the palace of Deiokes at Ekbatana (*Histories* 2.143 and 1.96–9). These passages seem to inspire the meeting Plato stages betwen Solon (to whom we owe his *Atlantikos logos*) and the priest of Neith at Sais, the statues of the kings of Atlantis and their wives displayed at the approach to the Temple to Poseidon in Atlantis (*Critias* 116E recalling the 345 *piromies* of Herodotus 2.143), and the seven ring walls investing the central sanctuary of Poseidon on Atlantis, which replicate the seven walls circling the palace of Deiokes.

Duke University DISKIN CLAY

XENOPHON'S *SYMPOSIUM*

B. HUSS: *Xenophons* Symposion. *Ein Kommentar*. (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 125.) Pp. 493. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1999. ISBN: 3-519-07674-8.

Symposium opens by saying one should study not only the serious acts of *kaloikagathoi* but also τὰ ἐν ταῖς παιδιαῖς. Huss rightly takes this seriously—and gives 493 pages of commentary on barely thirty-seven pages of Greek. Despite which, there is an exiguous *index rerum* (under three pages!) and no *index locorum*. Inter-relation with earlier Socratic literature preoccupies H., but the reader has no quick route to putative examples. Instead s/he must scan a table for Plato and pp. 18–25 ('Das *Symposion* als pastiche, sein Autor als reiner Literat') for the rest: the latter does not claim to register everything relevant and misses material on 66–7, 123, 142, 364, 398. Pursuing claims about Old Comedy (e.g. 197) without reading the entire text is even harder.

There is much textual criticism, with full reports on old editions, conjectures, and inaccurate assignment thereof. Even so, lists of editorial decisions are sometimes incomplete (e.g. p. 326, *ad* 5.7), and criteria of selection unclear. (And why must one consult *ICS* 22 [1997], 45–6, on 2.1, 6.9, 8.1, when the exposition could have been resumed here?) Analysis of problems is lucid, solutions not always mandatory: αὐτῶν for αὐτῷ in 1.7 is unnecessary—even harmful (the important thing is that everyone went to dinner, not that two sub-groups were differently prepared)—and even if ἰσουμένου is right in 8.1, Ast's ἀνθρώπῳ is no obvious improvement. H. says frequent papyri/MSS divergence 'erweckt generelle Skepsis gegenüber der mittelalterlichen Überlieferung'. The facts are unsupportive. *P.Mon.Gr.Inv.* 160 differed wrongly from MSS at 3.9–10. *P.Antin.* 1.26 had a right reading in 4.53 (with many MSS) and a wrong one in 4.54. In 4.64 it variously resembles MSS in a passage requiring emendation and supplies μοι (rightly) and ἔτι (unnecessarily). Its corrupt text in 5.1 may reflect something different from MSS tradition, while at 5.2 it adds an unnecessary τις. In ten cases in *P.Lond.* 152 and *P.Giss.* 1 in 8.6, 8, 16, 17, I see two improvements on MSS readings.

Symposium—written post-365 in Athens—was, like other Xenophontic Socratica, produced by a 'literary' Socratic, using a Socrates 'spät geboren und ausschliesslich aus Sokratesliteratur geschaffen' to express *kaloskagathos* values. Distinctive features are the interplay of ἔρως/καλοκαγαθία and σπουδή/παιδιά (proper grasp of which rebuts complaints about the structural inadequacies), a scenario which effaces nasty realities, and X.'s sense of humour. (The 'laughing Xenophon' appears more sharply in *AJP* 120 [1999], 381–409, which summarizes much in the commentary introduction and, through analysis of widespread blindness to a plain joke in 2.19, makes vivid the

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.58 Published online by Cambridge University Press

difference between old and new approaches to X.) The work—full of allusions and intertexts—can be read for edification (in popular-philosophical mode), entertainment (an amusing, historically valid realization of symposium-culture) and Socratic *apologia*. The last-named is achieved partly by creating a 'Golden Age' in which, for example, Charmides (one of the Thirty—who killed Niceratus and Autolycus) is charming, Lycon (Socrates' accuser) calls him a real *kaloskagathos*, and the Callias–Autolycus relationship (sordid to contemporary comedians) is uplifting (cf. Ischomachus' wife in *Oeconomicus*)—the imputation being that people deteriorated when not under Socrates' influence.

This is largely persuasive, and I end with some stray observations. 1.1 If X. is the only Socratic to make himself or his I-narrator a direct authority and if 1.1 contradicts the historical X'.s age, is X. making a joke about other Socratic writers' pseudo-historicity? 1.4 Callias deprecates generals—but is incited to political service at 8.37–8. This deserves notice, as does the link of σπουδάρχαις with σπουδή/παιδιά and Callias' claim to be σπουδῆς ἄξιον (1.6). 1.11 H. thinks Philippus only pretends to be uninvited (this is the joke in 1.12). If so, his suggestion that παῖδα is Philippus' stomach loses force; that Philippus has a slave is only inconsistent with his pretend-rôle (and mentioning him is part of the joke). 4.23 That Critobulus is younger than Cleinias adds another twist to the disconcerting way he rehearses his reactions to Cleinias rather than others' reactions to him. 4.27 Against a simple association of *grammatistes* and elementary education see T. Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman World* (Cambridge, 1998), 10ff., esp. 12 n. 31. 6–7 We move from silence (6) to uproar (7.1) and a song (unenvisaged in 6.3–4). 6.10 (ἂν ἃ μὴ δεῖ λέγειν, ἔφη, σιωπᾷς) is aimed at the Syracusan, and Socrates' rejection of the entertainment value of scientific problems about light (7.4) is prompted by his comments in 6.6–7 (cf. Socrates' remarks in 6.7 on divine provision of light and reference to the *phrontistes* tag in 7.2). These connections are under-developed in H. 7.5 H. says the Syracusan exercises artistic freedom in providing the Dionysus–Ariadne scenario. Is he not also getting his own back? Socrates wants something tame and civilized, not excessive gyrations. What the impresario produces provokes the physical sexual feelings which 8 denounces. (Whether this contextualizes or undermines Socrates' message in 8 is another matter.)

University of Liverpool CHRISTOPHER TUPLIN

THE ARISTOTELIAN *CATEGORIES*

R. BODÉÜS: *Aristote:* Catégories (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous la patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2001. Pp. CCXVIII + 321. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-00497-1.

The new Budé *Categories* has a vast introduction, a text with double apparatus and facing translation, miscellaneous notes, three appendixes, and a thematic index.

In the introduction Bodeus urges that *Cat.* is not a lacunose treatment of the 'categories'; 'for nothing authorizes us to believe that the original text of our treatise contained accounts of any category whatever after the study of quality' (p. 141 n. 1).

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.58 Published online by Cambridge University Press