bibliography in German, Italian, French, and English, but it is importantly available for those who do. That said, the notes seldom presume much prior knowledge and, if at times slightly dense, they will surely be accessible to readers of all levels. In the preface to this book the author states that he will be content if ‘the result is useful to students of the Classics, ancient religion, and mythology, and also attractive to the general reader’. C. should be rather pleased.

Merton College, Oxford

ANDREW T. FAULKNER


This book comprises Evans’s thesis, published by Turku University and unrevised, as far as I can tell, except for the addition of a long and woefully inadequate list of corrigenda. The burden of E.’s thesis is to show that the lay of Ares and Aphrodite is a defective hymn—by which he means it has no dedication to a god and a delayed farewell—accompanied by dance and lyre-playing. The evidence he adduces in support of this argument consists primarily of a comparison of the lay with middle-length *Homeric Hymns*. His approach is potentially compelling, though the philological work is not executed with the precision and rigor that is evinced in his technical discussion of the musical form of the Delphic paeans (pp. 152–5). Along the way, he describes the historical development of the term *hymnos*, the origin of Greek epic, the rôle of dance in hymnic performance, and the evolution of the lyre and techniques for playing it. These topical chapters bring together interesting, if not always new, material, but are not integrated satisfactorily into E.’s larger argument and, moreover, suffer frequently from imprecise language, indiscriminate use of popular and scholarly sources, and broad-brush treatment. E.’s argument is further rendered less cogent by his tendency to coin terms, such as ‘split unity’ (p. 68), without explicating them, to interpret poetics on a teleological axis (e.g. the ‘burlesque tone’ of Demodocus’ second lay is ‘primitive’ [p. 68]), and to accept as premises notions such as a ‘Greek national temperament’ (p. 68).

Brooklyn College and The Graduate Center, CUNY

DONNA WILSON


In view of the large number of publications on Cassandra, not only entire books devoted to her but also many articles and portions of books on her portrayal in specific authors, some may well ask whether another study could add much of importance. To this I would answer that Mazzoldi’s book, a revised doctoral dissertation from the University of Urbino, is indeed a significant contribution.

She discusses Cassandra from Homer to Lycophron under two headings, first as *parthenos* and then as *mantis*, and analyses the sources, both literary and artistic, in essentially chronological order. When passages contain textual or syntactical problems, these are treated with exemplary thoroughness and sound judgement, and she is not afraid to admit that in some instances the interpretation must remain unresolved. To give just one example of her thoroughness, consider her treatment of Pindar’s *Paean* 8a. One might assume that Rutherford in his *Pindar’s Paeans* (Oxford, 2001) would leave little room for further analysis, but whereas he devotes six pages to the fragment, she devotes twice as many. Mere length, of course, is not necessarily an indication of more thorough or perceptive treatment, but here and generally elsewhere it is. It is only when she turns to Lycophron that I think she should have been more concise. Too much of what she says about his poem is simply descriptive and not analytical.

Given that Cassandra is a figure in a relatively large number of sources, in some of which, especially Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon*, the bibliography is extensive, it is very impressive to see not only how thoroughly and fairly she covers the material but also how capable she is of independent judgement. A good illustration of the latter is her discussion of *Agam. 1202–7* (pp. 108–9). Virtually everyone has accepted Musgrave’s transposition of v. 1203 after 1204, but she defends...