

Eusebius, the persecutor is 'Antoninus Verus', the 'pro-Christian' emperor who allegedly credited Christian soldiers with the Rain Miracle the latter's brother, 'Marcus Aurelius Caesar': see T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA, 1981), pp. 137, 141–2. At least one martyrdom happened under Pius (Ptolemaeus and Lucius, sentenced at Rome by the urban prefect Lollius Urbicus, *HE* 4.17). Why not Polycarp too? The date under Pius preferred by many depends on the identity of the proconsul, named in the *Mart. Polycarpi*, but not by Eusebius, as Stadius Quadratus, who must be the *cos. ord.* 142, attested epigraphically and by Aelius Aristides. M. postulates an otherwise unknown Quadratus, not called Stadius; but the list for A.D. 160/1–166/7 seems to be complete (six or seven names, but no Quadratus), as M. could have seen by consulting B. E. Thomasson, *Lateralculi praesidium* I (Göteborg, 1984), pp. 229–30 or R. Syme, *Roman Papers* 4 (1988), 338–9. Buschmann (op. cit.) favours the earlier date for both Polycarp and the outbreak of Montanism—which M. (p. 166) puts 'about 170', citing Jerome, *De viris ill.* 40, 53, for Tertullian writing a refutation of Apollonius' anti-Montanist work, itself written 'forty years after Montanus first appeared' (Eus. *HE* 5.18.12). This presupposes that Apollonius wrote shortly before Tertullian, sc. c. A.D. 210. But it might have taken some time before Tertullian saw a copy; Apollonius could have written in the 190s. Questions of date aside, M. presents a useful discussion, and goes on to deal at length with Justin and Lyon (p. 245 he evidently accepts the late tradition that there were 48 martyrs, overlooking G. W. Bowersock's demonstration, in *Les martyrs de Lyon* [Paris, 1978], pp. 249–54, which is in his bibliography, that the extra names not in Eusebius were invented). He seems to favour the theory of J. H. Oliver and R. E. A. Palmer, *Hesperia* 24 (1955), 320–49 (often dismissed), that the 'new decrees' against which Melito of Sardis protested (Eus. *HE* 4.26.5) were connected with the *SC de sumptibus gladiatoris minuendis*, and that this *SC* also contributed to the Lyon pogrom. Chapter 5 ends with a sensible discussion of Marcus, *Med.* 11.3, on the Christians. All in all, there is much of interest for historians of religion here.

*Vindolanda Museum*

A. R. BIRLEY

## EPIGRAPHY AND THE SECOND SOPHISTIC

B. PUECH: *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale*. Preface by L. Pernot. (Textes et Traditions 4.) Pp. xiv + 588, maps. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 2002. Paper €46.50. ISBN: 2-7116-1573-1.

If we had no Philostratus, would we have a Second Sophistic? We would certainly not have the name, and some scholars have thought the whole concept either illusory, or at best a 'bubble'. In this question, the material remains have played a large part; indeed, archaeologists in the broad sense, e.g. Rudolf Münsterberg in numismatics and Josef Keil in epigraphy and iconography, kept the subject alive before it was resuscitated in the 1960s with Glen Bowersock's fundamental study, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*.

Bernadette Puech begins with a tribute to that book, and her own is in a sense a study of the ways in which epigraphy illuminates not only the Second Sophistic, but

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

the whole phenomenon of public rhetoric in the imperial and late antique periods. She has already contributed an indispensable prosopography of the friends of Plutarch to *Aufstieg und Niedergang*, and also many notices to the ongoing *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*. The present volume is no less full, accurate, and serviceable.

After a preface by Laurent Pernot, the introduction discusses ‘the orators in the inscriptions’. Here P. asks what kind of difference is to be expected between the epigraphic texts and the literary ones, especially Philostratus’ *Lives of the Sophists*. The inscriptions certainly illuminate many of the author’s subjects, notably Herodes Atticus, but in general their interest lies in showing, geographically, the spread of ‘sophistic’ outside the areas interesting to Philostratus (mainly Asia and Achaëa) and, socially, its penetration to levels below those that concern the biographer: thus Ptolemaios of Alexandria, who died at age twenty (no. 230), can never have been a star.

P. includes inscriptions and coins, from the reign of Augustus to late antiquity, that mention persons (usually but not always male) in one of three ways: (i) as a *rhêtôr* or *sophistês*, (ii) as notable for their *logoi*, or (iii) without such qualification but included in Philostratus’ *Lives of the Sophists*. She omits Herodes Atticus, as having been fully dealt with in Walter Ameling’s *Herodes Atticus* of 1983. The second criterion in particular might be questioned, since philosophers as well are associated with *logoi* (cf. Apollonius of Tyana, *Ep.* 44.1). In addition, P. follows Pernot in holding that there was ‘an insurmountable barrier’ between those who competed in encomiastic contests at Greek *agônes* and true orators, and hence she excludes persons known only from victory lists in such contests. Certainly, these people are very often *paides*, but many are certainly adult, for example, at the Caesarea of Corinth and the Mouseia of Thespieae, and the interest shown by such authors as ‘Menander’ and the pseudo-Dionysius in encomium shows that it was an essential part of the sophist’s equipment. Its absence from this book is all the more regrettable in that Louis Robert long ago noted the close connection between the emperors and the appearance of encomium in the program of ‘thymelic’ contests (*Études épigraphiques et philologiques* [Paris, 1938], pp. 3–30).

P. arranges the catalogue alphabetically by name or (in the case of Roman citizens) *cognomen*. For each inscription, she gives a full lemma ordered ‘genetically’, that is, with original editions preceding derivative ones, and thereafter a select bibliography. She translates all the texts and discusses them very fully, giving the lion’s share to chronology and prosopography. Omissions are extremely few, and one is all the more regrettable since it corroborates one of P.’s points, that there is no need to infer from the lack of inscriptions a decline of sophistic in the later third century (p. 7). This is the rhetor M. Aurelius Torquatus of Trebenna in Lycia, who is attested about 278. He has long been known (*Année épigraphique* [1915], 53), and a recent discovery reveals the carefully written ‘law’ that he set up on his family’s heroon (*ZPE* 142 [2003], 131–3).

In separate sections, at the end, P. treats inscriptions of students and related material. In this part, she includes two examples of rhetoric on stone: the decree of consolation for a student from Claudiopolis in Bithynia (no. 278) and the interesting speech of thanks from fourth- or fifth-century Ephesus (no. 280). She might also have given at least a glance to other decrees of the imperial period that show the influence of contemporary rhetoric, especially encomium, for example, the decree of Assos on the accession of Caligula (*SIG* 797). And Nero’s celebrated speech at the Isthmus of Corinth in 67, together with the decree of his high-priest at Acraephiae (*SIG* 814; Smallwood, *Documents of Gaius, Claudius and Nero* no. 64), are both in their ways examples of Greek rhetoric on stone.

The book ends with a discussion of particular problems, and very full bibliography and indexes. (I think that P. is mistaken [pp. 502–3] to contest the widespread view that

Aelius Aristides is the author of the poem published by Ch. Habicht as *Inscriptiones des Asklepieions* no. 145.) There are also several useful maps, showing the distribution of the sophists' places of origin, and also very thorough indexes. The book will be the essential point of departure for future work on the epigraphy of imperial and late antique rhetoric. Philostratus' view of the Second Sophistic was limited, not because he was looking at a bubble or a mirage, but because he chose only to describe the top of a very tall and broad pyramid. Its base extended not only beyond the space he allowed, both geographically and socially, but also in time back into the Hellenistic period and forward into late antiquity. P.'s book brings its outlines into clear focus.

*Harvard University*

CHRISTOPHER JONES

## ROMAN HOUSES

S. P. ELLIS: *Roman Housing*. Pp. viii + 224, map, ill., pls. London: Duckworth, 2002 (first published 2000). Paper, £16.99. ISBN: 0-7156-3196-9.

In the last ten years, Simon Ellis has contributed much to the growing volume of scholarship on housing and the use of domestic space in the Roman world. His numerous articles on Roman houses and villas, especially on late antique houses in the Roman East and in Britain, have offered new insights into questions of design and function in Roman domestic architecture. Here, in useful fashion, E. brings together many of his earlier arguments about Roman housing into a compact single volume which aims, ambitiously, to offer 'the first empire-wide, overall introduction to Roman housing, covering all provinces and all social classes, from the origins of Rome to the sixth century A.D.' (p. 2). With such broad parameters, it is not surprising to find that the treatment of the various topics covered by the individual chapters—town and country, furniture, interior decoration, household—is not equally rigorous. Some of the chapters offer little more than a survey of the standard literature on the topic (this is particularly the case in Chapter 5, dealing with furniture), while others contain critical and up-to-date discussions of important housing issues, such as the articulation of interior space (Chapter 6) and the fate of the peristyle house (Chapter 3).

One of E.'s primary interests here is to point out 'empire-wide' developments in Roman housing and to identify features of domestic architecture which typify 'Roman' house design across a broad area. As a result, considerable emphasis is put on the idea of a 'universal' model of élite housing which was adopted 'willingly and enthusiastically' (p. 182) by provincial aristocracies throughout the Roman world. To support this argument, E. collects together a vast assortment of archaeological evidence, drawn from many parts of the Roman empire and from many centuries of Roman occupation. These data are then used liberally to illustrate broad themes and arguments about 'typical' Roman houses and their decoration. At times, this makes for difficult reading. In Chapter 3, the discussion moves with alarming rapidity between Syrian villages, Celtic homesteads, and Ostian apartments. In Chapter 4, the use of houses for 'cult purposes' is illustrated by reference to distinctly different types of buildings in Italy, Libya, and Britain. While such comparisons may well have value, at a time when the emphasis in Roman studies is shifting increasingly towards the recognition of strong regional and provincial identities, this 'unitary' approach by E. may strike some as oddly out of place.

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved