follow Strand in keeping V.'s tempora, although the parallels show that Venus dat tempora iungendi is a possible expression, while tempora iungi is not. Yet Markland (in the preface on his commentary on the Silvae (1728), ix-xi) and Housman (Manil. 1.486) have so amply illustrated the tendency of scribes to change one three-syllable word for another that it is difficult to say whether Markland's foedera or Burman's corpora is better. In 387 P. reviews earlier conjectures at length and sensibly, but I think that in (equus) brevis in laevos piger angitur orbes first laevos must be changed into parvos (brevis can be an unhappy gloss on parvos, if P. wants), before replacing brevis (P.'s only parallel for in laevos orbes refers to battle). I agree with P. that no earlier proposal for 462 ad primos surgentia lumina fletus really convinces, but this text is not right (and that lumina fletus is a common ending may be used as an argument against it as well as in favour of it).

Even if we would have liked sometimes to anchor here rather than there, we are certainly happy to have taken this trip and grateful for the safe voyage and the quality of the entertainment on board.
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Suetonius is probably one of the most widely read Latin authors. His biographies of the first Roman emperors provide valuable information for historians and literary readers alike. He may be profitably studied at university or in the classroom, but he can also satisfy 'general' readers, who are curious about the private lives of the famous Caesars. Especially the biographies of the 'bad' ones (Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, Vitellius and Domitianus) remain fascinating reading, if only for the literary stereotypes in which Suetonius often models his characters.
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Sadly, modern scholars still tend to favour the 'good' emperors such as Augustus. This shows itself particularly in the lack of extensive modern commentaries on the 'bad' ones (for a survey of recent literature, cf. Perrine Galand-Hallyn, *Bibliographie suétonienne (les 'Vies des XII Césars') 1950-1988. Vers une rehabilitation*, ANRW II, 33,5, Berlin/New York 1991, p. 3576-3622). In particular, the life of Domitian has been badly neglected. For this, up to now one could consult only the full commentary of Suetonius by Mooney (1930) and a special commentary in Latin by Jansen (1919). This is all the more surprising, considering the renewed interest in Domitian among scholars like B.W. Jones.

Mr. Galli has now published an edition of the *Vita Domitiani* with an Italian translation and 47 pages of commentary. Given the void to be filled, the very fact of its publication is to be praised. However, the book itself is disappointing. The commentary concentrates on traditional historical material rather than literary topoi. So we find endless notes about wars and problems of administration, elements only briefly treated by Suetonius, but hardly a mention of points the Roman author is really interested in, such as the emperor's cruelty and moral depravation. Suetonius' rhetorical and literary techniques of character killing are paid hardly any attention to. In general, Galli seems to underline the 'positive' elements in Domitian's image. (In this, he agrees with B.W. Jones. But whereas the latter blames Suetonius for many of the negative elements, Galli tends to pass them over in silence.)

On the material side, Galli's book has some unpleasant surprises in store for the reader. The Latin text is printed in a xerox of Ihm's text of 1907, carelessly reproduced at that. If the Latin deserves so little attention, why include a text at all? More seriously, the commentary is needlessly difficult to consult. It is organized not by reference to the chapters of the text, as is common practice, but by reference to footnotes included in the Italian translation.

After this, it is almost a relief to turn to Kierdorf's useful edition of the lives of Claudius and Nero. Though commentaries on these lives are available in English, a modern German edition is most welcome. After a brief but excellent introduction, Kierdorf presents a clearly printed Latin text, followed by 162 pages of commentary (80 and 82 pages respectively). Modern literature is mentioned and fruitfully used, notes are short and instructive, both in historical and literary aspects, and present many points of discussion. Kierdorf has no bias against Suetonius, as historians so often show, nor
does he overreact by claiming complex literary structures for the lives, as has been done e.g. by Croisille. Suetonius must be approached neither as a scrupulous historian nor as a sophisticated verbal artist. Rather, we should accept him for what he is: an author desiring to tell good stories and give interesting facts and explanations about the deeds of famous *principes*.

Kierdorf's balanced view and broad scope make his small commentary a reliable and helpful companion for all readers and students of these interesting lives. On a minor point of criticism, one may regret the absence of a German translation, which would have made the book accessible to an even wider audience.
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The crisis of the family which presumably is taking place in the Western world, has drawn the historian's attention to this basic unit of social organization. Responding to the present interest, but without yielding to the temptation to take sides in actual discussions in the first chapter Suzanne Dixon defines the subject and surveys the controversies. Chapter 2 considers the legal setting, confronting formal rules to real life. Chapter 3 focuses on the Roman marriage and chapter 4 on the children living inside the cell of a family. Finally chapter 5 treats the way the Roman family adjusted itself to the different stages of its life cycle.

This is a very sensible and pragmatic approach. Pragmatism not only characterizes the organization, but also the reasoning throughout the book. Dixon agrees with the prevalent view that the nuclear family was the rule and that other households—two married brothers having one *domus* as the Aelii Tuberones and the Licinii Crassi—are atypical. The myth of aged parents living with their children is qualified by pointing out that only a small minority survived after their children reached the adult years to enjoy this right or obligation (p. 7).

The Roman family is rightly characterized as 'a flexible and pragmatic institution' (p. 11) and it had to be only because of the demographic conditions which was the cause of many a remarriage,