admit that Pindar has chosen a strange way to convey this, especially by his use of ἑλών rather than a word meaning 'having received' *vel sim.*

Fourthly, he treats οἴκοθεν οἴκαδε as adverbial with δωρήσεται rather than προπίνων, on the rather weak grounds that Homer uses one or the other (but not both together) with δίδωμι and comparable verbs, whereas there is no example with προπίνω.

The fifth problem is more substantial. Some have taken συμποσίου τε χάριν in apposition to what precedes, some treat χάριν as prepositional, and some, the majority, assume that χάριν, like κῶδος, is the direct object of τιμάσαις. R. rightly follows the majority, but his lengthy discussion of the various meanings of χάριν ignores the most substantial study of the word, B. MacLachlan's *The Age of Grace* (Princeton, 1993).

Finally, he discusses ἱλάσκομαι, the precise meaning of which is much disputed. His conclusion is that Fränkel's 'ich erwirke den Siegern göttliche Gunst' is the best rendering.

Without question this is an important study, but its scope should have been reduced for publication. For example, we do not need to have thirty passages with ἀπὸ χειρός printed in full in order to make the point required. In contrast, the bibliography is briefer than one would expect. Particularly surprising is his use of Sandys' Loeb edition instead of or together with Race's.

University of Western Ontario DOUGLAS E. GERBER

THE *EUMENIDES* AND HISTORY

M. BRAUN: *Die* Eumeniden *des Aischylos und der Areopag*. (Classica Monacensia 19.) Pp. 261. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 3-8233-4878-7.

Braun's approach to an old question begins with a statement of aims: first, to re-evaluate the relationship of the *Eumenides* to the reforms of Ephialtes in the light of revised understanding of the history of the Areopagus council; secondly, to explore the relationship between politics, myth, and religion which underlie Aeschylus' literary decisions throughout the *Oresteia*. The book sets out the evidence for the historical debate in a systematic manner, giving a fluent narrative supported by full footnotes. The following section considers a number of passages from the trilogy as evidence for political concerns, with attention to the idea of *nomos*, the influence of Solon, and the contemporary Athenian attitude towards Argos. The discussion examines both wider interpretative stances as well as the relevant details of textual divergence.

While B. provides a useful survey of previous approaches, his approach to the play as literature is dominated by comment on nineteenth-century ideas, and lacks engagement with the dramatic aspects. For example, he notes Agamemnon's comment on civil strife at *Ag*. 883/4 as a clear indication of a contemporary political message, with the dismissive comment 'Die Warnung des Strophios hat im Kontext des Stückes keine Funktion' (p. 146). This analysis takes no account of the dramatic movement as Clytemnestra bamboozles Agamemnon, or the ongoing debate as to the exact meaning of the political vocabulary. In general, I found that such blindspots in the appreciation of the trilogy as a piece of fiction were a weakness in B.'s case, and indicated a curious avoidance of the last generation of literary criticism.

Braun's conclusion, that Aeschylus was espousing a moderate view, calling for

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.10 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/53.1.10 Published online by Cambridge University Press