the final chapter is the startling suggestion that, in need of advice on how to handle the crisis of 415, the Athenians turned to Herodotus for reliably researched information, asking him to read to the Council and Assembly some relevant material from his *Histories*, which had been written over the previous decade in direct response to Athens' current situation (114–18, 191, 315). In arguing this, as in defending his views on Thucydides, M. displays much ingenuity, but the evidence which he manages to scrape together is hardly strong enough to support a fundamentally implausible scenario. In Thucydides' case, we are asked to believe that he gathered extensive notes on speeches delivered from 433 onwards (306–7), but kept no record of events, since he had no intention of writing a history until 37 years later, and that his 'archaeology' was not, as he said, an attempt to prove that the Peloponnesian War was the greatest war ever, but a veiled discussion of the relative positions of Sparta and Athens on the eve of the Corinthian War (316–18). We are implicitly asked to accept also that Thucydides regarded, say, the Corcyrean civil war of 427 as more pertinent to Athens' current political situation than the Athenian civil war of 403, or the effects of the plague on Athenian society as more relevant than the impact of Persian support on the international balance of power. And finally, we are asked to assume that the same people who normally let themselves be guided by mythical precedent, or by the dollops of scrambled history spooned out by the likes of Andocides (3.3–12) and Aeschines (2.172–6), were on occasion so moved by a concern for historical accuracy that they would – apparently – commission the longest briefing paper ever written and sit listening for days to absorb the last little detail of Demosthenes' Acarnanian campaigns or the finds of 'Carian' pottery during the purification of Delos. It is not easy to imagine a world in which historians are treated with such respect – not to mention paid more than a talent of silver to read selections of their work (386 n. 51). But what a wonderful world it would be.

HANS VAN WEES

NOTES

1. *Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta*. By Stephen Hodkinson. Duckworth and the Classical Press of Wales, London, 2000. Pp. xiii + 498, with 26 figures. £48.00.
2. *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*. Edited by A. B. Bosworth and E. J. Baynham. Oxford U.P., 2000. Pp. ix + 370, with 18 figures. £35.00.
3. *The Emptiness of Asia*. Aeschylus' *Persians* and the History of the Fifth Century. By Thomas Harrison. Duckworth, London, 2000. Pp. 191. £40.00.
4. *The School of History*. Athens in the Age of Socrates. The Joan Palevsky Imprint in Classical Literature. By Mark Munn. University of California Press, 2000. Pp. xvi + 525, with frontispiece and 11 illustrations and 4 maps. £23.50.

Roman History

The theme of old *versus* new is insistent, cheeringly not to the detriment of the latter, and two wishes for the future emerge. Most conspicuous is the new edition of Volume XI of the *CAH*, sixty-four years on with the triumphalist title *The Imperial Peace* transformed into [B]★*The High Empire*,[1] and different contents: wars and frontiers are present, but yield before demography and literacy. Note too that Egypt, Christianity, and Law are allocated to neighbouring volumes. Gestation was long, the baby a heavyweight. Libraries and scholars will buy, students take it down for essays, laymen consult it confidently, if with

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/48.2.239 Published online by Cambridge University Press

heavy hearts. I wish sections could be sold separately to reach institutions and individuals unable to afford the volume, or intimidated. There is so much to grip and inform: the narratives; A. R. Whittaker's compelling, gung-ho account of foreign policy. But perhaps its greatest boon lies in chapters giving access to the work of leading European scholars otherwise unavailable to monoglot students. So courage! Next, something for a shelf close to F. Millar's *The Emperor in the Roman World* of 1977: Clifford Ando's rich B★★*Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*.[2] A century ago the author's thesis did not need arguing. The long-lived Empire rested on gradually realized consensus: Roman rule was justified, produced by complex conversation between centre and peripheries; and the charismatic imperial office guaranteed orderly functioning of the bureaucracy (410). The ideology was internalized. Initially Ando brandishes wearisome sociological credentials; but he has read widely, far into the later Empire (it is in earlier phases that one finds occasional slips), and, more importantly, with extraordinary insight, as on *pater* and *pater patriae* (403f.). Providentially, he offers an *Index locorum*; anyone may benefit from individual interpretations. Despite the stress on communication, verbal and visual (but illustrations are scanty), readers conditioned against imperialism may rejoice that Ando's thesis cannot be 'proved' for a millennium of countless ethnic identities, let alone individuals, when the articulate among them were Greeks, practised diplomats, and Romans, practised hypocrites, and both self-deceivers too. And the conditioned, recalling the mentality that produced earlier favourable appraisals, will ask about perceptions of the contemporary hegemony. But it was time for a reconsideration, and this is a fine and profound one. Immediately next to W. V. Harris's *Rome in Etruria and Umbria* of 1971 G. Bradley's B★★*Ancient Umbria*[3] will take on honourable place, adjusting the historical focus on the basis of new material and reinterpretation of old (*e.g.*, later Latinization of inscriptions, 214). Bradley's thesis (courageous, for it makes nothing simple for the author) is the complexity of Umbria, the importance of seeing it as a group of organized *states*, not to be devalued because urbanization came late. Without jargon Bradley justifies and sums up his views in his first and last chapters and takes readers chronologically through the evidence of monuments, artefacts, epigraphy, literature, and coinage down to the integration (four appendices set it out), with a swipe at the 'Romanization' that neglects influences from Etruria and elsewhere. Continuity in our subject is illustrated by contiguous publication of two first books with that of one by a practised hand indeed. Ramsay MacMullen could not be bettered for the irresistible subject of B★★*Romanization in the Time of Augustus*,[4] which asks how the (material) changes that swept over the Roman world in that dynamic period came about. The author's reading is much in evidence and he will enthral travellers who have noticed traces from Lyon to Lepcis. He has no agonies over 'Romanization' (it is 'Italianization'); the changes were willed by Rome's subjects, not imposed, and 'ideology' is dismissed: 'pull', not 'push' (113). At times a list-like quality, due to the massive evidence on parade, baffles his aims, accessible though the style is, and the work cries out for illustration beyond austere drawings, maps (not all with scales), and sparse photographs. There are quaint slips, probably escaped from earlier writers, to eliminate in further editions: it is misleading to offer modern equivalents for ancient sums, even with health-warning (67), or to admit 'middle-class' (121). A desideratum in the bibliography is S. Mitchell and M. Waelkens's *Pisidian Antioch* of 1998. But no reader can fail to benefit, and there are engrossing sections: the Latinity of Iberia (84); skull-niches in Gallic residences (109). Jane Chaplin's

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/48.2.239 Published online by Cambridge University Press

book is based on her doctoral thesis of 1993; hence time to mature (and to provide translations); B★★*Livy's Exemplary History*[5] has the rigour of that origin, besides exhibiting an appendix ('Models for imitation and avoidance'), and an *index locorum* as well as a general index. The work makes a significant contribution to the revaluation of Livy as an historian – in an unexpected direction, by giving a familiar item new life and interest: *exempla* do not have fixed meanings. Livy's narrative, besides occasionally offering his own *exempla*, constantly depicts people scrutinizing and using historical knowledge, 'focalizing' it or attempting to persuade others (2f.), and he has internal audiences as well as readers, neither passive. First, the Caudine Forks disaster is followed through its vicissitudes as an *exemplum*; Chapter 2 (Cannae) shows Romans rejecting guidelines; then (Chapter 3f.) the authority of history yields to contemporary concerns; *exempla* and generations both conflict. Tensions with the past are further dealt with as precedents in Chapter 5. Behind lies Livy's own awareness of history's complexity and his interest in establishing continuity between past and present; the famous *Praefatio* 10 then needs reinterpretation (history as something to be pondered, 136). Ultimately Chapman is concerned with Livy's crucial present (no wonder Romans are seen as superior historians! 74), so she shifts to a reinterpretation of Augustus' Forum *elogia* (as a means of selling *ornamenta triumphalia*; this will not convince everybody). But, almost jargon-free, clearly and attractively written, this book is – exemplary of its kind. The Bristol Classical Press's useful series of Suetonius' *Lives* has a new addition, B. W. Jones's B★★*Suetonius Vespasian*,[6] which is much needed because the text itself is so skimpy (eight and a half pages) and the most recent English commentary is G. W. Mooney's of 1930. Jones gives generously of his learning and reading of recent scholarly works (but we still have 'senatorial' provinces, 19); the notes often carry the reader beyond the lemma to large topics on which it is good to have Jones's expertise. But he is a bit sweeping on 'the standard penalty for treason', with reference to Tiberius Gracchus (21), and do we need to know of the 'most interesting' example of a *SC* (69)? Jones has theses, notably and reasonably against Vespasian's *avaritia*, which was only financial prudence, and for Suetonius' scholarliness. A translation would have made this book even more useful, not only of the text, but also of substantial passages quoted; why offer the Gospels in the Vulgate? (56). Jones eschews Greek, not surprisingly: in the text it has sixteen slips in four lines; other misprints are few. Jones always gives fair discussion to disputed points; naturally some of his explicit and implicit claims may raise questions: the 'removal' of Claudius (26), for instance, and more importantly Jones's playing down of the poverty and humiliation of the Flavians under Claudius and Nero (e.g., 31) because they played it all up; there are items (5.3) that no self-respecting politician would want remembered. The clangour of conflicts, old and newer, resonates in ★★*Caesar und Vercingetorix*, by C. Goudineau and others.[7] Finely produced and illustrated by French authors and German publishers as a score of essays featuring joint French and German excavations, as well as those of Napoleon III (at random: 'Caesar'; 'Der Feldzug nach Lutecia: linkes oder rechtes Ufer?'; 'Die Schlacht von Alesia'), it is a guide for German-speakers, concluding with practical information, not a student's text. Anyone could learn from the illustrations (though not about the face of Vercingetorix from the coin on the cover); most piquant is the contrast between the amateurish Rubensesque nudity of Chassériau's 1855 painting and the sober checks worn by current museum dummies. To students of Spain and of Appian's account of Roman conflicts there, J. S. Richardson

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/48.2.239 Published online by Cambridge University Press

has performed a signal service, B★*Appian Wars of the Romans in Iberia*.[8] Richardson painstakingly elucidates geographical chaos, chronological difficulties, and prosopographical confusions, making sense of snakes-and-ladders Roman progress and throwing light into what for monoglot readers was a dark area of the Roman world. The translation is not exempt from inconsistencies over tense, nor is the English unblemished, but this is a distinguished contribution to the publisher's series, making one wish for a uniform *Civil Wars*. Two recent books have come out in new forms. B★*A History of Rome*, by M. Le Glay and others,[9] was favourably reviewed here,[10] though visibly Gallic origins were noticed; its use of the sources, illustrations, and maps were commended, like its inclusion of non-military, non-political history; students would welcome it. This edition preserves those merits, and answers a criticism, offering expanded coverage of the Republic, a new section on women and the family, and (why, with the reference books available?) a guide to classical writers; this while reducing the bulk by 45 pages. A random twig inserted into this mound of information hit on Cyrenaica: it was one of the 'conquests between 241 and 271 B.C.', attaining stability after 27 united with Crete in a senatorial province (*sic passim*); the Cyrene edicts, brought on to show Augustus intervening and so discrediting Mommsen's diarchy (*sic*; have we time for this? What matters is why he had to intervene); and Cyrene's trade links with Ostia. On this useful and informative, then, after the glitch; but with some repetition and old baggage. In closer focus J. Bennett's B★*Trajan Optimus Princeps*[11] has been reissued with a page of corrections and additions based on new material and reviewers' comments. ('Barea Soranus was somewhat older than his two known daughters' [12] might have been recast.) Hence it is enough to recall A. Keaveney's verdict: a picture of the public man, 'a trifle dull' but 'full and learned', it 'amply fills the need for a biography of this great emperor.'[12]

BARBARA LEVICK

NOTES

1. *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Volume XI. *The High Empire, A.D. 70–192*. Edited by Alan K. Bowman, Peter Garnsey, and Dominic Rathbone. Cambridge U.P., 2000. Pp. xxi + 1222, with 2 figures, 11 maps, 6 tables, and 1 graph. £95.00. (The present writer was responsible for one chapter and has discounted it in treating the volume.)

2. *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. The Joan Palevsky Imprint in Classical Literature. Classics and Contemporary Thought. By Clifford Ando, University of California Press, 2000. Pp. xxi + 494, with 7 illustrations. £38.00.

3. *Ancient Umbria: State, Culture, and Identity in Central Italy from the Iron Age to the Augustan Era*. By Guy Bradley. Oxford U.P., 2000. Pp. xvi + 333, with 18 plates, 8 figures, and 2 maps. £50.00.

4. *Romanization in the Time of Augustus*. By R. MacMullen. Yale U.P., 2000. Pp. xii + 222, with 20 figures. £16.95.

5. *Livy's Exemplary History*. By Jane D. Chaplin. Oxford U.P., 2000. Pp. xii + 245. £40.00.

6. *Suetonius, Vespasian*. Edited with Introduction, Commentary and Bibliography. By Brian W. Jones. Bristol Classical Press, London, 2000. Pp. xviii + 142. Paper £11.99.

7. *Caesar and Vercingetorix*. Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie. By Christian Goudineau *et alii*. Phillip von Zabern, Mainz, 2000. Pp. iv + 71, with 100 plates in colour, 2 in black-and-white, and 14 line drawings. DM.48.

8. *Appian, Wars of the Romans in Iberia. Iberike*. With an Introduction, Translation and Commentary by J. S. Richardson. Aris & Phillips, Warminister, 2000. Pp. viii + 184, with 3 maps. Cloth £35.00, limp £13.25.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/48.2.239 Published online by Cambridge University Press

9. *A History of Rome*. By Marcel Le Glay, Jean-Louis Voisin and Yann le Bohec. Blackwell, Oxford and Malden, 2nd edition, 2001. Pp. xxiv + 563, with 55 plates, 32 figures, and 7 genealogical tables. Hard cover £70.00, paperback £16.99.
10. *G&R* 44 (1997), 254.
11. *Trajan, Optimus Princeps*. By Julian Bennett. Routledge, London and New York, 2nd edition 2001. Pp. xviii + 329, with 32 plates, 11 figures and maps. Paper £15.99.
12. *G&R* 45 (1998), 98.

Archaeology and Art

Suetonius relates how Vespasian, as it were, put one foot in the grave with tongue firmly in cheek. '*Vae*', *inquit*, '*puto deus fio*.' Such cynicism in the face of impending deification lingers on as a refreshing sentiment amid the often megalomaniac mortuary projects of emperors from Augustus to Constantine. But perhaps it could only have come from one such as Vespasian, who had no direct dynastic claim upon imperial power – and who may have cared little about the identity of his successor. For the central thesis of Penny Davies's study B★★*Death and the Emperor*[1] is that the monumental marking of an emperor's death was chiefly important for the purpose of achieving continuity of power. Vespasian's insouciance was therefore eccentric: for, as Davies states, 'quite apart from ensuring the emperor's continued existence after death, his apotheosis was a vital means of guaranteeing his descendants divine patronage, and thus setting them above potential pretenders to the throne.' The survey of this tradition brings together a number of monuments not usually grouped as a genre – so because it celebrates its honorand as *divus*, the Arch of Titus, for example, categorically joins the more obviously posthumous mausolea of Augustus and Hadrian; and familial 'supporting cast' monuments, such as the Ara Pacis and the relief panel showing the apotheosis of Hadrian's wife Sabina, are justifiably included. Given that the thesis here emphasizes the vested interest in the commemoration of a dead emperor by his actual, nominated or presumptuous descendants, some questions remain surprisingly unsettled (for instance: did Hadrian put a narrative frieze on Trajan's Column, or did Trajan plan it that way?). But overall this is a closely argued and coherent book, defining nuances of imperial iconography often overlooked. 'The emperor may be thought of as an architect in the broad sense of the term, as someone with the capacity for conceiving space and manipulating form; but if and when he did launch a specific design, its elaboration would have been the province of professionals.' This observation, made apropos of Hadrian, is reasonable enough. But it has also a partisan thrust. For Mark Wilson Jones, the author of B★★*Principles of Roman Architecture*,[2] is by training an architect; and it is a truth universally acknowledged that architects know best – except when a building goes wrong, in which case others are invariably at fault. This book is very much a professional appreciation and analysis of Roman architectural practice; proceeding on the premiss that while we have very little in the way of documentary evidence about individual Roman architects and their principles of design, a tireless tape measure and a sympathetic eye will yield the technical data and 'blue-print' strategies we desire. A first part of the book is devoted to considering the value of Vitruvius, and vicariously establishing a number of formal 'ground rules' of mensuration, geometry, and so on. Then two buildings are singled out for particular attention: Trajan's Column, and the Pantheon (on both of which the author has previously published his ideas, including the hypothesis that Hadrian – personally? – 'compromised' the Pantheon's frontal appearance). So this is not perhaps what its title

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/48.2.239 Published online by Cambridge University Press