chronology, a guide to further reading, and three maps. Again, one may object to specific choices, such as the exclusion of works pre-1800 in the intellectual pedigree, since Montesquieu, Hume, and Adam Smith have been crucial for defining some of the fundamental problems in ancient economic history; or the almost complete neglect of French and Italian scholarship in the guide to further reading. Surely Tchemia's fundamental *Le vin de l'Italie romaine* and Veyne's classic *Le pain e le cirque* (available in abbreviated form in English translation) merited inclusion. These, however, are minor points. Only the maps leave a lot to be desired. In Map One, Greece and the Near East, Troy and Prusa are indicated in Asia Minor but not Milet or Ephesos. In the Middle East room is found for Damascus, Palmyra, and even Carrhae, but not for Antioch, the Seleucid capital and principal city in the area under the Romans. In Map Two, Italy and the West, outposts such as Vindolanda and Aquae Sulis (Bath) make an appearance, but not Lugdunum (Lyon), Aquileia, or Pompeii.

Nonetheless, in the broader picture these are but mere quibbles and cannot detract from the fact that the editors have done a brilliant job. In general, student and teacher alike are very well served by this reader. The editors are to be congratulated on a splendid and inviting selection of papers, which ought to appear stimulating to new students even if economic history is not exactly *en vogue* at present. It is to be strongly recommended.

University of Copenhagen PETER FIBIGER BANG

ÉDOUARD WILL—TOTAL HISTORIAN?

É. WILL: *Historica Graeco-Hellenistica. Choix d'écrits 1953–1993*. Pp. xi + 893. Paris: de Boccard, 1998. Paper, €95. ISBN: 2-7018-0113-3.

Edouard Will's selection of essays and articles on Greek and Hellenistic history appeared in 1998, the year after his death. The author chose his *opera minora* from half a century of historical output, aware of the *Zeitgeist* in which the chapters were written (p. vii). The historian's view of history is in the end a view perceived from his or her own time, 'L'historien est nécessairement homme de son temps' (p. 793). W. shows this to be as true of the work of Beloch and Rostovtzeff (Chapter 57) as his own writing. The 'longue durée' that was W.'s career can be seen in terms of 'histoire événementielle'. The collected articles, written over 40 years, reveal much of the 'mentalités' which W. perceived to be important both in his own lifetime but also in his approach to writing ancient history.

It is not possible to cover in any detail the content of all sixty-four reviews and articles (appearing in chronological order of publication) which W. selected for this collection. Almost all have appeared in journals or conference proceedings elsewhere. The papers range from the archaic period to the Hellenistic, and cover topics including the economy, historiography, political and social organization, cultural history and acculturation, and political history and institutions. W. has added numerous, and often illuminating, editorial comments to over half of the chapters; various themes can be traced through the index. This review attempts to focus on aspects of W's. historical methodologies.

W. worked at a time when the *Annales* school dominated French history writing (see J. Bintliff, *The Annales School and Archaeology* [Leicester, 1991], p. 5; P. Horden and N. Purcell, *The Corrupting Sea* [Oxford, 2000], p. 38). In the late 1960s, W. refused to compromise on the title of what became his *magnum opus*, and left as his legacy a view

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.153 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that politics was fundamental to Hellenistic history (*Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323–30 av. J.-C.)* [Nancy, vol. 1, 1966, vol. 2, 1967], vol. 1, pp. 7–8). In an article on social and economic history, written in 1960 and published three years later (Chapter 10), W. wrote against (as he describes in an editorial note) 'un terrorisme intellectuel' that was waging then a campaign 'anti-événementielle, anti-historiciste, anti-positiviste'.

One of the central obstacles to writing 'l'histoire "totale"', in W.'s mind, was the limitation of the sources. But this observation did not mean that W. was disinterested in economic and social history. Indeed, one often finds that W.'s insistence on sources allows him to establish continuities and links when others have imposed periodization. Garlan on warfare and siegecraft wanted to identify the dominance of siege warfare as a feature of Hellenistic Greece, while W. argued that in fact the sort of evidence given by the sources indicates that the picture is more complex (Chapter 41). Invasions of territory and threats to the countryside remained as important in the later third century as they had been in the fifth (pp. 614–16). In a review of Finley's *The Ancient Economy*, W. seems to accept that there were phenomena in the Mediterranean world which presented similar problems, apparently agreeing with F.'s presentation of 'l'homogénéité profonde des phénomènes économiques à l'échelle du monde méditerranéen' (p. 719). But for W. the important areas of history were often political. Trends and dynamics might be visible but do not necessarily answer why something happened when it happened. Ultimately, W. thinks the historian should be asking why does a war begin in year x, and not in year y or z (see p. 842). He pursues the decision making process behind history. So, behind every administrative reform, however elementary and apparently pragmatic it is, there lies political choices (see p. 764).

In 1979 W. compared the contemporary world and that of the Hellenistic (Chapter 48, 'Le monde hellénistique et nous'), pausing to reflect that the modern world can at least help stimulate the historian to ask questions about the past (p. 683). Aware of dangers in drawing comparisons in history (p. 782 n. 11), W. nevertheless exploited contemporary society and intellectual culture to explore the ancient world (Chapter 57, anthropology). History for W. remains a question-based discipline, but one in which answers to the questions must always be based on the evidence available. Although the historian him/herself must also shape answers, W. would never describe himself as a romantic historian: 'Je me méfie de l'histoire romantique'. The historian intervenes in terms of the time and place in which the historian (inevitably) writes. 'Homme social, l'historien participe de l'esprit du temps et du lieu' (p. 773).

W. is careful to avoid detailing an historical method, but this collection of articles can certainly shape our view of what he regarded as important and fundamental to his historiography of ancient Greece.

University of Liverpool G. J. OLIVER

THE ANNALS OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

F. MORA: *Fasti e schemi cronologici. La riorganizzazione annalistica del passato remoto romano*. (Historia Einzelschriften 125.) Pp. 389, 25 tables, 36 diagrams. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999. Paper, DM 136. ISBN: 3-515-07191-1.

M.'s book represents a radical attack on the reliability of the records of office-holders

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.153 Published online by Cambridge University Press