

chisch verlorengegangen ist, und auch die vorhandenen griechischen Texte können dann und wann auf Grund der Übersetzungen verbessert werden. Eine andere Frage ist, welche Bedeutung das klassische Erbe für die islamische Kultur hatte, aber dies wird hier ja nicht behandelt.

*Jussi Aro*

*Choerili Samii Reliquiae*. Introduzione, testo critico e commento a cura di P. Radici Colace. Biblioteca di Helikon, Testi e studi 13. 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, Roma 1979. 160 p. Lit. 15.000.

The fragments of Choerilus of Samos illuminate the rise of historical epics and also provide some very interesting glimpses of the development of epic diction in the 5th century B.C. Because a full edition has not appeared since Kinkel (1877) and because it seems reasonable to attribute some of the anonymous papyrus fragments of epic poetry to Choerilus, a reconsideration of all of the evidence was long overdue. Colace's edition includes a very comprehensive discussion of the primary and secondary material. It is an exemplary work of scholarship, well printed and well produced. Unfortunately, the new and positive results are not very spectacular, and Colace's reluctance to resort to conjectural editing has left most of the lacunae of the papyri untouched — which is to be regretted notably in the case of the extensive fr. 23, P. Oxy. 2814.

*H. Thesleff*

*Giuseppe Mastromarco: Il pubblico di Eronda*. Collezioni di Studi e Testi, Studi 15. Editrice Antenore, Padova 1979. 149 p. Lit. 8000.

This book is Giuseppe Mastromarco's reassessment of the question of the nature of the mimiambi of Herondas (or Herodas). There has been a widespread discussion, ever since the poems were published in 1891, of the numerous problems they raise. Mastromarco deals with two major problems. First and foremost, were the poems designed to communicate solely as literature — to be read, or were they recited by an actor in the form of a monologue or performed in the theatre by several actors? Secondly, Giuseppe Mastromarco deals with the question of the kind of audience for whom the poems were intended — was it a popular audience or an elitist one?

According to the author, the mimes were learned, highly contrived poems, which the actors recited at the court of Alexandria or at the homes of the richest and most cultured members of society. This view is not particularly new as such, but it has not been put forward before quite so systematically. The method of argument is, however, somewhat questionable. Mastromarco documents his arguments almost exclusively on the basis of earlier research. As an introduction to the