

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* ii².4478 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* ii².8413). 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,

‘no’. So it is probably time to put this controversy to bed, in the happy knowledge that the dialectical process of academic argument has actually accomplished something. ‘Mental Maps and Frontiers’ surveys Roman mapping technologies and moves beyond the usual gloomy assessment to investigate the positive consequences of Roman mapping habits for their understanding of their borders. And last on the strategy theme, ‘Roman Frontiers and European Perceptions’ places the whole debate in its modern historical context.

A pair of papers treat India. ‘To Reach Out to India and Pursue the Dawn’ and ‘Indian Trade within the Roman Imperial Network’ form an elegant diptych and are individually the strongest pieces in the collection, the former treating Roman conceptions of India and Indians, and the latter going far beyond its announced theme to offer an important contribution to the debate about Roman economic decision making. The rest of the papers are more various. ‘The Importance of the Invasions in the Later Roman Empire’ is a useful survey of the evidence that the invading barbarian forces of Late Antiquity were not so very big or destructive after all, and a fine examination of the reasons why late antique authors nonetheless represented them as such. Seeing ill-mannered hordelets rather than full-throated howling barbarian hordes is the fashion of the hour, but this shift needs be considered together with the new thinking about the late Roman army which reduces its effective size equally drastically. Hordelets are little threat to the late Roman army of 600,000 or more that camped in the older scholarship, but to the small army of the new, desperately scrabbling together a hundred men here and a thousand there, they might be formidable indeed. ‘The Use and Abuse of Immigrants in the Later Roman Empire’ — a new piece — argues that over time Romans became more aware of status distinctions and less aware of the distinction between Roman and barbarian: the latter may well be true, but I despair of imagining what evidence could prove the former. ‘Sex on the Frontiers’ — another new paper — wanders from considering the Roman personification of foreign peoples as women to asking how much rape there was on the frontiers (likely lots, but not enough evidence to say) via feminist and anthropological theory. Finally, ‘Supplying the Army: the Evidence from the Frontier Fort of Vindolanda’ concludes that ‘the overall impression one gets is that there is little new in the tablets to be learned about the broader picture of life on the frontiers and that the value lies in the detail’ (109), but even in some matters of detail ‘the evidence is hopelessly ambiguous’.

The core of T. S. Burns’ *Rome and the Barbarians* is a survey of the archaeology of settlement between 100 B.C. and A.D. 400 on what became Rome’s Rhine and Danube frontier. As such, this volume is useful, and especially on Pannonia, where B.’s knowledge is deepest, and to which he very wisely devotes a full chapter. In this realm, in broad and in detail, the reader will find much to think about: *inter alia* that barbarian settlement moved closer as the Romans built systematic fortifications along the rivers (232), and that the Roman passion for uniformity in camp design was such that the Romans built camp gates that opened into yawning ravines (166). B. also argues for a shared ‘frontier culture’ on both sides of the border, at once agricultural and martial, and offers it as the Middle Ages *in ovo*: an appealing idea with great explanatory power, but one for which the archaeological evidence he presents is quite exiguous. Alas, outside the areas of B.’s particular expertise there are many errors of fact (e.g. in chs 3 and 4, pp. 88, 90, 97, 100, 107, 134, 138, 154, 155, 156, 157, 167, 168, 170, and 177) and all through the book far too many failures of copy-editing and shipwrecks of syntax, although these last sometimes contribute to the gaiety of nations: ‘Ultimately, however, everybody sought the ear of the emperor at court, which followed wherever the emperor went’ (322).

As for B.’s analysis of Roman-barbarian relations over the centuries, some of it is good and some is bad. The good is mostly borrowed from Susan Mattern’s *Rome and the Enemy* (1999). The bad begins from the presumption that the barbarians were in almost every case perfectly innocent of aggressive intent towards the Romans; there was hardly ever any threat to Rome from over the rivers. So extreme a standpoint does generate some real insight — for example, that the Romans were often apt to attribute trouble to barbarian migrations because migration was the usual way they imagined changes occurring beyond their borders. B.’s use of ancient literary evidence does have the virtue of system: what little supports his case he accepts, the rest he rejects. Of the Cimbri and Teutones, ‘[s]uch is the state of our records that almost anything seems possible — anything, that is, except the traditional story of massive and well-led groups of invaders threatening Rome and its allies’ (84). And amidst the confusion of the sources, ‘[t]he most readily demonstrable contribution of the Cimbri and Teutones to Roman history was as a justification of Marius’s monopoly of power’ (68). So eager is B. to find the barbarians blameless in the crisis of the third century A.D. — they were victims too (251) — that he argues like a lawyer

in the alternative. Perhaps there was no crisis (269–70); but if there was, the barbarians were reluctant to invade (253–4); but if they did invade, it was in small bands (284) which had little effect (290); but if there were large groups and leaders, it was the Romans' fault for training simple barbarian villagers to be warriors (363–5).

B.'s unblemished barbarians grow from a process of stereotyping at least as thoroughgoing as that of which the Romans were guilty when they thought about barbarians, and far less forgivable because B. incessantly lectures the Romans on this very subject. It would be hard to find a more perfect example of the unwitting establishment of a monolithic evil Other — B.'s Romans — and over-identification with an 'oppressed' people. Why did the Celts abandon their great fortified *oppida*? Californian anomie: 'Perhaps there was a widespread doubt in the existing norms and values of society' (81).

Both Whittaker and Burns offer useful summaries of the current state of Roman frontier studies; from Whittaker much else can be learned about the Romans as well.

University of Virginia

J. E. LENDON

I. GRADEL, *EMPEROR WORSHIP AND ROMAN RELIGION*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Pp. xvi + 398, illus. ISBN 0-19-815-275-2. £55.00.

Ittai Gradel's chief goal is to prove that the worship of the emperor within Italy must be viewed in terms of honours paid to the emperor, rather than his 'absolute' divinity. G. shifts focus away from the worship of the *Genius* of the Emperor, placing emphasis instead on the cult of the *divi*, whose monuments are seen as deterrents to the bad behaviour of the living emperor. G. argues for stricter definitions of private and public cult with a view to proving that, while many did worship the living emperor, with few exceptions he was not deified by the state while alive. In addition, G. re-evaluates the significance of fundamental terms such as *numen*, which he shows should not be considered the equivalent of the *Genius*.

G. claims that a number of interrelated methods used by scholars of religion and empire — chiefly, the artificial separation of Roman religion from politics, the admission of philosophical works as evidence for how Romans viewed their gods, and approaches that view Roman religion through a 'Christianizing' lens in which belief in an 'absolute' divinity is paramount — have impeded the correct interpretation of the origins, nature, and ultimate significance of emperor worship. G. asserts that it was through divine honours that the emperor attained divine status, stressing that the focus of Roman religion was ritual actions, not 'belief'. His arguments complement those of his dissertation advisor, Simon Price, whose widely praised book on emperor worship in Asia Minor, *Rituals and Power* (1984) identified and attacked the Christianizing approach.

In the introduction, G. helpfully reviews the aspects of Roman religion which will inform his investigation, ranging from general concepts such as ritual and sacrifice to specific texts, most notably the Arval Acta. In the following chapters on the Republic and Caesar, G. argues that the divine honours accorded Caesar were an outgrowth of social practice in the Republic, in which benefactors were celebrated with honours that approached the divine. Patiently guiding the reader through the changes in honours decreed by the Senate, G. shows that the transitions are logical if not always smooth or unambiguous.

G. is at his best when examining epigraphic and archaeological evidence, and for this his book will be of immediate interest to students of those disciplines; but it will be a vital source also for students of Roman literature less familiar with the material evidence. G. takes a fresh look at monuments previously cited as proof of 'imperial cult' (which G. shows is a dangerously unclear term) — notably those buildings around the forum of Pompeii that have sometimes mistakenly been identified as dedicated to the worship of the emperor.

In discussing Augustus, G. compares inscriptions dedicated to the *Genius* of the *paterfamilias* with those to the *Genius* of the emperor, emphasizing that *Genius*-worship was the domain of those in servile positions and concluding that senators in Augustus' lifetime would never have bowed so low; in addition, he shows that inscriptions to the emperor's *Genius* only surface around A.D. 55. These conclusions throw suspicion on L. R. Taylor's widely-accepted claim that worship of the emperor's *Genius* was ubiquitous in the early Empire, although the word *Genius* itself was suppressed in inscriptions. While Augustus refused state deification, he gave approval to the worship of his *Genius* by the *magistri vici* who administered the compital cults in Rome. G. shows (against Wissowa and Taylor) that these compital cults revived by Augustus were in fact