

Author(s): John J. Peradotto

Reviewed work(s): Euripidean Drama: Myth, Theme, and Structure by D. J. Conacher

Source: *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 91, No. 1, (Jan., 1970), pp. 87-91

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

did not edit the inscriptions in his appendix, though this, with supporting arguments, would have lengthened the book substantially. Minor irritations in the appendix include inconsistent cross-referencing: at VI, 32739 he has "siehe CIL VI 3907" but does not state that *C. I. L.*, VI, 31828 = 1599 or 32658 = 2680. Likewise, he gives *A. E.* references for periodicals (e. g., *N. S.* or *P. B. S. R.*) but not for collections (e. g., *I. L. Afr.* or *I. L. Alg.*). He might also have cross-referenced Pflaum's excellent *Les carrières procuratoriennes equestres* without adding bulk to his volume. The appendix is comprehensive, including even such a scrap as *C. I. L.*, VIII, 24633a, though one apparent omission is *C. I. L.*, VI, 3253. Others that could be added, depending on restorations, are *C. I. L.*, VI, 2256 and V, 7894. In connection with Messius Atticus of *I. R. T.*, 439 Freis cites *I. R. T.*, 408 (showing him as a praetorian) but not *I. R. T.*, 438 (showing him as a *sacerdos*). In treating inscriptions with cohorts X, XI, or XII but no unit designation (*urbana*, *praetoriana*, *voluntariorum*, etc.) he is inconsistent, including *A. E.*, 1925, 19 but not *C. I. L.*, VI, 3630. A separate full bibliography instead of a single page of abbreviations would have been welcome. Nevertheless, the book is well-researched, well-written, and well-printed, deserving a place in any classical library.

FRED C. MENCH, JR.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

D. J. CONACHER. *Euripidean Drama: Myth, Theme, and Structure*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1967. Pp. xiii + 355. \$8.50.

It is not easy to write a book on Euripides, much less a good book. The unity of vision and consistency of form which a scholarly consensus might find in Aeschylus or Sophocles are not so evident in Euripides. That such plays as the *Troades* and the *Helen* should issue from the same hand (and within a few years of one another!) is a scandal to the simplifying intellect that considers the poet's variety of theme, structure, tone, and attitude the symptoms of confused, inconsistent thinking, and the first stage in the decline of "classical" form. As a result, the study of Euripides has for the most part taken the less desperate path of "historical" criticism, which treats the plays primarily as documents to explain, or be explained by, contemporary events and issues, or of chronological classification by stylistic, metrical, and dramaturgic criteria.

Without impugning the merits of such studies, or even entirely abandoning them, Professor Conacher sets himself the more rewarding, if more arduous, task of interpreting Euripides precisely in and through the multiplicity and variety which others have found so intractable. In particular, Conacher insists that variety and novelty of structure and technique are functions of variety and novelty of theme. He contends that tragedy is born of a tension between the pressure of external necessity and the freedom of indi-

vidual will. Of these two essential poles of the tragedian's art, the first is expressed by Aeschylus and Sophocles in *mythic* terms, which predicate, Conacher says, "the existence of another order of reality, external and divine, above and beyond the human psyche," and which dispose events in fixed patterns "indicative of some divine plan or order in the universe." This unified vision influences form, rendering it organic within each play and consistent from play to play. By contrast, the alleged inconsistency of Euripides derives from the fact that he is independent of the mythic view and, as a consequence, able to manipulate its traditional materials with relatively fewer restrictions. The external necessity confounding heroic will is no longer identified with remote, transcendent, supernatural, and (to a literal-minded age) arbitrary agents, but located within the protean world of experience, and expressed in a variety of realistic causal terms and credible contexts. Euripidean art is prismatic; it refracts the compact mythic vision of tragic suffering into multiple aspects, each with its own particular tone, each demanding a distinctive structure. Complementing this new outlook on the necessitous order of things is Euripides' treatment of the other pole of the tragedian's art, the tragic sufferer. Since, in Aeschylus and Sophocles, the picture of the divine order confronting the hero is accepted for the most part in the shape given it by tradition, their efforts are concentrated upon the individual tragic sufferer and the catastrophe which constitutes the climax of his drama. But the energy which Euripides expends in differentiating and investigating other than traditional mythic grounds of necessity leaves the individual tragic hero somewhat diminished, at times less sharply defined, and in some cases displaced from the center of dramatic focus.

There is yet another factor accounting for the novelty and variety of Euripidean art. Since replacing the mythic outlook often involves discrediting it, scepticism and satire of literal belief in the traditional gods plays an unprecedented role, covering a wide range of modulation, from the slightly but intentionally overdrawn Aphrodite of the *Hippolytus* to the fantastic assumption of the *Helen* and the bungling providence of Apollo in the *Ion*.

What emerges, then, are several *different kinds* of tragedy, none corresponding very neatly to any historical grouping of the plays (e. g., Conacher's division, "realistic tragedy," comprises works from the beginning, middle, and end of the playwright's career, whether one uses external evidence or the internal evidence of the percentage of resolved iambic trimeters: *Medea* 431 B. C. [6.5%], *Electra* 421-15 B. C. [17%], *Orestes* 408 B. C. [39.4%]). Conacher's categories are not rigid; he modestly admits that among the plays, just as in the spectrum, there are areas of interpenetration that baffle overnice discriminations. Yet as critical scaffolding, the author's arrangement permits the plays to illuminate one another more fully than any strictly genetic approach would do. Conacher's study of themes and structures accordingly takes the form of a "decentration" from the more traditional and "classical" ("mythological") *Hippolytus* and *Bacchae* through the "near-mythical" *Heracles* to the political and social tragedies (*Supp.*, *Herac.*), war tragedies (*Troad.*, *Hec.*, *Andr.*), and "realistic tragedies" (*Med.*,

Et., Or.). Three final divisions are set up to include plays in which a strictly tragic effect is aborted, diluted, or inverted: "tragédie manquée" (*Ph., IA*), "romantic tragedy" (*Ion, Hel., IT*), and "satyric (and pro-satyric?) drama" (*Cyc., Alc.*).

Even in the plays of his first classification Conacher finds that the literal framework of the myth affirmed in the prologue and epilogue is so undermined by the natural psychological dynamics of the dramatic action that Aphrodite and Dionysus become more obviously symbolic of powers (perhaps no less necessitous) within human nature and experience. In the *Heracles*, we are not even invited to interpret Hera symbolically: her irrational and fortuitous incursion into the career of Heracles, together with the structural violence that reflects it, serves to demolish any conception of cosmic order. Once presented, it proves to be dispensable scaffolding for the poet's more pressing concern: a humanity more estimable than the gods of myth as literally understood, and capable of heroic recovery from the most unpredictable shocks existence can offer.

In the political, social, and war tragedies divine causality is either entirely absent or, where it does appear, plays an even more diminutive role than in the *Heracles*. Although, to be sure, there may be in varying degrees what Conacher calls "disturbing flashes of . . . iconoclasm which Euripides allows to play around his central theme," the poet is for the most part concerned with suffering fully explicable in terms of man's dealings with his fellow men. As in the *Heracles*, catastrophe is less important than the response it elicits. Where it is possible to compare Euripides with Sophocles in their treatment of equivalent mythic subject-matter (as Euripides' *Supp.* with Sophocles' *Ant.*, and Euripides' *Andr.* with the probable contents of Sophocles' *Hermione*) Conacher notes a tendency of the younger poet to intellectualize, "socialize," and secularize a situation which in Sophocles involves religious issues and the fate of individuals. Conacher also sees in the idealized political themes of the *Supp.*, *Heracl.*, and to a lesser extent the *Andr.* a diluting of universal and properly tragic effects.

Conacher next considers "realistic" tragedies, which he calls the antithesis of the "mythological" tragedies, "for though like them they deal with individual and self-destroying tragic sufferers, they do so in realistic terms of individual psychology and environment which finds little use, except at certain isolated moments, for myth even in its symbolic uses." For his *Medea* Euripides is represented as having transformed untragic material—an inhuman witch from the folktale tradition—into a tragic sufferer whose maternal anguish and better judgments are overwhelmed by her passion for vengeance. The poet's *Electra*, in sharp and seemingly intentional contrast with the *Electra*'s of his predecessors, is a neurotic bent on matricide, propelled by a vindictiveness which is greater than and quite independent of divine command or paternal loyalty. Similarly, the *Orestes* shows us a "sub-hero," initially unbalanced not by Erinyes but by the tension between homicidal vengefulness and remorse, who plays out what Conacher describes as "an unconscious process of self-revelation in which what Orestes turns out to be at the end is what, for all his remorseful self-shielding, he really was at the beginning, the monster (as Euripides saw him) who could murder his mother."

Parody and satire of literally accepted myth play a greater role in Conacher's last three divisions. These include plays which are non-tragic for a variety of reasons: lack of thematic concentration, happy resolutions, impossible or incredible situations, paradoxical confrontations between myth and reality or between reality and rhetoric, and technical virtuosity for its own sake. Yet even the most frivolous of them have, as Conacher observes, "a disturbing way of hinting at a state of affairs more real but less palatable than the ones presented in the actions of the plays."

The space allotted for the presented review does not make feasible a detailed critique of Conacher's discussion and analysis of the individual plays. Suffice it to say that his is judicious and stimulating criticism at its best. Where a reader may now and again find himself in disagreement with the author, it will be over subtle shades of emphasis about which reasonable men will perhaps always differ. In surveying the critical history and inherited *crucis* of each play, Conacher's austere economy will gratify the specialist. But in his discussion of "the myth" and its uses in Aeschylus and Sophocles, some readers may be disconcerted by his brevity and generalization; in particular, they may (like Zuntz [pp. 36 f., 79 f.] and Winnington-Ingram [pp. 85 f.] in *Euripide, Entretiens sur L'Antiquité Classique*, VI) question the validity of the antithesis which Conacher draws between reality and myth and between the natural and the supernatural. One would like to have seen a somewhat fuller discussion of the following points: the Aristophanic interpretation of Euripides and what influence literally accepted myth might have had on moral attitude and behavior among his contemporaries; the relationship between Euripides and Socrates-Plato in revealing the bankruptcy of myth and in counterbalancing it; the inevitable difficulty encountered by Euripides in achieving universality in the twilight zone between myth and philosophy; the relationship between the breakdown of myth and the breakdown of the *polis*, and how this affects Euripides' attitude toward his citizen-audience; what *essential* difference of meaning is introduced by transforming a mythical agency into a psychological or environmental necessity in the face of which the individual sufferer is no less impotent. Further, one is surprised not to find, either in the discussion or in the bibliography (except on the *Cyc.*), any mention of Arrowsmith's suggestive essays on Euripides, especially "A Greek Theater of Ideas" (*Arion*, II [1963], pp. 32-56) and the introductions to his translations of the *Ba.*, *HF*, *Hec.*, and *Or.* And it is a pity that no one took the trouble to index this book.

The following *errata* were noticed. P. 7, line 36: for "p. 68" read "p. 168"; line 40: close parentheses at end of sentence. P. 20: for "her child Neoptolemus" read "her child *by* Neoptolemus." P. 21, line 38: for "chapter 8" read "chapter 9." P. 42: for "Thesueus" read "Theseus." P. 102: for "σῶζῆ" read "σώζῆ." P. 107, line 4: for "see" read probably "say" [trans. of λέγειν], and for "911-13" read "913-15." P. 112: for "Demaphon" read "Demophon." P. 113: for "Iophon" read "Iolaus." P. 117, lines 20 ff.: "Alceme, widow of Heracles," etc. is, of course, quite wrong. P. 119, line 31: for "note 16" read "note 17." P. 150: for "Hecubas" read "Hecuba's." P. 152, line 35 (and p. 162, line

39) : for "Matthiae" read "Matthaei" [Louise Matthaei is meant here, not Auguste Matthiae]. P. 161: for "θεοὺς" read "θεοῦς." P. 185 (and p. 186) : for "Creophilos" read "Creophylos." P. 230: for "Wecylein" read "Wecklein." P. 240: for "ῆ" read "ῆ." P. 241: for "ä" read "ä." P. 249, line 28: for "Phoenissae" read "Iphigeneia at Aulis." P. 252, note 6; for "Aulis'" read "Aulis." P. 287, line 27: for "Odysseus" read "Menelaus." P. 321: for "τοὺς" read "τοῦς." P. 355: for "EGP" read "EGF."

JOHN J. PERADOTTO.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO.

REGULA FREI-STOLBA. Untersuchungen zu den Wahlen in der römischen Kaiserzeit. Zürich, Juris Druck & Verlag, 1967. Pp. 299. Paper, Swiss Fr. 48. (Diss.).

Dr. Frei-Stolba (hereafter F-S.) offers an admirable study of elections to the magistracies from the later republic through the reign of Trajan. She is fully familiar both with the ancient sources and with modern scholarly literature. An only, and minor, complaint might be that the style is at times wordy and the conclusions hard to disentangle from the argument.

F-S. opens with an introduction on previous research into the topic and on discussions of the *Tabula Hebana*. In her first chapter, she reviews procedures for and conduct of elections during the later republic. Since she holds that the meanings of terms then used and the general procedures were revived by Augustus, this chapter merits somewhat full analysis. She follows Prof. L. R. Taylor in regarding the tribal organization as basic to campaigning for election in either *comitia*. She also accepts the modern emphasis on the rule of family-centered *factiones* behind the façade of electoral procedures. She defines the various terms used. *Profectio* was the application of a candidate to a qualified magistrate for inclusion on the list which the magistrate would eventually present to the assembly. *Nominatio* was used in Cicero's day for the proposal by a competent person of a candidate for election to one of the religious colleges. Under the empire it came to be used also for proposal for election to a civil magistracy. *Suffragatio* meant the oral recommendation of a candidate either in a set speech or, more often, by a simple statement of support or by a request (*prex*) that the candidate be elected. Finally, *commendatio*, which, since Mommsen, has been regarded as under the empire a binding recommendation for the election of a candidate, was used by Cicero in the general sense of "recommendation" and was practically synonymous with *suffragatio*, though usually written, not oral. Hence, through the succeeding chapters, F-S. argues that Mommsen's position that imperial *commendatio* had from the time of Augustus by actual law a binding force should be given up, though naturally