compromise and reconciliation, is clearly presented, but would have been more convincing if greater evidence for such a political mood in 458 B.C.E. had been adduced. B.'s interest is in situating this political stance in a wider context of Greek mythological thinking, and this section of the book is more successful. The examination of global conflict myths and the resolution through *peitho* makes good use of a range of material, and argues convincingly that Aeschylus' muthopoesis is part of a wider literary tradition. B. well notes the importance of the festival context not just to stabilize the final scenes of the trilogy, but also in the divine, Dionysiac atmosphere. This thoughtful analysis of the mythological patterns of the trilogy contrasts the earlier disregard for literary concerns, which indicates a structural problem with the book as a whole. The two projects do not fit together as well as they might. The argument that the trilogy works within mythologtical patterns of reconciliation is forced to cast off its appreciation of literary mechanisms in order to tie its concerns to the political realities of 458 B.C.E.

The book will undoubtedly be a useful touchstone for those wishing to apprise themselves of the impact of historical research in this area, and includes a number of concise summaries of other perspectives, particularly the discussion of Christian Meter's views in Chapter 5. It is an ambitious project which engages with a range of intersecting debates, but the reader looking for a current survey of relevant literary work on the *Oresteia* will be disappointed. The book displays a rather naive approach to 'reading' the text and the author's intentions, and fails to take account of the different critical strategies which have been applied to tragedy in recent decades. The book's greatest value lies in its emphasis on the mythological foundation for dramatic innovation and manipulation.

University of Manchester EMMA M. GRIFFITHS

ETHICS IN *ELECTRA*

L. MacLeod: *Dolos and Dike in Sophokles'* Elektra. (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 219.) Pp. viii + 210. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2001. Cased, $73. ISBN: 90-04-11898-5.

A well-balanced analysis of the ethical dimension of Sophokles' *Elektra* has been a long time in coming, but for this very reason, the publication of MacLeod's reworked Ph.D. thesis is all the more welcome and its value to the debate is all the more evident.

M. analyses significant stages throughout the play, organizing the chapters by the different interactions (or lack of it) between the characters. By coordinating the ethical, political, and religious codes of the play, she attempts to reconcile the conflict between the 'ironic' and the 'naive' readings of *Elektra*, those readings respectively that view the punishment of Orestes as imminent by insisting on the dubious moral value of the deception and the ambiguity of Apollo's rôle, or that view the play's triumphant ending as being without threat of future punishment.

She argues that the question of the moral justification should not be viewed only from the point of view of the *oikos*, but should also take account of the implications for the wider political community. The play emphasizes the political consequences of the murder of the leader and the destruction of his *oikos*, and for this reason, she says, the matricide brings no repercussions. Here, the moral ambiguity is acknowledged without allowing the negative view of the 'ironic' stance to have validity. She explains

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.11 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that the morally questionable *dolos* is justifiable, for the very reason that the undercover action of Orestes saves the city from civil war; he has a duty to protect the *polis* as well as to avenge his father. She sees, then, a strong political theme throughout the play, which is emphasized by the *polis*-centred values in Elektra's stance, including *eusebeia* and *aidos*.

Her argument is that the ambiguity of the play comes from the conflict between the justice of the revenge and the shame of the acts required to achieve the revenge. It forms a central part of her argument that where one's duties to one's family come into conflict with those to the city, the city must have priority. Elektra's *aidos* for her mother must be subordinated to her *aidos* for her city, and this is how we can distinguish the ethical differences between Elektra and her mother. This context is particularly important for assessing the moral quality of the *dolos*. The lie told by the *paidagogos* exposes Klytaimnestra's true feelings by creating the situation in which Klytaimnestra is most likely to feel pity; when she decides against it, she shows she does not have that emotion that is necessary for living in a *polis* community. She loses her claim to motherhood and her claim to pity.

Up to this point, M. has argued her case well. She succeeds in her purpose of bridging the division between the two camps to a great extent, and provides an important contribution to the study of this play. There are a few points, however, where her argument is not clearly presented. This is particularly so when she introduces a third emotion, *philia*, into the ethics of the play in an attempt to show a development in Orestes' attitude to his task. She holds this to be the function of the meeting of Orestes and Elektra, claiming that their understanding of philia allows the deed to be conceived in terms of *dike* rather than of honour and glory. My first objection is that this dichotomy between justice on the one hand and honour and glory on the other is something that we do not need to read into the play. More seriously, M. shows a weakness in her assertion that Orestes' character develops from a man who hesitates to use deceit in the prologue to a man enabled by his pity and *philia* for Elektra to kill his mother. Although she builds an argument upon this claim that Orestes hesitates, she does not in fact establish that he does hesitate. Nor does she establish that it is Orestes' meeting with Elektra that enables him to kill his mother. More attention to justifying this stage in the argument is needed here.

In fact, the assumption of Orestes' development clouds her argument later on. Seeming to have lost sight of her own main argument, M. surprisingly omits (pp. 180–1) to include Orestes' political response to Aigisthos' taunt in her political reading of the play, and instead focuses on the restraint evinced by Orestes' reply, which she considers the result of his better understanding of the deed. Likewise, she does not need to regard Elektra's speech about what people will say (975–85) as a half-blind one (pp. 143–6). On the contrary, it clearly emphasizes the political nature of Elektra's desire for revenge, and killing an adulterous tyrant is indeed a matter for honour and glory as well as justice. Are Orestes and Elektra 'lacking in full understanding' (p. 146)? Does Orestes learn anything? I would have liked more persuasion on this point.

It is a shame she was not able to comment on E. Belfiore's *Murder Among Friends. Violation of* Philia *in Greek Tragedy* (New York, 2000), which gives an account, even if only superficial, of the violation of *philia* in Sophokles' *Elektra*.

The book is well edited. Typographical errors I have noticed: p. 85 n. 17, no end quotation marks; p. 174, fifth line from bottom: the italics continue for too long ('*dolos is*' should be '*dolos* is'). The footnotes are sometimes distracting.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.11 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Although her analysis is not quite definitive, it goes a long way to giving the reader a satisfying understanding of this very difficult play.

Royal Holloway, London JUDITH OWEN

THE LOEB EURIPIDES (VOL. 5)

D. KOVACS (ed., trans.): *Euripides:* Helen, Phoenician Women, Orestes. (Loeb Classical Library, 11). Pp. x + 605. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2002. Cased, £14.50/$21.50. ISBN: 0-674-99600-3.

This is the fifth volume of K.'s Loeb edition of Euripides. The first three volumes were reviewed by David Bain in *CR* 45 (1995), 231–3; 47 (1997), 18–20; 49 (1999), 560. The general characteristics of K.'s Euripides are by now well known. His text is inevitably indebted to James Diggle's OCT, to which readers are directed for information about manuscript variants. K.'s own notes on the Greek text mostly list conjectures which he has adopted. Some of these are his own, and he is always critical and independent in his judgements. He is an adventurous editor, not afraid to emend or delete. In the great test case of *Phoenician Women*, he deletes 422 lines, as compared with 446 deleted by Diggle and 62 by Mastronarde. He sensibly tries to produce a readable text even when he does not feel certain of Euripides' exact words, and there are around twenty places in each play in this volume where he prints a plausible emendation when Diggle obelizes. There are only a handful of cases where K. obelizes and Diggle does not (*Hel*. 289, 445; *Pho*. 1374, 1524; *Or*. 38, 67, 345, 431, 1583). The volume is dedicated to Charles Willink, and K. has been much influenced both by personal communication with him and by his extensive published work on these three plays. Willink's contribution is most evident in the lyrics, but K. also follows Diggle in accepting some of his deletions in iambic passages (e.g. *Hel*. 503–9, 530–40, 728–33, 752–7).

K.'s translations are excellent on the whole. He keeps fairly close to the Greek, and is alert to the nuances which are so vital to Euripides' dialogue. His English style maintains an appropriately dignified level without sacrificing liveliness and fluency. Some striking turns of phrase add colour, e.g. 'hopes with loveliness in their glance but delay in their step' (*Pho*. 397) and 'Mr. Wealth's a cowardly warrior, afraid to lose his life' (*Pho*. 597). Each play has a brief introduction which summarizes the action and offers a few hints about interpretation. These are mostly quite helpful, although K. adumbrates some idiosyncratic ideas about *Orestes*. Overall, this book is a fine achievement and a substantial contribution to Euripidean studies.

*Hel*en 29: *βούσταθμα* are 'cow-sheds', not 'herds' (cf. 359). 86–9: K. accepts Diggle's deletion, agreeing with Renehan's argument (*CP* 93 [1998], 174–5) that *πόθεν* (83) means 'why?' rather than 'whence?'. 186: Willink (*CQ* 40 [1990], 93) is no doubt right that *νύμφα* can refer to 'maritally distressed ladies', but the chorus can hardly identify a lament as 'uttered . . . by some wife'. 632–5, 654–5: K. follows Willink (*CQ* 39 [1989], 50–1) in attributing these emotional lyrics to Menelaus, with significant consequences for characterization. 733: *ἀκούειν* here means 'obey', not 'hear oneself called' (cf. 1415). 933: 'my unmarried daughter' is rather weak for *θυγατέρ', ἣν οὐδεὶς γαμεῖ*. 948–9: omit 'what befell at' (cf. Denniston on *El*. 184–9). 1056: K. prints Cobet's *ματαιότης*, cheekily emending away the much-discussed *παλαιότης*. 1090: *μέγας γὰρ*

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.11 Published online by Cambridge University Press