

to Luke was interpreted as a manifestation of not only of Christ's human nature but also of his being the son of God. E.g. for Origen, the genesis of Christ makes his two natures clear.

For Christian writers such as Origen, Eusebius, Ambrose and Augustine, the incompatibility between the genealogies in Matthew and Luke was not essential because the genealogies were not historical documents of Jesus' noble descent but theological expressions. The genealogies in the two gospels manifested their *kerygma* of Christ's double nature in their own way, Matthew of his human nature and Luke of his divinity.

The church fathers from Origen onwards offered allegorical interpretations in which deeper meanings were sought for Jesus' forefathers. For Eusebius the genealogy in Matthew was an example of the double reality of the Scripture, the "letter", i.e. the historical reality and the "spirit", i.e. the deeper theological reality. The writer of the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* saw a deeper reality hidden from humans in Jesus' family tree in Matthew. Thus, Christian writers, e.g. Augustine, tried to find these secret deeper meanings by explaining the generations of Jesus' forefathers by number symbolism and the names of his ancestors by allegorical interpretations.

*Maijastina Kahlos*

*The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, ed. by Susanna Morton Braund and Christopher Gill. Cambridge University Press, 1997. ISBN 0-521-47391-8. 266 p. GBP 37.50 (H/b).

This book, partly based on a conference held at the University of Exeter in July 1992, consists of an introduction by the editors and eleven papers on different aspects of Roman literary culture. The linking theme between these is the interpretation of the presentations of passions in Roman literary texts from a philosophical point of view and the combination of philosophical and literary approaches of interpretation to obtain a clearer picture of the Roman mind (pp. 2,4). The volume is an indication of, and a natural sequel to, the constantly growing interest in the theories of passion and especially their adaptations to non-philosophical territories. The papers include an analysis of Cicero (A. Erskine), Juvenal (S.M. Braund), Tacitus (D.S. Levene), Catullus (J. Booth), Virgil (M.R. Wright), Statius (E. Fantham), and two analyses of Seneca (M. Wilson and A. Schiesaro). In addition to these, there are also papers on Epicurean anger (D.P. Fowler), on the role of emotions in rhetoric (R. Webb), and on an aspect of passion in Roman poetry (C. Gill).

In general, this volume is a most welcome project because in the classics it often seems that the boundary between philosophical and literary studies is an artificial one, or at least one without clear or well-founded reasons. There are, however, numerous problems in establishing a methodologically valid, intellectual continuum that would give a better understanding of these many-sided phenomena than the traditional division between philosophy and literature has given. The informative introduction by Gill and Braund concentrates on describing the framework for the papers and the unavoidable problems encountered in them. In the latter part of the introduction Gill gives a brief but lucid presentation of the importance of the emotions in Greco-Roman philosophy. In studying Roman thinking he stresses the importance of three Aristotelian approaches: Aristotelian school texts, Peripatetic tradition, and the conventional or 'vernacular' approach being ethically justified by the relevant situation (pp. 6-7). It is claimed that the latter,

especially, mixed with Stoic influence is a good basis for the understanding of the Roman mind (pp. 6–7, 14). Gill and Braund rightly recognize the impossibility of explaining specific literary representations through only one philosophical theory, though the contemporary philosophical influences must always be recognized as culturally relevant (p. 4).

The papers in general give a deceptive impression of inconclusiveness; this only proves the value of cautiousness in such a complicated subject and does not deny the significance of the results achieved. Difficulties in interpretations are evident e.g. in trying to combine two Senecas, the philosopher and the poet (Schiesaro), or in comprehending Cicero simultaneously as a mourning father and as a thinker discussing passions, especially grief (Erskine). In both of these examples the practical side of life forms an essential part in explaining the particularities of the representation of passions. In Seneca this practicality is, among other things, the effect his tragedies had on different audiences, and partly with reference to this, Schiesaro's last paragraph starts with the apparent conclusion that (p. 111): 'What we end up with is the impossibility of Stoic tragedy.' All in all, Schiesaro's contribution offers a fresh reading of Senecan tragedy stressing e.g. the importance of its self-conscious nature (p. 91). He also argues that Stoic theories on poetry do not offer a satisfactory rationalization of Senecan tragedy (e.g. p. 105; cf. Gill on Senecan tragedy and Stoic psychology, pp. 226–227). In Cicero's case Erskine points out how his own experience (Tullia's death) might have influenced Cicero's philosophical interests: in his *Tusculans*, Cicero was collecting arguments about passions but at the same time trying to find a cure for his own grief. Thus the characteristic practicality of later Roman thinkers would seem to have already begun with Cicero (p. 46–47).

Accordingly, the emphasis on the practical or conventional aspect of Roman thinking is apparent in almost all the papers of this volume, whether this practicality is that of the rules of rhetoric, the expectations and preconceptions of Roman readers and audience, or the consolatory tradition. A good example of a Roman literary *genre* is satire: Braund convincingly argues in her contribution that in Juvenal's *Satire* 13 the Roman consolatory tradition and philosophical theories of passion coincide: different ethical discourses, both Greek and Roman, are involved, not all of them necessarily derived from the main philosophical schools. The papers clearly illustrate that in order to reconstruct Roman thinking it is essential to explain it in its own cultural and intellectual context.

Translations of longer Greek and Latin passages are provided throughout the book though one may ask whether the possible readers in question are in need of these. Among the negative technical features of the volume may be mentioned Gill's irritating way of referring to 'text to nn.', already seen in his earlier contributions. Otherwise the indexes and bibliography are conveniently – and practically – drawn up.

*Risto Heikkinen*

FRÉDÉRIQUE BIVILLE: *Les emprunts du latin au grec. Approche phonétique. Tome II Vocalisme et conclusions*. Bibliothèque de l'information Grammaticale 29. Éditions Peeters Louvain – Paris 1995. ISBN 90–6831–734–2 (Leuven). ISBN 2–87723–267–0 (France). 562 p. FRF 480.

The second part of F. Biville's (B.) *mega biblion* concentrates on vocalism. The vocal system of both Greek and Latin is treated thoroughly in twelve chapters in the third