

B. ZIMMERMANN (ed.): *Euripides: Iphigenie bei den Taurern*. (Drama: Beiträge zum antiken Drama und seiner Rezeption 6.) Pp. viii + 138 + 28 pp. of ills. Stuttgart: M. & P. Verlag für Wissenschaft und Forschung, 1998. Paper, DM 45. ISBN: 3-476-45194-1.

The centrepiece of this volume on *IT* is a heretofore unpublished German translation of the play, discovered among the *Nachlass* of the Swiss scholar Georg Finsler (d. 1916), head of the literature department of the Bern Gymnasium. A biographical sketch by Z. outlines his career as energetic teacher and spokesman for the classical languages at a time when they were under attack and describes his scholarly work on Homer and on tragedy, which earned the praise of Wilamowitz. The translation reads very nicely and bears comparison with those of Wilamowitz.

The volume is filled out with three essays. Martin Hose, who has written at length about the chorus in his *Studien zum Chor bei Euripides* (Stuttgart, 1990), analyses the rôle of the chorus in *IT*. Although Aristotle recommended Sophocles' treatment of the chorus and implied that Euripides did not treat it as a participant in the action, H. argues that this implication is an exaggeration of the truth. The chorus in this play has an important rôle that recalls its rôle in *Choephoroe*, e.g. their attempt to trick the Messenger and prevent him from telling Thoas of the Greeks' escape parallels Aeschylus' chorus's persuading Cilissa to alter Clytaemestra's message to Aegisthus. There follow some acute observations on the stasima and other choral lyric parts. H. retails some of what he had written in his book, but in accordance with the aims of this series, he writes in a helpful and non-technical style for the general reader.

Frank Preßler's essay on *IT* in Aristotle's *Poetics* first tries to summarize the main points of Aristotle's treatise for the general reader, then considers its pronouncements on Euripides and on *IT*. To write about the *Poetics* without footnotes for the general reader and yet to try to move the debate forward at the same time is a difficult task. P. does a good job of exposition, but without more detailed argument than his format allows him it is difficult to assess the worth of what seem to be some novel theses. One general point he makes is that Aristotle's judgement of Euripides' art is by no means as one-sidedly negative as many of his interpreters have supposed. For example, in his remarks on the handling of the chorus he gives the palm to Sophocles over Euripides, but his really sharp distinction is between these two and the successors of Agathon, whose choruses are *embolima*. And when Aristotle quotes Sophocles (1460b32–5) about the difference between his own characters and those of Euripides, P. sees both Sophocles' remark and Aristotle's quotation of it as respectful of the younger poet. (I note, however, that translating *ὡς δεῖ* 'wie sie sein sollten' is problematic: see *Mnemosyne* 48 [1995], 567–9.) He also tries to argue that Aristotle is more approving of divine intervention in tragedies than he appears. The next section discusses all the references to *IT* in the *Poetics*, and the conclusion is drawn that Aristotle's view of the play is basically positive. The final section raises the question whether Aristotle need have found anything objectionable in the end of the play, where interventions by Poseidon and Athena cause the fate of the Greeks to move first toward disaster and then toward final bliss. P. argues that Aristotle might have been less prejudiced against such an ending than his interpreters have thought.

The last essay is Ines Jucker's on the story in art, not only in antiquity but also down to Benjamin West. For reasons that are unclear, this is prefaced by a page and a half on ancient portraits of Euripides. The ancient material is almost all available in *LIMC*, and I can detect little here that is new. Additionally, every single line reference to the play is wrong: J. must have worked from a German translation (we are not told which), and neither author nor editor thought to change the line numbers to reflect the standard, Greek line numbers used in the Finsler translation printed in the same volume. Still, it is good to have the illustrations, which help to round out an engaging volume.

University of Virginia

DAVID KOVACS

A. ERCOLANI: *Il passaggio di parola sulla scena tragica. Didascalie interne e struttura delle rheseis*. Pp. 252. Stuttgart and Weimar: Verlag J. B. Metzler, 2000. Paper, DM 50. ISBN: 3-476-45255-7.

'One must surely believe that the author-director [of a Greek tragedy] was capable, as author, of

handling the distribution of rôles and the cues in his own text, but what happened when, with the beginning of reperformances, the *mise-en-scène* was handled by directors who were no longer the authors?' (p. 200). E.'s answer to this question is that markers internal to the text aided these later directors and also actors in determining changes of speaker. Indeed, in their texts diacritical signs and *sigla nominum* were non-existent because these markers made them unnecessary.

E. focuses on the various markers that indicate the end of a speech in tragic dialogue, especially the end of a rhesis. He divides these markers into two main classes. The first is further divided into implicit (Chapter II) and explicit (Chapter III). Various implicit markers of a speaker's ending his speech serve to launch the interlocutor's reply. They are 'prompters internal to the text' (p. 28). The explicit markers consist of direct requests, imperative or interrogative, to the interlocutor to speak. The markers of the first class as a whole E. calls 'internal didascalaii', using 'didascalaii' in the modern sense of 'stage directions'. The second main class is 'complex'. It includes three kinds of concluding formula: announcements of entrances and exits (Chapter IV); gnomes (Chapter V); farewells and prayers (Chapter VI).

An objection to E.'s main thesis starts with the fact that, from the beginnings of tragedy in Athens down to the middle of the fifth century, there is hardly any evidence that a playwright might have anticipated a reperformance of his work. Why, then, would he have introduced internal didascalaii into his composition? The question becomes more insistent when one considers that the playwright participated in the production and could directly train the performers. E. sees the reason for internal didascalaii in the demands of memorization that were placed on non-professional (until at least the 440s) actors (pp. 5–7). But consider one of E.'s examples (p. 72). At Aesch. *Sept.* 451, Eteocles says to the Messenger: 'Tell me another whose lot puts him at another gate'. It is an 'explicit internal didascalaii', inviting the Messenger's reply. The chorus, however, has the next five lines. Then the Messenger replies, taking up the verb of speaking that Eteocles has used. The actor who played the Messenger had to be well enough prepared not to take Eteocles' imperative as a cue.

The conventions of tragic dialogue that E. describes must have evolved separately from any practical concern with *mise-en-scène*. Likewise, other supposed didascalaii in Greek tragedy, those indicating gesture and movement, have been explained as aesthetic and not practical. Oliver Taplin describes them as a verbal redoubling of the action. In his formulation: 'the characters of Greek tragedy say what they are doing, or are described as they act, and so the words accompany and clarify the actions' (*The Stagecraft of Aeschylus: The Dramatic Uses of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy* [Oxford, 1977], p. 28). This redoubling of the action by words was, Taplin holds, not for the director's sake but for the audience's (*PCPhS* 23 [1977], 129–30).

Though one can challenge E.'s main thesis, the phenomena that it led him to analyze are fundamental to the workings of the tragic rhesis, and they are lucidly discussed. E.'s survey of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides is exhaustive, and he comments on each example in his various inventories. His *index locorum* makes his book handy to use for reference, and it will often be used.

Rutgers University

LOWELL EDMUNDS

K. GLAU: *Rezitation griechischer Chorlyrik. Die Parodoi aus Aischylos' Agamemnon und Euripides' Bakchen als Tonbeispiel auf CD mit Text und Begleitheft*. Pp. 40, CD. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1998. Paper, Sw. frs. 25. ISBN: 3-82530753-0.

The CD has two tracks, comprising communal chanting of the parodoi of the *Agamemnon* and *Bacchae*, 11 minutes and 13 seconds for the former, 5 minutes and 3 seconds for the latter. The booklet informs us that the recordings were first made as part of birthday celebrations for Prof. Dr Herwig Görgemanns of Heidelberg University. The explanatory booklet includes as libretto the Greek texts from the editions of West and Kopff.

The choruses consist of both male and female voices. The choice of parodoi rather than other texts is perhaps partly determined by the fact that they are dominated by simple and regular metrical patterns that lend themselves well to this sort of presentation. Clarity of recording is excellent, and I noticed no errors in the pronunciation (the 'chi' is a soft German one). The sense of metre is pretty good, though I guess strictly they should have avoided pauses at commas in