

Ilias Arnaoutoglou, *Ancient Greek Laws. A Sourcebook*, London and New York: Routledge, 1998. xxii + 164 pp. + 5 maps. ISBN 0-415-14984-3 (hbk); 0-415-14985-1 (pbk).

The aim of this collection is 'to open the normative world of the ancient Greek *poleis* to students (undergraduate and postgraduate) of ancient history and at the same time to present a concise picture of legislation in ancient Greek *poleis*, with all its shortcomings from the viewpoint of a modern reader' (p. xiii). This formulation is misleading, all the more so because Ilias Arnaoutoglou (hereafter A.) justifies 'the need for a sourcebook on ancient Greek laws' by reference to the masterly collection by R. Darestes, B. Haussoullier, and Th. Reinach, *Recueil des Inscriptions Juridiques Grecques*, now almost a century old, without giving any indication that that work reproduced the Greek texts as well as their French translations and discussed textual matters. The Greek laws in A.'s volume appear only in translation — a method of presentation that necessarily precludes any discussion of textual problems — and addresses an audience that clearly, whether undergraduate or postgraduate, has no knowledge of Greek.

The collection consists of 111 laws, culled from literary and epigraphical (not papyrological) sources, products of the legislative procedures of more than thirty political units. 33 of these laws are from Athens, 31 from Gortyn, eight from Thasos, four from Delphoi, three from Samos, three from Erythrai and two from Teos. The origins of the rest, each of which comes from a different *polis*, are scattered through mainland Greece, the islands and the western littoral of Asia Minor. The Black Sea areas are represented by a single inscription from Olbia (no. 41); south Italy and Sicily are unrepresented. The earliest laws date from the sixth century BC, the most recent ones from the second century AD.

There is no question that A. has done a service to scholarship in bringing this material together and especially in accompanying each item with a useful (though not always detailed) list of parallels and suggestions for further reading. The overall value of such an enterprise, however, must depend on the placing of the individual laws within some new theoretical framework that permits them to reflect upon each other in such a way as to illuminate hitherto hidden aspects of the *polis*. A. does not seem to have found any such framework. The classification he uses to group and organise his material is inconsistent, its basis oscillating between technical definitions suggesting a lawyer's point of view (e.g. 'Inheritance', 'Sale', 'Leases') and simplistic, 'factual', labels suggesting that of an administrative manager (e.g. 'Cleanliness', 'Animals', 'Naval affairs').

The book falls into three chapters. The first, *oikos*, is sub-divided into four sections ('Inheritance', 'Marriage-divorce', 'Sexual offences' and 'Personal status') containing 32 items in all. *Agora*, the second, consists of seven sections ('Collectivities', 'Trade', 'Finances', 'Leases', 'Coinage', 'Sale' and 'Animals') made up of 26 items. *Polis*, the last chapter (and by far the longest), consists of 53 items divided into eleven sections ('Penal regulations', 'Constitution', 'Procedure', 'Cleanliness', 'Property and debts', 'Establishing colonies', '*Polis* institutions', 'Building', 'Naval affairs', 'Inter-*polis* relations' and 'Religion and *polis*'). The deficiency of the

framework is made evident by its failure to fit some of these items into its self-defined categories. A fourth-century BC law from Delphoi (no. 22) dealing with the maltreatment of parents ('whoever does not provide for his father and mother, when denounced in the Council, shall be convicted by the Council and shall be incarcerated till [...]') is thus classed in the section 'Sexual offences' together with laws from Athens and Gortyn dealing with adultery, rape and seduction (nos. 19-21). An Athenian law prohibiting the digging up of olive trees (no. 33) is included in the chapter 'Agora' without being assigned to any section whatsoever. The Athenian law on male prostitution (no. 59) appears in the awkwardly named section 'Penal regulations' (into which most of the laws included in the book could, as a matter of fact, be fitted) rather than in the 'Sexual offences' section mentioned above.

Acknowledging, once again, the achievement of this collection in bringing together such disparate material, I would like to suggest an alternative framework that could enhance its value. First, a firmer line should be drawn between the laws made by the independent *poleis* of the Classical period and those made by the subservient *poleis* of the Hellenistic and Roman periods. A. exaggerates in imputing to 'some scholars' the argument that the imposition of Hellenistic and Roman political order meant the annihilation of the Greek *polis* (p. xvii). Their claim is only that the loss of political independence affected the *polis* legislators' state of mind. The change deprived them of that freedom to think, deliberate and legislate without constraint, and to act without fear of compulsion from without, which characterised the legislative acts of their Classical counterparts and imparted to them such extraordinary vitality. The formulaic, nearly identical language that both types of *polis* used to describe their decision-making processes is a red herring: it conceals the deep psychological differences that existed between the frames of mind of their legislators. For that very reason the laws of the Classical *polis* should be assigned to one category and the laws of the Hellenistic and Roman *polis* to another.

Secondly, one might design a framework informed by a clearly worked out conception of ancient civic legislation. The citizen-elite of each *polis* (or equivalent group of people) generated a plethora of laws with a single overriding purpose in mind: to make communal life possible. They achieved this by regulating certain fields of activity, repressing others, and weaving all the fields of activity together so as to form a harmoniously functioning whole. The implication must be that in order to gain a better understanding of this process we must construct a classificatory system that reflects as far as possible the way in which the ancient legislator would have regarded these types of activity. Deduced from the material assembled by A., the structure of this system would look somewhat like this (numbers marked with an asterisk designate laws issued by the subservient *polis*): 'Family, property and inheritance': nos. 1-8, 10-20, 22, 26, 84, 94; 'Inter-personal conflict': nos. 9, 21, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 35, 53, 55-8, 60, 62, 63, 81, 93; 'Breach of communal norms': nos. 59, 61, 82, 83*, 84; 'Public space management': nos. 33, 42, 47, 48, 49, 54, 85-8, 92, 99, 100, 101; 'Personal status': nos. 23, 24, 29, 77, 78; 'Subversive activities': nos. 34, 61, 64-72; 'Defence': nos. 102, 103; 'Food supply': nos. 36, 37, 44, 45; 'Trade': nos. 38-41, 46; 'Debts': nos. 43, 90*, 91; 'Coinage': nos. 50, 51, 52; 'The

constitution': nos. 69, 73-6, 97; 'Religion': nos. 79, 80, 97*, 98*, 107*, 108*, 109, 110*, 111; 'Foreign affairs': nos. 89, 95, 96, 104, 105*, 106*.

Organised in this way, the material would reveal something of the way in which the minds of ancient legislators worked, disclosing the range of problems of communal life with which they were grappling. It would also provide us with a classificatory system that would leave out none of the laws that A. has so scrupulously collected.

Gabriel Herman

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Barbara Levick, *Vespasian*, London and New York: Routledge, 1999. xxiii + 310 pp. ISBN 0-415-16618-7.

No longer can we complain about the lack of a biography of Vespasian in English. Levick's account fills the gap and slots neatly into the list of Routledge's imperial biographies. Her long-awaited book consists of thirteen chapters, four dealing with his career before his accession to the throne and nine on various aspects of his reign. There are also 34 plates and 9 maps; a stemma of the Flavii, of the Arrecini and the Julii; indices of persons, of peoples and places and of subjects and terms; a bibliography, notes (in compressed form) and a concordance of McCrum and Woodhead.

Chapter 1 is detailed and, in the main, uncontroversial. One item that deserved some discussion is whether or not Vespasian ever held a post in the Vigintivirate. In a footnote, Levick mentions, but does not discuss, Chastagnol's article (*Historia* 1976, pp. 253-4) where, on the basis of Suetonius *Augustus* 38.2 and Dio 59.9.5, he argues that Vespasian could never have held such a post (that he did is accepted without question by L) and, furthermore, that he must have served in Thrace as a tribus angusticlauius: for a convenient list of those supporting and opposing Chastagnol's thesis, see A.A. Barrett, *Caligula: The Corruption of Power* (1989), p. 312 n. 86. Again, the possibility that Vespasian held the quaestorship as early as 33/34 is difficult to accept. More, too, should have been made of Vespasian's obsequious attitude to Gaius: as praetor, he never let slip an opportunity to curry favour with the emperor, as is shown by the two speeches noted by Suetonius (*Vesp.* 2.3) and, in particular, his proposal that Lepidus (and Gaetulicus) be denied public burial. If the latter coincided with Agrippina's return to Rome with Lepidus' ashes, then the hostility she showed towards him (Suetonius *Vesp.* 4.2) may well have had its origins at this time: her welcome was Vespasian's speech — no wonder she hated him. Chapter 2 deals with the Claudian invasion of Britain and Vespasian's role therein — a thorough and up-to-date account. A minor point — the reference to (A.R) Birley on p. 215 should read 1981 and not 1975.

Chapter 3 covers the period from Nero's accession to the fall of Jerusalem. Vespasian's proconsular year is given as 63 though no evidence for such precision is adduced. The hostility between Mucianus and Vespasian, connected by L to Corbulo, could be explained more plausibly in other ways. Presumably, Vespasian would have reached Ptolemais early in 67, some months before Mucianus, whose arrival (to take up his Syrian command) could be assigned to early August. The dispute between