denzen mit den Gefolgschaftsgruppen der Krieger aufweist. So wird im Königreich der Phäaken der Arbeitsdienst, den die *amphípoloi* ihrer Herrin Nausikaa leisten, mit demselben Terminus, *charízomai*, umschrieben (Od. 6,23) wie der Dienst des Kriegers in der Schlacht (Wagner-Hasel 2000, S. 144). Schon deshalb sind Zweifel am grundsätzlich unfreien Charakter der Textilarbeit angebracht, wenngleich gerade hier der Einsatz von Kriegsgefangenen erfolgt. Ndoye aber verweist die Schilderung der sozialen Praktiken der Phäaken ins Reich der Fiktion und entzieht sich damit der Notwendigkeit, die Befunde einer sozialgeschichtlichen Analyse zu unterziehen. Hätte er tatsächlich die innere Struktur der sozialen Gruppen in Bezug auf die Arbeit untersucht, wie es der Titel suggeriert, wären andere Schlußfolgerungen möglich gewesen.

Hannover *Beate Wagner-Hasel*

Marco Maiuro: *Res Caesaris.* Ricerche sulla proprietà imperiale nel Principato. Bari: Edipuglia 2012. 482 S. (Pragmateiai. 23.) 70 €.

This volume is an attempt to write a history of the imperial *patrimonium*. The focus is on the Principate, and on imperial property in Italy. In Part I (129 pages) Maiuro examines the formation and scale of the *patrimonium*. He argues that those who normally left property in their wills to the emperor, or had it taken from them, were a minority of senators and the majority of imperial freedmen, and that usually the *patrimonium* immediately sold off by auction properties which it acquired. He estimates that by the later second century AD the senatorial elite held no more than 8–10% of the landed capital of the empire, and the *patrimonium* no more than say 5% (p. 144), which nonetheless made it enormous. In Part II (93 pages) M. examines the location and function of imperial properties in Italy, and argues that they were concentrated in five zones, which implies a definite policy of acquisition, and hence an implicit management strategy. There was, he claims, a focus on production of the key resources of wine, wool and wood, and of ownership of coastal properties, apparently including ports, on the central Tyrrhenian and north Adriatic coasts, which show an interest in facilitating and controlling movements of these goods, and of wheat and oil too, out to supply the northern armies and in to supply Rome and the imperial court. The brief but helpful Conclusions (pp. 347–8) are oddly held back until after the more than 100 pages of survey ('repertorio') of imperial properties in Italy. There are six appendices on problems of detail, of which the most important is a review of brick- and tile-stamps at Rome from which M. concludes that the supposed imperial monopoly of production is a myth. After the bibliography there is a full index of sources cited, and a thin general index (emperors, and a handful of principal terms and topics).

This is in many ways an impressive work, but also in some respects frustrating. It distils an enormous amount of research. The bibliography is exhaustive (although some items in footnotes, e.g. the last three in n. 310, have slipped through the net). The survey of properties in Italy aims to include all literary, epigraphic and archaeological data. M. claims to blend Italian and Anglo-Saxon historiographical approaches, and does so in that while much of the book is a detailed presentation of the evidence with copious citation of previous views, the crucial estimate of the extent of elite and imperial landholding in Part I is a classic example of the parameter-setting speculative calculations used by Hopkins, Scheidel and others, and recently criticised by Andreau (J. Andreau, L'économie du monde romain, Paris 2010).

The main value of the book is that it adds considerably to our knowledge and understanding of the size, distribution and function of imperial landed properties in Italy, even if at times we might wish that the evidence and its interpretation had been more plainly and clearly presented. The arguments that imperial inheritances and confiscations were limited, and the properties often sold off, are persuasive, although the re-cycling of properties as gift-estates needs to be added (see below). We may also query, granted the complex hierarchy of the imperial *familia*, whether the patrimonies of most 'imperial' freedmen were left to the emperor rather than to the other imperial freedmen who were their immediate patrons. The quantitative estimate of the extent of elite landholding in the empire, as it developed from AD 14 to 165, at pp. 117–45, is extremely difficult to follow, even for a seasoned practitioner of such guesstimates. M., despite criticism of others for inconsistency, himself shifts between numbers of individual landowners and percentages of the population, between distribution within the 'elite' – sometimes senatorial, sometimes much broader (it seems) – and percentages of all landed capital in the empire. Oddly he does not mention the one direct piece of evidence we have which is that of the 695 neighbouring owners named in the alimentary table of Veleia (CIL XI 1147, c. AD 102–112), the emperor occurs four times only (0.6%); see R. Duncan-Jones, The Economy of the Roman Empire. Quantitative Studies[2], Cambridge 1982, 296. It is perhaps conceivable, but to me very doubtful, that by 165 the emperor owned 5% of the land, or perhaps the agricultural land, of Italy, and the claim at p. 236 that he had become the principal landowner in most Italian civic territories is implausible. Imperial ownership of 2.5% of the land would be impressive, and, despite M.'s objections at p. 153 n. 19, would justify the usual reading of Tacitus' 'rari per Italiam Caesaris agri' (*Ann.* 4.6, under AD 33) as a comparison with his own day. The survey of imperial properties in Italy, excluding mines and quarries, by patrimonial districts would have been better done by *regiones*, which are used in the main text, all the more so because towns are not indexed. The lack of a single map is inexcusable. Other curiosities are that north-west Italy is not included (surely not a total blank), Veleia is omitted (four imperial landholdings), and the Saepinum inscription which mentions imperial flocks (CIL IX 2438, alluded to on p. 298) is not cited in the earlier section on wool production (pp. 223–7). As surveys and lists of landed property in Italy multiply, from I. Shatzmann, Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics, Brussels 1975, to A. Marzano, Roman Villas in Central Italy, Leiden 2007, the desirability of a collaborative project to develop an online data-base of villas and properties in Roman Italy, to which all could refer, becomes ever more evident.

As a study of the *patrimonium* as a whole, there is much left to do. Starting with his introduction, M. has problems with terminology. It is not helpful to use *fiscus* as a straight synonym for *patrimonium* because *fiscus* was also used to denote the imperial finances and their management in general, and *patrimonium fisci* (p.14) is an unnecessary invention. The account of how *bona caduca et vacantia* entered the *patrimonium* needs clarification; there was a shift by the second century from a norm of adjudication to the *aerarium* (followed by auction) to straight confiscation to the *patrimonium* (or *fiscus* in the narrow sense), perhaps related to the emergence of *advocati fisci* (not discussed by M.). On the other hand, some of the 'confiscations' cited by M. are in fact reclamations of what may be termed 'gift-estates'. Two examples: the *saltus* in Illyricum which Tiberius claimed from the property of C. Calpurnius Piso had been granted to Piso by Augustus (*SC de Pisone patre* ll.84–90), and one of the large estates Nero 'acquired' in Africa seems to have been a tract granted by Augustus to Statilius Taurus which Nero probably reclaimed from his last wife, Statilia Messalina – see now M. de Vos, The rural landscape of Thugga: farms, presses, mills, and transport, in: A. Bowman and A. Wilson (eds), The Roman Agricultural Economy. Organization, Investment, and Production, Oxford 2013, 143–218, at 193–200. Almost all the *ousiai* ('properties') attested in Egypt in the Julio-Claudian period were allocated to members and friends of the imperial family as a way of providing them with revenues; see D. J. Crawford [Thompson], Imperial estates, in: M. I. Finley (ed.), Studies in Roman Property, Cambridge 1976, 35–70. That means that many patrimonial properties benefitted the elite (men like Seneca) rather than the emperor. Under Vespasian all *ousiai* in Egypt were bundled together in the names of Vespasian or Titus into an *ousiakos logos* (presumably part of the *patrimonium*), but there is no evidence this was part of an empire-wide reorganisation (contra M. at p. 174, drawing on an earlier article); Matidia's south Etrurian estate was probably a gift-estate. There is still much to doubt and research about the second- to third-century changes to the *patrimonium* and the emergence under the Severans of the *ratio privata*.

M. asserts that the *patrimonium* played a decisive role in the economy of the Roman empire (p. 17, 'un ruolo determinante'). That remains to be seen. If we are to assess the overall resources and economic impact of the *patrimonium* we have to include mines and quarries, on which see now A. M. Hirt, Imperial Mines and Quarries in the Roman World. Organizational Aspects 27 BC – AD 235, Oxford 2010. We have to include examination of imperial landholding in the provinces, for which Crawford [Thompson] (*op.cit.*) is still indispensable if in need of updating. M.'s statement that it was more extensive than in Italy is anything but a 'given fact' (p. 135) – not so for Egypt, for instance. We also need to investigate more critically, maybe with little hope of a firm outcome, whether the products of imperial properties were used primarily to supply the imperial court and imperial benefactions (including building projects), or were marketed to create a cash income, an issue often noted but never really confronted by M. in pp. 175–239. I note that *P.Bingen* 77 shows that from eleven ships arriving in an Alexandrian port in the later second century, one cargo (olive oil) and a half-cargo (pine trunks) belonged to the emperor. We must also add the cash income of the *patrimonium* from the fees and fines which were increasingly, it seems, assigned to it, going back to Augustus according to the *Gnomon of the Idioslogos* in Egypt, and one of the main targets of the *advocati fisci*. At pp. 37–8 M. claims that the patrimony of a rich senator could be as great as the total annual fiscal revenues of the empire, and that acquiring a senatorial patrimony was like annexing a new province, but without the costs of conquest. A hyperbole, perhaps, but one that provokes serious thought. Do we believe the *topos* of Suetonius, Dio and others that bad emperors could solve their spending crises by confiscating a few elite estates? We return to M.'s starting question. What was the role of the *patrimonium* in the imperial finances (and general economy) and how did it change through and beyond the Principate? M.'s present work has some weaknesses, and it straddles a contradiction between stressing the rareness of imperial acquisitions of property and claiming their economic importance, but it still is the first attempt to write a history of the *patrimonium*. We may hope that M. takes us further on the path to achieving that aim in his future research.

King's College London *Dominic Rathbone*

Marco Johannes Bartoldus: *Palladius Rutilius Taurus Aemilianus.* Welt und Wert spätrömischer Landwirtschaft. Augsburg: Wißner 2012. 316 S. 21 Abb.

Dieses Buch ist die überarbeitete Fassung der 2007 eingereichten Augsburger Dissertation von M. J. Bartoldus (im folgenden B.). Ziel ist die Zusammenfassung und Analyse des antiken Wissens zur Landwirtschaft, welches B. vor allem anhand des Werkes des spätantiken Fachschriftstellers Palladius Rutilius Taurus Aemilianus, aber unter steter Einbeziehung der älteren antiken Landwirtschaftsautoren zusammenstellen möchte. Es geht ihm nicht um eine Monographie über den Autor oder sein Werk, sondern um die Feststellung der «inhaltlichen Qualität des *Opus Agriculturae* des Palladius» [Vorwort].

Zunächst behandelt B. jedoch in knappen Zügen die Biographie des Palladius [11–36] sowie dessen Werk [37–61]. Er identifiziert Palladius mit einiger Wahrscheinlichkeit mit dem römischen Stadtpräfekten von 458 und späteren Bischof von Bourges. Die Entstehungszeit des Werkes setzt er plausibel ungefähr in die Mitte des 5. Jh., aber vor den Vandaleneinfall von 455. Er charakterisiert es als realitätsnahe «Sammlung möglichst kurzer und praktischer Regeln für den Bedarfsfall» der «landwirtschaftlich Interessierten» [41] bzw. «Stellvertreter und Verwalter» [42] der Grundbesitzer und spricht ihm literarische Prägungen und Stilisierungen nahezu gänzlich ab. Er schließt den einführenden Teil seiner Arbeit mit einer Besprechung der eindrucksvollen Rezeptionsgeschichte des Palladius in Mittelalter und Neuzeit sowie der antiken Quellen des Autors, unter denen er in Übereinstimmung mit