

convinced that Tenos in Laconia is any more likely than Telos; (iii) chronology: in a fine survey taking all the evidence into account, including literary stylistics, N. argues for an early fourth century date, combatting the view of Martin West, *ZPE* 25 (1977), 95–119, that the poem is an early Hellenistic forgery; (iv) biography: the tradition that Erinna died young is probably right, but the idea that she died at the age of 19 is a confusion with the age of Baucis' death; (v) the oeuvre: a good survey of what we know of the *Elakate* and its poetic dialect, offering the suggestion that it was probably transmitted on its own in a rather short papyrus roll consisting of fifteen columns of twenty lines (pp.158–9); (vi) the indirect tradition, in which N. attempts to demonstrate the authenticity of the *πομπίλος* fragment (*SH* 403), and even the possibility that it comes from the *Elakate* itself, which could have contained within it a mini-propempticon; (vii) the title: a nuanced discussion both of its meaning and the question of its authenticity; (viii) the genre: N. discusses and in the end accepts the idea that the *Elakate* is an example of *Kreuzung der Gattungen*; (ix) epigrams: N. examines the three epigrams in the *Anthology* attributed to Erinna, and argues that they should be approached as part of the Hellenistic doxography of Erinna; (x) a conclusion. The book is completed by four indexes, which are systematic and comprehensive.

N.'s book is an impressive achievement, and a real pleasure to read. Immense learning is tactfully deployed. Even in the rare cases where one wants to disagree with the author's conclusions, the evidence one needs to do so is all included. I have never before seen 'easy listening' used as an adjective in literary criticism (p. 179). We look forward to N.'s edition.

*University of Reading*

IAN RUTHERFORD

S. SCHRÖDER: *Geschichte und Theorie der Gattung Paian. Eine kritische Untersuchung mit einem Ausblick auf Behandlung und Auffassung der lyrischen Gattungen bei den alexandrinischen Philologen*. Pp. xv + 172. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1999. Cased, DM 68. ISBN: 3-519-07670-5.

Schroeder offers a critique of Lutz Käppel's (K.) important study of the paean (*Paian. Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung* [1992], reviewed in *CR* 44 [1994], 62–5). The main issue is this: K. argued that in the classical period, genre is about function; a paean is essentially a special form of prayer, not exclusively linked to any one god; from the fourth century, the concept of genre is supposed to be transformed, and formal features become critical (e.g. the 'paeian-refrain'), and in this period paeians are written where the formal features are particularly prominent, a transformation that K. labels 'Automatisation', borrowing the term from Russian formalism.

After a survey of K.'s position in Chapter I, S. proceeds in Chapter II to argue that paeians were after all addressed only to Apollo and his circle in the classical period. That means explaining away cases where they were sung to other deities, at least for the classical period. S. rightly points out that one important group of fragments ('Pindar Paean 13–22'), which do not involve Apollo, and which K. followed Snell-Maehler in labelling 'paeians', are not in fact paeians at all (cf. D'Alessio, *ZPE* 118 [1997], 23–60), but there are other contexts, including battle and the symposium, in which paeians do seem to have been sung to other deities. Another failing is that S. leaves out what some have seen as the core of the genre, the tendency of paean-performance to be correlated with scenarios where the collective male strength of the community is on display.

In Chapter III S. develops the argument that a defining rôle should be assigned to formal features as early as the classical period. One of the key texts is Philodamus of Scarpheia's Paean to Dionysus, which K. had seen as a generic innovation, crossing dithyrambic theme with paeianic refrain, and so pointing to the Hellenistic period; S. agrees that for Dionysus to be the dedicatee of a paean would have been disconcerting to an audience, but argues that (i) this is nothing to do with genre, (ii) it is intelligible within the ritual framework of the Delphic Theoxenia, and (iii) it would have been possible in the fifth century as well as the fourth. I certainly agree with (iii), though I doubt whether we can keep genre out of it entirely (cf. Bacchylides 16).

The most valuable chapter for me was Chapter IV, in which S. takes on K.'s use of contemporary literary theory, specifically of H. R. Jauss's essay, *Theorie der Gattungen und Literatur des Mittelalters* (available in English translation in *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, tr. T. Bahti [Brighton, 1982]). Jauss took issue with what he regarded as the traditional 'normative' theory of genres, in which generic identity is judged against a canonical model, and argued instead for a fluid notion of genre which varies over time, as individual works of literature

redefine it (taking on the rôle of the 'dominant') and which ultimately resides in family resemblances between different works as perceived by audience or reading public. K. tried to make this fit the history of the paean, insofar as it seems to change from classical period (defined by function) to post-classical (defined by formal features). S. argues (i) that the normative model is more appropriate for the paean, not only because it shows comparatively little diachronic variation (much less than the dithyramb, for example) but also because the defining features of paean are extremely simple (primarily the 'paean-cry'; Jaussian theory is better adapted to more complex genres; and (ii) that the normative model can accommodate the small number of minor variations effected by different poets, such as Bacchylides 17 (if you see that as a variation on a paean). S. convinces me on (i), but with respect to (ii), I think it could be argued that the degree of generic variation is much greater than S. allows, and that most of the fragments of paeans from the classical period (e.g. the Pindar Paeans) already display creative variation on the simple generic norm, whether we imagine the 'norm' as some lost subliterate form or as an abstraction situated somewhere in the past.

In the final chapter (V) S. turns to Hellenistic eidography, arguing that Hellenistic critics had much the same notion of genre as had prevailed in the fifth century B.C., not being exclusively concerned with formal features, and that the limits of book divisions did not constrain the Hellenistic critics unreasonably.

All in all, while it falls short of being a full treatment of the paean, and while not all of its claims are persuasive, S.'s book is a valuable critique of K., particularly *a propos* of his reliance on Jaussian generic theory.

*University of Reading*

IAN RUTHERFORD

H. FLASHAR: *Sophokles. Dichter im demokratischen Athen*. Pp. 220. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2000. Cased, DM 48. ISBN: 3-406-46639-7.

As F. points out in his introduction, this is the first German-language monograph on Sophocles since Karl Reinhardt, with two very minor exceptions; unsurprisingly, it resembles its influential predecessor in some respects. F. adopts the format of many Sophocles books, discussing each surviving tragedy, as well as *Ichneutae*, in an individual chapter. Like Reinhardt, he uses this format to pay careful attention to the plays as organic wholes; even in discussions of individual scenes or speeches, he is always sensitive to overarching developments, and how they shape meaning. What distinguishes F. from Reinhardt, as he hints already in his sub-title, is his interest in contexts. In three opening chapters he provides material on Greek tragedy in general, on the institutional and the performance context, and on Sophocles' theatrical and civic career. And in the rest of the book, the individual plays are related to preceding treatments of the story, to political and social history, and to typical patterns in the make-up of tragedies. Of particular interest are the short sections giving some details about the reception of each play from antiquity to today (there are fuller discussions in F.'s appendices to Schadewaldt's Sophocles translations, published by Insel). The book closes with a chapter on the tragic ('Tragik'), arguing for the central importance of conflict ('Streit') and suffering in Sophoclean tragedy, and a usefully annotated bibliography.

In the introduction, F. stresses that he has written not just for specialists but for everybody who wants to learn about Sophocles, and the book reflects this claim throughout. F.'s prose is attractive; he includes summaries of the plays in list-form; he has no footnotes and no Greek quotes. *Sophokles. Dichter im demokratischen Athen* is likely to become popular among students, and may indeed reach a wider audience, in German-speaking countries. So what does it have to offer to readers of *CR*? There are, inevitably, subjects that they may miss: the fragmentary plays, for example, or language, and perhaps also some of the topics that fall under the rubrics of performance and ideology. Generally, the scope of the book allows little time for in-depth treatment of matters of detail. However, F.'s great strength is his even-handed discussion of the eight plays. He does not promise to give fundamentally new directions to Sophoclean scholarship; what he does give is nuanced and fair-minded interpretations which are clearly the product of a