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/bni022 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(five-page) discussion on the provocative covers of two recent translations from Hackett Press. Performance and reception theory barely rate a mention; the general reader fortunately now has Lorna Hardwick's valuable 2003 *Greece and Rome* survey (No. 33) as a place to begin.

G.'s attempt to summarize recent trends in tragedy scholarship could only confuse and mislead the novice reader, who would come away from his discussion without even knowing of the existence of major scholars and perspectives. His discussion of French structuralist approaches to tragedy mentions Jean-Pierre Vernant, but not Pierre Vidal-Naquet, Nicole Loraux, or those writing in English, such as Charles Segal and others, who expanded extensively on their work in an eclectic fashion that is typical of most contemporary studies. (G. misleadingly divides his discussion into schools of criticism.) In analyzing why Sophocles' *OT* is a uniquely powerful tragedy of destiny, Freud himself intelligently focused on the subconscious of the play's audience, not (as G. does) on the hero's own psyche (p. 136). G. is apparently unaware of recent, cogent attempts to evaluate scholarship on the relation between tragedy and its historical context, such as that of Suzanne Saïd ('Tragedy and Politics', in D. Boedeker and K. Raaflaub [edd.], *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens* [Cambridge, MA, 1998], pp. 275–96). Most of the major scholarship on gender and women in Greek tragedy does not even find a place in the notes and bibliography. Post-structuralist approaches are simply absent.

The final chapter and related appendices on the evolution of production of Greek tragedy from the seventeenth century to the present is derived entirely from the work of others. I mention this partly because G.'s text and notes do not make clear his continuous debt to secondary sources and partly because his lack of first hand knowledge and research leads to uninteresting and unbalanced discussions. The pioneering rôle played by the work of Marianne McDonald and Karelisa Hartigan is not sufficiently acknowledged, although McDonald's work on film is credited in the notes. British productions are overemphasized because he has had Edith Hall's and Fiona Macintosh's articles to mine (in extraordinary detail). Readers should consult their works cited in the bibliography, and their forthcoming study, *Greek Tragedy and the British Theater 1660–1914* (Oxford, 2005), partly because G. does not always cite them correctly. To give one example, James Thomson's 1738 *Agamemnon* (p. 231) is not anti-George II, but anti-Walpole. Productions in the rest of Europe, the USA, Canada, Africa, South America, and Asia are cited haphazardly or not at all. The important tradition represented in modern Greek productions of tragedy is barely mentioned. G. apparently failed to find Kevin Wetmore's valuable study of Greek tragedy in Africa (*The Athenian Sun in an African Sky: Modern African Adaptations of Classical Greek Tragedy* [Jefferson and London, 2001]) or McDonald's and J. Michael Walton's work on Irish drama (now collected in *Amid our Troubles: Irish Versions of Greek Tragedy* [London, 2002]). His Appendix IV surprisingly offers not a single example of productions of Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*. In discussing modern versions of *Philoctetes*, G. mentions Seamus Heaney's *The Cure at Troy*, but not other significant adaptations such as Heiner Müller's; the same spotty selection of examples pervades the entire appendix. In short, two brief chapters could not in any case do justice to topics that are probably best left at this time to those doing primary research or original scholarship. The reader has much to gain from the synthesis offered in Chapters 1–5 of G.'s book, but should look elsewhere for studies of translation and production.

Barnard College, Columbia University HELENE P. FOLEY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni022

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni022 Published online by Cambridge University Press