

as compelling, as their classical forebears. Henning Börm and Nino Luraghi have done scholarship a service.

Anthony Smart
York St John University

ALICE BORGNA: *Ripensare la storia universale. Giustino e l'Epitome delle Storie Filippiche di Pompeo Trogo*. Spudasmata 176. Olms, Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 2018. ISBN: 978-3-487-15660-6. 294 pp. EUR 54.

Sometime in the Roman imperial era, a certain Justin wrote his work *Epitoma historiarum Pompei Trogi*, and his source was the now lost work, probably named *Historiae Philippicae*, of an Augustan historian Pompeius Trogus. For most of the last two centuries scholars have not had a high regard for Justin's *Epitoma*. Justin was accused of having mutilated the original work, which had been praised by the ancients, and his text was deemed to have no historical value. In the last two decades, however, Justin's epitome has finally become a subject of numerous systematic studies from new viewpoints. To mention only the newest publications that are not included in the reviewed volume, we also have a new translation and commentary in Italian (L. Santi Amantini, *Giustino. Storie Filippiche. Epitome da Pompeo Trogo*, 2 volumi, Tivoli 2017), two volumes and one upcoming volume of the new edition with translation and commentary in French (B. Mineo – G. Zecchini, *Justin. Abrégé des Histoires Philippiques de Trogue Pompée*. Tome I. Livres I–X, Paris 2016; idem, Tome II. Livres XI–XXIII, Paris 2018), and a monograph by D. Hofmann (*Griechische Weltgeschichte auf Latein. Iustins "Epitoma historiarum Pompei Trogi" und die Geschichtskonzeption des Pompeius Trogus*, Stuttgart 2018).

Despite the sudden profusion of new studies, Borgna's book is a long-awaited and necessary contribution to our understanding of Pompeius Trogus and Justin. Together with Hofmann's book, which was published at the same time, it is the first full-length monograph dedicated to the question of what the purpose and methodology of Justin's *Epitoma* and, respectively, Pompeius Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae* were.

In the introductory chapters Borgna summarizes the earlier studies on the subject and meticulously provides every piece of information we have on Justin or Trogus. Justin's *Epitoma* has often been studied as a historiographical work because of the assumption that Justin was merely abbreviating Trogus' vast text. For this reason, modern scholars have often accused Justin of enormous carelessness and a complete lack of historiographical skills. Borgna justly suggests that we should not make such assumptions but start by considering the only certain information we have about Justin's goals, that is, his *praefatio* in which he wrote about his methodology and the circumstances of his work. Only on these terms may we judge if *Epitoma* is a "successful" work and how it was supposed to be read. Furthermore, the only way to reach even partial understanding about Trogus' original lost work is to first understand Justin's work.

Borgna proceeds to analyse the relationship between Justin's *Epitoma* and the surviving prologues of Trogus' text in order to reveal what kind of material Justin selected from Trogus' work

and what he left out. It is well known that the origin of the prologues is uncertain: they were created neither by Trogus nor Justin (F. Lucidi, *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale* 17 [1975]: 173–180). In any case, Borgna works on the reasonable assumption that the prologues are a trustworthy enough indication of the original content of Trogus' work. The author does not provide detailed tables of this comparison of the prologues to Justin's text (provided, e.g. by Hofmann, whose abovementioned work concentrates on the linguistic analysis in more depth) but, rather, she focuses on the longest and therefore most informative prologues. The conclusion is that Justin was absolutely not trying to preserve the original structure, chronology, or themes of Trogus' work. Instead, he was selecting the anecdotes that best met his own criteria specified in his *praefatio*: he was looking for curious tales and moral *exempla* that were *cognitione dignissima excerpsti*. Justin was interested in the curiosity of human nature, psychology, individuals, and dialogues, whereas he was not interested in military matters, geography, or politics.

Based on this conclusion, Borgna proceeds to analyse Justin's relationship with history. She shows that Justin's *Epitoma* does not contain any clear references to time. The events are ordered vaguely in relation to each other, and sometimes several separate events are condensed into a single event. Justin did not provide any background or reasons for historical events either. All this makes it extremely frustrating to read Justin's text as a historical work that it was clearly not intended to be. Justin is indeed following a completely different type of methodology, explained in the previous chapter. It becomes clear that *Epitoma* was a product of Justin's own genius, not a mere abbreviation, even though he used Trogus' work as a source.

Having reached this understanding of the content and methodology of Justin's *Epitoma*, Borgna enters the discussion of the identity of Justin and the purpose of his work. Based on the style of the work, the quantity of moral *exempla*, and the *praefatio*, Borgna concludes that the target audience of *Epitoma* most probably were rhetors and students of rhetorical schools that produced and used such short collections of *exempla* and anecdotes. Borgna's conclusion, founded *not* on hypotheses or *Epitoma's* later use, but purely on what we effectively know of the work's own context and content seems rational and strongly contests those who would still think that Justin's *Epitoma* was intended to be a historiographical work (e.g. the review by F. Landucci in *Plekos* 20 [2018]: 507–510).

The theories of the dating of Justin range from the end of the second century AD to the end of the fourth century AD. Based on the assumptions listed above and on the possibility that Nazarius cited Justin in his panegyrics in AD 321, Borgna favours the theory that Justin wrote before AD 321 and opposes some recent arguments in favour of the late fourth century dating (G. Zecchini, "Per la datazione di Giustino", in A. Galimberti – G. Zecchini [eds.], *Studi sull'Epitome di Giustino. III. Il tardo ellenismo. I Parti e i Romani*, Milano 2016, 221–231; Hofmann 2018, 63–98).

Borgna moves on to analyse the historiographical style of Pompeius Trogus. Trogus has suffered from the bad reputation of Justin, and maybe for this reason some earlier scholars have thought that Trogus was merely copying or translating the Greek historian Timagenes. Borgna argues convincingly that this was not the case and that Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae* and other (also lost) works on natural history were original and highly esteemed in antiquity.

Mostly because of several anti-Roman speeches preserved by Justin, because of the praise of the Parthian power, and because of the very marginal position of Rome in *Epitoma* and Trogus' pro-

logues, Trogus has been called “anti-Roman”. Borgna sets out to dismantle the last remaining doubts about the falsity of this statement. The most famous “anti-Roman” speech is the one of Mithridates VI Eupator to his troops, claimed by Justin to be exceptionally preserved in his text *verbatim*. Borgna notes that such criticizing speeches were very common in historiography and several other historians include them in their works. Therefore Mithridates’ speech is in no way exceptional in this sense and can not be seen as a sign of the anti-Romanism of its writer.

Borgna argues that Trogus considered the history of the Hellenistic east as an excellent case study of the danger of *ambitio*, *discordia* and *cupiditas imperii*. The common thread running through Trogus’ work seemed to be *translatio imperii*, caused by these moral vices and the lack of an enlightened leader. Borgna thinks that even though the focus is in the East, the moral discourse of Trogus’ work was evidently in line with the Augustan ideology that celebrated Rome and its *princeps* as the bringers of peace and stability. We should not forget that Justin’s text contains an explicit statement that Trogus was a Roman citizen and gratefully considered Rome as his native land (Iust. 43.1.1). Also, *Epitoma* ends with the praise of Augustus (Iust. 44.5.8) who ends the infinite and vicious circle of *translatio imperii*.

To conclude with Trogus, Borgna touches upon the subject of Trogus’ cultural identity. Trogus seemed to be proud of his Gallic origins and wrote positively about the history of Massalia, founded by Greeks. Borgna justly emphasises that this pride did not mean that Trogus could not have been proud of his Romaness at the same time. In fact, Borgna writes that it perhaps was the *tria corda* of Trogus that explained his unique universal view of history: “Un patriotismo in cui cittadinanza romana, origine gallica e radici elleniche trovano un perfetto amalgama” (p. 203).

Lastly, Borgna dedicates a few pages to the discussion of the relationship between Trogus and his contemporary Livy. Borgna argues that the works of Trogus and Livy seem to have much in common, even though Trogus supposedly criticized Livy’s historiographical style (Iust. 38.3.11): both historians took part in the moral discourse typical of the Augustan era. Another reason why Trogus did not write the history of Rome might have been that Livy had already done this.

Borgna’s work is commendably rational, clear, and compact. She writes in a very clear Italian devoid of excessive formality. Borgna provides translations for numerous citations in Latin and Greek, which many readers will find helpful. The author’s philological skills are outstanding and allow her to analyse the literary technique of Justin efficiently. The bibliography is excellent, and the footnotes are comprehensive throughout the work. This reviewer did not detect any important publications missing from the bibliography apart from a few very recent works mentioned above. It would have been especially interesting to see a conversation between Borgna and Hofmann that reaches different conclusions on a few points. I recommend this book as a part of the obligatory bibliography for anyone wanting to study Justin or Pompeius Trogus in depth.

Jasmin Lukkari
University of Helsinki
University of Cologne