
Attention first alights on the pages of contents (v–xi) where the regions appear to outdo the sum of the central parts, and where decentralisation and devolution and their evident popularity extending even into areas of research are well and thoroughly highlighted). No longer the predominance of Rome, the urbs, but rather the new domination of Roman, as indeed the title to the tenth volume of the second edition of *The Cambridge Ancient History* implies: this work is devoted to the Augustan empire, created by the first princeps, and not exclusively to its political or cultural epi-centre. That is not to say that Rome is not fully accorded due place and honour deserving of the prima inter pares, but there is a distinct provincialisation of the chapters contained in this impressive looking volume, which demonstrates that “regional specialization is a marked feature of modern scholarship” (xx).

The narrative section—Part 1—of Volume 10 (pp. 1–282), slightly more than a quarter of the entire text, commences on “27 November 43 B.C., the day on which the Lex Titia legalized the triumviral arrangement” (xix), and concludes with the grudging acquiescence of the Rhine legions to Vespasian’s manifest grip on supremacy in early AD 70 (p. 281). With cinematic precision, which owes not a little to Ronald Syme, the reader is taken through the triumviral period by Pelling (Chap. 1): the battles at Philippi, the initial and later odysseys of Antonius, “the tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra” (p. 67), the Perusine conflict and its aftermath, the campaigns of Ventidius, the propaganda war of the 30’s and the climatic battle—actually a bit of a damp squib—at Actium (p. 59). A confusing and tiring period, if ever there was one, but made somewhat clearer but, as it has been for a generation or more now, the sympathy remains with Antony and his lover rather than with the victor in the civil war.

Crook takes up with the Augustan peace in the city and in Italy (Chap. 2), again very readable, if a trifle more legalistic than political, which rather belies the title—“Political History”—of this section. Still it is good to see the notion of “constitutional settlements” exposed as “too schematic a description” (p. 87) of the political changes which were inducted between 28 and 18 BC. The Augustan principate was truly a living entity at this stage and not a series of
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“paper arrangements” hammered out between senate and princeps every time there was a crisis, of which no shortage, even after Caesar appeared to be fully in control of affairs (p. 94), at least, that has been the opinion of historians from then and ever since. C. exposes the inadequacies of these sources with regard to a multitude of "crises", and urges sensible caution against too dramatic a development of the princeps during the 20’s, but that crisis even "catastrophe" does appear to have followed "hard on the heels of triumph". It is "an obstinate motif in the story of the age" (p. 97). Is it not in any age, one is tempted to wonder? Moving on to Augustus' authority and achievements (Chap. 3), C. ponders the ways through which the res publica, its institutions and conventions came to be controlled by a single man and his amici. Power over the armies, financial resources, patronage and auctoritas (p. 114–123) figure prominently here, but perhaps more important was the consummate way in which these were handled (p. 123–146), and that it was Augustus, and nobody else, who made the Roman empire a realistic long-term proposition. Indeed the "shape of the Roman Empire was his contribution" (p. 146)—no mean contribution that, and one not much emulated by his immediate successors.

Gruen (Chap. 4) assesses Roman foreign policy, or non-policy as the case may be, for this first princeps; and it is clear that policy, even if not defined as such does appear in regions such as Germany (p. 178–188) and the East (p. 148–163). However, whether "terrorism" (p. 166 & 180) is really an apt and accurate description is really rather debateable; in any case it is a purely subjective opinion. Still G. is probably right to conclude that diversity "stands out far more boldly than uniformity", and that the "policy may have been flexible but the image was consistent" (p. 196–197). Chapters 5 & 6 see Wiedemann retelling the familiar story of the Julio-Claudians, their decline—in sheer numbers if nothing else—and their final demise, and then their immediate, unfortunate and fortunate, successors (p. 265–281). There is good clarity here, but not much in dispute, and certainly no 'supressio veri' or 'suggestio falsi', rather a useful analysis of the evolution of autocracy, the development of domus Caesaris as pervasive and instrumental in ruling an empire, with the results that the: "nature of the Principate naturally gave any new emperor the advantage of having patronage to bestow, and being able to remove from positions of authority men upon whose loyalty he had no claims, to replace them with others who would be ipso facto in the new emperor’s debt" (p. 262). How times may have changed but, as Galba, Otho and Vitellius learned to their cost, patronage alone did not make for successful principes.