

updated in any way. Not even in the extensive notes does he take account of items passed over in the original, or published after 1997. Hence there is no engagement with, or reference to, some highly relevant recent work such as Wilfried Nippel's *Aufbruch und 'Polizei' in der römischen Republik* (1988) and *Public Order in Ancient Rome* (1995), or the current reviewer's study of *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World* (1999).

G.'s declared aim is to answer the questions, 'Whom did the Romans see as *latrones*, and what did they understand by *latrocinium*?' (3). He chooses to do this principally by establishing a typology, classifying *latrones* (or *leistai*, the principal word used in the Greek sources) according to what he sees as the two main conceptual categories. The first category is derived from the way the sources describe the activities of those referred to as bandits, and G. subdivides it into four types: 'real' bandits, or common criminals; 'bandit rebels', e.g. Viriathus the second-century B.C. Lusitanian 'guerrilla' commander; 'bandit rivals', those who are portrayed as usurpers of power, e.g. Catiline or Maxentius, the rival emperor whom Constantine defeated in A.D. 312; and 'bandit avengers', e.g. Clemens, the self-styled avenger of his master Agrippa Postumus. G.'s second category comprises 'ideal types' of bandits and is sub-divided into the 'common bandit' and the 'noble bandit'. The two sets overlap, so that Viriathus is classified as both a rebel and a noble bandit. G. makes it very clear that he does not see these as historical categories which can be used to classify social realities. For him the *latro* is 'an artefact of the literary imagination' (13). Ch. 1 surveys information about 'Real Bandits' to fill in the background to the use of the literary *topoi*, but the bulk of his main text (chs 2–7) is a series of philological analyses of examples of bandits in historical accounts of Roman history from the late Republic to the fourth century A.D. Precise definition and classification of terms based on an individual author's usage is an essential element of this kind of philological work, but it does sometimes lead G. to draw rather one-dimensional conclusions. To take one example, in ch. 4, 'Politicians and Pretenders as *latrones*', G. notes that Mark Antony is called a *latro* nearly forty times in Cicero's *Philippics*, and that the orator ascribes to Antony many of the usual attributes of a tyrant. This, according to G. 'allows us to see that "bandit", as used in this context, is a synonym for "tyrant"' (75). Yet there is surely more to it than that. Cicero chooses to label Antony as a bandit because it conjures up a range of meanings and associations that will encourage his readers to put Antony on a level with robbers and criminals and other *latrones*, like some of the leaders of slave revolts G. has just discussed in the preceding chapter. In this context 'bandit' is clearly not synonymous with 'tyrant', because use of the latter term might elevate Antony to a higher status than Cicero would wish.

G. is at his best when teasing out the different strands of bandit associations that are implicit in the ancient historians' depictions of political figures. In ch. 5, '*Leistai* in Judaea: Ancient Social Bandits?', he succinctly demonstrates how Josephus uses conventional bandit terminology to undermine the image of his Jewish rivals John of Gischala and Simon bar Giora. He also exposes the inadequacies of those modern scholars who have taken Josephus too literally and seen the frequent references to *leistai* in his works as early manifestations of Eric Hobsbawm's phenomenon of social banditry. His general rejection of the model of the social bandit in favour of 'the purely literary figure' (164) is less than entirely persuasive, but all future work on the subject will need to take careful account of his analysis.

University College Dublin

PHILIP DE SOUZA

C. WOLFF, *LES BRIGANDS EN ORIENT SOUS LE HAUT-EMPIRE ROMAIN* (Collection de l'École française de Rome 308). Rome: École française de Rome, 2003. Pp. viii + 294, 4 maps. ISBN 2-7283-0650-8. €32.00.

This new attack on the ancient problem of bandits and banditry is confined, as its title indicates, to a regional perspective: the circuit of the Eastern provinces of the Empire between Thrace in the north-west and Egypt in the south-east. The author rather grandly states that for the ancients to be a bandit was above all 'un état d'esprit'. She concludes that there were two basic types of person who shared this 'esprit': local highwaymen who were smaller operators, and bandits who operated on a grander scale and over longer periods of time, controlling whole regions as 'bandit peoples' (227). Her study comes armed with four useful 'annexes' that list references to attested *eirenarchs*, *diogmitae*, *paraphylakes*, *orophylakes*, and other police officials charged with the repression of brigands (235–9). But the book itself does not rise above being a fairly pedantic collection of evidence. The first three chapters are an uninspired run through the Greek and Latin vocabulary used to designate bandits and banditry, a sketch of the assumed modes of life and

operations of brigands, and a picture of their relations with ‘normal’ society. In all three aspects, Wolff’s work has been definitively superseded by the detailed research of Grünewald and Reiss on these same subjects (see below). Four chapters follow, each devoted to banditry in a different geographic region of the East: the Balkan Peninsula (Thrace), Asia Minor, Syria-Palestine and Judaea, and Egypt. These regional surveys are divided internally into chronological surveys of what is known of bandits (using the standard divisions by imperial dynasties, followed by an ‘anarchie militaire’ for the mid-third century A.D.). Each of the chronological surveys is followed by a separate section on bandit ‘acts’ or the individual episodes of violence noted in our sources. Within each of these chapters, there is a fair amount of repetition of the evidence adduced in the temporal narrative in the subsequent analysis of bandit ‘acts’.

In line with the programme of the book as a regional survey, the author tends to record and to read her sources rather literally, sometimes to arrive at rather disconcerting conclusions. Records of the successful repression of brigands in the high-tide of the Antonine age, for example, are often taken at face-value as evidence for a ‘resurgence’ of banditry (e.g. 160, 164–5, 205, 224). And no attempt is made to define banditry in terms of the modern historiography of the subject. The result is that W. has no way to separate ordinary ‘criminality’ or standard frontier raiding (e.g. the raids of the Costoboci south of the Danube, 87–9) from ‘brigandage’ proper. On almost any criteria, for example, much of W.’s evidence from Roman Egypt (162ff.) seems to refer to ordinary assault, robbery, and breaking and entering by criminals, rather than to anything that can reasonably be labelled banditry. Further, the absence of any general theoretical premises means that W. frequently disregards the significance of negative cases. Why, for example, does Cappadocia, a region that one would otherwise expect to be a typical breeding ground for bandits, provide so very little evidence, literary or epigraphical, for banditry? Is it a problem of the production and the survival of evidence? Or is there some other cause? W. is aware of the exception (97, 104, 114, 117, 178), but she never attempts to explain it.

The concluding chapters detail the ‘daily struggle’ waged against brigandage. The section devoted to the role of local communities in this fight largely returns to the incidents already listed in the regional surveys, cataloguing the various officials — *orophylakes*, *eirenarchs*, and others — who undertook the repression of bandits as a local liturgical service and, once again, the record of their ‘acts’. The chapter on the role of the imperial state and its forces is, alas, not much above this level, being reduced in its latter parts to encyclopaedia-like entries on a jumble of categories as diverse as *limes* and *vexillationes*, with no generalizations to knit these points of data into a persuasive interpretation.

Perhaps the biggest problem for the prospective reader, however, is one of anachronism. Although the book is based on a Thèse d’Etat completed in the mid-1990s, no apparent attempt has been made by the author to revise her findings in the light of two major works on banditry in the Roman Empire that appeared soon after its completion. Neither the survey by Thomas Grünewald, *Räuber, Rebellen, Rivalen, Rächer: Studien zu Latrones im römischen Reich* (1999) (Engl. trans. *Bandits in the Roman Empire: Myth and Reality* (2004), reviewed above), nor the more sweeping analysis produced by Werner Reiss, *Apuleius und die Räuber: ein Beitrag zur historischen Kriminalitätsforschung* (2001) have made any impact on her findings. This is rather surprising, since their existence refutes one of the primary reasons proffered by the author in justification of her book — the claim that all previous work has appeared in the reduced form of journal articles (4). In the construction of useful typologies and the general analysis of the phenomenon, both scholars have advanced our understanding of banditry in the Empire further, sometimes much further than W. Unless a compelling argument can be made that a regional study of the Eastern provinces brings something new to the analysis of brigandage in the Empire, the reader is perhaps best advised to consult one of these other works.

Princeton University

BRENT D. SHAW

S. SCHWARTZ, *IMPERIALISM AND JEWISH SOCIETY, 200 B.C.E. TO 640 C.E.* Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001. Pp. xi + 320. ISBN 0-6910-8850-0 (bound); 0-6911-1781-0 (paper). US\$45.00 (bound); US\$19.95 (paper).

It is a brave scholar who ventures a large-scale work of interpretation, such as the present one, in any area; but particularly, perhaps, in the field of ancient Jewish studies, where the concerns and debates of the modern world are often close to the surface, and where the expert academic community seems larger and more able than ever before. If you want to say ‘big’ things in this