Greece & Rome, Vol. 56, No. 1, © The Classical Association, 2009. All rights reserved

SUBJECT REVIEWS

Greek Literature

Everyone who works on Greek literature needs to be able to find, read, and understand the ancient scholarship embedded in scholia, commentaries, lexica, and grammatical treatises. Yet these texts present formidable obstacles to anyone unfamiliar with their distinctive character, and finding one's way into them is a challenge. Let us, therefore, sing the praises of Eleanor Dickey, whose *Ancient Greek Scholarship*[1] comprises both a finding aid (a thorough survey of the material, with explanations of the sources and their transmission, and guidance on editions and secondary literature) and a tutorial (an introduction to scholarly Greek, with an anthology of texts and a glossary of technical usages). Every research student should have this invaluable resource thrust upon them; many mature scholars will benefit from studying it closely; all will want to have it for reference. If you dip into the middle of Christopher Faraone's *Stanzaic Architecture of Early Greek Elegy*,[2] you may be worried that his argument for the use of a five-couplet stanza as a basic unit of composition in early elegy so often needs to invoke a diagnosis of textual disruption where stanzaic composition appears to fail. But, given the nature of the poems' transmission, textual disruption is likely to have occurred. And if, following the author's advice, you start from the beginning, you will find that the opening chapters establish a persuasive *prima facie* case. Some of the arguments left me doubtful (for example, the treatment of Tyrtaeus 12). But the general thesis illuminates the poets' compositional techniques and, perhaps also (as Faraone suggests), the performance tradition. Jonathan Gottschall seeks to understand Homeric violence from an evolutionary perspective.[3] His premise: 'to explain universal phenomena requires a theory of shared human nature, and the only scientifically viable one emerges from evolutionary biology' (43). Agreed – but Gottschall's *explanandum* is not a universal: Homeric heroes and celibate monks have the same evolutionary inheritance but behave differently. Biological universals must be mediated by socio-cultural particularities if such differences are to be explained. Gottschall's approach is therefore described, more exactly, as 'evolutionary anthropology' (3). Arguing that the pattern of Homeric violence is paralleled in societies with a skewed operational sex ratio, he proposes, with commendable caution, the hypothesis (or 'educated hunch', 138) that polygyny and a high rate of juvenile female mortality may have produced this effect in Dark Age Greece. Evolutionary biology, assisted by game theory, provides an explanation of why human males (and females) are such that, under those conditions, this

[1] *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises from their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. By Eleanor Dickey. APA Classical Resources. New York, Oxford University Press, 2007. Pp. xvi + 375. Hardback £45, ISBN: 9780195312928; paperback £14.99, ISBN: 9780195312935.

[2] *The Stanzaic Architecture of Early Greek Elegy*. By Christopher A. Faraone. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008. Pp. xii + 200. Hardback £45, ISBN: 9780199236985.

[3] *The Rape of Troy. Evolution, Violence, and the World of Homer*. By Jonathan Gottschall. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008. Pp. xii + 223. Hardback £50, ISBN: 9780521870382; paperback £17.99, ISBN: 9780521690478.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383508000715 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pattern of violence is likely to constitute a stable equilibrium. If his comparative data are sound, Gottschall's hypothesis has an explanatory potential that generalized appeals to 'human nature' – even buttressed by evolutionary biology – cannot attain. But, while evolutionary biology may propose explanations, only the texts can reveal what needs to be explained; and here Gottschall is vulnerable. No one doubts that Homer's heroes desired sexual access to females, and saw it as (at least) an incidental benefit of warfare. But at *Il.* 3.156–60 the Trojan Elders do not take 'fights and wars over women' as a matter of course (57): *this* woman is unique, and yet the elders *still* want to send her home – a crucial 'but' goes unremarked by Gottschall. So does Sarpedon's failure to mention preferential access to women as a benefit of heroic status (*Il.* 12.310–28). So does Ajax's disparagement of quarrelling over a woman (*Il.* 9.637 – curiously, Gottschall imagines that Ajax makes the first plea in the embassy: 63). These oversights are not needed for Gottschall's evolutionary explanation to work. He does not deny that the heroes were motivated by wealth and status, as well as by sex, and does not need to do so (wealth and status may indirectly promote reproductive success); and he does not need support from the heroes' self-understanding (evolutionary theory deals in behaviour's ultimate causal explanation, not its proximate motivations). But such lapses do raise doubts about the reading of the social *explanandum* from which he starts.

We may wait a long time for an evolutionary analysis of Quintus' *Posthomerica*; meanwhile, we can enjoy the fruits of the first international conference devoted to that work.[4] The introduction and sixteen varied papers could hardly fail to leave me better informed (I am embarrassed that when, a few years ago, I was assembling evidence for the continuing vigour of third-century intellectual culture, it never occurred to me that the century might harbour a major epic poet), but they were also unexpectedly stimulating. They left me wondering whether Quintus deserves his unflattering reputation, and wanting to read more.

I doubt whether *Reading Herodotus*[5] would have inspired me to read more if I had been equally ill-informed about the *Histories*. Oblivious to the exuberance of Herodotus' narrative, many of the contributions to 'the first multi-authored collection of scholarly essays to focus on a single book of Herodotus' *Histories*' give the impression that reading Herodotus is a laborious decoding of perversely oblique communicative strategies. Chris Pelling, alone in acknowledging 'the joy of reading Herodotus' (201), also acknowledges doubts about the 'globalizing quest for organicity' (198) that dominates the collection. He assuages his qualms by quoting Michael Silk: 'in life, in literature, as no doubt in much-derided science, it makes more sense to *expect* a single "answer" unless and until we are forced to conclude otherwise' (197, n. 65). But the expectation of a single answer is likely to guarantee its own satisfaction. With enough ingenuity, enough adhoccery, enough laxity in standards of evidence, it is easy to come up with integrated accounts even of arbitrary aggregations of data; the accounts will just be moonshine. So, unless we have robust criteria for recognizing failure, we need *independent* grounds for believing that a given data set actually has an integrated explanation. I write that as an admirer of

[4] *Quintus Smyrnaeus. Transforming Homer in Second Sophistic Epic*. Edited by Manuel Baumbach and Silvio Bär. Berlin, de Gruyter, 2007. Pp. vii + 501. Hardback €88, ISBN: 9783110195774.

[5] *Reading Herodotus. A Study of the Logoi in Book 5 of Herodotus' Histories*. Edited by Elizabeth Irwin and Emily Greenwood. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007. Pp. xv + 343. Hardback £55, ISBN: 9780521876308.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383508000715 Published online by Cambridge University Press

science. As a classicist, I would add: since conceptions of appropriate textual coherence ('unity') are generically and culturally variable, we should take care not to beg questions about what would constitute a satisfactory 'single answer' for a given text. Herodotean specialists will need to delve into this volume to assess its mass of detailed exegesis, but they should take Pelling's doubts more seriously than he does himself. By contrast, Emily Baragwanath's study of motivation in Herodotus[6] provides a reading of the text that is attentive to detail and subtle, but never loses a sense of empirically plausible processes of composition and reception. Or not often. Inevitably, I found some interpretations less convincing than others. But my sceptical moments simply posed a challenge: find a more convincing alternative. And that, if Baragwanath is right, is precisely the response that Herodotus designed his text to evoke. In a short review, one sample must suffice to give a flavour of the whole:

> The gulf between noble rhetoric and base reality is indeed a theme that Herodotus presses elsewhere in the *Histories*. But it is not a matter simply of allocating praise and blame…. Rather, Herodotus' emphasis is on demonstrating the inadequacy of simple slogans to do justice to a complex piece of history and complex motivations, and on engaging readers in thinking about these dilemmas and in bringing together for themselves the contradictory strands. (159)

On Baragwanath's account, reading Herodotus is not decoding intricate textual conundrums but thinking hard about substantive issues concerning the manifold intricacies and opacities of human motivation – a satisfying and worthwhile enterprise. This book did make me want to read Herodotus again. When I do, I will be grateful to have Angus Bowie as a guide to Book 8 (from Artemisium to Salamis and its aftermath).[7] In his preface, Bowie explains: 'In this edition I have had two intentions especially in mind: to try to bring to life for the reader the Achaemenid empire, and to offer a great deal of help with the grammatical aspects of the text' (ix). He succeeds admirably in both respects. The introduction and commentary are informative about the Persian background and guide the reader away from a Hellenocentrically biased reading of the narrative. The text (carefully punctuated) and commentary (well-organized and thoughtfully laid out) provide ample and well-judged linguistic support. This is the second book of Herodotus to turn green and yellow (Michael Flower and John Marincola led the way with book 9 in 2002); it can be strongly recommended. Turning now to oratory, the pick of the latest batch is Chris Carey's Oxford text of Lysias,[8] replacing Hude's 1912 edition. The introduction provides a lucid account (in English) of the history of the corpus and the transmission of the text. Carey's apparatus is fuller than Hude's and clearer than Thalheim's (though more selective in recording conjectures). The collection of fragments is the fullest ever, being both thorough (e.g. F412:] . . [) and up to date (with newly discovered book fragments added at the last moment). The fragments have been renumbered; regrettably, no *comparatio numerorum* is provided. Less

[6] *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus*. By Emily Baragwanath. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008. Pp. xii + 374. Hardback £65, ISBN: 9780199231294.

[7] *Herodotus. Histories Book VIII*. Edited by A. M. Bowie. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007. Pp. xvi + 258. Hardback £55, ISBN: 9780521573283; paperback £18.99, ISBN: 9780521575713.

[8] *Lysiae Orationes cum Fragmentis*. Edited by Christopher Carey. Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007. Pp. xli + 571. Hardback £45, ISBN: 9780198140726.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383508000715 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ambitious, but still valuable, is Cecil Wooten's commentary on the *First Philippic*.[9] The text reproduces Dilts, without the apparatus; there is no translation but the commentary provides some grammatical assistance to the students who are the target audience. The introduction economically and clearly explains the speech's historical context and general approach, with some discussion of the development of Demosthenes' rhetorical technique. The commentary, while not neglecting historical background, emphasizes rhetoric, especially at the level of stylistic analysis. Student readers may find much of the detailed stylistic and rhetorical analysis challenging. I, on the other hand, was delighted to see the extensive and effective use that is made of Hermogenes' stylistic theory, and of the work of other ancient rhetoricians and critics. *Philippics* 2–3, though not included *in extenso*, are introduced and more briefly analysed in appendices. The preface to Yun Lee Too's commentary on Isocrates' *Antidosis*[10] promises a 'detailed archaeology of the iconographies presented to the reader by the rhetorician's work' (vi). The product does not live up to that impressive-sounding programme. I came away from the mundane, and rather patchy, commentary with no clear sense of a well-defined agenda or of the volume's target audience. Inexpert readers risk being seriously misled. Consider the introduction's opening reference to 'a speech to absolve himself of a capital charge' (1), or this gloss on the hypothetical opponent's name, Lysimachus: 'literally and auspiciously, "one who loses the fight/battle"' (103). The simple emendation needed to secure literal accuracy would eliminate the imagined auspice; so that is a philological, not a typographical, blunder. But typos abound: shockingly inadequate copy-editing and proofreading have left the text littered with inaccuracies and inconsistencies, some of them bizarre. Readers will search LSJ in vain for *πήρασε* (199): 'correcting' a font error by adding a spurious accent takes a special kind of inadvertence. Pausanias has attracted increasing interest in recent years and the bibliography has been expanding rapidly. So Maria Pretzler's introduction[11] is timely, as well as being outstandingly lucid and informative. After a brief outline of the *Periegesis*, Pretzler sets Pausanias and his work in context, and goes on to discuss travel and travel-writing, Pausanias' sense of space (a chapter that I found especially illuminating) and time, descriptions of cities and works of art, and the reception of the *Periegesis* from its arrival in the West, around 1400, to the end of the nineteenth century. The endnotes aid further investigation, with copious directions to primary and secondary sources. Pretzler gives a fleeting, anonymous reference (170, n. 23) to the map in a papyrus published in 1998, which apparently augmented the fragments of the traveller and geographer Artemidorus (*c.*100 BC). This same papyrus also contains drawings of animals and human body-parts, the art-historical importance of which was celebrated by the Greek Art subject reviewer in *G&R* 53 (2006), 273 f. But is the papyrus a forgery? A formidable, multi-faceted case against authenticity is presented in full by Luciano Canfora and his associates in *Il papiro di*

[9] *A Commentary on Demosthenes' Philippic I. With Rhetorical Analyses of Philippics II and III*. By Cecil Wooten. APA Texts and Commentaries. New York, Oxford University Press, 2008. Pp. xiv + 179. Hardback £41, ISBN: 9780195333268; paperback £13.99, ISBN 9780195333275.

[10] *A Commentary on Isocrates' Antidosis*. By Yun Lee Too. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008. Pp. x + 254. Hardback £50, ISBN: 9780199238071.

[11] *Pausanias. Travel Writing in Ancient Greece*. By Maria Pretzler. Classical Literature & Society. London, Duckworth, 2007. Pp. xiv + 225. 13 maps. Paperback £18, ISBN: 9780715634967.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383508000715 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Artemidoro.[12] Selected (and abbreviated) chapters in English translation[13] present the argument's core: the papyrus is based on a nineteenth-century edition of a late antique epitome and makes statements about Roman provincial organization not true in Artemidorus' day. The English version concludes 'There is no such thing as a "perfect crime"' (126) but does not unmask the criminal. The Italian version goes on to accuse the enterprising nineteenth-century forger Constantine Simonides (with illustrations of his work). The papyrus text includes a preface on geography of such staggeringly pompous fatuity that one must hope, for Artemidorus' sake, that further research does not succeed in overturning what appears to be a strong case against authenticity. There are grounds for optimism: the preface is, as Canfora shows, suspiciously rich in expressions reminiscent of much later authors. And now prepare yourselves for astonishing news. A new introduction to Greek tragedy has appeared – published, believe it or not, by Blackwell![14] Whatever will they think of next? To stake a claim on our attention (and our cash), any new addition to the relentlessly accumulating mountain of introductions to Greek tragedy needs to be exceptionally good or else have a distinctive slant. Nancy Rabinowitz begins by placing tragedy in an Athenian context, with chapters on the nature of tragedy, tragedy and the *polis*, and tragedy and Greek religion. Part II looks at selected plays from a variety of thematic perspectives: war, family, and the relationship of mortals to gods. 'This section of readings is indebted to structuralist, as well as feminist and multicultural, modes of analysis' (85); its consequent emphasis on binary oppositions risks turning plays into embodiments of abstract schemata. To say, for example, that Polydorus and Polyxena 'are merely [!] gendered aspects of the same struggle' (139) strikes me as crass. But such reductionism is generally avoided; I was more often impressed by the subtlety and balance of the discussions, and the variety of perspectives touched on. Rabinowitz insists that 'tragedy is not just an object from the past that we study, but…it is also re-created in the present through the active involvement of reader, spectator, actor, and director' (1). She seeks to foster active involvement by inviting her readers to consider different possible responses to the plays and highlighting contemporary relevances. That risks rapid obsolescence; and the technique may depend too much for its effectiveness on the dynamics of classroom interaction to work when frozen on a page. On balance, then, this is an interesting experiment, but does not quite succeed. Pedants may also feel that 'small mistake' (15) is not a felicitous rendering of Aristotle's *μεγάλη ἁμαρτία*. Christopher Collard's Aeschylus translation is completed by *Persians and Other Plays*.[15] It shares great merits with his *Oresteia*, and one important limitation. The merits include high-quality scholarship (that scarcely needs to be said), a good introduction, excellent explanatory notes, a rich bibliography (though the dense layout is not user-friendly), and a careful, reliable translation. These features add up to an invaluable resource for advanced students, already

[12] *Il papiro di Artemidoro*. By Luciano Canfora. Rome/Bari, Editori Laterza, 2008. Pp. x + 518. 16 plates. Paperback €28, ISBN: 9788842085218.

[13] *The True History of the So-Called Artemidorus Papyrus*. By Luciano Canfora. Bari, Edizioni di Pagina, 2007. Pp. 198. 16 plates. Paperback €16, ISBN: 9788874700448.

[14] *Greek Tragedy*. By Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz. Blackwell Introductions to the Classical World. Oxford, Blackwell, 2008. Pp. xii + 218. Hardback £50, ISBN: 9781405121606. Paperback £19.99, ISBN: 9781405121613.

[15] *Aeschylus. Persians and Other Plays*. Translated by Christopher Collard. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008. Pp. xcii + 286. 5 maps. Hardback £60, ISBN: 9780198149682; paperback £9.99, ISBN: 9780192832825.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383508000715 Published online by Cambridge University Press

committed to tragedy. But I doubt whether the volume will win new converts. The translation, to my ear, has rather a leaden effect and lacks the qualities needed to enthuse new readers. But my predecessor spoke more positively of the 'weight' and 'vigorous momentum' of Collard's *Oresteia*, and its 'strong feeling for the densities of Aeschylean language' (*G&R* 50 [2003], 243 f.). Try it and see for yourselves: even if you share my reservations, you will not regret the purchase. I said last time that I could happily adopt Meineck and Woodruff's translation of Sophocles' non-Theban plays for teaching. But David Raeburn's new Penguin has already subverted my fickle allegiance.[16] Spoken verse is consistently convincing; recitatives in accentual anapaests skilfully avoid that rhythm's potential absurdity in English; and the attempt to render lyric isometrically is remarkably successful – the discipline has helped Raeburn find what is so often missing: a distinctive lyric voice. 'Wretched, wretched I surely am, / Crushed and broken by toil and pain. / No one ever again to come, / No one ever to share my home, / While I wither and die here' (*Phil.* 1101–5) is a marked improvement on Meineck's skeletal rendering: 'I am cursed! Cursed! / Abused in my agony, / Abandoned, / Alone, for the rest of time. / Dead.' Speech, recitative, and song are differentiated by levels of indenting, and their use is explained in Raeburn's notes; he has also given careful thought to staging (he rightly follows Scullion's lead on Ajax's suicide). Useful support is provided by Pat Easterling's general introduction and – for individual plays – by Raeburn's prefaces (following a standard pattern: tradition; synopsis; interpretation; casting; staging; dramatic technique) and notes. This is now my version of choice. Patrick Finglass[17] presents a newly constituted text and apparatus for Sophocles' *Electra*, and an extensive commentary (460 pages). The short and rather perfunctory introduction raises fears that larger interpretative issues will be neglected; they are not – indeed, some fine observations will reward the diligent attention that the commentary's uniformity of presentation demands. It is disappointing, though, to find the divergent optimistic and pessimistic tendencies in modern readings dismissed with a few tendentious gestures. Michael Lloyd's book (not cited) provides a more sophisticated treatment (*G&R* 53 [2006], 256–7). The arguments for excluding the Erinyes from Aegisthus' foreshadowing of future ills fail to carry conviction: no mention is made, for example, of allusive foreshadowings at the end of other Sophoclean plays (including *Philoctetes* and, more controversially, *Trachiniae*). I think, too, that the presence of the Argive *polis* is understated. In particular, the monthly choruses and sacrifices to the saviour gods (*El.* 281) surely have nothing to do with a funerary meal shared by relatives on the thirtieth day, as Finglass supposes: this a public and political celebration, instituted by Agamemnon's assassins as part of their new regime's self-legitimation. Despite these reservations, the wealth of high-calibre philological detail in text, apparatus, and commentary is more than enough to make this volume indispensable. William Allan's hefty green-and-yellow *Helen*[18] follows close on the heels of Burian's Aris &

[16] *Sophocles. Electra and Other Plays*. Translated by David Raeburn, with an introduction by Pat Easterling. London, Penguin, 2008. Pp. xlvi + 309. Paperback £8.99, ISBN: 9780140449785.

[17] *Sophocles. Electra*. Edited by P. J. Finglass. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007. Pp. xii + 646. Hardback £85, ISBN: 9780521868099.

[18] *Euripides. Helen*. Edited by William Allan. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008. Pp. xiv + 371. Hardback £50, ISBN: 9780521836906; paperback £19.99, ISBN: 9780521545419.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383508000715 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Phillips (*G&R* 55 [2008], 114). Allan deals with metre in more depth and more often comments on linguistic detail – though the blurb's suggestion that its 'notes on language and style are intended to make *Helen* fully accessible to readers of Greek at all levels' is over-optimistic: this commentary will be found demanding, and Burian's annotation (keyed to his translation) will be accessible to a wider readership. Both can be warmly recommended. A lengthy introduction gives Allan scope for displaying his talent for knocking misconceptions sharply on the head. However, while I am sympathetic to his emphasis on tragedy's 'affirmatory impact', the way this idea is developed makes tragedy look worryingly smug:

> we are shown repeatedly how fifth-century Athenian norms do not work in a heroic setting – yet the point is *not* that Athens is a failure, but that the excessive and dangerous figures of heroic myth are the problem…. It is not fifth-century Athens or democracy that is at fault…but it is the inability of the heroic world to accommodate Athenian norms which marks that world as doomed to conflict and ruin. (7)

Thus Easterling's 'heroic vagueness' is countered with 'heroic inversion'. But might the heroic world not exhibit with especial starkness factors common to all human life – even life in the fifth-century Athenian democracy? Elsewhere, Allan argues that the complaints of Euripidean characters about the gods are not 'a challenge to religious norms or beliefs, since they function in context primarily as another manifestation of human limitations, especially the limits of human knowledge, and of the inevitable fact of human suffering' (65). Precisely: human, not just heroic. Tragedy, as Aristotle knew, is περὶ τὸν ὅμοιον. Under the heading 'a tragedy of ideas', Allan claims 'serious philosophic import' for *Helen* (46). But this claim rapidly emulates the *eidôlon*, dissolving into airy vagueness: 'poets do not set themselves to explore the issues of (for example) truth and illusion *per se*, but rather harness the language and ideas surrounding these issues in order to explore the relevance of the myth as a whole for their society' (47). We are also asked to believe that 'the distinction between "appearance" and "reality"' in Parmenides embodied 'a massive conceptual advance' (47). Were Homer and Hesiod incapable of grasping that distinction? Stesichorus? Let us not confuse the idea that the totality of appearances may be systematically unreal (a conflict between, in Sellars' terms, the manifest and scientific images) with the commonplace that this or that particular thing might not be quite what it seems. Thalia Papadopoulou's Duckworth Companion to *Phoenician Women*[19] does well what it chooses to do, and provides a useful introduction to the play. But there are limitations. It begins by noting that Euripides lived during 'a time of radical change in Athens' (11), and goes on to emphasize his 'innovation and experimentation' (12). Did Sophocles, then, live in a time of tranquillity? Or leave everything unchanged? The otherwise excellent chapter on myth and intertextuality falls into the trap set here: the contrast between conservative Sophocles and radical Euripides may well be in large measure an artefact of our tendency to confuse the subsequently acquired canonicity of Sophoclean versions with traditionality. The chapter on 'characters and actions' entirely subordinates actions to the characters. The play is indeed 'rich in terms of both character and event' (49), but it also has a plot – an ordered

[19] *Euripides. Phoenician Women*. By Thalia Papadopoulou. Duckworth Companions to Greek and Roman Tragedy. London, Duckworth, 2008. Pp. 160. Paperback £12.99, ISBN: 9780715634646.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383508000715 Published online by Cambridge University Press

structure of events – which gets little attention. Textual problems are acknowledged briefly, but not addressed; the implicit, and therefore unargued, working assumptions are conservative. The abrupt ending of the chapter on reception draws attention to the sketchiness of its treatment of recent performance history. Not for the first time, I was left wondering whether trying to squeeze reception into a brief coda to a short book is the right policy. Contrast (an admittedly unfair juxtaposition) what is achieved in Kathleen Riley's book-length study of the reception- and performance-history of *Heracles*.[20] 'The primary interest of this book lies in changing ideas of Heraklean madness, of its causes, its consequences, and its therapy' (4); and, since changes in the understanding of Heracles' madness entail changes in the understanding of his heroism, 'this process of heroic redefinition is the second focus of my investigation' (5). Riley's account is absorbing, her material richly varied. One decisive point is Seneca's internalization of the madness (53); Wilamowitz's interpretation provides a similar pivotal moment in the modern period, with repercussions lasting to the present: 'Where the *Herakles* is concerned, this instinctive modern leaning towards Greek myth has assumed an intriguing un-Hellenic aspect. From the theatrical rehabilitation of Euripides' mad hero in the last half century, a neo-Senecan Herakles has emerged' (337). Riley is right to stress the externality of Heracles' madness in Euripides (14, 31) but wrong to assume that this supports the prevailing dogma that the plot violates the Aristotelian norm of necessary or probable connection (15–17). 'Euripides himself emphasized a total absence of reason for the madness' (5): clearly untrue – he went mad because Hera sent Madness to drive him mad. 'Her grounds for attack cannot but seem inadequate and illogical' (33): inadequate for what? Inadequate justification, perhaps ('an unpardonable mischief': 5); but that is irrelevant to causal explanation. Her grounds are certainly adequate motivation for a deity whose viciousness astonishes even Zeus (*Il.* 4.31–6: even so, he is willing to accommodate it for a *quid pro quo*). The origins of Hera's hatred and of Heracles' greatness are the same. Zeus has protected him only during his labours (*Her.* 827–9); those labours have left his family unprotected. So the synchrony of the family's rescue and hero's downfall is no coincidence. Modern readers struggle to take the gods of Greek tragedy seriously. The landscape beyond the Senecan divide may be stranger than Riley appreciates. Barbara Goff and Michael Simpson take a different approach to reception in their *Crossroads in the Black Aegean*,[21] which traces adaptations of Sophocles' Theban plays in Africa and the African diaspora from the 1960s on. One persistent theme, unsurprisingly, is the price exacted by the appropriation of canonical European texts:

> To the extent…that this classical authority can be identified as part of the culture that it is used to criticize, the plays deploying this authority are themselves identified as part of this European culture. The historical bonds between colonizers and colonized are thus ratified by the cultural efforts of the colonized, even in these audacious acts of resistance. (4)

[20] *The Reception and Performance of Euripides' Herakles. Reasoning Madness*. By Kathleen Riley. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008. Pp. xii + 398. 7 figures. Hardback £65, ISBN: 9780199534487.

[21] *Crossroads in the Black Aegean. Oedipus, Antigone, and Dramas of the African Diaspora*. By Barbara Goff and Michael Simpson. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007. Pp. xii + 401. 5 figures. Hardback £65, ISBN: 9780199217182.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383508000715 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The book contains much interesting material, but it should have done more to introduce the primary texts clearly to newcomers (I never gained an ordered sense of the plays as dramas). And it should have been shorter: the exposition is tiresomely long-winded, often stating the obvious at length ('although it [the present book] investigates not only several receptions but also theoretical models of transmission, it is itself merely [*sic*!] another reception in the relays it studies' (36)). On the other hand, it makes little attempt to justify crucial premises – for example, that the relationship between colonialism and the colonized can usefully be figured as 'incestuous'. This, you will observe, is *Freudian* postcolonialism. To be fair, the authors might not have succeeded in persuading me that any useful model of cultural transmission can be derived from dodgy psychodynamics, even if they had tried. But describing the Freudian model as 'officially sanctioned' (26) merely tempts derision.

doi:S0017383508000715 MALCOLM HEATH

Latin Literature

In 2006, Oxford University Press published a hardback translation of Terence's comedies by Peter Brown, reviewed in *G&R* 55 [2008] 118 f. Now they have issued a paperback version[1] identical in every other respect. Those who bought the hardback version for £60 may be unhappy to find that the paperback is selling for £9.99. However, Brown's stated hope to see his translations on the stage will be helped by this change. Francis Cairns has assembled thirty-four of his own papers on Roman Elegy,[2] (overwhelmingly Propertius), published in Britain, the United States, and five European countries from 1969 to 2003. Readers who wish to know what Cairns has thought on any particular passage will be able to consult his consolidated indexes on passages cited and on Latin and Greek words, complemented by a general index. For our first encounter with original writing we must examine John Warden's *Taking Back the Text*.[3] After a spirited critique of modern literary criticism, he proceeds to analyse selected poems of Catullus, Propertius, and Tibullus in what may seem to some a rather old-fashioned way and to others a rather self-indulgent way; even so, his work is stimulating and interesting: it clearly flows from a genuine enthusiasm for the poems he has chosen. He is correct to claim that the Phalaecian hendecasyllable starts with two *syllabae ancipites* (6) but he neglects to observe that the line never starts with two short syllables and usually starts with two long ones. Others must decide whether the complete absence of Cairns's name from Warden's book is significant and, if so, what the significance is. The title of Anton Powell's *Virgil the Partisan. A Study in the Re-integration of Classics*[4] is enough to alert the reader to the general thrust of his argument, but it may not prepare readers for his insistence on seeing *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid* as best understood as a unity.

[1] *Terence. The Comedies*. Translated with introduction and explanatory notes by Peter Brown. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008. Pages xxviii + 338. Paperback £9.99, ISBN: 978-0-19-282399-1.

[2] *Papers on Roman Elegy 1969–2003*. By Francis Cairns. Eikasmos – Quaderni Bolognese di Filologia Classica, studi 16. Bologna, Pàtron Editori, 2006. Pp. ix + 483. Paperback €35, ISBN: 978-88-555-2966-2.

[3] *Taking Back the Text. Poetic Technique in Catullus, Propertius and Tibullus*. By John Warden. Toronto, Edgar Kent, 2008. Pp. vii + 111. Hardback CDN$72.50, ISBN: 978-0-88866-656-7.

[4] *Virgil the Partisan. A Study in the Re-integration of Classics*. By Anton Powell. Swansea, The Classical Press of Wales, 2008. Pp. xii + 309. Hardback £45, ISBN: 978-1-905125-21-0.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383508000715 Published online by Cambridge University Press