

could only cancel each other out makes the idea of allegiance to monolithic factions implausible, and it leaves the field of Roman politics open to issues of programme, the credibility and prestige of competing candidates (*existimatio*), and to decisive action in the ‘comitial moment’: bad news for any remaining adherents of what North once called the ‘frozen waste’ theory. (North’s article in *CP* (1990) would, incidentally, be worth adding to C.’s bibliography.)

The index locorum, and separate indices of names and of Latin terms make the book very easy to refer to. Like the rest of the University of Bari’s *documenti e studi*, of which this is no. 33, its inexpensiveness reminds us how well Italian publishers serve us in this regard.

University of Manchester

JAMES THORNE

B. DREYER and H. ENGELMANN, *DIE INSCHRIFTEN VON METROPOLIS, T. 1, DIE DEKRETE FÜR APOLLONIOS: STÄDTISCHE POLITIK UNTER DEN ATTALIDEN UND IM KONFLIKT ZWISCHEN ARISTONIKOS UND ROM* (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 63). Bonn: Habelt, 2003. Pp. v + 134, 2 pls, 1 map. ISBN 3-7749-3203-4. €49.00.

In the course of excavations conducted in 1999 by Recep Meriç at the site of ancient Metropolis, a marble base was discovered. On it were inscribed the two civic decrees that Dreyer and Engelmann present in this volume. E. is responsible for the Greek text and facing German translation; D. for the commentary, which is presented in two sections, a line by line commentary and a historical discussion.

Both decrees honour Apollonios son of Attalos grandson of Andron, a prominent citizen of Metropolis. The earlier decree (or what D. and E. call the ‘Dekret der Nebenseite’ and presented second by them) honoured him in c. 145/4 or 144/3 B.C. for several significant benefactions up to that point: for defending the city’s interests before the Attalid crown in a boundary dispute with a neighbouring city; for making up the city’s loss when a contract concerning the collection of transport duties went awry and undertaking the resulting legal battle on the city’s behalf; and for a subvention of oil for the city’s youth. The details are complicated and the language technical, but all is explained with admirable clarity.

More attention is given to a decree on the same stone from a dozen or so years later, referred to as the ‘Dekret der Hauptseite’. The events recounted here are highly important: in the aftermath of the death of Attalus III Philometor, Rome freed all Attalid cities; when Aristonikos attempted to seize the kingdom and strip the cities of this freedom, Apollonios led Metropolitan troops to Thyateira and fell in the fighting that followed. This later decree is obviously very interesting to historians of the late Hellenistic period or Roman Republic, since it belongs to the critical period in which Asia came under Roman rule, a period about which so many details are uncertain.

There are, of course, other interesting facts in these texts: we learn, for example, that Metropolis introduced a priest of Rome (ll. 1–2), and that the Romans, who are referred to as ‘the common saviours and benefactors’, freed ‘all of the cities subject to the kingdom of Attalos’ (ll. 13–15). This last point deserves emphasis: we can now see that the Romans reacted more quickly to events in Asia than previous evidence had suggested. These points and many others are discussed in detail by D., with up-to-date bibliography and formidable learning.

The text is well-preserved and almost wholly complete: only a few words at the margins of a few lines require supplements. There is only one place where significant editorial intervention is necessary. At l. 26, Apollonios is said to have led his troops to join Πόπλιον καὶ Γάϊον καὶ ΠΑΠΙΟΝ, who are described as in charge of the camp at Thyateira. This illustrates again the Greek practice of referring to Roman officials by *praenomen* only, and the discussion by D. (72 n. 285) of this phenomenon should now become standard. The third name, however, is problematic, since unlike the first two it is not a *praenomen*. Πάπ<1>ον is printed, but no specific identification is offered (cf. p. 73 with n. 283); nor does the name offer any Republican resonances. It is better to suppose, I suggest, that Πάπρον is a corruption of the *praenomen* Ἀππιον, the only Roman *praenomen* that is close. (The difference between my emendation and that of D. and E. is a mere inversion of the first two letters.) This would present us with a list of three *praenomina* and a very likely identification — this is probably the man who was to become the *consul suffectus* of 130 B.C., Ap. Claudius (probably) Nero (see E. Badian, ‘The consuls, 179–49 BC’, *Chiron* 20 (1990), 402 n. 10), grandfather of the moneyer of 79 B.C., Ti. Claudius Ti.f. Ap.n. (Nero) (M. H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* (1974), no. 229).

Such an identification would require a date long enough before the suffect elections of 130 B.C. to allow Appius to have returned to Rome in time to stand. This would be (just) consistent with the chronology proposed by D.: he dates the decree to early 130 B.C. An earlier date is more likely, in my opinion. D. notes that Publius, Gaius, and 'Papus' are described as 'in charge of the troops' (τοὺς ὄντας ἐπὶ τοῦ στρατεύματος), which D. understands to allude to Roman troops, requiring a date no earlier than 131 B.C., since Roman legions first arrived with P. Licinius Crassus, consul of that year. We should not rule out the possibility, however, that these Roman officials, like Oppius at the outbreak of the First Mithridatic War (cf. *Aphrodisias and Rome*, doc. 2), were compelled by circumstances to assume command of a hastily gathered allied force. Thus it is possible that Publius, Gaius, and Appius were three members of the commission of five sent in late 133 B.C. to organize Asia, a possibility that D. rejects (42) because of the supposed presence of Roman troops. (This point is owed in part to a discussion with J.-L. Ferrary, who will soon address this question in greater detail.)

Whatever one makes of this chronology, there is no denying either the importance of this text or the erudition and good judgement of the edition and commentary. Scholars in all fields will appreciate the speed and efficiency with which the authors have brought these important texts to the public.

McMaster University

CLAUDE EILERS

G. SCHÖRNER, *VOTIVE IM RÖMISCHEN GRIECHENLAND* (Alturtumswissenschaftliches Kolloquium 7). Stuttgart: Steiner, 2003. Pp. xviii + 638, 100 pls, 16 figs. ISBN 3-515-7688-3. €90.00.

With his comprehensive work on Greek votive monuments of the Roman period G. Schörner is presenting the book that many have perhaps been waiting for without daring to hope that anyone would ever embark on such a difficult task. S. focuses on stone monuments and buildings that are securely identified as votives by their inscriptions, or, in the case of votive reliefs, by their iconography. These artifacts are likely to be hidden away in museums and, if found in isolation or in small numbers, they are difficult to put into a wider context. The long list of acknowledgements at the beginning of the book hints at how much effort went into just gaining access to the monuments presented in this book, an impressive 1,240 inscribed dedications and 100 *Weihreliefs*. The monuments are all documented in an extensive catalogue: one wonders, however, why S.'s database was not attached to the book on CD which would have made his catalogue searchable while at the same time being cheaper to publish.

The evidence is presented with great care: after a short introduction, 158 pages are taken up by a very detailed discussion of the material. S.'s insistence on interpreting monuments and inscriptions together is particularly welcome. We are introduced to the different types of monumental votive dedication and then S. discusses the images presented on many of the monuments, with a special focus on the iconography of the gods. This is followed by a detailed documentation of who dedicated the monuments, and which divinities they were dedicated to. S. employs quantification to illustrate changes over time and differences due to the social context of dedications. This approach seems somewhat problematic, as, in fact, S. himself seems to suggest at times (e.g. at 162, discussing Zeus), because the numbers almost have to be skewed by differences in dedicatory practice and especially in research in different regions and on different sites. Large, extensively excavated sites, such as Olympia and Epidauros where many votive monuments have been discovered, must surely make overall statistics for Greece somewhat doubtful. At the same time, a more thorough analysis of the geographical distribution than the short overview offered at 219–20, if possible with at least one map, would have been very welcome.

The great potential of S.'s research only shows in his three short chapters of analysis (187–224): it is difficult to understand why he does not take more time to explain and discuss the many ideas that are, it seems, just touched upon in this section. Interesting interpretations are just suggested or alluded to without taking the time to explain them in any detail or to follow them up with a discussion of their impact on our wider understanding of society in Roman Greece. What is so tantalizing about this part of the book is that S. gives the impression that he is aware of the full potential of his material but he simply does not follow up the leads he is presenting. Perhaps this should be expected from a work that promises 'eine ausgewogene, material- und nicht