

Gordon P. Kelly, *A History of Exile in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 270 pp. ISBN-13: 978-0-521-84860-2 (HB).

That exile influenced the course of Roman politics in the late Republic is clear. One would be very hard pressed to identify a member of the political elite who did not have a friend or enemy who had experienced exile. Gordon Kelly (=K.) provides a thought-provoking analysis of this surprisingly hitherto neglected topic. One *caveat* should be stated at the outset: the title is slightly misleading, since this book does not provide a complete narrative of exile (that is, discuss the details leading to, and following on from, every instance of exile for which evidence exists; but note my comments below on chapter six). Rather, K. aims to begin to tackle the legal and political issues pertaining to exile in the Republic.

K. faces a unique challenge in that he does not need to negotiate carefully a plethora of sources on Roman exile but a single source: Cicero. To be sure, Cicero's exile of 58-57 BCE casts a (very) long shadow over the topic, with so much being written by one man about what in reality was a minor event in a long and hardly distinguished career. The introduction opens with Cicero's exile, which K. covers in detail in chapter four (110-125); but Cicero's presence is felt on almost every page. K. successfully balances the need to use Rome's most famous exile without being subservient to him.

One might feel predisposed to adopt a negative approach to exile, that is, to focus on how exile adversely affected those who chose it (or had it forced upon them). K.'s approach, however, as carefully defined in the first chapter (1-15), moves the debate firmly in the opposite direction by being positivist: *exilium* was not meant to damage the political reputation of the exile, but to maintain *concordia*. If harmony in the state was the goal of all Romans (and surely it was), then exile was an important tool towards realising that goal. In other words, the key to understanding this complex phenomenon is not to focus on the exile to the exclusion of all others, but to consider the whole political community. This was surely the way the Romans looked at it, although the trauma of exile, as overlaid by Cicero, must have made it very difficult for the exile to appreciate the fact, even in hindsight.

The second chapter (17-67) is particularly strong, covering the complex legal issues pertaining to exile. It is good that K. addresses these early in the book, since they establish the necessary conceptual framework for reading the subsequent chapters. Several significant points are made. Exile is not a punishment, but a means of avoiding punishment; it might even have been a right (although K. tests this theorem). Departure from Rome did not exclude the state from taking steps *against* the exile: detailed analysis of the history and use of *aquae et ignis interdictio*, the legal process by which the state ensured that exiles could not return to Rome, forms the centre of this chapter. Finally, exile did not infringe on the citizen rights of the exiled.

Chapters three and four constitute the 'history' of Roman exile. Chapter three (69-92) covers the period from the early Republic to the Social War (although the period 220-123 BCE is passed over in one page); chapter four (93-131) carries the discussion down to 44 BCE. Both chapters emphasise the importance of the place chosen for, and the journey to, exile. The Social War emerges as the turning point in the history of exile. With the entire Italian peninsula under Roman control, exiles had to move further away.

Western Greece proved to be the most popular destination, where both its relative proximity and its civilized nature contributed to its popularity (one might reflect on the popularity of Paris or London as a place for exiles to congregate in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries). It was close to Italy, allowing for news to reach the exile quickly. Communities of exiles like that which existed at Dyrrachium, for example, would have developed a unique culture of their own, while at the same time appearing as a microcosm of the community which its members had left behind; existing friendships could be strengthened, new friendships formed or, most interestingly, old animosities set aside. While the evidence of Roman exilic communities is meager to non-existent

(although one might assume that valuable inferences could be made from the primary sources), this is a topic that could have been explored in this chapter — or formed a chapter in its own right.

Important in these chapters is mass recall. K. discusses two such incidences. In the early 80's political factions actively sought exiles, offering recall as a means to build political support. Caesar's refusal to allow a mass recall in the mid-40s, which initially appears inconsistent with his advertised policy of *clementia*, probably played a role in increasing his unpopularity, and may in fact have accelerated the plot to assassinate him. K. therefore makes a subtle and very interesting point: that while exile could help maintain *concordia*, it could also harm it.

Chapter five (133-160) is in some ways the most interesting. K. addresses three issues about exile which arise from the previous two chapters. The first is the exile's entourage. Who joined the exile is not easy to pin down. For an exile to be joined by his whole family seems highly improbable, since it would cut off the family from the social and political ties upon which they depended. The second part of the chapter addresses the question of how exiles supported themselves financially. This would seem the natural segue to a discussion of how exiles occupied their time, but unfortunately K. omits this intriguing, if esoteric, topic.

The third part of the chapter focuses on the importance of *exempla* in shaping attitudes towards exile. This is a very important point. Perceptions of exile would not have remained static, but continually evolved, influenced by a number of factors: the number of people faced with exile, those already exiled, who precisely these exiles were, and the prevailing political mood towards the potential recall of exiles. In some ways this is the book that K. ought to have written: a *cultural* history of exile. Each act of exile cannot not be read exclusively, but must be seen as part of a wider cultural phenomenon, in which each Roman accepting exile participated in a discourse of exclusion which had legal, political, and cultural consequences both for the exile himself, those he left behind, and the larger Roman community which drove him out.

The final chapter (161-219) provides a comprehensive chronological list of 65 instances of exile (sometimes involving multiple persons) from the period 220 to 44 BCE. This section is undeniably useful, and probably will be the first part of the book to which some readers will turn. However, it does not evince a proper relationship with the preceding chapters, and in part appears redundant given that most of the exiles listed here appear elsewhere in the book (there was surely no need to repeat the details of Cicero's exile here [190-92], given that it is treated fully in chapter four).

The book contains two appendices. The first (225-237) discusses the *leges Clodiae*, which concerned Cicero's exile. The second (239-40) briefly discusses the restoration of legendary figures in the early Republic: Camillus, Caeso Quinctius and C. Servilius Ahala. Discussion of Camillus should have been promoted to the main text, especially the section on *exempla*. This is surely the *exemplum* of behaviour as an exile *par excellence*. Camillus' experiences would have cut across the centuries, providing solace to the exiles of the late Republic.

The book has one (minor) weakness: its apparent age. The publication date is 2006 (the thesis upon which it was based was completed in 1999), but there are only three works in the bibliography which date to later than 2000 (the oldest is 2002), and one of these is an article by K., a shortened form of which appears in chapter two (47-54). This surely cannot be due to a delay caused by the publisher. Two important works are missing: Jane Chaplin's *Livy's Exemplary History* (Oxford, 2000), which would have been useful for the section on *exempla*; and Sandra Bingham's article, 'Life on an Island: A Brief Study of Places of Exile in the First Century AD' (in C. Deroux, [ed.], *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XII* [Collection Latomus 272, 2003], 376-400), is relevant to topics discussed in chapters three, four, and five. To these one can add Jan Felix Gaertner (ed.), *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond* (Leiden, 2007).

The attraction of tackling a virgin topic is immense, but sadly the rewards are often found to be inadequate. K. will not find this to be the case, since this book succeeds far more than it falls

short. He is to be commended for attempting this important and challenging topic, providing us with a good foundation upon which future studies can build.

James T. Chlup

University of Manitoba

Peter Eich, *Zur Metamorphose des politischen Systems in der römischen Kaiserzeit: Die Entstehung einer „personalen Bürokratie“ im langen dritten Jahrhundert* (Klio Beihefte, NS Bd. 9), Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2005. 467 pp. ISBN: 3-05-004110-2.

Wie hat die Administration des kaiserzeitlichen *Imperium Romanum* auf Veränderungen in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten reagiert? Das ist die zentrale Frage, die Peter Eich seiner Dissertation aus dem Jahr 2002 zu Grunde legt, welche sich mit der 'Entstehung einer "personalen Bürokratie" im langen dritten Jahrhundert' auseinandersetzt. Unter 'personaler Bürokratie' versteht der Verfasser dabei eine 'Form von herrscherlichem Zwangsstab, der schon partiell an bürokratischen Organisationsprinzipien orientiert war, dessen wesentliche Aufgabe aber die Kontrolle und Allokation der vorhandenen Ressourcen für den Herrscher war, und in dem die Sinnorientierung der eingesetzten Funktionsträger nur oder jedenfalls primär in der Unterstützung der Person des Herrschers und nicht in der Aufrechterhaltung einer transpersonal verstandenen Staatsordnung bestand' (33). Endpunkt der Metamorphose der kaiserzeitlichen Bürokratie ist dabei das dritte Jahrhundert, weshalb diesem auch ein besonderes Augenmerk geschenkt wird.

Die Arbeit ist in zehn Kapitel gegliedert. Das erste liefert die methodische Grundlegung und den theoretischen Unterbau der folgenden Untersuchung. Dabei geht Peter Eich besonders von dem Begriff der 'Bürokratie' im Werk Max Webers aus, der den Ausbau einer bürokratisch organisierten Verwaltung jedoch erst für die Moderne als möglich erachtet. Im Vergleich mit dem vorrevolutionären und revolutionären Frankreich wird ein Idealtyp entworfen, der im Folgenden auf Rom angewendet wird. Dafür untersucht der Autor zuerst die administrativen Grundlagen der Kaiserzeit, die ja bereits in der Zeit der römischen Republik gelegt wurden. Das Ergebnis überrascht nicht: Eine nicht einmal als provisorisch zu bezeichnende Provinzverwaltung (60) trifft in dieser Epoche auf unterentwickelte administrative Strukturen, um der mächtigen Elite Roms die Kontrolle zu erleichtern. Dies änderte sich nicht einmal während der Diktatur Caesars (65).

Mit der erfolgreichen Installierung einer Alleinherrschaft unter Augustus ändert sich der Verwaltungsapparat Roms langsam. Von ihm werden neue Elemente in die Verfassung eingeführt, die in erster Linie das stehende Heer und dessen Finanzierung betreffen (65). Dennoch mussten die *principes* 'in der Anfangszeit des Prinzipates mithin zwingend auf die Einflußmöglichkeiten ihrer Standesgenossen zurückgreifen, weil sie nicht über adäquate, getrennt von den Machtmitteln der Senatsaristokratie einsetzbare Verwaltungsstrukturen verfügten, die an die Stelle der traditionellen Mechanismen der Herrschaftsausübung hätten treten können' (74). Daher spielte das Patron-Klientel-Verhältnis in der Frühphase der römischen Kaiserzeit eine nicht zu unterschätzende Rolle.

Die Kapitel 4-9 widmen sich dem procuratorischen System, d. h. seiner Vorausgestaltung in der Zeit der Republik und besonders in der Zeit der Triumvirn und Caesars, außerdem dem Verhältnis von kaiserzeitlichen Provinzcuratoren zu den senatorischen Statthaltern. Dabei stellte der Verfasser fest, dass diese 'Finanzagenten' (98) ihre Aufgaben selbstständig und weitgehend von den Statthaltern unabhängig versahen. In der Kaiserzeit waren sie dann direkt dem *Princeps* unterstellt.

Dieses Ergebnis wird im Kapitel 5 auf den *procurator a rationibus* übertragen. Er war der Leiter der zentralen Finanzverwaltung des römischen Kaisers, was ihm natürlich erhebliche Bedeutung verlieh. Bis in die Zeit von Augustus hinein handelte es sich dabei um einen Freigelassenen. Erst im Laufe des ersten Jahrhunderts ging das *officium a rationibus* auf den Stand der