

*Dionysiaca* (Domenico Accorinti, Anna Lefteratou) to Colluthus' *Rape of Helen* (Enrico Magnelli). Last but not least, the last two papers are the most interesting and complex of the chapter as they examine the role of divinity both in late philosophy and poetry in general (Oliver Schelske) and the presence of polytheism in the Sibylline oracles (J.L. Lightfoot).

Likewise, the last part, entitled 'Beyond the Greeks', takes still another step forward, as it sheds light on the role of Greek gods in Latin poetry (Virgil: Ward Briggs; Ovid: Fritz Graf) and contemporary literary production (Tennyson: Edward Adams; Walcott and Oswald: Ahuvia Kahane).

Furthermore, the bibliography (both monographs and secondary literature) is sufficient and enlightened with all the recent studies concerning divinity in the ancient world. The volume also includes a general *Index*. Nonetheless, it appears that perhaps the addition of an *Index locorum* would make the references more easily accessible to readers.

In retrospect, in this reviewer's opinion, this collective volume is truly ground-breaking and a must-read for graduate/postgraduate students, researchers and scholars interested in the depiction of fate and divinity in ancient Greek and Roman literature. It also manages to present the intertextual dialogue between many different types of poetry or writers (e.g., Homer and Vergil) as far as the role of gods is concerned. Although a paper examining religion in the Roman literature of late antiquity is absent in the last part – so that the evolution of the divine element might not be presented just on poets of the Augustan age (Virgil and Ovid) – it is a useful tool for all readers and a totally remarkable accomplishment that all sorts of classicists, both philologists and historians interested in religious issues, will use with benefit.

*Anthofili Kallergi*  
*University of Ioannina*

*Polybios und seine Historien*. Herausgegeben von VOLKER GRIEB – CLEMENS KOEHN. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2013. ISBN 978-3-515-10477-7. 359 pp. EUR 62.

This collection of articles is the result of the conference with the same title held at the Helmut-Schmidt-University in Hamburg in April 2010. Articles presented in German (14) and English (1) shed light on different aspects of Polybios' work and how it can be compared with the works of Thucydides/Xenophon and Livy. The year 2013 was a very good one for Polybios enthusiasts; see *Polybios and his World: Essays in Memory of F.W. Walbank*, eds. Bruce Gibson and Thomas Harrison (Oxford University Press).

In the introduction, the editors offer a summary of research on Polybios conducted so far and the many new lines in the study of the Hellenistic period, making the point that despite the new discoveries of papyri and inscriptions, it is still the work of Polybios that enables us to understand the historical events of this period in larger perspective.

Hans Kloft, "Polybios und die Universalgeschichte", discusses the famous inaugural speech given by the history professor Friedrich Schiller in Jena in 1789 on the point of studying universal history; many of the main points of that speech reflect the ideas of Polybios. Kloft analyses the nature of Polybios' general history and what his standards are to do it properly. Those standards are high

and it still makes sense to use them. It is the war with all its participants, its political and military ramifications that for Polybios works as the universal demiurge that creates world history.

Andreas Mehl, “Geschichte in Fortsetzung: Wie, warum und wozu haben Autoren wie Polybios und Thukydides/Xenophon auf ein Ziel hin geschriebene Geschichtswerke fortgesetzt?“, studies the history of ancient historiography: histories were often written with a clearly defined goal and purpose to the work, however, the historians also included several introductions in their works which can be seen as rethinking the goal of their work. Moreover, historians continued the narrative of their fellow historians. Mehl discusses these situations and the problems that arise in continuing a contemporary history.

Helmut Halfmann, “Livyus und Polybios”, gives an overview of the *Quellenforschung* of Livy’s work and to what extent Livy used Polybios as a source. Halfmann makes the point that Polybios would probably not have esteemed Livy’s way of working and putting together his histories highly, and certainly Livy’s work would not function as a good guide to politics as it could only be written by someone drawing from their own experience. Livy as a representative of Roman history writing had another goal, however: he did not see Rome as the aggressor but as a defender of its allies in its many wars. Consequently, Livy has used Polybios only to that extent where the content of his work did not collide with the Roman doctrine of its wars.

Josef Wiesehöfer, “Polybios und die Entstehung des römischen Weltreichtums”, deals with Rome’s rise to world power and how Polybios compares this process with that of the rise of the Persian empire, Sparta, and the reign of Alexander and the Successors. Wiesehöfer discusses how this sequence of empires came about, starting with Herodotus (the Assyrians, Medians and Persians) and going on to the late republican Roman and Augustan period when the list already comprised the Assyrians, Medians, Persians, Macedonians and Rome.

Jürgen Deininger writes on “Die Tyche in der pragmatischen Geschichtsschreibung des Polybios”. This lengthy article states that there is no satisfactory and clear equivalent in other old or modern languages for the Greek expression Tyche as Polybios uses it. In modern terms the work of Polybios can be best seen as political history and military history and Polybios is keen to look for reasons (*aitiai*) for why something happened. What, then, is the relationship between the human causes effecting things and the superhuman Tyche? Deininger discusses the spectrum of meanings of Tyche, taking examples concerning the Achaean League, Macedon, Rome and other states. There is also an overview of the recent research on this topic.

Frank Daubner, “Zur Rolle der Geographischen Schilderungen bei Polybios”, discusses the many and also contradictory readings of Polybios as a geographer: Was he the “new” Herodotus in his interest in the topic and did he not contribute to the development of geography as a science? Daubner states Polybios cannot be included as actually developing geography; however, knowledge of geography and topography was an integral part of Polybios’ concept of teaching his readers.

Burkhard Meißner, “Polybios als Militärhistoriker”, refers to E. W. Marsden’s study “Polybios as a Military Historian” in 1974 and how modern ideas of strategy and warfare influenced his views. Meißner focuses on how Polybios writes about his role as a historian, narrating on the armies and war. To mention an interesting detail, Meißner offers comparative data on the frequency with which words connected to war, *-polem-* and *-strat-* occur compared to the word *polit-* meaning civic activities in the texts of Polybios, Xenophon, Diodorus, Thucydides, Herodotus, etc.

Clemens Koehn addresses the topic “Polybios und die Inschriften: Zum Sprachgebrauch des Historikers”. The question of to what extent Polybios used information from inscriptions derived through other authors and to what extent he saw the inscriptions himself has already drawn the attention of many Polybian scholars. As is known, Polybios only mentions seeing inscriptions himself in two matters: the Roman-Carthaginian treaties and the Carthaginian troop numbers in Spain and Africa at the beginning of the Second Punic War. Koehn investigates whether there was an Achaean official language that has often been connected with Polybios and what the many possible interpretations for Polybios’ use of the word *stele* are.

Volker Grieb, “Polybios’ *Wahre* Demokratie und die *politeia* von Poleis und Koina in den Historien”, deals with Polybios’ constitutional theory, which is the issue in book 6. Grieb discusses the wide meaning and the depth of Polybios’ concept of *demokratia* and what Polybios had to say of the domestic political conditions of Athens and Rhodes.

Linda-Marie Günther, “Innergriechische Diplomatie und zwischenstaatliche Beziehungen in den Historien des Polybios”, discusses how Polybios portrayed the form and content of diplomatic activities in the third and second century Hellenistic world so full of wars and conflicts. Günther takes examples from the Illyrian wars and the campaigns of Aratos commanding the army of the Achaean League as well as the foreign policy of Ptolemy IV. Günther asks the important question of how Polybios chose his sources and also presents the alternatives that he did not use.

Boris Dreyer, “Polybios und die hellenistischen Monarchien”, investigates how Polybios writes about Philip, Antiochus and Perseus, and what criteria he used in assessing their work as rulers. Polybios had a special interest in the personality of each king and how it developed over the years. For this, he used court sources to make a close assessment.

Martin Tombrägel discusses “Der Zugang des Polybios zur Kunst seiner Zeit”. As much as Polybios makes digressions to give details about geography, military technology and technical questions in general, one cannot spot any detailed discussions about art as such in his work. Nevertheless, the destruction and damage to art works as well as art thefts caught his interest, and Tombrägel discusses this with many examples. Also interesting are the results from the excavations at the sanctuary of Zeus-Homarios in Polybios’ hometown, Megalopolis, where 50 roof tiles exhibiting the names of those dedicating them have been unearthed, and where we have a brick stamp with the text “Polybios dedicated this”, giving us concrete archaeological evidence of our historian being involved in salvaging a building damaged by war.

Alain Bresson, “Polybios and the Economy”, presents two approaches to the topic: First, he examines why Polybios was not an ancient economic historian, for unlike Thucydides he did not give a systematic comparison of the forces of the two sides. (Yet this could be due to the structure of Polybios’ work, giving generally very little space to the First Punic War.) Second, Polybios nevertheless discusses many economic issues like greed for booty in many campaigns and the depopulation of Greece with its consequences. Polybios perhaps knew more about economics than he chose to write about, as his work was in any case about political history.

Peter Scholz investigates the topic of “*Philomathia* statt *philosophia*: Polybios, die Philosophie und die Idee der *paideia*”. Passages where Polybios makes reference to philosophical works or philosophers are just a few. In book 12, Polybios criticizes the philosophers for inventing useless paradoxes; however, this comment is not directed at all philosophers and philosophy in general but

to that of the Athenian Academy under Carneades. The 19th century idea of Polybios as a stoic has already been rejected; now Scholz reopens the question to see how far or close Polybios was to that school of thought.

Wolfgang Spickermann looks into “Kultisches und Religiöses bei Polybios”. Ritual and religion make another so far little discussed area in Polybios research. The topic is not as obvious as we find it in Livy. Nevertheless, Spickermann discusses *deisidaimonia*, for which there are examples in Polybios for the fear of gods and superstitious acts alike. Also, *asebeia*, impiety, is discussed with many examples: for instance, the unnecessary destruction of colonnades, statues and votive offerings by Philip of which Polybios disapproves. Polybios sees the Roman religion as the basis for the superiority of the Roman state in the way in which the performance of the state religion is used to discipline the unenlightened masses. Finally, Polybios’ involvement in the rebuilding of the abovementioned Zeus-Homarios sanctuary actually makes him a participant in a religious act.

This collection of articles provides many new and interesting insights. It is followed by a bibliography and an index of names and *loci*.

Christa Steinby  
University of Helsinki

MATTHIAS GELZER: *Cicero. Ein biographischer Versuch*. 2., erweiterte Auflage mit einer forschungsgeschichtlichen Einleitung und einer Ergänzungsbibliographie von WERNER RIESS. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2014. ISBN 978-3-515-09903-5. 405 pp. EUR 39.

I cannot say I have read all modern biographies of Cicero, but I have seen a number of them, and Gelzer’s biography has always struck me as being one of the most useful, and it is thus very good to have now a second edition of the book originally published in 1969, itself based on the author’s *Realencyclopädie* article of 1939, “Cicero als Politiker”. But before I get to Gelzer, let me start with the material added to this edition by W. Riess, at places with the help of assistants (cf. below). The subtitle of the book, mentioning the presence of an “introduction to the history of the research” (I hope this might be an adequate rendering of the apparently untranslatable expression “forschungsgeschichtlich”) and of an additional bibliography, does not seem to tell the whole story, for from the preface to the second edition (p. VII) one learns that this edition was augmented by an overview of the research since 1969 (“Forschungsüberblick ab 1969”; this is perhaps an error, as this particular overview – for which see below – is only part II of the “forschungsgeschichtliche Einleitung” not mentioned as a whole at this point); a list of the literature used by Gelzer; a supplementary bibliography of works which could not “any more” be used by Gelzer or which appeared after 1969 (p. 387); a chronological table (cf. below). But there is even more, for we read further below on the same page VII that a number of assistants compiled the two indexes of persons and places and the bibliography, collected from the book’s footnotes, of the works cited by Gelzer (missing in the first edition).

As for the “forschungsgeschichtliche Einleitung” (pp. IX–XXVII), it consists of four parts: I Matthias Gelzer and his *Cicero*; II Research tendencies since 1969 (this must be the (“Forschungsüberblick ab 1969” mentioned above); III Gelzer in context and desiderata regarding his research