Il mito escatologico non è solo una prima rappresentazione intuitiva della realtà che deve essere sottoposta a scrutinio nella successiva discussione dialettica, ma anche lo strumento più diretto per arrivare all’anima, il punto di partenza emozionale del percorso filosofico: la dialettica socratica presuppone infatti anche un forte coinvolgimento emotivo teorizzato da Socrate nella definizione della sua τέχνη come τέχνη ἔγωγυσκή. Platone crea quindi nel ‘Fedro’ come anche in altri dialoghi socratici continuamente un miraggio, il miraggio di una verità che sembra a portata di mano, raggiungibile e che, una volta avvicinata attraverso il procedimento dialettico, si rivela invece solo un fantasma, una immagine distorta.

A me sembra che il valore del ‘gioco’ socratico nei dialoghi platonici non sia soltanto e principalmente quello di mettere in luce la debolezza delle capacità cognitive ed espressive dell’essere umano, quanto proprio nell’esperienza concreta di un metodo che frustra, ma nel contempo suscita tensione e alimenta continue speranze, un metodo in cui mito e dialettica sembrano assimilati nel loro statuto di incerto strumento epistemologico proprio perché non hanno come fine una conoscenza, ma una esperienza.

Zürich

M. Laura Gemelli Marciano


No fragmentary tragedy has received such prolonged and intensive study by one scholar. All that is known of or bears upon Euripides’ play, or had been conjectured about it up to the year 2000, is accessible through these two volumes; they are both a widely interpretative philological edition and a work of reference; they are graced by generous illustrations and good indexes. Fresh ideas for reconstructing the play will always come forward, but only towards refining results already won, unless significant new evidence appears. This is likely only from papyri, whether dramatic hypotheses (to fill out or supplement P.Oxy. 2455 fr. 17) or text-fragments themselves; on T(estimonien) u(nd) F(ragmente) S. 20 M(üller) observes the paradox that no papyrus of the play-text has yet been found, although the play itself is so richly provided with secondary evidence. Second best, one or more vase-paintings may yet be recovered which match the suggestive power of two scenes on the ‘Hoby’ cup Copenhagen National Museum 9/20 (LMC VII. 1. 383 69° and 74°; ‘Beiträge’ Kap. 7 ‘Das Bildprogramm der Silberbecher von Hoby’., S. 133–76 and Abb. 12–16; TuF Abb.1 and 7).

But two volumes, and a total of more than 800 pages, on one fragmentary play? ‘Beiträge’ is a hugely convenient collection of M.’s eight preliminary and diverse studies published over the years 1990–96, and of three subsequent new pieces, on various aspects of the play and its reception down to our time; I men-
tion most of them in the course of this review. ‘Beiträge’ and TuF should ideally be used together (as M. himself advises, TuF, Vorwort S. 7), but it is possible to rely almost wholly on TuF because it frequently summarises or cross-references to the earlier ‘Beiträge’. In fact the individual studies were revised for the reprinted collection while TuF was being completed; and TuF has on S. 451–6 quite extensive ‘Nachträge’ to them which include many updated references necessarily left imprecise before. In this notice I concentrate accordingly on TuF.

Explanation for the great length of TuF itself is found in M.’s ‘Vorbemerkung’ (S. 21–4): M. needed, first, to conduct a comprehensive review of the sources both primary and secondary, with proper attention to their own context, as well as of literary treatments of the myth both before and after Euripides’ play of 431 B.C., especially Sophocles’ tragedy of 409 (‘Beiträge’ Kap. 10, S. 211–57 is ‘Gegegenelesen. Der sophokleische Philoktet und das Drama des Euripides’); and M. needed, second, to reappraise artists’ reaction to Philoctetes’ story again both before and particularly later than Euripides’ play; most of the studies in ‘Beiträge’ are devoted to this topic (note the latter’s full sub-title, ‘... zur Wiedergewinnung einer Tragödie des Euripides aus der Geschichte ihrer Rezeption’). These reviews and reappraisals are pursued with care in TuF in the long ‘Einleitung’ (S. 19–139) and in the ‘Kommentar’ (S. 219–448); they are served by one of the most valuable parts of the whole enterprise, a documented account of the recovery of ‘testimonia’ and fragments, and successive reconstructions of the play, from Grotius in the early 17th century to M. himself in the late 20th (S. 83–124).

Methodological circumspection is a theme of M.’s work throughout. Also in his ‘Vorbemerkung’ to TuF (S. 21–4) he warns would-be reconstructors to be wary of their own imaginations and unconscious motives, and not to abandon the texts and the historical evidence surrounding them, least of all to neglect Euripides the original author. These are the hard lessons all reconstructors have to learn, with the model objectivity of Snell-Kannicht-Radt’s TrGF before them; and M. had the huge advantage of seeing Kannicht’s early working notes upon the play (other recent editors too have been grateful for comparable generosity). In addition, reconstructors must learn caution from the most recent statements of ‘iconographers’, navigating particularly the reefs of vase-painting which depicts – or seems to depict – dramatic myth in single or composite scenes. At the heart of everything there are still, and must remain at the heart, the ‘Testimonien und Fragmente’ themselves. M. sets them all out in TuF S. 141–217 with Greek or Latin text and Latin ‘apparatus’ on the left-hand page, and translations and other editor’s matter on the right, approximately in the style of Lloyd-Jones’ editions of the Aeschylus and Sophocles fragments for the Loeb Library, of Jouan and Van Looy’s Budé edition of the Euripides fragments (Philoctetes ed. Jouan, VIII 3e Partie, 2002, pp. 269–312) and of Collard-Cropp-Lee-Gibert in ‘Euripides. Select Fragmentary Plays I and II’ (1995 and 2004; Philoctetes ed. Collard, II, pp. 1–34).

1 M. has even added to his work on the play; he has advanced reasons for Euripides’ mere third place at the Dionysia in 431 with the production including ‘Philoctetes’ (and ‘Medea’): RhM 145, 2002, 61–7.
As a fellow-worker who gratefully gathered in M.’s ample vineyard, I must risk a charge of sour grapes when I judge that M.’s presentation of testimonia and fragments has not worked well.

First, M. does not confine himself to the two entirely adequate category-symbols T(estimonia) and F(ragmenta) canonized by TrGF; he adds three of his own: H(ypothesis), P(araphrase) and S. The last is presumably S(upplement), for it is defined as ‘Ergänzung’ on S. 292 and explained on S. 139 as representing M.’s own ‘reconstruction of the context’, that is, narrative or amplification which he inserts into the surviving evidence as he articulates it on his right hand pages into a linear play-structure of Prologue, Parodos, five Episodes with four intervening Stasima, and Exodos. There are 56 such insertions signalled with ‘S’; M.’s category H runs in numbers from H 1 to H 4, T from T 1 to T 30, P from P 1 to P 15, F from F 1 to F 24. The intention with these many categories is to aid the reader as clearly and generously as possible, and that is admirable; but it leads to confusion, for M. not only duplicates and repeats matter under differing T, H and P numbers, but on his left-hand pages offers an interrupted sequence of H, T, P and F so that finding any one of them through cross-reference can take time. For example: for the play’s Prologue (filling S. 162–75) the sequence is T 1–9, F 1, P 1–2, F 2, P 3–4, F 3, P 5, F 4, P 6–8, F 5. Also, while M.’s own F numbers are indeed followed on these left-hand pages by those of Nauck\textsuperscript{2}--Snell in brackets, cross-referencing to the fragments throughout the work is through M.’s numbers alone, so that the reader must look at the Concordance on S. 460 which gives both sets. The renumbering of ‘testimonia’ and fragments by the editor of an individual Euripidean play is understandable, given the long period of time since Nauck\textsuperscript{2} (1889) and even Snell’s ‘Supplementum’ (1964); but it has always been better, and reassuring to the reader, to use their long-established fragment-numbers throughout, even if the individual editor sometimes changes their order or supplements them (problems were caused in the past by Mette’s complete renumbering of the fragments of both Aeschylus and Euripides). Further, it is a very great pity that M. has not used Kannicht’s single T category and limited letters and numbers (just T i, ii, iii a–c, iv a–d, v; these were, I assume, made available to him) for all the evidence he presents with his own H, T and P numbers, which total forty-nine.

The presentation of evidence from Dio of Prusa’s comparison between the Philoctetes-plays of Aeschylus, Euripides and Sophocles (‘Oration’ 52) and his paraphrase of Euripides’ beginning (‘Oration’ 59) suffers most from M.’s procedure. This evidence is a special problem, because no other fragmentary play has such extensive and important secondary matter of this kind.

In TuF Dio 52 stands complete on S. 148–61, as H 4; 52 §§ 11–13 reappear in whole or part on 162 as T 2; § 12 on 168 as P 2 and 3; § 13 on 174 as P 7, on 198 as T 21; § 14 on 166 as T 8 and 9. Dio 59 on the other hand appears distributed across three T 20, P 1, 4–6, 8, 10–14 and F 11, not unreasonably, given that much of 59 is paraphrase of the play-text; but Kannicht in TrGF himself presents all of Dio’s evidence and paraphrase much more economically under both T and F. (Similarly, P.Oxy. 2455 fr. 17. 246–66 stands complete on S. 144–7 as H 2, with parts reappearing on 164 as T 4 and 6, on 178 as T 14, on 198 as T 19, on 206 as T 27.)

M. has done his users no good service in presenting ‘testimonia’ and fragments in this way; the attempt to be helpful does not succeed. Readers are certain to be confused by the over-elaborate presentation and sequence, as I was myself (and I know the evidence fairly well); worse, do not M.’s own insertions (his S 1–56) into both the translated ‘testimonia’ and even the primary evidence, the translated fragments themselves, actually impair a reader’s own evaluation of the primary material, and even prejudice his own running ‘reconstruction’? – this too after...
M.'s own insistence that students and reconstructors of the play must concentrate on the historical evidence alone.

Now, some notes on the edited Greek text of the more important 'testimonia'.

H 2 (S. 144–7) is P.Oxy, 2435 fr. 17, 246–66; M. incorporates readings of the papyrus not only by himself but also by Kannicht in advance of TrGF. M. discussed and supplemented exempli gratia 246–51 and 264–6 first at 'Beiträge' Kap. 2, S. 43–51 (originally published in JPE, 98, 1993, 19–24); in TuF one may note 257 παρηγορεύον, too long for the space, and 266 ἐντριζάτω (Odysseus sets out to recover Philoctetes), attractive.

M. edits both 'Orations' of Dio on the basis of his own fresh collations of the principal mss., wider than in von Arnim's still standard edition; he attends to minutiae of orthography and includes revised stemmata, but has no new reading significant to the play's reconstruction; M.'s own conjectures nevertheless aim to help the text of Dio itself: Dio 32.9 (H 4 M.) (ὁ λάτρης of Odysseus persuading Philoctetes) εὐθυμονεύσας ἦσαν προπόντος M. in place of εὐθυμονεύσας ἦσαν προπόντος or εὐθυμονεύσας κατ' ἦσαν προπόντος mss.: very likely right. 32.11 (H 4 and T 2 M.) (Euripides' rhetorical όνομαζόν) ἀντιστοιχος ἦσαν τῇ τοῦ Λισάρχου ποιήσεως, παραπροτάτη καὶ ἄφθονον ὀφθαλμὸν, supplemented by M: plausible and attractive, but not evidently necessary. Here and 32.7 (also H 4 M.), M. translates πολιτικάς as 'true to the reality of the polis' rather than 'political'. At 39.6 (P 10 M.) the disguised Odysseus, aiming to ingratiate himself with Philoctetes, describes himself as σοὶ γε καὶ δίκαιος καὶ αὐλοτόμος; M. bases his supplement on the need to justify Philoctetes' later remark in 59.7 'you were right to say you were my φίλος' – but the remark is adequately justified by Odysseus' immediately preceding statement that he was one of the Greeks campaigning against Troy.

Copious circumstantial commentary on Dio 52 fills S. 240–91, on Dio 59 S. 302–7 (a valuable analysis of Dio's technique of paraphrase) and 356–82; there is translation and commentary of 39.7–10 as part of 'Beiträge' Kap. 3 'Der Palamedesmythos in Philoktet des Euripides', at S. 55–62: so this edition of the 'Philoctetes' contains also the best modern edition and commentary of two 'orations' of Dio.

On the attribution or location of some play-fragments. To find out the scholar responsible, one has often to consult the commentary and not the 'apparatus', for example for the important location of F 793 N² (now 789a TrGF = 1 M.) at the play's beginning (it appears to be due to M. himself: see the 'Kommentar' at S. 301–2). M.'s F 5 is his own importation from Cyc. 707 (not accepted by Kannicht, TrGF p. 810); he posits that Philoctetes' cave was like that of the Cyclops, and of Philoctetes in the later Sophocles play, with entrances at both front and back (i.e. off-stage): see 'Beiträge' Kap. 5, S. 97–110 'Höhlen mit doppeltm Eingang bei Sophokles und Euripides'. M. thinks that Euripides would have used the same description of the cave, and indeed the same phrase as in Cyc. 707, δόλιον ἄλοχον γένοιτο – but why not something like Sophocles' δίστομος πέτρα (Phil. 16)? M.'s F 7 is adesp.579 (not accepted by Kannicht, TrGF p. 810), introduced into the play because its wording, similar to that of Dio 39.11, suggests paraphrase by Dio; the suggestion goes back to Nauck. From the same section of Dio Nauck² p. 616 thought the words χατ᾽ ἄρχουσι δ᾽ οὐδόμοις ἀνεχτὸς ἦν (of Philoctetes' affliction) 'probably' Euripidean, a lead followed only by Mette ( = No. 1114c); this is M.'s doubtful F 11; because the plural in χατ᾽ ἄρχουσι is not Euripidean, M.'s doubt is just (also not accepted by Kannicht, TrGF p. 810). M.'s F 24 is the one word δριμοὺς, used of Odysseus at Cyc. 104; M. assigns it to the
play because it describes the Odysseus of both Aeschylus and Euripides at Dio 52.3 (see his S. 261): this is rash (not accepted by Kannicht, TrGF p. 832).

On the text and primary sense of some play-fragments. Here, it is worth observing how few these are, and how brief; some of them cannot be placed in dramatic context; all this increases the difficulty of determining the meaning, especially where corruption is evident. Progress here is most unlikely without new primary evidence.

F 793 N² (F 1 M.) again: M. supposes the first of these two verses to be in ‘quoted’ direct speech, preceded by some now lost introductory words of Odysseus, at the very beginning of the prologue-speech. This is an improbable place for such a conversational manoeuvre; since the two lines are gnomic in character, they can well stand at the very beginning of a play, like Or. 1–3; and the second line is better understood as part of the gnome, as in Stobaeus 4.17.18, rather than as an independent line accidentally cited without the first line at Stobaeus 3.39.13. In the second line, the adversative meaning of transmitted κοίτι as ‘and yet’, favoured by both M. and Kannicht, seems to me too difficult, and Gesner’s conjecture κοῖτοι much simpler. F 788.2 (F 3 M.): M.’s interpretation of περισσῶς as ‘pushy’ and approximating to πολιπράγµατος is good. F 792a (F 6 M.): ὦλες, ὦ δικαῖος, πέρσανε: M. accepts the not rare form of this paroemiac, but conjectures κόπος πέρσανε, in what seems to me an unnatural emphasis in a despairing expostulation addressed to an abstraction. F 792 (F 10 M.): φυγάζοντα is translated as ‘Krebsgeschwür’; but the sore is not ‘cancerous’, it is a severe, unhealing, ulcerous wound, ‘rodent’. F 794.4 (F 15 M.): M.’s apparatus does not mention the additional punctuation after γε (Barnes) which the commentary rejects; but it seems more natural (it is accepted by Kannicht in TrGF). F 795 (F 14 M.): after line 1, in which both M. and Kannicht are wrong, I think, to prefer ἄρρητος to μούστιος in the reference to seers’ ‘seats’, θυρωτος (cf. IT 1244: do the generality of seers’ ‘rule’?); this very difficult fragment is well handled by M.; Kannicht’s attractive suggestion in TrGF that in line 3 the article οὗ, or relative οὗ, should be replaced with the interjection δι, was too late for M.; his own proposal is not less appealing, a lacuna after line 3 containing a more logical preparation for the ideas of 4–5. F 797 (F 16 M.) is a classic problem for an editor of fragments: the text and bearing of lines 1–2 must remain in doubt because the source gives no dramatic context; lines 3 and 4 both contain offences against metre, all of which, I think, is allowed by the context, and by conjecturing θυρωτος for μούστιος, plausible on the supposition of mechanical error but unverifiable without the context, and in line 4 reasonably adopts Jacobs’ ἐμφανῆ θήκη for ἐμφανῶν οὐκ. Whatever is read, the fragment defies location. M.’s own F 18 (= desp.10) accepts its ascription to the play by Musgrave, and to Odysseus maligning Philoctetes as unlikely to attract a bride in his present sorry condition; Kannicht in TrGF (p. 832) omits the fragment, almost certainly correctly; in this fragment M.’s commentary on S. 434–5 does not adequately explain the syntax in εὖ ... ὅς γομίν έσχες. F 799a and 800 are combined into one fragment by M. (his F 20/21), but at the cost of fabricating a verse of his own between them (S 53) to ease the sequence of thought.

The majority of users will consult M.’s two volumes chiefly for a reconstruction and appreciation of the play; also, and increasingly nowadays, for its ‘reception’ from antiquity to the present. On all three of these topics, he offers abundant riches, in both ‘Beiträge’ and TuF. Since I have addressed them myself, particularly the first two, in my recent very brief ‘edition’ of the play (see above), I offer here only a few comments upon M.’s treatment of them. I risk being unfair to his extremely elaborate and full reconstruction, made into a continuum through his narrative supplements S 1–56 (above), by reducing it to a bare scheme, but it is useful for the purposes of this notice (in the scheme I note his location only of the principal ‘testimonia’ and of the text-fragments).
Scene: outside Philoctetes’ cave on Lemnos.

Prologue: Odysseus comes alone from his ship, to recover Philoctetes for the Greeks at Troy. He has been disguised by Athena to protect him from immediate, vengeful attack by Philoctetes; either he is accompanied by Diomedes or he has concealed him nearby for some future intervention. He reveals his mission to recover Philoctetes, the prophecies of the Trojan Helenus about Philoctetes’ bow taking Troy, and the threat of a Trojan counter-mission to secure man and bow for their own cause (F 793 N², 787, 788, 789, F 3 M., intercut with Dio 52.5–14 and 59.1–4, 11–14, and P.Oxy. 2455 fr. 17).

Parodos: the Chorus enter, coming from concern at their long neglect of Philoctetes (Dio 52.6–7), but they find him absent from his cave. Odysseus remains unseen by them.

Episode 1: the Chorus are interrupted by Actor, who brings Philoctetes some sustenance (Dio 52.8). M. adduces here the ‘Hoby’ cup, with its composite scene one part of which shows a man disembowelling a fowl, LIMC VII. 1.383.69°). Actor informs the Chorus (and therefore the unobserved Odysseus) of Philoctetes’ condition, and of the ‘Troyans’ advent; then he leaves.

Stasimon 1: ‘I hope never to have ill-fortune like that of Philoctetes!’ (F 791).

Episode 2: Odysseus approaches the Chorus, pretending to be a Greek in flight from Troy; they are interrupted by Philoctetes’ slow entry, and the disguised Odysseus begins his deception; he wins Philoctetes’ pity as a fellow-victim of the Greeks, playing also on their heartless destruction of Palamedes, so that Philoctetes invites him to share his poor hospitality in the cave, which they enter (Dio 59.5–11, F 7 M., 790a and 792, 792, F 711 M.).

Stasimon 2: a blank, but M. places here the two-word F 801, on Palamedes’ death.

Episode 3: the Trojan embassy to Philoctetes arrives. Philoctetes and the still disguised Odysseus come out to confront them; in an οφθαλμος Philoctetes rejects them after Odysseus argues for Greek patriotism and dismisses Helenus’ prophecies; Philoctetes agrees to accompany Odysseus home to Greece, and they enter the cave to prepare for departure (F 796, 795, 794, backed by P.Oxy. 2455 fr.17, and Dio 59.4 and 52.13).

Stasimon 3: a blank.

Episode 4: Philoctetes inside the cave is suddenly attacked by agony from his wound. Diomedes (who has left his concealment and entered the cave from the rear, i.e. off-stage) comes out with the bow, seized during this attack, and tells the Chorus what happened; then he goes off to Odysseus’ ship (here M. relies entirely on two vase-paintings, one of them again the ‘Hoby’ cup above, with its part-scene of the bow being taken from Philoctetes while he suffers).

Stasimon 4: a blank.

Episode 5 and Exodos: Odysseus, now in his true identity (in the cave, off-stage, his actor has changed masks), and Philoctetes come out, the latter recovered from his pain but outraged by the deception. They argue, but Odysseus forcibly persuades Philoctetes, who is now helpless without his bow, that his safety and destiny lie at Troy; they leave the scene for Odysseus’ ship (F 797, 798, 18 M., 799, 799a and 800, cf. Dio 52.2, P.Oxy. 2455 fr.17. At play-end, ‘forcible persuasion’, πεπόνησαν ἄνευ τεχνίτος, is said by Dio 52.2 to be a feature of all three tragedians’ Philoctetes-plays.).

(M. leaves the contextless one-word fragments F 802, 803 and 24 M. unlocated, inevitably. It is of interest that at TuF S. 446–7 he estimates the number of lines in each episode, but not in the lyric parts, and produces for the whole play a total of 900–950 dialogue-lines; this would yield a total length of perhaps 1200–1300 verses, a typical length for Euripides’ earlier career.)

This reconstruction fills out in one or two new and significant ways a plot which had been inferred in outline from Dio as early as the mid-19th century. Distinctive are (1) M.’s distribution of incident and fragments across the play’s opening scenes, and in particular the advance of F 793 to the start of Odysseus’ prologue; (2) M. grapples with the problematic initial presence and later role of Diomedes, allocating the whole fourth episode to him; (3) M. has his first episode
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dominated by Actor; (4) M. postpones the disguised Odysseus’ first meeting with Philoctetes until the second episode.

(1) is convincing, (2) the presence of Diomedes as a stage-person in the play seems certain from Dio 52.14, but a speaking part for him is not, for he may have been a mute (consider the role of Pylades as Orestes’ helpmate in the matricide, silent but for three lines in ‘Choephori’, silent throughout both Euripides’ and Sophocles’ ‘Electra’). Diomedes may have made a surprise entrance of which Odysseus himself gave no warning in the prologue; for example, he may have taken part in the deception of Philoctetes with a preliminary false promise of return to Greece (suggested by Wecklein and others); he may have contributed to the final scene of persuasion. Giving him an episode which is purely narrative, as M. does, seems rather contrived: it is necessary to have such an εξαγγελία than to allow the details of Philoctetes’ attack of pain, and the seizure of the bow, to emerge, perhaps with Odysseus himself coming out of the cave first? On the other hand, M.’s suggested scene allows the actor playing Odysseus to change his mask ‘in the cave’ and so to remove his disguise: excellent. (3) Dio’s statement that Euripides introduced Actor is unequivocal (52.8), and he is best given a place early in the play; most reconstructors have him bring Philoctetes both supplies of food and clothing as well as a warning that the Trojans are to approach him; Actor may also have aided Philoctetes physically in his final departure (but as a mute?). The large questions are whether Actor’s first appearance preceded that of Philoctetes (M.) or followed it (most reconstructors), and how closely: this is (4). It seems to me well possible that Actor’s warning about the Trojans heralded their entry and the ὄγνον in an immediately following scene or, more likely, episode, the second. Rather than postpone Philoctetes’ first meeting with Odysseus to the second episode, and to fill it with this confrontation (M.), I favour a second episode in which the Trojans arrive and are rebuffed, a third in which Philoctetes’ attack of agony leads to his dispossession of the bow, and a fourth, probably running into the exodos, in which both his new and hopeless predicament and ‘forcible persuasion’ make him accept departure from Lemnos for Troy.

As to ‘appreciation’, and what is possible: Dio in 52 is interested in Euripides’ dramatisation for its careful and credible plot, and its well-chosen, ‘realistic’, effective and morally instructive language (§§ 11–14); Dio 59 exemplifies Odysseus’ skilful self-analysis and self-appraisal, and resourceful manipulation of Philoctetes’ sympathy. The fragments themselves are too brief to permit more than superficial testing of Dio’s judgements; few fragments lie outside the prologue, the scene in which Odysseus first meets Philoctetes, and the ὄγνον, and even some of these are sententious, frustrating clear location; F 797 lacks a context altogether. What does seem clear – and this is a major result of recent studies, especially M.’s own in ‘Beiträge’ Kap. 1, S. 11–42 ‘Patriotismus und Verweigerung. Eine Interpretation des euripideischen Philoktet’ (first published in a journal in 1992 and taking account of S. D. Olson, ‘Politics and the lost Euripidean Philoctetes’, Hesperia 60, 1991, 269–83) – is that Euripides made the predicament of Philoctetes, and the challenge to recover him, the ground for much reflection on the nature of public and private moralities: ‘country or self?’ If Odysseus’ characterisation is clear enough from Dio 52.1–14 and 59.2–10 (and recognisably typical of Tragedy), that of Philoctetes is not. He is embittered by the Greeks’ betrayal and abandonment, but this is a staple of the story. In Euripides he is capable of sympathy towards a supposed fellow-victim of the Greeks, much as he shows a warmer feeling in Sophocles when faced with the son of his old friend Achilles; yet Dio 52.16 writes of him as ‘much gentler and straightforward’ (πολύ προσότερον καὶ ἀπλούστερον) in Sophocles than in Euripides. Neither in Dio
nor in any other lesser 'testimonium', however, nor in the text-fragments, are we told anything substantive about the cause of the snake-bite which has poisoned both his body and mind so violently: was it a carelessness or a true offence in Chryse's sanctuary when he guided the Greeks there, or a device of the gods both to punish that and still in the end to reward him with his delayed destiny at Troy? (Where are the gods in the play, except for Athena's disguise of Odysseus and the very incomplete allusions to the prophecies of Helenus?) How was Philoctetes' bitterness and stubbornness shaped by Euripides, so that he resisted the Trojans and then struggled against the revealed Odysseus' 'forcible persuasion'? These aspects of the play remain beyond conjecture.

'Art and iconography': M. gives these matters the most thorough possible discussion, whether as potential evidence for reconstruction or in their own right; this is the major theme of 'Beiträge' Kap. 4, 6–8, S. 71–97, 112–201, which treat respectively an Etruscan mirror from Castro, Etruscan funeral urns, the 'Hoby' cup, and a sarcophagus from Hever Castle, and of the methodological survey in Kap. 9, S. 202–10, 'Der Philoktet des Euripides als Problem der ikonographischen Deutung. Unstrittenes, Unsicheres, Falsches'. 'Beiträge' has numerous photographs; they are supplemented by line-drawings in TuF, where M. both lists artistic representations among the 'testimonia' and fragments, and evaluates them in the commentary. Literary 'reception' also gets unprecedented space: everywhere in 'Beiträge', but especially Kap. 11, S. 258–308 'Philoktet in Rom'; and in TuF S. 72–82 M. gives the useful summary 'Rezeption und Nachwirkung in der Antike'. Lastly: I emphasize the astonishing thoroughness and acuity with which over many years M. has correlated all hard or potential evidence, verbal and material, and analysed other scholars’ ideas. He has constructed a plausible dramatic structure and continuum, especially of the play’s beginning. These two volumes are a remarkable resource, provided the user of TuF distinguishes between what is attested and what is speculative, and treats the latter with caution (especially M.’s own 'supplements', his S 1–36). The volumes inform about much more than the unique problems of Euripides' 'Philoktetes' and the techniques (and duties) of a reconstructor approaching this or any other fragmentary play, for they illuminate too the tracing of a mythological tradition and its literary use.

Oxford            Christopher Collard


When Denis Knoepfler and Marcel Piérart invited scholars from several countries to the Colloquium ‘Éditer, traduire, commenter Pausanias en l’an 2000’, at the Universities of Neuchâtel and Friburg in 1998,1 much work had already been done on that invaluable testimony of late Antiquity, and great expectations had

1 Proceedings published under the same title three years later (Genève 2001).