twenty-first century? The recent discovery of Etruscan script is read by excavators to create a new cultural identity for Pompeii, or one that is newsworthy and headline grabbing, but is ultimately based on evidence for use of a language at the site. The 'new discovery' has to be presented as dramatic, and it is the drama of archaeology as the discovery of the new that is what sponsors and fundraisers wish to see. How this factor may colour the presentation of excavation and interpretation requires further discussion.

The focus on archaeology as excavation and discovery of new things causes a slight inbalance in the book. For example, the development of scientific laboratories in Pompeii in the late twentieth century has produced dramatic results—whether the reinvestigation of skeletons, the study of ancient DNA, or the chemical analysis of a theriacal compound. Equally, the book's selection of the development of archaeological method in the nineteenth century, and the focus on environmental archaeology and stratigraphic excavation below A.D. 79 levels in the late twentieth century creates a rather heroic picture of the discovery of the past at Pompeii. However, it needs to be remembered that the location of finds, excavation notes, and other elements fundamental to archaeological interpretation have been lost, are in a poor state of preservation, or are simply absent—the study and preservation of Pompeii has had a very chequered history. Every new generation of archaeologists has sought ways to deal with this problem. However, these criticisms should not detract from a book that provides an important summary of key periods of excavation, and will prove a very useful addition for the teaching of Pompeii in schools and at university.

University of Reading RAY LAURENCE

ELIS UNDER THE EMPIRE

S. B. ZOUMBAKI: *Elis und Olympia in der Kaiserzeit. Das Leben einer Gesellschaft zwischen Stadt und Heiligtum auf prosopographischer Grundlage.* (Meletemata 32.) Pp. 450, map. Athens: Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity, National Hellenic Research Foundation/Paris: Diffusion de Boccard, 2001. Cased. ISBN: 960-7905-11-3.

Zoumbaki discusses the main sources for the history of Elis and its territory (honorary inscriptions; lists of cult-officials in Olympia), the economy, agrarian and otherwise, and population of the city, its magistrates, and the specialized sacred and agonistic functions in the Olympic precinct, and finally Elis' relations with the Romans and the romanization of the region. The study is to a very large extent based on a large, alphabetically arranged prosopography of 887 persons (freeborn Eleans, both autochthonous and enfranchised aliens, and slaves) which constitutes the bulk of the volume (pp. 193–413). It is a true paradise for prosopographers to walk in. For some families Z. offers detailed commentaries. The reconstruction of the stemma of the family of the Vettuleni (pp. 243–8 and 306–8) is to be recommended strongly. One of her results is that the exploits of the victorious pankratiast T. Claudius Rufus, honored in a decree proposed by M. Vettulenus Laetus, are to be dated *c.* 100 A.D. (before 123 A.D.) rather than to the beginning of the first century A.D.

Elis never was a particularly advanced region; urbanization was late and artificial;

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.501 Published online by Cambridge University Press

there is just one Elean known to have been honored abroad. Were it not for Olympia, situated on Elis' territory, the city would never have received a monograph in its own right, notwithstanding the results of recent excavations in the ancient city. Elis was ruled by the kind of well-to-do, horse-breeding estate-owners who monopolized the Olympic Council and would have been De Coubertin's favorites, if we could be sure that he had known something about them. The many honorary texts for Elean victors significantly concern equestrian events, by definition the realm of the well-to-do.

Z. gives an excellent summary of recent archaeological explorations in Elis' territory and in the city itself. The outcome is a countryside full of small settlements, 280 in number so far, ranging from small villages, to villas and farmsteads. Archaeology confirms the impression conveyed by Pausanias and Strabo about the decay of old towns gradually developing into small villages but not the concomitant theories about depopulation and decay of the area as a whole. On the contrary, the countryside flourished and the city itself expanded, and Susan Alcock's model about rural depopulation and a resulting concentration of the people in the city is not applicable to Elis and its territory (p. 45). Immigration of 'landowning Romans' (Ῥωμαῖοι ἐνγαιοῦντες) and growth of production (and productivity, due to import of Roman agronomical expertise?) may well have resulted in a modest demographic rise. Z. points out that agriculture was predominant in the Elean economy. Whether grain, wine, and oil were produced for export is not known. She adduces the possible existence of an amphora workshop in Elis as evidence for export of wine (p. 47); but such a workshop does not, of course, necessarily work for the export market. We know that fine Elean flax (byssos; translated as 'cotton' by Z.) was exported to and processed in the Roman colony of Patras. It is just possible that other agrarian surpluses followed the flax; after all, the Elean estate-owners may well have needed cash for the payment of taxes. That flax was not processed in Elis itself perhaps indicates how predominantly agrarian the area really was. Craftsmen admittedly did exist in Elis, but a 'textile proletariat' was apparently something inconceivable in this backward area.

Z.'s analysis of the élite is sound but, through no fault of her own, hardly surprising: inscriptions, with all the limitations inherent to them, show the traditional picture of wealthy citizens, holding (and financing) magistracies, occasionally performing in the Achaian Koinon, acquiring Roman citizenship, practising intermarriage, and not averse to 'genealogical snobbery' (p. 68). Very few Eleans managed to penetrate into the imperial aristocracy: one knight is certain, two others possible if we accept the epithet κράτιστος as evidence for being *eques Romanus* (so Z., pp. 66, 185, 385; however, prior to 150 A.D. the term was used in a non-technical sense: see *SEG* XL 1004; and I am not so sure as Z. and others that from the time of M. Aurelius this suddenly changed). Z. makes much of a number of *nouveaux riches* who *c.* 150 A.D. allegedly took over leadership in Elis from the old aristocracy. From their cognomina she derives their 'newness' and she holds them to be freedmen (pp. 64, 78). In fact, we have descendants from such 'independent freedmen' (Garnsey). But four examples do not warrant the view that they ousted the old families. The safest assumption is that, just as in Italian cities, descendants of freedmen managed to penetrate into the urban *boule*, first into the ranks of the *inferiores* and subsequently into that of the *primores*, without ousting the latter: addition to rather than substitution of the established élite. Bouleutic élites always were open below, whether for demographic or financial reasons (or both).

Z. still accepts the dichotomy of archai and leitourgiai; and indeed inscriptions using both terms in career inscriptions confirm that the difference continued to be perceived. But to infer from *IvO* 478, where a man is said to have κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ἄρξας

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.501 Published online by Cambridge University Press

καὶ ἀγορανομήσας, that the *agoranomia* was not an *arche* and, therefore, a *leitourgia*, seems a step too far. Though she recognizes that *arxas* refers to the archonship, at the same time she connects it with the *general* term *arche* (magistracy; pp. 90 and 99). This is unacceptable: 'having been at the same time archon and agoranomos' means that the honorand held two magistracies rather than one *arche* and one *leitourgia*.

Brief remarks on the relations between Elis and Rome, largely focusing on honorary inscriptions erected by Eleans for Roman politicians, and on romanization conclude the analytical part of the book. 'Romanization' essentially boils down to a discussion of Eleans receiving *civitas romana* and worshipping the emperor as high priest, urban or provincial, and of the exceedingly low number of Latin words transliterated in Greek letters (e.g. δεκέμουιρ) or adopted in a slightly changed form (πάτρων: the only example Z. finds). In other words: romanization hardly took place. Worthy of note is the detailed discussion of a Trajanic Latin milestone found in Epitalion not far from the mouth of the Alpheios, and its implication for the emperor's policy lurking beneath this intervention (pp. 172–7).

Summing up: an excellent story of Roman Elis, based on an admirable control of the relevant literary, archaeological, and, above all, epigraphical evidence; the orange, pressed by Z., may not have produced much high-quality juice; but this is not Z.'s fault but that of the orange: Elis was never the exciting 'place to be'; and the sources reflect this except for the quadrennial Olympics and the accompanying *mercatus maximus*.

Oegstgeest H. W. PLEKET

THE GREEK EAST

O. Salomies (ed.): *The Greek East in the Roman Context. Proceedings of a Colloquium Organized by the Finnish Institute at Athens, May 21 and 22, 1999*. Pp. 217, pls, maps. Helsinki: Finnish Institute at Athens, 2001. Paper. ISBN: 951-98806-0-7.

Several of the papers in this well edited collection show a significant measure of thematic unity. They raise questions that relate to issues of Greek identity and ideological responses to Roman power, although they do not engage with the current debate about the part played by Greek authors in defining the cultural position of the Greek world under Roman rule. C. P. Jones shows how local communities preserved the memory of their contacts with individual Roman commanders of the first century B.C. from whom they had benefited. He distinguishes between the way in which an individual or a particular community commemorated important Roman contacts and the issue of the relationship between Greece and Rome at a generalized cultural level. J.-L. Ferrary discusses in detail the use of the term *Hellenes* especially in inscriptions of the first century B.C., and traces the story up to the foundation of the Panhellenion by Hadrian. The expression was adopted in Greece, as well as in Asia and Bithynia, not as something self-evident, but as a result of negotiation between Greek élites and Roman authorities. A. Rizakis analyses the diversified origins and composition of the municipal aristocracy of the Achaean colonies. As these tended to exclude families of local origin, they too have an important contribution to make to our understanding of Greek identity under Rome in the formative years of the late republican and Julio-Claudian period. M. Kantirea traces the early history of the imperial cult in Achaea. Early cults for individual members of the imperial house,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.501 Published online by Cambridge University Press