Greece & Rome, Vol. 53, No. 2, © The Classical Association, 2006. All rights reserved

SUBJECT REVIEWS

(* denotes that a book is specially recommended for school libraries.)

Greek Literature

'Listen, you country bumpkins, you pot-bellied blockheads . . .'—no, calm down: I don't mean you. That's Hesiod's Muses, speaking through the voice of Apostolos Athanassakis, whose respected translations of Hesiod[1] and the *Homeric Hymns*[2] have been reissued in revised form with expanded introduction and notes. He is modest in his claims: 'I have aimed for accuracy rather than for poetic effect.' But clarity and accuracy are substantial virtues. Nor is it necessarily true that 'a freer translation would be more elegant, and even more dynamic and moving', as yet another new entry into the increasingly overcrowded market of translations of the *Hymns* reminds us. How could anyone sensitive to Greek, to poetry, or to the numinous turn *Hymn to Aphrodite* 167 into 'a man, badly informed, slept with a goddess'? Sarah Ruden[3] can be admirably direct and economical, but her renderings are often misleading ('I'm going to die' suggests fatal illness or injury, not mortality), out of register ('your classy parents . . . they're not trashy people'), or just odd ('Otreus is my really famous father'). Moreover, this version's competitive price does not come cheap: the sparse supporting material will leave most readers with many unanswered questions. There are alternatives (notably, Michael Crudden: *G&R* 29 [2002], 239), but Athanassakis remains a leading contender. Hesiod's Muses speak many falsehoods that resemble truths. The psychoanalytic Muse is less choosy. She has persuaded Mark Buchan,[4] but not me, that (for example) desire enters Phaeacia only with the arrival of Odysseus (17); that the Cyclops is 'introduced into the realm of language' only when he loses his eye (21); that 'the Phaeacians have a perfect language, which . . . precludes the possibility of deception' (37); that the shame which inhibits Nausicaa from speaking openly of marriage to her father is 'not shame at all' (195). The trick, of course, is redefinition. 'For psychoanalysis, there is no desire without a prohibition' (195). So if daddy is happy to indulge Nausicaa's desire, it is not 'properly human' desire. And since it is not transgressive, she cannot be ashamed. One might argue in reverse: since she is ashamed, she must be aware of prohibitions that her desire might transgress; so, even if she gets away with it this time, prohibitions and therefore 'properly human' desire must be present in Phaeacia before Odysseus' arrival. The execution of Buchan's argument is as flawed as its basic premises. Franz Albrecht's work

[1] *Hesiod.* Theogony, Works and Days, Shield. Translated with introduction and notes by Apostolos N. Athanassakis. 2nd edition. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins UP, 2004. Pp. 192. Paperback $18.95.

[2] *The Homeric Hymns*. Translated with introduction and notes by Apostolos N. Athanassakis. 2nd edition. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins UP, 2004. Pp. 128. Paperback $18.95.

[3] *Homeric Hymns*. Translated by Sarah Ruden, with an introduction and notes by Sheila Murnaghan. Indianopolis, Hackett, 2005. Pp. 104. Paperback £6.95.

[4] *The Limits of Heroism. Homer and the Ethics of Reading.* By Mark Buchan. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 2005. Pp. ix + 282. Hardback £37.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000313 Published online by Cambridge University Press

on Homeric battles,[5] originally published in 1886–1895, appears in English translation tardily, and perhaps to little purpose. Albrecht delights in detail, but disjointedly. He does not subject any single extended battle-narrative to sustained analysis to show that it presents a consistent, and consistently credible, picture. I doubt whether anyone could succeed in doing that; but Albrecht's willingness to cast aside whatever does not fit his model as 'poetic embellishment' reveals how limited are his resources for coping with the text's resistance to being treated as documentation of military *Realien*. He shows little awareness of the text as narrative, and correspondingly little sophistication in his method. Malcolm Willcock's appendix, as well as giving an update on more recent work, highlights some important flaws in his conclusions. The same stable also recently produced a translation of Friedrich's *Wounding and Death*, received without enthusiasm by my predecessor (*G&R* 51 (2004), 253); I cannot greet its successor any more warmly. Gregory Nagy's *Homer's Text and Language*[6] brings together five previously published papers, developing Nagy's 'evolutionary model' and debating the composition and transmission of Homer, and Aristarchus' textual studies, with West and Janko. Nagy's habit of making unnecessary books out of previously published papers has moved me to adverse comment in the past (and the addition of four unrelated pieces as Part II suggests that he has not kicked the habit). But in this case, I concede that having these detailed discussions of such complex issues in a single collection does make it easier to see what is going on. That does not necessarily work in Nagy's favour. My scepticism about West's argument that it was Didymus, rather than Aristarchus, who systematically compared manuscripts has begun to erode in the face of Nagy's discussion of the relevant scholia, marred (in my view) by occasional mistranslations and by persistently arbitrary inferences. Nagy bizarrely criticises West for choosing readings because he thinks they are right (not 'for the simple reason that it stems from one manuscript tradition or another', 45), and wastes pages accumulating examples to prove that West is self-consistent (or, as Nagy puts it, 'the pervasiveness of West's attitude', 82). Perhaps overlooking the difference between a reconstruction of a definitive text and a definitive reconstruction, and despite quoting West's clear disclaimer (68), Nagy attributes to his opponents the futile quest for an 'elusive certainty'; yet he goes on to suggest that he can show us the way to 'another certainty' (37). How can that be? Consider an example: Alexandrian variants may only be diagnosed as conjecture if they are inconsistent with the formulaic system; but if we found such a variant, 'it could mean simply that we do not have enough data about the formulaic system' (128). Insulating your position against any possible counter-evidence is, indeed, one way of achieving certainty. But the methodological cost is high. 'The phrases "utterance of the enunciation" (*énoncé de l'énonciation*) and "uttered enunciation" (*énonciation énoncé*) designate the components of the utterance (*énoncé*) that point to its enunciation or performance.' Got that? I hope so: for if the translator's explanatory note (4) defeats you, Claude

[5] *Battle and Battle Description. A Contribution to the History of War.* By Franz Albracht. Translated by Peter Jones, Malcolm Willcock, and Gabriele Wright. London, Duckworth, 2005. Pp.140. Hardback £45.

[6] *Homer's Text and Language*. By Gregory Nagy. Urbana and Chicago, University of Illinois Press, 2004. Pp. xviii + 197. Hardback £24.95.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000313 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Calame's *Masks of Authority*[7] (another repackaging of published papers) will prove seriously hard going. Even the translator gives up on the 'isotopies' that recur throughout this collection; if you want to know what they are, Calame refers you to another book (198 n. 4). Is the effort repaid? I am not convinced that it needs a page of semio-narrative grammatical formalization to understand Sappho's 'I say [the most beautiful thing] is whatever one loves'. The analysis concludes: 'The procedures and words used by the enunciative instance, which technical prudence requires us (without disrespect to Sappho) to call the speaker-narrator, could not be more transparent: for the woman or man who takes responsibility for the enunciation of the poem, the most beautiful thing is that which arouses in the anthropomorphic subject, whoever it be, the feeling of love' (58). That's certainly less transparent than Sappho. And yet . . . the endnotes manifest a depth of scholarship that makes me think there *ought* to be more to all this than I have managed to detect. David Wiles has translated the *Hypsipyle* fragments, embedding them in a performable frame as mechanical and unimaginative in its self-referentiality as Harrison's *Trackers* was brilliantly creative. Did this deserve its place in *Lost Dramas of Classical Athens*?[8] Does the whole volume deserve a place on our shelves? Some collections are more than the sum of their parts; this is not one of them. It includes good contributions, which could just as well have been published separately; others needed much more work before they were published at all. To conclude that 'the motif of ghostly appearances was more common than the extant corpus of Greek tragedy (and comedy) suggests' (112), one needs to do more than mention examples in tragic fragments and art: the question is whether there are *more* examples than extrapolation from the extant corpus predicts. I could not detect that quantitative argument. Another contribution moves from the observation that filicidal madness is sometimes inspired by Dionysus to 'the portrayal of mothers slaying their sons in tragedy can therefore be understood as a Dionysiac theme and one which is especially suited to tragedy' (130f.). Child-killing would be perfectly suited to tragedy even if it were nothing to do with Dionysus; and while there is no doubting the connection between child-killing and madness, Dionysus has no monopoly on inspiring madness. No argument was forthcoming to show that there is anything *specifically* Dionysiac about child-killing. If the idea is that filicidal madness occurs in tragedy because it is a Dionysiac motif, and we know it is a Dionysiac motif because it appears in tragedy, the circularity would be too transparent. By now, you may be getting the impression that I have spent the last six months in a permanently grumpy mood. It would only reinforce that impression if I were to comment on the absurdly pretentious meditation on string theory with which *The Soul of Tragedy* opens.[9] So I will focus instead on the papers that follow, collected in memory of Charles Segal and exploring some of the varied trajectories of Segal's own work. It is a worthy tribute. Even those who did not find Segal's angles of approach unfailingly persuasive will be able to recognize the intellectual

[7] *Masks of Authority. Fiction and Pragmatics in Ancient Greek Poetics*. By Claude Calame. Translated from the French by Peter M. Burk. Ithaca, Cornell UP, 2005. Pp. 280. Hardback £27.50.

[8] *Lost Dramas of Classical Athens. Greek Tragic Fragments*. Edited by Fiona McHardy, James Robson, and David Harvey. Exeter UP, 2005. Pp. 256. Hardback £40.

[9] *The Soul of Tragedy. Essays on Athenian Drama*. Edited by Victoria Pedrick and Steven M. Oberhelman. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2006. Pp. vii +323. Paperback £14.50.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000313 Published online by Cambridge University Press

distinction of many of the contributions. David Konstan and Karen Bassi say interesting things about Aristotle, John Gibert about Clytaemnestra's first marriage, Martha Nussbaum about comic crowbars and erections. Mark Griffith discusses psychoanalytic criticism of tragedy, and of *Antigone* in particular, with exceptional lucidity and intelligence. Admittedly, he did not get me past the anticipated 'stumbling block' (99): I still see no reason to believe that Freudian or Lacanian models make any sustained connection with reality. But I cannot deny that the psychoanalytic Muse is on her best behaviour here. Simon Goldhill strays from the volume's advertised theme to bring a finely argued and philologically acute scepticism to bear on a restoration in Posidippus, moving with finesse between minute detail, a broad context, and larger cautionary lessons. While we're on the subject of Posidippus, and of collective volumes that do earn their keep, the *The New Posidippus*[10] is a weighty addition to the industry generated by P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309. It contains a translation by Frank Nisetich; papers on the book-roll itself, its readers and (ancient) editors; on the individual thematic sections of the collection; on the Ptolemaic context, poetic and political; and on the collection as a book. This is too large and too diverse a collection to be assessed in brief, and I am sure it does not need me to say that it will be core reading for anyone interested in any aspect of this find. I confess that I find the papyrus roll itself more interesting than the poems; others will judge whether that says more about Posidippus or about me. Since I began my incumbency by confessing that proliferating handbooks and guides make me especially grumpy, mention of Blackwell's *Companion to Greek Tragedy*[11] might be expected to presage a return to negativity. Not a bit of it! This is a substantial and well-planned collection, with few really weak contributions and many excellent ones—for example, Scott Scullion's economical, informative, and well-argued treatment of origins; Douglas Cairns' incisive chapter on values; Jocelyn Penny Small's persuasively sceptical discussion of illustrations of tragedy; and the account of Euripides by Justina Gregory, the editor, herself. The volume has a four-part structure: Contexts, Elements, Approaches, Reception. 'Elements' means largely formal components, but also myth and music. 'Aspects' or 'Topics' might have been a better title than 'Approaches', since this section avoids a parade of -isms and -ologies. This was a wise decision: the one exception, Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood's 'Tragedy and anthropology', is very disappointing. It begins by defining 'anthropological approach' in terms so broad that the concept loses all its distinctiveness, and therefore needs a crudely caricatured 'postmodernist' opponent of straw to do battle against (295); but then there is a sudden jump to the methodology which Sourvinou-Inwood herself favours, which is far more narrowly defined and far more contentious. Cairns has some pertinent comments on her approach (305f.), but there is unfortunately no cross-reference between these two adjacent chapters. The absence of any imposed consensus is admirable, and attentive readers of the whole volume will discover that there are radical disagreements among experts; but if the contributors had been put into explicit dialogue by more systematic cross-referencing, that effect would have been strengthened. Still, most chapters are heavily referenced, and so provide a good point of entry to the scholarly

[10] *The New Posidippus. A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Edited by Kathryn Gutzwiller. Oxford UP, 2005. PP. xvi + 394. Hardback £50.

[11] *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Edited by Justina Gregory. Oxford, Blackwell, 2005. Pp. xviii + 552. Hardback £85.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000313 Published online by Cambridge University Press

literature. Such a rich resource deserved a richer index, and the inexpert will find the chapter on fifth-century history hard to follow without a map. My only major complaint about this excellent volume concerns the section on Reception, which jumps directly from the Italian Renaissance to Nietzsche: at this point, something went seriously wrong with the planning, which in every other respect is remarkably systematic and comprehensive. Duckworth continues to supply readers of tragedy with its own brand of companionship. Of the three latest additions to its series, Michael Lloyd's treatment of Sophocles' *Electra*[12] is outstanding, a model of what such books should be. He outflanks my reservations about the synopses that are a regular feature of the series by expanding this chapter into an informative mini-commentary. Here and in the thematic chapters (Stagecraft, Electra, Matricide) he consistently succeeds in conveying a sense of the state of current scholarly debate and the range of interpretative options, deftly sampling the secondary literature through summary and well-chosen quotation. This approach poses questions for the reader to consider, and comments on a variety of possible answers without foreclosing judgement. Frequent reference to other plays ensures that a strong sense of the generic context is maintained. Barbara Goward, on *Agamemnon*,[13] is predictably strong on narrative and dramatic technique. The synoptic chapter concentrates on reconstructing the stage action; the synopsis itself is relegated to an appendix, where it is combined with analysis of formal structure. The divide between formal structure and staging is awkward, and symptomatic of a larger problem. A series format that eschews serial analysis can make it difficult to convey a sense of the text as a design that unfolds through time. The scale and complexity of *Agamemnon* exacerbates that difficulty. Goward's treatment left me with a sense of fragmentation: the play had been presented as a heap of disparate bits, not as an organized and functioning whole. Hanna Roisman's *Philoctetes*[14] is predictably strong in tracing ambiguities and possible hidden motives. She, too, enlarges the synopsis with analysis (for example, 44f. usefully points out the dilemmas set up in the opening scene). She faces less of a challenge in organizing the thematic chapters, since the triangle of characters provides an obvious ordering principle. But that brings with it a risk that the characters will be read through a grid of abstract polarities, effacing the concrete particularity of their respective situations and histories. Roisman does not entirely avoid this trap, and also falls prey to the danger inherent in focusing on hidden motives: it can create too great an emotional distance from the characters. I am astonished by the failure of imagination and sympathy which can regard Philoctetes as someone who has suffered a 'personal insult', like Achilles, (106), and comment censoriously on his 'harping on the past and holding on to his sense of victimisation' (79f.). Ten years after his comrades had dumped him, alone and in agony, on a deserted shoreline, how is he supposed to react to their self-serving change of mind? ('Hi, guys—great to see you again. No hard feelings! Anything I can do to help?') As often, emotional distance in turn impairs moral judgement. 'His honour offended he feels no more

[12] *Sophocles.* Electra. By Michael Lloyd. London, Duckworth, 2005. Pp. 159. Paperback £11.99.

[13] *Aeschylus.* Agamemnon. By Barbara Goward. London, Duckworth, 2005. Pp. 158. Paperback £11.99.

[14] *Sophocles.* Philoctetes. By Hanna M. Roisman. London, Duckworth, 2005. Pp. 159. Paperback £11.99.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000313 Published online by Cambridge University Press

obligation than Achilles had to the Greek forces' (59). Why on earth should he? What obligation could possibly remain intact after such a betrayal? In the chapter on reception Roisman concentrates on the twentieth century (her discussion of Heaney's *Cure at Troy* displays a shaky grasp of the recent history of Northern Ireland, apparently construing the widowing of policeman's wives as an act of 'British oppression', 121). Goward oddly chooses to focus on Seneca and English Renaissance revenge dramas, with the result that Aeschylus gets very little look-in until a parallel to *Hamlet* which turns on the unpersuasive premise that the chorus and Hamlet can be compared as the 'central figures' of their respective plays (129). Lloyd again does best, giving an excellent account of French classicism, as well as of Hoffmanstahl and Strauss. Susan Lape's *Reproducing Athens*[15] tackles the apparent absence of politics from New Comedy in several ways: by using 'political' in a more extended sense; by suggesting that politics appears in coded form (braggart soldiers as 'surrogates' for kings: 62f.); and—most interestingly—by arguing for an ideological effect. Seeking an explanation for the resilience of democratic culture through the suspension of democratic institutions, Lape suggests that the matrimonial and reproductive norms which defined citizenship continued to underwrite 'democratic Athenian ideology' (8); the enactment of these norms on the comic stage served not only to express this ideology, but also (re)produced it (11). It is, to be sure, hard to imagine a public discourse that has no ideological effect whatsoever. The crucial questions are: what effect, and how large an effect? Lape is careful not to overstate her claim for comedy. But once the possibility of other, perhaps more important, ideological vectors is admitted, then it must surely also be admitted that the resilience of democratic culture in the absence of democratic political institutions might be explicable without reference to comedy. Lape's claim for comedy therefore faces an evidential challenge. There may also be a problem of circularity, since the equation between citizen status (defined by marital norms) and political rights (defined by democratic ideology) presupposes a commitment to democracy. I worry, too, about the ease with which Lape moves from 'democratic' to 'Athenian' to 'civic', from 'Athens' to 'the democratic polis' to 'the Greek polis'. How does Lape's distinctively Athenocentric starting-point square with claims about comedy's inextricable ties to 'the continuity of democratic Athenian *and* transnational polis culture' (10, my emphasis)? And is it true to say that comedy enacts the reproductive norms, when irregular sexual unions are consistently represented as leading to desirable outcomes? Lape is not unaware of such problems, and I was impressed to discover how persistently my incipient objections were addressed. The resulting picture is complex, subtle and flexible; readers will need to judge for themselves how far that flexibility is achieved by surrendering substance. Whenever I meet the cliché of 'complex negotiation', I begin to suspect that a retreat has begun in the direction of claims whose indefiniteness and immunity to testing are mutually reinforcing. Yet Lape's ideas are sophisticated and original, and certainly deserve careful and critical attention. Is Menander a Hellenistic poet? The question is, apparently, a 'tired' one. I'm puzzled that it has ever been asked: what would the point of an answer be? But if it is asked, it needs a better answer than: 'It is clear that the play is firmly anchored in the world of

[15] *Reproducing Athens. Menander's Comedy, Democratic Culture, and the Hellenistic City.* By Susan Lape. Princeton UP, 2004. Pp. xvii + 294. Hardback $39.50.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000313 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hellenistic ethics, and can only be understood within the recurrent Hellenistic concern with "How should one live?"' (425: see n. 17). That is not a *distinctive* Hellenistic concern: it is recurrent in the Greek tradition from Homer and Hesiod onwards. This oversight is particularly surprising, since it goes directly against the programmatic insight that is central to the imposing collaborative study of Hellenistic poetry by Marco Fantuzzi and Richard Hunter, first published in Italian,[16] and more recently issued in a 'revised and augmented' English version, with updated references and a new chapter on 'languages of praise'.[17] The preface promises (vii-viii) 'serious analysis and hard thinking about the complexity of the Hellenistic engagement with the past', the 'principal purpose' being 'to set Hellenistic poetry within its own intellectual and cultural context'. The authors stress that Hellenistic (like most ancient) poetry 'emphasises tradition and continuity, rather than modernist rupture, even when at its most innovative', but are willing to defy cliché: 'homage to their great ancestors was not (necessarily) a sign of "anxiety".' (Isn't it obvious that influence can be a source of reassurance and confidence? What does the currently pervasive preoccupation with diagnosing ancient anxieties say about contemporary classicists?) 'Hellenistic poetry has suffered from lazy (un)critical generalisations . . . Generalisations have their uses . . . but one must begin with the particularity of each poet and each poetic mode'. The book delivers on this promise: it is rich, detailed, and discriminating. It will not be easy going for readers who do not already know their way round the subject. Such a wide-ranging book needed a programmatic introduction to provide orientation; instead, Chapter 1 launches straight into dense discussion of the texts. But those who persist will find it extremely enlightening—and not only about Hellenistic poetry: it also throws an incidental retrospective light on earlier literature. Like Fantuzzi and Hunter, Roberto Nicolai[18] is cautious about conventional periodization and resists the tendency to simplify literary history by constructing radical breaks that conceal deep continuities. His specific concern is the extent to which emergence of the (prose) book as a medium of communication at the end of the fifth century produced in prose literature an anticipation of the Hellenistic transformation of the system of poetic genres. His answer focuses on Isocrates' decisive contribution, examining the genres of Isocrates' *logoi* in the first (and longer) of the two parts, and his modes of composition and forms of publication in the second. This is an important contribution to the study of an author who in recent years has shown encouraging signs of emerging from undeserved neglect. *Lucian: Selected Dialogues*[19] is oddly titled (the selection is not restricted to dialogues) and ludicrously priced: presumably it will soon metamorphose into an affordable World's Classic. Having praised the virtues of clarity and accuracy, I should not complain that Costa's rather wooden prose gives little sense of Lucian's stylistic gifts (I doubt, in any case, whether my own venture into Lucian translation qualifies me

[16] *Muse e modelli. La poesia ellenistica da Alessandro Magno ad Augusto.* By Marco Fantuzzi and Richard Hunter. Roma-Bari, Editori Laterza, 2002. Pp. x + 600. Hardback €48.00.

[17] *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry.* By Marco Fantuzzi and Richard Hunter. Cambridge UP 2005. Pp. 511. Hardback £65.

[18] *Studi su Isocrate. La communicazione letteraria nel iv sec. a.C. e i nuovi generi della prosa.* By Roberto Nicolai. Rome, Edizioni Quasar, 2004. Pp. viii + 211. Paperback €30.99.

[19] *Lucian. Selected Dialogues.* Translated by C. N. D. Costa. Oxford UP, 2005. Pp. xvi + 278. Hardback £50.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000313 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to cast the first stone). But pedantry compels me to insist that Odysseus was Homer's advocate in the case against Thersites, not his 'lawyer'; in this respect, at least, Paul Turner's partially overlapping Penguin selection is more accurate as well as livelier. (I note belatedly, but have not seen, the existence of a more recent Penguin by Keith Sidwell, which must be worth a look.) *The Myths of Fiction*[20] examines the use of myth and literary allusion in the Greek novel, and effectively shows their diversity. But as a whole the volume (yet another assemblage of previously published material) is very uneven in quality and depth; the analyses are often pretty thin. They also seem to have little connection with the introductory sketch of the world in which the novels were written—which is a good thing, for I could not recognize in this sketch ('demoralization caused by living in a society in which the polis had lost its autonomy and no real, meaningful public debate was allowed . . . alienated from the present and dislocated from the past', 6) the energetic, clever, confident, and creative Greeks I have met in my own work on this period. Tim Rood[21] provides a study of the reception of two words in Xenophon—more precisely, one word twice. Or so he teasingly claims (2). In fact, some of the appropriations of those words carry with them a sense of the larger context; others do not. That variation is one of the many interesting things which his unusual choice of subject reveals. There is enough unfamiliar, sometimes surprising, material in this wide-ranging survey to keep the reader's attention; and though parading short echoes of a short phrase inevitably tends to give a fragmented impression, that is generally kept in check by a stimulating and not too heavy-handed commentary. Yet I came away only partially satisfied. Rood certainly made me want to reread the *Anabasis*, and equipped me to do so more intelligently; but he did not leave me thinking 'I must read that' of anything else. But Rood is not to blame if his authors sometimes made me wish that Xenophon's companions had confined themselves to silence and a wild surmise.

doi: 10.1017/S0017383506000313 MALCOLM HEATH

[20] *The Myths of Fiction. Studies in the Canonical Greek Novels*. By Edmund R. Cueva. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 2004. Pp. 154. Hardback £33.50.

[21] *The Sea! The Sea! The Shout of the Ten Thousand in the Modern Imagination*. By Tim Rood. London, Duckworth, 2004. Pp. x+262. Hardback £25.

Latin Literature

This collection starts with three Italian contributions to Plautine studies. For the first, a series of popular editions of the comedies I described earlier[1] now includes an edition of *Stichus*.[2] As in the previous plays, the *Mercator* and the *Persa*, and contrary to what is claimed on all three title pages, there is nothing called *Prefazione* in any of the books. However, the first sixty pages of the *Introduzione* are identical to the one found in each of the previous editions and are, presumably, Cesare Questa's *Prefazione*. The remaining twenty-two pages of the *Introduzione* to *Stichus* are

[1] *G&R* 52 [2005] 105.

[2] *Tito Maccio Plauto* Stico. Prefazione di Cesare Questa, introduzione di Elena Rossi, traduzione di Mario Scàndola. Testo latino a fronte. Classici Greci e Latini, Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, 2005. Pp. 179. Paperback €9.00.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383506000313 Published online by Cambridge University Press