

written an invaluable book, important both for ancient and mediaeval historians.

As I do not feel competent to give a thorough critical account of this book, I shall instead restrict myself to some minor remarks. On p. 44 the author gives some references to the movements of bishoprics from an old *civitas* to a newly fortified *castrum*. But in the list of the transfers that from *Tres Tabernae* to Velletri must be removed, for Velletri was an ancient centre in the area (a bishopric is attested from A.D. 465) while *Tres Tabernae* was of little importance and was only a temporary centre. In addition, to the admirable prosopographical index some further items from Capua could be added: Rugo vol. IV 104 (but perhaps from the 9th century, as Gray also thinks); and an unpublished inscription from Capua of a *Reparatus v.c.*, which, however, probably dates to the 540's (the date of another unpublished inscription from Capua in which an *Urbicus* is mentioned is also uncertain. – In the list of abbreviations on p. xiv *II* is missing (see also p. 256 under *Clarissima*); it would be preferable to choose a clearer abbreviation, e.g. *Inscr. It.* – p. 275: in CIL X 4502 one should read *Catelles* as gen. (I have seen the inscription) from *Catella*. – *P. Ital.* vol. II appeared perhaps too late to be considered.

Heikki Solin

*Erik Wistrand: Felicitas imperatoria. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia XLVIII. Göteborg 1987. 114 p. SEK 100.*

In recent years the idea of *felicitas* has attracted much attention. It has been interpreted as a magical quality inherent in man or as a blessing given by the gods. The latter explanation has become prevalent especially since H. Erkell's penetrating study in 1952. But a number of problems remain. Professor emeritus E. Wistrand has now produced a monograph on the most important variety of *felicitas*, the *felicitas* of the supreme commander and later of the Emperor.

Wistrand's treatise is a historical analysis of the development of the idea. *Felicitas* was originally connected with *auspicia*, which at first were the privilege of the patricians. The gods conferred blessing on the general who had made sure of their favour by taking the auspices. This is the meaning of the old claim of the victories of a general won *auspicio imperio ductu felicitate*. But in Livy a change of view is observable. Instead of the *auspicia* and *felicitas* granted by the gods, success is ascribed to the general's competence and ability. The supernatural gives way to rationally explicable causes, a clear sign of the increasing secularisation of Roman thought. The famous antithesis of *virtus* and *fortuna*, in which the Romans almost invariably gave precedence

to virtue, the human factor, also contributed to the weakening of the old belief in *felicitas* as a divine favour secured by *auspicia*. Simultaneously, the religious significance of the triumph as a thanksgiving to Jupiter for victory also declined. *Felicitas* was more and more considered a personal quality. Its religious significance, however, remained, though it underwent considerable changes.

The author discusses the problem in a few famous cases. Sulla and Marius had, or are represented to have had, different ideas of the importance of *felicitas*. Sulla took the name of Felix to show that he enjoyed divine protection as a personal privilege whereas Marius emphasized *honos*, love of honour, and *virtus* as the decisive factors. Cicero too preferred *virtus* to *fortuna* / *felicitas* despite the fact that the traditional explanation of *felicitas* as divine favour largely stems from his speech advocating Pompey's supreme command in the war against Mithridates (*De lege Manilia*). But this oration was made *ad Quirites* and naturally played upon received religious ideas. *Felicitas* in the old sense also began to be problematic because it was perceived to favour bad men like Sulla. During the Empire, beginning with Augustus, a new idea emerges. The emperor by his divine nature secures prosperity for the Empire. This is the meaning of *felicitas temporum* celebrated by the panegyrics of the Empire. Wistrand follows the history of the idea down to the fifth century. He argues that it survived in the Christian festivals of Christmas and Epiphany. The birthday of the Saviour replaced the birthday of the god-given emperor.

The book is well-argued and the conclusions in general acceptable. It is without doubt a valuable contribution to the study of the religious ideas of the Romans. Some passages, however, suggest possibilities for further discourses. Thus the relations of *fortuna*, and especially personal *fortuna*, and *felicitas* are not quite clear. Personal *fortuna* seems to be of complex origin. Besides the native *genius*, Greek personal Tyche may have contributed to its development. It is more problematic whether the Aristotelian or Ps.Aristotelian notion of Good Fortune, a personal impulse that guides certain men to success (cp. Arctos 1986, 30), was also involved.

*Iiro Kajanto*

*Michael Shanks - Christopher Tilley: Re-Constructing Archaeology. Theory and Practice. New Studies in Archaeology. Cambridge University Press, 1987. XVI, 267 p. GBP 27.50.*

Some 25 years ago the movement that was to be called New Archaeology was born. ("The lack of theoretical concern and rather naive attempts at explanation which archaeologists currently advance must be