



special care to dispel the misconception that ‘the digital has become synonymous with the online’, acknowledging that the terms are ‘often used interchangeably, but while something that is online is digital by definition, the reverse is not necessarily true’ (p. 3). Chapter 8 discusses the mechanics of *Traces of Antigone*, a Zoom-premiered work created during lockdown, and Berry’s ‘Prelude’ references the remote-produced *Reading Greek Tragedy Online*, but I would have been interested to see further engagement with the ‘online’. Works such as By Jove Theatre’s *The Gentlest Work* or the 2021 Oxford Greek Play (‘devised at a distance for its online platform’, as per the production’s YouTube description) are seemingly ripe for analysis. The introduction makes mention of lockdown-conceived large-scale adaptations and productions (e.g. Bryan Doerries’ Theater of War), but the volume adheres mostly to the ‘offline’ digital world. Part 2’s exploration of digital choruses also sparks a desire for further scholarship on extant tragedies through a digital lens. Euripides’ *Helen* comes to mind, consumed as it is with *eidola*, the immaterial, and moving beyond and beside the physical body.

The volume’s overall structure is lucid and easily navigable. The tripartite division of the main chapters is sensible, and the organisation of endnotes is user-friendly; the volume also readily lends itself to selective reading, with the result that readers dipping into one particular chapter are unlikely to be disoriented. Some chapters have a tendency to reference ‘Western’ culture without unpacking what might be a loaded term, and one more copy-editing pass may have been useful.

This is a rich volume that I would recommend to scholars of the ancient Mediterranean and theatre studies, as well as artists outside the academy. It may not be the best choice to introduce students of antiquity to the world of contemporary tragic performance or indeed to onboard artists to the ancient theatrical world due to its specificity of subject, but for more seasoned travellers on either road it is a compelling and useful text. For digital artists, theatre-makers, theatre scholars, Classicists, and anyone who inhabits multiple worlds at once, this volume is proof that tragedy and the digital have much to say to and through one another.

University of California Los Angeles (UCLA)

EMMA PAULY
epauly@humnet.ucla.edu

ANCIENT COMMENTARIES ON EURIPIDES

BASTIANINI (G.), COLOMO (D.), MALTOMINI (F.), MONTANA (F.), MONTANARI (F.), PERRONE (S.), RÖMER (C.) (edd.) *Commentaria et lexica graeca in papyris reperta. Pars I: Commentaria et lexica in auctores. Vol. 2 Fasc. 5.1: Euripides. Commentaria, marginalia, lexica*. Aduvante Marco Stroppa. Pp. xxii + 115. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2023. Cased, £91, €99.95, US \$109.99. ISBN: 978-3-11-115557-9.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X23002718

This volume is part of the much larger and complex project ‘Commentaria et lexica graeca in papyris reperta’ (CLGP), which aims to compile a collection of technical literature and

excerpts in papyri, i.e. specific and textual testimony that brings us closer to what remains of Alexandrian and early Roman philology. This item is a major step forward in the study of ancient exegesis and will enable scholars to access the products of Euripidean exegesis. This fascicule is included in vol. 2, Callimachus-Hipponax, of Part 1, *Commentaria et lexica in auctores*; it is entirely devoted to Euripides, and the texts included have been edited by K. McNamee, except for *scheda* (a) edited by E. Esposito. In terms of editors, this consistency makes for a more balanced volume.

The volume follows the usual CLGP format: an introduction to the author, followed by the analysis of the fragments. For each papyrus the editors present the usual bibliographical summary, a papyrological commentary, which is rich and revealing, the edition of the fragment accompanied by a critical apparatus and, where possible, a translation. This is followed by a rich commentary on the fragment.

The volume contains seventeen papyri + two *schede*, and they are classified according to their contents. Of the seventeen papyri, fifteen contain marginal notes. It is significant that, except for PSI XIII 1302 and P.Oxy. VI 852, the commentaries are on works from the selected plays. The fragments are arranged alphabetically by the initial letter of the tragedy commented. After these, McNamee includes two fragments containing *hypommemata* (P.Würzb. 1 and P.Oslo inv. 1662). The volume concludes with two lexical lists (*schede*). The label of commentaries to Euripidean works is clear in the cases commented on, despite the fragmentary and scarce information included in them. The fragments generally contain commentaries that do not exceed one or two lines or one or two notes per papyrus, except for P.Ant. I. 23, P.Oxy. LIII 3718, P.Würzb.1 and P.Oslo inv. 1662. This brevity sometimes makes it impossible to discern the content of the fragments. A lack of precision in the sources occurs in three cases and concerns the work to which the commentary belongs, not the authorship: PSI XIII 1302 (fr. 1), of which it is doubtful whether it belongs to *Alcmaeon in Psophis* or to *Alcmaeon in Corinth*; P.Oxy. XXXI 2543, which is considered to be a comment on *Andromache* because it belongs to a set of small fragments of a book roll containing *Andr.* 346–69 (even though it is not certain); and P.Oxy. LIII 3791 for the same reasons.

The introduction to Euripides is well written, and its brevity, precision and bibliographical richness (pp. 3–15) are appreciated. Particularly noteworthy is the review of the history of the transmission of this type of literature, starting with the written and regularised establishment of Euripides' text and what this implies in terms of ancient philology. This part shows the complicated transmission and tradition of this type of commentary on Euripides' work and its success. As McNamee acutely observes, despite the strong presence of Euripides in the school – of great relevance are Appendices 1 and 2 –, we have a low number of preserved fragments containing this type of commentary, which could be due to the school level, where it was most present, and to the oral nature of this level.

The work in the commentaries on the papyri is remarkable for the rich apparatus of the text edition. This richness allows readers to analyse critically the possibilities offered and to justify and understand the choices made by the editor, typically presented in a clear and well-argued style, as can be seen, for example, in P.Oslo inv. 1662. This, along with the bibliographical summary, is a useful tool for further research on these papyri.

For the study of ancient exegesis the analysis of parallel sources is of great importance. In this respect I note the work done on the parallels found in the *scholia*, the *Suda* and Hesychius. The parallels and their commentary and justification are of great use, for example in P.Würzb. 1, where the inclusion of the parallel text in the body of the work is appreciated. Finally, McNamee, where possible, refers to the potential school

environment of a fragment, for example P.Harr. I 38 (inv. 179) + P.Fitzw.Mus. inv. Add. 109 + P.Oxy. LXVII 4550.

Generally the discussions present, where possible, a solid argument, and the editing of the text does not tend towards speculation, but, where uncertain, a reading is added in the apparatus. However, when the nature of the commentary and the condition of the papyrus do not allow for assertions of a more positive nature, this condition is accepted, and all possibilities are presented with acute caution, as in *scheda* (a), by Esposito, and in P.Oxy. LIII 3718.

In many cases the space devoted to the commentary is limited, but this is not a negative note, since the discussions of the fragments vary for several reasons: the extent of what can be read, the amount of commentary and the type of commentary, not the same as the lexical or the exegetic one, as P.Oxy. LXVII 4554 and P.Oslo inv.1662, in which cases the effort is mainly devoted to the papyrological commentary.

Some minor shortcomings can be observed. Sometimes no comment is provided on the purpose of the note, as in P.Harr. I 38, where no reference is made to the possibility that the annotations it contains may be understood as textual variants, at least those of v. 1282, as other scholars have pointed out. Some bibliographical references are missing, although these concern general works. These include: G. Messeri and R. Pintaudi, 'I lettori dei papiri: dal commento autonomo agli scolii', in: V. Fera et al. (edd.), *Talking to the Text: Marginalia from Papyri to Print* (2002); one of the few works that provides an overview of the Euripidean *commentaria*: M.L. Martínez Bermejo, 'Comentarios y marginalia al texto de Eurípides en los papiros', *Ianua Classicorum. Temas y formas del Mundo Clásico* 2 (2015), 223–30. Further, I echo other reviewers' comments about the need for indexes; in this case, I missed a list of annotated passages and cross-references, something that would make the volume easier to use. However, these are minimal objections.

The volume is of high philological quality and usefulness. The editors have filled a gap in relation to this kind of study on the Euripidean corpus and have done what was expected of this edition: they have assessed the importance and value of this type of evidence and placed it in a wider context. These are essential steps in stimulating interest in these technical and often fragmentary texts. The editors provide a good commentary, rich in possibilities for the cataloguing and understanding of the Euripidean *excerpta*.

Universidad de Murcia /
Universidad de Salamanca

ALBA BOSCA CUQUERELLA
albabosca@usal.es

GREEK COMEDY AND SCHOLARSHIP

NOVOKHATKO (A.A.) *Greek Comedy and Embodied Scholarly Discourse*. Pp. x + 278. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2023. Cased, £91, €99.95, US\$114.99. ISBN: 978-3-11-108093-2.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X23002500

In what ways did ancient Greek comedy engage with scholarly discourses? N.'s revised *Habilitationsschrift* (Freiburg 2018), the bulk of which has already appeared in earlier papers, tilts at this question. The book covers a range of 'usual suspects' in ancient scholarship –