attractively arguing that the suicide of Dido must in fact be viewed as a magical effectuation of the curse against Aeneas and Rome. I would only remark that the parallelism with the Roman devotio is much closer than the mere reference to a formulaic concurrence (p. 262) suggests. Horace is present with Epodes 5 and 17, and Satire I, 8 ²). There is a discussion of various passages in Tibullus and Propertius, and finally Ovid receives due attention.

I do not hesitate to proclaim this part the best of the book: not because this section should show noticeably more coherence than the other sections (it does not), but because of the many really good elucidations of details and literary units both by way of sound philological scholarship and by the adducement of medical and psychological data. I regret that space does not allow a detailed catalogue of the most revealing observations ³). In my view the most honest conclusion is that Miss Tupet has partly succeeded in her intentions quoted in the first line of this review, provided that the words "travail de latiniste" be italicized.
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1) There is, incidentally, not one title in her long bibliographical index, nor in her notes, that even hints at things as the social implications of witch-persecution in ancient society: for example P. Brown, Sorcery, Demons and the Rise of Christianity, in idem, Religion and Society in the Age of St. Augustine (London 1972), 119 ff. provides a good introduction.

2) S. S. Ingallina, Orazio e la magia (Palermo 1974) is mentioned in the bibliography but has apparently not been utilized.

3) The reader who wishes to have an impression may be referred to H. Le Bonniec, who has directed this work and was a member of the jury, and who has written a laudatio of 6 pages in REL 54 (1976), 492 ff.

E. KUNZE-GÖTTE, Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum: Deutschland, Bd. 37, München, Bd. 8, Antikensammlungen. München, Beck, 1973. 95 pp., 74 pl., 44 figs.

During the last few decades the study of Greek vases has become more and more refined and complicated. Definite progress has been made and a far deeper insight into the functioning of Attic pottery workshops will in the long run be possible. It hardly needs saying, I assume, that the first break-through, made by Beazley, was by far the most important step, requiring a genius such as is not likely to be found again among archaeologists. Further progress of ceramology, if we may call it so, will ask for great patience in the accumulation of knowledge by single students. This makes the Mnemosyne, Vol. XXXV, Fasc. 3-4 (1982)
going hard and explains why the present-day study of Greek vases is sometimes harshly criticized as old-fashioned, even trivial, lacking broadness or modern interests of a sociological nature. It is true that classification is still the major job that is to be done. The criticism is, of course, due to the fact that it is much easier to scoff at this work than to take part in it efficiently. Besides, it is not always realized how much has to be done before the final evaluation of the vast material will be possible.

The present volume of the Corpus is an excellent publication of no less than 51 late Archaic neck amphorae, mostly from Vulci, from the collections Candelori and Canino. The vases are arranged according to shape, but there are exceptions: on pl. 386 four amphorae by the Antimenes painter show noticeable differences. The ornaments of these amphorae are standardized. The handle ornaments, which one might call the W-on-M’s, are collected on separate plates. Since the author makes many new attributions, these plates are useful for comparison. Remarkably clear are, for example, pls. 397.3-4 and 5-6. Very similar also are some vases of the Groups Toronto 305 and Bologna 16 on pls. 412.5-6, 418.1-3, to which also pl. 430.1-2 should be added, though here the bottom palmettes are at a higher level. These examples show how difficult it is to make distinctions, but on the other hand the same painter may also draw very different W-M’s: pls. 405.3-4 and 406.3-4.

The descriptions and discussions of the figure scenes are very good indeed. In fact, they seemed so perfect to me that I set myself the unfriendly task of finding fault with the text, to detect details that might have been mentioned (or mentioned in a different way). Of course, in such a search one is sure to succeed, but it proved to be surprisingly hard.

We may confine ourselves to the first vase, an amphora by the Lysippides painter, pls. 363-4. The white teeth and nails of the lion skin on A and the sharp ornaments of the breast strings of the horses on B are, I take it, scratched out, as the author says is the case on the next vase. The description of Athena’s skirt is not complete: this is a neglected detail on which Mrs. Geralda Jurriaans-Helle will, I hope, publish a note in the near future. Many of the women in this fascicule wear an extra skirt tied round their waist, comparable to some extent to an apron, but falling open on the front. Above this apron many women wear bolero-like jackets over their chitons or peploi, but Athena wears an aegis instead. This aegis seems to be double above her breasts; at any rate the way in which it is painted is remarkable. As for Heracles, he is, I believe, tuning his kithara, not playing it: he listens attentively to the sound. Finally it might have been mentioned that on this vase,