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*

---


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
modified”, L. Binford, Archaeology as Anthropology, American Antiquity 28 [1962] 224). About a decade later, with D. Clarke's “Archaeology: the loss of innocence” (Antiquity 47 [1973]), it had reached a point, where its first stage was over. Since then, there have been movements in various directions.

But archaeology is still in search of an identity. The authors of the present book are as unsatisfied with great parts of previous archaeological theory and practice, as were the “New archaeologists” with their predecessors in the early 60s.

This book can easily be called a challenge (and as such it is intended), and it makes interesting even if not always easy reading, owing to the learning and broad perspectives of the authors. It should be interesting not only to archaeologists but also to anybody else who is dealing with the past, were it not for any other reason than that the book is an eminent proof of why history has to be rewritten by every generation; that is to say, the values of the society in which we live condition us whether we wish it or not. As the “New archaeologists” were influenced by the great developments in natural and other sciences since the Second World War, so are the concepts of this new book greatly inspired by the thinking of today's influential continental philosophers like Heidegger and Gadamer.

Of the three parts in this book, part I (“Issues in archaeological theory and practice: critique and development”) deals with current archaeology. Its purpose is to show the lack of philosophical and methodological background in today's work. To put it simply, the questions that are dealt with are among others: Why do archaeologists dig up things? How do archaeologists gain reliable knowledge? What is the relation of archaeology to the present time? What kind of ideology do museums express?

In part II (“Perspectives for a social archaeology”) a new programme, relying on a hermeneutic approach, is set out. The term “Social archaeology” indicates which of the post-New Archaeology traditions the writers adhere to.

This book is not only a theoretical treatise, it also contains practical examples, the first of which deals with pottery analysis from the Swedish Neolithic age. (Actually, very little in this book deals directly with classical archaeology; one only finds mentions of exhibits in museums p. 71ff.).

The final third of the book is used for another demonstration of the method of its authors. It does indeed stress the relation of archaeology and today's society, as it consists of an “archaeological investigation of the present”, called “The Design of Contemporary Beer-Cans”. In this most interesting study (somewhat outside the normal field of this journal) the design of Swedish and English beer cans was analysed. Significant differences were discovered. A parallel investigation was made of topics of a much greater magnitude, such as the growth of capitalism in both countries since A.D.
1800, working class ways of spending leisure time, legislation on alcohol and so on. The results of these latter inquiries were then used as an explanatory factor for the actual findings (the beer cans). In turn, the concrete archaeological material, now placed in an illuminating historical and political context, gave new insights about the society from which it originated, in this case our own time. This is how the hermeneutic circle works (for the theory cf. pp. 104ff.).

Concerning the social analysis which provides the background the reviewer has no objections. But one gets the impression that the explanation of the findings is made a little too easy; the authors know too well the result that is to be expected from the beer can analysis. To be really convincing, a deeper view of the Swedish society based on the design of beer cans and the advertising of beer would, for instance, clearly require a comparison with Swedish advertising practice in general in order to discern if the position of alcohol in Swedish society really is different from the British situation to the same degree as beer cans and advertising seems to indicate.

This is, however, not intended as a general critique of the hermeneutic method. Altogether, this is an important book, which convincingly argues the need for archaeologists to consider the philosophical foundations of their activity (and this, of course, is something that all who explore the past should bear in mind).

Christer Bruun
