

discontent. We thus cannot be sure whether the five chapters in which Gellius makes Fronto one of the interlocutors represent the reception of Frontonian ideas by a member of the contemporary Roman intelligentsia or an approved portrait, forming part of the rhetor's self-presentation. Regrettably, this doubt may impair the validity of attempts to discover in these chapters the reasons for Fronto's vexation.

To sum up: though not very user-friendly, v.d. H.'s commentary is an essential tool for readers of Fronto, and a thorough and stimulating one.

Amiel D. Vardi

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Anna Maria Andermahr, *Totus in Praediis. Senatorischer Grundbesitz in Italien in der Frühen und Hohen Kaiserzeit*, Antiquitas, Reihe 3, Band 37, Bonn: Habelt, 1998. viii + 579 pp. + 4 maps. ISBN 3-7749-2846-0.

Anna Maria Andermahr is a pupil of Werner Eck and her book is a revised version of the dissertation that she presented at the University of Cologne in the winter semester of 1996/97. What immediately strikes the reader is how well she has absorbed the lessons of her supervisor in interpreting epigraphical evidence. The sophistication of her approach to technical matters sets in sharp relief the amateurish quality of some discussion of inscriptions to be found in recent books in English about the early Roman Empire which profess higher and more ambitious historical aims than Andermahr, but which still sometimes treat inscriptions as self-contained texts without reference to the lost statues and usually vanished monuments on which they were originally inscribed and which they were written to accompany and to explain.

The importance of landowning and landed estates to the Roman senatorial class has long been recognised, and it is significant that Andermahr's first footnote refers to the discussion of landed wealth in the Republic in the classic study by Israel Shatzman, *Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics* (*Collection Latomus* 142: Brussels, 1975). However, whereas the evidence used by Shatzman was overwhelmingly literary, the evidence for senatorial landowning in the imperial period is predominantly epigraphical. Andermahr confines her attention to senatorial landowning in Italy between Augustus and the year 260, which she misdescribes in conventional fashion as 'der Regierungsantritt Galliens' (2). The book has three parts: first come methodological prolegomena, most of which discuss the evaluation of different types of epigraphical evidence (4-42); second in logical order, though printed third, is an enormous catalogue of senators and senatorial families whose ownership of land is attested in a specific place or places (126-496); between the prolegomena and the catalogue Andermahr presents her results (43-125).

The first part systematically reviews different types of evidence, such as fistulae, funerary monuments, honorific dedications (subdivided by categories of dedicants), building inscriptions, foundations, dedications to emperors and archaeological evidence. It also considers briefly such topics as senators holding municipal office, the origins of senators' slaves and senatorial names borne by freedman and their descendants. All this is conscientiously and competently done. One section, however,

stands out as an original contribution to an important and disputed problem. What is the precise significance of the proper names often found inscribed in the genitive case on lead waterpipes? The traditional view, reiterated by Eck himself on several occasions (e.g., 'Die fistulae aquariae der Stadt Rom. Zum Einfluss des sozialen Status auf administratives Handeln', *Epigraphia e ordine senatorio*. Tituli 4-5, Rome, 1982, pub. 1985, 197-225), is that the names belong to property owners who were entitled to draw water through the pipes on which their names are inscribed. On this basis, inscribed lead pipes provide evidence that individuals or families owned land in specific localities — if not necessarily the land through which the pipes ran, then at least land nearby, which the pipes supplied with water. This traditional view was vigorously challenged by Christer Bruun in his study of *The Water Supply of Ancient Rome. A Study of Roman Imperial Administration (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 93: Helsinki, 1991), 72-6, 87-95, 286-93, 345-50, who argued that the inscribed name(s) need not be the name(s) of the owner(s) of adjacent property at all, but often belong to the manufacturer(s) of the pipes, that is, that the formula should be interpreted as (*ex officina*) *C. Seii*. Bruun's case was based largely on pipes from the city of Rome and the port of Ostia: Andermahr not only questions his inference in these cases, but brings in evidence from the rest of Italy, where it can sometimes be established for certain that the persons named in the genitive on waterpipes owned estates in the area — which implies, with some degree of probability, that these persons owned the land on which the pipes were found (7-10). To take the first relevant example in Andermahr's catalogue (127/8 no. 3): a *fistula* built into an aqueduct on Elba is inscribed P. Acili Attiani (*CIL* 11.2607), and from the same small island comes a dedication to Hercules by the praetorian prefect P. *Acilius Attianus* (*CIL* 11.7248 = *ILS* 8999). Although neither Bruun nor Andermahr seems to pose it explicitly, the obvious question which occurs to one who has not thought seriously about such matters is: when, where and why were names inscribed on pipes? The correct answer to this question is perhaps that the manufacturer stamped some pipes in each consignment as they were produced at the factory in order to indicate to whom they were to be shipped.

Andermahr's long catalogue is, so far as I have verified it, completely reliable in detail: it quotes evidence accurately and evaluates it fairly. Nevertheless, taken as a whole, it presents an overall picture that may be unintentionally misleading. Andermahr does not confine her catalogue, as I believe that she should have confined it, to attested landholding by known individual senators and known senatorial families. She includes *equites* like Acilius Attianus, the praetorian prefect of Trajan and Hadrian, who certainly received *ornamenta consularia*, but was never an actual member of the Roman Senate (despite A. Stein, *PIR*² A 45). She also has many entries for senators on the grounds that they must be presumed to have owned landed property in their home towns: as she observes of Sejanus, who came from Volsinii, 'seine Familie muss also im Gebiet der Stadt begütert gewesen sein' (135/6 no. 13). The inference is valid, but the book as a whole would surely have been more illuminating if the author had systematically contrasted the disparity between what happens to be attested in the evidence that survives with what must have been the case in reality. Some of the most interesting passages in Shatzman's book are those where he

comments on the very small number of Republican senators in the second and early first centuries BC who are actually attested by explicit evidence as owning houses in Rome (*Senatorial Wealth* [1975], 12, 18).

What of Andermahr's conclusions? The first and probably the most important will not surprise anyone who reflects on the vagaries of the surviving evidence: 'Senatorischer Grundbesitz in Italien war regional höchst unterschiedlich verteilt; in manchen Gebieten lassen sich zahlreiche Familien nachweisen, während anderswo entsprechende Zeugnisse vollständig fehlen' (43). But Andermahr provides some twenty tables, each with intelligent and succinct comment, analysing where senators owned land in Italy and correlating ownership and origin area by area. Her most important result is perhaps the large number of senators who are attested as owning land both in the close vicinity of Rome and elsewhere in Italy (91-94, Tab. 19). Andermahr is sensibly cautious and shows herself reluctant to draw far-reaching inferences, for example, about methods of farming and land exploitation, from the material which she has assembled and marshalled so ably. Hence, as she modestly and correctly observes in her concluding paragraph (125), 'die vorliegende Untersuchung lässt viele Fragen offen'.

T.D. Barnes

University of Toronto

M. Pucci Ben Zeev, *Jewish Rights in the Roman World: The Greek and the Roman Documents Quoted by Josephus Flavius*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998. xvi + 520 pp. ISBN 3-16-147043-5.

Josephus quotes thirty official documents dealing with Jewish rights in Books XIV, XVI and XIX of his *Antiquitates Judaicae*: resolutions of the Roman senate, letters of Roman magistrates and promagistrates, decrees of several Greek cities and edicts of two Roman emperors, Augustus and Claudius. Modern scholars of the last three centuries have used these documents for the study of Jewish rights and status under Roman rule in the Late Republic and Early Empire. The documents have also been the subject of long debate concerning their authenticity and veracity. Ben Zeev's book is the most comprehensive and systematic study of these questions. Her general conclusion is that the documents are basically 'authentic' (more on this below), and not forgeries fabricated by Josephus or any of his sources. Hence, they offer reliable material for the reconstruction of Roman policy towards the Jews during the period under discussion.

The structure of the book is plain. In addition to an introduction which presents the problem of the documents and surveys briefly the history of the scholarly debate about their authenticity, it consists of two parts. The first is devoted to a meticulous examination of all the documents. The text and English translation of every document are given (those of R. Marcus, A. Wikgren and L.H. Feldman in the Loeb Classical Library, with very few changes) with full bibliography of scholarly publications pertinent to the particular document. This is followed by a detailed historical and philological commentary which, among other points noted, draws attention to