

literature will be grateful to A. for making this amusing burlesque available again in print.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

JOHN VAIO

J. B. HAINSWORTH. *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1968. Pp. ix, 147. \$5.95.

A series of separate papers preceding this study aroused interest that the book sustains. Hainsworth offers both a revision and an extension of Parry's researches. The received definition of formula is mostly rejected. In its place we have the word-group. "Association" between the words, their "mutual expectancy," comes forward as one of the essential properties of formulas. Were the fixed metrical shapes of such exclusive importance, Hainsworth would not be able to demonstrate that in one case about 30%, in another 25%, of the formulas of two frequent shapes are "flexible." Flexible means that the position of the same formulas within different verses is mobile, that the order of words in a formula may be changed, that the formula may be lengthened or contracted, finally that the contents of the formula may be split apart by intrusive words. The demonstration of these properties is achieved by concentrating on noun-epithet formulas of common nouns. The chief criticism (perhaps exaggerated) of Parry is directed toward his too rigid schematism derived from the dazzling completeness of name-epithet formulaic systems. Analogists are criticized for extrapolating from the fixed metrical shapes that to Hainsworth seem less crucial.

Method and detail in such studies as this are all important. Here the demonstration is founded on counts of selected phenomena that are exhaustive within clear limits. The method, essentially Parry's own, immediately raises this study above more speculative analyses. Careful reading is demanded because of the detailed argument and statistics, but also because Hainsworth writes in a clear but compressed style, an odd combination of the ruminative and the geometric. The book's brevity conceals voluminous research. The ideas are important, the details exciting. The terms "flexibility" and "association" have been given strong credentials. Thanks to Mr. Hainsworth they should begin to circulate with profit in serious discussions of Homer.

H. G. EDINGER

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

WALTER KAUFMANN. *Tragedy and Philosophy*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968. Pp. xix, 388. \$6.95.

The fundamental fact of tragedy, Kaufmann argues, lies in its presentation of suffering as universal and inherent in existence itself. Tragedy cannot be reduced to a single type. Philosophers' attempts to systematize and moralize are inadequate.

The thesis is admirable, as is the concern with the humane relevance of Greek (and all) tragedy today. Unfortunately, the book is loosely organized, annoyingly prolix and repetitive, full of needless, petty polemics. Kaufmann tends to set up straw men and announce common-sense views as great discoveries

(e.g. 174-182 on Aeschylean "optimism," 236ff. on *deinos* in *Antig.* 332ff.). He is at his best when interpreting Hegel, Nietzsche, Brecht, and Hochhuth. Only two Greek plays, *Oedipus Rex* and *Antigone*, get adequate discussion. Euripides receives a scant, unsatisfactory twenty pages. The two initial chapters on Plato and Aristotle are, like most of the book, fairly intelligent and well-informed, but also, like most of the book, much more conventional than Kaufmann supposes. What is valuable lies in four chapters: "Toward a New Poetics" (3), "The Riddle of *Oedipus*" (4), "Shakespeare and the Philosophers" (9), "Tragedy Today" (10).

Kaufmann's knowledge of antiquity extends beyond the handbooks and popular translations, but not always far enough: witness his uncritical use of the Aeschylean *vita*, the judgment on Athens' "well-being and smugness" from 480 to 440, Achilles' "vivid sense of shame" in *Iliad* 24, the repeated mistranslation of Sophocles' *Electra* 1080, and the dubious pronouncements on that play, the *Ion*, etc. The modern perspective sheds some light back on Greek tragedy. Yet Kaufmann, with all his claims for the "philosophical dimension" and his tone of arrogant superiority to classicists, seldom gets below the surface.

As *haute vulgarisation*, the book is fairly good. As philosophical criticism, though more significant than much that is written on Greek tragedy, it is superficial and disappointing.

BROWN UNIVERSITY

CHARLES SEGAL

JOHN GRIFFITH PEDLEY. *Sardis in the Age of Croesus*. ("The Centers of Civilization Series," 24.) Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1968. Pp. xiii, 146; 4 maps. \$2.95.

Sardis, "acknowledged capital of one of the most powerful, richly endowed, and expressive countries of the world," from 650 to 550 B.C., stands forth, in this readable and informative little book, as something more than a bit of archeological refabrication of artifacts. Professor Pedley has both a catholicity of interests and a breadth of knowledge which presents the major contributions of Lydian activity and culture and makes this city seem again like a community of people, not just of collated facts.

Professor Pedley also writes so smoothly and lucidly that the modern reader gets added insight into the factors entering into the development of a people's culture and of their political and economic life as well. For the classicist he supplies some basic and revealing data; for the student of modern urban life he also provides a stimulating background for an approach to contemporary urban advancement.

JACKSONVILLE UNIVERSITY RICHARD K. MORTON

In writing advertisers, please mention CW.
