

the study of later Greek and help with the documentation of poorly attested words (mostly words that could be described as vernacular; cf. e.g. ὑποταγάτος, p. 121); it will give us a picture of the reception of Euripides in Byzantium and will illustrate Byzantine educational practices, which form the basis for Greek studies in the Italian Renaissance.

I have just a few points: p. 4, M. is not precise and clear enough in his discussion of Schwartz's selectivity in *relation* to Schwartz's own editorial goal; p. 23, sch. *Tro.* 228, there is no reason to follow Schwartz in deleting αὐτό; p. 30, 6th line from end, read 'Sch. *Or.* 115'; p. 33, 1st line, for '201' read '211'; p. 41, sch. *Or.* 32, read ἐκοινώνησα and κεκοινώνηκε; p. 69, sch. *Hec.* 143, I find it more natural to correct the text to ἴνα μὴ συνεμπέση τῷ ὀρμίζῳ, τῷ ἐλλυμενίζῳ; p. 72, sch. *Hec.* 168, I would translate τὴν περιουσίαν as 'property' rather than 'survival'; p. 73, sch. *Hec.* 304, ἀπλῶς has not been translated; p. 76, sch. *Hec.* 31, adding '(= desert)' after 'Eremos' will make the translation more intelligible; p. 83, sch. *Hipp.* 384, lines 2–3, for 'and all the craftsmen' read 'and all the people wishing so'; p. 85, 8th line from top, read θυμικούς; p. 85, 8th line from top, I would obelise πλήν; p. 97, 10th line from bottom of main text, read προσηγησαμένη; p. 97, sch. *Hec.* 973, I would emend the text to τὸ μὴ ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἀορίστοις ὑποτακτικῶ (scil. συντάσσεται), ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐνεστῶσιν προστακτικῶ – ὑποτακτικὸν and προστακτικὸν are corruptions under the influence of the preceding τό; p. 99, 7th line from bottom of main text, for 'Hesych. α 8322 and 8323' read 'Hesych α 8522 and 8523'; p. 99, 6th line from bottom of main text, for 'ἄμομβρία and ἄμομβρία' read 'ἀνομβρία and ἀνομβρία'; p. 131, sch. *Hec.* 103, I would correct the text to δορυάλωτος δὲ <ῦ> ψιλὸν and revise the translation accordingly; p. 110, 5th line from end of main text, for 'item 14' read 'item 13'; p. 112, 7th line, for 'item 14' read 'item 13'; p. 140, sch. *Hec.* 481, read ὅτι; p. 141, I wonder if ἀντίκλισις (= LSJ 'alternative inflexion') in sch. *Opp. Hal.* 1.59 refers to phenomena of *diaktasis* in contract verbs such as ἐλάουσιν/ἐλῶσιν/ἐλόωσιν; p. 203, sch. *Or.* 424, 10th line, the addition of οὐκ, which is borrowed from Schwartz, is mistaken, if ἐσόφισάς με is taken to mean 'you made me wiser'.

The studies foreshadow an edition that will meet the highest standards of scholarship; we eagerly await the next instalment and, of course, the completion of the project in the not too distant future.

University of Cyprus

GEORGIOS A. XENIS
gxenis@ucy.ac.cy

EURIPIDES' INFLUENCE ON RACINE

ALONGE (T.) *Racine et Euripide. La révolution trahie.* (Travaux du Grand Siècle 43.) Pp. 414. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2017. Paper, €65.40. ISBN: 978-2-600-05797-4.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X18002214

A.'s revisiting of Racine's relation to his chief Greek model, Euripides, is an ambitious project whose stated goals are tripartite: to inventory Racine's Greek, Latin and French sources in his 'Greek' plays, *La Thébàide*, *Andromaque*, *Iphigénie* and *Phèdre*; to contextualise these works in literary-historical terms; and to offer fresh textual interpretations through the lens of Euripides' works, seen as a 'clé de lecture' (p. 18).

The first two components of the project are impressive; the third yields mixed results. The discussion of the 'génétique du texte' will be extremely useful to Racine scholars interested in studying his sources, even though the French and Latin materials interrupt the flow of the central argument. A. also effectively contextualises Racine's oeuvre, including concrete matters like Corneille's irreverent view of Aristotle's *Poetics*.

It is about the project's third component, the readings of Racine, that I have reservations. Although I applaud A.'s broad synthetic approach, his hypothesis about Racine's use of Euripidean source material is not entirely convincing. He starts out well, postulating that Euripides' complex characters, emblematic of the ambiguity of the Aristotelian tragic hero, 'ni tout à fait bon ni tout à fait méchant' (p. 20), influenced Racine's 'revolutionary' emphasis on character development rather than plot, a better established dramatic element in French Classicism. This much seems reasonable; less compelling is the idea that to please the public, Racine ultimately 'betrayed' his revolution by simplifying the characters of Iphigénie and Phèdre in his final two secular plays. The two main problems here are that insufficient attention is paid to Euripides' relation to his predecessors and that the readings of *Iphigénie* and *Phèdre* seem forced, the need to mesh with the central thesis oversimplifying the texts.

A. never fully addresses the underlying implications of Euripides' 'complexity' of character: the fact that what Paul Bénichou famously called Racine's 'démolition du héros' parallels Euripides' undermining of Aeschylean and Sophoclean heroism. For Aeschylus and Sophocles, the conflict between heroism as a form of affirmation and tragedy as a genre dealing with irresolvable conflict is inclined in favour of heroism; even dreadfully beset characters generally retain their base-line nobility. Euripides, by contrast, focuses on the internal mechanisms of the tragic conflict, portrayed with greater psychological substance – in modern terms, more realistically. He allows audiences to glimpse the psychic processes demonstrated by his characters' struggles, weakening their heroic images. The conceptual framework of the volume would gain by integrating the idea that for both Racine and Euripides character complexity is inseparable from the fact that both playwrights are late-comers to the flowering of tragedy: because heroism as a form of idealism is a simplification of a complex reality, the deconstruction of heroism lays bare the kind of moral ambiguity that heroism struggles against recognising.

As for the readings of the plays, those of *La Thébàïde* and *Andromaque* are more convincing than those of *Iphigénie* and *Phèdre*, the two plays A. associates with Racine's 'betrayal' of character complexity. In these later plays, psychological mechanisms like doubling and internalisation that might undermine the idea of Racine's reversion to simplicity are themselves oversimplified. In *Iphigénie*, A. uses the doubling of the characters of Iphigénie and Ériphile as evidence that Racine has simplified Euripides' character; Racine's Iphigénie, A. posits, is too purely virtuous to be complex. But while at a literal level it is possible to construe doubling as a way of eliminating ambiguity by attributing conflicting traits to the doubles in turn, writers do not generally introduce doubles to lessen ambiguity but to exacerbate it. The radical moral polarisation of the two Iphigénies – Ériphile is also secretly named 'Iphigénie' – who love the same man and potentially share the same fate, sacrifice, is suggestive not of a clean break between a heroine and a villain but rather of two characters to be considered in tandem, expressing *together* a single psychological conflict. Their characters are less opposite than *complementary*, each providing exactly what the other lacks; they are seamlessly connected. Has Racine truly pulled back from Euripidean ambiguity in his portrait of this doubled character?

The most problematic reading is of Racine's masterpiece, *Phèdre*. Racine's preface depicts his protagonist as virtuous, and the majority of critics emphasise her conflict between morality and illicit desire, but A. views her as utterly consumed by her passion

and indifferent to virtue. We are told she demonstrates little internal conflict, her actions determined by the presence (or absence) of two external models of virtue, her husband, Thésée, whom A. reads as Phèdre's conscience, and C none, her nurse, whom he sees as a virtuous figure trying to keep Phèdre on the straight and narrow: 'Racine, qui, nous l'avons vu, a renonc   la complexit   de la caract  risation grecque de Ph  dre, transpose le devoir moral vers la nourrice et la r  pression chez un agent externe, Th  s  e' (p. 356).

While this reading supports A.'s hypothesis that Racine sacrifices the desire to impress the 'doctes' via his ongoing connection to Euripides to the need to 'plaire au public', it leaves out crucial aspects of the play. A. overlooks the fact that Ph  dre herself is the source of Th  s  e's conjugal virtue, having tamed his youthful womanising when they married: 'Et fixant de ses [Th  s  e's] v  ux l'inconstance fatale, / Ph  dre depuis longtemps ne craint plus de rivale' (I, i, v. 25–6). The chronology of the play's events supports Ph  dre's ongoing moralising role: Th  s  e embarks upon fresh philandering exploits only when, arriving in Tr  z  ne, Ph  dre sees the exiled Hippolyte for the first time in years, can no longer resist his allure and decides she must die to preserve her virtue; small wonder she also loses control over her husband at the same time. Given that in the very same time frame both Hippolyte and Aricie also fall in love for the first time, Ph  dre's suicidal surrender of her heroic struggle to maintain her virtue in spite of her family curse seems to allow not only Th  s  e but all those around her to (re)discover passion.

If this chain of events is embedded by Racine in the plot, what it drives is not plot development but character development. It does not support the claim that Th  s  e is Ph  dre's conscience but rather suggests the reverse: that Ph  dre had long been serving as Th  s  e's moral guide until she herself gave up struggling against Venus. As for the interpretation of C none as the central moral force of the play, the most puzzling of A.'s many observations about the character states that C none is simply 'telling the truth' when, after the false report of Th  s  e's death, she characterises Ph  dre's love for her late husband's son as having become an ordinary passion ('[elle dit] la v  rit   lorsqu'elle constate qu'   la suite de la mort de Th  s  e, la flamme est devenue ordinaire' [p. 342]), as if the many-year struggle against a love characterised in the play as 'incestueux' from the start (V, 7, v. 1624) could be rendered harmless in that way. I am no more persuaded by the reading of Th  s  e and C none as the sources of Ph  dre's virtue than by Ph  dre's depiction as a character without concern for honour, reputation and virtue.

In his introduction, A. refers to the important distinction R. Barthes makes in *Sur Racine* (1963) between historical and psychological approaches: 'deux postulats: l'une historique, dans la mesure o   la litt  rature est institution; l'autre psychologique, dans la mesure o   elle est cr  ation' (p. 16 n. 13). Barthes, rather than attempting a synthesis of these two approaches, set off a famous literary *querelle* by presenting provocative psychological readings of classical texts without extensive socio-historical considerations. That A. aims to synthesise 'g  n  tique du texte', sociohistorical and aesthetic contextualisation, and psychologically informed readings is laudable, but his more scholarly goals overshadow his textual analyses. I submit that more alert readings might actually illustrate a hypothesis opposite to his own, that of a 'r  volution aboutie': Racine's *realisation* of an extraordinary psychological complexity unprecedented in French Classical tragedy, but of a complexity that must be rooted out precisely because it is masked. Perhaps Racine's 'revolutionary' impulse to show his talents as a Hellenist does in the end get eclipsed by his desire for the broadest possible public acclamations. But does his revolutionary nature, like many subversive movements made to go underground, not become the more compelling for having been forced into hiding?

University of Wisconsin-Madison

RICHARD E. GOODKIN
rgoodkin@wisc.edu