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*).

presents reflections of language attitude in different genres of Ancient Greek literature (chapter 2, pp. 39-89). Although other comic authors use dialect forms, C. is wise to limit his corpus to Aristophanes (mainly to the speaking parts of the Megarian in *Ach.* 729-835, of the Boeotian in *Ach.* 860-954, and of three Spartan characters in *Lys.* 81-253, 980-1013, and 1076-1199; 1242-end): the nature of the text and its transmission are both extraordinarily complex. Colvin does give particular instances of related features of language attitude in other Comic passages (chapter 5, pp. 264-95) and in other genres (in his more general discussions in chapter 2), and he also refers very fully to passages which may be of interest to scholars wishing to focus on other authors.

We learn, for example, (pp. 41, 49-53) that Homer did *not* mark speech of non-Greeks as 'foreign', and that both Homer and Tragedy, unlike Comedy, do not allow for the representation of dialect, while the Homeric Hymns do refer to different language varieties, and archaic poetry in fact probably represents a foreign language in the text (Hipponax fr. 92 West, discussed by C. on p. 51); Herodotus makes no attempt to represent foreign language spoken, and no explicit mention is made in the narrative when a language other than Greek is spoken; the same observations apply to dialect variety. C.'s treatment of Tragedy is detailed, and yet it is clear that he could have made far more of this topic, had it been central to the scope of the book. I cannot do full justice to this chapter, but I merely repeat the observation from his summary to this chapter, that Tragedy 'drew the line between reference to dialect (permissible) and representation of dialect (not permissible)' (p. 86). Reference to dialect or language variety used is a compromise, as I see it, between the Homeric convention of no mention of language or language variety used, on the one hand, and on the other a strictly realistic representation, a literary version of a 'transcript'. C. here compares the permissibility of reference to dialect with the relative degree of realism presented in the genre within which Aristophanes wrote. This is in fact part of a larger question of how language variety is treated in a range of authors, and whether or not it is possible that trends traced in classical genres extended to Hellenistic literature, with its changed cultural setting. No one studying the larger question can afford to ignore C.'s survey.

This is among the merits of chapter 2, in which C. adds language variety as a dimension to our cultural reading of classical texts. C.'s comment (p. 305) that attitudes to language variety are not human universals is particularly relevant in the context of chapter 2, which forms a very rich and extensive background for this conclusive observation; even if one may not agree with all of C.'s analyses and interpretations in the specific genres, this background serves as a context into which ultimately to locate and interpret his very detailed evidence for the genre of Old Comedy, with its specific characteristics.

After giving us a long-needed description (chapter 3, pp. 90-118) of the state of the text and the possible mutual influences between knowledge of the dialect and the state of the text, and an equally important discussion of how Aristophanes himself might have written and spelled non-Attic (as well as Attic) forms (3.1, pp. 92-103), Colvin presents us with the central part of the book, the blow-by-blow, extremely judicious unfolding of the non-Attic dialectal phenomena found in the fully surviving

plays of Aristophanes (chapter 4, pp. 119-263). Two short discussions follow: language variation in Aristophanic fragments and other remains from Old Comedy (chapter 5), and a concluding discussion of dialect in Old Comedy (focusing on data from the central Aristophanic corpus) and its patterns and functions (chapter 6).

Any discussion of dialect ought, in theory, to begin with a definition of dialect. This is a very elusive task. Often it is held that pronunciation and vocabulary are features of 'mere' dialect, whereas grammatical and syntactic features exhibit language difference; this is a convenient distinction between language and dialect, but, aside from drawing clear-cut formal boundaries, very problematic. From an entirely different approach, some hold that each individual speaks an idiolect, and that, by extension, when studied in its literary form, the language of each author ought to be considered exclusively; this kind of study examines the entirety of the author's usage (not just phonology and lexicon), without a preconception of the features of his language and its consistency with the typical features of that dialect. C. does not discuss or define dialect along these lines (see pp. 33-4); however, his *modus operandi* reveals his broad, inclusive approach. An individual study of a closed corpus is the fundamental step for the comparison of one particular usage with that of other authors within that genre and its conventions, or in contrast with corpora from other genres, areas or periods. C.'s exhaustive description of the Aristophanic corpus enables a confrontation of firm data with evidence from other corpora. Such a 'confrontation', or comparison, would not be of much value if it did not rest on such firm ground, and this in itself should counter any claims of other reviewers that 'this is philological rigor at its finest, but even a linguist will find [chapter 4] tough going, especially the 50 pages on phonology' (see *BMCR*, May 2000). The question is highly complex and cannot make easy reading. Colvin does not limit himself to phonological (4.1, pp. 132-83) and lexical (4.4, pp. 231-59) evidence; in chapter 4 he also discusses morphology as well as syntax and usage (4.2, pp. 184-223 and 4.3, pp. 223-30). Simple arithmetic might lead one to claim that the bulk of the discussion (79 pages) does in fact center round pronunciation and vocabulary — those fields which often receive most attention in dialect studies. However, as C. himself warns the reader (4.0.1), some features belong under more than one heading, and he apologizes for his somewhat arbitrary division of these features into the four traditional headings (p. 121). As a reader, I found the cross-referencing, the duplication of reference to a feature under more than one heading, or Colvin's admissions of uncertainty in his taxonomy, highly judicious and commendable. Neat schemes are comforting, but inapplicable in natural language. I give just one example of how C. copes with taxonomical borderline cases with full honesty: when describing the Laconian pronunciation of [ee], appearing in the written text as εε (for which Attic has a corresponding [e:] spelled ει) in the υ-stem inflection, quoting Ar. *Lys.* 1002 πρέσβεις, he reminds us that 'dialect features like this hover on the border between phonology and morphology (4.2.1.4)' (p. 147). Cf. also, e.g., pp. 149, 154, 170, 173, 296.

The complexity of the linguistic phenomena involves, among other things, the discrepancy between the data and the analysis of epichoric dialects (those associated with geographical locations and attested mainly in stone inscriptions) on the one hand, and the findings in literary texts such as Aristophanic Comedy on the other.

Epichoric material is a frame of reference to be reckoned with, since C. is trying to discover the degree to which Aristophanes' representations of dialects resemble or differ from epichoric forms. Traditional work on the dialects sometimes draws conclusions from a combination of material from the mother-city and material from its colonies, a combination of early and late material, and combinations of dialect varieties with differing degrees of *koine* effects. The author copes admirably with combining such synchronic and diachronic features, sifting out the less relevant data: for example, when discussing -ου- reflecting ε + ο in the passages of the Megarian. The easy solution for him would have been simply to go with Ahrens' Megarian ου = Attic ου. Instead, Colvin brings in a critical sensitivity to changes over time; he argues that Ahrens' evidence is late, and that Thumb-Kiekers' evidence (for Megarian ευ) is from the colonies, not local. His reasons for reading -ου- are different (p. 152):

> The dividing line between shared areal features and *koine* influence is rather narrow in this case; the ἐστραταγουν (*IG* vii.4.15) that Ahrens quotes belongs to the 4th century. The problem is that evidence from the Megarid before this century is lacking; Thumb-K, working on a strongly genetic model, go to the colonies and quote στραταγευτας (D[3] 645.74 Seleuc., c. 172 BC) to support their assumption of ευ in Megarian. However, the location of the inscription, its lateness and the fact that it also produces διαμαρτυρουντι make it doubtful evidence.

Colvin prefers areal evidence which exhibits ευ, or εο, yet the passages from Aristophanes have -ου. The author accepts that although Megarian probably shared areal ευ/εο, it was 'influenced by Attic ου at a particularly early date'.

These are only some of the ways in which Colvin masterfully extracts the vital kernel out of complex evidence (cf. also, e.g., 4.1.6 describing Laconian [θ], written σ, corresponding to Attic [t^h], written θ, especially p. 170). We also learn that the text does not present a uniform replacement, that orthographic change lags behind phonetic change.

We have seen how Colvin applies epichoric evidence to interpret the forms of the literary text he studies. On rare occasions where the text merits this, Colvin concedes that editors are justified in generalizing a dialect feature, e.g. Boeotian accusative plural -ως for Attic -ους (p. 155). Although the dialect varieties for Attic -ου- are treated together as a feature of phonology, Colvin argues that Aristophanes would be less ready to give an inconsistent representation of ου as it is found in a *morphological* category (such as the accusative plural noun ending) repeated in the space of a few lines.

At this juncture it is well worth placing Colvin among the more sober and serious dialectologists dealing with literary texts. In particular, the work of Haiim Rosén on the language of Herodotus comes to mind. Colvin and Rosén differ in training and in direction, but I find gratifying similarities in the cautious approach and in the application of other features of 'Textpolitik' in the work of these two dialectologists.

Haiim Rosén's *Praefatio* to his edition of Herodotus (1987) is mentioned briefly by C. (p. 59 n. 39) with reference to the text of Herodotus. In constructing his version of that literary Ionic text, Rosén adhered to editorial principles some of which Colvin also follows in his unravelling of the textual evidence for Laconian, Megarian and

Boeotian in Aristophanes. Rosén's editorial principles are eloquently presented in the *Praefatio* and applied in detail in his edition of the text of Herodotus. These principles are solidly based on Rosén's view of Herodotus' language, which is mapped out in his brilliant *Laut- und Formenlehre der herodotischen Sprachform* of 1962. This work is presented as a grammar of Herodotus' language, in the tradition of monographs on the language of individual Greek authors; we think for example of earlier works such as Chantraine's *Grammaire Homérique*, or of later ones such as Moorhouse's *Syntax of Sophocles*, or Hummel's *Syntaxe de Pindare*. Rosén's task is more complex because he makes constant reference to the similarities and differences between forms attested in Herodotus and the forms attested in epigraphical material. Behind the modest title lies hidden an unannounced, but seminal section of his book, section IV, which is an introduction to the text and language of Herodotus (pp. 193-254). Many observations on dialect and the ancient and modern judgment of Herodotus' language are given in § 43 (pp. 231-47); § 44 (pp. 248-54) maps out phonological, morphological and lexical isoglosses in the language of Herodotus, and then positions Herodotus' usage within a larger geographical domain, following the isoglosses identified. Greek scholars are familiar with many of these, but I bring below some phonological and morphological examples from Rosén's much fuller list, which is a summary with cross references to more detailed scrutiny of these phenomena in Herodotus' language:

— Herodotus' fluctuation between ιερο- and ιρο- (common with epigraphical evidence from Paros, different from the stable use of ιε- in Attica and a number of other Ionic locales);
— Herodotus' 'psilosis' (as defined by Rosén in § 14.2 of his *Laut- u. Formenlehre*) common with Anaphe, Thera, Megara, Halicarnassus, Kos, Miletus, possibly Samos, not attested in inscriptions from Attica, Amorgos, Aegina;

— the sequence -ρσ-, found in Herodotus and in inscriptions from many locales, but not in Attica and Corinth;
— παρ-, κατ-, ἀν- are attested alongside παρα- etc. in inscriptions from Knidos, Nisyros, Kos, Paros, Thera, Corinth, and very rarely, but also in Herodotus. Elsewhere only the longer forms are attested.
— The paradigm of action nouns in -σις differs from that of other ι- stem nouns in Herodotus, as well as the inscriptions from Thera, Halicarnassus, Megara and Kos. The two types of noun share a single paradigm in other locales, such as Anaphe, Attica, Corinth, Delos, etc.

Colvin's title, too, does not reveal the full value of his book. The book is, among many other things, in fact a 'Laut- und Formenlehre' of the (partially stylized) Megarian, Boeotian and Laconian passages in Aristophanes.

The similarities I try to draw between C.'s treatment of dialect in Aristophanes and Rosén's work on Herodotus, in certain respects very different, are meant as very high praise of C. The two do not follow quite the same principles, yet C.'s work exhibits some similar policies. Both steer clear of the extreme of no editing on the one hand (and instead adopting in all cases readings supported by the strongest combination of manuscripts — Colvin (p. 115) gives as an example εἰ for Megarian at *Ach.* 788, whereas in all other places the manuscripts support αἰ); both also steer clear of the other extreme of generalizing dialect forms throughout the text (e.g. Coulon, in the Budé edition of Aristophanes, prints ει for η in all the passages spoken by the

Boeotian in the *Ach.*, even though η and ει are attested with equal frequency). Wholesale solutions for *variatio* disturbed Rosén:

> ... haec libera variatio, quoad permansit in memoria nostri, conservanda et sustinenda est in recensione, praecipue ubi omnes codices textum tradunt consentientes (*Praefatio*, vi).

C., like Rosén, is especially wary of standardizing or otherwise doctoring variation in phonetic phenomena, which appear sometimes in the expected dialect form and at other times in the Attic form. His caution in using the epichoric inscriptional data as a definitive model is consonant with Rosén's caveats on the matter: in particular it is not possible to 'match' the amalgam of features in the literary text with normal forms in dialects associated with particular locales.

> Credo autem meam grammaticam monstravisse non licere aggredi ad sermonem Herodoteum huic vel illi loco in geographia dialectorum sito attribuendam, antequam quae memoria codicum traduntur sine ullo opinione praeiudicata examinarentur (*Praefatio*, viii).

We have already mentioned C.'s integrity in the face of the temptation to schematize. He admits to not understanding all the inconsistencies within the text or between the text and the other testimonies associated with the same dialect. This is a vital lesson, and one to which Rosén strictly adhered in the dialect he studied. The 'unexplainable' vacillation between forms demonstrates that the text freezes some features of the author's language in a mid-transition stage 'sermonis Herodotei mixta conditio patet, quia illo tempore relationes grammaticae e veteribus in novas videntur transisse' (*Praefatio* xix).

C. uses an important rationale germane to this in preserving the so-called inconsistency between ξυν- and συν- (pp. 209f.); while admitting his inability to identify a pattern, he suggests that the competition between the two forms had not yet stabilized in the last quarter of the fifth century. The preservation of such 'doubtful' forms or 'bad dialect', as C. terms them, in instances where he cannot explain discrepancies, is the responsible policy. The reasons for *variatio*, even if they are unclear, may later be revealed. This, at least, is what Rosén reminds us whenever he preserves 'unexplainable forms', for example the fluctuation between contracted and uncontracted infinitives in -ειν:

> ... nullum ... e textu relegavi ..., etsi ignoro, qua ratione vel ex historia vel e structura linguae ... explicari possit; ... aliqui vir doctus formam memoria traditam posthac grammatice explicet (*Praefatio*, ix).

In fact, Rosén himself found patterns and uncovered *differentiae* on a variety of levels: e.g. between ἀφ' οὗ (literally taken as preposition + relative) and ἀπ'οὖ (unverbated conjunction); between τοισίδε (instrumental use) and τοῖσδε (locative use); between dative singular -ει in -σις action nouns and dative singular -ι in 'concrete' nouns such as πόλις; between accusative in -ην and in -εα conditioned by presence or absence of a pause or some other 'sandhi' requirement). These and other distinctions are listed and discussed in the *Praefatio* (xii, xvi-xx) and, for those *differentiae*

discovered already in 1962, in the relevant sections of the *Laut- u. Formenlehre* referred to there.

For C., the forms of Greek put into the mouths of the Megarian, the Boeotian, and the Laconians in the comedies of Aristophanes are not entirely authentic testimonies of how people in these ethnic groups and specific locales spoke. Rather, C. wonders how familiar the author Aristophanes was with each of these three varieties of Greek (see, e.g., pp. 27, 146, 205, 226, 240, 242, 258). He gives ample and subtle evidence that Aristophanes was not mechanically using replacement rules; the audience in any case would not be conceiving of the dialect variety in these terms (p. 296). Instead, Aristophanes selected features he thought typical or natural, according to his needs and, possibly to some extent, his familiarity, and inserted them word by word (e.g. *Ach.* 835 αἴ κά τις διδῶι, with Megarian features in Attic word order — p. 229). The fact that Laconian is represented more carefully than Megarian, Megarian in turn more than Boeotian, does not, in C.'s view, necessarily reflect Aristophanes' relative familiarity with these dialects, but may have literary reasons (p. 297).

C.'s analysis of the non-Attic forms in Aristophanes is always at the same time linguistic on the one hand, and social and literary on the other. The multi-dimensional nature of this analysis may cause some readers to feel that there are two parallel lines in the book which never succeed in combining to form a monograph. One of C.'s aims is indeed to compose, fully and accurately, a description of non-Attic features in Aristophanes. However, he also aims to use this description in order to 'decide whether Aristophanes introduces dialect for the purpose of mocking it, or whether the dialect comprises part of the realistic conventions of the genre' (p. 27) — namely the literary posture of dialect use. More broadly, C. analyzes dialect variation in Aristophanes 'hoping to use information from comic drama to illuminate a particular area of Greek social thought, namely thought about language and language variation' (p. 39). This combination of threads is very difficult to weave into a uniform whole, and even if the fabric is not smooth, in my opinion this is a price worth paying in order to tackle a very difficult question. In the final analysis (p. 300), regional variety in Aristophanes appears not to play the same role as it does in, say, English literature. Moral, social and other character portrayal may be conveyed by other linguistic means in Aristophanes, but dialect difference was part of the convention of Old Comedy: C. observes an increased, more blatant use of dialect features on entrance of a character as an 'integral part of the structure' (p. 298); this pattern is compared with analogous features in Plato and Xenophon (p. 290).

Returning finally to the term and concept of dialect, I believe it is no coincidence that C. does not offer a clear-cut definition of dialect (nor does this term have a lemma in the short glossary of linguistic terms at the end of his book). The complexities, specifically in the case of ancient Greek, are presented in the influential article of A. Morpurgo Davies (*Verbum* 1987). In this article, to which C. refers in his own short presentation of the problem, Davies discusses how the Greeks themselves viewed their language in its varieties. To her discussion of the use of διάλεκτος and other terms I would add earlier comments by Rosén on this subject (*Laut- u. Formenlehre* § 43.15ff): his remarks, concentrating on the ancient conception of

Herodotus' language, are important for an appreciation of ancient philology's treatment of the text. Rosén sketches the series of events that led to the conception of a single 'vera Herodotea forma' rather than a recognition of the fluctuation within Herodotus' language, which, he believed, cannot be doctored to fit the epigraphical evidence of a specific locale. This sort of appreciation has affinities with C.'s interpretation of the survival of fluctuation in the text of Aristophanes and the concept of dialect.

Stephen Colvin is to be warmly praised and congratulated for so illuminating the complex material of Aristophanic dialect. We await further, innovative application of sociolinguistic interpretation of Greek literary texts based on the very solid and scrupulous philological methods of Colvin typified in this book.

Donna Shalev The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Heinrich Dörrie, *Der Platonismus in der Antike. Grundlagen — System — Entwicklung*. Band 1, Die geschichtlichen Wurzeln des Platonismus, aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Annemarie Dörrie, Stuttgart-Bad Canstatt: Frommann and Holzboog 1987. xvii + 557 pp. ISBN 3 7728 1153; Band 2, Der hellenistische Rahmen des kaiserzeitlichen Platonismus, aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben und bearbeitet von Matthias Baltes unter Mitarbeit von Annemarie Dörrie und Friedhelm Mann, Stuttgart-Bad Canstatt: Frommann and Holzboog 1990. xvi + 531 pp. ISBN 3 7728 1154 X; Band 3, Der Platonismus im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert nach Christus, herausgegeben von Matthias Baltes, Stuttgart-Bad Canstatt: Frommann and Holzboog 1993. xix + 440 pp. ISBN 3 7728 1155 8.

These three volumes are the first half of what Heinrich Dörrie regarded as his life's work; a collection of texts, with translations and a commentary, illustrating the various aspects of Platonism in the period between the first appearance of what is now commonly called Middle Platonism, in the first century CE, and the rise of what is called Neo Platonism in the middle of the third century. In her *Geleitwort* to vol. 1 (pp. XV-XVII), his widow, Annemarie Dörrie (known to scholars as Annemarie Lueder, author of an important dissertation on Antiochus of Ascalon published in 1940), describes in dispassionate terms the passionate adventure of her late husband's life. As soon as Heinrich Dörrie completed his academic studies, he decided that his life's work was to consist in studying and writing the history of Middle Platonism. What he planned, already in those remote years, was not a 'book about' Platonism (something like Paul Moraux' *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen*), but an annotated collection of basic texts. While the project was in its first steps, D. was called up to active service in 1939. In 1944, he was dispatched to the Russian front, and he spent the years 1944-1953 in a Russian camp for German prisoners of war. In the few hours he was allowed to spare from hard labour, he went on working on his project. Friends in Germany supplied him with materials, and fellow-prisoners encouraged him to continue his studies and to lecture to them on some of the results. Returning to Germany in 1953, he spent the remaining thirty years of his life (he died in 1983)