professes to contain everything found in Latin literature concerning India. The end of the 6th century is taken as a boundary. Texts are given in Latin and French translation, and a minimum of apparatus is given only occasionally. A commentary is given in more than 600 notes, some of which are rather exhaustive.

A collection of this kind is difficult to make complete. But as the authors ask us to excuse only the occasional omissions among Christian texts, and state their desire to include even poetic banalities with no information worth noticing, it must be noted that there are further short references omitted here. Thus Padaeus in Tib. 3,7,146 belongs to India; and 3,2,92; 3,4,63 and 4,6,66 can be added to the many references in Statius' Silvae. Pomponius Mela also discusses India in his introduction (1,11). Pompeius Trogus is mentioned separately in the introduction, but the Prologues are apparently missing.

The book concludes with three useful indices. The list of authors (and anonymous texts) is indispensable, as the texts are given in chronological order. We may note the omission of Divisio orbis terrarum, p. 270, and the misprint Orose, p. 154 instead of 254, but the rest seems to be correct. "Index nominum et rerum" refers to the texts, the index of original (Indian) words to notes.

But these are only minor defects. The bulk of the work is scrupulous and thorough, which makes the collection a mine of information. For the first time we may form an exhaustive picture of what was known about the far East in the Roman West. And while for the most part Romans could use Greek sources as well, these Latin sources are those which the Middle Ages had access to, and from which the medieval conception of India was derived.

Klaus Karttunen


Bibliographies are always welcome, even such as the present. The Strasbourg project, based on the thirteen volumes of the Bull.anal.hist.rom. (1962-74), is undoubtedly useful within the limits it covers. However, the problem is that different countries are unevenly represented, as the excerption of various periodicals in BAHR was carried
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


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