inscribed apple at the core of Cydippe's story, first known in Callimachus' *Aetia* version.

Section III analyses the use of embedded letters in the Greek novel: here we find once again the relationship between letters and deception, the bridging function of letters, and the obsession with authenticity. A whole chapter (Chapter VII) is devoted to the *Alexander Romance*, presenting the title character as a master-writer and master-reader. Chapter VIII deals with the collection of letters attributed to famous historical characters. Considered since the beginning of the scientific study of philology as vile forgeries and in many cases lacking a modern edition more recent than Hercher's (1873), these epistolary collections are rightly set by R. within the framework of school and rhetorical exercises. Chapter IX is devoted to the only surviving example of a Greek 'epistolary novel'. R. deals only marginally with the issues of dating and attribution, focusing instead mainly on the typology of the letters, on the presence or absence of the epistolary conventions, and on the structure of these *corpora.* Section IV presents the collections of fictive letters conceived in the cultural environment of the Second Sophistic: we are not dealing here with *ethopoeiai* of great historical characters, but with the challenge of recreating the everyday life of the common people of fifth- and fourth-century B.C. Athens; unlike the pseudonymous letters, these are overt literary fictions, *progymnasmata*, concerned only with artistic verisimilitude.

This is a really enjoyable and interesting work, designed, as the author states (p. 16), to appeal not only to classicists but also to students of modern literature, who will be pleased to find many references here to modern epistolary fiction and theory.

Milan SILVIA BARBANTANI

FAIRY TALES

G. ANDERSON: *Fairytale in the Ancient World*. Pp. xi + 240. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. Paper, £16.99. ISBN: 0–415–23703–3.

Graham Anderson's latest book is in some ways as radical as he announces it to be, while in other respects retreading methodological ground that his readers will have come to expect. In his first book, *Lucian: Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic* (Leiden, 1976), he argued that the satirist's *oeuvre* can be reduced to a series of witty variations upon a limited range of stock themes. A later book, *Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Graeco-Roman World* (London, 1984), claimed to have proven that the origins of the ancient novel lay in Near Eastern literature. The book under review welds together both these preoccupations, claiming that the existence of certain motifs apparently shared by ancient literature and fairy tale proves the continuity of a tradition into the modern period from classical times (and indeed pre-classical: the Near East again proves a rich hunting ground).

A. braces himself for resistance from his readers, and resistance there surely will be. In some contexts, for sure, scenarios exists where new approaches are repulsed because they threaten to undermine the fragile foundations upon which a wobbly discipline is built. A. takes classicists to task for the 'elementary howlers' (p. 14) that stem from their ignorance of the study of folklore and its complex methods, and (implicitly) for constructing ancient literature in their own (adult, educated, élite) image: 'the student is constant [*sic*] labouring under the bias that *Red Riding Hood*, *Cinderella*, *The Frog Prince*, *Snow White* and the rest, somehow, should not have had any right to exist in antiquity' (p. 23). Fairy tale is the excluded other, the doppelgänger now returning to

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.34 Published online by Cambridge University Press

haunt the self-appointed guardians of an ancient world dominated by culture and taste. Well, fair enough: the corpse of Victorian values still twitches too often, and folklorism has not widely permeated classics (though A. does not acknowledge the full extent of the secondary literature on the fable, surely a related genre: cf. esp. F. R. Adrados, *Historia de la fabula Greco-Latina*, 3 vols [Madrid, 1979–], two volumes of which are now translated as *History of the Graeco-Latin Fable* [Leiden, 1999–2000]). In general, however, A.'s radicalism lacks bite—primarily (and paradoxically) because of the limited compass of its intellectual methodology; and it is this rather than any innate conservatism that is likely to militate against the general acceptance of A.'s thesis.

To identify continuity between ancient literature and modern fairy tale involves elaborate typologies. Tabular diagrams abound displaying the correspondences between elements in diverse sources. A. is alert to some of the problems raised by the argument for parallelism (pp. 17–18), but there is a broader problem of approach raised here: the distinction between fundamental elements and superficial accretion is not simply a challenge to be overcome, it also raises the issue of the editorial *authority* of the summarizer. 'At its very simplest we can break down *Beauty and the Beast* to the following . . .' (p. 70): but, 'simplest' here means 'most congenial to parallelism', and the same accusation of reductivism could be levelled at many of A.'s summaries of ancient texts. His retelling of Ovid's account of Chione, for instance, is dappled with ellipses marking the occlusion of supposedly extraneous detail (p. 48). A more discursive example: to argue that *Daphnis & Chloë* is a version of *Cinderella* in that Daphnis represents 'the prince' (p. 146) is to underplay Chloë's own aristocratic status (the point of Cinderella lies in the mismatch between the two lovers, whereas Daphnis and Chloë are symmetrically upper-class). Conversely, A. periodically amplifies accounts at will. To link the story of Rhodopis with Cinderella involves the fusion of details from the separate accounts of Herodotus and Strabo (pp. 27–8). In a more elaborate instance, A. welds together elements from Euripides' *Heracles* (where we learn of the hero's enemy, Lycus: 'the wolf') and Moschus' *Megara* (whence Megara's sister, Pyrrha: 'flaming-red') to concoct an ancient *Little Red Riding-Hood*. The sparseness of this picture does not inhibit A.: 'We have no details, but we are entitled to infer that the reasons for Heracles' vengeance on Lycus include the desire to protect the surviving members of his wife's family' (pp. 94–5). Entitled? By whom? What legitimates this inventiveness? Eventually in this case, however, even A. is stumped: 'we have a sense of looking at the essential ingredients but never being able to assemble them in quite the right way' (p. 95).

But attacking the detail does not get to the heart of the issue, as A. sees his argument as resting on the accumulated evidence rather than the plausibility of any specific cases. The real problem with this book lies in the universalization of the category of fairy tale. It is questionable whether *any* genre of discourse can exist independently of the institutions that perpetuate it, but 'fairy tale' is more conspicuously than most the product of the post-enlightenment preoccupation with folk roots. Fairy tale is inseparable from the Romantic culture of collecting that embraces figures as diverse as Cecil Sharp, Vaughan Williams, Wordsworth, and Schubert. Without an archaeology of the *concept* (as an intellectual tool, but also as a cultural product), it is difficult to accept arguments for its presence in the ancient world.

This book promises a new insight into ancient literature, but only in a limited sense can it be said to deliver. A. is formidably learned, but too often (at least for my taste) his lists of parallels drawn from Near Eastern or modern European traditions serve as ends in themselves. Though he frequently acknowledges the 'sophistication' of the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.34 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ancient texts with which he deals, the pared-down narrative snippets served up are meagre fare. If we are to accept the substrate existence of folkloric narrative in the ancient world (as surely we must, though its extent may be a matter for dispute), then the pressing matter must be instead to explore both the institutional contexts that disseminated folk wisdom in the ancient world—an exploration already begun by Richard Buxton in *Imaginary Greece: The Contexts of Mythology* (Cambridge, 1994)—and the subtle variegation of ancient literary texture. The question of whether fairy tale is simply 'there' or not in the ancient texts overly constrains the field of enquiry.

University of Exeter TIM WHITMARSH

SILENCE IN GREEK CULTURE

S. MONTIGLIO: *Silence in the Land of Logos*. Pp. x + 313. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000. Cased, £28.50. ISBN: 0-691-00472-2.

Sylvia Montiglio begins with an uncontroversial observation: the culture of archaic and classical Greece was an intensely verbal one. She looks obliquely across a number of Greek literary genres for indications of the rôle played by the absence of speech in ancient Greece: in the land of *logos*, what is silence, as the Greeks themselves perceived it? Successive chapters describe silence as an aspect of religion, the *Iliad*, epinician poetry, the Attic orators, drama, and the *Odyssey*.

M. is an industrious and well-read investigator. This book is a slimmer English version of her 800-page French thesis, produced under the guidance of Nicole Loraux. As she acknowledges in the Preface, it has been shaped by the French cultural poetics of the last generation, especially as articulated by Vernant, Detienne, Vidal-Naquet, and Loraux herself. But M. has profited also from many anglophone and Italian scholars of the performative aspects of Greek literary culture. Her reading of the basic connection between speech and culture comes directly out of Detienne's *Les maîtres de vérité dans la Grèce archaïque* (Paris, 1967); the rôle played by female silence/violence in tragedy builds on the work of Loraux, but also of Goldhill and Zeitlin. R. Martin's work lies behind her emphasis on warrior speech and the successful Iliadic hero, while Loraux and Ober, as well as Ricottilli's work on aposiopesis, shape her reading of the Attic orators.

M. does not artificially impose order or even coherence on a body of evidence that by its nature remains somewhat amorphous (a point to which I shall return). Thus, beginning with Greek religion, she notes that silence in an archaic or classic Greek religious context never testifies to the ineffableness of divinity or wordless devotion but rather to the potential power of speech to disrupt, either by spoiling the delivery of prayer or by bringing the anger of the gods down upon mortals. In the world of the Iliadic warrior, too, silence is not heroic but a mark of dismay (Agamemnon's audience in *Il.* 14) or weakness (Chryses' enforced muteness in *Il.* 1)—the Homeric heroic individual always talks, although the army itself is permitted to move in disciplined silence, and poets command silent audiences.

Both Pindar and the orators, M. observes, use the articulation of silent moments to organize their own verbal/literary productions. Pindar calls for silence at points of transition, to mark his refusal to indulge in abuse, recall inappropriate information, or raise negative emotions; the Athenian orators prefer *praeteritio* to aposiopesis, because the one not only articulates transitions in the argument but also signifies control (over

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.34 Published online by Cambridge University Press