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/53.2.288 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and exegetical, and serve mostly to back up the project of Section E. Their primary content consists of textual criticism, attribution of lines, and plot reconstruction, with material on mythological variants and some cultural context, especially where the dramatic setting involves festive or athletic contexts. The notes also extend to consider dramaturgical issues such as entrances and exits.

The general approach is clear, systematic, and logical. The downside, as may be apparent even from this summary, is that there is scope for considerable repetition here—Sections A and E and the notes in Section C have a tendency to overlap, and cross-referencing could be more efficient. This would perhaps be less obvious to readers who dip into the volume for reference rather than those working through it in a more linear fashion. Nonetheless, some more extensive editing would have been useful, at least as far as I am concerned. The same holds true for the broader and more methodological questions which crop up either in relation to the handling of the archaeological evidence or in terms of theoretical and/or generic concerns. Here the concluding sections on the reconstruction of the plays could have been tied more closely to the introductory essays, with which the volume opens.

This pair of essays survey the general picture of the genre and the problems which it raises. Bernd Seidensticker tackles literary and philological issues, covering the state of the evidence, the formal nature of the genre, its language, its typical content, themes, and *dramatis personae*, as well as a brief history of scholarship. No major surprises are sprung here and, indeed, this chapter is self-avowedly a return to work published some time previously. I did, however, find the section on the function of the genre brief and less than satisfying. Ralf Krumeich surveys the archaeological evidence, primarily vase-painting. This is perhaps the more interesting treatment of the pair, and he addresses full-square the problem of using vase-painting to reconstruct a history of the genre. For understandable reasons, I am not sure that the rest of the volume always shares the degree of caution advocated by his opening remarks.

The business of editing fragments has developed extensively in the last two or three decades, and we have reason to be particularly grateful to the respective authors of *Poetae Comici Graeci* and *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (*TrGF*). This volume does not set out to achieve the same goals, and the project it most closely resembles is the edition with commentary of Euripides' fragmentary plays by C. Collard et al. (Warminster, 1995–). However, the current volume does not gain particularly from the comparison, in terms of its organization, verbosity, and handling of the bibliography. Its organizational principles fall awkwardly between the various stools of (edition and) commentary, translation with notes, and annotated bibliography. Although there is a large (if not all-inclusive) bibliography at the end of the volume, for individual plays, bibliographic nuggets are embedded within the notes, narrative, and treatment of the authors' selected problems and controversies. I would have preferred to see a consolidated bibliography for each play. The text is taken from *TrGF* (the authors were given an advance copy of the forthcoming Euripides volume), but there is no *apparatus criticus*. This is surprising, given the emphasis on textual matters within the notes. Indeed, the rather leisurely treatment within the notes could have been greatly simplified and made much more concise with an apparatus to guide the reader. In addition, the notes are themselves tied explicitly not to the Greek text but to the translation, and, moreover, are handled as footnotes. The motivation for this seems to be to explain and justify the translation, which in places significantly extends the content of the original text, making a much more readable translation than the *TrGF* Greek. The net result is that for the editors' preferred Greek, readers need to consult the translation together with the notes, which seems a slightly convoluted way of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.288 Published online by Cambridge University Press

approaching the problem. It is, at the best of times, awkward to construct an approach to fragmentary plays, and it is near-impossible to translate fragments without making hypotheses and supplements about either sense or context. The rather curious format appears to be an understandable hedge—to provide both a minimalistic text and an easy-to-read translation for non-specialists. I would have liked to see the editors take a slightly braver line with the Greek and produce something closer to a reading text in the original, including probable supplements wherever possible. Given the existence of *TrGF*, there was scope in this volume to make something far more user-friendly. The editors acknowledge that it is a difficult balancing act to provide an in-depth guide to the field while maintaining accessibility for the student or scholar interested in Greek drama as a whole. I am not sure, on this evidence, that they have quite managed the feat.

Despite the quirks of design, the volume has a lot going for it, and I am personally delighted to have my hands on a copy. It is attractively presented, with clear font and generous supply of margins and other white space, and as such it is a pleasure to use. For researchers on satyr drama, it will save a lot of orthodox bibliographic legwork, as long as they are not looking for anything too radical. And to have a decent text of satyr plays in one volume will be convenient. Nonetheless, for the larger fragments of satyr play, not least in the hurly-burly of teaching, I already find myself plumping for the much more totable if far less comprehensive collections such as the Aeschylus and Sophocles Loebs (Weir Smyth, rev. Lloyd-Jones; Lloyd-Jones) or Diggle's select tragic fragments. This is, I think, one for the library, not the everyday bookshelf.

University of Glasgow IAN RUFFELL

PLUTUS

M. C. Torchio (ed.): *Aristofane:* Pluto. Turin: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2001. Paper, €22.66. ISBN: 88-7694-539-3.

Aristophanes' *Plutus* is often regarded, even by specialists, as something of an afterthought in the poet's career, despite its intrinsic significance as Aristophanes' last surviving play (produced in 388 B.C.). Scholars, after all, tend to conceptualize Aristophanes as a poet of Old Comedy and Athenian society of the fifth century, and *Plutus* certainly feels a little alienated, generically and culturally, from that world. No longer really Old Comedy, not quite New Comedy, it has the feel more of a transitional form that reflected the changing literary tastes of the fourth century. One sign of the relative indifference with which modern scholars have treated *Plutus* is the fact that until a few years ago there had not been a complete edition of the play, with text and full commentary, for almost a century. The year 2001, however, brought an embarrassment of *ploutoi*, with the publication of two such editions, Alan Sommerstein's final installment in his series of commentaries on all the plays, *Wealth* (Warminster, 2001), and the volume by Maria Cristina Torchio under review here.

As one might expect, there is a good deal of overlap between the two editions, especially in matters of basic information, history, and bibliography, but in other respects they complement each other in useful ways, not so much by offering markedly

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.288 Published online by Cambridge University Press