

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

long period of careful thinking about Sophoclean tragedy. For this reason, his book deserves the attention also of the specialist.

*University of Manchester*

FELIX BUDELMANN

R. TRAVIS: *Allegory and the Tragic Chorus in Sophocles Oedipus at Colonus*. Pp. xii + 243. Lanham, Boulder, New York, and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999. Paper, \$17.95. ISBN: 0-8476-9609-X.

The thesis of this book is that *OC* 'allegorizes through the chorus the self's relation to the maternal body' (p. 3). More precisely, this tragedy is 'the allegorical performance of the self's fantasy-contents' (p. 10), and of these Travis says: 'it seems to me difficult to deny that through drama's performance of fantasy we recover an earlier relation to the world, one based on fullness and maternal care' (p. 18).

The first chapter is a 'Methodological Introduction' which sets forth the conceptual background of the main terms of this thesis. Following Quintilian, T. defines allegory as extended metaphor. As for the self, T. is aware of the difficulties surrounding this concept, but *OC*, by placing 'a character in front of an audience', 'allows us to talk about a self as integral to tragedy even if we cannot agree on its exact parameters of selfhood as opposed to our own' (p. 13). Toward the end of the book, T. states more confidently: 'the selves and the fantasies of the Athenians who watched tragedy and our own selves and fantasies are analogous in the highest degree' (p. 194). Neither Freud nor Lacan provides T. with a suitable model for psychoanalytic literary criticism. Melanie Klein is preferred because of the importance that she assigns to fantasy. T. orients his project within the work of feminist scholars like Page DuBois, Judith Butler, Marilyn Katz, and Ruth Padel. An essay by Joel Fineman ('The Structure of Allegorical Desire') is another model. T. also links his approach to Nietzsche: 'my central argument can be derived from Nietzsche's dialectic' of the Dionysian and Apollonian (p. 25).

T. moves on to two chapters in which he compares *OC* with other tragedies, Aesch. *Suppl.* and Eur. *Bacch.*, in which, again, the central problem is 'the establishment of a tragic self in allegorical distinction from the body of its mother' (p. 85). He argues that *hiketeia* is the political equivalent of the maternal allegory of *physis* (Chapter III), and that the religious function of tragedy has a related allegorical significance (Chapter IV). The fifth and final chapter is a sequential reading of *OC* explicating 'choral allegory' from beginning to end. This chapter begins with a theoretical and methodological summary that could be read in conjunction with the first chapter (pp. 191–4).

*Rutgers University*

LOWELL EDMUNDS

S. D. SULLIVAN: *Euripides' Use of Psychological Terminology*. Pp. xii + 234. Montreal, Kingston, London, and Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000. Cased, £43. ISBN: 0-7735-2051-1.

Here is another valuable contribution to psychological lexicography by S., whose previous work includes books on psychological terminology in Aeschylus and Euripides (one wonders whether Aristophanes might be next). The words examined are *φρήν*, *νοῦς*, *πραπίδες*, *θυμός*, *καρδία*, *κέαρ*, and *ψυχή*. Their occurrences are exhaustively discussed, and then all are listed again in one appendix under a different set of headings and in another by tragedy. The order in which she treats the plays is alphabetical, a decision that seems to me based on underestimating what we can be reasonably sure of in Euripidean chronology. The tragic fragments are included, but not *Cyclops*. A central concern, as in the previous books, is whether the usage is traditional. *Ψυχή* is found to be used in a new sense in a uniquely high proportion (about half) of its instances. This is said to 'prepare us well for its prominent rôle in the late fifth century and particularly in Plato'.

*University of Exeter*

RICHARD SEAFORD

© Classical Association, 2001