

K.-J. Hölkeskamp, J. Hoffmann-Salz, K. Kostopoulos, and S. Lentzsch (eds.), *Die Grenzen des Prinzips. Die Infragestellung von Werten durch Regelverstöße in antiken Gesellschaften*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2019, 240pp. EUR 50.00.

It may seem tautological, but every society rests on principles, rules, norms and some basic values which set a foundation for wider social coexistence. The ancient world does not differ from our own time in this respect. It is very appropriate, therefore, that K.-J. Hölkeskamp, J. Hoffmann-Salz, K. Kostopoulos, and S. Lentzsch present a volume on this topic, with special focus on the limits of principles and rules and the violations of these limits.

The volume emerges from a conference held at University of Cologne at the end of January in 2016. The actual number of the conference's participants outnumbers the number of articles published in this collection;¹ nevertheless the articles provide extensive coverage of the topic, offering insights from archaic Greece to late republican Rome and into Augustan times. According to the editors, this is to provide a "möglichst breiten Einblick in die Thematik" (p. 9). The contributions are arranged in a chronological order, but other organizational structures are unfortunately lacking. However, in his absorbing paper (*Prinzip—Regel—Norm—Wert. Unabgeschlossene Bemerkungen zu Konzepten und Kategorien*) Hölkeskamp not only gives definitions for the terms "principle, rule, norm, and value", but also utilizes the figure of a parallelogram to demonstrate visually the interconnectedness of these four concepts. In this way, he provides a basic, implicit theoretical framework for the whole volume, even though, for some reason, references to this framework are hardly visible in the chapters.

Be that as it may, the respective merits of the individual articles remain unaffected by this small oversight. This becomes immediately evident after reading G. Seelentag's intriguing contribution on archaic Greece (*Konfliktregulierung im archaischen Griechenland zwischen Prinzipien- und Regelorientierung*). In a convincing way, Seelentag traces the development from the principle-oriented mechanism of conflict settlement, as depicted on the shield of Achilles, to more rule-based ones, as reflected in the inscription of the mid-sixth century BCE from Dreros in Crete. Next, R. Osborne (*Unruly Women and Greek Sanctuaries. Gendered expectations and their violation*) illuminates the liberties of religious dedications and procession enjoyed by women in classical times that contrasted with daily female restraint and separation. W. Schmitz delves into the social conflict in Euripides' *Andromache* (*Den Normenkonflikt aushalten. Euripides' Andromache und das Bürgerrechtsgesetz des*

¹ It is above all regrettable that Christoph Lundgreen did not submit his paper, especially since he published a well-received book on the subject for Roman republican times. See C. Lundgreen, *Regelkonflikte in der römischen Republik. Geltung und Gewichtung von Normen in politischen Entscheidungsprozessen*, Stuttgart 2011. His book is nevertheless having a vivid life in the footnotes of the contributions.

Perikles). While Neoptolemos' wife Hermione stands for Homeric (family) norms, the position of Andromache, enslaved by Neoptolemos yet mother of his only son, reflects instead the Attic law of the second half of the fifth century BCE. The play was first performed when Athenians were discussing a relaxation of Perikles' citizenship law, which Euripides allegedly opposed as a threat to the "civic identity". Instead, in such a "evolutionären Umbruchsituation" (p. 77) the playwright was promoting the marriage of Athenian citizens whilst rejecting marriages to foreign women or relationships with slaves. The section dedicated to archaic and classical Greece concludes with the contributions of K. Kostopoulos (*Denkmal und Debatte. Regelkonflikte um Ehrungen in der athenischen Demokratie*) and D. Rohde ("Verrat ist eine Frage des Datums." *Der parapresbeia-Prozess des Jahres 343*). Kostopoulos examines how honorific statues (especially through the depicted person) used to inculcate rules and principles of behaviour to spectators. This also included a moral comparison of the character of a person honoured by the setting up of a statue in the fourth century BCE to those individuals who were granted such an honour in earlier times. Rohde in turn nuances the legal uncertainty of envoys in late classical Athens. These envoys could be accused of treason years after their embassy, if the outcome of their mission turned out in the long run to be detrimental to the polis.

The analysis of Hölkeskamp' parallelogram in the context of Greek culture is completed with two articles on Hellenistic topics. M. Kleu ("Weder beweint noch bestattet." *Philipp V. und die Gefallenen aus der Schlacht bei Kynoskephalai*) turns the spotlight on Philip V's norm-violation after the battle of Cynoscephalae, when he mysteriously neglected to bury his fallen soldiers. In his intriguing contribution, F. Daubner (*Familienstrukturen und politischer Wandel am Rand der griechischen Welt. Beobachtungen an den Inschriften von Boutrotos*) draws the reader's attention to family norms in Epirus by analysing manumission inscriptions from Boutrotos. Daubner very carefully examines the multilayered problems of family and inheritance norms in the *koinon* of the Prasaipe Epirotes, using both ethnographic (modern Balkan people) as well as historical (ancient Thessalia and Phocis) comparison. He observes different norms within the Prasaipe clan. Some families followed a matrilocal practice while others followed a more "classical" approach with women moving into the house of their husbands. Matrilocality is more often to be found with families of the hinterland, while magistrates were almost exclusively recruited from urban families that practice patrilocality. Daubner's article offers a fascinating insight into the coexistence of a clan's different family and inheritance norms at the edge of the Greek world.

From here the perspective is shifted to the Roman republic. A. v. Ross (*Kontingenz und Risiko im politischen Leben der mittleren römischen Republik*) casts doubt on the *communis opinio* of the high standardization ("Normierung") in Roman political culture. In the light of sociological risk research, he reevaluates the *perduellio*-trial of the censors C. Claudius Pulcher and Ti. Sempronius Gracchus in 169 BCE as well as the *dilectus*-ritual. Focusing on the example of Pompeius, F. Pina Polo (*Transgression*

and Tradition in the Roman Republic. Some Reflections) demonstrates the political pragmatism in Roman republican politics. To his mind, Rome's historical success was also based on the mixture of conservative legalism and pragmatic flexibility. U. Walter (*Gewalterruption in der späten Republik. Unfall, stete Option oder Agens einer Dehnung von Regeln und Normen?*) discusses the use of physical violence and its effects on the prevailing norms, principles, and rules in the late republic. Orators for instance endorsed violence in their speeches, such as in the context of the struggle of orders. Violence used to be an integral part of the everyday life including the political sphere, but it remained in most cases confined to exceptional situation and was meant to restore the order. The situation dramatically changed in the 50s BCE – with the well-known consequences.

S. Lentsch (*Immer an der Spitze, manchmal, oder nie?*) *Normenkonflikte in der Rolle des römischen Feldherren*) traces the development of the standards expected of Roman commanders from the end of the third century BCE to the first century CE. J. Timmer (*Die Ankündigung eines Normbruchs. Caesar und der Kriegsrat im Winterlager von Aduatuca*) carefully analyzes Caesar's description of the war council before the battle of Aduatuca in his *de bello Gallico* to conclude that Caesar no longer believed that harmonious decision-making was still a possibility. Instead, Caesar seems to have favoured the "best" decision, even if it came at the expense of concord. Thereby, Caesar clandestinely broke the centuries-old norm of the Roman aristocracy to make decisions unanimously. Of course, Caesar could not put forward such a stance directly. Hence, he disguised his intentions in his literary description of the war council of Aduatuca. Though Timmer's point must remain somewhat speculative, his conclusions are highly attractive. The collection is rounded off by J. Hoffmann-Salz (*Die Selbstmorde der Gesandten. Augustus, Herodes und die Gesandtschaft der Gadarener bei Josephus*), whose chapter reflects on the complex web of relationships between the emperor, a client king, and local subject. The envoys of Gadara tried to outmaneuver their unpopular ruler, Herodes, by approaching Augustus directly—which was a clear break from norms. Herodes sanctioned their misbehavior by killing the envoys, which was in turn a violation of diplomatic rules. Hoffmann-Salz highlights rule-making and rule-breaking as both means of and challenges to rulership.

Apart from some weak points in respect of the composition of this volume (including the lack of an index), the respective articles provide valuable insights into the field of norms, standards, and rules. However, the volume does not fully achieve its aspiration to give a "breiten Einblick in die Thematik". The lack of papers centering on imperial or byzantine times is conspicuous. To put it the other way around, there is more research to be expected and this volume serves as a very qualified starting point at a reasonable price.

FABIAN KNOPF
TU BRAUNSCHWEIG