

Armin Eich (ed.), *Die Verwaltung der kaiserzeitlichen römischen Armee. Studien für Hartmut Wolff*. Historia Einzelschriften 211. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010. 210 pp. ISBN 978-3-515-09420-7.

The nine papers included in this volume were presented at a conference organized by the editor at the University of Passau (16-17 February 2007), in honour of Prof. Hartmut Wolff on the occasion of his retirement. As explained by the editor, the title of the volume comprises two topics: the army as a self-administered organization; and the army as the most important instrument which the central government had at its disposal for controlling the empire. Needless to say, various aspects of these two topics have been dealt with in studies on the Roman imperial army, old and recent; thus, the present volume is a reminder of the continuing scholarly interest in military administration. The following is a brief summary of the individual papers included in the book.

In the opening paper ('Die Verwaltung der kaiserzeitlichen Armee. Zur Bedeutung militärischer Verwaltungsstrukturen in der Kaiserzeit für die administrative Entwicklung des Imperium Romanum', 9-36) Armin Eich provides an overview of the activities and structures typical of and essential for the military administration, discussing and classifying them under several categories. For example, the self-administration of the army units is linked to elements characteristic of bureaucratic forms of organization, notably regular paperwork, the presence of a functional hierarchy, and binding criteria of promotion. One major argument is that the forms of the military organization served as a model for other branches of Roman administration, and yet, one may comment, the extent of the militarization of the imperial administration in general remains debateable.

The other contributors to this volume treat more specific topics. In a well-documented article R. Stauner examines the administrative work performed by the army units ('*Rationes Ad Milites Pertinentes*: Organization und Funktion der Binnenadministration militärischer Einheiten in den Frühen und Hohen Kaiserzeit', 37-85), a subject he has dealt with more comprehensively in a former publication.¹ His analysis of this work is presented under the headings: Valetudinarium, Victus, Arma, Vestimenta, Quaestura, Tabularium. These spheres of activity of the administrative personnel of the units, essential to the functioning of the army, were minutely documented in writing; to render accounts (*rationes reddere*) was a hallmark of the military administration. The article indeed helps to form some idea of the enormous scope of the annual paperwork produced by the army units in the periods discussed.

Regular enlistment of new soldiers to replace those discharged or deceased was vital for the smooth operation of the army. The ongoing discovery of military diplomas, altogether almost one thousand by now, is used by Werner Eck to correlate certain irregularities with specific historical events ('Friedenssicherung und Krieg in der römischen Kaiserzeit. Wie ergänzt man das römische Heer?', 88-110). Statistically, a 4% yearly replacement for a twenty-five year service is to be expected. The recruitment of 126 *tirones* from Asia for a *cohors equitata* stationed in Upper Egypt in 117, that is, about 25% of the cohort strength, is certainly exceptional. As Eck explains, it suggests that the unit suffered heavy losses in the Jewish Revolt of AD 116-117, and had to be replenished by recruiting outside the province. In this case the evidence is derived from a papyrus. In another case, military diplomas attest an exceptional number of discharges from auxiliary units in the late 150s, indicating a mass recruitment twenty-five years earlier, which was needed to

¹ See in particular his *Das offizielle Schriftwesen des römischen Heeres von Augustus bis Gallienus (27 v. Chr.-268 n. Chr.)*. Eine Untersuchung zu Struktur, Funktion und Bedeutung der offiziellen militärischen Verwaltungsdokumentation und zu deren Schreibern, Bonn 2004.

replace losses sustained during the Bar-Kokhva Revolt in the 130s. However, as Eck's presentation of other cases shows, correlation of events and irregular discharges or recruitment is not always easily established.

Peter Herz's paper ('Die Versorgung der römischen Armee mit Waffen und Ausrüstung', 111-32) deals with certain aspects of a subject extensively discussed in recent years, namely the supplies for the army. One issue is whether military supplies were handled directly by the army or given out by contract to civilians. Another issue is whether supplies were provided locally or centrally and from remote areas. Of course a combination of these possibilities may well have been practised. Herz limits his discussion to the manufacturing and distribution of arms and military equipment, warning the readers that his interpretations are not to be regarded as conclusive. On the whole he brings forth evidence which may suggest various modes of supply.

Michael Alexander Speidel's article ('Auf kürzestem Weg und gut gepflegt an die Frontier. Zur Versorgung pannonischer Expeditionstruppen während der severischen Partherkriege', 133-47), already published in a collection of his articles, presents archaeological finds discovered at Aulutrene, near Phrygian Apamea, and at Zeugma on the Euphrates; the finds (notably stamped tiles and grave inscriptions) are associated with the transfer of military units from the Balkan to the east during the Parthian wars of the Severan period, and may have to do with efforts made to facilitate military traffic along the east-west route in Asia Minor.

The role of the army in the administrative control of the population in Egypt is the topic of Bernhard Palme's paper ('Militärs in der administrativen Kontrolle der Bevölkerung im römischen Ägypten', 149-64). This is a straightforward description of the involvement of the military in two administrative processes concerning the civilian population of Egypt, namely the *epikrisis* and the provincial census. Well-supported by documentary evidence and references to scholarly works, Palme's account demonstrates the enormous amount of paperwork produced by the Roman administration.

Helmut Bender's discussion of the modes of supplying the army on the Rhein frontier is based on archaeological finds unearthed at four sites ('Die römische Armee und ihr Einfluss auf Produktion und Bevorratung im zivilen Bereich. Archäologische Beispiele auf den nordwestlichen Provinzen des Imperium Romanum', 149-64). The variegated evidence attests that in these cases the army got its supplies from places of production as remote as North Italy and also from adjacent sites. In his conclusion Bender points out that there was no stringent division between the military and the civilian population.

Rudolph Haensch ('Kontrolle und Verantwortlichkeit von *officiales* in Prinzipat und Spätantike', 177-86) examines the measures practised to attain control in the working of the administrative personnel, as well as to ensure personal responsibility. He exploits papyrological and epigraphic and not merely literary and legal sources, as did former scholars, in exploring this problem. The documents adduced testify to the prevalence, at various levels of the imperial administration, of counter-endorsement practice, by which control and responsibility were maintained.

The last paper, by Hartmut Leppin, deals with the problem of the replenishment of the army after the disastrous battle of Adrianople ('Truppenergänzung in einer außergewöhnlichen Situation: Theodosius der Große und die Rekrutierungen nach Adrianopel', 187-99). Leppin reviews anew, usefully, and on some points quite insightfully, the various relevant sources in the aim of presenting the measures taken by Theodosius to overcome the crisis, although on the whole he cannot make real progress beyond previous treatments of the topic.²

The collected papers in this volume represent the wide spectrum of topics pertaining to the subject of the administration of the Roman imperial army. Perhaps the more significant value of

² On recruitment in the 4th century, including Theodius' handling the manpower crisis, see esp. C. Zuckerman in *REByz* 56 (1998), 79-139.

the volume is that it demonstrates the need to take into account issues of military administration in any discussion of the functioning of the Roman army.

Israel Shatzman

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

D. Jacobson and N. Kokkinos (eds.), *Herod and Augustus: Papers Presented at the IJS Conference, 21st-23rd June 2005*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2009. 506 pp. ISBN 978-90-04-16546-5.

This volume contains nineteen papers that were presented at a conference organized by the editors on the theme ‘Herod and Augustus’. It testifies to the enduring scholarly fascination with Herod,¹ including his relations with Augustus and Rome. Scholars’ engagement with Herodian studies has increased in the last generation, a trend associated with the expansion of archaeological explorations of Herodian sites, as well as with new directions in the study of the writings of Flavius Josephus. The recent discovery of Herod’s mausoleum and theatre at Herodium by the late E. Netzer is just one remarkable example of this fascinating development.² Innovative investigations of Josephus’ writing methods have affected the understanding of the historian’s narrative of the Herodian period.³ Still, the topics discussed and the issues debated in scholarly research concerning Herod’s policies and his integration within the Roman Empire are enduring themes.

The main question examined by the contributors in the first section, ‘Augustan and Herodian ideology’, is whether Herod’s policies and deeds characterize him as a Roman client king, a Jewish king, or a Hellenistic king. Erich S. Gruen (‘Herod, Rome, and the Diaspora’, 13-27) explains away the significance of Herod’s intervention on behalf of the Jews of Ionia: it was an exceptional case that does not indicate that he assumed the role of the protector of Diaspora Jews everywhere. He argues that Herod strove to present himself as Rome’s collaborator, as indicated by the names he gave to some of his building projects (e.g. Antonia, Caesarea) which advertised to his subjects his close ties with the Roman rulers of the Mediterranean. Herod’s foundations, buildings and benefactions indicate, according to Gruen, that he fits the model of the magnanimous Hellenistic king. Achim Lichtenberger (‘Herod and Rome: Was Romanization a Goal of the Building Policy of Herod’, 43-62) reaches a similar conclusion. Although Herodian buildings display some characteristic Roman materials and technologies, they were initially meant to express wealth and grandeur of a Hellenistic king rather than assimilation to Roman values. In contrast to Gruen’s view on this topic, Lichtenberger claims that Hellenistic monarchy had to be balanced by a show of dependency on Rome. In sum, a programmatic Romanization cannot be imputed to Herod.

A much wider perspective leads Karl Galinsky (‘The Augustan Programme of Cultural Renewal and Herod’, 29-42) to view Herod’s policies and activities within the context of the Augustan “programme”.⁴ That “programme” is considered a flourishing stage in a long process of

¹ For a brief survey of studies on the Herodian dynasty see N. Kokkinos, *The Herodian Dynasty*, Sheffield 1998, 24-6.

² For a preliminary report see E. Netzer *et alii*, *JRA* 23 (2010), 84-108. Netzer, the leading researcher of Herodian sites, passed away (28.10.2010) after tragically falling downhill while working at Herodium.

³ See, e.g., S. Mason, *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 6 (2003), 145-88.

⁴ For the Augustan “programme” Galinsky refers in particular to works by A. Wallace-Hadrill, N. Purcell and G. Wolf (see their contributions in K. Galinsky [ed.], *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, Cambridge 2005, 55-84, 85-105, 106-129, respectively), as well as to P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Ann Arbor 1988; see also A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Rome’s Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge 2008, with the review article of R. Osborne and C. Vout, *JRS* 100 (2010), 233-45.