

International Journal of the Classical Tradition

VOLUME 4, NUMBER 3 WINTER 1998

The Official Journal of the International Society for the Classical Tradition

CONTENTS

Bernard Silvestris' Descent into the Classics:
the *Commentum super sex libros Aeneidos*

DAVID L. PIKE

343

Renaissance Classicism and Roman Sexuality:
Ben Jonson's Marginalia and the Trope of
Os Inpurum

BRUCE THOMAS BOEHRER

364

Militat omnis amans: Ovidian Elegy in
L'incoronazione di Poppea

ROBERT C. KETTERER

381

REVIEW ARTICLES

A Philosophical Approach to Aristotle's *Rhetoric*

HARVEY YUNIS

396

Sueton und Kaster: Zwei Prosopographen fanden sich

JAN-WILHELM BECK

400

Curtiusrezeption ausgeklammert werden. Aber da sich Atkinsons Werk als Beitrag zur aktuellen Forschung begreift, durfte auf die Darstellung der komplexen wirkungsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhänge verzichtet werden. Sie gleichwohl zumindest angedeutet zu haben, wäre begrüßenswert gewesen. In jedem Fall hat Atkinson mit dem vorliegenden Kommentar einen weiteren wichtigen Baustein zum tieferen Verständnis des Curtius beigesteuert. Man möchte hoffen, daß das Kommentarwerk bald zum Abschluß gelangt. Und man möchte wünschen, daß der noch ausstehende Kommentar leserfreundlicher gestaltet wird als der vorliegende Band.

Rüdiger Kinsky
Seminar für Alte Geschichte
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn

Swain, Simon, *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250* (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), XII + 499 pp.

This is a big book on a subject that has engaged ancient historians with mounting enthusiasm over the last three decades. Its chronological frame coincides with the era of the so-called Second Sophistic, as defined by Philostratus in his *Lives of the Sophists*. The work is yet another attempt to measure the Greekness of the Greeks in the Roman Empire and to determine to what extent they may have resented, resisted, or ignored the Roman administration under which they were obliged to live. The author declares his aim to be twofold: "to explore the identity of the Greeks of this time with respect to their ancestors" and to consider "how the leading Greek intellectuals of the second sophistic viewed Rome and Roman power in Greece and the Greek world" (p. 1).

The author is well aware that these issues have been repeatedly examined in the recent past, from Jonas Palm's *Rom, Römertum und Imperium in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (Lund, 1959) to Simon Price's truly path-breaking and fundamental work on the imperial cult in Asia Minor (*Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* [Cambridge, 1984]). Along the way we have had Bettie Forte's disappointing *Rome and the Romans as the Greeks Saw Them* (Rome, 1972) as well as important papers by Ewen Bowie that have complemented, corrected, and enlarged themes that I raised in my *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969). Graham Anderson's voluminous work on the Second Sophistic and related literary movements, although at times repetitive, has substantially enriched our understanding of the attitudes and role of Greek intellectuals under Roman rule. Maud Gleason's fascinating *Making Men* (Princeton, 1995) has explored the maleness of the male elite of the Second Sophistic through the physiognomic writings. The sophists have been studied in Europe to great effect, with the publication of inscriptions of sophists from Ephesus and the acute analyses of sophistic rhetoric, both classical and imperial, in the books edited by Barbara Cassin (whose books are among the few conspicuous gaps in Swain's bibliography). In Greece itself a large and immensely useful volume entitled *Hellenism and Rome* was published in Athens in 1977.

The subject has acquired such popularity that Peter Brunt felt obliged to burst what he wryly called "the bubble of the Second Sophistic" in a major article (*BICS* 39 [1994], pp. 25–52) that Swain unfortunately does not address in any serious way. In a

footnote on p. 2 he simply remarks, "Brunt's consequent doubting of a Greek renaissance (as if this too were an invention of Philostratus—rather than an indisputable fact) is a good example of performance rhetoric in itself." Brunt's arguments deserve better than this. His article challenges thoughtfully and meticulously what has become a virtual orthodoxy. It was overdue and should have been welcomed. After all Philostratus is, in fact, the only source for the concept and the phrase "Second Sophistic," and he had a vested interest in it—to such an extent that he included philosophers among his sophists as well as the rhetor Aristides, who repudiated the label of sophist. It was, and still is, time to stand back and take a hard look at the whole phenomenon.

If one stands back far enough, it is hardly possible to state, as Swain does on p. 6, that the cultural and political world recorded by Philostratus "was not to endure." Ewen Bowie has a far better perspective on this in his essay on the Second Sophistic for the admirable new *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (1996): "It is clear, however, that the prominence of declamatory rhetoric was not limited to Philostratus' favoured period. It continued as a major cultural phenomenon, little abated by the 3rd cent. crisis, into the 4th and 5th cents., whose properly sophistic texts are more voluminous than those surviving from AD 60–230" (p. 1378a).

Much of the work on Roman Greeks has owed a profound debt to epigraphy and, to a lesser degree, to numismatics, and the uncontested master in all of this was Louis Robert. It was the documentary evidence that provided at least some cloak of credibility to Philostratus's account, and by deliberately eschewing close attention to this testimony Swain has taken a retrograde step. He expressly states that his work "avoids the now common *Stadt und Fest* approach to the history of the Greeks under Rome, which studies them largely through the epigraphic and numismatic record of their communal displays" (p. 8). This looks like a gratuitous and wholly unwarranted slight to the magisterial book of Michael Wörle, *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien* (München, 1988), as well as to outstanding scholars of similar interests. Price's *Rituals and Power* is steeped in documentary evidence and gains in cogency because of it. Swain's decision to concentrate largely on literary texts was obviously his to make, but his justification of it sounds defensive at best.

The first and shorter part of *Hellenism and Empire* is the most satisfying, in that it explores Greek identity through the changing character of the Greek language and through the implications of the Greek novels, viewed as something peculiar to the age of the Second Sophistic. Swain sees the novels as mirroring new sexual ethics in an age that valued marriage and fidelity, and he can thus make interesting comparisons with Plutarch's views on love. But he has trouble in explaining why such ethics became prevalent, and the existence of brothels and distinctly unedifying writings such as the original of the Lucianic *Onos* might make one wonder whether it is legitimate to postulate a major change in outlook. If Petronius's *Satyricon* had a Greek prototype, as the *Iolaus* fragment now suggests, that too would rather work against an overall argument for the sexual ethics of the time. Any generalization for the age is naturally tricky, as Gibbon proved by his now untenable view of the Antonines, and as Eric Dodds and I proved once again in characterizing the same period as an age of anxiety when we were writing in the sixties.

Rather imprudently Swain thinks that the novel, the Second Sophistic, and the new sexual ethics all came to an end at about the same time (p. 130). Yet sophistic brilliance had an even brighter future before it in the coming centuries, as Bowie

observed, and for some scholars the novel lived on to achieve a brilliant peak in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*. But just as Swain neglected to answer Brunt's challenge, he likewise offers no argument to those (including myself) who have supported a fourth-century date for Heliodorus. I continue to believe that it is inconceivable that the emperor Julian would have borrowed from a novel to praise an emperor, as the partisans of the early date claim, in view of Julian's well known disparagement of the novelistic genre. Julian's account of the siege of Nisibis in a panegyric closely resembles Heliodorus' account of the siege of Syene, but I have tried to prove by the testimony of Ephraem, who witnessed the siege of Nisibis, that Julian's Greek narrative described what actually happened and therefore that Heliodorus must have borrowed from him. To refer to Ephraem's "allegorical allusions" as Swain does on p. 423 is to confuse allusion and interpretation. Ephraem provides precise allusion to the facts of the siege and offers an allegorical interpretation of them. There is nothing allegorical about the allusion.

A more ample treatment of the novel would have been welcome. Swain's spirited review of Simon Goldhill's *Foucault's Virginity* (Cambridge, 1995) in *JHS* 116 (1996), 201 shows that he has more to say on the subject. His opinions on Dares, Dictys, and Ptolemaeus Chennus would be worth reading and might provide some valuable corrective to the impressions that the romantic novels create. A recent article by J. J. O'Hara in *TAPA* 126 (1996), pp. 173–219, which takes seriously Chennus's summary of a lost elegiac poem by a certain Sostratus on an otherwise totally unknown series of six changes of sex for Tiresias, demonstrates that no work of scholarship is so bad that it cannot be resurrected by someone for a purpose. Karl-Heinz Tomberg's *Die Kaine Historia des Ptolemaios Chennos* (Bonn, 1968) had sunk into well deserved obscurity, but now evidently we shall have to deal with his argument that if an author cites sources for what he says the sources must be presumed to have existed. Experienced readers of the *Historia Augusta* will continue to be suspicious of a work for which nearly all the alleged sources are utterly unknown. An elegiac poem on six sex changes for Tiresias is bound to raise a smile no less broad than Chennus' intriguing report that a certain hetaera called Horpyllis was known by the name of Gamma. She appears in a list of personalities, including Moses, who were known by letters of the alphabet.

The longer, second part of Swain's book is devoted to essays on a series of authors of the period: Plutarch, Dio of Prusa, Arrian, Appian, Aristides, Lucian, Pausanias, Galen, Philostratus, and Cassius Dio. A more imaginative and topical structure would have been more appealing. The relentless sequence of chapters on one writer after another, with much information that is easily accessible elsewhere, reads like a series of encyclopedia entries. For convenient orientation Anglophone readers can now turn to the new *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, and few readers who are not reviewers are likely to plod resolutely through Swain's chapters. There is much of interest in them, but hardly enough to justify the amplitude and the structure. And occasionally there are some strange opinions, of which the most arresting comes at the conclusion of the chapter on Galen (pp. 378–9): "In a very real sense, in what mattered to him, Galen—who was never of course a sophist—was not in the Roman Empire." For someone who was not in the Roman empire he was terribly concerned that those who were should know which of the writings circulating widely under his name were authentic (*De libris propriis*).

In his final pages Swain makes a preposterous assertion that even a sympathetic reviewer cannot leave unnoticed: "It will be apparent to those who know the second-

ary literature in this area that much of what I have said is new and offers a different perspective that may be disturbing to anyone accustomed to read the Roman Empire mainly from Rome" (pp. 413–14). Since the present reviewer may claim without excessive immodesty to belong to the group "of those who know the secondary literature in this area," I think it necessary to register that there is actually little here that is new or different. In seeing himself as somehow in the vanguard of a new and more sensitive "non-Romanocentric approach" Swain patronizingly commends a few scholars he sees as harbingers of his own originality. These are Millar, Sartre, Price, Alcock, and Mitchell. All these excellent scholars know perfectly well and gladly acknowledge their debt to generations of scholars who have adopted a "non-Romanocentric approach." The tribute to Louis Robert at the beginning of Mitchell's *Anatolia* is particularly memorable, and Simon Price is no less indebted to Robert's scholarship. Henri Seyrig devoted a lifetime to research that never read the Empire from Rome. So did Adolf Wilhelm. And so today do Ernest Will, Antony Spawforth, and Charlotte Roueché, to name only a few. The approach is not new. What matters is what results from the approach. *Hellenism and Empire* unfortunately cannot stand up to the powerful originality of Price's *Rituals and Power* or Mitchell's *Anatolia*.

G. W. Bowersock
Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton
School of Historical Studies

Maria Tziatzi-Papagianni, *Die Sprüche der sieben Weisen. Zwei byzantinische Sammlungen. Einleitung, Text, Testimonien und Kommentar, Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 51* (Stuttgart & Leipzig: B.G. Teubner 1994), XXV + 497 pp.

Die unter dem Namen der sogenannten Sieben Weisen laufenden Sinnsprüche waren die ganze Antike hindurch und weit darüber hinaus bekannt und wurden immer wieder weitertradiert. Wenngleich es sich im Grunde durchwegs um einfache moralische Sentenzen handelt, erhielten diese doch ein gewisses Gewicht und eine numinose Aura, bedingt durch die Verbindung zum delphischen Apollon-Heiligtum, aber auch durch das hohe Alter der quasi-mythischen, als Personen - sieht man von Solon und vielleicht noch Thales ab - kaum faßbaren Autoren.

Unter den byzantinischen Gnomologien bilden die Sammlungen von Sprüchen der Sieben Weisen eine Gruppe für sich. Sie gehen auf spätantike Sammlungen, vor allem jene bei Diogenes Laertios und Ioannes Stobaios, zurück und sind, wie bei Produkten dieser Art nicht anders zu erwarten, in mehreren nach Bestand und Textgestalt unter einander differierenden Redaktionen auf uns gekommen. Die Verfasserin unternimmt es in dieser ausführlichen, überaus gründlich gearbeiteten Studie, einer von Wilfried Bühler (Hamburg) angeregten und betreuten Dissertation, zwei Redaktionen, die Pariser und die Münchener (benannt jeweils nach einem der wichtigsten Textzeugen), textgeschichtlich zu untersuchen und sodann in kritischer Edition darzubieten. Dabei greift sie weit aus, um die Beziehungen zwischen diesen beiden und allen übrigen bekannten Redaktionen zu erhellen.

Diesem Ziel entspricht die Anlage des Buches. Es beginnt mit einer umfangreichen Einleitung zu den verschiedenen Redaktionen (S. 1–60); darauf folgen dann die beiden