blocked and compressed, and they make for hard reading, despite their interest value. Several amplifications, particularly letters, would have injected the bare diary with vigour and substance.

Most of the photos are excellent, with just a few expanded beyond their safe limits.

The book helps to explain ethnic tensions in the coal mines of the period, particularly during the One Big Union phenomenon wherein "Austrians and Russians" conflicted with returning veterans. I suspect that the overall story of provocation and counter-provocation is very complex and rather more fully blown on both sides than we yet realize. While worse prison camps have oppressed most eras, portions of the Castle Mountain experience are still fit for the files of Amnesty International. It is sad that harsh times generate harsh measures—and that is a statement of fact, not a vindication.

The editors' research is exacting. They have succeeded well in revealing this important and little-known page in Canadian history.

David C. Jones
University of Calgary


Marc Kleijwegt. Ancient Youth: The Ambiguity of Youth and the Absence of Adolescence in Greco-Ro-


Emiel Eyben has a reputation in his discipline, that of Roman history, for producing long pastiche-like summaries of primary evidence that concern various aspects of the family life of the period (amongst them studies on age stages, puberty, and family planning). The snippets are rephrased and linked via sundry comments made by the author to form what is supposed to be a coherent whole. Although in book form, Restless Youth in Ancient Rome does not depart much from this tried-and-true personal format. Eyben advances relentlessly, chapter after chapter, through the subjects of the definition of "youth" in Roman society, the place of young men in the political order of the Roman state (mainly the army and high political offices), their leisure activities (a narrow range between sports and vandalism), and, finally, to the way young men thought and felt. Each subject is remorselessly ground through in detail, though mercifully to a lesser extent than in the author's 619-page opus in Dutch on the same subject published in 1977 (itself derived from a decade-old doctoral dissertation) to the footnotes of which the reader is constantly referred. The prose, if tedious, is reasonably well edited from the original Dutch, and is marred only by a few striking errors. The last time I saw him, Alan Cameron was still a man. Eyben's repeated reference to him as "her" (p. 91), however, may well be
just another sign of these confused times.

The problem is that the reader is assailed with a barrage of factoids and quotations, running from Cicero and earlier to Augustine and beyond, but is not provided with much in the way of consistent interpretation. The result has perhaps been best summarized by another reviewer: “Ebyen’s ‘cut-and-paste’ literary approach to the subject has resulted in a work which is generally unbalanced, sometimes bizarre, and often incoherent.” Apart from a cursory nod in the direction of Philippe Ariès and his landsmann Pierre Van den Berg, there is almost nothing in the way of a coherent interpretive framework, much less analysis. Ebyen must be gambling that a full frontal assault of repetitive “facts” that can be adduced about young men in Roman society will naturally lead readers to the right conclusions. In theory Ebyen limits his purview to young aristocratic Roman males, but in practice he constantly slips, with no caution given to the reader, to evidence drawn from vastly different ethnic and social groups in the Roman empire and from a range of time spanning almost a millennium. He then offers this potpourri of evidence as the basis for conclusions about Roman youth in general—justifying the approach on the unjustifiable basis of the “homogenization” of the Mediterranean under Roman rule. Not so. Whereas Roman rule was a considerable political and military achievement, it did not lead to the sort of cultural homogenization typical of modern industrial states.

Disregarding the obvious social, ethnic, and class barriers in the empire compels Ebyen to ignore the sometimes great shifts in valuation of gender (and hence of young men) and of age itself, depending on the regional society and community involved, as well as the longitudinal developmental waves in these valuations over time. Otherwise, Ebyen’s survey of “the evidence” is just practically coterminous with the evidence itself. Sometimes, however, it is worse. Given the outpouring of research on gender and sexuality in the past decade, Ebyen’s chapters on the sexual and romantic life of young men (pp. 240ff.) is embarrassingly deficient. It begins with the scholarly banality “In antiquity, sex was generally—but not always [sic! ]—taken completely for granted,” and proceeds to worse. By contrast, Kleijwegt’s approach to these same subjects (pp. 43ff.) including problematic aspects of them that require a fine theoretical touch, such as ritualized homosexual relations between men, is both current and critical, and made to bear on the problem of the inferior, yet privileged, place of young men in Roman society.

Kleijwegt’s work is indeed rather more promising at first reading, since it presents itself as having two clear aims: a coherent theoretical definition of “youth” in historical context (and a more cogent analysis attached to that definition); and the development of an explicit critique of Ebyen (especially at pp. 54ff.). Before advancing to matters of substance, however, it should be noted that Kleijwegt’s book suffers from a number of drawbacks, the most obvious of which is the more than occasional intervention of a sort of mélange of Dutch and English, fre-
quent typographical errors and malapropisms (scolars, teener age, twen-
nies, Nathalie Zemon Davis, medievist—a brief selection from the
two chapters), and—a problem especially for the generally interested
reader from outside “the field”—the
frequent quotation of materials left un-
translated in the original language, in-
cluding French, German, Latin, and
Greek. But the prospective reader
should not be deterred by these prob-
lems. No matter how annoying and
off-putting they might be, they are not
so pervasive as entirely to efface the
utility of this work.

Kleijwegt defends a modified ver-
sion of the Ariès thesis: that the mod-
ern term “adolescence” is inapplicable
to the world of antiquity where for a
host of cultural reasons the term
“youth” is to be preferred. He bases
this interpretation on a reasonably ex-
tensive use of comparative evidence
from anthropological models and the
social history of early modern Europe
(Introduction and chapter 1) drawn
mainly from Margaret Mead, and de-
bates over her claims, and, again, the
Ariès thesis and its critics. He claims
that “pre-industrial youth,” including
that at Rome, had an age-range that
was quite different from those of mod-
ern post-industrial societies—a longer
period between the end of infancy and
childhood, from about seven years of
age to the beginning of true adulthood,
perhaps as late as one’s forties and
fifties depending on social class, eth-
nic background, and political context.

Another critical difference between
modern and pre-modern youth groups,
according to Kleijwegt, was the com-
plete absence of any autonomous
“youth culture” in the latter. The con-
siderable power in the hands of seniors
in general, and fathers in particular,
encouraged a dominant “patriarchal
ideology” in which the young were
viewed as “prospective adults” and
were required by ideals, behaviour,
and work constantly to assume “mi-
nor” versions of adult activities. Klei-
jwegt argues that, rather than
threatening and challenging adult val-
ues as do modern adolescents, Roman
“youth” saw themselves as having a
special role in defending and propagat-
ing adult values. The “youth” age
group in Roman society, he argues,
was a strongly interstitial one that fol-
lowed immediately upon the “total de-
pendence” of infancy. It was a stage of
“semi-dependence” that lasted for
young men until marriage and forma-
tion of one’s own family and house-
hold (in their late twenties and early
thirties, or even later). Kleijwegt cau-
tions that many of the differences be-
tween this “ancient youth” and our
“adolescence” are not sharply drawn
ones, but rather shadings of new atti-
dudes, sentiments, and types and de-
grees of care first shown to children
beginning with the upper and middle
classes of eighteenth-century western
Europe.

The two exemplary areas of youth
culture and education can be used to
illustrate the differences of approach.
Feytten trots the reader through a large
number of primary texts relating to
what was called “education,” and as-
sumes this education to be an altered
version of our own. Kleijwegt (chap.
4), on the other hand, specifically con-
tests the apparent similarities and
wholly rejects the influential opinion
of Marrou that ancient education was the precursor of our modern systems. Kleijwegt shows that there was no public schooling worthy of the name—almost all of what passed as "education" functioned either by means of private elite patronage or within the context of the family. All education for young men, therefore, was oriented towards integrating them with their elders in the social and political elite. Schools were never able to function as institutions in their own right. Similarly, since neither economic nor cultural autonomy was provided by such institutions, Kleijwegt denies that there is any evidence for a consistent "youth culture" or "counter culture" in Roman society. It is not that young men might express (or be feared to express) ideas and emotions associated with their age-range and situation—it is just that these were never constructed autonomously as a "youth culture" that was able to challenge the values and power of adults. Eyben's (pp. 152ff.) attempt to elicit such a youth "counter culture" fails. It consists, for example, of exhausting the reader by dragging him/her through the poems of Catullus one by one, recording minutiae of debates over their meaning (pp. 184-96), and then regarding the case as demonstrated.

An obvious deficit in the analyses of both Eyben and Kleijwegt lies in their announced intention to analyze solely the position of young men (a point of gender that often slips unconsciously from view in their many generalizations about "ancient youth" as a whole). For Kleijwegt the choice is defended merely as one of convenience coping with the heavily skewed surviving evidence. Eyben is more certain: girls had no "youth" worth writing about since they were married off so young (p. 3)—an assertion which is false on both bases (some girls in the high elite were married off very young—most were not). A more fundamental objection to both authors' exclusionary principle is that it is only partially defensible, since the position of young men, even (perhaps especially) in elite families and society, stood in a strong causal relationship to their female siblings, and that such relationships cannot be ignored. In her detailed study of the relationships between fathers and daughters in Roman elite families, for example, Judith Hallett argues that the special place of daughters in these upper-class households had a profound impact on the valuation and treatment of sons.

But there is a more disturbing problem. In the current barrage of work on family, sexuality, and gender in the worlds of the Greek city-states and of the Roman empire, it was expected that more specific age-hierarchical groups would necessarily be drawn into the purview of social historians. The problem is that the most voiceless (in Latin, quite literally, infantes)—infants and children—seem to have been the object of more satisfying and penetrating studies (as, for example, those by Mark Golden on the children of classical Athens) than these two works have to offer on the interstitial group of "youth." Eyben's book is an erratic and uncontrolled pastiche that cobbles together almost every known activity that can be ascribed to young men between ages seventeen and forty-five. Although better con-
trolled, Kleijwegt's work is still plagued by an irregularly developed argument, and the inclusion of detailed scholarly excurses of marginal utility to the prospective reader. Despite two large-scale, and expensive, labours of calvinistic assiduity, therefore, we are left wanting a truly satisfying work on the subject. Given the economics of the academic book trade, we may well have to wait for some time—a shame, because even Eyben (p. 9) is able to argue that age is a characteristic of social behaviour that is as significant as gender or class. It deserves its own competent analysis.

Brent D. Shaw
University of Lethbridge


There are, according to Ronald K. Goodenow, a set of needs which have not, until now, received the attention they deserve within either the historical or the comparative educational canon. They include, first and foremost, the need to examine, question, and extend the current boundaries of historical research and writing in the field of urban educational history. Addressing this need is the principal aim of *The City and Education in Four Nations.* In this volume Goodenow and his co-editor, William E. Marsden, present us with eleven essays, written by scholars in Britain, Canada, the United States, and Australia, which deal with important issues rising from the complex relationship between historical research and praxis, and with the theoretical foundations upon which urban educational historians write.

Each of the contributors to this book maintains, either implicitly or explicitly, that the study of the history of urban education will be immeasurably strengthened both through international, national, and regional comparisons of developments in urban schooling, and through the international collaboration of urban educational historians which might result from such comparisons. Many of the contributors also point out that in order for this field to grow and gain prestige, it is essential that urban educational historians strengthen the theoretical basis upon which they write—in many cases borrowing from, and therefore presumably collaborating with, scholars in cognate disciplines.

The book is divided into three parts. In the first, contributors from each of the four nations discuss the historiographical trends in the study of urban schools in each of their respective countries. As the series editors, David A. Reeder and Pete Clark, note in their preface, all four of these papers demonstrate that educational history has come a long way from its institutional and celebratory roots, and that many of its current practitioners are manifestly absorbed in exploring “the inter-relationships between schooling, work, residential development, family life, and the experience of growing up in different environments” (p. xv). This point has a significant bearing on