Ammon and the Carthaginian Baal Hammon, as has often been suggested, but is simply a calque of the former; the presence of the 'h' is just a confusion in spelling (255–65).

In general, the book has both the advantages and disadvantages one would expect of a catalogue, and it is unreasonable to complain about the latter when the former are so well secured. Through her careful and judicious collection, B.-R. has provided a valuable basis for further work on the religious and social history of North Africa.

Columbia University J. B. RIVES

K. BURASELIS, *ΘΕΙΑ ΔΩΡΕΑ. ΜΕΛΕΤΕΣ ΠΑΝΩ ΣΤΗΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΗ ΤΗΣ ΔΥΝΑΣΤΕΙΑΣ ΤΩΝ ΣΕΒΗΡΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ* CONSTITUTIO ANTONINIANA (with English summary) (Academy of Athens monograph 1). Athens: Academy, Research Centre for Antiquity, 1989. Pp. 224. ISBN 960-7099-00-1.

The currently prevailing model of the spread of Roman citizenship under the Principate is a steady progression to the climax of Caracalla's edict of universal enfranchisement in 212: 'the world became ready, and Caracallus had only to affix the official seal' (so A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (1973²), 280). As for Caracalla's aims, most modern historians, beguiled by the siren authority of contemporaneity, have been content to go along with the jaundiced explanation of the Severan senator Cassius Dio (LXXVII (LXXVIII).9.5), for whom the measure was essentially fiscal (to enlarge the pool of subjects liable to the 10 per cent inheritance tax levied on Roman citizens). As Buraselis underlines in this important, heavily-footnoted, monograph, there are problems with these views. The widespread notion that, by A.D. 200, Roman citizenship was the norm among provincial decurions (a far broader social stratum than the *primores* of the city-councils) is not borne out by the evidence of papyri and inscriptions (carefully sifted by B., 120–48) for the edict's considerable impact on provincial onomastics (i.e. the sudden appearance in the third century of Aurelii in large numbers, a phenomenon well-known to papyrologists and Greek epigraphists), nor, indeed, by the Tabula Banasitana of 177/8 (published in 1971), with its solemn affirmation in the name of Marcus Aurelius that, as late as this, Rome still made personal awards of Roman citizenship only on grounds of 'very great merit', *maxima merita* (so B., 114). B. also challenges (149–60) the conventional wisdom that by 200 the old legal distinction between citizen and alien in Roman law had been superseded by the new one between *honestiores* and *humiliores*, citing in particular (155–7) the telling details in the account by Eusebius of the martyrdom in 177 of the Pergamene Attalus, a Roman citizen; indeed, the need to give legal privilege to provincial decurions in the second century could have arisen precisely because the protection offered by Roman citizenship was spread among them so unevenly. Secondly, the papyrus fragment (P. Giss. 40 I) of a Greek version of the original text of the edict preserves traces (the passage in question is heavily restored but the gist is clear) of a neglected rationale for the measure, one which takes us far from fiscality: Caracalla claimed to be offering thanks to Rome's gods by seeking to enlarge the pool of their Roman worshippers.

B.'s larger context for the edict is the levelling ideology which he imputes to the Severan emperors, who sought — on his view — to promote greater equality between different subject-groups (including those with and without citizenship); B. sees the background to this ideology in the need of the African Severus to legitimate his rule (by creating a broader stratum of provincial support), in his own provincial outlook, and in the religious and philosophical *Zeitgeist*. Since little or no direct support for the existence of such an ideology can be found in the two chief sources for the period (Dio and Herodian), B. has to reconstruct it (25–110) by trying to impart a coherence to an otherwise disparate body of indirect evidence concerning all four Severan emperors. B. is careful and judicious in his exercise of this methodology (one with which many ancient historians will be familiar), and in the end makes out a persuasive case, although some of his argumentation, inevitably, will be controversial (e.g., 50, his dating of the Alexander-historian Q. Curtius Rufus to the Severan age; and this reviewer has slight qualms about the extent of the ideological homogeneity which we can ascribe to the Severan 'dynasty' as a whole).

If Caracalla's edict is indeed his 'chief claim to fame' (so *OCD*² s.v. Aurelius (2)), B. offers a refreshing basis for a reappraisal of his reign. All serious students of Caracalla, and of the Severan monarchy in general, will have to pay heed to this excellent study, which would merit translation into a — dare one say it — more accessible language.

University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne A. J. S. SPAWFORTH

D. RATHBONE, *ECONOMIC RATIONALISM AND RURAL SOCIETY IN THIRD-CENTURY A.D. EGYPT. THE HERONINOS ARCHIVE AND THE APPIANUS ESTATE* (Cambridge classical studies). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. Pp. xix + 489, 1 map. ISBN 0-521-40149-6. £45.00.

This ambitious book may reasonably be described as the most important work published so far on the economy of Roman Egypt. Its value depends not on its breadth — it is limited to agriculture, to large estates, and to the third century — but on the depth of the documentation on which it is based (the

Heroninos archive), the acuteness of its analysis, and above all its conscious generalization from this analysis to fundamental questions of ancient economic history. These are large claims, but Rathbone has gone far beyond the assemblages of data visible in Johnson's *Roman Egypt* or in Drexhage's recent replacement of Johnson's lists (A. C. Johnson, 'Roman Egypt' in Tenney Frank (ed.), *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* 2 (1936); H.-J. Drexhage, *Preise, Mieten/Pachten, Kosten und Löhne im römischen Ägypten* (1991)), not to speak of the numerous but much more limited articles on such subjects.

The basis of this study is a body of some 450 published papyri (R. estimates that another 600 remain unpublished) from a trove found around the turn of the century at the ancient Theadelphia, a village in the Arsinoite Nome (the Fayum district of Egypt, SW from Cairo). These documents concern one portion of the estates of one Aurelius Appianus, a wealthy and high-ranking Alexandrian who may have attained equestrian census status (but who apparently did not have an equestrian career). The eponymous Heroninos was the manager of the Theadelphian unit of Appianus' holdings during the middle of the third century, and the archive consists largely of accounts and letters, now dispersed among various European collections.

R. sets out two aims: to provide a guide to the Heroninos archive to encourage and help editors of the hundreds of still unpublished papyri belonging to it; and to set out what he believes are the implications of the published texts for our understanding of the economic character of the estates described in this documentation and, more broadly, for land management in the Roman world. He argues that this evidence helps to fill three key gaps in our knowledge left by the literary and archaeological evidence for Roman estates: (1) labour systems outside Italy; (2) method and aims of management; and (3) social and economic relationships of the various people involved. Most of the bulk of the book is devoted to the first, more papyrological, aim, presenting the detailed analysis of the papyri necessary to support the larger conclusions. These studies will indeed be extremely valuable to papyrologists; other ancient historians may find them principally a painful reminder of how little comparable evidence survives from other parts of the Empire! Though I shall deal with them rather rapidly in what follows, I must emphasize that anyone seeking to challenge R.'s conclusions will need to meet him on the detail, not only the broad sweep.

The conclusions may be summarized briefly as follows. The estates studied here were owned by provincial magnates, some of whom were Alexandrian notables and others of whom had equestrian procuratorial careers. Their estates in the Arsinoite Nome were directed by members of the local élite, particularly city councillors of Arsinoe who surely had substantial landholdings of their own. The estates also had links to every other level of rural society; the managers (*phrontistai*) of the individual estate units (*phrontides*) came from prosperous rural families.

The labour force of the estates was entirely free, with no trace of slave labour. A core workforce was employed regularly, some permanently. Other persons were hired on a more casual basis as needed, and some tasks were contracted out to entirely independent parties. Practices varied considerably from one *phrontis* to another, depending on the type of land, the crops produced, and the style of operation resulting from these constraints. Except for the permanent employees, most workers belonged to the middle and lower strata of rural society. Their work for the estate furnished only a portion of family income, which came otherwise from a very diversified set of sources.

The estate as a whole, with its multiple holdings, aimed at much more than supplying most of its own wants via internal transfers of produce. Rather, it was fundamentally oriented toward production of surpluses of marketable products. In the case of the *phrontis* at Theadelphia (from which this archive comes), that meant above all wine. This goal fits with other evidence for economic rationalism: a centrally managed transport system, close central supervision of inputs and production, and above all a sophisticated accounting system in which all costs were recorded in structured syntheses expressed in cash (whether incurred in reality on credit, in kind, or by actual cash payments), and in which there was a constant concern to control costs of production. An analytic purpose for accounts is suggested also by the abstract use of ἐργάται to mean 'man-days of labour' and ζεύγη to mean 'days of labour by a team of oxen.' Central overhead costs are distributed to the units. The estate appears as a profoundly economic enterprise, not an enclosed mini-society.

All this, if true, is of profound interest for one corner of the Roman world at a particular epoch. How far this picture can be extrapolated, either back in time in Egypt or across the rest of the Roman Empire, is of course still more interesting. R. argues that the second-century accounts from the archive of the descendants of Laches (also from the Fayum) prefigure the rational accounting of the Heroninos Archive, and that one must at least not assume that the Egyptian situation is unique. (He notes (333) that most accounts on papyrus have no context; their potential function in a system of accounts is thus impossible to determine. Only occasionally can an entire system of accounts be seen whole.) He does not, however, attempt to argue the case for general applicability in detail.

Some other conclusions may be harder to apply outside Egypt. The society appears to be economically vigorous, thoroughly monetized, devoid of inflation until the 270s, and lacking in evidence for 'protofeudalism' or any public powers held by the private estate (and private it was). On the other hand, these are profoundly revisionist views even for Egypt, usually seen as being in economic disarray

along with the rest of the Roman world of the middle of the third century. They are worth testing for other parts of the eastern provinces, at least.

The main lines of these conclusions seem to me sound and adequately justified. It is only fair, however, to indicate the main points of vulnerability. The argument that παιδάριον does not refer to slaves (89–91), and that slaves are thus absent from the estate work force, rests in the end on a single individual supposed to have sons despite being a παιδάριον, a rather insecure prop. (The argument that the οἰκέται are free (106), on the other hand, is decisive.)

More importantly, the typicality of the estate even within Egyptian society still needs demonstration. R. remarks (265) that he will argue 'that the economy of the estate, and hence that of the society in which it was located, was basically monetary.' The word 'hence' brings us too far too fast. The basic accounting of the estate is indeed in cash, but many transactions in kind are included in the accounts at money equivalents. I think it is correct that the Egyptian economy was largely monetary in this period, but it remains to be demonstrated: the Appianus estate could have operated as it did without the rest of Egypt following suit.

The greatest difficulty, however, is not in the evidence but in its silences. We lack all but the scantiest of documentation from the central Arsinoite headquarters of the estate, to say nothing of whatever central management Appianus and his staff exercised in Alexandria. Two of R.'s most central theses depend on inference about what management in Arsinoe did. First, they are supposed to have received the balance of estate wine production after expenses were met, somewhere between a fifth and a third of the total (296–7), and then marketed it for cash. Secondly, they are inferred to have taken the monthly summary accounts from the individual *phrontides* and analysed them for cost efficiency. (It is less clear that they constructed profitability statements for individual units by comparing the income from their produce and their costs (387).) There are good arguments for both of these positions, which are central to the hypothesis of economic rationality as R. offers it. But because the surviving documentation comes from Theadelphia, not Arsinoe, we see central management only in its relationship to the unit, not in its own activities. The marketing of surplus produce of all kinds in Roman Egypt is poorly attested. We know a great deal about how tax grain and the like were collected, transported and fed into Alexandria for use or trans-shipment, but remarkably little about the equivalent management of private surpluses beyond what was needed locally.

Seventy years ago Michael Rostovtzeff published his account of the Zenon archive, *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B.C.* (1922). At the time, much of the Zenon archive (the largest of the Ptolemaic period, just as Heroninos is the largest of the Roman) still awaited publication, but Rostovtzeff had seen transcripts of many of the unpublished papyri. Rostovtzeff depicted the activities of Zenon, the energetic manager of the large landholding in the Arsinoite Nome of an important resident of Alexandria (in this case the *dioiketes* Apollonios), five hundred years before the Heroninos archive. Apollonios' estate was run, Rostovtzeff argued, with entrepreneurial rationality, a zeal for economic growth, and a strong interest in new crops and new methods. Although R.'s Heroninos innovates mainly in details of account-keeping and his Appianus is interested in stability more than in growth, the parallel is none the less striking. Rostovtzeff's portrait of Zenon subsequently came under heavy fire, and it is by now practically a commonplace to say that Zenon, however innovative and economic or not, was an isolated figure with little importance for our view of the Ptolemaic economy (and not, as Rostovtzeff claimed, typical). It is curious that R. nowhere (as far as I can see) mentions Zenon, who is a paradigmatic figure for the difficulty of moving from analysis of a single archive to the surrounding economy.

Part of the reason for the attacks on Rostovtzeff's view of Zenon was the stark contrast offered by the documents between his activity and outlook and those of almost everyone else around him, particularly the Egyptian peasantry, whose resistance to the introduction of new ways has been described by Jean Bingen ('Grecs et égyptiens d'après *PSI* 502', *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology* (1970), 35–40). Typical, Zenon and Apollonios were not. Nor, I imagine, were Heroninos and Appianus. But in both cases these archives of Alexandrian holdings in the Fayum help to define the limits of the possible, the kind of management practiced by those with the means and experience to try to get the most out of their estates. Even if they were only partly imitated by the wealthy landowners of the Fayum itself, even if the local peasantry was in no position to engage in advanced accounting, the practices of Zenon and Heroninos set conditions for what others did and pushed the system as a whole in directions where economic rationality mattered.

With this book the study of the economy of Hellenistic and Roman Egypt has made its largest advance in the last half-century.

Columbia University ROGER S. BAGNALL