tive marginalisation that it receives in earlier poetry, and as such is on a par with other areas of human life, including the life of people low on the social scale, old age, sickness, exhaustion, poverty, drunkenness, and sex.

Finally, no one nowadays denies that there is much truth in the notion that the Hellenistic poets tried to outflank Homer and the tradition by selecting material from the margins of the tradition. And there is great sense in Radke’s idea that the Hellenistic poets did this by selecting material that would ‘pre-date’ him. But in suggesting that the later poets were thereby stating their radical independence from the Classical poets surely Radke is admitting that the former were actively engaging with the latter, even if to deny any connection? The logic here is loose; and the Hellenistic poets themselves advertise the connection, as when Apollonius evokes the sequel of the story of Medea in Euripides’ Medea. Moreover, when she argues that because of this rupture with the past the value of intertextual studies is limited, surely she is swinging the pendulum too far? She spends little time on Callimachus’ Hecale, for example, but that poem, admittedly placed in a period of myth prior to the period of Homer’s main narratives, nonetheless consciously inverts the magnitude, personnel and tone expected of epic, and depends for its full effect on pointed echoes of Homeric scenes and language. As so often with Hellenistic poetry, innovation is a matter of degree and extent.

Radke commands our respect through the power of her argumentation for her view, but the view, in my opinion, does not cover all the facts, and should, at some stage, be confronted with the results of work on other elements of Hellenistic poetry, especially intertextuality and the political dimension. However, her learning, vigour, clarity and courage are enormously impressive, and Hellenistic studies will be in debt to her for the exciting challenge that she has thrown down.

Christchurch

Graham Zanker


In spite of the large interest in the ancient novels, there are still few monographs on the individual texts. It is therefore a great pleasure to note the arrival of a new study of Leucippe and Clitophon (L&C), previously the least appreciated of the Greek novels. This is, in fact, the second monograph on Tatius’ novel; the study of Helen Morales appeared only a few years ago.¹ Morales brought forth the elusive character of Tatius’ novel, its playful and ironic tendency to call for various interpretations. The present study, written by the well-known French scholar Marcelle Laplace (ML), also underlines the novel’s irony, but here it is seen as a reflection of its Platonic character. For, according to ML, L&C is a Platonic panegyric to Eros, celebrating the myth of the androgyne in the form of heterosexual marriage between the protagonists.

A more general aim of the monograph is to show how ancient literary criticism influenced the creation of the ancient novel, and Tatius’ novel in particular. Such a development is outlined in the Introduction (21–57), which focuses mainly on ancient and late antique rhetorical and literary theory. The ‘discours panégyrique’ plays a crucial role, since ML argues that Tatius appropriated that particular discourse along with its style, themes, and general aesthetics for his novel. The idea of a panegyrical discourse was first developed in some of Plato’s dialogues (Phaedrus and Critias, but also Republic and Laws) and then discussed and developed by, among others, Dionysios of Halicarnassos, Plutarch, and Hermogenes. The latter, in his On Types of Style, defined Plato as the best model for panegyrical discourse, which he described as a work in prose rivaling poetry, associated with the pleasure of the fable, ancient myth, philosophical fable and dramatic fiction. This is, according to ML, as close as we get to the kind of discourse we find in the novels, represented in both form (style and aesthetics) and action (drama and erotic imitation). The last section of the introduction (50–56) discusses Tatius’ novel from this perspective, and thus provides the indispensable basis for the following series of analyses.

Before moving on to a brief (and thus necessarily simplifying) description of these analyses, let me just point out that this is a book for specialists, or at least for experienced philologists. The Introduction is preceded by a learned account of questions related to the author and the dating of the novel (Préliminaires, 1–19), and in the Introduction the reader is immediately faced with a vast amount of sources, parallels and complex lines of argument. This rather difficult style (definitely not for first-year students) is representative of the entire book, but once ML embarks on her analysis the structure, in fact, becomes much easier to follow. The clear and logical disposition is indeed one of the book’s great merits, especially in regard of its sheer bulk – a volume of almost 800 pages may discourage the most enthusiastic reader, but a careful disposition certainly facilitates the reading.

Part 1, Description et discours épidictique (61–164), discusses elements that are generally held to be essential aspects of Tatius’ novel. The Platonic setting of Clitophon’s tale – a grove with plane trees and a spring of cool water as the perfect place for erotic story-telling (cf. Phdr 229a–230c) – is well known, but here it is seen also as an image of the literary aesthetics of the text, a sort of programmatic opening of the novel. The epistemological presentation of Clitophon’s story is also underlined, in line with Platonic thinking: it provides both profit and pleasure, and it is superior (yet close) to painting. Descriptions of paintings and animals are then discussed, in their function of being highly relevant to the intrigue.\(^3\)

---

\(^2\) ML places it in the last quarter of the 2\(^{nd}\) century, based on internal and papyri evidence. Cf. the more cautious and slightly earlier date presented by Morales, Vision and Narrative, 5.

\(^3\) Surprisingly enough with only very few references to the important and influential study of S. Bartsch (included in the bibliography, but not discussed in the book), Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius, Princeton, NJ 1989.
In Part 2, Thématiques panégyriques (167–256), these themes are seen as corresponding to two Hellenistic ‘realities’: the athletic competition and the celebration of victory. The latter is, in accordance with Plato, seen as a manifestation of perfection (harmonia, philia, or kosmos), and ML reads Tatius’ novel as representing the struggle for that ideal: the restoration of order and harmony in the form of marriage. The novel thus appears as filled with panegyrical celebration: the garden in Tyre (a symbol of harmony, a perfect ‘Athens’) provides a panegyrical spectacle with processions of trees and singing birds, and even the river Nile celebrates as the lovers travel on it.

The struggle for marital harmony is, however, disrupted by contrasting tragedy, which is discussed in Part 3, Contrechamps: les contreverses et le tragique (259–308). According to ML, tragedy takes the form of homosexual love, represented by the stories of Clinias and Menelaus, who both lose their young lovers in accidents. Love between men is thus punished by the gods, because it refuses marriage (order and harmony). So does any contempt of friendship and trust, which leads to similar tragedies (the storms at sea), because it disturbs social harmony. The novel’s diatribes against women are also discussed here, with numerous parallels from ancient literature.

In Part 4, Esthétique panégyrique (311–410), we turn to the novel’s expression of such an aesthetic. According to Plato, the panegyrical discourse is marked by divine motivation, a certain ‘truth’, and psychological power. In the novel this may be observed in e.g. the effect of stories, as healing, pleasant, or didactic. Panegyrical aesthetics are also mirrored in allegorical representations; the descriptions of the phoenix and the peacock, for instance, represent rhetorical and pictorial art respectively. A correspondence between these allegorical representations of aesthetics and stylistic practices is established through certain rhetorical figures, which in rhetorical theory are often likened to works of art, birds, or flowers. The theoretical considerations here are very complex, but the stylistic analysis that follows is an important and unique study of Tatius’ style, especially as regards his musical and rhythmical language. Two important observations deserve to be noted: the vital connection between rhetoric and emotion, and the carefully constructed correspondence between language, style and intrigue.

In Part 5, Transformations de fables et de récits platoniciens (413–532), we reach the core of the study: the novel’s use of Platonic myths, and especially the androgyne. This myth is seen as the novel’s structuring principle, both for the text itself (doubling, repetition) and the intrigue (the separation and search for the other half). Most incidents in the novel, even Clitophon’s paradoxical unfaithfulness with Melite (442 and 452–3; see also 751), or his behaviour first with Melite and then in front of the court (482–5, 502–16), are explained by Platonic interpretation. ML underlines that this is not to be seen as a parody or pastiche of Plato, but as an allegorical transposition; an ironic, but still serious work on the part of the author (453 and 527).

In Part 6, Transformations de légendes anciennes (535–619), ML turns to other ancient material, used by Tatius as a way of filling out the (primarily Platonic)

---

4 I miss references to important work on women and marriage here, e.g. K. Cooper, The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity, Cambridge, MA & London 1996.
intrigue and fashioning the main characters. The character of Melite, for example, carries with her references to women of ancient epic and tragedy (Circe, Medea, and Phaedra). According to ML, Tatius has chosen material mainly from Euripides (but also from Ovid and Aeschylus), following the recommendations of Aristotle’s Poetics.

In Part 7, Spécificité dramatique et transformations internes (623–746), a similar investigation is undertaken in relation to new comedy, and questions of transformation and moral change in the characters are addressed. ML points at the clear influence of comedy in the standard plot (Terentius, Plautus, and Menander), but underlines some differences: there is, for instance, less breaking of convention, and the characters are more complex. Psychological change is analysed along philosophical and moral lines, and from a Platonic perspective. The main characters change on their way towards harmony (marriage), taking on different roles in the intrigue: while Callisthenes, for instance, is the man of action, Clitophon is all along the (Platonic and Socratic-like) “artiste de la parole”.

The book ends with a Conclusion générale (747–766), taking us back to the novel’s descriptive and epideictic qualities: they create the illusion of a lively spectacle, containing both tragic and comic elements – just as Plato recommends (Symp 223c–d). It is again emphasized that the novel is not to be seen as a pastiche, but as a serious literary/philosophical endeavour. Or, as ML stated a little earlier in the book: «... sous l’allégorie, c’est l’auteur qui s’amuse de son savoir-faire, digne d’un sophiste divin» (524).

This is no doubt an impressive work. By providing the reader with copious parallels from ancient literature (both Latin and Greek), ML clearly displays the abundance of forms and tales that Tatius had at his disposal. Even for someone who does not agree with her interpretations, the book is both a rich commentary on Tatius’ novel and a thorough survey of ancient ideas and theories of storytelling. Such a veritable ‘catalogue’ of parallels and possible sources would, however, have profited from a discussion of the contemporary reader and his/her understanding of the novel. Many of ML’s close readings are so close, so erudite, that I cannot see how they would work for anyone but a classical philologist who spent years reading the text over and over again. Even if Tatius had been capable of inserting them, would any of his readers have been able to grasp all the allusions and puns, internal and external? I am sure that both Plato, tragedy and comedy – along with a large number of other literary works, myths and legends – played a significant role for both Tatius and his readers, but does that mean that each tiny component retained an intertextual implication or meaning in its new context? Did it not rather provide a literary backdrop against which to read a new work, a joint reference system of familiar (but not necessarily distinct and definable) stories and phrasings?

Despite the introduction’s emphasis on the novel’s sociocultural context, I get the impression of a rather isolated reading of L&C: a private business between Tatius and ML, as it were. The meticulous and sometimes pedantic analyses do not place the novel in a wider context, but force the reader to focus wholeheartedly on the text. To take but one example, the description of the crocodile’s teeth – as many as ‘the number of days illuminated by the god in an entire year’ (L&C 4.19.6) – is interpreted as an indication of the time it will take until the
protagonists marry (154). Which, according to ML, has already been implied by a brief mentioning of the myth of Heracles being sold to Omphale (L&C 2.6), because according to Sophocles (Trach. 253–5) he stayed there for one year (538).

Even in a compulsively allusive culture like that of the Second Sophistic, I am not convinced that such a narrative strategy would have worked. Another interpretation, one with wider implications for the overall understanding of the novel, makes me feel uneasy, namely the alleged condemnation of homosexuality (esp. 279–93, cf. also 191). I find it strange to argue for such a reading without bringing in the sociocultural context, as if the novel could exist in a vacuum with a ‘reality’ of its own, unrelated to the surrounding world (and at the same time clashing with its Platonic vein).

I would have liked to know how ML reasons about such things: the readers, the functions of literary allusion, a literary work’s relation to its sociocultural surrounding, and so on. And I would have liked clearer indications of how she relates her own interpretations to those of other scholars. Perhaps then I would have understood better the way she insists on Tatius’ novel not being a pastiche. «L’hypothèse d’un pastiche de Platon me semble réductrice et inadéquate», ML writes in her Conclusion (760), obviously referring to Morales, who has argued (against ML) that the novel is «not a straightforward vehicle for Platonic thought», but rather a «Platonic pastiche».\footnote{H. Morales in: Achilles Tatius, Leucippe and Clitophon. Translated with notes by Tim Whitmarsh, with an introduction by Helen Morales, Oxford 2001, xxi, with a reference to the dissertation of ML, Études sur le roman d’Achille Tatius, Leucippé et Clitophon (Paris 1988). Cf. also Morales, Vision and Narrative, 57–62.}

Without trying to prove either scholar right or wrong, I would like to point out that neither of them defines what they mean by the word ‘pastiche’, although Morales seems to see it as something positive and ML as something negative. I suspect that their contrary positions depend on the changing associations of the term (and the different branches of philology that they represent). Traditionally associated with plagiarism and ‘hodge-podge’, the word pastiche has been generally avoided by classical philologists (except to describe works they despise). But in modern literary criticism, the same word may carry quite different connotations: a pastiche can be seen as a playful imitation of an individual (or generic) style and thematic motifs, giving pleasure by playing on the relation between (at least) two texts. Such a pastiche is based on an intimate knowledge, even love, of the original(s), and its intent is appreciative rather than satirical (cf. 453 and n. 71).\footnote{See e.g. G. Genette, Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree, Lincoln, NE 1997 (first published in French, 1982), 82–84, who makes a clear distinction between pastiche and parody, the latter being more aggressive and having a satirical intent.}

Now, this is exactly how I understand ML’s reading of L&C: an imaginative and loving transformation, a coming together of comic poets, tragedians, and Platonic style, resulting in a lively tale filled with both irony and spoudogelaion.\footnote{7 Though possibly underestimating the importance of the spoudogelaion; cf. Morales (2004) 60, who may be underestimating the potential humour of a Platonic reading.}

The present monograph is valuable for anyone who is interested in Tatius’ novel – whether they wish to call it a pastiche or not. I would, however, take a cautious attitude toward the most laboured interpretations. Yet, I think that ML captures in her reading something of the core of L&C, and would therefore like
to end this review with her own words: «Achille Tatios se distingue par une certaine ironie ... il utilise le sophisme de l’Amour pour prouver sa divinité. Et ainsi il retrouve l’esprit de plaisanterie sérieuse qui anime bien des fables et récits de Platon.» (527)

Uppsala/Paris

Ingela Nilsson


Eine besondere Leistung des Werkes betrifft C.s geschichtliche Darstellung der Exege sie einiger für die Embryologie gewichtiger Bibelstellen, zu denen u.a. (Gen 3,21; Ex 21,22–23; Lev 17,10–14; Ijob 10,10–11; Kof 1,9–10 und 12,7; Weish 7,1–2; Jon 1,1–18 und 5,17) vor allem die Schöpfungsgeschichten in Gen 1,1–2,3 und 2,7 zu rechnen sind. Beide Passagen erweisen sich als mehrdeutig. In der ersten Passage geht es darum, ob Gottes schöpferische Aktivität nach der Ur-