There is no doubt that G. succeeds in this aim. Indeed, her close examination of the text, in which she pays particular attention to tenses and words relating to time, is dutiful and thorough. Throughout the book, G. is also careful to credit other scholars who make similar arguments to those she proposes, and is clearly aware of the wide range of literature dealing with this play and with issues of time in tragedy and other genres. Having said that, the book is very heavily footnoted, often containing substantial paraphrasing or quotation of other scholars' work, and this reviewer felt that, in some cases at least, details related were unnecessary. (One, perhaps frivolous, example: do we really need to know that Lackeit's dissertation is 111 pages [p. 14 n. 9]?). Similarly, G. is most diligent in quoting in full all textual passages referred to, but this sometimes affected the flow of the narrative, particularly when the same passages were repeated in very close proximity to each other (e.g. 97–99 quoted on p. 50 and on p. 51).

G.'s general arguments concerning the treatment of time in this play are not new in themselves, and this is something she acknowledges. It is the detail in which she explores the theme which is new, and her book is, in effect, a commentary on the play with reference to the dialectic of time, marked also by the absence of a conclusion, which the present reviewer would have welcomed. But her close reading of the play allows her to make some interesting conjectures. For example, on pp. 29–30, she suggests intertextuality with the *Oresteia* (though she does not phrase it in this way), remarking that the reference to Apollo as λυκοκτόνος 'wolf-killing' foreshadows the killing of Aegisthus called the 'wolf' at A. *Ag.* 1259; and on pp. 70–71, she explores the etymological link between the words ποινή 'punishment' and φόνος 'murder' in terms of the memory of shed blood retained in the term ποινή 'punishment'.

Overall, the book is well presented, with a cover image of Francis Bacon's triptych inspired by Aeschylus' *Oresteia*. Typographical errors are virtually absent. This reviewer noted just one, on p. 117, with the italicization of the last two letters of *Αγαμέμνονα*.

In summary, this book, with its seriatim structure, will be a useful reference for those interested in Sophocles' *Electra*, as it will be for those dealing with concepts of time in ancient literature.

University of Nottingham ISABELLE TORRANCE
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni229

A EURIPIDEAN COLLECTION

J. MOSSMAN (ed.): *Euripides.* (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies.) Pp. viii + 411. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Cased, £60 (Paper, £20.99). ISBN: 0-19-872185-4 (0-19-872184-6 pbk).

It would be an impossible task to come up with a selection of papers on Euripides which not only reflected the playwright's total output and the range of modern critical response, but which also satisfied every reader. Judith Mossman, well aware of this, offers perhaps as useful a selection as any, while pointing, in a succinct introduction (with useful bibliographical information), to both current and also more time-honoured critical approaches excluded on account of space constraints. The publisher's policy of avoiding 'very recent pieces' (as well as 'excerpts from books') has been followed, with the result that there is nothing originally published

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni230 Published online by Cambridge University Press

after 1990, and thirteen of the seventeen papers date from the 1960s, 1970s, and early 1980s. Naturally, some of the earlier papers betray dated attitudes or an understandable lack of appreciation of critical subtleties which have been developed by subsequent scholarship.

The papers vary in length (from ten to forty-three pages) and, one might add, in usefulness for a contemporary readership (translations are provided for all non-English quotations). I have most reservations about the first of the opening seven general studies, Reinhardt's 'The Intellectual Crisis in Euripides', which is translated into English here for the first time. The author's generalizing 'intellectual history' approach in the first part of the paper will be a real test for a younger generation of readers, and the second part is little more than a blow-by-blow account of the *Orestes*, a play which is more than adequately catered for elsewhere in the collection.

This is followed by Winnington-Ingram's 'Euripides: *Poiētēs Sophos*'. My only question about this 'classic' paper is the comment about the stage conventions 'within which Euripides, often so unhappily, had to work' (p. 51). It seems to me that Euripides actually relished the challenge presented by these 'restrictive' stage conventions. We then have Collard's well-constructed paper 'Formal Debates in Euripides' Drama', Conacher's 'Rhetoric and Relevance in Euripidean Drama' (a lively argument of the thesis that Euripidean rhetoric is *not* as dramatically inorganic as many have supposed), Lefkowitz's ' "Impiety" and "Atheism" in Euripides' Dramas' (a lucid corrective to the god-antagonistic view of Euripides), and Stahl's rather heavy 'On "Extra-Dramatic" Communication of Characters in Euripides'.

The final general paper is Pucci's 'Euripides: The Monument and the Sacrifice', a complex piece which nicely links the concepts of pity, remedial healing and sacrifice. A small quibble. The paper begins (p. 139) with the Aristotelian characterization of Euripides as the *tragikōtatos* (most tragic) of the Greek tragedians (the notion with which M. concludes her Introduction). This is not, however, securely nailed down to its specific context, which has to do with Euripides' reported privileging of the plot type illustrating the change 'from good to bad fortune'.

The longest paper in the collection is Heath's ' "Iure principem locum tenet": Euripides' *Hecuba*', which innovatively considers 'contemporary' interpretations of this play in the light of the changing interpretations of preceding centuries. It is slightly problematic, however, that, given its original publication date of 1987, it cannot take account of some excellent work on the play which has appeared since then (although it is one of the pieces described as 'revised by the author' for the collection).

There are two papers by Zeitlin, her brilliant study of *Orestes* ('The Closet of Masks . . .'), the classic treatment of Euripidean intertextuality, and 'The Argive Festival of Hera and Euripides' *Electra*', which demonstrates how an aspect of the parodos, commonly seen as mere decoration, is in fact tightly woven into the overall dramatic fabric. Similar in this sense is Mastronarde's 'Iconography and Imagery in Euripides' *Ion*' which, focusing on the ideas of primitive violence as opposed to civilized order, reads the play in terms of the exposure of 'the intractability of human passions' (p. 296).

We also find de Romilly's 'The Rejection of Suicide in the *Heracles* of Euripides' (the second paper translated into English for the first time), Winnington-Ingram's 'Hippolytus: A Study in Causation', Easterling's typically astute 'The Infanticide in Euripides' *Medea*', Foley's study of the *Bacchae* ('The Masque of Dionysus'), a 'classic' of the metatheatrical approach, and so much more convincing than many other more recent attempts to 'metatheatricalize' any and every Greek tragedy, and

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni230 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Buxton's 'Euripides' *Alkestis*: Five Aspects of an Interpretation', which is refreshingly written but less coherent than many of the other papers because it deals quite briefly with a range of different issues. The collection concludes with de Jong's 'Three Off-Stage Characters in Euripides', which argues convincingly that these characters 'despite their invisibility can move the spectators at the moment of their death' (p. 388).

The collection as a whole (attractively and accurately produced—I just noticed one rogue 'festivel' on p. 262) is a welcome addition to the series, providing as it does a stimulating and convenient point of entry into the mind and theatrical practice of Euripides ('this most controversial and polarizing of authors'—Introduction, p. 12). It will be up to the reader to judge on the basis of the evidence presented whether M.'s assumption (Preface, p. v) that Euripides is *especially* 'enigmatic, difficult and adverse' is justified.

Victoria University of Wellington JOHN DAVIDSON
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni230

EURIPIDES' SATYR PLAYS

N. Pechstein: *Euripides Satyrographos. Ein Kommentar zu den euripideischen Satyrspielfragmenten*. Pp. 400. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 3-519-07664-0.

This is a revised dissertation attended with the best possible auspices: it was originally supervised by Bernd Seidensticker and benefited from advice by Richard Kannicht. Its content has reappeared, heavily condensed and with some input from R. Krumeich, in the major collection edited by R. Krumeich, N. Pechstein, and B. Seidensticker, *Das griechische Satyrspiel* (Darmstadt, 1999), 399–478 and 552–61 (assessed by Ian Ruffell, *CR* 53 [2003], 288–90).

Content and general character of the work: an Introduction of thirty sides reviews the extent of Euripides' satyric drama, setting out, consolidating and evaluating the evidence for the seven certainly known plays in addition to *Cyclops* and two of probable status: *Autolycus A*, *Busiris*, *Epeius* (?), *Eurystheus*, *Lamia* (?), *Sisyphus*, *Skiron*, *Syleus*, and *Theristae*; but P. has no general assessment of Euripides' satyric drama, only referring (p. 10 n. 2) to the older work of Seidensticker and Seaford (in his *Cyclops*); now there is Seidensticker's revised appreciation and Krumeich's chapter on archaeological aspects of the drama, in their edited volume (pp. 1–73). The known plays are then presented in commentaries which are offered as 'philological' but which rightly embrace also full treatment of testimonia, mythological background, vase-paintings (examined with proper caution especially for *Autolycus A*), and problems of reconstruction (pp. 39–286); the order of these sections is sensible enough, and contrasts with the arrangement of both the Budé edition of Euripides' fragments (1998–2003, 4 vols) and the commentated editions of some plays by Collard, Cropp, and Lee (1995 and 2004, 2 vols). The texts of both testimonia and fragments are taken from standard editions (Nauck^2 still, unavoidably in 1998, for almost the fragments), but are given an apparatus only where the text is in doubt. There follow fragments uncertainly attributable to the nine titled plays above and a few satyric adespota (pp. 287–361); among them is the famous fragment ascribed to Critias by Nauck, Wilamowitz, and Snell–Kannicht in *TrGF* 1 43 F 19 (see below).

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni230 Published online by Cambridge University Press