As suggested earlier, the later part of the book on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries finds less convincing material. Keats' Grecian Urn, though it can be seen to share general Ovidian interests in mythological metamorphosis, ekphrasis and the poetic process, provides a thin harvest of persuasive detailed allusions (a clear contrast with what has gone before). Beddoes' 'Pygmalion', though clearly going back to Ovid's episode through the prism of previous English versions and engaging with a number of generally Ovidian themes, likewise provides few truly tangible links; Browning's 'The Ring and the Book' clearly picks up on this theme and specifically echoes some of Ovid's episodes of tragic erotic metamorphosis, but it is difficult to see this as a consistent poetic plan rather than as quasi-Renaissance wallpaper. Likewise, the few scattered allusions to Pygmalion and other episodes in Eliot, Joyce and H.D., though showing that Ovid has some modernist afterlife, are a little desultory. More successful is the chapter on Woolf's Orlando: the allusion to Daphne (p. 202) and the clear links with Ovid's tales of transgendered metamorphosis and constant mental contents are evident, though Brown's view that 'Daphne's story is being reinvented as an emblem of complementary harmony between the sexes' here (p. 205) seems a little hard to take.

A final chapter looks at the Ovidian renaissance of the 1990s in English literature that I alluded to at the outset. Brown makes the good point that some of the striking anachronisms and puns at tragic moments in Ted Hughes' versions forcefully replicate real qualities of the original, and that Hughes' view is bleaker and more brutal (as one would expect from the poet of Crow), and takes a brief look at episode-versions by Michael Longley, at the adventurous recent translation of the whole Metamorphoses by the scholar-poet David Slavitt, and at the intriguing novel The Last World by Christoph Ransmayr (in which Ovid, arriving at Tomis, finds it full of characters from the Metamorphoses. In all these she rightly sees the continuing fertility of the Ovidian tradition, and the endlessly metamorphic quality of the Metamorphoses itself.

This is a thoughtful guide to some of the chief elements of Ovidian imitation in English literature, which shows much persuasive detailed analysis in its more effective first part, and which throughout points clearly to those qualities and ideas which the author views as fundamental to Ovid's literary identity. It is not complete (not a task for a single volume), and its selections of what to discuss could occasionally be questioned, but there is no doubt that it has significantly advanced the knowledge and understanding of the reception of the Metamorphoses.

Stephen Harrison

Corpus Christi College, Oxford


The verb 'to Romanise' first appeared in the seventeenth century, used both of making Roman in character and of joining the Roman Catholic Church. But the noun
‘Romanisation’ in the senses of ‘assimilation to Roman customs’ and ‘alteration under Roman influence’ is late nineteenth century. In passing it may be noted that Romanisation also bore a linguistic sense, referring to Roman influence on English. A similar metaphor has now been suggested, creolisation. But this word is being used as a substitute for cultural Romanisation, especially the mutual influence of Roman and local civilisations. In Roman provincial studies Romanisation was first applied to the process by which provincials became Roman (essentially, that is), adopted Latin as their language and accepted a (Gracce-)Roman lifestyle, using ‘Roman’ artifacts. Some believed that this was encouraged by the Romans, presumably the emperor, the provincial governors and prominent Romans working in or emigrating to the provinces. However, it is clear that Romanisation was not enforced from above: it was an entirely voluntary process. Not that the Romans did not notice it occurring and disapprove. Virgil (Aen. 6.851-53) claimed that it was the mission of Rome to impose mos, her value system, on the pacified provinces. Tacitus (Agr. 21) commended his father-in-law Agricola for encouraging the local élite in Roman Britain to adopt the trappings of Roman civilisation. The Elder Pliny (HN 16.3) said of a German people, the Chaucans, that their almost sub-human way of life was a punishment from the gods because they had spurned the benefits of Roman peace. Elsewhere (HN 3.31) he says that southern Gaul (Provence) was more Roman than Italy.

Ramsay MacMullen, known for his many instructive books on Roman social phenomena and a shrewd article, ‘Notes on Romanization’, has now written on Romanisation during the principate of Augustus. In his preface (p. ix) he states: ‘My object is to point out and explain the appearance of a way of life in areas of the Roman empire outside of Italy just like that prevailing inside Italy. I focus on those decades when Augustus was alive.’ His main concern is with processes by which the ‘Roman civilisation of the Empire’ (p. x) became the universal way of life.

In chapter 1, ‘In the East’ (pp. 1-29), he discusses the Roman or Italian immigrants who settled in the East, the effects of Roman control on public institutions (including the introduction of the imperial cult), the introduction of Roman architectural forms (such as fora) and the response of local power-holders to Rome, especially their accommodation to her. Chapter 2 (pp. 30-49) is devoted to Africa.

---

Here the sub-headings are ‘The Occupation of the Land’, ‘Leptis Magna’ (as a case study), ‘Juba’s Kingdom’ (that is, Mauretania)—which corresponds to ‘Behavior’ (especially that of Herod the Great) in chapter 1. The final sub-section deals with ‘Acculturation through the Plastic Arts’. Spain is discussed in chapter 3 (pp. 50-84). The topics covered are ‘The Transformation of the Land’, ‘Urban Structures’, ‘The People Responsible for Change’ (both Roman administrators and local dignitaries), ‘The Formal Articulation of Change’ (the locals adapting to Roman administrative procedures) and, finally, ‘Arts, Letters, Private Life’. Gaul is the subject of chapter 4 (pp. 85-123). It deals with ‘What the Romans Found’ (that is, the existing ‘Celtic’ civilisation), ‘Re-Ordering Gaul on an Urban Basis’, ‘The Province Narbonensis’ (modern Provence), ‘Artists and Patrons’, ‘Public versus Private’ (that is, the use of Roman motifs on private monuments). The last chapter is called ‘Replication’ (pp. 124-37): its headings are ‘The Means’; ‘The Opportunity’; ‘The Motive’.

It can be seen that broadly the same themes are discussed in the various different regions of the empire, but with interesting differences which underline the point that there was uniformity neither in the culture of the provinces the Romans administered nor in the responses of the locals to Roman control.

A number of remarks may be made on some points of detail:

p. xi: MacMullen valuably recognises the diversity in Roman civilisation itself: cf. p. 2 on the Greek element in it (where perhaps he might have referred to *philanthropia* as the antecedent of *humanitas*). But the distinction between ‘Roman’ and ‘Italian’ is not particularly helpful. By the first century AD the culture of the wealthy in Italy was entirely Roman, so that the distinction is only geographical. Cf. ‘Italian’ on p. 68.

p. 4 n. 12: It seems odd to quote Deiotarus among local Romans exercising influence through the governor of a province.  

p. 10: More explanation of technical terms might have been given for the non-technical reader. *Duumviri*, aediles, *quattuorviri*, *sufetes* appear as such on p. 10. (On p. 39 *chalcidicum* is explained only on its second appearance.) ‘Colonial government’ as a description for city administration in Italy could be misleading for a modern reader.

p. 11 n. 30: Reference to ancient inscriptions and other documents are sometimes only recoverable from a modern author quoting them or are often rather cryptic. MacMullen includes Ehrenberg and Jones in his bibliography, so could have assisted the reader in p. 90 n. 30 by referring to EJ 311 and 322. On the first, the Edict from Nazareth, a reference to A. Giovannini’s recent article would have been useful: he places the edict in the context of Augustus’ eastern policy.

---


p. 12: MacMullen rightly stresses the political and cultural effect of the settlement of veterans in the provinces. But they were sometimes only dubiously ‘Roman’. Some of them who settled in Dalmatia under Augustus chose not ‘Roman’ style tombstones but a type common in Asia Minor.¹⁹ Many legionaries in the East had in fact been recruited locally and given Roman citizenship on enlistment.

p. 19: On occasion MacMullen refers to ‘Commanders of the Engineers’ as a type of specialist officer dealing with building and the infrastructure. From p. 127 it is apparent that he was thinking of praefecti fabrum. However, there is very little evidence of these officers dealing with building or engineering.²⁰ By the time of the early Principate praefecti fabrum had in fact become (administrative) adjuncts to the legionary commander. With regard to the M. Cassius Denticulus, whom MacMullen quotes on p. 20 (Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae 7729), he was not architectus ‘after his demobilisation’ but before: his military tribunate was the summit of his career. Most urban architecti were in fact recruited from freedmen. The document claimed to refer to an army architect quoted from Donderer (the reference might have been given: it is Orientis Graecii Inscriptiones Selectae 2.660 or Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes 1.1236) does in fact not do so: the architect in the inscription (Mersis) is a different person to the soldier (Mommogaius Bataiou of the Cohors Nigri). The text of the Liber Coloniarum (244 Blume, line 5) which MacMullen quotes on p. 20 is in fact corrupt, and does not seem to refer to soldiers assisting in land surveys in the Triumviral period: Mommsen, Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum 10 p.560, emends to date the incident to 126 AD. Cf. Real-Encyclopädie 1 a 1110f.

p. 78: Hispanenses (which in any case should be Hispanienses) is a strange lapse. Hispanienses were Romans resident in Spain: the local Spaniards were called Hispani, which is in fact what Tacitus has in the text. But even so, ‘natives’ is perhaps not the best translation for it. Roman residents in the province would not have been behind in promoting the imperial cult: Tarraco was after all a Roman colony. Cf. Dio Cass. 51.20.6: a special temple for the incipient cult for Roman residents in Ephesus.

p. 135: honoris aemulatio is a difficult phrase. But MacMullen’s translation ‘competition for promotion’ (in disagreement with A. Birley’s version quoted on p. 176 n. 27) is too concrete. Honor can of course refer to political office in Rome, but at this stage in Britain Agricola would have had no posts to offer British noblemen, who are not even attested as commanders of auxiliary regiments. The correct nuance is suggested by the 1938 translation of G. J. Acheson, ‘competition for the honour of his (that is, the governor’s)

approbation'. Ogilvie and Richmond ad loc. have ‘competition for honour (that of being praised)’.

MacMullen’s extended essay is a tour de force and will set the agenda for succeeding analyses of Romanisation. Its chief merits are its regionalisation and its restricted time-scale. It refuses to look for a single process of acculturation operating empire-wide and it concentrates on a specific period, the initial consolidation of the territorial empire under a new system of Roman government. Its main omission is a full discussion of the emergence of local élites into Roman society and its governing structures. Thus figures such as Theophanes of Miletus (and his descendants under Augustus) and Cornelius Gallus, administrator but also an important poet and a friend of Virgil, together with whom he was educated, could have been singled out and discussed (as in fact the Spaniard Cornelius Balbus is, but there are many more). At the lower end of the social scale the experiences of the non-Roman auxiliaries in the Roman army might have been considered: Augustus formalised their permanent use alongside the legions. And the impact of the ordinary legionary in his provincial camp—apart from his role as a purchaser—might have received more reflection.

By concentrating on specific areas within the empire MacMullen has been brilliantly able to show how organic the process of Romanisation was: the East responded differently from the West, where Gaul and Africa, with their stronger local tradition of town life, were different from Spain. The adoption of a very brief synchronic, rather than a lengthy diachronic, approach enabled MacMullen to bring out the real significance of the similarities and differences he was able to highlight.

The richness of his scholarship is apparent from the footnotes. His style is refreshingly simple and there are useful brief summaries of scattered details. The maps and drawings are excellent. MacMullen is usefully iconoclastic of old certainties: compare, for example, his scepticism about the presentation of the ‘ideology’ of the art of the capital into the provinces on pp. 113f. The work is indeed a reliable contribution to Roman provincial studies.

Denis Saddington

University of the Witwatersrand


The usefulness of this book is above all as a full presentation and fine-combing of modern views about the play. Harrison seems to have consulted and digested most of the scholarly work on Persai known to me (and some not known)—I count 469