

conception of good and evil if there are different gods with different personalities, sometimes pulling in opposite directions'? (p. 69).

Its shortcomings notwithstanding, Pulleyn's book provides us with good suggestions, insightful remarks and starting points for further inquiry, and succeeds in mapping out the most important intersections between prayer and the other verbal and ritual phenomena related to it. Connecting Greek prayer to the idea of reciprocity remains the most original and important contribution, although the notion of reciprocity as applied to the gods-men relationship still leaves room for investigation and refinement.

Manuela Giordano

Jerusalem

Piero Totaro, *Le seconde parabasi di Aristofane* (Beiträge zum Antiken Drama und seiner Rezeption Beiheft 9), Stuttgart-Weimar: Metzler, 1999. xxv + 219 pp. ISBN 3 476 45229 8.

Although it is not so described, this useful monograph looks like an adapted and updated version of a doctoral thesis; if so, the author has produced several other publications on Aristophanes and Old Comedy, unfortunately not yet accessible to the reviewer. A pupil of Giuseppe Mastromarco, to whom this book is dedicated, Totaro (T.) acknowledges the help and stimulus of working in the lively group of Old Comedy specialists at the University of Bari. The book contains an Introduction surveying what ancient and modern scholars have meant by 'second parabasis', followed by detailed commentary on the five passages that were already so described as 'second' or 'final' parabasis in the Old Scholia on five of Aristophanes' surviving comedies, *Knights*, *Clouds*, *Wasps*, *Peace* and *Birds*. Finally two appendices discuss a couple of particularly thorny historical problems arising in the relevant parts of *Knights* and *Wasps*.

To qualify for this scholarly title a later 'parabasis' had (a) to have at least part of the epirrhematic structure found in the main parabasis, and (b) to develop subjects already present in the main parabasis. Unlike the main parabases, these later 'parabases' contain no verbal indication that Aristophanes himself would have so described them, but the epirrhematic form and the choral address to the audience and/or the judges of the dramatic contest suffice to justify the term.

Although confining his detailed study to commentary on the five 'second parabases' recognized as such by ancient scholars, T. discusses also in his Introduction the two passages in *Acharnians* that some modern scholars have seen as also qualifying for the title, or at least to be termed a quasi- or pseudo-second parabasis. The strophic pair at *Ach.* 971-99, in cretic-paeonic metre except for a final trochaic tetrameter, in which the chorus begins with an address to 'you whole city' and has many self-references, is termed 'second parabasis' by e.g. Zieliński (*Gliederung* 175) and Sommerstein (edition ad loc.), and a *Mischform*, of second parabasis and *Makarismos* of the hero, by Zimmermann (*Untersuchungen* II, 154 n. 17), but this is

disputed on metrical grounds by Parker (*Songs* 145) because there is no clear break between odes and epirrhemes, unlike the cretic-paeonic epirrhemes following trochaic odes at *Wasps* 1265-91. Later in the play, there is a sequence of (i) an anapaestic run (1143-9) that sends off Dikaepolis and Lamachos on their different ways with ἔτε δὴ χαίροντες κτλ., a formula that often introduces the main parabasis, and (ii) an iambo-choriambic strophic pair (1150-73), in which the chorus metatheatrically utters an elaborate curse on Antimachos, the stingy choregos who at the Lenaia had cheated this chorus of their dinner, and ends with a side-swipe at the rival poet Kratinos. The clearly parabolic tone and content, which led some scholars (e.g. Gelzer, *RE* Supplb. II, 1970, 1426) to see the passage as functioning as a second parabasis, are admitted by others (e.g. Sommerstein *ad loc.* and T. himself), for whom, however, its non-epirrhematic structure excludes that definition. This repeated uncertainty suggests that Ar. might have seen attempts to establish strict criteria for a 'second parabasis' as a misuse of energy and midnight oil.

The rest of the Introduction discusses with appropriate caution the attempts of various scholars to detect parts of second parabases among the comic fragments where the scanty material rules out any firm conclusions.

The main meat of the book is naturally in the long and detailed commentaries on the five undisputed second parabases, each prefaced by a translation and examination of the thematic relation of this parabasis to the rest of the play. The notes are very full but mercifully free of literary jargon, tackling textual, literary/stylistic and historical aspects and aiming at a thorough overview of the conflicting interpretations. Indeed T. seems anxious not to be seen to omit even wildly improbable views: e.g. on *Eq.* 1288-9 he adds without comment an Italian article of 1998 arguing that the aristocratic Chorus' 'excommunication' formula is directed against those who reject homoerotic practices. For an Old Comedy specialist the thorough and up-to-date bibliographical references should be the book's most valuable aspect; e.g., the reviewer discovered that Luppe and Mastromarco have been continuing their controversy over the Dionysia festival programme in the 1998 and 1999 volumes of *Eikasmos* — the 1997 volume is the most recent one visible in Oxford. The work will also be a useful source for students investigating, e.g., examples of *captatio benevolentiae*, or the antithesis of town/country or soldier/musician, or Greek and Latin views of the *locus amoenus* (but *Av.* 1089-101 is not a very good example, for humans in the place have to endure the climatic extremes). Sometimes T.'s long notes cease to be relevant to Ar. and create a sense of a text sinking under bibliographical overload. He shows an engaging awareness of this danger at one point late in the book (p. 189 n. 23) with 'Solo per pedanteria bibliografica ricordo i dubbi sulla genuinità del composto avanzati da H. van Herwerden', etc.

Clearly no two commentators will agree on every point at issue, but I list a few examples where T.'s own view seems particularly good and well argued. On *Nu.* 1119 he prefers Koraes' καρπὸν τε καὶ τὰς ἀμπέλους to the paradosis τεκούσας, rightly objecting to the lack of article with 'your vines'; on *Av.* 1093-4, although the reviewer's own edition did not consider the possibility, T.'s ἀνθηρῶν λειμώνων εὐφύλλων κόλποις ναίω, based on Bergk's suggestion εὐφύλλοις κόλποις, is worth pondering, although the song's other examples of double epithets are either separated

by a phrase or seem predicative (ἤρηνά at 1099 T. rightly translates 'in primavera'); in Appendix I, on the possible facts behind the puzzling references in *V.* 1284-91 to Ar.'s spat with Kleon, T. agrees with MacDowell in stressing the importance of 1291 in ruling out a reference in the line to *Knights*, produced two years before, and follows Mastromarco in taking Ar.'s *πιθηκισμός* and *ἀπατή* as having been practised, not against Kleon, but against the rival poets (the *τινες* of 1284) who had failed to help Ar. in his struggle with Kleon and spread the rumours that Ar. had done a deal with him. Also well handled is the survey in Appendix II of the interconnected problems of Aristophanes' relation to Eupolis and the stages of his dramatic career referred to metaphorically at *V.* 1016-22.

Passages where T.'s original or adopted interpretation seems impossible or improbable are less numerous, but some demand a mention. P. 40: on *Eq.* 1270-3, it is unlikely that the dactylo-epitrite rhythm, the initial echo of a Pindaric *prosodion* and the occurrence of vocative Ἄπολλον and Πυθῶνι δίεα at both *Pi. P.* 7.10-11 and *Eq.* 1270-3 confirm that even Ar. himself, let alone a considerable number of the audience, would note the ironic contrast between the two Athenians — Megakles, victor in the chariot race of 486 BCE, and the starveling Thoumantis. Another probable exaggeration of literary influence is T.'s extensive use (pp. 108-12) of Hesiod *Op.* 582-6 to account for Ar.'s picture (*Pax* 1127-58) of the Attic farmer's life in winter; would Ar.'s description have been very different but for Hesiod?

On *Eq.* 1294-9, the translation (p. 31) 'dicono che non viene ... e quelli ... lo premano' is inconsistent with the explanation (p. 50) of the construction as 'iterative ἄν', which is surely confined to actions in the past; see Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, p. 69.

The most surprising section, though the reviewer has an editorial axe to grind here, is on *Av.* 1073-8 (pp. 154-8), where T., after rightly noting that F.E. Romer was mistaken in claiming (*AJPh.* 115 (1994), 359) to be the first to have identified Philokrates the bird-catcher of *Av.* 13-14 and 1077 with the Athenian general who conquered and sacked Melos in 416 (Thuc. 5.116.3-4), proceeds to relate and develop this improbable theory with no discernible sign of scepticism. Although we must always try to put ourselves in the shoes of one of the first audience, it is hard to believe that Romer is right in believing that the recitation of the decree outlawing Diagoras of Melos quoted at *Av.* 1272-5 and said there to be 'proclaimed again [probably earlier] on this day' would cause the audience to have Diagoras and the recent fate of Melos in mind throughout the play, and that the passing reference to 'Melian famine' at 186 would inevitably remind them again of Diagoras. (A respected historian of the period, A. Raubitschek, did not, *pace* T., 'argue for' this identification of Philokrates in *Historia* 12 (1963), but simply mentioned it in a brief appendix, apparently as proven [by Droysen, the first of the line?], without considering the implications for the *Birds* passages he listed.) T. does not discuss how the audience, on hearing at *Av.* 13-14 the indignant description of the madman who had sold the speaker a couple of useless birds as 'the man from the bird-market', οὐκ τῶν ὀρνέων, ὁ πινακοπώλης Φιλοκράτης μελαγχολῶν, would know that this was really referring to the general of that name who may (or may not) have been involved in the Athenian-Argive expedition to Orneai (with different accent) a year or so before

Birds was performed; they would be likely to know of more than one Philokrates — the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* lists a dozen 5th-century Athenians so named — and would find the anti-birdseller outburst dramatically appropriate. This identification admirably illustrates the critical principle followed by David Lodge's Professor Morris Zapp, that in literature 'Nothing is what it seems'. Cf. the reviewer's criticism of other midnight oil throwing a pseudo-light on Ar. in *SCI* 15 (1996), 66. T. does not examine what the implications of accepting this identification would be for Ar.'s comic effects in this parabasis, or how the audience were likely to react, if they realised that the Chorus, in denouncing Ph. the bird-catcher for capturing and mistreating birds, are really (or also?) metaphorically denouncing the Athenian general who conquered and massacred the Melians. The brief, casual reference at *Av.* 186 to the prospect of 'destroying the gods by a Melian famine' hardly suggests that the audience felt any unease over what had happened to Melos; would Ar. have risked making his Chorus, even 'metaphorically', protest against Athens' cruel treatment of the Melians? Far from questioning the presence in the comedy of Philokrates the general, T. goes on to note that 'a similar metaphorical context would make more plausible' Russo's hypothesis (*Aristophanes: An Author for the Stage* 148) that the Chorus at *Av.* 1084-5 may be alluding to the Athenian custom of releasing prisoners on bail for the duration of the festival, to allow them to take part, when they demand that the public should release their captive birds (for good). Ar. usually makes his analogies clear. If T. had any doubts about all this ingenious over-interpretation, he has failed to make them clear.

The book is very well produced, and the few misprints not noted in the *Errata* are unlikely to trouble the reader. All in all, although there is not much room left for sane originality in this field, it makes a useful contribution to ongoing discussion of Old Comedy.

Nan Dunbar

Somerville College, Oxford

Stephen Colvin, *Dialect in Aristophanes. The Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999. xii + 333 pp. + indices. ISBN 0 19 815 249 3. *

Dialect in Aristophanes is only part of what Colvin's excellent book discusses under this title. After a very clear delineation of its scope (pp. 2-3), and a basic introduction to the terminology and methodology of sociolinguistics, the book also discusses language attitude on a theoretical level and in world literature (chapter 1, pp. 1-38), and

* This review is conceived and presented with constant reference to two works by the late Haiim Rosén: *Eine Laut- und Formenlehre der herodotischen Sprachform*, Heidelberg 1962 (henceforth *Laut- u. Formenlehre*), and his *Praefatio* to Herodoti *Historiae*, vol. I, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, Leipzig 1987 (henceforth *Praefatio*).