

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 a 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

history of Herondas research, the book is excellent, but the writer's own contributions seem slight in comparison with the number of quotations and references. Even in the section in which the best preserved mimes are analyzed on the basis of what their texts can tell us of the context of their performance, the writer supports his arguments extensively on the basis of secondary literature rather than on that of the original text itself.

However, the work can be commended for the diversity of the many angles of approach it adopts in justification of its arguments and for its contribution to a better understanding of Hellenistic poetry and its relationship to society.

*Jaakko Aronen*

*Stefania Nonvel Pieri: Carneade. Collana di "Testi e saggi" 10. Liviana Editrice, Padova 1978. XIII, 112 p.*

This is a well-informed and sophisticated little essay (indeed somewhat over-technical in its terminology: encountering the old 'Stagirite' and the like will probably bore or irritate some readers). It attempts to give a fresh interpretation of the philosophy of Carneades, notably of the nature of his scepticism. The 'modernity' of many of Carneades' views and approaches is here suitably emphasized. As such, the book is a good example of the usefulness and the shortcomings of an up-to-date reconsideration of Hellenistic philosophy. On the whole, Pieri seems to have avoided the pitfall of disturbing anachronisms. But it is reasonable to ask whether such a full picture is actually justified by our sources (mainly Cicero in this case)?

*H. Thesleff*

*Marci Aurelii Antonini Ad se ipsum libri XII. Edidit Joachim Dalfen. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1979. XLII, 176 p. M 52.—.*

The new Marcus Aurelius from Teubner in Leipzig — in fact the third one in the Bibliotheca Teubneriana, after Stich 1882 and Schenkl 1913 — is a solid piece of learning which will serve scholars well for many years to come. Dalfen's recension follows the best of the more recent Teubner traditions; the preface and the very full critical apparatus eloquently indicate how much was to be done here. His own text is rather eclectic and will probably not meet with approval throughout, which is inevitable I feel. The apparatus of notes and parallels is, less inevitably, extremely selective. There is a good bibliography and a useful Index Verborum.

*H. Thesleff*