In two volumes, the last in the series *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Richard Kannicht (K.) has edited the fragments and testimonia of Euripides. This means that now for all the tragic fragments modern editions have replaced the second edition by Nauck of 1889, which has long been the standard edition, but soon after its publication became rapidly outdated because of the increasing numbers of papyrus finds, particularly of Euripides. In the course of the twentieth century several supplements to Nauck’s edition were published and several editions with translations and/or commentaries appeared. Even so the need for a complete scholarly edition of Euripides, including all the new material, was strongly felt and K.’s edition, which has been well worth waiting for, fulfils that need admirably.

Volume 1 contains a preface; a list of abbreviations, which also serves as a select bibliography; a list of editions of ancient and Byzantine sources; the testimonia of Euripides’ life and work (T 1–240); a survey of the plays and fragments (p. 149–50) and the fragments of *Aegeus – Oedipus* (F 1–557). Volume 2 contains the fragments of *Oeneus – Chrysippus* (F 558–844); the *Incertarum fabularum fragmenta* (F 845–1106); the *Fragmenta dubia et spuria* (F 1107–1132); indexes of words and sources; a *comparatio numerorum*; and an appendix containing additions and corrections to *TGF* 1 (1986); 2 (1981) and 3.

The arrangement of the 240 testimonia on Euripides’ life and work, which are neatly divided into categories, numbered from A–Z, is very useful. The survey in 1,41–43 leads the reader quickly to the subject he/she is interested in, e.g. Euripides’ stay at the court of Archelaus of Macedonia at the end of his life (T 112–120) or the judgments of others on Euripides (T 145–205). Thus the collection of testimonia will help subsequent scholars working on these subjects to get easy access to all the relevant sources. As in the volumes on Aeschylus and Sophocles, this section is a great improvement on Nauck’s edition, where, due to the format of his edition, no testimonia on Euripides’ life and work in general are

---


5 However, even as the volume was in press new material turned up and one may almost hope that at some stage a new ‘update’ may be needed again; see the promising addenda on the last pages.

---
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given. Testimonia which refer to specific plays are quoted in the introductions to the plays and numbered with Roman numbers (i, ii, iii etc.; see also below).

The texts have been edited in a very careful manner. K. has made use of the proper modern editions of the sources, but has also carried out independent research on the texts, tracing corrections and conjectures by earlier scholars, checking almost all the papyri and inspecting other manuscripts when necessary, and on the whole giving his own well-balanced judgment. Besides, the presentation of all the relevant material also helps the reader to form his/her own judgment.

For each play the edition offers an introduction in which K. first quotes all the relevant information which is available for it. These lists of testimonia contain the material adduced by Nauck, sometimes with additions and discussion of less likely testimonia, which may refer to other plays, and references to visual art. Thus the reader is enabled to form a view of the evidence for the play and to check and evaluate the material for him/herself. In some cases there may of course be room for dispute as to which texts to include among the testimonia, as e.g. with the fragments of plays by Ennius, who has written several tragedies with titles similar to those of Euripides, like the Cresphontes or Erechtheus. It may be tempting to treat the fragments of Ennius’ plays as testimonia for Euripides and several scholars have done so, but K. seems to have acted wisely in resisting that temptation and quoting the fragments of Ennius only when a connection with Euripides’ text seems more or less plausible (as in e.g. Erechtheus F 360, 14–15 or 370, 44).

Following the list of testimonia K. briefly discusses the play and refers the reader to the most important secondary literature. He tells the reader what is known about the play’s dramatis personae and chorus, date, similar plays by other tragedians, its reception in later literature, other fragments which have been attributed to the play, and other relevant facts, if known. Attempts at reconstruction of the plays’ contents and at locating the fragments in the play are rightly kept sober and limited to what is based on solid evidence. K. generally refers the reader to the work of earlier scholars, who, often with mixed results, have tried to reconstruct the plays and locate the fragments in them.

The numbering – very conveniently – is generally the same as in Nauck’s edition, with extensions (with a, b, c etc.) where new fragments have been inserted. Sometimes new evidence has suggested that fragments must be located differently, as in e.g. Antiope fr. 183–184, and then the numbers are changed accordingly.

The apparatus is divided into an apparatus of sources and a critical apparatus. In the case of book fragments the apparatus of sources quotes all the fragment’s sources with ample context (often more than in previous editions) as well as references to the modern editions of the context and to other relevant material. In

1 K. also indicates when he has been able to refer to an author only second-hand, as in the case of Gesner’s editions of Stobaeus, for which he relies largely on the evidence of Hense; see 1, 22.

2 Only occasionally one misses a small reference, as in the testimonia to the Cresphontes, where Tzetzes in Graeco AP 1,191, 1–5 offers a slightly differently phrased comment on Aristotle about Merope’s attack on Cresphontes. This passage was briefly mentioned by Nauck (p. 497) and my attention was drawn to it by G. J. Boter in a letter of 1986.
the case of papyrus fragments there are references to the editio princeps and subsequent editions and K. informs the reader whether he has seen the papyrus himself. The critical apparatus gives a full survey of readings, corrections and conjectures, but is also selective and does not slavishly take over everything that was mentioned by Nauck (cf. e.g. Phaethon fr. 771, where K. apparently does not share Nauck’s view that γένος is ‘mirum’ and does not mention Schmidt’s and Nauck’s attempts to change the text). It also refers the reader to earlier scholarship on matters such as the location of the fragment or the attribution to a certain speaker and in this respect K. is often more complete than other editions. Thus we learn e.g. that the idea that Phaethon fr. 771 is from the play’s prologue stems from Valckenaer and the notion that it was spoken by Clymene from Rau and Wecklein (information which is not found in Nauck or in Diggle’s edition). Although to some this kind of information may seem mainly of antiquarian interest and therefore somewhat superfluous, it seems proper that in this kind of edition our debts to earlier scholarship are thus acknowledged. The critical apparatus sometimes also adds further comments and references to other passages or to secondary literature. For the sake of clarity it might have been preferable to place these remarks, which are generally very useful and to the point, in a third ‘apparatus’, so that the reader would be better able to see quickly what refers to the establishment of the actual text and what is more in the nature of a commentary.

Fragments of lyrical passages are preceded by a brief indication of the metre. In the section of the fragmenta incerta we find that compared with Nauck’s edition some fragments have been added while others have been removed and the overall number has increased with ca. 30 fragments.

Sometimes and for various reasons K. has been able to locate fragments in specific plays which in Nauck’s edition still appear among the incerta, e.g. fr. 845 N’ ἐπίθεμα, where careful weighing of the evidence leads him to place it in the Alope as F 112a; fr. 847 and 848 N’, which are now regarded as fragments of the Bacchae; fr. 861 N’, which K., following a tentative suggestion of Nauck, regards as Thyestes F 397b because of its contents; or fragments which now undoubtedly belong elsewhere, such as fr. 884 N’, which overlaps with Telephus F 696,13, or fr. 970 N’, which overlaps with Melanippe Sophe F 481,11. In other instances K. has seen that a certain reference should not be regarded as an independent fragment, as in fr. 859 N’ διοικήτη, which he very plausibly regards as a reference to F 435, or fr. 891 N’, a remark of Aristotle about living in a democracy, which must refer to Suppl. 440. Also the doubtful fr. 953 N’ (now PCG 8,289), a speech by a girl who is urged to leave her husband, is finally banished from the fragments of Euripides. Elsewhere new fragmenta incerta appear, as in F 882a–b or 888a–b, sometimes thanks to new papyrus-finds, as in F 928a–b or 953a–m.

The fragmenta dubia et spuria are edited in a similar critical way and e.g. fr. 1083 N’ about Messenia has been transferred to Temenai/Temenidai as F 727 e. Although there may be some dispute about some of the fragmenta incerta or dubia et spuria that have been re-located, K. generally enables the reader to follow his arguments and weigh the evidence for him/herself.

The appendix in 2,110ff is an important supplement to the earlier volumes as well as to the present volume and should not be overlooked.

It contains many small additions and corrections, but also some substantial fragments of e.g. a play about Achilles (TGF 2 F 640a–b) and of a dialogue between Odysseus and Antenor (?) (TGF 2 F 672a) as well as an important addition to TGF 5 F 453 of Euripides’ Cresphontes (an intriguing new papyrus fragment, which adds some parts of lines of the famous choral ode in F 453 and the end of the scene preceding it) and the results of a new inspection of Erechtheus F 370 by M. Fassino. On 2,115 off K. adds an index to the new material in this section.

Summarizing, this is a work of very high quality and a major achievement of scholarship. The edition of the book-fragments and papyri is careful and reliable. The introductions to the plays offer a complete survey of the material, with attention for visual art and inscriptions as well, but refrain from undue speculations. The references to secondary literature are to the point and give evidence of wide and careful reading. There are of course occasional small lapses, but these are quite understandable in a work of this size and by no means diminish its quality. Altogether this work provides us with a complete, reliable and up to date tool for further research on the fragments of Euripides.

Groningen

M. Annette Harder


Walter Lapini ha ritenuto utile raccogliere in un volume, dopo averli rielaborati e in alcuni casi riscritti, i suoi precedenti contributi critico-testuali ed esegetici sugli epigrammi ‘vecchi’ e ‘nuovi’ di Posidippo, in ogni modo, a lui attribuiti, confermando con ulteriori argomentazioni e maggiore ampiezza di documentazione le opinioni già espresse, tranne alcuni ripensamenti, opportunamente segnalati. Alle precedenti ricerche si aggiunge la trattazione di altri componimenti, primo tra tutti il cosiddetto Sigillo. Nella Premessa (pp. VII–XII) lo studioso, manifestando subito con franchezza il proprio pensiero, scrive che il poeta di Pella (non è mai passato per grande artista, e infatti non lo è) (p. VII), per continuare così: «gli epigrammi nuovi, quelli del P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309, sono risultati, a m e n o, p e r a d e s s o, ancora più scialbi dei vecchi» (p. VIII). L’autore chiarisce quindi che nel volume, dal taglio prevalentemente filologico ed

1 Only occasionally one could add a reference, as in e.g. Oedipous F 555, where K. leaves out the first line of fr. 555 N’, which overlaps with Call.SH 230,5. This line is (not very plausibly) regarded as a quotation from Euripides by Callimachus by O. Nitikinski, Kallimachos-Studien, Frankfurt M. – Berlin 1996, 30.

2 I noted e.g. the reference to Jouan – Van Looy (see p. 577 n. 4) on 1,23, which mentioned only vol.VIII.1, but was corrected by K. himself on 2,1159; 1,41, where the Stemma familae follows T 4, whereas on 1,52 it follows T 5; 1,313, where «commentationes ad T P.b. Iter in Macedoniam» does not quite correspond to the arrangement in the section of the Testimonia (‘P. Extremum vitae tempus: iter in Macedoniam ad Archeaum’ with no subdivision into a. b. etc.).

3 For the ongoing interest in tragic fragments and various approaches in recent research see e.g. H. Hofmann – A. Harder, Fragmenta Dramatica, Göttingen 1991; F. McHardy – J. Robson – D. Harvey, Lost Dramas of Classical Athens, Exeter 2005.