

* (4b) $N(\sim Sf)$

(5) $\sim M(Sf)$

The steps marked by asterisks are not explicitly mentioned in Cicero's text, but S. explains why Cicero was justified in assuming the implicit steps and why it is probable that Cicero would have subscribed to them. The argument is, as S. remarks, somewhat pedestrian, and he suggests shorter alternative routes and argues that Cicero in fact used one such shorter version in *De fato* 14, with a view to recapitulating the longer argument (pp. 137–8).

The example will serve to illustrate why I have ambivalent feelings about S.'s reconstruction. While modern logical reconstructions help us understand the complexities that might have stood behind a seemingly straightforward passage, they also place us at a distance from the text: many of the logical concepts employed were not available to the Hellenistic philosophers.

Moreover, the procedure brings with it the risk that passages are pressed in a logical mould where a closer analysis of terminological peculiarities and of the larger structure of the text might have been more fruitful. A point in question is *De fato* 17–18. S. interprets Cicero as offering an 'indeterminist' reading of Diodorus Cronus. This would clash with the discussion of Diodorus in *De fato* 12–14 where Cicero seems clear about the determinist implications of Diodorus' position. S. resorts to the hypothesis that Cicero considered Diodorus an indeterminist and that *De fato* 12–14 presents Chrysippus' view of Diodorus (pp. 165–7). There is, however, no need to resort to this *ad hoc* explanation. S.'s interpretation (see p. 160) hinges on a single concessive phrase in *De fato* 18 (*Nec, cum haec ita sint ...*). It seems more promising to see in this phrase a signal that Cicero has so far presented Diodorus' determinist position and goes on to explain why one can accept the way in which Diodorus would have formulated his position without drawing any determinist implications from it.

Occasionally S. does not make clear immediately which interpretative options he favours and offers such decisions only at a later stage in the book, but without argument (cf., e.g., pp. 41 and 291 on the third lacuna). A comparison with today's ideas about agent causality is hinted at in the summary (p. 301), but is not used in the main part of the text. But these are minor issues in a text which will prove to be a valuable tool for students of the *De fato*.

University of Groningen

CHRISTOPH JEDAN
c.jedan@rug.nl

THE ROMAN HISTORIANS

FELDHERR (A.) (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*. Pp. xviii + 464, ills. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Paper, £21.99, US\$40 (Cased, £60, US\$110). ISBN: 978-0-521-67093-7 (978-0-521-85453-5 hbk).

doi:10.1017/S0009840X10002155

Reading Roman history as a genre is the overarching aim of this collection. Twenty-five chapters introduce readers of the Roman historians to recent historiographical approaches; to ancient historical contexts and traditions; to themes investigated, writing modes adopted and character types represented by Roman historians; to

non-Roman encounters with the dominant historiographical discourse; and to the reception of these historians by modern scholarship. The Editor states at the outset that generating 'significant prospects for new research' (p. xv) is key to certain elements of this enterprise.

The first section, 'Approaches', comprises three essays intended to survey ancient and modern views of historiographical practice. J. Marincola examines the audience for ancient historiography, identifying the usual suspects (elite writers, elite readers), generic expectations (a history of the city of Rome from its origins to the writer's present; a history of specific events or time periods), established focal points (the deeds of generals and armies; the actions of magistrates and Senate), traditional purposes (education, inspiration), and an endemic relationship between the writing project and 'the business of politics and contemporary public life' (p. 22). W. Batstone addresses how postmodern historiographical approaches may be used to read and understand Roman historians. Traversing Lyotard's rejection of metanarrative, Derrida's excoriation of language as arbitrary, and Barthes' view of history as part of an inescapable discursive feedback-loop, B. interrogates empirical notions of historical truth, causation and closure. Episodes in Sallust, Caesar and Livy are provided as test-cases for a selection of postmodern tenets: subjectivity (of writer and reader) is constructed within texts; the present is at one and the same time similar to and different from the past; history is non-linear, composed of intersecting forces rather than scientific sequences; historians are interested and subjective, and their history is literature. Rounding off this section – or, rather, squaring off for battle – J. Lendon targets the work of T.P. Wiseman and A.J. Woodman as representative of a 'species of scholarship' which has removed Roman history from the Roman historians. Adopting a mantle of reasoned caution, L. methodically dismantles Wiseman's preference for the influence of early drama on Roman historiography over documentary origins for Rome's historical tradition, then challenges Woodman's inclusive view of Classical historiographers as unapologetically untrustworthy and intentionally rhetorical. Having restored the principles of truthfulness and generic authority to ancient history writing, L. proceeds to demolish by appeal to extremes of scholarship the inheritance of Wiseman and Woodman, warning against diminution of robust historical practice and the potential for disciplinary dissolution in reading historians as literature.

The development of Roman historiography (origins and frames of reference) is the focus of four essays in the second section, 'Contexts and Traditions'. H. Flower situates historical writing at Rome within the variety of 'traditional forms of memory making in Roman culture' (p. 65). She demonstrates the exceptional nature of written history by reference to an exemplary catalogue of alternative commemorative practices (poetry and drama; public inscriptions; funeral orations; forensic and political speeches) and attendant private and civic contexts for display and self-representation (the aristocratic atrium; monuments and statuary; public festivals and processions). J. Dillery looks at the expectation for early historiography at Rome to be written in Greek and its cultural capital as a marker of status (between Greek and Roman, within the Roman elite) and identity (as definitively Roman). Through close study of exemplary fragments from Fabius Pictor's *Annales Graeci* and Cato's *Origines*, D. explores the degree to which early narratives of Rome's past, whether written in Greek or Latin, articulate Romans speaking to the Greek world *and* other Romans. Extending analysis of Cato's history, U. Gotter assigns to the *Origines* features of Roman historiography he considers essential: the integral link between the writer's political present and his construction of a

'relevant past' (p. 109); the embedding of the laws of politics (competition and conflict) in historiography at Rome, rendering its conception of the past a product of revision rather than an instrument of consensus. According to this view, G. understands the narrative of historical events in the *Origines* – a national history, with unnamed individual protagonists, grounded in an idea of Italy as an ethnic collective – as antithetical to the Roman aristocratic enterprise, a radical alternative to the annalistic principle underwriting the Republic's elite culture of memory. J. Davidson concludes this section with a brief portrait of Polybius as paradigmatic of the relationship between Greek and Latin historiography. Pivotal to D.'s discussion is the notion of cultural and textual exchange. Polybius' biographical status as 'actor-spectator, hostage-guest' (p. 132) permeates the *Histories*: in his Romanised vocabulary and syntax; in his quasi-official interpretation of Roman policy to conquered compatriots, Roman companions and posterity; in his transmission of the assumptions, principles and ideas of a Hellenistic intellectual inheritance and of Roman historical practices. Neatly dovetailing with the premise of this section, D. leaves us with a lasting impression of the historian's gaze on the interdependent fields of *historia* and historiographical method.

The following three sections provide synoptic treatments of the ways in which Roman historians deal with their subject matter, how they construct and situate those individuals integral to the historical fabric, and the literary methods through which they transmit their perspectives on the past. D. Feeney opens Part 3 with a survey of the methods by which Roman historians adapted or integrated indigenous systems of time to existing Greek chronologies: fundamentally by connecting in series or parallel events, people and places. F. emphasises the importance of ideology informing choice of chronological markers in these relative historiographical systems. A. Riggsby investigates the uses of space and spatial frameworks – in his view, space is 'the articulation of places' (p. 154) – in developing understanding of Roman historiography, in both geographical and narrative terms. To explicate how constructions of space by Roman historians affect cultural and political relations, R. considers the treatment of strategic and geographical space in Caesar and Sallust, and of individually owned (private) and collectively used (public) space in Livy. J. Davies explores the representation of religious practice and institutions in Livy and Tacitus, arguing that historical writers at Rome worked naturally and effectively within traditional religious modes of thought. J. Connolly seeks to restore the primacy of 'traditional moralism and self-criticism' (p. 182) to the formulation of politics in the Latin historians. For her, Roman values rather than sustained analysis of republicanism lie at the nexus of genre and culture in historiographical representations of civic government at Rome.

In Part 4, 'Modes', A. Laird, M. Roller and E. O'Gorman treat distinctive literary techniques underpinning Roman historiography: rhetoric; exemplarity; intertextuality. All three essays demonstrate the utility for modern historians of ancient Rome in continuing analysis of the literary dynamics that convey historical information in Roman culture. Part 5, 'Characters', surveys some of the roles that characterisation of individuals and types of person play in Roman historiography: sophisticated portrayals of *personae* produce narrative realism and extend conceptual complexity (A. Vasaly); emphasising the visual world of the author and his subject (in this case, the emperor) sharpens understanding of the composition and contemporary reading of historical writing (C. Vout); women's presence in public affairs constitutes transgression *and* transformation of civic integrity in Roman historical narrative (K. Milnor); the ideological function of barbarians as objects

of Roman conquest foregrounds multifaceted portraits of significant individuals like Alexander (E. Baynham) and descriptions of foreign peoples like the Jews (A. Feldherr).

The final section, 'Transformations', canvasses a selection of ancient and modern episodes in the reception of the Roman historians. H. Chapman demonstrates how the study of Josephus' texts helps to open up modern understanding of cultural relations in the ancient Mediterranean. A. Gowing canvasses the use of the Roman tradition of *exempla* in imperial Greek historiography, taking the case of Camillus as a paradigm for defining what it means to be Roman. G. Kelly examines Ammianus Marcellinus in the context of earlier Latin historiography (Tacitus) and his later reception (Gibbon), teasing out suggestive threads of manipulation and partiality connecting the historiographical prerogatives of each author. B. Fontana discusses the influence of Roman historians on the development of early modern political theory, in particular the reception of Livy, Sallust and Tacitus in the discourse of Machiavelli, Hobbes and Montesquieu. V. Schröder analyses the 'Roman' drama of Jean Racine for entry-points into the tradition of Roman historiography and its use in French classical tragedy. Concluding the section and the collection, E. Dench explores some of the major changes in modern historical writing of the past 30 years (discourse, perceptions, receptions; historicism, new historicism; history, historiography). For ancient historians, she considers that '[a] further round of self-scrutiny seems well overdue' (p. 405).

Each author offers suggestions for further reading, and the Editor has provided a chronological catalogue of Roman historians, including Greek historians writing about Rome, and an extensive bibliography.

Though its scope and sequence condemn it to selectivity and specialism, this *Cambridge Companion* achieves its stated aims in large measure: it gives orientation to important concerns of the Roman historians and points to new directions in historical and historiographical research.

Macquarie University, Sydney

PETER KEEGAN
peter.keegan@mq.edu.au

HISTORY AND LITERATURE

LOWRIE (M.) *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome*. Pp. xiv + 426. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Cased, £75. ISBN: 978-0-19-954567-4.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X10002167

Roman poets are unusually interested in commenting on the modes and media of literary communication. Such metaliterary reflection, however, is rarely straightforward. 'Song' is juxtaposed with the terminology of reading and writing, monumentality is claimed in the absence of an actual material monument, and the putatively unique occasion of poetic performance stands in tension with iterated, future acts of reception. L., whose earlier book, *Horace's Narrative Odes* (Oxford, 1997), was especially valuable for its attention to Horace's figuration of writing within a generic frame privileging song, now applies the same analytical finesse to a broader array of poets, genres and media. 'Media', in L.'s use, refers both to modes of transmitting and transcribing poetry (papyrus scroll, oral recitation, song, wax tablets) and to public monuments, inscriptions and spectacle.