

not cover all the possible academic approaches, such as the New Historicism (xxvii), which was unintentional on their part. Contributors however do reference and make use of the key players in that area (for example Nicholson and Kurke). There are also the essays in S. Hornblower and C. Morgan (eds), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals* (Oxford 2007). The volume has a sister book by the same editors (*Receiving the komos: Ancient and Modern Receptions of the Victory Ode* (BICS Supplement 112), London 2012), which examines the *epinikion* after Pindar and Bacchylides. On account of space, I offer comments only on a selection of chapters.

G.B. D'Alessio's chapter (28–57) on the lost *Isthmian* odes of Pindar offers a tantalizing glimpse of his forthcoming edition of the Pindaric fragments, and explores a few interactions between Greek lyric and tragedy. The reconstructions of the missing 10% of the Alexandrian edition of Pindar's *epinikia* are cogent and convincing. It may have been helpful though for orientation purposes to have included a second appendix showing the reconstructions and arrangement of all the fragments discussed together. L. Prauscello's piece (58–82) is the go-to source on the state of ancient Greek music in the late Archaic and early Classical periods. It is both accessible, which is something sorely needed in Greek music, and groundbreaking. It plausibly makes the case on how sixth- and early fifth-century poets such as Pindar, Lasus and Pratinas may have innovated and influenced ancient music.

The chapters of L. Athanassaki (134–57), F. Budelmann (173–90) and P. Agócs (191–223) together provide essential information on and reconstructions of the cultic and choreographic aspects of the victory ode and its sympotic interactions. R. Rawles (3–27), who examines proto-epinician features in Ibycus and the *epinikia* of Simonides, and G.W. Most (249–76) and D. Fearn (321–46), who comment on Bacchylides, provide interesting and thought-provoking material. This helps to balance out our own Pindaro-centric view of the *epinikion*, which is due to the surviving material, and offers comments on the style and language of these authors. These chapters would be helpful to both scholars and students alike.

A.D. Morrison's chapter (111–32) on Sicilian victory odes is a little redundant on account of his 2007 book (*Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes* (BICS Supplement 95) London) and his supplementary piece on the Aigenetan odes in D. Fearn (ed.), *Aegina:*

Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry: Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century BC (Oxford 2011) 227–56. G.O. Hutchinson's chapter (277–302) is a useful macroscopic catalogue of certain metaphors in *epinikia*, but it offers little analysis. C. Calame (303–20) however offers some analysis in his microscopic piece on *Olympian* 6. Typographical errors are few and far between. S. Hornblower's chapter (93–107) talks about numbered sections in the text, but none of the sections are numbered. These are minor points.

In an age when we are saturated with companion volumes, sometimes several on the same author or genre, although many of them are helpful, this collection of essays is both useful and original. They demonstrate the complexity and diversity of approaches to the victory ode and of the odes themselves. The reader will find the indices very helpful in dealing with such a wide array of topics. If a *Companion to the Victory Ode* were put together, many of the essays in this volume would be liberally and justly cited as authoritative sources, and may well render such a project unnecessary. The editors and contributors should be praised for a volume that is helpful and thought-provoking for both students and scholars.

T.R.P. COWARD

King's College London
thomas.coward@kcl.ac.uk

SEAFORD (R.). **Cosmology and the Polis: The Social Construction of Space and Time in the Tragedies of Aeschylus.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. xiii + 366. £65/\$110. 9781107009271.

doi:10.1017/S0075426914001529

Few things in life are more important than what we think about Greek tragedy, and Seaford has been provoking us to think for quite a while. The present book builds on his earlier monographs, *Reciprocity and Ritual* (Oxford 1994) and *Money and the Early Greek Mind* (Cambridge 2004), as well as his many articles. The majority of the concepts will be familiar to those who know his earlier work, and the book is characteristic in other ways too. It combines a large, sweeping argument with detailed attention to the text and it examines its material, sometimes somewhat repetitively, from a series of different angles. The preface makes it clear that the book is partly driven by a critical view of contemporary politics, and this too is an important part of its contribution.

The focus is on the plays of Aeschylus and how these responded to their particular socio-economic conditions by mobilizing different ‘chronotopes’. A ‘chronotope’ here names a way of constructing time and space, and it is a social rather than solely literary phenomenon, so that it changes in response to social and economic pressures. Homeric society is characterized by the ‘reciprocal’ chronotope, in which a series of individual households construct relationships with one another through gifts and rituals (23). This is replaced, as the polis emerges, with the ‘aetiological’ chronotope, read here via the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, which constructs a ritualized community from a difficult encounter between the royal house and the divine (30). The community of the emergent polis is, however, menaced by the monetization of society, which proceeds from the development of coinage. This new monetized chronotope opens up the possibility of unlimited accumulation, and unlimited translation from one identity into another, so that monetization threatens to dissolve boundaries and relationships even as it offers a means of integrating society through transaction. Aeschylean drama presents a synthesis of the monetized with the aetiological chronotope, but ensures that the aetiological chronotope prevails (120), thus supporting the polis in the face of the destabilizing, disintegrating effects of monetization.

This bald account does not do justice to the sustained, intricate argumentation which provides rewarding insights into almost all the Aeschylean plays, as well as *Bacchae* and the Theban plays of Sophocles. The analyses chime with Seaford’s earlier work in that tragedy develops from the necessity to found the polis on the body of the royal house, which here shows vulnerability to monetization in the forms of tyrannical accumulation of wealth, introverted autonomy followed by incest and kin-killing, antagonism between the royals and the community focused often on the arrival of a stranger, perversion of ritual forms, prominently including the resistance of females to marriage, and deferral of *telos* or ritual completion. The polis, as it emerges from Aeschylean dramaturgy, achieves viable community via proper ritualized control of space, time, wealth and the household. That the *Persians*, with its focus on a non-Greek royal house, takes a different path in all these respects, underlines the strength of the analysis.

A new note is the focus on the unlimited, which is related to monetization, and which reveals itself, for instance, in the *Oresteia*, as the unbounded nature of prosperity, violence and revenge. These

are shown to be interconnected, such that the problem for the trilogy is not justice but ‘the insatiable accumulation of individual wealth’ (202–03). Connected to this theme of the limit, its absence or its desirability, is a fascinating chapter on the ‘form-parallelism’ of Aeschylean language (225–40), demonstrating how the imagery addresses the pernicious, monetized unity of opposites and endeavours to separate them out. Following this is an equally original demonstration of Aeschylean work with the tropes of Herakleitan and Pythagorean cosmology. These are connected not because of personal influence among historical figures but because they were all caught up in specific social changes which put pressure on their representations of the world (240).

The book is a *tour de force* of coherent exposition, providing a powerful overall model for understanding Aeschylean drama and often shedding new light on difficulties in the texts (150, 191, 205, 261). It can also sometimes appear slightly obsessive in its detailed consistency. There are more localized weaknesses, for instance that the arguments must rely on the unknown endings of *Seven* and the Danaid trilogy. Perhaps a more persistent drawback is the argument’s apparent refusal to accept that anything in Aeschylus can be doubting or hesitant. Negative readings of the *Agamemnon*’s Hymn to Zeus are, for instance, put down to Cold-War rejection of large narratives (314) and there is no postmodernist ambivalence about the settlement in the *Eumenides* (273–74). This strikes me as slightly odd; an Aeschylean drama which fully acknowledged the difficulty of what it achieves, in founding and preserving the polis, would not be undermined by the acknowledgement. But these minor criticisms do not detract from the impressive achievement of this book.

BARBARA GOFF
 University of Reading
 b.e.goff@reading.ac.uk

NOOTER (S.) **When Heroes Sing: Sophocles and the Shifting Soundscape of Tragedy.** Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. viii + 200. £57. 9781107001619.

doi:10.1017/S0075426914001530

In this slender but stimulating volume, Nooter offers close readings of six of the seven extant tragedies of Sophocles, focusing on the presence and implications of ‘poeticity’ in the voices of his