

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

as we know (nos. 6, 7, 11-13). However, these officers were not merely legionary legates, but also provincial governors. This in itself was a reason for appointing senior figures. In the later period only three legates are sufficiently known: the anonymous no.15 *may* have been tribune before commanding the legion; Annius Fabianus (no. 16, p. 43) held the obligatory tribunate before he became legate of *X Fretensis* and, finally, C. Popilius Carus Pedo (no. 17, pp. 44f.) was tribune of *III Cyrenaica* and fought in the Bar Kokhba war before his appointment as commander of the *X Fretensis*. It may be noted, however, that he did not take up this appointment, and yet this did not prevent him from being appointed governor of Germania Superior at a later stage. He thus obtained a major military command elsewhere, in the west, without any further army experience. I would therefore conclude that the importance of previous military experience for legionary commanders has to be left an open question at this stage. There is no doubt, however, as to the duration of the legateship: the table on p.52 clearly shows, and D. observes that this ranged from three to five years in the Flavian period and thereafter was three years on average.

The six *tribuni laticlavii* (pp. 55-64) obviously had no previous military careers to discuss. The thirteen *tribuni angusticlavii* (pp. 65-80) followed the regular career pattern of equestrian officers and the majority came from the western provinces and from Italy. There is no space here to go into the various exceptions and details discussed by D. A total of 43 centurions are recorded. It is not always easy to determine their origin, as may be illustrated by the case of A. Instuleius Tenax (no. 19, p. 89), who was *primipilaris* of the *legio XII Fulminata* in AD 65. It is perhaps significant that Instuleius Tenax is not described as a *primipilaris* on a later inscription from Ascalon which mentions him as a plain centurion of the *X Fret.* The explanation may well be that he first served in the *XII Fulm.* which suffered disgraceful defeat under Cestius Gallus at Beth Horon and was banished to Melitene in Cappadocia after the war (Jos., *BJ* vii 1, 3 (18)). It is therefore quite possible that Instuleius Tenax was on the same occasion demoted to a lower centurionate in another legion. In the winter of 67-8 Vespasian placed (temporary?) garrisons in Judaea, commanded by decurions in villages and by centurions in towns (*BJ* iv 8, 1 (442)). If Instuleius Tenax was one of these there is no reason to assume that Ascalon was his place of origin, as suggested by D. A similar case may be Aurelius Marcellinus, centurion of the *legio X Fretensis*, buried by his spouse at Tiberias (no. 5, p.82). Again, it is clear that Herennius Moschus (no.17, p. 87) buried his daughter at Philadelphia (Amman), but it is not clear whether this was his home town or whether he settled there later. In short, we cannot always distinguish between centurions who settled somewhere during or after their army service and became honoured citizens there, and those who returned as distinguished citizens to their home towns. There is no doubt, however, that L. Gerellanus Fronto and L. Valerius Celer were recruited at Heliopolis (Baalbek) (no.16, pp. 86f.) in the reign of Nero at the latest. This is of interest because they were clearly descendants of the veterans established by Augustus in the Roman colony - or colonies - of Berytus and Baalbek. As regards the origin of the centurions, D. reaches the following conclusion: AD 30-70: 2 came from Italy, 3 from the east. AD 70-117: 1 from Italy, 1 from Pannonia Superior and 1 from Spain. After 117: from a total of 17 centurions 7 were from Italy, 2 from Spain, 1 from Gaul, 1 from Africa and 4 from the east. I am not certain what can be deduced from these figures.

Another question of interest is the matter of the previous military experience of the centurions who, as is generally known, were the backbone of the Roman legion. The centurions listed in the present study usually started their military career as centurions, apart from those promoted from the ranks of the praetorian or urban cohorts. D., however, is clearly right in observing that the *legio X Fretensis* was usually not the first posting for those centurions whose career can be followed. Eight of these served first in other legions while only four began their career in this legion. Moreover, three of the four belong to the second half of the second century and the first half of the third, when Judaea was a less problematic province. It is thus quite possible that there was a tendency to post experienced centurions to the legion from AD 70 till the second half of the second century. So far these general comments. If I disagree with D. in some of my conclusions this merely shows that his work provides a sound and useful basis for the discussion of real issues.

A few points of detail may be mentioned here. The map on p.6 is copied from B. Isaac & I. Roll, *Roman Roads in Judaea*, i (1982), figs. 1-2. Through an oversight no reference is made to the source. I do not believe that Tiberius turned the Euphrates into a defensive line against Parthia (p.12). The evidence for unrest in Judaea under Antoninus Pius is unreliable (p. 17, n. 47, referring to *SHA*, Ant.Pius 5, 4). D. is rightly hesitant in accepting countermarked coins and stamped bricks as evidence for garrisons in cities (p. 19f.). One stamped brick in Jaffa does not prove that there was an army base there, although, of course, there may have been one, and countermarks on coins from Tyre and Sidon should not be construed as indicating that vexillations of the legion were sent to Phoenice. I am not sure why D. describes Flavius Silva as one of the most popular people during Vespasian's reign (p. 30). The identification of the legate of AE 1978.825 (n.8, p. 31) is a brilliant conjecture by Ronald Syme, but in no way an established certainty. However, these are matters of minor importance. D. has given us a useful tool which will render good service to many scholars.

Benjamin Isaac

Tel Aviv University

Joseph Méléze Modrzejewski, *Statut personnel et liens de famille dans les droits de l'Antiquité. Variorum Collected Studies* 411. Aldershot, Hants, 1993, pp. x + 298.

It is not often that one can express a desire in a book review and have it fulfilled almost instantly. In reviewing Joseph Méléze Modrzejewski's first volume of collected articles, *Droit impérial et traditions locales dans l'Égypte romaine* (Aldershot 1990) in *Scripta Classica Israelica* 12, 1993, 209-10, I noted that this volume omitted M.'s articles on Ptolemaic Egypt, on family law, and on Jews and Greeks in Egypt, and that collections of these important contributions would also be most welcome. This new volume, also from Variorum, collects ten articles on the Greek and Hellenistic side of M.'s work, fulfilling one of these desiderata admirably. (Another volume, *Les Juifs d'Égypte de Ramsès II à Hadrien* [Paris 1991], which I had not yet seen when I wrote the earlier review, provides an elegantly produced and illustrated synthesis of his work on Jews in Egypt, rather than just a collection of published articles. An English version is to be published shortly, and it will no doubt have wide use in university teaching.)