the Latin historiographical scene so well illuminated by Kraus. In contrast to what Christopher Jones identifies as the peripheral existence of Josephus in the Greek literary context of the city, Louis Feldman (ch. 11) sees a much closer relationship between Plutarch and Josephus in his comparison of what they say about Lycurgus and Moses. Although Feldman cannot make a case for direct borrowing, the similarities themselves seem to suggest a more engaged participation by Josephus in the literary world he inhabited. The same applies to Steve Mason's important contribution on figured speech and irony in Josephus (ch. 12), the longest in the volume. His starting point is the dearth of attention paid to artful speech in Josephus, who has usually just been treated as a 'source'; and the basic requirement that imperial writers simply could not say what they wanted without cloaking it. Whether you buy all Mason's arguments or not will depend on a close examination of each text, but I suppose the main point is the validity of this sort of reading, which places Josephus securely in the literary and political world of Rome: even if we cannot identify literary borrowings, Josephus knew the rules of Flavian imperial historiography and abided by them in fashioning a thoroughly rhetorical account. Other aspects of this rhetoric are examined in the remaining two chapters: Honora Chapman (ch. 13) on Josephus' use of vivid narrative (*enargeia*), as manifested particularly in the presentation of spectacle in the *Bellum Judaicum*; and John Barclay interestingly using post-colonial theory to tease out how Josephus responded in the *Contra Apionem* to the demands of figurative writing.

Over the centuries Josephus has often had to rely on the kindness of strangers. A work like the present one helps to establish him in his own right as an author we can regard as one of the major surviving Greek writers of the first century A.D. He has, I am sure, a great deal more to say to us, but this excellent volume will surely lead scholars of all interested disciplines to seek out his voice more often than they used to, and to listen to it with much more finely attuned hearing.

Trinity College Dublin BRIAN MCGING

M. GOODMAN, *ROME AND JERUSALEM: THE CLASH OF ANCIENT CIVILIZATIONS*. London: Allen Lane, 2007. Pp. xiv + 639, illus. ISBN 978-0-713-99447-6 (bound); 978-0-14-029127-8 (paper). £25.00 (bound); £9.99 (paper).

This is a book of two halves, both of which constitute important advances in the understanding of how Jews interacted with the Roman Empire. The first half (Parts I and II) compares and contrasts Roman and Jewish civilizations up to the disastrous events of A.D. 66–70, the second (Part III) examines the reasons for those events and the consequences which ensued. The first half takes a new approach, looking at various aspects of the civilizations in parallel, with chapters such as 'Lifestyles' and 'Politics'. The second half offers a revised interpretation of events at Jerusalem in A.D. 70 and throughout the Roman Empire afterwards. The whole book is based on impressive scholarship which is equally at home in the Roman and Jewish worlds, and is thus something which probably only Goodman could have written. It would provide an excellent introduction for a newcomer to Roman or Romano-Jewish history, but also has an important role in the ongoing academic debate about relations between Jews and Romans.

The differences between Romans and Jews are of course more obvious than the similarities, but until A.D. 66 they generally existed in an atmosphere of mutual toleration: Romans laughed at Sabbath observance and not eating pork but respected the Temple; Jews benefited from imperial peace and stability. Some of the differences which G. identifies are ones which only a study of this nature would make clear. For example, Jews in the first century were much less well informed about their recent history than Romans were. Romans expected history to go on; Jews were waiting for the end in one form or another. Romans celebrated birthdays and enjoyed hunting but Jews, apart from Herod, did not. Jewish attitudes to slaves were more humane than Roman ones (although it could be added that Roman society offered much greater social mobility to slaves who benefited from manumission). Jews 'heard' the truth but Romans 'saw' it. 'Jews did not ascribe glamour to war, as Romans did' (347). Possession and expenditure of wealth did not confer social status among Jews as they did to some extent among Romans.

G. is able to highlight some very interesting parallels too. Herod's monumental tomb at Herodium was as eye-catching as Augustus' similarly-shaped Mausoleum which predated it. Jerusalem's pilgrim population was, apart from the religious aspect, 'as culturally heterogeneous as the rainbow population of the city of Rome' (64). Romans and Jews both held a wide range of

views about the afterlife (255). There are also some strange convergences. One of the last known descendants of Herod was a victim of the eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79. Rabbis worried about the right which Roman law gave for women to divorce. Jewish use of ossuaries reflected admiration for Roman cremation urns but not for the practice of cremation. The different perspectives of the two civilizations are neatly summarized by comparing the list of Pontius Pilate's abuses derived from Josephus and Philo with Tacitus' statement that in Judaea 'under Tiberius all was quiet'.

Part III is entitled 'Conflict' and begins with a chapter on 'The Road to Destruction'. G.'s previous work is now fundamental to understanding the situation in Judaea under Roman rule. When the revolt broke out in Jerusalem in A.D. 66, G. sees it not as intrinsically anti-Roman, but only as opposed to bad Roman government (whereas all possible explanations for the revolt of A.D. 115–17 assume that the Jews by then hated Roman rule). Many of the issues were internal to Judaean society, not directly linked to Rome. Roman war aims initially went no further than the restoration of the loyal sacrifices in the Temple. Vespasian was given such a large army simply because the troops happened to be available in the East, rather than because the revolt was seen as a serious threat. The recapture of Jerusalem only became urgent in A.D. 70 because of the political situation at Rome.

The arguments of Part III which have attracted most interest since the book's publication, partly because of their actual or perceived relevance to the present day, are those concerning what happened in A.D. 70 and immediately afterwards. G. argues that the Temple was destroyed accidentally by Titus' troops in A.D. 70, just as Josephus claims. The need to cover up this lapse of military discipline, and the need for the Flavian dynasty to provide military justification for its shaky claim to power, led to the celebration of the recapture of Jerusalem in a manner out of proportion to its real significance, to the continued penalization of Jews by the Flavians and most of their successors, to the renewed violence in the second century, and to the failure to rebuild the Temple and allow the old form of Judaism to be restored. There was nothing inevitable about any of this; it was instead the result of a series of accidents and short-term considerations which could not have been foreseen in A.D. 66 or even in early 70.

Institutionalized punishment, in the form of the Jewish Tax, was imposed on all Jews of the Roman Diaspora even though there is no evidence for their involvement in the revolt. Nerva attempted to remove the tax but his policy was reversed under Trajan's influence. Trajan and Hadrian had to deal with further Jewish revolts, and Hadrian's defeat of Shimon bar Kosiba in A.D. 135 was deliberately played down, in striking contrast to the propaganda about the Flavian victory, as it was inconsistent with the emperor's peaceful image. The airbrushing extended to the renaming of the province of Judaea as Syria Palaestina, a unique punishment for revolt, and to the eviction of Jews from Jerusalem, refounded as Aelia Capitolina. The Severan emperors took a more sympathetic attitude towards the Jews, but with the consequence of greater Jewish autonomy under the leadership of the patriarch rather than greater integration. Ultimately Jerusalem was reinvented by Constantine as a centre for Christian pilgrimage, making the absence of the Temple as symbolic of Christian 'victory' as the presence of other monuments — although one might ask if the failure of Julian the Apostate's proposed rebuilding was any more inevitable than the first-century events.

Some small corrections and additions: Domitian, according to Suetonius, added two chariot-racing factions, gold and purple, not one (306). Jewish concern with archival proof of ancestry is paralleled by the stemmata displayed in the atria of Roman élite houses (351). Augustus' supposed seduction of senators' wives did not take place after he was established as emperor (369). By 31 B.C., Alexandria was only the second greatest city of the Mediterranean world (420).

The most vulnerable point of G.'s argument is perhaps its inevitable reliance on Josephus. This is effectively acknowledged by G. himself, who always justifies why Josephus should be believed, if he should, and uses other literary or material evidence wherever possible. There are some points where G. may tend to downplay evidence for bad Roman-Jewish relations before A.D. 70 (e.g. the various outbreaks of possibly anti-Roman violence in Judaea before A.D. 66), and to over-emphasize evidence for bad relations afterwards. While it is true that 'less than ten' Jewish epitaphs from Rome give a full three-part male Roman name, as G. states (508), this is not really an indication of lack of Jewish interest in Roman status: there are over fifty women recorded with a standard two-part name, and nearly thirty other men whose Roman name is given without the praenomen, as was common in all third- and fourth-century epitaphs. However, the overall

picture which the book presents, of an abrupt change from tolerant co-existence to hostility and suspicion resulting from the political needs of a few Roman leaders requiring a scapegoat, is a compelling one which goes far beyond anything Josephus would have admitted.

University of Wales Lampeter DAVID NOY

M. CORBIER, *DONNER À VOIR, DONNER À LIRE. MÉMOIRE ET COMMUNICATION DANS LA ROME ANCIENNE*. Paris: CNRS Editions, 2006. Pp. 352. ISBN 9-782-27106-382-3. €45.00.

This book is so rich in ideas and fascinating examples that it is difficult to do it justice in a short review. The attractively presented volume updates and republishes several important articles originally published between 1977 and 2001. This is not merely a book of reprints, however. The inclusion of well over 100 illustrations contributes substantially to the force and clarity of the arguments. The footnotes have been extensively updated to incorporate more recent bibliographical references. A new section at the end of ch. 4 happily draws attention to a recently published diploma (*AE* 2002, 1770), which supports the author's contention that the *aerarium militare* was a separate building in its own right. In addition, the revised articles are now prefaced by an extensive introductory section, lending coherence to the whole.

The volume offers a multitude of insights into epigraphic culture in the Roman world. To give a taste of its flavour, I might mention the view of Roman literacy as being a widespread, though shallow, phenomenon, or the detailed discussion of the significance of topographical context both to imperial constitutions displayed on the Capitol, as revealed through *diplomata* (ch. 4), and to the inscribed honours decreed for Claudius' freedman Pallas (ch. 5). The book contains a great variety of tone and depth of analysis: some chapters circle widely around a theme, whilst others deal in great detail with a single inscription (e.g., ch. 10 on *ILS* 6987 relating to the grain-shippers of Arles). In the case of these latter chapters, the author presents texts and translations. The book also provides astute analysis of wider historical themes, including various economic activities, such as transhumance in Italy, protection of the *annona*, and the place of the *fiscus* in the Empire's finances. It is perhaps worth drawing attention to the useful analysis of the topography of Augustus' house on the Palatine that appears during the course of discussion of the inscribed honours for Germanicus, which readers may not otherwise anticipate finding (ch. 6). Close analysis of the language and historical context of Caracalla's edict inscribed upon the 'Banasa Tablet', in which the emperor offered remission of taxes in return for the delivery of *caelestia animalia* (which, according to Corbier, should be interpreted not as referring to a single species of animal — elephants or lions according to many — but rather as 'animals fit for the emperor'), throws doubt upon the common assumption that Caracalla is revealing his irrational love of amphitheatre pursuits in this edict. C. argues convincingly that the edict masks the real social and political relationships between emperor and Mauretanian provincials, and that Caracalla may have been forestalling possible unrest in the province likely to arise from the inappropriate fiscal demands being made upon it. It is her contention that, despite explicit claims to the contrary made in the edict, this tax remission is unlikely to have been a spontaneous gift from the emperor, and she traces how the language it uses may well echo the language used by the provincials in the first place in their appeal to the emperor for relief. In this way, detailed analysis of a single edict goes some way towards rehabilitating a 'mad' emperor and offers insights into the operation of provincial administration.

The volume is a stimulating read, with fascinating examples (my favourite being the 'talking ink-well' on p. 48, *AE* 1998, 1015), but occasionally themes could be developed at more length. For example, discussion of 'the inscription as monument' is overly brief (13), and could have fruitfully explored the parallel world of coins as monuments (cf. A. Meadows and J. Williams, *JRS* 91 (2001), 27–49). I would also question the assumption of a mass of instructions issuing from Rome relating to the publication of documents in inscribed form that underlies discussion of the role of 'official initiative' in ensuring the display of inscribed documents (27–9, especially the statement that 'une telle diffusion ne s'explique que par une injunction du pouvoir central'; cf. my chapter in K. Lomas, R. Whitehouse and J. Wilkins (eds), *Literacy and the State in the Ancient Mediterranean* (2007)). There is also a worrying tendency to take Suetonius at his word (for example, apparently accepting at face-value his description of Augustus writing down all his conversations in advance, even those with Livia (87)), which could take more account of recent literary studies questioning the source-value of the biographer (especially the chapter by