

his contemporaries is in itself a well-known example of his ironic treatment of myths. It is of course impossible to fathom exactly what fifth century Greek audiences thought of Euripides' scenes, but it would be strange if the ironic sense of some of the lines was not apparent to more than a small minority – I refer for example to Apollo's words in the final tableau of *Orestes* 1653f. and Orestes' ready acceptance of the promised bride 1671f., and Admetus' word in *Alcestis* 357ff. V. shows convincingly that Euripides employs irony on a much larger scale than is generally claimed in the interpretation of his works. I mention especially V.'s treatment of *Orestes* (ch. 3, pp. 53–81) and *Alcestis* (pp. 99–106) and his analysis of the motif of sacrifice of victory (pp. 178–204) and of Euripides' comments on war (pp. 153–177). I am less convinced by his view of the Euripidean Helen, whose "proper person, full of charm, honesty, warmth, and wit" (p. 148) he finds revealed in *Helen* and also in the *Trojan women* (her speech 914ff. being interpreted as an ironic comment of Euripides). I do not see why Euripides should not in *Helen* give a different portrait of Helen from that in e.g. the *Trojan women*, as the portrait of Phaedra is different in *Hippolytus* I and II, and in my opinion, Helen cannot be characterized as "a symbol of that world of experience which ignores the lure of adventure, violence, and power" (p. 148), whatever Euripides thinks of the magnitude of her sin of adultery. V. has gone so far in explaining almost everything in Euripides' words as the working of the poet's ironic method that we get a rather schizophrenic impression of the poet, who has quite exceptional insight into the human heart and human conduct and quite an extraordinary breadth of vision and sense of justice and the equality of men, but who, during his career of more than thirty years, cannot express his thoughts publicly much as he would like to, for fear that the magistrates will not grant him his chorus any more if he openly reveals the social and moral wrongs of his society; thus often "the unacceptable truth is expressed early in the action, so that later events may cover the memory of it" (p. 235). I would ascribe less deliberate cowardice to Euripides, and also allow for some inconsistencies of plot and character occasioned by his wish to produce a dramatically effective series of scenes. However, V.'s book offers a fruitful interpretation of all Euripides' plays, and considerably enriches our concept of Euripides as a writer.

Maarit Kaimio

Kaiser Marc Aurel: Wege zu sich selbst. Hrsg. u. übertr. v. *Willy Theiler*. 2. verb. Aufl. Die Bibliothek der alten Welt. Zürich, Artemis Verlag 1974. 347 p. DM 28.—.

This second edition of a very useful work (1951) includes only few changes in the Greek text (9.41.2 is ingenious as Theiler's conjectures often are); though the reviewers of the first edition were not always convinced by Theiler's solutions they did not produce actual refutations (see e.g. D.A.Rees, *Gnomon* 26, 1954, 8–11). In several cases Theiler has evidently improved upon Farquharson (1944). Since his recension is likely to be accepted as a standard text in many countries, the apparatus criticus is unnecessarily brief. The German translation has undergone a

somewhat more extensive revision. It aims at exactness and admirably interprets Marcus' Greek; stylistically it is not very enjoyable (nor is, of course, Marcus' Greek), but the book is not really intended for Greekless amateurs. Theiler's introduction and notes are concise but give a wealth of information, especially on philosophical points. His view that Posidonius was one of Marcus' main sources is interesting though disputable.

H. Theleff

Dionysii Bassaricon et Gigantiadis Fragmenta. Cum Prolegomenis Italica versione et Indicibus edidit *Henricus Livrea*. Bibliotheca Athena 12. Rome 1973. 170 p. Lit. 4200.

The new edition of the fragments of *Dionysii Bassarica et Gigantias* is a welcome contribution to the efforts at reconstructing that learned Hellenistic poetry which had a considerable influence on the last fruits of the Greek epic, the *Posthomerica* of Quintus of Smyrna and the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus. This reconstruction work is difficult, and in spite of such an elaborate and profound analysis as Mr. Livrea's work is, it is hardly possible to achieve new insights into problems already discussed by Byzantine scholars. The most concrete contribution comes from papyri. The latest addition to the extant fragments of Dionysius is P.Oxy. 2815 (ed. by E. Lobel). The attribution to Dionysius (made by Lobel and accepted by Livrea) is based on the finding in a papyrus fragment of the name *Keladone* which, according to Stephanus Byzantinus, occurred in the *Gigantias* of Dionysius. But is the occurrence of a single name sufficient argument? The Thessalian location of the matter in the papyrus fragments might be possible also in a *Gigantias* but it is more suitable for the much favoured type of *Heraclea*. The best part of Livrea's book is the Prolegomena, where he approaches Dionysius' literary personality from two viewpoints: the literary tradition of the topic and the analysis of language and style. His conclusions about the dating and the learned nature of Dionysius' work are convincing. One remark: Would it be possible to analyse the extant fragments internally by comparing them with each other? How to explain the Hesiodic style of P.Oxy. 2815? Almost all Hesiodic reminiscences occur in this papyrus. On the other hand, is it merely accidental that the much discussed rapports with the Oppiani and Quintus of Smyrna are lacking in the fragments of this papyrus?

Toivo Viljamaa

Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana: P. Papini Stati Thebais. Edidit *Alfredus Klotz*. Editionem correctiorem curavit *Thomas C. Klinnert*. 1973. LXXVIII, 630 S. — **P. Papini Stati Achilleis.** Recensuit *Aldo Marastoni*. 1974. XLIX, 53 S. — **Sex. Iulii Frontini de aquaeductu urbis Romae.** Edidit *Cezary Kunderewicz*. XVIII, 69 S. 1974. — BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig.

Von den drei anzuzeigenden lateinischen Teubner-Editionen ist die erstgenannte ein Nachdruck, die zwei restlichen stellen neue Bearbeitungen dar. Es war