

in Augusto Rostagni's important work on Julian (1920). This book, edited by Italo Lana, offers many interesting views on the history of classical scholarship in Italy and on Italian literature and cultural history. Rostagni's work is studied from various points of view. Italo Lana writes on its origin and general nature, Francesco della Corte on Italian scholarship's interest in Julian and Giorgio Bàrberi Squarotti on Rostagni's analysis of satirical and ironical aspects in Julian's writings; Nino Marinone, for his part, studies Rostagni's translation of Julian's *Misopogon*. These articles are well supplemented by Piero Treves, who studies Julian's place in general in nineteenth century Italian culture. There are also four essays (by Eugenio Corsini, Isabella Labriola, Giovanni Castelli and Augusto Guzzo) on Julian and his writings.

*Hannu Riikonen*

*Hipponactis Testimonia et fragmenta*. Edidit Hentzius Degani. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1983. XXIX, 226 S. M 74.—

This new B.T. edition of Hipponax adopts the modern B.T. standards of a full-scale reference work. Degani's model has been Gentili's and Prato's 'Poetarum Elegiacorum Testimonia et Fragmenta' (1979). Even without looking into details, it is easy to see that Degani goes considerably further in comprehensiveness (and to add to the accuracy, a leaflet of *Corrigenda*, dated 31 May 1983, accompanies the book). Having read some of the 226 pages of intensely close print, I can assure any potential reader that Degani has reached his aim, "novum studii instrumentum comparare ... quod subsidium *quam maxime uberrimum* [my italics] ad Hipponactis reliquias interpretandas lectoribus suppeditaret...".

The fragment material presented is practically the same as in the last editor's collection (M. L. West in the Oxford 'Iambi et Elegi Graeci', I, 1971), and the additions to the text on the whole consist of careful recordings of variant readings and various suggestions made before and after Diehl, rather than of actual improvements. But the fragment numbering is altered (an understandable step in this case where no consistent norms exist among editors; but it seems doubtful whether any particular order can be decisively motivated), and the mass of information contained in lists, apparatuses and indexes admits of no comparison at all: for instance, the comments on the δὲς χλαῖναν Ἰππώνακτι fragment (42 a Deg., with context) extend over four pages. It is to be seriously hoped that some real profit will come out of this monumental piece of erudition — however old Hipponax (hopefully not too uncomfortable in his Hades) may be smiling at the efforts of his commentators!

*H. Thesleff*