appreciation (p. 201) of the limitations of archaeological evidence. Potter's discussion of army and navy (pp. 66–88) shows an uncertain grasp of the period of crisis. The dismissal of Tiberius Gracchus' claims of depopulation (p. 79) is a trifle glib. He was in a better position to see what was going on than we are. Land hunger is exaggerated (p. 82), while the political consciousness of the Roman soldiers is downplayed (p. 84)—partly, I suspect, because of a failure to recognize that Sulla was a champion of the republic (p. 84). The bracketing with Caesar is false in that it fails to recognize the generational difference.

This, then, is what a trawl of a large part of this book yields. The verdict must be favourable. For someone approaching the topic for the first time there is a good deal of information here presented, for the most part in accessible form. A fairly generous bibliography should ensure, as the editor wishes, further exploration. This may allow readers to solve what I could not. Who has got it right about the quinquereme, Potter (p. 77) or Lazenby (p. 228)?

University of Kent at Canterbury ARTHUR KEAVENEY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni132

PRISONERS OF WAR

K.-W. Welwei: Sub Corona Vendere. *Quellenkritische Studien zu Kriegsgefangenschaft und Sklaverei in Rom bis zum Ende des Hannibalkrieges*. (Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei 34.) Pp. viii + 181. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2000. Paper, DM 48. ISBN: 3-515-07845-2.

This meticulous study brings to fruition a project originally undertaken by the late Gottfried Prachner. The monograph is, however, wholly W.'s work, with citation of Prachner's drafts in some footnotes.

The bulk of the work assembles and critically analyses the evidence for prisoners of war taken in Roman wars down to 201 B.C., focusing particularly on texts reporting numbers captured. In collecting and evaluating this material W. has performed a valuable service, providing a more complete presentation of the evidence than was previously available and bringing out clearly the problems which it poses. The results are to a considerable extent negative. Many of the reported numbers of captives are unreliable (like the associated numbers of killed), and even the more reliable figures often pose problems of interpretation. There is sometimes a lack of clarity about whether some or all of the victims were already slaves at capture, and it is not always certain that enslavement was their ultimate fate: ransoming is only occasionally attested, but is likely to have occurred more often. We can never be sure what proportion of those sold as slaves ended up working for Roman owners: the merchants who bought them may have disposed of many in other markets. W. prudently eschews any attempt to estimate the total number of those captured or of those serving as Roman slaves.

W.'s circumspect approach is particularly apt in the case of the Third Samnite War. Livy recounts this war in much greater detail than earlier conflicts, and includes frequent reports of numbers killed and captured (only sparingly recorded in his earlier narrative). W. V. Harris (*War and Imperialism in Republican Roman 327–70 B.C.* [Oxford, 1979], p. 59) tabulated the notices of captives, and several subsequent writers

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

have followed him in taking an optimistic view of their reliability. W.'s careful discussion (pp. 42–50) brings out well the numerous problems of reliability and interpretation posed by these Livian notices. (One further point may be added to his observations: the capture of three Samnite forts reported at Livy 10.18.8 may well be a doublet of the captures narrated at 10.17.1–10.) W. rightly concludes that it is impossible to estimate the number captured and enslaved in this war, but that we can, nonetheless, be sure that the war (and in particular the invasions of the Samnite heartlands) yielded far more captives than any earlier Roman conflict, and that the majority of these ended up as Roman agricultural slaves.

Besides studying the captive reports, W. provides a more general discussion of the rôle of slavery and in particular of the enslavement of war captives in the Roman economy down to 201 B.C. He argues convincingly that enslavement through war will have been practised at Rome from very early times, and that there were sharp increases in the volume of such enslavements, first when the capture of Veii began Roman expansion and secondly with the Third Samnite War. The significant military rôle of slaves, as attendants, rowers, and emergency troops, in the Second Punic War confirms how numerous they had by then become at Rome. Peasants by origin, most of those enslaved in Roman wars will have ended up as agricultural slaves; not all of these will have worked for the élite, for farmers of quite modest means may have been able to afford some slaves. W.'s analysis provides valuable support for the now widely held view that the widespread use of rural slave labour was not a sudden new development of the second century B.C., but had from long before been a well-established feature of the Roman economy.

W. is inclined to take an optimistic view of the capacity of the slave population in this period to reproduce itself, and thinks that this may be the main way in which demand was met in 290–264 B.C., when he holds that the level of war enslavements will have been relatively low (pp. 62–4, 145–6). However, the shortage of captive reports for that period merely reflects the inadequacy of our sources resulting from the loss of Livy's account. Roman forces invaded the homelands of their enemies in southern Italy in 282 and frequently from 278 on. Dio (fr. 40.27) has Pyrrhus remark that his allies' lands had been so ravaged that one could not tell whether they had ever been settled, and it seems likely that the warfare of this period was no less productive of captives than the Third Samnite War.

W. has an interesting discussion of the practicalities of large-scale slave sales in a non-monetized economy (pp. 53–61). However, he may underestimate what was feasible in such a system: it seems unlikely that, as he maintains (pp. 35–8, following Clerici), the introduction of the 5% tax on manumissions should be downdated from the transmitted date of 357 to 241.

University of Nottingham J. W. RICH
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni133

PATER PATRIAE

B. SEVERY: *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire*. Pp. xiv + 280, ills. New York and London: Routledge, 2003. Cased, £60. ISBN: 0-415-30959-X.

This book deserves the most careful reading. The author has two theses. The first is relatively uncontroversial: it is that Augustus made maximum use of members of his

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni133 Published online by Cambridge University Press