on Matthiessen, whose edition is the fruit of a lifetime's engagement with the play, but they will appreciate Battezzato's up-to-date bibliography and his incorporation of insights drawn from pragmatics; they will also want to take note of his textual decisions (for example, his provocative deletion of 531–33 as an actor's interpolation or his ingenious emendation of καὶ τὰς ἀνάγκας to καινὰς ἀνάγκας at 847). Battezzato's edition seems ideally calibrated to graduate students, who will benefit from his deft metrical guidance, his lucid rhetorical analyses, his gift for trenchant summary, his illuminating emphasis of the play's dominant motifs of *charis*, *xenia* and *philia*, and his acknowledgment at every turn of alternative possibilities and points of view.

The introduction can be consulted with profit before, during or even after reading the play. Battezzato summarizes Euripides' career (eschewing, however, the questionable cliché of the unpopular playwright who ultimately quit Athens for Macedonia), proposes a plausible date range for the play (424–418 BC), suggests a possible distribution of parts and lists entrances, exits and significant 'stage movements' such as supplication and embrace. He then surveys the play's myth, characters and major themes, and evaluates with some equivocation the morality of Hecuba's revenge (while he notes that her victim, King Polymestor of Thrace, presents Hecuba's upcoming metamorphosis as a punishment, he does not acknowledge that neither the chorus nor Agamemnon ever condemns her). After briefly summarizing the play's reception (chiefly in Virgil, Ovid and Seneca), Battezzato explains the transmission of the text and his own presentation of textual evidence (to keep the *apparatus criticus* within limits, he generally reports readings only from four early manuscripts). He concludes with an overview of tragic metre and language.

I noted two surprising omissions. Since the first part of the play focuses on the Greek army's sacrifice of Hecuba's daughter Polyxena and the second on King Polymestor's murder of her son Polydorus, *Hecuba* is often criticized for a lack of unity. Battezzato, however, does not raise this issue in the introduction. The same insouciance is reflected in the commentary. For example, he sees nothing out of the ordinary in Hecuba's exit at 628, which by leaving the stage empty of actors would appear to signal an emphatic break, nor does he mention the role of Hecuba's slave woman in tying the two actions together. Presumably he does not regard the play's structure as problematic, since 'all the characters are linked by a web of obligations and favours' (9), yet the issue is such a staple of criticism that it deserves at least brief discussion.

The second omission concerns links between the central choral odes. The captive women who make up the chorus sing the first stasimon while Polyxena's sacrifice takes place off stage; they implicitly contrast her journey towards death with their own upcoming journey to Greece. The second stasimon, spanning the transition between the Polyxena-action and the Polydorus-action, flashes back to the originating events of the war – the ship that carried Paris to Sparta, the Judgement of Paris – before moving ahead to the nearer past and the destruction of Troy. The third stasimon, sung just before Hecuba sets in motion her revenge on Polymestor, homes in on the midnight hour when the city fell to the Greeks. In short, all three odes evoke the fall of Troy, viewed through a kaleidoscope of perspectives and time frames. Battezzato emphasizes the references they contain to Athens and Sparta, thus relating them to the fifth-century performance context. He could have done more, however, to stress their thematic interrelationship – another means by which Euripides enhances the unity of the play.

These cavils aside, his commentary will confirm *Hecuba*'s standing as a first-rank Euripidean tragedy and ensure that it continues to be widely read.

JUSTINA GREGORY
Smith College
jgregory@smith.edu

SHAW (C.A.) **Euripides' *Cyclops*: A Satyr Play** (Companions to Greek and Roman Tragedy). London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018. Pp. xi + 158. £85. 9781474245791.
doi:10.1017/S0075426919000181

Adapting a well-known story from *Odyssey* book 9, Euripides' *Cyclops* is the only satyr drama to have survived complete, and so it is our most important source for this genre. The first companion to this play comes from a specialist in the field, who has recently published an influential monograph on the relation of satyr drama to comedy (*Satyric Play: The Evolution of Greek Comedy and Satyr Drama*, Oxford 2014). Given that satyr dramas were written by the tragic poets, this book is an excellent complement to Bloomsbury's attractive series of 'accessible intro-

ductions to ancient tragedies'. It is also fortunate that it is the fruit of the author's teaching in his 'Advanced Greek class' (x). A teacher's perspective is evident throughout the book, which is written in a flowing and engaging style, and includes a conclusion at the end of most chapters, as well as helpful illustrations from relevant vase paintings. At the same time, the companion contributes to research on this play (especially its staging), for which reason it will be appreciated also by experienced readers.

Shaw has organized his book into four chapters. Chapter 1 is in effect a double introduction. The first part, which covers the genre (a necessary inclusion, as satyr drama is the least known of the three dramatic forms), can also stand as an independent reading. The second part on the *Cyclops* includes a detailed presentation of the story in the play's Homeric prototype (this contributes to the companion's self-sufficiency), as well as a section on the (much-debated) date of the *Cyclops* and the history of the text. Shaw agrees with scholars who assign the play late in Euripides' career; he revisits the issue of dating in more detail in chapter 4 (109–16), where he leans towards 412 BC, a date proposed by M. Wright ('*Cyclop*s and the Euripidean tetralogy', *PCPhS* 51, 2006, 23–48). Chapter 2 is a big asset to the companion, as Shaw offers a scene-by-scene analysis of the action, with a focus – for the first time – on the staging and the visual experience of this fascinating play; I suspect that many readers will find this the most rewarding section of the book. Chapter 3 deals with key aspects of the *Cyclops*, including the Dionysiac element, meta-theatrical allusions (which Shaw persuasively claims to be an inherent feature of satyr drama, 'a particularly self-reflective genre', 69), Euripides' novel handling of the *xenia* theme and the interesting fusion of barbarism and contemporary philosophy in the characters of Polyphemus and Odysseus, as well as the play's potential reflection on the Sicilian expedition. Finally, chapter 4 places 'Euripides' *Cyclops* in its literary context', comparing it, in addition to *Odyssey* 9, to the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* and to previous (fragmentary) dramatic handlings of the same myth (another satyr drama with the same title by Aristias and three comedies, Epicharmus' *Cyclops*, Cratinus' *Odysseis* and Callias' *Cyclopes*), as well as to other drama (mainly Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* and Euripides' *Andromeda*).

Although Shaw makes very useful points throughout the book, some ideas are less promising. For instance, the assumption that 'Aristotle … suggests a potential connection between satyr drama and comedy's early development from dithyramb' (89) is not deducible from *Poetics* 1449a; the philosopher clearly speaks of two distinct evolutionary lines, one starting from dithyramb, passing through the 'satyr-like' (σατυρικόν) and ending with tragedy and (obviously) satyr drama, and the other starting from phallic songs and ending with comedy. Also, the view that 'Silenus' reference to the myths of earlier satyr plays [i.e. in the prologue of the *Cyclops*] … suggests that this play surpasses all other satyr plays' (96) is far-fetched. There are also instances where the author should have been more cautious with phrasing. For example, although Euripides' *Alcestis* substituted for a satyr play and displays certain themes similar to those of satyr drama (see mainly the drunkenness of Heracles and the reunion of male and female), the statement that it 'is, after the *Cyclops* and perhaps Sophocles' *Ichneutae*, our most important literary evidence for ancient satyr drama, even though it has no satyrs' (93) is misleading: there can be no notion of satyr drama without the chorus of satyrs. Besides, our most important source after these plays are other fragmentary satyr dramas, chiefly Aeschylus' *Diktyoulkoi* and his *Isthmiastai* or *Theoroi*. In terms of coverage, one misses the 'Guide to further reading' that appears in other companions of the same series, such as N. Slater's to Euripides' *Alcestis* (2013) or D. Cairns' to Sophocles' *Antigone* (2016). As regards the presentation, the use of endnotes rather than footnotes (apparently a stylistic feature of the series) is somewhat inconvenient, as the reader is constantly obliged to turn back and forth in the book. Also, the printing of transliterated Greek should have been avoided, as it creates confusion; this is most intense in cases with marks of quantity and other diacritics (albeit no accents!), as, for example, *kômôidia*, *kômos* and *ôidê*/*aoidê* (88), respectively for κωμῳδία, κῶμος and ᾠδή/ἀοιδή. These are just minor points for consideration and should not overshadow the big picture: Shaw's superb work is clearly a must-have companion to the only complete satyr drama from ancient Greece.

ANDREAS P. ANTONOPOULOS
University of Patras/Hellenic Open University
andreas.antonopoulos@ac.eap.gr

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426919000181 Published online by Cambridge University Press