

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. Thesleff

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