

M. Jehne and F. Pina Polo (eds.), *Foreign Clientelae in the Roman Empire. A Reconsideration (Historia Einzelschriften 238)*, Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2015, 374 pp., ISBN 978-3-515-11061-7

In 2015, Franz Steiner Verlag published a collection of papers presented during the international conference entitled “Provincial *Clientelae* in the Roman Empire: A Reconsideration,” which took place at the University of Zaragoza on 14–15 March 2013. The title of the book refers to Ernst Badian’s classic work, *Foreign Clientelae (264–70 B.C.)*, published by Clarendon Press Oxford in 1958.

Published almost six decades ago, Badian’s book became an important voice in the discussion on the relationships between the Republic and the states which came into its sphere of influence, but most importantly between Rome with its elites and the inhabitants of provinces. Badian’s (1925–2011) doctoral dissertation was an attempt to look at the Roman hegemony in the context not only of the Republic’s activities as a state and its institutions, but also of the policy of making subordinate areas dependent through personal relations between members of the Roman aristocracy and local elites. In his dissertation, written under the supervision of Sir Ronald Syme, Badian chose the institution of the Roman *clientelae*¹ as the foundation for his studies. He considered it the basis of all relationships between Rome and its representatives and the organisms subject to the Republic, which became an instrument of control over the conquered. Such an approach was informed not only by the experiences of Syme; Badian also used the works of historians such as Theodor Mommsen, Fustel de Coulanges, Matthias Gelzer, and Anton von Premerstein.² The author was aware that the term *clientelae* was not the only one to describe close relationships between individuals and political bodies in the Roman legal terminology (there was also *amicitia*, *hospitium*, etc.),³ but in his interpretations he as-

¹ According to Badian 1958, 4–7, the deciding factor for creating a patron-client relationship was *deditio*: “This is, for our purposes, perhaps the most important way of becoming a client, as it embraces defeat in war. Unlike the ways we have discussed so far, it is a voluntary arrangement: the weaker party may refuse to offer and the stronger to accept it. The relation of dependence is formed only by the acceptance of the offer, which must proceed according to a set form.”

² T. Mommsen, „Das römische Gastrecht und die römische Clientel“, *Römische Forschungen*, vol. 1, Berlin 1864, 355–390; N.D. Fustel de Coulanges, *Histoire des institutions politiques de l’ancienne France*, vol. 5: *Les origines du système féodal. Le bénéfice et le patronat pendant l’époque mérovingienne*, Paris 1900, 205–225; M. Gelzer, *Die Nobilität der römischen Republik*, Leipzig – Berlin 1912, 49–53; 71; A. von Premerstein, *Von Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats*, München 1937, 16–21.

³ Badian 1958, 11–13. Cf. A. Wallace-Hadrill, Patronage in Roman society: from Republic to Empire, in: A. Wallace-Hadrill (ed.), *Patronage in Ancient Society*, London 1989, 78–79: The republican system was

sumed its superior role. This approach drew criticism, voiced by many historians almost immediately after the publication of *Foreign Clientelae*.⁴ The criticism has continued until the present day, which is reflected in the texts included in the reviewed volume. It should be added that Badian's book was not the only work of this kind. Almost at the same time, the French historian Louis Harmand published *Le patronat sur les collectivités publiques des origines au Bas-Empire. Un aspect social et politique du monde romain* (Paris 1957).

The volume under review consists of eighteen articles in English, French, and German, prepared by scholars from several European (German, Spanish, French, and British) as well as Canadian and Australian academic institutions. Due to its very broad approach to the explored problems, in terms of both chronology and geography, the book is divided into six parts. The First Part, entitled: "*Clientela* at Rome and in the Provinces: Some Methodological and Historiographical Remarks," consists of two articles: Francisco Pina Polo's (University of Zaragoza) "*Foreign Clientelae* Revisited: A Methodological Critique" (pp. 19–41) and Angela Gantner's (Goethe University Frankfurt) "Decline and Glorification: Patron-Client Relationship in the Roman Republic" (pp. 43–54). The Second Part, entitled: "Rome and Italy: Interstate Relations and Individual Connections," consists of three articles: Hans Beck's (McGill University, Montreal) "Beyond *Foreign Clientelae* and *Foreign Clans*. Some Remarks on the Inter-marriage between Romans and Italian Elites" (pp. 57–72); Fernando Wulff Alonso's (University of Malaga) "Italians in Badian's *Foreign Clientelae*" (pp. 73–92); and Wolfgang Blösel's (University of Duisburg-Essen) "The Etruscan and Italic *Clientelae* of Scipio Africanus Maior (Livy 28.45) – A Fiction?" (pp. 93–103). The Third Part, "*Foreign Clientelae* in the Western Empire: Hispania, Gaul and Africa," contains six articles, mainly by Spanish and French scholars: Estelia Garcia Fernández's (Complutense University of Madrid) "Client Relationship and Diffusion of Roman Names in Hispania: A Critical Review" (pp. 107–118); Enrique Garcia Riaz's (University of the Balearic Islands, Palma de Mallorca) "Foreign Cities. Institutional Aspects of the Roman Expansion in the Iberian Peninsula (218–133 B.C.)" (pp. 119–139); Francisco Beltrán Llorisa's (University of Zaragoza) "The *Hospitium Publicum* of Gades and Cornelius Balbus" (pp. 141–151); Michel Christol's (Panthéon-Sorbonne University, Paris) "*Foreign clientelae*, la Gaule méridionale: un modèle d'intégration?" (pp. 153–163); Frédéric Hurlet's (Paris Nanterre University) "Le gouverneur et les clientèles provinciales: la province romaine d'Afrique de sa création à Auguste (146 av. J.-C.–14 ap. J.-C.)" (pp. 165–183), and Arnaud Suspène's (University of Orléans), "L'apport de la documentation numismatique à l'étude des *Foreign Clientelae*: le cas de Juba II de Maurétanie" (pp. 185–206). The Fourth Part, "*Amicitia* and *Foreign Clientelae* in the Eastern Mediterranean," contains three articles: Michael Snowdon's (York University, Toronto) "Beyond *Clientela*: The Instrumentality of *Amicitia* in the Greek East" (pp. 209–224); Paul Burton's (Australian National University, Canberra) "Nabis, Flaminius, and the *Amicitia* between Rome and Sparta"

pluralist in its nature. A multiplicity of patrons acted in competition with each other, offering alternative routes of access to resources.

⁴ J. Bleicken, Review of E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae*, 264–70 B.C., *Gnomon* 36, 1967, 176–187; E. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*, vol. 1, Berkeley – Los Angeles 1984, 158–200; P.A. Brunt, *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*, Oxford 1988, 382–442.

(pp. 224–237); and Claudia Tiersch's (Humboldt-Universität, Berlin) "Von personaler Ambindung zu territorialer Organisation? Dynamiken römischer Reichsbildung und die Provinzialisierung Zyperns (58 v.Chr.)" (pp. 239–260). Part Five, "The Impact of Foreign *Clientelae* in Rome: Political and Military Aspects", consists of two articles: Cristina Rosillo-López's (Pablo de Olavide University, Seville) "Reconsidering Foreign *Clientelae* as a Source of Status in the City of Rome During the Late Roman Republic" (pp. 263–280) and Jonathan R. W. Prag's (University of Oxford) "*Auxilia* and *Clientelae*: Military Service and Foreign *Clientelae* Reconsidered" (pp. 281–294). The last part, entitled: "Foreign *Clientelae* beyond the Republic," also consists of two articles: Martin Jehne's (TU Dresden) "From *Patronus* to *Pater*: The Changing Role of Patronage in the Period of Transition from Pompey to Augustus" (pp. 297–319) and Claude Eilers's (McMaster University, Hamilton) "Change and Decline in Civic Patronage of the High Empire" (pp. 321–335). The Introduction was written by Martin Jehne and Francisco Pina Polo.

As I mentioned above, Badian's book had a great influence on the scholarly discussion and provoked numerous controversies as well as positive responses, which is also reflected in the reviewed volume. Apart from the already mentioned division into six parts based on geography and chronology, what also draws attention is that individual parts include articles which respond both critically and positively to Badian's theories. Already the first article in the first section, Francesco Pina Polo's "Foreign *Clientelae* Revisited: A Methodological Critique," criticises Badian's methodology, namely drawing conclusions concerning patron-client relationships on the basis of onomastics in Roman Spain. Fernando Wulff Alonso's article "Italians in Badian's *Foreign Clientelae*" is equally critical; the author believes Badian's conviction about the decisive role of *clientelae* in the consolidation of Rome's hegemony over Italy to be exaggerated. We can find a similar opinion in Estelia Garcia Fernández's article "Client Relationship and Diffusion of Roman Names in Hispania: A Critical Review." Garcia Fernández describes the phenomenon of Latin onomastics developing in Spain differently to Badian. For the author, the influence of the patronage of Roman generals over local communities was not the key factor in assuming Roman names; she believes that what was a more important factor was native inhabitants imitating Roman names and the existence of Latin colonies created in Spanish provinces by Italian people who migrated there. In "Foreign Cities. Institutional Aspects of the Roman Expansion in the Iberian Peninsula (218–133 B.C.)," Enrique Garcia Riaz emphasises the Republic's role in establishing diplomatic relations with political organisms in Spain; he does not share Badian's view about the influence of Roman generals as creators of such relationships. Another Spanish scholar, Francisco Beltrán Lloris, in his article "The *Hospitium Publicum* of Gades and Cornelius Balbus," draws attention to the peculiar institution of *hospitium publicum* in Spanish Gades on the basis of Cicero's speech *Pro Balbo*. Its content allows us to understand that various Roman institutions were adapted in the provinces, which proves the diversity of relations between the Roman elites and the natives. Paul Burton's "Nabis, Flamininus, and the *Amicitia* between Rome and Sparta" can be read in a similar spirit; the author empha-

sised the institution of *amicitia*⁵ as the decisive factor in Rome's relations with the Greek world in the 3rd and 2nd century BC. He based his conclusions on an analysis of Rome's relations with Sparta in 210–195. He also emphasised that the conflict which broke out in 195 between Sparta, ruled by Nabis, and the Republic and its commander in Greece, T. Quinctius Flaminius, was not merely another instance of Rome's imperial aggression, but rather the Republic pursuing, in the moral sense, obligations following from its *amicitia* with Sparta. Changes in the Roman policy concerning the territories which could become the target of the Republic's expansion, occurring in the second half of the 1st century BC, are shown by Claudia Tiersch in her article "Von personaler Ambindung zu territorialer Organisation? Dynamiken römischer Reichsbildung und die Provinzialisierung Zyperns (58 v. Chr.)." Tiersch shows that the elites of the Late Republic, regardless of their political affiliation, the *populares* or the *optimates*, became more open than before to the idea of annexing territories, out of which provinces were created. According to her, this is illustrated by M. Porcius Cato's annexation of Cyprus in 58 B.C. and the establishment of a province there. Part Five of the book also contains articles which criticise Badian's views on Roman politicians during the Late Republic using the support of foreign *clientelae* as a factor which brought prestige and increased their importance in the eyes of Rome's inhabitants. One of them is Cristina Rosillo-López's article, "Reconsidering Foreign *Clientelae* as a Source of Status in the City of Rome during the Late Roman Republic." According to the author, we should not overestimate the generals' ability to use foreign *clientelae* during the Late Republic.

Some scholars also address problems which are briefly merely mentioned in *Foreign Clientelae*, such as Rome's use of military units from outside of Italy (*auxilia externa*) in various conflicts during the Roman Republic between the 3rd and 1st century BC. We can presume that their presence may have had an impact on the development of patron-client relationships. Such an opinion is put forward by Jonathan Prag in "Auxilia and Clientelae: Military Service and Foreign Clientelae Reconsidered."

The volume under review also contains texts by authors with a positive opinion on Badian's work. In "Beyond Foreign Clientelae and Foreign Clans. Some Remarks on the Intermarriage between Romans and Italia Elites," Hans Beck shows the strong relationships between representatives of the Roman elites and the Italic aristocracy, which were cemented through marriage, indicating an important role of women. Beck's conclusions are mainly about the period of the Early and Middle Republic, and his model is Campania. Michel Christol ("Foreign clientelae, la Gaule méridionale: un modèle d'intégration?") expands the catalogue of Roman names deriving from the names of Roman generals which appeared in Spain, the Gauls (Narbonensis and Cisalpina) and Africa, which Badian included in his book (Appendix B II a and b). The catalogue allows us to establish their significance for the integration of provincial elites within the *Imperium Romanum*. Frédéric Hurllet ("Le gouverneur et les clientèles provinciales: la province romaine d'Afrique de sa création à Auguste (146 av. J.-C. – 14 ap. J.-C.)"), based on Latin onomastics in the Roman province in Africa, draws our attention to the role of Roman governors of this province in creating the local *clientelae*. Michael Snowdon's article

⁵ Burton studied *Amicitia*, in: *Friendship and Empire. Roman Diplomacy and Imperialism in the Middle Republic (353–146 B.C.)*, Cambridge 2011, critiquing Badian's work.

(“Beyond *Clientelae*: The Instrumentality of *Amicitia* in the Greek East”) is immensely interesting; he shows, on the basis of analysing epigraphic evidence, that *clientelae* and *amicitia* between Rome and Greek states were not merely slogans but involved real and specific mutual obligations. Martin Jehne (“From *Patronus* to *Pater*: The Changing Role of Patronage in the Period of Transition from Pompey to Augustus”) describes the evolution of the institution of *clientelae* in the last years of the Republic and at the beginning of Octavian Augustus’ reign, pointing out a clear difference in regarding the princeps not as the highest patron in Roman society, which had been the case in the earlier literature, but as the person above all social divisions – the father (*pater*) of the fatherland.

We should also certainly note the article by Claude Eilers (“Change and Decline in Civic Patronage of the High Empire”), who draws attention to changes of the patron-client relationships in Italy during the Empire in comparison with the Republican period.⁶ The change consisted in the fact that during the Republic the patrons of Italic urban communities were mainly senators. During the Empire, however, the patrons of local communities in Italy were mostly representatives of the local elite. This meant that client relations took on a distinctly local character.

It is also worth noting the texts which show the complexity and diversity of patronage on the basis of analysing the sources. Angela Gantner (“Decline and Glorification: Patron-Client Relationship in the Roman Republic”) analysed the text of Dionysius of Halicarnassus in which he defines the Roman term *clientelae*. The author points out that Dionysius’ definition of *clientela* reflects the mentality of Roman society in the Late Republic. Plautus’ comedy the *Menaechmii* shows that the institution was different in the 3rd century BC and transformed in the course of its existence. Wolfgang Blösel’s article (“The Etruscan and Italic *Clientelae* of Scipio Africanus Maior (Livy 28.45) – A Fiction?”) is also interesting and noteworthy; the author argues that Livy’s account (28.45) about the help provided by Italic allies to P. Cornelius Scipio, later Africanus Major, in his campaign against Carthage during the Second Punic War is not authentic. As a consequence, Blösel concludes that it is difficult to prove the existence of extensive patronage of the *gens Cornelia Scipio* in Italy towards the end of the 3rd century BC. Arnaud Suspène’s article “L’apport de la documentation numismatique à l’étude des *Foreign Clientelae*: le cas de Juba II de Maurétanie” is also very engaging. Analysing the coins of Mauritanian kings (mainly Juba II), he shows how a ruler subject to Rome understood and cultivated the relationship (*amicitia, societas, clientelae*) with his suzerain. In the case of this text, it should be added that numismatic sources in the studies on patron-client relationships were not a major part of Badian’s work.

The reviewed book shows that scholars continue to find Ernst Badian’s work *Foreign Clientelae* (264–70 B.C.) very inspiring. It forces historians not only to pay attention to various aspects of Rome’s policy towards the states under its rule, but also to discuss relationships between the Romans and the representatives of the conquered states, cities, tribes, and provinces from a much broader perspective than the one proposed by Badian, who took only the institution of *clientelae* as his starting point. The authors of the texts included in *Foreign Clientelae in the Roman Empire. A Reconsideration* show Roman

⁶ Eilers is the author of the monograph *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities*, published in Oxford in 2002, where he offered a different definition of patronage/*clientela* to Badian. Cf. Eilers 2002, 20–25; 30–33.

hegemony over Italy, but also over the East and the West of the *Imperium Romanum*, through a wide array of instruments (*clientelae, amicitia, hospitium publicum*, patronage etc.), which Rome used during the Republic and the Empire. The scholars' use of new research methods made it possible to show this broad perspective.

Maciej Piegdoń (Jagiellonian University in Kraków)