

Author(s): John J. Peradotto

Reviewed work(s): Nova fragmenta Euripidea in papyris reperta by Colin Austin

Source: *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 91, No. 3, (Jul., 1970), pp. 380-381

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Classical scholars, however, will find it a reliable and valuable repository of fact and of documentary and bibliographical information.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY.

HUBERT MARTIN, JR.

COLIN AUSTIN, ed. *Nova fragmenta Euripidea in papyris reperta*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1968. Pp. 116. DM 20. (*Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen*, 187.)

Though certainly still indispensable as a scholarly tool for the study of Greek tragedy, Nauck's *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* has been rendered insufficient by the extensive papyrus finds since its second edition in 1889. The recent editions of Aeschylean fragments by Mette and Lloyd-Jones, and Pearson's 1917 edition of the fragments of Sophocles have remedied the deficiency in part (though a supplement of Sophoclean papyri fragments discovered since Pearson's work would be of no inconsiderable service). To these may be added an edition of the fragments of the minor tragedians by Snell which should soon be out. But for the study of Euripides no aids like these exist. The publication of his fragments is scattered, and in some cases the sources are not easily accessible or are out of print. There have been partial collections since Nauck: von Arnim's *Supplementum Euripideum* of 1913 (containing new fragments from ten plays), Page's *Loeb Greek Literary Papyri I* of 1941 (containing many of the same texts as von Arnim's *Supplementum* plus those which had come to light in the meantime), and Snell's 1964 supplement to Nauck (containing new fragments of Euripidean quotations in ancient authors). Now there is Austin's work, and, if it does not provide us with that much needed single-volume collection of Euripidean fragments, it demonstrates the combination of patient care, erudition, and good judgment which such a work will require.

In the present volume Austin assembles the new papyrus fragments of six plays—*Archelaus*, *Cresphontes*, *Cretes*, *Erechtheus*, *Oedipus*, and *Telephus*—together with the relevant *testimonia*, *loci similes*, selected bibliography, and the fragments from these plays already known to Nauck, but here freshly examined. In the first of two appendices, the author includes some short fragments of the *Alcmeon* and *Alcmene*, and excerpts from a *florilegium* in a Florentine papyrus; the second appendix contains Euripidean hypotheses preserved in the papyri. There is also a complete *index verborum* which brings the concordance of Allen and Italie up to date. The *apparatus criticus*, at once more economical and more discriminating than Nauck's, includes many fine contributions by Barrett, Kassel, Lloyd-Jones, Page, and Snell.

Austin has himself re-examined all but a few of the papyri involved, even the lengthy *Erechtheus* fragment (*Pap. Sorb.*, 2328) the *editio princeps* of which he himself published in 1967. The

resulting versions are more accurate than most of the *editiones principes*. Cautious and conservative when it comes to restoration, Austin openly eschews the lacunaphobia of editors like von Arnim (of whom he remarks: “. . . in lacunis explendis extra fines iustos saepe vagatur novus vates dum versus totos pro ingenii ubertate ipse factitare gaudet. In *Phaethonte* rescribendo satis effrenate bacchatus est”). Austin’s text is the very image of austerity. Those restorations which are plausible but still inconclusive are few, offered as specimens only, and demurely confined to the *apparatus*.

A few small points of detail:

P. 13: In dealing with the fragments of the prologue to the *Archelaus*, Austin places *Pap. Hamb.*, 118a after 228N². He might have mentioned the very plausible suggestion of Stoessl (*R.-E.*, s. v. *prologus*) that *fr. inc.* 846N² (which Austin quotes in a note) fits quite reasonably *between* 228N² and the Hamburg papyrus fragment. 228N² mentions Danaus and the fifty Danaids reaching Argos; in 846N² we learn that Aegyptus and his fifty sons arrive; *Hamb.*, 118a begins with a reference to Lynceus and Hypermetra.

P. 28: In 362N² Erechtheus is offering Polonian advice to someone addressed merely as *teknon*. Austin follows Wilamowitz in identifying a grandson, Ion, presumably adopted by Erechtheus, as this *teknon*. But if Ion had been old enough to succeed to the throne, it is unlikely that Praxithea would have failed to mention him in her long speech (360N²) or that she could have said (at lines 22-4) *εἰ δ' ἦν ἐν οἴκοις ἀντὶ θηλειῶν στάχους ἄρσσην, . . . οὐκ ἄν νῦν ἐξέπεμπον εἰς μάχην δορός*; Webster (*The Tragedies of Euripides* [1967], p. 129) supposes that in this play Xuthus is the young adopted son in question, a suggestion already made thirty years ago by Owen in his edition of the *Ion*.

P. 49: Among the *testimonia* for the *Cretes*, Austin does not include that portion of Hyginus, 40 which indicates that Pasiphae’s passion was a punishment meted out for her long neglect of sacrifice to the goddess—a point which may not be irrelevant to Euripides’ play (see Webster, *op. cit.*, p. 89).

But enough of arguable minutiae so obviously overshadowed by the careful competency and balance of the whole book, in the face of which one cannot but look forward eagerly to the author’s *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta* now in preparation for the “Kleine Texte” series.

JOHN J. PERADOTTO.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO.

G. J. D. AALDERS H. WZN. Die Theorie der gemischten Verfassung im Altertum. Amsterdam, Adolf M. Hakkert, 1968. Pp. vi + 132. Fl. 20.

This book outlines the origin, history, and development of the “mixed constitution”—a favorite subject among classical historians and philosophers. There is little emphasis on the actual working of