

I would highly recommend this book both for students on Classics and theatre courses and for use in production. Preferences for *Medea* translations will vary, but E.'s emphasis on actability and clarity ensures his work a special place among the options. The accompanying notes are useful and insightful for anyone interested in performance questions. Given the focus on brevity, the commentary will not, of course, replace more extensive treatments of the play such as C. Segal (1996), H.P. Foley (2001), W. Allan (2002), D.J. Mastrorarde (2002), P.E. Easterling (2003) and L. Swift (2016), to name a few.

*College Year in Athens*

NINA PAPATHANASOPOULOU  
[nina.papath@cyathens.org](mailto:nina.papath@cyathens.org)

### THE ODES OF EURIPIDES' *SUPPLICES*

GIANNINI (P.) (ed.) *Euripide: Supplici. I Canti*. (I Canti del Teatro Greco 10.) Pp. 135, pls. Pisa and Rome: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2021. Paper, €44. ISBN: 978-88-3315-349-0.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X22001731

This book provides an edition of the lyrical sections of Euripides' *Supplices* based on the manuscript colometrical division of the text. G.'s methodology will not be immediately apparent to readers unfamiliar with the series or with the body of scholarship that, in the last decades, has been arguing and elaborating on the assumption that the MSS colometry might reflect the original arrangement of the lyrics. No critical assessment of such theoretical framework is provided, nor does G. refer to scholarly work arguing for or against it (see e.g. the points of method in G. Galvani, *Eschilo: Coefore. I canti* [2015], pp. 13–21, and the contrary judgement of L. Battezzato, *QUCC* [2008], 137–58).

G.'s edition is based not only on **L** (Laur. plut. 32.2), which the scholarly consensus regards as *codex unicus* for Euripides' 'alphabetic' plays, but also on **P** (Vat. Pal. 287), examined respectively in 'digitised colour photographs' and Spranger's facsimile. (To the extent I judged necessary, I checked G.'s readings against the reproductions made available online by the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana and the Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, and on other collations, mainly, N. Rosso's UPO dissertation, *La colometria ... delle Supplici di Euripide* [2015].) Although the view that for the alphabetic plays **P** is not a (mere) *codex descriptus* from **L** has recently gained supporters within the Italian academy, G.'s position seems to rely on an *a priori* assumption: none of the divergences between **P** and **L** listed on pp. 21–2 or recorded in the apparatus is a separative error, nor does their cumulative weight seem appreciable; as for colometry and strophic arrangement, as ascertained by G., **P** substantially reproduces the original facies of **L**. As for Triclinius' interventions on **L**, G. dismisses Zuntz's distinction between three phases of revision according to the ink colour ( $\text{Tr}^{-3}$ ; only  $\text{Tr}^1$  would find its way into **P**). Attaching to it a descriptive rather than a chronological meaning, G. implicitly opens the possibility that not only  $\text{Tr}^1$ , but also  $\text{Tr}^{2/3}$  might depend on the lost antigraph. Nevertheless, whatever their weight may be, the examples of agreement of **P** and  $\text{Tr}^{2/3}$  against **L** listed on p. 22 turn out to be oversights: 284 (σοῖσι<ν> is due to  $\text{P}^2$ =Diggle's p, not **P**); 609 (ἀμφιβρίνει was already in **L**<sup>ac</sup>); 617 (**L**<sup>ac</sup> [G. reports πάντα]: the erasure probably hides two letters

[Rosso, p. 145], and πάντων [P] seems highly probable); 1128 (L<sup>ac</sup>: ματρή [G. reads μητρή]). A check of the instances in which, according to the apparatus, P and Tr<sup>2/3</sup> would agree in colometry against L, produced the following results: *Supp.* 51–2 (the dicolon after ᾱ is plausibly regarded by Rosso [p. 43] as self-correction of L [wrong word-division?]), 798 (ματέρεις is due to P<sup>2</sup>, not P), 271 (ιερών | διαπέδων LP; colon-break removed by Tr<sup>3</sup>P<sup>2</sup>), 1015–17 (agreement of L and P). *Pace* G., L and P agree in the following passages too: *Supp.* 629 (P has dot, not dicolon before πόριος [P<sup>2</sup>]), 1078 (μετέλαχε is due to P<sup>2</sup>), 1007–8 (φίλοις P, not P<sup>2</sup>).

The situation in the MSS is in some passages more puzzling than is apparent from the colometrical apparatus: at *Supp.* 920, 1010–1 and 1139, for example, the blanks in L are not meaningful enough to mark a colon-break where G. recognises one (ὄδισι, σός and αἰθήρ| respectively). A certain confirmation bias shines through from the use of *coniungit/-unt* in the colometrical apparatus to mean the lack of colon-break in the MSS where G. would expect one. G.'s approach to the text is much more than simply conservative: generally speaking, corrections are admitted only when literal meaning or basic syntax is unintelligible, while those addressing issues related to style, logical coherence etc., when mentioned at all, are quickly dismissed as 'superfluous'. To mention one example, at *Supp.* 273 G. prefers to admit an odd use of the *oratio recta*, rather than to accept Markland's re-accentuation of κόμισαι into κομίσαι. Medieval conjectures normally gain preference over superior ones originating from modern scholars, as at *Supp.* 366, where the artificial ἐκλύετε, τάδε γ' (P<sup>2</sup>, not Tr<sup>3</sup>) is printed instead of Page's impeccable <τάδ'> ἐκλύετε. A specific band of the apparatus records the metrical annotations contained in L and P, published here in full and accurate form for the first time.

In G.'s text the homogeneity of the modern colometries gives way to an impressive metrical variety, deriving from the manuscript colometry. His interpretations seem too often somewhat artificial. *Pace* G., for instance, the arrangement of the second choral intervention (*Supp.* 271–85) into dactylic sequences (mainly hexameters) is recommended by the epic flavour conveyed by imagery and diction (cf. Collard's nn. on 271 ἄπο and 282 χάριματτα θηρών). In his treatment of the second stasimon, no attention is paid to the lack of correspondence between speaker changes within the second strophic pair (*Supp.* 618–25 ~ 626–33), and Wilamowitz's linguistically and formally resolute μόλοις at *Supp.* 621 is not recorded in the apparatus (a brief discussion in R. Lionetti, *Lexis* [2016], 73 n. 101). G. rules out that Evadne's lyrics at *Supp.* 990–1008 and 1012–30 respond to each other, despite what Collard defines as 'detailed resposion between the metrical periods in language and ideas' (ii.346); furthermore, the MSS' incorrect division of the spoken trimeters at *Supp.* 1009–11 inspires little confidence in the reliability of the manuscript colometry. In the kommos of *Supp.* 1123–64 a bizarre lyrical structure ABA'B'CDEFF' is admitted, and Adrastus introduced into the dialogue between the Argive heroes' mothers and children on the only ground that L assigns 1144b–6 to him. (In such matters, MSS are of no help: J.C.B. Lowe, *BICS* [1962], 27–42). Irregular resposions are generally admitted with no hesitation, even in passages such as *Supp.* 374 ~ 378, where Wilamowitz's replacement of ὀεί with οἰεί would avoid a resposion choriamb ~ trochaic. One may be disoriented at the sight of a 'palimbacchius' at *Supp.* 80 and to discover that it responds to a cretic. To remain close to the paradosis, at *Supp.* 969 G. prints his own ἐν ζωοῖς, admitting an unparalleled monosyllabic scansion of ζωοῖς. It is not clear why *Supp.* 778 ~ 786 should be interpreted as glyconic and not, as the evidence in Collard, ii.307, suggests, enoplian, and so on. Metrical anomalies are admitted on the sole basis of theoretical speculation. Rather than to parallels, readers are usually referred to secondary literature; yet, when they go away to check the references, they will discover that, normally, they do not deal with the specific passage, irregular resposion or metrical sequence.

I noticed a few oversights. Metrical schemes: *brevis in longo* and *finis versus* are not recorded for *Supp.* 44 ~ 50, 72 ~ 80, 365 ~ 369, 805b ~ 818b, 1145b, 1149; ‘hiatus’ and *finis versus* are not marked for *Supp.* 781 ~ 789, 807 ~ 820; lack of correspondence between text and scansion at *Supp.* 1004 and 1078. Misreading: *Supp.* 280, **P** (μ’ is due to **P**, not **P**<sup>2</sup> [cf. Rosso, pp. 87–8]); 963 (‘μητέρες **LP**’ is misleading, for the MSS have the word written through *compendium*); 1004, **L** (ἐς, not εἰς); 368, **PL** (absolutely no subscribed ι in *μεγάλα*); 372 (δὲ also in **L**<sup>ac</sup>); 374, **P**<sup>ac</sup> (I read ἦσαι, not εὔσαι); 380, **L** (definitely πάντα, not ‘πάντου(?)’). Text: ‘Doric’ α to be restored at *Supp.* 809 and 1014.

Students of *Supplices* interested in the manuscript colometry of the play should not entirely rely on this edition and are advised to keep an eye on the MSS and other bibliographical items. I suspect that readers moving from different premises than G.’s will finish the book without feeling their views really challenged. In my view, this is regrettable.

Università degli Studi di Urbino “Carlo Bo”

RUGGIERO LIONETTI

[ruggiero.lionetti@uniurb.it](mailto:ruggiero.lionetti@uniurb.it)

## INTERACTIONS BETWEEN GREEK TRAGEDY AND COMEDY

JENDZA (C.) *Paracomedy. Appropriations of Comedy in Greek Tragedy*. Pp. xii + 341. New York: Oxford University Press, 2020. Cased, £47.99, US\$74. ISBN: 978-0-19-009093-7.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X22002372

In this monograph J. focuses on a phenomenon that many of us recognise in the study of Greek drama, but all too often pass over: *paracomedy*, the way that tragedy engages with comic drama. According to J., paracomedy is on the face of it the obverse of *paratragedy* – where paratragedy refers to the way that Greek comedy actively engages with tragedy. J.’s definition of paracomedy draws on E. Scharffenberger (*Text and Presentation* 17 [1996]) in seeing paracomedy function as an alter ego to paratragedy. J.’s work provides a broader study of paracomedy that ‘contributes to our understanding of generic interactions in Greek drama and literature more broadly’ (p. 4). The interest is not in looking for comic humour in tragedy, but rather for the way in which tragedy appropriates various aspects of comic drama (a distinction drawn by B. Seidensticker [1978]).

Paratragedy has been much studied by scholars: from P. Rau, *Paratragodia* (1967), to M. Silk, ‘Aristophanic Paratragedy’, in: *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis* (1993), expanded by M. Farmer, *Tragedy on the Comic Stage* (2017), and numerous other publications. Paratragedy has earned its place in A.H. Sommerstein’s *Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Greek Comedy* (S. Miles, ‘Paratragedy’ [2019]), but paracomedy receives no direct mention there or, more tellingly, in H.M. Roisman’s *The Encyclopedia of Greek Tragedy* (2013). In short, paratragedy is an established and recurrent part of scholarship, but the same cannot be said for paracomedy. J.’s work is a significant step forward because it provides the first wider treatment of how tragedy can engage with comedy. As such it is a welcome and overdue addition to scholarship on intergeneric play within Greek drama. H. Foley (‘Generic Boundaries in Late Fifth-Century Athens’, in: *Performance, Iconography, Reception* [2008]) had already drawn attention to the cross-fertilisation between dramatic genres, but