

Theonoe, who ‘knows everything’ (*Hel.* 823, etc.). He tries to play down the usefulness of her knowledge (pp. 296–7), but cannot dispute its accuracy.

The final chapter (‘The Tragic Universe’) attacks some outdated scholarly views (‘It may be thought that these easy targets are not worth the effort of shooting down’, p. 345), and concludes that ‘Euripides’ gods, like Homer’s, are omnipotent, capricious, cruel and unfathomable’ (p. 383).

The book is evidently based on W.’s PhD thesis (Exeter, 2002), although one would not have guessed it from his acknowledgements. It has some characteristic features of the genre, including elaborate refutation of older views and lengthy discussion of issues on which he has nothing of particular interest to contribute. He tends to exaggerate his own originality, and treats other scholars in a correspondingly ungenerous and even offensive fashion (e. g. pp. 185, 204, 230, 247, 256, 359). The book often seems, despite its length, to deal rather cursorily with points which are central to the argument. In sum, not enough has been done to transform the thesis into a book.

University College Dublin

MICHAEL LLOYD  
michael.lloyd@ucd.ie

### THE BUDÉ FRAGMENTS OF EURIPIDES

JOUAN (F.), VAN LOOY (H.) (edd.) *Euripide: Tragédies. Tome VIII, 4<sup>e</sup> partie. Fragments de drames non identifiés*. (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l’Association Guillaume Budé.) Pp. xi + 181. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003. Paper, €46. ISBN: 2-251-00510-2.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X05000144

This book concludes the four-volume set of Euripides’ fragments in the CUF series. It covers the fragments ‘incertarum fabularum’ and ‘dubia et spuria’, along with a few aids to the entire set: index of proper names; a list of papyri; index of passages commented upon in the notes; tables of concordance between this edition and the numbering established by R. Kannicht’s edition (2004) and by H.J. Mette (*Lustrum* 23–4 [1981–2] 5–448), plus a concordance with C. Austin’s 1968 edition of the papyrus fragments; a list of errata relating to the numbering of fragments in vols. 1–3.

J./V.L.’s numbering of the fragments of this volume fully anticipates Kn.’s edition, with some differences over 953b–f; as for 1094a Kn., J./V.L. must have considered it = *Ion* 764, but here contravene their (and Kn.’s) practice of enclosing in square brackets the fragments identifiable as quotations from existing tragedies and, disappointingly, eliminate it from the text. It was possibly a good initiative of J./V.L. to publish *POxy.* 3216 (= *TrGF* adesp. F654 Kn./Snell) among the dubia (\*1123a), because of the presence at l. 7 of the adjective *ἀλίστος*, which among the tragedians is attested only in Euripides; but *νεόρποις* l. 18 (M.W. Haslam’s conjecture, regarded with favour by M.L. West, *ZPE* 26 [1977] 41 and printed in the text by J./V.L.; *νεόποις* pap.) might on the same basis point to Sophoclean authorship.

The text is carefully printed. However, in 845a (four lines from a *Hypothesis*) no typographical differentiation or helpful translation or note aids the reader in understanding that ]ωνος σθένο[ς l. 2 must be a part of the first verse of the tragedy, at

The Classical Review vol. 56 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2006; all rights reserved

least according to C. Austin's integrations, which J./V.L. follow (a different view of the text is possible, but with different readings and integrations, cf. M. van Rossum-Steenbeck, *Greek Readers' Digests?* [Leiden 1998] 228; however *σθένος* is more probably a poetical word, as it hardly ever appears in prose, apart from the idiom *παντὶ σθένει*). J./V.L. are inconsistent in other similar cases: in *Alexandros* they do not print the first line quoted within the *Hypothesis* as an individual fragment (a line whose text is thus given only in the Introduction to the tragedy), whereas they do in the cases of *Auge* and *Skvrioi*. Some other inconsistencies in the text: in the case of 942a, on the basis of a test. where Euripides is said to have made a pun on *Ἀθάνα* and *ἀθάνατον*, J./V.L.'s text of the fragment consists only of the word *Ἀθάνα*, of course of hardly any interest (Kn. correctly prints both words as text in smaller size); more or less the same is true for 955, where Euripides is said to have called Hecate *Δήμητρος λάτρην* (a plausible ending for a trimeter), and the text of the fragment is made to consist of just these last two words, without *Ἐκάτην*, which on the contrary would have fitted well e.g. at the beginning of another trimeter (as Kn. prints it); but in 989a, where *ὄρνιθας* are said by the test. to be called *θεῶν κήρυκας* by Euripides, all three words are included in the text – and in a sequence, *ὄρν. θε. κήρ.*, whose metre is unidentifiable to me. In most of the very few cases where J./V.L. give a text different from that established by Nauck (and/or from Kn.), their choices appear correct or plausible, but in 921 it seems difficult that ll. 2 and 3 are connected in asyndeton, and it is more likely that the two verses belong to two different fragments, though of course concerning the same topic. Furthermore in 1007e the remains of the first three lines of fr. 39 col. VI in Satyrus' pap. do not belong to three different trimeters (numbered 1–3 in J./V.L.), but to a single one, since the other three verses of the fragment (numbered 4–6) fill almost 9 entire lines in the pap. (see on the contrary the correct organisation of the text in fr. 1007g, from the same pap.).

J./V.L.'s selective critical apparatus satisfactorily presents the most relevant variants necessary for allowing the reader to ponder alternative textual choices, though in 1069.l the variant *τοῖσδε* is not recorded, which in light of the second line seems more appealing to me than *τούσδε*, for which J./V.L. opt. The apparatus, like the text, is usually free from mistakes, though at 868.2–3 *ἔδραν τῆν φθειρουμένων libri* misrepresents the paradosis of the *Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων* (cod. B a 361 Cunningham), where there is no article (also 'libri' has to be corrected to 'liber', since the *Anecdota* of Bachmann and the *Anecdota* of Bekker edit the text of the *Συναγωγή* from the same MS., Coisl. gr. 345; J./V.L. seem to wrongly refer more than once to the two *Anecdota* as if they were different testt.: see at 869, 870, 871, 872–3, 874). Furthermore, 'Trincavallus' has to be corrected to 'Trincavellus' in pp. 91 & 117, and at 1063 N. Wecklein, *JclPh* Suppl. 7 (1873–5) 356 considered interpolated from another passage only l. 8, not ll. 8–16 (as in J./V.L.).

The translations are exceptionally clear and reliable. At 1064.2, however, the translation of the vocative *μητέρα* is omitted, and ll. 1–2 of fr. 1113b are exclamatory, not interrogative; moreover at 956, 973, and 995 a part of the report of the context in the test., for which no metrical reconstruction has ever been tried, and which is correctly omitted in the text of the fragment, is wrongly introduced in the translation of this fragment; see also 1115, where the note confusingly specifies 'fragment (en prose)'.

The CUF ed. of Euripides' fragments was challenged from its beginning (1998) by the monumental ed. of Kn. – considered destined to become the standard text long before its publication, but whose apparatus, though incredibly rich in exegetical information and sharpness, cannot replace a commentary; by the selective but

excellent ed. of the tragic fragments by J. Diggle (OCT, 1998); and by the thorough and most thoughtful ed. and comm. of C. Collard, M.J. Cropp, K.H. Lee and J. Gibert (Warminster and Oxford, 1995–2004), which however only includes ‘selected fragmentary plays’ of Euripides. None the less it will remain the reference exegetical guide to the corpus of Euripides’ fragments as a whole set, and the only one for the fragments included in this last volume, as Collard, Cropp, etc. did not deal with them. Deservedly, because the information provided by J./V.L. as a guide to the translation is essential and reader-friendly (though sometimes repetitively paraphrastic of the Latin critical apparatus, and not without discrepancies: 908a is said to be ascribed to Euripides by Meineke in the apparatus – after Nauck (adesp. 111) – but by Wilamowitz in the comm.; the ascription to Euripides actually appeared already in Barnes’s ed.), nearly free from mistakes (but at p. 126 the enigmatic ‘M. West (Londres, 1993, p. 255)’ may be the syncopated conflation of two references to M.L. West, *BICS* 28 (1981) 74–6 plus N.G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium*, London 1993, 255–6), and well informed both in the fields of language and style (see, e.g., at 897, 1020, 1038, 1063; J./V.L. frequently highlight the un-Euripidean words, though e.g. in the case of 908c.2 they omit to point to ἐπιχέρα, which is unattested in Euripides, and might thus contribute to doubt over his authorship of the fragment), and in terms of cultural history (see e.g. the especially illuminating notes to 913, 983, 1007c, 1010, 1021, 1052, 1060, 1063).

Firenze/Macerata

MARCO FANTUZZI  
mfantuzzi@unifi.it

### THESMO

AUSTIN (C.), OLSON (S.D.) *Aristophanes: Thesmophoriazusae*. Edited with Introduction and Commentary. Pp. cviii + 363, colour pl. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Cased, £75. ISBN: 0-19-926527-5.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X05000156

The Austin and Olson *Thesmophoriazusae* brings the Oxford Aristophanes, inaugurated by K.J. Dover’s magisterial *Clouds* in 1968 (after a false start with Platnauer’s 1964 *Peace*, replaced by Olson in 1998), to within two plays of completion: only *Knights* and *Wealth* are left. *Thesmo* arrives none too soon, in view of the attention it has received in recent years (including editions by Sommerstein in 1994 and Prato in 2001), after having long suffered relative neglect: as the Editors say, *Thesmo* is ‘arguably the jewel in the crown’ of Aristophanes’ extant plays, ‘carefully structured, side-splittingly funny, and concerned with problems likely to strike a twenty-first-century reader or audience as remarkably contemporary’ (p. xxxii).

This edition, the first in the series by a team (‘a joint effort from the very first’, p. x), began as a commentary on lines 1–530 by Austin for his 1965 D.Phil., ‘Towards an Edition of Ar. *Th.*’ But the planned edition remained unfinished until Austin joined forces in 2001 with the speedy Olson, who had already contributed *Acharnians* (2002, taken over from Handley) in addition to *Peace*. Handley and Dover, who were the examiners for Austin’s thesis, reunited forty years later as readers for this eventual edition.

And a fine edition it is: the play’s transmission (direct and testimonial) and

The Classical Review vol. 56 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2006; all rights reserved