

example can be found on p. 287: "The earlier uncertainty dissolves and the solution seems nearer than ever: It would not be surprising if, in the near future, the outcome states: Homer is to be taken seriously." In my opinion, "outcomes" do not state anything.

Many Nordic scholars will have difficulty with Latacz's model of the transition from orality to literacy in Greece, and of Homer's role in that process. More worrying are the claims that Homer's literacy is an accepted fact, that Greek culture was transformed from orality to literacy in the space of twenty years, and that Homer was largely responsible for the transformation. Others, myself included, would prefer to think of an initial formative stage in the eighth century followed by an extended period of oral transmission. Whether or not a 'monumental composer' stood at the beginning of this process will be more important to some than to others (for discussion, see most recently G. Nagy, *Homeric Questions* [Austin, 1996]). At any event, it cannot be said that Latacz represents a consensus opinion among Homeric experts in America, or indeed in much of Europe. On the other hand, Latacz may well in fact be fully aware of the main tenets of the Anglo-American consensus (to the extent that one exists) and realizes that his opinions, like those of most other German-speaking scholars, diverges from them. The translation of this book into English is intended precisely to give wider currency to an alternative conception of Homeric composition.

Stephen Evans

EURIPIDES: *Selected Fragmentary Plays*. Volume II. Edited with Introductions, Translations and Commentaries by C. COLLARD, M. J. CROPP and J. GIBERT. Aris & Phillips Classical Texts. Oxbow Books, Oxford 2004. ISBN 0-85668-620-4 (hb), 0-85668-621-2 (pb). XVI, 384 pp. GBP 40.00 (hb), 19.50 (pb).

Euripides, *Selected Fragmentary Plays*, Volume II (hereafter *SFP II*) is dedicated to the memory of Kevin Hargreaves Lee, co-author of Euripides, *Selected Fragmentary Plays*, Volume I (hereafter *SFP I*) and "a fine Euripidean and an even finer colleague and friend" (Preface, p. x). The three editors of this book are Christopher Collard (C.C.), Martin Cropp (M.C.) and John Gibert (J.G.). The plays included in *SFP II* are *Philoctetes* (by C.C.), *Alexandros* (by M.C.) with *Palamedes* and *Sisyphus* (by C.C.), *Oedipus* (by C.C.), *Andromeda* (by J.G.), *Hypsipyle* (by M.C.), *Antiope* (by C.C.) and *Archelaus* (by J.G.). In accordance with *SFP I*, all plays are presented with: 1. a summary Bibliography (arranged under Texts and Testimonia; Myth; Illustrations; and Main Scholarly Discussions); 2. an Introduction (dealing with Reconstruction; Myth; Illustrations; Themes and characters; Staging; Date; Other dramatizations; and Later influence); 3. Greek text with a critical apparatus and an English prose translation; and 4. a Commentary. All the fragmentary plays which are included in *SFP II* are extremely interesting ones. In addition, one would also have welcomed with joy *Meleager*, whose story, according to Aristotle (*Poet.* 1453a18–22), was one of the favorite subjects of tragic poets.

Before Euripides' *Philoctetes*, Aeschylus had already written a tragedy of the same name. Sophocles, on the other hand, wrote his extant *Philoctetes* after Euripides' play. Luckily we have two orations (nos. 52 and 59) of Dio of Prusa in which Dio

compares these three plays with each other. The most interesting parts of Dio's oration no. 59 are presented in translation in *SFP* II. *Alexandros* was part of Euripides' "Trojan trilogy", together with *Trojan Women*, *Palamedes* and satyric *Sisyphus*. *SFP* II has a total of three appendices added to *Alexandros*: 1. "Ennius, *Alexander*" (by M.C.); 2. "Euripides, *Palamedes*" (by C.C.); 3. "Euripides, *Sisyphus*" (by C.C.). Oedipus and his sad lot is one of the subjects about which all of the three big names of classical Greek tragedy wrote a play or plays. It is a pity that we have so little left of Euripides' *Oedipus* (as well as of Aeschylus' *Oedipus*). *Andromeda*, with its romantic hero-saves-girl element, must have been a popular play in antiquity. Aristophanes parodied Euripides' *Andromeda* in *Thesmophoriazusae* and mentioned it in his *Frogs*. Before Euripides, Sophocles had already written an *Andromeda*, and later also Livius Andronicus, Ennius and Accius each wrote a homonymous play. In addition to this evidence, there are many South Italian vase paintings from the 4th century B.C. which depict Andromeda bound to a rock and/or before a cave. (However, it must be kept in mind that the connection between these vase paintings and Euripides' play remains problematic). More of *Hypsipyle* has survived than from other lost plays of Euripides (altogether over ca. 300 complete lines), a large part of the text which we have comes from *P. Oxy.* 852. The cover illustration of *SFP* II is a detail from an Apulian volute-krater (from Ruvo) by the Darius painter, Naples, Mus. Naz. 81394 (H 3255), ca. 340–330 B.C. (*LIMC* VIII Suppl. "Hypsipyle" no. 15). It is discussed by Martin Cropp (on pp. 180–181) with other vases depicting *Hypsipyle*. An interesting detail (which Cropp does not mention) is that on the other side of this vase (on its neck) there is a picture (of Oenomaus and Myrtilus chasing Pelops and Hippodamia) which is sometimes thought to be inspired by Euripides' or Sophocles' *Oenomaus* (*LIMC* V "Hippodameia I" no. 19* = *LIMC* VI "Myrtilos" no. 18 = *LIMC* VII "Oinomaos" no. 18 = "Pelops" no. 27). *Antiope* is one of the plays of Euripides which have been connected, perhaps most convincingly, with some South Italian vase paintings (no other Greek tragedy of the same name is known). *Archelaus* was written in the last years of the poet's life and contains elements which were written in order to please the historical Archelaus, king of Macedonia. In addition to this, the place of *Archelaus*' premiere (Pella/Aigai/Dion?) still remains an open question.

SFP II is furnished with addenda and corrigenda to *SFP* I and four indices (1. "Ancient authors and texts"; 2. "Language, style, metre"; 3. "Names and places"; 4. "Topics"). The general layout of the book is clear and the Greek text is also easy to read. *SFP* II contains no illustrations (except the cover illustration), but good references are made to well known and easily accessible works like, for instance, *LIMC*. There are only a few misprinted references in *SFP* II: In the Preface, on p. ix, the authors mention the reviews of *SFP* I which they have noted. S. Halliwell's review was published in *Greece & Rome* 43 (not 42) and M. A. Harder's review is on pp. 746–50 of *Mnemosyne* 50 (not on pp. 246–50). On p. 169 (concerning *Hypsipyle*), a reference is made to W. Burkert in A. Bierl (ed.), *Orchestra: Drama, Mythos, Logos*, Stuttgart 1994, 44–49. The correct name of the book is *Orchestra: Drama, Mythos, Bühne*.

To conclude, *SFP* II should be welcomed by all students of classical Greek drama. It can also be recommended, together with *SFP* I, to those students of theatre history who want to learn a little bit more about Euripides than just the usual "Medea and Phaedras". Scholars, on the other hand, are now happy to have Rickhard Kannicht's

TrGF, Vol. 5 as well. I hope (and believe) that *SFP* II will succeed in achieving its objectives which, I presume, are the same as those of *SFP* I:

"to increase accessibility to these fragmentary plays for specialist and non-specialist alike, and to encourage attention to some fascinating texts which are often of considerable importance to the critical appreciation of the poet" (*SFP* I, Preface, p. vii; *SFP* II, Preface, p. ix).

Vesa Vahtikari

M. TULLIUS CICERO: Fasc. 43. *De finibus bonorum et malorum*. Recensuit C. MORESCHINI. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. K. G. Saur, Monachi et Lipsiae 2005. ISBN 3-598-71280-4. XVIII, 215 pp. EUR 84.

Two editions of *de finibus* have appeared within a few years, the *OCT* text by L. D. Reynolds of 1998, and now this new *BT* text by C. Moreschini. Obviously reviewers will compare the two, and I shall not be an exception.

The edition of Reynolds strikes one as being most satisfactory. The ms. tradition of the *de finibus* is a bit complicated, as all mss. seem to include corrections made at some point by scribes. In the Praefatio, the facts leading to the establishment of the stemma on p. viii, with a division of the mss. into two families, are set out with admirable clarity (and in a very clear Latin). Reynolds shows, in my view pretty convincingly, that **BE** and **AMOSRP** (**A** being the Vaticanus Palatinus saec. XI) belong to two different families, **A** and **MOSRP** thus being representatives of the same family, **BE** of the other. (Obviously there is also much more.)

The Praefatio of Moreschini seems to me a bit less clear. In Reynolds, the abbreviations of the mss. which are discussed are set in bold and placed outside the text field, this resulting in more clarity. In Moreschini, the abbreviations of the mss. under discussion are mentioned only as parts of the main text and are not set in bold. But this is of minor importance. What is important is that Moreschini produces, on p. XIV, a stemma which also has two families of mss. but which differs fundamentally from that of Reynolds in that **BE** and **A** appear as representatives of the same class, **MRP** (**OS** being discarded) as those of the other. Now what one would like to have is obviously a demonstration of sorts of why M. thinks Reynolds' stemma is wrong, but, to tell the truth, I have not been able to locate a clear statement of this. (M. says that his exposition is an abridgment of his article in *Studi F. Della Corte* of 1987, but the most important points should be repeated here, and this article in any case precedes Reynolds' edition.) In fact, at the point where one would expect M. to discuss Reynolds' views, he refers (p. XIII) only to Reynolds' paper in *IMU* 35 (1992), not to the edition (mentioned only on the next page in a footnote), and the clearest statement presented here seems to be that Reynolds "haud multum novi attulit". On p. XIV, he goes on to say Reynolds' edition's merits are "magna", and that he was right in dividing the mss. "in duas tantum classes" (this being, for an unclear reason, put inside quotation marks); without being preceded by any description of Reynolds' stemma, the passage ends somewhat surprisingly with "sed hoc stemma nobis verius esse videtur" (M.'s stemma follows).

Therefore, the bottom line is that I was not able to locate a clear statement