Propylaeum
recensio.antiquitatis

Zitierhinweis

Lloyd, Michael: review of: Emily Kearns (ed.), Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023, in: Exemplaria Classica, 27 (2023), p. 269-276, DOI: https://doi.org/10.33776/ec.v27.8040, downloaded from Website

exemplaria
CLASSICA
Journal of Classical Philology

copyright

Dieser Beitrag kann vom Nutzer zu eigenen nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken heruntergeladen und/oder ausgedruckt werden. Darüber hinausgehende Nutzungen sind ohne weitere Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber nur im Rahmen der gesetzlichen Schrankenbestimmungen (§§ 44a-63a UrhG) zulässig.

che, nel complesso, si lascia apprezzare per chiarezza, profondità e accuratezza dell'indagine testuale, per la solidità della documentazione bibliografica messa a frutto nelle note di commento, sempre puntuali e ben informate, nonché per la linearità dello stile e l'ampiezza dell'erudizione che emerge dalle pagine. Insomma, parliamo di un lavoro ottimamente confezionato e destinato a essere uno strumento indispensabile per chiunque si occupi degli studi cratinei e, più in generale, della commedia greca.

Felice Stama
Università degli Studi di Cagliari
felice.stama@unica.it

Emily Kearns, *Euripides:* Iphigenia in Tauris, Cambridge Greek and Latin classics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023, xii + 330 pp., £24.99 (pb), ISBN 978-1-107-61461-1.

Iphigenia in Tauris (abbreviated as *IT*) is the Latin title of the play known in English as *Iphigenia among the Taurians*. 'Tauris' is not strictly speaking a geographical term, although used as such by Goethe (*Iphigenie auf Tauris*) among others, so Kearns correctly if rather laboriously prefers 'Taurike', 'the Tauric Chersonese', or 'the Tauric peninsula' for the location of the play (p. 18 n. 41). *IT*, produced about 414 bc, is one of Euripides' late plays sometimes known as 'romances' or 'melodramas. It is set in the Crimea and resembles *Helen* (set in Egypt) in taking a famous heroine of myth to an exotic location and subjecting her to innovative adventures. Both plays end with an exciting escape and return to Greece. The happy ending may seem untragic, but Aristotle (*Poetics*, ch. 14) regarded the averted catastrophe in *IT* as an example of the best kind of tragedy.

Readers in need of an English commentary on the play had for many years to rely on Maurice Platnauer's edition (1938), generally regarded as one of the weaker in the Oxford 'red' series, but the play has been well served by recent scholars. There is an Oxford Classical Text by James Diggle (1981), a Teubner by David Sansone (also 1981), a Loeb by David Kovacs (1999), an Aris & Phillips edition, with translation and commentary, by Martin Cropp (2000; 2nd edition, 2023), a commentary by Poulheria Kyriakou (2006), a large-scale edition by L.P.E. Parker (2016), and book-length studies by Edith Hall (2013) and Isabelle Torrance (2019). Kearns nowhere explains why she thought a new edition was necessary, or what she sees as her own distinctive contribution. Her comments in the acknowledgements (p. ix) suggest a certain indifference to the issue:

> Anyone who prepares an edition of or commentary on a classical text, especially of an author as well served as Euripides, is conscious of how much is owed to predecessors. I have been

> helped immeasurably by works of Euripidean scholarship too numerous to mention here (they will be found in the bibliography), but I must make an exception for Laetitia Parker's recent edition and commentary (Oxford 2016), which appeared after the first draft of this smaller-scale version was completed but has been invaluable in its revision.

These two Oxford scholars were presumably at work on their editions for some years unaware of each other's labours. The much-revised second edition of Cropp's book was completed before Kearns' was published, so they too were ignorant of each other's work. Her book (330 pages) is actually not all that much shorter than Parker's (385 pages), or indeed much longer than Cropp's (304 pages in the second edition), so there is no great difference in scale. Kyriakou's book extends to 504 pages even without a text. Kearns' 54-page introduction covers ground well trodden by her predecessors, notably the complex mythical and cultic background. The ten pages on reception overlap with extensive treatments of the subject by Parker and Torrance as well as with Hall's book.

Kearns' text does not differ very significantly from Diggle's, although she often accepts the transmitted text or prints conjectures where he obelizes (213, 225-6, 284, 394, 409, 423, 455, 466, 477, 580, 759, 829, 914, 942-3, 993, 1144-52, 1218, 1249, 1309, 1346), as is reasonable in a book like this where a readable text is the priority. She is more ready than some editors to suspect lacunae (e.g., 142, 380, 633). Her judgement on textual problems is generally sound and she explains the issues clearly, although she is uninformative about earlier discussions and alternative explanations. The following note on lines 35-41 is typical of her style:

> It is probable that lines 38–9 are an interpolation added to clarify the point, by someone who failed to appreciate the disadvantages of explicitness. Not only is it dramatically weak for Iph. to declare at this point the nature of her ritual duties, it is patently absurd for her to do so when she has just said (in the line-order of the text as transmitted) that she will keep silent about them. Line 41 is also very doubtful, because it is clear from the second part of the *prologos* (72ff.) that the sacrificial altar is as normal outside, not inside, the temple. Given that the original seems to have been thoroughly tampered with, it is also quite possible that some rearrangement of lines has taken place, and line 37, bringing a sense of closure on a note of enigmatic menace (echoing exactly the Watchman's words in the prologue of *Agamemnon*, line 36), is better transposed to follow 40.

Parker remarks (ad loc.), 'This is one of the most problematic and contentious passages in the play', and gives two pages of detailed discussion with reference to the views of earlier scholars. Her edition is indeed on a somewhat larger scale,

but Cropp too offers much more information about alternative views. Kearns only mentions other scholars briefly in her *apparatus criticus*: ‘38–9 del. Murray 41 del. Monk 37 post 41 trai. Markland’. Cropp’s (English) *apparatus* has: ’37 after 41 Markland (‘perhaps’), after 40 Stinton (deleting 38–39, 41) 40–41 del. Stedefeldt (38–9 Murray, 38–39, 41 Diggle, *alii alia*)’, and he discusses these possibilities in detail in the commentary.

Kearns’ reluctance to refer to secondary literature contributes to a rather dogmatic tone, as in the discussion of the shout which the second messenger hears from the escaping Greek ship (1386-9):

> Ὦ γῆς Ἑλλάδος ναύτης λεὼς
> λάβεσθε κώπης ῥόθιά τ᾽ ἐκλευκαίνετε·
> ἔχομεν γὰρ ὧνπερ οὕνεκ᾽ ἄξενον πόρον
> Συμπληγάδων ἔσωθεν εἰσεπλεύσαμεν.
> ‘O sailor-folk of the land of Greece, seize hold of your oar and whiten the surge. For we have [the things] on account of which we sailed within the Symplegades into the inhospitable sea’ (trans. Parker).

Kearns comments:

> The ‘shout’ is probably intended to suggest, without actually stating, a divine origin. The first-person verbs would then represent the deity taking the role of an anonymous sailor, or perhaps Orestes himself, in order to encourage the crew.

Why ‘probably’? The first-person verbs imply on the face of it that the speaker is a member of the crew, and Kyriakou (*ad loc.*) gives good reasons why he cannot be a god. If he were Orestes then the messenger would have identified him, as the Egyptian messenger does Menelaus in a similar context at E. *Hel.* 1591-5. There is a clear allusion to the patriotic cry heard by the Persian messenger from the Greek fleet going into battle at Salamis (A. *Pers.* 401-5), where the speaker is evidently human. See now the detailed discussion in Cropp’s second edition, rejecting his earlier belief that the voice is divine.

Kearns lacks the usual commentator’s appetite for citing parallels. See for example her note on line 266, ἄκροισι δακτύλοισι πορθμεύων ἴχνος (‘Conveying his footsteps on the ends of his toes’, her translation), describing one of the cowherds retreating cautiously after spotting Orestes and Pylades:

> πορθμεύω, properly to take something across a stretch of water, occurs unusually often in this play, a fact it is tempting to connect with the thematic importance of travel to and from the Black Sea area.

Kearns' 'unusually often' is characteristically imprecise, in contrast to Parker and Cropp who both give the other six examples of the word in the play. She floats her suggested explanation tentatively ('it is tempting'), without doing anything either to substantiate it or to consider other possibilities. None of the commentators remarks on Euripides' habit of repeating sometimes quite rare words frequently in a short space without any particular significance (see, for example, Seaford's note on *Cyc*. 98).

Kearns is a specialist in Greek religion, and makes a distinctive contribution to explaining the complex ritual and cultic aspects of the play. An example is when she defends L's text in Iphigenia's instruction to Thoas ἅγνισον χρυσῷ μέλαθρον ('purify the house with gold', 1216), rejecting Reiske's generally accepted πυρσῷ ('with a torch'):

> Purification 'with gold', i.e. probably sprinkling water from a gold vessel, is attested in ritual prescriptions of Kos (*LSCG* 154, 156, esp. 154 B26) and at Selinous (*NGSL* 27 B11); see Parker 1983: 228 and n. 118, *ThesCRA* II.22–3.

Similarly, in her note a little later on lines 1226-9:

> An attendant has been sent to announce that the citizens should remain at home (1209–12), but Iph. as leader of the purificatory procession makes her own announcement; there is a parallel for an announcer preceding a murderer in the fourth-century law on purifications from Kyrene (*LSS* 115, Rh–Osb. 97, line 137).

These notes are informative, with useful references.

She takes some interest in staging issues, with a survey in the introduction (pp. 24-5) and discussions in the notes of such issues as the problematic comings and goings of non-speaking characters in the second episode (pp. 175-6). It is rather odd that she never mentions Oliver Taplin's *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford 1977), although her reluctance to accept the recognition duet (827–99) as 'act-dividing' follows his explanation of the structure of a Greek tragedy: 'The lyric-and-trimeter dialogue between brother and sister was unaccompanied by exits or entrances, and thus cannot mark a true scene break' (900–1088 n.). Reference might also have been made to his discussion (*Stagecraft*, p. 73) of anapaestic announcements of 'moving tableaux' including the entry of those condemned to death (456-65 n.). She uses the term *parodos* for a side entrance to the orchestra, ignoring his arguments (*Stagecraft*, p. 449) that *eisodos* is preferable; she italicizes 'parodos' in this sense, but not when she uses it for the entrance song of the chorus which is at least a way of distinguishing the two words.

Her approach to literary interpretation is quite traditional, and exploits modern theory cautiously if at all. A play with two messenger speeches offers scope for

narratology, but she confines herself to Irene de Jong's *Narrative in Drama: The Art of the Euripidean Messenger Speech* (Leiden 1991) ignoring later developments. She uses the term 'secondary focalisation' a few times, but in a broad sense which owes little to narratology, as in the following note on lines 260-339:

> The narrative further enlists the audience's sympathy for Orestes and Pylades by 'secondary focalisation' (intrusion of a point of view other than the dominant one, which in this case is the narrator's), both in the use of direct speech (321–2) and in the description of Pylades' actions in helping his friend, where his aims and thought processes are recreated (310–14). In this way the account of even a hostile witness reinforces the pair's positive characteristics of courage and mutual friendship, which we have seen introduced in the prologue and which will be highlighted in the following scenes.

A passage where more recent narratology would have had something to contribute is the beginning of the first messenger speech (260-3):

> ἐπεὶ τὸν ἐκρέοντα διὰ Συμπληγάδων
> βοῦς ὑλοφορβοὺς πόντον εἰσεβάλλομεν,
> ἦν τις διαρρὼξ κυμάτων πολλῶι σάλωι
> κοιλωπὸς ἀγμός, πορφυρευτικαὶ στέγαι.
> 'When we were putting the woodland-grazing cattle into the sea that flows out through the Symplegades, there was a hollow cliff, cut by much surging of the waves, shelters for murex-fishers' (Kearns' translation).

Her comment on this is shrewd, and interesting so far as it goes:

> The idiom 'when x happens/happened, there is/was y', with y referring to a place, though strictly illogical, is quite common in tragedy and recurs at 1449–50. The hollow cliff existed independently of the herdsmen's presence, but this fact is subordinated to the narrator's experience.

The typically vague expression 'quite common' misses an opportunity to give a potentially useful list of parallels, and the point could have been developed by exploiting recent work in cognitive narratology, for example J. Grethlein and L. Huitink, 'Homer's vividness: an enactive approach', *JHS* 137, 2017, 67-91, which includes a remark which is relevant to the present discussion: 'cognitively realistic narratives are those which, instead of providing fully fledged and isolated descriptions, introduce objects as and when they are entangled in the action' (79).

Metatheatre is suggested occasionally, although without much conviction. The chorus announces the arrival of the first messenger (236-7):

> καὶ μὴν ὅδ᾽ ἀκτὰς ἐκλιπὼν θαλασσίους
> βουφορβὸς ἥκει σημανῶν τί σοι νέον.
> ‘But look, here comes a cowherd leaving the seashore to tell you of something new’ (trans. Cropp).

Kearns comments:

> Their assumption that he has news to convey suggests an element of metatheatre, since it is a convention that when a low-status character enters he does so as a messenger.

This manages to be both tentative and dogmatic, supplying neither argument nor primary or secondary references (compare the note on lines 1325-6: ‘there may be an element of metatheatre here’). It has indeed been argued that Euripides’ plays contain knowing allusions to tragic conventions, notably by R.P. Winnington-Ingram, ‘Euripides: *poiêtês sophos*’, *Arethusa* 2, 1969, 127-42 (not mentioned here), although Kearns does not engage with this line of interpretation in any systematic way. Furthermore, it would need more argument to demonstrate that it is specifically a messenger we are expecting here, especially as it is so early in the play. Electra’s ‘Where are the messengers?’ (E. *El.* 759), influentially discussed by Winnington-Ingram (pp. 131-2), is a more plausible case of metatheatre.

Kearns favours a rather leisurely style of running commentary. A random example is the following note on lines 669-71:

> As friends think alike, Pylades represents himself as being in agreement with Orestes, although there is one important difference. He cannot really doubt that the priestess is from Argos – as Orestes has just said, she would be unlikely to want to send a letter there if she were not, and she has expressed her willingness to give him the best funeral she can because of his origin (630) – but he is evidently less inclined to attribute significance to Iph.’s knowledge than his friend, who was struck and impressed by it at 540, to the extent of wondering about her identity. The difference expresses their different preoccupations; despite his willingness to die in place of his friend, Orestes is moved by a connexion with his home, but Pylades is not Argive and is more concerned with the difficulties posed by not sharing Orestes’ death. His scepticism is perhaps justified, in realistic terms, but Orestes as the more important character is closer to the truth. He must be assumed to have some unconscious sense of affinity with his sister.

Notes of this kind might be useful for students in giving them the general sense of what is going on without offering a full translation, although a fair amount of translation is also supplied in the commentary. It is an approach which works particularly well in bringing out the poetic qualities of the choral odes. Other readers may find the extensive paraphrase superfluous, and prefer more specific detail to these rather subjective reflections.

47: Kearns states confidently that running out of the house is 'an instinctive, if misguided, response to an earthquake'. The modern advice is indeed to shelter under a table inside, but did the same apply in an ancient urban context? The lines which follow suggest that (in her dream) Iphigenia did well to get out of the palace as quickly as possible. **99:** Barrett on E. *Hipp.* 577-81 argues that κληθρα often means 'door as preventing passage, barred door', which would make better sense than 'bolts' here, as noted by Cropp (2nd edition). **222:** Kearns points out that (in weaving) the κερκίς is 'not the shuttle but a type of hand-held beater used to pack in the weft', and that it is the sound made by this process which gave rise to the poetic trope of the loom being 'sweet-voiced'. The new *Cambridge Greek Lexicon* similarly explains 'pointed rod for bringing together the weft-threads (on a loom)', offering the translation 'pin-beater', so clearly the traditional 'shuttle' must be abandoned. **275:** μάταιος means 'foolish' or 'reckless' here rather than 'useless'. **393:** The 'Thracian' Bosporus was indeed thought to be named after Io's crossing from Europe to Asia, but in *Prometheus Bound* (732-4), cited by Kearns, it is the 'Cimmerian' Bosporus further north where she crosses. **542:** See Dale on E. *Hel.* 1226 for ὀρθῶς meaning 'naturally' here: 'No wonder then you long to know of events there' (Kovacs). **550:** Orestes asks Iphigenia why she expressed grief when he mentioned the death of Agamemnon, and continues μῶν προσῆκέ σοι; Kearns translates 'surely he was not related to you?', and suggests that it 'may be spoken with some indignation on Orestes' part. Why should this unknown woman weep for Agamemnon's death, when it is Orestes himself who has truly suffered from it?'. Orestes may in fact be sympathetic rather than indignant. μῶν is common in polite contexts (e.g. E. *Alc.* 812, 820; *Med.* 1009; *Hipp.* 794, with Barrett's note): 'No one close I hope?', as we ask when someone says they are going to a funeral.

615-16: Iphigenia is impressed by Orestes' willingness to die instead of Pylades: πολλὴ δέ τις | προθυμία σε τοῦδ' ἔχουσα τυγχάνει. Kearns comments: 'Versions which render τυγχάνει as 'for some reason' (Cropp, Kovacs) introduce a sardonic note which is at odds with the admiring tone of the speech'. Cropp and Kovacs are presumably just trying to express the element of vagueness in τις and τυγχάνει. Kearns' own translation is not a great deal of help: 'Some great desire for this chances to possess you'. Is there a sardonic note at 64-5 when Iphigenia says of her servants 'for some reason (ἐξ αἰτίας τινός) they are not here yet'? **659:** Orestes asks Pylades 'Pylades, for the gods' sake, are you experiencing the same as me?', and he replies 'I don't know. You ask me when I am unable to answer' (trans. Parker). Kearns comments 'Pylades cannot know the answer until Orestes

tells him his thoughts', missing the conversational gambit which is mentioned by Parker and has been analysed in more detail in recent work on pragmatics. Such questions are devices to introduce a new topic (cf. *Ion* 794, 987, 999; Battezzato on E. *Hec.* 1008, Martin on E. *Ion* 936-8). **1023:** The idea that αἰνῶ and ἐπαινῶ can mean 'no thank you' was refuted by J.H. Quincey, 'Greek expressions of thanks', *JHS* 86, 1966, 133-58, pointing out that these words may (as here) express thanks for the interlocutor's good intentions in a context of refusal but do not in themselves express refusal: 'Such qualities as προθυμία were always acceptable, even when the favours which they prompted were being declined' (155).

In conclusion, this book is the product of long study of Greek literature and religion and is an agreeable companion to *IT*, although there remains an element of doubt whether it establishes a distinctive place in a crowded field. Martin Cropp's expanded and improved second edition is an especially strong competitor.

MICHAEL LLOYD
University College Dublin
michael.lloyd@ucd.ie

HANNA M. ROISMAN, *Euripides:* Andromache. Companions to Greek and Roman tragedy, London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2022, pp. 176, £63.00, ISBN 978-1-350-25626-2.

Prefacio y Mapa (VIII-XI)

Roisman (R., en lo sucesivo) espera que los lectores se interesen por la obra euripidea donde encontramos a Andrómaca, la princesa troyana convertida en concubina, luchando por salvar a su hijo, nacido de su unión forzosa con Neoptólemo; las maquinaciones de la esposa de éste, Hermíone, pues carente de hijos intriga contra la concubina y su hijito, en lo que le ayuda en todo su padre, Menelao. R. afirma que escribe este libro para estudiantes y lectores no profesionales a fin de que puedan apreciar mejor el mundo clásico. Un mapa ilustrador de la Grecia antigua cierra esta sección.

1. LA OBRA (1-17)

Estructura de la trama. Tenemos un resumen del contenido ajustado a la forma trágica pertinente: prólogo, cuatro estásimos, cuatro episodios y éxodo.

Teatro y representación. Se subraya que a pesar de que durante el siglo V a.C., al que pertenece la obra examinada, Atenas mantuvo varias y largas guerras, logró, no obstante, alcanzar el mayor grado de su desarrollo político y cultura.

Fecha y lugar de su primera representación. Basándose en razones métricas y estilística los críticos aceptan que la pieza que examinamos fue compuesta y representada entre los años 425 y 418 a.C. El lugar de la primera representación habría sido Atenas durante la celebración de las Grandes Dionisias.