

transire pacis interfuit) et balbutire et publici iuris facere queant. tunc demum, et nos hic alii, oppido pauci, quibus studia humanitatis adhuc curae sunt, dicere possimus עוד לא אבדה תקוותו. sed querelae, ne tum quidem gratiae futurae κτλ., a laudatione certe tanti operis absint: librum auctoremque semel ac iterum ad caelum ferre res ipsa postulat, admonent loca, tempora flagitant. lector intende, laetaberis.

Dabam Kfar Savae, Id. Febr. MDCCCCLXXXV.

Ioannes Glucker

Ella Hermon, *Rome et la Gaule Transalpine avant César*. Jovene editore, Napoli, 1993, pp. ix + 362.

According to what used to be the conventional wisdom, a new, permanent province, in the geographical-administrative sense, was annexed and established through the drawing up of a *lex provinciae* by a Roman general, normally helped by ten *legati* sent from Rome. Magistrates or pro-magistrates, as the case might be, were sent in an unbroken succession to govern a duly organized province (see, e.g., W.T. Arnold, *The Roman System of Provincial Administration*, 1879, 23-6; J. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, 1, 1881, 500-1; G.H. Stevenson, *Roman Provincial Administration*, 1939, 68-9; I. Bleicken, *Lex publica. Gesetz und Recht in der römischen Republik*, 1975, 167). Unfortunately, in not a few cases no *Lex* is attested and the lists of governors are notoriously full of *lacunae*. Given the poor state of the extant sources, that is not surprising at all. However, the deficiency in evidence may engender doubts and debates about the dating of the annexation and first organization of a given province. And there is another problem. Since *provincia* originally meant a task or a command entrusted to a Roman magistrate, without denoting a distinct territorial definition, the mere fact that several magistrates were given as their *provincia* to conduct war in a certain country over a period of years does not necessarily show that that country was organized as a province. Thus, for instance, E. Gruen argued, against the commonly held view, that Macedonia was not organized as a province in 146 because there is no evidence that annual magistrates were regularly appointed for Macedonia after 146, nor is a *lex provinciae* expressly attested for this country (*The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*, 1984, 433-5. For a rebuttal see D.W. Baronowski, *Klio* 70, 1988, 448-60). In addition, a reexamination of the evidence has shown that past scholars had overrated the significance and scope of the *lex provinciae*, as well as its importance for the administration of provinces (B.D. Hoyos, *Antichthon* 7, 1973, 47-53; A. Lintott, *Greece and Rome* 28, 1981, 58-9).

A new approach to the problem has emerged in the course of the debate about the nature of Roman imperialism which was started off by the publication of W.V. Harris, *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome 327-70 B.C.*, 1979. Annexation, it is argued, was not a one-time comprehensive, systematic action, but rather a long process during which a peripheral territory was gradually integrated by the Roman empire. A case in point is the province of Cilicia, for it has long been disputed whether it was annexed and established by M. Antonius in the very late second century (thus, e.g., Th. Mommsen, *The History of Rome*, 3 [The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois], 382 with n.1), by Cn. Cornelius Dolabella in 79 (thus A.N. Sherwin-White, *JRS* 66, 1976, 10), by P. Servilius Vatia in the 70s (thus E. Badian, *Athenaeum* 37, 1959, 285), or

by Pompey in the 60s (thus A.H.M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, 1937, 207). P.M.W. Freeman has reexamined the evidence and offered a different model: "the emergence of any province can only have been gradual. With the example of Cilicia in mind, it is possible on the basis of this approach to witness a continuity of purpose in the appointment of magistrates to this *provincia*. At the same time this appointment should be seen as independent of any considerations of the province, as communities and peoples. Strategic security was the prime concern...the emergence of what we call the province can be described as involuntary; this being a concept and appellation, conditioned by modern experiences... Warfare, and continuous warfare at that, requires armies in the field; armies require generals, and it is this basic fact which explains why provinces emerge" ("The province of Cilicia and its Origins", in *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East* [edd. P. Freeman and D. Kennedy], 1986, 264-5).

Another case in point is Gallia Transalpina. Most scholars dated the establishment of this province in about 120, as a result of a series of wars conducted by four Roman generals, the last of whom, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, took the decisive action (see, e.g., Mommsen, *op. cit.*, 3, 419; H. Last, *CAH*, IX, 1932, 112; H.H. Scullard, *From the Gracchi to Nero*⁵, 1982, 40). This traditional view was contested by E. Badian, who argued that no *lex Domitia* is attested in the sources and that magistrates are not known to have been regularly appointed to Gallia Transalpina as governors: it was only after the defeat of the Germans by Marius that the province was established towards the end of the century (*Mélanges André Piganiol*, 1966, 901-18). Badian's view was rejected by C. Ebel, who argued that the area west of the territory of Massilia had come under the responsibility of the governor of Hispania Citerior already in the early second century but the province Gallia Transalpina, extending from the Alps to the Pyrenees, was established by a *lex provinciae* of Pompey as late as the 70s (*Transalpine Gaul: The Emergence of a Roman Province*, 1976, esp. 46, 77-8, 93, 98-9). Ebel's arguments are less than convincing (cf. J. Richardson, *JRS*, 1979, 157-8), and the difficulty of the problem was admitted by A.L.F. Rivet: "it is impossible to reach a definite conclusion as to the specific date at which our province was formed" (*Gallia Narbonensis*, 1988, 48).

In her new book E. Hermon, unsatisfied with the traditional view concerning the constitutional procedure for the establishment of new provinces and critical of the solutions of Badian and Ebel (see the survey pp. 3-22, and esp. 310-19), proposes a different approach to the emergence of the province of Gallia Transalpina, akin to some extent to that proposed by P. Freeman, although she never refers to his views. A province is not created by one-time action, rather it gradually emerges in the course of a long process, as the cumulative effect of diverse actions and developments: "Ainsi, la province transalpine précésarienne nous révèle qu'une province républicaine, qui se réalise par l'aspect opérationnel de notre modèle provincial, lié à la sphère d'action des magistrats, n'est nullement subordonnée à cet élément temporaire, d'ailleurs très peu connu ou incertain; en revanche, son caractère stable peut être recherché à travers l'ensemble des actes législatifs qui la concerne et non pas à partir de ce qu'on appelle la *lex provinciae*. Mais l'arrière-plan de tout acte législatif repose sur le droit souverain de conquête, qui déclenche tout le mécanisme juridictionnel: actes des magistrats, du Sénat, et en dernier lieu des assemblées du peuple" (322-3). This conclusion may be compared with that of A. Lintott, in his examination of the

nature of the Imperium Romanum: "It follows that we cannot postulate a single *lex provinciae* for each province nor use this as a criterion and date for the incorporation into the Roman empire of any given territory. Instead, there were a number of decisions by magistrates and senatorial commissions, some dependent on *senatus consulta*, some on legislation, and some on the unfettered authority of the magistrate himself" (*Greece and Rome* 28, 1981, 60-61).

Hermon's interest in the Roman conquest of Transalpine Gaul goes back to her "thèse de doctorat de III^e cycle" of 1973, or even further back to her studies in Jerusalem with the late Prof. A. Fuks and Prof. D. Asheri. For the last twenty-five years she has presented the results of her investigations in seminars and conferences and published them in various journals. Thus the work under discussion is the mature product of research carried out over a long period. At the outset Hermon affirms her conviction that a province is not established by a *lex provinciae* nor in consequence of a regular succession of magistrates, but rather by the convergence of ideological, legislative and material data. Her aim is to study "le contexte politique afin d'identifier le type, la signification et l'ampleur des interventions de Rome susceptibles de concerner la Transalpine; de signaler les secteurs d'activité provinciale affectés par ces interventions, de même que la nature de la présence romaine dans la région, et de chercher enfin les interférences entre les deux premiers plans d'analyse" (XIV).

A basic assumption of this study is that internal events and developments that took place in Rome and Italy directly affected or were closely associated with the course of events in Transalpine Gaul, in other words the process of provincialization and Romanization of the relevant Gallic territory may be interpreted in the light of Roman politics and the social and economic problems of the period under discussion. Hence the agrarian legislation at Rome from Tiberius Gracchus to the *lex Plotia* is presented, in successive stages, as a prelude to a thorough discussion of the literary, epigraphic and archaeological sources concerning the wars of 125-120, those against the Germans and the campaigns of Pompey. The achievement of M. Fulvius Flaccus, *cos.* 125, is construed as marking a demarcation point, for several sources characterize it as the first subjugation of the peoples of the region. The various campaigns are analysed in respect of the territories involved, as well as their impact on the urbanization and economic life of the Gallic tribes. The import of Italian wine to Gaul from the third to the first century is accorded special treatment (esp. 149-63), with good exploitation of the extensive literature on this subject, although one misses J. Patterson, *JRS* 72, 1982, 146-57; N. Purcell, *JRS* 75, 1985, 1-9, as well as J. Patterson, *CQ* 28, 1978, 452-8, on *Cic. Rep.* 3.16, a passage which is taken to have had some bearing on the development of viticulture in Gaul (296-8). The spread of Roman citizenship and institutions is investigated in detail, with a concentration on sixteen inscriptions attesting the existence of *praetores* in Gallic communities (165-211). These inscriptions, dated to the period under discussion, provide significant evidence for the process of municipalization of the Gallic tribes. Equally detailed is the examination of Roman taxation, confiscation of land and colonization and other forms of exploitation.

E. Hermon envisages the process of provincialization of Transalpine Gaul as consisting of three phases: the Gracchan, the Marian and the Pompeian (20-21, 330), a process which comprises various elements of Romanization and acculturation. She has exposed exhaustively the actions that were taken by the senate, assemblies and

magistrates with regard to Gaul, as well as the involvement of Roman generals, soldiers, businessmen and other citizens in the province. One can hardly argue against the view that provincialization was a process. However, on several occasions Hermon discusses and refers to the right of conquest (e.g. 55, 329). If so, it follows (but Hermon does not say so openly) that Rome established her claim to Transalpine Gaul at one time, viz. with the wars of 125-120. In other words, although the traditional view on the procedure for the establishment of a province may no longer be maintained, those wars mark the initial annexation of Gallia Transalpina: from then on it was explicitly within the Imperium Romanum.

Israel Shatzman

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Edward Dąbrowa, *Legio X Fretensis: A Prosopographical Study of its Officers (I-III c.A.D.)*. *Historia Einzelschriften*, Heft 66, Stuttgart, 1993, pp.128.

The author has collected all known testimonia regarding the officers who served in the *Legio X Fretensis*, with full references to the scholarly literature and brief discussion of each career. The aim of this study, as explained in the introduction, is to see whether the particular duties of this legion had an impact on the selection of its officer-corps. From AD 67 onwards, the legion served in an area with chronic internal security problems and two major rebellions. Thus the author rightly observes that it is interesting to trace whether the origin and the previous and subsequent careers of its officers reflect a recognized need for special competence. Since such studies are always based on statistics the validity of any conclusions for this work is necessarily limited, given the absence of a comparable study of other legions in the eastern provinces, which is not, of course, the fault of the author of the monograph under review. This then is the first attempt to engage in such research for the eastern provinces and it will therefore be obvious that D.'s work will be particularly useful for those interested in Roman Judaea and the military history of the region. It contains full references to the sources and copious citations of the secondary literature.

The author concludes that (a) for all ranks, a western origin predominates among officers serving in the legion in the period following AD 70, and that (b) most officers had previous military experience before serving in this legion. Since these are significant conclusions it may be useful to discuss the evidence and the results briefly. Firstly, I must confess that it is less clear to me than to most Roman historians what significance should be attached to the matter of origin. If we find fewer commanders from the east than from the west this may reflect the existence of social networks rather than a successful search for competence among officers. Next, it may be noted that the evidence for the legionary commanders is not unambiguous. The first two, Ulpus Traianus and Larcus Lepidus, who served in the First Jewish Revolt, did not have any recorded previous military experience (nos. 1, 3, pp.23-6). Sextus Vettulenus Cerialis was legate of the *V Macedonica* in the war before commanding the *X Fretensis*, but, again, he does not seem to have had any recorded commands before going to the Jewish war. Thus three senior officers in the Jewish war do not appear to have had a serious military background. The subsequent commanders, up to the Bar Kokhba war, had all held previous commands before their tour of duty in Judaea, as far