

of Aeschylus is not, however, limited to his choral songs.) I believe too much is lost and too little gained by this move. *Epinikia* by Bacchylides and Pindar display many similar properties lacking from either poet's dithyrambs or paeans, but it remains unclear if these include any 'reenactment' patterns. On the other hand, readings of Aeschylus would benefit from a sense of what makes his poetics stand out from other Attic dramatists. The extended discussion of the *Choephoroi*, while attentive to detail, serves to illustrate the general point, which few would dispute, that the appearance of 'bodies, both phenomenal and semiotic', in the theatre 'is an act of iterative duplication' (200).

Uhlig is a penetrating reader of poetry, and her particular analyses are generally well-considered (an exception is the bizarre notion that in *Pythian 2* Ixion devised the torturing wheel as an instrument of seduction, intending it 'for the body of Hera', 212–14). The book will serve as an introduction to the two ancient poets for scholars interested in performance, both within and outside Classics.

BORIS MASLOV

University of Oslo

Email: [borismas@ifikk.uio.no](mailto:borismas@ifikk.uio.no)

MIRALLES (C.), CITTI (V.) and LOMIENTO (L.) (trans and eds) *Supplici/Eschilo*. Rome: Bardi Editore, 2019. Pp. 500. €40. 9788821811883.

doi:[10.1017/S0075426922000246](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922000246)

The year 2019 witnessed the publication of two commentaries on Aeschylus' *Suppliants*, namely, A.H. Sommerstein's *Aeschylus' Suppliants* (Cambridge) and the Italian book reviewed here. The Italian volume has a lot to offer and represents a reliable working tool, full of well-thought-out opinions and interesting ideas, though almost exclusively in matters of traditional philology, the *constitutio textus* in particular. The analytical introduction, in addition to offering essential data (a biography of the poet, sources of the myth, scenic reconstructions and an overview of the manuscript tradition), provides an effective synthesis with various levels of interpretation. Emphasis is given to the reason why Danaus flees from Egypt with his daughters, their presence in Argos and the ways in which marriage is achieved between cousins.

On the order of the first two tragedies, the debate is open, and the commentary follows the reconstruction of W. Rösler ('Der Schluss der *Hiketiden* und die Danaiden-Trilogie des Aischylos', *RhM* 136 (1993), 1–22), who identifies the first drama as the *Egyptians*, against the prevailing opinion, according to which *Suppliants* opened the tetralogy. The central argument is the presence in the *Suppliants* of some elements which may not make sense if the audience had not attended a previous drama. In particular, the insistence that Danaus shows in the finale in recommending his daughters not to marry, which reveals an interest in the maintenance of their virginity that seems to go beyond the legitimate concern of a father for the reputation of his daughters. Yet, again following Rösler, the authors argue that the reason for the involvement of Danaus must be knowledge of an oracle, mentioned by some predominantly scholastic sources. Since nothing of this oracle is mentioned in the *Suppliants*, it had to be remembered by the audience from a previous tragedy, that is, the *Egyptians*. The same goes for the reference to the bellicosity of the Aegyptiads in lines 741–42, which is given as a comment to Danaus without having been mentioned elsewhere.

As for the chronology of the work, the authors believe that the most likely year for the representation is 463 BC, but they do not rule out other possibilities, with a time span between 470 and 459 BC, most probably between 466 and 462. The introduction continues

with a discussion of the various themes of the *Suppliants*, including the perception of the spectators and relevant cultural data such as supplication, marriage, the ‘Greeks vs barbarians’ opposition and the relationship between monarchy and democracy. On stage issues, the commentary follows the well-established view that the *Suppliants*, in which no building is required, belongs to the phase of the history of the Theatre of Dionysus prior to the construction of the *skēnē* (‘stage-building’), which appears for the first time in the *Oresteia*.

The critical apparatus that accompanies the edition is extremely detailed. The readings are recorded with great precision; the same is also true of the authors’ conjectures. This is the great merit of the volume. The line-by-line commentary that follows fully addresses issues of textual criticism, again and again argued for with philological rigour. However, one is less happy when it comes to more interpretative issues such as intertextuality, intratextuality, structuralism, poetics, gender studies, reception, etc. This is regrettable for a contemporary commentary, which should not have dismissed such important trends of classical criticism.

All in all, one must make clear that this commentary, apart from its value in textual issues, is quite restricted, repetitive and derivative, with expanded discussions of well-known issues. Therefore, the book is a good working tool especially for Italian readers, who, however, will not gain more from it if they have read Sommerstein’s English commentary first.

THALIA PAPADOPOULOU

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

Email: [pthaleia@lit.auth.gr](mailto:pthaleia@lit.auth.gr)

STUTTARD (D.) (ed.) **Looking at Agamemnon**. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021. Pp. viii + 228. £85. 9781350149533.  
doi:[10.1017/S0075426922000258](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922000258)

Readers likely will be familiar with the format of this volume, the sixth to appear in the ‘Looking at’ series edited by David Stuttard. In addition to a translation of the play, Stuttard provides a short introduction (on myth, play, playwright, context, staging and his approach to the translation) and gathers a dozen essays on the play by some of the most eminent anglophone scholars of Greek tragedy.

Giving the contributing scholars the freedom to address issues that interested them results in a collection reflecting many of the play’s most salient issues, with little overlap. Edith Hall (‘Eating children is bad for you: The offspring of the past in Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon*’) presents a rich essay, focussing on the background of the Hesiodic account of the Erinyes’ birth from the blood of the castrated Uranus and the resulting curse that serves as a paradigm for the family curse in the trilogy. The imagery that blurs animal and human sacrifice and sees ruin in terms of reproduction underscores the perversion of norms throughout this family’s history. Alan Sommerstein takes up the vexing question of Agamemnon’s choice in sacrificing Iphigenia in ‘Agamemnon at Aulis: Hard choice or no choice?’ and lays out a very clear analysis of the issues, conflicts and constraints. His conclusion that Agamemnon’s decision was inevitable but was indeed a choice (37) is reached also by Robert Garland (‘Agency in *Agamemnon*’), who cites the valuable notion of ‘double motivation’ (99).

Alex Garvie (‘Homecoming of Agamemnon’) effectively describes the play’s several elements that conform to the patterns of *nostos* (‘return’), including the fact that neither the returning hero nor his home community is the same as before he left. Similarities