are indications of laments performed by women in honor of Achilles as cult hero (at Olympia: Pausanias 6.23.3; at Croton: scholia to Lycophron, *Alexandra* 857; cf. Shaw, p. 169 n. 24). The connection between women's lament and elegiac meter is highlighted by Dimitrios Yatromanolakis in a close examination of Simonides 22 W^2. He argues that the wording of this elegiac composition re-enacts a woman's lament (the counter-arguments of Mace, curiously placed by the editors ahead of the arguments of Yatromanolakis, fail to persuade). He further argues, most convincingly, that the form of elegiac meter is historically linked to the threnodic function of a composition like 22 W^2. Thus the elegiac meter of the lament of Andromache in Euripides, *Andromache* 103–16 represents an archaic revival, not a modernistic experiment (cf. also Aloni p. 90). The point that Yatromanolakis makes about the threnodic function of 22 W^2 can also be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Plataea poem itself, 11 W^2 (cf. Aloni, p. 98 n. 47).

There are many other points of interest in this book, too numerous to be treated properly in a short space. Among these are the chapters on Callimachus and Theocritus (by Hunter and Fantuzzi respectively). Special honors should go to Alessandro Barchiesi for proving that the *exemplum* of Horace *Odes* 4.6 is the Plataea elegy of Simonides.

Harvard University GREGORY NAGY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni226

SOPHRON'S MIMES

J. H. HORDERN: *Sophron's Mimes*. Text, Translation, and Commentary. Pp xiv + 202. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-19-926613-1.

Archaic and classical Sicilian texts have virtually disappeared: we regret the loss of Stesichorus' lyric, Epicharmus' comedies, Empedocles' poems, and Sophron's mimes all alike. But whereas it is at least possible to form a rough idea of the first three authors' works, the fragments of Sophron are so tantalizingly uninformative that we can only guess what a complete mime of his would have looked like.

H.'s book constitutes a welcome and successful attempt to bring some light into this darkness—welcome even though, with the publication of *Poetae Comici Graeci* I in 2001, nearly all the material (except for H.'s fr. 30A from Athen. 9.394d and the doubtful fr. 172 from Pl. *Rep.* 10.607c) had already been assembled and *PCG* I will remain the standard edition: since H.'s text and apparatus follow those of Kassel and Austin but '[provide] only the more essential details', 'Kassel–Austin should always be consulted for a full account' (p. 34); even 'full bibliographical references for each fragment' and 'other details . . . mentioned in the apparatus' have to be looked up in *PCG* (p. 35). The strength of H.'s contribution should, and does, therefore lie in the introduction, translation, and commentary.

The introduction (pp. 1–34) comprises sections on Sophron's life and dating (fifth century), the themes and character of his mimes (whose bawdy humour is more easily recognized than the character-drawing praised by Diog. Laert. 3.18), their style and language (including a brief treatment of the thorny question of orthography), their influence on later writers (certainly on Theocritus, perhaps on Herodas and Callimachus), and the history of the text (from Apollodorus of Athens in the second century B.C. up to some twentieth-century papyrus finds, especially *PSI* 1214, which

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni227 Published online by Cambridge University Press

includes eighteen nearly complete lines depicting a magical scene and thus plausibly attributed to *Ταὶ γυναῖκες αἳ τὰν θεόν φαντι ἐξελâν*).

One important point stressed by H. is 'Sophron's startling decision to write in Doric prose', which 'suggests someone consciously asserting a local identity' (p. 1); this can be read as an appeal to liberate ourselves from an Athenocentric perspective when dealing with Sicilian texts. However, to state that 'it is hard to believe that [Sophron's mimes] were produced on a public stage' and to assume a 'sympotic performance' instead (p. 8) may then seem over-confident as we know so little about Sicilian culture. And, given the fragmentary state of our evidence, how can we affirm that the Hellenistic Charition mime 'was clearly much longer than any of Sophron's pieces' (p. 10)?

For anyone not used to reading Doric, H.'s observations on Sophron's language are most helpful. Linguists might occasionally desire more information, also in bibliographical terms (e.g. why should the infinitives in *-μειν* be 'foreign to Syracusan' even *if* they were Rhodian in origin (p. 17); what was the status of *Ϝ* when we find uncontracted *δα(Ϝ)ελόν* next to contracted *ἆς* < **ἆϜος* (p. 135)?). Sometimes they may even wish to disagree: e.g. pronominal forms in *-ευ* probably derive from **-eso*, not **-ειο* (p. 20); forms like *ἐμοῦς* are hardly Koine elements but rather exhibit a development *ἐμέος* > **ἐμῡς* > *ἐμοῦς* (cf. *ἐσσουμένων* = *ἐσσ(ε)ῡμένων* in Epich. fr. 113.251) (p. 21); *ἐπεπείγει* in fr. 4D is not a pluperfect (p. 140); enclitic *μοι* and *σοι* can well be Syracusan even though the non-enclitic forms are *ἐμίν* and *τίν* (p. 153); *λειοτριχιῶσαι* is derived from *λειοτριχιάω*, not from a 'factitive' *λειοτριχιόω* (p. 160); we would not 'expect [the gen. sg. of *o*-stems in Syracusan] to be *-ω*', but rather *-ου* (p. 175); the 'Sicel' word *λίτρα* is unlikely to have been 'borrowed' into Latin where we find *lībra* (not *liber*, as stated on p. 23!) (p. 180); Doric *στραφθέντες* corresponds to Ionic *στρεφθέντες* but Attic *στραφέντες* (p. 182).

In the translation inaccuracies are rare (but note e.g. fr. 148, where 'a coin' mistranslates *τὸν σταθμόν*; fr. 168 where *χάρις* designates a 'favour' rather than 'thanks'; fr. 171 where *πὸτ τῶν θεῶν* means 'in the name of the gods', not 'to the gods'; also, *εὐτελές* in Hsch. *α* 8453 is 'cheap', not 'well-made' (p. 148), *ξενίζω* 'to speak with a foreign accent', not 'to speak a foreign language' (p. 153), and a *λίμνη* is not a 'harbour' (p. 166)). Fortunately H. also translates the Greek testimonia; that the overlap of the Greek and the English texts is not always exact, is rarely a problem (but in fr. 122 the omission of *ἔνθα λείπει κτλ.* is awkward, and in fr. 130 *τὸν ἀηδῆ* is essential).

The backbone of H.'s book is the commentary. Even where the evidence is meagre he succeeds in suggesting plausible outlines for many pieces, and with his detailed discussions of single words and phrases he clearly illustrates how Sophron combined realism and funny entertainment. While thematic parallels in other genres are carefully pointed out, the trap of discovering too many literary allusions is judiciously avoided (e.g. on frr. 105, 140), and Sophron's influence on later authors is never overestimated (e.g. p. 145).

Elsewhere H., like every good commentator, stimulates further reflection. Why, for instance, should Hecate be imagined to arrive during the scene described in fr. 4A, as is by no means implied by the cletic vocative *πότνια* (p. 136)? On fr. 8, an invocation of Hecate, H. notes that 'Plutarch says this is an invocation of Artemis, but . . . this either must be a careless error or reflects syncretism of the two goddesses' (p. 144); surely, the second view finds support in Hsch. *α* 391, where *Ἄγγελος* is said to be a Syracusan name for Artemis while a scholion on Theocr. 2.12 identifies *Ἄγγελος* with Hecate (cf. pp. 166–7). In fr. 58 the postponement of enclitic *τυ* must be due to *οὐχ ὁ*

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni227 Published online by Cambridge University Press

δεῖν being an indivisible phrase ('not just anyone'). Apoll. Dysc. *Pron*. 95.23–5 refers to the gen. pl. of ὑμός when he says that ὑμῶν is 'possessive' as opposed to 'personal' ὑμέων; so he is not 'contradicted . . . at fr. 45' (p. 182). Finally, in fr. 125 δραστοχαίτας might be read as δραστι(ο)χαίτας (rather than πρασιοχαίτας) and explained by Hsch. δ 2343 δράστις· ἡ βύσσος 'flax'.

Even in a text of this complexity, misprints could be fewer (e.g. p. 23.2 'εἶ' for 'εἰ', 131.16 'ποι' for 'ποί', 161.17 'ἄρτον' for 'ἄρτου', 171.2 'δέ-εσθε' for 'δέ-ησθε'); also, the *index locorum* is excessively selective. Such quibbling, however, should not distract from the fact that H. has greatly furthered the study of Greek mime and Sicilian literature; thanks to him, Sophron may now reappear on our literary maps.

Istituto Svizzero di Roma ANDREAS WILLI
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni227

ONE ANTIPHON OR TWO?

G. J. PENDRICK: *Antiphon the Sophist: The Fragments*. Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary. (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 39.) Pp. xi + 472. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Cased, £55. ISBN: 0-521-65161-1.

Pendrick's *Antiphon the Sophist* is part of an increasing revival of interest in the thought of the sophists and is an extremely valuable work. It is the first full-length edition and commentary devoted solely to Antiphon's sophistic works, and also includes a translation of all fragments. Much of the book is devoted to the commentary, which covers a very broad range of issues, with careful attention to detail. As well as this, P. has updated the fragments included by Diels-Kranz and Untersteiner to take into account, e.g. the Oxyrhynchus papyri and Diogenes of Oenoanda's Epicurean inscription, and has offered some suggestions of his own relating to their restoration.

One of the challenges facing those who work on the sophists is undoubtedly the question of how far we can go in trying to reconstruct the ideas of thinkers for whom our evidence is so fragmentary. P.'s response to this dilemma is, by and large, a degree of caution verging on agnosticism and he seems keen to avoid any substantial suggestions concerning the details of Antiphon's views. This may well be the safest strategy, and P. has clearly produced a rigorous scholarly work. However, the reader who is looking for further understanding of Antiphon or some sense of what distinguishes him as a thinker might at times feel slightly frustrated with P.'s approach.

The book begins with a long introduction, which considers general questions concerning Antiphon's identity, corpus, and ideas, as well as working through each of the texts in turn. On the issue of Antiphon's identity and division of works, P. is, as one can see from the selection of texts he covers, a confirmed separatist and draws a sharp distinction between his Antiphon, the Athenian sophist, and Antiphon the Rhamnusian, to whom he ascribes the *Tetralogies*. The primary evidence which P. uses to support his claim is the testimonia of ancient authors such as Xenophon, who refers to Antiphon, the sophist, in the *Memorabilia* (p. 3). While P.'s readings are certainly plausible, he offers little positive evidence to support the separate identities. Instead, much of his argument relies on proposing, for example, that ancient sources

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni227 Published online by Cambridge University Press