

thesenorientierte Behandlung' (Introduction, 8). In short, S. has done all the hard work, but he seems to be willing to let others reap the rewards. It would be particularly interesting to follow up the many connections between the monuments and texts of the Second Sophistic period, particularly Pausanias' *Periegesis*, which offers so much geographically specific information on votive monuments. A further geographical analysis of S.'s catalogue might yield interesting results, and it would also be interesting to look at votive monuments in the context of the local sacred landscape.

Nevertheless, there are many insights to be gained from S.'s conclusions. His work offers an insight into changing ideas about the nature of the relationship between man and gods, changes that can be detected from the development of iconographic preferences as well as from trends in the wording of inscriptions. S.'s material also represents a tendency towards archaism in Roman Greece, a phenomenon that is also well documented in the texts. It is particularly fascinating to see the many forms an allusion to the past could take, both in the form and content of the inscriptions and in the decoration and design of a monument. S. also detects subtle variations in the relationship between local, provincial (Greek), and imperial religion, and more generally, in the attitudes of Greeks to their imperial rulers. These insights are a truly valuable contribution to an ever more complex picture of Roman Greece: let us hope that the author will find an opportunity to share further insights and interpretations based on his intimate knowledge of Greek votives.

Somerville College, Oxford

MARIA PRETZLER

B. BURRELL, *NEOKOROI: GREEK CITIES AND ROMAN EMPERORS*. Leiden: Brill, 2004. Pp. xviii + 422, 37 pls, 1 map. ISBN 9-0041-2578-7. £139.00.

Smyrna was the second city within the Roman province of Asia to receive the title of *neokoros* ('temple warden' and *koinon*-centre for worship of the reigning emperor). Tacitus describes the city's victory in the contest for that privilege (*Annals* 4.55–6). Eleven cities applied, and their ambassadors were heard by the Senate and the emperor Tiberius over several days. Some were discounted because of honours held already; Hypaipa, Tralles, Laodikeia, and Magnesia 'were passed over as not up to it' ('ut parum validi'); 'there was some hesitation over the Halikarnassians, who claimed that their home had never been shaken by earthquake in 1,200 years, and that the foundations of the temple would be in living rock'; in the end only Smyrna and Sardis were left to battle it out, with a mixture of genealogical arguments, claims about the clemency of their climate and about their past loyalty to the Roman people — arguments which look at first sight rather inconsequential to modern eyes, but which are perhaps not so far removed in spirit from the more idealistic elements of modern Olympic bids, with their appeals to historical heritage and tourism potential.

One of the things Burrell's book shows most compellingly is the enormous amount of energy which was devoted by the Greek cities to gaining and advertising grants of *neokoria*. The pleas made by the eleven ambassadors of Tacitus' narrative were probably far from unusual. From what we can see, the same story of rivalry for honours was endlessly repeated over the centuries which followed, as different cities scrabbled for successive *neokoria* grants, and advertised their successes in their coin issues and inscriptions. This was not a system which sprang up ready-made, nor was it uniform. Tiberius' grant to Smyrna was only the second step (the first *neokoriai* had been granted by Augustus to Pergamon and Nikomedia) in a long ladder of *ad hoc* adaptations. We see innovations and idiosyncratic treatments of the institution by a range of emperors: for example, Hadrian's unprecedented (but later standardly imitated) decision to grant more than one *neokoria* to a single province — Asia — as part of his wider policy of obsessive attention to traditional Greek cities; and Septimius Severus' systematic use of *neokoria* grants to reward cities supportive of him (and his removal of *neokoros* status from those who had opposed him).

B. also shows, however, that we should not be thinking only about imperial decision-making here. What we see instead is a dynamic process of ongoing negotiation involving city, *koinon*, Senate, and emperor, with solutions thrashed out through passionate and often painstaking debate (although the degree of conflict varied, and was likely to be less intense within *koina* which had one city in a place of uncontested pre-eminence). Often the impetus for change in imperial policy seems to have come from the cities themselves. That conclusion will not be a surprising one — it is fully in line with recent insistence on seeing the relationships between cities and imperial

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