

P. DRÄGER: *Stilistische Untersuchungen zu Pherekydes von Athen. Ein Beitrag zur ältesten ionischen Prosa.* (Palingenesia, 52.) Pp. vii + 98, 1 fig. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1995. Paper.

Fr. 105 Jacoby of the fifth-century B.C. mythographer Pherecydes of Athens relates the origins of Jason's quest for the Golden Fleece. D., who has recently published a sizeable monograph on the Argonaut myth in this same series (*Argo Pasimelousa I* [Stuttgart, 1993]), here presents what he terms a *parergon* to that larger work, a stylistic analysis devoted almost entirely to the hundred or so words of this fragment. Naturally he refers to other fragments of Pherecydes and to other early Ionic writers, but only by way of illustration, and he explicitly refuses to investigate significant questions about early prose which have no direct bearing on fr. 105 (e.g. p. 45 n. 164). At the same time D. offers some stylistic comments on [Apollodorus], whose *Library* 1.107–9 seems based on Pherecydes 105, but again only really in comparison with this fragment. Four *Anhänge* complete the book, the last of which is an interesting discussion of Pherecydes' rationalizing influence in choosing the name of Jason's mother, but it has nothing at all to do with the style of the fragment and it is not surprising to read (p. 73 n. 1) that it had been written, and already accepted, for separate publication.

Despite this very narrow focus, it cannot be said that the book really adds much to our understanding of the style of even fr. 105. Often it reads more like a literature survey than an original contribution, and more often still it reads like an extensive and very late review of Lilja's *On the Style of the Earliest Greek Prose* (Helsinki, 1968). Lilja's book was modest enough and unenthusiastically reviewed when it appeared (e.g. *CR* 21 [1971], 73–4), and D. quotes extensively from these reviews, while adding many negative comments of his own, but it has in a quite literal sense given form to this new study: D.'s five chapters (Poetische Elemente, Alliteration und Wiederholung, Wortstellung, Satzbau, and Historisches Präsens) follow the titles of the first five chapters of Lilja's book. Furthermore, her reported conclusions are often the starting point for discussion of these areas in relation to fr. 105, but the discussion seldom goes beyond an acceptance or (more usually) rejection of her claims. Often the latter process is justified—his criticism (pp. 30–1) of her treatment of adjectival position regardless of the presence of the article, for instance, is lethal—but invariably nothing is offered in their place beyond claims that the small amount of early Ionic prose does not allow us to make the sort of generalizations that Lilja wanted to make (e.g. pp. 34–5). The final chapter is the least negative, but its analysis of tenses in the fragment (pp. 55–7) owes more to Lilja's (pp. 108–9) than is acknowledged.

Lilja's study had faults, but after nearly thirty years D. had the chance to do more than simply point out some of them. Concentrating on just one fragment, he could have investigated seriously the reliability of the scholiastic source which preserves it; writing in the present decade, he could have made use of new technology to supersede the statistical foundation of his predecessor's work. Even a *parergon* needs to set its sights higher than this work does.

The University of Western Australia

NEIL O'SULLIVAN

P. HARDING: *Androton and the Atthis: the Fragments Translated with Introduction and Commentary* (Clarendon Ancient History Series). Pp. xi + 236. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993. Cased, £37.50. ISBN: 0-19-872148-X.

How many of us have sat down and read Androton's fragments from beginning to end in Greek, instead of cherry-picking items of particular interest? If his appearance in English encourages readers to look steadily at the surviving fragments as a whole, that in itself will make this volume beneficial to advanced scholars as well as to Greekless students. Its appeal is greatly enhanced, however, by H.'s substantial introduction and commentary, which are of major value.

After a preface alerting the reader to the hazards as well as the benefits of grappling with a fragmented author, a wide-ranging introduction (52 pp.) discusses the title, structure, style, content, and sources of the *Atthis*, with a section on each Atthidographer, although A. receives pride of place. The translation of Testimonia and Fragments 1–68 (24 pp.) helpfully quotes some contexts more fully than Jacoby did. There are no notes to the Testimonia (many of which

however receive discussion in the introduction) but the commentary on fragments 1–68 extends to 120 pp. The result is an ensemble less extensive than Jacoby but undoubtedly more approachable, and offering notable constructive dissonance with Jacoby's views of A.'s political slant.

Throughout the volume, H.'s strengths as a commentator are evident: he offers help even-handedly both on historiographic questions (A.'s methods and attitudes; use made of him [minimized] by the Aristotelian *Ath. Pol.*) and on historical matters arising (e.g. the early Areopagus Council, FF. 3–4; the chronology of the Kolakretai, FF. 5, 36; the reforms of Solon, F. 34; ostracism, FF. 6, 42; the Athenian generalship, F. 38; the return of Alcibiades, F. 45). The notes are invariably lucid and well-arranged, and display salutary caution about speculating upon A. beyond the evidence of his surviving text. More broadly, it will come as no surprise to readers of H.'s articles that he sees A. not as an ideological conservative, but as a democratic politician writing within a democratic tradition. H. is surely right to insist that most of A.'s surviving fragments show no conservative ideology, and that his father Andron cannot be *proved* to have been the Andron who was a member of the Four Hundred; but he carries fashionable distrust of ideology too far when he writes as if no active Athenian fourth-century politician *would* have written from an ideologically conservative point of view (how can we know? An *Atthis* is not an Assembly speech, and A. was completing his in *exile*). Likewise H. is not compelling in denying a conservative tenor to F. 4 (*pace* H., Solon's own poem *apud Ath. Pol.* 12.4 suggests that A. is a conservative dissenter) and to F. 42 (where incidentally we have no right to reject the contemporary testimony of Thuc. 8.73 on the *a priori* grounds that 'we have no reason to believe' something that T. is precisely asserting!).

H.'s translation of testimonia and fragments is in the main clear, accurate, and helpful. Only in a few instances should more concessions be made to the Greekless reader: T1, 'orator' would be preferable to the pseudo-technical '*rhetor*'; F2, for 'every fifth year' (for the Great Panathenaea) read 'every four years'; 10, 'Tenpartner' is not a perspicuous expression for δεκαδοῦχος and the ambiguity of τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα should not be confined to the commentary; 24, 'Fourth Philippic' (instead of 'First Philippic', for δ, Φιλιππικῶν) will mislead in the text, despite H.'s note; 30, H. does not explain why he prints a lacuna and [[διὰ]] τοῖν θεοῖν would be better rendered 'for the Two Goddesses' (with διὰ dropped) (not 'on account of. . .'); 35, Ballene in the text, when Pallene is in the notes, will baffle or be thought a misprint, since H. fails to explain that Ballene is a joke in Aristophanes; 38, for the Greekless reader, the use of * in a text should be elucidated; 41, H.'s use of 'done in' instead of the simple 'done' as a colloquialism for 'cheated' will mislead those for whom 'to do in' connotes murder (but perhaps Canadian usage differs); 59, Lykos and the Wolf both appear in the translation but the Greekless will miss the pun and at 61 they will need more linguistic help on Iaones and Ionians. Finally, at 6, ἐτυράννησε has more point when taken as ingressive, and at 34, πάντων ὁμοῦ and at 57 ὡς<δ>αὐτὸς κ.τ.λ. have dropped out of the translation.

Yet these are minor points. This English Androtron will be a great aid to the serious study of Greek history in translation, which has been such a welcome feature of the last generation, and H.'s introduction and commentary are an important contribution to scholarship. Both editor and publisher are to be congratulated.

University of Glasgow

RONALD A. KNOX

E. HEITSCH: *Geschichte und Situationen bei Thukydides*. (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 71.) Pp. 103. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1996. ISBN: 3-519-07620-9.

The goal H. sets himself in this monograph is to illustrate how Thucydides' *History* brings out the general message it promises about 'the human condition' (1.22. 4). His method is to analyse the specific details of Th.'s narrative of the years 425–420 B.C. (4–5.48). And his conclusion is that Th. points up the multiplicity of factors (conflicting interests, chance, etc.) which are hard for agents to assess or foresee, and which render decision-making difficult.

H.'s conclusion is a useful antidote to some overly reductive readings of Th.'s narrative. And he makes good points along the way (particularly welcome is his positive assessment of Th.'s narrative of the uneasy peace). But his good points are often buried in paragraphs of prolonged paraphrase; and there are no section headings or index to help the reader locate them. A bigger