

a strong sense of community many generations after most of them had actually been migrants, as Tacoma briefly acknowledges (206), but they were exceptional. Evidence for truly migrant cults is limited; Isis and Jupiter Dolichenus were cults with local origins in Egypt and Commagene, respectively, but they became popular among people who had no connection to those regions. Trading stations linked to specific cities were mainly relevant to those involved in business. Network theory “helps us understand the weak sense of community among the immigrants” (240).

Studies of modern migration usually include interviews with migrants themselves. The lack of anything equivalent from the Roman world has led some writers to fill the gap with imaginative reconstructions. Tacoma has gone somewhat in the other direction: his migrants are almost entirely anonymous, and discussion of individuals usually takes place in the footnotes. Nevertheless, he has added significant depth to our understanding of Roman migration, and the large number of “forthcoming” works in the bibliography shows that the subject is moving forward rapidly.

DAVID NOY
The Open University

KAIUS TUORI. *The Emperor of Law: The Emergence of Roman Imperial Adjudication*. (Oxford Studies in Roman Society and Law.) New York: Oxford University Press, 2016. Pp. ix, 482. \$125.00.

Behind an enigmatic main title lies a long-standing historical puzzle: how did the Roman emperor come to be supreme judge? The first answer proposed was simple, and dates back to the time of Theodor Mommsen in the mid-nineteenth century. The power was conferred constitutionally, by law, and it was an answer feebly supported by claims put forward by the third-century Greek historian Cassius Dio and by reference to a *lex regia* in the sixth-century *Digest* of Roman law—feebly because of their late date. More recently scholars have preferred different solutions, and now Kaius Tuori, in *The Emperor of Law*, offers one based on narratives, a word that figures freely throughout his work.

Narratology has long played a role in ancient literary studies, so it is only natural that narrative should catch the attention of historians. Tuori is calling on Tacitus and Suetonius, but on other authors, too, who are not historians—indeed on any author who has a story to tell that reveals something about the development of the emperor’s jurisdiction (or his adjudication, which is sometimes the author’s preferred term). In fact, Tuori starts with Cicero, as the orator in 46 B.C.E. defends Quintus Ligarius before the dictator Julius Caesar, who was, Tuori stresses, emphatically *not* an emperor. From this point, Tuori proceeds chronologically, ending with the Severan dynasty in the third century.

Tuori’s task is thus prodigious in the quantity and scope of the sources that he has to examine, both ancient writers and inscriptions and exacting modern scholarship (wrestling as he goes with biographers such as Suetonius

who described their subjects as model judges on the bench and bloodthirsty madmen off it), and one must salute his heroism. His organization into periods—Caesar, Augustus, Tiberius to Trajan, the “ideal” Hadrian and the Antonines, who saw the full development of the *libellus* system and thereby the delivery of justice throughout the empire, Caracalla and the Severans (Tuori hesitates on the motives for the grant of empire-wide citizenship by Caracalla, the *Constitutio Antoniniana*), and a concluding chapter—is compelling. And there is a massive and valuable appendix of known instances of imperial adjudication from Caesar to Severus Alexander, with sources.

Handling such quantities of diverse material has its dangers. Most obviously, it requires first-class indexing and bibliography, and this volume provides them. Secondly, it might seem to risk monotony, even dreariness; though that it is far from the case. But it is bound to mean that the author encounters any number of knotty problems on his onward path, some quite notorious, and inevitably will fail to satisfy in some places. There will be few readers, even non-classicists, who are unfamiliar with the mysterious exile by Augustus of the poet Ovid, which has attracted one writer after another, and countless readers. Tuori, concerned with judgment, renounces inquiry into Ovid’s offense, which surely was relevant. The method in general has a weakness, tempting scholars to put too much faith in sources such as the adulatory Pliny the Younger and Aelius Aristides, and it is a test for Tuori in this Augustan chapter. He comes up with a striking solution to the Ovid problem, making him an example of Augustus’s vital power of making exceptions. Whatever Ovid’s offense, Tuori’s Ovid declares roundly that Augustus is on the one hand a gentle *paterfamilias*, inclined to mercy, and on the other a cruel monster, far different from the figure the emperor presents in his own *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*.

Another striking exposition concerns the opening of Vespasian’s reign in 70 C.E. and the incomplete and much-discussed *Lex de imperio Vespasiani*. The author takes the clauses of this law to be restrictive, limiting what the new and upstart emperor could do. This seems highly unlikely when it belongs to a moment when Vespasian’s forces were in control of the Senate and his predecessor Vitellius had been crushed and killed. Rather, the enactment laid down the precedents that the absent Vespasian’s partisans thought that he would deign to follow, adding for good measure in the discretionary clause that whatever course of action he considered to be in the interests of the state should be legitimate. Less seriously, Tuori shares with a large number of scholars an overestimate of the importance of the offense of *maiestas*, that of diminishing the emperor’s majesty, derived from diminishing that of the Roman state. This has been caught from its use by Tacitus; but the spread of capital offenses under *maiestas* was much wider than that.

Perhaps Tuori’s greatest successes lie with the cases found in epigraphic documents (all translated into English) where the “narratives” are those of the participants themselves, as with the humble villagers of Syrian Goharia in dispute under Caracalla about a local priesthood.

But there can be little doubt that Tuori's overall method of following such narratives, however diverse they are, is sound. He goes where the sources lead him, tracing each tributary in its exact wording. All that one might hope for is occasionally a greater crispness in delivering his own verdicts on the evidence before him.

That is not all. At the end of the inquiry lurk major problems, of greater relevance today than the first question of the origin of jurisdiction: Did the emperor initiate policy, or did he merely react to petition and prompting? And, when he spoke, was it in his own words or the words of bureaucrats? Rightly, Tuori decides on an emperor who is far more than a merely passive authority reacting to external events: he has principles, even policies, and individual voices have plausibly been detected. The author has indeed produced a work of judgment and sense, one that all students of the imperial legal system will find helpful.

B. M. LEVICK
St. Hilda's College, University of Oxford

SARAH E. BOND. *Trade and Taboo: Disreputable Professions in the Roman Mediterranean*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2016. Pp. xv, 318. Cloth \$80.00, e-book \$65.00.

Sarah E. Bond's new monograph, *Trade and Taboo*, is a welcome addition to the growing body of literature dealing with those professionals and tradesmen who performed important roles within Roman society but who, on the whole, received scorn rather than gratitude from those members of Rome's elite who considered themselves above such petty or unpleasant tasks. Over the course of five chapters, Bond examines the duties and social positions of a variety of workers and economic/social groups, and also thinks about the sorts of restrictions—beyond the legal designation of *infamia*, which was reserved for only the most reviled professions—that were imposed upon them. In particular, Bond seeks to demonstrate that, whatever condemnation of them might be voiced by literary sources, many such workers fulfilled vital functions and were essential elements within the Roman economic and social machine.

Chapter 1 deals with criers, who, while ridiculed and barred from holding municipal offices, were nevertheless prominent individuals who served as intermediaries between the different social classes in a variety of contexts, whether at religious events, the theater, public auctions, or funerals, and disseminated messages from the center to the peripheries across the Roman Empire. The profession was popular among members of the freedman class, for whom it presented significant opportunities to acquire wealth and foster connections.

Chapter 2 considers the well-known restrictions placed upon funeral workers and corpse-handlers, but places the laws surrounding Roman funeral workers within their broader Mediterranean context, alongside Egyptian and Jewish customs concerning burial. While Roman practitioners were excluded from the city and classed as religiously unclean, the religious views of Egyptians and Jews

concerning the afterlife (along with the complexities of Egyptian burial customs) meant that funeral workers in their communities were better regarded. This, in turn, had a significant impact on the trade in Rome following the rise of Christianity, which viewed funeral workers as performing a pious service as well as a necessary one.

Chapter 3 moves on to tanners, a group synonymous with bad smells and unpleasant materials. Once again, despite being derided by the elite, tanners performed a vital service, and their trade was a central economic node that influenced and supplied numerous other trades and industries. While tanners were commonly thought to have been banished to the urban (and social) periphery, Bond demonstrates that the reality was far more variable, with the locations of tanneries dictated more by the necessities of the trade in terms of water supply and proximity to other relevant production centers. As a result, across the empire we see a lot of evidence of tanneries situated within city limits.

With Chapters 4 and 5 the argument shifts slightly when analyzing first mint workers and then those associated with sensual (culinary) trades. These chapters focus increasingly on the later empire, arguing that the increasing restrictions placed upon those engaged as mint workers, bakers, fishermen, and so on were imposed not to denigrate these workers, but to ensure that they continued to serve in their existing, essential roles. Although mint workers might be barred from the equestrian order and in various ways confined by their profession, they might also enjoy tax breaks and the prestige that came with proximity to power. Bond illustrates the potential for mint workers to convey legitimacy on emperors or usurpers through the supply of reliable currency, as well as their potential to be a destabilizing factor in times of unrest. The chapter discussing sensual trades highlights the long-standing hostility toward cooks, bakers, fishermen, and others by those who sought to blame them for the perceived spread of luxury and effeminacy. Particular censure was directed toward those whose trades or goods were equated with excess or else associated with the private entourage of wealthy individuals. The condemnation voiced in works of philosophy is contrasted with the essential role played by those who ensured food supplies both to urban centers and to the army. However, the importance of meeting such demands also led to the use of servile/penal labor in mills, which provided hostile onlookers with additional ammunition against bakers.

Each chapter provides a clear overview of the trades under discussion and will be a useful resource for readers, as will the collection of appendixes, which brings together epigraphic examples of four of the trades discussed. While the focus on trades produces a sustained and coherent argument throughout, the attempted emphasis on “taboo,” stigma, and pollution is far more sporadic and less convincing, and there perhaps needed to be more detailed discussion of what is at stake when such terms are employed. Despite Bond's repeated use of words like “sordid” and “polluted,” with the exception of funeral workers, the use of such language and dirt imagery in reference to the professions that are examined is rather