

trenchantly against the defensive interpretation. Next comes a chapter dealing with economic policy, in particular the coinage (where the lack of illustration seriously hampers the discussion), and with building policy. The final chapter is devoted to Augustus' policy for the empire, focusing particularly on the winning over of the Greek east and on city-building.

K.'s interpretative approach and the resulting structure have their drawbacks. The first is organizational: some topics are oddly located (notably the marriage legislation, treated under Augustus' relations with the senate: pp. 164–8), and there is some repetition (thus Augustus' new buildings in Rome figure in Chapters 2, 4, and 6). The second is more important. K.'s intentionalist stress on the ruler's policies leads him to what most would now regard as an exaggerated view of the part played in the developments of the reign by Augustus' personal choices and of the extent to which those choices derived from comprehensively conceived policies. This weakness was already noted by Andrew Wallace-Hadrill in a review of the first edition (*JRS* 75 [1985], 245–6). Subsequent work by, for example, Wallace-Hadrill and Paul Zanker on art and culture and Peter White on the poets has stressed the extent to which the subjects co-operated with the ruler in shaping the ideology and imagery of the regime and changes in society and culture were the product of new structures rather than individual choices. K. notes these works in this edition, but does not address their implications. The effect is most marked in Chapter 4, where sensitive discussion of the details of developments in religion and literature is marred by the tendency to subsume them all under imperial policy and the failure to problematize the concept of 'propaganda'. Similarly, although there is much useful material in the last two chapters, K. has not sufficiently considered how helpful it is to speak of the emperor's 'Wirtschaftspolitik' or 'Reichspolitik'.

Such criticisms, however, do not detract from the importance and value of K.'s work. For serious students of Augustus' reign this book has been an indispensable mine of information and its updating is most welcome. It is, however, much more than that: despite the drawbacks noted above, it remains the most detailed, comprehensive, and penetrating study of Augustus' achievement currently available.

University of Nottingham

J. W. RICH

AUGUSTUS (ii)

W. ECK: *The Age of Augustus*. Translated by D. L. Schneider. New material by S. A. Takács. Pp. x + 166, maps. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003 (first published as *Augustus und seine Zeit*, Munich, 1998). Paper, £12.99. ISBN: 0-631-22958-2 (0-631-22957-4 hbk).

This English translation of E.'s *Augustus und seine Zeit* (1998; I have not seen it) brings the book to a wider audience, which it deserves. E. has aimed his book at an undergraduate-level readership new to the age of Augustus; those more advanced in the period will find here a concise treatment of this crucial time, the perfect 'potted' history or *aide-mémoire*.

E.'s Augustus is a familiar figure: his bloody rise to supremacy and consolidation of his position; his carefully and slowly marching the state into the future under the

banner of the ‘republic restored’; his dynastic arrangements to secure the succession within his family. Augustus claimed that *auctoritas* was the basis of his political actions (RG 34; p. 113), but E. asks that we look beyond the ‘ideological camouflage’ (p. 48) to discern the real power behind it: the legal powers of various offices, the command of provinces and armies, his immense wealth, and the broad network of clients. To this end, E. uses the *Res Gestae* well to present how Augustus saw his reign and wanted history to see it, and to encourage us to look beneath the emperor’s presentation to what we know actually (or probably) happened. But how *do* we otherwise know what happened? E. uses a range of literary and non-literary sources to reconstruct the period and to fill out and balance Augustus’ version. They are named, but the only quotations from them are to sensational details: the displaying of M. Brutus’ head at Rome (Suet. *Aug.* 13.1; p. 18), and Cleopatra and the asp (Hor. *Odes* 1.37; p. 39). Not even Cassius Dio is actually quoted. This is not really good enough: the full range of evidence should have received independent treatment (perhaps in an appendix) to indicate coverage, bias, strengths, and weaknesses. An English translation of the *Res Gestae* by Sarolta A. Takács has been included in this edition. She includes helpful explanatory notes, but no source comparison (nor are the notes cross-referenced to E.’s text; and there is some repetition between her introduction and E.’s first chapter). Despite its centrality to Augustus’ reign, and Takács’s insistence that other sources are needed for a comprehensive picture of the period (p. 133), the *Res Gestae*, in its isolated treatment in the text and appendix, risks being considered the only source worth consulting.

The first eight chapters of the book provide a chronological narrative of Augustus’ career down to 2 B.C. E. then treats themes for five chapters, the most valuable in the book: Augustus’ relations with the aristocracy; with the army; his building programme; his expansion of the empire (good on the consequences of the Varian disaster: Augustus did not abandon the German offensive, Tiberius did); and, most importantly, his practical implementation of political power. Did Augustus proceed here by policy or by pragmatism? E. argues for the latter (see esp. p. 77). The last two chapters take the reader through the succession crises, to Augustus’ death, and to a brief summation of his achievement; those are in a combination of theme and chronology. Unfortunately that means that the thread of Augustus’ life is not picked up tidily from the end of Chapter 8.

Occasionally E. does not push his analysis far enough. The name ‘Augustus’ is said to have religious connotations (p. 49), but what are they? The reader is not helped by his translation of it as ‘the illustrious one’. Some explanation could have been provided by quoting Ennius’ statement that Rome was founded ‘with august augury’ (*augusto augurio*; *Ann.* 4.154 Skutsch), which would also have drawn attention to the symbolic link between Augustus and Romulus, whose name was canvassed and rejected, as E. mentions (cf. Takács’ note on RG 34, better on the name). There is the odd error. The content of Dio 54.3.2 could have been expressed more exactly: when defending his campaigns outside Macedonia, Marcus Primus claimed at one moment that he had acted on instructions from Augustus, at another on instructions from Marcellus—not quite, as E. has it, ‘on the instructions not only of Augustus, but also of Marcellus’ (p. 55, cf. p. 115). The *Res Gestae* is not ‘The Accomplishment . . .’ (p. 1). And ‘Inspector Caesar . . .’ for ‘Imperator Caesar’ (p. 50) looks like a misprint (cf. the translation of *imperator* on p. 93 as ‘victorious commander’).

St John’s College, Cambridge

S. J. V. MALLOCH