Hopkins' remarks on why neither the Welsh dwarf gambit nor the Mount Everest gambit (195) are valid against models which are properly constructed on the principle of a Red Indian wigwam (193). No, really, it makes perfect sense in context. The editors top this all off with a range of helpful introductory matter, including a glossary for those who don't know their *artaba* from their *aroura*. Gary Reger's chapter on prices in Hellenistic Delos actually quotes a bit from a review I did in my first year as *Greece & Rome* subject reviewer (136), which leaves me torn between a sense of closure and a sensation of vertigo at the thought that I have just reviewed a quotation of a review cited in a reprint of an article based on the book which was reviewed in the first place. The time has clearly come to stop. Now.

HANS VAN WEES

Roman History

Lacking the courage of the BBC, which sent Lord Nelson, the late Princess of Wales, and eight others into competition as 'Great Britons', I shall put one outstanding work at the head and order the rest on other principles, such as newness. First then comes an enthralling, informative book, R. Sallares' *Malaria and Rome*.[1] The author, boldly writing when genome research is poised to transform understanding of the *falciparum* parasite, possesses the skills required to be intelligible about the disease (his glossary might have been more extensive) and acute about the ancient world, illuminating it from later history and insisting on continuity. He changes ideas of the extent, effects, and complexity of problems caused by various parasites and poses questions for those who put their faith in model life tables, as well as for political historians (C. Gracchus' road-building promoted malaria (95)). Beginning with a typology and history of malaria (always with us, it may return), he turns to Italian ecology, which is patchy, paradoxical, and affected by the presence of other diseases. There is a gripping comparison with malaria's demography in England before the author goes on to particular hot-spots, the Pontine Marshes, Tuscany, Rome, Campagna, Apulia. A final chapter analyses results and their implications. Minor scepticism persists: 'Cato knew all about . . . malaria' (244). About *malaria*? And that leaves room for other diseases. Because old Vespasian succumbed to 'fevers', can we be sure that they were malarial (3 n.6; cf. B. W. Jones on Suet. *Vesp.* 24)? 'Mass chattel-slavery was an adaptation to malaria' (254), but the rôle of malaria in pre-Gracchan peasant depopulation (196) cannot be quantified.

Next, a collection of fine essays delivered in honour of Fergus Millar and accompanied by portrait and bibliography, all edited by A. K. Bowman and others: *Representations of Empire: Rome and the Mediterranean World*.[2] Such is the range of Millar's work that it would have been impossible to put tributes under one title. This one is misleading. Readers need to know what they get: from J. North's trenchant reassessment of Roman – and academic – democracy we pass to A. Kuhrt's lucid analysis of accounts of Sennacherib's siege of Jerusalem; then S. Mitchell directs a brilliant searchlight onto the

[1] *Malaria and Rome*. A History of Malaria in Ancient Italy. By Robert Sallares. Oxford U.P., 2002. Pp. xvi + 341, with 37 plates, 7 maps, 9 tables, 1 fig.

[2] *Representations of Empire*. Rome and the Mediterranean World. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 114. Edited by A. K. Bowman, H. M. Cotton, M. Goodman, and S. Price. Published for the British Academy by the Oxford U.P., 2002. Pp. xii + 196, with frontispiece, 3 maps, 3 tables, 17 figs.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/50.2.257 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pontic region (may it encourage further research), and D. Schwartz discusses Josephus' use of two emotive Greek 'freedom' terms. Then three essays take us to the centre: K. Clarke's subtle enquiry into Tacitus' idea of his rôle, P. Zanker on what the Palace of Domitian tells of his conception of *principatus*, and W. Eck defending with exemplary clarity the reasonable position that promotion in the imperial service was subject to rules, if not regulations; these are papers of methodological interest. Finally P. Garnsey elucidates the thinking of Augustine and Lactantius, doing the latter great service. This book is essential for libraries and for scholars not on tramlines; students will benefit from the several essays. Overall, a work worthy of the honorand. In *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities*,[3] which links centre and periphery in another way, Claude Eilers uses literary and above all epigraphic evidence to review received conceptions of patronage. He treats successively how such relationships were created (conquest; inheritance?), what patrons did, when the phenomenon appeared in the Greek East, how patrons were distributed and what they could achieve, and how the institution declined. Wider issues are discussed in the conclusion: the very nature of Roman patronage (formal), and how it has been exploited by modern historians (sometimes illegitimately); readers are invited to reconsider relations between emperor and subjects, Rome and 'allied states'. There are six substantial appendices, the main one a catalogue of 164 patrons, geographically arranged, with the evidence set out. For those entering the subject from other angles, there is an *index locorum*. Now come two very different works on the latter end of Antiquity. Continuing an admirable sequence of recent works on Late Antiquity and the law, R. W. Mathisen, in *Law, Society, and Authority in Late Antiquity*,[4] has published the sixteen contributions to a conference of distinguished scholars, based mainly in North America, but with such well-known European names as A. Arjava, G. Clark, J. D. Harries, and B. Sirks. The collection is evenly divided into two parts: 'Law and the Manifestations of new Authority', and 'The Impact of Law on Society'. It is hard to select items, because of the way in which the topics interrelate with other areas and ages (an interesting example is M. E. Jones' 'Legacy of Roman Law in post-Roman Britain'); but of striking intrinsic interest are D. E. Trout's exposition of the *Feriale Campanum*, C. Peyroux's amusing demonstration that female monastic practice did not always follow male theory, and K. Pearson's ingenious exploitation of Salic Law as an indicator of Frankish diet. It is the drawback of such collections, as well as their delight, that they offer different things to each reader. But these are all of high quality. A. Schiavone's work *The End of the Past: Ancient Rome and the Modern West*[5] is 'the American version' of his better titled *La Storia spezzata* of 1996, and makes an interesting read. His question is why the historical course of the West contained within itself 'the greatest catastrophe ever experienced in the history of civilization', and his answer brings together 'economic history, the history of culture and mentality, social and political history', imposing 'continuous counterpoint

[3] *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities*. By Claude Eilers. Oxford Classical Monographs, Oxford U.P., 2002. Pp. xiv + 334, with 5 tables, 3 figs. Only a factual description can be given here, because of my connexion with the work at an earlier stage.

[4] *Law, Society, and Authority in Late Antiquity*. Edited by R. W. Mathisen. Oxford U.P., 2001. Pp. xvi + 324. £45.

[5] *The End of the Past*. Ancient Rome and the Modern West. By Aldo Schiavone. Translated by Margery J. Schneider. Revealing Antiquity 13, ed. G. W. Bowersock. Harvard U.P., Cambridge MA and London, 2000. Pp. viii + 278. Paperback.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/50.2.257 Published online by Cambridge University Press

between ancient and modern' (2). That is, the book is all over the place, with far-sought quotation interspersed with provoking reflection making a curiously lumpy effect. He starts with Gibbon and Aelius Aristides, but surprisingly, after going back to the third century BC, and so necessarily thinning the texture of the discussion, finds the fork in the road where Romans made the wrong choice in the first century BC and in Italy, this although he is aware of the importance of demand in the Industrial Revolution (92). Despite the author's learning and the complexity of his argument (and language), both hypotheses (catastrophe and fork) seem too simple, like his acceptance of the 'crisis' of the third century AD (88), but the discussions of issues such as 'primitivism' and slavery and of earlier writers such as Marx and Rostovtzeff are worthwhile. There are notes and an index mentioning authors discussed, but no bibliography, excusably. In a neat handbook with sparse but well-chosen illustrations, the eminent historian Karl Christ, *Die römischen Kaiserzeit*,[6] has made a succinct survey of a vast topic (thus 13 pages for administration and law, 17 for social structures). It will be useful for German students of the ancient world, and it is so clearly written that English-speaking graduate students looking for an outline in an area in which they are not specializing might well use it as a means of learning German too. (Naturally the bibliography is mostly German-oriented.) Those not put off by a vulgar publicity handout will be keen to read the 'imperialist historian' Werner Eck's ⋆*The Age of Augustus*,[7] which has been used in Germany as a student textbook since 1998. Concise and clearly written, it should be used here too, in schools and as an introduction for undergraduates and general readers. There is a strong narrative structure (Chapter 2: 'Modest Origins'; Chapter 15: 'Augustus' Death'), with thematic chapters towards the end, on the élite, provincial government, army, imperialism, and the City. This last has architecture, but there is little else on art and literature, despite the work's title (they have sections in the up-to-date international bibliography). An appendix contains a useful translation of the *Res Gestae*, with notes (there are no others). There is a 'Time Lines' list and an index. Any scholar will find items to dispute in a book on this subject (the interpretation of '*per consensum universorum*', 35) or doubts to assuage (about the voltage of Augustus' *imperium,* given that Tiberius' was *maius*, 57), but the reader is in safe and sensible hands. The grandeur that was Rome in the manner of 1066, or rather 1492, and all that is Rose Williams' ⋆*Once upon the Tiber*.[8] She rewrites Roman History using mainly literary sources, with Livy and Virgil providing the most entertaining stories (Tacitus and Suetonius are 'gossipy historians'). She has a serious purpose, shown by her glossary, index, notes, chronological table, and bibliography (authors beginning B to L!): to enlist the sympathy of students. She will succeed where they are either adult or already sympathetic. There are some good cracks and a few slips, and the illustrations are ingratiating, though rather Hellenic in style. Readers will enjoy it or hate it. A quotation may help them decide: 'Romans called these residents of Africa the Punic people because had been refugees from Phoenicia, but they were soon to learn that there

[6] *Die römischen Kaiserzeit von Augustus bis Diocletian*. By Karl Christ. C. H. Beck, Munich, 2001. Pp. 128, with 7 photographs, 2 maps. Paperback €7.5.

[7] *The Age of Augustus*. By Werner Eck. Translated by D. L. Schneider. New Material by S. A. Takács. Blackwell Publishing, Malden, MA, etc., 2002. Pp. x + 166, with 2 maps. Paperback £12.99.

[8] *Once upon the Tiber*. An offbeat History of Rome. By Rose Williams. Anthem Classics, Anthem Press, London, 2002. Pp. [vi] + 135, with line drawings. Paperback £9.95.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/50.2.257 Published online by Cambridge University Press

was nothing puny about them.' Jerry Toner's uncouth *Rethinking Roman History*[9] has as its first thesis that Roman History (he is not much concerned with Greek) should detach itself from the dead hand of élitist (!) Classics, to associate with proper history and join, even lead, theoretical debates. Secondly, history has passed the post-modern phase and is becoming 'neo-modern', i.e., ready to admit that some historical propositions are true, though contingently. After specimen neo-modern analyses (gladiatorial shows, cookshops; reassuringly familiar), Toner ends with another rattle of the Classics skeleton. One sympathizes with his passion, but it is hard to forgive his obtuse 'Let's face it, how many people want to read Homer in the original nowadays'? (12) and his sloppy treatment of the modern writers he alludes to. Is there evidence either that History will be more generous with its space (teachers, money) than surviving Classics faculties, or that Roman historians coming from Classics are at a disadvantage? I end this section with a work on a classical historian. It is a pity that Stephan Schmal's introductory *Sallust*[10] is not available in English. He writes clearly and with enthusiasm, but not excitingly, in a series of chapters that are naturally oriented towards German scholarship, historical thinking, and experience, though the bibliography is wide-ranging and balanced. After life and times, justified dismissal of inauthentic works, and a chapter each on the monographs and *Histories,* Schmal deals sensibly with geography, political thought, style, predecessors, reception, and scholarship. An index of Sallust passages mentioned adds to the value of the book. The first of the next two volumes takes us to items not all freshly minted in English. James E. Packer's *The Forum of Trajan*[11] is an abbreviated version of a work that came out in 1997, in three volumes.[12] The present version is no coffee table book, handsome though it is, and its restorations of what Ammianus Marcellinus called 'a construction unique under the heavens . . . never again to be imitated by mortal men' breathtaking. Part One deals with the Forum, excavations and monuments; Part Two with restoring the Basilica Ulpia, and Part Three, Conclusion, perhaps the most interesting, with design, construction, and 'meaning'. An afterword draws attention to new excavations and to changes shown in the Getty computer model, thus adjusting the original work. The author's preoccupation with predecessors' methodology (131) will make it valuable for students of archaeology. Again, Packer sees the complex, its proportions and style, as celebrating the perfection of pre-existing political as well as artistic forms (183). Not that he neglects Apollodorus' geometric details, or the rhythm of the stately complex. Two complaints: library copies will not long keep the carelessly inserted loose site-plan, and those who write for the Latin-less should provide meaningful translations: what does 'ordinary consul' convey? From the publishing house of the Getty Museum itself comes a lavish volume, Ada Gabucci's ⋆*The Colosseum*.[13] The authors are six Italian

[9] *Rethinking Roman History*. By Jerry Toner. The Oleander Press, Cambridge, 2002. Pp. 138. Paperback £9.95.

[10] *Sallust*. By Stephan Schmal. Studienbücher Antike 8. Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim, Zurich, New York, 2001. Pp. 216. €15.80.

[11] *The Forum of Trajan in Rome*. A Study of the Monuments in Brief. By James E. Packer. Architectural reconstructions by John Burge, James E. Packer, and Kevin Sarring. University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 2001. Pp. xviii + 235, with 171 figs. In colour and loose map.

[12] Reviewed by A. Viscogliosi in *Journ. Rom. Arch.* 12.2 (1999) 600–613.

[13] *The Colosseum*. Ed. by Ada Gabucci. Translated by Mary Becker. Getty Publications, Los Angeles, California, 2001. Pp. 248, with 166 coloured plates and 127 figs.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/50.2.257 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scholars, including F. Coarelli, and their essays cover six aspects of the building: urban and demographic context, gladiators, architecture and function, history of the building (most impressive), and its water system; there are brief notes and a bibliography. Special topics such as 'amphitheatre origins according to Pliny' and 'The Dedication of the Amphitheater in Pompeii' are treated in segregated boxes with bibliographies. Perhaps more might have been said of the building as part of the Flavian building programme. The pictures are the thing, and if scholars will not generally deploy this book in their citations, students and the general public will enjoy many stretches of it, especially if they are familiar with the names of ancient writers (the translation has some split infinitives and occasional slips over names). The publication of a new volume by Maria Wyke, especially with the title ⋆*The Roman Mistress*,[14] is an event, but of what kind needs to be made clear. This is not a unified social study, but two sets of five essays, the first set on elegy, particularly Propertius, Ovid, and the Sulpician corpus, the other on cinematic versions of Cleopatra and Messalina. All but those on Messalina are expanded reworkings from periodicals and an earlier book (1987–97). They constitute a pair of worthy Wyke corpora, but not necessarily of works that one scholar would wish to possess; the central concern Wyke claims is itself wide-ranging. On the poets, she brilliantly develops her argument that 'Cynthia' and her friends are not women, but piquant constructions of a genre of Latin literature; for the cinema she entertainingly links the sirens to contemporary societies. But what else would one expect? The clothes give the game away. But it is a wonderful collection, the illustrations attractive and apposite. A second edition of Tessa Rajak's ⋆*Josephus*[15] is very welcome. A standard work since 1983, it combines scholarship and readability in a remarkable way, and must already have served thousands of students both of the author and of the history of his time, whether from the Jewish point of view or as part of the history of the Roman Empire. It is a book that one takes from the shelf with confidence (the other grades being hope and desperation). The review copy arrived garlanded with reviews, one quoted from this journal (but wrongly ascribed): 'A vigorous, tightly argued interpretation'.[16] The text remains the same, with a new preface, a short list of corrections, and a separate 12-page bibliography with a guide to literature since 1983. New work has also been taken account of in the introduction, and the modern approach to the author, 'taking him on his own terms'. Rajak draws attention to differences from her class-based interpretation of the war of 66, to new work on the Jewish peasantry, and to acceptance of Josephus' biases; his nationalism is to be given less prominence, and his rôle as a Judaeo-Greek writer better understood. Rajak looks forward to his occupying a place as one of the Greek historians associated with Rome. Alan Wardman's ⋆*Rome's Debt to Greece*[17] presents six aspects: the Greek character, philhellenism, Greek poetry, Greek history and historians, rhetoric, and philosophy, and concludes that Rome took Greece as she wanted to find her, and claimed to improve on what she found. The work is sober and thoughtful, and when it first came out was called 'a useful introductory survey'[18] but

[14] *The Roman Mistress*. By Maria Wyke. Oxford U.P., 2002. Pp. x + 452, with 32 Plates. £40.

[15] *Josephus: the Historian and his Society*. By Tessa Rajak. Ed. 2, Duckworth, London, 2002. Pp. xviii + 261, with map. Paperback £14.99.

[16] Jeremy Paterson, *G&R* NS 31 (1984) 218.

[17] *Rome's Debt to Greece*, By Alan Wardman. Duckworth/Bristol Classical Press, 2002, first published by P. Elek and Co., London, 1976. Pp. xx + 201. Paperback £14.99.

[18] T. J. Cornell in *CR* NS 28 (1978) 110–12.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/50.2.257 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the reviewer pointed out that it had 'little or nothing about drama, architecture, law, science, agriculture, warfare, or religion', concluding that it was 'rather insubstantial'. A light start might be what some beginners need (all passages are given in translation), but much has been written since 1976. That might have been included in a supplementary bibliography, which, with a fresh introduction, could have enhanced the value of the book as a springboard.

BARBARA LEVICK

Art and Archaeology

Nocturnal sessions of gossip and Glenmorangie with the late R. M. Cook were not usually yielding of much praise for academic colleagues. But more than once I remember that the topic of John Boardman's productivity brought forth rare encomia. 'What's extraordinary, ' Cook would say, 'is not so much the quantity – but that it's all worth reading.' Indeed: and, I would add, worth *having*. For even when one might disagree with the author's premises, arguments, and conclusions, his methods of collecting and presenting evidence are invariably reliable; displaying a thoroughness, and an empirical at-homeness with relevant material, that seem to have deserted much of modern scholarship. So exemplary solid usefulness is maintained in Boardman's latest production, ★*The Archaeology of Nostalgia*.[1] The theoretical aspect of this subject is left to others (Paul Veyne's 1983 essay, *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths?* is not even cited). How far would Boardman share Plutarch's assumption that myths relate to truth as rainbows relate to the sun (*De Iside* 358F)? – and that wondrous as they may seem, myths are the phenomena of history's atmosphere? Perhaps it does not matter, since in antiquity, levels of mythological credence were rarely calibrated. For the Greeks, myths might get written up, dramatized, recited, and parodied; but ultimately, and originally, myths *happened*. Olympia was supposed to be where 'history' began, with the First Olympiad of 776 BCE. Yet a distinguished mathematician – Pythagoras – saw no problem in accepting that Olympia's Stadium had been paced out by Herakles, and computing the bodily proportions of the hero by making a ratio of his *stade*-length of 600 steps to that of an ordinary mortal. Herodotus, the 'father of history' himself, admitted that the Greek penchant for collapsing 'heroized' and 'real' chronologies was considered deplorably inaccurate by Egyptian scribes, who kept more scrupulously annalistic archives. It stands as an incorrigible habit – mocking the Levi-Strauss definition of myths as 'events without time'. And truly incorrigible – as Boardman shows throughout his survey of what might be called the 'relic trade' of the Classical world. What must the empiricist make of all this? He raises an eyebrow here and there with regard to the myths as such ('who *eats* shoulder-blades?' – a mordant aside on the Pelops story). Following work by Adrienne Mayor (*The First Fossil Hunters*, 2000), he indulges in some speculative natural history; even some quasi-Jungian analysis of mythical archetypes. But in general Boardman does what with hindsight can only be done: the collation of texts, images, and topography, to demonstrate the parochial nature of Greek myths – their stubborn rootedness in space and time. The practice of mapping myths upon the landscape was ubiquitous throughout the Greek world. So Boardman's gazetteer of

[1] *The Archaeology of Nostalgia*. How the Greeks Recreated their Mythical Past. By John Boardman. Thames and Hudson, London, 2002. Pp. 240.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/50.2.257 Published online by Cambridge University Press