

F. has written very valuable detailed studies (fifty-two are listed in the bibliography, of which thirty(!) appeared in the years 1992–99), some in fact excellent, and many reappearing in the present work — but he seems strangely averse both to theoretical discussions and to constructing and presenting a synthesis. *Ad hoc* syntheses are to be found intermittently, but they simply drown in the overwhelming amount of empirical detail. Where such broader characterizations do indeed appear, they are employed to support a detailed argument of some kind rather than in their own right: as a means rather than as a result, argument rather than conclusion (e.g. 3.1, 82ff. on Claudius' temple at *Camulodunum*). In effect, these volumes ultimately constitute an annotated catalogue of sources — large and small, important and non-consequential sources, absolutely everything of greater or lesser relevance. And sometimes no relevance at all: e.g. 3.3, 256–8 deals with a statue base for a provincial *flamen*; on the sides of the base are sculpted standard sacrificial implements, *urceus* and *patera*; rather than simply giving a reference to Siebert's recent standard work on sacrificial tools and paraphernalia (A. V. Siebert, *Instrumenta Sacra. Untersuchungen zu römischen Opfer-, Kult- und Priestergeräten* (1999)), a full page is spent on describing the use of these gadgets in Roman sacrifice. There is no relevance whatsoever to the *flamen* or imperial cult as such, and in fact the iconography is completely generic: *urceus* and *patera* appear more often than not on any statue base of this period — whether to priests or anybody else. In other words, it tells us nothing whatsoever about imperial cult. This is an extreme case, perhaps, and F. should be given credit for his consistently interdisciplinary approach: all sources are taken equally seriously, whether literary, epigraphic, iconographic, or archaeological. In spite of intermittent signs of haste and fluctuations in the quality of F.'s judgement, this attitude is exemplary.

F.'s empiricist project smacks, for better or worse, of the positivism of an earlier age, the idea that if all sources be collected and published, some kind of ultimate truth — or historiographical theory of everything — would become attainable. Yet it would be grossly unfair to merely scoff at such nineteenth-century optimism: it resulted in impressive monuments of scholarship, such as Pauly-Wissowa, immensely useful tools in constant use today. Likewise with F.'s monumental series of tomes. The absence of synthesis, or of discussions of theory or methodology — and the regrettable lack of translations of Greek and Latin quotations — makes them far too demanding for most students, who will simply drown in this sea of empiricism. However, present and future scholars will return to them time and again as the obvious starting point for a vast number of questions of detail or individual shrines, in search of evidence, of analysis, of opinions and discussions, and of further literature. And will discover all these in opulence. F.'s green tomes constitute a rich quarry whence readers can pick their stones, cut them into novel shapes if so desired, and erect new monuments.

Wolfson College, Oxford

ITTAI GRADEL

B. CAMPBELL, *WAR AND SOCIETY IN IMPERIAL ROME, 31 BC–AD 284*. London: Routledge, 2002. Pp. xiv + 208, 9 pls, 9 figs. ISBN 0-4152-7881-3 (bound); 0-4152-7882-1 (paper). £50.00 (bound); £15.99 (paper).

Producing a coherent and comprehensive synthesis of imperial warfare and its place in contemporary Roman society in two hundred pages is a tough task, but one that Brian Campbell has boldly taken up, and one at which he has been largely successful. The book, like others in Routledge's *Warfare and History* series, is aimed at students and the general reader, and sets out to provide a general survey of and introduction to the current state of the subject rather than presenting new research by the author, and brings together perhaps for the first time between two covers discussions that usually inhabit rather different areas of Roman historical study: there is much here for the political or social historian as well as the military enthusiast. C.'s chapters are well-informed by recent scholarship, as can be seen in the prominence given to two particular areas that have been the subject of many recent publications: the army as an 'institution' and its relationship with Roman society more broadly, and the 'Roman face of battle'.

The text is an easy read. C. does not assume any understanding of ancient languages or significant prior knowledge of the subject, and the reader keen to learn more can delve into the gold-mine of the footnotes. These are extensive, densely packed with references, sometimes continue the arguments and discussions outlined in the main text, such as ch. 4's footnote 64 which provides rough calculations of the huge bite out of the imperial budget that the army made, and occasionally allow the author a bit more opportunity to engage himself in the debates. C. disagrees with Cornell that the élite of the early Empire were disinterested in war (ch. 1, n. 70),

but tends to agree with Alston's argument that auxiliary pay was equal to that of legionaries (ch. 4, n. 63). Though this book is a hugely expanded version of C.'s paper in Raaflaub and Rosenstein's *War and Society in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds* (1999), one cannot help feeling that the current work would have been more satisfying, certainly for the reader and perhaps for the author, had there been greater opportunity for direct engagement with these discussions. Sometimes the existence of different interpretations is ignored, such as the strength of the legion's first cohort in the first century A.D., and the question of whether there was distinctively different equipment for legionaries and auxiliaries. C. makes very full use of the literary sources, the obscure ones often noted as being available in translation in his *The Roman Army: a Sourcebook* (1994), and indeed in many ways the two books are companions, the earlier volume providing the exempla to the theories presented in the later. However, as in the sourcebook, C. makes disappointingly little use of archaeological material: military tombstones are more than just texts, the frequent accompanying sculptures are an integral part of the monuments, but this rich source of information on the army and the self-image of its personnel is sadly largely ignored. In his epilogue, C. points to the Hollywood attraction to the Roman army because of its splendid glittering appearance (154), but we are given no hint of the colourful display an army could produce, or the high visibility of soldiers through their equipment and clothing, whether in a military or civilian context.

C. begins with the causes of wars in the period under study (Actium to Diocletian), this first chapter setting the overall structure of others in providing the Republican background before concentrating on Augustus and the remainder of the period. Given the aim of the book this approach is sensible and helpful, though inevitably places too much emphasis at times on the Augustan period, rather leading to the impression that the imperial army sprang fully formed from that one emperor's principate. The chapter provides a useful summary of late republican imperialism and a critique of Luttwak. C. then moves on to 'soldiers and war', and in one chapter breezes through recruitment, training, morale and discipline, motivation, officers, battle leadership, and religion, with a rather 'senatorial' view presented of the nature of ordinary soldiers (33). Fortunately the ever-helpful footnotes guide the reader towards more detailed and leisurely treatments of many of these subjects. Having described the army personnel, we move on to the nature of war, and here C. draws heavily on Goldsworthy's *Roman Army at War* (1996), and concentrates on 'set-pieces' — the ambush, pitched battle, and siege warfare. Descriptions are provided of Cestius Gallus' disastrous retreat from Jerusalem in A.D. 66 and Mons Graupius; I would have liked greater emphasis here on the literary presentation of the 'set-piece' action, particularly since the chapter begins with a brief but valuable section on the problems of literary accounts of battles by Tacitus, Dio, Josephus, and Caesar (but not the wonderfully graphic Appian). Logistics gets a quick look-in at the end of this chapter, though it is a pity that Roth's *Logistics of the Roman Army at War* (1999) could not have supplied material here, and supply pops up again in the following chapter on 'War and the Community', in the context of the economic impact of the standing army on the Empire and its towns and villages. This chapter begins with the effects of war on communities, but in actual fact this is little more than a list of external wars, civil wars, provincial revolts, and barbarian incursions during the period under study. The role of the army and veterans in the life of communities is much more relevant, and C. turns to Alston's study of *Soldier and Society in Roman Egypt* (1995) for specific examples (i.e. Egypt), before concluding that 'the [economic] impact of the army's presence varied from province to province'. It would have been nice to have another province other than Egypt discussed: like Roth, Pollard's *Soldiers, Cities and Civilians in Roman Syria* (2000) did not get a look-in.

The final two chapters cover 'War and Politics' and 'War and Public Opinion'. In the first, C. rightly stresses the limits of the army in precipitating political change rather than change of emperor, and though there is plenty of material on the latter, the matter of the involvement of the rank and file, as opposed to legates or even centurions, is skipped over. There is a detailed discussion of whether Roman society became more militarized under Septimius Severus, and C.'s conclusion, though largely negative, nonetheless rightly stresses the closer relationship between emperor and army that emerged in the early third century. The relationship between army, (successful) warfare, and the emperor is explored in the final chapter, which I found the most disappointing. There are stock descriptions of the principal relevant monuments of Augustan Rome (Forum of Augustus, Ara Pacis, the Prima Porta statue) and the Columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, and some discussion of poets and other élite writers, and public displays,

triumphs and imperial *cognomina* thrown in. Coinage under Augustus is covered, but later coinage largely ignored, possibly on the grounds that, according to C., ‘coin issues... have nothing to say about individual legions or the personal relationship between emperor and army’ (127), though there are plenty of late second- and third-century coin issues that do refer to particular legions, their loyalty, and that of the army more generally. The chapter mentions a few provincial monuments but is rather too Rome-centric, and could at least have included the Trajanic monuments at Adamklissi.

In his epilogue, C. rightly warns against trying to understand the Roman army through understanding other professional (i.e. modern) armies. As the whole work stresses throughout, one can only properly understand (or at least, try to understand) the Roman army by studying it in its contemporary political, social, and cultural context. C. has provided an excellent introduction to this institution and the right way to go about studying it. The book is truly accessible to its intended audience, and that audience receives warm encouragement and assistance in furthering their knowledge through a wide bibliography and those excellent footnotes.

Cardiff University

KATE GILLIVER

J. J. WILKES (ED.), *DOCUMENTING THE ROMAN ARMY: ESSAYS IN HONOUR OF MARGARET ROXAN* (Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement 81). London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 2003. Pp. xvii + 204, illus. ISBN 0-9005-8792-x. £45.00.

M. ROXAN and P. HOLDER (EDS), *ROMAN MILITARY DIPLOMAS IV* (Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement 82). London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 2003. Pp. xix + 313, illus. ISBN 0-9005-8793-8. £75.00.

With the death of Dr Margaret Roxan in 2003, the community of ancient historians has lost its leading expert on Roman military diplomas and a dear colleague of rare generosity. In particular, Margaret Roxan is sorely missed by all students of the Roman army. Two publications bearing her name appeared in 2003: a collection of essays in her honour edited by J. J. Wilkes and volume IV of her *Roman Military Diplomas*.

The first publication puts on record the proceedings of a colloquium held in honour of Margaret Roxan on 17–18 May 2002 at the Institute of Classical Studies in London. This volume combines a foreword by J. J. Wilkes, a bibliography of Dr Roxan’s writings, ten essays by leading scholars, and an index. The excellent contributions, in different ways, all owe much to Dr Roxan’s work (though not all are primarily concerned with military diplomas) and thereby are proof of the outstanding importance of Margaret Roxan’s work.

Anthony R. Birley, in his paper ‘The commissioning of equestrian officers’ explores the questions: how did equestrian officers secure their commissions? How did army commanders — or the emperor — select officers? And: What qualities were expected? Birley masterly combines Roman literature (such as Pliny’s and Fronto’s letters) and documentary evidence (mainly the Vindolanda tablets) with the prosopography of equestrian officers to throw new light on the functioning of the office *ab epistulis*. Denis Saddington (‘An Augustan officer on the Roman army: militia in Velleius Paterculus and some inscriptions’) rightfully highlights the (occasionally underestimated) historical value of Velleius’ work, in particular for the Roman army and the background of equestrian officers. Veterans, too, were always a subject of great interest to Margaret Roxan. Lawrence Keppie (‘Having been a soldier’) in his richly illustrated contribution thus raises the interesting question whether, in the early Empire, the low numbers of soldiers on record who returned to Italy after military service is perhaps the result of such veterans having merged back into civilian life without leaving a trace of their former life as soldiers in their funerary monuments. In his fundamental contribution, ‘Der Kaiser als Herr des Heeres. Militärdiplome und die kaiserliche Reichsregierung’, Werner Eck combines his rare knowledge of statistical, prosopographical, and historical information relevant to *diplomata militaria* in a rich and profound overview of a wide variety of issues relating to the imperial government and the production of military diplomas. Slobodan Dusanić (‘The imperial propaganda of significant day-dates: two notes in military history’) attempts to unveil seemingly overlooked imperial propaganda by pointing to the symbolic religious or military significance of the (in his view)