

Octavia, the sister of the first Roman emperor Augustus. Harders emphasises that her brother was always the most important man in Octavia's life. In our sources, which actually highly idealise Octavia, she manages perfectly both her role as sister and wife. Octavia eventually failed in mediating a peace between her brother and her husband Antony, but according to the sources this was rather the fault of Antony and Cleopatra. Harders discusses widely the various activities of Octavia. It is interesting that Octavia is commemorated as Augustus' sister in her funerary inscription, not as somebody's wife.

In her conclusion, Harders sums up by claiming that Roman families could create networks only if women assumed a double role as wives and sisters. Behaving according to social norms and expectations was essential even if the law did not recognise this double role. The social expectations of a proper relationship between brother and sister remained intact even if a sister was married *cum manu* or the brother was adopted into another family. Personal emotions were not essential: a brother was supposed to act like a good brother irrespective of his personal feelings towards his sister. As for the relationship between brothers-in-law, Harders considers that the affinity enabled political networking but was not a guarantee of unconditional and close co-operation.

Harders' book is a thorough and systematic study of social relationships based on kinship in Republican Rome. Her argumentation is sound and easy to follow. Kinship can be regarded as a cornerstone of Roman society and it could certainly have political implications. This book deals with the ideals and values of the Roman elite, but it would of course be interesting if the mental world of the lower classed could also be studied. As for the woman's own point of view, one would have wished for a bit more, for brothers and brothers-in-law seem to dominate the book, though it is, of course, difficult for a classical scholar to change the nature of the available evidence. Nevertheless, Harders illustrates in an exemplary way the functions of family relationships in Roman public life and politics.

*Marja-Leena Hänninen*

MICHAEL DOBSON: *The Army of the Roman Republic. The Second Century BC, Polybius and the Camps at Numantia, Spain*. Oxbow Books, Oxford 2008. ISBN 978-0-521-88269-9. XII, 436 pp. GBP 40.

In his book, Michael Dobson approaches the Roman army of the Republic in the second century BC through the archaeological field work conducted in Numantia as well as through the works of Polybius. He aims to stimulate interest in the Roman Republican army through a reassessment of what happened at Numantia and Schulten's excavations. Much of Schulten's interpretation of Numantia is still part of the commonly accepted wisdom on the Roman Republican army.

The book is divided into four parts. The first presents Schulten's fieldwork conducted in Numantia from 1905 to 1912 with Dobson utilising even Schulten's century-old notes from the field. Schulten's work is held in high regard but it is evident that he often gave primacy to literary evidence over the archaeological record. The second part concerns itself with the structure of Roman armies of the period of the Numantine wars through a discussion of the information supplied by Polybius. This part is extremely useful in itself as an overview of the

state of modern scholarship concerning the Republican army of the second century BC. The third main section combines archaeological data with literary evidence (i.e. Polybius) in a judicious examination of the theoretical layout of camps of this period. Dobson presents three models for the Roman camp at different phases and argues, for example, that Polybius used Greek units of measurement in his account instead of Roman ones as is usually assumed. The fourth main part is a reconsideration of the archaeological evidence on Numantia, taking up 284 of the total of 436 pages in the book. The reconsideration offers many insights such as the author's reinterpretation of Scipio's circumvallation of Numantia.

The book is invaluable in not only carefully examining a phase where the late manipular army was giving way to the early cohort armies, but also because in addition it sheds an interesting light on the often difficult relationship between ancient history, as understood through literary evidence, and the archaeological evidence. This book is an important contribution towards a better understanding of the Republican Roman army.

*Joonas Sipilä*

SARA ELISE PHANG: *Roman Military Service. Ideologies of Discipline in the Late Republic and Early Principate*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge – New York 2008. ISBN 978-0-521-88269-9. XV, 336 pp. GBP 64.

Phang's book takes on an important subject, discipline in the Roman army. Discipline is one of the facets of the Roman army that is not very well understood and is subject to numerous popular myths, as Phang herself notes. The author first lays out the theoretical framework of the book, which draws on critical theory and especially the works of Weber, Althusser and Bourdieu, bringing such concepts as Bourdieu's *habitus* into the discussion, and succeeding in finding a fresh perspective to the issue. In the subsequent chapters she considers, through the framework presented in the beginning, the training of soldiers (Ch. 2), military culture (especially employing the concept of *habitus*) and the ever-intriguing question of military punishment. The fifth chapter considers military pay and donatives while chapter six takes a look at work as a form of discipline. The seventh chapter is about military dining and feasting and their relation to the ideology of *disciplina*.

The author is able to bring together an impressive collection of very disparate evidence and discuss it in a meaningful way. Especially her discussion on the role of work, *labor militaris*, as a means for imposing control and discipline in an army that did not use parade ground drill as a source of regimentation is well founded, and her discussion of donatives is also interesting.

To my mind the only major weakness of the book is the exclusion of a comprehensive discussion of the army in action. Fighting wars is the rationale for the existence of the army in the first place and discipline in the military sense is a critical force that enables the army to function in battle. Training, exercise and discipline were all primarily means to achieve success in battle. In this light the decision not to use battle narratives to examine systematically the functioning of discipline in the battlefield is odd. This also increases the author's dependence on the work of Vegetius. Reliance on this author is perhaps unavoidable, but the problem is further accentuated by the decision not to discuss the related source problems. As a result, and