

Cic. *Pis.* 4 (55 BCE); Cic. *Fam.* 1.9.2 (54 BCE); Cic. *Fam.* 13.4.1-2 (46 BCE); Cic. *Fam.* 8.6.5 (50 BCE); Plin. *HN* 7.116-17; Plin. *HN* 8.210; Quint. *Inst.* 2.16.7-8; Quint. *Inst.* 5.3.13; Quint. *Inst.* 8.4.12; Plut. *Cic.* 12.2-6. The lacunas are discussed and evaluated, and, together with the *testimonia*, the reader is suitably informed as to the hazards of relying solely on the speeches which have survived.

The commentary itself is useful, detailed, and broad. G.M. does not focus on one aspect of the text, and future students and scholar will find it authoritative. In order to fulfil my reviewer's task diligently, I point out one omission, which is a reference to the *lex (Roscia) Mamilia*. Cicero himself referred to a *lex Mamilia* in his *Topica* 43 and *Leg.* 1.55. According to Cicero, the this law emended a pre-existing one (in fact, an item of the *XII Tables*), which required three *arbitri* to preside over boundary disputes, into a more humble requirement of one *arbiter*. It is possible to assume that in this context Cicero identified *arbitri* with *finitores*. The single *arbiter*, who presided over boundary disputes might have shed a different light on what Cicero present as an unlawful novelty in *LA* 2.33 where the *decemviri* were to rest on the report of a single *finitor* they themselves dispatched. It might indicate that Rullus alluded to a pre-existing habit, and that his bill was less revolutionary than Cicero suggests. Such a hypothesis finds further support in three items of a *lex Mamilia* (probably, but not surely, the same law) concerning the marking of boundaries. These were recorded by Bruns, *Fontes iuris Romani antiqui* p. 95 in a collection of the *Scriptores Gromatici* and have been associated with Mamilius. It is the only known quotation of these chapters of law. Their content is different from the *lex Mamilia* Cicero mentioned in *Top.* 43 and *Leg.* 1.55. They are numbered K.L.III, K.L.IIIII, and K.L.V. All three concern the safeguarding of boundaries and landmarks (*limites* and *termini*) by individual owners, state commissioners, or local boundaries in newly founded colonies, *municipia*, *fraefectura*, *fora*, or *conciliabula*, which were established by law.¹ Needless to say, this criticism is petty. It is an admirable work, which appeals to students and researchers alike.

Ido Israelowich

Tel Aviv University
ido0572@tauex.tau.ac.il

Cédric Brélaz (ed.), *L'Héritage grec des colonies romaines d'Orient. Interactions culturelles dans les provinces hellénophones de l'empire romain*. Collections de l'Université de Strasbourg. Études d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne. Éditions de Boccard: Paris, 2017. 467 pp. ISBN 978-2701804972.

The formal settlement of groups of Roman citizens as new communities in conquered territories was a long-lived and fundamental aspect of Roman imperialism, one which helped consolidate the empire and also mitigated some socio-economic pressures by the resettlement of poor citizens. In Italy, and then in the western provinces, these colonies offered strategic security, and promoted Roman rule and the ruling dynasty. They also acted, if unintentionally, as engines of cultural change, spreading Roman law, customs, cults and institutions, as well as Latin.

¹ On this *lex Mamilia* see Hardy, E.G. (1925), 'The *lex Mamila Roscia Peducaea Alliena Fabia*', *CQ* 19: 185-91; Cary, M. (1929), 'Notes on the legislation of Julius Caesar', *JRS* 19: 113-19; Crawford, M.H. (1989), 'The *lex Julia Agraria*', *Athenaeum* 77: 179-90; Bispham, E. (2007), *From Asculum to Actium* (Oxford).

The act of colonization often deleted an indigenous community and replaced it with a new one, and demoted the old inhabitants to the status of resident aliens (*incolae* or *paroikoi*), handing over their privileged position to Latin-speaking immigrants; the *caesura* in communal society represented by colonization cannot be underestimated. Nevertheless, the long-term impact of colonies founded in the Greek-speaking (or semitic but ‘Hellenised’) half of the empire was, in strategic and cultural terms, rather different. By the third century Latin was very largely restricted to, and sometimes competed with Greek in, official public pronouncements and the legends of colonial coinage. Linguistically and culturally, these communities, far from being ‘islands of Latinity’ or ‘Roman-ness’, by the Severan era led a double existence as both (formally) Roman colonies and (socially and culturally) Greek *poleis* interacting with Greek non-colonial peers.

Some 30 colonies, mainly of veterans but in some cases with a civilian population, were founded in the Greek-speaking East, from Sicily to Judaea, from the 40s B.C. onwards. This volume explores how they responded to, used, shaped and embraced their *héritage grec*, between their foundation and the age of the tetrarchs (when Latin briefly became again the language of power and administration in the East). Their Hellenistic heritage was not effaced; rather all these colonies acted in some way to preserve, revive or reboot some of what had gone before, in terms of infrastructure, material culture or memory. Nor were the colonies hermetically sealed Roman entities; rather they show the clear traces of sustained interaction with surrounding populations, and thus offer an excellent case study in acculturation in the Roman Empire in the east. This is a flourishing field, and the present volume sets itself the modest aim of being a *bilan* or *état de la question*, building on seminal contributions by, among others, Barbara Levick on Asia Minor, Fergus Millar in the Near East, and more recently by Rizakis in Greece and the Balkans, in order to offer a synoptic view across the Greek-speaking world.

The colonies discussed are split into four geographical groups: Greece and the Balkans; Anatolia; the Levant; Sicily and Italy. The focus is on those founded by Caesar, the triumvirs or Octavian-Augustus, often as a reflex of the playing out of the civil wars in the East. The contributions deal with almost all the Eastern colonies founded in this period. This coherent data set is oddly expanded to deal with Italian Neapolis, Aelia Capitolina and Caesarea Maritima (this last probably not a colony at all). The volume is book-ended by thoughtful contributions by the editor, discussing the areas in which colonization had most impact: demography, society, institutions, language, urbanism and land-holding. Roman institutions were, in their lived reality, susceptible of local modulation; colonies were *not* “reproductions statiques”, but were permeable by their environments. Here, Brélaz rightly draws attention to the diversity of both the datasets available and the individual contexts within which diverse local outcomes were determined.

The 17 contributions (in French, Italian and English, by both young and established scholars) share a similar trajectory: historical overview of the foundation; discussion of the physical remains of the colony; a synopsis of colonial coin types; analysis of epigraphic evidence, especially as pertaining to language-choice, linguistic interference; onomastics; institutions and cults; and discussion of identity and cultural memory, which again often implicates cult.

In a few cases (Corinth — Millis; Goeken; Apameia / Myrleia — Guerber) we have serious literary evidence from the Second Sophistic. In the case of Corinth these offer interesting perspectives on the complexities and selectivities which could govern the representation of colonial identity by outsiders for a colonial audience, to the point of eliding all reference to a colonial phase in favour of emphasis on a Greek cultural ascendancy. In the case of Apameia the evidence of Dio points to a degree of penetration of the colonial citizenship by Prousans (albeit, as Guerber argues, by those who were already Romans) and of intermarriage and interaction, which

the epigraphic evidence would not lead us to expect. In only one case (Knossos — Baldwin-Bowsky) is material culture other than the monumental considered, through the fluctuating fortunes of Italian sigillata tableware, which lost out to eastern sigillatas between the Flavian and Hadrianic periods. Baldwin-Bowsky sees this as a “normalization” of the material culture of the colony, reverting to its pre-colonial orientation in terms of domestic behaviours. More studies of this sort would be desirable.

Most contributions face similar challenges: we know, in almost all cases, little about the foundation and early years of the colonies, and this problematises the recurrent claims about individuals with Latin names from the second or third centuries, that they are of ‘probable colonial descent’; all the contributors are aware of the dangers of drawing social or demographic conclusions from bare names, but nonetheless allow themselves considerable latitude in doing so, even when (as at Kassandreaia, Pella or Knossos, for example) the epigraphic record is too thin to allow conclusions about the ‘exclusivity’ or ‘openness’ of the colonial élite (and n.b. above on Apameia). Almost all the colonies show the increasing displacement of Latin by Greek (or the failure of Latin to make headway outside certain domains), and the recrudescence of Greek cultural, cultic or institutional practices, by the third century (Philippi — Brélaz & Demaille — is a fascinating counter-example in linguistic terms). Indeed colonists often appropriated and adapted their Greek pasts; this is a process which often seems to be underway by the Hadrianic period, which gave a shot in the arm to (selective) interest in Hellenic cultural traditions; but again lack of evidence hampers our ability to grasp the first-century situation, and the nature and motivation of these changes are opaque. Perhaps more should be made of the point noted by Labarre on Pisidian Antioch, that colonial populations will have been compelled from quite early on to draw (and keep drawing) on the surrounding population to renew themselves. This population was not always Greek, and many contributions address the impact of the *héritage non-grec*, be it Anatolian, Thracian or, as in the most interesting case-study, Semitic (Hošek — Berytus & Heliopolis). Greek and Latin, Greek culture and Roman culture, cohabited (Belayche) within the colonial territory. The re-emergence of the former is partly owing to natural interactions of colonists and indigenes, with the latter working their way into colonial society, partly to “normalization”, but also to a conscious development by the colonists, in different ways and at different places, of what Kuhn happily terms a “colonial Hellenism”. The result was communities which enjoyed the privileged status of Roman colonies, but appropriated and manipulated Greek spaces, cultural assets and institutions, memories myths and cults to support interaction and competition with Greek neighbours. What metaphors we should use to understand this process remains unresolved (fluidity? mixture? creolism? hybridity? normalization? hellenization? globalization? code-switching is almost entirely absent, but note Barat, p. 218).

All of these papers are interesting; most of them deal directly with the themes which the volume sets out to address. At times the piling up of data, or a superficial cherry-picking of unusual cases, are substituted for analysis; and sometimes one wishes for more caution in using onomastics or small datasets. There are some standout pieces: Brélaz & Demaille offer a rich and rewarding comparison of two neighbouring colonies (Philippi and Dium); Kuhn offers a sensitive reading of change over time at Alexandria Troas, and plays with the categories of colonial Hellenes and Hellenized colonists as offering a potent way to pass beyond the Greek :: Roman dichotomy; Belayche, on tricultural colonial realities, and for the most sensitive treatment of how linguistic choice is affected by location and cultural domain; and Hošek, with a sophisticated and nuanced discussion of the different uses to which colonists put different deities, differentiating cult on the one hand (and the difference between Roman and Greek cult for local deities) from the use

of local divine heritage as a means of expressing a new colonial identity on the other; all this within the context of interactions with other Phoinikian cities (the discussion of iconography here cried out for illustrations, however).

This rich volume, with its wealth of case studies, offers much to stimulate, and opens up some new avenues for understanding the rich and varied processes by which *coloniae* became *poleis*. It is much more than a *bilan*, rather an important study in Graeco-Roman acculturation.

Edward Bispham

Brasenose & St Anne's Colleges, Oxford

John D. Grainger, *Syrian Influences in the Roman Empire to AD 300*. London and New York: Routledge, 2018. 273 pp. ISBN 9781138071230.

The subject of John D. Grainger's latest book should be, in theory, easy to define. According to the title, it is supposed to show the impact of Syria on the Roman Empire. However, it is not clear what Grainger's Syria is. From the first pages, it seems that Grainger defines Syria according to the idea of Greater Syria, which includes many territories such as Arabia and Judaea (pp. 1-2). But this position is problematic as he often describes those territories as not being part of Syria (e.g. p. 35). Moreover, not only does he alter his definition of Syria, he does this frequently. The most obvious example is on page 60, which begins with him claiming that the legions posted in Palaestina should not be counted as part of the "Syrian Legions", while at the bottom of this page, he defines Judaea as part of Syria (the author flips randomly between "Judaea" and "Palestine"). On page 63, he counts the legion in Jerusalem among those included in the list of legions posted in Syria, whereas on page 64, Arabia and Palaestina are again considered separate from Syria. There are many further examples but the point is clear.

Through the book, Grainger often provides us with sentences that would leave an academic reader puzzled. For example:

As a geographical region Syria was comparable with Italy, Spain, Gaul or Asia Minor in importance, though in size it was smaller than any of these. And yet its influence on the life of the Empire was out of all proportion compared with these and was infinitely greater than any of them. (p. 1)

There are some problems with this sentence. Firstly, he never tries to prove the "infinitely greater" influence of Syria. Secondly, it is puzzling to find an assertion that Greater Syria, which includes Palaestina and Arabia, was smaller than Italy, by someone who wrote numerous books about the area.

The book's first chapter introduces the land, its inhabitants and history. This chapter is filled with many inaccuracies and gross mistakes. One of them is Grainger's claim that the Assyrian system of mass deportations "reduced most of Syria outside Palestine and Phoenicia to an impoverished rural society" (p. 14). This statement is not only utterly wrong but also demonstrates that Grainger misunderstands the scholarly works that he relies upon in his footnotes. Astour, in a book review of an earlier publication by Grainger, highlighted the same problems and mistakes.¹ Unfortunately, Grainger does not absorb corrections offered to him by book reviewers. He

¹ Michael C. Astour, Review of, *The Cities of Seleukid Syria* by John D. Grainger, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 114/2 (1994), pp. 267-270.