

H's *Catullus* is a book that improves as it progresses. It is a suitable introduction for senior school students as well as undergraduates and the casual reader. Of particular merit is the effective incorporation of key terminology, which is defined and discussed with a clarity that is accessible to the non-Latin reader. The translations aim to capture the 'feel' of the poetry if not always its literalness. Some Catullan scholars may find much to criticise, but that is a superfluous observation in light of H's target audience.

Marguerite Johnson
University of Newcastle

Beryl Rawson *Children and Childhood in Roman Italy* Oxford University Press Oxford 2003; xiv + 419 pp. + 30 Plates ISBN 0-19-924034-5 \$182.00.

This book is a welcome addition to the shelves. Its subject is one that Professor Emerita Beryl Rawson has made very much her own over recent decades. Beginning with the first of the Roman family conferences which she hosted in 1981, Professor Rawson has drawn to Australia outstanding international scholarship in the field of Roman social history (for which her academic colleagues owe her a great debt), and on Roman childhood she is the recognized authority.

One of my most enduring memories of a Roman child is that presented by Plutarch in his *Cato the Younger*, section 2.1-3. It is the story of young Cato under the care of his maternal uncle M. Livius Drusus after the death of his father. The question of Italian rights, due recognition of Rome's allies, was again to the fore and Livius Drusus had put himself forward as the champion of those rights. We are told that on a particular occasion when Drusus was playing host to an Italian delegation, one of the Italian leaders (a friend and guest of Drusus to the extent that he was staying in the house for a number of days) playfully asked the youngster to intercede on the Italians' behalf. Cato, already famous for a sternness beyond his years, refused — even when the Italian picked him up and dangled him from a window. Cato remained obdurate, despite an increased violence to the jocular threat. His tormentor had to content himself with a witticism to the effect that the Italian cause was well served by the fact that Cato was not yet of age. It was all there, we are to think: the formidable man within the child. Since Cato must have been by my

reckoning, three or four at the time, we might question the level of mature perspective he brought to the assessment of his ordeal.

Rawson (R) is too careful a scholar to make use of this piece of evidence. She is interested in Roman realities and Roman concepts; the Greek Plutarch, she reminds us, may not be a reliable source for Roman values and concepts: 'Plutarch lived in Greece for most of his life and wrote in Greek. Although he received Roman citizenship and visited Rome and no doubt shared some of the same cultural outlook as other educated, upper-class men of the cosmopolitan Mediterranean world of his time, I am not convinced that he "belonged" to Roman society in any deep sense and thus that he is a reliable source for values and concepts relevant to Roman children and childhood' (2–3). This exemplifies the rigour R brings to her reading of the evidence. When she does make passing reference to the incident she cites Valerius Maximus (3.1.2a; Rawson 242 n.89). Here the story is on surer Latin footing. But she does not dwell upon it. Though rich in detail, this is not a study given to the anecdotal. But the Cato episode resonates with the case of young Q. Sulpicius Maximus, with whom R begins the study. He died at the age of eleven, having already shown, according to his grieving parents, his great potential as a public speaker. His commemorative monument includes a full-length statue showing the budding orator togate (i.e., in the dress of a Roman citizen), scroll in hand and serious in expression (18, fig.1.1): 'he is represented as somewhat older than his years — proleptically as the accomplished orator which he was expected to become' (19). Again, R reminds us of the rigour required in the use of all evidence; 'the expression may not be true to the original' — the statue has been partly restored. Yet the bearing of the statue seems to say it all: we see the little man within the boy. Such thoughts lead inevitably to the controversial claim of Ariès that the very concept of childhood was new to the modern world: that it had not existed before the sixteenth or seventeenth-century. R will not subscribe to that at all. She sees (and presents for us) Roman childhood in costume, games and rituals. We are reminded that Sulpicius, in his public performance, first attracts the audience's favour on account of his tender years (and that only after that came admiration for his potential talent). His auditors responded warmly, then, precisely to his precocity; there can be no clearer recognition of childhood. The initial response was 'How cute!'. Similarly, in the Cato episode, if it can be tentatively admitted as evidence (and I would tend to think that this particular item emanated from one of the Roman panegyrics which circulated on Cato; Plutarch cites that of Thræsea Paetus, based upon the memoirs of Cato's friend Munatius Plancus), I would think that the Roman audience responded to the anomalous image of a child behaving beyond its years.

The book is divided into two sections: one analyzing the representations of children and the other charting 'the life course'. The two sections are not commensurate in length; the latter, more than three times longer, examines a Roman child's experience from birth, through rearing, various stages, and education to passage into adulthood. But the decision to begin with a survey of representations was a sound one. It underlines the importance of focussing on the media through which our knowledge of Roman children is filtered. To understand a text, we must know how to 'read' the genre — for example, the image upon the altar of A. Egrilius Magnus, dead at the age of fifteen, showing the boy with one hand on the horn of a goat. Is this to be read symbolically or as a commemoration of his pet? How is his expression to be understood and how are formulae to be read? R's familiarity with a broad range of evidence and with associated modern scholarship allows her to write with authority and/or to alert the readership to the instances where options should be left open (50–51, see esp. n.55). Even in two examples of the same media (and not so chronologically disparate) important differences might be discerned. R explores such diachronic developments in the depiction of children as victims of war on the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius (55–59).

The bulk of this first section is devoted to the epigraphic evidence and artwork. Towards the end of this, R also treats literary testimonia. 'The many genres of Roman literature have other preoccupations [than childhood]. Like any artefact, literature must be assessed according to its purpose, who produced it, who was the purchaser, patron, recipient, or audience' (82). That discussion leads me to think of an ancillary study which might be pursued in the future: the discourse of childhood in, for example, political polemic. Cicero was given to reducing his opponents and those of whom he did not particularly approve to a rhetorical infancy. *Puer* is an interesting word, meaning 'boy' but carrying the more general connotation of inferior. The word *garçon* springs to mind. (And the word *puella*, as 'girlie', might be used in a variety of ways.) In his *Against Q. Caecilius* (24), Cicero refers to a twenty-three year-old aristocrat as a *puer nobilis* in a belittling allusion which suggests naivety and/or lack of talent. Cicero's *bête noir*, P. Clodius was the 'Pretty Boy' or, rather 'little pretty boy' (*pulchellus puer*; Cicero's *Letters to Atticus* 1.16.10), a nickname encouraged by the man's fine looks as well as by his family's name (*Pulcher*) and the attraction of alliteration. Cicero rejoiced in the assassination of Caesar, but thought it should have gone further (with the murder of Antony). Hence he wrote to Atticus (14.21) that the conspirators had acted with the spirit of men (*animo virili*) but with the thinking of children (*consilio puerili*). Thus did he deride Brutus' principled restraint. Pompey's opponents, when Pompey was in his twenties and had

forged his own military career, called him *adulescentulus*, the diminutive form of adolescent (Val. Max. 6.2.8), an item first drawn to my attention many years ago by Professor Rawson. Famously, Octavian was underestimated by Antony as a *puer*. Cicero was as doting a father as any. What does his embrace of these rhetorical *topoi* tell us of the ambiguity of child-images in Roman antiquity? A similar juxtaposition is apparent in other cultures, our own included. R is also an authority on Roman political life; it would have been interesting to read her reflections on this topic as well.

As mentioned above, the second, longer section of the book deals with a Roman child's experience of life from birth through to the passage into adulthood: adoption of the *toga virilis* for boys (around the age of seventeen, but ranging in known examples from thirteen to eighteen) and marriage (and the surrender of their childhood toys on the eve of marriage) for girls, perhaps as early as the age of twelve (142–145). Another chapter deals with children in public life; this chapter is, of course, more focussed on children of the elite, but covers the general population as well. A final chapter deals with the sad phenomenon of premature death, a feature of Roman life so much more common than in our own. (And the presence of death in Roman society was not something which afflicted children only in the sense of their own deaths. Many children will have experienced early the death of those whom they loved [338]). Here, in this latter section of the book, will be found a wealth of detail, as I have already said; but, while a thorough index will guide readers to the items which excite their particular interests, this is no mere repository of antiquarian curiosities or cumulation of anecdotal material. R is interested in the place of childhood in Roman culture.

Nor, as I have indicated above, is this study confined to the children of the privileged (where so much of our evidence centres). R examines the experiences of those who are too often overlooked. See, for example, 261–63 on the ambiguous situation of *deliciae* (play-things). See also the fascinating discussion of *alumni/-ae* (foster-children) and *verni/-ae* (home-born slaves) at 251–257. The most curious of relationships might be engendered within a large establishment. We are told by Plutarch (*Cato the Elder* 20) that Cato's wife suckled not only her own child, but did the same for her slaves' children in order to encourage fraternal feelings in them towards her son. The case was not unique. R treats the fascinating topic of the feelings between *collocati/collocatae*, fellow-nurselings, on pp. 122, 219 and esp. 257–8 (a particularly interesting example). The complex dynamics of relationships within a slave-owning family are also revealed within the family of Augustine (see, e.g., *Confessions* 9.8.18), though this lies outside the purview of R's monograph. Bonds could be close, but cruelly terminated by

circumstance with callous disregard on one side. Seneca the Elder recounts (with a very different purpose in mind) an occasion when he was confronted by a childhood playmate, now an age-worn specimen. The latter, presumably without access to the life-enhancing facilities available to his master, wore his age with disturbing clarity. Seneca, disconcerted by the unwanted mirror, instinctively pushed the man aside (*Letters* 12.3). On the many relationships that might exist within the Roman family, see 267–68.

Overall, R discerns a developing consciousness of the child's experience in Roman culture. The imaging of children in the second century CE can be called benign (59). The Romans had, of course, always valued their children highly. The Roman proletariat, of so little utility to the all-important Roman war machine, had none the less been credited with its provision of children to the state. The word *proles* (offspring) bespoke the term's antiquity (Cicero *de Oratore* 3.153). Where other (crueller) languages dismiss those of such little account as so much cannon-fodder, *la chair à canon*, *carne da cannone*, or *Kanonenfutter*, the early Latin language set about, consciously on the part of its coiners we are told, to express the valued contribution of these people to the community (Cicero *de re publica* 2.40; Aulus Gellius *Attic Nights* 16.10). The same instinct can be found in the elite. One of the patrician Appii Claudii set up portrait shields of his ancestors in the temple of Bellona (Pliny, *Natural History* 35.12). Such reverence for the line of descent does not surprise; but R (26) points to Pliny's interesting rider (which is all too often overlooked): this was a fine practice, Pliny said, 'especially if this is balanced by a crowd of children in miniature form representing a sort of nest of fledglings.' The Claudii were, it seems, child-proud. They can be seen to be engaging here in that self-advertising dynastic promotion such as can also be seen in the custom of Roman *triumphatores* having their children ride with them in celebration (on which practice, see Rawson 143, and chapter 7). It is easy to be cynical, but R would point to what this says of the public Roman response to such images. As R shows, it was an avenue of publicity pursued by the imperial families. Readers will be familiar with the ways in which Augustus exploited images of the children of his family to promote himself, his (personal and political) heirs, the idea of a leading family and the very concept of his 'moral program'. (R explores this topic, 31–35). Are princes the makers of fashion? If so, society followed suit.

Augustus made it personal; and the metaphor of childhood can be seen to have been extended to reflect his commanding position, bringing back to mind my earlier allusion to the discourse of childhood. The parenting metaphor had a history (in the military sphere), and alluded to succour. In 2 BCE, Augustus was proclaimed father of the fatherland (*pater patriae*); he

shed tears of joy and pride (Suetonius *Divus Augustus* 58). By that time, he had long been recognized in the rôle. (It can be found in an attribution in Horace's virtual hymn to the man [*Odes* 1.2.45] which dates to the twenties.) In what rôle did this cast the citizens of Rome? (When Horace addresses himself to the current moral program, the revival of antique morality, he envisaged youths labouring to please a stern mother; *Odes* 3.6. 39–40). In 2 BCE, Augustus is said (after the initial public tears) to have made a joke of it: he had *two* spoilt children, Rome and his daughter Julia (Macrobius *Saturnalia* 2.5.3). Before the year was out, Augustus left the public mind in no doubt as to what he expected of his children. Julia was banished to an island. The citizenry might take note. They did; they demonstrated in her favour — and he castigated them as one might chide wayward children (though he cursed them as parents); Suet. *Aug.* 65.3.

As R shows, something had happened by the second century CE. Trajan too basked in the title of *pater patriae*, having declined it for some time — until he felt worthy of it (60–61). His panegyricist proclaims that the citizens, 'in our hearts and minds', had long known this to be so. The image is totally benign: Trajan is generous and benevolent. Of course, we would not expect his praise-singer to say anything else. But what is interesting (politically) is the premiss that the Roman citizenry has embraced its child-like situation with enthusiasm: 'You live with your citizens like a parent with his children' (Pliny *Panegyricus* 21). At the same time, R warns against rash conclusions. Customarily, Roman culture is regarded as a rather stern one in the popular mind, the culture of the Republic especially. With regard to their children, such thoughts are dispelled in this book. The letters of Cicero and Pliny in particular (Rawson 83, 85–87) demonstrate a fondness which undercuts the prevailing image of Roman *severitas* (and see also the many touching images that emerge from chapter 6). Again, the importance of genre is underscored. 'Most literature of the Republican period was public rather than personal, with history the preferred genre.' The evidence sought here will need to be hunted down if an imbalanced picture is to be avoided. R provides the evidence. It is to be found in the chance remark of Lucretius, an allusion of Catullus and so on. This monograph will provide its readers with so many more thought-provoking images and much enlightenment.

Back in 1963 the renowned Lily Ross Taylor closed her review of J.P.V.D. Balsdon's *Roman Women* by drawing attention to the rich material which had not been available to Balsdon. She referred, with some pride I should imagine, to the doctoral thesis of one of her own students, Beryl Wilkinson, on 'The Names of Children in Roman Imperial Epitaphs: a Study of Social Conditions in the Lower Classes' and to the light which the data from these

1500 inscriptions would shed on the fabric of Roman social life. It was the last dissertation which Taylor was to supervise, though her own work on Roman political life continued for another six years. She also alluded in that review to the work which could follow. There is a sense here of Taylor passing on the baton in this field. Beryl Wilkinson went on to become Beryl Rawson. One feels that Lily Ross Taylor would have been proud indeed to see the fruition of her expectations.

Tom Hillard
Macquarie University

M. Todd (ed.) *A Companion to Roman Britain* Blackwell Malden MA 2004; 508pp. ISBN 0-631-21823-8 £85.00 or \$A 327.00.

This large, and it must be said, expensive volume is worth the waiting for - and probably worth the money, although libraries will think first before ordering more than one copy. It is far removed from the first *Companion to Roman Britain* published in 1980, edited by Peter Clayton and containing but 208 pages. Such is the growth in studies on various aspects of this outpost of Roman Empire. The twenty-four articles, written mostly by experts in their field, are well written and concise - perhaps in some cases too much so, but this may have been an editorial decision.

Although the book purports to cover Roman Britain, the first four articles are on aspects of the Late Iron Age. In 'Britain and the Continent' Barry Cunliffe interprets the evidence of trade between the two from the literary and archaeological evidence, and suggests considerable interaction. His proposal that the Braughing-Puckeridge site was indicative of a community of Roman or Gallo-Roman traders is a possibility, but it could also merely indicate the Romanisation of members of the local ruling class, whose cremated remains (mostly from first century AD) are found in a discrete burial area, placed in wooden caskets with elaborate bronze ornamentation (Borrill 1981: 318). Colin Hazelgrove looks at 'Society and Polity' in the same period, and acknowledges that the sources, particularly Caesar, are unreliable. He sees different cultural influences on the north-western and south-eastern parts of Britain, accounting for differences in metalwork and its deposition, in the