hence will become a memorial to him), is attached to a somewhat token piece of his text. The idea that Pliny has deliberately included a (brief) discussion of portraiture as a way of making his own work more memorable seems a little forced, since the actual passage is so short.

However, if there was any doubt at all about the cohesiveness of the project, C. demonstrates her strong control over the material, by weaving it all together very deftly in the conclusion. Pliny is revealed as the author of empire, taking a Greek tradition of learning and turning it into a vehicle for Roman conquest. This book, then, offers a neat way of dealing with Pliny's huge work and of presenting it as more than just the sum of its diverse and lengthy parts. From this point of view, C. does an excellent job of inserting Pliny more squarely into the wider concerns of contemporary scholarship. A possible criticism would be that there are some big, difficult, and potentially messy questions lurking beneath the surface here that have been suppressed for the sake of neatness—but how does one author go about dealing with everything?

University of Bristol S. HALES
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni082

TACITUS' *HISTORIES*

H. HAYNES: *The History of Make-Believe. Tacitus on Imperial Rome.* Pp. xii + 231. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 2003. Cased, US$55, £36.95. ISBN: 0-520-23650-5.

The examination of ideology as a tool used to create political stability has offered valuable insights into governmental systems both modern and ancient. In this sometimes fascinating, sometimes exasperating study of Tacitus' *Histories*, H. seeks to apply this concept to imperial Rome and the writings of its greatest historian. Tacitus is seen as a critic of an ideology within which he himself works, tracing how a belief system was created in the period between Augustus and Trajan that would result in a world of make-believe. If, in response to the crisis of the *res publica*, Augustus was able to replace *libertas* with a façade of a restored Republic, the death of Nero created the crisis that is the focus of the first books of the *Histories.* Only the divinization of the emperor Vespasian offered a solution to the psychological trauma of the end of Julio-Claudian rule, but that only by the substitution of *superstitio* for the previous Roman system of *religio*, and the suppression of civil war by the creation of a strong 'Other' in the Jews and the Batavi to reinforce Roman identity. H. regards this new ideology as so successful that all acquiesced with imperial authority, leaving the only possibility of change in a violent eruption from outside the boundaries of the empire.

H. is strongly influenced by the work of Slavoj Zizek on modern ideology, while also drawing on continental thinkers such as Althusser, Baudrillard, Derrida, Foucault, and Lacan. The path leads back through Freud and Marx to Cicero and ultimately to Plato, who is seen as the intellectual inspiration for Tacitus' writing. This is a heady mix and perhaps a welcome antidote to treatments that would view Tacitus primarily as a rhetorician. Concepts such as the *simulacrum*, an empty reference with no relationship to reality, are 'good for thinking with' in the confusion of the Roman civil wars. They may also mislead: it is dangerous to compare the Caesars with 'Caesarism' and the

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni083 Published online by Cambridge University Press

application of post-colonial theory to the imperial subjects of Rome (for instance, regarding Segestes and Arminius, pp. 17–18) is questionable.

Rhiannon Ash has recently sought to place Tacitus' depiction of the military in the context of Roman descriptions of warfare, but H.'s work is much more grounded in twentieth-century theory. While she identifies two crises of public confidence (at the end of the Republic and after the fall of Nero), Tacitus seems to have added two more (after the assassinations of Gaius, where Claudius' actions in Suetonius [*Claud.* 10.4, 12.3] mirror those of Otho in 69, and of Domitian, ushering the new Trajanic age). The difference in approaches not only probably reflects H.'s wish not to over-complicate her model by reference to the Senate (which she regards as 'utterly degraded', p.112), but, more significantly, also illustrates Tacitus' concern to highlight the interests of his own status group. Given the influence of Marxist thought in H.'s book, it is remarkable that there is no mention of class in her argument. Instead, the emphasis is placed on the relationship between the masses (the people of Rome or the army) and their leader throughout. The populace makes up its Caesars and believes in them. This view does not just run contrary to the work of modern historians of the Roman world, but also requires considerable effort by H. to justify in her texts. H. views the bogus applause of the crowd at Otho's departure from Rome (*Hist.* 1.90.3) as deriving from *privata cuique simulatio*, individual pretence reflecting the fictions of Otho's own speechmaking (p. 7). This is to disregard the more commonly accepted reading *stimulatio* that provides another reading of the passage: where no liberty exists, applause and prayers are dependent 'not on concern or support, but are simply arbitrary (*ex libidine servitii*), as occurs in slave households, where each has his own interests at heart (*stimulatio*) and public esteem (*decus publicum*) matters little'. In her text, H. erases the institution of slavery that defines *libertas*: only runaway slaves impersonating others are mentioned in the index. Yet it is basic for Tacitus' thought: in the Roman world, enslavement does not so much rob its victim of choice as replace it with mere whim, with no thought for the common good.

This use of slavery as metaphor, seen, for instance, in Vitellius' servile dependence on Blaesus when travelling through Gaul (*Hist.* 2.59.2) which leads to future imperial hatred, should then give us pause before we accept the necessity of aggressive imperialism for the establishment of Roman liberty. There need not be any Tacitean self-recrimination (p. 165) for the actions of his father-in-law Agricola. It is true that the Jews are described as thoroughly 'other' in *Histories* V, but they are an 'other' already within the empire. In his description of the Batavians, by contrast, Tacitus calls the whole concept of otherness into question. Civilis does not simply pass himself off as one of Rome's famous enemies as H. suggests (p. 148)—he claims to be both a Hannibal (a foreigner in Roman lands) and a Sertorius (a Roman amid foreign peoples). Similarly, H.'s claim that a Republican aristocratic *religio* that imposes negative constraints is replaced by an imperial *superstitio* under the Flavians, indicating 'a major change in the ideology of power relations' (p. 121), is not likely to convince many historians of Roman religion. And H.'s claim that Tacitus is a Platonic philosopher, defended in her conclusion, more than skirts the question of the historian's debt to Stoic thought.

There are signs of haste in publication: the Greek of *Sophist* 236b is garbled on p. 20; a phrase from Calgacus' speech (*Agr.* 30.5) is missing in the translation; *parum effugerat* (*Hist.* 3.39.2) means 'he failed to escape' rather than 'he barely escaped'; *publicum id facinus* (*Hist.* 3.25.2) is mistranslated as 'this crime had not been public'.

In sum, H.'s book raises the possibility of a deeper investigation of Tacitus' ideology, for which a thorough study of his analysis of the events of A.D. 69 will be

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni083 Published online by Cambridge University Press

crucial. But I also find myself too often in disagreement with the application of the numerous methodologies H. employs to regard this as more than a tentative first step.

Victoria University of Wellington ARTHUR J. POMEROY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni083

A CONSERVATIVE *GOLDEN ASS*

J. MARTOS: *Apuleyo de Madauros:* Las metamorfosis *o* El asno de oro. *Volumen I (Libros 1–3). Introducción, texto latino, traducción y notas*. Pp. clv + 68. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2003. Cased. ISBN: 84-00-08188-9 (84-00-08187-0 set).

J. MARTOS: *Apuleyo de Madauros:* Las metamorfosis *o* El asno de oro. *Volumen II (Libros 4–11). Introducción, texto latino, traducción y notas*. Pp. vii + 226. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2003. Cased. ISBN: 84-00-08189-7 (84-00-08187-0 set).

The introduction to Martos's edition of *The Golden Ass* is on an ample scale, providing full coverage of Apuleius' life and works, and judicious discussion of the problems familiar to anyone who has seriously engaged with this extraordinary book. Students of Apuleius will find the copious bibliography a valuable resource; Hispanists will be particularly interested in the pages on his reception in Spain, where his influence has been especially strong. In this review I shall concentrate on the distinctive feature of the edition, M.'s critical position and the resulting character of his text.

What he has to say about the transmission of the text essentially reproduces Robertson's conclusions. However, when it comes to the establishment of the text and the reception of conjectures, he parts company with him (I.xcviii). Starting from the indisputable premiss that the idiosyncratic character of Apuleius' language counsels caution, M. follows the post-Robertsonian trend towards conservatism most recently exemplified in the Groningen commentaries, and prints the reading of F 'wherever possible'. It is clearly with some complacency that he suggests that his text may be one of the most conservative ever published (I.xcix–c). I wonder, however, whether he and others who follow the same line have thought seriously about the logical implications of their position? That word 'possible' masks a trap.

An editor who is faced with a corrupt or suspect reading of which no clearly certain emendation has been proposed has three options: to obelize, to accept *faute de mieux* what seems to be the most plausible conjecture among those on offer, or to print what the author at best is very unlikely to have written. M. declines to obelize, and impales himself firmly on the second horn of the resulting dilemma. What comes of this can be illustrated by an instance (less trivial, given the rhetorical and literary power of proper names, than might appear) from the very beginning of the book. At 1.1.3 F offers and M. prints *Spartiaca.* How likely is it that Apuleius should have preferred this otherwise unexampled form of the word to the usual one? That, *doctus* and *philologus* as he was, he should have chosen (supposing that it existed) or coined a form that was shorter and less expressive than the orthodox *Spartiatica* (Salmasius) and could have conveyed no

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni083 Published online by Cambridge University Press