geographical and cultural contexts of portraits of Agrippa, and has some interesting things to say about his place in dynastic groups of statues, including those from the reigns of Caligula and Claudius, when claims to restore the Julian dynasty in the former case and, in the latter case, to assert close links with the Julian house, make desirable the presence of Agrippa once again (pp. 85–90). The final substantive chapter considers the presence of Agrippa in Roman historical reliefs, where identification is sometimes a lot less secure (e.g. the identification of heads of Agrippa and Octavian in the 'San Lorenzo' frieze, pp. 119–21).

Beyond the careful individual analyses, aims and conclusions are clearly (and, it has to be said, repeatedly) stated. The broader conclusions are not particularly surprising: R.'s material is largely read and interpreted by reference to a well-known narrative mainly based on the literary sources, and is used in turn to illustrate this narrative. The lines of the story are well known, and particularly so now, with the recent publication of the multi-authored *Il bimillenario di Agrippa* (Genoa, 1990), and F. Hurlet's *Les Collègues du Prince sous Auguste et Tibère* (Rome, 1997). It is precisely because the story is well known that R. needed to say rather more about the specific contribution of an iconographical study to the subject, along the lines, perhaps, of C. B. Rose's *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period* (Cambridge, 1997) or E. Bartman's *Portraits of Livia: Imaging the Imperial Women in Augustan Rome* (Cambridge, 1998). One unfortunate effect of the author's attention to detail is that she almost forgets to ask the most obvious questions about why Agrippa, for ancient and modern biographers 'always the bridesmaid and never the bride', seems to have been such a focus of attention not just for his contemporaries, but even for the post-classical world. R.'s cover illustration, Sir Lawrence Alma Tadema's *An Audience at Agrippa's*, and her tantalizingly brief discussion of 'modern' representations (p. 47) hint at phenomena that could also be usefully discussed with reference to the ancient world.

Birkbeck College, London EMMA DENCH

STALKING SYME

L. LORETO: *Guerra e libertà nella repubblica romana. J. R. Seeley e le radici intellettuali della* Roman Revolution *di Ronald Syme*. Pp. xvii + 169. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 88-7062-981-3.

R. SYME: *The Provincial at Rome and Rome and the Balkans 80 BC–AD 14* (ed. A. Birley). Pp. xxvi + 238. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1999. Cased, £32.50. ISBN: 0-85989-632-3.

I feel a little self-conscious reviewing the work of Ronald Syme and considering his historical legacy. I never met him and was still a student at the time of his death. I suspect many who read this know far more about S.'s politics and would be able

© Classical Association, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.335 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to deploy personal recollections to discuss his intellectual origins and interests. Yet anyone who teaches early Roman imperial history lives with S.'s legacy, and it seems to me that knowledge of S.'s intellectual roots is important for a deeper understanding, both of his work and his place in historiography. Six decades on, the Roman revolution continues to obsess historians and *The Roman Revolution* plays a large part in our understanding. Thus, both these works are to be welcomed.

Publishing the discarded works of dead authors is a somewhat dangerous task. *The Provincial at Rome and Rome and the Balkans* predate *The Roman Revolution*. S. could, one supposes, have returned to the works had he regarded them as important or worthy, and one must always suspect that such works are best left on the shelf to which the author so obviously consigned them. Of the two, it is *The Provincial at Rome* that appears the more interesting and the more finished piece. In this, we see some of those features that made S. a great historian. There are the Tacitean rhetorical flourishes, the tremendous eye for detail, and the impressive knowledge of the interconnection and careers of the Roman imperial aristocracy. But it is his knowledge of the major themes of history as reflected in these seemingly minor details that marks S. out from others who have adopted the techniques of the prosopographer. The themes of law and politics and the histories of individuals and political structures are already present and, to an extent, *The Provincial at Rome* is an obvious precursor to *The Roman Revolution.*

L.'s book is a study of S.'s intellectual roots within English historiography and especially his debt to the Professor of Modern History at Cambridge, John R. Seeley. Classicists probably know Seeley best for his edition of Livy *Book 1*, but Seeley was a notable political writer whose most controversial work was *The Expansion of England*, published in 1883, a significant contribution to the late nineteenth-century debate on the purpose of Empire. Seeley argued for an England that would blend the colonies into a single political nation which would harness the talents of the new and vibrant cultures of, say, New Zealand, an example which one can only imagine appealed to S.'s ironic sensibilities. This debate may lurk behind *The Provincial at Rome*. S.'s attention had been drawn to the Claudian debate on the incorporation of Gauls into the Senate. He dismissed the legalistic approach of previous scholars and argued forcibly that the proposal caused controversy because of prejudice against the Gauls, who were not regarded as being part of the Roman system. The parallels resonate further if one considers that S.'s general approach to politics was to disregard issues of constitutional form and argue that oligarchy was the fundamental power structure behind all political systems. Thus, the parallels between twentieth-century oligarchs, unwilling to let a New Zealander into the hallowed inner social and political sanctum, and the behaviour of the Claudian aristocracy were particularly pertinent.

L. sets S. within a peculiarly English political context. 'Revolution', for instance, in S. and Seeley looks not to the continental uprisings of 1848 or the French Revolution, nor is it part of a Marxist class struggle, but instead is a violent uprising within the government-making power. It is, therefore, not so much a change in political system as a shaking of the oligarchy. For S., the paradigm seems to have been the Glorious Revolution, the greatest conservative revolution in English history. Similarly, although L. notes that 'imperialism' was not part of English political discourse in the mid-nineteenth century, words such as 'Caesarianism', 'Bonapartism', or 'Cromwellianism' at least served some of the same functions. The interest of Seeley in the militarization of power was again carried through to S. together with an interest in political structures (Seeley also wrote an introduction to political science) rather than constitutional law. L. demonstrates S.'s intellectual roots in the nineteenth-century and

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.335 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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

© Classical Association, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.335 Published online by Cambridge University Press