repaying all sacral debts, and spending the loose change on fortifications and shipsheds (Samons' interpretation of Callias Decree A, pp. 113–33). This inevitably meant that they had to start borrowing back almost immediately, and by 428 they had nearly exhausted all the temple treasuries and incurred another huge debt to the gods. Despite raising extraordinary property taxes and tribute, the shortage of funds was a major factor in forcing the Athenians to conclude the Peace of Nicias (209–11). Then, at last, they created a system of gradual, capped repayments of sacral debts (Samons' interpretation of Callias Decree B, pp. 212–29) and began to rely primarily on non-sacral funding. This worked insofar as in a matter of years the accumulated surplus was large enough to finance the Sicilian expedition, but the war continued to drain more money than the city could raise, and by 404 Athens was 'an exhausted country, still assiduously maintaining and dutifully inscribing the [financial] records of its own downfall' (290). This is no more than a broad outline of a meticulously reconstructed financial history of fifth-century Athens. The argument is not always easy to follow, partly because of the constant references forward to material to be discussed and conclusions to be drawn later, partly because Samons needs to engage in a series of highly involved and technical debates, and partly because he insists on considering every single possibility, however remote. Some of the earlier parts of the book end up with largely negative conclusions which may seem something of a let-down. A discussion of the Delian League treasury begins encouragingly: 'if . . . we can determine the . . . sum transferred from Delos to Athens, we shall have an excellent starting point for our subsequent work' (83). After a sentence like that, one is surely not supposed to conclude that we actually do not have a clue what that sum might have been (107). Some might also feel that the book would have been better without its closing comments to the effect that fourth-century Athenians might have stood up to the Macedonians, just as their ancestors stood up to the Persians, if they had not been such a bunch of dole-drawing scroungers – I paraphrase – led by 'less than scrupulous demagogues' (292–3, 297). But overall this is an important book which convincingly shows that Athens' management of its public funds was long characterized by piety more than by strict economic rationality. Not long ago, we might have seen this as evidence for the 'primitive' nature of the Athenian economy. Now, of course, in our age of mismanaged privatized services demanding to be bailed out with government money and shareholders expecting compensation when they fail to make a profit, we know that the sphere of public finance is the last place to look for rational behaviour.

HANS VAN WEES

Roman History

Cambridge has rolled out another big gun, and there is no comparing [B]★*Late Antiquity: Empire and Successors A.D. 425–600*[1] with an earlier edition. But no apology is needed, given advances in the study of late Antiquity in English made on the institutional side by A. H. M. Jones and in intellectual and social matters by P. Brown, who contributes 'Holy Men', and the emerging material evidence. About a third of the last section is devoted to visual art and architecture; by no means excessive. The layout is

[1] *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Volume XIV. Late Antiquity: Empire and Successors, A.D. 425–600. Edited by Averil Cameron, Bryan Ward-Perkins, and Michael Whitby. Cambridge U.P., 2000. Pp. xx + 1166, with 23 maps and 63 text-figures. £110.00.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.1.119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

conventional: Chronological Overview (particularly helpful: there are many synchronic studies); Government and Institutions; then two sections with titles emblematic of what was to come (succinct pages open up the rise of Islam): East and West: Economy and Society and The Provinces and the Non-Roman World; Religion and Culture. The East-West split caused heart-searching about the terminal date, but the editors ground it in social and cultural continuities. This is surely one of the most useful volumes of the series. After this, there is nowhere to go but backwards, to a gifted, vain, self-deceiving individual. The late A. F. Norman has done a service with the translations in B★*Antioch as a Centre of Hellenic Culture as observed by Libanius*.[2] The nine orations (with full, almost always very clear annotations) are central texts in the history of education: some, notably that on the pedagogue (another word would be preferable) tossed in a carpet will entertain students, and the whole is a touching record for teachers of a man in a profession racked by unwelcome changes. Another leap takes us to early second-century writers, elucidated by experienced scholars: D. W. Hurley's B★*Suetonius: Divus Claudius*[3] does not give a translation, any more than J. Mottershead did in 1986 for the Bristol Classical Press, but offers hints and grammatical comments on difficult points. She adds concise introductions to the *topoi* that Suetonius employs, painting with a less broad brush than Mottershead: two dozen lemmata for 24.1, to Mottershead's four; the ratio of comment to text is a little higher, but there are typographical differences. Hurley, however, has the advantage of works written since 1986. One might take issue with 'Julius Caesar Octavianus' (56); *scribarum decuriae* as 'generally knights' (51); does 'quid nepoti tuo faciendum esset' in 4.1, on his rôle at the games, contain a dative of advantage, rather than of the agent (Kühner-Stegmann 1, 324)? *Sodales Augustales*, founded after Augustus' death (Tac., *Ann.* 1.54.1), would not be in charge of the games of Mars in 12 (see on 6.2); Tac. *Ann.* 1.13.4 has escaped as an imitation of Cicero's 'Quousque tandem . . .?', and so has Agrippa I of Judaea as a dependent who struck a treaty (125; 179). Was adrogation effected by a vote of the senate (191)? Nor did imperial wills end with Claudius (235): cf. *Dom.* 2.3. But Hurley is accurate, trenchant, and lively. Now too R. Martin adds to his distinguished editorial corpus B★*Tacitus Annals V & VI*,[4] with text and translation juxtaposed (he rightly puts clarity above stylistic considerations), and admirably clear and judicious notes on both (Latin lemmata italicized), and two appendices (the 'financial crisis' of 33 and the obituary of Tiberius). Perhaps Martin is over-cautious in dealing with modern speculations – we have to go to the authors he lists – but the same caution in his closely argued analysis of the obituary keeps his view closer to the mark than A. J. Woodman's. This edition is to be kept at hand by lecturers and students alike. My copy had the text of p. vii out of alignment, and in a reprint the back cover should correct the historian's name. As to the history of the first century, we have two studies in tyranny. M. Roller's B★★*Constructing Autocracy*[5] seems to

[2] *Antioch as a centre of Hellenic Culture as observed by Libanius*. Translated Texts for Historians 34. Translated with an introduction by A. F. Norman. Liverpool University Press, 2000. Pp. xxiv + 198, with 1 map. Paper £13.50.

[3] *Suetonius, Divus Claudius*. Edited by Donna W. Hurley. Cambridge U.P., 2001. Pp. vii + 272, frontispiece, two stemmata. Paper £14.95.

[4] *Tacitus Annals V & VI*. Edited with an introduction, translation and commentary by Ronald Martin. Aris & Phillips Ltd., Warminster, 2001. Pp. xii + 211, Stemma. Paper £16.50.

[5] *Constructing Autocracy*. Aristocrats and Emperors in Julio-Claudian Rome. By Matthew B. Roller. Princeton U.P., 2000. Pp. xii + 319. £27.95.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.1.119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

promise more than it will deliver: its four chapters are concerned with 'Competing Communities in Lucan', 'Seneca, Stoicism, and Traditional Roman Morality', 'Dining, Exchange, and Social Hierarchy', and 'The Master-Slave Relationship and its Alternatives'. These are 'Studies in – ' rather than an exhaustive treatment (the author had despaired of a title). There is obligatory theorizing and horrid words are brought on throughout (disvalue, structuration, bollix, dispreferred), but Roller makes the vital point that conceptual categories partly constitute reality, and his first two chapters are unified by the idea that his writers found received modes of ethical discourse malfunctioning, while in the second part he shows the aristocracy attempting to guide the new order. The chapter on Lucan, with its distinction of 'assimilating' and 'alienating' view-points and its effective use of the oath of loyalty, is the most interesting. Seneca's proposals are fairly transparent, though Roller uncovers weaknesses, deals with the problem of action-oriented *exempla*, and makes use of military success (he resists Foucault's suggestion that Stoicism of the Principate indicates increasing individualism). On Domitian's notorious dinners the theme is gift-exchange, rather than P. Veyne's euergetism. But the discussion of freedom and slavery is also interesting for its insistence, against earlier scholars, on seeing political slavery as distinct from social; while slavery exists, freedom lacks positive characteristics. But he seems to underestimate the rampant and precocious wilfulness of the idea even in the presence of slavery. Roller's book changes ideas of Lucan; but one might not have to reread it for further benefits. Steven H. Rutledge's [B★★]*Imperial Inquisitions*,[6] a title that needs the explanation that follows, is an older kind of book. The author has a gripping subject, and it has long demanded enquiry. He rightly begins by defining the fluid term *delator* (the person who laid information might not be the person who conducted the prosecution). The second and third chapters are concerned with their advancement, and with law enforcement; then comes the big topic, senatorial resistance, if the term is still admissible, taken chronologically; there is little on Domitian. Chapters 6 and 7 are devoted to *delatores* in the *Domus* and to conspiracy; more than a hundred pages go on an alphabetical prosopography. One of the four appendices deals with informants and conspiracies in the Republic, little enough, given the point made by the author that *delatores* were already established before the Principate began. Nor does the author make much of the types of delation he distinguishes; analysis by narrative might have given place to systematic attention to authors' language and *delatores*' social standing. The author begins on this, *e.g.*, when he remarks on the obligation to offer information on behalf of patrons. He has provided much useful material, but something remains to be done; certainly English, translations, and glossary (*dies nefas*; *septemvir epulo*) would need attention in another edition. This is the point to return to a theme broached in reviewing C. Ando's *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty*.[7] S. Keay and N. Terrenato have edited a collection of essays based on a conference, called [B★★]*Italy and the West*,[8] which brings into conjunction and contrast the operations of historians and archaeologists, and work done in Italy as against that in western provinces. There are predictable failings: repetition (the authors scourge themselves

[6] *Imperial Inquisitions*. Prosecutors and Informants from Tiberius to Domitian. By Steven H. Rutledge. Routledge, London, 2001. Pp. xiv + 416. £55.00. (A fuller review is to appear in *Latomus*.)

[7] *Greece and Rome* 28 no. 2 (2001).

[8] *Italy and the West*. Comparative Issues in Romanization. Edited by Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato. Oxbow Books, Oxford, 2001. Pp. xiv + 233. £24.00.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.1.119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with the 'Romanization' rod; no wonder S. Alcock in her concluding essay says she 'detests' the word), lack of balance and unity (the sections are misleadingly entitled 'chapters'; Anthony King's essay on pig, cattle, and sheep bones is in stark contrast to the rest, which are partly theoretical), abuse of historians for dependence on literary sources. Yet intermittently it is extraordinarily informative and interesting, well illustrated (figures are not listed, and there is no index), and most of the writers are ultimately singing the same hymn to diversity in place and time, with attention also directed to the rôle of the Augustan Principate. That interestingly recalls R. MacMullen's *Romanization in the Time of Augustus*, also reviewed here.[9] Should we not give up the 'R' word, and discuss specific developments without dragging in useless baggage? The answer is that we need to generalize, and the view favoured here is of élite convergence. This is what ties up with the previous review: the Empire is beginning to be seen as benevolent, a view which in its extreme forms Alcock is already warning against. This is an Empire for the age of a benevolent post-Cold War hegemony and an enlightened G7. 'Another?' will be the cry at D. Cherry's handsome volume, B★*The Roman World: a Sourcebook*,[10] and established editors may experience alarm. Users should be delighted to have more choice. The editor, admitting that it is impossible to encompass every aspect of Roman history in a single volume, aims to provide readers with a broad range of written materials from the Twelve Tables to late antiquity on nine topics important to understanding the shape of the Roman world (as, 'Social Order'; 'Women, Marriage, and Family'; 'Economy'), each preceded by an introduction. But only 57 documents are chosen. 'Economy' plays down trade and industry and is represented by a chapter of Plutarch's *Cato the Elder*, *that* passage from Cicero's *de Officiis*, and selections from Cato and Columella's works on agriculture. Passages on this scale would best be used as a class textbook; the publishers see it as a supplement to narrative survey courses – and remind us that the editor has recently updated *A History of Rome*, by M. Le Glay and others.[11] Something pacier might go down better with students; the lone enquirer could get lost. As its Bibliography shows, the subject of G. K. Young's B★★*Rome's Eastern Trade*[12] is not new. The first of the author's two theses is that, spectacular as the wealth produced by the trade was (figure 4.1, the Palmyrene Grand Colonnade, might give Cherry's readers pause), the Roman government took little interest in it, apart from drawing the tax revenue (not perhaps such an unorthodox view, in spite of the authors Young cites); the second, stressing the interest taken by local authorities exploiting the commerce, gives occasion for useful discussion of the organization of Palmyra and the caravans. There is some over-simplification ('the political crisis of the third century had grave economic results'), but the author has the benefit of recent archaeological exploration, his maps are helpful, and his workmanlike exposition is much to be welcomed.

BARBARA LEVICK

[9] *Greece and Rome* 48 no. 2 (2001).

[10] *The Roman World: a Sourcebook*. Edited by David Cherry. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford 2001. Pp. x + 268, 10 figures, 2 plates. Paper £15.99.

[11] *Greece and Rome* 48 no. 2 (2001).

[12] *Rome's Eastern Trade*. International Commerce and Imperial Policy. 31 BC–AD 305. By Gary K. Young. Routledge, London and New York, 2001. Pp. xvi + 303, 8 maps, 11 figures, 6 tables. £50.00.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.1.119 Published online by Cambridge University Press