Cups might not be as absolute or accurate a reflection of an Augustan monument as K tends to assume.

Such difficulties and others notwithstanding, the work is a deep and interesting one. It is a surprise to find such a long gap between the latest references (1989) and the date of publication (1995), though the Notes (213-305), Bibliography (307-27), and Indices (329-87) are extremely full and valuable.

T.R. Stevenson
University of Auckland


Lacey assembles here, with revisions, his investigations into the government of the Augustan Principate, adding some new essays. It looks like out-of-fashion Staatsrecht, and risks being brushed aside; but Lacey is looking not statically at the ‘system’ (which is what people are nowadays castigated for if they do it) but dynamically at the ‘evolution of the system’, at shifts and changes, accommodations and formulations, related to an ongoing political story, and that has every right to be attended to.

Chapter 3 reactivates Lacey’s thesis from over 20 years ago, that there was no ‘constitutional settlement of 27 BC’ because there didn’t need to be. That one has come to be pretty widely accepted.

Chapter 4 contains the less well-known thesis, from just over 10 years ago, that there was no ‘constitutional settlement of 23 BC’ either (and Chapter 7 must be drawn in here, being a new version of Lacey’s 1979 paper ‘Summi fastigii vocabulum’); for Augustus
did not, in that year, take the *tribunicia potestas* but said—according to Tacitus—that for looking after the plebs he was content with it, implying that he already possessed it in continuation of an earlier grant. To the objection that when *tribunicia potestas* came to be used as a serial marker for the years of reign the series was counted from 23 BC, Lacey's answers (116) fall short of adequacy.

Chapter 5 accords to Marcus Agrippa, after his consulship of 27 BC, a great eastern naval command like that held by Pompey in virtue of the *lex Gabinia*. It is discovered, Lacey explains, by a method that we might describe as like that of finding Black Holes—by observing the perturbations of other bodies: Lacey urges that from a study of the material it is reasonable to guess that Agrippa had such a command in the absence of evidence that he didn't. It is doubtful whether that 'inductive method' (as Lacey—not well—calls it) is as appropriate to the historical as to the natural sciences; and if applied in Chapter 4 it would surely have given him the answer he didn't want!

In chapter 9 we encounter another thesis first published nearly 20 years ago, about the 'Crisis of 2 BC', viz. that Augustus had to banish his daughter in that year for adultery in order to protect his current plans for the succession against rumours that Gaius and Lucius Caesar might have been born of her promiscuous intercourse years earlier. Now 'this allegation', as Lacey calls it, was not, as far as we know, ever made: he offers arguments for supposing that it might have been, but it wasn't, because the two young men so closely resembled the man supposed to be their father as to make it the one allegation that could not plausibly be made. To put the matter rather unkindly, Lacey has invented it. He has here, this once, succumbed to the seductions of the 'conspiracy' model of Augustan history. But 2BC in fact constitutes the *reductio ad absurdum* of that model, because several different conspiracies, quite incompatible with one another, have been read into it by scholars, depending on which bits of the evidence they choose to privilege and which to soft-pedal (Lacey's account, for example,
has nothing sensible to make of the significance of Iullus Antonius in the story).

Other studies in the collection move into the currently more fashionable vein, the analysis of symbols, public acts putting people's perceptions into a favourable mode. Chapter 1 is about reditus, formal reception upon return within the pomerium, which became a regular occasion for pomps and ceremonies. Lacey most valuably shows how that was rooted in Republican constitutional thinking and procedure—which is why it's Chapter 1! Chapter 8 is about the harnessing of family religion to the régime, with a re-statement of Lacey's thesis (published in B. Rawson, The Family in Ancient Rome, 1986, Essay no.5) that the culminating symbolic gesture, the grant of the title of pater patriae, implied that 'the common people' thought 'of Augustus as their paterfamilias'.

The final chapter, Chapter 10, looking still a bit wet behind the ears, carries brief observations about two concepts used by Tacitus to characterise the dynamic of the Augustan Principate. The first is in the famous phrase insurgere paulatim, which so accurately describes the gradualness of transition, the taking over of spheres of decision-making bit by bit until there is only one decision-maker left. The second is adulatio, the aspect of the Principate that the historian 'found most distasteful'. Lacey uses the evidence of opposition sentiments to show how the climate of upper- and lower-class opinion was not one of unalloyed sycophancy and that plenty of opportunity was available for the expression of dissatisfaction, until things turned sour towards the end (incidentally, the date of the banishment of Cassius Severus for defamatory writings should not be thought as secure as Lacey [230] seems to imply). Servility as against surliness, or, more broadly, acquiescence as against resistance: there, now, is a truly major theme, about which a lot of piecemeal writing has been done in recent years. Can we prevail on Lacey, who has given it only
J.A. Crook
St John's College, Cambridge

E.I. MCQUEEN (ed.) Diodorus Siculus: the Reign of Philip II

This is a welcome English translation and commentary on the
sixteenth book of Diodorus Siculus (the Loeb translation, the only
one hitherto available, inconveniently divided the book between
two volumes). The book is aimed at undergraduate ancient
historians without Greek and has a nice durable feel to it, vital to
its life as a textbook. The main interest is Philip, so that some
parts of the text that do not bear on Philip are not translated (the
account of the Persian expedition against Egypt and the story of
the coming of Timoleon to Sicily). The introduction discusses
Diodorus' life, the structure and contents and chronology and
sources of the work, as well as the portrait of Philip. There are
not so many introductions to Diodorus that another is not welcome.
Nor does this introduction attempt to conceal Diodorus' weaknesses as an historian, such as his plain errors of fact, his
missing years, and his contradictions.

The commentary has an historical focus and offers valuable
glosses and supplements of various sorts on specific information in
Diodorus. It also corrects him where he seems to be wrong (did
Philip really have the resources to distribute weapons on his
accession, 3.1? no, because he inherited a bankrupt treasury). The
translation is readable and informed by scholarship. There are
times when, for the sake of those Greekless students, there might
be greater consistency. The Greek arete is translated within one
section as referring first to Philip's 'abilities' and then to his
'excellence' (1.4, 6). That seems unnecessary. The Loeb translation