to the Analytics-model. At II 8 93a15 Aristotle employs the phrase logikos syllogismos, whose meaning is controversial. When read as backward-looking, as referring back to the aporetic section of II 4, it means that the attempt to demonstrate a definition ends up generating a useless outcome, for the conclusion of the syllogism is inevitably flawed by circularity. This meaning accords with other passages in which Aristotle employs logikos or its cognates, implying by them something negative or flawed. But one can read its meaning as distinct from these other uses and take it rather as forward-looking, to what comes next in II 8, outside the previous aporetic section, so as to take it as referring to a general proof that may occasionally require to be filled in by other methods. This forward-looking reading gives this notion a quite positive account. This is the reading Natali adopts, for he is keen to find a general, positive syllogism whose conclusion may still be in need of further elaboration. The forward-looking reading is possible, but it is surely not plain given the other negative contexts of logikos; and although this is not a work on the Analytics, this point does deserve further discussion.

Touching on controversial issues is pretty natural to any reading of disputed passages, and more so when a controversial topic – the Aristotelian method for ethics – gets elucidated by a somewhat obscure passage about which we easily go amiss, as the first chapters of APo II are. Despite this risk, Natali’s reading of APo II 1–8 and his application of its strategies for revealing the structure and the definitions obtained at the central parts of NE is cogent and convincing, and it pays for all its cost, as it makes us see how well organized and conceptually structured the NE is. Moreover, Natali displays an impressive familiarity not only with the Aristotelian texts (notably with his ethical treatises), but also with Greek and Modern commentators (Magyrs’ Corona virtutum moralium is more than once summoned to illuminate interesting, but often disregarded aspects of the text). To sum up, Natali’s ‘Il Metodo e il Trattato’ is deeply rewarding not only as an inquiry into the method of the ethical treatises, but also as a study of Aristotle’s scientific method, and as such it will surely become a benchmark for scholarly discussions on these topics.

São Paulo

Marco Zingano


Karin Schlapbach’s brilliant new monograph ‘The Anatomy of Dance Discourse’ is dedicated to a subject that has received increasing attention over the past years: ancient dance and performance. Yet this book is much more than another con-


GNOMON 6/92/2020

https://doi.org/10.17104/0017-1417-2020-6-508

Generiert durch IP '54.70.40.11', am 05.10.2020, 02:16:13.

Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.
tribution to a current debate, and this is due not only to the fact that, unlike most recent studies, it concentrates on pantomime (around 2nd century CE), but also to the peculiar perspective the author chooses for her analysis. As she specifies in the introduction, her intention is to offer «a study of the cultural significance of dance through the lens of texts» (1). This lens, however, is not treated as an instrument that helps to reconstruct ancient dance practices, but becomes itself the object of intense scrutiny. Thus, the subject of this book is not precisely (or not only) dance in itself, but the interaction of dance and text and, from this starting point, of dance and language, rhetoric, figurative art, philosophy and religion. This original approach opens up a new and highly prolific perspective on the theorization of dance throughout antiquity.

The book is divided into two parts which consist of three chapters each. Following an ample introduction, the first part, titled ‘Frameworks for a Discourse on Dance’, concentrates on a formal analysis of the relationship and mutual influence of dance and the above-mentioned cultural elements, whereas the second part, under the heading ‘Ekphraseis of Dances’, is dedicated to the interpretation of dance scenes as a literary motif in ancient literature.

Chapter One explores the relationship of dance and language in Plutarch’s Table Talk 9.15. Schlapbach points out that the setting of this text – a symposium – provides «a twofold perspective on dance» (34) both as a part of the dramatic action and as a subject of conversation. But the speaker Ammonius shifts attention to discourse and puts forward a theory according to which dance consists of three elements: ‘phrase’ (φορά), ‘pose’ (σχῆμα), and ‘pointing’ (δεῖξις). Schlapbach’s analysis concentrates on the third component. She refutes the claim according to which the direct, non-mimetic expression of meaning through pointing derives from an analogy with language theory and proposes instead, in a highly original way, to trace this distinction back to Plato’s Cratylus 422e–423a, where deictic and pictorial gestures form the basis for the differentiation between names and the imitation of sounds. In more detail, the deictic gesture expressing ‘the nature of the sky’ mentioned by Socrates is not to be understood as ‘pointing’ towards the sky, but refers to «the action itself of raising the hand upwards» (55). Based on this claim about the Cratylus, Schlapbach then develops an account of δεῖξις as non-referential display in the sense of «drawing attention to things themselves» (62), if only a limited range of things such as the body of the dancer, bystanders, earth and sky. She concludes that in this understanding of δεῖξις dance transcends language (which remains limited to signs) and turns out to be «an art form that possesses its own specific qualities» (73). Even though parts of this last paragraph are, as the author admits, to some extent speculative (64), they are very well argued. Moreover, her acute interpretation of the Cratylus passage (whether it influenced Plutarch or not) is, as far as I am aware, unique and deserves great attention by Plato scholars. It would be interesting to pursue the further question of whether Socrates’ account of gesture – despite the initial context of deafness – might not itself be inspired by dance, since the context is rich in references to drama.

Chapter Two analyses the relationship between dance (pantomime) and rhetoric as well as the figurative arts with regard to Lucian’s dialogue On Dancing. Against the alleged paradigmatic function of rhetoric for the depiction of panto-
mime, Schlapbach argues on the basis of the affinities between both (e.g. the solo performance) that «the exchange between dance and oratory went both ways» (81). The main focuses of her comprehensive analysis are symbolic figures, such as Proteus, that are commonly applied to illustrate the art of the orator but which the dialogue’s main character Lycinus uses in reference to the versatility of the pantomime dancer. Through Lycinus’ de-mystifying portrayal of Proteus not as a model for dance, but as a dancer (Salt. 19), pantomime becomes its own paradigm: «Pantomime is therefore uniquely true to itself: it is in fact what it represents» (87). In conclusion, pantomime turns out to be «a better rhetoric than oratory» (102). But rather than interpreting it as polemical, Schlapbach suggests reading Lucian’s dialogue against the background of a (lost) history of dance discourse. The interpretation she offers is insightful and entirely persuasive. One additional aspect to investigate could be the witty and paradoxical interplay between the advantage of dance over oratory in Lycinus’ speech and his own success through oratory: could he have convinced Crato of the value of dance by dancing? 2 The following paragraph moves on to the confrontation of dance with the figurative arts. On the basis of the fact that dance shares with painting the visual expressiveness of character disposition (ῆθος), but also possesses a narrative capacity (the motif of ‘silent speech’), Schlapbach lucidly proposes to interpret this relation in the light of the literary technique of ekphrasis. Subsequently, the inspiration dance draws from the figurative arts and its tight connection to sculpture leads the author back to a discussion of the second element of Plutarch’s dance theory, σχήμα. In its application to both dance and figurative art, σχήμα is still, as the contrasting claims of several recent studies confirm, a particularly controversial term since in some passages it refers to a static dimension in dance, while others seem to imply movement. 4 Schlapbach accentuates this tension (see 110–114, 49) and attempts to reconcile it by suggesting that a dance σχήμα «encapsulates movement and action» (113) like the σχήμα in figurative art does in Xenophon (in Mem. 3.10.4–5). Regrettably, the brief analysis of the sources as to what «the seemingly static element of the [dance] pose» (113–114) consists of, is rather cursory and falls short of the profound insights offered by her interpretation of δεξίας. Moreover, in this particular paragraph little caution is exercised regarding the enormous time span the analysis covers: σχήματα in

1 Perhaps a trace of proximity between dance discourse and oratory can already be detected in Plato’s Laws: the expression μιμήσεις διεξόμενον (Lg. 635d7) could be read as a variation of λόγῳ διεξόμενος; the verb διεξόμενοι itself is frequent in oratory.
2 Schlapbach does hint to the ending of the dialogue, but only with regard to the protreptic tradition (see 125, 130–131, and below). For the rhetorical character of Lycinus’ speech see 82.
4 For the static connotation see (apart from Plutarch) Aristox. Rhyth. II.18 and (a late source) Lib. Or. 64.118; for the implication of movement Ar. V. 1484 ff. and X. Sm. 2.15–16. At any rate, Plutarch’s account of σχήμα is different from Plato’s, insofar as he attributes the expression of feelings only to φορά (see Quaest. Conv. 9.15, 747E4–5), and not, as Plato in the Laws, to σχήμα (see Lg. 654e9–655b6).
Plutarch’s time and in Plato’s and Xenophon’s epoch might have been ‘static’ in different ways. The remaining part of the chapter provides an interesting account of the expression of motion in stasis in Hellenistic sculpture, based on two perspectives on the same sculptural group, the Ludovisi Gaul.

The third chapter addresses the way in which imperial dance discourse draws on traditional literary themes and rhetorical strategies, especially the motif of heavenly contemplation. Lucian’s On Dancing is shown to bear similarities to the protreptic tradition, since it (satirically) portrays dance as a τέχνη which leads to the highest good and ends with the conversion of a critic to an enthusiast of dance. While there is a tradition of analogic references to dance as a protreptic method in philosophical discourse, Lucian, by contrast «puts the spotlight on dance itself» (131) and thus «turns the hierarchy between philosophy and dance upside down» (149). As a background, Schlapbach then provides a brief, but useful overview of the motif of ‘cosmic spectatorship’ (divine, heavenly dance) both in platonic philosophy and in poetry. The aim is to carve out how philosophy brings itself into opposition to civic and ritual spectacles, while at the same time it is deeply indebted to them. The next paragraph, under the heading ‘intelligent design’, traces the use by Aristotle, Dio Chrysostom, Plotinus and Augustine of cosmic dance metaphors to express the orderly nature of the universe. According to Schlapbach, Augustine’s On the Teacher is «most innovative» (148) in contrast to Platonic tradition, because it employs the theatrical spectacle as a metaphor not for the universe, but for its intelligible character: something that can be seen and understood through itself. A further paragraph is dedicated to the important role of dance in mystery initiation in which, according to the author, sensory and emotional experience are followed by, and ultimately coincide with, insight (150–151). The final part of the chapter presents a close reading and novel interpretation of the apocryphal Acts of John. Schlapbach’s cogent and extremely detailed analysis reveals this text to be «deeply informed by the ancient tradition of mystery rites» (166). This chapter covers a wide spectrum of subject matter and is less unified than the previous chapters, yet the overall argument is coherent and every single section offers a strong claim.

The first chapter of Part Two works out a tension or «rivalry» (171) between the narrative content (the myth) and its actual re-enactment during a pantomime performance. The starting point is the dance scene in the final chapter of Xenophon’s Symposium (9.4–7): here, the authenticity of the dancers’ performance directs the audience’s attention away from the myth being re-enacted and towards the seemingly genuine emotions of the dancers. As Schlapbach points out, the resulting mimetic identification of the audience with the dancers mirrors Plato’s critique of impersonation. Subsequently, she explores the possibility that in antiquity this dance scene was read metapoetically not as a re-enactment of the ‘common’ (πάνδημος) Aphrodite, but as an example of a certain kind of musical performance. In her view, such a reading could be the point of origin for Aristoxenos’ use of πάνδημος in reference to μουσική which, via Athenaeus’ Learned Banqueters (Book 14), features again in Plutarch’s Table Talk 9.15. The remaining two paragraphs discuss a number of epigrams which provide further evidence

for the interest which ancient authors took in the power of an authentic performance and reveal two crucial dangers: firstly, a very accurate performance might «emancipate itself from the myth» (192), and secondly, faithfulness is not a guarantee for success, but can be perceived as an excess. Schlapbach concludes and thereby re-embraces her claims from the first part: «In order to [do the myth justice], the re-enactment must avoid drawing too much attention to its own physical presence. Thus the greatest advantage that physical re-enactments have over poetry or music, namely that they are palpable and life-like, is also their greatest problem» (200). This chapter, too, deals with a plurality of issues, but succeeds in connecting them and brings to light how the inner tension of mimetic dance reappears with continuity in different genres throughout antiquity.

Chapter Five turns to the analysis of embedded dance performances in the ancient novel. The first part presents a new reading of the dance scene in Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe* (2.37.1–38.1) in connection with the three tales which surround it. The second tale about the invention of the syrinx (2.34) is followed by the principle characters’ dance performance: a re-enactment of the same myth of Pan and Syrinx. On the basis of a thorough textual analysis, Schlapbach challenges the claim that the dancers identify with the characters and points out that during the dance performance there is an emphasis on play-acting, but when Daphnis starts playing a syrinx himself, myth and performance merge. Daphnis’ solo performance actively creates a social hierarchy between the two young lovers which corresponds to the message of all three tales. The author concludes that interpretation is «much more than mere elucidation. [...] While in the form of tales it imposes itself on the perception of nature, as performance it shapes social reality» (220). Schlapbach’s textual analysis is generally convincing, yet it is not entirely clear how her reading of the tales interacts with the main story and its ending: social hierarchy is surely present in the text, but it does not seem to be a matter of conflict. The second part of the chapter explores the role of the spectator of a pantomime performance in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* X. Schlapbach’s main suggestion is to differentiate between Lucius (the protagonist who has been transformed into an ass) as a spectator and as the I-narrator of the story: while the first maintains an aesthetic distance from the performance, the latter, in a digression in which he reflects on the myth represented (10.33), is absorbed by his own self-interested exegesis. In the author’s view, the passage thus denounces a bad scholarly attitude and expresses a warning as to the interpretation of the *Metamorphoses*. Again, pantomime obtains a paradigmatic function for the absorptive power of the mimetic arts. Schlapbach completes her original reading by emphasizing various motifs in Book 1 which anticipate the metapoetic perspective of Book 10.

The last chapter examines the role of dance in Nonnus’ *Dionysiaka* (Book 1 and 19) whose poetry, according to Schlapbach, «is inspired by the idea of dancing» (252). In a first step, the reference to Proteus in the first book is carefully analysed in its linguistic details, showing that it is to be understood as an icon of poetic inspiration not only by Homer, but equally by immersion in physical performance. Secondly, Schlapbach turns to Book 19 and highlights
how the narrative depiction changes in the course of the contest between Maron and Silenus. Whereas the first and second dance scene focus either on form and content, or on content alone, the third scene concentrates entirely on the pure movement of dance. Yet in the culmination of this non-representational dance, Silenus is transformed into a river and thus retransferred into the sphere of representation: «Silenus, after going beyond representation in his dance, literally collapses back into ambiguity» (276). For since a river is not tout court a symbol of the flexibility of dance, but only through interpretation, it is ambiguous. Thus, as Schlapbach cogently concludes, the poem demonstrates the limits of non-representational art, while it also reinterprets death as an act of mimesis and integrates it into the Dionysiac universe of ambiguity.

The reader of this book is in no danger of committing the error of Apuleius’ ‘scholarly ass’: it is truly an exemplary piece of scholarship. The argument is often complex and requires an attentive reader, but it is clear and coherent. It is a great merit of this book to have shown how tightly the arts were interconnected in antiquity, and that the role of dance in this network was pivotal. Two elements which considerably enrich Schlapbach’s study are, firstly, her comprehensive expertise in approaching a wide range of sources, from Homer to late antiquity (including numerous fragments), as well as, secondly, her precision and acuity in the translation and close reading of key passages. The book has undoubtedly benefited from the long period of composition, not least with regard to its extended bibliography. It is to be recommended to all scholars interested in ancient dance and ancient literature on dance, performance studies, ekphrasis, the relation between the arts in antiquity as well as their relevance in rhetoric, philosophy and religious discourse.¹
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Julia Pfefferkorn

¹ I am grateful to Dr Matthew Shelton (Cape Town) for his proofreading.