The issues of composition and style are central to his argument against authenticity and are repeatedly alluded to in the commentary. Liapis examines the author's lack of skill in dealing with various elements of the play, namely dramaturgy, stagecraft, character portrayal, language, style and metre, and, of course, the authenticity question itself, analysed in section five of the 'Introduction'. Liapis comes up with a plausible scheme on how the entrances and exits could be used by the different characters (which he then applies in his analysis of the play) and then embarks on an examination of well-known issues and difficulties in staging and plot construction – the empty scene in line 565, the sensationalism (a common feature in fourth-century theatre), the notorious shortcomings of the Alexander scene in lines 642–74, the Dolon scene which he deems a relic of the epic tradition with no real dramatic function, the many contradictory, superfluous and inconsistent characters, the number of actors (which he accepts to be four) – as he is, convincingly, pushing the date of the play after the fifth century and thus supporting the argument against the play's authenticity.

The section on language and metre offers a summary of the major linguistic and stylistic problems identified later throughout the entire commentary in great detail, and reveals that both the author's taste for the *recherché* and the amount of repetition and 'plagiarism' throughout the play, as well as the mixture of early and late Euripidean features in metre, language and style indicate (as seen in section five of the 'Introduction') that (a) this is the work of an imitator and (b) it points to the pastiche techniques popular in the fourth century. Liapis' assertion that, although the evidence is not conclusive, is certainly pointing heavily to a fourth-century date and to an author familiar with fifth-century drama, is both reasonable and plausible. He even offers that the author might have been a professional actor, possibly Neoptolemos, writing and performing in the Macedonian court. However, although the hypothesis of an actor-author is logical, the evidence is not enough for this to be deemed certain.

The text used is the James Diggle edition, published in the Oxford Classical Texts series and reproduced in the present edition (1–53). Liapis offers a list of all available manuscripts, papyri and testimonia and points to the necessary bibliography.

The commentary itself is meticulous, offering a very close investigation of linguistic and metrical points which Liapis uses in order to prove the points he has made in the 'Introduction' concerning dating and authenticity. Errors in grammar and syntax, rare, incompatible or non-tragic vocabulary and atypical metrical usage are employed to prove the shortcomings of the author's language and dramaturgy. The book is completed by a lengthy 'Bibliography' and three indices (*Graecitatis*, *Nominum et rerum potiorum* and *Locorum potiorum*).

Overall, the usefulness of this volume is indisputable. Liapis deals with the numerous problems of the play in depth and in detail, and the fact that this is the first English-language commentary of the play in almost 80 years renders the publication of this work both valuable and indispensable for those working on Greek tragedy.

DIMITRA KOKKINI
University College London
d.kokkini@ucl.ac.uk

RUTHERFORD (R.B.) **Greek Tragic Style: Form, Language and Interpretation**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. xix + 471. £65/$110. 97805218-48909.

doi:10.1017/S0075426913000232

Rutherford's *Greek Tragic Style* is an instructive and stimulating study in poetics that will prove useful to a wide range of readers, from students who are first encountering Attic tragedy to advanced scholars who are preparing commentaries on particular plays. The book is not thesis-driven: instead, Rutherford explores language, style, rhetoric and formal elements in the plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, and shows how the three poets draw, in distinctive ways, on what might be considered a genre-specific *koinê*, a tragic *Kunstsprache*. He locates his book in 'the commentary tradition' (xi), unlike most work on Attic tragedy in recent decades, which has focused on the theatrical, performative, socio-political, ideological and ritual dimensions of the plays and on later receptions. Rutherford does not completely ignore these topics: for example, he considers that visualizing stage actions 'in the mind's eye' is a necessary component of textual interpretation (11). His main emphasis, however, is on close reading as a basis for literary interpretation and comparison. Relying heavily on well-chosen quotations accompanied by accurate translations that bring out the specific features of language and style under discussion, he typically

moves from alert and resourceful close reading of particular passages to broader ideas and interpretation. Like any good commentator, Rutherford is most effective when his discussions of specific linguistic, stylistic, formal and rhetorical features lead to or are part of the general interpretation of the play(s) in which these features occur. He avoids discussion of the tragic fragments, which lack the context of a 'larger world of the play', and he aims 'to do justice to the tragedies that survive in their entirety' (411).

Rutherford is clearly familiar with a wide range of literary theory but rarely engages with it directly. Chapter 1, 'Introduction', opens with the quotation and brief discussion of short passages from Aeschylus' *Choephori*, Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* and Euripides' *Bacchae*, illustrating how a focus on specific linguistic and stylistic phenomena can productively raise 'larger questions affecting the interpretation of [a] passage in the context of the whole drama' (4). The rest of the chapter clarifies Rutherford's use of the terms 'language' and 'style' and briefly reviews relevant ancient and modern scholarship, while chapter 2 offers a formal description and historical outline of the genre of tragedy, with emphasis on 'generic appropriation and distortion' in Old Comedy and on 'perceptions of tragedy' in oratory and New Comedy. Chapter 2 is the only part of the book that does not rely mainly on close reading of specific passages; it sometimes reads more like a handbook than an exploration of a text or texts leading to interpretation.

Chapters 3–6 constitute the heart of Rutherford's project. Chapter 3 first focuses on diction, syntax and style, including figures of speech and thought and the use of key words to set a scene and establish a mood, and offers an exceptionally rich reading of the prologue of Sophocles' *Antigone*; then it discusses the dramatic and interpretative significance of naming and forms of address, as seen in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*. Chapter 4 is devoted to 'the imagery of Greek tragedy', including recurrent or 'thematic' imagery, as in the *Oresteia*; imagery used to personify 'divinized entities' such as Ate, Hubris, Koros, Moira, Erinys, Dike (especially in Aeschylus), Chronos (especially in Sophocles) and Tyche (especially in Euripides); and imagery used 'to 'bridge the gap' between divinity and humanity, metaphor and actuality. Chapter 5 focuses on spoken verse, with particular attention to formal units such as prologue, stichomythia, agon and messenger speech and to the distinctive ways in which particular texts play against the generic expectations of audiences and readers. Chapter 6 is devoted to sung verse, with emphasis on the use in tragedy of traditional lyric forms (for example hymns and prayers) and on the dramatic functions of choral poetry, including self-characterization, response to events in the play, narrative and general reflection. This discussion forms the basis for two detailed, illuminating comparisons: of the second stasimon of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (681–781), the first stasimon of Sophocles' *Electra* (473–516) and the second stasimon of Euripides' *Hippolytus* (732–75), and of the odes on Athens in Euripides' *Medea* (824–65) and Sophocles' *Oedipus Coloneus* (668–719). The chapter also includes a survey of scenes combining song and speech; an interpretatively rich consideration of actors' monodies, with particular emphasis on the expression of 'intense personal emotion' (259) in Euripidean lyric, especially in Creusa's monody at *Ion* 859–922; a brief discussion of 'New Music, New Styles' in the final quarter of the fifth century, with extended discussion of several passages in Euripides' *Phoenissae*; and a final section on late Sophoclean song, with detailed interpretation of the third stasimon of Sophocles' *Oedipus Coloneus* (1211–48).

The final three chapters of *Greek Tragic Style* address more general topics. Chapter 7 discusses dramatic characterization, especially in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, Sophocles' *Trachiniae* and *Philoctetes*, and Euripides' *Hippolytus* and *Medea*. Chapter 8 considers the variety and effects of irony, with special attention to the role of the gods, scenes of entrapment (for example in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, Sophocles' *Philoctetes* and Euripides' *Electra*) and representations of ignorance and recognition (for example in Sophocles' *Electra*, Euripides' *Ion* and *Iphigenia in Tauris*); it then brings these topics together in a fruitful discussion of Dionysus in Euripides' *Bacchae*. Chapter 9, on 'the wisdom of Greek tragedy', takes up 'the general and the gnomic', 'novelty of thought and ideas', 'questions about deity' and 'grandeur of expression' (especially in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* and Sophocles' *Oedipus Coloneus*), building to an instructive interpretation of the role of general statements in Sophocles' *Ajax*.

It is somewhat surprising, given Rutherford's focus on the texts, that he does not do more with the differences among the tragic poets in regard to sentence length and structure, syntactic

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426913000232 Published online by Cambridge University Press

complexity and patterns of word-end and metrical word-shape in the iambic trimeter (though in his 'Epilogue', Rutherford mentions sentence structure as a topic that would repay further study). This 'Epilogue' summarizes the central points of the nine main chapters and emphasizes both continuities throughout the fifth century in 'diction, form, theatrical practice, [and] linguistic expression' and changes that would have given 'audiences in 410 … very different expectations and experience of tragedy from those of 460' (401). It is striking that the changes Rutherford mentions are not at the level of the detail he discusses throughout his book, but in what one might call the gross anatomy of the plays: they have become 'longer and more self-contained' with the decline of connected trilogies; there is more action and debate on stage and narrative is for the most part limited to messengers (and speakers of Euripidean prologues); actors' roles have increased, with a corresponding reduction in the amount of choral lyric (but with a greater variety of choral forms and heightened musical and emotional impact).

At one point, Rutherford praises studies by other scholars that 'tak[e] account of older work but brin[g] a fresh sophistication' … avoid[ing] dogmatism and critical superiority and seeking to explore these extraordinary plays with scholarship not untinged with humility' (27–28). This is a fair description of Rutherford's own work, which makes a new and significant contribution not by radically rethinking its topic, but by bringing together familiar material in a way that recaptures the experiences and expectations of fifth-century audiences, enables present-day readers to approach the plays with heightened pleasure and understanding, and successfully establishes a basis for future scholarship.

SETH L. SCHEIN
University of California, Davis
slschein@ucdavis.edu

SERGHIDOU (A.) **Servitude tragique: esclaves et héros déchus dans la tragédie grecque**. Besançon: Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté, 2010. Pp. 368. €32. 9782848672793.
doi:10.1017/S0075426913000244

Tragic servility has attracted relatively little scholarly attention compared with the bibliography on Greek tragedy's representation of other marginalized groups in Athenian society such as women and foreigners. A detailed study of servitude in Greek tragedy is thus to be welcomed, and Serghidou brings together many interesting passages in a project of ambitious scope. Her arguments, however, are not always clear and can be problematic, particularly in the first part of the book.

Serghidou treats servility in a broad sense encompassing both slaves and the condition of tragic heroes who are 'prisoners of destiny, dominated by divine will' and who thus 'bear witness to the universality of the servile condition' (11). One problem with this approach is that terms referring to actual and metaphorical slavery are discussed together in ways which can be confusing. Serghidou argues, for example, that the term *doulos* is used metaphorically or as an insult in Aeschylus and Sophocles, but acquires a more concrete sense of captivity in Euripides (28–29). The claim is odd since Cassandra in *Agamemnon* is the same sort of captive as are the chorus members in *Trojan Women* (both given as examples). It is not clear why Cassandra is designated as a 'slave' in inverted commas (28). Serghidou makes a further distinction between slaves in Aeschylus and Euripides, suggesting that slaves in Euripides are more imbued with a concern for civic obligations than with divine force (30), but the reference to Eteoclus in Euripides' *Suppliant Women* relates to metaphorical slavery (31), which undermines the point made a couple of pages earlier. Moreover, apart from Cassandra, no other example is given of a slave in Aeschylus possessed of divine power.

Serghidou is right to stress that the vocabulary of slavery in tragedy evokes 'a general state of inferiority' (45), but it is frustrating to find little attempt to tease out the differences in tragedy's application of language to actual servile characters as opposed to the imagery of slavery. Euripides' Andromache, Hecuba and Antigone are all grouped together through the language of slavery (51–52) although Antigone in *Phoenician Women* is a rather independent-minded princess and not a slave at all. Indeed, it is strange to speak of imprisonment and lack of mobility in relation to Antigone (52) since her excursion to the ramparts is presented as a daring undertaking for a young woman (*Pho.* 88–102). Serghidou does distinguish between terms for war captives and those for other household slaves (56), and she notes that war captives are rarely men (63) but without considering the epic paradigm of annihilation warfare where all men were normally killed.