PRISONS

C. Bertrand-Degenbach, A. Chauvot, M. Matter, J.-M. Salamito: *Carcer: prison et privation de liberté dans l'Antiquité classique* (Actes du colloque de Strasbourg, 5 et 6 Decembre 1997). Pp. 250. Paris: De Boccard, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 2-7018-0127-3.

As with any such collection of papers, the reviewer has not space to discuss them all. The first part deals with legal and concrete themes, the second with more sociological issues. Unsurprisingly the great majority of the papers are in French. The introduction points out that Livy relates that Ancus Martius built a prison in the centre of the City, and that Vitruvius thought the prison an essential building for any city. These views hardly support Mommsen's limitation of imprisonment to detention before trial or execution.

The first two papers deal with imprisonment for debt, in the Greek world by Maffi, among the Romans by Lintott.

Santalucia, writing in Italian, discusses the imprisonment of Naevius. He concludes that the *tresviri* were the equivalent of *juges d'instruction*, passing to a competent magistrate their adverse conclusions on the prisoners they held, but releasing where there was no case. Lovato, who also writes in Italian, picks up Cicero's *poena sine provocatione* (*De Leg. Ag.* 2.13.33). Traditional *provocatio* protected against death or flogging; the *lex Iulia de vi* replaced Republican legislation, but there is no mention of protection against *vincula* in D. 48.6.7, although it could be read into the text. I found these two papers and the next among the most interesting in the collection. Yann Rivière, building on an earlier article in *MEFRA*, comes closer to Mommsen's view that prison was not a proper penalty, based partly on the absence of archaeological evidence. He ranges from the Verrines to Apollonius of Tyana.

Halm-Tisserant writes from an archaeological and technical point of view on prison in Greece and particular forms of constraint. A. Marcone finds that prison in Graeco-Roman Egypt was above all preventive, and designed to put pressure on an accused. Prison conditions were terrible—heat and hunger, particularly if there was no bribery of the gaolers. M. Matter is also concerned with Egypt, where he finds under the Empire permanent as well as temporary detention, but prison does not seem to have been used systematically.

Pavar Pilon, writing in Spanish, holds that judicial torture was normal in prison, citing—not entirely convincingly—the Acts of the Christian Martyrs at Lyons, and the martyrdom of James and Marian. She also observes the ready admission of visitors, including priests coming in to see Christians.

In the second half Krause starts by saying that one cannot write on crime without taking account of how state and society fight it. Fear of crime was, like the decay of morals, a literary topos, not necessarily reflecting reality. He finds the evidence weighted towards the Later Empire, when prisons existed everywhere, and there were even some efforts at prison reform, e.g. by Libanius. Perhaps this was linked with actual Christian experience of prison? Possibly K. gives too much weight to Egyptian evidence.

S. Vilatte discusses loss of liberty by confinement to an island in the Greek, Hellenistic, and Roman worlds in a rather abstract paper focusing on literary treatment of such a plight. X. Lafon discusses the relegation of members of the imperial family to the Tyrrhenian islands, too small and poor to sustain a natural population. He

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.124 Published online by Cambridge University Press

points out that in the modern world too these islands have been used both as prisons and as exclusive holiday places. The harshness of exile he reckons as another topos.

A. Chauvot discusses detention under Tiberius. Exile to a fixed place and condemnation to forced labour are both found in his reign. Mommsen thought Tiberius introduced them as penalties (whereas I incline to think this was Claudius), but C. thinks that the cases are an exercise of *coercitio* rather than the development of lawful penalties. He holds that the shadow of Tiberius reached forward to Tacitus, Suetonius, and even Dio, rather than seeing a back-projection from the reigns of Domitian or Commodus.

E. Évrard looks at Seneca's treatment of confinement, using word counts of such terms as *vincula*, *carcer*, *exilium*, but his basic theme is Seneca's Stoicism. J.-M. Salamito, citing various twentieth-century biblical scholars, is concerned with whether St Paul's companions in captivity were fellows in their captivity to Christ, as philology might suggest, or literally in prison with him.

C. Bertrand-Degenbach writes on prison as deliberately a place of terror, both a literary topos and a reality. Its use suggested tyranny; it was rated by Seneca between exile and death. There is no trace of a pre-Christian Roman enduring prison's disgrace with fortitude, not even Socrates, because it was designed to strip the prisoner of all dignity. It was Christianity, and Stoicism, which supported Boethius.

Chauvot wrote the conclusions to the colloquium's set of papers. Prison is an aspect of the state. There is little on prisons and prisoners in ancient literature; indeed, a prisoner is invisible because of his condition. Physical suffering and psychological degradation, like categorical torture, were designed to produce confessions. The more involved the magistrate or official in the investigatory process, the more the use of prison.

There is an index of sources, and two of technical terms connected with the deprivation of liberty, Greek and Latin, and this is probably good enough for the proceedings of a colloquium. The footnotes are where they should be, at the foot of the page. There was a misprint on p. 169, but in general this was a very well-produced as well as a very interesting book.

University of Glasgow O. F. ROBINSON

AMPHITHEATRES

D. L. Bomgardner: *The Story of the Roman Amphitheatre*. Pp. xix + 276, figs, pls. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. Cased, £60. ISBN: 0-415-16593-8.

What do the Royal Fireworks of King George II, Spanish bull-fighting, Renaissance 'pageants' and courtly 'masques', and early Medieval circus troupes have in common? In a final flourish, Bomgardner suggests that all these may be considered in some ways as the heirs of the shows produced in Roman amphitheatres. This may give some sense of the wide range of material included in this book, which is, however, at the same time frustratingly limited in scope. Though ambitious in its chronological framework, it discusses only a limited range of amphitheatres, picking out some of the old favourites (the 'Colosseum', Pompeii, Puteoli, Capua, Verona, Arles, and Nîmes), before presenting a detailed analysis of the amphitheatres of North Africa. Admittedly, a work of this sort cannot aim to cover everything, but this concentration upon Gallia Narbonensis, Italy, and North Africa is not convincingly justified by

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.124 Published online by Cambridge University Press