to minimize the difference between the third and fourth kinds of metaphor in *Poet.* 21. Aristotle’s views on genus and species do not admit of a simple transference, since between genera as such there is no likeness. Only a relational similarity is possible; hence the fourth kind. It is of greater importance to question the equation of ἀστεία with metaphors. *Rhet.* 1412 a 22 ff. seems to make this impossible. The fact that in 1410 b 20 ff. enthymeme and metaphor are sharply distinguished, and especially the absence of any reference to metaphors in the discussion of enthymemes in *Rhet.* I and II call for caution. My main objection concerns the distinction of three kinds of metaphor. Even if ἀστεία stands for metaphor—*quod non*—the distinction is still questionable. 1410 b 35 and other loci rather indicate that metaphorical expression, vividness and antithetical form are aspects of ἀστεία. Morpurgo (p. 254) obscures the important, and to his argument destructive, remark that vivid expressions are the result of the transference *per analogiam.* Cf. also 1411 a 27 f. In my opinion, Aristotle prefers τὰ ἀστεία for the style of prose and poetry (be it with quantitative differences); they can be procured in the best way by analogous metaphors, which are the more preferable when they make matters vivid and contain an antithesis.

Apart from these objections I wish to point out that Morpurgo’s book makes stimulating reading, especially by his references to Renaissance theories in Italy.

Unfortunately the book is marred by hundreds of typographical errors.
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This is a very useful collection (with an extensive commentary) of testimonies on Greek authors who have written about dreams and their interpretation, and whose works have not come down to us. These authors are divided into three categories, the first of which deals with those authors who have written exclusively about the interpretation of dreams. This part contains 13 writers, two of which, *viz*, Aristander of Telmessus and Artemon of Miletus, are more than mere names to us. In the second part Del Corno has collected the testimonies on authors who have occasionally written about the interpretation of dreams. The third part consists of excerpts on dream-interpretation from writers of general works.
on divination. Nigidius Figulus has been included in an appendix. The first half of the book gives the testimonies, the second half supplies a commentary on them.

The present reviewer mostly agrees with Del Corno’s views as expressed in the commentary, e.g. his theory that there is not any relationship between the classification-systems of Artemidorus/Macrobius on the one hand, and Cicero/Philo (= Posidonius) on the other (p. 173 ff.) (cf. my article in Mnemos. 1969, 389 ff.). There are only some minor points that evoke criticism.

Artemon of Miletus is credited with the invention of the classification of dreams into five classes (p. 112, n. 7; p. 175, n. 27). This theory seems to me rather doubtful, since the terms of this classification were known long before Artemon; nor does Artemidorus appear to have held this Artemon in high esteem: p. 179, 11-18 P he speaks rather disparagingly about such authors as Artemon, Geminus and Demetrius. Artemon in fact wrote about the φάντασμα, which in Artemidorus’ opinion had no value at all.

Pp. 120 f. Del Corno confines the activities of Nicostratus, who together with Panyasis receives abundant praise from Artemidorus, to a treatment of dreams regarding the whole nation (δημόσιου δαίμονοι). However, I think it more probable that Nicostratus and Panyasis, as is generally assumed, specialized in the division of significant dreams into five ζηδη. The anonymous πνεύμα (7, 1 P) and οἱ πάλαιοι (8, 17 P) do not exclude this possibility: these words only indicate that the division into ζηδη had not been originated by Panyasis or Nicostratus. Hipp. διαλέγοι IV 87 seems to confirm that this division is very old. Artemidorus’ rather unusual esteem for these two writers would not be easy to explain, if they had been writing only about δημόσιου δαίμονοι. On p. 121 Del Corno rightly distinguishes this Panyasis from his namesake the epic poet, a fact that has been overlooked by M. Kaiser in his recent translation of Artemidorus 1).

Del Corno (p. 112, n. 7; 173 and n. 24) seems to equate the classification of Artemidorus/Macrobius with that of Calcidius. This is rather surprising, for Del Corno rejects (rightly) any connections between Posidonius’ system and Artemidorus’ classification. Calcidius speaks about the Hebraica philosophia, by which Philo is meant, who adopted, and modified, the Posidonian system.

Del Corno (p. 111-2) following Gelzer and Blum credits Artemon with a Posidonian doctrine in F 4 A-B. However, this theory, that