of those involved. This is an issue broached by the two most polemic pieces here, which are those by Woolf on Gaul and Jameson on Britain. Woolf argues that notions of Romanization, which he calls 'Romanisation theory', ought to be entirely abandoned. Instead, he looks to what he calls a 'cultural revolution', which he sees taking place both at Rome and in the provinces. Woolf suggests that, *inter alia*, the development of *terra sigillata* shows participation in this revolution by Gauls. He points out that such an approach allows us to avoid what he sees as false questions concerning agency and provincial resistance, opening the way to see changes in Gaul as a local aspect of a much broader movement of social change. This is a novel approach, but in the end seems not to explain why those living in this period thought they were indulging in Roman, as opposed to just new, cultural practices.

James's piece is perhaps both more polemical and more carefully nuanced. He examines Terrenato's negotiation hypothesis of cultural change and, while finding it useful in parts, also exposes its shortcomings both in its failure to deal with Rome's use of force and in the narrowness of its focus. As James notes, it finds no room to discuss Rome's cultural impact or the lack of it on the broad mass of the population of the provinces as opposed to local aristocracies. He goes on to argue for the need to distinguish firmly between these two groups, pointing out that acquisition of Roman culture by non-Roman aristocrats could easily be a product of a wish to separate themselves from the rest of the population and demonstrate their superiority to it. The 'bottom' of a 'bottom-up' interpretation of Romanization can be much nearer the top of society than is often envisaged. Oddly again there is no use of the literary evidence (most obviously Tacitus, *Agricola* 21, but also Plutarch, *Sertorius* 14) which would help strengthen his case.

James uses a contemporary example of drinking Coca-Cola to show how an artefact from one culture can be happily used by another culture which is actively hostile to it. His choice of period is significant. Several of the authors here look to prehistory to cast light on issues of Romanization. James shows that it is the mental at least as much as the physical environment we need to study to help resolve these problems. Prehistory can give us no aid here, and it would surely make more sense to use the much richer material and literary record of cultural interaction from historical periods as our point of comparison. The copious documentation of Spain's experience in the new world is one of many potentially fertile areas worth exploring here.

In general this book is a stimulating read and, despite a tendency to overstatement at times, provides a valuable contribution to an important debate about the nature of the ancient world.

University of Manchester A. T. FEAR

ROMAN SOCIAL HISTORY

S. Treggiari: *Roman Social History*. Pp. xiii + 170. London and New York: Routledge, 2002. Paper, £9.99. ISBN: 0-415-19522-5 (0-415-19521-7 hbk).

This short handbook will be invaluable to students starting to study Roman social history. It contains a general introduction to the subject, an examination of the types of evidence available, a brief sketch of the salient characteristics of Roman society,

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.165 Published online by Cambridge University Press

two chapters illustrating possible approaches (on Tullia and on religion and the *domus*) showing in detail how source material can yield results, and finally a guide to research tools. It concentrates upon literary evidence, without altogether neglecting other sources, such as epigraphy and archaeology.

It is suitable for students embarking for the first time upon the subject without any knowledge of Latin. The text is presented in a lively style, drawing interesting parallels with modern situations. It is also eminently affordable, and will be of use to students both as a reference tool and as an introduction to the subject. This is because the book explores in some detail (Chapters 2 and 6) how to pursue research, and constantly suggests ways in which a student could continue beyond the bounds of this book, encouraging those new to the subject to have the courage to develop their own approach to a particular topic. Students of ancient history in general can take away many invaluable messages from the book, such as the necessity to chase up primary references, and the reason why these should then be listed (p. 11). A general principle like this is then illustrated through a particular example—in this case, discussion of the evidence for the murder of Julius Caesar displays the complexity of different kinds of primary ancient sources. Both by demonstrating good practice and by drawing attention to it in her Chapters 4 and 5, which deal with case-studies, Treggiari provides sound guidance for students.

One of the most noteworthy achievements of this slim volume is that the author succeeds in writing for the novice and at the same time avoids talking down to her reader or oversimplifying the subject. For instance, the basic problem of writing 'social history' is tackled (p. 5), and T. constantly shows how social themes cannot be explored in isolation from their contemporary political situation (e.g. p. 99 on Cicero's house), even though time frames created by political events do not necessarily provide the most satisfactory background against which to explore social history (p. 4). A sense of chronology pervades her chosen case-studies, which focus on the period *c.* 100 B.C. to *c.* A.D. 235. Despite the fact that the book is aimed at readers without knowledge of Latin, T. also rightly persists in using Latin words in her text, and shows in detail why confronting terminology in the original language is necessary (p. 103). Furthermore, she challenges students to use standard academic reference works such as *PIR* and *RE*, explaining how these may yield results even to those without the linguistic skills necessary to read every word in them.

Only minor quibbles can be raised with regard to the book. The first couple of pages seemed unduly laborious, discussing what is meant by 'history', and risked confusing a new student by referring to Herodotus without setting him in context. In fact, the index serves as a way of setting a name in its historical context—the entry for Herodotus includes the information that he wrote during the fifth century B.C.; similarly, Vespasian (alluded to on p. 46 without any contextualization) is qualified as 'emperor 69–79'. But it is not immediately obvious that the index has this extra function. Occasionally, details may confuse the novice, such as the unexplained naming of the 'Umbrian' Plautus (p. 22). Maps of Italy and the empire would have been useful in identifying locations mentioned in the text, following T.'s own precept that 'We should have maps constantly before our eyes' (p. 42). Otherwise, a little more detail would have been welcome in the general chapters at the start of the book, without running the risk of making the book over long. For example, one further short sentence could be added to elucidate the brief comment that the senatorial decree on Piso 'is a rich source for social conventions' (p. 15).

University of Warwick ALISON E. COOLEY

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.165 Published online by Cambridge University Press