

- (5) The section ‘Language and Dialect’ is a reprint from A.M. Bowie’s edition of book 8 (*Herodotus: Histories Book VIII* (Cambridge 2007), 22–27) and includes a useful brief guide to the language of Herodotus. This is understandable, since a student reading book 6 can always rely on the section on language and dialect; however, it stands somewhat at odds with the choice of excluding much of the material already discussed in the introduction to book 5.
- (6) Finally, a brief section on the Greek text of book 6 closes the introduction, where the editors signal that they have made use of Wilson’s OCT text and his *Herodotea* (Oxford 2015), while minor disagreement has been included in the apparatus criticus. This does not allow readers to identify with ease those passages where Hornblower and Pelling’s text differs from Wilson’s, but they probably regarded this point as superfluous. Finally, in their introduction the editors refer to those passages that some scholars have regarded as interpolations, namely 6.60, 6.119.2, 6.121.2–123.1, suggesting that these are signs of different stages of composition. Such issues do not usually have a yes-or-no answer, but Hornblower and Pelling’s approach seems well balanced. Another passage that could have been flagged up in the apparatus or commentary is 6.98.3, which looks very much like an interpolation by later readers and is regarded as such by most editors.

It should be remarked that the distribution of the topics in the introduction is somewhat uneven: I am afraid that those unfamiliar with the contents of book 6 will find the introduction rather hard to follow. Since many topics discussed by Hornblower in the introduction to book 5 have been omitted from the introduction here, readers should read the two introductions in sequence, which is not always practical.

The commentary is certainly the most important and rewarding part of the book. It deals with matters big and small in an accessible way; it also offers students useful remarks on Herodotean syntax and grammar. Literary criticism is its strongest aspect, and readers will profit greatly from both authors’ deep knowledge of ancient sources and experience with commentaries on Greek prose authors. Insights regarding Homeric/epic allusions (for example, 6.11.1–2, 83.1, 114, 126–27) as well as Thucydides are particularly welcome, especially since book 6 includes the only reference to Pericles in the *Histories* (at 6.131.2). Some amusing remarks scattered throughout the commentary are an effective antidote to the risk of dullness that the commentary genre often faces.

It is evident that a short review cannot do justice to the quality, richness and erudition of the present book. Students of Greek and classical scholars in general will rejoice at the publication of another fundamental tool for understanding and appreciating one of the most charming and intriguing prose authors that has come down to us.

IVAN MATIJAŠIĆ

Ca’ Foscari University of Venice

Email: ivan.matiasic@unive.it

FANTUZZI (M.) (ed.) *The Rhesus Attributed to Euripides* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 63). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. Pp. viii + 711. £130. 9781107026025.

doi:[10.1017/S007542692200043X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S007542692200043X)

Marco Fantuzzi’s edition of *Rhesus* is a most welcome addition to the Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries series. It is an impressive work of a high scholarly standard,

which crowns Fantuzzi's long-standing interest in the play. The third book on *Rhesus* to be published in less than ten years after Vayos Liapis' *A Commentary on the Rhesus Attributed to Euripides* (Oxford 2012) and Almut Fries' *Pseudo-Euripides, Rhesus* (Berlin and Boston 2014), Fantuzzi's edition substantially enriches the growing stream of critical work devoted to the play.

The book opens with an ample introduction (1–79), a large part of which deals with the much-disputed issues of *Rhesus*' authorship and chronology. The play, transmitted as part of Euripides' corpus, has long been suspected, and is nowadays widely thought, to be pseudo-Euripidean; according to Fantuzzi, it is possibly the product of a pseudonymous tragedian, or, rather, 'a text composed by one or more actors or producers from the fourth century', responsible for an extensive 'reworking of the original Euripidean play with the same title' (23). Especially through sections 3–6, Fantuzzi takes readers on a convincing *tour de force* of the reasons why a date in the fourth century, in keeping with recent scholarship, should be viewed as the likeliest one. While the evidence adduced by Fantuzzi does not amount to cogent proof of his proposed dating of *Rhesus* to the 330s (with the death of Philip II in 336 cautiously proposed as a plausible *terminus post quem*, 39–41), his arguments are certainly enough to at least tilt the balance of probability in favour of such a proposal. Fantuzzi's textual approach is also expounded in the introduction, where his critical text is said to follow that of James Diggle 'very closely' (79). A number of his deviations from Diggle's OCT constitute convincing instances of a return to the *paradosis*, each in turn lucidly argued for in the commentary: for example, at 518 Fantuzzi rightly defends the unanimously attested reading *καταλίσθητε* (implying that Hector's order to 'encamp' is addressed to Rhesus and his troops) in place of Kirchhoff's singular imperative *καταλίσθητι* (recently also favoured by Liapis and Fries); at 675 the fourfold anaphora of *βάλε*, preserved by most manuscripts, is retained (and reasonably so, especially in view of the similar sequence at *Ar. Ach.* 281–82 and of the possible allusive link between the two passages); at 875 Fantuzzi refrains from suspecting corruption in the line's second hemistich, persuasively explaining away its interpretative difficulties in the note *ad loc.* (Further notable choices in line with the *paradosis* are made, for example, at 54 and 615.) As for Fantuzzi's own interventions, in two cases he provides the text with a different, either more dramatically effective (687) or syntactically perspicuous (899), punctuation. However, his major contribution to the text will be found in the often novel interpretations of it, which are thoroughly expounded in the commentary (for example, 251b–52).

Just short of five hundred pages, the commentary is as ample as it is wide-ranging, and these two aspects are the book's greatest achievement. Fantuzzi's approach is truly 'holistic' (as per his description in the foreword, vii), in that it scrutinizes the play from a conspicuously rich variety of perspectives. The notes evenly address matters of literary analysis, interpretation, textual criticism and dramaturgy, while also analysing at length aspects of historical and material-cultural relevance, with a recurrent focus on the play's military dimension. Fantuzzi's mastery of language and of the Greek literary tradition will enable readers to appreciate the play's text to its subtlest nuances and dramatic implications. (For select examples of insightful close readings of the text, see commentary on 8, 184, 438–42, 562–64.) Just as conspicuous is Fantuzzi's practice, consistent throughout the commentary, of providing sets of literary parallels, at times remarkably ample (for example, 758–62), meant to elucidate a relevant feature or theme in the text, or to support a textual choice. Also noteworthy is a close attention to the workings of textual transmission, with meticulous discussions also of variant readings, or conjectural emendations, that are justifiably discarded (for example, 91–92, 115). More generally, Fantuzzi successfully manages to place *Rhesus* in 'dialogue' with the literary tradition, thus allowing the play's peculiarities and unconventional features (be they on the level of style, stage action or other) clearly to emerge; particularly fruitful is the discussion of the complex intertextual relationship between *Rhesus* and its epic model, *Iliad* 10 (see, for instance, Fantuzzi's

perceptive remarks concerning lines 7–10 on the chorus' opening speech and its relevance for the 'allusive or emulative intentions of the author' of *Rhesus*. An extensive bibliography (627–89), followed by a general index (690–707) and an 'Index of Greek Words Discussed' (708–11), rounds off the volume. The book is very well-produced: misprints and slips are rare and generally of a minor nature.

In sum, Fantuzzi's vast and excellent contribution to our understanding of *Rhesus*, and of its continuity with, and divergence from, the tragic tradition, positions his edition as a critical tool that both scholars and students with an interest in ancient drama will find it hard to dispense with.

FRANCESCO LUPI
 Università degli Studi di Verona
 Email: francesco.lupi@univr.it

TODD (S.C.) **A Commentary on Lysias, Speeches 12–16**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020. Pp. xii + 754. £150. 9780198851493.
 doi:[10.1017/S0075426922000441](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922000441)

The first volume of Stephen Todd's commentary on Lysias' speeches appeared in 2007 (*A Commentary on Lysias, Speeches 1–11* (Oxford)); this is the second. Like the first, the present volume is a major contribution to scholarship on Athenian law court oratory. It offers a strong foundation for future scholarly work on these five speeches (some of which have had no published commentary in English since the nineteenth century), and it will be an indispensable reference point for anyone looking at any of them for any purpose.

The second volume's organization largely matches that of the first (though there is no general introduction this time, only a brief preface). Each speech in turn receives an introduction to the main interpretative issues associated with it (with the linked speeches 14 and 15 sharing one), a translation (alongside Christopher Carey's Oxford Classical Text) and then the commentary proper. Todd's consistently accurate translations reflect (but do not simply reproduce) those he published in the relevant volume of the Texas 'Oratory of Classical Greece' series (*Lysias* (Austin 2000)); that book's very helpful introductions and notes are drawn on and sometimes adjusted or corrected in the present work.

This second volume has been especially eagerly awaited because it includes one of Lysias' best-known and most intriguing speeches, *Against Eratosthenes* (speech 12). Along with speech 13 (*Against Agoratus*), *Against Eratosthenes* is central to our understanding of the oligarchic regime of the Thirty at Athens. Todd's treatments of both speeches are authoritative while also indicating where further interpretative work on key aspects of the texts and their contexts (especially literary ones) might concentrate. His work complements Cinzia Bearzot's primarily historical commentary on these two speeches in *Lisia e la tradizione su Teramene* (Milan 1997), as it is geared to those interested in the rhetorical strategies of the speeches as well. It is also necessarily more up to date than Bearzot's work, drawing on recent scholarly developments, though a notable characteristic of both volumes of Todd's commentary to date is the author's attention to what can be gained from close engagement with both less and more familiar nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholarship as well.

Contextual aspects receive ample discussion throughout, both in the introductions and the commentary sections. For example, readers approaching speeches 12 and 13 are offered (in the case of speech 12) detailed introductory coverage (6–32) of a number of contentious issues of interpretation of the Thirty's rule and its aftermath, where Todd pays meticulous attention to the evidential problems involved. He also offers an excellent