

could be treated along the same lines as the ritual performances out of which they developed. Again, this is not to say that ritual patterns like those uncovered by Seaford should be simply discarded as irrelevant; yet, significant as they certainly were, these patterns presented only one aspect of epos and tragedy and not, as in Seaford's interpretation, their main if not their only *raison d'être*. In fact, there were many other occasions on which the fifth- and fourth-century Greeks could attend ritual performances or even become participants in them; yet, when they went to the theater, they obviously looked for something more than just an enactment of ritual.

Margalit Finkelberg

Tel Aviv University

G. Basta Donzelli (ed.), *Euripides, Electra*. Stuttgart-Leipzig: Teubner, 1995, xxxviii + 83 pp.

The project of providing separate editions of the 19 surviving plays of the Euripidean corpus, undertaken by Teubner Leipzig beginning in 1964, has now been brought to completion under the imprint of the post-reunification Stuttgart/Leipzig Teubner with the appearance (following W. Stockert's *Hippolytus* in 1994) of the edition of *Electra* here under review. Donzelli (hereafter D.) has worked on this play for many years, having published a monograph in 1978 and since then a series of articles (not all, however, widely available in North America), the most substantial of which are a study of the manuscripts and the early printed editions of the play (*Bolletino dei classici* 10, 1989, 70-105)—important background for the briefer information provided in the preface of this edition—and a careful review of the arguments about speech-divisions and speech-attributions in some vexed passages (*Bolletino dei classici* 12, 1991, 5-35). The Teubner editions have of course varied in scope and quality and editorial philosophy, as 14 different editors have been involved in the project. The advantage of these editions is the leeway they give to the editor to provide extras not allowed in an Oxford Classical Text: a detailed bibliography permitting others to locate where particular emendations or textual discussions have appeared; metrical schemes; a separate testimonial apparatus; sometimes fuller citations of witnesses or conjectures in the apparatus, providing historical background that would be omitted on severer principles of what an apparatus criticus should contain. D. provides these extras for *Electra* (although the play has few testimonia and she has been selective in citing what little there is) and occasionally has found an earlier proponent of a correction than Diggle could cite (e.g., 198, 413), and the metrical schemes pay attention to period end and are annotated with references to the key discussions and to comparative cola.

Of the Teubner editors who have dealt with the alphabetic plays, a few have maintained the view that LP are *gemelli*, but D. is with the majority who have rightly accepted the proofs of Zuntz and others that P is descended from L after Triklinios had performed the first phase of his corrections in L. Having found the criterion of ink color to be too subjective, she has eschewed the refinements of Tr<sup>1</sup>, Tr<sup>2</sup>, Tr<sup>3</sup> and simply cited P in those places where Triklinios has been active, so that one may easily distinguish L vs. TrP variants (generally T.'s earlier work) from LP vs. Tr variants (generally T.'s later phases of correction).

D.'s textual choices are very similar to Diggle's for long stretches, especially in dialogue portions. Many of the differences are in the most problematic passages, where the choice may be evenly balanced and widespread agreement will never be reached. A number of her disagreements with Diggle will already be found in M. Cropp's fine Aris & Phillips edition of 1988. On the whole D. is not averse to recognizing corruption or interpolation, but she is more conservative than Diggle. Sometimes she retains a manuscript reading as sound (e.g. 353 τίν' ἀγορεύοντες instead of Reiske's tempting τίνα πορεύοντες) or prints an obelized text where Diggle has opted for a restoration of readability (e.g., 414, 483-4, 504, 1058, 1263)—the obverse occurs more rarely (as 1059). She keeps 59 in its transmitted position, but the line is troublesome whether kept there or placed after 56. I think she is too conservative in retaining 131 σύγγοι λατρεύεις; 377 ἔλθω; 659 τοι ... ἄγω (it is much more usual for one partner in stichomythia to ask the other to get to the point, as occurs with Jortin's ἄγε, rightly read by most editors). At 374 the papyrus' τᾶρα strikes me as superior to γ' ἄρα (favored by Denniston; but I don't think ποιηρῶ needs the emphasis of γ' here). Among attractive features I would mention adoption of Kamerbeek's <κ> σᾶς ἀλόχου σφαγείς in 123, the punctuation of 300, Kirchhoff's καὶ μὴν in 619 (Weil's conjecture τᾶμ' οὖν is at first sight palaeographically easier [κάμου γ' L], but the emphasis on τᾶμ' οὖν is not really needed here and if μου/έμου was a supralinear gloss L's reading could have resulted from καὶ μὴν); retention of τήνδε in 757 and of καλῶς in 1015 (both already defended by Cropp). In decisions regarding suspected interpolations, the most significant difference from Diggle is her retention of the whole of Orestes' speech at 367-400, which has been variously reduced by critics: D. argues for a thread of relevant argumentation in *Εἰκασμός* 2, 1991, 113-17.

On the distribution of speeches, D. (like others) has argued successfully (against Victorius, followed by Diggle) that the anapaests following the *deus ex machina* speech are to be assigned in a manner very close to L's markings (keeping μισαροῖς in 1292 and leaving the chorus out of the exchange until the final χαίρετε). D. has provided an interesting defense of treating 982-4 as stichomythic, but I still find Weil's reconstruction as one speech of Electra more convincing. In 684ff. I sympathize with D.'s resistance to a large deletion, but 693 cannot, in my view, stand between 692 and 694 (a standard shift of addressees [read σοὶ not σοι in 692]) and the antilabe without dramatic force is doubtful at the date of this play. I am not persuaded by her published arguments concerning 671-83: in particular, the γε in 681 is much better viewed as marking continuation of another speaker's thought, and χῶσοι in 683 following on οἵπερ γε may also be an index of change of speaker; and if the triplet 680-81-83 is shared by three speakers, then so probably is at least the previous triplet and perhaps the two triplets before that. Likewise, at 959-65, I cannot see what motivation there would be for Electra at 962 to say "Hold on!" and urge her partner to consider ἄλλον λόγον: the speaker who is urging this (not simply stating that another topic is now being forced upon them by their mother's arrival) must have a reason to want to discuss something (deliberately left vague by the preparatory ἄλλον λόγον), and that reason is a weakening of resolve caused by sighting their mother, as Electra herself diagnoses it in 968. I would also side with Seidler and Diggle against D. in giving 1226 to Electra (and not giving 1232 to Chorus).

On the whole, this is a work of serious and helpful scholarship, satisfying the higher ambitions of the more recent Teubner Euripides volumes. Production and readability of the type are up to the high standards of the new combined Teubner. There are two minor

misprints in the apparatus (251 read τηλ- [bis]; 1031 read ἡγρωμην), and I consider ἡπύχῃσεν the preferred spelling in 8 (*Glotta* 67, 1989, 101-105).

Donald J. Mastronarde

University of California, Berkeley

Christoph Kugelmeier, *Reflexe früher und zeitgenössischer Lyrik in der Alten attischen Komödie* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Bd. 80), Stuttgart-Leipzig: Teubner, 1996, 379 pp.

This book, the revised version of a Köln doctoral thesis, is a useful, thorough, and competently executed work of synthesis. Two thirds of it illustrate how Old Comedy poets used quotations from, and allusions to, the lyric, iambic and elegiac poets of the past (all included in 'lyric' in the modern sense); the remainder examines comic treatment of the contemporary New Dithyramb. Although rightly drawing heavily on many earlier studies, from Wilamowitz onward, with inevitably extensive footnotes, K. shows critical independence; occasionally (see below) the reviewer found what seems over-eagerness to identify echoes of an earlier poet, or to see literary significance in a purely comic passage, but mostly K. displays a healthy awareness of comic techniques, and his general conclusions seem justified.

The Introduction distinguishes four kinds of 'Reflex', according to their degree of dependence on the model: 1) verbatim quotations, often but not always producing a humorous incongruity with their new setting; 2) partial quotations, with some words replaced by others more suited to the new context; 3) more tentatively, given the very fragmentary state of Greek poetry, echoes (Anklänge) of a lyric original, alluding to it 'only with a striking expression or a typical motif' — a category inevitably arousing disagreement; 4) not textual reminiscences, but allusions to the person of a poet and his work. It also notes the need to investigate a possible correlation between the way in which a quotation or allusion is used and the particular part of the comedy's structure (e.g. parabasis ode, non-lyric dialogue) in which it occurs; this consideration sensibly governs the arrangement of K.'s detailed examination of comic 'Reflexe' in Ch. IV.

Before that, Ch. II discusses the importance of quotations in Old Comedy for the text of lyric, noting the problem caused by a natural Athenian tendency to assimilate a quotation at least partially to Attic, as with Alkaios at Ar. V. 1234-5; Ch. III examines the evidence of comedy for the extent of Athenian knowledge of earlier poetry, acquired at school and reinforced by regular singing at symposia, at which at least some boys were present and were expected to perform.

In Chapter IV, K.'s systematic analysis of the effects of lyric quotation and allusion reveals that this earlier poetry, though often parodied, is (unlike tragedy) never itself the target of ridicule, but is (like tragedy) used to produce a dignified tone, often suddenly sinking to bathos. Parabasis odes, sometimes beginning with echoes of Stesichoros and Pindar, are the richest source, as is to be expected from their probable origin in cult-hymn, but other, non-lyric, parabasis sections, other choral parts, agons and self-standing solos all yield what adds up to a considerable total. Pindar seems to have been a favourite of both Aristophanes and audience; the Pindaric poet of *Birds* is well handled, but surprisingly appears in the section 'Andere Chorpartien', not under 'Eigenständige Lyrik'. The comparative rarity of allusions to Lesbian poetry (even rarer than K. thinks