

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

— see below) is reasonably attributed to their dialect and Sappho's subject-matter. Ch. V examines the relation of Old Comedy to the iambographers, and finds the allusions to iambic poems conforming to the same patterns as those to lyric. Archilochos is evoked oftener than Hipponax, having a whole play of Kratinos devoted to him, which, despite the paucity of evidence, probably represented him as a favourable witness for Kratinos' own satirical creations.

Chapter VI fills almost a third of the book, examining the ways in which comic poets, in contrast with their quotation and parody of archaic poetry to produce humorous incongruity, regularly employed stylistic parody as a weapon to ridicule the New Dithyramb composed by their contemporaries; the two tragedians usually seen as influenced by the new genre, Euripides and Agathon, are included by examining the parodies in *Frogs* and *Thesmophoriazousai*. Although inevitably drawing often on Schönewolf's thorough study of the New Dithyramb (Diss. Giessen 1938) and Zimmermann's recent *Dithyrambos* (Göttingen 1992), K. surveys the data with an independent eye. He reasonably argues e.g. (261-2) against Schönewolf's seeing in Ar. *Plut.* 290ff. a personal attack on Philoxenos, and against Zimmermann's deducing a solo element in Philoxenos' *Kyklops*; he rightly sees as parodying the old image of the inspired poet 'soaring aloft' the acted metaphor in Ar. *Av.* 1373ff., where the dithyrambist Kinesias comes in quest of wings; he concludes that the picture in Ar. and other comic poets of a skeleton-like Kinesias, 'light-weight' (λεπτός) in physique as well as art, although implied in the famous polemical fragment 143 of Lysias, is at least partly a transfer from his weightless poems; but he is on less firm ground in seeing an unfavourable rather than naïvely admiring reaction to Socratic subtlety in Strepsiades' use of λεπτο- forms in *Nu.* 153, 319-20. Comic poets, he concludes, were not attempting any serious literary criticism, but hoping to amuse the audience by selecting those aspects of contemporary poetry that lent themselves most easily to ridicule.

Throughout the book, K.'s lively enthusiasm for his subject, and his desire to take an independent line, occasionally lead him to abandon his usual common sense for questionable statements or even error; e.g. arguing (32-3) that Ar. *Pax* 1301, ψυχὴν δ' ἐξεσάωσα, alone preserves the original text of Archil. 5,3 West, he rightly notes that Archil. uses ψυχή as 'one's own life' in fr. 213, but fails to account for the *difficilior* αὐτόν of other witnesses; on the same passage of *Peace* he oddly suggests (42) that the joke consists in the attempt of Kleonymos, through his young son, to justify his own shield-shedding by alluding to his famous predecessor. On p. 58, whether by a slip of the pen or by a metrical muddle, he reasonably objects to Diels's conjecture Μίνως, but adds that the name contains a *short* first syllable; further confusion over metre is caused on p. 108 by muddled line-references in discussing the Pindar quotation in *Wasps* 308: as the non-responding lines are 297-309, not 296-308, the surprise effect of the Pindar quote in 308 is distinct from the metrical surprise in 309.

P. 114: On the Pindaric poet, K. would retain ἐμὶν τεῖν at *Av.* 930; one wonders what he thinks it means, but in any case he is wrong to imply that West in deleting both datives took them as a gloss; West agreed with editor Blaydes's suggestion that they began as a grammarian's note on the first ἐμὶν at 928 (for which Σ 930b may well have been originally intended); K. objects to the lack of article in Kock's τῶν, which in lyric is surely unnecessary. P. 139: The frog chorus's εὐγῆρυ... αἰδάν at *Ra.* 213 may be in lyric-epic style, but 'the parallel nature of the scene' hardly makes this a reminiscence of the Sirens' μέλιγῆρυς ὄψ of *Od.* 12.187; but K.'s discussion of the frogs' lyric duet admirably rebuts

various modern efforts to read a literary-critical significance into the scene. P. 158: K. improbably sees echoes of Sappho in *Eq.* 730, where 'Who is wronging you, Paphlagon?' seems more likely to be a question common in a competitive and quarrelsome city than a reminiscence of Sappho 1.19-20, and the farewell exchanges at Sappho 94.5-7, famously criticized by Denys Page (*Sappho and Alcaeus* 83) as reflecting social conventions rather than deep feeling, seem unlikely to have come into Ar.'s or the audience's mind when Paphlagon takes farewell of his speaker's garland at *Eq.* 1250-1, or when Hermes bids farewell to Trygaios at *Pax* 719; Sappho echoes, not surprisingly, seem not to occur in extant Old Comedy. On p. 160 a slip of the pen makes Pindar *Nem.* 1 refer to Olympia (for Ortygia); p. 166, n. 286: M. Heath's scepticism (*Political Comedy* 18) concerns the seriousness with which Ar. treats his quarrels with Kleon in *Acharnians*, not the reality of the quarrels. Pp. 192-3: The Strasbourg Epode is unconvincingly claimed, with Rosen, as the model for *Ach.* 1150-60, on the basis of such parallels as a dog being mentioned in each, both curses expressed by the optative, and 'May I see him suffering', the last being, as noted with many parallels by Fraenkel (*Horace* 29, referred to by K.) a standard element in curses. Pp. 213-4: K.'s defence of a proceleusmatic in Eupolis fr. 366 (iambic trimeter), obelized in K-A, overlooks the fact that the metrical authorities he invokes are all concerned with lyric passages. Pp. 235-9: A long and learned argument for seeing a double sense, with allusion to the chromatic in musical theory, in Theopompos fr. 25, where Leotrophides is described as εὐχρώς... καὶ χαρίεις ὡς περ νεκρός, founders on the clear evidence of *Av.* 1405-7 (where scholia quote the Theopompos lines), that L. was not another dithyrambic poet but a choregos. P. 269: K. wrongly attributes to Zimmermann the categorical statement that cretic metre is 'something completely untragic.' Pp. 284-5: There is bad confusion over the text of R and ΣR in the critical apparatus given for *Thes.* 161ff.

The book is well produced, with good indexes; none of the dozen misprints noted should trouble the reader. Altogether, despite a few blemishes mostly due to excess of zeal, it shows admirable common sense, is blessedly free from theoretical jargon, and is valuable as well as enjoyable.

Nan Dunbar

Somerville College, Oxford

Whose Socrates?

Thomas C. Brickhouse and Nicholas D. Smith, *Plato's Socrates*, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. xiv + 240 pp.

A visitor from the outer space of Classical and historical scholarship might, perhaps, entertain the idea that a book called *Plato's Socrates* would attempt to study, in greater depth and with more detail than hitherto, the various images of the character called Socrates who appears in so many of Plato's dialogues; compare them both among themselves and with the Socrates of other 'primary sources' such as Xenophon, Aristotle, and the remains of Aeschines and Antisthenes; and attempt, by various forms of elimination, combination, conjecture and suchlike gymnastics to arrive somewhat nearer the historical Socrates. This is an exercise performed time and again over the centuries of modern scholarship — most recently (albeit not in an entirely philological and historical manner)