(the imperial cult), or some more discussion of the factors possibly responsible for the 'sameness' mentioned above, which characterized the Empire as much as the diversity highlighted here, but that perhaps requires another book. In the meantime, I found much that was interesting and inspiring in the contributions collected in this volume.

Ghent University ARJAN ZUIDERHOEK
andriesjohan.zuiderhoek@ugent.be
doi:10.1017/S0075435817001113

M. JEHNE and F. PINA POLO (EDS), *FOREIGN* CLIENTELAE *IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE. A RECONSIDERATION* (Historia Einzelschriften 238). Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2015. Pp. 374, illus. ISBN 9783515110617. €68.00.

Ernst Badian's *Foreign Clientelae* (*FC*) was published in 1958 and irreversibly changed the way in which the making of the Roman Empire and its impact on Roman politics are studied. The eighteen essays gathered in this volume stem from a 2013 conference: some contributions are closely focused on *FC* and its author, while others use the work as a springboard for the discussion of specific historical problems.

Let us start with the first group (partly reshuffling the sequence in which the papers appear in the book). In the opening chapter, Francisco Pina Polo finds much to criticize in Badian's approach and conclusions. Many of his objections will not surprise those familiar with the work on *clientela* and patronage by P. A. Brunt and Jean-Louis Ferrary; his critique of Badian's reliance on onomastic criteria is in places overstated (cf. 29 on Balbus' gentilician Cornelius), and risks misleading some into thinking that *FC* predominantly deals with citizenship grants and onomastics. In the process, the ground-breaking work of Anton von Premerstein is labelled as 'schematic and slightly simplistic' (21; for a more sensitive discussion of that contribution cf. A. Marcone in J.-L. Ferrary and J. Scheid (eds), *Il princeps romano: autocrate o magistrato?* (2015), 55–77). In a similarly iconoclastic mood, Angela Ganter critiques Brunt's reading of urban *clientelae*, and proposes to elicit 'specifically Roman traits of patronage' (54) from Dionysius' account of the Romulean settlement. Fernando Wulff-Alonso provides a detailed reading of *FC*, and makes the worthwhile point that the discussion of Italian matters in that book is more Mommsenian than other sections. Cristina Rosillo-López criticizes Badian's argument on the rôle of foreign *clientelae* in enhancing the status of a political leader. She lists a number of instances in which associations with foreign clients prompted hostile reactions from the people. That such connections could play a part in establishing one's standing within the senatorial order, however, receives no discussion. Moreover, the whole project of the *Verrines* suggests that the connection with the Sicilians was valued by Cicero as a major political asset.

Hans Beck draws a thought-provoking connection between the foreign *clientelae* model and the pattern of intermarriage between Roman and Italian élites that Friedrich Münzer placed at the centre of his account of the Roman nobility. He then makes an attractive case for testing the enduring value of these models by stressing the significance of the human factor in the dealings between Rome and Italy, not least in the crisis of the Hannibalic War. Moving further from Badian's work, Wolfgang Blösel discusses a *clientela* arrangement that was altogether overlooked in *FC*, notably the Italic *clientelae* of Scipio in 205 B.C.: the whole story in Livy 28.45 is viewed as a fabrication, possibly modelled on the example of Caesar in the 50s (that point would have warranted closer discussion). The central section of the book is taken up by specific discussions on the Western provinces: on Spain (Estela García Fernández on onomastics and Latin status, Enrique García Riaza on the need for an institutional reading of the Roman conquest of Iberia, and Francisco Beltrán Lloris on Balbus and Gades), Gaul (Michel Christol on the integration of provincial élites, with valuable comments on Badian and Syme at 155–7), and North Africa (Frédéric Hurlet, with important insights at 173 on the risk of the 'hypercritique' that rules out any links between the spread of *gentilicia* in a province and *clientela* ties, and Arnaud Suspène on Juba II of Mauretania and his coinage).

The papers on the Eastern provinces tend to focus on instructive case studies. Michael Snowdon discusses *amicitia* in the Greek East, with a rewarding treatment of the Sullan *S.C.* on Stratonicea; Paul Burton looks at the ties between Rome and Sparta in the age of Nabis, while Claudia Tiersch has a perceptive piece on the annexation of Cyprus, in which wider issues, such as the link

between the influence of prominent individuals and provincialization, and the definition of client kingdoms, are effectively discussed (especially 246 on Badian's contribution to the latter debate).

Jonathan Prag discusses *auxilia externa*, and rightly urges setting both that issue and the relevance of *clientelae* against the wider background of élite relationships, which could so often acquire more 'shadowy' forms than usually recognized (290). Martin Jehne deals with political patronage between the late Republic and early Principate. Octavian's letter to the Samians (*Aphrodisias and Rome*, no. 13) is identified as a document of central significance, not least because it shows that there were clear limits to the remit of the patronage that the emperor could exercise. In the concluding paper, Claude Eilers reasserts his view of a decline of civic patronage during the Empire, against the opposite case recently made by John Nicols; a useful prosopographical annex is appended.

This is a worthy collection, which offers thoughtful contributions to some of the most significant debates (old and new) in the study of the Roman Republic. The book is well produced: occasional errors ('tribunes of the people', 277; 'Bovillae Undecumanorum', 308) and infelicities ('hundreds or even tens of Hispanians', 34; 'abusive use', 77; 'alleged physicality of the alliances', 130) never stand in the way of the argument, and the indexes are helpful (no *index locorum*, alas). It deserves wide attention, and should serve, first and foremost, as a valuable prompt to keep engaging with the great book to which it reacts, more than fifty years on.

Newcastle University FEDERICO SANTANGELO
federico.santangelo@ncl.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435817000259

A. PEER, *JULIUS CAESAR'S* BELLUM CIVILE *AND THE COMPOSITION OF A NEW REALITY*. Farnham, Surrey/Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2015. Pp. x + 200. ISBN 9781472452078 (bound); 9781472452085 (e-book). £70.00.

This monograph offers a new book-by-book reading of Caesar's *Bellum Civile* (henceforth *BC*) in support of the proposition that the work reveals *in nuce* the political programme of Caesar the dictator. Ayelet Peer's Caesar was aiming for sole rule from the outset of the war and wrote the *BC* in service of that ambition.

The first two books of the *BC*, P. argues, were written to influence the course of events during the war — to discourage contemporaries from joining Pompey (2), minimize Cato's influence (25) and contribute to a contemporary debate (29), for example — while the traitor Labienus is largely overlooked because Caesar may still have hoped to win him back (33). *BC* 3, on the other hand, 'serves as the founding narrative of Caesar's ascent to sole rule in Rome' (113). Sustaining this argument requires P. to argue away the Republican ideology present throughout the text, even in *BC* 3. For example, Caesar's deference to the *populus Romanus* at 3.1.5 is treated as a tactic designed to shift criticism from himself onto the *populus* (116). Apropos of Caesar's proposal to seek a solution to the military stalemate from the Senate and people at 3.10.8, P. maintains that 'these are not the words of a consul who genuinely believes in the republican system' (118). Perhaps not, but they are the words he put into his text. When Crastinus heralds *libertas* at 3.91.2, she suggests that he is either exposing his deluded belief in Caesar's slogans or referring to military discharge (126). In these and other places the reading proposed here gives us a Caesar who intends his readers to see through his empty rhetoric to the underlying reality (for example, 52).

P.'s reading is predicated on her view, presented in the appendix (167–81), that *BC* 1–2 were written and published seriatim in 49 B.C.E. and that *BC* 3 was written in 48 B.C.E. and finalized and published in 46 B.C.E. in connection with Caesar's triumph (167). The dating questions, which have long been the subject of scholarly debate, are not resolved here, where the evidence for incompleteness is dismissed and the argument for serial composition rests largely on 'changes and developments from book to book in tone, vocabulary and themes' (177). No explanation is given for the delay in publication. P. overstates the closure achieved in *BC* 3 as a tale of retribution — 'Caesar set the matter straight and punished the murderers' (159) — since only the regent Pothinus is dead by the end of *BC* 3, while Achillas and young Ptolemy survive into the *Bellum Alexandrinum* and Septimius' death goes unreported. She also leaves unexplained Caesar's provision of details (such as the descriptions of the Alexandrian army, 3.110, and Pharus Island, 3.112) that are irrelevant to the story of revenge.

The book contains, in addition to the aforementioned appendix, an introduction, conclusion and twelve chapters, some of them quite short; one of the best chapters is '*Caesaris Miles*' (83–96) on the