

seems to be provable, and under these circumstances it is unlikely that he cribbed entire arguments from his authorities.

Petrella discusses an unusual aspect of the treatment of Pamphylia, noting the complete lack of information on leading citizens as supplied in the case of cities elsewhere in Asia Minor. This corresponds to the geographer's perception of Pamphylia as a centre of low cultural achievement reflecting its involvement in the pirate trade. The ideal against which this is measured appears to be that of the Greek *polis*, but city life did develop early in Pamphylia, although linguistic individuality remained important. Precise understanding of integration is hampered by sporadic archaeological work, but the topographical importance of Pamphylia in the age of Strabo and beforehand is to be emphasised. Some of these points can be demonstrated from the epigraphic record. Attaleia is typical with a mix of *negotiatores italici* and veterans, many of whom originated from Pisidian Antioch. There is a review of the considerable number of notables known from the major centres. Sometimes this exploration deals with individuals well beyond Strabo's own age, and their relevance is to understanding an acme of city life in Pamphylia rather than to an exact match with what Strabo claims is the debased quality of the country as a whole. Petrella thinks the evidence is sufficient to show that these cities continued for a long time to operate under the empire in an unchanged environment, autonomous cities maintaining their Hellenistic magistracies, and their own coinage.

Overall, it can be seen that this volume from Perugia treats an enormous range of material, and will be indispensable for serious students of Strabo's *Geography*, especially those with a primary interest in the books on Asia Minor.

Hugh Lindsay

University of Newcastle, Australia

Fergus Millar, *Rome, the Greek World, and the East*, Volume I: *The Roman Republic and the Augustan Revolution*. Ed. by Hannah M. Cotton and Guy M. Rogers, Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 2002. xxii, 383 pp. ISBN 0 8078 4990 1.

Without any doubt, Fergus Millar (M.) is one of the most influential ancient historians of the 20th century. The sheer number of his articles in journals, congress proceedings and other collections is impressive; many of them were innovative, and some of them even triggered off ongoing international debates on central topics of Roman history. These contributions — as well as his famous books on Cassius Dio, on the emperor and his role(s) in the Roman world and on the place and development of the Near East in this world¹ — have greatly enhanced our understanding of Rome and her provinces from the last century B.C. to late Antiquity. Indeed, it is impossible to overestimate the importance of M.'s work for our conception of the Empire, its city-state centre, and its society (or rather societies), of emperor(s) and citizens, structures and events as well as of persons, politics and policies (if there were any, something which M. has called into question).

As a consequence, it goes without saying that a comprehensive collection of these contributions will be warmly welcomed by the international community of classical scholars. We are especially indebted to the editors Hannah Cotton and Guy Rogers who have done an admirable job, in more than one respect. The reviewer, for one, is firmly convinced that it was the right decision and indeed absolutely necessary to provide English translations of quotations in Greek and Latin as well as of certain technical terms — after all, the most important goal of this project is to make M.'s lasting contributions accessible not only to a new generation of students and future Roman historians, but also to the widest audience possible. This purpose is also served by the *Index* (377-83), compiled by the editors according to a well-considered systematic pattern: it does

¹ *A Study of Cassius Dio*, Oxford 1964; *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC-AD 337)*, London 1977; *The Roman Near East, 31 BC-AD 337*, Cambridge (Mass.) etc. 1993.

not just give bare names, events and institutions, but is 'meant to give clues and keys to the string of thoughts and ideas developed over the years' in M.'s articles (377).

The organisation of the more than 50 items is also clear and convincing. The collection as a whole — entitled *Rome, the Greek World and the East* — will eventually comprise three volumes. The first volume — *The Roman Republic and the Augustan Revolution* — is discussed here; the two remaining volumes — II: *Government, Society and Culture in the Roman Empire*, and III: *The Greek World, the Jews and the East* — will follow soon. These titles actually indicate the impressive scope of M.'s interests over the last four decades, and the individual contributions in them will once again (and, in these well-ordered collections, in a particularly impressive way) show his expertise in all sorts of sources, literary and epigraphical as well as papyrological, which is unsurpassed, if not unequalled — as is M.'s ability to take a bird's-eye view of the biggest and ever-growing body of such material in magisterial handbook articles. His (re-)view of inscriptions as a 'Source for Ancient History' is still worth reading — not least as a gentle reminder to newcomers and experienced epigraphists alike of the potential as well as the limits of historical interpretation.² This is certainly also true for the other view from the top included in Part I (*Conceptions and Sources*) in which M. takes 'the measure of the ancient world',³ as it were, in time and space, emphasizing 'the interweaving of Greek and Roman culture and history' which created 'the vast and long-standing Graeco-Roman world' (pp. 27f.) — whatever that meant yesterday or means nowadays. That is what M. is concerned about: he wants to put things into perspective, in all possible senses of the phrase, and he does so with a certain air of modesty and unassuming freshness. And again, as in the *Author's Prologue* (1-22), he makes it unmistakably clear that the way he defines, and looks at, this world is deliberately and even unabashedly 'traditional and even old-fashioned' (11) — in fact, quite a few critical readers may detect a distinctly anti-postmodern turn in M.'s questions, methodological premises and perspectives that he maps out in this chapter. The past of the 'Classical world' as M. sees it is not a foreign country, where they do things differently,⁴ as the somewhat well-worn and sometimes misquoted aphorism has it; for him, it is rather 'a period which in terms of human history is very recent indeed', and, moreover, it is a world to which we are directly linked, through 'the continuous use of texts, pagan and Christian, in Greek and Latin' and a few other languages, among them not least Hebrew: 'If nothing else, there has never been a break in the cultural history of the Near East, the Mediterranean and Europe ...' (4, 5, cf. 11; 22).

In these contributions, the more concrete overall theme of all three volumes also plays a prominent part; it could be summed up, in M.'s own words, as 'the communal culture and civil government of the Graeco-Roman world, essentially from the Hellenistic period to the fifth century A.D.' (11). This is to be taken literally: for M. the history of Rome, her empire and its (Eastern) provinces should be the history of the whole community of the *populus Romanus* — not just of the Republican and imperial aristocracy, the Senate or, for that matter, the Emperor — on the one hand and of many local and regional communities under the roof of the Empire on the other. It is this particular interest, its implications and ramifications for the direction of M.'s concrete work that Guy Rogers addresses in his perceptive *Introduction to Volume I* (pp. xi-xvi) —

² 'Epigraphy', pp. 39-81 (first published in *Sources for Ancient History*, ed. by M.H. Crawford, Cambridge 1980, 80-136). Cf. also W. Eck, 'Lateinische Epigraphik' in *Einführung in die lateinische Philologie*, ed. F. Graf, Stuttgart etc. 1997, 92-111, esp. 109ff.; id., 'Zur Einleitung. Römische Provinzialadministration und die Erkenntnismöglichkeiten der epigraphischen Überlieferung', in *Lokale Autonomie und römische Ordnungsmacht in den kaiserzeitlichen Provinzen vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert*, ed. W. Eck, E. Müller-Lückner, Munich 1999, 1-15; *Epigraphic Evidence. Ancient History from Inscriptions*, ed. J. Bodel, London 2001.

³ First published in *Proceedings of the Classical Association* 90, 1993, 11-33.

⁴ Cf. D. Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge 1985, xvi, on the famous formula in L.P. Hartley, *The Go-Between*, London 1953.

although, it is true, its heading strikes me as misleading and indeed problematic: 'Polybius Was Right'. Or was he? If Polybius was right, M. must be wrong — this is the consequence of the simple fact that Polybius never claimed that the Republican 'constitution' was basically a (Greek-style) 'democracy'.⁵

Be that as it may. This whimsical heading obviously refers to the central thread of Part II (*The Roman Republic*).⁶ It contains the series of M.'s articles on power and politics, persuasion and the central role of the 'sovereign' *populus* in the Roman Republic — contributions which have been truly thought-provoking, once again in all possible senses of the expression. Whatever the outcome of the international debate on the Roman 'democracy' which began in the mid-eighties, in the wake of M.'s first article on the theme, dedicated 'Polybio nostro'⁷ (and we do not expect, and perhaps should not welcome, an overall consensus that settles the question once and for all⁸), M. has initiated a lively international discussion which has made us rethink a lot of things that had for far too long been taken for granted: concepts and categories with which to describe and analyse the 'constitution' and the 'political culture' of the Republic. He has made us see afresh, and take seriously, the fundamental importance of a political culture in which life in public and the omnipresence of publicity played a vital part. M. was certainly right to emphasize the political, religious, ideological and symbolic dimensions of the urban landscape as the typical city-state topography; it is this fundamental spatial pattern which determines the character and meaning of face-to-face interaction of leaders and followers, politicians and citizens, orators on the Rostra and the man in the Roman street, in the Comitium and Forum. I cannot but agree with Guy Rogers (xvi) and indeed with M. himself (6ff.; 18ff.) that it is this debate about the very nature of (Roman Republican) politics that resoundingly proves the vitality of Ancient History as a discipline.

In Part III (*The Augustan Revolution*), the editors have assembled M.'s important contributions to the emergence of the 'Principate' (a term which M. may have come to find problematic), its political, social and institutional framework and its ideological foundations.⁹ Once again, it is

⁵ Cf. Polyb. 6, 51, 6-8; 23, 14, 1-2 on the Roman 'mixed constitution' and its aristocratic bias; cf. now K.-W. Welwei, 'Demokratische Verfassungselemente in Rom aus der Sicht des Polybios', in *Res publica reperta. Zur Verfassung und Gesellschaft der römischen Republik und des frühen Prinzipats. Festschrift für J. Bleicken ...*, ed. by J. Spielvogel, Stuttgart 2002, 25-35.

⁶ Cf. now also F. Millar, *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*, Ann Arbor 1998. Important reviews include T.P. Wiseman, *JRA* 12, 1999, 537-40, and W. Nippel, *Gnomon* 73, 2001, 232-6.

⁷ 'The Political Character of the Classical Roman Republic', pp. 109-42 (first published in *JRS* 74, 1984, 1-19). The series also includes 'Political Power in Mid-Republican Rome: Curia or Comitium?' pp. 85-108 (review article on *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome*, ed. by K.A. Raaflaub, Berkeley etc. 1986, and K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *Die Entstehung der Nobilität*, Stuttgart 1987, first published in *JRS* 79, 1989, 138-50); 'Politics, Persuasion, and the People before the Social War (150-90 B.C.)', pp. 143-61 (first published in *JRS* 76, 1986, 1-11); 'Popular Politics at Rome in the Late Republic', pp. 162-82 (first published in *Leaders and Masses in the Roman World. Studies in Honor of Zvi Yavetz*, ed. by I. Malkin, Z.W. Rubinson, Leiden 1995, 91-113). The remaining chapters of Part II are 'Cornelius Nepos, 'Atticus', and the Roman revolution', pp. 183-99 (first published in *G&R* 35, 1988, 40-55); 'The last century of the republic: whose history?' pp. 200-14 (review article on *The Cambridge Ancient History: The Last Age of the Roman Republic, IX²* ed. J.A. Crook, A. Lintott, E. Rawson, Cambridge 1994, first published in *JRS* 85, 1995, 236-43); 'The Mediterranean and the Roman Revolution: Politics, War, and the Economy', pp. 215-37 (first published in *Past and Present* 102, 1984, 3-24). M.'s article on 'The Roman *Libertus* and Civic Freedom', in *Arethusa* 28, 1995, 99-104, is not included.

⁸ M. Jehne, 'Zur Debatte um die Rolle des Volkes in der römischen Politik', in id. (ed.), *Demokratie in Rom? Die Rolle des Volkes in der Politik der römischen Republik*, Stuttgart 1995, 1-9; K.-J. Hölkeskamp, 'The Roman Republic: Government of the People, by the People, for the People?' in *SCI* 19, 2000, 203-23, both with further references; H. Mouritsen, *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*, Cambridge 2001.

⁹ 'Triumvirate and Principate', pp. 241-70 (first published in *JRS* 63, 1973, 50-67); 'The Emperor, The Senate, and the Provinces', pp. 271-91 (first published in *JRS* 56, 1966, 156-66); 'State and Subject: The

not only the Emperor and the Senate, the *domus Augusta* and the senatorial upper crust of society which is at the centre of his interest, but the *populus Romanus* as a whole, the 'subjects' of rule and 'their' provinces, their roles in the new 'system' and generally the 'sovereignty of the Roman people' (*Index*, p. 382 s.v.).

This collection deserves to be widely used and indeed really studied, not only by newcomers to the ever-fascinating field of 'ancient history'. It is also a most valuable contribution to the (increasingly interdisciplinary) debate on the character and patterns of participation or, in other words, on the political culture of city-states and other grass-roots communities vis-à-vis Empires. Let us hope that the two remaining volumes will be available soon — and at an equally reasonable price (\$65 cloth; \$24.95 paper).

Karl-J. Hölkeskamp

Universität zu Köln

Nadja Schäfer, *Die Einbeziehung der Provinzialen in den Reichsdienst in augusteischer Zeit*, Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien 33, Stuttgart 2000. 166 pp. + indices. ISBN 3 515 07723 5.

Waren noch in der späten Republik Senat und Ritterschaft fast ausschließlich stadtrömisch-italisch besetzt, so fanden sich in der Mitte des 2. Jh.s n.Chr. unter den Rittern und Senatoren bereits mehr Provinziale als Italiker; beinahe alle Provinzen waren nun in den beiden hohen *ordines* vertreten. Gerade dieser Aufstieg provinzieller Eliten in die politischen und administrativen Führungsschichten bildete einen wesentlichen Faktor für die Stabilität und Dauerhaftigkeit des römischen Reiches.

Auch wenn es sich dabei um das Ergebnis eines jahrhundertelangen Prozesses handelte, der von unterschiedlichen politischen Einflüssen und praktischen Erfordernissen geprägt, aber auch durch aktuelle, nicht langfristig geplante oder vorhersehbare politische Ereignisse wie etwa die Bürgerkriege 68/9 gelenkt wurde, so kam doch einer Phase eine besondere Bedeutung zu. Die Regierungszeit des Augustus bildet, wie für viele andere Phänomene, so auch hier eine Schlüsselzeit, in der wesentliche Entwicklungen in Gang gesetzt wurden und Weichenstellungen erfolgten. Dies war auch den Zeitgenossen bewußt, und bereits in der nächsten Generation wurde das Vorgehen des Augustus als Muster genommen, nach dem man sich richten und auf das man sich berufen konnte.

Der Betrachtung dieser Schlüsselzeit sowie ihrer Bewertung durch und Vorbildfunktion für die folgenden Generationen ist das Werk von S(chäfer) gewidmet. Dabei liegen der Arbeit zwar detaillierte prosopographische Einzelstudien zugrunde; sie beschränkt sich jedoch nicht auf die Untersuchung einzelner Personen, sondern folgt einem generelleren Ansatz und soll zwar „eine bestimmte Zeit, die augusteische Epoche, ins Auge fassen“, dabei aber „im Unterschied zu älteren Arbeiten stände- und regionenübergreifend vorgehen, um die augusteische Praxis mit ihrer Beurteilung durch Claudius und Cassius Dio zu vergleichen“ (S. 9).

Impact of Monarchy', pp. 292-313 (first published in *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*, ed. by M. and E. Segal, Oxford 1984, 37-60); "Senatorial" Provinces: An Institutionalized Ghost', pp. 314-20 (first published in *AncW* 20, 1989, 93-7); 'Ovid and the Domus Augusta: Rome Seen from Tomoi', pp. 321-49 (first published in *JRS* 83, 1993, 1-17); 'Imperial Ideology in the Tabula Siarensis', pp. 350-59 (first published in *Estudios sobre la Tabula Siarensis*, ed. by J. González, J. Arce, Madrid 1988, 11-19); 'The Roman City-State under the Emperors, 29 B.C.-A.D. 69', pp. 360-76 (first published in *Sidere mens eadem mutato. The Todd Memorial Lectures, University of Sidney 1976-1997*, ed. by F. Muecke, Auckland 1998, 113-34). M.'s recent treatment of 'The First Revolution: Emperor Caesar 36-28 BC', in *La Révolution romaine après Ronald Syme. Bilans et perspectives*, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens XLVI, Geneva 2000, 1-30, and his Conclusion to this volume (323-31) are however not included.