Austin, (C.) Menander. Eleven Plays. (Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, Supplementary Volume 37.) Pp. xviii + 84. Cambridge: The Cambridge Philological Society, 2013. Paper £20. ISBN 978-0-9568381-2-4

This slim volume contains the testimonia, text and critical apparatus for eleven of Menander's less well-known comedies whose state of preservation is far poorer than that of *Dyskolos*, *Samia*, *Aspis*, *Epitrepontes*, *Misoumenos* or *Perikeiromene*. The plays in the present volume are arranged in (Greek) alphabetical order and include: *Georgos*, *Dis Exapaton*, *Enkheiridion*, *Heros*, *Theophoroumene*, *Karkhedonios*, *Kitharistes*, *Koneiazomenai*, *Leukadia*, *Perinthia*, *Phasma*. Therefore, the volume contains the majority of Menander's more fragmentary but identifiable comedies with the exception of Menander's *Sikyonioi* (see A. Blanchard, *Les Sicyoniens Ménandre* (2009)), Menander's *Kolax* (preserved mainly in excerpts recorded on one papyrus) and Menander's *Titthe* (discovered in 2004 but still awaiting any publication).

The edition of these eleven comedies fills an important gap in the recent textual criticism of Menander, updating the *OCT* by F.H. Sandbach, *Menandri reliquiae selectae*, rev. edn. (1990) and the Loeb edition by W.G. Arnott, *Menander* (1979-2000). These eleven plays were also not included in R. Kassel & C. Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci* (1983-), hereafter *PCG*. In *PCG* VI.2 (1998), only the titles of the eleven plays are to be found alongside the note: 'vid. Vol. VI 1', and indeed VI.1 is listed in the back as 'in preparation' but has never made it to publication. *PCG* VI.2 contains the testimonia and book fragments for Menander, but *PCG* VI.1 would have involved editing large numbers of papyri, including the eleven plays presented here and the best preserved of Menander's comedies (listed above). Therefore, a new critical text for these eleven more fragmentary plays preserved mostly on papyrus was much needed.

Moreover, this volume marks the final publication by Colin Austin who was working toward an updated Oxford Classical Text of Menander at the time of his death in 2010. The loss to scholarship

is very great from one who contributed so much to our understanding of Menander, Greek comic fragments, Greek papyri, and Poseidippos (with Guido Bastianini), as displayed in the survey by V. Garulli & E. Esposito, 'C. Austin. Bibliographie 1964-2010', *Eikasmós* 22 (2011) 351-73. There is all the more reason, then, to be thankful that Austin's friends and colleagues saw fit to take on the task of finishing the edition of at least these eleven plays and bringing them to publication. The editorial note at the start of the volume lists an impressive group of editors involved in the overall project: Peter Brown, Eric Handley and Peter Parsons, and it is all the more sad to note the death of Eric Handley in January 2013. Austin's Preface presents a brief but fascinating record of his relationship with Menander throughout his career. It also includes a Latin epigram composed by Austin in 1961 for which he was awarded a University medal, which serves as a ready reminder of Austin's facility and creativity with both Greek and Latin, skills which he used to the full in his work as a textual critic.

At the very start of the volume Peter Parsons and Richard Hunter make clear their respective roles in editing the text and arranging it for publication through the Cambridge Philological Society. This was done along the lines laid out by Austin in his Preface which explained that his text does not mark every doubtful and missing letter if there is little controversy about the word. To put it in Austin's words: 'why not let Menander some day recover some of his pristine glory in an attractive and user-friendly presentation?' (p. xii). The editors have kept to this, producing a text whose appearance is very different from Arnott's Loeb, where there was far more use of square brackets and dots. Austin's edition certainly aids reading of the text and makes the work more accessible to those who wish to study Menander's text but have less experience with papyri. Nonetheless, I found myself constantly comparing Austin's text to those of Sandbach and Arnott in order to better understand the text of Menander. The different styles of textual editing are most clearly seen through such a comparison, and Austin's choices to include supplements are frequently more bold than Sandbach, e.g. *Heros* lines 10-15 and 46-9.

There are some points on which one would have welcomed a fuller presentation of the supplements. For example, at Phasma line 32 (= line 1 Sandbach) the critical notes make no mention of Austin's decision to record  $\Delta \omega$  line 32 (= line 1 Sandbach) the critical notes make no mention of Austin's decision to record  $\Delta \omega$  line 32 (= line 1 Sandbach) the critical notes make no mention of Austin's decision to record  $\Delta \omega$  line 32 (= line 1 Sandbach) the critical notes make no mention of Austin's decision to record  $\Delta \omega$  line 32 (this is the reading of Jernstedt and Koerte also followed by Arnott). Turner and Sandbach go for the more cautious lovidov. Given the significance of the presence/absence in the play of such a word as  $\Delta \omega$  lovidov, the decisions of different editors deserved a mention in Austin's text. Cf. E.G. Turner ('The Phasma of Menander', GRBS 10 (1969), 307-24) who considers that this line from Phasma: 'must be ignored. Hudoff puts  $\Delta \omega$  lovidov at the end of the verse. I cannot see its first v. If the letter were  $\theta$  or o,  $\theta \omega \omega$  would result. Or even, e.g.,  $\delta \varepsilon \omega$  lovidov idov' (1969, 314, n. 14). Elsewhere, at Phasma lines 56-56a Austin presents the supplement of  $\varepsilon \omega$  and then  $\tau \eta \zeta$  E $\sigma \tau \omega \zeta$  at the end of the divine prologue, which emphasises the case for identifying Hestia as the prologue speaker. The inclusion of these words, even as a supplement, again has a huge effect on how one reads these lines, and indeed the whole play. Sandbach and Arnott do not include the supplements, nor do they mention Hestia at all which is perhaps safer in this instance.

The volume adds to what we know about these fragmentary dramas. In particular the new texts of *Georgos* and *Dis Exapaton* build on Sandbach (1990) and Arnott (1979), e.g. *Dis Exapaton* lines 6-12 and 31-46, 64-88 in Austin are not in Sandbach. It is also useful to have an updated *Enkheiridion*, and *Leukadia*, neither of which features in Sandbach's edition. There are a few errors, but these do not obscure the meaning, e.g. *Phasma* lines 35 and 50 are mislabelled in the Greek text, but in the textual apparatus the correct lines of Greek are referenced so that the textual apparatus does not quite align with the text; the apparatus for *Georgos* refers to line 4 when line 44 must have been intended. The Greek text is clearly presented and well-spaced which can only help to make the edition more usable, in keeping with Austin's wishes as expressed in the Preface (p. xii). However, the spacing and arrangement of the text comes at a price: the apparatus is printed at the end of the

main play text, resulting in continuous flicking between pages.

Every new publication of Menander contains the acknowledgement that the most recent discoveries are too new to find their way into the publication. And this one is no exception, but in preparing the text Austin notes his use of photographic images and digital images, helpfully pointing the reader towards online resources which any simple search-engine query will locate with ease. The references to Mertens-Pack3 are particularly fruitful for anyone to find images of the papyri to explore for herself or himself on-line.

From the scholar who presented the first critical edition of *Samia* and *Aspis* (1969), the edition of comic papyri (*CGFP*, 1973), and who co-edited *PCG*, this final contribution toward our understanding of Menandrean comedy is not to be missed. The edition reflects Austin's customary flair in offering supplements, and despite the associated risks of pushing such conjecture too far, Austin's supplements are clearly marked, so that any reader of the text can feel suitably encouraged by Austin's readings to seek meaning in the fragmentary text while also being aware of how unstable is the matter of meaning.

University of Durham

SARAH MILES