

Further, critics will want to reconsider the role of writing in the emergence of the 'poetics of fiction' (cf. p. 166). There is reason to believe that a concept of the 'dead artefact', typologically opposed to the Homeric concept of the 'living artefact', emerged after the consolidation of the latter, for sculptures are described as lacking ψυχὴ and καρδίη in Hippocrates (*de victo* 1.21 = Heracl. DK C 2.21) and Democritus (DK B 195), while Pindar (*N.* 5.1-3) and Isocrates (9.73-74) refer to statues' lack of life and movement in order to enhance the value of their own arts. A similar dichotomy is found in the fifth and the fourth centuries BC with reference to writing. On the one hand, the new technology was much admired (Aesch. *PV* 459-461, Eur. *Palamedes* fr. 578N<sup>2</sup>, Philemon fr. 10) as Daedalus' sculptures were (e.g. Eur. fr. 372, Diod. IV.76). However, when Alcidas (Soph. 27-28) and Plato (*Phaedrus* 276) criticised the use of writing, they compared it to sculpture and painting precisely because these two art forms lack life and movement. Moreover, both used the word ποιητής derogatorily for writers of speeches — a word that, as F. shows, replaced the traditional αἰιδός (176). It seems, therefore, that at some point in the fourth century BC writing was explicitly assimilated into the handicrafts and treated in terms of a 'dead artefact'. Should we think that this assimilation was facilitated by the new 'poetics of fiction'? Is it not possible that writing, or, rather, a specific reaction to written composition originating in the realms of oratory and philosophy, helped bring poetry into the sphere of craftsmanship and thus contributed to the emergence of the 'poetics of fiction'?

These are just two points of departure. Surely many varied discussions, debates and research will find their origin in F.'s masterful work. For the readers of this journal F.'s book gives full form to the arguments worked out in three articles previously published here, namely: 'Enchantment and Other Effects of Poetry in the Homeric *Odyssey*', 8-9 (1985-88), 1-10; 'How Could Achilles' Fame have been Lost?', 11 (1991-92), 22-37; and 'The Shield of Achilles, or Homer's View of Representation in Art', 13 (1994), 1-6.

*The Birth of Literary Fiction in Ancient Greece* is a significant contribution to classical scholarship because it challenges standard philological procedures with admirable philological skill. Finkelberg manages to combine the deductive approach of structuralism of her first two chapters with a reconstruction of the cultural context in which the Greek views of poetry developed. The book thus makes sense of Greek poetics as a historical process. It is this which makes it inspiring reading.

Andrea Rotstein

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Alain Martin and Oliver Primavesi, *L'Empédocle de Strasbourg (P.Strasb. gr. Inv. 1665-1666). Introduction, édition et commentaire*. B.N.U.S. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1999. xii + 396 pp., vi planches. ISBN 3-11-015129-4.

A papyrus purchased by Otto Rubensohn in 1904 at Akhmin (Panopolis), folded and twisted into the shape of a funeral wreath (1f., 27-51), was sent to the Imperial Library at Strasburg where it remained 'under glass' (inventoried as nos. 1665 and

1666) for some 90 years. Finally parcelled out to Alain Martin, its connection with the writings of Empedocles was announced in April 1994 (2 n. 3). The contents of 1665-1666 consist of 52 fragmentary pieces which Martin and Primavesi (henceforth = M.-P.) have organized into six 'ensembles' (designated as **a**, **b**, **c**, **d**, **f**, **g**), together with several isolated pieces (2-7). From this assortment, M.-P. believe that they can reconstruct '74 (+?)' lines of Empedoclean hexameter ('complets ou lacunaires'), 25 of which show points of contact with the indirect tradition (20 are identical), the remainder of which were previously unknown (99f.). What is more, this text, which is dated on paleographic grounds to the first century AD (13-5), and which certainly appears to be a scholar's text (including sigla, corrections, and variants; 20-5), is said by the authors to represent the direct tradition (100-3). That is, it is neither a commentary (like *P. Derv.*), nor derived from some type of *florilegium*, but is claimed to be the remnant of an actual bookroll that originally contained (presumably) the whole of Empedocles' poem. If this is correct, then the Strassburg Empedocles is a major find. Not only does it present us with our earliest evidence for the text of Empedocles (and at several significant points corrects the indirect tradition; see, e.g., 297ff. ad DK 31B139), it supplies us with what is virtually the first, and certainly the fullest direct transmission of any major Presocratic author (101f.).

This *editio princeps* is meticulously produced. It includes a reconstructed text, translations, exhaustive commentary (159-323), plates, appendices, detailed indices, and a lengthy introduction (1-119), with English summary (339-48). The authors' conclusions, however, will in some points prove controversial.<sup>1</sup>

The papyrus appears to support many of the traditional claims made for Empedocles' cosmogony. Cosmic alternation between the unity of the Sphere and its maximal dissolution under Strife is cyclical (cp. Pl. *Soph.* 242E 4ff.; Ar. *Met.* 985a25ff., *Phys.* 250b26ff.). At the point of maximal separation, the great elemental masses are organized into concentric spheres possessed of a (presumably) rotary motion (71ff., 88). Love is compressed into the center (see below), and is not driven out to the periphery (91ff.). Importantly, there is new evidence of a double zoogony (**a** [i].7 - [ii].17; see M.-P., 55ff., 75-82, 186ff.) that is in accord with the four stages described by Aët. 5.19.5 (*Dox. Gr.* 430.21ff. = DK 31A 72). Our world falls within the fourth and final stage, prior to the ultimate triumph of Strife (89, 95ff., 283f.).

Now, while the indirect tradition had on several occasions in its account of the Empedoclean cosmogony used the neuter participle *συνερχόμεν* to describe the process of the unification of the elements under the increasing influence of Love (DK 31B 17.7f.; 20.2; 26.5; cp. 35.5), the papyrus gives at several points, in similar or identical contexts, the first person plural *συνερχόμεθ'* (**a** [i].6; **a** [ii].17 [εἰσ-ηρχόμεθ']; **c**3 [= B20.2]; cp. **a** [ii].20). At **a** (i).6 (cp. B26.5), and apparently (277) also at **c**3, this final *θ* is corrected by a second hand *supra lineam* to the *ν* of the indirect tradition. Such a repetitive error, admittedly, is not likely to be accidental (91) and M.-P. believe that both readings are genuine variants: i.e., that the correction

<sup>1</sup> See also O. Primavesi, *Empedokles-Studien: Der Strassburger Papyrus und die indirekte Überlieferung* (forthcoming); also *Elenchos* 19.2, 1998 (special issue); *Mnemosyne* 52, 1999, 525-44 (van der Ben).

at issue was introduced by the second hand through collation with another manuscript tradition (93f.). But the authors insist that the first person plural, which they deem the *lectio difficilior*, is the correct reading ('la leçon authentique') for Empedocles. **a** (ii).17, which occurs just before Love (Φιλότης) comes into the center (μέση) of the eddy as Strife completes its domination (see **a** [ii].18-20; cp. DK 31B 35.3-5), as reconstructed, reads: 'and we were coming together to the middle places, so as to be only one' (μεσάτους τ' εἰσηρχόμεθ' ἐν μόνον εἶναι). Assuming these two 'centers' to coincide, the authors infer that this 'we' is precisely those same particles of Love that will presently seize the center of the eddy, and following Cornford, Kahn, O'Brien, and others who identify the δαίμονες of the Καθαρμοί with scattered fragments of Love, M.-P. argue that the 'we' of this passage must be just these very δαίμονες. In the present instance, at the final stage of the world, before its utter dissolution, the destruction of the physical bodies under Strife liberates ('libère') the *daemones* (i.e., the particles of Love) which, thus disincarnate, grab the center of the eddy just as they are about to begin on the process of reunification. In fact, 'leur retour ... dans la petite région centrale où les progrès de la Haine tiennent alors l'Amour confiné, constitue pour ce dernier le signal d'un nouvel essor' (95). Indeed, in all of the passages where the first person plural appears, though the context (as we shall see) is unequivocally cosmogonical, the 'we' points precisely to those δαίμονες otherwise associated principally with the Καθαρμοί. In this way, and on the back of these scattered *thetas*, M.-P. harmonize the doctrines of the *Physics* and the *Purifications*.<sup>2</sup>

But there is more. Ensemble **a** (see Planche III) preserves portions of two columns of writing: portions of the last nine lines of a left-hand column (= **a** [i]) and of all thirty lines of a right-hand column (= **a** [ii]). By a lucky chance, **a** (i).1-5 coincide with B17.30-35. We may therefore assume 28 lines (omitting B17.9) prior to the start of our fragment. We thus possess 68 continuous lines of text. Now, Simpl. *In Phys.* 157.25-27 Diels ascribes B17 to Book I of the *Physics* (οὕτως ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Φυσικῶν παραδίδωσι). Furthermore, a stichometric notation just to the left of the right-hand column of **a** indicates that **a** (ii).30 is, in fact, line 300 (21f.). And so, assuming that we are indeed dealing with a direct transmission of the text of Empedocles' poem, M.-P. believe it certain that we now possess, relatively intact, vv. 233-300 of Bk. I of the *Physics*. So what precedes? B17 looks much like the start of the cosmogony (δίπλ' ἐρέω κτλ.) and is usually taken as such. Consequently, following Sedley (*GRBS* 30, 1989, 269-96), M.-P. suggest (111-4) that v. 233 was preceded by a lengthy proem. Moreover, the casual allusion to *daemones* which M.-P. find embedded in **a** require that the reader be prepared, prior to **a**, by some account of the demonology. Hence, with van der Ben, M.-P. would place B115 (ascribed by Diels and others to the Καθαρμοί), together with many, if not all, of the other fragments dealing with the demonology (cp. 118f.), into this 'proem' of the *Physics*.

In light of the content of DK 31 B112, and Diogenes' referral of it to the opening of the *Purifications* (8.54 αὐτὸς ἐναρχόμενος τῶν Καθαρῶν), M.-P. are not willing

<sup>2</sup> On this last point, however, cp. H. Cherniss, *Aristotle's Criticism of Presocratic Philosophy* (1935), 294 n. 15.

to deny the existence of two separate poems. After all, both titles are well attested. Their conclusion is rather: 'Quoi qu'il en soit de la relation entre les deux titres, Empédocle n'a développé qu'une doctrine, dont le papyrus, par une rencontre heureuse avec la recherche récente, concourt à restituer à la fois la diversité et la cohérence' (119). However one judges the specifics of their case, students of the Presocratics will appreciate the clarity and thoroughness of this valuable edition.

Alexander Tulin

Howard University

N. Dunbar ed., *Aristophanes: Birds*, with introduction and commentary, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995. xvii + 782 pp. (in paperback 1997).

In these days, when scholarly enquiry would seem to be endangered by the pressure to manufacture an increasing number of ephemeral studies, there is something almost unique about Dunbar's large-scale, immensely informative edition of Aristophanes' masterpiece *Birds*, which relies so scrupulously on the cumulative efforts of generations of scholars and is in itself the result of nearly forty years of relentless search and enquiry. Indeed, Dunbar has provided us with the fullest and best critical account so far of the play under consideration. One could have wished for a deeper study of the literary aspects of this play's action in terms of the dramatic expression of thought and character, and for a more penetrating account of Aristophanes' comic technique, artistic aims and preferences; but given this limitation in Dunbar's approach to her subject, the present volume, judged by purely philological standards, should be welcomed as a major contribution to Aristophanic studies, as also to our understanding of the particular comedy it discusses.

Dunbar's commentary constantly reflects her special interest in matters concerning textual criticism, Greek idiom, stylistic nuances, metrical analysis, and — in accordance with the play's main theme — ornithology.

Her erudite introductory account of the history of the text offers a systematic attempt at reassessing and re-evaluating the manuscript evidence in full, including an unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyrus of 1661-76 (pp. 19-31). Conceived against the background of Aristophanic scholarship from Aristotle to the end of the eighteenth century (pp. 31-51), it is exemplary for its clarity and puts into its proper perspective the textual contribution to *Birds* of the Scholia, the Suda, Tzetzes and Triklinius, respectively. Dunbar has also done much in the area of line-attribution. Of special interest is her present substantial attempt to redefine the spoken parts commonly attributed to Peisetairos (Dunbar's preferable version of this character's name) and Euelpides, respectively, in the preliminary stages of the play's action (see esp. pp. 132f., 228; n. ad 13-22a; n. ad 128-34; n. ad 155-6a; n. ad 638-40; n. ad 667-74; in fact, the two Athenians are not named until 644-5). This attempt, instigated by a close consideration of Aristophanes' differentiated characterization of the two friends, should assist us in rectifying certain inconsistencies concerning the nature and the extent of the protagonists' initial reactions, verbal or otherwise, to the dramatic situation concerned.