

IN THE QUEST FOR “ROMAN FACTS”: LINDERSKI’S *RQ II*

Jerzy Linderski, *Roman Questions II. Selected Papers*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2007 (Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien [HABES], Bd. 44), XI, 726 pp., ISBN 987-3-515-08134-4.

It is a formidable, even intimidating, task to write a review of a collection of 50 papers and a score of other items (with additions and corrections of earlier works) in a volume of 726 pages, and one not to be undertaken lightly. That is certainly the case before the book is opened, and fears may well often turn out to be justified, but after reading the first page or two any reader will feel that s/he is going to find an alluring path through it.

That is due in the first place to the excellence of the writing throughout the volume (one article is in German, one in Latin) from an author whose native language is not English and who at some time had to learn it. (Perhaps that helped: we live in times when bare correctness cannot be taken for granted among native speakers, even in works offered by the best-known publishing houses, when clarity is sometimes avoided and elegance is taken for affectation.) His mastery of language helps in part to explain how Linderski [= L.] carries his reader on with him, a reader eager to reach conclusions that s/he is confident will be revealing – but relishing the byways as s/he goes. When the conclusion of one paper is reached s/he turns the page, eagerly again, to explore the next. This is only a partial explanation; it is a necessary and not a sufficient condition for enjoying the book. Other reasons will emerge.

Before that there is another difficulty for the reviewer beyond the mere size of the volume: a disparity between the importance of each item and that of the whole. Other scholars who have worked in the same way for one reason or another might be cited: C. Cichorius and L. Robert, the former lauded by L. as “an acute student of *res Romanae* and of Latin texts” – before having a view summarily and justifiably dismissed (p. 237, n. 26), the latter taken as a paradigm – see below. In the musical sphere the brief, even slight, keyboard works of Domenico Scarlatti or Chopin would be a parallel, making (even without the latter’s large-scale concertos) not only a rich and varied *œuvre* but one comparable with that of their greatest contemporaries. The output is extraordinary – and would be even coming from someone now an *emeritus*. The reading is even more prodigious, as L. apparently effortlessly passes in review the literature and what his predecessors have done with it.

Read these brief papers and you will learn big things. “Romulus the Founder” teaches us that the Roman gods do not speak: “only a few utterances in Latin are on record” (p. 512, cf. p. 6). How different they are from Jehovah, who has given Christians as well as Jews the Word of God and at some periods seemed never to stop talking. So the Romans, dealing with their gods, set to, constructing their own language in four dimensions, livers and the flight of birds. Incidentally Roman gods do seem to speak in dreams: Alfius, *Bellum Carthaginiense* 1 in T. Cornell et al., *FRH* (Oxford, forthcoming) 069, F1 (= Peter vol. 1², pp. 316 f., Festus 150), where Apollo in a dream prescribes a *uer sacrum* on Sthennius Mettius to enable escape from a plague.

History, Law, and Religion have elicited most of the contributions, and those that stand out in one reader’s mind are indeed the most substantial. Let us go straight to *The Pontiff and the Tribune: The Death of Tiberius Gracchus* (2002; pp. 88–114), which exemplifies all the qualities that are best in L.’s repertoire. It examines the notorious problem of the headgear that Scipio Nasica was wearing when Gracchus was killed and his followers inexplicably put to flight, a detail in those events that has immense implications.

First of all L. presents the event as a cosmic clash, whose “upheavals ceased when Augustus united in his person the sacrosanct power of the tribunate, the *imperium* of the magistrates and the dignity of the pontiff, thus emasculating at once both the people and the gods”. Narrating the

episode, L. finds that the sudden collapse of the Gracchan supporters defies rational explication. “The secret lies in the toga of Nasica”. He analyses ancient and scholarly interpretations of the distorted garb, gallantly rescuing *en route* a long-neglected work, that of G.G.C. Bijvanck, *Studia in Ti. Gracchi historiam*, Diss. Leiden 1879. Bijvanck and others interpreted the action of Nasica as that of the Pontifex Maximus sacrificing an animal. But evidently he had left his appropriate head-covering, the *pilleus* or *apex*, at home. L. examines the regular attire of the sacrificing priest and finds it quite normal to cover the head with the toga, although Nasica had to don the *praetexta* before he left the temple of Fides. But Tiberius was not a sacrifice, for the body was thrown into the Tiber. Just over half way through the paper L., citing Badian’s despairing claim that we are on ground that is wholly non-rational, cheerily invokes his own particular strengths (“The historian cannot abdicate half of his patrimony”) and proceeds. Of the two other rites that demanded that the priest act *capite velato*, he selects *consecratio* – the consecration of a miscreant to be destroyed by the gods. “We are at the crossroads of politics, religion and law”. At this point knowledge of art history comes into play to establish the position of the all-important *clauus* on the upper or lower border of the *praetexta*: it was not (irreligiously) moved in the time of Augustus. Nasica removed his toga, as Cicero did when he was presiding over the trial of Licinius Macer, and put it back on upside down (*toga perversa*). Not running up the hill against Gracchus, but emerging from the temple behind him with the *clauus* over his head and uttering the curse “Iovi sacer esto”, Nasica confounded the tribune’s supporters. Here we have a brilliant array of techniques, guileful twists in the plot, and a thrilling *peripeteia* in an episode that the reader (originally, we note, the audience!) knows to be of first class importance.

Then there is the sad figure of Pompey’s father-in-law and Julius Caesar’s opponent in Africa *Q. Scipio Imperator* (1996; pp. 130–173), a prosopographical study that takes its origin from a gem inscribed with his name and title (in abbreviated form). What follows are scrupulous and critical assemblages of evidence for the precious title and for the nomenclature of the Caecilii Metelli and Cornelii Scipiones, with legal expertise deployed to put another nail in the coffin of “testamentary adoption”, although wooden nails and a stake through the heart seem to be the only devices that will suffice to keep that vampire in its grave. The wily Octavian, dissatisfied with the terms of Caesar’s will, which made him the chief heir on condition that he took Caesar’s name, went through formal procedures that were appropriate only for the regular form of adoption by a living *paterfamilias*, *adrogatio*, so becoming *Divi filius*, and he has continued to take in generations of scholars. Next L. tackles Caesar’s complaints against the legitimacy of the *imperium* of Pompeian generals, uncovering malleable half-truths (what an asset he would have been to the augural college!). Section V of the paper concerns the resonances of the name Scipio, the literary sources telling only part of the story, while Scipio’s coins tell the other side. So L. proceeds to a new idiom, with its own grammar, the coins. The objects they feature give his learning free play: elephant, *sella curulis*, most controversially the augural jug and *lituus* (Scipio was not an augur but a *pontifex*, but the symbols allude to his claim to possess *iustum imperium*), and trophy. L. has done something judiciously to rescue Caesar’s ill-starred opponent and restore his *dignitas*.

L. has gathered the papers in this volume, in their wide variety of subjects, under the headings *Historia et Ius*, *Historia et Philologia*, *Historia et Epigraphica* (including three substantial items updating the *CIL* for Italy), *Historia et Religio*, and *Antiqua et Recentiora* (five essays on modern scholars). We have already seen how important a role expertise in Roman religion plays in the author’s work. The review of M. Beard, J. North, and S. Price, *Religions of Rome*, vol. 1: *A History*; vol. 2: *A Sourcebook*, Cambridge 1998, entitled *Religio et Cultus Deorum* (pp. 501–514), is indispensable for an understanding of his perspective: it allows a high authority to set out his position in a leisurely and systematic way. And in a commemorative article on Agnes Kirsopp Michels (pp. 584–602), L. rebukes scholars such as W. Warde Fowler and K. Latte, obsessed with purity and corruption, who found Roman religion wanting. He emphatically endorses Michels’ rejection of this view: Roman religion responded to or was created by Rome’s needs. “No student of religion can ultimately avoid or evade choosing between Varro and Augustine” (p. 596). It is thanks to

such efforts that it would be hard now to find Roman religion dismissed for its lack of interest in personal salvation.

This is not to ignore the solidity of L.'s contributions to *Historia et Epigraphica*, but they are in large part densely packed commentaries on inscriptions and topography, supplementing the Italian volumes of *CIL* (1998–2001) and to be saved and used in connexion with them. It is remarkable though how many smaller but entertaining points are made as the author winds his way through the complex trains of thought that lead to the conclusions of his longer papers in this section too, such as *Games in Patavium* (pp. 463–491). Each reader will turn to a number of pieces that involve topics in which s/he has taken a particular interest. Besides “testamentary adoption” I also savoured the little supplement on the *professio* of Pompey and the notion that his candidacy for the consular elections of 70 BC was made *in absentia* (pp. 611 f.): “I can only restate the obvious”. It is often necessary and salutary.

This is of course the second such volume that L. has sanctioned, making his *Roman Questions* of 1995 *Roman Questions (RQ) I*. Volume 1 covered work published between 1958, when the writer had his twenty-fourth birthday, and 1993. The two volumes are naturally alike in appearance and size, the first comprising 64 items in 746 pages. There are advances, however. The papers in *RQ I* had not been reset as they have in its successor. This is a great improvement. It avoids disconcerting changes of type face and the shift of pagination from top to bottom and back again with no inconvenience apart from the uncertainty where in a precise line the original turnover came (the pagination of original publications is recorded in the margins). A second and consequent improvement is that the author has been able to introduce any corrections, additional thoughts, and updated bibliographical material into the text at the appropriate place instead of adding them at the end of the volume (with such a meticulous scholar this was likely to be copious: 49 pages in *RQ I!*). The curly brackets that signal such additions prove neither intrusive nor misleading. One convenience that is not always granted as a result of this is that of having notes at the foot of the page; it depends on the format of the original publication. A third improvement is that there are indexes of ancient persons as well as of ancient authors and documents and of general topics and a list of scholars mentioned; the importance of indexes in such a work was stressed by O. Salomies in his review of *RQ I* in *Arctos* XXX 1996, p. 264.

The two volumes overlap, in that there is a section in II devoted to further thought, additions, and corrections to items in I, and this volume does contain a compositions from before 1993. Four of the papers on the other hand are new and unpublished, and that means that there is a quicker rate of striking in II than in I, most of the papers produced within the last two decades. These newly published pieces include *Augustales and Sodales Augustales* (pp. 179–183), which should short-circuit many a potential confusion, and a contribution to military history, *Orbilus, Scaurus, and the award of Corniculum* (pp. 184–215), not the author's first (see Latomus LX 2001, pp. 3–15, next in the volume, on *armillae* and *torques*), but, like the pages devoted to individual legions, such as *Legio V in Messana*, it is another “original” contribution, first class evidence of the effectiveness of the author's approach to a diversity of contexts. L. comes up with a remarkable paragraph that arises from updating *CIL* (inscriptions from the Augusteum at Rusellae, on the peregrinations of *Legio IV* (pp. 429–431).

The high striking rate is hardly surprising when a scholar reaches the height of his powers and the fullness of his knowledge – and may be able to command the leisure that s/he has earned. Besides, there has been no emigration this time to interrupt the flow of work, such as G. Alföldy noted in *RQ I*, p. XI. All this leads the reader to ask whether the papers omitted from I but now selected for this volume are less good in quality than the others not omitted. The answer must be in the negative; they are simply shorter, and gathered into the single item number 19 (pp. 282–296). The consistency of L.'s work will be a repeated theme of this review.

Two distinguished reviewers of *RQ I*, O. Salomies (see above) and E. Gabba, *Athenaeum* LXXXIV 1996, p. 666, noted that the focus was on the later Republic. The same is true of the present volume: Cicero and Livy predominate in the index of ancient authors, along with *CIL*,

though p. 385, on the epigraphy of Albingaunum, carries us forward to the fifth century poet Rutilius Claudius Namatianus. Another original contribution (pp. 262–276) starts from a silver dish from Georgia presented to a King Flavius Dades by a Publicius Agrippa and enquires how they came by their Roman names. That takes us to the north-east corner of the Empire in the second century, but L. has an amused glance at their spear-heading of current Georgian efforts to join NATO and the EU: in one scholarly and patriotic essay Agrippa has been made to lead a Georgian contingent to help Rome put down rebellion in Judaea (p. 276, n. 50).

Inherent and justifiable scepticism keeps the author from lingering very long on the (hi)story of Rome's earliest years, though he opens the volume with it: *Ennius and Romulus on the Site of Rome*. In this scepticism he is in line with another great scholar, P.A. Brunt, who would declare that nothing could be known of the early history except what could be deduced from institutions that survived into the later Republic, such as that of the *rex sacrorum*. On *religio* the author is correspondingly sceptical: "It has to be stressed again and again that the only Roman religion of which we can say anything with any authority is the religion of the developed Republic and the Empire; of the early stages we have little, and the less we know the more fertile is the ground for scholarly fantasy" (p. 596).

Matter and content aside, the way is now free to enquire further how it is that this heavy (approximately 1.3 kg) volume, a handful to read, comes to be so irresistible to the reader. The answer lies in the author's own enthusiasm and drive, evident from his sixties onwards as it was in the earlier volume. Tone is important. There is something exuberant, even joyful, in L.'s learning and exposition, which makes turning the page for each new turn of the argument or to each new subject exciting and refreshing. Very illuminating are the adjectives of praise that he selects: marvellous, exemplary, erudite – and impish (p. 457). It was no surprise to find, quite late on in the volume (p. 586), the sentence that exactly fits the case: "A true scholar is engaged in discovering things like a child".

But L. is no child. Would it infringe his dignity to compare him with a detective, a Poirot or an Adam Dalgliesh? There are procedures that irresistibly suggest the detective story (as at 254). These of course are fictional characters, the puppets of their creators. But L. has over the years created his own character and techniques. Another comparison is implicitly made by the author himself (p. 464): "There appears to exist one avenue that has not yet been traversed. This temptation an explorer cannot resist".

Nor is the reader's journey through the book, as he follows L.'s explorations, much marred by the sight of the bodies of wounded scholars grimly knocked down on the way. (L. resembles R. Syme in that respect.) How one scholar writes about others gives an indication of his own views and capabilities, as well as of his manners. There is no sneer or snarl, even in unfavourable reviews (forbearing comments may be found on A. Alföldi at p. 161, n. 102 and on E.D. Rawson at p. 303), though L. is not mealy-mouthed in criticism whether in passing footnotes or in full-scale reviews; "deficiencies" are straightforwardly pointed out.

Throughout, however, L. is severely critical of certain scholarly trends, and it is here that many recent writers would part company with him. His journey of discovery has been made, especially in the last generation, in a changing landscape that on one side of him has produced novel and even exotic scholarly crops. On the other side of the path stands tradition, still strong in the universities of some European countries, but less fruitful than it once was. Although L. is hard on the "supreme disregard for clarity and the reader characteristic of the German *ordinarius*" (p. 559), and there is an attack on German historiography (p. 178), his fire is regularly directed elsewhere, at "vulgar sociology and other aberrations" (p. 289, n. 3).

Even well-established prosopography receives a sidelong blow (admittedly there have been excesses) for "reducing the blood, suffering and emotion of history to a parade of names" (p. 586), but when he wishes L. himself can make adroit use of it, as we have seen with Q. Scipio and when he deals with Cato's opponent L. Thermus (p. 65) or discusses a relative of the Emperor Pertinax (p. 454). As an observer, but one exercising judgment, he traces the fortunes of the citizen of Bergomum C. Cornelius Minicianus (*CIL* V 5126) at the hands of E. and A. Birley, R. Syme, A.N. Sherwin-White,

B. Dobson, and H. Devijver (pp. 439 f.): correspondent of Pliny or not? Judgment has to be reserved after all, but L. has an original proposal for Minicianus' *praefectura fabrum*.

The accused are all guilty of the same offences, obscurity and lack of precision, but the worst cases have emerged from France: in particular there is the *thèse*. L. assigns blame, in one case (p. 39), not to the writer of the book, but to "the absurd academic system that rewards effuse scribbling and frowns upon concise lucidity. It is no accident that Louis Robert never wrote a *thèse*". This would be akin to the "impressionistic literary musings" published by the students' elders. Thus "much nonsense has been written about gladiatorial games", and it would indeed be tedious to count the number of books on gladiators that have been published even since L. made his complaints in a review of 1985, printed here on pp. 458–462, which has an annotated list of publications in n. 1, of G. Ville, *La gladiature en Occident des origines à la mort de Domitien*, Rome 1981 (BÉFAR 245). American scholarship does not escape criticism, for the same familiar disease "thrives in American graduate programs, together with another pest, the scholarly oligoglottism" (p. 522). "The pest has spread far and wide" (p. 285), and L. rails at the "shallowness of American politography" (in combination with "the ponderous weight of German idiom", p. 515). "Anthropology is now the fad [...] classical erudition now appears quaint and superfluous" (p. 555). Hence L.'s denunciation of "voguish (and amateurish) incursions into the sphere of the Roman *religio*". In one volume he reviews these are combined with a bibliography "infested by the belief 'the newer the better', a tendency as pernicious as it is ahistorical: for it consigns to neglect great minds of the previous generations, and loses sight of the historical progression of our investigations" (p. 522). Sometimes there have been direct ideological confrontations: L.R. Taylor's lesson that "where there is obfuscation there is no true scholarship" is brought out in contrast with R.P. Saller's criticism of her "limited appreciation of ancient Rome", which is illustrative of the "modish sociological morass" (p. 582 f.). The castigation is unrelenting and the ancient language enlisted in the campaign: "'verba volant, scripta manent', unfortunately" (p. 561). Thanks and offerings may be made to celebrities such as J. Habermas (p. 519), but "the reader whose bent is toward 'liturgy' would prefer more Roman facts and less modern talk" (p. 503). These passages came from papers already published, but L. now inserts a remark that shows his stern adherence to them: an account of an exchange with H.S. Versnel when L. reviewed his edited work *Faith, Hope, and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, Leiden 1981 (Studies in the Greek and Roman Religion 2) and admitted that the words of the title "aroused the worst suspicions of the skeptic who dreads a torrent of semi-profound banalities in the fashion of the Parisian gurus" (p. 556, n. 1). L.'s response to Versnel's protest at this comment ends: "Somebody has to call juvenile fancies by the name they deserve".

L.'s own approach is essentially 'scientific'; he seeks scientific analysis and what can be tested, putting the case starkly in his review, already mentioned, of Beard, North, and Price, which enables him to set out his views on the gulf between Roman religion and Christianity with great lucidity: "Scientific are only such views the falsifiability of which is admitted by the very proponents of those views" (p. 505; cf. pp. 512 f.), and the result will be "a just appreciation of what can be known". At least, when he admits that "after our disquisition we do not necessarily know more about the Games in Patavium" (p. 491), "it is an informed *aporia*". I should prefer to speak of "uncompromising scholarship", for "science" and "scientific" in English are narrower than their equivalents in German and French. Besides, when L. comes to set down his view of what history is he explicitly rejects a course that can be tamed and explained: "This is a serious misunderstanding. History is not a preordained and reproducible chemical reaction; it is a dynamic and chaotic process, with many possible options and outcomes" (p. 177, n. 1). What he means, and what his principles are, can be gauged from remarks scattered throughout the book (apart from sidelong observations, as on the danger of using snippets of writing as evidence, p. 330, n. 18). There is praise for exact scholarship undertaken far from the purlieu of the gurus and their transatlantic ashrams: "Still another marvelous contribution [...] from Helsinki", he writes of M. Kajava's article on *visceratio* (Arctos XXXII 1998, pp. 109–131): it is "a rich blend of epigraphy, philology

and social history”; with characteristic candour he now adds a reference to J. Scheid’s *Quand faire, c’est croire. Les rites sacrificiels des Romains*, Paris 2005, pp. 213–254, written in direct polemic with Kajava (p. 326 with n. 1). In general terms, however, he holds that “no speculation can replace a careful reading of every line and every word, a procedure nowadays too often forgotten or disdained” (p. 183). The historian’s craft is “a painstaking analysis of the sources” (p. 633). There is a nice illustration at p. 154 of the claim that the work is all about reading texts: L. is able to show how Cicero was appointed governor *praeter opinionem*, unpicking the method of appointment. One late twentieth century development has provided the careful reader with additional weaponry: the computer. L., honouring his own computer (p. 194, n. 34), explicitly tells how electronics are useful and what they can add to the learning that he is championing (pp. 248, 419, with an engaging discussion of Nursia); he frequently alludes to them and (p. 405) looks forward to an enhancement of their role, indeed calls out for it.

This is where the candid reviewer, as part of her brief, must say something about the intellectual (and social) developments that L. has so effectively, if intermittently, castigated. (A substantial, argued, piece of prose from him on the subject would be worth having, and perhaps salutary, though the worse tendencies are probably too strong to be reversed.) Ironically, they have arisen in part from the same hankering to be “scientific”. Sociologists and anthropologists, and so on, have sought to approach recognized scientific disciplines, physics, chemistry and the like, in their prestige, power, and command of funds. That wish has largely been fulfilled because the new disciplines have provided a new subject of study (human kind in the mass) and made it available for study by the mass, who after all are funding centres of learning through the taxes they pay. Instructors in the new disciplines need to be able to deploy the vocabulary that will set them too apart as *cognoscenti*, to be looked up to in the scholarly world and perhaps also to mark them out from the mass of people to which we all belong. All this came about while Classics – Literature, History, and Philosophy – was entrenched and moving at its own slow pace. Lacking both the stature of the exact sciences and the glamour of the new disciplines, and combining those disadvantages with that of being thoroughly difficult as well as “irrelevant”, they have been “rescued” by being hauled on board (or at least taken in tow) by anthropology and sociology, acquiring the jargon of those disciplines as a part of their new orientation – or perhaps it would be better to say of their new uniform. Thus disguised, sometimes even subsumed into Faculties with all-embracing humanistic names, they enjoy protection and, with aid from tangible, glamorous, non-verbal, archaeology (not mentioned by L.), which relies heavily on scientific methods and processes, fresh prestige. At the same time they have apparently become accessible to all. A warning drawn from ancient classical culture was uttered by M. Rostovtzeff at the end of *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (2nd edn., rev. by P. Fraser, Oxford 1957), a work that came into being in the aftermath of the Bolshevik revolution (1926), and, as L. remarks (p. 572) “soars into the realm of *idea*”. Rostovtzeff wrote (vol. 1, p. 541): “Our civilization will not last unless it be a civilization not of one class, but of the masses”. But he went on to ask, “Is it possible to extend a higher civilization [...] without debasing its standards?”.

The costs of the rescue of Classics are painfully obvious: students of Classics who have not even any Latin, and books apparently made both erudite and fashionable through being kitted out with the appropriate jargon. That unfairly suggests charlatanism on the part of authors. On the contrary, they are faithful adherents, occasionally the victims, of the particular doctrines they have taken from their tutors and embraced. A tiny, and wilful, example comes from L.’s reviews, that of M. Dettenhofer, *Perdita Iuventus: Zwischen den Generationen von Caesar und Augustus*, München 1992 (Vestigia 40). As the content of her books shows, this author is thoroughly familiar with Latin, but she chooses to use the word *perdita* (‘lost’) to apply to the “lost” generation between Caesar and Augustus. L. berates this, for the author, though aware of the connotations of moral decadence that belong to *perditus*, applies it to a whole generation, without moral implications. L. uses this example to illustrate the divorce of history from philology, and the replacement of close attention to texts by sociological commonplaces (pp. 175–178).

I have to draw back from the root and branch condemnation that L. implies through his remarks cited above. That is not because I have reservations about his condemnation of the precise failings he mentions, still less about his own methods (the rest of this review shows that); only about the language he uses to describe them. The means by which the Classics has come in some aspects to combine obscurantism with superficiality are regrettable, but that does not mean that the exploitation of the techniques of sociology and anthropology is fruitless in itself. "In my father's house are many mansions" is a salutary dictum; and those mansions include well-signalled speculation.

Besides, I am less confident of "Roman facts" than the author: they are all reported by some writer or interpreted by some archaeologist or numismatist. "Fact" gives too much credit; "Roman material" is a safer phrase. Each modern author needs to ask himself or herself whether the techniques or terms s/he is about to adopt, especially novel ones, are sound in themselves and appropriately named, and then whether it is safe and candid to apply them to his or her own study. (I will not communicate one such new-fangled Latinate term that I learned recently – for Latin still has its uses – and for which I discovered that "layering" would serve as well.) And each reviewer must ask the same questions. Only in this way, through the strenuous self-discipline of individuals and their resistance to impressive cant, can the integrity of the subject be recovered and maintained. Effusiveness is another matter.

Integrity is the word that is thoroughly suitable for L.'s own body of work. Not only his consistency suggests that; his ever-renewed emendations and additions to his papers demonstrate it: 64 items in *Addenda et corrigenda altera* (!) to *RQ I*. Within each paper he demonstrates prodigious and profitable reading and learning, and incidentally sometimes points the way to Polish scholarship that might otherwise have been missed; even we near-monoglots are likely to be given the help of a synopsis.

Integration is another theme that recurs in this review and must be mentioned explicitly. Yet the publicity material for this book puts it well enough: "[The papers] uphold the unity of *Altertumswissenschaft*: history cannot be understood without philology, and philology is blind without history; and history, law and literature are infused with ideology and religion. And the tool to knowledge is the painstaking linguistic dissection of texts". L. stands where these disciplines meet and intersect (as he notes, p. 302, of the articles of E. Rawson collected in her *Roman Culture and Society*, Oxford 1991). They are thus able to deal with Roman society in all its dimensions. This quality has emerged several times in this review. Each perspective that the scholar can command adds to his power and reinforces the strengths of the others. (He explicitly deplores the legal incompetence of classical historians, p. 282). Of their tools prosopography has already been mentioned, and so has numismatics. Not far from prosopography is the quite specialized study of the army. The interplay of geography and history is on show too, in L.'s discussion of Forum Iulii Iriensium (p. 434).

With integrity goes loyalty. It is only a few years since L. published *Imperium sine fine: T.R.S. Broughton and the Roman Republic*, Stuttgart 1996 (Historia Einzelschriften 105). Now he offers the obituary notice, along with commemorations of Lily Ross Taylor and Agnes Kirsopp Michels, mentioning the qualities that he most admires in them. It is not surprising that Broughton and Taylor are scholars most frequently mentioned in the index of authors after Th. Mommsen, "our previous supreme deity" (p. 405), and alongside F. Münzer, who receives a special tribute (p. 352, n. 34), D.R. Shackleton Bailey, H. Solin, and R. Syme. These obituaries and encyclopaedia articles are other instances, along with the dedication of the present volume, of the care and attention that he has bestowed on the great American scholars with whom he has worked, men and women who were untouched by the malaises of which he complains. (The comprehensive uptake of French sociology in the United States came after them or after their scholarly habits were formed.) And he takes pleasure at the end of his paper on *Q. Scipio Imperator* in honouring his First Master and Teacher, Ludwik Piotrowicz (p. 174, n. 154). Where rationality is so much in evidence is humanity distant? These tributes show that that is not the case; so do references to scholars lost in great

and useless wars (p. 352, n. 34; p. 357, n. 53), and the warning for Europe that L. finds (p. 287) at the end of his review of E. Gruen's *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1984, in Gruen's conclusion (p. 730) that "Hellas ultimately fell under Roman authority not because the Romans exported their structure to the East but because the Greeks persistently drew the westerner into their own structure – until it was theirs no longer". Then there is the throwaway general remark (or was it made tongue in cheek?) that endeavours end in death and sorrow. However that may be, fun can be had on the way.

It is a necessary and dreary part of a reviewer's brief to find slips and misprints, even in the largest haystacks. I shall relegate my meagre collection to a footnote and not allow them the dignity of a place in what cannot be anything else than a celebratory text¹. The author has been honoured with a *Festschrift*: C.F. Konrad (ed.), *Augusto augurio: Rerum humanarum et diuinarum commentationes in honorem Jerzy Linderski*, Stuttgart 2004. That year he was only at the biblical marker of threescore years and ten; seventy-five not out, which he is to achieve in 2009, is a score even more fit for celebration. It is good to know that another volume is planned (p. 633).

Barbara M. Levick
Oxford

¹ P. 36: "The reforms of Marius and the introduction of a professional army". This sounds sharp and precise. The process may have been slower and more uneven than that: so A. Keaveney, *The Army in the Roman Revolution*, London–New York 2007, pp. 93 f.

P. 37: "Long after the public assemblies [...] ceased to exist, the senate endured under the imperial autocracy". When did popular assemblies cease to exist? Not before Nerva's *lex agraria*, in *Dig. XLVII 21, 3, 1*, with P.A. Brunt, *JRS LXVII 1977*, p. 107. They still endured in Cassius Dio's day, as he reports XXXVII 28, 1–3, writing of the centuriate assembly. Their functions were formal, not political.

Pp. 342–361: It is not only because the name of the subject reveals her gender that I object to the derogatory word "paintress" in the title of *The Paintress Calypso and other Painters in Pliny*, for all the clarification that the article brings, and the usefulness of its bibliographical references. This is "old school" in a regrettable way. It may be argued that the comparable formation "actress" continues unabated, but there has never been such depreciation of actresses (except for their morals); since the seventeenth century they have performed on the English stage in full equality with their male colleagues and could never, like poets, authors, and even painters, be relegated to the boudoir.

Minima:

P. 69: "Amynander, a small fry" should have no article.

P. 242: The reproduction of *CIL* XI 6053 has suffered in the printing.

P. 267: With "rather very summary" a choice of adverbs should be made.

P. 305: Are the much debated *quattuor ordines* the first fourteen rows in the theatre reserved for equestrians?

P. 309, n. 7: T. Ñaso del Hoyo should be T. Ñaco.

P. 323, n. 23: *existement* in Colum. I *Praef.* 1-2 should be *existiment*.

Pp. 343 and 545, n.6: "Alternative" is to be preferred to "alternate".

P. 468, n. 19: "C. Barret" is "A. Barrett".

P. 556, n. 1: "Preset" takes the place of "present" (in a quotation).

Index, p. 706: Antiochia ("in" Pisidia), for "towards".