

Comme dans tout grand ouvrage, on peut trouver dans ce livre monumental de R. Scholl certains défauts mineurs: répétitions presque littérales,¹ citations parfois incomplètes de la bibliographie,² fautes de frappe.³ L'article de S. Calderini⁴ n'est pas "eine erste Zusammensetzung der Quellen zur Textilindustrie im griechisch-römischen Ägypten" (827). La première monographie sur l'industrie textile dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine est l'admirable livre de M. Khvostov, publié en 1914 en russe,⁵ et pour cela ("Rossica non leguntur"), passé inaperçu même après les jugements élogieux de M. Rostovtseff et de E. Wipszycka.⁶

Ces remarques⁷ ne diminuent en rien la grande valeur du livre de R. Scholl qui restera pour longtemps un instrument de travail indispensable.

I.F. Fikhman

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

J.-M. Alonso-Núñez, *La Historia Universal de Pompeyo Trogo. Coordinadas espaciales y temporales* (Ediciones clásicas, Madrid 1992) pp. x + 123

Pompeius Trogus was a *tria-corda* man — a Helleno-romanized Vocontian Gaul — and the only pagan who wrote a universal history in Latin in the Augustan Age. His originality in other respects is a matter of dispute. What survived of Trogus' work are his *prologi* and Iustinus' *Epitome*, which is rather an "anthology" than a systematic summary, as Alonso-Núñez rightly observes (p. 25; see the important list of Iustinus' omissions at pp. 27-46). An epigone of the genre, Trogus had the advantage of benefitting from a great

- 1 V. 144 n. 4, 206 n. 3, 281 n. 11 ("Signalement"), 355 n. 9, 697 n. 5, 698 n. 5 ("Ausbildung"), 276 n. 8, 284 n. 20, 301 n. 2, 318 n. 11 ("Asylwesen"), 858 n. 2, 861 n. 1 ("Bad"), etc.
- 2 V. par ex. la bibliographie sur le signalement (note précédente), cf. I.F. Fikhman *Vvedenie v dokumental'nyy papirologiyu* (supra, n. 2), 227 n.57, sur l'apprentissage (note précédente), cf. I.F. Fikhman, *ibid.*, 241 n. 138, 256 n. 219, 257 n. 221), sur les bains (note précédente), cf. I.F. Fikhman, *ibid.*, 256 n. 215, etc.
- 3 Par ex.: *CPtST* 26 (p. 110) = *P. Tebt.* III 970 et non IV 970 (110), *CPtST* 92 (p. 342) = *SB* I, 5627 et non 5626 (342), la même faute dans la "Quellenkonkordanz", 1044). P. 369 est cité P. Petrie III, 59b = W. Chrest 66. A la l. 6 on lit: $\nu\theta\theta\iota\ \iota\ \delta$ mais dans la traduction — Nothoi 12. P. 37 n. 4, il faut lire G. Messeri Savorelli et non G.M. Savorelli. P. 222 n. 1: il faut corriger "Biezuńska-Małowist, *L'Esclavage* [I s. 50 mit Anm. 1]" en "mit Anm. 143". L'article de C.A. Forbes (355 n. 9, 697 n. 5, 698 n. 5) a paru en 1955 et non en 1935, etc.
- 4 S. Calderini, "Ricerche sul' industria e il commercio dei tessuti in Egitto", *Aeg.* 26 (1946), 13-83.
- 5 M. Khvostov, *Ocherki organizacii promyshlennosti i trgovli v greco-rimskom Egipte. 1. Tekstil'naya promyshlennost' v greco-rimskom Egipte* (Études sur l'organisation de l'industrie et du commerce dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine. 1. L'industrie textile dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine)(Kazan 1914).
- 6 V. par ex. E. Wipszycka, *L'industrie textile dans l'Égypte romaine* (Archivum Filologiczne 9 (Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków1965), 7: "L'étude de Khvostov représente un rare alliage d'une parfaite analyse des sources avec des intérêts très vastes et des connaissances profondes en économie. Il faut dire que cet ouvrage n'a pas eu la fortune qu'il méritait. Pour la plupart, les résultats des recherches qu'il présente n'ont pas été mis à profit par d'autres chercheurs".
- 7 La mention dans *P. Moen inv.* 5 Re IV, 54 = *SB* XVI, 12375 = *CPtST* 130 (ca. 180 BCE) du mot d'origine latine $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\rho\iota\ \omicron\nu$ constitue une énigme car — comme le note justement dans l'éd. princ. P.J. Sijpestejn (*Chronique d'Égypte* 54 [1979], 281) — il apparaît seulement dans les papyrus d'époque byzantine tardive. Qui pourrait en offrir une explication?

tradition. He did not have to create the theory of the “Four Monarchies”, nor to invent the practice of digressions about the origins of peoples or cities with which the protagonists of the main narrative came into contact, or the synchronization of historical events of East and West. All such devices and many others had been invented centuries before Trogus and already had a history of their own. However, A.-N. has done his best, in this remarkable study, to collect and point out all Trogus’ original contributions to the genre. Some of them are, predictably, questionable. For instance, A.-N. believes (p. 93f.) that Trogus’ Fifth Monarchy was not Rome, but the couple Rome/Parthia. Admittedly, Iustinus states that *Parthi penes quos velut divisione orbis cum Romanis facta nunc Orientis imperium est*, etc. (41.1.1); but since elsewhere he declares that *neque mundum posse duobus solibus regi, nec orbem summa duo regna salvo statu terrarum habere* (11.12.15), Trogus’ (or Iustinus’) daring novelty seems only half-heartedly stated, to say the least. A.-N. also suggests that the synchronization of the Gallic fire with the King’s Peace (6.6.5) in 387/6 BC may reflect Trogus’ well-known (and often overemphasized) Gallic patriotism (pp. 83-84). This could have been accepted without reservation had this synchronism been an original contribution of Trogus; but it is not: it was already formulated by Polybius (1.6.2), probably following Timaeus, and tacitly endorsed by Diodorus (14.117.9). It looks like a didactic synchronism, aiming at highlighting a strange coincidence between a catastrophe in the West and general peace in the East, without any specific interest in the Gauls as such.

I single out here two minor chronographic topics which, to my mind, must remain open to discussion. (1) Since Trogus assigns to the Assyrian Empire 1300 years (1.2.13), the author argues that he dated Ninus in $612+1300 = 1912$ BC (pp. 62-63). Yet, the year 612 BC for the fall of Nineveh is the date accepted by modern scholarship, not the one known or assumed by any ancient historian from Herodotus on. Besides, since Trogus assigned 350 years to the Second Monarchy, i.e., the Median (1.6.17), by the same logic one could combine *our* dating for the end of the Median Empire (550 BC) with Trogus’ figures and arrive at $550+350+1300 = 2200$ BC as an approximate, yet much more plausible, dating of Ninus in Trogus’ chronological system. (2) According to Trogus, Carthage was founded 72 years before Rome (18.6.8). This clearly shows that he did *not* follow Timaeus (contrary to what A.-N. believes: pp. 70-71), since Timaeus, as we all know, synchronised the foundations of the two cities in the same year (*FGrH* 566 F 60). However, the Timaic hypothesis could perhaps be partially rescued by assuming that Trogus dated Carthage in 814/3 (as Timaeus) and Rome 72 years later, i.e., in 742/1 BC. But since the year 742/1 is elsewhere unattested as an ancient dating of Rome, we might be compelled to correct, at 18.6.8, *LXII* instead of *LXXII*, to allow Trogus to date Rome’s foundation to 752/1, which is the date accepted by his contemporary Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 1.71.5), possibly following Cato (see *HRF* fr. 17 Peter), and by a few later writers. Trogus perhaps favoured one of the several current versions approving Timaeus’ absolute dating of Carthage without endorsing automatically his synchronization with Rome.

Alonso-Núñez’s book is a valuable contribution to Trogus studies; but not only that. As the author rightly remarks, most representatives of the genre of “universal history” were people born in the peripheral areas of the Graeco-Roman world, reflecting on the

meeting of cultures (pp. 1-2). It is needless to stress the importance of such an approach for a deeper understanding of form and thought in ancient historiography in general.

David Asheri

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Averil Cameron and Lawrence I. Conrad, ed., *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East I: Problems in the Literary Source Material (Papers of the First Workshop on Late Antiquity and Early Islam)* (The Darwin Press, Princeton 1992) (= *Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam* I), pp. xiv + 428

Gerhard Endress and Dimitri Gutas, ed., *A Greek and Arabic Lexicon: Materials for a Dictionary of the Mediaeval Translations from Greek into Arabic*, Fascicle 1, (E.J. Brill, Leiden-New York-Köln 1992) (= *Handbuch der Orientalistik/Handbook of Oriental Studies, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten/The Near and Middle East XI*. Band), pp. 30 + 96 + 20

The transition from late Antiquity to Islam has never really received the amount of attention that it deserves, and in recent decades, with the decline in the numbers of students for the classical languages, it has occasionally appeared that studies in this borderland between cultures were doomed to decline, too. More recently, however, the general field of cultural frontiers and of transitions from one culture to another has begun to arouse a greatly heightened degree of interest. The present studies demonstrate the importance of much work that is being done now, and also illustrate the potential to be derived from scholarly collaboration in a field, or a group of fields, where isolation has too often been the companion to creative endeavour. The first volume, under the editorship of Averil Cameron and Lawrence Conrad, is the outcome of a workshop on the theme "Late Antiquity and Early Islam" held in London in 1989, and the first in a series of projected publications, not only of the proceedings of workshops, in this area. The work itself, like the interest of which it is an earnest, is greatly to be welcomed; although, perhaps inevitably, it raises some questions of method and approach, it also illustrates well a number of problems and of areas in which scholars in different fields have much to learn from each other.

This first volume contains an introduction and eight papers, ranging from twenty-five to over eighty pages in length. In the Introduction, the editors lay out the main problems which they and their colleagues seek to address, both in this series of volumes and in the series of workshops which will underlie it. One of the main difficulties which they hope to attack is the increasing compartmentalisation of scholarship which seems to accompany the acknowledged growth of interest in the period of change in the Near and Middle East between the mid-sixth century and the mid-eighth century. This segmentation is itself in part related to the enormous expansion and increasing sophistication of the work that is being done; but keeping abreast of new work is thereby becoming all the more difficult.

The project aims therefore to facilitate communication between workers in different fields, and also to provide opportunities for inter-disciplinary cross-fertilisation; the editors hope to encourage more synthesis and integration between history and archaeology, and also to address the need for efforts to make widely scattered material in various subjects more easily available. All this is highly commendable, and very important especially