Buxton's 'Euripides' *Alkestis*: Five Aspects of an Interpretation', which is refreshingly written but less coherent than many of the other papers because it deals quite briefly with a range of different issues. The collection concludes with de Jong's 'Three Off-Stage Characters in Euripides', which argues convincingly that these characters 'despite their invisibility can move the spectators at the moment of their death' (p. 388).

The collection as a whole (attractively and accurately produced—I just noticed one rogue 'festivel' on p. 262) is a welcome addition to the series, providing as it does a stimulating and convenient point of entry into the mind and theatrical practice of Euripides ('this most controversial and polarizing of authors'—Introduction, p. 12). It will be up to the reader to judge on the basis of the evidence presented whether M.'s assumption (Preface, p. v) that Euripides is *especially* 'enigmatic, difficult and adverse' is justified.

Victoria University of Wellington JOHN DAVIDSON
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni230

EURIPIDES' SATYR PLAYS

N. Pechstein: *Euripides Satyrographos. Ein Kommentar zu den euripideischen Satyrspielfragmenten*. Pp. 400. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 3-519-07664-0.

This is a revised dissertation attended with the best possible auspices: it was originally supervised by Bernd Seidensticker and benefited from advice by Richard Kannicht. Its content has reappeared, heavily condensed and with some input from R. Krumeich, in the major collection edited by R. Krumeich, N. Pechstein, and B. Seidensticker, *Das griechische Satyrspiel* (Darmstadt, 1999), 399–478 and 552–61 (assessed by Ian Ruffell, *CR* 53 [2003], 288–90).

Content and general character of the work: an Introduction of thirty sides reviews the extent of Euripides' satyric drama, setting out, consolidating and evaluating the evidence for the seven certainly known plays in addition to *Cyclops* and two of probable status: *Autolycus A*, *Busiris*, *Epeius* (?), *Eurystheus*, *Lamia* (?), *Sisyphus*, *Skiron*, *Syleus*, and *Theristae*; but P. has no general assessment of Euripides' satyric drama, only referring (p. 10 n. 2) to the older work of Seidensticker and Seaford (in his *Cyclops*); now there is Seidensticker's revised appreciation and Krumeich's chapter on archaeological aspects of the drama, in their edited volume (pp. 1–73). The known plays are then presented in commentaries which are offered as 'philological' but which rightly embrace also full treatment of testimonia, mythological background, vase-paintings (examined with proper caution especially for *Autolycus A*), and problems of reconstruction (pp. 39–286); the order of these sections is sensible enough, and contrasts with the arrangement of both the Budé edition of Euripides' fragments (1998–2003, 4 vols) and the commentated editions of some plays by Collard, Cropp, and Lee (1995 and 2004, 2 vols). The texts of both testimonia and fragments are taken from standard editions (Nauck^2 still, unavoidably in 1998, for almost the fragments), but are given an apparatus only where the text is in doubt. There follow fragments uncertainly attributable to the nine titled plays above and a few satyric adespota (pp. 287–361); among them is the famous fragment ascribed to Critias by Nauck, Wilamowitz, and Snell–Kannicht in *TrGF* 1 43 F 19 (see below).

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni231 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Full bibliography and indexes close the volume (pp. 362–400). P. is a thorough and methodical worker, ready to examine all possible evidence afresh. He has a marked interest in the authenticity and attribution of fragments, evident particularly for those of *Autolycus*, *Sisyphus*, *Skiron*, and *Syleus*. His illustrative commentary upon content and language is competent and useful. He is restrained in 'reconstructing', for example reaching no conclusions at all for *Sisyphus* beyond airing Hourmouziades's idea of a scene between Heracles (addressed in F 673) and Sisyphus (pp. 216–17), and judging that no plot can be articulated for *Syleus*, a model test-case for ambitious reconstructors when evidence in fact seems plentiful (pp. 274–83). Scholars will find the whole book a good basis for their own interpretations and speculation; and they can test it generally against the entries in Krumeich et al. (1999, above), where they will find the testimonia and fragments also translated, and some of P.'s commentary transfigured into footnotes.

A few details. On *Autolycus A* (F 282–4, pp. 39–122), P. thinks that *Autolycus B*, a mere but definite title for us, was probably a 'tragedy with a happy end', perhaps pro-satyric like *Alcestis* (pp. 113–15, cf. pp. 39–40). He dismisses D. F. Sutton's claims for dating the satyr-play as unfounded or too speculative (pp. 40–1), and dismisses Tzetzes, *Histories* 8.435–53 Leone as an indication that Tzetzes had access to a full text of the play. Commentary on F 282.3: P., like Diggle in *TrGFS*, rightly prefers Galen's οἰκεῖν to Athenaeus' μὲν ζῆν, in a fragment 'largely about familial concerns'—the reason he gives for preferring in l. 5 Galen's εἰς ὑπεκτροφὴν πάτρας 'for ensuring his country's posterity' to Athenaeus' εἰς ὑπερβολὴν πατρός 'to exceed their father's wealth' (better, and adopted by Diggle). F 282.23–4: P. conjectures ἱστάμενος for στάς (left obelized), on the analogy of the present in comparable images of close fighting in Tyrtaeus F 12.12 West and Eur. *HF* 1176; in retaining the rest of l. 24 he does not deal with the asyndeton. The invective against athletes in F 282 is examined, especially against Xenophanes F 2 West, in a special excursus (pp. 70–85). On p. 117 P. floats a suggestion that Critias F 19 (above) may in fact come from a confrontation in *Autolycus A* between the master-thief and the arch-deceiver Sisyphus. For in presenting *Sisyphus* itself (pp. 185–217) P. rejects Wilamowitz's theory that Critias' supposed play of this name (of which F 19 is the only fragment) was substituted for Euripides' play in the ancient tradition, and was the satyr-play in Critias' tetralogy containing *Pirithous*, *Tennes*, and *Rhadamanthys*—a correct rejection, I think (see my 'The Pirithous Fragments', in J. A. López Férez, *Da Homero a Libanio. Estudios actuales sobre textos griegos II* (Madrid, 1995), pp. 183–93: unknown to P.); the rejection recurs in Krumeich et al. (1999 above), pp. 553–4. P. argues (pp. 291–318, esp. p. 295; cf. pp. 186–92) that language, style, and the supposed 'atheistic' content of F 19 permit neither its ascription nor its denial to either author; but, like myself, he follows the balance of the evidence in favouring Euripides. In his commentary he interprets F 19.16 τὸ θεῖον εἰσήγησεν as 'introduced (mortals) to the nature of the gods' against M. Davies's 'he introduced religion' (*BICS* 36 [1989], 18–36); and believes ll. 37–40 so full of corruption and contradictions as not to belong to the original play, perhaps being imported and versified from a prose-source.

I apologize to author and editors for my slowness with this report.

Oxford CHRISTOPHER COLLARD
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni231

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni231 Published online by Cambridge University Press