Pirro, se decide a morir, pero se inclina por salvar la vida de su hijo. Ya en el XIX, Baudelaire le dedica a Víctor Hugo su poema *Le Cygne*, en el que la heroína es vista como viuda reciente caminando por los márgenes del Simois troyano, obligada luego a caer en las manos de Pirro y finalmente casada con Héleno, momento es que es encontrada por Eneas.

A continuación R. aborda la presencia de nuestra heroína en óperas de los siglos XVII-XIX: por ejemplo, *Astianatte* (1701) de Antonio Salvi, basada en la *Andrómaca* de Racine, y que contiene la escena en que ésa le pide a Pirro preservar la vida de Astianacte. En cuanto a las artes visuales R. señala el cuadro *Andromaque et Pyrrhus* (1810) de Guérin: Andrómaca, arrodillada ante Pirro, protege con sus brazos a Astianacte.

6. Tras la conclusión, siguen las Notas (127-39), una Bibliografía, muy rica (141-51), un Glosario (153-4) y un Índice de nombres propios y conceptos relevantes (155-62). Las abundantes frases y citas de la pieza las toma R. de las versiones realizadas respectivamente por D. Kovacs (1995) y M. Lloyd (2005).

7. Añadamos que R., ahora *Professor emerita* en Colby College, tiene una dilatada experiencia docente en varias universidades de los EEUU, y ha publicado, entre otros, estudios sobre Sófocles (*Electra*, *Filoctetes*), Eurípides (*Hipólito*, *Alcestis*, *Andrómaca*, *Electra*), y, en general, de literatura griega.

El reseñador ha leído con interés y aprovechamiento el libro que le fue encargado, y está seguro de que otros numerosos lectores podrán disfrutar y aprender mucho del mismo.

Juan Antonio López Férez
Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (UNED).
jalferez@flog.uned.es

Andreas Bagordo, Fragmenta Comica. *Aristophanes fr. 101-204*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2022, 175 pp., 80,00 €, ISBN 978-3-949189-57-9.

With this elegantly learned book Andreas Bagordo marks his eighth contribution to the ambitious and astoundingly vigorous *Fragmenta Comica* (*FrC*) series, which can now boast of completing more than half its projected 73 volumes.[1]

[1] Earlier commentaries by Bagordo cover Aristophanes fr. 487-589 (2020), fr. 590-674 (2016), fr. 675-820 (2017), and fr. 821-976 (2018). He was also responsible for other Old Comedy fragments: *Telekleides* (2013), *Alkimenes-Kantharos* (2014) and *Leukon-Xenophilos* (2014). Other commentaries on Aristophanes in the series have been produced by Christian Orth (fr. 1-100: 2017) Maria Cristina Torchio (fr. 392-486: 2021) and Olimpia Imperio (fr. 305-391: 2023). Three final volumes in progress (by Bagordo on fr. 205-304, Natalia Kyriakidi on testimonia, and a general introduction by A.H.

Offering detailed commentary on all the fragments of Attic comedy within Kassel and Austin's monumental *Poetae Comici Graeci* (eight volumes, 1983-2001), the series provides an indispensable tool for appreciation of the precious but frustrating remains of a dramatic tradition that flourished during the course of two crucial centuries in Athens. Bagordo's latest effort perfectly encapsulates the strength and promise of the entire enterprise, even as it opens questions about how one conceptualizes and employs such elusive evidence.

The broader "Kom Frag" project (*Kommentierung der Fragmente der griechischen Komödie*), directed by Bernhard Zimmermann at Freiburg, supports colloquia, workshops, and a supplementary collection of books on comedy (now sixteen volumes). Under its aegis, the Fragmenta Comica series (advised by Glenn Most, Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, S. Douglas Olson, Antonios Rengakos and Alan Sommerstein) has turned out on average four volumes every year since 2013. Readers of previous volumes will be familiar with the standard, series-wide format. An overview of each play is followed by analytical study of the fragments that touches on, in turn, textual criticism (where necessary), metrics (a guide to whether we are dealing with speech, parabasis, or song); analysis of the citation context; interpretation of the place of the fragment within a reconstructed plot, using evidence of other comic passages; and close philological analysis. In the lattermost, Bagordo regularly excels in his wide-range of reference to ancient and Byzantine lexicographical and encyclopedic resources, employing the latest editions.[2] Apart from its detailed analyses, this expertly edited volume allows one to ponder what must have been the immense variety of Old Comedy in its prime. In so doing, it draws attention (as does any such collection) to some serious hermeneutical challenges. To what extent do we rely on more fully attested tropes, motifs, and plots to interpret the smaller, scrappier remains of once-whole plays? How "formulaic" do we assume Old Comedy to have been? Or to put a finer point on it: if a play like *Frogs* features a journey to the underworld and talk about politics and literary criticism, are we then entitled to extrapolate other portions of it to interpret the much more fragmentary *Demes* of Eupolis (in which famous dead politicians revisit Athens), let alone the even more obscure *Gerytades*—one of the four comedies examined here?

The conventional arrangement by titles in alphabetical order groups together in this volume diverse plays that ranged over Aristophanes' extended artistic career, from *Georgoi* (usually dated 424-422), through *Geras* (shortly after 410-409 if we credit its mention of allotment machines at fr. 152 as a reference to a recent bouleutic innovation); to *Gerytades* (often said to be to be 408 or 407, but on the

Sommerstein) will complete the treatment of this key poet. For full list of *FrC* volumes: https://www.komfrag.uni-freiburg.de/baende_liste.

[2] Bagordo makes good use of Stefano Valente's *The Antiatticist,* Berlin 2015 but was not able to engage with the more recent remarks (on fr. 151 and fr. 185) in Simone Fiori's *Le citazioni di Aristofane nel lessico dell'Antiatticista*, Göttingen 2022. On the problems involved with such ancient lexicographical sources see now C. Monaco, "Atticist Lexica and the Interpretation of Comic Language", *Trends in Classics* 15, 2023, 9-30.

basis of guesswork and some circular argumentation) and *Daidalos* (date unknown but likely late, if it was a mythological burlesque like *Kokalos*, produced in the 380s). The editor of fragments is constantly tempted to construct larger dramatic and thematic frameworks to contain the disparate bits and pieces—sometimes a passage, more often a few words—that have randomly managed to survive from antiquity. The tendency is even stronger when some identifiable concerns and an apparent proximity in production-dates magnetize the fragments, like so many iron filings, to cluster them closer to known, fully-preserved comedies. Thus, *Georgoi* (fr. 101-27) with its chorus of farmers who express a desire to leave the city for the country (fr. 109) and a speaker who prefers digging and pruning to war (fr. 111) inevitably makes one think of *Peace* and *Acharnians*. Look closer, however, and the same chorus, apparently, wants to plant *platanos* trees (fr. 113) in the Athenian agora, perhaps in the spirit of Kimon—a reversal in which the country invades the city—and a speaker (perhaps the same as in fr. 111) complains that his agricultural pursuits are hampered by civic responsibilities (fr. 102) to which another character responds with a cynical hit at Nicias. This is hardly the high-minded rebel that we perceive in Dicaeopolis. It is worth observing how few of the attributable fragments are actually relevant, after we have fantasized on the basis of several brief passages, to such broader similarities with surviving dramas. A joke about avoiding Lakonian figs, though free-floating, is obviously connected (fr. 110), but how did lines about jurymen of old (fr. 101), a mention of Meletos or the rhetor Philippos (fr. 117, 118), allusions to prostitution (fr. 124, possibly 125), bread on a spit (fr.105), a cup called *kulikeion* (fr. 106) or the people of the Thracian polis Strepsa make sense in context? In short, as Bagordo states with the reasonableness and good sense apparent throughout his edition, "Die 27 erhaltenen Fragmenter der *Georgoi* erlauben keinerlei auch nur approximative Rekonstruktion des Plots…." I would add that dramatic personae are even more difficult to extrapolate.

When it comes to *Geras* (old age), the title does not reveal the chorus' identity, but Kaibel long ago suggested a resemblance between *Wasps* 1388-401, in which a woman bread-seller complains of having her goods ruined by Philokleon, and fr. 129, a funny dialogue that, according to Athenaeus (3.109F), had a bread-woman speaking "after her loaves have been seized by those who had cast off their old age" (ὑπὸ τῶν *τὸ γῆρας* ἀποβαλλόντων):

> (A.) τουτὶ τί ἦν τὸ πρᾶγμα; (B.) θερμούς, ὦ τέκνον.
> (A.) ἀλλ᾽ ἢ παραφρονεῖς; (B.) κριβανίτας, ὦ τέκνον,
> (A.) τί; κριβανίτας; (B.) πάνυ δὲ λευκούς, ὦ τέκνον
> (A) What's the meaning of this? (B) Give me hot ones, kiddo!
> (A) Are you crazy? (B) Oven-baked ones, kiddo!
> (A) What? Oven-baked ones? (B) And real white, kiddo![3]

[3] Translations in this review are from J. Henderson, ed. and trans., *Aristophanes. Fragments,* Cambridge, MA, 2008.

Athenaeus' words provide the only clue to the otherwise-lost plot. The newly invigorated Kleon-lover of *Wasps* that interpreters readily took as a parallel is not quite the same as the sleekly rejuvenated Demos at the end of *Knights*, but a general pattern underlies both episodes, and could have been varied in yet other ways in *Geras*. Alternatively, the "outraged baker" gimmick is just a bit of comic business that might have been re-used in any number of plays. Working along thematic lines, other fragments might be slipped into place. Maybe the drunken man who vomits at the statues of the *phyle* heroes (fr. 135) is a re-energized elder on a spree; or the Persian staff and shepherds' bent crook of fr. 141-2 are sticks that spry old men tossed away; or talk of carrying ball and strigil while accompanying adolescents (fr. 145) refers to a new spurt of interest in sex (as one could argue as well for fr. 146-8). But maybe not. Whatever narrative arc did structure *Geras*, from the fragments it appears devoid of the pressing political concerns, domestic and foreign, on display in *Wasps* and *Peace*. The only mockery of a politician comes in fr. 149 about "the boar from Melite" (almost certainly Eukrates, a miller-turned-demagogue from that deme)—but the joke's point is totally lost on us. Then again, even this lack of topical relevance might be a total mirage.

One would not expect explicit political points from a mythological burlesque of the type more common in Middle Comedy.[4] As to whether *Daidalos* did belong to this comic sub-genre, and possibly staged the legendary engineer as an enabler of Zeus's seductions, the short fragments are singularly uninformative (being mostly about cuttle-fish, squid, wind-eggs and a partridge). Although he mentions the mythic figure's presence in *Kokalos* (p. 126), Bagordo does not press comic typology further to suggest a production date. Once more, he admirably refrains from speculation, choosing to note instead the common generic topoi underlying individual fragments—for example the swipe in fr. 191 at women as adulterers, which he aligns with passages from *Peace*, *Lysistrata, Thesmophoriazusae* and *Ecclesiazusae.*

Gerytades (a made-up title-character, roughly "Son of the Singer") most acutely raises the problems with extrapolating plot and stage-action from a better-preserved, allegedly cognate play (in this case, *Frogs).* The comedy seems to have staged the dispatch to Hades of a group of Athenian poets who represented the three genres of the Dionysia contests: Meletus (tragedy), Sannyrion (comedy), and Cinesias (dithyramb). An interesting longer fragment (156) is worth the five full pages Bagordo devotes to it, in a characteristically diligent and sober discussion (pp. 86-90). One of the several puzzles in these dozen lines is that the selected poets are said to be chosen by the assembly because they were known "Hades-Haunters and regularly fond of yonder parts." Bagordo emphasizes that the compound's second element (like that of Θρᾳκοφοῖται "Thrace-haunters" to which they are compared

[4] See I. Konstantakos, "Tendencies and Variety in Middle Comedy", in S. Chronopoulos, C. Orth, eds., *Fragmente einer Geschichte der griechischen Komödie*, Mainz 2015, 159-98.

in this passage) must signal *back-and-forth* movement; he therefore questions the more common interpretation that the ultra-thin composers are on the verge of death and thus face a one-way trip. The precise reference, though, remains opaque—perhaps their lost compositions frequently alluded to the Underworld?[5] What the poets' mission was is unclear, as is the identity of the chorus, and of the speakers in fr. 156, whether Gerytades goes to Hades too, and how much of the action is really set there, whether a symposium takes place with extended discussion of literature, or whether the unnamed poets even had speaking roles. Doubt has not kept interpreters from exercising over-vivid imaginations. Here Bagordo firmly and rightly endorses (p. 84) Olson's bracing deconstruction of such speculations, in particular those most recently made by Matthew Farmer concerning what the play was about.[6] This sceptical stance best befits a commentary that aims to state the facts uncontroversially without foreclosing interpretive options.

Yet if we are prevented by the nature of the evidence from saying much if anything about dramatic structures, characters, or themes, what good *does* it do to lavish attention—like Bagordo's diligently accumulated materials and those of the massive *KomFrag* machine---on mere literary scraps, often consisting of a word or two? Although he never states the principle, Bagordo on each page puts into practice the faith that by analyzing tiny surviving pieces we can expand our appreciation of an entire universe of discourse, thereby opening our eyes to all the possible tropes, turns of phrase, cultural items, props, situations, persons and paraphernalia of Athenian comedy. In other words, the microscopic study of landscape features gives one the lay of the land, even if we cannot rebuild the structures that once stood upon it. In that way, such granular knowledge is immensely useful (as well as entertaining in itself).

In the interest of space, two themes might be singled out that have somewhat more prominence in these particular fragments (metatheatrical moments and semiotically charged place-names) and one further group within the analytical comments (those on comic syntax and morphology). One cannot easily disentangle *Wörter* from *Sachen*: the ways that people of ancient Attica spoke about their world (on or off stage) and the items in it form a whole, as poetic speech is indissociable from "natural" language. That so many of our fragments descend from such sources as Athenaeus, Pollux and prescriptive Atticist texts, seen in this way, offers reassurance that the cultural information being transmitted remained

[5] See most recently on this fragment C. Michel, *Transtextuelle Technik in den Aristophanischen Komödien*, Göttingen 2023, 599-600.

[6] S. Douglas Olson, "The Fragments of Aristophanes' *Gerytades*: Methodological Considerations", *Fragmentation in Ancient Greek Drama*, Berlin 2020, 129-44, precisely illustrates how Farmer's over-confident assertions in his 2017 Oxford volume *Tragedy on the Comic Stage* are implausible individually and therefore less compelling as a whole. For further valuable comments on methodology, see S.D. Olson, H. Baltussen, "Epilogue: A Conversation on Fragments", in J. Kwapisz, ed., *Fragments, Holes and Wholes: Reconstructing the Ancient World in Theory and Practice* (*Journal of Juristic Papyrology* Supplement), Warsaw 2017, 393-406.

unusual and important in antiquity (although the context in which it occurred was often erased by the excerpting process). Citation choices were not totally random.

Two striking metatheatrical fragments have to do with the stage-crane used for *deus ex machina* effects. Someone in *Daidalos* (fr. 192) addresses the μηχανοποιὸς "since you wish your pulley to leave me aloft, say "farewell, light of the sun!" and the same figure of the operator is mentioned in fr. 160 of *Gerytades* as having failed to deploy his machine quickly (both recall the shtick at *Peace* 174-6). Dionysos' theatrical precinct appears in fr. 130, when someone asks directions to "where the Mormo-Goblins (τὰ μορμολυκεῖα) are hung on display"—apparently dramatic masks. Fragments 117, 128, 158, and 178 make fun, meanly or obscenely, of the tragedians Meletus, Euripides, Sthenelus and Agathon, respectively, while other references to dramatic art allude to fattening someone with monodies (fr. 162) and Aeschylus being recited at dinner parties (fr. 161) –both in *Gerytades* and cited by some to argue for its resemblance to *Frogs*. Finally, although fragment fr. 119 (*Georgoi*, via Zenobius 2.27) just refers to a "house in the deme Melite" as a proverb about poor renters, Bagordo adds evidence for the place in question being a *khorêgeion*, since Photius and Hesychius record that in that place "tragedians used to practice, *going frequently*" (*phoitôntes*—a significant term, given *Gerytades* fr. 156).

If Melite, the deme near the Pnyx, carries such latent associations, similar semiotic markers can be detected for other spots named in these fragments, as Bagordo skillfully observes: the Σηράγγιον, a place in Piraeus (*Georgoi* fr. 125), had unsavory overtones (as a bath complex, with attendant questionable characters); Cilicia was a by-word for bad behavior (fr. 107), and the Attic frontier area called Halmyrides was where corpses were dumped (fr. 131). His note on the Thracian city Strepsa (fr. 126) fills out the fragment's bare information that "Strepsaeans" was used in *Georgoi* with a helpful list of comic twists on the verb *strephein* and related forms.

The two aforementioned areas of interest, chosen *exempli gratia*, can be explored further by a reader using one of the four detailed indices (*verborum, rerum, nominum, locorum*) in this volume. Amplifying the potential for discovery is the super-index now being constructed by Anna Novokhatko, Virginia Mastellari, Beatrice Gavazza, and Leon Glaser that allows one to search for any object or word mentioned in the aggregated indices of all *FrC* volumes.[7] What is more difficult to track are the many illuminating comments made by Bagordo (and others in the series) concerning syntax and morphology in Aristophanic comic usage. A future archive of such materials might direct attention to his remarks about fragments 104 (case-structure with *glikhesthai*); 107 (concerning suffix *-ize* with ethnic names); 111 (on compounds with *bathu-*); 121 (on semantic variation between verbs in *-izo* and contract verbs); 122 (on denominative verbs based on agricultural products); 124 (parodic tone of forms in *-tria*); 132 (-on *-ian* in verbs

[7] Accessible at: www.lggk.uni-freiburg.de/wordpressNew/test/.

denoting medical conditions); 134 (on idiomatic use of definite article with body parts); 166 (on adverbial *euthu* + genitive in comic usage); and 172 (on compounds with *-kolax*).

It remains to note only that the text is almost entirely free of typographical error. (I detect only "Anpielung" on p. 15, 3rd line from bottom). The apparatus printed under fr. 193 properly belongs only with fr. 195 (where it also appears). Two secondary-source references in the text fail to show up in the bibliography: Harris-Lewis-Woolmer 2016 (p. 118) and Pirrotta 2009 (p. 126).

Richard P. Martin
Stanford University
rpmartin@stanford.edu

James Diggle, *Theophrastus:* Characters, Cambridge Greek and Latin classics, Cambridge-New York: Cambridge University Press, 2022, x+250 pp., £24.99, ISBN 9781108932790.

Als der Erzähler in Lukians *Wahren Geschichten* (2.20.8-12) bei Homer auf der Insel der Seligen ankommt, fragt er ihn, ob die Verse, über deren Echtheit die Philologen seit Jahrhunderten stritten, wirklich von Homer stammten oder nicht, worauf dieser behauptet, dass in der Tat alle Verse ausnahmslos von ihm stammten. Darin liegt eine geistreiche, dabei aber auch abfällige Bewertung des philologischen Strebens nach der Rekonstruktion eines ursprünglichen Textes. Diese Bewertung mag heute ungerecht erscheinen, vor allem, wenn man etwa in den Forschungen von Gelehrten wie James Diggle (fortan: D.) sieht, welches Potenzial (um mit Martin West zu sprechen) zur Verfeinerung unseres Verständnisses der Sprachen, Metren und Stile der Griechen und Römer in der einfachen Frage liegt, welches Wort ein antiker Dichter oder Autor tatsächlich geschrieben hat.[1] Die hier rezensierte neue Ausgabe der *Charaktere* des Theophrast beabsichtigt, eine solche Verfeinerung auch einem nicht auf diesen Autor spezialisierten Publikum zugänglich zu machen, anders als die bereits vor fast zwanzig Jahren in der ‚orangen' Reihe Cambridge Classical Text and Commentaries erschienene ausführliche, sehr gelungene Ausgabe von D., welche dies bereits für Theophrast-Experten erreicht hatte,[2] ganz im Sinne der anderen der

[1] Vgl. M. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, Stuttgart 1973, S. 8: „But by asking the question "which [*sc*. word] in fact did the poet write?", scholars may be led to inquire into the usage of the particles and the habits of Aristophanes more closely than it would ever have occurred to them to do otherwise. In the same way, by asking such questions all the way through the text, they learn all kinds of things that they did not know and never wondered about, sometimes things that were not known to anybody. So our understanding of the languages, metres, styles of the Greeks and Romans has been continually refined by the observations of clever critics".

[2] J. Diggle, *Theophrastus: Characters*, Cambridge 2004.