

ausführliche Kommentare zu fünf maßgeblichen (leider nur in Übersetzung gebotenen) griechischen Textpassagen (Hdt. 1, 131 f.; Strab. 15,3,13-15; Plut. Mor. 369D-370C; Diog. Laert. 1,6-9; Agath. 2,23-25). Der Autor kommt dabei – nicht am Ende des Kapitels, sondern in der Einleitung des Buches (S. 2) – zu folgenden Schlüssen: „The five texts evidently reflect different periods and provide information on different manifestations of the religion (!) of the ancient Iranians. It will be argued that the earliest text, Herodotus . . . , and the latest text, Agathias . . . , reflect lay traditions. The other three texts . . . appear to reflect priestly Zoroastrian traditions. Strabo focuses entirely on ritual, Plutarch on doctrine and mythology and Diogenes Laertius gives an overview of the lost works of early authorities on the religion of the Magi, which reflects a summary of conventional Greek knowledge of the religion of the Persians.“

Im vierten und längsten Kapitel (S. 251-451) bietet der Autor einen vorzüglichen Überblick über das nach Sachgruppen (Götter, Dämonen, Religionsstifter Zoroaster, Theologie, Rituale, Tempel und Kult, Funktionäre, Ethik) gegliederte ‚zoroastrische‘ Material des griechischen und lateinischen Schrifttums, der nicht nur des Verfassers stupende Kenntnis beider – der eigenen wie der fremden – Seiten der zarathustrischen Medaille beweist, sondern in einer Fülle von Einzelbeobachtungen Erkenntnisfortschritte bereit hält. Die zu Beginn gestellte und in Kap. 2 wiederaufgenommene Leitfrage nach dem angesichts des westlichen Befundes angemessensten religionshistorischen ‚Modell‘ gerät allerdings in den beiden großen Kapiteln 3 und 4 aus dem Blick bzw. ist diesen sogar nur sehr bedingt angemessen.

Etwas enttäuschend fallen die kurzen „abschließenden Bemerkungen“ (S. 452-459) aus, bei denen man sich eine ausführlichere Erörterung manchen Sachverhaltes gewünscht hätte.

Zusammenfassend möchte der Rez. dennoch noch einmal den großen Wert des Buches hervorheben, das auf Jahre hinaus Standardwerk zu den westlichen Zoroastrismusbildern sein wird.

KIEL

JOSEF WIESEHÖFER

EVA STEHLE, *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece*. Nondramatic poetry in its setting. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1997. xvi, 368 pp. Pr. \$ 35,—.

This is a study about Greek nondramatic pre-Hellenistic poetry as performed. S.'s point of departure is the actual, physical, performance. She certainly has an open eye for the many elements that came together

in such a performance—she mentions dance quite frequently—, and stresses that all these elements interacted. It is, however, ‘speech as a sign’ on which she has chosen to concentrate, speech as part of and as determined by a particular performative context.

S. takes for granted that the performers were conceived by the audience as speaking their own words. In some sense, this is always true, but there are many complexities involved. S. is, of course, aware of the recent spate of publications on first person issues in Greek poetry, and that debate has led her to except Homer and Pindar’s *epinicia* from her sweeping statement. I am not completely comfortable with this. S. seems to say that the only alternative to performers speaking their own words is that they are speaking the poet’s words (p. 15). Things are rather more complicated. So does S. herself think, presumably, because she explicitly excludes reperformance from consideration (p. 22). But reperformance keeps cropping up; it can hardly be avoided. Anyhow, it is undeniable that many performers will indeed have been conceived to be speaking for themselves, either because they did, or because we are dealing with performances where this was a feasible fiction. S. is certainly cutting some difficult corners, but she can, I think, get away with it.

When performers are perceived as speaking with their own voice, according to S., poetry is a medium for the performer, and not the other way round. A performance is the performer’s self-representation, the enacting of the actual or the idealized identity of that performer. But it is also public discourse: during a performance cultural beliefs are presented. The performer is speaking both *to* and *for* the community, or some segment of the community, in order to “influence the audience’s conception of life, state, or world” (pp. 19-20). S. must be one of the very few who are *not* quoting Clifford Geertz’s “story they tell themselves about themselves” at this juncture. S. stresses that the types of nondramatic poetry which she discusses, that is the collective, choral poetry, the hexameter bardic poetry by the professional performer, and the monodic poetry of the segregated group such as the symposium, are all of a public nature. The denial in recent years of a dichotomy between public and private, in itself quite justified, has led on the rebound to a continuing broadening of the concept of ‘public’. One fears it is on its way to becoming a synonym of ‘social’ or ‘communal’.

Being confined to texts, we are not able to study in every instance all aspects of the performer’s self-presentation and of the community “communicating with itself” (p. 58). Gender, however, is an aspect which can be read from any text. There is also a way leading back from the text to the gendered speech in performance, because when

the text was still part of a living performance the audience had to be aware of the body of the speaker. Whoever was performing, was unquestionably present as a male or female body. Gender is insolubly bound up with both textual recording and actual performance.

In the course of tracing engendering in Greek poetry, S. discusses many different texts, which are analysed in more or less detail. Complete poems or relevant fragments are quoted in Greek, with some textual comment wherever appropriate. But the book is also accessible to those without Greek: all texts are translated, and at the back of the book one can find a chronology of sources and a small vocabulary. As I consider these analyses to be the main attraction of this book, I will here list the main (fragments of) texts which are discussed at some length and from the point of view of gender: Alkaios 70 V (70 LP), 130b V (130, 16-39 LP), 347 V (347a LP); Alkman 1 PMGF (Calame 3), 3 PMGF (Calame 26-56); Anakreon 360, 388, 417 PMG; Archilochos 7, 13, 23, 118, 119, 172, 173 W, 196a W²; Bacchylides 13, 17, 19 SM; Hesiod, *Works and days*, *Theogony*; Hipponax 84 W; Ibykos 286, 287 PMGF; Isyllos, *paian* (CA pp. 133-136); Korinna 655 PMG; Pindar, *Olympian* 6, fragments 52b, 52d, 52f, 52k, 94b, 107a, 123 SM; Sappho 1, 5, 22, 30, 31 43, 44, 56, 71, 94, 96, 98, 112, 130, 142, 160 V (= LP); Semonides 7 W; Simonides 519 fr. 35 PMG, 11 W²; Solon 1, 2, 3, 36 W; Tyrtaios 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 11 W; the Rhodian Swallow Song (PMG 848); the Elian Hymn for Dionysos (871 PMG), Spartan songs (856, 870 PMG), the Palaikastro Hymn (CA pp. 160-162), Athenian song for Demetrios Poliorketes (CA pp. 173-175), the Homeric Hymns to Delian and Pythian Apollo, Dionysos and Pan, and several inscriptions (CEG 19, 24, 28, 31, 34, 38, 47, 137, 138, 144, 152, 169, 273, 334, 344, 354, 403, 413). Surely the main contribution which this study makes is to offer a fresh look at a lot of well-known Greek poetry. It contains a pleasant surprise for those who doubt whether anything new could possibly be said about a text like Alkman's Louvre *partheneion*; as far as I can judge S. manages to do so, and does it well.

S.'s rereading of several examples of pre-Hellenistic poetry is the main ingredient of the six long chapters that make up the bulk of the book. In the chapters 1 to 3 S. turns to community poetry, i.e. choral poems performed by (probably) the elite members of society, who stage their centrality in the community, but also speak for and to their audience. The first chapter is introductory. We get down to the main theme in the second chapter, dealing with women's choruses, and in the third, which opposes male choruses.

Women sing their lines and are present as physical bodies; they are women giving a voice to their feminine identity. There is a contradiction involved, because when women voice publicly the gender role

for Greek women, their performance would actually violate that very gender role, which keeps women from speaking out publicly in their own voice. This contradiction is more or less solved—although some tension will always remain—by what S. calls ‘deauthorizing’, i.e. the portrayal of the performers by themselves as lacking authority. This is underlined by contrasting performance with writing. In writing, women need not be ‘deauthorized’, and can speak in their own voice to (but this time not for) the community. S. adduces examples from inscriptions. Women can do so exactly because it is no performance, and they do not have to expose themselves physically to some audience.

Please note that S.’s performing women are mostly *parthenoi*. On *gunaikes* S. has much less to tell. She does say something about contexts and types of performance, but there are hardly any texts to analyse. S. has much more to go by when dealing with male performers, and what she has to say about them is easily as interesting as what there was to tell about the female choruses. The male performers leave their gender identity unspoken, or simply assert it. Their gender identity is the norm. This position gives men the opportunity to also adopt some metaphorical identity, even feminine personae.

In chapter 4 S. turns to bardic poetry, i.e. non-canonized dactylic hexameter poetry, texts which are not fixed and have not yet been ascribed to a particular author, and are not so much recited as composed by travelling professionals. Here S. offers a very rewarding analysis of the Homeric Hymns, in terms of a ‘contest of voices’: panhellenization versus localizing tendencies, and male mobility versus female immobility.

Chapters 5 and 6 deal with poetry performed for a restricted audience, during the symposium or its female variants. The symposium is presented as an alternative to the household. The *Leitmotiv* is male bonding, at the same time disconnecting from women. The men in the symposium have to construct a male identity without antagonizing other men. The sixth chapter is mainly occupied with the role of writing, which can hardly be concluded from the title of the book. It deals above all with Sappho’s texts, which according to S. are not merely written, but are consciously exploiting the possibilities of written communication. The text was conceived as text, which procedure has parallels in inscriptions and in contemporaneous poetry by Solon. Sappho is a voice surviving, because she made herself a source of fascination, detaching the speaker from the performer. Thus it is *written* text which offers women an opportunity of “escaping the tyranny of performance”, as S. puts it.

These six chapters are all expertly done and contain a great many subtleties which I cannot here do justice. At the same time it should be clear what it all adds up to. S. offers us interpretations of almost

100 (parts or fragments of) poems. Such interpretations are, in the nature of things, speculative. That many of the poems under discussion are badly preserved, and that the original context of their performance can almost always only be guessed at, are aggravating circumstances. Which, I hasten to say, the author never tries to gloss over. What S. suggests about the way these texts have been put together, that is with an eye to their actual performance as gendered speech, is, I think, important and illuminating as textual criticism. But this does not supersede previous interpretations, or maybe just a few of them. E.g., the author opposes the heavy stress on initiation by Claude Calame (*Les choeurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque* [Rome 1977]; the first part now translated as *Choruses of young women in ancient Greece. Their morphology, religious role, and social functions* [Lanham 1997]). It is a pity S. could not engage the work by Gregory Nagy, *Poetry as performance, Homer and beyond* (Cambridge 1996); the cut-off date for S.'s bibliography appears to be 1994-1995; the only 1996 publications she mentions are her own. As S. herself points out, concentrating on gender is quite restrictive: there is also the performer's place in a social hierarchy, and so on, which she does not deal with (and need not deal with). What I mean to say is that we now have got a set of speculative, but new and intelligent, readings of some poetry, looked at from the viewpoint of gender. Nothing less, nothing more.

More, however, seems to be claimed for this study by its title. But this is not "a history of communal performances, poetic and other, in Greek culture", as Richard Martin says in the advance praise quoted on the dust jacket. S. presents a few generalities on actual performance, but these constitute the background against which she analyses texts in close detail. S. offers no hypotheses, and draws no conclusions concerning performance. Only rarely does she try to visualize what was going on. Few are remarks such as the one on p. 239, where S. quotes Alan Boegehold on the completion of what in our texts seem to be incomplete sentences by some appropriate gesture. Of course we know precious little about performance (S. dutifully mentions all debate about the modes of performance of different kinds of poetry). There is very little certainty to be found about either performers or audience. Still, comparative material could help us gain some impression of what these performances might have been like, but this is not S.'s line of business. Although the introduction has some references to the likes of Ruth Finnegan on oral poetry and Richard Bauman on the ethnography of speaking, it is some of the insights of such scholars that are put to use, but never any of the empirical material they offer.

So S. does not really speak about 'performance in ancient Greece'. Nor has she anything new about 'gender in ancient Greece'. Again,

some generalities about gender and gender roles are suppositions with which S. approaches the texts. When she does say something about gender, it is in danger of being rather empty, e.g. p. 123, where S. quotes Maud Gleason on Greek masculinity, which “constituted a system of signs. It was a language that anatomical males were taught to speak with their bodies”. Yes, undoubtedly, but this is hardly something distinctive for the Greek communities under discussion. One could just as well point to our own culture (which, in this respect, might or might not be independent of its Greek antecedents. Remarkably, in the only instances where S. brings up comparative material on gender issues, she seems, perhaps unwittingly, to hint at continuity within the same area: Janet Cowan on Northern Greece, Michael Herzfeld on Crete, and Michael Stewart on Vlach gypsies).

My main criticism of this study is that the title, preface and introduction made me expect things that are not delivered—and that everyone runs the risk of being deceived in this way, unless one entertains very simplistic ideas about the relationship between poetic texts and observable reality. I was disappointed, having been led to think that this was a book about performance; concentrating, it is true, on the verbal, but on *speech acts*, that is, on words as actually performed. I expected a complement to my own work on the kinetic aspects of Greek performances (*Attractive performances. Ancient Greek dance: three preliminary studies* [Amsterdam 1997]). It was not. Nor was it on gender as such, so those who are after that aspect will not be satisfied either. But if we forget about those expectations, and take an impartial look at what this book really is, viz. an exercise in textual criticism, the picture is all different, and disappointment gives way to admiration. We have on our hands a study wherein textual criticism is pushed further by taking into account the original performative contexts of the poetry concerned. About this context we do not learn anything, but all the more about the poetry. Whether one agrees with all that is said is neither here nor there (especially what S. has to say about Sappho I do not find convincing, based as it is on thin air); what counts is the fact that this is a stimulating book.

Despite some outbreaks of jargon, S. writes in quite an elegant manner. The good writing is matched by excellent editing; I have not done any systematic checking, but did not see any mistakes or misprints at all, except for the François Vase, which in note 110 on p. 158 has been ‘alternatively engendered’ as the Françoise Vase, and the fact that the *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* is listed with the journals on p. xiv, with the editions on p. 332, and again under the name of Woodhead on p. 333.

All in all, this study contributes significantly to our understanding

of a wide range of pre-Hellenistic poetry, even if there is little here that is definitive (there cannot be), and it invites scholars to look at other texts from the same perspective. Though I do not think it contributes much to our understanding of the *society* which produced this poetry over and above what we think we already know, as textual criticism this is an exemplary study, an instance of the best of American scholarship as regards both contents and book production.

2253 LJ VOORSCHOTEN, Welterdreef 85

F.G. NAEREBOUT

A. RIJKSBARON (éd.), *New Approaches to Greek Particles*. Proceedings of the Colloquium held in Amsterdam, January 4-6, 1996, to honour C.J. Ruijgh on the occasion of his retirement (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology, 7). Amsterdam, Gieben, 1997. 285 p. Pr. fl. 140,—.

Ce livre contient, outre l'introduction due à A. Rijksbaron (1-14), treize articles, suivis de l'index général (p. 275-278), de l'index des particules (p. 279-281) et de l'index des passages cités (p. 282-285). Ces articles reflètent les communications d'un colloque qui s'est tenu à Amsterdam en janvier 1996 pour le départ à la retraite du professeur C.J. Ruijgh et qui avait pour thème les particules grecques. Le sujet—on le sait—avait été traité par J.D. Denniston dans *The Greek Particles*, ouvrage paru en 1934 (seconde édition en 1954). Or, comme le souligne A. Rijksbaron (p. 1), depuis ce livre devenu livre de référence par le choix et la discussion de nombreux exemples, il n'y avait plus d'étude sur ce sujet, non que ce livre ait épuisé tous les aspects de la question (en particulier les particules complexes sont peu abordées par Denniston). En une dizaine de pages, A. Rijksbaron décrit le cadre théorique choisi par plusieurs auteurs des articles et indique le programme de recherche sur les particules tel qu'il se dégage du colloque. Le cadre théorique tient à l'évolution de la linguistique, qui se veut actuellement pragmatique, que ce soit avec les travaux d'O. Ducrot sur les deux valeurs du français *mais*, ou ceux d'E. Roulet. Ce dernier, représentant l'"école de Genève", distingue trois niveaux de discours (représentation, présentation, interaction), schéma théorique que C. Kroon a utilisé pour le latin dans une étude parue en 1995 (*Discourse Particles in Latin. A Study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at.*). L'application de la pragmatique aux particules grecques s'imposait donc presque. Je rendrai compte de chaque article par ordre de présentation dans le livre, car le critère de la pragmatique n'est pas toujours pertinent pour classer un article, et terminerai par le programme de recherche.