

*I Papiri di Eschilo e di Sofocle. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Firenze 14-15 giugno 2012*, a cura di G. Bastianini e A. Casanova. Edizioni dell'Istituto Papirologico "G. Vitelli" 2. Firenze University Press, 2013. vii + 243 pages + 10 plates. ISBN 978-88-6655-386-1.

This volume collects the proceedings of a conference on the papyri of Aeschylus and Sophocles held at the Istituto Vitelli in Florence, Italy, in 2012. It follows other volumes originating from similar conferences and collecting studies on the papyri of Posidippus, Menander, Euripides, Callimachus, Sappho and Alcaeus, Hesiod, the ancient novel, Christian authors, and Homer.

I will give here an overview of the studies collected in this volume. Piero Totaro discusses the papyri of the *Niobe* plays of Aeschylus and of Sophocles, focusing in particular on a reading in *PSI* 11.1208.7 of Aeschylus' *Niobe* (pp. 1-17). Matteo Taufer discusses the papyri of the *Seven against Thebes*, concluding that these papyri (*P.Oxy.* 18.2179 + 2163 fr. 10, *P.Oxy.* 22.2333, and *P.Oxy.* 22.2334) help us to confirm the colometry, which is not always correctly preserved by the medieval tradition. In addition, they offer interesting variants, some of which are certainly incorrect but whose presence in papyri mostly dating to the second century AD suggests that the manuscript tradition of Aeschylus' plays is more complex than generally assumed. The idea that the medieval manuscripts derive from one single archetype should be revised (pp. 19-31). Patrick Finglass focuses on the value of papyri for textual criticism in Sophocles, concluding that a dozen readings that are attested only in papyri seem to be genuine and should be adopted in the text of Sophocles. *P.Oxy.* 18.2180 is particularly interesting, as it yields four of these better and otherwise unattested readings. In addition, papyri offer another dozen readings which are correct and scarcely attested in the medieval manuscripts. These results are even more significant when we take into account that the number of Sophocles papyri is limited (18 in total for the 7 tragedies), and the fragments themselves are not very extensive. The fact that the good readings are not concentrated in a restricted number of fragments but are spread throughout several papyri (even if *P.Oxy.* 18.2180 stands out) proves that the papyri carry a text of Sophocles different from the medieval tradition and most likely closer to the original (pp. 33-51).

Guido Avezù discusses Sophoclean satyr plays (the *Ichneutae* are preserved by *P.Oxy.* 8.1174 + *P.Oxy.* 17.2081[a] and the *Inachus* by *P.Tebt.* 3.1.692 and *P.Oxy.* 33.2369), concluding his analysis with a table listing possible titles of Sophocles' satyr plays and tragedies dealing with the main mythological sagas (pp. 53-63). Massimo Pinto (with a preface section by Luciano Canfora) tells the story of the fake manuscript of Aeschylus' *Persians* by the nineteenth-

century forger Constantine Simonidis (p. 65-79). The article by Alan Sommerstein, who tries to reconstruct the Dionysian trilogy of Aeschylus, is more literary-oriented but nonetheless very interesting. According to Sommerstein, the trilogy started with the *Toxotides*, dealing with the myth of Actaeon who was punished by Zeus for his desire to marry Semele; the second play was the *Semele* or *Hydrophoroi*, on the story of Semele, Zeus, and Hera, then followed by the *Xantriai* or *Pentheus* dealing with Pentheus' death. The thematic link would have been the depiction of a human (Actaeon, Semele, Pentheus) punished through divine madness because he/she had offended a divinity (Zeus, Hera, and Dionysus; pp. 81-94). Luigi Battezzato discusses *P.Oxy.* 27.2452, a fragment from a tragedy on Theseus, which contains a dialogue between Ariadne and Eriboea/Periboea. A comparison with the *hypothesis* of Euripides' *Theseus* (*P.Oxy.* 68.4640) as well as with some Aristophanic scholia quoting lines from this tragedy excludes the possibility that the papyrus preserves a passage from the Euripidean play; on the other hand, the presence of Eriboea/Periboea, whose descendants included Miltiades and Cimon, suggests that this tragedy has to be linked with the revival of Theseus' cult facilitated by Cimon, when he brought Theseus' bones back to Athens in 476/5 BC. If this reconstruction is correct, the tragedy preserved in *P.Oxy.* 27.2452 might perhaps be by Sophocles and would be a celebration of some Athenian aristocratic families (including the *genos* of Cimon), yet performed during a "popular" festival such as the Dionysia (pp. 95-117).

Paolo Scattolin surveys the information concerning Sophocles' *Tereus* and derived from two papyri, *P.Oxy.* 42.3013 and *P.Oxy.* 76.5093. The former is a *hypothesis* of a *Tereus*, which can be attributed to Sophocles thanks to a note of Tzetzes on Hesiod's *Works and Days* 568. In *P.Oxy.* 76.5093, on the other hand, an anonymous author informs us that Euripides' *Medea* (431 BC) was defeated by Sophocles' *Tereus*. Medea's infanticide was shocking, yet in Sophocles' *Tereus* a mother also killed her child and served him to her husband for dinner. According to Scattolin, *Medea* was more shocking and lost the competition not because of the infanticide but because Medea was a barbarian, while Procne was a Greek taking vengeance against the barbarian Tereus – a more appealing plot for the Greek audience (pp. 119-141). While this hypothesis is possible, I wonder whether Euripides' *Medea* lost because Medea went unpunished for infanticide, flying away on the chariot of the Sun, while poor Procne was condemned throughout her "new" life as a nightingale to weep and mourn her child Itys.

Augusto Guida focuses on *P.Oxy.* 9.1174, preserving Sophocles' *Ichneutae*: he discusses possible readings and suggests some new ones (pp. 143-157). Alexander Garvie's article is on the literary implications of *P.Oxy.* 20.2256, fr.

3, a *hypothesis* which dates Aeschylus' *Supplices* to the 460s. Garvie finds this a "shocking" dating, since the *Supplices* has always been considered an early play of Aeschylus. Yet Garvie shows that in many respects it is "as modern" as the later ones (in terms of structure, the role of the chorus, and its relationship with actors), and so the papyrus should be trusted (pp. 159-171). Angelo Casanova focuses on Aeschylus' *Diktyoulokoï* (preserved in *PSI* 11.1209 and *P.Oxy.* 18.2161) and tries to reconstruct the plot of the satyr play (pp. 173-184). This is quite an interesting paper; yet it would have been better to also offer the original Greek text and not only the Italian translation when the text of the papyrus is discussed, as one often wonders what the original text might say.

Paolo Carrara surveys the presence of Aeschylus at Oxyrhynchus: 26 papyri of Aeschylus come from Oxyrhynchus, which is very interesting given the scarcity of papyrus fragment of Aeschylus in general (32 of Aeschylus against the 36 of Sophocles and the 170 of Euripides). Among the Oxyrhynchus papyri, four papyri (*PSI* 11.1211, *P.Oxy.* 22.2333, *P.Oxy.* 22.2334, and *P.Oxy.* 56.3838) look like "single" books, but the others seem to derive from two "editorial enterprises" on Aeschylus: the fragments written by scribe A3 (20 papyri) and then *P.Oxy.* 20.2256, which collects a series of fragments of Aeschylus, and perhaps *P.Oxy.* 20.2257, which shows similarity to *P.Oxy.* 20.2256, and so may also belong to the same editorial project; both projects point towards a renewed interest in Aeschylus during the second century AD after the decline during the Hellenistic period (pp. 185-198). Franco Ferrari deals with some specific points of *P.Oxy.* 18.2162, preserving a passage from Aeschylus' *Theoroi*: he discusses the entity of the mysterious "images/portraits not according to human measures" (εἰκὸν[ς] οὐ κατ' ἀνθρώπου σ[τάθμην]) mentioned in col. i, l. 1 and of the "toys" (ἀθύρματα) mentioned in col. iii, l. 14, as well as the presence of choral parts in col. ii, concluding his article with the text and the translation of the fragment (pp. 199-215). Marco Stroppa surveys the exegetical papyri of Sophocles, distinguishing papyri with marginal notes, *hypotheseis*, entries in lexica which derive or may derive from Sophocles, treatises (*syngrammata*), and quotations of Sophocles in exegetical works concerning other authors. Regrettably, no *hypomnemata* on Sophocles have yet been found (pp. 217-231). Finally Guido Bastianini offers a new edition and commentary of the marginal scholia to the *Oedipus Rex* contained in *PSI* 11.1192 (pp. 233-243).

As my (rather long) survey shows, the content of the volume is rich and varied. The topics covered reflect the specific orientation of each scholar: some articles are clearly papyrological (e.g., Bastianini, Ferrari), others more philological (e.g., Totaro, Taufer, Finglass), others more literary (e.g., Avezzù, Sommerstein, Garvie, Casanova); others bring together a papyrological analysis and more literary discussion (e.g., Battezzato); finally, there is at least one con-

tribution (that of Carrara) which focuses on the information that the papyri can give about the “historical” reception of one of these tragic poets in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Although the articles are generally of good quality, the volume suffers the usual problem of many proceedings: they are a collection of several, often interesting scholarly contributions, but it is difficult to find unity among them, aside, in this specific case, the fact that this collection concerns the “papyri of Aeschylus and Sophocles” – yet one of the best articles in this volume in my view, the one by Sommerstein, is not really about papyri, as it engages only very briefly with *P.Oxy.* 18.2164 and is mostly a literary study on one lost trilogy of Aeschylus. To have a more cohesive volume, one would have wished for a more general article at the end (or at the beginning) giving an overview of the papyri of Aeschylus and Sophocles, and of their value and significance for the study of these two poets. In addition, even if there are eight articles dedicated to Aeschylus and seven to Sophocles, one feels that the two authors are not treated equally: for example, while there are two articles on the exegesis of Sophocles, there are none on the exegesis of Aeschylus. Even if the exegetical papyri of Aeschylus have already been edited in *CLGP* vol. 1.1 (pp. 19-73), at least one article discussing the exegesis of Aeschylus from a broader perspective would have been welcome. In fact, even for Sophocles one would have wished for an analysis of the ancient exegesis preserved in papyri in addition to the list of Stroppa and the very detailed, papyrological article by Bastianini. Indeed, one or more articles detailing the ancient reception of both poets as attested in papyri from the Hellenistic and Roman periods would have added greatly to the volume. From this perspective, the article of Carrara is among the most interesting in the collection as it gives an overview of the ancient reception of Aeschylus, even if limited to the papyri of Oxyrhynchus. A similar article for Sophocles would have been beneficial to the volume.

In volumes such as this, final indexes (of manuscripts, names, passages, and topics) are absolutely necessary. However, in this volume there is no index at all, which makes its consultation quite difficult. There are also some (indeed small) inaccuracies which could have been avoided with more accurate copyediting, such as nouns in italics as if they were titles when they are simply mythological names (e.g., “nymphs” at p. 91 and “Teseo” at p. 109). More importantly, the tables in Avezzù’s article (p. 56) which are in principle very interesting, could have been clearer and easier to read. All in all, however, this collection offers valuable articles on two of the three greatest tragedians.