This is a learned book, full of insights, and it provides us with a new approach to Diaspora Jewry. It includes two important appendices (the Hezekiah coins and the dating of Pseudo-Aristeas) and a section of extended notes. Bar-Kochva's work is extremely professional since not only is he in full control of Greek material, but he has also mastered the literature in Hebrew, both source material and modern studies. Even if I do not always agree with Bar-Kochva's arguments, he has presented us with a well thought-out and useful book which will remain a milestone in the field of Jewish Hellenistic history and literature for many years to come.

Doron Mendels The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Renato Oniga, *Sallustio e l'etnografia*, Biblioteca di Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici 12, Pisa: Giardini, 1995. 151 pp. ISBN 88-427-0258-7.

As a Roman historian writing in the first century B.C.E. and drawing inspiration from centuries of Greek literary tradition, Sallust weaved ethnographic detail into his historiography. In focusing upon this aspect of Sallust's extant writings, Renato Oniga examines a number of badly transmitted fragments from the *Historiae* (ch. VI), yet concludes that Sallust's ethnography finds its best and only complete expression in the digression on the Numidian and other North-African tribes in *Bellum Iugurthinum,* 17-19.

The first chapter of Oniga's book surveys the well-known history of classical ethnography prior to Sallust. Descriptions of peoples as well as descriptions of countries were at the same time both appendices to historiography and an integral part of it. The first Greek historian to apply this method was Herodotus who, as Oniga rightly states, might very well be called "the Father of Ethnography". The military campaigns of Alexander the Great in the East provided further rich material for ethnographic monographs which introduced both India and other remote countries to Greek audiences. Polybius continued this tradition, concentrating most of his ethnography into the 34th book of the *Historiae*. Finally, Poseidonius added an ethical dimension to ethnographic and sociological discussions.

This tradition of ethnological digressions in historiographical treatises continued up to Sallust's time, finding its way into the Latin literary corpus through Cato's *Origines*, Varro and Caesar. Oniga stresses the fact that Caesar initiated a new trend in ethnography in contrast to Greek theoretical and philosophical interest. Caesar was an eye-witness for his own material, and he wrote from a clearly political and pragmatic point of view, using ethnography as a means to know and to control conquered people. As a consequence his writings are imbued with strategic significance. In this sense, Sallust is more akin to the Greek tradition with its emphasis on the pure pursuit of knowledge, a matter upon which Oniga further elaborates in Chapters III-V.

In Chapter II, Oniga defines Sallust's cultural models, that is, some general concepts in ancient ethnography through which historians, geographers and philosophers described other human societies, and some of the methods they used for the analysis of their development.

The primary method of defining a foreign people was the analogy with a known people, a technique already extensively employed by Herodotus. This simple

comparison between countries and societies in different regions of the world formed the theory of the *climata*, that is, the notion that climatic factors, such as temperature and humidity, affect the appearance and behaviour not only of fauna and flora, but also of humans. According to this theory, the climate in different latitudes of the earth determines the physical and moral character of the inhabitants. This deterministic system became the basis for descriptions of countries and peoples in ancient ethnography. Eratosthenes and, later, Poseidonius added a scientific dimension to this theory by applying astronomical calculations of latitudes and forming defined zones on the globe — cold at the poles, hot at the equator, and temperate between the two in both hemispheres — according to latitude and climate.

Another type of analogy, creating a theory for defining stages of development within human society, was the typology of different modes of life or different modes of culture. This model was presented by Aristotle who differentiated societies according to varying degrees of sophistication in their means of subsistence: nomadic life, hunting, fishing or agriculture. Oniga observes that this theory was applied both synchronically and diachronically, the former providing a comparative study of different cultures on a contemporaneous basis and the latter tracing the evolution and development of one particular society from primitivity to civilization.

The literary precedents and theoretical models applied in Greek ethnography provide a suitable backdrop for evaluating the way Sallust approaches the discipline. Thus one comes to the core of this book, which forms its main original contribution. In Chapter III Oniga shows how the African digression in the *Bellum Iugurthinum,* 17-19, conforms to the Greek tradition. Sallust first discusses the geography of the country, its ethnic composition and the habits of its inhabitants while adopting the theory of climatic determinism (17), and then proceeds to present a mytho-historical survey of cultural development (18-19).

Chapters IV and V demonstrate even further how far Sallust was indebted to the Greek tradition. First, Oniga argues that the "Punic Books written by King Hiempsal", claimed by Sallust as his source, may be little more than an exotic invention dressed up as an ethnographic treatise, Greek in its use of language, style and themes (ch. IV). Then Oniga shows how Sallust adopts *topoi* firmly rooted in the ethnographic tradition, (re)constructing a mythical genealogy for the North-African tribes as descendants of Heracles and presenting common etymologies for their names (ch. V).

The last two chapters of Oniga's book examine, as far as is possible, the pieces of ethnographic information in the fragments of Sallust's *Historiae* (ch. VI), and identify a fragment preserved by Priscian as a version of the digression on Africa in the *Bellum Iugurthinum* (ch. VII).

As a whole, Oniga's book provides an interesting and convincing argument for the relevance of Sallust's ethnography and the African digression to the time and place in which it was written. The description of the African tribes as primitive, strong, healthy and warlike conforms, on the one hand, to the traditional Greek view of remote peoples living in extreme weather conditions and possessing a primitive mode of life, and, on the other hand, it presents the enemies of the Romans as inferior yet frightening. This use of ethnography as a means of defining relations between Romans and their enemies is evident in the words of Sallust himself in the opening sentence of the digression: "My subject seems to call for a brief account of the

geography of Africa and some descriptions of the nations there *with which the people of Rome has had wars or alliance*" (trans. J.C. Rolfe, LCL). The conquests and the growth of the Roman Empire in the age of Sallust explain the growing interest in geography also to be found in the writings of Cicero, Cornelius Nepos and Varro. It was not merely by chance that Strabo chose, a few years later, to write his *Geography*, addressing both Greek tradition and Roman pragmatism.

To sum up, the first two chapters of this book form an expanded introduction to the main theme in the following chapters, which constitute an extensive and thorough discussion of the Sallustian excerpts on ethnography. Oniga's highly enjoyable survey not only illuminates the style and methods of Sallust but also enhances our understanding of ancient ethnography.

Daniela Dueck Bar Ilan University

Valeri Maximi Facta et Dicta Memorabilia, edidit John Briscoe, 2 vols., Stuttgart and Leipzig: Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, 1998. pp. xlii + 888.

'A new text is badly needed.' So Peter Marshall on Valerius Maximus *(Texts and Transmission*, ed. L.D. Reynolds [Oxford, 1983], 428). Briscoe has now given us one, and it will at once become standard.

Marshall's quarrel with C. Kempf's edition (2 1888) was that it 'is frequently wrong in the reports of L and A, and fails to understand the importance of the third family of manuscripts'. One assumes that Briscoe has remedied the first of these faults. As to the second, he actually values G even more highly than Marshall did. Whereas Marshall saw it as descended from the archetype common to L and A (which are very close to each other), Briscoe thinks that G's parent and the common source of AL were copied from the archetype. One would like to see that case argued in greater detail. Briscoe gives us (p. viii) a list of nine places where G gives readings that are, in his view, true and probably not the result of conjecture. Briscoe explains away one of them himself (n. 8), one is trivial (7.6.5); at 1.5.6 we cannot be sure that a scribe of this period would not know Greek letters (knowing Greek is a different matter); 6.3.1a is one of the many cases where G could be drawing on A as corrected; and there is no certainty about the correctness of ueriori at 2.8.5 (especially just after uerae). As for diutius at 3.6.1, it seems to me clearly wrong (PHI shows 23 juxtapositions of multum with diu, seven of them in Valerius: none with diutius). If these are the most impressive examples Briscoe could muster, I am not very happy with them. As for his view (p. ix) that there are so many examples of G agreeing in correct readings with A corrected or L corrected (or both) that some must be transmitted from the archetype, that is just a hope. We do not need to suppose that G or G's source is (always) conjecturing what had already been conjectured by the correctors of A and/or L. There is no reason why, 150 years later, AL or descendants of AL could not have been sources of contamination for G. Examination of representative twelfth-century MSS might throw light on this possibility.

It would in fact be interesting to know if Briscoe's text would be very different if he had used G merely as a source of conjecture where A and L are wrong. I should