

If some contributions are to be singled out, Cairn's ingenious analysis of Propertius 4,6 is a model of scholarship. By a minute literary interpretation he shows that this much-maligned poem conforms to the Hellenistic type of hymns, with its carefully balanced structure, ostensibly honouring Apollo but indirectly the Julian House and Augustus.

In the volume there is little scope for serious disagreements. If the significance of a particular passage is sometimes stretched, this is natural in a paper trying to prove a particular point. Thus, in my opinion, the features of the Golden Age mentioned on p. 6 are too general to tell us anything certain about the dependence of Horace's Epode 16 on Virgil's Fourth Eclogue. The same comment concerns the alleged echoes of Sallust on p. 8. In the paper on Satire I, applying the conclusions drawn from I 6, 15–17 to the Pompeians seems somewhat rash. Finally, the argumentation in the essay on Aristaeus is in places somewhat difficult to follow.

But apart from these and some other minor critical remarks, this is a valuable work. It also suggests that classical scholars are not living in an ivory tower. They can quickly react to the events and currents of thought in the surrounding society, as is indeed the duty of humanists to do so.

*Iiro Kajanto*

*Richard F. Thomas: Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry. The Ethnographical Tradition. Cambridge Philological Society, Supplementary Volume no. 7. Cambridge 1982. 144 p. £ 30.00.*

The frequent use of the names of near and remote countries, peoples and places in Roman poetry is far from being a neglected area of classical scholarship. Professor Thomas's four-page bibliography is not exhaustive and could easily have been longer. There has not, however, been any thorough and systematic study on the ethnographical tradition in Roman poetry so far, i.e. how the main Roman poets have adapted ethnographical literature for poetical purposes. It seems to me that in his book Professor Thomas gives solid information which forms a good basis for further investigation. He throws new light on the way the Roman poets used material afforded by Posidonius and the Hippocratic treatise 'Airs, Waters, Places'.

After giving some background information in the introductory chapter, the author in the first chapter deals especially with Horace's sixteenth Epistle as compared to the tenth Epistle. Although the author is well aware of Horace's way of contrasting city and country in his epistles, it would have been profitable if this contrast had been studied more penetratingly in relation to Horace's ethnographical motives. The second and third chapters have been devoted to Virgil's Georgics. The author shows convincingly how Virgil "consciously presented the world of the bees in the language of the ethnographical study" (p. 36). He gives new insights into the discussion provoked by Dahlmann (pp. 70–73). While most scholars have repudiated Dahlmann's views, the author is willing to support them but sees, however, some flaws in them. When dealing with Virgil's *Laudes Italiae* the author makes comparisons with Horace's Ode 3,24, which he considers as a

commentary on Virgil's views (pp. 54–55). And of course, Virgil's relation to Lucretius is also discussed.

In the fourth chapter the author is concerned with some aspects of Virgil's Aeneid. He shows how the use of ethnographical material in the second half of the Aeneid (although not so elaborate as in the Georgics) is closely connected to Virgil's implicit criticism of the achievements of civilization (see p. 94). There are also two complementary chapters, the former dealing with the ninth book of Lucan's Pharsalia, the latter with Tacitus. The author gives a new possible reading of Tacitus and Lucan in the light of their use of ethnographical tradition. He proposes that they provide a commentary to Horace's and Virgil's views of Roman culture and history. While they write in a society different from the world of Augustus, the landscapes that they picture are in many ways a contrast to those of Virgil and Horace (p. 130).

In his analyses the author has an eye for ambiguity and allusions in poetry, whilst his division of ethnographical material into the categories of site, produce, climate, people, 'thaumasia' and social features is also illuminating (cf. the table on p. 37).

*Hannu Riikonen*

*Memorie della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino*. II. Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche, Serie V, Volume 5, Fasc. IV, Ottobre-Dicembre 1981. – Filologia, glottologia, storia letteraria dell'antichità classica. Accademia delle Scienze, Torino 1981. p. 225–426. Lit. 54.000.

Questo volumetto, mandatoci dall'Accademia torinese, comprende due contributi: G.P. Selvatico, Lo scambio epistolare tra Frontone e M. Aurelio: esercitazioni retoriche e cultura letteraria; nonché A. Monaci Castagno, I commenti di Ecumenio e di Andrea di Cesarea: due letture divergenti dell'Apocalisse.

Il lavoro di Selvatico si propone di ricostruire gli interessi che Frontone professava e cercava di trasmettere al suo allievo Marco Aurelio. Esso è diviso in due parti. Nella prima si tratta degli autori latini compresi in una lettera di valore programmatica (4,3); nella seconda si passano in rassegna tutti gli altri autori citati nell'intero epistolario. Il risultato è che Frontone consigliava al suo allievo la lettura di alcuni autori arcaici o arcaizzanti e che questo gusto inculcatogli dal maestro restava vivo in Marco Aurelio anche dopo la sua conversione alla filosofia e l'ascesa al trono. Queste considerazioni di Selvatico sono interessanti sotto vari punti di vista, non ultimo quello della conoscenza dei gusti letterari dell'epoca di Antonino Pio. Il contributo poteva essere più approfondito sotto l'aspetto storico; per es. sarebbe importante tentare di distinguere il contesto sociale dei destinatari delle altre lettere oltre a quelle scritte a Marco Aurelio. – Un poco fuorviante mi sembra il termine 'canone' dell'elenco degli autori raccomandati nella lettera summenzionata, perché richiama il canone degli Alessandrini.

Nel secondo contributo Monaci Castagno studia due commenti dell'Apocalisse dall'inizio del VII secolo, quello di Ecumenio (scritto verso il 600) e quello di Andrea di Cesarea (scritto prima del 614). Un'analisi sistematica delle due opere dal punto di vista storico,