

that he looked beyond the dictators of the 1930s to rather older political models. This might be seen as devaluing S. the European, whose awareness of European politics illuminates virtually every page of *The Roman Revolution*, but certainly adds another level of complexity to our understanding of S. and his thought. Both the new additions to the Syme corpus and L.'s analysis are valuable contributions to our understanding of intellectual debate in ancient history in the early twentieth century.

*Royal Holloway, London*

RICHARD ALSTON

## HADRIAN

M. T. BOATWRIGHT: *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire*. Pp. xviii + 243, figs. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000. Cased, £31. ISBN: 0-691-04889-4.

This is an important book which gathers together a large amount of material on civic administration, the running of the Empire, and the rôle of the emperor. It complements A. R. Birley's avowedly speculative account of Hadrian's doings and feelings in his fine *Hadrian, The Restless Emperor* (London, 1997) by trying to stick close to the (mostly epigraphical) evidence and by focusing solely on how Hadrian encouraged and promoted urbanism and 'the spread of Roman norms and values' (p. 209). The cultural history which is missed in Birley is here a prime staple. Although the evidential sections are necessarily rather dense, B. writes lightly and makes allowances for non-experts. Undergraduates and non-classicists will have no trouble understanding.

Since B. operates from a Roman perspective, it is only natural that her Empire is a Greco-Roman unity (ever a Roman or a Roman historian's concept). B. does not, however, just assume this: she argues it strongly (sometimes too much so), for the basic premiss is that from East to West cities and the emperor's central rôle in them were the universal markers of what it meant to be Roman. These ideas are outlined in the first chapter. Chapter II offers a judicious survey of the types of evidence B. uses and emphasizes the care needed in handling them, including aspects of the language of benefaction. Chapter III examines Hadrian's active rôle in instituting colonial or municipal statuses, a phenomenon 'almost completely restricted to the Latin West', particularly North Africa and the Danubian region (p. 41). B. explains well the relatively unimportant distinctions between colonies and *municipia*, and argues for the continuing appeal of service on the local councils (strengthened by Hadrian's new grants of *Latium maius*), and for Hadrian's care to respect local autonomies and the dignity of local customs. Chapter IV looks at emperors', and especially Hadrian's, holding of local magistracies and priesthoods *in absentia*, the rôle of their substitutes, the rise of the imperial *curator*, and possible evidence of Hadrian's interfering in cities' territories. Honorary positions have to do with promoting the imperial name and promoting the local élite by nominating stand-ins (p. 72). As for the eight Hadrianic *curatores*, both those with specific tasks and the general *curatores rei publicae* 'seem appointed to work with, not dictate to, the community they served' (p. 77). Everybody is happy, though B. notes that local contentment in Italy at any rate may have been

in mitigation of the *IV viri consulares* whom the emperor set over it. Hadrian the interferer is suggested by some entries in the *Liber coloniarum*, but the evidence is weak. Only land apportionment at Aezani is the ‘exception that proves the rule’ that Hadrian always sought to reinforce local power. The case of the Ephesian sea captains whom Hadrian put forward for membership of the council (*Ephesos* 5.1487–8) shows this well: ‘I make the decision yours’ (καὶ γὰρ τὴν μὲν δοκιμασίαν ἐφ’ ὑμεῖν ποιῶμαι).

Chapter V covers land, taxes/revenues, games/festivals, names/titles of cities. The Athenian Oil Decree is very unusual for the extent of intervention it presupposes for Hadrian (p. 91). Far more typical are the games Hadrian sanctioned (twenty-one include his name in their titles). B. argues in this very informative section (pp. 94–103) that these games show the convergence of Greek and Roman elements in the urban rituals of the East. The location of the emperor cult in these rituals well shows ‘local distinctiveness and a universal consciousness’ (p. 97).

Chapter VI examines engineering and architectural projects (flood control at Lake Copais, the harbour of Trapezus, city gates, warehouses, aqueducts, especially the building and restoration of temples, sanctuaries, and hero tombs). Chapter VII looks specifically at Athens (taking as examples the Panhellenion, the Olympieion, the so-called Library), Smyrna, and Italica. Finally, barring a short conclusion, B. offers important studies of Cyrene (refounded after its destruction in the second Jewish Revolt), Antinoopolis, and Colonia Aelia Capitolina.

It is no doubt a truism of empires that rulers seek accommodation with the ruled and that the ruled come to tolerate, accept, and then cooperate widely with their masters. For B. the example of Colonia Aelia Capitolina is a glaring exception which shows Hadrian refusing to recognize the local culture and tradition of ‘the Jews and nonparticipants in the Graeco-Roman ideal’ (p. 173). As she recognizes quietly, this ideal is Roman: we shall interpret *HA Hadr.* 22.10 (‘sacra Romana diligentissime curavit, peregrina contempsit’) aright, ‘if we distinguish “Roman” and “foreign” as Hadrian apparently did, with “Roman” embracing Graeco-Roman culture’. The Jews were incomparably more cohesive, more antagonizing, and more antagonized than the Greeks. It was lucky for Greeks that Romans had taken Classical Greek culture and Hellenistic politics as their models. This allowed for accommodations on both sides. The Greek élites embraced Roman power which supported them. The evidence of public inscriptions shows this accommodation (Greek *cives* honouring their *princeps*). It shows a unified *oikoumene* on this political plane. But behind ‘unifiedness’ is unification. What choice did the Ephesians really have when Hadrian so politely asked them to make his agents councillors? If cities incorporated Hadrian’s name into their own official titles, was this a way of ‘asserting their arrival in the Greco-Roman oikoumene’ (p. 105) rather than primarily bidding for imperial cash? Hadrian’s Panhellenion seems to show the limits of Roman philhellenism: not many cities joined and not the greatest. The many statues of Hadrian in the Olympieion were not from the ‘cities of the Panhellenion’ (p. 153, misquoting Pausanias 1.18.6). Rather, if ‘every city’ dedicated a statue in the finished temple (as Pausanias actually says), we see the pressure on all to be seen to integrate in the reign of one of the most visible and visiting emperors. Again, when Hadrian donned ‘native costume’ at Athens (Cassius Dio 69.16.1), it may be not so different from e.g. Mark Antony (Plutarch, *Ant.* 33.7), and not so ideally responsive to local culture as B. suggests (pp. 101–2). There is no doubt that Greeks appreciated Hadrian’s benefactions (cf. especially Pausanias); but it was a rather bolder move from Rome’s first non-western dynasty, the Severans, that finally

helped all Greeks to wear the badge of Greco-Romanism and to begin to throw off the veils of Hellenism.

*University of Warwick*

SIMON SWAIN

## THE CAH ENLARGED

A. CAMERON, P. GARNSEY (edd.): *The Cambridge Ancient History: Second Edition: The Late Empire A.D. 337–425*. Pp. XVI + 889. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cased, £90. ISBN: 0-521-30200-5.

This is the first of two volumes which will extend the coverage of the second edition of this series beyond its original completion date at A.D. 324 until A.D. 600. It consists of six parts, containing twenty-five chapters penned by twenty-one different contributors. It is a worthy addition to the series and one hopes that it will take its place upon the shelves of various public libraries to serve as one of the main instruments by which the wider public will be introduced to the fascinating world of late antiquity.

Some friendly criticisms are possible, however. One notes that the latest items cited in the bibliography of 'Frequently Cited Works' date to 1994, while Cameron uses her editorial advantage to squeeze in references to two of her own articles published in 1997 in the bibliography to the last of the six parts. Nevertheless, the weighting of the more recent citations towards works published in 1993 suggests that we should regard the spring of 1994 as the effective cut-off date for contributions to this volume. It would probably be somewhat unfair, therefore, to criticize Cameron's repetition of the tired claim that 'Ammianus is no pagan propagandist' (p. 688) on the basis that she had not read T. D. Barnes, *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality* (Ithaca, 1998), but Barnes had made his basic case at a much earlier date (*CPh* 88 [1993], 55–70), as had T. G. Elliott in his *Ammianus Marcellinus and Fourth-Century History* (Sarasota, 1983), neither of which are cited in her bibliography. Greater acknowledgement that there was a different understanding of such an important author would have been nice. Similarly, while one can excuse her claim that Enmann's *Kaisergeschichte* had been composed under Diocletian or Constantine (p. 684) on the basis that R. W. Burgess's demonstration otherwise probably came too late (*CPh* 90 [1995], 111–28), Burgess does point out that Enmann had himself come to favour a termination date of 357.

On the subject of the choice of contributors, the bias towards members of the anglophone world represents a missed opportunity. While appreciating that various factors may have dictated otherwise, one would have welcomed the views of A. Demandt, the author of the major study of the office of *magister militum*, on the Roman army, or of J. Szidat, the author of the major commentaries on Ammianus' account of Julian's reign, on that reign. Indeed, the choice of contributor sometimes seems deliberately humorous. Hence it is D. Hunt, a specialist in the growth of pilgrimage to the Christian city of Jerusalem, who contributes the chapter on the reign of Julian, the emperor who tried to reverse this process by rebuilding the temple of Solomon. Similarly, it is J. Curran, a specialist in late antique Rome (*Pagan City and Christian Capital: Rome in the Fourth Century* [Oxford, 2001]), who contributes the chapter on Jovian, Valentinian I, and Valens (for the most part), three emperors who