

Sophocles' original play closed with Oedipus resolutely going into exile as he and the oracle had said he must.

In keeping with the goals of the series, this edition 'is intended for those studying the play both in Greek and in English', with a commentary 'based on the translation of the play rather than on its text' (48). It is not easy to serve both of those audiences at once, and this, like many Aris & Phillips editions, is of greater value to the student of Greek. The translation is intentionally 'as literal as possible, while still retaining a reasonable fluency' (48). Its close adherence to the original wording and sentence structure makes it an excellent resource for someone trying to understand Sophocles' Greek. But, as a stand-in that might convey something of the vitality and beauty of the original, it is inevitably less successful: more distance from the literal is needed to achieve that in English. It would be hard, for example, for a Greekless reader to grasp the mysterious menace of Teiresias' revelations to Oedipus from a mouthful like, 'And without realizing it, you are an enemy to your own kin in the world below and on the earth above, and a dread-footed curse, double-edged from mother and father both, shall one day drive you from this land, looking then on darkness when now you see true' (87).

March's commentary has much to offer both kinds of targeted reader, with helpful information about the play's mythological background and references, reconstructions of the staging and good observations about the development of the action and the states of mind of the characters; her own insights are supplemented by frequent quotations from other critics. But here, too, her heart is really in the Greek text, and she often discusses textual questions and matters of Greek diction and syntax. In this respect, the book is well suited to serve as the primary text in a course in which the play is introduced for the first time in Greek, especially given the idiosyncratic character of the Cambridge Green & Yellow edition by Roger Dawe (*Sophocles: Oedipus Rex* (Cambridge 1982)). But that will depend – and this is a conundrum presented by the Aris & Phillips series in general – on an instructor who is comfortable with giving their students immediate access to a translation just as they first confront the Greek text.

SHEILA MURNAGHAN

University of Pennsylvania

Email: [smurnagh@sas.upenn.edu](mailto:smurnagh@sas.upenn.edu)

MARÉCHAUX (P.) and MINEO (B.) (eds) **Plutarque et la construction de l'Histoire: entre récit historique et invention littéraire. Actes du colloque organisé les 13 et 14 mai 2016 à l'université de Nantes.** Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2020. Pp. 208. €24. 9782753580114.  
doi:[10.1017/S0075426923000368](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426923000368)

This edited volume speaks to the great popularity which Plutarch is currently enjoying: it is one of several published on his works in the last two years. Surprisingly, the two editors of this present volume are both Latinists, and not Hellenists as one might expect. Its primary theme, Plutarch and the construction of history, focuses on the tension between historical narrative and literary invention. The subject is immense and allows for the variety of approaches proposed.

The contributions to this volume touch upon three broad themes. The first, Plutarch's adaptation of his sources, is present in most of the essays but central to three in particular, which come to very different conclusions. Isabelle Pimouguet-Pédarros reads the

theatricality of the *Demetrius* as principally emanating from Plutarch's sources and therefore reflecting a historical reality, but wonders at the absence of theatrical imagery in the war scenes of the *Life*, considering its existence in other sources. The query remains unanswered. Thierry Piel proposes a reconstruction of early Roman royal history by taking into account Plutarch's narrative of the battle of Ariccia (459 BC) in the *Virtues of Women*. This essay is clearly the work of a historian and will be of special interest to those seeking to compare diverging accounts of early Roman history. Most convincing is Laurent Gourmelen's exciting essay on Plutarch's use of mythology in the *Theseus*, especially with regards to the Amazons. Gourmelen demonstrates how, despite his assertion in the proem that he will rationalize myth, Plutarch weaves elements of mythology – without seeking to historicize it – into his narrative to further illustrate Theseus' negative traits.

Secondly, this volume includes a number of essays that explore Plutarch's break with previous traditions. Alain Billaut argues that Plutarch thought to distance himself from the supremely positive image which Demosthenes had enjoyed in his afterlife by presenting the reader with an ambivalent portrait of the orator. This, however, ignores the influence of the Peripatetic tradition – very hostile to Demosthenes – on the *Life*. Gaëlle Tirel outlines the general ways in which Plutarch uses dreams to illustrate his protagonists' character and life. Plutarch's approach, she argues, diverges from the conventional ways in which dreams had been integrated into narrative from Homer onwards. The essay falls short, however, of other works on the topic (I think here of F. Braund's works, including 'The Dreams of Plutarch's Lives', *Latomus* 34 (1975), 336–49, but there are others). Jérôme Wilgaux re-contextualizes Plutarch's use of physical description within the long-standing tradition of physiognomic semiotics in antiquity. He argues that, while Plutarch did not systematically subscribe to ancient physiognomy, in some cases physical descriptions are used to contrast with the hero's inner character and in others, especially the *Alexander*, they do not even point to specific character traits.

Thirdly, this volume offers three analyses of Plutarch's exploration of the relationship between Greek and Roman cultures. Pascale Giovannelli-Jouanna outlines the parallels between Timoleon and Aemilius Paullus, especially with regard to the role of Fortune in shaping the pair. This topic, however, has already been explored with more sophistication by Douglas Cairns in 'Roman *Imperium*, Greek *Paideia*: Plutarch's Lives of *Aemilius Paullus* and *Timoleon*', *Horizons: Seoul Journal of Humanities* 5.1 (2014), 5–28. Emmanuèle Caire's excellent analysis of *philantropia* in the *Parallel Lives* demonstrates the complex attitudes of Plutarch's leaders towards this virtue and its potential to become a tool of *Realpolitik*. Her essay highlights the key differences between the Greek protagonists' embodiment of *philantropia* and the Romans' interpretation of what Plutarch considered a Hellenic virtue. Finally, Eric Guerber offers a superb examination of the similarities and differences between Plutarch and Dio of Prusa's attitude towards Roman hegemony. This essay gives us a sense of Plutarch's view of Rome, not in the past, but in his present. The comparison with Dio also serves to highlight the versatility of Greek attitudes towards Rome in the early Imperial period. This parallelism is welcome since we are often tempted to treat Plutarch as an exception rather than a remarkable voice amidst others. Where Plutarch saw Rome as the centre of a peaceful empire which the Greeks needed to navigate with caution and diplomacy, Eric Guerber argues that Dio was more critical, seeing Rome as an overlord with violent and tyrannical tendencies, inferior in its values to those upheld by the surviving Greek *poleis*.

The volume's conclusion is one we know well: Plutarch drew on many different types of sources, from myth to tragedy and history, in order to construct ambiguous and nuanced portraits of his subjects. Generally, the themes or approaches featured in these contribu-

tions are not radically new. While not all contributions impress or persuade, those that do add elegant and convincing discussions to topics that have already been opened in Plutarchan scholarship.

RAPHAËLA DUBREUIL  
Trinity College Dublin  
Email: [rjdubreuil@gmail.com](mailto:rjdubreuil@gmail.com)

MARMODORO (A.) and VILTANIOTI (I.-F.) (eds) **Divine Powers in Late Antiquity**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. Pp. xi + 288. £76.50. 9780198767206.  
doi:[10.1017/S0075426923000459](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426923000459)

Already in 2015 Anna Marmodoro (with Brian D. Prince) edited a volume entitled *Causation and Creation in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge). The title of that volume provides a clue as to what might be meant by ‘divine powers’ in the present volume. In a sense, power (Greek δύναμις, Latin *potentia*) is what makes causation possible. In the introduction to *Divine Powers in Late Antiquity*, Marmodoro and Viltanioti write: ‘When a power is exercised or manifested, this changes the causal profile of the world’ (2). Divine power, then, is power not exercised by humans or nature. To assume its existence is to assume that not everything in the universe, or indeed the universe itself, is caused by human or natural causes, but that there is a superiority, a hierarchy of being, transcendence.

The 12 contributions to this volume explore this kind of thinking in late ancient philosophy and Christianity. Six chapters are dedicated to pagan and six to Jewish and Christian themes, ranging from Plotinus to Proclus and from Philo of Alexandria to the Cappadocian Fathers. Two chapters, by Kevin Corrigan and Pauliina Remes, discuss the sources and structures of power (17–37) and human action and divine power in Plotinus (38–60). Irini-Fotini Viltanioti writes about divine powers and cult statues in Porphyry of Tyre (61–74), Peter T. Struck about divine power and human intuition in divination according to Iamblichus of Chalcis (75–87). Todd Krulak studies statue animation and divine manifestation in Proclus’ *Commentary on the Timaeus* (88–107), while Marco Antonio Santamaría Álvarez examines the transmission of divine power in the Orphic *Rhapsodies* (108–126).

Moving on to Part II, divine powers in Philo of Alexandria’s *De opificio mundi* (*On the Creation*) is Baudouin S. Decharneux’s topic, while Jonathan Hill writes about the term *dunamis* in early Christianity as the ‘self-giving power of God’. Following on from this topic, Mark Edwards explores the concept of the ‘power of God’ in a number of early Christian texts, while Ilaria L.E. Ramelli studies the concept in Origen. The volume concludes with Andrew Radde-Gallwitz’s contribution on powers and properties in Basil of Caesarea’s *Homiliae in hexaemeron* (*Homilies on the Hexaemeron*) and Anna Marmodoro’s on Gregory of Nyssa’s teaching on the creation of the world.

Given this broad range of contributions, the volume offers fascinating insights into the concept of divine power in late antiquity across philosophical and Christian thinkers. Readers today may find little therein which they deem relevant, given the fundamental changes in cosmology and anthropology since late antiquity. An analysis of human action according to Plotinus presented by Pauliina Remes in her chapter may still be considered of some use to contemporary investigations on that topic, but a discussion of Gregory of Nyssa’s conception of the creation of the world would have to take into account that Gregory’s ‘world’ and Gregory’s understanding of how it came to be might have been quite different from what is commonly thought of as ‘the universe’ today. But even stranger for