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 The brief bibliographies are useful but will be out of date all too soon; it is to be hoped that reprintings will include updatings.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/54.2.305 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sense', many have felt that the action—including what is likeliest to be the work of Euripides—is so unheroic at best, and often sordid, that it is hard to find a plain or natural way to understand it. K. reconstructs Euripides' original to remove entirely the inconsistencies about who knows the prophecy demanding Iphigenia's sacrifice, on the grounds that 'prophecies affecting an army are made to the army in epic and tragedy': only by hairsplitting could we see *Phoenissae* as other than an exception to such a rule, and I suspect Euripides, who worried about such matters, would have been concerned that his audience would not believe Clytemnestra could be deceived even briefly if the prophecy was public. K.'s interpretations are always, like even his boldest textual interventions, clearly argued and worthy of thought, but they are not uncontroversial.

The introduction to *Rhesus*, where most would surely agree with K. that the extant play is unlikely to be Euripides', presents no such issues. It would have been helpful if, during his discussion of the Second Hypothesis, he had informed the reader that he prints it after the play. The non-scholarly reader would be grateful also to be told who Dicaearchus was—throughout there are occasional notes about wordplay, mythology, and place-names, though not enough to ease the confusion of the average undergraduate.

With so much to be thankful for, it is ungracious to quibble. This is a fine achievement, and further confirms the high reputation of recent Loebs.

University of Michigan RUTH SCODEL

EURIPIDEAN ANNOTATIONS

D. KOVACS: *Euripidea Tertia*. (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 240.) Pp. x + 191. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003. Cased, €70/US$82. ISBN: 90-04-12977-4.

David Kovacs's Loeb edition of the plays of Euripides is now complete (six voll., 1994-2002). The monograph under review, like K.'s earlier *Euripidea* (1994) and *Euripidea Altera* (1996), is a companion volume to his Loeb edition designed to explain and justify numerous choices of readings or conjectures, and, on occasion, of translations. In addition, some discussions are more wide-ranging and explore such issues as the use of the *eisodoi* in exits and entrances (pp. 79–82, 95, 108, 124, 163–4) and the meaning of a particular passage for the interpretation of the play as a whole (e.g.pp. 126–30 on *Ba.* 810–19). This third volume is devoted primarily to the plays contained in Loeb Volumes 4–6 (*IT*, *Ion*, *Hel.*, *Ph.*, *Or.*, *Ba.*, *IA*, *Rh.*), but also includes some addenda to *Cyc.*, *Alc.*, *Med.*, *Heracl.*, *Hec.*, *Supp.*, *HF*, and *Tr.* All this is a major achievement and must be recognized as such; K. has established himself as an eminent authority on Euripides. If I express occasional disagreements below, I ask the reader to keep this fact firmly in mind. In textual matters, as every connoisseur will understand, disagreement is not synonymous with disrespect. K.'s discussions always reveal an acute intelligence and his treatments can be quite valuable even where one may not accept his conclusions.

It would not be possible in the space allotted to discuss in detail a number of specific passages so a few brief comments must suffice. In general, K. is a venturesome critic who does not hesitate to propose, and print, numerous new conjectures of his own. He

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.305 Published online by Cambridge University Press