.

In addition to the excavation itself up to 1988, the volume contains reports on the archaeobotanical, faunal, and human skeletal remains, on the Hellenistic stucco and mosaic, and on a topographical study of the Tarquinia environs. Publication of the pottery and other artefacts will appear in due course.

In an earlier publication Bonghi Jovino had quoted D. H. Lawrence's comment on Tarquinia made in 1932: 'of the city I cannot find even one stone', a remark that was equally true of the site documented in Camporeale's book until the mid-eighties, when the Florence University excavations were initiated here. But for a very long time the site of ancient Tarquinia has never been in dispute, whereas Accesa area B was not known even to exist; it was simply a densely wooded hillside frequented only by hunters and charcoal-burners. Although initially there must have been difficult clearing operations to get at the structures, this is a site that does not have the complexities of stratigraphy of Tarquinia, and the publication is in more traditional format with a description of the buildings and of the finds from them, and discussion of the finds by class of material.

The little lake had been rather larger in Etruscan times than now (p. 9). Around it have been found four groups of buildings. Area A, first investigated by D. Levi in the 1920s (who also dug the necropolis near it) and excavated by C. in the early 1980s, waspublished by him (ed.), *L'Etruria mineraria* (1985), pp. 128–80 (for a summary: *ArchReps* 32 [1985–6], 114–15). Areas C and D, closer to the lake, have yet to be published. The present volume publishes the buildings of area B, but in the analysis of the artefact material includes the finds from area A. It also publishes and in some

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cases republishes the tombs (seven in all) from B, together with a burial (probably infant) from near one of the houses in area A.

Building activity in area B may have begun slightly earlier than at A, in the late seventh century, but the settlement does not outlast the sixth. The buildings of B, certainly dwellings, are nine in number and arranged in a slightly less haphazard fashion than in area A; there is even some alignment between them. Some are very simple indeed, consisting of a single room. Only the stone footings of the walls survive. Most would have had tiled roofs, though not necessarily ridged: ridge tiles are present only for building 5. Some houses show a succession of building phases, but the phases are very rapid ones, and there is no attempt to differentiate them on the plans.

The importance of Accesa is that it is still one of only a small handful of archaic Etruscan settlements that have been thoroughly excavated. C.'s broader conclusions about the site remain essentially those expressed in 1985. It was the rich minerals in the area that attracted settlement and the buildings grew up as part of an infrastructure to exploit them. But they are not of a workshop or industrial nature, nor are they homes of low-status miners, but of the families who controlled them and the terrain itself (see the mineralogical/geological map with sites of abandoned mines, p. 16). Hence the widespread use of bucchero tableware. Building 1 has more rooms than most, and C. suggests it had a position of control over the others. (However, building 7 is almost as large, and moreover produced about the same quantity of bucchero and even an Attic black-figure cup fragment). The distribution tables of artefacts for the houses of both areas are helpful and informative. From finds of loomweights and bobbins one can pinpoint to individual rooms the presence of looms certainly in one house in area A and another in B. (In the text p. 209: seventeen loomweights for building B7, rm 1; but only three given for the same room in the table on p. 211). Throughout, C. is at pains to extract as much information and background from the site as possible, without being over-speculative.

Not all weighty volumes are important volumes, but both of these are. However, theAccesa volume, though paperback, is over-weighty, as are most titles in the 'Archeologica' series: it uses extremely heavy paper, is very wasteful of space in the catalogue sections, and moreover is difficult to handle because the pages are unevenly cut.

University of Manchester TOM RASMUSSEN

HOUSES OF POMPEII

THOMAS FRÖHLICH: *Casa della Fontana Piccola (VI 8, 23.24)*. (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut. Häuser in Pompeji, 8.) Pp. 123, 477 ills (including colour). Munich: Hirmer, 1996. ISBN: 3-7774-6520-8.

WOLFGANG EHRHARDT: *Casa di Paquius Proculus (I 7, 1.20)*. (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut. Häuser in Pompeji, 9.) Pp. 172, 487 ills (including colour). Munich: Hirmer, 1998. ISBN: 3-7774-7300-6.

These two most recent volumes in the Häuser in Pompeji series deal with a couple of medium-sized houses, measuring respectively about 600 and 750 m^2 in ground area. The Casa della Fontana Piccola was excavated in 1827. Its chief claims to fame are

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the mosaic-decorated garden fountain after which it is named, one of a dozen or so such domestic fountains constructed during the last years of the city, and the large-scale landscape paintings which adorn the garden walls. It is also interesting, however, for possessing two atria (unusual in a house of comparatively modest size) and for preserving a number of good-quality and reasonably complete wall-paintings in the so-called Fourth Style. More recently, Hans Lauter has argued that it was originally joined with its neighbour, the Casa della Fontana Grande, and that its present form is the result of a later division. The Casa di Paquius Proculus, excavated in the 1920s, is noted for its mosaic pavements, especially the unique figure mosaics which extend over the whole of the fauces and the atrium; but scarcely less interesting is the clear evidence of wall-paintings being repaired, presumably after the earthquake of 62, in imitation of earlier styles. Also of interest are the well-preserved cellars beneath the southern part of the house.

Fröhlich submits the Casa della Fontana Piccola to exhaustive examination and analysis, supported by the lavish visual documentation which is one of the Häuser in Pompeji hallmarks. Among his more important results is to disprove Lauter's theory: the house was never connected to the Casa della Fontana Grande, and what seem tobe blocked doorways in the party wall between them are actually shallow recesses or *Scheintüren* in the south wall of the Fontana Piccola's atrium. As for the final double-atrium format, this was the result of the fusion of two small houses which were originally separate. More interesting still is the recognition that there seem to have been two phases of Fourth Style decorations, the first following damage caused by theearthquake of A.D. 62, the second a response to a putative later earthquake. It is possible to take issue with some aspects of this last conclusion, but F. presents his arguments with exemplary caution and open-mindedness, and, if a challenge is to be mounted, this is possible largely because of the fullness of his own documentation. Elsewhere there are important observations on the relation of types of decoration to the function of rooms (pp. 86f.), on the identification and possible organization of painters' 'workshops' (pp. 87–92), and on patterns of architectural development within Pompeian housing, including the changing rôle of the atrium (pp. 114–16). Mistakes and misprints are minimal, though the reader should note that Figs 36 and 37 have been transposed and Fig. 260 is back to front.

Ehrhardt's study of the Casa di Paquius Proculus is much less lucid and concise than F.'s; the descriptions are often difficult to follow, and there is excessive repetition (in one or two places whole sentences are repeated verbatim). There are also a number of errors and inconsistencies, especially in relation to the illustrations. In many cases, for instance, details or measurements given in the drawings conflict with those in the text. Figures 115 and 211 are back to front; Figs 420 and 421 are transposed. In the captions of Figs 415–422 room 26 has become room 27 and vice versa. Figure 7 unnecessarily repeats part of Fig. 6 and turns the motif on its side. The detailed drawings of thresholds (a commendable innovation in relation to previous Häuser in Pompeji volumes) are inconsistent in their orientation, some showing the exterior at the top and the interior at the bottom, others reversing the formula. But all these are minor quibbles. In his discussion of the house's architectural history F. sets new standards for the series: he literally leaves no stone unturned in his search for clues to the course of events. Above all he makes highly effective use of R. Meyer-Graft's classification of wall-plasters to assign particular modifications to particular phases. As with the analysis of F., one can question certain conclusions. The idea that theCasa di Paquius Proculus and its neighbour, the Casa di Fabius Amandio, were originally built as a double-atrium unit (pp. 119–20) leaves me unconvinced: in such a unit one

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

would surely expect at least some of the internal cross-walls to be on the same alignment.

There must also be some doubt as to the chronology of the decorations in the atrium and *tablinum*. The fact that the Second Style and Candelabrum Style paintings are associated with two different types of plaster provides a *prima facie* case for assigning them to different phases; and the fact that the mosaic pavement abuts against both types of plaster offers a similar case for making it later than both. E. assumes that all three are contemporary, or at least were applied within a few years of one another, in the third quarter of the first century B.C. I suspect that the reality may have been less simple: the Candelabrum Style paintings may be twenty or thirty years later than the Second Style ones, while the mosaic could belong to a later period altogether. These, however, are differences of opinion. E.'s position is internally consistent, and is argued with exemplary thoroughness. Like the volume of F., this is anexcellent addition to a series which is performing an invaluable service in applying modern standards of publication to some of the innumerable Pompeian houses which were excavated before such standards became expected.

University of Manchester ROGER LING

POMPEIAN SPACE

R. Laurence, A. Wallace-Hadrill (edd.): *Domestic Space inthe Roman World: Pompeii and Beyond*. (*Journal of Roman Archaeology*, suppl. vol. 22.) Pp. 240. Portsmouth, RI: *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 1997. Cased. ISBN: 1-887829-22-9.

The 1990s have witnessed a rich harvest of books concerned with the meanings of space. Interest in the shaping of society by space and space by society links together those whose historical studies range from prehistoric to modern times. This volume of papers offers a contribution to this wider scholarly agenda, exploring the social processes that shaped domestic space in the ancient Mediterranean world. Architecture dominates the archaeological evidence available for analysis, but furniture, decorative art, and household artefacts also contribute to our understanding. The book is divided into two sections: its second section centres upon the case study ofPompeii, but section one ranges more widely in time and space, including chapters on Egypt and late antiquity. A number of common themes creates a coherent programme between the two sections.

One common theme is that domestic space may actually have been used for purposes other than those originally intended. Attempts to pin down the particular function of an individual room are defeated by the possibility that any individual room may have been available for a multiplicity of uses at different times and by different people. According to George, this helps to explain why slaves are invisible in the architectural record. She suggests that their failure to make an impact upon domestic architecture may be attributed to their lack of an identity separate from that of their owner. Hope's discussion of tomb architecture at Isola Sacra explores the possibility that house-tombs may share similarities with housing in the way they are spatially organized, and she observes that slaves are equally invisible in the tomb as

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

inthe house. Alston warns that we may find in Egypt a discrepancy between the intention behind a space's design and its actual usage. This is vividly illustrated by an image from the photographic archive at Pompeii, which shows the atrium of I.ix.12 at the time of excavation, with amphorae lying in the *impluvium*. Berry's analysis of the find-spots of household artefacts underpins her discussion of the Pompeian house as both home and place of production, a further illustration that reality does not always measure up to the ideal. Foss suggests that the numbers and contexts of *lararia* in different houses can reveal aspects of the social relations between slave and free members of a household.

The two chapters dealing with late antiquity consider how the élite might exploit private space in order to make claims to status. Ellis concentrates upon the house-owner's display of status within the context of dining. He explores the interaction of mosaics, paintings, food, and lighting in conveying messages about status, suggesting that the activity of dining occupied merely a third of the available space, leaving the rest of it for self-advertisement. Scott advances the hypothesis that domestic space provided a new venue for display and competition by the élite, even to the extent of supplanting public space. Social control by the élite is also illustrated by Grahame's analysis of the spatial layout of one of the most impressive residences at Pompeii, the House of the Faun. He presents a picture of how members of the élite could make statements about their own status and that of visitors by controlling the degree ofaccess to their houses granted to different people. He argues that architecture isabetter guide than wall paintings to understanding the manipulation of social relationships. The clarity of his argument is weakened, however, by the lack of room numbers on the ground plan (Fig. 9a, p. 152), since this hinders comparison with the access map (Fig. 9b).

Two chapters particularly advance our understanding of Pompeii. Firstly, Nappo publishes a report on recent archaeological excavations that cast fresh light upon the town's early history, revealing a period of rapid urban expansion during the late third and early second centuries B.C. His study of 'row houses' modifies our picture of them in important respects: the original houses of this type occupied the full width of the *insula*, contained open courtyards, and consisted of a single storey. He argues that they represent a planned phase of urban expansion, in response to the need to accommodate an influx of smallholders after the second Punic War. His chapter contains many further points of interest relating to Pompeii's early urban development, provoking eager anticipation for the full publication of these stratigraphic investigations. Secondly, starting from a re-examination of two painted inscriptions relating to the letting of living space, Pirson suggests how to identify rentable domestic space purely from architectural remains. Like Nappo, Pirson reminds us that Pompeii wasnot purely a town of atrium-peristyle-type houses. His conclusion, that a notable proportion of the town's housing was occupied by tenants, challenges the assumption that Pompeii was dominated by single-owner atrium-type accommodation.

Wallace-Hadrill's concluding chapter is a *tour de force*, effectively binding together much of the preceding discussion. In particular, he further explores issues raised in Dickmann's chapter about the introduction of the peristyle into Pompeian houses. He criticizes the evolutionary model of changes in domestic space, and proposes an alternative model that emphasizes the 'continuous and developing dialogue between forms of domestic space and forms of social practice'.

The book is littered with misprints, one amusing ('pubic' for 'public' space, p. 164), others potentially misleading for the reader ('1.8.17' instead of '1.8.14' in the caption to Fig. 4, p. 190; 'wife & female' in place of 'male & female', third entry in Table 1,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

p.74). This table includes half a dozen errors, typographical and factual, which leave the reader wondering about the validity of the conclusions drawn from it. In sum, an interesting collection, if the reader can avoid being distracted by an occasional lack of clarity. Indexes by subject and place would help to reveal the various threads of argument common to different authors, and a consolidated bibliography would be useful in promoting further research. There is often a problem in integrating Pompeii into a wider context of urban development; this book helps to suggest some possible solutions and future directions.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford ALISON E. COOLEY

DOUGGA

M. Khanoussi, L. Maurin (edd.): *Dougga (Thugga). Études épigraphiques.* (Ausonius Publications—Études, 1.) Paris: Diffusion de Boccard, 1997. pp. 277. Cased. ISBN: 2-910023-06-0.

The small hill town of Dougga in Tunisia has produced one of the richest harvests ofinscriptions from Africa Proconsularis, by no means all of which have been published. These papers from a 1996 colloquium are part of a Franco-Tunisian project to make available the full corpus of inscriptions from the site in updated and completed form. The task resembles a three-dimensional jigsaw in which most of the pieces are missing; post-classical re-use and habitation on the site from the Byzantine period to the 1930s has resulted in the constituent blocks of many public inscriptions becoming widely scattered throughout different buildings across the site.

A. Bresson describes the database used by the epigraphic project; J. Desanges catalogues the references to Dougga in ancient literature; and M. Ghaki highlights the relative abundance of the Libyan and Punic epigraphy of Dougga. Many studies focus on the town's civic status: papers by A. Chastagnol and A. Beschaouch review the development of the juridical status of the *civitas* of Thugga to the reign of Marcus Aurelius, while J. Gascou and Cl. Lepelley examine dedications to *conservatores pagi* and the defence of *libertas* respectively, both arguing that *libertas* means *immunitas* from taxes, a privilege probably resulting from the site's location within the *pertica* of Carthage, which apparently came under threat on several occasions in the second and third centuries.

V. Bouard, N. Demaison, and L. Maurin ('*CIL*, VIII.26580 et l'écriture "africaine" ') attempt to refine the dating of inscriptions by letter styles. They identify a style typical of African inscriptions between the late first and mid-third centuries A.D., characterized by contrasts between light and heavy strokes, and elegant flourishes, especially the occasional continuation of upper strokes of letters such as C and G over the following letter. On narrow monuments such as statue bases letters are thinner and more elongated, while on architectural friezes more square capitals are used. So far so good, but the arguments for tracing the development of the style over its lifetime are unconvincing. The inscriptions reproduced as Pls 21.11 and 27.16 are as stylistically close as any other pairing, yet the former dates from A.D. 83/89 and the latter from the reign of Gallienus. The authors acknowledge the need for caution, yet their eventual dating of the inscription which forms their starting point for discussion,

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to the 160s,remains no more than a guess. Despite their conclusions, the article seems to have demonstrated how unreliable lettering style is as a dating indicator, and that thestyle they identify as 'l'écriture africaine' is more a regional than a chronological phenomenon.

M. Corbier presents a brief summary of water-related inscriptions; curiously, she accepts Poinssot's interpretation of *AE* 1966, 512, a dedication to L. Terentius Romanus *ob curam aquae*, as referring to his rôle in the construction of the town'saqueduct, even though the aqueduct was built over twenty years earlier andpaid for by the town; Romanus is nowhere mentioned on the aqueduct dedication (*AE* 1966, 511). It seems to me far more natural to read *cura aquae* as referring to Romanus' rôle in overseeing the operation of the waterworks, a kind of small-town Frontinus.

Dougga is best known for the information it provides about private euergetism; as Duncan-Jones's classic study showed ('Who Paid for Public Building?', in *Structure and Scale in the Roman Economy* [Cambridge, 1990], pp. 174–84). To the Marcii and Gabinii, hitherto the two most prominent families on the dedications of public buildings, can now be added the Calpurnii. S. Aounallah and Z. ben Abdallah trace the progressive Romanization of this family, fourteen of whom are now known, including the builders of the temple known as Dar el-Acheb. M. Khanoussi's paper ('*Thugga*: Épigraphie et constructions publiques') is a welcome attempt to put the euergetic inscriptions into their architectural context and to trace the town's physical development through a combination of epigraphy and archaeology. V. Brouquier-Reddé and S. Saint-Amans make a particularly successful effort to match inscriptions with archaeological remains, identifying the so-called Temple B, a second-century A.D. Punic-style courtyard sanctuary with five cellae, with the *templa* of Concord, Frugifer, Liber Pater, and Neptune donated by the Gabinii and recorded on several published and previously unpublished inscriptions. But the archaeology of Dougga is still very epigraphically focused, and what is desperately needed is careful and controlled stratigraphic excavations of key monuments to distinguish phases of construction, alteration, and repair, and allow the epigraphy and archaeology to illuminate each other.

One paper presents significant new archaeological fieldwork: 'Gli antichi insediamenti rurali nei dintorni di Dougga e il riciclaggio delle epigrafi', by M. de Vos, gives preliminary results of field survey around Dougga: some 100 sites discovered in 36 km^2, many of them olive farms. About half seem to have been abandoned after the Vandal invasion; those that continued in occupation tended to lie close to the Carthage–Theveste road. Excavation at Aïn Wassel, find-spot of a Severan inscription confirming the validity of the *lex Hadriana de rudibus agris* (*CIL* VIII.26416), uncovered an olive press and amphora with carbonized olives; the structure seems to have been in use between the second half of the fifth and the start of the seventh century A.D.

The book is attractively produced, although with high-quality glossy paper used throughout it is difficult to see why all the photographs have been relegated to the back. There are occasional problems with figure cross-references (e.g. read Pl. 14.11 for Pl. 9.3 on p. 121).

Magdalen College, Oxford ANDREW WILSON

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

NEW CHRISTIAN DOCUMENTS

S. R. Llewelyn (ed.): *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity, Vol. 8: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1984–1985*. Pp. 202. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998. Paper, £23.99. ISBN: 0-8028-4588-5.

The continuing existence of the New Docs series in the face of considerable difficulties will be a matter of great pleasure to papyrologists, epigraphists, and everyone involved in early Christian and Jewish studies. The latest volume is the last one under the sole editorship of S. R. Llewelyn, who is also the author of all but two of the entries. It follows the usual formula of giving the text of one or more 'recently' published papyri or inscriptions, followed by a detailed discussion of issues raised in it. The time lag between the first publication of the documents and their appearance in New Docs has now become rather excessive, since Volume VIII ostensibly covers documents from 1984–5 (in fact, some were published in the early 1980s, as noted in the introduction).

The largest of the seventeen entries deal with 'The Government's Pursuit of Runaway Slaves', 'Tax Collection and the τελῶναι of the New Testament', and 'Taxes on Donkeys'. The entries are divided into sections on 'Slavery', 'Taxation', 'Public Courtesies and Conventions', 'Judaica', and 'Ecclesiastica'. Recurrent themes include the style and content of letters, the use of obscure isopsephisms by Christians, and the ideology of Christian and pagan benefactions. The documents cover a considerable time-span: §1 is 'not later than second century B.C.' and §2 is 'fifth to sixth century A.D.', so links with *early* Christianity are somewhat tenuous at both ends.

Two third-century A.D. 'wanted' notices for runaway slaves form the basis of §3. In this case the importance for early Christianity is clear, since the situation is, assuming practices from Egypt were replicated elsewhere, directly applicable to Onesimus in Paul's *Epistle to Philemon*. The notices provide interesting insights into the social world of slaves ('he walks awkwardly, speaking with the shrill voice of a pretentious person') and their physical appearance ('tattooed on right wrist with two foreign letters'). Runaways tended to be adult males who could plan their escape and leave as a group of two or three. They were likely to run to places where they already had contacts, or to big cities where they would be inconspicuous. State help was available to owners in the Roman period, although it was not necessarily very effective. Onesimus, whatever his exact situation, apparently did not express remorse for the unspecified wrong he had done to his owner (unlike other fugitives known from literature), and relied instead on Paul's influence with Philemon to effect a reconciliation. Ll. suggests that Paul may have avoided revealing Onesimus' fugitive status to theauthorities, and instead tried to broker a private arrangement between slave and owner.

Section 4 is a papyrus attesting a female tax-farmer in Egypt in A.D. 187. Since there is a little evidence for women holding municipal posts in Egypt, it is not particularly surprising if they could be involved in tax collecting too. Most of the discussion concerns the nature of tax collection in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. The potential for abuse was considerable, and there are numerous papyri recording complaints about the treatment of individuals. Tax-farmers in Judaea, by analogy with those in Egypt, were wealthy individuals at a local level, according to the view of Herrenbruck which Ll. apparently endorses, but the exact implications of this for the world of Jesus and Matthew are not really explored. However, §6 shows that *anachoresis* ('flight from

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

personal obligations to the state') was already an issue in Egypt in the 50s A.D., a clear assertion of the reality of some of the social problems illustrated in the Gospels.

There are three entries in the Judaica section. Section 11 is a Hebrew prayer fromOxyrhynchus, which, Mark Harding suggests, reflects the execution of Jews in the revolt of A.D. 115–17. The language is so ambiguous that this can only be a very tenuous suggestion, but the preservation of a Jewish prayer from the Diaspora is initself unusual and important. Section 12 gives the texts of the two Samaritan inscriptions from Delos which were first published in 1982, and summarizes other epigraphic and literary evidence for Samaritans in the Diaspora. Section 13 is the career inscription of T. Mucius Clemens, who was '*praefectus castrorum* of the great king Agrippa' but is shown, contrary to the views of earlier editors, to have had no other Jewish or Judaean connections.

According to the introduction, future volumes will have less detailed discussion of a greater number of documents. While the promised annual appearance of New Docs would be very welcome, the series does not need to compete with *AE* and *SEG*, and it is to be hoped that thorough surveys of parallels and implications will continue, perhaps concentrating on documents from a narrower period, and dealing with more recent publications rather than continuing to try to clear the thirteen-year backlog.

University of Wales, Lampeter DAVID NOY

MEDICAL ETHICS

H. FLASHAR, J. JOUANNA (edd.): *Médecine et morale dans l'antiquité*. (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 42.) Pp. 415. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1997. Cased, Sw. frs. 70.

The appearance of this excellent collection of essays on ancient medical ethics in the prestigious Entretiens series marks a further step towards the establishment of ancient medicine as a more and more widely respected area within the study of the classical world. This is perhaps no surprise, as few topics serve so well as illustrations of the relevance of classical antiquity to the modern world as medical ethics. One only needs to point to the rôle of, for example, the Hippocratic *Oath* in twentieth-century discussions on abortion and euthanasia, or to the ways in which such famous statements as 'to help, or to do no harm' (ὠφελέειν ἢ μὴ βλάπτειν, Hp. *Epid.* I.11) continue to be embraced as guiding principles by the medical profession. Yet, perhaps paradoxically, this volume also shows that the interpretation of such ancient documents in their original historical context is essential for a correct assessment ofthe extent and mode of their applicability to contemporary bio-ethical issues. Theprevailing message of the volume (if indeed it intends to have one) is rather awarning against the often uncritical, highly selective use of ancient medical deontology to vindicate positions taken in the modern debate.

Thus in his introductory sketch of the issues facing contemporary medical ethics, Hellmut Flashar points out that the differences in status, setting, and impact between ancient and modern medical ethics are at least as important as the similarities, and hemakes the interesting claim that ancient medical ethics, contrary to its modern counterpart, was 'neither based on popular ethics' nor 'merged into philosophical ethics' (p. 18—although the latter is debatable when one considers the strong relation between ancient dietetics and moral philosophy). And in a masterly essay on twentieth-century perceptions, receptions, and transformations of Hippocratic ethics

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and etiquette, especially the selective versions and interpretations of the Hippocratic *Oath* (whose ban on cutting and details of the master–pupil relationship are often suppressed), Vivian Nutton shows how 'what physicians regarded as the significant features of Hippocratic medicine themselves have changed considerably over time' (p.38) with the changing modalities, fashions, and self-definitions of the medical profession. In a similar vein, Thomas Rutten discusses the reception of various tenets of Hippocratic deontology through time, especially the ban on the administration of lethal drugs (which he argues alludes to acts of poisoning rather than euthanasia) and abortion.

The volume not only addresses classical influences in later times. Jacques Jouanna deals with Galen's reception of Hippocratic ethics, in which he shows that Galen, perhaps surprisingly, hardly refers to the *Oath* (although there is some indirect evidence that he wrote a commentary on it), and in his commentaries on other Hippocratic writings frequently manipulates or even contradicts the Hippocratic position in order to expound his own view of the ideal physician. Charlotte Schubert tries to relate evaluative terms in fifth- and fourth-century medical literature to changes in moral and socio-political thought in the classical period. Heinrich von Staden deals with the question of to what extent the medical practitioner in antiquity was expected not only to be a competent technician but also a person of outstanding character. On the basis of a wealth of literary and epigraphic evidence, he argues that although this view was expressed more explicitly in the Hellenistic and Roman period, it would be wrong to regard it as a peculiarly Roman flavour. In a meticulous analysis of the famous but obscure phrase in the *Oath*, ἁγνῶς δὲ καὶ ὁσίως διατηρήσω βίον τὸν ἐμὸν καὶ τέχνην τὴν ἐμήν, he shows that the oath-taker undertakes to keep not only his profession but also his life free from any transgressions of divine laws pertaining to religious and ritual affairs as well as to human relationships.

The contributions by Jackie Pigeaud and Philippe Mudry are concerned with deontological aspects of Roman medical literature, especially the views of Celsus, Scribonius Largus, and Caelius Aurelianus on the doctor's *humanitas* and *philanthropia*, and on such issues as vivisection, the value of life, the treatment of chronic diseases, and homosexuality. They claim that by the Roman period, a shift in emphasis has taken place in what has become known as the 'Hippocratic triangle', whereby the doctor is to be seen as a 'servant of the patient' rather than 'servant of themedical art'. Antonio Garzya offers a rich survey of medico-ethical themes in lateantiquity, in patristic and Byzantine medical literature, and the volume concludes with a *causerie* by Olivier Reverdin on the 1598 Dioscorides edition by the Geneva physician Jean-Antoine Sarasin, which well conveys the characteristic atmosphere of the Entretiens, as do the discussions following the presentation of each paper, which are also, as usual in the series, printed in the proceedings. (There is something to be said for this, as itallows disagreements to stand and preserves the individual contributions of the participants, although some of the mutual admiration might have been edited more selectively).

All in all, this is an extremely interesting collection of papers, high in scholarly quality, and rich in material and thought-provoking observations. Perhaps the only comment I should make is that the Hippocratic *Oath* (whose representativeness for Hippocratic medicine has often been questioned by scholarship, as is acknowledged inthe volume) once again occupies most of the attention, whereas the other deontological works in the Hippocratic Corpus, such as *Decorum*, *Physician*, *Law*, and *Precepts*, are touched on only briefly. One would like to see these writings analysed rather than quoted, and one would like to know more about their authorship, their

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

purpose and intended readership, their medical and intellectual context, and their place in the tradition. They thoroughly deserve a study in their own right, and this colloquium might have been the place for it.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne PHILIP J. VAN DER EIJK

GREEK AND CHINESE SCIENCE

G. E. R. LLOYD: *Adversaries and Authorities: Investigations into Ancient Greek and Chinese Science*. (Ideas in Context, 42.) Pp. xvii + 250. Cambridge, New York, and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1996. Cased, £40/$54.95 (Paper, £14.95/$19.95). ISBN: 0-521-5531-8 (0-521-55695-3 pbk).

Are contemporary differences in arts and sciences between East Asia and the West founded in the civilizations of ancient Greece and China? L.'s investigation into the methodology of science in the two cultures from the beginnings in the fifth century B.C.E. to the third century C.E. provides ammunition for both sides in the debate. Interdependency between philosophy and science is not a new theme in comparative studies of European and Chinese civilizations, and Bloom, for example (in *The Linguistic Shaping of Thought* [Princeton, 1981]), traced the effect of the languages on scientific perception and methodology. Unlike his predecessors, however, who were more concerned with the question of why modern discoveries did not originate in China, L. gives a brief examination of the common features of Greek and Chinese sciences but focuses on the philosophic, social, and cultural aspects which made science as a whole, and astronomy, mathematics, and medicine in particular, develop differently in ancient Greece and China.

Being well aware of the danger of generalizations within a single culture and ofgeneral views crossing cultures, L. tentatively compares the Greek and Chinese attitudes towards a number of issues and attempts to solve some commonly recognized problems. In the first chapter he sets out his methodological preliminaries for the contrast that follows between the adversarial Greek and the irenic Chinese methods ofinvestigation. The third chapter, based on necessarily limited mathematical andmedical texts, argues that methodological statements have certain pragmatic and defensive rôles, for the introduction and description of particular techniques and procedures easily shade into the validation and justification of their use. So polemic and persuasion come to characterize the presentation of scientific works, and the next section examines the 'techniques of persuasion', in which Greek concentration either on the rhetorical ploys required before a popular assembly or rules of demonstration needed to convince fellow-professionals is contrasted with the Chinese interest in the psychology of winning over a powerful individual. Chapter V then explores the foundations of cause-oriented Greek culture and the Chinese tradition based on correlation, and is followed by specific investigations into Greek and Chinese dichotomies (Chapter VI), their understanding of finite and infinite (Chapter VII), and the contrasting astrological/astronomical pictures of the universe (Chapter VIII). A fascinating piece on 'the politics of the body' makes the point that, while human bodies on the outside are much the same everywhere, the Chinese studied the hidden innards as a topic relevant to the wisdom of the man of learning, whereas the Greeks tended to produce weird and wonderful theories in the interests of individual

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

self-publicity; and although both cultures linked anatomy with politics and cosmology, the Chinese would look for interconnections, but the Greeks (Plato especially, andwithout foundation in actual medical practice) used the expertise of the doctor asa *model* for political *τέχνη*. L.'s conclusion to the whole re-emphasizes the effect ofdifferent social, political, and cultural views on the approach to science; it might indeed help in following the book's dense argument to read the conclusion first.

One of the lessons learnt from *Adversaries and Authorities* is that investigation ofthe underlying reasons for similarities and differences is more important than simply annotating divergence and convergence, and that is why there have been serious weaknesses in earlier contrasts between Greek and Chinese perceptions of scientific method. A main theme in the second chapter, for example, is the contrast between thehighly developed agonistic character of the Greek tradition and the Chinese rejection of aggressive adversariality of any kind. L. examines the credibility of this generalization by exploring the sources of Greek and Chinese attitudes towards philosophical argument. Chinese scholars certainly gave credit to their predecessors ina non-confrontational manner and admitted that each of the '100 schools' had succeeded in grasping at least some part of the Way, whereas there was intense rivalryamong the Greek Presocratics (cf. Heraclitus' contempt for Xenophanes and Pythagoras, fr. 40), and Aristotle criticized his predecessors from his own standpoint and using his own terminology. But Chinese philosophers certainly did argue with each other and the Greeks on occasion conformed to authority. In the Chinese of the Warring States period (476–221 B.C.E.) the *Zhuangzi* caricatured Confucius and *Hanfeizi* mentioned factions within the Confucian and Mohist traditions. Mengzi (Mencius), Xunzi, and Gaozi engaged in serious debate, each putting forward a different view of human nature, whereas Greeks could reach agreement on some fundamental issues. After clarifying and conceding such modifications, L. then examines the reasons for the characteristic Greek and Chinese attitudes towards their rivals, and in this context L. highlights the differences between the Greek *Hairesis* (sect/school) and the Chinese *jia* (family/school)—in the former the students debate to make a name for themselves while in the *jia* they tend to attach themselves to their teachers as to father-figures, and to take it as a prime duty to preserve and transmit a received body of text.

L. limits his research to comparing Chinese and Greek scientific methodologies along with attitudes to debate and deductive reasoning, with the focus on mathematics, medicine, and astronomy. But this limitation inevitably weakens the strong link in both cultures between science and metaphysics. Without a fuller investigation into the cosmo-human relationship (involving the relationship between humans and Heaven for the Chinese) it may be difficult to uncover the major cause for the underlying differences between Greeks and Chinese. L. also underplays the contrast between the moralistic tendency inherent in the scientific approach of earlier Chinese thinkers such as Confucius, Mengzi, and Gaozi in the fourth century B.C.E. and the intellectual orientation of Greek philosophers. A striking example is to be found in the discussion of the hierarchy of souls. Aristotle claimed (in *De Anima* 2.2) that all soul has the nutritive faculty, animals in addition perceive, but the human soul is superior in having a rational faculty, allowing a life of intellectual contemplation denied to other forms of life. In contrast, the Chinese philosopher Xunzi, about fifty years later, speculated that humans are distinguished from animals not by intellectual ability but by a sense of morality and propriety: 'Fire and water possess vital breath but no life; plants and trees possess life but lack awareness; birds and animals have awareness but lack a sense of morality and justice; humans possess vital breath, life and awareness, and add to

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

them a sense of morality and justice' (*Xunzi*, trans. Knoblock). A study of Greek rationality vs. Chinese morality may solve some of the puzzles in the comparison of the two cultures and philosophies, but meantime there is plenty to ponder here.

University of Wales, Lampeter M. R. WRIGHT
XINZHONG YAO

RECEPTION

B. M. Olsen (K. F. Jensen [ed.]): *La réception de la littérature classique au Moyen Age* (*IXe–XIIe siècle*)*: choix d'articles publié par descollègues à l'occasion de son soixantième anniversaire*. Pp. 282. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 1995. DKK 325/$57. ISBN: 87-7289-357-5.

V. Riedel: *Literarische Antikerezeption: Aufsätze und Vorträge*. (Jenaer Studien, 2.) Pp. 444. Jena: Dr Bussert & Partner, 1996. DM 68.20. ISBN: 3-9804590-1-2.

These two collections of papers by Olsen and Riedel represent respectively thirteen years (1979–92) and twenty-one years (1973–94) of research. They both study the reception of the classical world, but that is where the similarity ends. Whereas O. deals with the mediaeval and early Renaissance collecting of classical literary texts as physical objects, R. covers the reception of textual narratives and ideas from the classical world by modern German creative and critical writers. Whilst O. is exemplary in his traditional Western philological approach, R. is consciously modern and provocative in his Eastern European Marxist sociological decoding of the classical tradition.

O.'s work was published as a Festschrift on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday in1995. Unlike R.'s, it is well known internationally, and he is accepted by both classicists and mediaevalists as the leading scholar of the mediaeval classical tradition. Danish by birth, O.'s writing is mainly in French owing to his attachment to the Sorbonne.

The ten papers, all previously published, have been arranged logically rather than according to their date of publication. Thus catalogues of classical Latin texts existing in mediaeval collections from before the thirteenth century provide a useful appendix (Papers 9 and 10). The preceding papers range from general discussions on early mediaeval editing (1) and textual popularity (2) through to more specific essays on poets in general (3) and Virgil (5) and Ovid (6) in particular.

'Les classiques au X^{e} siecle' (4) provides a valuable supplement to the appendices of R. R. Bolgar's *The Classical Heritage* (Cambridge, 1954). Bolgar lists Renaissance vernacular translations of both Greek and Latin texts: these are particularly useful in providing a 'league table' of the most popular classical texts during the Renaissance. We learn that Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, arguably now more popular than Homer and Virgil on account of Ted Hughes's recent award-winning versions, was also one of the most widely translated Latin texts in High Renaissance Europe. O.'s statistical list of 'Les textes classiques conservés dans plus de cinq manuscrits ou fragments copiés auX^{e} siècle' (p. 49) allows for similar analysis. Ovid is conspicuously absent, whilst Virgil's *Aeneid* and Juvenal's *Satires* are the only texts which have survived in more

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

than twenty copies from the tenth century. In general, these statistical lists of surviving manuscripts and library catalogues form the basis of O.'s empirical attitude towards the mediaeval reception of the classics (see e.g. p. 102).

O. has the enthusiasm and wit to convey potentially dull historical material in an entertaining yet thoroughly scholarly manner. His one English-language paper in the collection, 'The Cistercians and Classical Culture' (7), is a case in point, where he demonstrates his wonderful eye for humour in his survey of the cautious classical allusions in the religious writings of this most anti-pagan of sects: 'The Cistercians took a vivid interest in ancient history, not—or not only—out of shameful curiosity, but because it gave an excellent background for Biblical exegesis' (p. 107).

Though three of the papers were published in the *Revue d'Histoire des Textes*, most of them form part of conference proceedings or other miscellaneous collections. Therefore the present book provides an excellent sample of O.'s research in a convenient and accessible form.

R.'s book consists of twenty papers published over a sixteen-year period from 1979to 1995. Two previously unpublished conference papers are also included (pp.205–25). R.'s research over the past twenty-five years has covered a breathtaking range of material, in terms of both chronology and genre: namely, the history of the reception of classical antiquity in modern European literature. The papers are divided into three sections covering (1) the effects of antiquity on several different periods of modern literature; and the reception of antiquity in (2) eighteenth-century and (3) twentieth-century German literature. R. focuses on mainstream German writers such as Arendt, Brecht, Fühmann, Goethe, Lessing, Müller, and Winckelmann. However, this is not a book aimed solely at Germanic scholarship. In studying the psychological and sociological reception of the antique by these authors, not only in terms of basic translation of classical texts but also in the way that they adapt the texts for their modern audiences, R. provides much that will be of interest to students of other modern disciplines, ranging from theatre through to cultural and gender studies.

But are the essays of any interest to classicists? This depends on whether we perceive the subject as framed firmly within its own ancient chronological limits or whether, as R. states in his typically succinct and unpretentious introduction, 'das antike Erbe für uns nur dann lebendig ist, wenn wir es in seiner Verbindung mit der neueren Kultur sehen' (p. 5). It is certainly a stimulating and often provocative text for teachers of the classical tradition, and in the opening paper, 'Forschungen zum Nachleben der Antike als interdisziplinäre Aufgabe' (pp. 9–21), encourages broad cultural approaches to the subject. Here R. typically draws not only on his knowledge of both classical and modern writers, but also on his own experience of living in a divided Germany for a good part of his life. His cultural and political standpoint has grown out of this personal experience, and is firmly rooted within the European academic Marxist tradition (p. 5).

The papers in Section 1 deal with the way that classical philosophers (Aristotle) and mythological figures (Amphitryon, Herakles, and Oedipus) have both influenced and in turn been reinterpreted by modern German writers. R.'s broad Marxist approach is evident in his coverage of both popular as well as high cultural sources. Thus his treatment of the Herakles theme in 'Herakles-Bilder in der deutschen Literatur des 17. bis 20. Jahrhunderts' (pp. 46–64) ranges from analysis of Schiller's Odes through to recent books for children by Hannes Hüttner. The latter might raise a few eyebrows amongst classical scholars, but Plato himself would surely have approved the serious academic discussion of the myths we tell our children.

Section 2 focuses mainly on the work of Gotthold Lessing (1729–81), whose critical

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and dramatic writings are central to R.'s research interests. The opening paper, 'Lessings Verhältnis zur Antike' (pp. 83–98), provides a clear and enlightening introduction to the classical ideas of a writer perhaps best known to the English-speaking world as having recommended Shakespeare's realism as a stylistic model for German playwrights. The subsequent papers look at the incorporation of ancient material into Lessing's own tragedies and comedies. This could become overbearingly esoteric, but R.'s textual analysis is always fascinatingly set against the backdrop of broader socio-political issues in contemporary Germany. The reader, rightly in a book dealing with reception theory, learns as much about eighteenth-century German culture as about the classical tradition.

Section 3 offers a refreshing appraisal of the classical tradition within our own century. Once again R. restricts his studies to German authors, but the issues raised are often of global significance. The unpublished paper on the recent reception of women, 'Frauengestalten in der Antikerezeption der DDR-Literatur' (pp. 205–12), isof particular interest in the light of both recent German political history and contemporary feminism. R. demonstrates how the experience of patriarchal Fascism and its militaristic links have led post-war writers to revisit the tragic feminine myths in a new light. Thus Brecht's *Antigone* of 1947 presented the character of Kreon as an 'evil' tyrant, 'Tyrannen im pejorativen Sinne des Wortes' (p. 207); however, Brecht saw Antigone herself as fatefully linked to Kreon's crimes. More recently, however, following the military junta in Greece between 1967 and 1974, R. argues that Antigone has become a symbol of passive resistance, 'Kraft der Schwachen'.

If there is a weakness in R.'s approach for the non-German reader, it is that he is sometimes too parochial. There is no mention, for example, of Tony Harrison's *The Common Chorus* (London, 1992), the Broadway versions of Euripides' *Trojan Women* and of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, in which the women were infamously represented asprotestors at the Greenham Common US airbase. The book does, however, unwittingly point to a vacuum in traditional British classical scholarship, which, until very recently (see e.g. M. Beard, J. Henderson, *Classics: A Very Short Introduction* [Oxford, 1995]), has tended to marginalize the modern reception of the ancient world. R.'s particular kind of reception theory merits wider circulation amongst contemporary classicists and, since many of the papers were previously published in non-classical journals, this collection provides an ideal opportunity.

St Mary's College, Strawberry Hill DAVID BELLINGHAM

REVALUATIONS

P. GODMAN: *From Poliziano to Machiavelli. Florentine Humanism in the High Renaissance*. Pp. xiv + 366, 9 halftones. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998. Cased, £33.50. ISBN: 0-691-01746-8.

This is a remarkable book whose full import will require many years to digest. G. presents erudition over an astonishing range of subject-matter in a clear and engaging style. His achievement is magnified by the extraordinary swiftness of execution.

At the heart of the book is a re-evaluation of the until now largely forgotten Florentine humanist Marcello di Messer Virgilio di Andrea di Berto Adriani (1464–1521). Adriani succeeded Poliziano in his chair at the Florentine Studio in 1494,followed Bartolomeo Scala as First Chancellor in 1498 (at the same time as

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Machiavelli was appointed Second Chancellor), and became, for the first time in Florentine history (p. 151), state censor in 1507. More successful in his public career than either Poliziano or Machiavelli, Adriani retained both his major posts until 1521. Although Adriani's printed works amount only to an oration on the conferment of military power on Lorenzo de' Medici, Duke of Urbino, delivered in 1515, and an edition (Florence, 1518) of the *Materia medica* of Dioscorides, G. has analysed a course of lectures on Virgil and fifteen other orations (all but one from manuscript sources). G. promises an edition of Adriani's unpublished works with commentary as a sequel. G. refers also to a complete edition (p. 251) and commentary (p. 298) on Aristotle by Adriani, which have presumably perished.

G. writes vivid narratives of Florentine politics (e.g. pp. 167–71, 236–9) which enable him to bring the connections between intellectual and political activities to life far better than most intellectual historians. He demonstrates Adriani's skill in responding to the expectations of opposing factions in Florentine politics, arguing that he used his lectures in the Studio to placate the supporters of the Medici prior to1512, while he was still working in the Chancery for Soderini's regime (pp. 193–7). G. shows that Adriani's different drafts of the preface to his lectures on Statius catered to audiences of different political complexion (pp. 171–6). He makes such interesting observations on the methods of Adriani's commentary on Virgil and its relations to earlier forms of humanist commentary (pp. 183–7) that one would have welcomed more examples from the commentary itself. Nor does he spare criticism of Adriani's character or his flimsy, evasive defence against Mainardi's strong criticisms of the edition of Dioscorides (pp. 231–3).

The most controversial part of G.'s book is his attack on Poliziano, normally regarded as one of the heroic figures of the Florentine high Renaissance. G. shows a thorough grasp of the immense bibliography on Poliziano and makes admirable use of Poliziano's lecture notes and marginalia to interpret his published works. He demonstrates Poliziano's servile attitude to the Medici (p. 26) and his arrogance towards his predecessors and rivals. G. provides examples of very dubious philological arguments from the *Miscellanea* (pp. 88–9, 120–2). His attack on previous opinions about Poliziano's use of Aristotle's *Poetics* is devastating (pp. 59–61). He places moreemphasis than previous scholars have on the *Nutricia*, Poliziano's generic and comparative poetic history of poetry (pp. 62–79). In many respects G.'s portrayal of Poliziano as an Alexandrian type of scholar, more interested in the individual than the universal, emphasizing historical change and eclecticism (p. 64) rings true. But none of this seems incompatible with the achievements in editing and philology ascribed to Poliziano by A. T. Grafton and others.

In the final section of the book G. argues that the awkward collegiality of Adriani and Machiavelli contributed more to the latter's insights, working methods and forms of expression than has previously been recognized. The validity and significance of this original claim must be left to the Machiavelli scholars to determine. G.'s breadth of interest is shown by his delightful comments throughout the book on knowledge and description (the two are different) of exotic animals in Renaissance Florence. His forthright criticism of the medical humanism of Poliziano and Adriani brings to the fore the importance of the contribution of Niccolò Leoniceno in this area. If even a quarter of the scholarly attention presently given to Poliziano were devoted to Leoniceno (and G. acknowledges the work of Daniela Mugnai Carrara and Vivian Nutton on him), how much richer our understanding of Renaissance classicism and medicine would be!

The book concludes with a remarkable coup: the first account of the dealings of the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Inquisition and the Index with Machiavelli's *Istorie florentine* to be written with access to the archives in the Vatican (pp. 303–33). G. provides a transcription of the censor's proposed alterations of the text and a riveting account of the struggle between those who wished to produce an acceptable version of Machiavelli's work and those who preferred simple condemnation.

In a book of such breadth there are bound to be lapses. G.'s witty description ofAgostino Nifo's 'anti-dialectical dialectic' (p. 254) misrepresents the traditional character of the dialectic presented in *Dialectica ludicra*, probably as a result of theoverestimate of the influence of Lorenzo Valla's *Repastinatio dialecticae et philosophiae* which was common in secondary work in the 1970s. The captions to the illustrations are inadequate. But G.'s work remains a remarkable achievement, not least for its stylish presentation and wit.

University of Warwick PETER MACK

ALDINES

MARTIN SICHERL: *Griechische Erstausgaben des Aldus Manutius. Druckvorlagen, Stellenwert, kultureller Hintergrund.* (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums. Neue Folge. 1. Reihe: Monographien, 10.) Pp. xxii + 386, 8 pls. Paderborn, etc.: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1997. Paper, DM 88. ISBN: 3-506-79060-9.

Professor Sicherl has collected in this volume eight studies based on his discoveries of the manuscripts used as printer's copies for several Aldine editions, a subject on which he has worked for more than forty years. These papers had already been published between 1975 and 1992; here, they have been revised and a new paper, on the edition of the Greek Epistolographers, has been added.

The discovery by S. of the authentic manuscript models used by Aldus Manutius and his collaborators as the basis of their editions was the starting point for research which goes deeply in all directions. For every Aldine text of which he has found the printer's copy, S. has carefully examined the way in which the manuscript was prepared for the printer: a sign was traced, or incised, through the text at the actual point where the division among pages took place; next to it, in the margin, were written the letter and the number of the corresponding Aldine page. Often, the editor added in the margins instructions to the printer as to the final aspect which the page had to assume; they were mostly in Italian: *Maiuscoli*, or *rosso*, or *riga da per se*, indicating a word to be written in capitals or in red, or a line to be left on its own. The eight illustrations provide clear examples of these copies.

For every Aldine edition examined (Musaios, Aristotle, Aristophanes, Greek Epistolographers, Euripides, Greek Rhetoricians) the analysis of the external characteristics of the printer's copy is followed by an accurate codicological examination of the manuscript; the study of the watermarks often allows a precise dating and localization of the codex, and this in turn helps to identify the scribe, when the manuscript does not have a subscription. S. has then ascertained the place which the printer's copy (and therefore the Aldine edition) occupies in the manuscript tradition of the author in question, in order to assess the philological importance of Aldine editions in the *stemma*; this is done by examining in detail the textual tradition of each text, including variants, and conjunctive or separative mistakes. When the actual

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

printer's copy has not been found, S. has often succeeded in finding the manuscript source from which it derived.

This painstaking procedure has led to two developments; on one side, now that so many Aldine printer's copies have been discovered, it has become evident that most were contemporary to the editions and do not have great value from the textual point of view—contrary to popular opinion which considered Aldine editions mostly derived from important lost codices. On the other side, S.'s studies allow an assessment of Aldus' methods in choosing the codex or the codices he would send to his printers. Aldus usually found a good manuscript and had a copy of it made; after its use, the codex was destroyed, unless parts of it were saved by mere chance. This has been the case for MSS *Harvard. gr.* 17 and *Paris. Suppl. gr.* 212, used as printer's copies for texts in Aristotle's edition; they are miscellaneous codices formed almost entirely by papers belonging to the German scholar Iohannes Cuno, who worked with Aldus in Venice and evidently rescued parts of the manuscripts after their use.

Alternatively, Aldus used a fairly recent copy, but chose it with care: either it came from a *scriptorium* he knew well, e.g. the Cretan workshop of Michael Apostolis (so *Paris. gr.* 1848, *Paris. gr.* 2755, copies for Aristotle and the Greek Epistolographers' editions), or it belonged to a renowned scholar (so *Paris. gr.* 2131 or *Paris. gr.* 3054 [Greek Epistolographers], which were the property of Gianos Laskaris).

It is difficult to do justice, within a reasonable word limit, to the profound knowledge of the world of printers, scribes, humanists, scholars, and bibliophiles at the turn of the sixteenth century developed in this book. Every page provides the reader with an interesting and thorough insight into the world of Renaissance scholarship, expressed with commendable clarity and concision. I will just add a list of the printer's copies discovered and studied by S.: *Harvard. gr.* 17, *Paris. gr.* 1395, 1848, 2921, 2924, 2939, 2960, *Paris. Suppl. gr.* 212, 393, 924, *Ravenn.* 137, *Vat. gr.* 1379, *Vat. Reg. gr.* 173, *Selest.* 347, *Marc. gr.* 622. To these I can add *Bruxell.* 14773, printer's copy of part of Hermogenes' text; and, for editions printed after Aldus' death, *Londin. Add.* 10968, printer's copy for Aldus' *Bible* (1518), *Paris. gr.* 2170 and 2316 for Galen (1525), and *Paris. gr.* 2198 for Aetius Amidenus (1534).

London ANNACLARA CATALDI PALAU

CHALKIES RULE OK!

YUN LEE TOO, NIALL LIVINGSTONE (edd.): *Pedagogy and Power: Rhetorics of Classical Learning.* Pp. xii + 319. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-521-59435-9.

This collection of articles explores how the ideal of a 'classical' education has served different purposes in different historical contexts. Most contributors are classicists, but there are also contributions on the Byzantine and Renaissance worlds and on early-modern and modern Germany and England. Inevitably such a joint project results in a plurality of approaches, parallel narratives which are not always integrated. At one end of the spectrum Colvin (Chapter III) emphasizes the effective exclusion of women from educational opportunity in early-modern Gemany up to the later nineteenth century (their integration being symbolized by the founding of the Lessinggymnasium in Karlsruhe in 1893); the reader is hardly surprised when sheargues that women who entered the male domain of rhetoric ('the tongue') wereperceived as 'phallic women' (p. 65). On the other hand, Stevenson (Chapter V)

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

discusses the significant number of women, many but by no means all of them aristocrats or in religious orders, who participated in the study of the Classics in many parts of Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (for Olympia Morata's teaching of Greek at Heidelberg, see N. Holzberg in *Heidelberger Jahrbücher* 31 [1987], 77–93); and she draws attention to the fact that the myth of a malemonopoly of classical scholarship itself served (serves'?) to reinforce that male dominance (no reference is made to R. Fowler's pioneering ' "On Not Knowing Greek:" the Classics and the Woman of Letters', *Classical Journal* 78 [1983], 337–49). Some contributors are particularly successful at combining the careful study of groups of texts with an analysis of how access to the Classics serves to reinforce authority, if not dominance (Brant on the use of the dialogue form in political/constitutional pamphleteering in late eighteenth century England, Chapter IV, pointing out that the use of Lucian, Cicero, and Plato as prototypes permits the dissemination of radical ideas while maintaining the authority of the teacher, pp.76f.). While some contributors emphasize that the classical canon divides, marginalizes, and excludes, others emphasize its integrating rôle (eg. Boutcher on how sixteenth century Oxbridge colleges integrated what Dairmaid MacCulloch hastermed 'second-tier England' into the world of the Tudor Court, Chapter VI, orLivingstone on Isocrates' claim that *paideia* is able to extend the boundaries of Greekness with the same sort of effectiveness as warfare can, Chapter XII).

The editors themselves clearly intend their theme to be the exercise of power through the canon/syllabus/educational rôle-models, as the Foucaultian title suggests.Too, who has provided the introduction as well as a chapter on Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, relishes educational theory (associating, for example, 'pedagogy' with 'pederasty', p. 5 n.14: cf. her *Rethinking Sexual Harassment* [London, 1994]). The reader should not be put off by the earnest, urgent, almost preaching tone which the introduction shares with the first chapter, Paul Cartledge's equally programmatic—and characteristically incisive—exploration of issues and preconceptions of what hecalls the 'culture wars' between 'canon' and 'theory', focusing on Bernal's *Black Athena* 'as a case study' (p. 17). Both T. and C. rightly warn of the ideological implications of applying the model of genealogical descent to the ways in which the Classics have been used over the centuries. The organization of the volume by reverse chronological order symbolizes the editors' wish to escape from that model; the point might have been better made by looking at the appropriation of classical texts in non-Western cultures such as the Islamic world or (as part of the modernization process) Russia or China. But the volume is explicitly not a history (p. 5), nor does it claim completeness (p. 11).

Some will turn with relief to Stray's summary of the teaching practices of Edward Moreshead in late nineteenth-century Winchester. Not that it is free of theoretical implications (' "Latin" symbolized the internalised self-control of the new voter'; orthe reference to the provision of English notes for school texts being described as'mental effeminacy' in 1838: p. 42); but it is soundly underpinned by detail. Ourattention is drawn to the rôle of the Dictionary Monitor in supporting the class-teacher's authority, as well as important wider issues such as the control of the publication of texts, and the fact that élite culture is so often not a homogeneous entity to be contrasted with that of marginalized groups: there is a range of attitudes to (and appropriations of) the Classics. Rundle's discussion of late fifteenth/sixteenth-century panegyrics shows that attitudes to which bits of the Classics could be used, and how, were by no means clear-cut (Chapter VII); Agapitos' account of the circle of Michael Psellus illustrates both mistrust and suppression of new uses of the Classics, but also

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

how such differences could be resolved and reconciled (Chapter VIII). Inantiquity, too, the use of classical literature was complex: Whitmarsh shows (though this is hardly new) that the culture of the Second Sophistic was much more than merely a strategy of accommodation to Roman political control on the part of Greek-speaking communities (Chapter IX). Morgan has interesting things to say on Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, arguing that, since it is not a handbook on rhetoric but a statement of educational theory, it should be read as making statements about Roman public life, and the relationship between the reality of monarchy and a culture that emphasized the authority of tradition (Chapter XI). That ambivalence also appears inan issue raised at various points, but particularly in Atherton's piece on thesocialposition of the grammarian in the Graeco-Roman world (A. stresses the divisive/excluding function of grammar rules, though it might be objected that thedevelopment of Latin grammar in the first century B.C. precisely coincided with the process by which Italians for whom Latin was a second language were success- fully integrated into the Roman system). Similar points could be made about the ambivalent status of the teacher in so many societies (A.'s comments on slaves in Roman education appear to make no use of Christes's *Sklaven und Freigelassene als Grammatiker und Philologen* [Wiesbaden, 1979]): teachers claim that their access to a privileged body of knowledge gives them the power to lay down the rules, but in fact they are often badly paid, low-status outsiders whose opinions are barely tolerated by those with real political and economic power who authorize them to teach their children.

University of Nottingham THOMAS WIEDEMANN

LIFTING THE VEIL

URSULA WOLF: *Litteris et Patriae: Das Janusgesicht der Historie*. (Frankfurter historische Abhandlungen, 37.) Pp. 518. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 3-515-06875-9.

In the years after the war public discussion about the entanglement of historians in the policies of the Nazi era was subdued, to say the least. Most German academic historians were not very hard on themselves when thinking about their careers before 1945. Very few 'Ordinarien' (holders of chairs) were so obviously compromised that they were dismissed for good. Others spent some years in the wilderness, feeling hard done by, to return in due course to their 'Lehrstuhl'. It is, in a strange way, not surprising that the first official discussion of this difficult subject on a 'Historikertag' took place only in September 1998, with sometimes alarming results: more than one founding-father of post-war German scholarship proved weak in political judgement while furthering historical research.

Wolf's book seems to have been written somehow before the beginning of these debates. It is itself an example of the rather timid approach of years gone by. Or perhaps more than that. The rather naive chapters on the Weimar Republic and the Nazi Ideology, with the author's self-proclaimed 'impartiality' when summarizing eventhe most ridiculous statements of the times, are not so far removed from the carefully coded prose of those who cannot and will not mark a difference between setting the era of 1933–45 into its historical perspective and exculpating it, more or less, at the same time (see p. 28). The subject of 'Wissenschaftsgeschichte' for the years 1933–45 is, of course, still a minefield. But it should be clear that sound historical

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

research about these years is not necessarily tied to a strangely uncommitted moral 'objectivity' or 'neutrality' (see the remarks on p. 28), leading, for example, to uncouth comparisons between the German university 'reform' in the thirties and nowadays (p.396).

Apart from these less acceptable aspects, W.'s work is quite a useful survey of the publications and statements of the 'Ordinarien' of all historical departments, at the top of their careers, 'beamtete Historiker', as she says without a trace of irony (p. 13). Readers of *CR* will be mostly interested in the chapters about 'ancient history'. Herlack of familiarity with this part of the subject leads to some infelicitous conclusions. The division of ancient historians into 'political scholars', political moderates, and uncommitted scholars is open to debate. To list Walter Otto (Munich) alongside the racist Franz Miltner is clearly wrong, and to place Friedrich Münzer, who died in Theresienstadt, under the same rubric as Lothar Wickert is disquieting for many reasons.

After these prosopographical listings (pp. 89ff.) W. proceeds to a chapter of more detailed discussion of ancient history, which owes much to the pioneering studies of Volker Losemann. We read about the activities of Helmut Berve, holding forth in 1933 and 1934 about the future of 'new' scholarship and reaching the position of 'Leiter des Kriegseinsatzes der Altertumswissenschaften'. He is, of course, the leading light of those 'politically active', but, relatively speaking, perhaps not without any merit, given his decision to accept an official rôle (for the sake of scholarship, as he certainly thought). A much less sympathetic figure may have been Joseph Vogt, he of *Rom und Karthago*, who competed eagerly, albeit without success, with Berve for the top position within the hierarchy.

The only ancient historian discussed extensively is Fritz Taeger (Marburg). The reasons for this choice are not made very clear. Taeger was not in the limelight, like Berve or Vogt, and he regarded himself as just a good conservative. Thus Taeger's published work breathes an overzealous nationalism representative of that select sociological group of German 'Ordinarien'. A glance at the quotes supplied by W., absurdly dated by now and utterly unreadable, nevertheless shows how very close a scholar who deemed himself independent and far removed from the rabble in power was to the tenets of Nazi ideology, bursting with 'völkischem' nonsense and the undiluted adoration of mighty 'Führertum'. W., despite her belief that there was awide gap between Nazism and that sort of right-wing conservatism, cannot but confirm that Taeger was a prime example of the sort of scholarship which helped to give respectability to Nazi ideas.

Apart from this somewhat unlucky example, W.'s conclusion for ancient, as well as for mediaeval and modern, history is that scholars kept by and large their intellectual standards and duties, apart from the few activists. At the same time she cannot deny that the majority of 'Ordinarien' stabilized the regime with their publications, with the proviso that most of them believed in their scientific autonomy even then ('Litteris etPatriae', in that order, therefore). It should be added that the open support in scholarly publications for war and conquest was rather widespread in the first years of the war. It comes as little surprise that these voices grew much more circumspect in the years nearer defeat. The book presupposes that 'scholarship' was rather isolated from the surrounding ideology. It was, of course, different. It may suffice to draw attention tothe important study of Frank-Rutger Hausmann, *'Deutsche Geisteswissenschaft' imZweiten Weltkrieg. Die 'Aktion Ritterbusch' (1940–1945)* (Dresden, 1998), esp. pp.177–203 on the so-called 'Kriegseinsatz'—what a word!—of the historians.

No less important than further research on the willingness of a very great part of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the—remaining!—academic establishment to cooperate in one way or the other with the regime (now made easier by the more liberal opening of the archives of universities) is the awareness of the dark side of all this continuing academic work. One has to remember those who were dismissed, or the younger ones who never got a chance to become a 'beamteter Ordinarius' despite their brilliance. Not long ago the publication of the diaries of Victor Klemperer ('Ordinarius' of French Literature at Dresden University, dismissed in 1933) shed light on the misery of those who were nolonger allowed to be members of the academic community. One volume has now been translated into English: *I Shall Bear Witness: The Diaries of Victor Klemperer 1933–1941* (London, 1997).

Eichstätt Catholic University JÜRGEN MALITZ

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.548 Published online by Cambridge University Press