

Sophocles' *Trachiniae* and Euripides' *Phoenissae*, producing in some cases texts that seem arguably more dramatic than postdramatic. The final chapter in Part I turns to the work of Australian playwright Tom Holloway, who adapted Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* in order to explore the difficulties that contemporary soldiers experience upon war and repatriation. Again, the postdramatic was more clearly realized through postdramatic performance.

In Part II, Cole focusses on performances collaboratively devised by an ensemble of performers (The Wooster Group's 2002 *To You, the Birdie!* and The Hayloft Project's 2010 *Thyestes*), arguing that in analysing such a political theatre it is important to include the idea of a 'politics of form' (189–90) and an interrogation of modern values and stereotypes.

In Part III, the author discusses devised pieces of work performed outside traditional theatrical spaces, following uncanonical and durational formats, namely, ZU-UK's overnight, immersive reception of Euripides' *Medea* (*Hotel Medea*, 2009–2012) and Jan Fabre's 24-hour *Mount Olympus* (2015). Such productions (which meet the traditions and techniques of the Environmental Theatre of the sixties), put their audiences 'in a dialogic and revelatory relationship with the original plays' (30), creating ideological and 'intellectual emancipation' (31).

Cole's monograph argues programmatically that 'postdramatic reinventions can appear to test the limits of reception ... and constitute a significant, political form of classical reception' (31). The political, of course, is not new (or not exclusively postdramatic) in the receptions of Greek tragedy, and it cannot be solely accepted as *the* indicative factor of postdramatic receptions. There are two indicative elements which render most of the works discussed in Cole's book broadly postdramatic, if we must choose from Hans-Thies Lehmann's plethora of characteristics (*Postdramatic Theatre*, trans. by Karen Jurs-Munby (London and New York 2006), 90): (a) the refusal of the normalized forms and (b) the *deforming figuration* of a classical text. But generally, Cole's interest lies in the textual transformations of classical tragedy and its theatrical reinventions, which affect a significant experience of sensations, ideological stimuli and performative energies.

Undoubtedly, this well-written book is a significant contribution to classical reception studies, mostly because it enriches the philological and philosophical study of tragedy with new analytical tools that broaden its interpretation. In some cases, the book tries to fit dramatic texts to postdramatic stage 'realizations' or reinvent environmental performances in found spaces as mainly postdramatic, hoping to canonize a new type of political reception of tragedy (that can historically be rendered as somehow typical). The performances discussed in the book, as Cole maintains in the conclusion, 'have pushed both the tragic genre and the postdramatic style in new directions' (277) which are neither very new or very deforming (before and after Bertolt Brecht, or after Heiner Müller, the most postdramatic of them all).

GEORGE SAMPATAKAKIS
University of Patras
Email: gsampatak@upatras.gr

CONNELL (S.) (ed.) **The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Biology**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. Pp. xvii + 355. £85. 9781107197732.
doi:[10.1017/S0075426923000824](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426923000824)

The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Biology, edited by Sophia M. Connell, is a valuable and significant addition to the Companion collection. The essays in this volume offer engaging exegeses of various aspects of Aristotle's biology and orient the reader in key

interpretative debates in current scholarship. In this respect, the guides to further reading following each chapter are also very useful resources. Beyond exposition, many of the contributors advance their own arguments about the questions at hand, which will undoubtedly encourage further fruitful discussion. This is, accordingly, an excellent collection for the newcomer and specialist alike.

The volume contains 18 chapters by well-known scholars. After Connell's introduction, where the integration of Aristotle's biology with the rest of his philosophy is emphasized, chapters 1–3 contextualize his biology relative to his theology (Monte Ransome Johnson) and his predecessors (Karel Thein, Hynek Bartoš). Chapters 4–6 introduce the methodology (Mariska Leunissen, Devin Henry) and teleological perspective (Jessica Gelber) underlying Aristotle's study of biology. Chapters 7–11 discuss the activities of living beings, beginning with their ontological status (Charlotte Witt), moving to the activities fundamental to living beings, nutrition and reproduction (R.A.H. King, Connell), then to activities characteristic of animals, perception and self-motion (Cynthia Freeland, Klaus Corcilus). Chapters 12–13 explore the difference between the nonhuman and human by considering the various cognitive capacities of animals (Connell) and the influence of Aristotle's biological theses on his politics and ethics (Elena Cagnoli Fiecconi). Chapters 14–17 turn to the western reception of Aristotle's biology, from his early successors (Myrto Hatzimichali) to later antiquity (Andrea Falcon), to a comparison with Darwin (David Depew) and contemporary biology (Denis Walsh). An afterword by James G. Lennox (Chapter 18) on the history and legacy of *Philosophical Issues in Aristotle's Biology* (Cambridge 1987), edited by himself and Allan Gotthelf, closes the volume. As the richness and variety of this collection make it impossible for me to address each chapter individually, I will instead highlight a few which I find to be exemplary of the project.

Hynek Bartoš' contribution (Chapter 3) argues (conclusively, to my mind) that Aristotle's biology is far more engaged with the Hippocratic writings than has usually been recognized. He demonstrates this by working through the instructive example of Aristotle's comments in the *Parva naturalia* on the relationship between medicine and natural philosophy. According to Bartoš, these comments, in which Aristotle takes medicine to use the explanatory principles of natural philosophy, intervene in a debate among physicians with which Aristotle expected his readers to be familiar. As Bartoš says, Aristotle's debt to the Hippocratics for the most part remains understudied and underappreciated by commentators (48–49); hence this chapter points the way forward for new and valuable research.

Devin Henry's contribution (Chapter 5) introduces the reader to a methodological issue prominently discussed by commentators: the connection between the method of Aristotle's biology and the model for scientific inquiry in his *Posterior Analytics*. Henry analyses the discussion in *Parts of Animals* of the methods to be used for defining animals and offers a satisfying interpretation of these passages by taking *Parts of Animals* on its own terms. Whereas looking at these passages through the lens of the *Posterior Analytics* might lead one to think Aristotle rejects one of the two methods discussed, Henry shows that Aristotle thinks that both methods should be used depending on context. The chapter thus illustrates an interpretative desideratum: that one should 'read the biological works in their own right first' (93).

Finally, Denis Walsh's contribution (Chapter 17) makes the intriguing case for the relevance of Aristotle's biology to contemporary biology and philosophy of biology. He argues that evolutionary biology, with its sub-organismal population thinking, needs a 'substantive theory of the organism', for which it can turn to Aristotle for inspiration (287). This speaks to the generative potential of Aristotle's biological writings; and if Walsh is right, the curious biologist might begin with Gelber's chapter (Chapter 6) for insight into Aristotle's organism-centred teleology.

This collection thus showcases many important elements of recent scholarship on Aristotle's biology. Probably its biggest impact on the field, though, will be in making the study of Aristotle's biology more accessible. As the first comprehensive introductory

volume on Aristotle's biological corpus, and one that fulfils that role admirably, it will be a reliable resource for newer students of Aristotle, scholars of other parts of Aristotle's philosophy turning to his biology and historians of biology interested in the premodern.

Lennox's afterword (Chapter 18) on *Philosophical Issues in Aristotle's Biology*, whose publication helped spark philosophical interest in the topic, underscores the progress made from past neglect of Aristotle's biological treatises to today's flourishing literature. *Philosophical Issues in Aristotle's Biology* aimed to show the relevance of the biology to the study of the rest of Aristotle's philosophy, and this Companion confirms that that aim has been achieved; yet one can hardly read this collection without also appreciating the appeal of studying Aristotle's biology for its own sake.

NORAH WOODCOCK
Princeton University
Email: norahw@princeton.edu

COX (F.) and THEODORAKOPOULOS (E.) (eds) **Homer's Daughters: Women's Responses to Homer in the Twentieth Century and Beyond** (Classical Presences). Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2019. Pp. xviii + 341. £79. 9780198802587.
doi:[10.1017/S0075426923000204](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426923000204)

The field of classical reception studies has been booming since the turn of the millennium. Yet it is not really a field at all. Rather, it is a series of interventions into the innumerable creative works that have drawn upon ancient Greek and Latin traditions unceasingly since antiquity. Given the extraordinary impact of Homer on all kinds of literary forms throughout the millennia, simply identifying various responses to Homer as being by women does little to unify the vast range of possible material. This creates a challenge for anyone who wishes, as Fiona Cox and Elena Theodorakopoulos do in the volume under review, to unite a series of articles on reception under a single umbrella.

The umbrella in question is a capacious one, covering a wide range of literary forms: novels, many different forms of poetry, intellectual and scholarly responses, various modes of adaptation and translation, even a children's book. The authors under study hail from Germany, Spain and France as well as multiple anglophone countries. Their works, too, range from the usual suspects (Margaret Atwood's *Penelopiad*, H.D.'s *Helen in Egypt*, Christa Wolf's *Cassandra*) to more recent groundbreaking works like Kate (now Kae) Tempest's hip-hop epic *Brand New Ancients* and the Welsh poet Gwyneth Lewis' *A Hospital Odyssey*. Some of these authors are not so much Homer's daughters as his grand-daughters, especially Francisca Aguirre, a female Spanish poet whose *Ítaca*, discussed here by Victoria Reuter, responds to the *Odyssey* via the male Greek Cavafy's famous treatment in his *Ithaka*.

The contributors are diverse as well. Though all female, and all based in the British Isles or North America, they are not all classicists, which produces an interesting variety of perspectives, most strikingly in the case of Emily Spiers, a lecturer in creative futures at Lancaster University who examines Kate Tempest's poetry through the lens of futures studies. They are also at various career stages, ranging from eminent scholars who participated in the groundbreaking marriage of Classics and feminism in the 1970s to freshly minted PhDs. Yet their contributions are uniformly stimulating, scholarly and polished; a credit not only to the authors but to the two editors.

In their helpful introduction, Cox and Theodorakopoulos make a virtue of diversity while providing a broader context in order to establish a unity that goes beyond mere