

a point that remains salient regardless of time period and author: comic drama is probably not the best place to look for an accurate sense of slaves and slavery.

New College of Florida

CARL SHAW
cshaw@ncf.edu

FESTIVAL INSCRIPTIONS

MILLIS (B.W.), OLSON (S.D.) (edd.) *Inscriptional Records for the Dramatic Festivals in Athens. IG II² 2318–2325 and Related Texts*. Pp. xiv + 238, ills. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012. Cased, €117, US\$163. ISBN: 978-90-04-22912-9.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X13002230

This book focuses on the three best known epigraphical records of Athenian ancient theatre, which have been the subject of more than a century of archaeological, philological and epigraphical studies (U. Köhler [*IG II*], E. Reisch, A. Wilhelm, E. Capps, J.B. O'Connor, J. Kirchner [*IG II/III²*], P. Ghiron-Bistagne, A. Pickard-Cambridge, H.J. Mette). M. and O. seek to offer a much needed update to the last edition of Mette, *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen* (1977). The first catalogue, the *Fasti* (*IG II² 2318*), consists of a record of men's and boys' choruses, poets, actors and choregoi, who won at the dithyrambic and dramatic competitions of the City Dionysia every year. The second catalogue, the *Didascaliae* (*IG II² 2319–23a*), records both participating and winning poets at the Lenaea and Dionysia along with their protagonists and the titles of their plays. The third catalogue, the *Victors Lists* (*IG II² 2325*), contains chronological lists of the winning comic and tragic poets and actors at the Lenaea and Dionysia, followed by the number of their victories. Two similar records of contests for actors (*SEG XXVI 208* and *IG II² 2324*) are also republished here. In the appendix, the three largest of the so-called 'Roman fragments' (*IGUR 215, 216, 218*) are included, which record artists participating or winning at the Athenian dramatic competitions in the fifth–fourth centuries B.C.E.

These long and extremely fragmentary inscriptions represent the most precious and in many cases our only source for the history of the dramatic and dithyrambic contests in the Athenian theatre from the early fifth to the second century B.C.E. For this reason they need to be examined and treated with the utmost care and caution, which unfortunately this study does not. In the foreword M. and O. announce their intention to dismiss some of the earlier research, as 'doctrinal' or 'ill-founded' and offer instead some new categorical statements which, however, are rashly presented and in some cases (see below) not supported by the evidence.

M. and O. re-examined the fragments of the three records kept at the Epigraphical Museum of Athens and at the Agora Excavations, and they provide dimensions and technical details. The reproduced photographs are courtesy of the Epigraphical Museum, Agora Excavations and A.P. Matthaiou. As noted by M. and O. (p. xi), several of these fragments are in worse condition today than in Reisch's and Kirchner's time (*Didascaliae* and *Victors List* were examined by H.R. Goette and myself in 2007). It should be noted, however, that the squeezes made by Kirchner and kept in the archives of the *Inscriptiones Graecae*, can enable us to read several letters no longer visible. M. and O. renumber most of the inscriptions and change the collocation of some fragments, but these changes can only be considered speculative: most of the originals are lost and we have to take into consideration possible exceptions, which cause more or fewer lines (for example the artist Ameinias

still ἔφηβος ὃν ἐνεμήθη [*IG II² 2323a*, year 311], more or fewer participants, years with no contexts, etc.).

The chronology of the crucial events of the Athenian theatre, as we construe it from certain familiar dates, is not affected by their recalculations (p. 25). The texts of the inscriptions are followed by ‘epigraphical notes’, consisting of an accurate description of the shapes of the dotted letters and including superfluous details, such as a number of impossible readings. Their supplements and readings (more or less dotted letters) substantially correspond with the former editions, but one misses an apparatus criticus that systematically mentions the different readings and supplements (both accepted and refuted) and their authors. In the following section ‘Prosopographical Notes and Comments’ essential information about artists, plots of plays and identity of sponsors is summarised. Space does not allow me to mention the many omissions of earlier readings and supplements.

In Chapter 1, ‘The Fasti: *IG II² 2318*’, the possible total of the lines is recalculated. The actual result of their long ‘numerical’ reflections is that the fragment *i*, usually dated to 333/2 B.C.E., is shifted one year later, which in the absence of cogent arguments can only be considered as a possibility. Some of the photographs of *IG II² 2318* are too bright to be fully legible (pp. 9, 19, 21, 23).

Chapter 2, ‘The Didascaliae: *IG II² 2319–23a*, SEG XXVI 203’.¹ M. and O. refute Reisch’ theory of a single building for both Didascaliae and Victors Lists, without having undertaken a new archaeological or architectural investigation: ‘the walls on which the Didascaliae were inscribed were in fact much too thick to have stood below the architrave blocks that preserve the Victors Lists, and the two sets of inscriptions must accordingly be dissociated’ (pp. 59, 138). As to their basic criticism, one need not accept that the architrave blocks are too small. Their preserved maximum thickness is very similar to those of the wall-fragments (23–5 cm). Furthermore the architrave does not need to be as thick as the walls, as it may have single, double or triple rows of dressed stones (R. Ginouvès, *Dictionnaire méthodique de l’architecture grecque et romaine*, II [1992], pp. 112 and 114, pl. 59).

Regarding the single fragments: *IG II² 2320*. Ibid. l. 15 (l. 13 *IG*) Ὀρέστηι is no longer legible on the stone, but it is clear on the squeeze. *IG II² 2323*. Col. II l. 132 (l. 112 *IG*) -]σε M. and O., -]σει or Πο]σει(δίπτου) cett. (with the following observation about the iota ‘this supposed letter is simply damage on the stone’: the squeeze however confirms that it is an iota and not damage). The new supplement in Col. IV l. 457 (l. 220 *IG*) [ὕπὸ] Εὐερ[- M. and O. instead of [ἐπι] Εὐερ[γέτου οὐκ ἐγένετο] cett., is not a cogent refutation of Meritt’s supplement. In Col. IV l. 461 (l. 223 *IG*) the new supplement ἐπι Ἀρισ[τόλα οὐκ ἐγένετο] M. and O. instead of ἐπι Ἀρισ[τόλα παλαιᾷ] cett. (year 161/0) is unlikely, because the following lines contain the beginning of a competition. *IG II² 2319*. The claim (p. 108) that the fragment should be separated into two is unfounded, but I shall set out the detailed evidence elsewhere. In *IG II² 2321* l. 4 (l. 87 *IG*) the possible restoration suggested by M. and O. Ἀριστοφ[ῶν (Ἀριστοφ[άνης? cett.) is not new (see Wilhelm, pp. 84–6).

Chapter 3, ‘Actors Competitions: SEG XXVI 208 (= *Hesperia* 7 [1938], 116–18, no. 22) and *IG II² 2324*’. The first document is a well-known list of competitions with old

¹Some studies omitted on Didascaliae: D.F. Sutton, *ZPE* 37 (1980), pp. 158–60; P. Ghiron-Bistagne, *Dioniso* 61 (1991), pp. 101–19; W. Luppe, *ZPE* 129 (2000), pp. 19–20; idem, *ZPE* 159 (2007), pp. 25–7; D. Summa, in H. Lohmann and T. Mattern (edd.), *Attika. Archäologie einer ‘zentralen’ Kulturlandschaft, Akten der internationalen Tagung, Marburg 2007* (2010), pp. 121–30, Taff. 30–1.

plays, discussion of which is relegated to footnote 3 (pp. 123–4). On *IG* II² 2324 not belonging to the Didascalieae, cf. already Wilhelm (p. 88); Kirchner, *IG*².

Chapter 4, ‘The Victors Lists: *IG* II² 2325 A–H’. In 2325E col. IV l. 56 (l. 156 *IG*) M. and O. print the new supplement Πύρ[ρος] as more usual than Πυρ[ρήν] (cett.) or Πυρή[v] (Wilhelm, with explanation of his reading, p. 129). On the squeeze Πυρία[ς] is legible.

The appendix, ‘The Roman Fragments (*IGUR* 216, 215, 218)’, does not include the smaller fragments (217, 219, 220, 221, 222). M. and O. say that these fragments ‘perhaps decorated the walls of one of the imperial libraries in Rome (thus Körte)’, but Moretti in *IGUR* p. 184 has suggested more interestingly a provenance from the *Vereinshaus* of the *technitae*.²

A bibliography and indexes of poets, actors, choregoi and archons close the book.

Errors: pp. 16, 26 and 40 παρεδίδαξαν οἱ τραγ[ωιδαί] instead of τραγωιδοί; p. 226 ἀναδίδαξ]ε instead of ἀνεδίδαξ]ε; *ibid.* Μορχίδου instead of Μορυχίδου.

Sadly this study does not really update Mette’s edition. We need an apparatus criticus mentioning all the significant supplements and readings with names of their authors in order to enable us to understand what is new and what is not. In the absence of a new archaeological and architectural investigation of both epigraphical and architectural elements, the rejection of the theory of one monument for Didascalieae and Victors Lists cannot be considered well founded. Furthermore, the erroneous statement on *IG* II² 2319 risks being a step backwards in the study of these most valuable inscriptions.

Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften

DANIELA SUMMA

summ@bbaw.de

STUDIES OF EROS

SANDERS (E.), THUMIGER (C.), CAREY (C.), LOWE (N.J.) (edd.) *Erôs in Ancient Greece*. Pp. xiv + 349, ill. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. Cased, £75, US\$160. ISBN: 978-0-19-960550-7. doi:10.1017/S0009840X13002242

Eros, it seems, does produce grandiloquence and set everyone up for a fall. If only the two younger editors of this strikingly pink-coloured volume had not announced in their introduction, ‘All important thinking about the nature of *erôs* across the entire span from Hesiod to the Second Sophistic is considered, including the input offered by the figurative arts’ – a claim which, they say, makes the book ‘surely an unprecedented contribution’. Such a declaration does so tempt the reviewer to wonder why there is no discussion of Menander, Theocritus, Apollonius of Rhodes (whose work may be thought to have been quite influential in the sphere of erotic verse); or why – when the last poem mentioned comes from the sixth century C.E. – there is no place for the Gospels, the Letters of Paul, or the Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible and Philo, which helped form the canonical texts of Greek Christianity – again rather important on the topic of *erôs*. If Christian prose is still somehow not really Greek for Classicists (though I did think that such a strange disciplinary division had rather dissolved after Michel Foucault and Peter Brown), one could add texts like Dio Chrysostom’s *Euboicus*, or the novels of Heliodorus and Chariton. Or the erotic letters of Philostratus, Lucian and Alciphron. Or

²On these fragments cf. also W. Luppe, *ZPE* 8 (1971), pp. 123–8.