

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

prisoners. But the other instances of the use of this participle by the novelists are found under "ἄλίσκομαι 1 *essere catturato, essere fatto prigioniero*", where in addition to H I 4.3 (with quotation) many other similar examples are mentioned, e.g. H I 1.7. Under "αἶρω I 1 *sollevare*" we read "H VII 10.4, VIII 15.6 (τὰ στέφρα καὶ τοὺς ὄμους καὶ τὸν αὐχένα . . . αἶρων)": the quotation is from VII 10.4, and in VIII 15.6 we read ἄραντες ἤλαυνον, which should come under the following usage, "2 *salpare*". Under "αἰσθάνομαι 3 con gen." is mentioned also "H V 2.6 (γυναικός)", which should be quoted with its participial construction (γυναικὸς . . . μυρομένης) and placed under "4 con part.", where all occurrences where a participle is used are happily mixed together, regardless of whether you have the construction ἤσθάνετο . . . ἀποτυγχάνων or κύουσαν ἑαυτήν or Χαρικλείας ὀδυρομένης.

I have not sufficient knowledge of the Italian language to estimate the translations of the words. However, "*sedurre*" as the translation of "αἰθέω I 3 metaf." in connection with Achilles Tatius VIII 17.6, where a man is much taken by his future son-in-law's good principles and decorous manners, strikes me as odd.

*Maarit Kaimio*

*Il museo epigrafico. A cura di Angela Donati. Colloquio AIEGL – Borghesi 83 (Castrocaro Terme – Ferrara, 30 settembre – 2 ottobre 1983). Epigrafia e antichità, 7, Fratelli Lega Editori, Faenza 1984. 640 p. Lit. 85.000.*

Non esiterei a definire molto importante la pubblicazione di questo volume. La scienza epigrafica vanta una grande tradizione, nomi illustri e scuole serie. Ma d'altra parte si può dire che per molti aspetti gli studi epigrafici siano ancora agli inizi. Lo si vede anche dal grande sviluppo che essi stanno avendo di recente. Particolarmente insoddisfacente può dirsi la situazione in quel settore cui il presente volume è dedicato. Infatti non era stata mai affrontata prima d'ora la problematica dei musei epigrafici nel suo complesso. Dobbiamo essere veramente grati all'amico Susini per questa iniziativa che spero possa avere un seguito nel futuro.

Il volume si divide in due parti (se si escludono le premesse di rito, che fortunatamente sono brevi e così non aumentano sostanzialmente il prezzo dell'opera), in cui vengono trattati problemi generali di storia, di metodo e di organizzazione del museo epigrafico, e dei singoli musei epigrafici quanto alle loro origini, situazioni, e ai loro progetti. Il primo settore viene aperto dall'interessante relazione di I. Calabi Limentani sulle descrizioni dei musei lapidari nel '700 italiano, in cui vengono dati esempi significativi sul trattamento delle iscrizioni nelle edizioni del Settecento. Il valore di questo contributo viene aumentato dalla buona illustrazione. Segue un lungo saggio di G. Gualandi, 'Il testo epigrafico come didascalia delle opere d'arte greca nei complessi monumentali e nelle raccolte collezionistiche di antichità'. Per quanto non sia privo di spunti interessanti, mi sembra troppo lungo e non molto aderente alla tematica del volume. Lo stesso vale per il contributo successivo, quello di G. Sanders, 'Texte et monument: l'arbitrage du musée épigraphi-