

centre as dynamic and negotiable. The strength of B.'s book is that she is able to reconstruct glimpses of these processes in action in so much depth, in so many different locations and different ways, and in the process to challenge over-simplified generalizations about how the imperial cult worked. Even the commonly assumed automatic association between *neokoria* and sacred festival B. shows to be unreliable — although the first did usually lead to the second, especially by the time of the agonistic proliferations of the second and third centuries A.D.

The energy and expense of *neokoria* negotiations emerge clearly, then. However, B. also shows that the *neokoria* was just one tiny piece in a much larger mosaic. The culture of civic honour-seeking was acted out in many different arenas, each with its own distinctive norms of engagement, each constantly evolving. Even imperial cult was not a monolithic entity, though it is too often treated as such. It is hard, in other words, to make an argument for the *neokoria* as an exceptional or predominant feature of civic anxiety, and B. resists the temptation of doing so.

Few of the sources predominantly are forthcoming, which makes it all the more remarkable that B. has managed to piece together such a vivid picture. The first section of the book works through the evidence on a city-by-city basis, mapping out the available material exhaustively. The shorter second half then draws some wider conclusions, with chapters on chronological development, temples, cities, *koina*, and the Roman powers. Even in the second half the tone is often functional: the repeated resort to chronological organization could in different circumstances come to seem mechanical, and the fact that so much material is repeated between the two parts of the book could be distracting. But the richness of the material makes that much less of a problem than it would otherwise be.

Sophistic culture is not addressed in depth before the end of the book, in ch. 40 (on 'The Cities'), but it is a constant background presence before then. B. makes it clear that even seemingly abstruse rhetorical skills were often grounded in the needs of civic self-advertisement. That must have been the case even for the ambassadors in front of Tiberius in the mid-first century A.D. Smyrna's rhetorical pre-eminence in that first debate was later replicated under Hadrian, who granted the city's second *neokoria*; on that occasion Polemo's eloquence was the city's strongest suit. Interaction between sophists and cities is more often seen, following Philostratus, from the sophistic perspective, so it is fascinating to see that perspective reversed here. For this reviewer, one of the questions B.'s book raises is the question of how one might write a history which gives equal weight to both — to sophistry and city together. A history of competition and competitiveness in the Roman East, for example, would need to draw out the rich interrelations between sophistic and agonistic styles of self-presentation in the Greek East on the one hand, and the idioms of competitive civic self-presentation on the other. B.'s book would be an essential starting-point for that project.

University of St Andrews

JASON KÖNIG

S. G. BYRNE, *ROMAN CITIZENS OF ATHENS* (Studia Hellenistica 40). Leuven/Dudley, Mass.: Peeters, 2003. Pp. xxxiv + 566. ISBN 90-429-1348-7. €80.00.

Byrne is best known as the co-author, with M. J. Osborne, of *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names Volume II: Attica* (1994; hereafter *LGPN II*; B.'s updates and an online searchable version are available at <http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk/>). The *Lexicon's* onomastic mission prevented the inclusion in *LGPN II* of two categories of names found at Athens — foreigners and in particular Roman names (1). B. has already provided for the first category (*The Foreign Residents of Athens* (1996) = *FRA*) and now plugs the other gap with Roman citizens at Athens (= *RCA*).

*RCA* is a register of Athenians and non-Athenians resident at Athens who had a Roman gentile name (*nomen gentilicium*). It is on the basis of an individual's possession of the *nomen* that B. offers the register as a list of Roman citizens found at Athens. Those who consult this book will need to read the criteria that determine the inclusion of individuals in the register (xvi–xx). *RCA* addresses both onomastic and prosopographic aspects of the Romans at Athens. Individuals are listed in accordance with their Roman *nomen*, from the first complete *nomen*, Aedius, to Vulustius (3–494), with a small section of partially preserved *nomina* (495–500). For each Roman *nomen*, Athenians are listed first in accordance with their tribal affiliation, and deme membership within each tribe if the demotic is known, then individuals whose Athenian tribe is unknown, followed by the non-Athenian categories (such as *epengraphoi* or foreigners with an ethnic).

There is some overlap between *LGPN II*, *FRA*, and *RCA*. A Caninius of Rome, the father of Makaria, is a Roman citizen (*RCA* Caninius 4) and foreign resident (*FRA* no. 6287); a Caninius

on a freedman's tombstone is a Roman (*RCA* Caninius 2) but the only example of the Greek name Caninius in *LGPN* II (s.v. Κανίνιος 1, thought not to be Athenian). *RCA* offers the most comprehensive study of Roman names in Athens. It will be an important tool to those working on onomastics, epigraphy, and, of course, political and social history. *RCA* controls material that can be difficult to access for historians who are not immersed in Athenian epigraphy. For instance, N. Mathieu's study of the Aufidii (*Histoire d'un nom. Les Aufidii dans la vie politique, économique et sociale du monde romain* (1999); not cited in *RCA*) would have benefited from *RCA* (e.g. on L. Aufidius Bassus M. f. Maior, see *IG* ii<sup>2</sup>.4478 with *RCA* Aufidius 23; incorrect date and stemma at Matthieu, *Histoire* 123 and stemma 1, pp. 200; 240 no. 187). At the same time, the nature of the work means that B. has little space to develop wider points than the Register allows. For instance, B. makes a case that one of the most prominent Athenians of the Augustan era, Antipatros son of Antipatros of Phlya (*RCA* Vipsanius 4 = *LGPN* II s.v. Ἀντίπατρος 45), held Roman citizenship (xiii). Where the identification of an individual's *nomen gentilicium* is uncertain it appears in brackets (xviii). Antipatros' *nomen* Vipsanius is in brackets: neither he nor several subsequent family members (*RCA* Vipsanius 5–7) are attested in state inscriptions using the *nomen* (note three slaves?) who died in a shipwreck belonged to an Antipatros and have the *nomen* Vispanius, *RCA* Vispanius 4 vii = *IG* ii<sup>2</sup>.8413). Antipatros had proposed the decree at Athens arranging the celebration of Augustus' birthday (now *Agora* xvi.336, cf. 488). In the construction of the family's stemma (*RCA* Vipsanius 4–16, stemma XVI), B. argues that the family's *nomen* was secured when Agrippa visited Athens in 16 B.C. (492). In that year when Antipatros was hoplite general for the seventh time, he was also honoured by *emporoi*. The case for Antipatros' award of Roman citizenship from Agrippa is persuasive. It forms part of B.'s argument that particularly in the first century A.D. Athenian inscriptions omit *nomina* (xiv). B.'s book is not the place to develop the point but his work adds to other instances displaying the same phenomenon (for convenience, see *CR* 53 (2003), 143–4).

The development of Roman citizenship, and indeed dual citizenship, in the Greek East is now receiving more attention and is one of many areas which will be illuminated by *RCA*. The book supplies passing corrections to *LGPN* II; offers a valuable list of inscriptions summarizing new dates or other important changes (511–45); and includes a revised list of Athenian Archons (501–10) dating from the Flavian era to c. A.D. 267/8. *RCA* is the latest addition to the historian's and epigrapher's bookshelf based on a strong antipodean tradition of careful study of inscriptions and patient collection and analysis of documentary evidence.

*The University of Liverpool*

G. J. OLIVER

C. R. WHITTAKER, *ROME AND ITS FRONTIERS: THE DYNAMICS OF EMPIRE*. London/New York: Routledge, 2004. Pp. x + 246, illus. ISBN 0-415-31200-0. £55.00.

T. S. BURNS, *ROME AND THE BARBARIANS, 100 B.C.–A.D. 400*. Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003. Pp. xvi + 461, illus. ISBN 0-8018-7306-1. £37.00/US\$49.95.

The earth of the Roman marches forever yields up new discoveries. No longer are the lower reaches of the Danube hidden from view by the Iron Curtain. There is always new controversy too, and new ways of mating the hippopotamus of archaeology to the peacock of the literary tradition. Fortunately experts on the Roman frontier sometimes stop to review their findings for the rest of us.

C. R. Whittaker offers a collection of his essays on Roman foreign relations, frontier society, and the eastern trade written since his 1994 monograph *Frontiers of the Roman Empire*. Most have been published before, but some are heavily revised. Those who follow W.'s writings will admire the way he has transcended the economic approach of the earlier monograph: W. has risen from being one of many controversialists working on the frontier to being the fair-minded chronicler and wise arbiter of the field. W. begins *Rome and its Frontiers* with an admirable introductory survey entitled 'Where are the Roman Frontiers Now?' The title of the piece is its main defect: for this is not an updated version of W.'s 1996 article by that same title published in D. L. Kennedy (ed.), *The Roman Army in the East*. That update appears in this volume instead under the title 'Grand Strategy or Grand Debate?' In it W. comes out against a Roman imperial grand strategy, but in doing so, he — like most recent contributions to this fight — betrays how very close the two sides have grown on the evidence. The wrangling is now mostly over names — how is 'grand strategy' to be understood? If you define it one way, you answer 'yes'; another way,