

Whether readers will be convinced that the system proposed here is part of the *Iliad's* design will depend in part on the cumulative persuasiveness of the parallels that are examined and implied. The system will also, given the state of current scholarship, in part be judged on its ability to offer an explanation for thematic repetition in the *Iliad* that is more instructive than, or at least complementary to, explanations that take into account the origins of the Homeric poems in an oral tradition (including the work of William Hansen and Steven Lowenstam, to mention two names absent from the bibliography). The argumentation does not benefit from repeated framing as "experiments," which are by definition repeatable and falsifiable, unlike this (or any) act of literary criticism. More useful than the appeal to unobtainable objectivity would have been a discussion of what the medium of papyrus scrolls might have meant for the design and use of such a system.

Homer's Cosmic Fabrication, then, offers a bold new approach to reading the *Iliad*. Scholars, teachers, and advanced students, whatever their views on the origins of Homeric epic, will come away from this book with a deepened appreciation of the relationships among the characters and the subtle variations that help the *Iliad* to create its sweeping panorama.

NECJ 36.4 (2009)

J. Marks
University of Florida



Alan H. Sommerstein (ed. and trans.), *Aeschylus (I). Persians, Seven against Thebes, Suppliants, Prometheus Bound*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press, 2008. Pp. xlvii + 576. Cloth (ISBN 978-0-674-99627-1) \$24.00.

Alan H. Sommerstein (ed. and trans.), *Aeschylus (II). Oresteia. Agamemnon, Libation-Bearers, Eumenides*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press, 2008. Pp. xxxvii + 494. Cloth (ISBN 978-0-674-99628-1) \$24.00.

Alan H. Sommerstein (ed. and trans.), *Aeschylus (III). Fragments*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press, 2008. Pp. xiii + 363. Cloth (ISBN 978-0-674-99629-8) \$24.00.

In the long process of the production of the new Loeb editions of Greek drama, Sommerstein's Aeschylus finally appears: last, but certainly not least. This is more than a worthy successor to J. Henderson's Aristophanes, G. Arnott's Menander, H. Lloyd-Jones' Sophocles and D. Kovacs' Euripides. Any future student of Aeschylus will be lucky to have this edition at hand, which has been written by a scholar with the wisdom of decades

of experience laboring in the Aeschylean mines, with a fine critical touch, still definitely at the top of his game. Other reviewers will focus on Sommerstein's textual choices (e.g., V. Citti's review in *BMCR*; <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2009/2009-08-50.html>), while I shall here focus on more general concerns about the substance of the three volumes.

The Loeb Aeschylus had been in particularly urgent need of revision. The English translation of H. W. Smyth's 1922 edition has long been archaic to an increasingly unreadable extent, with minimal notes and stage directions. In 1963, an updated edition appeared, with Lloyd-Jones contributing an appendix with fragments that had been published since 1930. Most importantly, since 1922 much seminal work on the text of Aeschylus has been done with, for example, D. Page's Oxford Classical Text and then in such commentaries as, to focus solely on the *Oresteia*, the *Agamemnon* of first E. Fraenkel and then of J. D. Denniston and Page, the *Choephoroi* of A. F. Garvie, the *Eumenides* of Sommerstein himself. The importance of the publication of M. West's Teubner edition of Aeschylus should not be underestimated, and Sommerstein frequently cites his debt to West's work. Sommerstein's approach to both text and scholarship is even-handed and not dogmatic in the least. It takes a distinctly open mind, for example, to accept A. W. Verrall's creation of an additional speaking character at *Ag.* 1651.

Sommerstein gives us a thoroughly modern (in the best sense of the term) edition of Aeschylus, which will be useful to undergraduates as well as advanced scholars. Two volumes of 426 and 610 pages in Smyth (for a total of 1036) now have become three of 576, 494 and 363 pages (for a total of 1433); approximately an increase of 40%! The expansion certainly is not frivolous in any respect. One of the world's leading scholars of Aeschylus, Sommerstein provides a detailed general overview of the life, times, and works of Aeschylus at the beginning of the first volume (though I would have preferred a little more coverage of staging), along with lucid introductions to each of the individual plays. Experienced scholars will learn much from these introductions, and teachers can be confident that their students who read these works will have a sound sense of the important issues and scholarly controversies for each of the surviving works of Aeschylus, as well as the identifiable fragments. Sommerstein masterfully addresses controversies such as the spurious final scene of the *Seven Against Thebes* (interpolated to conform to the events of Sophocles' *Antigone*) and the authorship of the *Prometheus Bound*; Sommerstein argues, rightly I believe, that this play was begun by Aeschylus but completed and staged by his son Euphorion. I was intrigued, and I am confident many other scholars will be as well, by Sommerstein's proposal that the *Persians* was, after all, performed as part of a tetralogy, as its other components, which were more traditionally based in myth, prophesied a future war between Greeks and Persia. In addition to the substantial essays before each play, Sommerstein's Aeschylus offers far more in the way of commentary and detailed textual apparatus than has been the case even with the recent

Loebs. The commentaries, while not as comprehensive as, say, a Cambridge "Green and Gold," still offer much even to the experienced reader of Aeschylus. The textual notes clearly indicate where Sommerstein departs from the work of other editors, yet also specifically acknowledge where other textual critics, especially West, have influenced his decisions. The facing prose translations are generally clear and unfussy; I note below the few areas where I have concerns. Last, one feels utterly spoiled by volume III, which is devoted entirely to the surviving identifiable fragments, including those published since *TrGF* iii in 1985. Sommerstein provides as much information as possible about the plays' contents, along with relevant bibliography. Many will find the substantial fragments of satyr plays of particular interest.

I hope that the following observations concerning the works' few shortcomings will not seem ungrateful or captious. As I noted earlier, the introduction is relatively unsatisfactory for Aeschylean dramaturgy, with only just under two pages (xv–xvi) devoted to a large and rich topic. Sommerstein is fairly sensitive to matters such as entrance and exit direction, and his initial comments on each play's scene clearly indicate the relative sources and destinations of the side paths. There are, I must allow, more comments on staging for the *Oresteia* than for the other four plays; of course, in the *Oresteia* Aeschylus was experimenting with the innovations of the *skênê* building and the *ekkyklêma*. Yet I was surprised at times to find less on staging matters in the commentaries than their otherwise copious annotations would promise. For example, at Athena's entrance (*Eum.* 307), Sommerstein proposes her arrival either by foot or on the *mêchanê*, eliding a fairly common theory that she entered by chariot; this proposal was recently argued very compellingly by L. Himmelhoch (*Arethusa* 38 [2005] 263–302), an article that Sommerstein does not cite. Also missing, more strangely, from Sommerstein's bibliography and notes are N. G. L. Hammond's two large, important articles on Aeschylean stagecraft in *GRBS* (13 [1972] 387–450 and 29 [1988] 5–33), which contain some of the most stimulating work on the theater of Aeschylus. What is particularly odd about this omission is that, for volume I, the comments on the scene of each play bear distinct traces of Hammond's influence. In particular for the *Persians*, *Seven against Thebes*, and *Suppliants* (but not for *Prometheus* and the *Oresteia*), Sommerstein notes the presence of a mound in the orchestra, which evokes Hammond's proposal (1972, 409–11) of a native limestone outcropping in the orchestra of the Theater of Dionysus that Aeschylus exploited to serve as a mound or a hill as the action of the plays required. Since this proposal was accepted to varying degrees by O. Taplin (*Stagecraft of Aeschylus*, 448–49) and M. West (*JHS* 99 [1979] 135–36), it is odd not to see Hammond's work mentioned, nor any attempt to account for the mound in the three plays.

There are editorial choices that unnecessarily limit this edition's utility for readers with little or no Greek. In volume I, xxiii–xxx, Sommerstein lists helpfully the known individual plays as well as the tetralogies (both known

and theorized), but only using Greek letters. I can imagine some Greekless readers finding this limitation unhelpful; it does, after all, conflict with the Loeb's stated aim of giving "access to all that is important in Greek and Latin literature." That said, I increasingly wonder about the use of Greek letters in the footnotes, which should be accessible to all readers. I also do wish Loeb editions would include line numbers for the English translation, as the textual layouts do not always conform exactly to each other, and, for long speeches in particular, a reader with limited Greek who is trying to compare both sides might get lost.

I now turn to some issues of translation. A British translator whose words will be read by Americans inevitably makes some choices that become unintentionally humorous. In the *Suppliants*, for example, I noted the reference to "the underdog" (p. 353); a "killer marriage" (p. 391); "public housing" (p. 413), which makes me think of the ugly buildings I can see from my office in North Philadelphia; and "juicy fruits" (p. 421), which sounds too much like a brand of chewing gum. On a more serious note, not all will agree with Sommerstein's choice in *Persians* (p. 35) to translate *barbaros* as "orient(al)" or "Eastern(er)", especially while translating it as "barbarian" in other plays. In *Eumenides* (19), the translation of *prophētēs* as "spokesman" sounds far too mundane and prosaic. In *Prometheus Bound*, I would have preferred to translate *tyrannis* more pungently as "tyranny" and not "autocracy," but I understand also that translating this word into English easily becomes a fraught subject. Sommerstein's translation of Ag. 877–79 is misleading, as it misses how Clytemnestra, when first addressing Agamemnon after his decade in Troy, obfuscates which child is missing by withholding the gender-determining article from *pais*, which should thus be not "our son," but "our child."

Last, despite my earlier concession of textual matters to other reviewers, I must make one minor comment on Apollo's mysteriously silent departure from the acting area in the *Eumenides*. Sommerstein notes (p. 451) the problem and favors an exit at 753, immediately following Athena's announcement of Orestes' acquittal, but he concedes that exit could occur, along with Orestes' departure, at 777. I would have to assume that Glenn Most's conjecture on these lines (CQ 56 [2006] 12–18) appeared too late for Sommerstein to consider. Most proposes reassigning 775–77 to Apollo, who then departs, following an appropriate brief exit speech, with Orestes. I have yet to decide finally whether I agree with Most, but those interested in this question should, after reading Sommerstein's comments, consult the article.

I have found very few mistakes in these very many pages. Volume II, p. 80, lacks line numbers. Footnote 279 on p. 157 of volume II has "text2" instead of "text." The quality of the production for all three volumes is

typical of Loeb's high standards, although I must report that the hard covers tend to warp under the influence of a humid Philadelphia summer in a house that lacks air-conditioning.

NECJ 36.4 (2009)

Robin Mitchell-Boyask
Temple University



Emily Baragwanath, *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Pp. xii + 374. Cloth (ISBN 978-0-19-923129-4) \$130.00.

Baragwanath's book, a revised version of her 2005 Oxford dissertation, is a study of the way that Herodotus depicts the complexities of human motivation. Grounding her analysis in reader-response theory, she argues that Herodotus deliberately represents crucial actions in the *Histories* as being motivated by multiple factors, some of which often appear to be incompatible with one another. As a result of this approach, his readers themselves also become, like the *histor*, arbiters of conflicting accounts and come to understand how difficult it is to know and understand accurately the events of the past. She locates her analysis in the dialectic between Herodotus' "conviction that truth about the past is accessible and worth preserving, and his recognition...that much of importance remains partially concealed" (4). Thus the quote she uses on the frontispiece of her book from Arundhati Roy: "There can never be a single story. There are only ways of seeing." The multivocality of Herodotus' narrative has been much discussed since the groundbreaking *Arethusa* volume edited by Deborah Boedeker came out in 1987. Herodotus himself, in his prologue, famously declares his intention to tell of the great deeds accomplished by both Greeks and barbarians and, as is well known by now, often goes out of his way in his narrative to signal alternative and even conflicting accounts of events and explanations of causation. What distinguishes Baragwanath's study is her particular focus on the question of motivation.

Her book is divided into nine chapters. The first three provide her historical and theoretical background. In chapter 1 she introduces the value of reader-response criticism for reading Herodotus and also, to a lesser degree, of narratology. She then takes the criticisms of Plutarch in *De Malignitate Herodoti* as a starting point for examining key aspects of Herodotus' narrative technique. Her use of Plutarch, once "the praise-and-blame character" of his formulations has been toned down (9), provides some interesting new categories for thinking about the ways in which Herodotus draws his readers into an active role in his narrative. In chapter 2 she considers how the Homeric poems prefigure Herodotus' technique both in the way that they elicit an active response from their readers and in their depictions of the psychological complexity of human motivation. In