Dieses wird besonders deutlich, wenn die Vorstellung von einer allgewaltigen Muttergöttin ('The multiplicity of goddesses ... were all manifestations of one great mother' p. 258f) von der Autorin durch den Begriff eines femininen Prinzips, das zu dem männlichen komplementär ist, ersetzt wird. Der abstraktere Ausdruck ist zudem fähig, mehr Aspekte der ägyptischen Göttinnen und ihres Synkretismus zu fassen, als der extrem konnotierte Begriff der Muttergöttin.

Es ist doch gerade die neue Perspektive, die dieses Buch interessant macht: ein ägyptische Religionsgeschichte, die sich auf das Wesen und die Bedeutung von Göttinnen konzentriert und vor dem Hintergrund von dreitausend Jahren ägyptischer Geschichte erzählt, so daß die Geschichte von der Verehrung dieser Göttinnen gleichsam als Spiegel des alten Ägypten fungiert.

Katja Reinhardt, IHAC
Northeast Normal University

J.C. YARDLEY & Waldemar HECKEL, *Justin, Epitome of the Philippic of Pompeius Trogus Books 11-12: Alexander the Great*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. ISBN 0-19-814907-7 (hbk); ISBN 0-19-814908-5 (pbk). Pp. xxiv +360. US $85.00.

It would be a difficult task to comment on Justin's 'Epitome' of the *Historiae Philippicae* of Trogus. Regretfully, Trogus' monumental history of the non-Roman Mediterranean world in Latin was lost, leaving only the prologues to the forty-four books and some quotations in works of other authors. But while epitomizing the original, Justin introduced not a few errors of his own often as a result of being too bold in the abridgement and compression of the original. Hence, to detect and differentiate as far as possible what belongs to the historian Trogus and what belongs to the epitomator, Justin has become a cottage industry for enterprising commentators. John Yardley and Waldemar

Heckel have proven beyond a doubt to be qualified for this task as is shown by this excellent volume, which deals with Justin's Books 11-12, that is the part of the history devoted to Alexander the Great. Yardley and Heckel have provided a meticulous introduction, an easy-to-follow and smooth translation, an exhaustive commentary, and appropriate appendices mainly pertaining to the fragments and style.

What we know about Trogus is mostly based on Justin's 'Epitome': Trogus' origin among the Vocontii, a people of Gallia Narbonensis, and his family's *Romanization* are to be found in Book 43. Furthermore, the commentators notice Justin's description of Trogus' eloquence (*vir priscae eloquentiae*, *Praefatio* I), and therefore assume that he received the traditional rhetorical education afforded to offspring of the provincial elite, and that he was perhaps even sent to Rome. Justin 41.5.8 is adduced as crucial evidence for dating Trogus: he says that the Parthians gave the name Arsaces to all their kings, 'as the Romans use the names Caesar and Augustus'. Some commentators as a result contend that the earliest possible date for such Parthian nomenclature would be the period AD 69-79, whereas others comment that the imperial offices of 'Caesar' and 'Augustus' ought to belong to a later period, that is, that of the epitomator. Yardley and Heckel first discuss the latest securely dateable reference in the work (42.5.11-12), Phraates' surrender of his sons and grandsons to Augustus as hostages in 10 BC, and consider this to be a secure *terminus post quem* for Trogus' history. The possibility of even later references are considered but dismissed and the authors conclude that the final publication of Trogus' work must belong to the turn of the milennium. This dating would make Trogus roughly contemporary with Livy (59 BC-AD 17).

An analysis of Livian expressions, and non-Livian as well, in Justin/Trogus is made in Appendix V.1 and .2, and it is enough to say that the commentators remain cautious. They note that the paucity of remains of prose from the Augustan age makes it impossible to ascertain with confidence whether individual expressions occurring in Livy and Trogus were not more likely common ones at the time. They also warn that Trogus' words have passed through the sieve of Justin and we can no longer be sure what Trogus' exact words were. However, the conjecture that Trogus was influenced somewhere by Livy still seems reasonable, by comparison with

the authors who are known to have used Trogus as a source. Further, the commentators also emphasize that all the 'identifications' of Trogan expressions -- whether paralleled in Livy or not - are tentative. Some of the 'identified' Livian echoes are further deemed to probably have been taken directly from Livy by Justin.

Of Justin one knows almost nothing apart from what he tell us in the preface to his work. The major question, however, is the date of the 'Epitome': scholarly opinions range from as early as the reign of Antonius Pius (specifically, AD 144 or 145) to about the end of the second/beginning of the third century AD, and even c.395. Yardley and Heckel favor an earlier dating, that is, the second half of the second century AD (or at the latest the first two decades of the third). The key evidence for this is 41.1.1 in which Justin apostrophizes that 'today the Parthians rule the East, the world being partitioned, as it were, between them and the Romans'. Such a statement is, as any researcher will perceive, no longer possible after AD 226/7, when the Sassanids established a new Persian Empire conquering Artabanus V and the Parthians; hence, for most scholars, this provides a *terminus ante quem* for Justin.

However, the commentators advance the argument that Justin perceived of the 'Epitome' as a work of literature in its own right. Thus it is rather natural to hold that Justin wrote no later than the earliest possible *terminus ante quem*. Such a view is supported by linguistic evidence such as the influence of some second-century authors, especially Apuleius (collected in App.V.3) and, further, the use of such poets as Virgil, Statius, and Lucan, among others (in App.V.4), which was a standard feature of the Second Sophistic. The authors are deeply sceptical that Trogus was influenced by Virgil, and even Ovid; they thus assign the insinuation of Virgilian reminiscences with integration of reminiscences from poets writing after Trogus, and credit all of these to Justin.

It is the commentators' opinion that Justin should not be condemned as a poor historian, as many scholars would indict him, who merely stitched together, very poorly, passages of Trogus, and often mangled the history which Trogus recorded. It is perhaps worth mentioning that Justin stands accused of doing what Florus did with Livy. Thus Livy the Paduan, author of a Roman history, and chided by Augustus for his republican symphathies,

is seen to suffer the same fate at more or less the same time as Trogus, author of an universal history that paid little attention to Rome. Nevertheless this does not imply an anti-Roman bias on the part of Trogus the Gaul. The truth surely must be that he decided not to cover the same material as Livy but chose instead to write a history complentary to that of Livy adding a non-Roman perspective. Florus made an epitome of Livy, in which, like the Epitome of Pompeius Trogus by Justin, poetic fluourishes can be observed, a sign that both Florus and Justin considered themselves 'creative writers' with oratorical interests rather than simple *epitomateurs*. They excerpted from their authorities and rewrote, only presenting those historical events that were able to evoke orators' interest or which could contribute to the training of orators. Yardley and Heckel think that Justin was more an orator than historian, and is thus being judged by the wrong criterion.

As far as historiography is concerned, the *Historiae Philippicae* is unknown to us in its original form: its scope, character, and reliability can be determined only with difficulty, and limited accuracy, from a study of Justin's abridgement, the so-called Prologues of the forty-four books and the 'fragments' collected by O. Seel in his *Pompei Trogi Fragmenta*. Translations of those pertaining to Books 11-12 can be found in App.1). On the basis of these, the commentators analyze the Hellenic perspective of Trogus' work, and weigh its general scope partially by comparison with the world view of his contemporaries, and partially through the generously interspersed digressions. The authors would rank Trogus alongside Polybius, Cornelius Nepos, Diodorus Siculus, and Nicolaus of Damascus, who are also the writers of universal history of the same sort, that is, a pageant of the panorama of Rome's unification of the Mediterranean.

As to the significance of the title, *Historiae Philippicae*, there is little agreement. All explanations, though none of them is indeed entirely satisfactory, are enumerated. In respect to chronology, it seems unfair to assume that Trogus was as careless about chronology as his epitomist on the basis of superficial observation. Even so, Trogus clearly did not have a strict chronological system nor did he employ an annalistic approach as rigorously as Diodorus Siculus does. Rather, he combined and catalogued events in a loose and generic association .His book laid emphasis upon *translatio imperii*

('transference of empire'), and accordingly tends to be more specific about the durations of reigns and empires.

With regard to the issue whether there is in Trogus' work a Gallic Bewüftstein or not, the commentators side with Seel whose answer is positive. Trogus' negative portrait of the Gauls is looked on as reflecting that of his Greek sources, while the phrase 'terror of the Gallic name' (*terror Gallici nominis*) is a reflection of the greatness of the Gauls. Another key phrase 'the fortune of Rome' (*Romana fortuna*), so far as the commentators judge, need not be construed as a sign of Trogus' hostility to Rome. His attempt to maintain a balance between his inclination towards Rome and the less enthusiastic stance of the Greek sources can be felt in Justin's description (43.1.1) of Trogus thinking about the necessity of writing 'his native land', Rome, into his history. As to *Quellenforschung*, the 'Timagenes hypothesis' has been rejected by many scholars, that is, the view that Trogus used the *Basileis* or *Peri Basileon* ('Kings' or 'On Kings') of Timagenes of Alexandria. But Yardley and Heckel suggest that it is equally unwise to abandon the view that Trogus was influenced by and used Timagenes. They then constructively inspect the traces of Timagenes in the *Historiae Philippicae*.

The history of Alexander the Great in Trogus-Justin is the commentators' central concern, for which the extant sources can be divided into two traditions the 'apologetic' and the 'Vulgate'. Trogus, together with Diodorus Siculus, Q. Curtius Rufus, Plutarch and the Metz Epitome, belongs to the latter. The common source of the 'Alexander Vulgate' was Cleitarchus. Perhaps the clearest reflection of Cleitarchus' original is Book 17 of Diodorus Siculus, written before 30 BC. Books 11-12 of Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae* are closest to it both in time and scope. The nature and relationship of the lost primary sources have been subjects of considerable debate and extensive speculation, which are appraised one by one by the commentators. Consequently, a study of the extant 'Vulgate' authors shows that certain apparent errors cannot be used to discredit Cleitarchus any longer but ought to be explained in terms of the aims and methods of those who use him as a source. Common elements and strikingly similar narratives recurring in the extant sources invite speculation by the commentators about the

interrelationship of these sources. The only confirmed certain use of one by another is Curtius' use of Trogus (Curtius 59-61).

The deservedly unkind assessment of Justin by modern scholarship extends by implication to Togus as well. Refreshingly the commentators compare in detail the 'fragments' or Prologues of Trogus with the 'Epitome' of Justin, and paint a more favorable picture of Trogus and at the same time posit how Justin's most notorious errors may have originated. They come to the conclusion that most serious errors can be attributed directly to the epitomator, and that Trogus was better than he might appear to be from the 'Epitome', a truly circumspect and fair *apologia* for Trogus the stylist and historian.

This sentiment neatly sums up the overall character of this book, including the short Introduction, and permeates the entire commentary. As for detailed exegesis of the text, Yardley and Heckel present ancient sources and modern scholarship as thoroughly as possible, resisting the temptation to impose their own interpretation of events too strongly, in order to allow the public to make up its own mind. The scholarly book can meet the requirements of undergraduates and scholars alike. The former will read the lucid and graceful English translation, and find the more general discussions by which they wish to enlighten themselves, while the latter must welcome the bibliography and the more technical discussions that they favor. That is the very aim of Yardley and Heckel, merciful judges of Trogus and Justin who have too long suffering the slings and arrows of unkind critics.

Xu Xiaoxu, IHAC
Northeast Normal University