

ground,” (also termed “hybridity”), thus opening up new possibilities of examination and avoiding binary confrontation as the only mode of interaction between two different societies.

As we now know, modernization and globalization do not destroy local cultures. Rather, they stimulate new patterns of creativity, producing something that one could call, in paraphrase of Hegel, a “cunning of culture”. Indigenous cultures usually counter-attack the aggressions of cultural imperialism, and their subversive submission (we owe this term to the early modern historian Sanjay Subrahmanyam), giving rise to rejuvenation. Under such conditions, Hellenism was a medium, affording a new, eloquent voice to local and indigenous traditions. Far from destroying local cultures, then, cultural contact and global modernization strengthen them. Living together, cohabitation, middle ground, are all terms which seek to explain the nature of the complex processes that were taking place in the Hellenistic Near East better than the traditional term “Hellenization”.

To a great extent, CB is correct to highlight the ambiguities of classical formulations, and to offer new approaches to what really took place in Hellenistic Phoenicia. Nonetheless, one is reminded of Arnaldo Momigliano’s word of caution: ‘As a rule terminological ambiguities should never detain a scholar for long.’ (‘J. G. Droysen between Greeks and Jews’, *History and Theory* 9 (1970), 139-153, p. 139). After all, it is in excellent Greek that Syrian authors such as Meleager of Gadara would express pride about their ethnic roots. It is also through reinterpretations of Greek myths that the Sidonians insisted upon their anteriority to the Greco-Macedonians.

The religious story of Phoenicia in Hellenistic times is quite different from that of Palestine during the same period. To some extent, one could well imagine that much in the approach and the findings of CB would hold for coastal cities. Jewish reactions to Hellenism were of course highly diverse. In contradistinction to what happened in Phoenicia, they have left us very important literary traces. A by no means minimal benefit of CB’s impressive work is that it allows us to reformulate comparative studies anew.

Guy G. Stroumsa

Hebrew University of Jerusalem
University of Oxford

A.G.G. Gibson (ed.), *The Julio-Claudian Succession: Reality and Perception of the “Augustan Model”*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013. 179 pp. ISBN 978-90-04-23191-7.

Among the numerous recent publications on Augustus in the context of the bimillennial anniversary of his death, this fine collection of eight essays, originating from a conference at St. Andrews in 2008, provides a salutary reminder of the importance of investigating not only the establishment of the principate under Rome’s first princeps but also its continuity under the other Julio-Claudian emperors. How was the Augustan principate perceived, transmitted, adopted and modified up to the time of the last Julio-Claudian emperor? The question posed by this volume, which aims to foster a better understanding of the evolutionary nature and complexity of the Julio-Claudian principate, is certainly ambitious. The reader should be clear about the fact that this volume does not intend to provide (and, given its natural constraints, cannot provide) a systematic, comprehensive overview and structural analysis of the issue of succession and the political and institutional continuities and changes of the ‘Augustan model’. What the editor, A.G.G. Gibson, aims to achieve is to add ‘another dimension’ (p. 15) to the scholarly discourse by specifically bringing to the fore how the various sources represent the transition of imperial power, the role of the princeps and the conception of the principate in dialogue with the ‘Augustan model’.

The editor (pp. 1-17) sets the scene with general reflections on the constitutional position of the princeps, the concept of succession and the challenges which the emperor faced in maintaining power and passing it on to a natural heir. The eight essays that follow are arranged in chronological order. Josiah Osgood (pp. 19-40) starts with the Augustan period, focussing his analysis on how Suetonius deals with the idea of succession. He rightly draws attention to the lack

of a proper discussion of matters concerning succession in Suetonius' *Life of Augustus* and *Life of Tiberius*. This omission is particularly remarkable when compared with the accounts of Tacitus and Cassius Dio, who offer a more detailed narrative of Augustus' promotion of members of the imperial family, especially of Gaius and Lucius during the years 6 BC and AD 4. In this context, Osgood provides a valuable overview of these events, which considers the epigraphic and numismatic evidence. Interestingly, he presents the year 6 BC as a kind of turning point for the issue of succession: he argues that 'from 6 BC many came to see Gaius and Lucius as his [i.e. Augustus'] possible successors, the "blood of Augustus" thus took on a special significance, and a tacit principle that Augustus would be succeeded, ideally by a hereditary successor, took hold' (p. 35). For Suetonius' special treatment of succession he offers the following explanation: 'for Suetonius, imperial power has a surprising transmission, one that often does not go according to plan and defies contemporary expectations' (p. 36); (...) 'it was not a matter of any one emperor's wishes or of "imperial policy" nor was it a matter for the Senate (as it might have been, in part for Dio), but was rather in the stars' (p. 38).

The next three essays are concerned with the Tiberian principate. Robin Seager (pp. 41-57) provides an extremely useful discussion of the public image of the *domus Augusta* between AD 4 and 24 through a close analysis of the evidence from literature (Ovid's *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*), epigraphy (*SC de Cn. Pisone patre*; *Tabula Hebana*; *Tabula Siarensis*), numismatics and archaeology (Arch of Ticinum). He skilfully filters out the key messages of public communication that helped to guarantee the survival of the dynasty during these years: the *domus Augusta* was presented in public propaganda as a harmonious, mutually devoted family free from tension, as a dynasty with abundant heirs in a clearly defined hierarchy of succession which was prolific enough to survive in the long run and to maintain the well-being and internal peace of the principate. The construction of a public image is also the topic of Caroline Vout's contribution (pp. 59-77), which considers the question of how Tiberius was *visually* turned into incumbent. Her essay is a powerful reminder that to a great extent 'continuity rests on visualisation' (p. 74). Tiberius was confronted with the necessity and difficulty of assuming the appearance of a princeps in Augustus' shadow; due to Augustus' success, he was 'compelled to follow' (p. 74), even though the role did not suit his character. Vout suggests that Tiberius' notorious *dissimulatio* should not be understood simply as a 'purely literary device' but as 'a response to the environment' (p. 70). It should be seen not so much as a 'weakness but a virtue' (p. 75). Next, a critical assessment of Tacitus' Tiberius is given by Jane Bellemore (pp. 79-94), who investigates Tacitus' claim that Tiberius gave preference to Drusus over Germanicus (Tac. *Ann.* 2.43.5). Drusus' career before AD 14 is systematically explored and compared to the key stages of Germanicus' promotion. Bellemore's comparative overview of the careers of Tiberius' natural and adopted sons is most informative and it convincingly underlines her point that Germanicus was favoured over Drusus in Augustus' own plans for succession. However, her hypothesis (misleadingly presented as a historical fact in her conclusion) that the senatorial 'accession debate' in AD 14 revolved around Tiberius' (unsuccessful) proposal that 'both Germanicus and Drusus join him as *principes*' (p. 92), may provoke debate. A more nuanced interpretation of the sources would have been welcome here.

With Roger Rees's article (pp. 95-106) the volume moves on to the later Julio-Claudian emperors. Rees examines the literary reaction to the *Laus Pisonis*. Assuming that it was composed in AD 39/40 for Gaius Calpurnius Piso, who would lead the conspiracy against Nero in AD 65, Rees demonstrates the considerable impact which the poem had on later writers such as Martial, Juvenal and Tacitus and offers an insightful discussion of Tacitus' account of Piso (Tac. *Ann.* 15.48) as 'a deliberate corrective of the flattering picture the poem creates' (p. 102). The article will doubtless prove useful for any future study of intertextuality in Roman imperial literature and the literary afterlife of a conspirator, but its direct relevance to the volume's theme of succession is harder to define. A.G.G. Gibson's article (pp. 107-132) focusses more directly on the topic of succession. It reviews the circumstances of Claudius' accession in comparison with the previous

imperial successions of Tiberius and Gaius. Gibson carefully analyses the iconography, precedents, significance and audiences of the Claudian PRAETOR(ianis) RECEP(T)IS coins with a sharp eye for interesting detail. However, he ultimately attaches too much significance to the role which these coins may have played in the maintenance of the stability of the Julio-Claudian principate.

Finally, two articles are devoted to the Neronian principate. Emma Buckley (pp. 133-154) draws attention to the construction and representation of Neronian identity in the Pseudo-Senecan *Octavia*. She offers a stimulating analysis of how the text engages with Seneca's *De clementia*, Vergil's *Aeneid* and Lucian's *Bellum Civile* to present Nero's conception of Caesarianism and his role as princeps — a role which 'brings the Julio-Claudian dynasty to its self-destructive endpoint, an end which is found in its civil war beginnings' (p. 148). John Drinkwater (pp. 155-173) explores the weaknesses of the Neronian political system under the label of the 'half-baked Principate'. He makes interesting observations on Nero's inner circle of supporters and suggests that 'three legs of the tripod' (p. 163) were the most important guarantors of political stability: the household freedmen, senior field commanders and the court. Drinkwater encourages the reader to understand Nero as a princeps who 'does not direct the regime, but is protected and isolated by it' (p. 167), at least as long as his main supporters stand to the emperor's side. He regards Nero's downfall as an inevitable consequence of the interplay between an unsuited emperor and a "hybrid" system of government which oscillated between the poles of a restored *res publica* and monarchy: 'the "half-baked princeps" was, to the end, the victim of "the half-baked Principate"' (p. 173).

Overall, this collection of articles is a rewarding read for anyone interested in the Julio-Claudian period. Although the authors are dealing with well-trodden ground, they nonetheless succeed in providing thought-provoking and fresh analyses of the evidence that will certainly stimulate further discussion and reflection on the formative phase of the principate.

Christina T. Kuhn

University of Oxford

Suzanne Stern-Gillet and Gary M. Gurtler (eds.), *Ancient and Medieval Concepts of Friendship*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2014. xvi + 327 pp. ISBN 978-1-4384-5365-1/-8 (hardcover/electronic).

This issue in the SUNY series of Ancient Greek Philosophy comprises a collection of papers written by leading scholars concerning theories of *philia/amicitia* expounded in the works of thinkers active between the ancient period and pre-modern times. Although not claiming to be a definitive study, the selected theories discussed typify conceptualization of friendship envisaged in: Classical and Hellenistic thought, Patristic and Medieval theology and writing by thinkers of the early Enlightenment. In such a broad context, the contributions naturally concentrate on only a small group of philosophers from each period, but ones who left specific works on the theme of friendship and discussions of it. The contributions in this volume clearly show that common to all later examinations of this theme are the theories first set forth in Plato and Aristotle. Each shows how later thinkers reputedly reinterpreted specific points in the discussions of Plato and Aristotle in order to construct their own theories. This characteristic can thus be seen as a unifying factor in the conceptualization of friendship during this lengthy era. Following a short preface by the editor summarizing the contents (pp. ix-xvi), these themes are set out in four general chronological sections:

'Plato and Aristotle'

1) Dimitri E. Murr opens with a contribution 'Philia in Plato' (pp. 3-34), in which he examines *Leg.* 8 836e-837d as a solution to Plato's earlier accounts, but here defined as a form of attraction