In 1969 Bruce Donovan investigated the papyri of Euripides, presenting some general tabulations but concentrating on the 23 papyri then known from Oxyrhynchus (a second part of the study, intended to cover the pieces from other sites, never appeared). Donovan counted fewer than 60 book fragments and about 15 fragments of anthologies, school exercises, and the like reflecting Euripidean passages. Carrara’s (hereafter C.) new compilation catalogues and discusses 156 items, a striking testimony to the ever-increasing contribution of literary papyrology. Fortunately, most of these were already taken into account in James Diggle’s OCT, since he had access to unpublished pieces from Oxyrhynchus and elsewhere that have since been published. But there are a handful of items that were not yet available for the OCT, and more Euripides papyri are certain to be identified and published in the future.

C.’s purpose is to provide a comprehensive study of the current state of our knowledge. Several overarching themes or arguments characterize his book, as expressed in the introduction and the conclusion and frequently stated in relation to individual items. First, although there are some anthologies, extracts for school, and possible extracts for singers or actors, it can still be inferred with greater or less probability that most of the pieces come from what were once complete copies of a play (and sometimes we can believe that the codices from which later fragments survive originally contained more than one drama). Second, there is a range of different levels of formality of handwriting and production, and no necessary correlation between the quality of the handwriting and the quality of the text, since some handsomely written papyri are textually careless and some informally written pieces (often on the vertical-fiber side of a used roll) show evidence of serious philological engagement through the presence of more lectional signs, corrected readings, and annotations. Third, it does not take very long for the popularity among readers (and students and teachers) of most of select plays to be evident in their survival in the known fragments, and in particular the triad plays *Hecuba*, *Orestes*, and *Phoenissae* emerge already in the Roman period as abundantly attested. Fourth, for plays outside the selection, there is no distinction at all between the ones that happened by a most fortunate chance to survive as the so-called ‘alphabetic’ plays and the ones that did not enter the medieval tradition. Fifth, the textual readings of the papyri must be carefully weighed one by one with due attention to the nature of the copy and what can be learned of the habits and competence of the scribe. In particular, new readings attested in papyri may sometimes be suspected of being one-off errors of a particular copyist (or an immediate predecessor) and not reflections of an actual stream of ancient textual tradition; and when readings of a papyrus match those of part of the medieval tradition a direct connection is not always to be

---


2 On a few occasions C. is able to correct a misleading entry in Diggle’s app. crit.: e.g., Hec. 255, where θεοσκισθ έμοι is reported but the third-century BCE ostrakon has no lectional signs or spaces between words, just ΠΙΝΟΣΚΟΙΣΘΕΜΟΙ.
postulated, given the ease with which some kinds of phonetic and visual errors can occur independently. Sixth, when papyri give us evidence about the alphabetic plays, it becomes clear that the manuscript from which L was copied carried a text of comparatively low quality compared to what was circulating in antiquity for these plays.

Between the introduction (pp. 1–11) and the conclusion (585–612), C. presents a catalogue of separate items divided into 4 chronological parts: Hellenistic age (divided into chapters on the third century and on the second-first centuries), the transitional period from Hellenistic to Roman (first centuries B.C.E. and C.E.), the Roman period (in two chapters on the first-second centuries and on the third century C.E.), and late antiquity (in two chapters on the fourth century and on the fifth-seventh centuries C.E.). Within each chapter C. generally treats pieces presumably from complete copies of surviving plays, followed by those from complete copies of lost plays, followed by papyri attesting anthologies, extracts for schools, and the like. The latter category receives fuller treatment for the earliest periods, but more cursory attention for later periods, except for the assessment of the significance of catalogues of dramatic titles and collections of hypotheseis in the Roman period. C. plausibly postulates that the tradition of gnomological extracts began early and developed somewhat independently from the full texts, so that the later the date, the less likely it is that variants in anthologies (which often suffer certain kinds of generalizing modifications) tell us about the readings of the full texts of the same period. In the third and fourth chronological periods, where two thirds of the pieces are concentrated, C. modifies his arrangement, here subdividing the pieces by treating those from Oxyrhynchus first and then those from other locales in Egypt (or outside Egypt, in a very few cases).

With few exceptions, C. provides for each item a careful and thorough discussion of the issues it raises. (One exception is P.Oxy. 22.2336, the lyric duet from Helen, where C. is brief because the evidence of this papyrus has been so thoroughly evaluated in previous work.) He explains the criteria for dating, classifies the hand using the terminology of G. Cavallo, gives details about the use of silent iota, punctuation, lectional signs, and marginalia, and suggests on what basis one may infer (or not) that a fragment derives from a copy of a complete play. Then he discusses the textual soundness of what the scribe has written, and for fragments from plays that are extant evaluates the textual variants in the light of the known readings of medieval manuscripts (and indirect tradition) and conjectures entertained by editors. Only rarely does one feel that C. has not provided as much information or discussion as one might like: on 120 (P.Hib. 1.7) we are not told enough about what else survives in the anthology in addition to Electra 367–379; on 242 I miss some elaboration about the scholastic nature of the piece BKT 5.2, 78. In one matter of scribal habit, C. falls victim (72 et passim) to a misunderstanding that has afflicted others who deal with the papyri of Euripides, remarking as notable that a papyrus reads εἰς when our editions print ἐς. Despite the convention followed by the majority of modern editors of tragedies (namely, they tacitly print ἐς everywhere it is possible), the medieval manuscripts

1 G. Cavallo, Il calamo e il papiro, Papyrologica Florentina 36, Firenze 2005.
most commonly have the form εἰς in any passage where it is not metrically impossible (and I have confirmed this for the passages C. comments on), and the papyri show that this intrusion of εἰς (if that is what it really is, and not what Euripides himself wrote in the Ionic alphabet) is very ancient indeed.²

It is a common phenomenon that scholars who find a new reading or textual arrangement in a papyrus are tempted to champion that reading, sometimes beyond its merits, or to postulate radically different recensions of a play. C. reports all such suggestions and gives them polite consideration, but usually concludes by doubting the most adventurous claims.

Some examples may be cited: 32–34 on a suggestion of Luppe about an apparent extra line after Med. 1119; 89–90 on the difficult P.Hib. 2.179 and our text of Hecales; 166–8, after a long and polite consideration of arguments of those who champion [strlen thù] in Med. 594, C. correctly concludes that this reading is not to be accepted; p.174, on Or. 240; 293 on Med. 1183; 345, due caution about ascribing a gnomic passage to a particular play. Rarely, C. seems to me to give too much attention to an unlikely theory: 69, the idea that Hipp. 58–72 could have been sung solo by Hippolytus with the extras of the 'secondary chorus' remaining mute; 93–94, on IT 591, where emendation seems to me mandatory; 183 with n. 3 (on Hipp. 497–507a in BKT 3.2, 123–128), attributing an unlikely sense to what is more probably a slip of the pen by a sloppy excerptor.

This book is the fruit of almost 20 years of study and preparation, and one unfortunate feature is that each piece in the catalogue is discussed almost as if it were being treated in isolation. This leads to quite a bit of repetition for anyone who reads the book from cover to cover. Perhaps, however, few will do so, other than a reviewer. Even so, there is far too little cross-referencing from one discussion to another.

Some examples: the discussion of Phoen. 51–52 on 273 does not refer back to the similar discussion on 248; 397 n. 1 provides one cross-reference for an early codex, but no reference to another recently espoused possibility discussed on 390; 486 n. 1 repeats much of what is said on 57, with no cross-reference; 499 n. 1 should have been cross-referenced to and coordinated with 215 n. 1; 529 n. 4 repeats 77; the same quotation of Haslam appears on 563 and 303. The extended timeframe of compilation and writing probably explains why the bibliographic citations seem more up to date for some pieces than for others: e.g., W. Johnson, Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus, 2004, is referenced for one relevant piece, but not for another.

I offer some observations on a few points of detail.

50 n. 1: C. is aware of the continuing efforts of some to controvert the majority opinion that in the alphabetic plays P is a copy of L, but (rightly) considers the evidence for the majority opinion to be sufficiently compelling.

107 n.1: C. does not agree those who postulate a tradition of texts with musical notation; he refers to the important article of L. P. E. Parker in CQ 2001, but could also have cited the first chapter of L. Prauscello, Singing Alexandria. Music between Practice and Textual Tradition, Mnemosyne Supplements 274, 2006.

¹ Incidentally, C. (correctly, I think) sides with those who believe Eur. wrote in the Ionic alphabet and that his plays did not in general undergo a conversion from Old Attic to Ionic alphabets (527, n. 1).

² See D. J. Mastronarde and J. M. Bremer, The Textual Tradition of Euripides’ Phoinissai, University of California Publications: Classical Studies 27, Berkeley 1982, 175–177, where I speculate that many of the instances of ἐς that do occur in manuscripts may be due to an archaizing alteration of the tradition.
149, n.2: note that K. McNamee gives a rather different explanation of the notation ζη (= ζητει), as 'check the reading' rather than a reference to a formal ζητημα.

153ff.: C. provides a thorough study of P.Köl 2.67 (IA), with some disagreement with ed. pr.

190–195: in P.Ross. Georg. 1.9 the change in handwriting and incomplete nature of the second extract might be in favor of the hypothesis that this is a single sheet, not part of a roll or a succession of columns: the scribe may have realized that he would be short of space if he continued with the same careful and larger script, and so changed to a smaller script, but still did not calculate correctly how much he could fit and then abandoned the Orestes excerpt in mid-sentence.

215 n.3: C. reasonably argues that echoes of Euripides in John Malalas do not reflect direct knowledge of plays lost to us, but depend instead on previous collections of excerpts, especially one explaining myths in a euhemerist fashion.

186–187, 240–241: C. offers some observations on possible connections of pieces with theatrical or other performances.

297: in the marginal note on Med. 1282 in P.Harr. 1.38, where δῆ after μοῦν is usually taken to mean μόνον δίς or μόνον δίπτος, that is, a notation that there is a variant reading in which both occurrences of μίαν are replaced by μόνον; but might it be instead a phonetic error for μόνον δῆ (variant for μίαν δῆ)?

314: C. espouses the papyrus reading φόνον in Andr. 962; I am confident that φῶν is to be preferred here.

316: C. espouses δεικτή in Andr. 1001, the reading of the papyrus and of the ms, but the emendation δείξα gives a superior text (with the right tone of threat) and a more normal use of σφε and of the negative μή instead of οὐ.

333: on Hec. 217 in P.Tebt. 2.683, both autopsy and the online image show that Montanari’s original reading χρε[ is the best we can do here; the letter after chi cannot be omicron, as suggested by Lenaerts.

403: the argument in favor of the papyrus reading βάκχιον in Phoen. 21 seems to me inadequate: there are indeed some places where ϒὐκχιος by metonymy means ‘wine’ (IT 953, Cyclo. 454, 519, fr. 562.1), but nowhere does it mean ‘drunkenness’; βακχιον is simply a common phonetic error for βάκχιον.

442: in Tro. 344 λοιπάν may be a banalization of λοιπόν and not dependent on a visual error; but if it is a visual error, as C. suggests, it need not have arisen in majuscule copies, since majuscule gamma reasserts itself against (or coexists with) minuscule gamma in many medieval hands.

426: in P.Oxy. 67.4568 at Rhes. 841 the traces I see in the image are incompatible with the omicron that C. thinks cannot be excluded. In Rhes. 846, the reading οὖν is not in fact completely inexplicable, since with it the line can be read as a rhetorical question with almost the same meaning as the transmitted οῦ in a declarative sentence. οὖ, however, should be preferred because it is smoother with the appended second subject καὶ Φρυγῶν στρατός.

429 n. 2: I would say the hiatus shown by the papyrus reading is impossible, not merely improbable.

439: C. notes as odd a scribe’s use of a circumflex on the aorist active participle ending -ων, but this phenomenon is found in medieval mss of Euripides as well (D. J. Mastronarde, Euripides. Phoenissae, Leipzig 1988, xxiv).

473: C. correctly notes that we cannot know whether the lost opening of Hec. 740 contained προσθεν ορ κροσθεν (the variants in the medieval tradition).

490: for the replacement of ήξες (papyrus, Christus Patiens) by ήλθες (ms), it is worth noting that aorist forms of ήλθον are the standard gloss on forms of ήξο in the medieval tradition.

528: The ms Sa (Salamanca 31) is a gemellus, not the source of Vr (Vat. Pal. gr. 141).

588: in addition to the use of Euripidean extracts in the education of children from a very early date, we should recognize that extracts were recited in private symposia already
during Eur.'s own lifetime, and adults also quoted poetry in public debates and in private discussions (again in the symposium).

This is an ambitious and largely successful work of mature scholarship. I learned a great deal from it. I hope it will not be taken as detracting from C.'s considerable achievement if I go on to express some reservations about the format of the work. One could, of course, imagine such a collection of information on a website, capable of being updated and corrected. But even as a printed volume, the material had potentials which were not fully realized. Donovan produced some tabular presentations of the evidence he had gathered, and such tables are commonplace in studies of documentary and subliterary papyri. Donovan's tables could have been updated with the far greater corpus now available. Furthermore, it is a pity that certain kinds of information about scribal practice were not presented in list or tabular form instead of discursively. If one is interested in topics like treatment of mute iota, punctuation, scriptio plena vs. elision, use of paragraphoi and eisthesis/ecthesis, the information must be gleaned from paragraphs using different orders of treatment and variations in terminology. The same is true for some significant textual matters, such as accidental omission of lines in papyri, omitted lines matching modern suggestions of deletions, and passages in which conjectures of modern scholars have been confirmed by papyri. There are, to be sure, partial lists of some of these items in the conclusion (605–608), but they are not complete lists. This lack is exacerbated by the fact that there is no subject index to guide one to these topics, nor (as mentioned earlier) is there adequate cross-referencing within the book so that one can follow a phenomenon from one example to others. Similarly, the index of papyri discussed includes only the Euripidean papyri, so there is no easy way to locate the non-Euripidean papyri that C. mentions from time to time for comparison as to dating, format, or hand.

For a book of such length and complexity, there are relatively few typographic errors (several are in foreign names, like Habicht, and repeatedly Rendel (Harris) and Woodbrooke; a few are in the Greek), and none that will not easily be emended by the textual experts consulting it. Note, however, that on 82, «sotto il μ di v. 1098» should be „sopra il μ di v. 1099”; on 109, n. 1, C. has conflated two different anecdotes about the popularity of Euripides, one about defeated Athenians in Sicily and one about a ship fleeing to the harbor of the Caunians in Asia Minor; on 387 Hecuba’s interlocutor is said to be the «messaggero» whereas it is actually Agamemnon.
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Die systematische Beschreibung von Sprache und die Interpretation ihrer Anwendung in literarischem Kontext stellten in der Antike den Gegenstand einer intensiven theoretischen Auseinandersetzung dar, an der verschiedene Disziplinen aktiv beteiligt waren. Eine besondere Stellung nehmen im gesamten Ent-