ἀγὼν means 'a lot is at stake', not '[t]he contest before us is a great one' (cf. Mastronarde on *Pho*. 860). 1254: 'as far as money is concerned' (cf. LSJ s.v. ἕνεκα I.2). 1261 refers to the ἐκφορά of an empty bier (cf. Thuc. 2.34.3). 1269 refers to the visibility of the splash of the oars (ῥόθια) from the shore (χερσόθεν). 1278: 'very well then', rather than '[s]he may go': 'ἴτω is the Greek for a shrug of the shoulders' (Dodds on *Ba*. 365).

Phoenician Women 66: 'He [Oedipus] now lives in the palace' misses the emphasis on ζῶν. 105: 'footstep', not 'foot' (cf. 1718). 163: Mastronarde plausibly argues that δρόμον means 'racing' rather than 'path': 'as fast as the wind-swift clouds' (Waterfield). 307–8: παρηίδων τ' ὄρεγμα δὸς τριχῶν τε means 'reach out your cheeks and hair', not 'let me put my hand to . . .'. 413–14: K. remains unpersuaded by Mastronarde's trenchant criticisms of Jacobs' transposition. 549–67: K.'s deletion (cf. *GRBS* 23 [1982], 42–5) is based largely on a narrow view both of the context and of Greek ethics. 727: 'easy' is an odd rendering of δεινόν. 874: translating ἀμαθῶς as 'grievously' seems perverse, especially as the sons' folly is thematic. 1010: σηκός can mean 'lair', so there is no need to give the serpent a sacred precinct. Lines 1009 and 1091 show, against K.'s remark in the introduction (p. 208), that Menoeceus kills himself on the battlements.

Orestes 84: 'except that' is a surprising rendering of οὕνεκα. 167: 'unfeeling one' is not quite right for τάλαινα here, which could almost be translated 'you idiot' (cf. Ar. *Eccl*. 90, 156, 190). 192: 'ordaining' would convey the somewhat specialized sense of δούς here better than K.'s plain 'giving'. 255: 'shake' is presumably intended. 1106: the restrained tone of the 'tragic' aorist ἤνεσ' (Willink) is exactly right here. ἐμέμφθην (*Hel*. 463) is probably another example of this type of aorist. 1302–10: K. rightly rejects di Benedetto's suggestion that Electra sings along with the chorus. Her inclusive παύσωμεν (1314) is polite (cf. Soph. *OC* 1627). 1441–2: ἕδρανα παλαιᾶς ἑστίας = 'ancient hearth-seat', not 'seat by the ancient hearth'. 1513: K. prints his own τεμεῖν, but it is difficult to see its advantage over the palaeographically easier θενεῖν. 1534: read σώσει, a rare misprint.

University College Dublin MICHAEL LLOYD

HERACLIDAE

W. ALLAN: *Euripides:* The Children of Heracles. Pp. xii + 236. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 2001. Cased, £35 (Paper, £16.50). ISBN: 0-85668-740-5 (0-85668-741-3 pbk).

This newly annotated Greek–English edition of Euripides' *Children of Heracles* makes what is generally regarded as one of Euripides' weaker plays more accessible to students of classical Greek literature. In his thorough, concise, and well referenced introduction, Allan declares his hope that his edition 'will contribute in some way to the play's continuing rehabilitation' (p. 22). Whether or not an intrinsically flawed play can be 'rehabilitated' remains a moot point. Nonetheless, the edition, with A.'s informative Introduction and detailed commentary, is most welcome.

The introduction, which begins with A.'s efforts to explain away scholars' disenchantment with the play, covers considerable ground. It reviews in detail the known versions of the myth of the flight of Heracles' children to Athens and their rescue by the people of Athens from sure death at the hands of Eurystheus. It discusses

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.14 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at length the mythical figures in the play, analyzing their treatment in the sources available to Euripides and suggesting Euripides' probable innovations. It also includes a brief sketch of suppliant plays, their essential components, and the significance of supplication in Greek society. Throughout the introduction, A. is concerned to refute the play' critics. In his discussion of the play's structure, to take one of his major claims, he contends that the volatility of focus and mood for which the play has been criticized are 'deliberately geared both to enthrall and to provoke the audience' (p. 39). Along similar lines, he disputes the common view of the *Herakleidai* as a laudatory political drama written to suit the circumstances of the time, the war with Sparta, and Athens' efforts to strengthen its ties with the Argives. A. argues that Euripides does more than praise Athens, he also explores issues with which the Athenians were struggling at the time, including the conflict between power and justice and the treatment of prisoners of war. The play certainly deals with these issues, but much more is needed to support A.'s conclusion that this play 'reflects, and engages with, history in a more complex and stimulating way' and 'emerges as not merely a "political", but also a tragic drama' (p. 46).

The Greek text used in the book is the recent OCT of Euripides, edited by J. Diggle (Volume I, Oxford, 1984), with A. occasionally offering his own contrary version in the notes. The *apparatus criticus* is sparse and, to use A.'s term, 'selective' (p. 58). As is customary in the Aris & Phillips series, the text is fully translated, with short stage directions added and notes appended in a separate section. The translation strives for accuracy rather than poetics and in general achieves its aim. The sung parts are printed in italics, which gives the student a clearer sense of the distinct parts of a Greek tragedy—which is helpful, even though there is relatively little song in this tragedy.

The notes (with the lemmata keyed to the translation) are basic and very thorough, well referenced to the introduction, and point the reader to a wealth of scholarship. A.'s brief but instructive analyses of the various speeches are very helpful, as are his analyses of the main scenes. Most of the words chosen for explanation are well selected, and most of the explanations are clear and useful. For example, A.'s notes on causal datives and the accusative absolute (with references to relevant paragraph numbers in both Smyth and Goodwin) should be greatly appreciated by students. So should most of his lucid comments on basic matters of grammar and syntax, though his detailed explanations of more abstruse textual matters, which may interest the scholar, are at times too complex to be entirely accessible to less advanced students. The notes also include, where needed, explanations of the mythic background, political reality, and social norms, as well as the stage props that were used. His pointing out and explaining the literary tropes and strategies (e.g. the agon-scenes) is also helpful.

In short, this commentary should be useful to any instructor who would like to have his or her class read this play. It is therefore a pity that in his zeal to defend the play, which he does very scrupulously, A. devotes an inordinate amount of space to quoting and paraphrasing its detractors. For example, in his commentary introducing the first seventy-two lines, A. relays Grube's harsh criticism of Iolaus' speech at some length. The reader may well remember the negative view more than A.'s rebuttal. It would have been more effective had he simply noted the speech's virtues (e.g. the creation of the required atmosphere of danger) and allowed readers to decide on its merits on their own.

The text and notes also include fragments falsely ascribed to the play, and a selected bibliography.

The production is flawed. Every so often the ink fades or some other blemish

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.14 Published online by Cambridge University Press

appears on the page. The Greek in l. 204 should be corrected from βαρυνθεὶ̓ς to βαρυνθεὶς.

Colby College HANNA M. ROISMAN

TRAGIC VIOLATIONS

E. BELFIORE: *Murder Among Friends. Violation of* Philia *in Greek Tragedy*. Pp. xix + 282. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Cased, £36.50. ISBN: 0-19-513149-5.

Elizabeth Belfiore's book covers more ground than its main title suggests, discussing all kinds of violation of *philia* and defining *philia* broadly to include relationships with *xenoi*, suppliants, and even (with reference to Ajax's suicide) oneself. Harm to *philoi*, B. argues, is a consistent and fundamental concern of tragedy (whether or not Aristotle meant to imply this in *Poetics* 14), and is pervasive in its main plots and many incidental features. While kin-murder is its strongest manifestation, other violations are assimilated to kin-murder and represented in analogous ways.

Chapter 1 sets out this thesis and summarizes B.'s conclusions from a survey (detailed in three appendices) of the known plot-material of tragedy. She discerns seventeen extant tragedies about violence between blood-kin, nine about *pathê* involving married couples, *xenoi*, or suppliants, and six concerning significant though less obvious violations of *philia*. In the fragments, harm to *philoi* or something analogous is found to have been central to about 75% of plots (though often the basis for classification is slight; titles alone suffice for 78 of the 110 plays by minor tragedians included in this count.).

Chapters 2–6 discuss five plays where B. sees the theme of *philia*-violation as crucial. In *Iphigenia in Tauris* salvation is achieved through the reassertion of *philia*-obligations which previous generations of the family of Pelops have denied. In Aeschylus' *Supplices* the issues of marriage, *xenia*, and suppliancy are seen as central and interrelated, so that 'the union of Zeus and Io can be interpreted as the prototype of an ideal Greek marriage' (p. 56) characterized by suppliancy, *aidôs*, and persuasion; the trilogy may have culminated in the reconciliation and marriage-renewal of Zeus and Hera as well as the proper marriage of one or more Danaids. In *Philoctetes* B. traces the development of a *xenia* relationship between Neoptolemus and Philoctetes which increasingly inhibits the younger man from its betrayal, and goes on to argue that the play's allusions to Skyros make it an unheroic antithesis of Troy, reminding us of Achilles' seduction of Deidameia and Neoptolemus' illegitimate birth, and so contributing to a distinctly ambivalent characterization of Neoptolemus. *Andromache* is analysed as a tragedy of obligations towards friends and against enemies thrown into turmoil by Neoptolemus' misalliance with Andromache (and behind that, Peleus' misalliance with Thetis). In *Ajax*, B. argues, the suicide has a paradoxically positive value: on the one hand to kill oneself is to harm one's own greatest *philos*, but on the other hand Ajax sees his death as a means of fulfilling his obligations and restoring his standing *vis-à-vis* both enemies and friends: 'Just as he will yield honor to his enemies in order to get honor from them in his turn, so he will give present pain to his friends in order to benefit them in the future' (p. 112).

B. offers useful insights into each of her chosen plays, but in promoting her main thesis she sometimes pushes interpretations too far or treats texts in questionable ways. In *Poetics* 11 *anagnôrisis* is surely not 'the realisation that one is in a state of friendship

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.14 Published online by Cambridge University Press