concern. It is not possible in a short review to do more than suggest the richness of critical comment in the various essays. Readers will turn to this volume not only for its overal account of the ancient iambic tradition, but also for discussion of particular poets and particular poems. The various authors employ a wide variety of critical strategies and methods: close reading of individual poems or fragments, philological discussion of particular programmatic words, historical and ideological analysis, comparison of the practice of two or more poets, survey of a group of poets in a period. I particularly enjoyed the essays on Horace and the survey of late antique iambic—a subject completely new to me—but each reader will find something worthwhile in this important collection.

York University, Toronto MATTHEW CLARK

TRAGIC VOICES

N. LORAUX: *The Mourning Voice. An Essay on Greek Tragedy. Translated by Elizabeth Trapnell Rawlings with a Foreword by Pietro Pucci*. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 58.) Pp. xv + 127. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2002 (original French edition 1999). Cased, £23.50. ISBN: 0-8014-3830-6.

Much study of tragedy is still influenced by Nietzsche—or rather, by the tradition of which Nietzsche is the most notable proponent. Loraux's newly translated book—deriving from the Townsend lectures she delivered at Cornell University in 1993—is in this tradition, but unusual both in being explicitly Nietzschean and in being especially close to the specifics of Nietzsche's account in his *Birth of Tragedy*. She makes much of Nietzsche's notion of tragedy as a synthesis of the Dionysiac with the Apolline. For her, this duality is especially important in the expression of the voice in tragedy. Apollo is both incompatible in a sense with lamentation and yet in tragedy implicated in it (and consequently in the Dionysiac), a synthesis evident notably in the tragic figure of Cassandra. Irreducible contradiction is—again, as for Nietzsche—fundamental, so that the 'ultimate tragic figure' is the oxymoron, e.g. the hymn which becomes a lament at A. *Ag*. 709–11. She writes of 'the very ambiguity that constitutes tragedy itself' (p. 10).

And yet tragedy is for L. not 'apolitical' (as it is in effect for Nietzsche) but 'antipolitical', i.e. it embodies active opposition to the political. Behaviour is antipolitical if it 'diverts, rejects, or threatens, consciously or not, the obligations or prohibitions constituting the ideology of the city-state' (p. 26). Whereas the ideology of the city-state prizes clear discourse and restricts female lamentation, tragedy tends to subvert the former with the latter. Further, tragedy sets the 'always' of stubborn heroic emotion and of female lamentation against the 'always' that civic discourse embodies in the *polis*. In a section of great interest L. traces the tendency for the *aiei* ('always') of the tragic lament to be associated with the inarticulate *aiai* ('alas') that constitutes the extreme antithesis to the articulate clarity of civic discourse. The spectators of tragedy are being solicited less as members of a political body than as members of the 'race of mortals'.

L. regards her argument as 'a departure from the wholly political readings that have dominated studies of tragedy for several decades' (p. 14). Here one suspects confusion, between a reading that focuses on the relation of tragedy with the social and political

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

processes of the *polis* and a reading that says 'tragedy is merely political'. As an instance of the latter view, L. would perhaps cite the politicized adaptation of Euripides' *Trojan Women* by Sartre, performed in 1965, which she criticizes for its suppression of the lyricism of mourning. However, in the scholarly and critical literature on tragedy I know of no instance. Can L. really be setting up such an absurd straw man? The answer seems to be yes, for she thinks it necessary to remind us that 'tragedy is not only politics' (p. 16), and that it 'is not uni-dimensional' (p. 46). This is more than just a rhetorical flourish, for she seems at times to propose a complete reversal of what she takes to be the mainstream view, thereby substituting her own uni-dimensional view (p. 111 'tragedy is wholly dependent on mourning').

Her view of this relation is that 'tragedy . . . is antipolitical' (in the sense defined above). Here is another confusion, between the characters of tragedy and the genre. She has no difficulty in showing—for it is anyway obvious—that the behaviour of tragic characters is antipolitical. We can agree that 'the tragic universe is everything but a replica of the city' (p. 20). But this is perfectly compatible with the view that the tragic genre is not antipolitical, and even with the view that tragedy expresses the ideology of the *polis*. It is difficult to see why emphasis on the paramount importance of the chorus and of inarticulate lamentation should constitute a 'challenge' (as Pietro Pucci puts it in his Foreword) to the idea that tragedy maintains the cohesion of the community. One could indeed argue precisely the opposite.

L. is distracted by these confusions from what is needed, an investigation of the precise relation between tragic lamentation and the *polis*. This would require far more contextualization than she provides. How does the lament function in the *polis*? Can comparative anthopology provide any clues? As for her welcome focus on the oxymoron, why is it so much more important in tragedy than in Homer? Is the importance of the oxymoron in (say) Herakleitos and certain ritual formulae relevant? L.'s delightfully subtle reading of tragedy should elicit, and would be enriched by, such investigations. Instead she ends at the usual road blocks of contradiction (or ambiguity) and metatheatricality: tragedy contains 'metatheatrical reflection of the genre upon itself . . . upon the incompatibilites that are inherent in it' (p. 59), and 'the point is that the theater is about theater' (p. 86).

Finally, there are some minor oddities. The *aulos* is translated as 'flute' (rather than 'pipe') throughout. *Stasimon* is translated as 'discourse' (p. 7), *sumphorai* as 'sorrows' (p. 29). Clytemnestra is said at A. *Ag*. 1061 to tell (in Greek) the supposedly Greekless Cassandra to use sign-language (p. 76). E. *Tro*. 407 is translated 'and tell of prophecies that your own fate may contradict' (p. 80). *Heraclidae* is throughout called *Heraclides*.

University of Exeter RICHARD SEAFORD

TRAGIC SPACE

R. REHM: *The Play of Space. Spatial Transformation in Greek Tragedy.* Pp. xi + 448. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2002. Cased, £29.95. ISBN: 0-691-05809-1.

R. begins by dismissing semiotics of theatrical space and also approaches to tragedy governed by 'metaphors of text and reading'. His own theoretical framework is perceptual (deriving from James J. Gibson) and psychological. He offers three

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.281 Published online by Cambridge University Press