

audience heard than S. is willing to admit. (Cf. Pl. *Resp.* 586c; *Leg.* 817c; Plut. *Dem.* 10; Diod. Sic. 15.7; see P.E. Easterling, 'Actors and Voices', in R. Osborne and S. Goldhill [edd.], *Performance, Culture and Athenian Democracy* [1999], pp. 154–66.)

S.'s claim that Plato has used 'devious means' (p. 47) to blur the lines between the activities of actors and rhapsodes is no more convincing. Though the Muse was not explicitly invoked at the beginning of a tragedy, there can be no doubt that tragedians were thought to be under the influence of the goddess. The author of epigrams concerning the tomb of Euripides in Pieria is keen to stress his special relationship to the Muses ('Ion' *Anth. Pal.* 7.43.2; 7.44.5–6) and, as S. notes, Aeschylus and Euripides in Aristophanes' *Frogs* (884–94) both call upon the divine. Rather than assuming that Plato or Aristotle have somehow conspired to obscure the truth (and with astonishing success), it is easier to believe that they were simply unaware of a strict dichotomy between tragedy and other poetic genres.

Finally, I am not absolutely convinced by S.'s outline of the 'visual element' of tragedy. Actions and gestures are frequently indicated with words, suggesting that what audience members see and hear are not necessarily simultaneous. Poets may have felt the need to direct the attention of audiences to different parts of the stage. For example, in discussing Euripides, *Phoenissae* 454–9, S. notes 'it is one thing to be told ... that Eteocles and Polyneices cannot bear to look at one another; it is another matter altogether to see the two brothers conspicuously avoiding eye contact' (p. 109). And yet this scene shows the pains Euripides takes to point out this action with words. Furthermore, although the audience can see that Polyneices has turned away from Eteocles, they cannot see the expression of hate on Eteocles' face because of his mask: Iocasta has to describe it to them (454–6).

Though S.'s central thesis is not entirely convincing, the book is none the less valuable for the potential questions it raises regarding drama's relationship with rhetoric. He convincingly demonstrates that Euripides' use of rhetorical features was not an innovation confined to his later plays and his claim that Gorgias was influenced by Aeschylus seems plausible. We may wonder whether scholars have overestimated the impact of Gorgias and other late fifth-century teachers of rhetoric. Though the teaching of rhetoric was new in the late fifth century, the practice of making speeches was not. Could it be that tragedy and rhetoric developed alongside each other? The Greeks certainly did not distinguish between poets and 'intellectuals' and the often complex relationships between poets, orators and sophists merit further study.

The University of Leeds

EDMUND STEWART
e.j.stewart@leeds.ac.uk

ANOTHER COMPANION TO SOPHOCLES

MARKANTONATOS (A.) (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Sophocles*. Pp. xxii + 737, ill. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012. Cased, €180, US\$247. ISBN: 978-90-04-18492-3.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X13002199

This is the second Sophoclean companion to appear within the last two years, after K. Ormand (ed.) *A Companion to Sophocles* (2011). While one could wonder about such a duplication, I am not about to question the general utility of two companions to Sophocles nor to engage in close comparisons. The list of 32 contributors – well-established

scholars in the field of Greek tragedy from all over the world – does justice to twenty-first-century Sophoclean scholarship.

In his introduction, M. undertakes the ambitious challenge of sketching out the history of Sophoclean criticism from the classical period to the present. On the one hand, he undoubtedly succeeds in identifying major turning points of criticism, such as Aristotle's *Poetics*, Campbell and Jebb's reaction to nineteenth-century editing fashion, the French school of Vernant and Vidal-Naquet, and so on. On the other hand, some reservations arise from his survey. While allotting nineteenth-century German scholars a single paragraph, he spends too many words discussing Oedipus as 'exemplar of the tragic hero', i.e. a 'symbolic condensation of great principles' (p. 8), as proved in the final heroisation of *Oedipus at Colonus*. Elsewhere he appears to misrepresent studies on dramatic technique, which have supposedly fallen behind due to the 'realization that this kind of formalist abstraction disregards the vital principles binding together the parts of the play in a continuous chain of cause and effect and, what is worse, excludes contextual matters in favour of pedantic exaggeration' (pp. 5–6). What are the 'vital principles' in a kind of poetry quintessentially conceived for performance? While everyone should be aware of the shortcomings of Wilamowitz, nobody could forget the vital contributions to the study of Greek tragedy made by scholars of formalistic inclinations, such as Reinhardt, Kranz, Fraenkel and, more recently, Taplin, Matthiessen and Mastronarde (see esp. Mastronarde's *The Art of Euripides. Dramatic Technique and Social Context* [2010], p. 14, even though I agree that Sophocles has received less attention in these respects than Aeschylus and Euripides). Not surprisingly, therefore, staging and technical problems related to original performance are almost completely absent from the book.

The volume is made up of eight Parts, completed by a bibliography, indexes of subjects and Sophoclean passages. The first Part contains eleven chapters, including individual discussions of extant plays; Parts 2–8 each accommodate between two and four articles and are respectively concerned with intertextuality; music, language and narrative; image and performance; religion, history and politics; status and gender; education, philosophy, irony; ancient and modern reception. One could have desired a more rational grouping, or lament the postponed discussion of crucial topics, such as dating (by Ferrario, mainly on historical grounds), or even criticise the excessive dispersal of chapters referring to characters (Kitzinger on choruses, Mikalson on gods and heroes, Mossmann on women and Zimmermann on minor characters). Internal cross-referencing is inconstant. There is no univocal policy for transliterations or quotations from Greek: translations are often missing (though not in M., Kitzinger, Battezzato, Dunn). Secondary literature is invariably surveyed and abundantly quoted in footnotes by all the contributors. Different viewpoints on single questions are inevitable and not negative: I note the intermittent acceptance of Knox's 'Sophoclean hero' and the presence of hero worship in the endings of *Aj.* and *Tr.* Repeated discussions on the same passages are not infrequent.

In Part I, essays on individual plays are marked by different approaches: Finglass addresses the vexed question of unity in *Ajax* (briefly discussed in his 2011 commentary, which he does not cite) by suggesting thematic parallelisms between the two halves of the play. Griffiths reads *Electra* in the light of recent key issues of Sophoclean scholarship, such as mythical tradition and reception, democracy, language and performance, and finally suggests the implied paradigm of the phoenix myth (of which I am not persuaded). In the wake of Reinhardt, Beer mercifully interprets the dramatic sequence of *Oedipus Tyrannus* by means of the theatrical choices of Sophocles and the presentation of Oedipus' mask. Carter chooses to study *Antigone* as a 'diptych' and offers a structuralist analysis based on oppositions between the two main heroes' agendas, inside and outside space, death and life. Helden explains *Trachiniae* through the lens of philosophy, focusing

on the use of non-sceptical theories of knowledge by its characters, compares Deianeira's first lines with Herodotus' report on Croesus (*Histories* 1), discusses the preparation of the pyre for Heracles (and its implied sequel) in comparison with Croesus' rescue in Herodotus and Bacchylides 3 (omitting questions of chronology), and compares Heracles to Polyphemus and Deianeira/Hyllus with Penelope/Telemachus in the *Odyssey*. *Philoctetes* is analysed by Kyriakou through the major themes of inherited nature, integrity in words and deeds, favours and solidarity, and the deceptive and harmful power of the word. Hesk's summary of *Oedipus at Colonus* is illuminating on echoes of contemporary Athens, supplication, the moral judgement of Oedipus, and the play's specific relationship with *OT*. Individual readings are sound, though at times a little speculative (e.g. *Electra*, *Trachiniae*) and in any case are intended as 'no substitute for reading Sophocles' (Finglass, p. 59). The order of presentation (that of Lloyd-Jones/Wilson's OCT) may be indicative of declining interest in matters of chronology. The first section is completed by four articles on crucial aspects of Sophocles' work, such as the complicated biographical tradition (Tyrrell), textual transmission (Avezzi), fragmentary plays (Sommerstein) and satyr-plays (Seidensticker): these studies will serve as invaluable starting surveys for both students and scholars.

Parts 2–8 are equally stimulating. The narrow focus on intertextuality is especially welcomed. Dunn's concept of 'dynamic allusion' to tragic rivals, explored in terms of arising narrative opportunities, for me is particularly convincing and deserves further investigation. At times, both he and Davidson (on Homer) go too far with parallels, some of which I would downgrade to occasional similarities (e.g. *Iliad* 1 matched with *Ant.* and *OT*, Aeschylus' *Persae* with *Ajax*). Perhaps it would have been fruitful to expand the discussion to the Epic Cycle and lyric poetry, but this is personal taste. In investigating the scanty evidence for music, Power rightly questions old assumptions of Sophocles' alleged middle course between conservatism and innovation, and detects possible dramatisation of the motif in the plays (*Trachiniae*, *Ichneutae*, *Thamyras*, etc.). Battezzato surveys Sophoclean language and insightfully elaborates on old and new trends in linguistics (word order, tropes, politeness, sociolinguistics). Worman thoroughly discusses enactment of persuasive modes of discourse by Sophoclean characters, although she tends to stretch too far her argument about the identification of Odysseus (in *Ajax*) and Oedipus with the paradigm of the clever politician. M. discusses at length the narratological approach of de Jong and restates the point of Ajax's heroisation. On the latter point, he partly misconceives the attitude of the Messenger in *Aj.* 748–83, who does not alleviate Ajax's responsibilities: for the ending of *Ajax*, the idea of a moderate 'rehabilitation' seems preferable. In a methodologically magisterial discussion, Small warns against the use of artistic representations to improve our knowledge of dramatic performances, while Kitzinger explores issues related to the chorus.

The 'historical' half of the book is inaugurated by Rehm with a well-balanced survey of the presence of ritual, and is continued by Mikalson, who gives a complete list of the occurrences of gods and discusses the heroisation of Ajax and Heracles in *Ajax* and *Trachiniae*. Ferrario and Raaflaub tackle discussions of history and political thought by concluding that Sophocles' drama certainly interfered with Athenian reality, but only indirectly and unintentionally. Part 6, 'Sophoclean Anthropology', comprises Mossman's re-evaluation of the treatment of women's voices, mainly focused on decision-making, and Zimmermann's systematic classification of minor characters. The title of the penultimate section, 'Instructing the Polis', may appear misleading: Gregory's essay on education treats the topic as a dramatic motif, not as a supposed aim of the dramatist-Sophocles; Wilson explores Sophocles' possible philosophical background, but concentrates solely (and unconvincingly) on *Electra*; Lloyd elaborates old theories about

irony and tests it on the triad. Part 8 on reception contains well-informed essays by Wright on ancient reception (from Aristophanes to Dio of Prusa); Anderson on the influence of Sophocles on a range of twentieth-century authors, such as Stravinsky, Cocteau, Anouilh, T.S. Eliot, Scorsese, etc.; Walton on translations; and McDonald on modern re-performances.

Minor inconsistencies in structure and focus, and occasional disagreement cannot detract from substantial appreciation of this volume, which will quickly become – alongside Ormand’s – a useful starting-point for the study of Sophocles.

Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa

MARCO CATRAMBONE

marco.catrambone@sns.it

SOPHOCLES’ *OC* AND ATHENIAN TRAGEDY

MARX (W.) *Le tombeau d’Édipe. Pour une tragédie sans tragique*. Pp. 206. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 2012. Paper, €16. ISBN: 978-2-7073-2201-2.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X13002205

This is an immensely enjoyable book on Athenian tragedy, written in lyrical prose and elegiac mode. Throughout M. uses Sophocles’ *Oedipus at Colonus* as a guiding principle: literally, as the book is structured according to the parts of the play (*parodos*, episodes, *exodus*), but figuratively, too. For M. the *OC* captures and embodies all that is irrecoverable about Greek tragedy, and he returns to the play time and again as a symbol and repository of tragedy’s secrets. Because this is a meditation on how inaccessible Athenian tragedy has become, a deep sense of loss permeates what is nevertheless a joyful celebration of mystery. The surviving scripts may seem to be complete works of ‘literature’ (the very notion of literature will be contested), but stripped of their contexts (geographical, performative, affective, theological) they are but artefacts and fragments. *Oedipus at Colonus* is thus a far cry from the perfectly balanced Ionic column that we make it out to be; rather it is ‘a ruin, a true ruin, just as ruined as the Parthenon is today’ (p. 42). M. conjures many such images, and even the most jaded philologist should find buoyancy in this impassioned tour through tragedy’s secrets. Readers will doubtless find many points to disagree with, but as a whole this is an elegantly written review of important problems in the history of ‘tragic’ scholarship and an energising reminder that an entire, irretrievable world lies behind the words on the tragic page.

Each of the chapters begins with an *in memoriam* to a scholar with whose ideas M. is sympathetic: the first, ‘The Place’, is dedicated to Jebb. Here M. argues that Athenian tragedy was deeply rooted in topography and the numinous spirits of place (the kind with which visitors to modern-day Colonus find it difficult to commune). The places of Greek tragedy are palimpsests of the heroes and rituals that haunt them, and for the Panhellenic audiences gathered in the Theatre of Dionysus tragedy was in this respect a mirror of the world. But tragedies, in the form that they have survived, have become denuded of the particularities of place and context, which today we view only as nice exegetical supplements to the poetry. Regarded all too often as a purely ‘literary’ form, Attic tragedy is deracinated, just as ‘fragmentary’ (and just as alluring in its fragmentation) as the Nike of Samothrace. For a more accessible dramatic tradition similarly rooted in place, here defined in terms of both space and enunciative context, M. brings us to a piece of Japanese Noh which has many uncanny points of contact with the *OC*. The comparison is