Let me close with one significant example of this. Schironi devotes some two and a half pages (only) to what she designates as 'athetesis of longer passages' (481–84). She notes that in such cases 'Aristarchus took particular trouble to look for more than one reason to support his decision', and she then sets out what we can reconstruct of the reasons for two of his most famous atheteses: Helen's harsh speech to Aphrodite at *Iliad* 3.396–418 and Zeus' catalogue of his past amours at *Iliad* 14.317–27. For modern readers of Homer these are extraordinary and extraordinarily radical interventions, but Schironi offers no discussion at all beyond the attempt to clarify Aristarchus' reasons, although she does allow herself her own wry irony ('Aristarchus … certainly knew what women want (and do not want) to hear and how a romantic rendezvous should go – too much talking is never elegant': 484). Here, however, was a chance to help modern students of Homer understand why Aristarchus actually still matters, but the opportunity is not taken, and these pages are, I regret, not going to change anyone's mind about the attention due to Alexandrian scholarship on Homer. That is a real pity, and it is not the outcome that this monumental study deserves.

RICHARD HUNTER
University of Cambridge
rlh10@cam.ac.uk

MASTRONARDE (D.J.) **Preliminary Studies on the Scholia to Euripides**. Berkeley: California Classical Studies, 2017. Pp. xxix + 246. $34.95. 9781939926104.
doi:10.1017/S0075426919000508

This volume, which can also be read online at https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5p2939zc (free of charge), grew out of Mastronarde's work in progress on a new digital edition of the Euripides scholia (https://euripidesscholia.org/). It is divided into five main chapters: (1) 'The scholia and the ancient and medieval tradition of commenting on Euripides'; (2) 'Teachers' scholia, Tzetzes, and Planudes; (3) 'The extra exegetical material in SSa and the teaching tradition; (4) 'On Venetus Marcianus Graecus 471 (codex M of Euripides); (5) 'On Vaticanus Graecus 909 (codex V of Euripides)'. The last two chapters are accompanied by seven plates illustrating the scripts of M and V (191–97). Of particular use are two lists of 136 Euripides manuscripts, arranged by location and siglum respectively, and one of the URLs for online images in the relevant collections (xviii–xxviii). To the last add 'Vienna: https://www.onb.at/digitale-bibliothek-kataloge', where Phil. gr. 119 = Rw has so far been added.

The book offers a wealth of information on the transmission and use of the Euripides scholia from antiquity to the later Byzantine era. Examples are primarily taken from the 'Euripidean triad' (*Hecuba*, *Phoenissae*, *Orestes*), which offers the richest material. The stupendous level of detail Mastronarde includes in recording scholiastic and palaeographical data will often look forbidding to the non-specialist, but important results emerge for the persistent.

Mastronarde's greatest strength is his focus on the teaching tradition, not only as a factor that aided the survival of a text or text corpus, but also as part of its reception history. In chapter 1 he shows that 'pedagogical' notes already occur in the oldest extant manuscripts of Euripides (HBM, *ca*. AD 1000–1050) and probably reach back further in time. This goes some way towards closing the gap in educational history between antiquity and the first Byzantine revival in the ninth century. A notable methodological corollary is 'that classification of the Euripidean scholia as *vetera* vs. *recentiora* is in many cases problematic and misleading' (60).

In chapters 2 and 3, Mastronarde examines various types and corpora of teachers' notes, mainly from the *codices recentiores* (13th to 14th century). With few exceptions, these scholia have not been edited so far. His most significant discovery here is that many notes that, on account of their transmission history, could easily be labelled 'Palaeologan', in fact are likely to date to the 12th century or earlier, and so are testimonies not only of an older teaching tradition, but also of the remarkable conservatism of the Byzantine school system. Mastronarde's painstaking approach of tracing the relationships between scholia and conducting stylistic comparisons with more securely datable corpora is a model for anyone working in the field.

Chapters 4 and 5 apply the previously established methods and findings to two of the most important Euripides manuscripts, M and V. A thorough assessment of the script supports an 11th- rather than 12th-century date for M, which is relevant not so much for editing the Euripides text and scholia as for determining M's status in Byzantine intellectual history (161–62). Regarding V, Mastronarde demonstrates how better knowledge of the pre-1200 teaching

tradition disproves Planudean or Palaeologan influence on the codex and thus indirectly favours its dating to 1250–1280 instead of 1280–1300. The teacher's notes written by V^3 (early in the 14th century?) can be connected with John Tzetzes' work on Euripides (200; *cf*. chapter 2.2).

As indicated above, the book is primarily for specialists. The general reader interested in the subject will profit most from chapter 1.1, where Mastronarde outlines the history of scholarship on the Euripides scholia, discusses the relative merits of extant editions and argues for an all-inclusive and non-hierarchical digital approach, without denying that the aim of reconstructing the earliest recoverable form of a scholia corpus still has its place.

Even the most chalcenteric enthusiast, however, will occasionally wonder whether quite so much information is required to prove a point. Does every aspect of M's script need to be described to locate the manuscript in the 11th century (chapter 4.3)? And should further extensive study of the annotations in the *recentiores*, which will benefit only a very small circle of educational historians, be prioritized over the production of a new workable text of the 'old' scholia, which most ordinary Euripideans look forward to?

The organization and production quality of the book generally match that of its scholarship. One should like to learn Robert Allison's explanation for the 'notation of the tally of leaves in a section of a manuscript' (172 n. 56) and references to the illustrative plates would have been welcome in chapter 4.2 as well as 4.3. Without searching systematically, I noticed only a handful of typos.

ALMUT FRIES
University of Oxford
almut.fries@classics.ox.ac.uk

PUCHNER (W.) assisted by WHITE (A.W.) **Greek Theatre Between Antiquity and Independence: A History of Reinvention from the Third Century BC to 1830**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. Pp. xvii + 355. £99.99. 9781107059474.
doi:10.1017/S007542691900051X

Puchner argues that 'although there is ample evidence for continuity of Greek as a spoken language, and to some extent of Greek-speaking culture from antiquity to the modern era, there is no hard evidence of continuity in traditional theatre' (vii). He recommends 'a new approach to cultural historiography based on a closer, contextual analysis of the evidence … [so as] to create a solid framework for theoretical discussion of the continuity issue in the Greek cultural tradition' (vii–viii). There is no 'master narrative'; rather, he tells stories 'worth collecting and telling together for the first time' (322).

The book consists of a preface, introduction, eight chapters (each followed by secondary references and further readings) and an epilogue. Chapter 1 treats the Hellenistic period, when 'we can observe how a theatrical tradition begins to fall into a state of decline' (viii) and, more particularly, 'the development of blurred genres' (17) and the 'emergence of new, more popular and less demanding shows' (18) such as mimes and pantomimes (see especially 30–34). He suggests further that everyday life in the Hellenistic period and later itself acquired a theatricality, which was one of the reasons for the changes. This Hellenistic idea of life as drama or the world as a stage was to have a 'long *Nachleben*' in Byzantium and the Western Renaissance (34). Chapter 2 questions whether the theatre and dramatic literature were part of Byzantine culture in the form that we know them in the Hellenistic age and in Renaissance Italy and Venetian Crete in the 15th and 16th centuries. As Puchner writes, 'profane theatre can be traced up to the fifth to seventh century, but afterwards the evidence is scarce and doubtful' (90). Because of Christian hostility toward the theatre as a manifestation of idolatry, 'the ancient *hypokrites* became a metaphor for fraud; *dramatopoiia* for intrigue' (55–56). Ancient tragedies were mainly reading material and comedies were replaced by mime. The *Christus patiens* serves as a case study.

The reinvention of drama and theatre took place in Crete under Venetian rule (chapter 3). Eight dramas, including tragedies, comedies, pastoral drama, religious drama and 18 intermedia ('a form of courtly entertainment played between the acts of a regular drama and/or at the end, or in separate performances', 142) have survived from Greek dramatic production in Venetian Crete (122). Special attention is devoted to the tragedy *Erofile*, written in Greek at the end of the 16th century and attributed to Georgios Chortatsis (117, 124, n. 59). Although *Erofile* was influenced by the tragedy *Orbecche* by Giambattista Giraldi (1547), its author made many changes to the Italian model. *Erofile* and Cretan dramas in general influenced modern Greek literature and folk culture until the 20th century.