

d'approche plus narratologique qui pourrait mettre en valeur les étapes du récit et la constitution de la figure de Pythagore comme héros de la science harmonique (il pourrait être intéressant de comparer l'épisode avec les récits qui racontent les découvertes d'autres scientifiques, et notamment Archimède) ; on aurait pu également commenter la présence d'instruments de mesure dans une perspective plus générale d'histoire des sciences. L'auteur a également joint neuf extraits de Nicomaque dispersés par la tradition, qui recoupent plus ou moins le traité : l'auteur propose pour l'un d'eux une démonstration très aboutie sur le triangle rectangle parfait (p. 339-341). Enfin, le dernier traité a été écrit par le philosophe Gaudence dont on ne sait presque rien, ce qui rend toute datation sûre impossible. L'avant-propos s'ouvre par une citation d'un poème orphique : « Je chante pour ceux qui comprennent ; restez à la porte, profanes ! », ce qui manifeste une conception hermétique de la science musicale. Le traité se compose en outre de vingt-deux chapitres qui se succèdent en se complétant les uns les autres : comme on l'a dit, certains chapitres sont plutôt aristoxéniens (I-IX) et d'autres pythagoriciens (X-XVI). Comme pour la *Sectio canonis*, F. Garrido Domené met bien en évidence leurs liens logiques. Les derniers chapitres (XX-XXIII) sont plus originaux dans un traité d'harmonique : ils sont en effet dévolus à la notation musicale. Gaudence ne donne pas l'intégralité des signes, mais expose le principe fondamental de la notation vocale et de la notation instrumentale à partir de l'exemple du trope hypolydien. Ce choix n'est pas anodin : le seul signe commun à la notation vocale et instrumentale, le sigma lunaire, γ occupe la place de la mèse, donc le centre de l'échelle. Dans la transcription de ce trope, F. Garrido Domené aurait dû mieux distinguer entre les degrés fixes et les degrés mobiles. En outre, elle construit tantôt ses échelles du grave à l'aigu et tantôt de l'aigu au grave, sans motiver ses choix, ce qui est un peu curieux. Signalons enfin qu'elle a repris les signes musicaux tels qu'ils sont dessinés dans l'édition de C. von Jan, dans une graphie un peu dépassée aujourd'hui. Ces quelques remarques n'enlèvent rien à l'effort louable de l'auteur de rendre accessibles ces textes difficiles au lectorat hispanophone, avec des commentaires qui permettent de comprendre bien des aspects éminemment techniques grâce à des schémas pertinents. Pour les spécialistes du domaine, le principal intérêt de cet ouvrage réside dans les commentaires d'ordre mathématique et physique.

Sylvain PERROT

Germán SANTANA HENRÍQUEZ (Ed.), *Plutarco y las artes*. XI Simposio Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Plutarquistas. Madrid, Ediciones Clásicas, 2013. 1 vol., 494 p. Prix non communiqué. ISBN 978-84-7882-7754-7.

This book collects the papers presented at the “XI Simposio Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Plutarquistas”, which took place in November 8-10, 2012 in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria. The forty-three articles explore the interactions between Plutarch and a wide range of *technai*. They are divided into seven thematic sections, respectively centred on: rhetoric art, erotic art, other arts (from visual to performative), myth, humanism, classical tradition, and *varia*. For this review, due to space reasons, I will focus only on some of the most relevant papers selected from each chapter. The first section, “Plutarco y el arte de la retórica”, opens with an engaging

contribution by J. A. Fernández Delgado on “El arte de la retórica en Plutarco”. He challenges the assumption that rhetoric has heavily influenced Plutarch’s juvenile literary production, and that it has become always less important throughout his later writings. By drawing attention to the fact that rhetoric was intended as a *techné* in Plutarch’s time, the article calls into question the practice of *progymnasmata* (pre-exercises performed in rhetorical schools), especially as attested in the handbook of the rhetorician Theon of Alexandria, and shows the constant presence of their influence in Plutarch’s works. A. Ginestí Rosell’s “Para una poética del diálogo: el buen hablar en las *Quaestiones Convivales* de Plutarco” is a very beautiful contribution that, starting from the analysis of two meta-symposiac questions (number 7 and 8) collected in the seventh book of *Quaestiones Convivales*, stresses the intertwining of “theory and practice” throughout this work (p. 52), and Plutarch’s adherence to a sophisticated ideal model of communication, which is addressed to (accomplished or future) *pepaideumenoí*. In the second section, “Plutarco y el arte amoroso”, G. Roskam analyses “A *zêtêma* on Eros and Poetry in Plutarch”. This *quaestio*, found in *Quaestiones Convivales* 622C-623D, presents an “associative connection” (p. 95) between Sappho’s and Euripides’ views on poetry and is based on the enigma as to whether love is beneficial and inspirational for the poet, or rather if it is an illness to be cured with poetry. Roskam, after analysing two other places of the Plutarchan corpus presenting very similar arguments (*Amatorius* 762B-763B and *De Pythiae oraculis* 405D-406B), focuses on Plutarch’s writing method, which he shows to include thematic clusters, recycling and probably the use of source-notebooks. “La *parthenos* sin *parthenia*: modelo de jovencita casadera en la obra *Virtudes de mujeres* de Plutarco”, by G. González Almenara is also a remarkable contribution dealing with the connection between the two Greek terms present in its title, analysed against the wider historical-sociological background of reference. The third section, “Plutarco y otras artes”, is the most conspicuous one. M. Meeusen’s “Natural Philosophy, *Techné* and Technicality in Plutarch” starts with an interesting analysis of “physical aetiologies” (p. 158), followed by a thought-provoking examination of the various degrees of technicality of the scientific vocabulary exhibited by the Chaeronean. This article has the merit of shedding new light on the wider, and controversial, issue of the way in which specialists can convey their knowledge to the broader public. A. G. Nikolaidis’s “Plutarch’s Views on Art and Especially on Painting and Sculpture” explores Plutarch’s interest for artistic craft and artworks, which at first sight might contrast with his Platonic affiliation. Nikolaidis’s conclusions can be fruitfully compared to those that A. P. Jiménez reaches in his “Interpretación moral de las obras de arte en Plutarco”, which focuses on the moral contents and teachings that Plutarch, as a committed Platonist, attributes to works of art – a thesis supported by making use of iconographic sources. S.-T. Teodorsson’s “Plutarch on the Noble Art of Preserving the Health”, by resorting to an intriguing selection of passages, shows that Plutarch’s blend between specialist knowledge of science and medicine was informed by his strong practical sense and by his keen attention to physical needs. F. Titchener’s “Plutarch the Architect: The Structure of Plutarch’s *Nicias*” proves that this biography is founded on a well-structured framework and a fascinating design. Titchener also shows the interaction between *The Life of Nicias* and its pair, *The Life of Crassus*, by stressing the strict relation between their respective key themes and

passages. The almost specular organisation of these biographies fosters their dramatic power and ethical relevance, thus displaying Plutarch as a skilful “technician” (p. 254). L. Van der Stockt’s “Plutarch and the Art of Drama” is an informed study on how Plutarch dealt with ancient Attic theatre and on his effective participation to the dramatic performances of his days – while placing emphasis on his moral engagement as a spectator and author. P. Volpe Cacciatore in “Quale sia la tua sorte, meglio il lavoro: Plutarco, fr. 44 Sandbach” follows the Plutarchan fragment to compose an encomium of work, expressed in activities like agriculture and craftsmanship, and stresses the importance of *technai* as *erga* (p. 282). The short section “Plutarco y el mito” collects three captivating papers by I. Campos Mendez, G. D’Ippolito and R. González Delgado, which focus respectively on: Mithra and mystery cults; various references to myth found in Plutarch’s works, and in particular to Philoctetes; the presence of the myth of Orpheo and Euridice in Plutarch and its diverse functions. The section “Plutarco y el humanismo” includes contributions devoted to interesting aspects of the various forms of the reception of Plutarch’s writings, and his heritage during the Renaissance: the readers will find there some unexpected and challenging correspondences between Plutarch’s texts and dramatic, ethical, political, juridical works of Spanish humanists. The section “Plutarco y la tradición clásica” contains a very original study by A. M. Martín Rodríguez entitled “Ecos plutarquianos en una tragedia canaria sobre el tema de Espartaco”, which displays interesting correspondences between Plutarch’s *Crassus* and the drama *Spartacus* (1900) by A. Rodríguez López, and reflects on modern techniques of re-elaboration of ancient sources. C. Sánchez Mañas proposes an “Estudio sobre las reminiscencias herodoteas en los *Diálogos píticos* de Plutarco”, where she highlights and examines the implicit references to Herodotus in the Delphic dialogues. Finally, in the section collecting “*Variá*”, Jolanda Capriglione’s exam of the different functions of *phantasia* in Plutarch is especially worthy of note. The volume as a whole is nicely edited, and contains some very valuable contributions as well as useful bibliographical references listed at the end of each article. A strong point of this miscellany is that it embraces a wide number of topics through different methodological approaches, which makes it suitable for a large, and variously specialised, audience. This is also due to the overall successful exploitation of the great potential of the theme investigated, *i.e.*, the complex interactions between the writings of the Chaeronean and the multiple aspects of ancient *technê*. The book also attests to the wide effort of modern scholarship to engage not only with the ethical concerns of Plutarch the “moralist”, but also with the original and stimulating challenges presented by Plutarch the “thinker” – who is mostly in need of reevaluation.

Elsa Giovanna SIMONETTI

Sophia XENOPHONTOS, *Ethical Education in Plutarch. Moralising Agents and Contexts*. Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter, 2016. 1 vol., IX-266 p. (BEITRÄGE ZUR ALTERTUMSKUNDE, 349). Prix : 99,95 €. ISBN 978-3-11-035036-4.

This study, which is a revision of an Oxford dissertation, results from a happy encounter between an ancient Greek *pepaideumenos* from the first and second centuries AD and a modern Greek *pepaedeumenē* from our own day. By focusing on