accosted by his adversaries is probably rightly explained as involving the introduction of a lawsuit (*interpellatum*, 'sued', *OLD* 6) which Claudius ordered to be settled on the spot. Unfortunately, this explanation is confused by retaining Rolfe's translation, 'challenged' (*OLD* 2), which suggests a different scenario of an interruption regarding the juror's right to be on the rolls. 18.1 'pro opera dignam cuique mercedem': H. claims this is redundant, since 'the proper (*dignam*) reward was obviously one in proportion to a man's labour (*pro opera*)'. But, following hiring practices in the ancient world, employers generally paid on the basis of the completion of a full day's work (*opera*)—cf. *Matt.* 20, the workers in the vineyard. Claudius was probably offering to pay for less than a complete day's efforts. 22: Claudius' action in excluding the workmen and slaves when reciting a prayer of purification ('summotaque operariorum servorumque turba') is not just removing 'freedmen and peregrines' as well as slaves. The exclusion bars the *sordida plebs*, the working population (perhaps the same as the *pullati* excluded by Augustus: Suet. *Aug*. 40), to limit attendance to retainers of the respectable households of Rome. In 25.1, Claudius, after a decision to restore ungrateful freedmen to their masters, responded to a tribunician challenge (Dio 60.28.1): 'negavit se adversus libertos ipsorum ius dicere'. The translation 'he would not hear cases brought against their own freedmen' (so too Edwards) is confusing. Suetonius is elliptical here, but Claudius surely ruled that he would not hear cases involving freedmen and their masters (cf. *OLD ius*, 4, Tac. *Ann*. 13.51, 'adversus publicanos ius dicere'; *OLD ipse*, 6)—that is, where freedmen wished to challenge their ex-owners at law. *Dumtaxat* in 25.3 should not be translated 'at least' in regard to Claudius' protection of the Roman *nomen*, but rather 'apart from' (*OLD* 2). The pamphlet entitled μωρῶν ἐπανάστασις (38.2) need not be a Menippean satire, but perhaps a serious Stoic treatise ('the resurrection of fools', since all non-Stoics were regarded as stupid). The thesis that no one feigns stupidity falls into the same category of paradox as that the wise man never dissembles (Stob. *Ecl*. 2.7.11m = 2 p. 108 Wachsmuth). 41.2: *plurimum* is wrongly taken to refer to Claudius' Roman history; rather, he wrote 'a good deal' (Edwards) even while emperor. These comments, however, should not be seen as detracting from the considerable value of H.'s commentary.

Victoria University of Wellington ARTHUR J. POMEROY

SUETONIUS' *VESPASIAN*

B. W. Jones (ed.): *Suetonius:* Vespasian. Pp. xviii + 142. London: Bristol Classical Press, 2000. Paper, £11.99. ISBN: 1-85399-584-3.

The appearance of Brian Jones's *Vespasian* is a most welcome addition to the growing BCP collection of Commentaries on Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars*; there can be few, if any, scholars active today who have published more extensively, or to better effect, than J. on the Flavians. This work, J.'s second contribution to the series (*Domitian* appeared in 1996), conforms to its general pattern: there is a useful introduction with an account of Suetonius' career, sources, and works, followed by an analysis and critique of the *Vespasian*. The text is essentially that of Ihm's Teubner (1908), with seven textual variants and changes in punctuation, spelling, and paragraphing. One notes with regret that BCP is still quite unable to print Greek intelligibly: witness 23.1 and the corresponding lemmata in the commentary. The commentary itself is brisk,

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.23 Published online by Cambridge University Press

fairly brief, and full of useful information (mostly historical, but with occasional discussions of text and translation). This is followed by a detailed bibliography over twelve pages in length; however, there are, as usual, no maps or indexes.

In any work such as this, it is inevitable that certain items will make a marked impression, either good or bad. Particularly useful are notes on Vespasian's wife Domitilla (*Vesp.* 3), especially on *Latinaeque condicionis . . .*; on Titus at 4.6, on *inter legatos maiore filio assumpto*; on 8.4, a brief (four lines) but very complicated passage on Vespasian's provincial creations and reorganizations, which gives rise to almost six pages of discussion; on 8.5–9.1, with over six pages of comment on Vespasian's restoration of the city of Rome and his new public works; at 14, with an excellent note on Mettius Pompusianus and his horoscope; on 16.1–18, where Vespasian's financial policies generate nine pages of useful commentary; and, finally, on 23.4, with a sensitive discussion of the famous *puto deus fio* remark. By contrast, there are a few minor factual slips at: 6.2, on *Moesiaci exercitus . . .*, where there is no reference to *Vit*. 15.1, which is essential to the discussion about when Moesian legionaries first declared for Vespasian; 8.1, on *in urbem reuersus*: Vespasian could not possibly have reached Rome early in October 70—it was more probably mid-November; 8.3, on *classiarios*: Puteoli is not '12 km north of Naples'; 13.1, on *Licinium Mucianum*: there is total muddle in the cross-reference to '7.1, s.u. *deposita simultate*'; 19.2 on *in Tiberim*: Tiberius' body was *not* dumped in the Tiber (cf. 23.4, on *Mausoleum*); also, at 2.2, on *fratre adepto* and *latum clauum*: discussion of the senatorial 'broad stripe' found on toga and tunic will baffle the unwary; while 3, on *Antoniae* (Antonia the Younger), concludes with a sentence which is simply meaningless, since the previous note refers to Caenis; and 4.5, on *caeso praeposito*, requires explanation of 'the Antonia's garrison'.

With regard to scholarly references, J. has long used the 'Smith, 1995: 53–55' system, where the full citation is contained in the main bibliography at the back of the book; this obliges a moderately attentive reader to flip pages back-and-forth incessantly. However, in this work there are eleven such citations which simply do not appear in the bibliography (page references are given in brackets): A. R. Birley, 1986 (13); Shotter, 1998 (28); Adam-Beyewitz, 1997 (39); Lindsay, 1995 (44); Stroebel, 1985 (62); Mitford, Timothy, 1980 (64 bis, 65); Schieber, 1976 (65); Dąbrowa, 1988 (65); Devrecker, 1980a (73, 75); Wallace-Hadrill, 1982 (78); and Vitucci, 1956 (132). Some of these mysteries can be fathomed, but an 'author + short title' system of reference is much easier to use. Contrariwise (and more subjectively), one notices certain discussions where there are surprising bibliographical omissions, not all of which are recent: at *Vesp.* 4.4, on *inter comites Neronis* (and elsewhere), H. Halfmann, *Itinera Principum* (Stuttgart, 1986); at 5.4, on *canis extrarius . . . subiecit*, A. Scobie's excellent paper on filthy living conditions in the Roman world, *Klio* 68 (1986), 399–433; at 5.7, on *duas aquilas*, two separate episodes are confused: see M. G. Morgan, *RhM* 136 (1993), 321–9; at 16.1, on *noua et grauia addidisse*, M. Alpers, *Das nachrepublikanische Finanzsystem. Fiscus und Fisci in der frühen Kaiserzeit* (Berlin and New York, 1995); and at 23.4, on *Mausoleum*, E. Dąbrowa, 'The Origin of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*: a Hypothesis', *MAAR* 41 (1996), 153–61. Finally, although typographical errors are rare and trivial, there are a few incorrect references to Dio's *Roman History* (always problematic, given the state of the text) on pp. xvi–xvii, 25, 46, and 69.

In summary, this is a valuable work, marred slightly by rather too many slips and omissions: like ancient biographers, modern commentators need attentive and eagle-eyed editors!

University of Western Ontario C. L. MURISON

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.23 Published online by Cambridge University Press