and Mills, in very different ways, examine the tendencies of (ancient and modern) scholars to interpret Sophoclean plays as conforming to certain typical patterns, and they suggest that we can understand Sophocles better if we abandon such 'straitjacketing' approaches.

Inevitably, there are more questions here than answers: but an overall conclusion does seem to emerge. Sommerstein sums it up: 'the more we explore the scanty shards . . ., the less likely it comes to seem that the seven extant tragedies are at all typical of [Sophocles'] output. There seems to emerge a Sophocles who is much more like Euripides than we have been accustomed to imagine' (p. 20). It certainly does seem, on the basis of the discussions here, that Sophocles' lost plays were more varied than the seven which survive. However, this fact should not necessarily lead us to conclude that Sophocles' plays were 'Euripidean' (that is, provocative, generically impure, or *outré*). Sommerstein and the other contributors imply that tragedy is to be seen in terms of a fixed generic 'norm', from which certain radical or innovative playwrights might from time to time depart. This type of assumption has had serious consequences for Euripidean studies, in that Euripides has often been seen as 'untragic' (or, worse, defective); one would not wish for Sophocles to suffer a similar fate. However, an alternative conclusion suggests itself. One could say, rather, that fifth-century tragedy was simply a very diverse, inclusive genre, encompassing a wide range of subjects and tones, and very far from modern ideas of 'the Tragic' (vel sim.).

The book is quite attractively produced and meticulously copy-edited, but excessively large and unwieldy. Uneconomical typesetting is partly to blame (especially in the bibliography and indices, which occupy a remarkable 109 pages); but many of these essays could have made their point just as effectively in a shorter span (there is too much in the way of prefatory remarks, repetition of basic information, and summary of existing scholarship). Nevertheless, *Shards* is a significant publication which will, one hopes, stimulate further fruitful debate about Sophocles and fifth-century drama.

University of Exeter MATTHEW WRIGHT

ECCE ITERVM STEPHANVS

A. HARDER, R. REGTUIT, P. STORK, G. WAKKER (edd.): *'Noch einmal zu . . .' Kleine Schriften von Stefan Radt zu seinem 75. Geburtstag.* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 235.) Pp. xii + 508. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2002. Cased, €125/US$145. ISBN: 90-04-12794-1.

Stefan Radt is celebrated for his editions of the fragments of Aeschylus (*TrGF* Volume III, 1985) and Sophocles (*TrGF* Volume IV, 1977, 1999^2). And now, in retirement, he is set fair to make a second name for himself with an ambitious edition of Strabo, of which the first two volumes of a projected ten are already published. Those who have worked through his editions of the tragic fragments will be aware of the virtues with which Radt is blessed. I shall mention only one, a virtue which easily goes unnoticed and is apt to go unrewarded. I refer to his superhuman care for accuracy, and his capacity to achieve it. He is a perfectionist, at a time when it is almost fashionable to disown that title and instead pass rapidly on to the next show

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.303 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of virtuosity. Radt does not let a subject go until he is satisfied that he has exhausted it. The revised Sophocles volume (1999) contains forty-eight pages of 'addenda et corrigenda' on Sophocles and a further eleven on Aeschylus. The title which its editors have given to the present volume, 'Noch einmal zu . . .', an allusion to the formula which opens the title of several of his papers, offers a more oblique testimony to this same virtue.

Here are fifty-seven papers, most of them first published in *Mnemosyne*, presented in order of publication, dating from 1963 to 1999. Their subjects may be classified very roughly as: (i) overall interpretation (Pindar, *Nemean* 1; Thucydides' description of the plague; two on sections of Aristotle's *Poetics*); (ii) notes on the text and interpretation of verse authors (Aesch. *Ag*., Aristophanes, Men. *Dysc.*, Posidippus, Sappho, Sophocles, Theocritus) and prose authors (Aristotle, Diodorus Siculus, Epictetus, 'Hippocrates', 'Longinus', Plato, Plutarch, Polybius, Strabo, Thucydides, the *Vitae* of Aeschylus and Thucydides, Xenophon); (iii) tragic fragments; (iv) individual matters of vocabulary, syntax, style, accentuation, and orthography; and (v) more general essays ('Sophokles in seinen Fragmenten', 'Welcker und die verlorene Tragödie', 'The importance of the context'). This last, the only non-German paper, was (I infer) a lecture delivered in this country, and was published in one of the less accessible Dutch journals. It starts with an entertaining discussion of context-induced errors and ends with a striking new argument on the date of Aeschylus' *Supplices*.

These papers show that Radt has another old-fashioned virtue. He knows the Greek language *tamquam ungues digitosque suos*. Although he makes conjectures from time to time, it is not conjectural criticism that distinguishes his textual notes. They are distinguished by his keen understanding of grammar and idiom, which enable him, time and again, to establish what is normal usage and to uncover new or unfamiliar norms, richly illustrated. Here are a few examples: pp. 107–9 an idiomatic use of ἄλλος; pp. 301–5 how οὗτος ἐγώ differs from ὅδε ἐγώ (but at Eur. *Cycl.* 105 [p. 304] I should still follow Dindorf in replacing οὗτος with αὐτός: see R. Janko, 'αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος: a neglected idiom', *CQ* 35 [1985], 20–30); pp. 305–8 (cf. pp. 388, 391–2) idiomatic use of the article in οἱ λίθοι; pp. 310–14 future for present with verbs of speaking or wishing and the like; pp. 314–19 difference between subjunctive and future indicative in deliberative questions; pp. 345–7 dative of author ('in X'); pp. 372–4 idiomatically superfluous παρὰ in ὁ παρὰ + genitive; pp. 454–5 postposition of πάνυ and other intensives. Above all, pp. 236–46 (cf. pp. 362–8, 449), the demonstration that οἱ περί + (acc. proper name) X means 'X & co.' or even 'X' alone.

The book is attractively printed. At the front is a photograph of Radt in his study, then a brief introduction by Annette Harder, which testifies to the warmth of feeling which he engendered in his Groningen colleagues and pupils. At the end is a complete list of his publications (98 items), followed by an ample index of passages discussed and brief indexes of words and topics. The editors (see p. 456) have corrected minor errors and have changed cross-references between papers into references to the pages of this volume. One might have hoped for just a little more. For example, it would have been helpful to indicate that the new fragments of Sophocles which Radt detected in 1966 (pp. 2–3) and 168 (pp. 40–1) are now 799a and 991c in *TrGF* 4. And when a paper begins 'Dawe scheint mir meine Argumente keineswegs widerlegt zu haben' (p. 80), we need to be told explicity that Dawe's paper immediately preceded Radt's, and we deserve to be told that Radt's was immediately followed in turn by a riposte from Dawe, to which Radt appended a brief valediction. (Incidentally, pp. 82 and 84 have the wrong heading.) The collection was put together without Radt's knowledge, as a surprise birthday present. In *Mnemosyne* 56 (2003), 637–9 Radt has published a long

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.303 Published online by Cambridge University Press

series of corrections to mistakes in 'Ein neues Sophoklesfragment bei Eustathios?' (pp. 249–55), reprinted here from the version which had been mangled by an American journal.

Queens' College, Cambridge JAMES DIGGLE

THE LOEB EURIPIDES COMPLETED

D. KOVACS (ed, trans.): *Euripides VI:* Bacchae*,* Iphigenia at Aulis*,* Rhesus*.* (Loeb Classical Library 495.) Pp. viii + 455. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2002. Cased, £14.50. ISBN: 0-674-99601-1.

The Loeb Euripides is now complete, with a final volume at the same high scholarly standard as the earlier ones: cause for rejoicing. The editorial approach is also the same as that of the earlier volumes. Kovacs is not a timid editor (and these three plays do not call for timidity). He is especially renowned for rejecting transmitted lines and positing lacunae. When these are short, he fills them *exempli gratia*, displaying an enviable talent for composing verse in Euripides' style, but perhaps confusing the uninitiated. Reading K.'s edition is always fun and enlightening. I may think that K. cleans up a little too much, that Euripides may sometimes have been more verbose and less clear than K. wants him to be, but K. frequently leaves me wondering if I am not too tolerant of carelessness. Insofar as these texts are aimed at Hellenists, they deserve detailed, careful, and thoughtful study; but I cannot help but worry that colleagues in modern languages (let alone students) may read this very critical edition uncritically. An English apparatus might have been helpful in a Loeb, to encourage non-specialists to notice it; K. helpfully provides English footnotes to explain his views of the text in some especially vexed parts of *IA*. The brief bibliographies are useful but will be out of date all too soon; it is to be hoped that reprintings will include updatings.

I have no such concerns about the translation, which is accurate without being fussy. It does not convey the poetry of Euripides, but that is not its job. It occasionally employs archaisms or eccentric terms—'argosy', 'bane', 'visage'—but not often enough to make the translation sound like the old Loebs.

The introductory essays also raise concerns about the non-specialist user, who may be assume that their interpretations are standard. K. interprets very much as he edits: he likes clarity. Indeed, he tends to be reductive. He insists, for example, that Pentheus in *Bacchae* is an opponent of religion generally, not just of Dionysus, while acknowledging that 'Euripides has accepted some inconsistency' in order to portray him that way. Indeed, Dionysus himself in the prologue at 45–6 indicates that Pentheus participates in normal prayer and libation. Various passages indeed imply that Dionysiac worship is traditional (even as the plot demands that it be new) or that Pentheus is opposing religion generally. K.'s formulation clarifies a difficult question in a way that makes the tragedy less interesting. Similarly, he not only denies any irony in Iphigenia's turn to patriotism in *IA*, but suggests that Euripides fashioned the story 'to express the way he thought such a war should be conducted'. Yet although he sees a straightforwardly patriotic interpretation as the play's 'plainest and most natural

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.303 Published online by Cambridge University Press