

Das durchnummerierte Corpus der nahezu 700 Inschriften ist nach Inschriftenpublikationen geordnet und folgt so, außer was die Inschriften aus der *AE* angeht, gleichzeitig einem gewissen geographischen Muster. Jedem Text sind eine Übersetzung, nähere Bestimmung des bzw. der Namen bezüglich der Herkunft, Ausgangs- und Endpunkt der Migration, sozialer Status sowie eine (Grob)datierung beigelegt. Der vielleicht wichtigste Bestandteil ist der ausführliche Kommentar zu den jeweiligen Personen und Orten mit oft sehr konkreten Vermutungen über Situationen und Tatsachen, welche jedoch eigentlich nicht belegbar sind, so z. B. in Nr. 438 bezüglich der Todesart und des Alters des Ehemannes der Verstorbenen. Weiterführende Angaben finden sich auch in den zahlreichen Anmerkungen. Eine gewisse Inkonsequenz scheint mir darin zu liegen, dass Hinweise auf andere Inschriften innerhalb des Corpus nicht auf dessen eigene Numerierung zurückgreifen, sondern die jeweilige Hauptedition nennen.

Es folgt eine ausführliche Bibliographie sowie Indices mit Stellenverzeichnis, Namen, Orten und allgemeinen Begriffen, hier mit Hinweis auf die Seitenzahl und nicht auf die Corpusnummer, was ein schnelleres Auffinden des gesuchten Begriffes ermöglicht hätte. Abgesehen jedoch von solchen kleinen "Schönheitsfehlern" bietet das Buch eine willkommene Ergänzung zu dem eingangs erwähnten Band und läßt sich auch unabhängig davon in vieler Hinsicht heranziehen und auswerten. Die Arbeit hat sich ganz bestimmt gelohnt.

*Uta-Maria Liertz*

*The Cambridge Ancient History XI. The High Empire, A.D. 70-192* (2nd ed.). Eds. A. K. BOWMAN, P. GARNSEY, D. RATHBONE. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2000. ISBN 0-521-26335-2. xxi, 1222 pp. GBP 95 (USD 160).

This massive volume, the result of the efforts of three editors and 29 contributors, contains 35 chapters divided in six parts: I. Narrative, II. Government and Civil Administration, III. The Empire, IV. Rome, Italy and the Provinces, Va. Economy and Society, Vb. Art and Culture. Around 1000 pages of text are followed by some 150 pages of Bibliography and an Index comprising a further 60 pages (the first edition had a total of 997 pages). As is obvious, no single author could have mastered all the topics of the book, and no single review can do the enormous accumulation of material justice; certainly not in only a few pages. (See G. Bowersock, *JRA* 15 [2002] 511-15 for an ambitious attempt, voicing mixed feelings.)

The contributors are, with very few exceptions, well known to practitioners of Roman history. The *CAH* contributes to the immortal glory of Cambridge, but, perhaps surprisingly, only three writers give Cambridge as their academic affiliation. Five are from "the other place", three from London, and five from the rest of the United Kingdom. The international participation is not negligible, with five scholars from German universities (of which one is of English and one of Hungarian origin), four from universities in the USA (one British, one Canadian), three from France, and one from Dublin. Italian scholars are conspicuously absent. In comparison, the first edition relied to a much larger extent on authors from British universities (11, among whom Ronald Syme from New Zealand), as well as three Germans, and one each from Belgium,

France, Hungary, Sweden, and the USA (M. Rostovtzeff).

It would be wrong to say that the new volume replaces the first edition since *CAH* XI from 1936 did of course long ago cease to be of any particular use. But from a historiographical point of view it might be of some interest to briefly survey the changes that have taken place. The Rise of Christianity, Roman Law, and Latin Literature had separate chapters in 1936; the editors point out that the two former topics are now dealt with in *CAH* X and XII, while for Classical Literature there is a separate Cambridge history.

In total there were 21 chapters in 1936, of which 6 provided a chronological narrative, 7 dealt with the provinces, 2 dealt with the empire and its administration, and, in addition to the three mentioned above, 3 dealt with particular topics (Greek intellectual life, Social life in Rome and Italy, and Art). There are surprises: in a world not yet striving to get away from Romanocentrism and ridden with post-colonial guilt, would one expect the first edition to have had as chapter 2 "The Peoples of Northern Europe: the Getae and Dacians", followed by a chapter on "The Sarmatae and Parthians"? These "barbarian" peoples do not have their own spokespersons in the new *CAH*, although their interactions with the Romans are treated with predictable competence in the narrative section by Miriam Griffin and Anthony Birley; they appear briefly also in the provincial surveys.

Changes in the structure of the new *CAH* were to be expected and are welcome. A chapter such as Brent Shaw's fine "Rebels and outsiders" could not have been written in 1936; it is now part of the "Empire" unit in which one also finds chapters on "Frontiers", "The army", and "Local and provincial institutions and government". A major innovation is the emphasis on social and economic history in the new *CAH*, and to some extent also on cultural history (e.g. "Literacy" by Greg Woolf). Chapters on "Land", "Trade", "Industry and technology", "Commerce and finance" deal with topics that scholars were working on already well before 1936, but which found little place in the previous edition. The chapters on "Demography" (Bruce Frier), "Status and patronage", and "Family and household" (both by Richard Saller) in part deal with subjects and methods with which few classicists were very familiar in 1936. With the unfortunate exception of the chapter on "Industry and technology", these contributions provide valuable additions to the view on Roman history presented by the *CAH*.

The *CAH* is intended to be of lasting value, and the editors point out that the contributors were "asked to write accounts which summarize current knowledge and generally held views" (xxi). In order for the various chapters to be comprehensive and, at the same time, present a text that is readable, references are held to a minimum. In this day and age it is rare to see a serious work on Roman history with only one or two lines of footnotes following forty lines of text. References to primary sources appear with some frequency and are by their nature precise. But the contributors have apparently been instructed to follow a different system when referring to modern scholarship, for like scholars in the social sciences they mostly refer only generally to a particular work, without indicating chapters or pages. A reader wanting to follow up or check the accuracy of a secondary reference would often be facing a daunting task. The *CAH* of course intends to be a work of reference and does not seem to expect unexpert readers to proceed any further.

What does this "short version" in fact mean for the user? The authors were "not requested to suppress any reference to heterodox beliefs", as the editors point out (p. xxi), and of course we all know that once one starts thinking deeply about a particular historical phenomenon, there is rarely only one view that matters.

One would have to conclude that only prolonged use of the *CAH* by scholars engaged in serious study will show how well it serves their particular purpose (there are also, to be sure, many other uses and users to which it caters), were it not for the fact that a test case exists. Werner Eck's four admirably succinct chapters on the imperial administration, which together make up all of part II "Government and Civil Administration" and comprise almost a hundred pages, include the customary two or three lines of references and additional commentary per page. But that is not the whole story. It is greatly to the credit of the publisher that Professor Eck was allowed to publish an expanded version of his work in German. Due to a delay in the publication of the *CAH* (the editors are candid about the fact that most of the book was written in 1991-94; some later revision was carried out, p. xxi), the German version of the four *CAH* chapters actually appeared first, in W. Eck, *Die Verwaltung des Römischen Reiches in der Hohen Kaiserzeit. Ausgewählte und erweiterte Beiträge 2* (Arbeiten zur römischen Epigraphik und Altertumskunde 3), Basel – Berlin 1998, 3-145, but there are very few later additions in the *CAH* (see however note 22a on p. 201). In his "Vorwort", Eck characterizes the German version as a "wesentlich erweiterte Fassung", and continues "vieles, was dort [in the *CAH*] vor allem aus Platzgründen nicht möglich war, auch ausführlichere Anmerkungen, sind nunmehr in die Kapitel 1 A-D aufgenommen". Any reader will immediately realize that this is indeed the case, which of course means that, in the future, a serious scholar will immediately be recognized from his/her quoting the German version, not the *CAH*.

It is likely that most contributors had similar feelings about the text they submitted to the editors: the restricted space allotted to each must often have been the source of intense frustration. Experts will probably always find missing details; nobody is perfect even when the space is unlimited. One chapter, however, seems to me not only to lack details but also some important topics that needed to be treated. The chapter on "Industry and technology" (741-68) is very heavily slanted towards the archaeological evidence (to the detriment of epigraphical evidence, which provides most of the sources from which this kind of history can be written) and technology. The latter aspect is of course dictated by the rubric, but one wonders why manufacture could not be given a chapter of its own. A comparison with William Harris' thorough chapter on "Trade" illustrates the kind of opportunity that was missed here. There is no denying the importance of Rome the Capital (Rome and Italy receive over 40 pages by Nicholas Purcell elsewhere in the book), and the brick industry of Rome and Central Italy would have deserved more attention than 25 words and one reference (to Helen 1975 and Champlin 1983, p. 258 (sic)). Where is the work of E. Margareta Steinby, and where is at least a mention of the vivid discussion on the role of senators in the brick production? The next sentence moves on to a new subject and contains a reference to "the Sestii", "their" villa at Settefinestre, and the involvement in "shipping, wine, bricks and *terra sigillata*". But who are "the Sestii"? There is no word on whether we are dealing with senators, equestrians, common *ingenui*, or freedmen, nothing on possible, and likely,

developments over time, nothing on the vivid scholarly debate in the matter of organization of manufacture and commerce. (One looks in vain for *instrumentum domesticum* in the Index of this volume.)

To be fair, urban brick stamps are mentioned once more, on p. 971 in the chapter on Roman art, in connection with Nero's "sensible building regulations" after the fire: "a mass of commercial and domestic structures arose, identifiable by brick stamps which, in the efficient Roman manner, often bear stamps indicating date". That loose passage does not save the day. (The proceedings from the international colloquium on "Interpretare i bolli laterizi di Roma: tra amministrazione, storia economica ed edilizia" at the Ecole Française and the Institutum Romanum Finlandiae in March 2000 will address a number of important topics.) For information on Roman manufacture I will not recommend the *CAH* to my undergraduate students.

It would however definitely be wrong to end on a negative note. It is a praiseworthy accomplishment to have brought this international project of co-operation to its conclusion (and soon the 2nd edition of the *CAH* will be complete). In a time when collective publications and proceedings from conferences and colloquia, often with important contributions, are ever more common, one more difficult to find than the other, the *CAH* has its firmly established place in the libraries, and vol. XI will provide useful guidance for many decades to come in the hands of whoever acquires it.

Christer Bruun

ATTILIO MASTROCINQUE: *Studi sulle guerre Mitridatiche*. Historia Einzelschriften 124. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1999. ISBN 3-515-07418-X. 128 pp. EUR 32.

King Mithridates VI Eupator "the Great" of Pontus undoubtedly belongs to a select group of "greatest enemies of Rome", along with Hannibal, Jugurtha, Decebalus, and perhaps a few more. He reigned from ca. 113 B.C. until the eventful year 63 B.C. and fought three wars against Rome; he undoubtedly warrants attention from every student of that period.

Mastrocinque begins his investigations around the year 100 B.C. and takes the reader down to ca. 80 B.C.; his study is thus located in the era of Marius and Sulla. Much has been written on these decades, but the work here under review is by no means superfluous. Historical problems relating both to Mithridates' life and times – as well as to the interaction of Marius and of Sulla with events in Asia Minor – persist, not least because of a lack of a comprehensive source for the period, and regardless of studies such as B. C. McGing, *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator King of Pontus* (Leiden 1986) and works on Rome's policy in the East by Badian, Gruen, Ferrary, and Kallet-Marx.

The work consists of 21 brief chapters subsumed under six headings (here in English translation): "Mithridates and Apuleius Saturninus", "From the Asian mission of Sulla to that of Aquilius", "The victories of Mithridates", "The sources for Appian's *Mithridateios*", "Athens and Aristion", and "After Dardanus".

Mastrocinque gives the recent publication of F. De Callatay's work on Asia Minor numismatics (*L'histoire des guerres mithridatiques vue par les monnaies*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1997) as one reason for his undertaking. Many dates of rulers in the