

tes nicht erfaßt wird. Gerade sie aber hätten Wesentliches zu einer Bereicherung dieser Untersuchung beitragen, mindestens aber zu einer Entschärfung der Behauptungen oder gar zu einer Relativierung der Hauptthese führen können.

Nach der Lektüre des Buches fragt man sich abschließend, ob es nicht an der Zeit wäre, allmählich den Weg zu einer Sprachphilologie mit neuen Akzenten zu finden, die nicht nur – wie die gute alte kritisch-historische Methode – auf rein Formalsprachliches beschränkt bliebe, die aber andererseits auch nicht nur im Aufzeigen geistesgeschichtlicher Bögen und Linien zu einer subjektiven Aktualisierung führt und sich darin erschöpfte, Probleme der eigenen Zeit im Spiegel der Antike wiederzufinden und hochzuspielen, sondern die vielmehr ein historisch-semantisches Denken betonen würde, das über historisch-semantische Einzeluntersuchungen des Wortes und der Sprache mosaikförmig ein Bild der Antike zusammensetzen könnte, das der von Isokrates schon in seiner Helena-Rede aufgestellten Forderung näher käme, wo es heißt: "Ὅσα μὲν γὰρ ἐφ' ἡμῶν γέγονεν, εἰκότως ἂν ταῖς δόξαις ταῖς ἡμετέραις αὐτῶν διακρίνοιμεν, περὶ δὲ τῶν οὕτω παλαιῶν προσήκει τοῖς κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον εὖ φρονήσασιν ὁμονοοῦντας ἡμᾶς φαίνεσθαι.

Siegfried Jäkel

Euripides Bacchae. Edidit E. Christian Kopff. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1982. XXI, 79 S. M. 31.-.

In the new Teubner series of Euripides' plays we now have a new edition of the *Bacchae*, which is notoriously one of the most difficult plays of Euripides from the point of view of textual criticism. Not only is the end of the play preserved in our MSS. in a severely mutilated form, but the papyrus fragments found recently have also shown remarkable differences from the MSS. text. A fresh evaluation of the difficulties in the form of a new edition is therefore welcome (and we are soon to welcome another one by J. Diggle in the OCT series). The Teubner edition by Kopff presents a better text than e.g. Murray's. It incorporates many instances of corrections to Murray's text made by E.R. Dodds in the additional notes to the second edition of his commentary. The emendations made by Kopff himself are, according to the critical apparatus, not more than a dozen. In some cases, they concern the order of the lines, e.g. 199–203 are transferred after 247, 325–327 after 344; as in these cases the transposition brings with it a change of the speaker, a considerable change in the interpretation must be expected – it would be nice to have Kopff's arguments, but they cannot, of course, be given in an edition, and there are no references to other publications by the author. Some of the conjectures made and adopted in the text by Kopff are in my opinion not probable (e.g. 69 ἔντοπος pro ἔκτοπος, 239 χερός pro στέγης, which, I agree, is doubtful, 796 ἄξιαι – Camper's ἄξιον would be better). The colometry of the lyrics is much changed, often in accordance with the colometry of the MSS., which is given in a special apparatus. There is

also a full apparatus of the indirect tradition for the text, with constant references e.g. to the *Christus Patiens*, and an appendix giving the tradition for the missing part of the tragedy containing the reconstruction of Pentheus' body. The apparatus criticus is divided in two parts, the apparatus proper giving only the necessary information for the text adopted, more information about other conjectures being given in an appendix. For a convenient use of the text, I would have preferred more information in the apparatus proper. There is some confusion in the extensive bibliography on the *Bacchae* – C. Segal's article in *CW* 72, 1978, is not "Dionysus on the Couch and on the Grid" but "Pentheus and Hippolytus on the Couch. . .".

Maarit Kaimio

Hans Oranje: Euripides' Bacchae. The Play and its Audience. *Mnemosyne*, suppl. 78. E.J. Brill, Leiden 1984. VII, 200 p. Hfl. 64.-.

Euripides' *Bacchae* is one of the Greek tragedies which seem to be most alive in our time. There is a continual flow of diverging, even contradictory interpretations. Euripides has here touched some of the most basic and disquieting elements in human nature – sexuality, violence, experience of religious mysticism – and explores the frontiers of reason, irrationality and madness.

The method of the author of this book is to trace the audience response of Euripides' own day by analysing the action of the drama and the experience of the public as the drama unfolds itself; this way, he tries to elucidate Euripides' intentions with this drama, mainly his relation to the god Dionysus. It is, of course, very difficult to grasp the response of the original audience, but the way to analyse the plays on the basis of the fifth-century performance is surely a healthy and rewarding one. This holds especially true of the *Bacchae*, which has so often been handled from the viewpoints of modern thought (which can naturally also be a rewarding and revealing way to look at it), especially of psychology (e.g. E.R. Dodds, who in his commentary, ²1960, sees Pentheus as "the dark puritan whose passion is compounded of horror and unconscious desire", p. 172 to lines 222–223) or of psychoanalysis (e.g. C. Segal, 'Pentheus and Hippolytus on the couch and on the grid: psychoanalytic and structuralist reading of Greek tragedy', *CW* 72 [1978–79] 129–148; not mentioned by the author).

The author discusses (pp. 23–28) Bernard Beckerman's four aspects of the response of a spectator to the action of the play: the descriptive, the participational, the referential and the conceptual (*Dynamics of Drama. Theory and method of analysis*, New York 1970). This theory forms the frame of his analysis, although he admits that he is not keeping too strictly to it and that Beckerman's definitions of these aspects are in any case somewhat vague (p. 24). Especially in the question of such a drama as the *Bacchae*, the boundaries of these aspects seem very artificial. For instance, one cannot really analyse the participational aspect of the audience response – that is, the emotional involvement on the part of the spectator – without taking into account the referential aspect, in this