gewöhnt, Mommsen kurzum als einen Judenfreund anzusehen, mit einem vorbildlichen Verständnis für die Lebenswelt der Juden. Dass dem gar nicht so war, weist Malitz anschaulich nach: Hierin werden u. a. Mommsens Forderung zur Assimilierung der Juden in die deutsche Gesellschaft durch Bekehrung unterstrichen sowie das von Mommsens altem Freund und gleichzeitig großem Antipoden Heinrich von Treitschke berühmt gemachte Zitat aus Mommsens *Römischer Geschichte* (und dessen Instrumentalisierung) analysiert, "das Judentum bilde ein wirksames Ferment des Kosmopolitismus und der nationalen Decomposition" (wir erfahren z. B., dass selbst Hermann Göring einen Mommsen-Enkel im Jahre 1933 mit den Worten begrüßte: "Das deutsche Volk wird Ihrem Großvater für seine Worte über den zersetzenden Geist des Judentums ewig dankbar sein"). Auch die übrigen Beiträge sind lesenswert; auch wenn einige mit etwas leichterer Hand geschrieben wurden, tut dies deren Bedeutung keinen Abbruch.

Heikki Solin

Epitheta deorum apud Homerum. The Epithetic Phrases for the Homeric Gods. A Repertory of the Descriptive Expressions for the Divinities of the Iliad and the Odyssey. Edited by JAMES H. DEE. Second edition (Alpha-Omega 220). Georg Olms Verlag AG, Hildesheim 2001. ISSN 0175-9086; ISBN 3-487-11379-1. XXI, 143 pp. EUR 62.

The main part of this book consists of a catalogue of the divinities appearing in Homer, arranged alphabetically according to the name of the god (pp. 9–107); after that comes an index of epithets and *iuncturae*, as the author calls any "collocation of divine names, epithets, and epithet-like expressions in a common syntactical unit, usually a sentence of major clause" (p. XV). The catalogue is preceded by a long introduction where the plan and arrangement of the repertory is discussed, and a select bibliography and signs and symbols are illustrated. This volume can from now on be used with profit in addition to C.F.H. Bruchmann's *Epitheta deorum quae apud poetas Graecos leguntur*, which appeared as the first Supplement of Roscher's mythological lexicon in 1893. Let me add that this re-issue contains several improvements and emendations of the first edition (the author accounts for it on p. VII).

Heikki Solin

SOPHOCLES: *Selected Fragmentary Plays.* Volume I. Edited with Introductions, Translations and Commentaries by A. H. SOMMERSTEIN, D. FITZPATRICK and T. TALBOY. Aris & Phillips Classical Texts. Oxbow Books, Oxford 2006. ISBN 0-85668-765-0 (hb), 0-85668-766-9 (pb). XXXIX, 317 pp. GBP 40.00 (hb), 18.00 (pb).

This book (hereafter *SSFP* I), which is dedicated to the memory of Malcolm Willcock, is edited by A. H. Sommerstein (AHS), T. G. Fitzpatrick (TGF) and T. H. Talboy (THT). The plays included in *SSPF* I are *Hermione* or *The women of Phthia* (by AHS), *Polyxene* (by AHS), *Syndeipnoi* (*The Diners*) or *Achaiôn Syllogos* (The Gathering of the Achaeans) (by AHS), *Tereus* (by DGF and AHS), *Troilus* (by AHS) and *Phaedra* (by THT and AHS). All plays are presented with: 1. a bibliography (comprising texts and testimonia, myth, artistic

evidence, and main discussions); 2. an introduction (dealing with the myth and the play); 3. the Greek text with a critical apparatus and a translation on facing pages; and 4. a commentary.

Preceding the plays, there is a general introduction (by AHS) in which Sophocles, as well as the study of fragmentary plays in general, are introduced briefly. I liked especially the paragraph beginning "Why study fragments?" As AHS points out (p. xxv), fragmentary dramas throw light upon, or have thrown upon them by, dramas by other authors based on the same stories. Three of the plays which are included in *SSFP* I run parallel to Euripides' extant plays, i.e., *Hermione* to *Andromache, Polyxene* to *Hecuba* and *Phaedra* to *Hippolytus*. These plays are also discussed in comparison with each other in *SSFP* I (and when Procne's filicide in *Tereus* is discussed, Medea's filicide in Euripides' play is also brought into discussion).

The fragments are arranged in the order in which the editors think they occurred in the plays and designated by letters of the alphabet. In addition, the fragments still bear the numbers of *TrGF*. Thus, for example, the fragments of *Hermione* are: A (202), B (694), C (696), D (695) and E (203). Fragments which are not included in *TrGF* are referred to by other collection numbers, for instance the third fragment of *Phaedra* is C (693a Lloyd-Jones). The order of the fragments is, of course, always explained in the introduction and commentary sections to the plays. This is a good solution. It is easy for the reader to follow the reconstructions of the plays.

In the introduction to *Hermione*, AHS first discusses the role of Neoptolemus (in all the plays of Sophocles in which he figured), then compares Sophocles' treatment of the myth with Euripides' *Andromache*. He concludes that *Phtiotides* was the same play as *Hermione* and states that Sophocles' *Hermione* was earlier than Euripides' *Andromache*. Pacuvius' *Hermiona* is discussed in an appendix.

When discussing *Polyxene*, AHS suggests that there were two appearances by the ghost of Achilles in the play, one enacted (in the prologue) and one narrated (in a messenger's speech). AHS also proposes that Polyxene (not Cassandra or the ghost of Achilles) predicted the future death of Agamemnon and that *Hermione* was earlier than Eudipides' *Hecuba*, i.e., that it was produced no later than 425 B.C.

Syndeipnoi (*The Diners*) and *Achaiôn Syllogos* (The Gathering of the Achaeans) are thought by AHS "beyond reasonable doubt" to be the one and the same play and the conclusion is that it was "pro-satyric". Although the pro-satyric status of this play is far from certain, it is worth quoting AHS' vivid text here (p. 102):

"the heroes, except perhaps Nestor, are none of them admirable – Ajax with his gargantuan appetite, Achilles with his hair-trigger temper, Agamemnon with his tactlessness, Odysseus with his inferiority complex – and like a group of reckless children, they have to be rescued from themselves by one of their mothers, who is luckily a goddess. And this when all they were trying to do is feast!"

DGF and AHS are very cautious when reconstructing the action and the structure of *Tereus*. They especially warn of the risk of importing backwards into the lost tragedy something which does not belong there when using later literary versions to reconstruct the plot of the play (in this case, esp. Ov. *Met.* 6.424–674). DGF and AHS present only an outline of the play without breaking the action into episodes. DGF and AHS also discuss the

true nature of Procne's revenge, and finally, suggest a date of 438 B.C. for the play (which would mean that the play was earlier than Euripides' *Medea*).

When speculating about the reasons why Achilles killed (and mutilated the body of) Troilus in Sophocles' play named after this Trojan prince, AHS tentatively suggests that Troilus was secretly in love with his sister Polyxene, came to know of Achilles' passion for her and, after having prevented the marriage of Polyxene to Sarpedon, managed to infuriate Achilles with his message of rejection by her. AHS also reproduces Hoffmann's old suggestion (from his dissertation of 1951) that a part of *IG* II² 2319 (= H. J. Mette, *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Griechenland*, Berlin 1977, III D 1 col. 1, 14) concerning tragic production at the Lenaea in 418 B.C. should read Tp- instead of Tt- and that Sophocles won the first prize that year at the Lenaea with his *Tyro* and *Troilus*.

Before handling Sophocles' *Phaedra*, THT and AHS carefully reconstruct Euripides' *Hippolytos Kalyptomenos* (the discussion on the details of the plot and on the date of the play takes seventeen pages). Sophocles' play is then compared both to this lost play and to the extant *Hippolytos* (nicknamed *Stephanephoros* or *Stephanias*) and in some details, also to Seneca's *Phaedra*. THT and AHS propose that *Phaedra* was set in Athens and that a *deus ex machina* appeared at the end of the play to ordain the cult of Hippolytus. This god (Apollo) may possibly also have mentioned the bringing of Hippolytus back to life by Asclepius. A date between the two *Hippolytus* plays of Euripides is suggested for Sophocles' *Phaedra* (i.e., 435–429 B.C.)

The editors of *SSFP* I also promise (p. ix) to publish (together with Amy Clark) *SSFP* II which will (probably) include the two *Tyro* plays, *Niobe, Ajax the Locrian, The Epigonoi*, the two *Nauplius* plays, *Oenomaus, The Shepherds* and *Triptolemus. SSFP* II is scheduled to be published in 2010. All the fragmentary plays which are either included in *SSFP* I or planned to be included in *SSFP* II are interesting for different reasons and therefore deserve to be edited, translated and discussed. Purely on the basis of my personal interest, I would have hoped that *Andromeda* and the three *Thyestes* plays had also been among the chosen ones.

To conclude, *SSFP* I can be warmly recommended to all fans of Sophocles, or more widely, to all fans of Greek drama. The best parts of this book are the careful analyses and reconstructions of the plots of the lost tragedies from all possible sources (earlier, contemporary and subsequent), although it must be admitted that many details of these plays still remain obscure or cannot be verified. Proposals for the characters of the plays, for example, or speculations about the turns of the events make one wonder how much did Sophocles (as well as other tragedians) alter the conventional myths, what parts of the stories did he copy from earlier authors and what parts did he invent himself. Finally, after having pondered these questions for awhile, one realizes that the audience at the City Dionysia was truly privileged to witness such a wide variety of different versions of the deeds and the fates of, for example, Neoptolemus, Achilles and Phaedra.

Vesa Vahtikari

CHRISTINA SCHEFER: *Platons unsagbare Erfahrung. Ein anderer Zugang zu Platon.* Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 27. Schwabe & Co. AG Verlag, Basel 2001. ISBN 3-7965-1561-4. XII, 276 S. CHF 88.