Alexander—yet after Bosworth has said 'I have tried to avoid value judgments and psychological speculation' (791) he follows up in the next paragraph, on Alexander's accession (794), with 'the sources hint at civil war, narrowly averted by ruthless massacre'. The paragraph after begins with 'More personal acts of vengeance followed'. 'Ruthless' and 'personal' would certainly reflect value judgments, even supposing that 'massacre' and 'vengeance' were dispassionately descriptive. Perhaps the material just demands a response and a writer cannot help making one: taking for granted that a new king of Macedon had to murder most of his known enemies in order to establish himself would be an act as much informed by perception of value as Bosworth's rhetoric is. Objectivity is hard to achieve. Still, here and throughout the volume the basics are in place, so that CAH VI will do the job it is meant to, probably for a generation.

Paul McKechnie
University of Auckland


This is a sensible work, which will be a helpful guide to inquiring students, and will often be useful to their teachers as well. The text is that of Ihm (Leipzig 1907), with three changes listed at 28; unfortunately, the commentary does not discuss any textual problems, not even obelized passages. This review, therefore, only discusses the English parts of the book. A reviewer's job is to point out what could be done better, so what follows is largely negative; many of the blemishes, however, could be removed in a second edition, which I hope the book will have.
The greatest fault—presumably the publisher’s decision—is the lack of indices. This gaping hole often makes it very hard to find information which one is sure is there, somewhere. Several works are mentioned in the book with slight or no details, and not listed in the bibliography: among them, ‘Rietra (1928)’, ‘J. Elsner and J. Masters (1994)’, ‘Balsdon CR 65 (1951)’, ‘E. Badian, JRS 63 (1973)’. Twelve Syme articles are in the bibliography; for only one is a cross-reference given to Roman Papers (or to one of the other Syme collections). The bibliography shows other strange gaps. Older standard works, like Friedländer’s Sittengeschichte, Berger’s Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law, or even Crook’s Law and Life of Rome (all of which might have been used with advantage in the commentary), can probably be found through existing bibliographies; but it is strange, for example, to include (very properly) Koenen’s 1970 article on Augustus’ funeral speech for Agrippa, but not Gronewald’s addition, published thirteen years later (ZPE 52 [1983], 61-2); to have an article by L. de Coninck, but not his important book, Suetonius en de archivalia (Brussels 1983); and not to mention the author’s own article on the elder Agrippina’s children (Latomus 54 [1995], 3-17), at least as ‘forthcoming’. Quite inexplicable is the failure to use, or even to mention, Roman Provincial Coinage, vol. 1 (London 1992).

The introduction is conventional, but useful. However, Nicolaus of Damascus also wrote an imperial biography (4-5), and there is an edition, with a poor translation and commentary, in the same BCP series (J. Bellemore 1984); L’s English is sometimes unclear, for example (16), ‘Drusus’ funeral itself is treated summarily by Tacitus, since he did actually participate in it, and delivered the funeral speech’—‘he’, in this case, is not Drusus, who certainly participated in the funeral, but did not speak; nor is it Tacitus; in fact it is Tiberius, who is not otherwise mentioned in the sentence. Also strange is L’s use of ‘u’ for ‘v’ in Latin-based words, when he is writing English—not only ‘Liuia’, but even ‘Liuian’ and the like.

The really important part, however, is the commentary and in general this is reliable. But there are serious omissions: no discussions of several important items, for example:
(75 on 7.3) no discussion of Tiberius' alleged continued love for 'Agrippina' (i.e. Vipsania), or how Livia was able to keep the pair apart for thirty years after their divorce;

(80-81 on 9.1) no discussion of troubles in Gaul, 19/18 BC, and little (9.2) on the conquest of Rhaetia and Vindelicia, not even a reference to Horace, Odes 4;

(91 on 14.2) Livia and the omen of the hen (on the beginning of Julio-Claudian power) should have brought a reference to the parallel omen of the end of the family's power (Suetonius Galba 1), also involving Livia and hens;

(96 on 17.1) no mention that the site of Varus' disaster has now been established, at Kalkriese, near Osnabrück;

(97 on 17.2) Tiberius' triumph for restoring the situation in Pannonia was postponed, yet he apparently crossed the pomerium into Rome, and didn't lose his eligibility to triumph; hence his imperium, like Augustus', was valid within the city;

(100 on 20) Tiberius finally triumphed in AD 12, and this may be illustrated by the 'Vienna cameo' —i.e. the Gemma Augusta—but on it, Tiberius does not do homage on his knees to his step-father, as Suetonius describes; L misses the point that, though the triumphator was Jupiter for the day, yet Tiberius on that day treated Augustus as Jupiter; E. Künzl (Der römische Triumph, Munich 1988, 122) rightly saw this as 'a conclusive symbol of the downfall of the Republic';

(104 on 21.4) the Greek in this section is corrupt, puzzling, and perhaps inexplicable, but it needs a comment;

(111 on 25.2) the treatment of the 'debate' in the Senate about how much of the imperial responsibilities Tiberius should assume is very inadequate;

(113 on 26.1) discussion of Tiberius' attitude to imperial cult needs a reference to the Gytheium inscription and particularly Tiberius' own letter (Ehrenberg & Jones, Documents 102), and, for Pontius Pilate, to his dedication at Caesarea Maritima (AE 1971, 477);

(140-42 on 43-45) Tiberius' alleged sexual activities are treated very delicately, and no references are given to similar accusations (if they exist) against other unpopular rulers;

(166-67) the brief bibliography on Sejanus needs, at least, to include Syme, Tacitus 254-6, 384-5, 401-6, 752-4;
(178 on 68.3) no comment on Augustus' explicit mention (with attempted palliation) of some of Tiberius' offensive traits, not even a reference back to 21. 2-3, or to Tac., Ann. 1.10;

(181-2 on 70.3) students will look in vain for any discussion of the songs the Sirens sang, or Achilles' name among the maidens;

(188 on 75) nothing on the numismatic evidence that Gaius intended to deify Tiberius;

(188 on 76) nothing here, or in the bibliography, on H. Bellen's fundamental work on the transformation of the imperial property from private to public (ANRW 2.1, 1974, 91-112) and how important nullifying Tiberius' will in 37 was in this process, and also no remark that, if the will was void, so were all the legacies it granted—so that Gaius had to pay them as gratuities (Suet. Gaius 16.3).

Not only are there omissions, but also errors:

(56 on 1.2) the patrician Claudii used Publius and Quintus (both mentioned by L elsewhere) as praenomina, as well as Appius, Caius, Decimus and Tiberius;

(74 on 7.2) to call the later Augustus 'emperor' already before 32 BC is an improper prolepsis;

(80 on 9.1) the standards regained from the Parthians included those taken from Crassus in 53 BC, and not 'from Antony in 40 BC', but from Decidius Saxa in 40 and from Antony in 36 BC;

(83 on 10.1) L wrongly interprets Tacitus' remark (Ann. 1. 53. 2) that Julia despised Tiberius ut imparem as meaning she contempted his inferior birth, but in fact it refers to his inferior—indeed hopeless—prospects while C. and L. Caesar lived;

(88 on 12.2) not Augustus but Tiberius attacked M. Lollius, according to Tac. Ann. 3.48;

(96 on 17.2) the cognomen which Augustus stated Tiberius would get after Augustus' death is not 'Caesar', which Tiberius had had since AD 4, but 'Augustus';

(102 on 20) there was no Pannonian triumph, nor even a victory, in AD 6, but the final victory came in AD 9, the triumph in 12;
at Augustus’ death, Tiberius did not ‘demand a praetorian bodyguard’, but took over the command of Augustus’ guard, without more ado;

the suggestion that ‘Tiberius’ initial grant [of imperial power]...was for a ten year period only’ is directly contradicted by the two Dio passages referred to (57. 24.1; 58. 24.1) especially in conjunction with Dio 53. 16.3;

‘Nero’ and ‘Agrippina’ should have epithets to distinguish them from more famous namesakes;

the claim, with reference to Gaius and Nero, that ‘The standard theme is that stinginess led to rapacity’ is obviously untrue for these two emperors;

L credits Seneca with a ‘Cons. ad Liu.’;

a more important factor in Livia’s political ambitions than ‘her powerful lineage’ was her inheritance of one third of Augustus’ estate, and the slaves, freedmen and influence which went with it;

the date of the annual vota was 1st (not 3rd) January, at least till 69 (Tac. Hist. 1.55), and it was probably transferred to the 3rd as a result of the events of that year, and the fact that the 2nd of every month was held to be unlucky;

Seleucus the grammaticus is known from other sources besides this, as a glance at the article in Der Kleine Pauly will show; in fact my former colleague E. A. Duke wrote her Oxford D. Phil. thesis (unfortunately unpublished) on him and his works;

‘the younger daughter of Drusus’ at first sight is strange, since this Drusus (Tiberius’ son) only had one daughter; it is only a second reading which reveals that what is meant is that Drusus’ daughter was younger than Drusus’ widow, Livilla; Dio 58. 7.5 might usefully have also been cited;

the fact that Tiberius, on first entering the curia after Augustus’ death, sine tubicine supplicavit does not reveal him as ‘a staunch traditionalist’ but as one innovating in Roman ceremonial on the basis of Greek learning.

There are regrettably numerous misprints, and several mistakes in Latin, but they do not seriously affect intelligibility.
Finally, there must be two questions about the publishers: first, why do they produce this text—which never has been nor will be studied for its own literary merit—without a translation? The commentary would be very useful to 'Classical Studies' students, if only the lemmata were in English, referring to an English translation. Secondly, L frequently refers to his commentary on Suetonius Caligula in the same series, published in 1993. To date I cannot recall having seen this book advertised, and my impression is that Duckworth's could have done more to create some publicity profile for it in the learned world. Is there a tendency for Duckworth's to hide its light under a bushel?

C.T.H.R. Ehrhardt
University of Otago

- o -


This is a volume of papers mostly delivered at a symposium held at the University of Wisconsin in October 1989. The Preface (xi-xii) states that the studies 'are devoted to reconstructing and assessing the career, intellectual environment, and stylistic tradition of one of fifth-century Greece's most renowned sculptors, Polykleitos of Argos' (xi). It is beautifully and comprehensively illustrated with both black-and-white and colour photographs. In fact, the production values are first-rate: large, glossy pages and that wonderful 'crack' and smell of a strong new book as you open its pages. The chapters may be divided under four headings:

i) Precedents and parallels for the intellectual and theoretical aspect of Polykleitos' work (Chapters 1-5).