enough so that the explorations were not felt to be symbolically threatening to the audience, yet close enough to allow them to be felt to be relevant (p. 46; I attempted to examine a similar point in 'Time, Space and Ideology: Tragic Myths and the Athenian Polis', in J. A. López Férez [ed.], *Mitos en la literatura griega arcaica y clásica* [Madrid, 2002], pp. 175–89).

Numerous insightful observations are made by S.-I., both about Greek religion and about specific plays. But one defect mars the overall impact of this intelligent book. This defect is stylistic. In countless passages of this work of 547 pages, the writing is either awkward or redundant or both. This example from p. 92 is taken more or less at random:

> The Altar of the Twelve Gods is in the immediate proximity of the area in which the performances would have taken place. More significantly, in front of the Altar of the Twelve Gods, in the immediate proximity of the area in which the performances would have taken place, between the Altar of the Twelve Gods and the performance area, at the time when the dramatic performances would have been taking place in the Agora . . .

Editors need authors, but authors need editors just as much. S.-I.'s typescript desperately cried out for the services of an editor prepared to be cruel in order to be kind. Judiciously shortened and appropriately rephrased, the work would have had far more punch and bite. As it is, it will test the patience of all but the most dedicated of students; even one or two of their teachers may skip a page or two here and there. This would be a real pity, because S.-I.'s analysis is rich in insights important for the understanding of Greek religion as well as Greek tragedy.

University of Bristol RICHARD BUXTON
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni020

THE IMAGE OF ATHENS

J. GRETHLEIN: *Asyl und Athen. Die Konstruktion kollektiver Identität in der griechischen Tragödie.* (Drama: Beiträge zum antiken Drama und seiner Rezeption 21.) Pp. iv + 492. Stuttgart and Weimar: Verlag J. B. Metzler, 2003. Paper, €39.90. ISBN: 3-476-45309-9.

Grethlein's book, which is based on his dissertation, is a remarkable achievement. The author's command of scholarship, particularly in English and German, is both broad and deep, and includes comprehensive explorations of contemporary literary and cultural theory. G. is concerned to show how the idealized image of Athens that appears at its purest in the Funeral Orations is put to subtle and varied use in tragic suppliant dramas. Extending work by N. Loraux, F. Zeitlin, C. Sourvinou-Inwood, and C. Pelling, he argues that these plays, in which outsiders come to Athens for help, raised interesting questions about what it meant to be Athenian. The book amply justifies G.'s contention that literary works, and in particular tragedy, were basic to the construction of a complex and dynamic sense of public identity in the Athenian democracy. G. threads his way carefully through the difficult question of reception, making it clear that different members of the audience might interpret a play differently, and showing how the 'pluriform' nature of tragedy permitted a particularly searching examination of the contrasts between Athenian and non-Athenian, past and present, ideal and real.

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni021 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Euripides' *Suppliants*, which is based on mythic material from the Funeral Orations, also contains a funeral speech by Adrastus, in which the Seven, shown as hubristic in the rest of the play, are depicted as models of civic good conduct. G. sees this incongruity as underlining the difference in genres, the one-sided praise of the Funeral Oration contrasting with the subtler shadings of tragedy (pp. 168ff.). Adrastus' speech ends without the traditional consolation, an absence that is reflected in the continuing extravagances of Argive mourning; G. (pp. 179ff.) sees this as another instance of the tensions between the genre of rhetorical praise in the Funeral Orations and the tragic themes of human frailty and weakness. He argues that choral lyric 'panegyric' supplied an additional model (see discussion, e.g. pp. 128–31, 434), one that centered on topics such as piety and divine favor that were avoided in the rhetorical genre. But, given that the theme of human limitation is omnipresent in early poetry, and that praise in the epinicians of Pindar and Bacchylides is anything but one-sided, the dominant contrast should be that between traditional poetic forms and civic rhetoric.

This contrast is also evident in the discrepancies between contemporary Athenian political life and the mythical Athens of the plays. G. argues (pp. 163ff.) that in Euripides' *Suppliants* anachronistic references to contemporary political debates do not directly threaten the idealized image of Athens and its democratic leader Theseus, since political dysfunction is largely displaced onto Argos and Thebes. Yet, precisely because of the 'zooming' effect (see pp. 37–8 on Sourvinou-Inwood) of the anachronism, the political themes necessarily evoke a critique of contemporary Athens, contrasting it with the ideal. In *Oedipus at Colonus*, on the other hand, a play in which contemporary resonance is almost wholly lacking, Theseus, like his opponent Creon, is a traditional monarch; and democracy is never mentioned. Athens, through Colonus, is given the ideal qualities of the *locus amoenus* (pp. 276–81), further distancing the Athens of the play from the turmoil and suffering of the *polis* in the last years of the century. Yet the play's emphasis on change and disruption in human life, shown in Oedipus' altered view of himself and thematized in his speech at 607 (pp. 307–14), encourages the audience to become aware of the gulf that can separate past from present, ideal from real.

The book's origin in a dissertation may account for some minor and some less minor deficiencies. There is no index, a shame for such a rich and complex book. The structure is almost completely determined by G.'s analysis of the questions he wants to consider and by the order in which the plays are taken. But an overview of suppliancy, as it appears in Greek history and ritual (see the brief discussion, pp. 9–15), would have helped to delineate the characteristics of specifically dramatic suppliancy. For instance, dramatic suppliant scenes often feature a triangular conflict among suppliant, pursuer, and savior (p. 48); but epic supplications do not follow this model. G. emphasizes the theme of assimilation of the alien suppliant in Aeschylus (with some modifications, he makes it apply as well to Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, in which the alienness of the suppliants is transferred to the pursuers, the Furies). But Aeschylus' *Suppliants* takes place in Argos, and the assimilation of alien suppliants never occurs in an Athenian context. In *Eumenides* the Furies and in *Heracles* the hero are offered residence and cult in Athens; but neither of these behave like suppliants. Their cases suggest that, for good historical reasons, Athenians' idealized view of their *polis* fitted better with the assimilation of alien divinities than with that of alien mortals. G. attempts, with appropriate circumspection, to assess the possible interplay between contemporary events and the dramas; but, oddly enough, he hardly mentions the famous parallel of the Areopagus reforms of Ephialtes with the foundation myth in *Eumenides*.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni021 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Although all the discussions of individual dramas are insightful and make their contribution to G.'s central themes, the sequence of plays determines the structure of the book and produces some discontinuity. After a theoretical overview, he begins with Aeschylus' *Suppliants* and proceeds to Euripides' play of the same name. The two dramas have little in common, and the *Eumenides* chapter that follows returns to Aeschylean themes. Only with the fifth chapter on *Oedipus at Colonus* do the elements of the book come together. The chapters that follow make points of varying effectiveness: the distancing and idealizing techniques in *Medea* provide a useful foil to those in *Oedipus at Colonus. Heracles* is more problematic, since G. focuses on the final scene, which is not really suppliant in form. The *Heraclidae*, in many ways a prototype of suppliant drama, is saved for last, perhaps because it evades G.'s usual argument that Athenian ideals are not directly challenged by these plays. As he remarks, when the discrepancy between ideal and real within a play is sufficiently marked, the ideal loses its normative function and becomes itself the object of critique (p. 428).

Miranda, California ANN N. MICHELINI
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni021

THE SURVIVAL OF TRAGEDY

R. GARLAND: *Surviving Greek Tragedy*. Pp. xviii + 286. London: Duckworth, 2004. Paper, £16.99. ISBN: 0-7156-3123-3.

Surviving Greek Tragedy offers to the general reader the story of the reception and influence of Greek tragedy from the fifth century B.C.E. to the present. Most of the book usefully surveys the journey of the tragic texts from Athens, where they passed from (most probably) the hands of the heirs of the three great tragedians to those of actors and a small number of manuscript collectors and then to the state, which attempted to stabilize the texts and protect them from interpolations in the late fourth century. From there they found a place in the libraries of Alexander the Great's successors, and were copied on papyrus rolls whose fragments were preserved in the dry sands of Egypt. Somewhere along the way a group of canonical texts emerged, although the Greek originals continued to be performed and new tragedies composed for many centuries. New versions of tragedies popular in Southern Italy appeared in Latin. The Greek originals were eventually preserved by Byzantine scholars, and then taken to Italy after the fall of Constantinople. This journey has been traced in works that address the history of ancient Greek texts more generally, such as those of Pfeiffer or Reynolds and Wilson, or in specialized studies of manuscripts such as those of Turyn. Garland's book extracts the reception of tragic texts from this larger picture.

The earlier chapters (1–5) of this book, then, present a competent synthesis of specialized material. Unfortunately, the final two chapters reveal Garland's lack of experience as a scholar of either Greek tragedy or its post-Renaissance reception. Although the reception of Greek tragedy is currently undergoing an exciting scholarly renaissance and the criticism of Greek tragedy has been at the forefront of innovative work in Classics for the past thirty years, both of Garland's final chapters leave embarrassing gaps and demonstrate a surprising lack of knowledge and judgement. Translation theory and the study of translation from antiquity to the present has developed considerably in recent years. G.'s Chapter 6 simply mentions a few notable efforts, apparently chosen at random, and spends a large portion of his brief

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni021 Published online by Cambridge University Press