

XXII (k), 1-10), one published by Maehler in ZPE 3 (1968) 97 (PBerol 21114 = Paeon VVII (k), 10-19) and one published by Lobel as POxy 2622 (= fr. 346). But how long must we continue to use such references as Pind. Paeon XXII = fr. 52w in order to follow Schroeder's numeration of fragments (fortunately the alphabet does not allow for many more new paeans), now with the additional inconvenience of having to look up fr. XXII (k) in the *addenda* in order to follow the numeration of pages inherited from Snell's edition? Moreover, the system of guiding the reader to the *addenda et corrigenda* by means of small squares in the margin at the places where a change is due does not function as it should, if, as happens, about 10 per cent of the squares are missing (e.g. p. 91,1; 31,10; 57,3; 106,3 and 10; 207).

There has been lively investigation of the manuscript tradition of Sophocles during the last two decades; the established views were challenged first by A. Turyn (*Studies in the manuscript tradition of Sophocles*, Urbana 1972), and Turyn's principles in the constitution of the text of Sophocles were in their turn seriously challenged by R.D. Dawe (*Studies in the text of Sophocles*, Vol. I, Leiden 1973). The editions prior to this revolution are thus, in spite of the indisputable merits of many of them, definitely out of date, and Dawe's studies render suspect the main lines of the text of the new Budé edition by Dain and Mazon (1955-1962). The edition of the triad *Ajax*, *Electra*, *Oedipus Rex* by Dawe - a sister volume to his *Studies* - is therefore especially welcome and important. The preface is very short and offers only the main lines found in the grouping of the nineteen manuscripts used as the basis of the text; a more detailed discussion is found in his *Studies*. The form of the text of the three plays found in this Teubner volume is discussed in detail in Part Two of the *Studies*. In addition to a short bibliography, the Teubner edition contains a *conspectus metrorum* of all the lyric passages of the plays. Maarit Kaimio

*Aristoteles*. Privatorum scriptorum fragmenta. Recognovit *Marianus Plezia*. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1977. XXV, 57 p. M 19.50.

This edition by the Polish scholar M. Plezia of the fragments and the testimonies relating to Aristotle's 'privata scripta' - the Poems, the Letters, and the Will - is in the best scholarly tradition of the Bibliotheca Teubneriana. A considerable amount of textual criticism is included which is, of course, particularly important in the case of the poetical fragments; the edition of the Letters is based upon fresh collations. In other respects, too, there are rather full references to ancient sources (also to some Arabic ones) and to modern discussions (up to 1974), and there is every kind of index that a user of the book could possibly desire. The fanciful and hitherto imperfectly known Arabic traditions concerning the Letters have been excluded for reasons given in the Preface (p. VIII). The exclusion of the supposedly Aristotelian

letters attached to the Rhet. ad Alex. and the Hist. Alex. Magni (p. XI) is less well motivated since the edition includes obviously spurious letters anyway. H. Thesleff

Wayne N. Thompson: *Aristotle's Deduction and Induction: Introductory Analysis and Synthesis*. Rodopi N.V., Amsterdam 1975. 114 p. Hfl. 20.-.

At the beginning of the Posterior Analytics Aristotle says that all teaching and all intellectual learning is produced by already existing knowledge. In his introduction to the Aristotelian ideas of deduction and induction W.N. Thompson has taken this advice seriously - for the most part the matter treated is such that it can be found in any introduction to Aristotle's thought. The only exception is the attempt to clarify the methods of deduction and induction in rhetoric and dialectic; this is often neglected in general accounts.

Much space has been devoted to the enthymeme. The writer criticizes attempts to define it as an elided syllogism. After a survey of the context, material, and form of the enthymeme Thompson characterizes it as "any deductive argument employed to further the communicator's persuasive ends". In Chapter Four devoted to induction example, analogy, and *a fortiori* are discussed as inductive forms.

The book thus sheds some light on the relationships between demonstrative, rhetorical and dialectical arguments in Aristotle. The general characterization of the nature of Aristotle's scientific thought is not satisfactory, however. The writer has not sufficiently consulted the modern discussion of Aristotle's methodology (e.g., Barnes, Hintikka, Patzig). Thus he is not sensitive to the highly problematic nature of his "succinct explanations" of notions, elementary to Aristotelian deduction and induction.

When, for example, he characterizes the Aristotelian necessity as "true in every instance" (p. 54-55), he should have added an explanation of how to distinguish between assertoric and apodictic syllogism. As it is, the rules given on pages 35-37 remain problematic. Clearly erroneous is the claim that there are far-reaching exceptions to the Law of the Excluded Middle (one of the examples mentioned on p. 31 is the Golden Mean). A strange philosophical insight guides the author when he defends the existential presupposition present in Aristotle's methodology by maintaining that the question *quod sit* is meaningful only if the answer to the question *an sit* is affirmative (p. 49). Simo Knuuttila

*Plutarch's Moralia*. Vol. XIII, Parts I-II: 999C-1086B. With an English translation by *Harold Cherniss*, index compiled by *Edward N. O'Neil*. The Loeb Classical Library Nos. 427 & 470. Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass. - William Heinemann Ltd, London 1976. XXVI & XXVI, 885 p. £ 2.95 & 3.40. These new Loeb volumes represent the scholarly trend which is