the frequent references to life's vicissitudes, suggest to the recipient that such wishes and prayers have some compelling force or authority behind them.

In the outlines given above I have touched on the major areas covered in M.'s book, but there are also many other areas that receive a less detailed treatment. These can be easily identified by consulting the index. As a general assessment, I think it can be said that those familiar with Pindar will find little that is new here, but at the same time, I know of no other study which approaches Pindar from the viewpoint of the rôle played by the present, past, and future in his odes. This is one of the few general books which I would recommend as required reading for those beginning their study of Pindar. The style is refreshingly lucid, a genuine pleasure to read, and the argumentation is easy to follow. The bibliography, however, is woefully inadequate. Of the 153 items listed, only three are in German and two in Italian, and even in English, numerous works of importance have been disregarded. If more attention had been paid to these other studies, the reader would be in a better position to determine the extent to which previous scholars disagree with or support M.'s arguments. Perhaps this deficiency can be explained, in part at least, by the fact that M. does not seem to have been trained in Pindar in graduate school. As she states in the prologue, 'I first became interested in Pindar in the winter of 1997, when a Postdoctoral Mellon Fellowship at Stanford University gave me the opportunity to teach a graduate course on epinician poetry'.

University of Western Ontario DOUGLAS E. GERBER

FRAGMENTS OF SOPHOCLES

A. H. SOMMERSTEIN (ed.): *Shards from Kolonos: Studies in Sophoclean Fragments*. ('Le Rane' 34.) Pp. 573. Bari: Levante Editori, 2003. Paper, €61.97. ISBN: 88-7949-307-8.

This collection of essays is a welcome contribution to Sophoclean studies. It deserves to be widely read by scholars of Greek drama, not—alas—because it contains any astonishing new discoveries, but because the best contributions use the fragments to raise important questions about Sophocles and fifth-century drama in general. As Sommerstein writes in his Introduction (p. 16), the broad aim of the volume is to use the evidence of the fragments, alongside the extant plays, to re-assess the traditional scholarly image of Sophocles. That Sophocles was more staid and less adventurous than his younger contemporary Euripides is a commonplace which persists: but is it accurate?

The volume is based on a conference held in Nottingham in 2000, and it is good to see that many younger scholars are represented here as well as more established names. There are twenty essays, widely varying in subject matter and approach, which have been divided (not very helpfully) into seven loosely defined sections. A brief summary can scarcely do justice to the content of the contributions, but at least testifies to their diversity and range.

André Lardinois (pp. 23–44) attempts to demonstrate that the 'adviser figure' is a recurring character type in Sophocles; but in fact the paucity of evidence and the number of divergences from the supposed pattern make it hard to discern a 'character type' except in very broad terms. Elizabeth Craik (pp. 45–56) draws attention to the presence of medical language in the fragments, but finds it difficult to conclude what such language signifies. Katerina Zacharia (pp. 57–74) examines the evidence for

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.301 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Sophocles' interest in Italy and Sicily. Amy Clark (pp. 79–116) and Glenn Moodie (pp. 117–38) offer two contrasting reconstructions of Sophocles' *Tyro* play(s). Jenny March (pp. 139–60) suggests that the infanticide in Euripides' *Medea* inspired Sophocles' *Tereus*. Dan Curley (pp. 163–97) argues that Ovid's Tereus narrative (*Met.* 6.424–674) is in some (not very clear) sense a 'metatheatrical' version of Sophocles' tragedy. Carolin Hahnemann (pp. 201–18) gives a helpful overview of the methodological problems which face the fragment-collector, as well as a meticulously transparent and lucid reconstruction of *Aegeus*. Sophie Mills (pp. 219–32) also judiciously questions the basis on which scholars reconstruct tragedies from fragments, with reference to *Aegeus* and *Phaedra*. Nothing of great importance emerges from Thomas Talboy's discussion (pp. 233–40) of two fragments of *Phaedra* (which ponders *inter alia* whether dogs salivate more than bulls), nor from David Fitzpatrick's inconclusive reconstruction (pp. 243–60) of *Aias Lokros*. C. W. Marshall's reconstruction of *Nauplius* (pp. 261–79), which refers to a miniature mechanical theatre described by Heron of Alexandria, has little to conclude but is certainly a fascinating curiosity. Eleanor OKell (pp. 283–303) connects Sophoclean satyr-drama (*Ichneutae*) with political discourse, arguing that rhetoric and sexual humour are (somehow) linked in a 'nexus of ideas'. Arlene Allan (pp. 310–28) offers a new reconstruction of *Inachus* as satyr-drama. The next five papers all deal, in different ways, with the relation of satyr-drama to other dramatic genres. Pierre Voelke (pp. 329–53) stresses the thematic similarities between satyr-drama and comedy, but concludes (somewhat controversially) that the two genres differ from each other in terms of social function: whereas comedy is subversive, satyr-drama is cohesive. Alan Sommerstein (pp. 355–72) makes a case for reading *Syndeipnoi* as a tragedy, despite the presence of 'low' elements. Ralph Rosen (pp. 373–86) argues that *Poimenes* was satyric and explains why genre is important. Antonio López Eire (pp. 387–412) and Jordi Redondo (pp. 413–32) both offer admirably detailed analyses of the linguistic register of satyr-drama. Finally, Francesco De Martino (pp. 435–64) gives a general discussion of Sophocles' non-dramatic works (including *On the Chorus*) as well as a detailed commentary on the elegiac and melic fragments (frr. 1–5 West, fr. 737/1a–b Page).

As most of the contributors acknowledge, the remains of Sophocles are less substantial and less revealing than those of (say) Euripides. Given the nature of the evidence, it is impossible to add much of substance to the work of previous fragment-collectors (Pearson, Radt, Lloyd-Jones et al.). The essays here which concentrate on reconstructing lost plays are often ingenious or diverting, but such speculation properly belongs in the realm of fiction. (One becomes a little weary of such words and phrases as 'it may be that . . .', 'perhaps', 'probably', and 'possibly'.) The main value of essays of this type is that, collectively, they testify to the great variety and interest of Sophocles' lost plays and reflect the enthusiasm of scholars who yearn, against hope, for their recovery.

Nevertheless, the more satisfying contributions here are those which look outwards to the 'big picture', suggesting ways in which the minutiae of interpretation or hypothetical reconstruction can lead us to pose broader questions about ancient drama. Zacharia, for instance, uses Sophocles' scattered references to the western Mediterranean as a basis for a new view of tragedy's political and ideological function, arguing that its outlook may have been more imperial than domestic. Several pieces (notably those of Voelke, Sommerstein, and Rosen) use the fragments to revisit the question of dramatic genre and the relations between the different genres: these discussions add much nuance and clarity to existing scholarship. Lardinois, Moodie,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.301 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/54.2.301 Published online by Cambridge University Press