EURIPIDES' *CRETANS*

A.-T. COZZOLI: *Euripide:* Cretesi. *Introduzione, testimonianze, testo critico, traduzione e commento.* Pp. 129, pls. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 2001. Paper. ISBN: 88-8147-279-1.

Euripides' lost *Cretans* is noteworthy because a portion of the parodos survives in a quotation in Porphyrius, *De abstinentia* (for its reference to a meatless diet), while a parchment leaf in Berlin gave us in 1907 Pasiphae's striking rhetorical speech of exculpation and an Oxyrhynchus papyrus offered in 1962 tantalizing bits of a stichomythia that still defies convincing interpretation. Cozzoli's edition is based on a doctoral thesis written during 1994–6. Thus the edition with English translation and notes by Collard in C. Collard, M. Cropp, and K. Lee, *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays* I (Warminster, 1995) appeared during Cozzoli's work, and the Budé edition, F. Jouan and H. Van Looy, *Euripide 8: Fragments,* Part 2 (Paris, 2000), appeared while her work was being revised for publication, as did J. Diggle's text of some of the fragments in *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Selecta* (Oxford, 1998). C. refers to all of these.

The most striking new information in C.'s edition is that the Berlin parchment, which disappeared during World War II and is still recorded as lost in the other recent editions (and in Pack^3-Mertens online), was relocated by Günter Poethke in the National Museum in Warsaw in 1992 (see also the Leuven database of ancient books, http://ldab.arts.kuleuven.ac.be/). The piece is, however, still not accessible to scholars, and C. restudied this witness by using new prints from the archival negatives in Berlin (Pls III and IV). C. has also collated all the manuscripts of the chapter of Porphyrius containing the fragment of the parodos, since the most recent edition is not informative or accurate enough.

Otherwise, the edition presents material quite similar to that in Collard–Cropp–Lee and Jouan–Van Looy, but with the expansiveness to be expected of a monograph. For instance, in the introduction C. pursues the issue of Cretan cults of Zeus and Dionysus from Mycenean to classical times, and argues that Euripides' portrayal of the priests of the chorus may be close to cultic reality and not an *ad hoc* amalgamation of motifs from diverse sources. The commentary offers convenient access to the history of scholarship on the fragments, but sometimes at the cost of paying too much attention to bizarre mistakes or obscuring what view C. really judges most probable.

Some differences between C.'s judgements and those reflected in other editions may be noted here. In fr. 1, 5–8, where the testimonia offer a contorted and corrupt text and no one should be very confident of the multiply corrected text generally presented in the recent editions, C. objects to the construction of a double accusative with παρέχει, so adopts the emendation οἷς for οὕς as well as δοκός for δοκούς in 5 (governing κυπαρίσσου, retained in 8), and proposes a different transposition, taking στεγανούς (active in sense) with ἁρμούς and the latter as the object of παρέχει. The convoluted word order of this solution outweighs any benefit (if it is a benefit) from the simplification of the syntax. In fr. 1, 11, where most have recently read βούτης (after Diels) for transmitted βρο(ν)τάς and assumed this to be an alternative expression for the Orphic–Dionysiac cultic term βουκόλος, C. objects to the assumption that βούτης could be used metaphorically in this way (but why should a poet not dare a variation of this sort?), denies Orphic associations, and interprets βροντάς with τελέσας in the sense 'avendo celebrate i tuoni di Zagreo' (that is, a rite featuring the loud noise of the

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.287 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dionysiac tympana). In treating the P. Oxy. fragments, C. emphasizes (with support from Maehler) that 2461 fr. 1 cannot plausibly be placed in the same column under 2461 fr. 2, where many have wanted to place it, and she agrees (rightly) with Page and Diggle that we are unable to identify the partners in the stichomythia; and in fr. 2, 14, C. had arrived at the supplement *ταυρωπόν* independently of Diggle. In fr. 7, 20 (the famous rhesis of Pasiphae), C. unconvincingly defends the imperfect with *ἄν* of the parchment, claiming the plain imperfect is unjustified, apparently because she misunderstands the rhetoric of the passage ('If there was therefore no plausible reason for me to desire the bull, then why was it that I was crazy with this sick desire? Because of you!'). In ll. 31–3, where there are a number of possible interpretations of the governance of the genitive *τῆς σῆς γυναικός*, C. adopts an impossible punctuation and syntax for the whole phrase, as if *γάρ* could introduce a participial phrase.

There are miscellaneous minor faults in proof-reading, some in the Greek, most of which are harmless. The correct date for L. C. Valckenaer's *Diatribe in Euripidis perditorum dramatum reliquias* is 1767, not 1824 (reprint date) (p. 27). The abbreviation EV on p. 54 is not explained (Excerpta Vaticana = Constantinus VII Porphyrogenitus, *de virtutibus et vitiis*).

University of California, Berkeley DONALD J. MASTRONARDE

SATYR PLAYS

R. Krumeich, N. Pechstein, B. Seidensticker (edd.): *Das griechische Satyrspiel*. Pp. xii + 676, pls. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1999. Cased, DM 148. ISBN: 3-534-14593-8.

This collaborative enterprise originated in an advanced seminar in classical philology and archaeology, in which the contributors and editors were participants. Originally conceived as an introduction to the genre of satyr play, the scheme has developed into a much more grand project. The stated aim is to present in this single volume a completely documented account of the state of play of research on the genre, systematically working through authors and individual plays. Within these terms, narrowly conceived, they are successful. As a result, however, this is a less than an exciting or challenging read. It functions best as a reference work, to help entrants into the field to get up to speed with the main lines of enquiry, and as a bibliographic resource. For the specialist already familiar with the area, there will be less to set the juices running.

The plan of the volume is as follows. Authors are tackled chronologically, and plays alphabetically by author. *Adespota* for which an original play can be identified with some probability are treated together with the plays in question, which is a sensible approach. In addition to known authors, there are separate sections for the anonymous Atlas drama and for (other) *adespota* in general. Euripides' *Cyclops* is not handled at any length (although it is central to any global assessment of the genre), and the reader is referred to the standard commentaries, such as that by Seaford. For most individual plays, the treatment falls into five regular sections, as follows: (A) discussion of whether the play in question is a satyr play (including evidence for the date, didascalic information, etc.); (B) analysis of possible subject matter, together with text and translation of relevant literary or mythographic material; (C) text of the fragments, with a following translation and notes; (D) discussion of the archaeological evidence; and (E) an attempt to reconstruct the play. The notes in Section C are primarily critical

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.287 Published online by Cambridge University Press