

NOTICES

MERRO (G.) (ed.) *Gli scoli al Reso euripideo*. (Orione 2.) Pp. 297, pls. Messina: Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità, Università degli Studi di Messina, 2008. Paper, €60. ISBN: 978-88-8268-021-5.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X11004033

The tragedy *Rhesus*, widely considered a fourth-century work by an unknown author, is transmitted in the collection of select plays of Euripides. It was placed near the end of that collection, and therefore (like *Troades*) survives in few manuscripts and has the least dense surviving annotation, with scholia occupying only 20 pages in Eduard Schwartz's standard edition of the *scholia vetera* (*Scholia in Euripidem*, vol. II [1891], pp. 326–45). A beneficial side effect of the relative neglect of this play among late ancient and medieval readers and scholars is that the annotation contains much less of the paraphrasing and parsing and rhetorical analysis that bulk so large in the scholia on other plays (especially those of the Euripidean triad). Though now sparse, the scholia to *Rhesus* retain in some of the longer notes the identification of particular scholars and works and verbatim quotations (importantly, Pindar fr. 128c Maehler), having avoided the standard shift found in transmission of more heavily used and more frequently copied scholia toward elimination of the names of particular scholars and shortening or complete omission of quoted passages.

M. has provided an excellent edition based on her Ph.D. thesis at the University of Messina. The sole witness of most of the scholia on *Rhesus* is Vaticanus graecus 909 (V), which has faded ink and water damage in many places. She has been able to study V carefully by autopsy and using an ultraviolet lamp. She has consulted and digested all the previous work on these scholia and informs the reader well in both the apparatus criticus and her commentary. Typographic errors are extremely rare, a most welcome feature in an edition of a difficult text, and M. provides the necessary full indexes of sources, similar passages, ancient authors and passages. Two plates illustrate folio 315 recto and verso of V (a sheet separated from the codex and not known until its contents were published by H. Rabe in 1908).

The Introduction contains helpful sections on the categories of content in the scholia, on the probability that the core of the surviving annotation on this play goes back to Didymus, and on the problem of identifying the origin of the claim in the second hypothesis that this play is not by Euripides (M. argues that Dicaearchus is the likeliest candidate). Her discussion makes clear that there is little to support Wilamowitz's youthful idea (*De Rhesi scholiis disputatiuncula*, 1877 = *Kleine Schriften* 1.1–26) that the scholia are amalgamated from two sources, one arguing against Euripidean authorship and the other for it. One of the few factual slips in the book is that M. repeats (p. 12) Tury'n's fourteenth-century dating of Laur. plut. 31.10 (O of Euripides, K of Sophocles) and shows no awareness of the redating (c. 1175) that has been accepted by editors of the two tragedians for decades (N.G. Wilson in *Scrittura e Civiltà* 7 [1983], 161–76; previewed in *CR* 28 [1978], 335). The commentary is appropriately selective, leaving many shorter notes without remark but explaining textual choices and in particular discussing at length the hypotheses and the major mythographic and exegetic scholia that contain citations (sch. 29, 36, 251, 342, 346, 528a, 859, 916a, 922). As an editor, M. tends to be less regularising than Schwartz (as is appropriate when dealing with scholia) and somewhat more conservative about emending the text (naturally, one may not agree with all her decisions, but the information needed for independent judgement is provided). All in all, this is a very welcome contribution to the resurgence of interest in Greek scholia.

I close with a few points of detail. Sch. 1: Vater's γερόμενοι is needed, since γερόμενος πλησίον almost invariably describes an animate being or moving object, so that πλησίον γερομένων τῶν κοιτῶν is very unlikely. Sch. 29 (comm.): editors who keep τὸ after ἔχει δὲ ὁ λόγος understand it as article with the infinitive, not with ἔτερον, and Wilamowitz's suggestion ἔχει δὲ λόγον would produce the idiom 'it makes sense' (frequent in scholia). Sch. 311: I would keep transmitted ἐκάστους ('each city's people') as less obvious than ἐκάστην, conjectured by M. Sch. 411: Schwartz's correction is superior to Dindorf's. Sch. 441: sch.

Phoen. 45 should be cited as similar. Sch. 479: *προενεκτέον* is a necessary correction (Vater): cf. sch. *Andr.* 79, *Med.* 1129, sch. *Soph. Ant.* 7, sch. *Hom. Od.* 5.23, etc. Sch. 480 (line 1): read *ἐκφαιλίζομεν* (typo). Sch. 509: Wilamowitz's *διαπλεῖν* is closer palaeographically (in some mannered ligatures) to V's odd *ἐξπλεῖν* than Vater's *ἐκπλεῖν*.

University of California, Berkeley

DONALD J. MASTRONARDE
djmastronarde@berkeley.edu