

teologico e letterario ha dimostrato la sostanziale divergenza di vedute dei due autori. Ecumenio, prolungando la linea interpretativa dell'Apocalisse proposta soprattutto da Origene, ma anche da Eusebio, tende a sottrarre ampie parti del testo apocalittico ad una interpretazione di tipo escatologico; per contro, l'analisi del commento di Andrea mette in rilievo una interpretazione di tipo escatologico rigoroso dell'Apocalisse nella linea della tradizione ecclesiastica risalente almeno ad Ireneo ed Ippolito e che, secondo l'A., si spiegherebbe alla luce del travagliato momento storico in cui Andrea scriveva ed a cui egli fa del resto riferimento esplicito.

Ecco due contributi che fanno onore alla filologia italiana.

Heikki Solin

*Robert Jamison – Joachim Dyck: Rhetorik-Topik-Argumentation. Bibliographie zur Re-
delehre und Rhetorikforschung im deutschsprachigen Raum 1945–1979/80.
Fromann–Holzboog, Stuttgart–Bad Cannstatt 1983. 349 S. DM 248.-.*

Die Rhetorikforschung erlebt seit einiger Zeit einen bedeutenden Aufschwung. Besonders im deutschsprachigen Raum ist eine Fülle von Arbeiten erschienen, die zeigen, wie die wissenschaftliche Beschäftigung mit den Wandlungen der "Redekunst" und ihrer Geschichte zunimmt. Die aktualisierende Theorie der Antike gewinnt an Einfluss auf die Analyseverfahren der modernen Textwissenschaft, auf bestimmte Teile der Jurisprudenz und Politikwissenschaft sowie auf all jene neuen Disziplinen, die sich mit den sozialen Aspekten privater und öffentlicher Kommunikation beschäftigen. Ziel dieser Bibliographie ist, die Fülle der modernen Beiträge zur Rhetorikforschung zusammenzustellen und der wissenschaftlichen Welt zu erschliessen. Sie dokumentiert in erster Linie ein Stück deutscher Wissenschaftsgeschichte nach 1945 und ermöglicht eine erste Übersicht über Gang und Stand im deutschsprachigen Raum, das heisst in der Bundesrepublik, der DDR, der Schweiz und Österreich. Dabei werden nur die in deutscher Sprache verfassten Publikationen berücksichtigt; nur ausnahmsweise wurden andere aufgenommen (kurioserweise beginnt das Buch mit einem englischen Titel – übrigens aus der Feder eines Landsmannes von uns – weil der Aufsatz in einer deutschen Publikation erschien). Alles in allem eine willkommene Bereicherung der bibliographischen Hilfsmittel in den Humaniora, die auch die klassische Altertumswissenschaft gebührend berücksichtigt.

Heikki Solin

*F.H. Sandbach: Aristotle and the Stoics. Cambridge Philological Society, Supplementary
Volume no. 10. Cambridge 1985. XI, 88 p. £ 35.00.*

In this handy little volume F.H. Sandbach argues that the alleged influence of Aristotle upon the Stoic system of thought has been very much exaggerated in modern times. On the contrary there is little or no evidence of the pragmatics Aristotle ever having been studied by the Stoics before the late Hellenistic period.

Sandbach's well-informed and prudent argument is likely to meet with approval although, as he admits himself, it runs *ex silentio* to some extent. Some further support for it could be found in the pseudo-Pythagorean texts which largely reflect early Academic concepts. In fact, generalizing Sandbach's position, it could be maintained that very many of the ideas and technical terms of Hellenistic philosophy which since Zeller have been regarded as Peripatetic, are actually Academic in origin.

H. Thesleff

Fabrizio Conca – Edoardo De Carli – Giuseppe Zanetto: Lessico dei romanzieri greci I (A–Γ). Cisalpino-Goliardica, Milano 1983. 167 p. Lit. 50.000.

The dictionary of Greek novelists compiled by the Italian team Conca, De Carli, Zanetto comprises the authors Achilles Tatius, Chariton, Heliodorus, Iamblichus, Longus and Xenophon Ephesius plus the fragments of novels found in papyri. The texts of these authors cause some difficulties, as there are not good modern editions on all of them – for Chariton, Blake's text (1938) is used instead of Molineé's (1979); Reeve's Teubner edition of Longus (1982) was not yet available. And the flow of new papyrus fragments on Greek novelists does not seem to be abating.

The most important function of such a lexicon is, as I understand, to give a picture of the vocabulary used by the novelists and of the syntactical constructions where the words appear. The present work naturally helps these ends, but in overall design as well as in details it leaves much to be desired. I mention two general principles – or lack of general principles – which make the reader uncomfortable. Firstly, the articles on different *lemmata* are richly furnished with examples, as they should be, but these examples are offered in a sort of random selection: often almost every occurrence is quoted, and one expects that those which are not quoted are left out because they are identical or similar to the others, especially to the examples quoted just before or after, but this is not the case – e.g. on "αἴρω II Med. 1 *sollevare, alzare*" every other of the eight occurrences is quoted except Iamblichus 65.2 and Longus III 16.2, although the objects in these two places are not particularly similar to those in the preceding or following examples. Secondly, most articles on verbs have as their main principle of division the formal schema "I Att., II Med., III Pass." (but not all – sometimes a division according to different senses of the verb is used, e.g. "ἀποστέλλω a) *inviare, mandare*" with active and passive, "b) *pregnante, inviare uomini*"). The rigorous separation according to *genus verbi* is often very uncomfortable and separates similar idioms, as in αἴρω I 1 (active) and III (passive), where typical examples of the use of the verb in connection with water or sound are now separated from each other for purely formal reasons.

As for details, one cannot, of course, expect any dictionary to be completely without slips, but when I took a random sample of the words on pp. 28–29, I found cases of rather severe inaccuracy. In "αἰρέω III Pass. 2 *essere preso*" the only example is H(eliodorus) I 4.3, where (as is not quoted) the participle τοῖς ἐάλωκόσιν is used of