

*Von der militia equestris zur militia urbana. Prominenzrollen und Karrierefelder im antiken Rom. Beiträge einer internationalen Tagung vom 16. bis 18. Mai 2008 an der Universität zu Köln.* Herausgegeben von WOLFGANG BLÖSEL – KARL-JOACHIM HÖLKEKAMP. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2011. ISBN 978-3-515-09686-7. 237 S. EUR 48.

As one can see from the title of this book, what we have here are the acts of a colloquium held in the University of Cologne. The book begins with an introduction by Hölkeskamp. In contrast to many introductions in similar publications, which often tend to be summaries of the contributions that follow, the author does not seem to say much about the contents of the contributions in this book (one observes, e. g., that although many of the publications of J.-M. David are cited here, the same author's contribution in this particular volume is not mentioned). Instead, this is an introduction to the concepts "Prominenzrollen" and "Karrierefelder". This is an interesting and illuminating contribution, although it must be admitted that it is at places a bit on the theoretical side, with Bourdieu (cited in German translations) and other thinkers being often adduced; and some non-German readers may find its modern academic German of the more *recherché* type a bit hard to follow.

Of the contributions that follow, there is much of interest in that of M. McDonnell on "*Virtus* as a Specialization in the Middle Republic" (p. 29ff.), intended to illustrate the concept of *virtus*, its evolution, and on which basis one could become seen as representing some aspect of *virtus*; however, my impression is that the author does not strictly keep to his subject proper at all times (e. g., p. 34 on "what the Roman cavalry was like"; pp. 38-40, on Lutatius Catulus and Marius). In his paper on the "militärische Führungsschicht" around 100 BC (p. 43ff.), V. Parker studies the development of a military "ruling class" which was based on military experience and talent in general rather than on nobility. In a way, this topic is continued in the contribution of W. Blösel on the "Demilitarisierung" of the Roman nobility from Sulla to Caesar (p. 55ff.). However, this article also has two further aims, both of great interest: on the one hand, the author intends to show that the separation, normally postulated in modern scholarship, of an urban office and a provincial promagistrature is "nicht historisch". On the other hand, the author intends to show that the normal assumption that consuls and praetors declined a subsequent provincial appointment only in some rare exceptional cases is incorrect; on the contrary, this refusal to go to a province represented a widespread "Karrieremuster". The exposition, supported by several informative tables, seems most convincing.

L. De Blois (p. 81ff.) goes on by studying "the changing position of the military middle cadre in Roman politics at the end of the Republic", with "middle cadre" here meaning tribunes, prefects and centurions (the point of lumping these groups together is discussed on p. 83f.). The questions asked are whether Caesar and other commanders used these officers to "manipulate military masses" and, if so, how they were rewarded and whether rewarding them had an impact on their "social status and political influence" (p. 82). The author's conclusion seems to be that whereas Caesar and Antony certainly can be seen as having promoted their officers in various ways, Octavian's political programme did not allow him to "take the risk of widespread upward social mobility of military middle cadres, particularly of centurions" (p. 91). This contribution also includes a discussion of the problematic passage *civ.* 1,39,2-4.

The title of R. Schulz' paper (p. 93ff.) on the exploitation of the provinces by Roman governors begins with the Latin quotation "Rapaces magistratus?", where the questionmark could be in-

terpreted as implying that all governors may not have been that rapacious. However, the point of this article is clearly not to pursue this aspect, for in line 2 we are told that the governors' rapaciousness is not something to be questioned but "gilt als eine Grundtatsache (sic!) der Römischen Geschichte". In this paper, the author studies the opportunities afforded to provincial governors during the late Republic to make some money in their province; he concludes that it was the provinces offering the prospect of warfare, rather than the pacified provinces in the interior, that were the most lucrative. In his study of the role of senators in the "economic life" of the late Republic, H. Schneider (p. 113ff.) discusses not only their various business options but also stresses the huge cost of living for a senator supporting a lifestyle befitting his rank.

In an article which is described as summary of the main results of the author's book *Den Vätern folgen. Sozialisation und Erziehung der republikanischen Senatsaristokratie* (2011), P. Scholz studies (p. 137ff.) the ways in which a Roman could acquire a way of life that could be described as *vita honesta* (it goes without saying that the discussion is of the highest classes). This is a most interesting and instructive exposition which, however, is at places marred by the author's apparent lapse into a philosophical mood, with the result that he spends half a page on the elucidation of the concept of "knowledge" ("Wissen", p. 138 n. 4; cf. n. 11 on whether the term "väterliche Praxis" should be preferred to "väterliches Handeln", n. 12 on "Familie"). On p. 153, the author interestingly suggests that what is often described as the "Hellenization" of the Roman upper classes from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century onwards should preferably be called "Intellektualisierung".

In the only contribution in French, J.-M. David (p. 157ff.) studies the role and importance, from the point of view of one's career, of the "éloquence judiciaire" in the late Republic. This contribution also includes a section on the *accusatores*, of whom the author observes (p. 163; cf. 165) that the accusation "ne constituait pas une spécialisation dans la pratique de l'éloquence". He also concludes that one cannot really speak of *patroni* specializing on defending. On a more detailed level, I am not sure that the translation (p. 167) "orateur assez médiocre" catches the meaning of *rabula sane probabilis*.

The paper of E. Stein-Hölkeskamp (p. 175ff.) turns to the senators (but does not exclude prominent equestrians) of the early imperial period, and deals mainly with those senators who modern scholars, used to honorific inscriptions setting out the details of one's career but rarely illustrating the personality of the honorands, might think of as exceptional: senators who refrained from pursuing senatorial careers, senators who dedicated themselves to intellectual pursuits such as writing poetry (including tragedies, p. 185), as are familiar, e.g., from the letters of Pliny (and touched upon also in the contribution of M. Roller). The author tends to see the proliferation of senators and equestrians dedicated to rhetoric and literature and similar pastimes as an evolution of sorts resulting in the following situation: "Die hergebrachten Rollen, die auf Erfolge in Politik und Krieg beruhten, wurden durch neue Prominenzrollen etwa als Redner, Literaten und Protagonisten eines kultivierten Lebensstils teils ergänzt, teils ersetzt". To a certain degree this is surely true; however, this of course does not mean that Republican senators could not have been interested in things other than politics and war (one thinks of, e.g., the senators discussing *res rusticae* in Varro's work on the subject).

Finally, the contribution of M. Roller (p. 197ff.) deals with the "Changing Venues of Competitive Eloquence in the Early Empire". With the evolution from Republic to Empire, orators, or at

least senatorial orators, lost many of the traditional opportunities for displaying oratory in public on offer to their Republican predecessors; as a result, "the focus of competitive aristocratic eloquence turned inward, away from public audiences and toward other members of the aristocratic group", the Senate, rather than the Forum, now becoming "the primary audience judging an orator's success or failure" (p. 204). However, as pointed out by the author, this does not of course mean that the need for "vigorous, dramatic oratory" (p. 206) would have been nonexistent, especially in senatorial trials (much of the exposition here is based on Pliny). In addition, there were of course also civil courts dealing with minor matters (succession, property, etc.). The author has interesting things to say about the surge in prestige of the centumviral court, which for Pliny appears to be as important as an "arena for competitive reputation-building" as the senatorial court (p. 209). The paper finishes off with a section, based on the *Dialogus*, on the question whether a senator should prefer poetry to advocacy (cf. the contribution of Stein-Hölkeskamp) and on the role of recitation and declamation, the author e.g. observing that pursuing declamation did not (necessarily) mean abandoning "real" oratory (cf. p. 219 on Q. Haterius). This contribution also includes an interesting reference to *con-tiones* during the Empire (p. 203 n. 14).

The book is rounded off by a recapitulation ("Versuch einer Bilanz") by U. Walter (p. 223ff.). Whereas similar contributions, often found at the end of conference publications, tend to merely repeat what is said in the preceding papers, in this case the author adds many points not made elsewhere in the book. This is an impressive contribution, and those who do not find the time to read the whole book should concentrate on this paper. The only thing I wonder about is the tendency of the author to quote word-for-word lengthy passages from the other contributions in his notes (e.g., p. 227 nn. 23, 24; 229 n. 36, etc.), although it is true that this may well be of use to those who in the future will use only an offprint of this paper instead of the whole book.

In conclusion, clearly this particular colloquium was planned with great care, as this book – its result – is not just a collection of miscellaneous articles but a collection of papers with a clear focus, often illustrating each other and in any case dealing with a subject of great interest. An index would therefore certainly have been desirable.

Olli Salomies

*The Emperor and Rome: Space, Representation, and Ritual.* Yale Classical Studies 35. Edited by BJÖRN C. EWALD – CARLOS F. NOREÑA. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge – New York 2010. ISBN 978-0-521-51953-3 (hb). XVIII, 365 pp. USD 99.

The spatial turn in the humanities has, like many other "turns" that preceded it, run through the usual phases of enthusiasm, energy, exploration, (partial) disappointment and consolidation. The current volume, now already a few years old, shows the hallmarks of the consolidation phase. An immensely distinguished cast (with the likes of Paul Zanker and Werner Eck) has been assembled to investigate the spatial dimension of the emperor's presence in Rome. Like the Republican nobleman, who sought to immemorialize himself and his family with *munificentia publica*, the Roman emperor would seek to leave his imprint on the city. In contrast, however, the emperor had not only vast resources at his disposal, but also the time, energy, and power to push through much larger