multiple relationships between ancient medicine and philosophy.

*Sari Kivistö*


This book is a miscellaneous collection of papers read at a conference that was held in memory of the Italian historian of religions Ugo Bianchi (1922–1995) [UB] at the University of Salerno in April 1997, plus some recollections contributed by international colleagues.

The book has four sections and two appendices. The first appendix contains an extensive and useful bibliography of UB and the second one the Salerno conference programme and selected correspondence between the organiser and academics invited to that conference (this correspondence seems totally misplaced in the publication as it does not add anything of real academic value to the book).

The first part of the book, "La vita", gives an overall picture of UB's academic career from its very beginnings in war-time Rome (by Ennio Sanzi pp. 31–44) through his various academic posts, e.g., in Messina (by Concetta Giuffré Scibona pp. 45–54) and Bologna (by Giovanni Casadio pp. 55–65) to his last academic office, professor of the history of religions at the University of "La Sapienza" in Rome (by Silvia M. Chiodi pp. 67–73). These four articles make monotonous reading for someone not interested in the tortuous administrative parlance and bureaucratic processes of Italian academia but entertaining for those readers for whom "history of learning" holds a fascination.

The fifth article in the opening section, by Peter Antes (pp. 75–83), discusses UB's complicated and no doubt in many ways invigorating relationship with the International Association for the History of Religions I.A.H.R (founded in 1950). UB was IAHR's vice-president 1985–1990 (p. 78, N.B. according to the IAHR website: 1980–1990) and president 1990–1995 and a passionate discussant in the many life-or-death (or so it seemed) battles of this young organisation (e.g., over the name of the association; UB defended the old name and the dispute was resolved in UB's favour, though only after his death).

The second part of the book, entitled "L'opera", shows the incredibly wide spectrum of academic fields covered and touched upon by UB's publications. His wide-ranging interests may be as much due to the mid- and late 20th century developments in the history of religions as an academic subject and its early phenomenological tradition, which UB was *de facto* following rather than rejecting even if he was in an apparent struggle against it (cf. the discussion between the "history of religion" and the "phenomenology of religion" on p. 401). In this pioneering spirit, UB displayed his erudition in the religious thinking of ancient Mesopotamia, Iran, Egypt, Greece, and Rome from the perspectives of comparative religion, philosophy (though he himself partly denied his philosophical inclinations, claiming philosophy was too abstract to be of methodological aid to a historian, cf. Francesca Brezzi pp. 329–352 and Aldo Natale Terrin p. 370), and ethnology.
The third part of the book, "Il metodo e gli antenati", discusses UB's methodological contribution to the field of the study of religions and his relation to his teachers near and far. Three chapters placed in the second part would fit more naturally here (namely the ones by Giulia Sfameni Gasparro: UB e il mondo cristiano, gnostico e manicheo: scelta di temi e impianto metodologico della ricerca storico-religiosa; Alessandra Cattini: L'etnologia religiosa di UB; and Maria Vittoria Cerutti: UB e il dualismo) as they discuss UB's theoretical and methodological contributions. The fourth part of the book is "Varia", two articles with oddly made-up connections to the book in question.

There is one obvious problem comparing the topics between parts two and three. As far as I understand (as someone participating in UB's seminars at "La Sapienza" in the spring of 1995), UB's primary interests were methodological; he was interested in the definitions and systematization of religious concepts and phenomena, not so much in a single religion or culture or historical era as a whole. Given the opportunity, some of the methodological articles in the book address this issue quite adequately (e.g., Maria Vittoria Cerutti pp. 291–326, Francesca Brezzi pp. 329–352, and Aldo Natale Terrin pp. 353–391) but those scholars who have been asked to write about UB and a single culture/religion are at a disadvantage in the context of this book. It should not be the writers' problem that UB repeated himself as a scholar but it becomes one, due to the inconsistent editing. This has also resulted in overlapping and repeating the same themes over and over again throughout the book. Reflecting on one's topic in relation to the totality of UB's publications and cross-referencing is also almost inexistent (Jaakko Aronen is a rare exception, pp. 201–218).

UB was by no means the most clear-thinking of the 20th century historians of religion, but most of the writers do not admit this straightforwardly. One writer, however, takes the bull by the horns: despite the startlingly cryptic title "Fenomenologia "criptica" della religione in UB", Aldo Natale Terrin makes it very clear that UB was not coherent in his methodological thinking and that he resembled, in his methodological ideas, much more the "big names" of his academic discipline than he ever wanted to admit himself (p. 376: "Sembra qui di leggere una pagina di M[ircea] Eliade e non di Bianchi" when referring to UB's book "Problemi di storia delle religioni" 1958, 2nd ed. 1986). UB never denied the influence of his teacher Raffaele Pettazzoni on his methodological thinking and the advancement of his academic career (he dedicated most of his academic works to P.!) but his relationship to other historians of religion was much more controversial. On one hand, UB wanted to present himself as an independent and original thinker (he boldly regarded most of the great 19th and early 20th century works in the history of religions as "absolutely inadequate for a useful definition of religion" (Problemi di storia delle religioni 1986, 20–24)). On the other hand, he saw his own role in the field of the history of religions as a mere compiler (compiling material other researchers had produced and making methodological remarks on it (Selected Essays on Gnosticism, Dualism and Mysteriosophy 1978, 7–8).

UB was good at creating all-encompassing definitions (for his definition on religion see pp. 262 and 341, and on dualism, p. 298) but he was also known for heavy methodological language and often obscure terminology. For twenty-five years in the meetings of the IAHR, it was UB who took the trouble to introduce methodological
discussions (a demanding role either not desired by anyone else or so much one man's desire that the others preferred to remain quiet?) Either way, it shows where UB's passion lay. This book can be regarded as an attempt to encompass some aspects of this grand passion but, in the end, the person himself remains admittedly even more plurivocal than the book written about him.

Ulla Lehtonen


This doctoral thesis will be of interest not only to theologians but to all of us who, in Goldhill's words, "need Greek". Many of the issues of diglossia and indeed polyglossia endemic in Ancient Greek from Homer onwards come to head in the period from 200 BC to AD 200 which is particularly under focus in this survey. Basically Walser deals with morphosyntactic convergence, integration, assimilation and code-switching between Hebrew and Greek. It is clear that in the cultural ambience of the synagogue, Hebrew language and ideology would rub off onto Greeks and their linguistic expression. This indeed has been investigated by Krause and the Finnish scholars Aejmelaeus and Soisalon-Soininen. Walser observes a hierarchy of superordination with the Pentateuch having the maximum prestige. Though Septuagint (LXX) specialists talk about the "Hebrew colouring" (Helbing) and "stylistic Hebraism" (Sollamo) of Septuagint Greek, Georg Walser has an obvious penchant for German quotations giving a "German colouring" to his English expression. This book was briefly reviewed by de Lange in Vetus Testamentum (2003).

In his introductory first chapter Walser lists the corpora of texts used, one set being synagogue-linked and the other not. In the first set, he restricts his choice to the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judith, Tobit, 1 Maccabees, Daniel, the Apocrypha of Daniel, Apocalypsis Mosis, Joseph and Aseneth, the Testament of Abraham, the Testament of Job, the Testament of the 12 Patriarchs, the Gospels, Acts, all Paul's 13 epistles, Revelation, Aristeas Judaeus, Philo Judaeus, Josephus, and Yadin Papyri. Walser thus omits the Psalms (referred to on p.152), Isaiah, Jeremiah (referred to on p. 101) and most of the prophets. From LXX he omits eg. Esther and 2 Maccabees (referred to in n. 150, p. 34). From the New Testament (NT) he omits Peter's and John's Epistles (referred to in n. 150, p. 34). Walser sides with Thackeray in assuming that the Pentateuch was translated into Greek en bloc though he admits a lack of homogeneity in the different books (p. 10). On the Gentile or secular side are listed Herodotus 2, Xenophon's Anabasis 1–3, Polybius' Histories 1, Diodorus Siculus' Bibliotheca Historica 2, Dionysius Halicarnassensis' Antiquitates Romanae book 1, Dio Chrysostom's 7th, 12th and 36th speeches, Plutarch's Life of Alexander, Epictetus' Dissertations 1–2, and Selected Papyri. One notes that Thucydides and Plato are missing. Walser has collated examples from the TLG-disc and the Accordance programme. For statistical comparison he has used the Mann-Whitney U-tests explained in notes 17 and 19 and repeatedly referred to