

solid historical evidence of Jewish hostility to Christians, without even once hinting at the longstanding literary tradition of this particular polemical theme.

Despite such flaws Williams has succeeded in compiling, from a variety of sources too wide and unwieldy for a beginning student, an introductory book that supplements Menachem Stern's three volumes of Greek and Latin authors on Jews and Judaism of 1974-84 by offering glimpses, however peripherally, of everyday life in the earliest centuries of the Jewish Diaspora. Her English translations are very accessible—the student is never distracted by problems of philology nor burdened with the historiographic controversies that may surround the material. The succinct bibliography is to the point and manageable, though one misses a number of titles that would have lent more depth to Williams's brief introductory analyses; important publications in Hebrew (notably Safrai's *Pilgrimage at the Time of the Second Temple* of 1965 and later [cf. entries III.34-63] and Stern's collected essays of 1991) are conspicuously absent. With the information being scattered over so many, often brief or fragmentary, sources, one misses an introductory synthesis in which the main characteristics of the Diaspora and the main points of contact and difference between East and West are summarized (a series of appendices and thematic indices only to some extent make up for this omission). Such a summary might also pay slightly more attention to Jewish life within the Palestinian homeland itself, in order to better explore the duality of Jewish existence and to better appreciate what was unique, and what was not, in the Diaspora-situation (language, the degree of Hellenization and Jewish identity) at various moments in antiquity.

University of AMSTERDAM, Juda Palache Institute

IRENE E. ZWIEP

THOMAS SCHMITZ, *Bildung und Macht. Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit* (Zetemata, 97). München, Beck, 1997. 270 pp. Pr. DM 98,—.

The Second Sophistic has not suffered from scholarly neglect during the 1990s; as Schmitz (S.) himself acknowledges in the preface of the study under review (p. 7), to come up with a new monograph on the phenomenon requires some justification. This condition is at least partly fulfilled by the fact that S. systematically employs modern social theory, viz. Bourdieu's theory of practice, in order to analyze the social and political functioning of Greek oratorical culture during the 'long'

second century A.D., from the Flavian period up to and including the Severan era (p. 33). Although in applying Bourdieuian concepts such as *habitus* and symbolic capital to the Second Sophistic S. was preceded by Maud Gleason,¹⁾ his utilization of this theoretical framework is remarkable for its thoroughness. This is linked with the fact that the focus of his study differs from Gleason's, who concentrated on the role of oratory in male socialization rather than on its function in the legitimation and reproduction of social differences and political power relations. Therefore, whereas S.'s approach is not original in the narrow sense of the word, his methodological consistency and thoroughness in themselves sufficiently justify the publication of another book on the Second Sophistic.

As is obvious from the title of S.'s study, he does not share the view—advocated by Wilamowitz and, more recently and in a mitigated version, by Brunt²⁾—that the Second Sophistic is nothing more than a Philostratan invention. While conceding that as an oratorical and literary phenomenon the declamations on historical and fictional themes characteristic of the imperial sophists portrayed by the author of the *VS* were not a novelty, he argues in the first section of the introduction (pp. 9-18) that as a *social* phenomenon Philostratus' chapter from the history of oratory is more than a chimaera. This claim is underpinned by epigraphical evidence which shows that titles such as *ῥήτωρ* and *σοφιστής* and terms such as *λόγοι* and *παιδεία* gain an unprecedented prominence in second-century honorary inscriptions.³⁾ Combined with numismatic and iconographic evidence this suffices to buttress his conclusion that "die Sophistik in der Perzeption des zweiten Jahrhunderts einen wesentlich höheren Stellenwert genießt als in der Zeit zuvor und daß hochgestellte Persönlichkeiten sich nunmehr als Sophisten betätigen" (p. 17). Incidentally, these pages illustrate another quality of S.'s study, viz. his apt handling of epigraphical evidence.

In the second section of the introduction (pp. 18-26) S. discusses several attempts to connect the oratorical and literary activities of the representatives of the Second Sophistic with contemporary social and political realities. His conclusion is that such attempts have failed to establish that the larger part of these activities had a direct socio-political function as e.g. imperial propaganda or training of future diplomats and executives. Accordingly, he considers aloofness (*'Weltabgewandtheit'*) an essential characteristic of sophistic oratory and of imperial Greek literature in general. This leaves us with the paradox of a literature created and appreciated by members of a socio-political elite but at the same time detached from socio-political reality. As S. himself points out (p. 31), it is suggestive of the viability of his theoretical approach that it offers a satisfactory solution to this paradox.

The basic assumptions of this approach are set out in the third section of the introductory chapter (pp. 26-31). In S.'s view, attempts to construct a hierarchical relationship between socio-political reality on the one hand and culture on the other should be rejected in favour of acknowledgment that the two constantly influence one another. In both fields people struggle for power; the patterns of their behaviour and their successes and failures in both fields show structural parallels, and the results of the battles waged in both fields are mutually reinforcing. However, to be effective in bolstering and legitimizing socio-political power relations, achievements in the cultural field should be presented as intrinsically valuable: it is in the interest of the socio-political and cultural elite that their culture should seem to be fully autonomous. Thus the 'Weltabgewandtheit' characteristic of sophisticated oratory and of imperial Greek literature in general was conducive rather than detrimental to its socio-political functioning. In S.'s view, this insight resulting from the model's application establishes its merits as a heuristic tool and warrants a further testing of its serviceability in analyzing the socio-political role of literary culture in the Greek world under Roman rule.

The second chapter of *Bildung und Macht*, 'Gebildete Aristokraten' (pp. 39-66), is an investigation into the function of παιδεία in legitimizing the position of civic elites in the Greek-speaking provinces of the Empire. S. correctly characterizes the political reality in the Greek cities under Roman rule as oligarchic (pp. 39-44),⁴ and then proceeds to illustrate from a wealth of literary and epigraphical evidence that cultural superiority was considered an inalienable virtue of members of imperial and civic elites which entitled them to rule over their less gifted fellow citizens (pp. 44-50). This assertion is followed by a discussion of the extent to which παιδεία could pave the way for upward social mobility (pp. 50-63). S. rightly maintains that being cultured in itself was not a sufficient condition to reach for the summits of imperial society and, following Robert Kaster's analysis of the role of education in Late Antiquity, suggests that παιδεία may rather have functioned as a 'brake on sudden, unstructured mobility'.⁵ Non-elite intellectuals could, however, make money from παιδεία, and in a brilliant piece of analysis S. argues that sophists and grammarians such as Polemo of Laodicea, Herodes Atticus, and Alexander of Cottiaenum dissociated themselves from their less privileged colleagues either by renouncing their fees or by charging outrageous sums, thus demonstrating beyond reasonable doubt that their dedication to literary culture had nothing to do with the need to make a living. Whereas theoretically the possession of παιδεία was inextricably linked with social eminence, in reality oratorical skills were unequally divided among

members of civic elites. Consequently, in practice a certain amount of division of labour was inevitable. In the final section of the second chapter (pp. 63-66), S. argues that such a division of labour was functional: the masters of sophistic oratory epitomized the cultural superiority of their class, just as large-scale benefactors exemplified its generosity.

The third chapter, 'Die zweite Sophistik und das Ideal der Sprachreinheit' (pp. 67-96), describes the set of linguistic and stylistic phenomena known as Atticism, and analyzes their social function in securing a 'profit of distinction' for those who were in the position to purge their usage of non-Attic blemishes. S. defends the reality of Atticism against the attempt by Higgins to question its existence (pp. 67-75),⁶ and shows how in second-century Greek society having command of the artificial Atticist language was considered tantamount to being cultured and belonging to the upper class (pp. 75-91). Members of the lower orders, on the other hand, were effectively excluded from public discourse: their political and economic impotence was symbolically reproduced in their inability to speak properly (pp. 91-96).

The fourth chapter, 'Das Streben nach Distinktion als Konstante der Gesellschaft der Kaiserzeit' (pp. 97-135), investigates the place of παιδεία in intra-elite rivalry. Although S. correctly observes that civic munificence was the most important battleground for φιλοτιμία (97-101), he presents convincing literary and epigraphical evidence for his contention that literary culture served as an arena for competitive aristocrats too (pp. 101-110). Cultural competition was not confined to the ubiquitous festivals, though. Sophistic declamations (which were more often than not followed by fierce debates among the connoisseurs about the performer's merits) should be regarded as 'implizite Wettkampfsituationen' (pp. 110-127), and a dinner party discussion might offer the host and his guests a splendid opportunity to test each other's cultural competence—or to revel in their common cultural superiority (pp. 127-133). As S. notes in the chapter's final section (pp. 133-135), παιδεία was also a centripetal force: after all, it was the elite's common ground that was marked out as a battleground for intra-elite competition.

In the fifth chapter, 'Eine aristokratische Bildung' (pp. 136-159), S. attempts to get a grip on the second-century perception of what it meant to be a πεπαιδευμένος. Using honorary inscriptions as his main evidence, he demonstrates how παιδεία was presented as part of a person's ἀρετή, an innate quality rather than a result of prolonged exertions (pp. 136-146). The prominence of this 'essentialist' concept of παιδεία finds confirmation in the disapproval of the ὀψιμαθής, the man who lacks both an adequate education and the right attitude towards culture (pp. 146-152). Unfortunately our evidence is insufficient to answer the question whether this despicable character to be found in

literary texts corresponded to a historical reality: it is possible that, as a cultural antihero, the ὄψιμαθής was an invented character (pp. 152-156). This does not, however, affect his usefulness as an aid in delineating the elite's self-perception: "Im Gegensatz zum ὄψιμαθής hatte der ideale πεπαιδευμένος seine Bildung gewissermaßen schon mit der Muttermilch eingesogen" (p. 156). In the chapter's final section (pp. 156-159), S. makes the attractive suggestion that the importance attached by sophists to extemporizing should be understood as an expression of this concept of παιδεία.

The sixth chapter, 'Der Sophist und sein Publikum' (pp. 160-196), focuses on the interaction between the πεπαιδευμένοι and their audiences. S. holds that the sophists found their listeners not only among fellow members of the elites, but also among the urban public at large. Although the discussion leading up to this conclusion (pp. 160-175) is balanced enough, some doubt remains as to the evidence that S. adduces. Dio Chrysostom's *Alexandrian oration* (or. 32) is not a declamation but an address to an assembly, and when Aristides in a polemical setting refers to his appeal to the masses (or. 34.42), the context likewise suggests an ἐκκλησία or a πανήγυρις rather than an audience gathered to witness a μελέτη. Of course, the leopard cannot change his spots: sophists or other oratorically competent members of the elite addressing political or festive gatherings reproduced many of the features characteristic of the ubiquitous μελέται. Nevertheless, I think that it is useful, or rather necessary, to distinguish those branches of oratory from sophistic declamations. Panegyric and symbouleutic oratory had direct social and political purposes which were absent in the case of purely sophistic performances.⁷⁾ Given the importance attached by S. to the aloofness of sophistic oratory for its social functioning, one would expect him to differentiate more rigorously between declamations on the one hand and orations before an audience expecting advice or at least edification from the speaker on the other.⁸⁾

The above criticism does not imply that S.'s observations on the strategies used by public speakers to win the goodwill of their audiences are mistaken. One of these strategies was to enable the listeners to mobilize their cultural luggage, modest as it might be. S. argues that to appeal to their pride in being Hellenes was another one, and accordingly the second half of the sixth chapter (pp. 175-196) focuses on attempts to provide the citizens of Greek cities in the Roman empire with a spiritual 'Heimat' through a culturally defined Hellenism, through local mythical traditions, and through Atticism. In spite of S.'s competent description of these phenomena, it is at this point that the limitations of his theoretical approach become manifest. Of course, he is perfectly right in pointing out that civic elites reinforced their author-

ity by controlling these 'identitätsstiftende Faktoren'. Neither is he wrong in rejecting attempts to interpret each and every affirmation of Greekness as an expression of 'geistige Widerstand gegen Rom'. The perceptive reader of imperial Greek literature, however, can hardly fail to notice symptoms of a certain tension between loyalty to Rome on the one hand and the allegiance to a Greek identity rooted in the Classical past on the other. As an ideology of the elites of the eastern provinces of the Roman empire, Hellenism was a more problematic affair than is allowed for by S.'s emphasis on the communicative function of appeals to the audiences' Greekness as a *captatio benevolentiae*.

Accordingly, S.'s admission that Greek cultural superiority also functioned as compensation for the absence of political glory (p. 181) attests his intellectual honesty rather than the merits of his theoretical approach. The function of Second Sophistic culture as a medium for the expression of *Greek* elite identity seems to be in need of a separate analysis and does not deserve wholesale subordination to its role in the formation and expression of Greek *elite* identity.⁹⁾ The 'Weltabgewandtheit' of Greek imperial literature in general and of sophistic oratory in particular, analyzed by S. as integral to the presentation of literary culture as 'autonomous' and, therefore, conducive to its functioning as a legitimation of socio-political relations and as a strategy of social distinction, also permits another interpretation. Such an interpretation should reckon with the fact that, in form and content, sophistic oratory reproduced and played variations on what once had been an art of political persuasion in externally independent and internally democratic Greek *poleis*. After all, Aelius Aristides (*or.* 2.430 Behr/Lenz) presents the political aloofness of his oratory as a consequence of a change in political circumstances, while Lucian (*Rh.Pr.* 10) has his bad teacher of oratory raise the question what is the use of emulating Demosthenes and Aeschines "in times of peace, when no Philip is making raids and no Alexander issuing orders." In this connection, Swain's observation that historical themes seem to have been "more usual than purely fictional ones in public performances"¹⁰⁾ is telling, as are the equations made by imperial Greek authors of the prestige resulting from literary and oratorical activities with glory earned by political and military achievements.¹¹⁾ In combination, such data indicate that the autonomous field of literary and especially oratorical culture also provided members of the Greek elites under Roman rule with a sanctuary in which they could relive the glories of the past. The situation has been aptly characterized by Swain: "Historical declamations allowed the elite not only to practise as leaders but to practise as the leaders of the great age of Greece."¹²⁾

In the penultimate chapter, 'Typische Kommunikationssituationen'

(pp. 197-231), the performances of famous sophists and the role of sophists and other intellectuals in forging links between cities allegedly related to each other by ties of kinship pass in review (pp. 198-219), and the way in which power relations became manifest in such situations is examined. The one-sided character of the communication reflected the unequal distribution of communicative competence which, in turn, reproduced the highly asymmetrical distribution of social and political power (pp. 209-214). At the same time, the expectations of the listeners in general and of fellow members of the elites in particular put the public speaker in a delicate position (pp. 214-220), as did the demands of the cultural tradition within which he operated. Nevertheless, the rules of the contest for symbolic profit and symbolic power, restrictive as they may have been for individuals, were such that as members of a ruling elite the competitors were bound to win (pp. 220-231).

The final chapter, 'Ergebnisse' (pp. 232-234), emphasizes the status of the phenomena under discussion as elements of a *system* directed towards the cultural reproduction of power relations. Although S. acknowledges that lack of evidence often makes it impossible to corroborate his findings empirically, he discovers a certain amount of confirmation in the parallels between the social functioning of elite munificence and of elite culture. Consultation of the book is facilitated by a general index, an index of Greek key words and an *index locorum*. The bibliography is a valuable tool for further research in itself; its exhaustive character is illustrated by the fact that it lists even publications in Dutch.

On balance, it should be said that *Bildung und Macht* has a number of noteworthy merits which certainly outweigh its weaker points. Not only does S. offer a well-argued affirmation of the reality of the phenomenon labelled by Philostratus as the 'Second Sophistic', he also presents a convincing interpretation of the aloofness of Greek literary culture under the High Empire. This interpretation directly results from the application of Bourdieu's theory of practice, and the same is true of S.'s excellent exposition of the 'essentialist' concept of being cultured prevailing among members of the Greek elites during the period under discussion. The chapters on Atticism and on intra-elite competition are persuasive as well. In dealing with the Second Sophistic as a medium for expressing Greekness, however, S. is more or less let down by his theoretical tools, and the undeniable quality of his treatment of this aspect of Second Sophistic culture actually results from his willingness to look beyond the confines of his model. Besides, his discussion of the interaction between sophists and their listeners remains problematic in that it lumps together sophistic declamations and forms

of oratory less remarkable for 'Weltabgewandtheit', and in that it rests on the unproven assumption that sophists succeeded in reaching mass audiences with their declamations. S. himself holds that sophists were constrained by the ideals of their own class even more than by the expectations of the public at large (p. 218). Perhaps we should conclude that, as a justification of social and political inequalities, sophistic oratory was directed at members of the elites in the Greek cities in the Roman empire themselves rather than at their underprivileged fellow citizens.¹³⁾

The above comments should be interpreted as a tribute to the penetrating and thought-provoking character of the study under review. S.'s command of a stunning range of ancient evidence, both literary and epigraphical, is as admirable as his methodological consistency is courageous. Even if one feels that at some points a more eclectic approach might have given better results, the advantage of S.'s theoretical rigour is that it enables his readers to form a full picture of the possibilities *and* the limitations of the application of his chosen model to the Second Sophistic. In short, *Bildung und Macht* is obligatory reading for anyone interested in the Greek world under the High Empire.

1081 HV AMSTERDAM, Vrije Universiteit,
Faculteit der Letteren, De Boelelaan 1105

JAAP-JAN FLINTERMAN

1) M.W. Gleason, *Making men*. Sophists and self-presentation in ancient Rome (Princeton, New Jersey 1995). Cf. my review of this study, *Mnemosyne* 52 (1999), 229-233.

2) U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Asianismus und Attizismus*, *Hermes* 35 (1900), 1-52, esp. 12 ff.; P.A. Brunt, *The bubble of the Second Sophistic*, *BICS* 39 (1994), 25-52, at 37.

3) As S. in this connection generously refers to relevant publications of the present reviewer, it seems only fair to point out that I followed K. Goudriaan, *Over classicisme*. Dionysius van Halicarnassus en zijn program van welsprekendheid, cultuur en politiek (Amsterdam 1989), 51-61, esp. 59 f.: "De stroom epigrafische vermeldingen van sofisten begint ongeveer op het tijdstip waarop Philostratus de tweede sofistiek laat beginnen." Cf. S. Swain, *Hellenism and empire*. Language, classicism, and power in the Greek world AD 50-250 (Oxford 1996), 99 with n. 96.

4) In spite of the fact that, as S. notes (p. 39), the constitutions of Greek cities in the Roman empire were labelled by most contemporaries as 'democracies'. Aristid., *or.* 26.60, referred to by S. in this connection, is not very helpful as this passage does not pertain to civic constitutions but to the political structure of the empire; for references to more relevant evidence see Swain, *Hellenism and empire*, 72, 173, and 281 f. with n. 107. A comparable misunderstanding can be found at p. 42: contrary to what S. implies, Aristides' words τὸς μὲν ἀρίστους καὶ πάλαι ἡγεμόνας (*or.* 26.96) do not refer to civic aristocracies but to Athens and Sparta. Neither case affects the validity of the claims for which the passages under discussion are adduced as evidence. Now that I am splitting hairs, I might just as well point out that, contrary to what S. seems to believe (p. 25), Antipater of

Hierapolis did not owe his consular status to a consulship but to an *adlectio inter consulares*, see Philostr., *VS* 607: Ὑπάτοις δὲ ἐγγραφεῖς ἦρξε μὲν τοῦ τῶν Βιθυνῶν ἔθνους.

5) S.'s quotation (p. 63) is from R.A. Kaster, *Guardians of language. The grammarians and society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley 1988), 30.

6) M.J. Higgins, *The renaissance of the first century and the origin of Standard Late Greek*, *Traditio* 3 (1945), 49-100.

7) On the social and political functions of panegyric oratory see L. Pernot, *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain* (Paris 1993), esp. 710-724; cf. the review of this study by D.M. Schenkeveld, *Mnemosyne* 50 (1997), 86-89.

8) It is confusing to lump together μελέται and epideictic orations, as S. does on p. 19. Apparently, he uses the adjective 'epideictic' in this connection to denote texts such as Lucian's Μυίας ἐγκώμιον. However, 'epideictic' is also the term used to designate the third branch of oratory in general, and many orations falling within this category had clear social and political functions: they served, among other things, to reaffirm and to recreate the consensus around dominant values (thus Pernot, *La rhétorique de l'éloge*, 720).

9) Bourdieu is not very interested in ethnicity, as has been pointed out by, among others, J.B. Thompson, 'Editor's introduction', in: P. Bourdieu, *Language and symbolic power*. Edited and introduced by John B. Thompson (Cambridge 1991), 30.

10) Swain, *Hellenism and empire*, 95.

11) See e.g. Aristid., *or.* 50.49; *Ar., An.* 1.12.5; cf. J.J. Flinterman, *Power, Paideia & Pythagoreanism. Greek identity, conceptions of the relationship between philosophers and monarchs, and political ideas in Philostratus' Life of Apollonius* (Amsterdam 1995), 45-51, esp. 51.

12) Swain, *Hellenism and empire*, 92.

13) Cf. S.'s observation on p. 44: "Wenn Macht nicht (...) als reine Gewalt- oder Willkürherrschaft auftritt, so müssen diejenigen, die einen Machtanspruch stellen, ihn auch begründen—zum einen vor den Beherrschten, zum anderen (und hier vielleicht in noch höherem Maße), vor sich selbst [my italics, jif]."

RICHARD DUNCAN-JONES, *Money and Government in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge, University Press, 1998. (Pb. edition.) XIX, 300 p. £ 19,95.

It will be recalled that "money makes the world go around", a truism memorably articulated into song by Sally Bowles/Liza Minelli in the film *Cabaret*. However, you might be forgiven for assuming that the coined variety, at least, did not make its advent nor its presence much felt until the modern era, so seldom does this commodity seem to warrant good discussion in written works about Greco-Roman civilisation. Richard Duncan-Jones has had the presence of mind to bring to the forefront the role of money in the administration of the Roman empire, between the principate of Augustus and the murder of Severus Alexander.

In the body of this volume the title is reversed, as it were, as the author grapples first with the methods by which the Roman government secured a reasonably steady flow into its treasury, and the ways