

out so that certain countries were included only from a given year (Belgium, France, Luxemburg and Switzerland, 1962-, etc.). The result is that the English-speaking countries are not included at all, which is of course very regrettable. It is also a pity that many important periodicals published in the European socialist countries have not been considered (Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland). As regards the African countries, only Egypt and the other Arab states are included. Furthermore, considering the subject of this bibliography, i.e. the Greek-speaking provinces, it is very annoying that Cyprus, Greece and Turkey are represented only with articles that appeared between 1971 and 1974. Finally, in my opinion, a bibliography of this scale should include all the monographic studies as well, regardless of whether they are published in a scientific series or as independent books. In its present form the bibliography lists only a few such works (e.g. p. 35: J. Deininger, *Provinziallandtage...[Vestigia 6 (1965)]*).

The list of abbreviations reveals that a number of important periodicals are missing, either by accident, or because they printed no relevant items between 1962 and 1974. But even articles not directly concerned with the present subject might nevertheless contain information of interest. Moreover, reviews (and review articles) of the books dealing with the Greek East could also have been excerpted. Therefore, a look at e.g. the following periodicals, which are not, at least, recorded in the list of abbreviations, might have been of some use: *Atene e Roma* (Firenze), *Class. & Mediaev.* (Copenhagen), *Dial. Arch.* (Milano), *Epigr. Stud.* (Köln), *Eranos* (Uppsala), *Glotta* (Göttingen), *Hist. Zeitschr.* (München), *Hist. Jb.* (München), *Mel. Arch. Hist. Ec. Fr. Rome* (Rome), *Nuov. Riv. Stor.* (Milano), *Riv. Stor. Ital.* (Napoli), *Riv. Stud. Class.* (Torino).

*Mika Kajava*

*Judith P. Hallett: Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society. Women and the Elite Family. Princeton University Press, Princeton 1984. XIX, 422 p. USD 42.00.*

The central term in this book is what the author calls "filiafocality". By this neologism she seems to mean that Roman aristocratic daughters enjoyed a particular affection of their fathers. They would have derived their identity from their position as daughters to their fathers. In Hallett's mind, the high valuation placed on daughters on the part of their fathers encouraged strong sister-brother and mother-son ties as well.

Hallett's study is largely a compilation of examples from literature. In principle this method is valid, if it is adopted objectively and with great

care. Unfortunately, Hallett's way of treating the examples reported by Roman writers is anything but even. It is not acceptable to pay no attention at all to any evidence that is incompatible with one's theory. It is clear that the author underestimates the ties between father and son, and between brothers, not to mention the affection between husband and wife (to take only one example, a careful systematic analysis of the relations between various members of Cicero's family would have given a very different picture from that presented by Hallett; one wonders why Cicero's letters to Terentia are neglected, as are those of Pliny displaying love for Calpurnia). There are, of course, a great number of cases to show that the bond between husband and wife was highly valued; examples occur not only in literature but in inscriptions as well (it is regrettable that so little weight has been given to the epigraphic evidence, such as epitaphs and *laudationes*). In general, the author pays little attention to the literary context or to counter-evidence. It would have been very useful to Hallett to observe that it was largely the context and environment that counted in the way of identifying individuals. A look at various documents (of a formal, semi-formal or informal nature) shows that women could be identified in relation to either the father or the husband, or both. Furthermore, many anecdotal cases intended to show that the ties between father and daughter were especially strong (90ff.) are totally irrelevant. In addition to the literary sources, Hallett makes use of legal and linguistic evidence. Here, too, the approach is one-sided and at times awkward (cf. e.g. the very dubious arguments about the original meaning of *avus* and *avunculus*; 127ff.).

The greatest problem (and danger) with Hallett's book clearly lies in the uneven treatment of the evidence. It is exorbitant to require that a normal reader should be aware of every piece of counter-evidence (which Hallett usually neglects) to be able to know whether some arguments are valid or not. A typical example of Hallett's use of evidence is her claiming (190ff.) that in Roman society the relation between *patrui* and their nephews was much more distant and problematic than that between *avunculi* and their sisters' sons. A reader who is not familiar with the Roman literature, might very well agree with the author.

*Mika Kajava*