

attested as real *nomina* in the area are also often attested as individual names (thus, e.g., *Alfidius*). The author then moves on to the names of Roman citizens (144ff.); here, too, the division into categories (144f.) seems too subtle (any T. Flavius Orestes might at some point be referred to as 'Flavius Orestes'; moreover, something seems to be seriously wrong with the category (στ), where the author cannot really mean what he seems to be saying), but the exposition is in general interesting and useful. – After the conclusion (157–62), we have (163ff.) a list of all attested names, divided among names of *peregrini*, *nomina* of Roman citizens (but the Aburnius [p. 196] surely comes from Heraclea Salbake, not from Macedonia, and no doubt *Stertinius* rather than *Sertinius* should be read on p. 210; as for possible additions, note the soldier of the 7th legion called Mestrius and with the tribe *Maecia* in *IGR* iii 1476, who looks like another man from Pelagonia), *cognomina* and names in filiations. After this section, there are very detailed indices (223ff.) and, at the end of the book, a 5-page summary in English.

The author is to be congratulated for having chosen a rewarding subject for his dissertation and for having done a good job in dealing with that subject (note also the very detailed bibliography on p. 11–23). Clearly, this is a very significant contribution to the study of Roman Macedonia. However, a map would have been useful.

*Olli Salomies*

FRANCIS X. RYAN: *Rank and Participation in the Republican Senate*. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1998. ISBN 3-515-07093-1. 394 pp. EUR 96.

This is a dense book which is of interest to all who are seriously interested in the working of the Roman senate, especially during the late Republic. Before the publication of the book, the author was already well known for his numerous shorter articles on Roman Republican political life. In this work, on the contrary, Ryan shows his skills in advancing a substantial argument of considerable length. The book is divided into two main sections. The first part discusses the situation of the least important senators in the senate (13–136), while the second part focuses on the other end of the power structure and discusses the role of the *princeps senatus* (137–356). An Appendix on "Senators attested speaking in the Senate 219–43 B.C." (357–75, listing some 630 certain or probable interventions) concludes the book.

How much influence did the less prominent senators have? This is the first question Ryan sets out to answer. As a preamble the author clarifies the context: what were Senate meetings like; how many members were in fact usually present? Ryan concludes that the attendance in the Senate must normally have been quite low, as the quorum needed for certain less important matters (which he specifies) was only 1/3 of the members. A definite novelty (surely based on a CD-ROM search) is the realization that the expression *frequens senatus* in the sources is a "terminus technicus" that indicates a meeting for which the quorum was both required and fulfilled ("a quorate session" is Ryan's suggested translation).

The quorum, the function of which obviously was to prevent a small minority from hijacking the state, is surprisingly low, and means that as few as c. 1/6 of the Senate

might have been able to decide matters even in quorate sessions. On the other hand, a quorum was not required, as far as we know, for certain important matters such as declarations of war; the assumption must have been that a good attendance could be relied upon for such matters. The assumption that so many senators frequently were absent leads Ryan to conclude that it would mostly have been possible for the young senators to participate in the debate (if they cared to be present).

Part of identifying the situation of the junior senators is a discussion of the expression *senator pedarius* (52–95). The presentation of the material could have been clearer, as the six sources which are discussed in detail are not given in extenso until p. 88 (among them is Frontin. *aq.* 99,4; that passage was briefly discussed in my *The Water Supply of Ancient Rome. A Study of Roman Imperial Administration*, Helsinki 1991, where I also mentioned the only known epigraphical occurrence of the word *]pedari[* in an inscription not known to Ryan). The author suggests various etymologies for the term, e.g. that it referred to the lack of a particular senatorial shoe (*calceus senatorius*) (55), which is not very convincing, but the main point of the argument is that we should not believe that the only way in which a *pedarius* could participate in the Senate was by using his feet (when joining the speaker he supported, or when voting). The latter view seems persuasive to me, but even after reading Ryan's extensive argument, I doubt that we can say more than that people characterized as *pedarii* had the right to speak, while they rarely used it and normally only contributed "by using their feet". To have the right to speak does not mean that one automatically uses it, and it is inherently improbable that in any gathering of men everybody would have the same drive and an equal interest in voicing an opinion, especially in a society which was so authoritarian as the Roman world. (Even the useful Appendix on senators known to have spoken in the Senate cannot change this).

The second part of the book, "The Consular Grades", is by far the longer. It is concerned especially with delineating the origin and the importance of the position of *princeps senatus*. In order to do this, Ryan sets out from when the Roman Senate as we know it from the later centuries of the Republic took shape, which means discussing the *lex Ovinia*. The date of that law is much debated. Ryan dates it to shortly before 312 B.C. (with Mommsen and others), which was not accepted by T.J. Cornell, "The *Lex Ovinia* and the Emancipation of the Senate", in C. Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic. Politics, Religion, and Historiography c. 400 – 133 B.C.* (Acta IRF 23), Rome 2000, 69–89, esp. 79, who instead proposes 339/334 B.C. (Cornell 83f. reads *iurati* in Festus 290L, while Ryan prefers *curiatim*). Based on Ryan's date for the *lex Ovinia*, and the fact that the senior former censor used to be the foremost in the Senate, the author argues that a regular appointment to *princeps senatus* could not take place before the death of App. Claudius Caecus, which creates a *terminus post quem* of c. 275 B.C.

Next, a substantial section is dedicated to analysing the individuals who are attested as *principes senatus*, or who can be presumed to have been in that position. That investigation leads to a list, the *Fasti principum senatus* (p. 223), which contains 19 individuals from Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus (c. 275 B.C.) down to M. Tullius Cicero in 43 B.C. That list can be compared with corresponding ones by Mommsen (14 entries), Willems (19 names), and J. Suolahti (in *Arctos* 17 (1972) 215 f.: 15 names), which all contain some entries from the early Republic that Ryan excludes.

The rest of the book is dedicated to chapters on "Appointment to the Principatus", "Priority in the Consular Grade", and "The Influence of the *primus rogatus*", which show the same characteristics as the pages discussed above: a close argument, not always easy to follow, but necessary reading for anyone seriously concerned with the topics. There are ten pages of indices, covering Greek and Latin words, topics, and persons, but unfortunately not the sources. Among the persons, one looks in vain for the historian Cremutius Cordus. He is mentioned, though, on p. 133 n. 253, where the fact that his Republican opinions were fatal for him (Tac. *ann.* 4,34–35) receives the surprising comment "*iure caesus*" (in fact he committed suicide, *vitam abstinentia finivit*), with the motivation that Cremutius gave the epithet "the last of the Romans" to C. Cassius, not to M. Favonius, one of the dedicatees of this book. Not everyone will agree.

*Christer Bruun*

*Fonti letterarie greche e latine per la storia della Lucania tirrenica.* A cura di FERNANDO LA GRECA. *Studia archaeologica* 115. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 2001. ISBN 88-8265-161-4. 418 pp. EUR 260.

Si tratta di un nutritissimo catalogo delle fonti letterarie antiche riguardanti il versante tirrenico della Lucania, che si è soliti individuare nel territorio dal Sele al Lao. Tuttavia nel presente volume vengono giustamente considerati anche i territori immediatamente confinanti come pure quelli che si riferiscono più in generale all'antica Lucania. Partendo dal periodo della colonizzazione greca il materiale raccolto arriva agli inizi del Medioevo. Tra i 761 brani letterari, elencati alfabeticamente secondo l'autore, molti risultano poco conosciuti o solo di recente segnalati negli studi lucani, mentre alcuni vengono qui considerati per la prima volta come testimonianze sulla Lucania antica.

La consultazione del catalogo è resa più facile dalle note introduttive e dalle piccole osservazioni sul contenuto dei testi e sulle varie problematiche che le testimonianze comportano. Tuttavia più che un'analisi storico-filologica, il volume costituisce un'accurata raccolta di materiali destinata ad essere un'ottima base di partenza per le future ricerche sulla Lucania antica. L'utilità del volume viene inoltre considerevolmente aumentata dall'indice analitico che consente al lettore di risalire facilmente ai testi riportati nel catalogo precedente.

Mi risulta pienamente giustificata la consegna del premio internazionale "Colonie Magna Grecia" a questo volume nel 1998. Peccato però che per acquistarlo occorra pagare una somma da capogiro.

*Mika Kajava*