

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

part of the book (p. 1–374). The fourth part (p. 375–504) is a conclusion with a rich collection of examples. Linguistic change is discussed through several examples of Latin and Greek words. The method used is the traditional comparative methodology which has been applied to this kind of longitudinal linguistic material for almost a century. B. is well aware of the difficulties to which this system leads: "Le vocabulaire latin comporte bien des éléments obscurs qui paraissent avoir été empruntés, sans que nous puissions dire à quelle langue, à quelle région, à quel moment, ni dans quelles circonstances ces termes ont pu être assimilés" (p. 503). She has not, however, tried to discuss this with the more general linguistic research on contact and areal linguistics and on bilingualism. This would have offered some fresh views and theories which usually enrich the traditional methods of comparative historical linguistics.

The book contains a vast collection of examples and linguistic variation. As a reference book it is without any doubts indispensable, and it also is a solid work in comparative historical linguistics. Here it is not possible to go into a deeper and detailed analysis.

Martti Leiwo

Inscriptiones Graecae. Voluminis I editio tertia: Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno anteriores. Fasciculus III, Indices. Consilio et auctoritate Academiae scientiarum Berolinensis et Brandenburgensis editae. Composuerunt David Lewis†, Eberhard Erxleben, Klaus Hallof. Gualterus de Gruyter et socii, Berolini – Novi Eboraci MCMXCVIII. ISBN 3–11–016183–4. 168 p. DEM 228.

Die Redaktion des Berliner Inschriftenwerkes legt hier die Indices von IG I³ vor. So hat die glänzende von David Lewis und seinen Mitarbeitern besorgte dritte Auflage der voreuklidischen Inschriften Attikas einen Index von gleicher Qualität erhalten. Er wurde zu einem guten Teil von Lewis vor seinem Hinscheiden zusammengestellt; den Rest haben E. Erxleben und K. Hallof redigiert.

Der Index ist ein zuverlässiges Instrument für die Benutzer der Edition geworden. Stichproben haben ergeben, daß die Redaktion mustergültig zuverlässig gewesen ist. Nach alter Gewohnheit werden im Index überall η und ω gebraucht (sollte man aber nicht Ξενοκλέης statt Ξενοκλέες schreiben?), wenn langer Vokal gemeint ist (dagegen werden z.B. -νγ- und -χσ- so gelassen). Zur Reihenfolge im onomastischen Index sei notiert, daß während etwa Θεοδόσιος oder Θεόδωρος unter Θεο- stehen, werden z.B. Θεουκλείδης und Θεουκυδίδης unter Θεου- placiert. Warum? – Der Index gibt zuweilen die Namen genauer als Band II des LGPN wieder; ein Beispiel bietet der Name eines Arztes in 1393, den der Index vorsichtig (und richtig) Αἰνεΐας (? Αἴνειος?) wiedergibt, während das LGPN ihn unter Αἰνέας placiert; freilich hat der Stein ein Epsilon, das Metrum fordert aber lange Silbe. Ein paar Einzelbemerkungen: Ist die auch sonst allgemein akzeptierte Ergänzung [Αἶσ]χράϊος in 1041 sicher? (Der Name fehlt bei Bechtel, HPN und in LGPN I.) Ich zweifle stark an der Richtigkeit der Ergänzung [Π]άμιλλος 583i, denn es gibt keine anderen sicheren Belege für einen solchen Namen (Πάμιλλος in Thuc. 6,4,2 ist varia lectio für Πάμμιλος, das z.B. von Dover vorgezogen wird), der außerdem morphologisch undurchsichtig wäre; etwas plausibler wäre Σάμιλλος; Σημο- war eine verbreitete Namensippe, bestens auch in Attika belegt, und die einzelnen Namen werden auch in