Yale-graduated millionaires strolling through the rural Midwest with flannel shirts and down-home attitudes.

University of Kansas ANTHONY CORBEILL
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni344

CAH XI

A. Bowman, P. Garnsey, D. Rathbone (edd.): *The Cambridge Ancient History. Second edition. Vol. XI. The High Empire, A.D. 70–192*. Pp. xxi + 1222, map. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Cased, £95. ISBN: 0-521-26335-2.

It goes without saying that a new edition of a volume of the Cambridge Ancient History series is an eagerly awaited event, and that the usual line-up of distinguished scholars and editors ensures that expectations of authoritative coverage are fully met. This volume is a worthy contribution to the series, and will prove invaluable to student and scholar alike. With a project of this sort, there are always going to be areas which the individual reviewer feels receive short change (Latin literature is only discussed for its relationship to the 'Greek Second Sophistic', p. 919; Egypt no longer merits its own provincial chapter, although it does appear prominently in discussions of demography and literacy; Christianity too lacks its own chapter), and there are always going to be individual details of interpretation which do not meet with wholehearted approval (does it really make sense to view Vespasian's restoration of melted down inscriptions on the Capitol as a sign of his antiquarian interests (p. 21), rather than as a significant political gesture?). It is worth stepping back a little, however, in order to consider the justification for continuing with the present format of publication.

The Cambridge Ancient History series occupies a distinctive place within publications on ancient history, catering not only for a general educated audience but also for students and scholars. As such, each volume has to tread a judicious path, presenting an authoritative account of a particular period that is comprehensible to the lay reader as well as taking into account recent trends in scholarship and new discoveries. On the whole, this volume successfully achieves this aim, but there are a number of additional ways in which it could have catered for the student and lay reader.

Traditionally, plates are published separately for each volume, but these are not integrated into the text-based volume, and instead offer an independent, complementary view of a period. In *CAH* XI, this does make for a slightly old-fashioned feel, and does not help the authors of chapters on art and architecture, or on provinces for which our knowledge is overwhelmingly archaeological. The days of writing ancient history purely from texts and documents are now long past. This tension emerges clearly from the necessity of resorting to a reference on p. 110 to Pl. XIV (presumably of Speidel 1970) for the scene of the capture of Decebalus on Trajan's column. Even accepting, however, that a volume of *CAH* is not intended to be a picture-book, this particular volume does seem short of helpful illustrations, containing only two figures, six tables, and one graph (all relating only to two chapters), in addition to the standard maps of provinces. (Contrast the eighty-four text-figures in the second edition of *CAH* IV.) In Chapter 19, 'The Danube Provinces',

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni345 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for example, the descriptions of the layout of Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa (p. 591) and of Doclea (p. 592) would make more of an impact and would be much clearer if accompanied by ground-plans, and the chapter as a whole would benefit from the inclusion of plans of other towns and buildings too. The unenviable task of writing Chapter 34, 'Art and Architecture', without including any pictures might have been slightly eased by the inclusion of some line-drawings or plans (e.g. of the Villa Adriana on p. 976).

The other issue about accessibility is the way in which technical terms or phrases from sources in Greek and Latin are presented. As students increasingly come to ancient history through translation, it is crucial that they can use what is the standard reference work with ease. Of course, this is not to suggest that all words in Greek and Latin should be expunged from the text, but to transliterate a passage from Dio Cassius as 'tous te gennaiotatous kai tous aristous tous te plousiotatous' (p. 817) looks strange to someone who knows Greek and does nothing to help the non-linguist, since the phrase is not translated. Although many technical terms are explained, significant numbers of them remain without a gloss, so that some chapters look distinctly forbidding to non-linguists. Perhaps the volume as a whole could have included a glossary.

My main concern, however, is with the lack of consistency between chapters. On occasion, the need to produce a streamlined political narrative in Part I has resulted in a more cut-and-dried account of events than is perhaps justified. One need only compare the unproblematic presentation of the Hadrianic revolt in Judaea in Part I (p. 145) with the rather more tentative analysis in Chapter 22 (Judaea, pp. 671–4) to perceive the problem. Sometimes, the reverse is true too, however, with a more subtle analysis in Part I being swept aside in a later chapter. Thus, the thoughtful analysis of Domitian in Chapter 1 gives way to a simple explanation of his assassination as simply due to his megalomania in Chapter 34 (p. 971). Only by reading substantial chunks of *CAH* XI can the reader discover that what at first sight seems to be 'received opinion' on particular issues is in fact open to question. Thus, the martyrdom of Christians at Lugdunum/Lyons in A.D. 177 (p. 182) has recently been challenged (p. 490), albeit not entirely convincingly. More serious, though, is the way in which one contributor can appear unaware of the main argument of another's chapter. Comments about Roman fixed frontiers in Chapter 9 (p. 340) cannot easily be squared with the thrust of Chapter 8, 'Frontiers' (which, incidentally, also deserves a place on any reading list relating to the Augustan period). Slightly different views on the interpretation of patterns of citizenship grants and military *diplomata* can also be found in Chapters 9 and 11 (pp. 337, 366, 368). We would not expect scholars to agree on everything, of course, but it would have been useful to highlight differences of opinions, perhaps by inserting cross-references to alternative views expressed elsewhere in the volume. If a reader were to peruse only the one chapter in question, he would miss out on the uncertainties and complexities of interpretation which enrich our picture of the period.

I end with a list of the typographical and factual errors which I have spotted (remarkably few for such a weighty tome), in the hope that corrections may be made in any future reprints: p. 138 '17 July 122', not '22'; '*ab epistulis*', not '*ab poistulis*'; p. 147 'Baetican Ucubi', not 'Bactican'; p. 165 heading should be 'MARCOMANNIC', not 'MARCOMMANIC'; p. 176 '*Historia Augusta*', not '*Historica Augusta*'; p. 192 '*colonia Commodiana*', not '*Comodiana*'; p. 201 n.22a 'see now', not 'new'; p. 215 'year of the four emperors', not 'years'; p. 246 n. 26 'Eck

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni345 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1986b)', not '(1986)'; p. 261 'reign of Marcus Aurelius', not 'reigh'; p. 290 n. 99 'Eck (1992d)' not '(1992)'; p. 365 n. 14 'Spanish towns', not 'town'; p. 413 'Athenaeus', not 'Athanaeus'; p. 467 'risen', not 'arisen'; p. 469 'sometimes', not 'sometime'; p. 1143 Barnes (1981)—'T.D.', not 'J.'; p. 1209 romanization entry in index—'544', not '545'; p. 308 death of Gaius Caesar not in 2 B.C., but in A.D. 4; pp. 876 and 891 Villa of Papyri is at Herculaneum, not Pompeii (consequently index entries need changing); p. 887 attributing over 3,000 inscriptions to Ostia is probably an underestimate by a couple of thousand.

University of Warwick ALISON E. COOLEY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni345

THE THIRD AND FOURTH CENTURIES A.D.

D. S. POTTER: *The Roman Empire at Bay, AD 180–395*. (Routledge History of the Ancient World.) Pp. xxii + 762, maps, ills. London and New York: Routledge, 2004. Paper, £25. ISBN: 0-415-10058-5 (0-415-10057-7 hbk).

The Routledge History of the Ancient World nears completion. Over the last decade, the series has included volumes which are of great interest to both novice and specialist, striking a good balance between innovation and information. The book under review fits the pattern well. The first of a number of more general volumes dealing with the third century (the long-awaited *CAH* XII^2 should appear shortly, whilst Clifford Ando is working on a volume called *The Critical Century, AD 193–284* for EUP), *The Roman Empire at Bay* sets high standards. Its scope, chronologically, thematically and in terms of learning, is majestic; its size somewhat daunting at almost 800 pages, of which 133 are filled with endnotes and thirty-seven with bibliography.

The number of pages, however, is an absolute necessity in order to deal properly with the Roman Empire at large over a period of more than two centuries which saw several major transitions. These changes—political/institutional, socio-economic, and religious/intellectual—dominate the development of empire, as Potter makes abundantly clear. This was inevitable: 'no large institution can exist in a steady state' (p. xi). How transitions affect the institution thus becomes the central question. This question lies at the heart of the book. How did the Roman Empire change from being the greatest power in the world in A.D. 180 to its distinctly less dominant position in A.D. 395? Potter argues that the main cause was the creation of administrative homogenization through the hands of military and court bureaucracy. Thus, local reactions against imperial centralization, such as the 'empires' of Postumus in the West and Odaenathus in the East were, rather than a problem in themselves, 'a sign that the centralizing tendencies that were in evidence from the Severan period onwards had yet to choke the life out of' local institutions (p. 262). The growing gap between the interest of the ruling officials and the needs of the realm hampered the functioning of the empire as a whole. Even in 'political stability, the administrative apparatus of the army was not well suited to handing sudden threats' (p. 226). The third and fourth centuries, as this book makes clear once more, were anything but politically stable.

Changes to military and institutional structure are, as Potter rightly emphasizes,

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni345 Published online by Cambridge University Press