Specifically, the insistence throughout the play on words for 'hand', especially in connection with Ajax himself, is related to a focus on the legal status of Ajax as *autocheir*. The discussion of *autocheiria* is informed and valuable, but does not include reference to the important treatment of the concept by David Daube, 'The Linguistics of Suicide', *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 1 (1972), 401–5.

More directly related to the topic of the volume, Ciappi's contribution reviews the evidence for the reconstruction of Soph. *Niobe* and argues well that Ovid (*Met*. 6.146–312) has followed Soph.'s version closely, except that Ovid has in one important detail abandoned his model, in which, according to the reconstruction followed by Ciappi, one of Niobe's daughters had been spared. It enhances the pathos of the Ovidian scene in which Niobe unsuccessfully shields her youngest daughter if Ovid has first established an expectation that he was faithfully following the Sophoclean version. In his otherwise excellent discussion of Ovid's narrative detailing the slaughter of Niobe's sons, which Ciappi shows to have the character of a tragic messenger-speech, he unaccountably fails to mention (p. 156 n. 20) by far the most closely parallel instance, the speech of the Paedagogus in *El*., with its Pythian setting, its athletic and equestrian subject-matter, and its affecting description of the bystanders' reactions.

The volume's only contribution not in Italian is the French article by Thévenaz, which seeks to explain the almost total absence of the figure of Oedipus from Latin literature before Seneca and then discusses Sen. *Oedip*. Thévenaz well observes (p. 182) that the pattern of Seneca's tragedy, with its movement from the personal to the public realm, reverses that of the Sophoclean original. Finally, Boschetti describes the development of a digitization project, facilitated by the availability of a lemmatized text of Aeschylus supplied by the Centre Informatique de Philosophie et Lettres in Liège, using XML marking. A repertory of conjectures, from Wecklein, Dawe, and other sources, is being added and the Aeschylean text is being marked for syntactic, semantic, metrical, morphological, phonological, and other features.

Boschetti's is the only paper in the volume that concerns itself with Aeschylus, but it does not really treat the ancient textual tradition or 'reception' of that author. The remaining papers deal much more fully with Euripides than with Sophocles. This is perhaps appropriate given the extraordinary popularity of Euripides in antiquity, but I suspect that the emphasis on the younger playwright has more to do with his 'reception' among contemporary critics, especially among younger ones. While none of the papers is truly outstanding, all are at least competent and some are a good deal more than that.

University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign DAVID SANSONE
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni023

SATYR DRAMA

P. CIPOLLA: *Poeti minori del dramma satiresco.* Testo critico, traduzione e commento. (Supplementi di *Lexis* 23.) Pp. x + 447. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert Editore, 2003. Paper. ISBN: 90-256-1179-6.

In the wake of the recent flurry of publications on satyr drama, and given that tragic and satyric fragments are undifferentiated in *TrGF*, the need to overhaul Steffen's *Satyrographorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (1952) became urgent. Following, among

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni024 Published online by Cambridge University Press

others, Pechstein's *Euripides Satyrographos* (1998) and the comprehensive *Das griechische Satyrspiel* by Krumeich *et al.* (1999), the process of substitution is now happily furthered by P. Cipolla's ambitious new volume, which comprises critical text, facing Italian translation and in-depth commentary on all satyrographers of whom substantial fragments survive, excluding the Triad. The following list of poets included in Steffen is excluded in C.: Choerilus, Harmodius, Phrynichus, Polemaeus, Polyphrasmon, Theodorus, Theodotus, Timesitheus, and Xenocles. Adespota are also excluded.

C. has innovated in terms of format in various ways. The main novelty is to expand the context of the fragments cited—the gains from this practice are not always apparent—and additionally to cite the full text of Athenaeus' Epitome, wherever meaningful divergence from the Marcianus occurs (but this happens only rarely). The book is organized by author or groups of authors; commentaries follow immediately after the respective texts. Commentaries are often capped by extensive essays, some previously published, tackling specific issues. Among these, I single out (i) the piece on the attribution of the 'Sisyphus'-fragment (pp. 247–68), a longish *status quaestionis*, which endorses Pechstein's novel but unverifiable idea that the fragment belongs not to a play entitled *Sisyphus* (by Critias or whoever), but to Euripides' *Autolycus*; and (ii) the excursus on the dating of Python's *Agen* (pp. 347–60): C. cogently opts for 326 against Snell's 324 B.C. Introductions and *testimonia* to individual authors precede the texts. A brief 'panorama' of satyr drama as a genre, lucid and concise if conventional, introduces the book. A major inconvenience is, in a long and diverse book, the omission of an index.

C.'s text is based on autopsy of all the main codices of Athenaeus and **N**, **L** of Sextus Empiricus, but only on indirect reporting of Hesychius and Pollux manuscripts. The apparatus is generally more comprehensive and informative than both Steffen and Snell-Kannicht. Deviations between C. and previous editions are not numerous. In the absence of a comparative table of readings (there is only a *tavola comparativa* of fragment numbers), I catalogue the most important differences between C. and *TrGF* I for the reader's convenience in Table 1. Full discussions and doxographies of textual problems are provided in C.'s commentary (see also P. Cipolla, 'Alcune osservazioni sul testo dei satirographi minori', *Eikasmos* 14 [2003], 63–74).

C.'s text is generally of high quality. Most of the points listed above constitute improvements on Sn.-K. (usually by restoring the paradosis), though the occasional glitch is not avoided. Among the most confusing is Achaeus, fr. 15 (= PHerc 1609 I, ll. 10–15 = Phil. *De piet.* p. 48 Gomp.). C. adopts Luppe's new reconstruction of the papyrus (*Philologus* 129 [1985], 188–91), but fails to note that, as it stands, the new fragment does not correspond with fr. 16b Sn.-K. (= PHerc 1609 I, ll. 15–20). Luppe takes Ἀχαιός (papyrus l. 15) to be the last word of the sentence beginning with ἢ ὡς in l. 10 rather than the first word of the sentence ending with Ὅμ[ηρος in l. 20 (Philippson, *Hermes* 55 [1920], 260, followed by Sn.-K.). Neither C.'s apparatus nor his commentary points out this non-correspondence.

An uncomfortably large number of misprints also strike a jarring note (Adolf Hakkert has generally let C. down; the sheet of corrigenda that accompanies the book is just the tip of the iceberg: two whole pages, 71 and 74, were blank in the copy I examined). I here list only corruptions in text and *testimonia*:

p. 40: Pratinas, fr. 1 (=1 Sn.-K.): ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ πέρδικες. Read: ὡς καὶ οἱ πέρδικες.
p. 110: Ion, frr. 6–7, 8 (=23, 22 Sn.-K.): ἀλλὰ μὲν οὐδὲ. Read: ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni024 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1

Fragments	C.	Snell–Kannicht
Pratinas, fr. 1 (=1 Sn.-K.)	*φωνάεντες*	*φωνήεντες*
Pratinas, fr. 3, 12 (=3 Sn.-K.)	*ὀλοσιαλοκάλαμον*	*ὀλεσιαλοκάλαμον*
Achaeus, fr. *2 (=4 Sn.-K.)	*ποδῶν*	†*ποδῶν*
Achaeus, fr. 14 (=15 Sn.-K.)	*Ἄλκμαίωνι*	*Ἀλκμέωνι*
Achaeus, fr. 15 (16b Sn.-K.)	Luppe's reconstruction. PHerc 1609 I, 10–15	Philippson's reconstruction. PHerc 1609 I, 15–20
Achaeus, fr. 16, 5 (=17 Sn.-K.)	*ναί·* <*καὶ*> (Casaubon)	*ἠνίκα* (Kaibel)
Achaeus, fr. 18 (=20 Sn.-K.)	*καὶ μα*[*νί*]*ᾳ κατά*[*σ*]*χετον* (Schmidt)	*καὶ μά*[*λ*᾽] *ἀκατάσχετον* (Nauck)
Achaeus, fr. 26 (=27 Sn.-K.)	*πολὺς* {*γὰρ*} <. . .> *ὅμιλος ποντίου κύκλου σοβῶν* / <×-⏑-×?> *ἐνάλιος θεωρία*	*πολὺς* †*γὰρ ὅμιλος* / *πόντιος κυκλοσοβῶν, ἐνάλιος θεωρία*
Critias, fr. 1 (=19 Sn.-K.)	*κατεῖδεν* (codd.)	*κατεῖδον* (Snell)
Chaeremon, fr. 2 (=10 Sn.-K.)	*θηρώμε*<*ναι μέ*>*νοντα* (Lorenzoni)	*θηρώμε*<*ναι* ×>*οντα*

p. 118: Ion, fr. 17 (=32 Sn.-K.): *θίασος τὸ ἀθροιζόμενον*. Read: *θίασός ἐστι τὸ ἀθροιζόμενον*.
p. 120: Ion, fr. 18 (=33 Sn.-K.): *Αἰσχύλος. . .φησί* (F540). Read: F450 Sn.-K.
p. 150: Achaeus, fr. 10 (=11 Sn.-K.): *Δημέτριος*. Read: *Δημήτριος*.
p. 150: Achaeus, fr. 11, 12 (=12-13 Sn.-K.): *ἐπισκόπτουσι*. Read: *ἐπισκώπτουσι*.
p. 154: Achaeus, fr. 16, 5 (=17 Sn.-K.): *ἐκποδῶν*. Read: *ἐκποδών*.
p. 162: Achaeus, fr. 28 (=29 Sn.-K.): *Ἄρης λῃστής*. Read: *Ἄρης ὁ λῃστής*.
p. 164: Achaeus, fr. 30, 4 (=33 Sn.-K.): *κερύσσετον*. Read: *κηρύσσετον*.
p. 294: Theodectes, fr. 1 (=6 Sn.-K.): *Θεσέως*. Read: *Θησέως*.

C.'s commentary is nothing if not thorough and meticulous, even if its own fastidiousness makes it appear, at points, rather overstretched (some notes read like essays in their own right). C. exposes himself to criticism only rarely on issues of substance, e.g. (i) Achaeus, *Linus*, pp. 211ff.: a reference to Alexis' *Linus*, apparently the only other ancient play with Linus as its main subject, would be welcome; (ii) Astydamas, *Heracles Satyricus*, p. 305: 'contengono un paragone fra l'arte del poeta scenico e quella del cuoco'. This metaphor is excellently treated by E. Gowers, *The Loaded Table. Representations of Food in Roman Literature* (Oxford 1993), pp. 50–108; (iii) Lycophron, *Menedemus*, fr. 1, 5: *κατέχω δεδειπνηκώς*: Snell takes

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni024 Published online by Cambridge University Press

κατέχω to be an equivalent of *μέμνημαι*, Latte as a periphrastic present perfect (*κατέχω* = *ἔχω*). For C. the verb 'si referisce alle cene consummate da Sileno in altri occasioni, cene che egli non può più affermare di "avere dentro la pancia" '. C.'s interpretation sounds over-literal. In fact, *κατέχω* here seems to mean plainly 'know perfectly well', 'I am well aware that'. Lycophron's usage may well be one of the earliest attestations of a sense that became very common in medieval Greek, cf. Kriaras, *Λεξικὸ τῆς Μεσαιωνικῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Δημώδους Γραμματείας 1100–1169*, Vol. VIII, *s.v.* *κατέχω* 9*β*.

But this is small print. Overall, C.'s work successfully fills a gap and should become a standard reference on the 'minor' satyrographers, even if the quality of the publishing detracts something from its value.

Trinity College, Cambridge ANTONIS K. PETRIDES
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni024

TRAVESTIES OF MYTH

F. Casolari: *Die Mythentravestie in der griechischen Komödie.* (Orbis Antiquus 37.) Pp. xiv + 333. Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 2003. Paper, €48. ISBN: 3-402-05416-7.

'Eine vollständige Abhandlung über das Phänomen der Mythentravestie im allgemeinen liegt nicht vor', writes C. (p. 12) at the beginning of her discussion of previous work on the subject. Unfortunately this is as true after the publication of this book, a slightly revised version (p. xiii) of the author's doctoral dissertation, as it was before. C. aims to trace the development of mythical travesty—defined (pp. 7–10), following Rau, as a comic imitation of a mythical story in which the mythical characters retain their names and identities but their personalities and actions are distorted and degraded—through all the chronological and regional varieties of Greek comedy (and, in certain chapters, satyr-drama too); she does not, however, attempt to cover every play or every mythical theme, but proceeds 'anhand bedeutender Beispiele' (p. xiii). These examples comprise about a dozen plays, from Epicharmos to Alexis (with a notable concentration on Kratinos, specifically *Odyssês*, *Nemesis*, and *Dionysalexandros*), and four key mythical characters, Dionysos, the Cyclops, Odysseus, and Herakles. In the last three cases an attempt is made to set comedy's portrayal of these characters against the background of the whole history of their presentation since Homer or even earlier. What is not attempted anywhere is to use the selected plays and themes as a framework to aid the understanding of *all* our evidence about mythical travesty in comedy: between two-thirds and three-quarters of the hundreds of known comedies of this type are not so much as mentioned, and astonishingly, no significant use is made of our most extensive single item of evidence for mythical travesty in ancient comedy, the *Amphitruo* of Plautus.

The overall conclusion is unsurprising and unexciting: that travesty gives 'human traits' to gods and heroes and reduces them to a 'human level' (p. 297)—or more precisely, it exploits and exaggerates 'human weaknesses' which were already detectable in their traditional and/or epic personae, while downplaying or altogether ignoring their more elevated characteristics. This tendency reaches its fullest development in Middle Comedy, but is already strong in Epicharmos and Kratinos; the latter, however, and some other Old Comedians, can also use mythical travesty to attack Perikles and

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni024 Published online by Cambridge University Press