is primarily concerned with the unstable balance in his subjects between reason and passion (another Platonic idea).

The case-studies of four pairs (*Pyrrhus–Marius*, *Phocion–Cato minor*, *Lysander–Sulla*, and *Coriolanus–Alcibiades*) represent the substance of the book, and give D. an opportunity to display the thematic tessellations that can be detected in a Plutarchan pair. D. lays considerable emphasis in the book as a whole upon the importance of the paired structure, and upon the challenges to the reader that accrue as a result of the complex interconnections and differences that run between two *Lives*. These readings here are subtle and persuasive, and (despite the voluminous scholarship on these texts) represent a powerfully innovative way of reading the *Lives*. The one niggle—and it is a churlish one, given that no one could reasonably offer a close reading of every single *Life*—surrounds the principle of selection, which is not discussed anywhere. How representative are these four pairs? *Pyrrhus–Marius* is the fall guy, the one pair discussed here with an apparently 'fairly straightforward moral message' (p. 131); but does this exception prove the rule? How generalizable is the principle that Plutarch's writing knowingly tests the reader's interpretative confidence?

The final section deals with the syncritic structure, which is central to D.'s interpretation of the *Lives* as challenges to the reader's interpretative control, and in particular with the formal *synkriseis* that conclude many of the *Lives*. These brief epilogues, often disappointingly reductive, are, according to D., not the solutions to Plutarch's intended meaning of the *Lives* but part of the hermeneutic puzzle: the 'dissonance between Life and *synkrisis* . . . forces the reader to assume a more active role in assessing the men he has read about' (p. 283). This is a stimulating proposition, even if it does not fully explain why Plutarch has actively chosen to include these bizarre appendages in the first place. In the concluding chapter, D. widens his focus to consider Plutarch's comparative project as an enquiry into cultural definition in Roman Greece. Twenty-two pages is perhaps too brief a compass to do justice to this complex issue, and the conclusions here (Plutarch does not explicitly judge between Greek and Roman, but his categories of ethical assessment are definitively Greek) do not build substantively upon those of, for example, Simon Swain in *Hellenism and Empire* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 138–40. For once, D. reverts to the picture of Plutarch the genial conservative: there is no sense that the reader's conceptions of what it is to be Greek or Roman are engaged or put at risk.

Despite my intermittent snipes (a review *should* be critical . . .), this intelligent, learned, and lucid book will undoubtedly (and deservedly) have an immediate and profound impact upon studies of the *Lives*. In its sensitive and nuanced attention to the texture and detail of Plutarch's writing, as well as its methodological reorientations, it raises the stakes substantially. No serious Plutarchan scholar (as they say) will want to be without this one.

St John's College, Cambridge TIM WHITMARSH

TERGEMINUS SOPHOS

M. KORENJAK: *Publikum und Redner. Ihre Interaktion in der sophistischen Rhetorik der Kaiserzeit.* (Zetemata 104.) Pp. 254. Munich: C. H. Beck, 2000. Paper, DM 98. ISBN: 3-406-462-17-0.

In this imaginative and resourceful, but also somewhat straightjacketed (*habilitationsschriftlich*) study, Martin Korenjak sets out to collect and discuss the

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.34 Published online by Cambridge University Press

evidence for interaction between speaker and audience in the sophistic rhetoric of the imperial period. His aim is thus to contribute both to the study of the Second Sophistic and more generally to the theoretical understanding of rhetoric, modern as well as ancient. The results are uneven, with some repetition of well-known material and some strained arguments, but more than enough that is new and well said to justify the book's existence.

In subject-matter, there is obvious common ground with Gregory Aldrete's *Gestures and Acclamations* (Baltimore, 1999), but the different chronological and topical focus, and the wider range of phenomena taken into consideration, ensure that the two books complement each other rather than compete. K. indeed casts his net very wide, counting as 'interaction' everything from preliminary suggestions of theme, via fidgeting and interjections during a performance, to the erection of honorific statues and the 'publication' of successful speeches and extracts ἀπὸ φωνῆς.

Part I of the study (Chapters I–II) covers the physical and social setting of sophistic oratory, the general shape of a sophistic performance, and the composition of the audience. This is a very competent assembly of relevant material, not going far beyond familiar commonplaces. In the discussion of the physical setting, though the general picture given is convincing and helpful, some hard archaeological questions about the identification of lecture-halls, *odeia*, and so forth on the ground are left to one side. Also useful is the treatment of the social composition of the audience and the social functions of sophistic oratory, which contains some well-phrased and surely correct criticism of Thomas Schmitz's contention that sophistic audiences might often include a substantial proportion of lower-class auditors.

Part II (Chapters III–VI) deals with the media of expression available to the audience, the emotional interaction between them and the speaker in and out of performance, their influence on the course of a performance, and possible commemorative reactions in the aftermath (honorific statues, the recording of extracts or even whole speeches in writing independently of the speaker, and the [alleged] possibility of converting specially favoured excerpts into short-lived hit songs). It is in this section that K.'s most original and valuable contributions come: his establishment of a 'lexicon' of the verbal and non-verbal gestures open to a sophistic audience (building ably on earlier studies, such as Lateiner's of Homer, and making good use also of modern communication theory); his insistence that such responses were not a side-issue, but central to a sophistic event, both for the participants and for its understanding by modern scholars; and his insightful discussion of the emotional atmosphere of sophistic performance, in which the urge to competitive display and the ever-present risk of humiliating failure created a tension and an undercurrent of anxiety which could both make and break a performace (the parallel with theatre is obvious, but curiously underplayed by K.).

Part III (Chapters VII–VIII) concludes the study with an examination of ancient perceptions of the relationship between speaker and audience, as mirrored both in explicit discussion and in the dominant metaphors for speaker–audience interaction in sophistic texts themselves. This is perhaps the least successful part of the book, though for reasons that in fact underline the value of the questions K. raises and the desirability of taking them further. The one extended normative discussion of audience behaviour available is Plutarch's *De audiendo*, which is about listening not to sophistic oratory but to lectures in philosophy. By his own criteria K. should therefore have excluded it—but his discussion is a good one, proving the value of the text for a project of this kind, and the correct moral to draw is that conclusions about audience behaviour and etiquette in this period, and the expectations of interaction with the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.34 Published online by Cambridge University Press

speaker, should be based on our evidence for both philosophical and sophistic audiences, rather than just one or the other. The discussion of metaphor, right at the end, is both somewhat stranded, with no direct connection to the chapter before it, and disappointing in content. K. endorses the perception of metaphor as a shaper as well as a mirror of experience, but then does very little with it.

Overall, K.'s study makes a very positive impression. It is a good addition to literature on the Second Sophistic, and his suggestion that the approach might fruitfully be extended to other ancient periods and genres, already supported by his own flirtation with philosophical oratory, is further strengthened by the near-simultaneous publication of Aldrete's work. Whether its insistence on the dialogic element in oratory has all that much to say to modern rhetorical theory is perhaps a more open question.

Production and general standards of accuracy are high, the main exception being the complete failure of both K. and his editors to ensure the correct accent for (*προ*)*λαλιά*.

King's College London M. B. TRAPP

POLYAENUS

M. T. SCHETTINO: *Introduzione a Polieno*. Pp. 341. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 1998 [1999]. Paper, L. 45,000. ISBN: 88-467-0179-8.

Polyaenus' renaissance continues. In the wake of recent Spanish, English, and Italian translations (a Russian translation in progress) and other work, comes a detailed overview by M. T. Schettino, previously known for her *Tradizione annalistica e tradizione ellenistica su Pirro in Dionigi* (Brussels, 1991) and numerous articles. S.'s 'cultural' reading of the text stresses P.'s originality and continuity with Second Sophistic trends to absolve him from any taint as a military writer. This excellent survey of P. and especially his sources also provides bibliography on individual exempla and a useful reference tool for Greek historiography. S. displays meticulous work in, and a genuine talent for, the lost art of *Quellenforschung*.

This expansion of a 1995 Catholic University of Leuven dissertation (*Polyaenus, Strategemata, Books I and II. A Commentary*) has much to offer. For S., analysis of P.'s sources betrays his historiographical knowledge and culture. Hence his 'vision of the past' affords an assessment of his Greek view of the Roman Empire and the imperial power (p.18). The second-century popularity of various historians as a criterion for P.'s sources is new: P. preferred fourth- and third-century B.C. writers, shunned Herodotus' work except as a *Persica* (pp. 134, 142), and probably used Thucydides in a collection of excerpts (pp. 147–8); Theopompus becomes a major source for Books 2–4 (pp. 163–76). Moreover, S. demonstrates correlations with Aelius Aristides' *Panathenaicus* (pp. 218, 221) and familiarity with Pausanias' work (pp. 89–90, 221).

S.'s pro-Roman P. (has anyone argued otherwise?) thinks Greeks, earlier victors over barbarians, have much to teach the Romans militarily. Greek–Roman conflicts are largely ignored (e.g. little attention to the *rusé* Pyrrhus, p. 268), and the Macedonians, P.'s ancestors, become not only defenders of Greek civilization but also intermediaries between classical Greece and Rome (p. 256). S. finds both a *translatio imperii* (pp. 259–60, 288–9) and a *translatio virtutis militaris* in P.'s view of Spartans, Macedonians (esp. Philip II, pp. 175, 225), and Romans. P.'s 'vision of the past' stresses Rome's Greek heritage.

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.34 Published online by Cambridge University Press