

non so se la critica del riposo sabbatico sia solo un topos letterario che affonda le sue radici in ambito greco. Certo si tratta anche di una manifestazione di pragmatismo romano. Qualche volta l'A. manca di sicuro giudizio critico; per es. il passaggio sui Cristiani (p. 154—5) è meno felice: contiene più di una inesattezza ed è in sostanza superfluo.

Il secondo volume è un buono e minuzioso studio della traduzione ciceroniana del *Timaeus* platonico che sostituisce in questo punto l'invecchiata opera di R. Poncelet, *Cicéron traducteur de Platon*, demolendone completamente la sostanza. L'A. dimostra come la lingua di Cicerone si rivela assai complessa, dal momento che il suo sforzo non si è limitato a riprodurre una terminologia univoca (egli varia nella traduzione delle parole del tipo οὐσία e delle costruzioni come participi attivi); il suo merito è di aver costituito a Roma, con la sua arte e tecnica di vertere, un linguaggio specifico della filosofia. Nel complesso si tratta di un libro intelligente ed equilibrato. Non trovo nella bibliografia l'importante articolo di C. Moreschini, *Osservazioni sul lessico filosofico di Cicerone*, ASNP 1979, né il fondamentale libro di J. Kaimio, *The Romans and the Greek language*, Helsinki 1979.

Nel terzo volume si offre un commento storico, seguito da una traduzione italiana, al difficile e lacunoso testo di Granio Liciniano, scrittore compendiarario del secondo secolo d.C. — un benvenuto pendant alla recente teubneriana di N. Criniti uscita nel 1981. Il commento è ben informato e ricco di dettagli; abbondante anche l'appendice bibliografica — talvolta anche troppo. L'introduzione potrebbe essere più approfondita.

*Heikki Solin*

*Emin Tengström: A Latin Funeral Oration from Early 18th Century Sweden. An interpretative Study. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia XLV. Göteborg 1983. 217 p. Sw.Cr. 95.—.*

Neo-Latin, i.e. the Latin in use from the Renaissance to the present, has until recently attracted all too little notice. Eduard Norden's notorious verdict of the death-blow dealt to Latin by the humanists has coloured the general view of this period in the history of Latinity, in spite of the fact that Latin remained the language of learning down to the 18th century, in more peripheral countries even longer, for instance in Finland actually down to 1852. Many of the fundamental works of European civilization were written in Latin. It is now generally recognized that Neo-Latin was not a petrified copy of Cicero's language. It developed along its own lines, which were, it is true, more strictly drawn than in the case of medieval Latin. Neo-Latin showed considerable flexibility to adapt itself to the new demands set by rapidly developing culture and science. New words were coined to express new things and ideas, and styles were developed to suit different literary genres.

During the last decades, the scientific study of Neo-Latin has, however, got

under way, though in comparison with the study of medieval Latin it is still treated in a somewhat stepmotherly fashion. Thus, the dictionaries of later Latinity do not, with few exceptions, include words found in Neo-Latin works. J. IJsewijn's *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, 1977, sums up the results so far achieved. *Humanistica Lovaniensia* records annually the new publications in this branch of learning.

Prof. Emin Tengström, from the University of Gothenburg, has already published several studies on Neo-Latin in Sweden. *The Interpretation of Learned Neo-Latin*, 1977, written in collaboration with Dr. Margareta Benner, analyzed the Latinity in Swedish dissertations. *Latinet i Sverige*, 1973 is a general survey of the use of Latin in Sweden. His most recent book, here to be reviewed, is a remarkable achievement in many respects. Though it only analyzes the *Oratio funebris* in memory of an Upsalian professor of Latin Eloquence, Johan Arendt Bellman, held by the professor Skytteanus Johan Upmarck, in 1710, in my opinion its importance lies in the fact it demonstrates and develops the methods to be used in interpreting Neo-Latin texts. The author advocates an all-round method combining seven different approaches (p. 6), textual criticism, language, literary aspects (i.e. style, the literary genre etc.), and historical reality, references to historical events, institutions and persons. These are of course traditional methods in classical philology. But Prof. Tengström also stresses the importance of interpreting the ideological perspective and the social context of a text, which "lead to conclusions about the social and cultural signification of the text". Only then it will be possible to sum up the entire message intended by the author. Although these methods are here applied to Latin oratory, they are *mutatis mutandis* applicable to other publications as well. But the demands this puts upon a Neo-Latin scholar are truly exacting. He has to have a good knowledge not only of classical and later Latinity, but also of the political, social and cultural history of the period to which the publication analyzed belongs. In an age of increasing specialization, these demands are not always easy to satisfy.

Prof. Tengström's analysis proceeds along these lines. He shows that Upmarck's Latin was moderately classical and his style typical of the Baroque age. Historical information, chiefly concerning the persons mentioned in the speech, is given in the form of a running commentary. True to his program, he also tries to interpret the ideas expressed or — especially — implied by Upmarck. According to him, one of the speaker's main aims was to bolster the social prestige of the intellectuals, in his case that of university professors. It is another matter whether Upmarck's comparative reticence in regard to religion and absolute monarchy suggests latent criticism. This would put Upmarck in the vanguard of the Enlightenment in Sweden. To convince a sceptical reader, however, a wider discussion of the philosophical and cultural climate in Sweden in the first decade of the 18th century should be given.

In this as in any book a reader encounters details with which he may disagree. As an epigraphist, the present writer, e.g., wonders what the author means by

making a difference between "tombstones with inscriptions" and "epitaphs" (p. 186). In a few cases, the use of English is somewhat misleading, e.g. "pretend" is used in the sense of "suggest".

But these are minor points. Prof. Tengström is to be congratulated for having produced a fine study, which will be of considerable use to other scholars dealing with similar Neo-Latin texts.

*Iiro Kajanto*

*La soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'Impero Romano.* Atti del Colloquio Internazionale su La soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'Impero Romano, Roma 24—28 Settembre 1979. Pubblicati a cura di U. Bianchi e M. J. Vermaseren. Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain, tome 92. E. J. Brill, Leiden 1982. XXV, 1025 p. Hfl. 450.—.

The present volume gives an illustrative glimpse of what is happening at present in historico-religious studies in the field of oriental cults in the Roman Empire. The generalizations and erroneous points of emphasis of the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* and other previous scholars (e.g. F. Cumont) have largely been recognized, and, still retaining, of course, many of the results of the preliminary work, new questions are asked and problems are approached from fresh angles. This does not, however, mean that many final conclusions have been reached, and the somewhat varying quality of the articles clearly demonstrates that further clarifying in method and in terminology is needed. Indeed, the terminological problems are frequently dealt with in the discussion parts which follow every singular contribution and in the general discussion of the final session as well as in the Epilegomena of Prof. Bianchi. It seems to me that the seminar did not succeed in its attempt to establish an overall specific terminology to be used in the research of the 'mystery cults'. Thus the urgent necessity of defining concepts such as 'mystic', 'mysteric', 'mysteriosophic', 'soteriology' intersubjectively, and of coming to terms for their uniform use among the scholars still remains.

The publication contains forty-seven articles, the writers of which are usually well-renowned scholars, to mention besides the editors U. Bianchi and M. J. Vermaseren, for example the names of F. Coarelli, I. P. Culianu, M. Guarducci, E. Paratore, G. Sanders, F. Sfamini Gasparro, M. Simon, H. Solin and R. Turcan. The subjects of the papers range from presentations of new archaeological and epigraphical material through phenomenological studies and analyses of the literary sources to the cults of the Ancient East and to considerations of soteriology in Judaism, Christianity, and Gnosticism.

The articles surely contribute in many ways to a better understanding of the structures of the oriental cults attested in the Roman Empire, and the book is, by virtue of its extensive notes and large indices, also likely to be used by students and scholars alike as a sort of reference book or guide to these beliefs and rites, and their perspectives to the other world.

*Jaakko Aronen*