wars were expensive and needed long-term planning (pp. 142–9), and considers the rewards of conquest (pp. 149–61). The recent interpretation of an inscription on the Colosseum that its construction had been funded by booty (G. Alföldy, 'Eine Bauinschrift aus dem Colosseum', *ZPE* 109 [1995], 195–226) supports M.'s conclusions (pp. 151–2) on the quantity of booty taken by Vespasian.

The final chapter, 'Values' (pp. 162–210), is the most original in the book. M. constructs a convincing model of the Romans as 'status warriors' whose aim is a hierarchy of states with Rome at the top. Any loss of face on Rome's part was thought to lead to barbarian arrogance (*superbia*), which in turn would lead to a contempt for Rome and thus danger. Awe and fear were the correct attitudes for barbarians. Thus any injury (*inuria*) to Rome called for revenge (*ultio*), which would be a just war (and this, of course, did not have to be the same as a defensive war). A brief epilogue (pp. 211–22) suggests that the same values had obtained under the republic.

This well-written book, well versed in ancient and modern texts, splendidly fulfils its aim to appeal to students of Rome and non-specialists alike (p. xiii). For the former it makes a valuable contribution to the debate on Roman strategy started all those years ago by Edward Luttwak's *The Grand Strategy of the Roman Empire* (Baltimore, 1976).

Further nuancing of our understanding of imperial attitudes might be possible if systematic study were made of the genres of the relevant ancient texts, their 'Greekness', 'Romanness', or 'Jewishness' (cf. p. 158), where in the empire they were composed, the status of their authors, and their date of 'publication'.

Lincoln College, Oxford and University of Warwick HARRY SIDEBOTTOM

COMPARATIVE STUDIES IN WAR

K. Raaflaub, N. Rosenstein (edd.): *War and Society in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds. Asia, the Mediterranean, Europe and Mesoamerica*. (Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia 3.) Pp. viii + 484, ills, maps. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1999. Cased, £31.50. ISBN: 0-674-94660-X.

With a span of four millennia and two-thirds of the earth's circumference, from Tokyo to Tenochtitlan, and a theme as broad as 'war and society', this book might seem impossibly ambitious. Yet it miraculously succeeds in covering its vast subject matter in depth. The editors, Kurt Raaflaub and Nathan Rosenstein, have asked some tough questions—who participated in war? How and why were wars waged and justified? How did economic, social, and political structures affect warfare? How did warfare in turn affect these structures?—all of which are gamely tackled by all sixteen contributors. This indeed is the secret of the volume's success: everyone has taken their brief very seriously and resisted the temptation to write more selectively about topics in which they happen to have a particular interest or for which there happens to be most evidence. The result is coherent and comprehensive to a degree rarely seen in edited volumes.

Greece and Rome are at the centre of the enterprise, not only in the sense that the chapters dedicated to classical antiquity come in the middle of the book (Raaflaub and Rosenstein themselves write on archaic and classical Greece and republican Rome, respectively, while Charles D. Hamilton covers the Hellenistic world and Brian Campbell the Roman empire), but also in the sense that the specialists in other areas

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.174 Published online by Cambridge University Press

draw comparisons and contrasts with classical antiquity much more often than the classicists refer to warfare in other times and places. On the other hand, most chapters range far beyond these central areas, from the Far East (Yates on China, 1500 B.C.–A.D. 220; Farris on Japan, A.D. 300–1300) and Near East (Briant on the Persian empire; Crone on the early Islamic world), via Bronze Age Egypt (Gnirs), to two European medieval empires (Haldon on Byzantium; Bachrach on the Carolingians) and the new world (Webster on the Maya, A.D. 250–1500; Hassig on the fifteenth-century Aztecs). On top of that, we are treated to a double conclusion: first, a meticulous and extremely helpful 'paradigm for the study of war and society' devised by the anthropologist Brian Ferguson (pp. 389–437); secondly, a modestly billed but audaciously executed 'epilogue' in which Victor Hanson and Barry Strauss seek to define broad types of warfare: ritual and non-ritual, western and non-western, modern and pre-modern (pp. 439–53).

The case studies are a mine of information as well as rich in interpretation, and they often answer questions which most books on warfare do not even ask. It is easy enough, for instance, to find detailed studies of samurai armour and its development, but accounts of how the samurai emerged as a class are another story—which, as it happens, is lucidly told and analysed in Wayne Farris's excellent chapter (pp. 47–70). Again, there is plenty to read on Egyptian chariots or the Battle of Kadesh, but little to match the wide-ranging and incisive survey of Old-to-New Kingdom warfare presented here by Andrea Gnirs (pp. 71–104). Most impressive of all is the concluding chapter by Ferguson, which systematically summarizes all the key findings of the previous chapters while adding a great deal of ethnographic material for further comparison. He uses 'a common framework usable for cross-cultural comparison, or for wide-ranging war-society connections in one case' (p. 390), which distinguishes between infrastructure (ecology, demography, technology), structure (society, economy, politics), and superstructure (culture, psychology) at two levels, within the polity (i.e. the war-making community) and between warring polities. At the very least, this 'paradigm' proves an effective way of organizing the evidence, and it should indeed also be 'capable of generating contrasting hypotheses' (ibid.), even if the propositions outlined at the end are a little too generic to be very exciting.

The opposite might be said of the epilogue, which offers more exciting propositions but less careful analysis of the comparative evidence. Early Japan and the Aztec empire are cited, for example, as a parallel to classical Greece insofar as 'peasants or farmers compose the majority' of their armed forces (p. 440), in order to support the view that agriculture and warfare are indissolubly linked in pre-modern societies. Yet when it comes to arguing that there is a fundamental difference between the adaptable and destructive western way of war, based on egalitarian militias, and the conservative and restricted eastern way of war, based on élite armies, the same two instances are cited as a contrast to the classical world: in Japan 'war is confined more to particular castes' (p. 446) and 'warfare among the Aztecs was completely stratified' (p. 447). In fact, as the relevant chapters show, both Japanese and Aztec armies consisted of élite troops and a general peasant levy (as did early Chinese and early medieval European armies), so they support neither proposition. More generally, as the authors are well aware, their broad-brush characterizations of long periods and whole continents gloss over major developments and differences within each. There is certainly beauty in stark black-and-white pictures, but perhaps we should allow for boring old shades of grey, and even the odd splash of local colour.

The ideal approach may lie somewhere between the painstakingly developed but somewhat bland hypotheses offered by Ferguson and the tasty but hasty conclusions to

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.174 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which Hanson and Strass jump with such infectious enthusiasm. Anyone who would care to give it a try will be enormously helped by the evidence, ideas, and scholarship assembled in this splendid volume, which marks a major step forward in the study of war and society.

University College London HANS VAN WEES

THE ROMAN WORLD OF ST PAUL

B. WINTER: *After Paul Left Corinth. The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change*. Pp. xvi + 344, ills. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2001. Paper, £17.99. ISBN: 0-8028-4898-2.

Why was it necessary, so soon after leaving Corinth, for Paul to enjoin upon his converts the elementary moral precepts that they must have heard from him when he lived among them? The answer of this able and provocative book is not, as we might expect, that the church had grown, but that pagan tastes and habits clung to everyone in the congregation, even Paul's own neophytes; therefore, to understand the two Corinthian Epistles, we must know what it was to be a Corinthian. An able chapter, collating the results of archaeology, epigraphy, and other modern disciplines, reveals that a Greek metropolis could also be proud to be a Roman colony; Winter rightly argues that when Paul deplores a mixed or incestuous union, the hasty dissolution of a marriage or the embroilment of two saints in litigation, he is not opposing a handful of delinquents, but the laws and customs of the Roman world. To dine in the idol's temple was a privilege that the Christian man of means would be loth to waive (pp. 280–2); the law condemned, but society condoned the cohabitation of son and stepmother, even when the father was alive (pp. 50–2).

Such points are illuminating, but the very pertinacity of W.'s research invites a charge of supererogation. How much study is needed to convince us that public offices were enviously contested (pp. 138–9), or that the law was in the pockets of the rich (p. 63)? Worse still, I fear that some of W.'s ends are gained by conjuring with the evidence. Chapter 6 commences with a passage of arms between Philo of Alexandria and an unnamed sect which argues that we ought to cherish the body as the mansion of the soul; at once we learn from W. that these libertines were sophists, though the heyday of these itinerant professors came a full half-century after the death of Philo. Although it was the business of the sophists to be at war with one another, it is assumed that this one passage speaks for a whole 'élite'; it seems that they were too élite to believe in any soul that was not immortal, though no evidence from Philo's text is offered for this conjecture. On the premises that to deny the resurrection of the body is to affirm the immortality of the soul, these carnal Platonists are identified with the adversaries of Paul in 1*Cor* 15. Corinth, we are left to surmise, knew nothing of the Stoics and Epicureans who made game of Paul in Athens; on the other hand, everyone is assumed to have had Menander by his pillow. Glossing the trimeter, 'evil communications corrupt good manners' (1*Cor* 15.33), Winter contends that even if the words had become proverbial, it is possible that Paul had read the *Thais* (p. 99). Historians must deal in probabilities; and since this is the only verse in Paul that can be confidently traced to a comic poet, and it is also one of the few lines of Menander that is known to have travelled independently as an aphorism, the balance of probabilities

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.174 Published online by Cambridge University Press