Ed ora alcune puntualizzazioni su problemi specifici:

- p. 25, n. 101: a proposito dell’elegia per Salamina di Solone, è veramente strano che si disattenda ancora la testimonianza esplicita di Plutarco (Sol. 8, 1) secondo cui essa fu eseguita nell’ἀγαπή dal poeta che si era finto pazzo;
- p. 56: la valenza metaforica dell’aggettivo σύμμορφον nel fr. 41 di Ipponatte viene fondata sul fatto che «the well-known porous quality of the fig-tree suggest availability for sexual penetration»: l’interpretazione appare forzata e non adeguatamente motivata;
- p. 104: Solone fr. 20 contiene ‘reflections on the proper age for death’: sarebbe utile aggiungere che si tratta di uno scambio di opinioni (simposiale?) con Mimnermo, come testimonia la fonte antica che cita il frammento (Diog. Laert. 1, 60);


Si segnalano infine alcuni errori ed imprecisioni nel testo greco: p. 4 H. Dem. 203 παρὰ σχολίου (per παρασχολίου); p. 19 fr. 21, 7 ἡμειότης (per ἐνταμειότης); p. 54 nel v. 4 del fr. 25 manca βουκόλιος; p. 86 fr. 25, 2 ἑνετίς (per ἡπειτίς); fr. 48, 6 ἡπούστου (per ἡπάστου) p. 151 in Poet. 1448b–1449 a 5 ἐκάτετερον per ἐκάτετον.

In conclusione, il lavoro di K. si presenta come uno studio ben strutturato e coerente, che ha il suo punto di forza nell’analisi tematica dei testi giambici (ed anche dell’elegia arcaica). L’analisi offre un’interessante classificazione che può essere utile punto di partenza per ulteriori indagini.

Lecce
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Although Satyrus’ ‘Collected Lives’ survive today only in fragments, in the Hellenistic world they were widely read and often cited. In Alexandria Heraclides Lembus chose Satyrus’ work for epitomization along with Aristotle’s ‘Politeia’ and Sotion’s biographies of the heads of the philosophical schools. In the second century AD someone in Oxyrhynchus had a copy of Satyrus’ ‘Life of Euripides’. Satyrus was cited by Athenaeus in his Deipnosophistae and by Diogenes Laertius in his ‘Lives of the Famous Philosophers’. The writers of the Vitae of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides also drew, both directly and indirectly, on Satyrus. His biographies were still being read by Greek and Latin authors as late as the second century AD.

The names of other biographers appear in the manuscript Vitae of famous poets and philosophers, but for none of these do we have as many ipsissima verba as
we do for Satyrus. These allow us to see that the original biographies were far more interesting and amusing than they became in the condensed form in which we find them preserved in quotations or summaries. The fragments of his biography of Euripides in POxy 1176 preserve a lively dialogue with give and take among its three characters, at least one of whom is female.

Ancient quotations of Satyrus’ work were first collected by K. O. Müller in FHG. Because so many of these excerpts had such dubious historical value, it is not surprising that beginning with A. S. Hunt in the editio princeps, scholars greeted the fragmentary Life of Euripides with something less than enthusiasm. The papyrus life showed clearly that Satyrus constructed his biographies of poets from their writings. Most probably, he had little else to go on, other than information in Athenian public inscriptions.

Instead of asking Satyrus to provide the kind of historical portrait that we might expect from a modern writer of biography, but rather judging him on the basis of what he was trying to do, scholars can offer a more positive and interesting assessment of his work. G. Arrighetti in his 1964 edition of the Life of Euripides was the first scholar to observe that Satyrus often sought to indicate that he did not entirely believe in the veracity of his sources. In the present volume Schorn continues that more fruitful line of approach, but takes our understanding of Satyrus’ work much further than any previous scholar. Here is an exemplary edition, with an informative introduction, text, translation, full commentary, with excurses on issues of particular interest or difficulty. Schorn’s assessment is comprehensive, well-documented, accurately printed, and attractively presented.

In this new edition Schorn has collected all the fragments, including the Life of Euripides, in a single volume. He has reviewed all the papyrus manuscripts and has removed some previous reconstructions of the text. He has also surveyed all the relevant scholarship, and subjected many long-held assumptions to fresh scrutiny. He never fails to recognize the difference between Satyrus ipse and the writers who refer to him, and through careful re-examination of the data offers a detailed and penetrating account of Satyrus’ methodology. As a result of Schorn’s work, it is now possible to see that Satyrus was a far more influential and respectable figure than previous scholars had supposed.

Schorn’s seventy-five page introduction should now be required reading for anyone interested in Satyrus and Hellenistic biography generally. There is no evidence to support the assumption that Satyrus lived in Alexandria. In the Hellenistic age Satyrus’ birthplace, the city Callatis (now Mangalia, Romania) had considerable cultural resources. Perhaps the biographer traveled to Athens during his lifetime, because he appears to have consulted the Attic didaskaliai in the construction of his chronologies, but even that is by no means certain. Schorn believes that he was active during the last decades of the third century. That suggests that he cannot be identified with the author of the ‘Demes of Alexandria’, who appears to have lived in the middle of the second century.

Although Satyrus’ Life of Euripides is a dialogue, Schorn cautions us not to assume that all his other biographies took that form. Here again we are limited by the nature of our evidence. Satyrus’ excerptor Heraclides Lembus appears to have had a preference for anecdotes and sensational stories and did not share Sa-
Satyrus' interest in historical issues or skepticism about oral traditions. One can get a better sense of the quality of Satyrus' original work by comparing his Life of Euripides with the Euripides Vita. Both appear to have used a common source (Q), but with strikingly different results. In Satyrus' dialogue about Euripides the characters evince respect for the poet; the Vita emphasizes the negative aspects of Euripides' life.

In the dialogue in Satyrus' Life of Euripides the speakers include a woman called Eucleia, who cannot be identified with any real person; Diodorus, who could be male or female; and a central speaker who appears to have more authority than either of the others, but whose name does not occur in the papyrus fragments. There are clear affinities here with Aristotle's biographical works (or at least from what we know about them), not only in the dialogue form, but in the use and discussion of anecdotes and legends.

The papyrus fragments of Euripides' life show clearly that Satyrus' primary sources were the poets' own words and ancient comedy. Because of the second- (or third-) hand nature of the fragments of his other lives of poets and philosophers, it is possible only to list occasional correspondences with other writers; but here again Satyrus appears to have read a wide range of materials, including Herodotus, the writers of Atticides, literature about Socrates, and Aristotle. In some cases the quotations contain noticeable variations from other known sources. Some of these appear to be deliberate adjustments, made to adapt the quotation to its new context.

The idea that characters speak for the poet, as Satyrus realized, comes from comedy. In the Life of Euripides an interlocutor quotes Aristophanes 'as if he were called in to testify on this topic: 'he [the poet] is himself what he makes his characters say,' (Ο γ[ν][ῶν Ἀριστοπάθης] φησὶν ὃ[ς]περ ἐπ' αὐ[τῷ] τοῦτο[ι] καὶ καθ[τοιο][ν] ο[ι]ς μὲν π[ι]ο[ε]ί λέγειν το[ῦς δέ][την F 6 fr. 19 IX 19–28). When later in the dialogue an interlocutor makes fun of another interlocutor's attempt to read autobiography into one of Euripides' choral songs: 'What you say seems to me to be more ingenious than true,' (κομψόχε[ῖ]ς το[ι]ς φοινίκ[ας] λέγειν ἢ πε[ῖ]ς άληθώντως F 6 fr. 19 IX 17–21). Unfortunately, the writers who epitomized Satyrus' biographies or quoted from them did not choose to make such critical distinctions between the poet and his characters in his writings.

By close reading and careful analysis Schorn is also able to derive from the surviving fragments some sense of the general character of the other Lives. Even when dealing with figures like Alcibiades, Satyrus appears to have been more interested in describing his subject's character than his politics or cultural environment. He seems also to have been influenced, at least indirectly, by the Peripatetic understanding of personality. Euripides, for example, appears in Satyrus' Life to display some of the qualities of the μεγαλοπόρος ([Ετί δ]ὲ καὶ τὴν [ψυχὴν μέγας] [ἡν], F 6 fr. 8 II 20–24).

Schorn's detailed and informative commentary shows how much can be learned from a comparative consideration of all we know about Satyrus' work. Even when we do not have the text of Satyrus' own words, we can get a sense of what the biographer was doing from analogues in the Life of Euripides. For example, Satyrus' story (F 4, cited in Vit. Soph 13) about Iophon's lawsuit against
his father can hardly be historical. Rather, it is one of several anecdotes in Satyrus’ works that derive directly from the plots of dramas or comedies, in this case the ‘Oedipus at Colonus’, and the myth of Oedipus’ quarrel with Polynices. The anecdotes about Euripides’ second marriage and cuckoldling by Cephsiphon (F 6 fr. 39 XII–XIII) may have ultimately been inspired by the first ‘Hippolytus’; Satyrus expresses his doubts about the accuracy of this story through his interlocutor (δόξα Σωτέρης, F 6 fr. 39. XII 24–25; ὅσις μἠν ἄραντοιον, F 6 fr. 39 XIII 2–3). The story of women’s plot against Euripides comes directly from ‘Thesmophorizea’.

Once we see how Satyrus (and others) created these anecdotes, it is easier to understand why similar stories in the works of other biographers are unlikely to be historical. If comedy is the likeliest source for the account of Cleon’s lawsuit against Euripides for impiety (F 6 fr. 39 X), it may also have provided the basis for the information that the dramatist was accused of impiety because of his line about Hippolytus’ mind not being bound by his oath (Hipp. 612). Scholars who still want to treat that story as historical, because it appears in Aristotle, should read Schorn’s discussion. Even though the cave has recently been found in which according to Satyrus Euripides spent his days thinking and writing (F 6 fr. 39 X), its connection with the poet may well be secondary; it was probably ‘discovered’ for tourists to confirm its existence in literature.

In the case of fragments based on summaries of Satyrus’ work, as Schorn shows, it is not easy to distinguish what Satyrus may have said when he is cited along with other biographers in later sources such as Diogenes Laertius or Athenaeus. Some of the information attributed to Satyrus may have been invented by other writers, such as the chronologically improbable idea that he married Aristides’ daughter Myrto as well as Xanthippe, and the notion that toward the end of the Peloponnesian War Athenian men were allowed to take two wives (F 17a–b).

It is impossible to give a full account of everything that can be learned from this fine commentary, but I hope at least to have made it clear that scholars who are seriously interested in ancient literary biography will need to consult this book. Even if they are not specifically concerned with Satyrus, they will benefit from reading Schorn’s balanced discussions of many complicated issues. They will also find a helpful analysis of some fragments that most likely were not written by Satyrus of Callatis, such as the ‘Demes of Alexandria’. They will learn about the work and methods of other ancient Greek biographers, and in the process gain a better understanding of education and literary life in many different areas of the Hellenistic world.
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La nuova edizione di Caritone di Afrodisia, curata da B. P. Reardon, ‘Professor Emeritus of Classics’ (UCI), è licenziata a Lion sur Mer, era attesa da molti anni.