after he captured Babylon in 324 BC' (332). It is difficult to understand the reasons for such errors and many other inaccurate or faulty statements.

There are other flaws or deficiencies in Mayor's discussion of the ancient evidence. I give four examples. She accepts the authenticity of the reports of Polybius and Strabo about the ban of the use of missiles connected with the Lelantine War (35-6). That these reports are unreliable has been persuasively argued by E.L. Wheeler (*TAPhA* 117, 1987, 157-82), an article apparently unknown to Mayor. She discusses at some length the ancient stories concerning the siege of Kirrha (101-5), adding: 'A few scholars have suggested that the destruction of Kirrha may have been a legendary event, but the fact that it is mentioned in a recorded speech by the Athenian Isocrates and so many other credible writers has convinced most historians that it really took place' (105). Mayor does not even try to analyze the ancient reports and to deal with the arguments raised against their reliability, nor does she refer to the scholarly works dealing with the subject. For a thoroughly critical examination see N. Robertson, *CQ* 28, 1978, 38-73; cf. H. Bowden, *SCI* 22, 2003, 73-5, with the literature cited there. For a defense of the authenticity of the reports see V. Parker, *Rh.Mus.* 140, 1997, 17-37. Given the ongoing debate, Mayor's assertion that most historians accept the historicity of the First Sacred War is questionable, to say the least. My third example concerns Mayor's suggestion that the Athenian besiegers of Syracuse succumbed to a biological subterfuge on the part of the defenders of the city (115), following (275 n.13) in this matter the view of M. Grmek (*REG* 92, 1979, 151-4). Now it is true that Thucydides refers to the diseases the Athenians and their allies suffered at Syracuse (7.47, 1-2), but, *pace* Grmek, his account of the siege operations does not show that their adversaries purposely maneuvered them to camp in malarial swamps. In this case, too, Mayor does not discuss the Thucydidean account to substantiate her suggestion. My last example concerns the acceptance of Polyaenus' report (*Strat.* 7.9) that the Egyptians held off Cambyses and the Persians at Pelusium 'with batteries of artillery that shot stones, bolts and fire' (189-90). That this might be an anachronistic tale has not occurred to Mayor, notwithstanding Diodorus Siculus' well-known report that the catapult was invented under Dionysius I (14.41-2); the common scholarly view dates the invention and development of artillery in the fourth century (E.W. Marsden, *Greek and Roman Artillery. Historical Developments*, Oxford, 1969, 46-85). It is true that some finds of stones at Paphos and Phocaea give occasion for the suggestion that some kind of artillery was used by the Persians *ca.* 500 BC (e.g. P. Briant, *REG* 96, 1994, 111-14), but see the detailed discussion of I. Pimouguet-Pedarros, *REG* 102, 2000, 5-26, and cf. I. Shatzman, *SCI* 9, 2000, 188.

In sum, one should not assume that the ancient evidence presented in this book has been properly checked and analyzed; and the significance attributed to and the interpretation of the evidence — to fit Mayor's major thesis — quite often do not hold water or are questionable.

The book is equipped with three maps, unfortunately crudely executed, and forty-five figures, but the captions are sometimes speculative (e.g. fig. 15, 121; fig. 19, 137).

Israel Shatzman The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

D. Erkelenz, *Optimo praesidi. Untersuchungen zu den Ehrenmonumenten für Amtsträger der römischen Provinzen in Republik und Kaiserzeit.* Antiquitas: Reihe 1, Abhandlungen zur alten Geschichte, Band 52. Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt Gmbh, 2003. 395 pp. ISBN 3 7749 3221 2.

This admirable book is a revised version of a dissertation presented in 2000/2001 by the author Dirk Erkelenz, a pupil of Werner Eck, at the university of Cologne (Köln). Its subject is the monuments set up in honour of Roman provincial officials, the period considered being the Republic and the early Empire until the end of the third century (see 11f. for the reasons for the omission of Late Antiquity).

In the interesting introduction, Erkelenz starts by describing the practice of setting up monuments — most often statues accompanied by inscribed bases — in honour of Roman officials and the meaning of the monuments to the honorands themselves. He notes (1) that the relations between officials and the people living in the provinces (the 'Provinzialen') required 'bestimmte Formen des Umgangs', and that one of the main results of these dealings was the statue in honour of the official.

Although the term *praeses* appears in the title of this book, the author does not limit himself to the study of monuments in honour of governors. On the contrary, practically all Romans who served in some official function in a province have been included, legates of proconsuls, procurators, even tribunes and centurions (see 4f.). What is important is the fact that the monuments honouring the officials have a relation to the official's term in a province (5) and that one is dealing with monuments not set up by a member of the family or the *familia* of the honorand; in other words, there has to be a 'dienstliche Beziehung' between the honorand and the dedicator (6).

Monuments from the whole of the Roman Empire are considered (11), the chronological limit being (as mentioned above) the end of the third century C.E. (For some purposes, the material is divided into three periods: the Republic, the early Empire until the Flavians, and the second and third centuries, 12.)

The source material (consisting of the relevant inscriptions) is presented on 14ff. It appears that the existence of a total of 1,364 monuments can be established, 431 from the western provinces and 933 from the East. The numbers of the monuments grow constantly (19): from Period 1 (the Republic) there are 225 monuments, 319 from Period 2, and 820 from Period 3 (but note also the observations on 19-21 on the diminishing numbers of monuments in some places, e.g., in most cities of Achaia). The observations on the geographical distribution (14ff.) are of great interest, as there is considerable variation in the numbers of monuments; note e.g. the observation on 14f. that both among the 'military' provinces and among the 'non-military' provinces there are some which offer but few relevant cases (e.g., Lusitania and Aquitania among the 'non-military' and all the provinces along the northern border from Britain to Moesia Superior among the 'military' provinces), whereas other provinces are better represented (e.g., Tarraconensis among the 'non-military', Moesia Superior and Dacia among the 'military' provinces). In most provinces, there is a heavy concentration in certain cities (e.g. Lugdunum in Gallia Lugdunensis, 15, and Caesarea in Mauretania Caesariensis, 16).

22ff. consider how representative the material is, with notes e.g. on honorific monuments being destroyed or re-used on 23ff. and, on a more general level, discussion of questions related to 'epigraphical culture' on 26ff. The author observes (on 35) that the distribution of honorific monuments pretty much follows the trend of the distribution of inscriptions in general.

Chapter 3 (38-77) deals with the persons involved, part 3.1 with the honorands, part 3.2 with those who set up the monuments. Among the honorands, governors (3.1.1), senatorial officers subordinated to the governors (legates, quaestors, *legati legionis*, *iuridici*: 3.1.2) and equestrian officials (3.1.3) are treated separately. There is also a section on differences between the Republic and the Empire (3.1.4; note the observation on 53 that provincial quaestors seem to have been honoured by statues during the Republic more often than later) and another (3.1.5) on family members of officials who are honoured by statues.

The author then goes on to the dedicators (3.2, 61ff.), who can be identified in ca. 1,100 cases. There are four categories, individual cities (3.2.1), groups of cities (i.e., *koina*, etc.), individual provinces (3.2.2), subordinates of the honorands (3.2.3, divided into members of the *familia Caesaris* — *tabularii*, etc.; dedications by members of the honorand's own *familia* are of course omitted, 68 n. 237 — and those of the armed forces) and private individuals (3.2.4). In the section on private dedicators, the author makes some interesting observations, e.g. (77), that dedications by private individuals tend to be concentrated in provincial capitals (e.g., Corinth in Achaia, Ephesus in Asia).

Ch. 4, of great interest, deals with the monuments themselves. The first part of this chapter (4.1) deals with language and style, part 2 with the form of the monuments, part 3 with the setting of the monuments; at the end, there is also a note (4.4, 166ff.) on the relation between monuments honouring Roman officials and those honouring emperors. In the section on language (4.1.1), E. observes (79) that, in the Greek-speaking provinces, most of the inscriptions using Latin were set up by persons belonging to the category of the 'zivile(s) und militärische(s) Unterpersonal'. This section is followed by one (4.1.2, 80ff.) dealing with the definition of the position of the honorand in honorific inscriptions, i.e. with questions such as how many offices of the honorand were mentioned (e.g., just the highest office or the whole *cursus honorum*). The author observes here (81f.) that *cursus* inscriptions, once they had come into use in the time of Augustus, never dominated: according to his calculations, about 50% of the Latin honorific inscriptions after Augustus enumerated the stages of the honorand's *cursus*, the other 50% being satisfied with just one office or a choice of the highest offices. (In Greek inscriptions, the share of *cursus* inscriptions is considerably smaller, between 10 and 20 percent.) There are also inscriptions mentioning no office at all, mainly earlyish Greek inscriptions (83).

There follows a short section on how the dedicators define themselves (4.1.3, 85-7), and a note on other persons involved (especially cases in which someone is said to have 'taken care' of setting up the monument).

Part 4.2 (90-119), more archaeological in nature, is devoted to an analysis of the types of statues attached to the monuments; busts and *statuae pedestres* are treated in 4.2.1, equestrian statues in 4.2.2, *bigae*, *quadrigae* etc. in 4.2.3. In the two latter sections there are interesting observations on how to establish the fact that one is dealing with (e.g.) an equestrian statue on the basis of the dimensions and form of the monuments dèstined to carry the statue; I had not realized before that equestrian statues of Roman officials, mostly governors, were quite common (105f.), and that even *bigae* etc. were not that rare (112).

Part 4.3 (120-65) deals with the places in which honorific monuments were set up. In section 4.3.1, the monuments set up in the 'home towns' ('Heimat') of the dedicators (including individual cities) are discussed, this section also incorporating the dedications made by persons (e.g., military men in the service of Rome) only temporarily based in a certain place. Not surprisingly, the author observes (121) that persons of lower status representing the Roman government in the provinces (members of the *familia Caesaris* and of the *officium*) tended to set up their dedications in the provincial capitals (an observation already made and fully exploited by R. Haensch in his monograph on the *Capita provinciarum* of 1997); on the other hand, the author also notes (ibid.; cf. 135) that there does not seem to be much evidence for provincials from elsewhere coming to those capitals in order to set up monuments in honour of Roman officials. The author then goes on (124ff.) to discuss monuments set up in the hometowns of the honorands. On 131, the author makes the interesting observation that members of the military forces are especially well represented among the dedicators of monuments set up in the hometowns of the honorands (a quite convincing explanation is provided on 131-33). The rest of the section (134-38) is dedicated to other locations of honorific monuments.

In section 4.3.2 (138ff.) the author discusses the location of honorific monuments within the cities, noting (141) that there were many suitable settings for a public monument (forum, theatre, basilica, etc.). Separate sections are devoted to cities in provinces (with notes on honorific monuments in temples, 148-51, and in administrative buildings and military camps, 151-3), cities in Italy (153f.; there is not much to report in this section), and the city of Rome itself (155ff., the exposition being divided into sections on the public and the private sphere); as for public monuments, the author observes (161) that the last public monuments in honour of provincial officials in Rome are from the time of Augustus, later monuments all belonging to the private sphere.

Chapter 5 (172ff.) deals with the formalities of the setting up of honorific monuments. In section 5.1, the author discusses the question on what grounds monuments were set up in honour of

provincial officials, the bottom line being that normally there had to be a reason of sorts for the monument; various reasons are then adduced separately in the case of monuments set up by subordinates (188ff.) and by individual cities (192ff., with, e.g., observations on the ways a governor could be of service from the point of view of a city). The next section (5.2, 204ff.) deals with the question when exactly the monuments were dedicated. Studying this question from all possible angles and using all available sources (e.g., monuments in honour of proconsuls known to have been in a province more than one year, 210f.), the author concludes that the majority of the monuments honouring Roman officials were set up at or very soon after the end of their term. In some cases, however, it is attested that monuments were set up in honour of provincial officials years after they had served in the province; here one may assume with confidence the existence of special ties between the honorand and the dedicator (205). The rest of this chapter deals with the role of the honorand himself in the business (e.g., by furnishing details concerning himself for the inscription) and the financing of the monuments.

A conclusion follows on 225-34; this is not a mere summary of the results, for the author introduces some novel aspects (note, e.g., the discussion of the view of some scholars, not accepted by Erkelenz, that emperors tended to dislike monuments in honour of Roman officials, 231ff.). The conclusion is followed by a numbered list of all the relevant monuments (237-314; monuments the existence of which can only be inferred — e.g., a monument in honour of a governor can be inferred if a monument in honour of his wife exists — have a number followed by a letter, e.g., '33a', 241). Governors, *legati*, quaestors, etc., are listed separately (the divisions might have been indicated in the table of contents), and everything is arranged by provinces. There are also some tables recapitulating the material presented in the list, and at the end, there are two appendices, one on monuments known from literary, numismatic and papyrological sources (331ff.), and another on monuments in honour of Roman officials in places not yet attached to the Roman empire (342f.; all from the Republic). At the end of the book, there are a 20-page bibliography and very detailed indexes (365-95).

This is clearly a publication of exceptional merit and interest. The aim of the author was to study all aspects of the phenomenon of the erection of monuments in honour of Roman provincial officials, and one can certainly say that this is exactly what he has achieved. He is in full command of the secondary literature and of all the relevant sources, including the literary (note the index of literary sources, 375-8, with several references e.g. to Ovid), and the result is a monument of learning far beyond the dimensions of a typical dissertation, and will be the standard exposition of the subject for years to come.

Perhaps the only problem with this book is the fact that it is hard to review. The sources, when studied together, speak a clear language, and generally the author seems, with admirable competence, to let his sources say what they have to say, entering only rarely into problems of interpretation. In consequence this is a pretty smooth exposition in which one rarely disagrees with the author. As a matter of fact, in many places one seems to be dealing with a handbook of sorts rather than with a dissertation. But this is certainly not at all a bad thing, especially as the subject is of great interest. So what I can do here is to congratulate the author upon his achievement and stress once more the importance of this volume.

Olli Salomies University of Helsinki