Literatur, und zwar je nach Bedarf von etwa 1850 bis zu den 1990er Jahren. T.s Gelehrsamkeit erstreckt sich auf die vielfältigsten Gebiete.

Es handelt sich natürlich nicht um einen mechanischen Kommentar Zeile für Zeile, sondern der Leser muß gewiß mitarbeiten. Aber sobald der Text schwierig wird, greift T. ein.


Überaus nützlich und als Sachindex zum ganzen Kommentar brauchbar ist der Index of English words (24 S.). Es folgen 10 Seiten Index of Greek words, ebenso für alle drei Bände. Hier sei auch erinnert an die 8 Seiten "Abbreviations" am Anfang von Band I, wo die wichtigsten bibliographischen Angaben für das ganze Werk verzeichnet sind.

Teodorssons Kommentar wird kommenden Generationen als Standardwerk gelten. Er gereicht der Gothenburger Universität, der klassischen Philologie in Schweden und vor allem dem Verfasser selbst zum Ruhme.


Gabriele Broszio's Genealogia Christi is based on a doctoral dissertation in the Catholic theological faculty of the University of Bochum. Broszio has surveyed how Jesus' genealogies in the gospels of Matthew and Luke have been treated in early Christian literature, from the early Church Fathers until the Council of Chalcedon. B’s purpose is not to study these genealogies from a modern exegetical viewpoint or to analyse the infamous differences between the genealogies but to study for what purposes and how Jesus’ genealogies were utilised in patristic literature.

The work is divided into two main sections: the discussion, in which Broszio surveys and analyses the use of family trees, and the documentation, in which B. has collected the vast source material concerning Jesus’ genealogies for later use.

The genealogies were treated in various contexts, in commentaries to the gospels, homilies, questions and answers, harmonisation of gospels, letters and didactic poems. Broszio shows that genealogies were of crucial importance in christological controversies. Matthew’s version of Christ’s descent functioned as an evidence of his real birth as a human and of his human essence whereas the family tree presented in the gospel according...
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the incompatibility between the genealogies in Matthew and Luke was not essential because the genealogies were not historical documents of Jesus’ noble descent but theological expressions.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


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,