

or reformulated. No. 704 n. 3 "Membership of the *tresviri stlitibus iudicandis* indicates that the career belongs to the last years of the third century" (similarly in the German edition); this is mysterious, for *triumviro* (sic, not *tresviro*) in the inscription must be a mistake, and certainly cannot be used to date the inscription in this way (although the date may in fact be correct). No. 746: in the *Fasti Septempedani* (AE 1998, 419, not quoted here), the consul of 81 appears as "*M. (not C.) Asinius Pollio Verruc(osus)*". No. 1021: if this man was *salius Palatinus*, he should have been labelled a patrician (similar cases in no. 2084 and in no. 2723, a *salius Collinus*; on the other hand, Pliny the Younger in no. 2730 is not designated as plebeian; and there is also L. Pinarius Natta, member of a rather obscure patrician *gens*, but called a plebeian in no. 2711). No. 1252: scholars nowadays agree that the associate of P. Clodius was called Sex. Cloedius, not "Clodius" (as demonstrated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey; no trace of this in the entry). No. 1255: shouldn't it be *sodalis Titius* rather than *sodalis Titii* (this expression also in no. 2788)? No. 2722: a man known as "A. Platorius Nepos" cannot be identified with someone referred to as "C. Licinius Pollio" even if his full nomenclature might have included the sequence "C. Licinius Pollio" (n. 4 to this entry is, by the way, fairly obscure). No. 3239 (Galeo Tettienus Severus) n. 6: "older ('ältere' in the original; I think that 'earlier' might have been better) inscriptions do not mention the pontificate"; but the "older" inscriptions pertaining to this man are Greek inscriptions from Asia referring to this man as proconsul and cannot be expected also to have mentioned the pontificate, and besides these, there is (in addition to *ILS* 1027 used in this entry) only one inscription which can be furnished with a date of sorts, namely *CIL* V 5813 (set up after the proconsulate of Asia) which, though not cited here, does mention the pontificate as well (the first line must be *consul(i), po[nt(ifici)]*). No. 3466: in n. 2, there is an obscure reference to an "above identification".

Of course these are only minor details, and the fact that I am pointing out a few such details should by no means not be interpreted as implying that I am unhappy with this book. On the contrary, I consider it a major achievement and a milestone in prosopographical studies. No doubt this book will be of great service to an equally great number of scholars and students.

Olli Salomies

MARIE-LAURENCE HAACK: *Prosopographie des haruspices romains*. Biblioteca di "Studi Etruschi" 42. Istituto nazionale di studi etruschi ed italici. Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali, Pisa – Roma 2006. ISBN 88-8147-425-5 (b.), 88-8147-424-7 (r.). 217 pp. EUR 195 (b), 295 (r).

Marie-Laurence Haack has published her doctoral thesis (Université Paris IV Sorbonne, 2000) on the Roman *haruspices* in two important volumes, *Les haruspices dans le monde romain*, (*Scripta Antiqua* 6; Bordeaux: Ausonius 2006), offering the necessary historical introduction and conclusion to this prosopography. In this volume, after a short introductory note, she lists 110 (plus 11 without preserved name) *haruspices* known from literary or epigraphical sources. For all of them, she gives the full text of the source and its translation, extensive bibliography, analysis of the text, possible (but very rare) other references to the person and his career, and finally the approximate date for the person. She still gives a list of 21 other persons, for whom

she does not accept the position as a *haruspex*, mainly on good grounds (for *Aemilius Petensis*, I cannot fully accept her doubts). The volume is completed with a bibliography of 22 pages and indices of no fewer than 45 pages!

There is no doubt about the expertise of the author on the subject, and her general scholarly background is sufficient for prosopographical work. She is not an epigrapher, which becomes apparent in the occasional mistakes, e.g., in supplementing *C(naei)* (p. 102) or *arh[e]s[pex]* instead of *arh(e)s(pex)* (p. 34). But more crucial is the question of who needs a prosopography of 121 Roman *haruspices*, separated from the historical study based on this material? I understand problems of getting a thesis published, but it would certainly have been much more economical to have this prosopography included in the aforementioned historical study, which, in any case, is needed for an understanding of the position of individual *haruspices*.

*Jorma Kaimio*

JOEL ALLEN: *Hostages and Hostage-Taking in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge University Press, New York 2006. ISBN 978-0-521-86183-0. XIV, 291 pp. GBP 48.00, USD 80.

Joel Allen has written a book about hostages, an important subject, but, as the author notes in his introduction, one that is difficult to define. Also, the ominous connotations of the word "hostage" as used today contrast with hostages of the ancient world as an established "political" practice. Allen approaches the subject of hostages and hostage-taking in the Roman world employing a discursive approach and taking the accounts and stories written between 200 B.C.E to 200 CE concerning hostages and hostage-taking as his source material. He produces his own definition for hostages in the context of the study in the form of a "type" that consists of different dependent people, or more specifically: "young, elite figures who crossed into another world, were technically autonomous, yet betokened the subordinate role in a hegemonic, reciprocal relationship" (p. 22) thus widening the discussion from the formal *obsides* to a much larger group. He then examines this group of people through six categories of relationships: Creditor-Collateral; Host-Guest; Conqueror-Trophy; Father-Son; Teacher-Student and Masculine-Feminine followed by two separate discussions first on Polybius and then on Tacitus. The chapter on Polybius in particular is very interesting.

The relational categories themselves are useful for approaching the evidence and conceptualizing the phenomenon. The typology of different potential dimensions and political uses of being a hostage is well founded but at times casts a slightly modernizing view on the sources. Indeed, the discussion is somewhat marred by the vagueness of the term (or "type") "hostage" itself as used by Allen. All examples that can be categorized among the functional categories are put there without too much consideration of their status as presented in the sources. At times representatives of Allen's definition of hostages (his "type") are as easily traditional *obsides*, defeated enemies taken prisoner, or even students of Roman culture – hostages of Rome's powerful culture. Even if the sources are imprecise and vague, the ancient terms of hostages, which reflect ancient understandings, should have been given more consideration. Perhaps a reflection on what "Roman" types are to be found mostly in which category of relationship could have given rise to some additional conclusions. At the very least one would have