argued that the ruler cult was above all a religious phenomenon. However, was the emperor a divinity to Arrian (*Anabasis* 4.10), Curtius Rufus (8.5.5–20), or Cassius Dio (52.35)? It is a serious and inexplicable omission that, despite its length and repetitiveness, the book has no detailed discussion of such ancient critics of ruler worship.

In an effort to show how seriously the Romans took deified rulers, C. discusses pilgrim sites (pp. 354–5). However, his selective approach to the literary sources leads him to miss the two most instructive of such pilgrimages: the visit of Augustus to the tomb of Alexander and Trajan's sacrifice to Alexander in the room where Alexander died in Babylon (Suetonius, *Augustus* 18; Dio 58.30). 'Antike Religion', C. tells us, 'ist Handlung, nicht Haltung' (p. 23). He is not the first to see cult action as the definitive mark of the worship of a ruler (cf. Fears, *RLAC* XIV, 1047). However, in the story told by Suetonius, it is the attitude of Augustus that makes Alexander an object of reverence and the rest of the Ptolemies a bunch of stiffs. Suetonius understood the primacy of belief over cult action. In describing the deification of Caesar, he writes: 'in deorum numerum relatus est, non ore modo decernentium sed et persuasione volgi' (*Caesar* 88; cf. 85). The deification of a Roman emperor expressed the inextricable nexus between religion and politics that characterized the Greco-Roman world. C. fails to understand the inapplicability to Rome of our modern separation of religion and state (cf. Fears, 'The Cult of Jupiter', *ANRW* II.27.1, 7–9). In these terms, his persistent translation of 'divus' as 'Staatsgott' is more than inaccurate. It is nonsense.

In recent years, archaeology has made the most important accretions to our knowledge of the ruler cult. To be used intelligently, such archaeological material must be studied at first hand. The frescoes of Vespasian and Titus as Hercules in the Collegiate House of the Augustales at Herculaneum may be our most important single source for understanding the theology of ruler worship. The temple of the Flavian family erected by Domitian at Misenum has revolutionized our understanding of sacred space in ruler worship and provides a most dramatic instance of *damnatio memoriae* (J. R. Fears, 'Herculanensium Augustalium Aedes and the Theology of Ruler Cult', in R. F. Docter, E. M. Moormann [edd.], *Proceedings of the XVth International Congress of Classical Archaeology* [Amsterdam, 2000]). The frescoes from Herculaneum are apparently of no interest to C., who seems to think that the temple at Misenum is Trajanic (p. 410). Quite apart from such new material, we looked to C. in vain for a discussion of even the best-known artistic and monumental sources for ruler worship. At the high end of the scale, the Pantheon is of primary importance for Hadrian's vision of his relationship to the divine world. The Igel Column outside Trier is hardly less significant for our knowledge of the impact of the theology of ruler cult upon the religion of private individuals.

Written without adequate knowledge of the ancient sources and modern literature, and lacking insight into Greco-Roman religion, C.'s *Kaiser und Gott* is a step backward in the study of ruler worship in the Roman world.

University of Oklahoma J. RUFUS FEARS

DELATORES

S. H. RUTLEDGE: *Imperial Inquisitions: Prosecutors and Informants from Tiberius to Domitian*. Pp. xiv + 416. London and New York: Routledge, 2001. Cased, £55.00. ISBN: 0-415-23700-9.

Delatores loom large in first-century historiography. For Tacitus, they actualized all

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.321 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the potential for corruption latent in the Principate's concentration of power in the hands of autocrats and their courtiers. 'Perhaps nowhere is Tacitus' rhetoric more misplaced and his analysis more flawed' (p. 174). Rutledge wishes to persuade us not simply that private prosecutions and secret informants were endemic to the early Principate, but that they were necessary for the maintenance of order, protecting provincials and *principes* alike from those who felt the misgovernance of empire their prerogative.

R. describes his aims thus: 'to offer the reader a particular perspective on Roman history which has not been offered before, that of the Roman who collaborated with the regime and who felt his own interests were closely tied to the imperial court', and 'to throw into deeper relief and [*sic*] more enduring aspects of Roman society and politics which, [he believes], inevitably leads us to modify the picture of *delatores* and *accusatores* as presented by our sources' (p. 4). In pursuit of these goals, he offers a study in two parts, the first analytical and the second prosopographic. Part I offers seven substantive chapters and an epilogue. Besides Chapter 1, which seeks to 'define the *delator*', Chapter 2 studies the aims and aspirations of *delatores*, while Chapters 3–7 survey chronologically the rôle of informants in law enforcement, the suppression of senatorial 'resistance', and dynastic politics. Part II presents a prosopography of *delatores*, according to the taxonomic principles outlined in Chapter 1. Each entry cites testimonia and modern bibliography, and provides lengthy, idiosyncratic assessments of individuals and the trials in which they were involved. Four appendices, a glossary, bibliography, and index close the volume.

The conceptualization and execution of the project do not permit R. to achieve his goals. Within chapters, R. proceeds chronologically, often paragraphing so that his summaries of trials are clustered according to year (see, e.g., pp. 91–103); this results, *inter alia*, in paragraphs that run to as long as 1500 words. Within paragraphs, he often presents information in the same order as it is related by whatever source he follows, interspersing or appending his own observations by parataxis (see, e.g., pp. 91–2, following Tacitus *Ann.* 3.22). The remarkable dearth of logical operands and simple subordination within these long paragraphs make it difficult to establish the point or points that will be central as the argument moves forward. The decision to study trials according to the principal charge on the indictment, moreover, forces R. and his readers to revisit the reign of Tiberius in sequential narrative at least four times. The presentation of data in Part II might have been expected to abbreviate source-critical or bibliographic excursuses in Part I, but, remarkably, the two parts almost never refer to each other. Discrete data about each trial under study (*delator*, defendant, date, charge, and outcome) are then repeated a third time in tabular form in Appendix 1.

Similar problems bedevil the book in its geographic, chronological, and conceptual limits. Thus, despite his avowed aim of situating first-century A.D. delation in a chronologically and sociologically broader understanding of a specifically Roman culture (pp. 4, 37–9, 54, 136, 176), R. opens his introduction with a discussion of Matthew 27:2–5, in the course of which he identifies Judas as 'part of a much larger phenomenon'. Does R. then argue that the rise of delation in the provinces formed an important element in the spread to the provinces of 'enduring cultural and political values' originating 'in Roman society' (p. 3)? Alas, he subsequently devotes only seven pages to '*delatores* in the provinces', where they were 'a constant presence' (pp. 71–8, at p. 71). Their very ubiquity, it would seem, renders pointless any inquiry into their native and necessary implication in the structures of Roman administrative and legal practice. The project of elucidating the 'enduring cultural and political values' that underlay delation at Rome remains similarly abortive: R. devotes three pages to

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.321 Published online by Cambridge University Press

financial gain as an inducement to delation under the Republic (pp. 37–9), and consigns all further discussion of Republican history to Appendices 3 and 4. R. furthermore restricts himself to the analysis of those 'criminal trials . . . depicted as *delationes* or in which *delatores* or *accusatores* took part' (p. 7). How can one contextualize delation in the early Empire by studying only delation in the early Empire?

The peculiarly rigid chronological parameters of this study, so obviously dependent upon the capricious survival of source materials, stand uneasily beside a source-critical stance that often belittles that historicity of such information as Tacitus and his peers provide. 'We are frequently dealing with a rhetorical construct as much as a historical phenomenon' (pp. 5, 11). That said, R. undertakes to define delation, and to analyze particular trials, in part by asking whether the charges in any given case were true (p. 12), or whether prosecutions *de repetundis* were 'genuine' (pp. 65–6); it seems important that Julius Silanus, Caesius Cordus, and Vibius Serenus the elder were 'clearly' guilty (pp. 68, 161). How R. reaches his verdicts is not clear; he devotes little space to the hermeneutics of reading Roman texts. We must content ourselves with his methodological digression on the use of New Testament texts: 'We therefore have two ways—for our purposes—to read the account: either the gospels are genuinely historical or they are anachronistic. Either way, the gospels no doubt contain hefty doses of historical fiction; nonetheless, they at least reflect (relatively) contemporary realities such as appear in Roman historical sources' (p. 73).

Delation as a category of social action does seem to have achieved a new importance under the Principate. R. has assembled and conveyed much of the data one would need in order to ask why this was so. But he has confused the possibility of presenting this data prosopographically with the necessity of analyzing it so. In its unwillingness to credit structural aspects of the Augustan settlement with social-historical importance and its denial of factional opposition before Claudius (p. 136), this book stands tacitly in opposition to another prosopographical study, Syme's *Augustan Aristocracy*. Start there.

University of Southern California CLIFFORD ANDO

ROMAN MUNICIPAL FINANCES

Il capitolo delle entrate nelle finanze municipali in Occidente ed in Oriente. Actes de la Xe Rencontre franco-italienne sur l'epigraphie du monde romain. Rome, 27–20 May 1996. Pp. ix + 330, ills. Rome: École Française, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 2-7283-0540-4.

This volume discusses municipal finances in the Roman world, focusing on sources of income other than euergetism, and concentrating upon epigraphic evidence. It is not for the faint-hearted: few of the inscriptions discussed are translated, sometimes the reader has to wait for enlightenment about how the author is interpreting a text, and some inscriptions are not even quoted verbatim. These are only minor irritations in a fine volume, however, which presents four new inscriptions, casts fresh light on previously known ones, and provides overviews of several aspects of municipal finances. As its title suggests, the book discusses both East and West, but the greater part of it deals with Italy and North Africa. It also concentrates upon the imperial period, with two chapters focusing on inscriptions from the republic, and one on late antiquity.

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.321 Published online by Cambridge University Press