

Für den Epigraphiker ist es interessant, daß im Katalog auch einige Inedita bzw. in CIL XI nicht enthaltene Inschriften mitgeteilt werden; diese werden auf S. 9 aufgezählt, aber unverständlicherweise ohne Berücksichtigung der Denkmäler aus Iguvium, unter denen sich mehrere früher nicht bekannte Steine finden: GUB 1 (mit dem neuen Gentilnamen *Vaccilius*), 2, 5, 6 (der Gentilname lautet m.E. *Vedennius*). – An der Wiedergabe der Inschriften in dem Katalog wäre einiges zu bemängeln – natürlich darf man nicht vergessen, daß es sich hier nicht um eine Inschriftenedition handelt (die Archäologen könnten sich aber in diesen Sachen an die Epigraphiker wenden) –, aber ich begnüge mich hier zum Schluß mit den folgenden kurzen Bemerkungen: ASS 44: *C.l. Rufus*. ASS 46: *Me[v]ia?* ASS 65: [.] *Atiedius [C]hrestus*. ASS 74: *cohor. IX praetor. [(centuria)] Naevi*. BEV 8: [*S]alvena L.f.* BEV 17: *C. Alle[i]us T.[f.](?)*. FOL 5: [.] *Aufidius S[ex. f.]*

Olli Salomies

*Past Perspectives. Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing.* Papers presented at a conference in Leeds, 6-8 April 1983. Edited by I.S. Moxon, J.D. Smart, A.J. Woodman. Cambridge University Press, 1986. IX, 241 p. GBP 25.

This is the collection of papers presented at a conference on the Greek and Roman Historians, held at the University of Leeds in 1983, plus the critical epilogue written by the editors I.S. Moxon, J.D. Smart and A.J. Woodman. The volume consisting of ten articles of well-known scholars, gives an interesting overview of Greek and Roman historical writing.

J. Cobet, J.D. Smart and C.J. Tuplin approach the problem of the nature of war in the Greek historiography. In his article, "Herodotus and Thucydides on war", J. Cobet concentrates mainly on the conceptualization of war and the different explanations of its consequences. Herodotus thought that war was caused by human action and that consequently it could and should be avoided. Thucydides, however, had a different viewpoint. His response to the horrors of war were more stereotypical. This conclusion is, however, strongly criticized in the epilogue in which it is argued that Thucydides' analysis of the causes of war should be seen against the background of the tragical structure of his work.

J.D. Smart examines particular episodes in Thucydides and Hellanicus in order to find out the place and the meaning of war in their composition. He examines Thucydides' methods and the extent to which he was influenced by contemporary sophistic concern with physis.

In his paper on Xenophon's *Hellenica*, C.J. Tuplin discusses Xenophon's work and his treatment of military engagement. He argues that there are good reasons for accepting Xenophon's accounts. However, it should be remembered that historiography had functions other than to produce authentic documents covering important events: historians also sought to provide detailed description of battle-scenes to entertain their readers.

The following articles treat various aspects of Roman historiography, the question of reliability and the political and philosophical influences on the discipline. T.J. Cornell criticizes the old tradition of *Quellenkritik*, which had a strong influence on the generally-agreed view about the formation of the historical tradition of early Rome. He emphasizes the fact that, after all, the surviving accounts of Roman writers such as Cicero, Diodorus, Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, are in close agreement on all fundamental points. Moxon, Smart and Woodman, however, remind us that the existence of the living tradition is not a guarantee of its genuineness. However, we should remember that this does not make the tradition less important as a source of Roman history.

T.P. Wiseman approaches the historical tradition of Rome as a monument to preserve the glory of great deeds. He argues that defacing or destroying monuments was equivalent to destroying or distorting an historical record. Here we approach the very fundamental question concerning the meaning and function of *memoria* and monuments in Roman society. In her article on Cassius and Brutus, Elisabeth Rawson also discusses the question of memory. She analyzes the characters of the liberators Cassius and Brutus, and concludes that the Roman historians, whatever opinion they had, did not lose touch with reality.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus is often regarded as a second-class historian without any originality or literary merit. Clemence Schultze emphasises that Dionysius' work still has value for what it reveals about the interests and models of thought of its author and his audience. According to Schultze, historiography was regarded as one of the more popular genres of literature and its main function was to entertain readers. Nevertheless, Dionysius was one of the few historiographers who even discussed the theory and practice of historical writing.

T.J. Luce makes an interesting attempt to understand Tacitus' motives and methods in his account of Tiberius. First, he analyses Tacitus' works in order to find how and when we can be sure about what was the author's own opinion. In the second part of his article Luce discusses Tacitus' account of the deterioration in the reign of Tiberius, and his tendency to suggest alternative motives for individual action. In this

article, the question of the authors' opinion or intention is seen from a new viewpoint.

In his paper, "Plutarch and the Roman Politics", C.B.R. Pelling discusses Plutarch's conception of society, which is discernible especially in the "Gracchi", the "Marius" and the "Caesar". According to Pelling, Plutarch views Roman society in the light of the Greek dichotomy between *boule* and *demos*. Pelling claims that Plutarch's view of the political conflicts of the late republic as a contradiction between these two elements is the author's personal opinion, and not directly taken from earlier sources.

T.E.J. Wiedemann concludes the book with an analysis of Ammianus Marcellinus' descriptions of marginal places and peoples in terms of anthropological and literary conventions, and introduces the concepts of normal and abnormal, central and marginal. Through these dichotomies, Wiedemann tries to approach the *topoi* which were already known by Herodotus. On the other hand, we should remember that Herodotus himself was dependent upon oral traditions which were, however, in many cases no more reliable than the accounts of Ammianus. In any case, that does not make them uninteresting from the viewpoint of the historian.

"Past Perspectives" contains many important studies. The essential problems of classical historiography are discussed from a critical viewpoint. The excellent epilogue, in particular, helps readers to discover many new problems and fresh aspects which often throw new light upon conventional interpretations and standard views.

*Katariina Mustakallio*

*Serta historica antiqua*. Pubblicazioni dell'istituto di storia antica e scienze ausiliarie dell'Università degli studi di Genova, XV. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1986. VII, 276 p. ITL 250.000.

The 15th volume in the Pubblicazioni of the Institute of Ancient History in the University of Genoa contains a series of articles from different fields: Gianfranco Gaggero, Considerazioni sulla legenda di Sesostri nella tradizione greco-romana; Giorgio Camassa, Una possibile traccia della presenza euboica nella Penisola salentina durante l'età arcaica; Rossella Pera, Tipi dionisiaci in Sicilia e Magna Grecia; Luigi Piccirilli, La prima moglie di Milziade; Carla Ferretto, Milziade e Egesipile. Un matrimonio di interesse; Mariella Galletti, Furono i *Persiani* di Eschilo un dramma filotemistocleo?; Luigi Santi-Amantini, La terminologia degli accordi di pace nella tradizione letteraria greca sino alla conclusione delle guerre persiane; Ugo Fantasia, Samo e Anaia; Maria Gabriella Angeli