

Świderek, Anna

"Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus", I-II,
Carl Schneider, München 1967-1969 :
[recenzja]

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 18, 281-295

1974

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez **Muzeum Historii Polski** w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

REVIEW OF BOOKS

Carl Schneider, *Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus*, I—II, C. H. Beck, München 1967—1969.

This imposing book by C. Schneider presents us with a comprehensive picture of the culture of Hellenism, an epoch whose role in the history of mankind no one today will attempt to diminish. This attempt to cover such a large canvas was undoubtedly a gigantic task. The first difficulty every author inevitably encounters when constructing a work of this kind is the necessity of deciding what to include in the history of culture, and what attitude to take to political history. This last problem in particular is one that generally constitutes a stumbling-block to those who would write a history of culture. Authors generally either avoid the question altogether, by referring the reader to the appropriate textbooks or monographs, or at best summarise the most important events in a brief and inevitably more or less sketchy introductory chapter. An additional hurdle which the writer on the Hellenistic world has to cross is the very diversity of that world. The simplest, but not altogether the happiest solution to these problems is for the author to devote each of the successive chapters to a different sphere of culture — for example literature, philosophy, art, science, etc. But the price he must pay for doing so is that the subject of his discourse then deals with more or less abstract phenomena which never existed in that form in the real world at all, and that the entire cultural life of Athens or Alexandria or Pergamon, which was a living, single-functioning organism, becomes lost from sight. Schneider's great merit is that, owing to the originality of his conception of his book, he was able to avoid both the Scylla and Charybdis of these difficulties.

Volume I begins with two introductory chapters, which are followed by imposing Ch. III (pp. 159—977!) entitled *Der Raum der hellenistischen Kultur. Reiche, Länder, Städte*. In this tremendous chapter the author takes us on a tour of the entire Hellenistic world, recounting to us the history of every city, every province, every kingdom in succession, practically without once repeating himself! He gives us a wide panorama of the material culture, the archaeological discoveries, the architecture, art, literature, science, and philosophy. A most laudable feature of the book is that its subject is treated historic-

ally, not statically. In Vol. II the arrangement is different, being based rather on concrete topics. Chapter IV, for instance, deals with the culture of everyday life (*Die Kultur des hellenistischen Alltags*). Chapter V is devoted to particular spheres of civilisation (*Die objektiven Ausprägungen der hellenistischen Kultur*), while the last chapter, Chapter VI, attempts to distinguish periods. At the end of the book we have an index, and also a bibliography for the various chapters. This list is of course not an exhaustive one, and is largely a repetition of the bibliographical notes given in the footnotes under the text. Another point to note is that at the very beginning of Volume I there is a long list of abbreviations used by the author (it is perhaps to be regretted that the universally accepted papyrological abbreviations have been replaced in some cases by much more complicated ones, such as the abbreviation "Preisigke-Bilabel" instead of "SB", etc.).

This huge work is not merely the outcome of Schneider's labours, but also the issue of his passion. We find a confession of this passion, and at the same time a clarion call to the reader, on both the first and the last page (I, p. VII: "Das Buch möchte... auf Grund des Quellenmaterials das Wesentliche dieser Epoche darstellen und Liebe zu ihr und ihren Menschen erwecken"; II, p. 988 — the last sentence of the book — "Aber man muss ihn [den Hellenismus] lieben, um ihn zu verstehen"). It is the author's desire that his book be read as a whole, not merely dipped into. He warns the reader that it was not his intention to write a textbook, or an encyclopaedia which could be referred to from time to time — in a word, to create what the Germans call a "Nachschlagwerk" (I, p. VII). This, however, in my opinion he has not been able to avoid. For the book is too big, too rich in detail and, what is more, entirely bereft of illustrations! This last shortcoming was due to weighty technical reasons — namely, illustrations would have added considerably to the length of an already long book, and no doubt would also have added to its price. On the other hand, owing to the complete absence of illustrations the book's circle of readers will probably be confined to specialists on the ancient world who will use this book to look up on questions that happen to interest them at a given moment, and who will manage to find the appropriate illustrations (which are generally indicated in the footnotes) for themselves. This deficiency is felt in some parts of the book more than in others. Certain parts of Chapter IV, for instance, which is concerned with matters of everyday life, cry out for drawings at the very least. How otherwise is it possible to discuss the plans of dwelling-houses or other buildings, or clothes or jewellery? Chapter III, too, which is such an extensive and valuable one, loses a great deal through not being supplied with appropriate maps or even sketches, and especially photographs of the landscape.

In his account of the history of Hellenistic culture, Schneider tends to treat the whole of Hellenism as primarily a cultural phenomenon, even although

he criticizes Burckhardt's definition (cited in the very first sentence of his book) of Hellenism as "die grosse Verwandlung des Hellenismus aus einer politischen in eine Kulturpotenz" (I, p. 2). It is this tendency that permeates Chapter II, which (following a consideration of "pre-Hellenistic Hellenism" in Chapter I) the author devotes to those problems which he calls "die allgemeinen Grundlagen der hellenistischen Kultur". Yet Schneider does not take the economic and political conditions of the new world as the "general foundations of the Hellenistic culture" but other spheres which we would be inclined to regard as the consequences of those circumstances, namely, the character and mentality of Hellenistic man, the position of woman, language, and, further, what we might term man's environment: townlife, education, and finally (which is perhaps to some degree an outcome of that environment) the attitude of Hellenistic man to nature. The book abounds in interesting, original, and sometimes extremely telling observations (e.g. the author's remarks on psychology on p. 52, or on the change in what he calls "der agonale Wesenzug" on p. 55, where we read: "an die Stelle des Agon trat der Wettbewerb", which means that now men competed with each other no longer "um das Beste zu sein", but "im Hellenismus rang man meist, um der Erste zu sein").

Why does Schneider give prominence to those factors in particular, as the "general foundations" of the Hellenistic culture? Obviously to Schneider "Hellenismus" is only one stage in the evolution of Greek culture — a culture which grew and flourished in complete isolation, independently of all economic, social and political changes, and finally triumphed over all alien influences, a victorious culture, undefiled and unadulterated by any impurities from the East. Along with the tendency described here, which infiltrates the whole of Schneider's book, is linked a very marked idealisation of all that is Hellenistic, and especially Early Hellenistic (cf. II, p. 988: "Fast alles was es seither in Guten, Schönen und Grossen in der Welt gibt, steht in Zusammenhang mit dem Hellenismus") — both the period itself and various individuals who lived in it, and diverse aspects of the period. At the same time Schneider feels a strong dislike for other people (generally arbitrarily chosen ones), and above all for Rome and the Romans. Here are several of the more blatant examples of this tendency:

In a fine section on the language of the Hellenistic period (I, pp. 117—126), we find a charming apologia of *koine* (pp. 118—119). It must be stressed, however, that although the relative purity of *koine* as compared with borrowings from the Greek that have appeared in other languages is certainly marked, nevertheless its "Greekness", which was so lauded by Schneider, and its resistance to foreign accretions, are not all so absolute as he would have us believe, as everyone who has ever read papyrus documents written in frequently very bad and too-Egyptian Greek will admit! In a somewhat later passage, discussing the question of Hellenistic education, Schneider makes the very apt observation that Hellenism was the first culture to "discover" and fuss over the child (I,

pp. 131ff.). He quite unnecessarily tries to prove, on the other hand, that the custom of exposing children was much more rarely practised than one would be led to think from the new comedy. We surely cannot believe him, either, when he says that warm feelings between father and son were first observed in Hellenistic times; as a matter of fact he himself refers to Xenophon in this matter (pp. 132—133; see also the defence of Hellenistic customs in Vol. II, p. 979). His picture of the women of early Hellenistic times is particularly idealised. Women are supposed to have saved Greek culture from being inundated in Utopianism and amorphism. In Schneider's view the women of those days were completely different from those of later times ("nicht die Herrscherinnen des Hochhellenismus oder gar die rein sinnlichen Aphroditen des Späthellenismus", II, p. 969). His ideal woman, for example, is Arsinoe II (for a description of whom see I, pp. 83—86). Yet there are absolutely no grounds for thinking that when Arsinoe was hiding from Keraunos on Samothrace, she found there not only a safe refuge, but also an "inner strength", nor for believing, as Schneider does, that she certainly did not ("auf keinen Fall") contribute to Ptolemy II's expulsion of his first wife. Again, it is surely quite fallacious to suppose, as Schneider does, that the Egyptians paid the tax called *apomoirā* more willingly when it became allocated to the cult of the deified deceased Arsinoe (see also II, p. 898 and 954—955). It is difficult to understand why, when he is such a great admirer of Arsinoe II (he attributes to her, quite unjustifiably, the merit of carrying out great irrigation schemes at Fayum — not drainage schemes as he reports), he has such a dislike of her mother, Berenice I, who of course was also one of the early Hellenistic women. But Schneider denounces her roundly for her "intrigues", which, in his opinion, in the end led the old Ptolemy I to abdicate the throne in favour of Philadelphus (I, p. 82), whereas in actual fact this move (which was really not so much an abdication as an act co-opting Philadelphus to co-regency) was simply the only way Ptolemy could ensure that the throne would go not to his oldest son, but to the youngest one.

According to Schneider, even the early Hellenistic wars were different from later ones. As far as we are concerned, of course, it is difficult to believe Schneider when he says that in actual fact in the fratricidal wars between the Greeks in the 3rd century B.C. the ideal of liberty was more important than land, or spoils of war or economic advantage (I, p. 56). For after all it was not the question of liberty which set the Diadochs, and afterwards the rulers of the various Hellenistic states, at conflict with each other. Yet Schneider comes back to this theme again in Vol. II, in describing the Hellenistic soldier. He also asserts that to begin with all the wars were "chivalrous", and were waged for noble purposes ("entweder die Macht zu gewinnen oder aus Freude am Wagnis oder im Erinnerung an die grossen Zeiten des Alexanderzuges",

II, p. 111), and that it was only towards the end of the 3rd century that morals began to go down (II, p. 124).

The Hellenistic kings are idealised, too. The author declares that these sovereigns were firmly convinced that "law rules the ruler", and he asserts that for this reason they "hesitated" to issue laws, and so only issued ordinances and wrote letters (II, p. 490). Some of the author's favourites are portrayed as heroes without blemish, whose every action was motivated by some ideal. Attalus I (I, p. 633), and above all Ptolemy I and III, belong to this group. As for Ptolemy I (Ch. I, pp. 499—501), it should be noted that contrary to what Schneider believes, the seizure of Alexander the Great's body was primarily a deed of political significance, whereas the return of prisoners and spoils to Demetrius after the Battle of Gaza was a skilful diplomatic move. Neither is there anything to prove that Ptolemy I (or any of his successors) "took the Hellenomemphitai under his protection". Then Schneider calls Ptolemy III Euergetes the "best of the Ptolemies" — we do not quite know why, and in the author's description of this rule (I, p. 515) we find the following surprising and ungrounded statements: "Vor allem verwirklichte er zur Freude vieler griechischer Städte sein Ideal der Kalokagathie und Mässigung im dritten syrischen Krieg", and "Der Zurückhaltung des Königs entsprach die Ablehnung des Herrscherkultes für sich selbst"; the first of these statements is completely incomprehensible, for we have no idea what Greek cities are mentioned here, nor how the king gave proof of his nobility of feeling; the second statement of course is fallacious, for Ptolemy III was worshipped in his lifetime as the *theos Euergetes*, and never rejected that cult.

Another thing which Schneider idealises is the administration of Ptolemaic Egypt. Yet despite, his suggestions no one ever thought of ensuring that the "Egyptian farmer" had a quiet and peaceful life (I, p. 457). Moreover, the frequent amnesty decrees are no proof at all that the State administration was successful in "keeping the peace" (I, p. 456), or that the State authorities wanted to aid the hired workers (II, pp. 84—85).

Whereas he idealises some individuals, or groups, or institutions, or phenomena, Schneider is also ready with criticism of others, and not always justified criticism at that. For instance, it is a mystery why he thinks that Dioecetes Apollonius was "dishonest and greedy" (I, p. 450), or why, a little further on, he even says that Apollonius and his closest collaborator Zenon were both "brutal egoists and materialists" (I, p. 504). But the author's greatest antipathy is reserved for the Romans: all of them, according to him, were robbers and destroyers (see I, pp. 326, 341, and especially p. 974: his opinion of Aemilius Paullus). Then again, according to Schneider, the Greeks were against having children because they did not want them to end up as Roman slaves (II, p. 979). He draws a contrast between the "free will" ("freie Wille") with which the

“entire world” (“die ganze Welt”) adopted the Greek laws, and the “compulsion” (“Zwang”) with which the world was forced to adopt Roman law — he forgets that in the eastern Hellenistic monarchies it would be hard to see any evidence of this “free will” (II, p. 489). In his dislike of the Romans, Schneider even goes so far as to speak of their religious pressure (II, p. 772), which of course is simply not true. For where and when did the “Roman conquerors deprive the Greeks not only of their freedom and their property, but of their gods as well”? The fact that statues of the gods were carried off to Rome was undoubtedly a case of plunder of works of art, but after all the result was that the Greek gods acquired new worshippers. Schneider’s hatred of the Romans is so marked that it makes him attribute to them the kind of behaviour which was absolutely foreign to their mentality.

This tendency to interpret Hellenism as a purely Greek culture has had a particularly unfortunate effect on his account of Greek religion. Schneider states that in the late Hellenistic period one should not speak of syncretism at all — but only of “interpretatio”. Even the cult of Artemis of Ephesus, in his view, is altogether Greek (“nichts zwingt dazu, fremde Einflüsse anzunehmen”, II, p. 792). He also thinks that the strengthening of the position of the Egyptians in Egypt in the 2nd century B.C. hindered syncretism there, for the Greek rulers had to construct temples to the Egyptian gods and finance the cult of these gods (II, p. 771). Clearly, however, Schneider has forgotten that the Ptolemies had already built such temples in the 3rd century B.C. (one of the greatest temple builders was Ptolemy III Euergetes). Nor does he think that eastern religion had any impact on the development of Hellenistic thought; according to him, Hellenism’s reversion from science to religion was due solely to Stoicism and Platonism (II, p. 581). A completely Greek phenomenon, in his eyes, was the Hellenistic king-worship, which he describes as “ein grossartiger Versuch, die auffällige historische Erscheinung so vieler übermenschlicher Gestalten religiös zu verstehen und zu verfassen” (II, p. 905), forgetting that this was a cult nearly always imposed by the kings themselves, for very diverse reasons (among which political reasons were by no means of the least importance).

In the final outcome, Schneider believes, Hellenism brought complete victory to Greek culture both over the Latin world and over the entire East (especially in its latest period, lasting for the years 146—30 B.C., which the author calls “Späthellenismus”, II, p. 983). This statement taken as a whole is too categorical, and as far as the fate of Hellenism in the east is concerned, even untrue. In Ptolemaic Egypt, for instance, Schneider finds only Hellenised Egyptians between the “pure” Greeks and Macedonians and the “pure” Egyptians (II, pp. 495—497), whereas in actual fact this was the very place where the Greeks themselves became greatly egyptianised, and gradually melted into the mass of Greco-Egyptians. The Roman administration alone halted

this process, namely by granting certain social and taxation privileges to people who had passed through the Greek gymnasium. This ensured the survival of Greek culture in Egypt for several centuries more. Schneider moreover exaggerates the extent to which the Egyptian people were hellenised: it is simply not true that the "simple Egyptian peasant" was able to read and write Greek, and that "everybody" wrote letters (I, p. 477), and in actual fact it would have been impossible to find a Greek library in "the smallest Egyptian villages", as Schneider asserts (I, p. 967). On the other hand, one should not underestimate the strength of Egyptian cultural influences: for despite what Schneider says (I, p. 497) we also have Greek texts translated or adapted from the Egyptian, as for example the *Potter's Prophecy*. Nor are there any grounds for accepting nor for rejecting Schneider's view that even those Greeks who mummified their dead did not adopt "Egyptian religious ideas" (II, p. 984).

Following along those lines, Schneider holds that the decline of culture in Ptolemaic Egypt began when the Egyptians came into prominence in connection with the war against Antiochus III ("Aufstieg der Ägypter" I, p. 517, cf. p. 519), for according to him the decline of culture is synonymous with the disappearance or weakening of Greek elements (I, p. 523). It is not surprising, then, that he regards as Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II's most serious crime the fact that he relied on the support of the Egyptians (I, pp. 525—526).

In such an extensive work, covering such a wide field and dealing with nearly every part or parcel of human life, some errors of fact, or inaccuracies, are inevitable. No doubt every expert in the field would point out different ones. Here, at any rate, are several observed by the reviewer:

In imposing Ch. III (*Der Raum der hellenistischen Kultur. Reiche, Länder, Städte*), the author takes us on a tour of the whole of Greece proper, as well as Macedonia, Epirus, Athamania and Illyria, the islands in the Aegean, the Africa of the Ptolemies, the Asia of the Seleucids and the Attalids as far as the Tigris, the lands on the Black Sea coast, Galatia, Cappadocia, Commagene and Armenia, other lands of Hellenistic Asia, and Palestine, finally coming back to western Hellenism and the question of the impact of Hellenistic culture on the non-Greek peoples of the west. Schneider offers the reader a colourful panorama of life in all corners of the Hellenistic world. While devoting most attention to architecture and art, he is not forgetful of literature, philosophy and religion, and into his story he also weaves something of the political history, in so far as he deems it necessary to give a true understanding of the whole. It is here that the greatest number of trifling errors occur. For instance, Brennus was beaten in 279 B.C. by the Greeks, but not by Antigonus Gonatas. The latter routed the Gauls (not Brennus) at Lysimachia two years later (I, p. 270). When describing Hellenistic Athens, whose cultural role in the 2nd c. B.C. is admirably outlined (e.g. p. 183), the author is somewhat confused in his account of the political events (e.g. p. 180). He seems to be somewhat

lost here, for he apparently has the impression that the famous hymn to Demetrius Poliorcetes sung in 289 B.C. (Ath. VI 253 b—f) was principally directed against the piety of Demetrius of Phaleron (I, p. 174), yet the latter had already been driven from Athens in 307 B.C.! There is also a surprising statement that “the most important ports of Caria were in the hands of the Ptolemies from 247 B.C. onwards” (I, p. 707). In footnote 1 on this same page the author cites the Zenon Archive, whereas in actual fact the documents of this very archive prove that Caria was subordinate to Egypt at a much earlier date (see also Theocr. XVII 89). Partly because this is the reviewer’s special subject, and partly because of the wealth of papyrus documents, the bulk of the criticism in this review is directed against the section dealing with Ptolemaic Egypt. For instance, Demetrius of Phaleron was, it is true, compelled to leave Athens in 307 B.C., but arrived in Alexandria not in this same year (as is given in Schneider’s book, I, p. 500), but much later. Again, Ptolemy II, neither during his lifetime nor after his death, was ever called *theos Philadelphos* (I, p. 514). It is not sure, either, that Ptolemy I or Ptolemy II already adopted the Egyptian coronation ritual (“das pharonische Krönungsritual” I, p. 492), since the available evidence indicates that Ptolemy V (or at the earliest Ptolemy IV) was the first to have himself crowned at Memphis according to the Egyptian ritual. A little further (I, p. 493, see also II, p. 896), in speaking of the gradual but steady growth of king-worship, Schneider seems to have forgotten that even Ptolemy II introduced the cult of his own person while still alive (*theoi adelphoi*). In a description of Fayum (I, p. 560), we read that from the 12th dynasty onwards the Pharaohs took special care of this nome. But this not so. For the Pharaohs of the 12th dynasty were the only ones who looked after Fayum. Later on it became neglected and gradually went into a decline which lasted till the time of the first Ptolemies. A clear misrepresentation of the facts occurs in footnote 2 on p. 562 (I), where we read: “Zenonpapyri aus Philadelpheia sind gesammelt bei Preisigke-Bilabel III etc.”, whereas the true state of affairs is that only a few documents from the Zenon Archive have been reprinted there. The papers belonging to this archive have been published principally in: C. C. Edgar, *Zenon Papyri I—V*, Cairo 1925—1940; *Publicazioni Società Italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto* (PSI) IV, 321—432, V 482—548, VI 551—682, VII 854—869, VIII 975—976, IX 1001—1010, Firenze 1917—1929; C. C. Edgar, *Zenon Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection*, Ann Arbor 1931; W. L. Westermann *et al.*, *Zenon Papyri. Business Papers of the Third Century B.C. Dealing with Palestine and Egypt. Columbia Papyri I—II*, New York 1934, 1940. It is also an error to say that Apollonius, after being dismissed (“Entlassung” I, p. 562) still had any business in Philadelphia. It is also perhaps worth pointing out that the documents from Tebtunis, published by van Groningen (*A Family Archive from Tebtunis*), which are referred to on p. 565 (I), date from Roman

times, and not, as Schneider declares, from the Ptolemaic period. As a matter of fact lack of proper papyrological information is frequently evident in this book. For example in footnote 1, I p. 17 the author quotes a book by R. A. P a c k, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*, in the out-of-date 1952 edition, whereas a second edition was published in 1965. In I, p. 86 we have another mistake: Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy II, was according to Schneider given in marriage to Antioch II "in 248/7 or earlier", whereas PCZ 59251 permits us to date this marriage on 252. Then again in I, p. 126 we find the sentence: "jedes kleine Fayumsstädtchen legte grössten Wert darauf, nicht Dorf, sondern Stadt zu sein" — again an error, since in Fayum there were only villages — even Krokodilopolis, the capital of Fayum, being a village from the legal and administrative point of view.

A disturbing feature of the book is that the author repeatedly states an authoritative view on controversial matters without bothering to give the reasons for his view. It is in this dogmatic manner that he deals with the question of the senate of Alexandria (I, p. 554), the coronation of Antioch IV as King of Egypt (I, pp. 654 and 622), the testament of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II (I, p. 594; here, too, he seems to be ignorant of the existence of SEG IX, 7), or of Theocritus's sojourn at the Alexandrian court (I, p. 414). Moreover, for no apparent reason he even calls Popilius Laenas's famous ultimatum a "silly legend" (I, p. 623: "die Legende von dem kreisziehenden römischen Gesandten zu albern ist, um historisch zu sein" — surely a strange criterion!)

Comments of the same kind come to mind on reading Vol. II. Ch. IV, on the "culture of everyday life", holds one spellbound. It also abounds in apt observations. The only thing I would cavil at is that I think the section on "education" given in Ch. II of Vol. I would have been better here. Subsection 3 is a particularly lucid and useful one. In it Schneider, having previously discussed "the home" (see I, where he draws an interesting link between "Wohnkultur" and "Stadtkultur des Hellenismus"), goes on to deal with dress, cosmetics, and jewellery (2) and finally "the culture of eating and drinking". In the reviewer's opinion, subsection 4, on "the culture of various occupations", is most open to criticism. This subsection is divided into further divisions on the basis of various occupations. The author warns the reader that it is dangerous to apply modern concepts to the ancient world (II, pp. 79, 82—83), but he has a habit of drawing general conclusions from single sources, for example, when speaking of the situation of hired workers in Egypt (II, pp. 84—85). I doubt, too, whether one can really speak of the "peasantry" in Hellenistic times (II, pp. 86ff.). It is true that Schneider stresses the differences within this class, but nevertheless he treats it as a whole entity, which leads him to make such mistakes as referring to the "Greek peasant from Fayum" ("griechische Fayumbauer" — what kind of person was that? — a cleric or a Greek official, or perhaps a Hellenised Egyptian peasant?), who was supposed

to have been fond of reading Callimachus (II, p. 273). Moreover, the author is blind to the existence of social movements. Even when discussing Ptolemaic Egypt he asserted that the leaders of the rebellions were motivated solely by nationalist reasons ("nur aus nationalistischen Gefühlen heraus", I p. 496), and even believed that all the revolts of slaves (with the exception of that at Laurion) were nationalist movements against Rome (II, p. 85 and 177). As a matter of fact he states that there were hardly any slaves at all in the kingdoms of the Ptolemies (? II, p. 167), and declares that in the Greek East one cannot speak of a slave-owning society at all ("Sklavenhaltergesellschaft" II, p. 168). Coming to the situation of the Hellenistic soldiers (II, p. 115), Schneider gives their average rates of pay in Egypt as follows: 20 obols in the reign of Philadelphus, only 4 obols in the reign of Euergetes I, 14 obols in 245 B.C., 60 in 239 B.C., and in 223 B.C. again only 4. In this list one is struck by the fact that the author draws a distinction between the average rate of pay in the reign of Euergetes I and that in the years 245, 239 and 223, since these years, too, belong to the period when Ptolemy III Euergetes I was on the throne. One is also struck by such considerable fluctuations in the average rate of the soldier's pay in such a short period as twenty-five years. The explanation for this is extremely simple, when we realise that Schneider generalises rather clumsily from observations made by M. L a u n e y (*Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*, 1950, II p. 768), whom as a matter of fact he cites. For in the book referred to above L a u n e y does not himself draw any general conclusions (nor does he say anything about an "average" pay), since it would be difficult to do so on the basis of individual, scattered sources.

As for other comments on Ch. IV, when we come to subsection 6, on Death, can we really accept Schneider's assertion that man's conflicting attitudes to death were the invention and attribute of Hellenism (II p. 208ff.)? On the other hand he is right in emphasizing (II p. 210) that Hellenism was the first culture not to be afraid of portraying death in all its natural horror. Then a slight correction to p. 185 (II): what the author had in mind here was probably the wedding of Antigonus Gonatas (not Demetrius Poliorcetes) to the younger Phile (for she was the granddaughter, not the wife of Demetrius Poliorcetes).

Chapter V, entitled *Die objektiven Ausprägungen der hellenistischen Kultur*, is a huge one. It contains an account of all those spheres which we generally bring under the general heading of spiritual or intellectual culture. In subsection 1 (*Buchwesen, Bühne, Dichtung*), Schneider deals with books, the theatre, and belles-lettres. The part dealing with books is interesting and well arranged. The author is especially good on such subjects as book illustration (II, 231—233), and on author's rights, author's fees, size of edition, book-selling, and libraries (II, p. 233—236). It is a pity, though, that he did not give more prominence to the impact of the Alexandrian Library on the form of the ancient

books — that is, the papyrus roll, which reached its final form in the Hellenistic period. Speaking of the oldest known ancient books (II, p. 225), Schneider mentions only Timotheos's *Persians*, and makes no reference to the Macedonian roll from Derveni, which is generally dated to the 4th c. B.C. He also takes it quite for granted that parchment was introduced at Pergamon in the reign of Eumenes II (II p. 226), ignoring the fact that parchment fragments dating from as far back as the beginning of the 2nd c. B.C. were found at Dura Europos (esp. P. Dura 15). One of the weakest passages here seems to me to be that on script (II p. 228—229). After all, "Steinschrift", that is, inscriptional writing, was different from the calligraphic writing taught in school. Calligraphy later on developed into both book-hand and cursive (the term which Schneider uses is "Gebrauchsschrift", although it is not quite clear to me whether this term includes cursive alone, or book-hand as well).

Having dealt with books, the author then goes on to deal with the subject of the theatre in all its aspects — buildings and all kinds of moveables connected with the theatre, and the dramatic works themselves. Next he goes on to speak of poetry and the poets, "narrative prose" ("erzählende Prose"), epistolography, anthologies, etc. The division which he makes between what is termed narrative prose (romances, etc.) and historical prose seems to me wrong and artificial. One consequence of this division, for instance, is that when discussing the beginnings of the romance (II, p. 319) he quite unjustifiably omits to mention Xenophon. History and biography, too, are placed among the "Geisteswissenschaften", and not discussed till later on, after discussion of rhetoric, mathematics, the natural sciences, and medicine. This arrangement, however, is altogether too modern, for in Antiquity historical prose was first and foremost artistic prose, and was connected most closely with what the author calls "erzählende Prose", and with rhetoric, too. It is surely also a clumsy arrangement to put Callimachus and Theocritus at the very end of the review of the Hellenistic poets. Apart from the fact that those two initiate the chronological series of poets, an acquaintance with their works is needed in order to be able to understand Hellenistic poetry as a whole (for how could one speak of bucolic poetry without Theocritus?).

As for other comments on this subsection, on p. 245 (II) we have a misstatement to the effect that tragic trilogies, in which the three separate plays were unconnected in subject, was an Hellenistic innovation. But this was not true, for after all that was how Sophocles constructed his trilogies! And Timotheos's *Persians* is not a tragedy at all (as given in II, p. 247), but a so-called new nomos. Surely, too, the author is wrong in trying to persuade us that Alexandrian poetry was not very learned (II, 273). For although we can willingly agree with him that "the Hellenistic man could read without help many things which we today would need to read with the aid of a commentary", nevertheless

the fact remains that Callimachus and his imitators (even in Rome!) wrote for the intellectual élite, and that the reader had to be as learned as the poet himself in order to understand his allusions, associations, and sometimes even language. So without the proper education it would have been impossible for the simple "Greek peasant" from Fayum ("Fayumbauer", whoever he was) to delight in the poetry of Callimachus.

Now we come to criticism of the remaining part of Ch. V. The reader is warned that a true assessment of subsections 3—5 and 7—10 (mathematics, the natural sciences, technology, medicine, law, philosophy, music and art) does not lie within the competence of the reviewer.

In dealing with the mathematical and natural sciences, Schneider rightly begins by warning the reader not to draw too close an analogy between Hellenistic learning and that of modern days, for the world of Antiquity took a different view of the nature of scholarship ("Art und Wesen"). The people of the Hellenistic world also had a completely different approach from ours to the exact and natural sciences, which they frequently regarded as merely crafts or entertainments. As for state and constitutional matters, it is worth pointing out that Antigonus Gonatas was certainly not a typical example of an absolute monarch (II, p. 489). It is also a rash statement to say that "despite their many differences all the Hellenistic monarchies had the same basic features" ("die gleiche Grundlagen" II, p. 507). Among these, and even prime among them, he mentions the restriction of absolute power, which he thought was characteristic of every reign. But thereby he effaces the main difference between the Antigonid monarchy and that of the Ptolemies or the Seleucids, a difference which is particularly marked in early Hellenism (on this point see too the author's remarks in II, p. 508). In speaking of court titles (II, p. 513) he forgets that the full hierarchy of titles, in the form he cites, is known only from Ptolemaic Egypt, and not before the 2nd c. B.C. (see lately L. M o o r e n, *Ueber die Ptolemäischen Hofrangtitel, Antidoron W. Peremans... oblatum*, 1968, pp. 161—180). The lack of emphasis on the fact that the Hellenistic states were not yet territorial states, and the failure to stress the personal character of the Hellenistic monarchy, are also to be regretted here.

The last great subsection of Ch. V (subsection 11) is devoted to religion. At the very outset Schneider warns against the danger of falling into extremes (II, 765—766): against a tendency to see manifestations of religious feeling everywhere, and against the tendency to deny *a priori* all religious feeling, likewise against the tendency to date certain phenomena too early (to prove the existence of Christianity before Christ) or too late (treating certain matters as new phenomena newly arisen on the soil of Christianity). It must be said, however, that Schneider himself is by no means free from bias, and easily gives way to those extreme tendencies which he himself denounces. For instance, on II, pp. 838/839 we read: "Allerdings muss man sich streng vor einem

methodischen Fehler hüten. Die Geschehnisse der hellenistischen Religionsmetamorphose dürfen auf keinen Fall von Quellen hergedeutet werden, die erst Jahrhunderte später entstanden sind und ganz andere Verhältnisse voraussetzen". How, then, can one explain the use the author of these words made several pages earlier (p. 834), of sources post dating the Milan Edict? A similar mechanism can be perceived in his "Christian" interpretation of the myth of Dionysus-Zagreus (II, pp. 802—803) or of the myth of Heracles (II, pp. 810—811), or in his account of the Dionysian mysteries (II, pp. 878—879).

Schneider derives a great many far-reaching conclusions from works of art and literary works. Here again, he falls into one of the very extremities which he was so careful to warn readers against: nearly every image of a deity, and nearly every mention of a deity in a poem is treated by Schneider as proof of the religious faith of the artist or poet. For instance, the great altar of Pergamon, or the Olimpieion at Athens, seem to him to "express faith in the ultimate victory of the old gods" (II, p. 771), while his idea about the Gigantomachies is that they were conceived as "sermons in stone" ("Predigten aus Stein" II, p. 775). These are all very noble ideas, but they would no doubt appear surprising both to the Attalids and to Antioch IV. Nor is it possible to understand why the final lines of the Id. XV of Theocritus prove the existence of an "echte Adonis-Frömmigkeit", nor why the festival taking place in the Alexandrian palaces is to be regarded as "a true religious folk festival" (II, p. 860). Nor can I share his religious interpretation of Callimachus's *Hymn on the Bath of Pallas* nor of the same poet's *Hymn to Zeus* (II, pp. 793 and 777). When we compare Callimachus's *Hymn to Zeus* with Cleanthes's *Hymn*, we at once see the glaring difference between a god to whom a poet philosopher offers up a prayer, and the splendid, but mythological figure whose story intrigues the scholarly Alexandrian, who takes this opportunity of paying the king a skilful compliment and begging his favour. In the case of Heracles, too, it is really difficult to believe that the Alcestis of Eurypides really could have had such "decisive significance" in the creation of what the author calls the Hellenistic religion of Heracles the Saviour (II, 810).

With the exception of his interpretation of the Dionysian rites which we mentioned above, Schneider generally obeys his own word of warning and is cautious in his discussion of the Hellenistic mysteries. This is especially so in his mention of Mithra, where he rightly stresses that everything we know about this god is of later origin, and does not come from Greek sources at all (II, 887—888). In the subsection headed *Gottmenschen*, appropriate prominence is given to the cult of Alexander the Great. But it is also worth adding that in what we may arbitrarily call Greek "theology" there was never any abyss between god and man (this was an eastern element). Moreover, it was not Hellenism that first "made men" of heroes, and not every conferment of the title "euergetes" was in actual fact a manifestation of "true gratitude" (II,

390). Nor does it seem correct to treat the cult of Demetrius Poliorcetes in Athens as an expression of "Aristophenesian" humour (II, p. 895—896), for the Athenian comedy-writers themselves did not think so! Another point is that it was not until the reign of Ptolemy IV Philopator, and not in his father's time (as Schneider thinks, II, p. 898) that Ptolemy I Soter and his spouse, as the *theoi Soteres*, appeared in the "dynastic cult chain". One is also inclined to doubt if Cleopatra II and Cleopatra III were really "bigots" (II, p. 900), for the accumulation of cult epithets is surely insufficient evidence! It is also a mystery to me where the author found out that the library at Alexandrian Serapeum was a "specialised theological library" (II, p. 848), for we have no information at all as to its character.

Schneider next goes on to deal with astrology, prophecies, magic, and folk beliefs (*Astrologie, Orakel, Magie, Volksreligion*). As regards this subsection one criticism is called for: Chrysermos *exegetes* in OGIS 104 is here a magistrate, not an *interpres iuris sacri*, as Schneider informs us (II, p. 913; cf. Dittenberger ad OGIS 104, 3). The last subsections in Ch. V are on the subjects of piety (*Frömmigkeit, Lehre*), and on cults and their organisation (*Kult, Organisation*).

* Chapter VI, which is the final one in the book, is headed *Phasen der hellenistischen Kultur* (II, 963—988). In it the author proposes his periodisation, and arranges the cultural phenomena discussed in the previous chapters in chronological order. The first period, "Frühhellenismus", taking us up to the year 280 B.C., is characterised by the rivalry between Alexandria and Athens. In this connection the author makes the somewhat surprising statement that Ptolemy I made Alexandria a great centre of cultural life because he wanted to impress the Egyptian "élite", and also because he aimed at uniting "mancherlei griechische Stämme" in this way (p. 963). Schneider takes the figure of Demetrius Poliorcetes, of whom he gives an apt and interesting description, as more or less symbolising this period (p. 969).

The second period, "Hochhellenismus", lasted from 280 to 220 B.C., and marked the full flowering of the royal courts, especially at Alexandria, Pella and Syracuse. It was the most brilliant period in the history of Hellenistic literature and scholarship. This was followed by a "period of internal crises and Roman invasion" ("Die Zeit der inneren Krisen und der römischen Invasion"). According to Schneider, there were two reasons for this decline: it was due partly to the fault of the Greeks themselves (such as the egoism of various individuals, the rivalry between the cities, and a trend towards hegemony of the rulers), and partly to Roman imperialism. Finally we come to "Späthellenismus", taking us to the year 30 B.C., marking the end of the Hellenistic world. But as Schneider points very justly out, from the point of view of the historian of culture this was not really an end, but "die Brücke hinüber zu allen Kommenden" (p. 983).

Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus is all in all a very useful and stimulating book. One of its chief merits is its originality of thought and its profusion of new ideas, controversial or not. The reader is advised to use it cautiously, however, and not place too much reliance on some of the detailed facts given there.

[Warszawa]

Anna Świderek

E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri: an Introduction*, Oxford, at the Clarendon Press 1968, pp. 220, 8 plates.

E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, Oxford, at the Clarendon Press 1971, pp. 132, 71 plates.

In *Greek Papyri*, which appeared in 1968, Professor Turner promised its companion volume, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*. This was published also by the Clarendon Press, in 1971. These volumes are complementary, and for that reason, should, I think, be reviewed jointly in order to do them justice. In both books the author was aiming primarily at the non-specialist classical scholar, but it is worth pointing out that also the professional papyrologist will find them a mine of valuable observations and suggestions. In the first of these two books Professor Turner wishes, as he himself expresses it in the *Preface*, "to facilitate a profitable approach to the originals (in the manner of W. Schubart's *Einführung in die Papyruskunde*, Berlin, 1918), rather than to summarize and codify the findings of past scholars" (p. V.) In the next volume, on the other hand, his aim is to provide the reader with "a representative body of material illustrating Greek manuscripts written in antiquity", and to explain how a manuscript was turned into a book, at a period when a book was always a manuscript. Thus the two books taken together constitute an introduction to the world of Greek papyri, although only the first of them bears such a subtitle.

For a start it should perhaps be said that although in *Greek Papyri* Professor Turner refers to W. Schubart's *Einführung* as more or less his model, he diverges from that model to quite a considerable extent, even in the very essence or principle of his book. For, unlike Schubart, he treats his material mainly, and even, one is tempted to say, solely, from the point of view of the philologist. He puts great stress, it is true, on the importance of papyrus documents, and is strongly against undervaluing them, but to him their importance lies principally in the fact that they "describe the conditions under which literature was studied and copied". Only the last chapter of the book, headed *Types of Papyrus Document*, is devoted to the documentary papyri themselves