

extreme difficulty of presenting this strange play to a modern reader as something more than a mere archaic curiosity. The translation is inspired and often brilliant, and, in spite of certain licences taken, has a truly Aeschylean ring. As an example of deft treatment of a desperately corrupt passage, mention may be made of the scene 825ff. between the Danaids and the Egyptian herald. In this free interpretation, the scene has the dramatic life and vigour it certainly must have had in the original. One should be aware, however, that a certain interpretative tendency is at work in this version of the *Suppliants*, a tendency which the translator explains at greater length in her introduction and notes, but which, nevertheless, has a rather strong flavour of unaeschylean psychologizing. Maarit Kaimio

**The Proem of Empedocles' *Peri Physios*.** Towards a new edition of all the fragments. Thirty-one fragments edited by *N. van der Ben*. B.R. Grüner, Amsterdam 1975. 230 p. Hfl. 50.-.

In this Amsterdam thesis, the author argues with considerable competence that thirty of the fragments that Diels (following the edition of H. Stein from 1852) assigned to the *Katharmoi* of Empedocles, together with fr. 30 DK, do in fact belong to the Proem of *Peri Physios*. And further, e.g. fr. 128 DK would seem to come from the long-since forgotten 3rd book of *Peri Physios*. So the *Katharmoi* begins to vanish into the unknown, and the *Peri Physios* begins to take firm shape. The volume contains a substantial introduction with substantial notes, a new edition of the thirty-one fragments together with lemmas and apparatus criticus, and a great number of interpretative notes. In a case like this it is easy to disagree on single points, and some of van der Ben's arguments are indeed of doubtful value. He has not proved that all the fragments are necessarily from the Proem of *Peri Physios*, though he may have proved that their provenance from the *Katharmoi* is unlikely. He could have made his interpretation much more full (for instance, he largely neglects the recent discussion of 5th century Pythagoreanism). But the basis of his criticism is, I feel, sound, and he tackles a really worth-while problem. The reader is looking forward to his new edition of all the fragments of Empedocles. It is this kind of re-examination and reconsideration that is needed before the *Vorsokratiker* can be properly re-edited. H. Thesleff

**Aristotle and Xenophon on Democracy and Oligarchy.** Translations with introductions and commentary by *J.M. Moore*. Chatto & Windus, London 1975. 320 S. £ 4.25.

Dieses nützliche Buch über griechische Verfassungsgeschichte entspricht den Bedürfnissen derjenigen Interessenten, die nicht griechischkundig sind. Mit seiner Auswahl will Moore vor allem zeigen, wie sich verschiedene politische Doktrinen im praktischen Staatsleben auswirkten. Da kommen in erster Linie in Frage Aristoteles' Staat der Athener und Xenophons Staatswesen der Lakedämonier sowie auch die pseudoxenophontische Schrift über Athens Staatsverfassung ("Old Oligarch"). Völlig motiviert ist ferner, dass auch der kurze Abschnitt über die böotische Konstitution aus den *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* aufgenommen ist, und zwar als "the only surviving account of a Greek oligarchy" (was mit dem Titel des Buches in gewissem Widerspruch steht). Den gewandten Übersetzungen sind sehr instruktive und eingehende Kommentare angeschlossen, die souveräne Beherrschung des Materials und der Einzelfragen zeigen. Auch den Fachleuten bieten sie vielfach Belehrung.

Das Buch will ausdrücklich die politische Praxis beleuchten. Als theoretischer Hintergrund hätten dennoch einige repräsentative Auszüge aus den Politika des Aristoteles aufgenommen werden können. Henrik Ziliacus