

provide a contribution to onomastics and palaeography.

Four articles deal with Greek history, another interest of Manni's, particularly with source criticism. Margherita Giuffrida examines the tradition of the Carians and Minos; Vincenzo La Bua shows that Croesus died at the stake and the tradition of his pardon mere Persian propaganda. Matia José Fontana attempts to white-wash Alcibiades' reputation by proving that his policy before the Sicilian expedition was sensible and consistent. Maria Jannetti's new interpretation of the relations between Alexander the Great and Chius is based on an inscription (SIG<sup>3</sup> No. 283).

Half of the articles deal with Roman history, Manni's main field of study, and are closely connected with his own research. Most of them deal with the Republic and its sources. Giuseppe Martorana presents a new theory of the origin of the Lupercalia, Mari- lena Savagnone of Poseidonius' influence on Sallust and Francesco Paolo Rizzo of his influence on Diodorus. Giovanna Bruno Sunseri shows that Timagenes the historian was not anti-Roman. Manni's pupils, like their master, are also interested in the development of Roman administrative law. Marcello Leone studies Caesar's office as *flamen*, Pietrina Anello Trajan's second and Rosalia Marino Commodus' first *tribunicia potestas*.

The articles by Eugenio Manni's pupils reveal the influence of their teacher both in their subject-matter and treatment. There are many good observations and many cautious hypotheses. The careful and critical use of sources is well worth mentioning. The publication does credit both to Manni and to his pupils.

Jaakko Suolahti

★

*Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana: Pindari carmina cum fragmentis.* Pars I: Epinicia. 1971. Pars II: Fragmenta. Indices. 1975. Post Brunonem Snell edidit Hervicus Maehler. XI, 191 & VIII, 219 p. M 14.- & 15.50. - *Sophoclis tragoediae.* Tom. I: Ajax. Electra. Oedipus Rex. Edidit R.D. Dawe. 1975. XVI, 195 p. M 39.-. - BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig.

The new, fifth edition of Pindar's Epinicia, re-edited by Maehler, has been published admirably quickly to replace the fourth edition by Snell, now out of print, with which it is virtually identical. As the new editor remarks in his preface, only few minor changes and additions have been made to the text and overall critical apparatus. It can only be regretted that the corrections have been made - apparently for economical and time-saving reasons - in the inelegant and, for the reader, impractical way of changing the text itself, and leaving the corrections of the apparatus to the *addenda et corrigenda* at the end of the book - a clumsy system which could well have been avoided, as is shown (by accident) in the apparatus on p. 38 l. 5. - In the fourth edition of the fragments of Pindar, the corrections and additions are more numerous; compared with Snell's edition, there are three new fragments, one found and published by Maehler here for the first time (PBerol 11677 = Paeon

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