

whatever society currently needed ancestors to promote or legitimate. This was not confined to the political domain, but also involved private needs, as is shown in what for me were some of the most interesting articles. In the Athenian funerary monuments discussed by Schmaltz, inscriptions played an important part in attaching new identities to existing, generalized representations of the dead; and in her wide-ranging paper on Etruscan tombs and burial practices, Nielsen shows their importance in constructing genealogies. The central rôle played by ancestors in developing a sense of family identity in Etruscan society is also stressed by Steingraber, writing on images in funerary sculpture and wall-painting. The interaction of private commemorative needs with more public social concerns is nicely illustrated in a trio of papers which show the value attached to ancestor representation in Roman society: Kragelund looks at commemorative portraits of successive generations of an aristocratic Roman family from late Republic to early Empire; D'Ambra explores ways in which the non-élite, by contrast, made up for their lack of imposing ancestors, and discusses how this was met through the appropriation of some aristocratic themes into their funerary art; and Fejfer discusses the relationship between private commemoration and public honours in statues erected in Italian and provincial towns, and changes in this over time.

If social status and manipulation are obvious themes of the book, gender emerges as another persistent concern of many essays as they show how women fitted into the picture. In a paper which directly asks 'Were Women ever "Ancestors" in Republican Rome?' Flower shows that from the second century B.C. certain women had been honoured as *exempla* of patrician behaviour, as 'ancestors'. A similar recognition of women's rôles (not least in ensuring social continuity) may be seen from the Roman empire (see Kragelund) right back, via the fourth century (Jeppesen on Artemisia), to Iron Age Lefkandi (Antonaccio).

The volume is neatly produced and adequately illustrated. Its rather unassuming presentation belies the richness of the subject, to which these papers make an important and readable contribution.

The Open University

JANET HUSKINSON

ROMAN REFLECTIONS

A. K. BOWMAN, H. M. COTTON, M. GOODMAN, S. PRICE (edd.): *Representations of Empire. Rome and the Mediterranean World*. (Proceedings of the British Academy 114.) Pp. xii + 196, maps, ills. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Cased, £19.95. ISBN: 0-19-726276-7.

A useful collection, this, of papers given at a 2000 conference in honour of the sixty-fifth birthday of Fergus Millar, and so serving as a Festschrift, but thankfully free of the sort of bruised and mushy fruit that often gathers at the bottom of honorific volumes. Three major pieces of interest to any ancient historian, accompanied by five narrower essays, gracefully celebrate the outgoing Camden professor.

Of the articles of general interest, Stephen Mitchell's 'In Search of the Pontic Community in Antiquity' offers a generous survey of what is known of the littoral of the Black Sea in ancient times—a region about which recent discoveries (enabled by the collapse of the Soviet Union) have enormously expanded our knowledge—

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

concentrating especially on Hellenistic and Roman Pontus proper, on the north coast of Asia Minor. As usual, Mitchell should be read slowly and luxuriously, for there are many arresting details here and they are not always cried loudly out: under the Romans, for example, inhabitants of Pontus (like the Egyptians) enjoyed an unusual provincial citizenship. And Arrian (Mitchell reminds us) identified an exact boundary to Roman power in this area of the world, displaying a territorial conception of empire that some have denied the Romans possessed.

In ‘Domitian’s Palace on the Palatine and the Imperial Image’, Paul Zanker tackles the enigmatic pile that so astonishes even the scholarly tourist, because it has been so wretchedly served by scholarly publication. Zanker’s palace is the product of contrasting needs: the pinch of security battles with the sumptuous requirements of ceremony, the urge to be grand fights with the need for an audience to witness grandeur, and Domitian’s aloofness struggles with the traditional sociability of the Roman emperor. The palace, Zanker concludes, was designed to leave Domitian elevated and alone—amidst a throng.

More argumentative is Werner Eck’s ‘Imperial Administration and Epigraphy: In Defense of Prosopography’. Peter Brunt, Brian Campbell, and Richard Saller largely killed off, in English-speaking scholarship, the use of prosopography to study Roman government under the empire. But in Germany it lives on, and in this piece Eck tries to salvage what he can from the Anglo-Saxon onslaught, while alerting the complacent to the fact that the controversy over whether the Roman administration had objective standards of merit for appointment and promotion to office (*Beförderungskriterien*) is hardly over. Millar is no friend to a rigid system of explicit rules (*JRS* 53 [1963], 194–200) and so should be pleased that its advocates have been driven back so far: all that Eck can now find is a scattering of informal ‘norms and rules’, the storm of exceptions having forced the prosopographers off their old position that the whole structure was regulation-based, like promotion in a unionized post office. But Millar might be disappointed that Eck seems oblivious to the true nature of the controversy. ‘To deny that this succession of posts was designed to take advantage of experience would be tantamount to accusing the Romans of lack of rationality in building up their administration. And no administration can do without rationality’ (p. 138). But the real question is whether the Roman understanding of merit and experience, and so of ‘rational’ appointment, was the same as ours: and a glance at surviving letters of recommendation shows that it was not. To Eck, an essentially modern, rule-bound, merit-based system of appointment is opposed to appointment by patronage: patronage must work within it. That makes sense in contemporary, but not in Roman, terms: to the Romans, patronage *was* merit.

Of the narrower papers, Peter Garnsey, in ‘Lactantius and Augustine’, argues for the latter’s reliance on the former’s *Divine Institutes*. Daniel R. Schwartz’s ‘Rome and the Jews: Josephus on “Freedom” and “Autonomy”’, is exactly the word-study the title promises. Katherine Clarke, ‘*In Arto et Inglorius Labor: Tacitus’ Anti-history*’, argues that characteristics of the historian’s method (many familiar) render him a method-obsessed, self-referential ‘anti-historian’. No doubt it is entirely by accident that Tacitus’ doubts and preoccupations turn out to be exactly those of the more theoretically minded members of Clarke’s own profession in 2000. It might have been a kindness to the author for the editors to excuse from this volume Amélie Kuhrt’s ‘Sennacherib’s Siege of Jerusalem’, however warm her feelings for Millar, because readers interested in an admirable source-study of that event in 701 B.C., by a leading student of the Ancient Near East, will hardly know to look for it here. John North’s ‘Introduction: Pursuing Democracy’ starts from Millar’s conception of the Roman

Republic as a democracy, and argues that the Republic's decline can be usefully paralleled in the erosion of academic autonomy in the UK (a cause of Millar's): in both cases, the guileful bosses took over. Other parallels suggest themselves: the USA, for example, where the story is rather that of the lazy surrender of the nasty jobs to the hacks, half unaware that it is in the nasty jobs that power lies. But North's ingenious yoking of Millar's interests honours him indeed.

In total, a strong collection, although we miss papers by the volume's four distinguished editors, which would have made the volume even stronger. Yet bravo to them for arranging publication as a British Academy Centenary Monograph: the volume is sumptuous—one wants to eat the pages—and reasonably priced, at £20. Finally, the photograph of Fergus Millar, looking like the sprightliest of basset hounds, with which the volume opens, and his formidable bibliography, which forms an appendix, make one rail against the bizarre and unjust system of mandatory retirement which casts the most useful of professors out of their chairs at the height of their powers.

University of Virginia

J. E. LENDON

ROMAN RELIGION

J. SCHEID: *An Introduction to Roman Religion*. Translated by J. Lloyd. Pp. viii + 232. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003 (first published as *La Religion des Romains*, 1998). Paper, £14.99 (Cased, £45). ISBN: 0-7486-1608-X (0-7486-1607-1 hbk).

Professor Scheid needs no introduction to scholars of Roman religion. Lady Lloyd's translation of *La religion des Romains* (Paris, 1998) is an opportunity for English-speaking undergraduates to become familiar with the insights of one of the most prestigious scholars working in the field.

The five sections deal with questions of methodology (including terms, concepts, and definitions) relevant to the theory and practice of Roman religion (pp. 5–38); the structures of Roman religion (the calendar, festivals, temples, and other sacred sites) (pp. 41–76); religious rituals (sacrifice, rituals of expiation, and divination) (pp. 79–126); the rôle of priests, gods, and emperor (pp. 129–70); and exegeses and interpretations of Roman religion (pp. 173–91). A series of text boxes highlights specific issues (including modern perspectives on Roman religion; definitions of religion; examples of the decoding of ritual actions and gestures; public and private sacrifices; auguries and auspices; and the public priests under the Republic and the Empire). The chronology (pp. 193–212), table of principal people (pp. 213–15), and glossary (pp. 216–18) are all helpful. The suggestions for further reading (pp. 219–25) are conveniently subdivided, although the array of German, French, English, and Italian titles may be too much to ask of the average undergraduate. Missing from the English text are the useful 'objectifs de connaissance' that appear at the head of each chapter in the French edition.

S. stresses the importance of ritual and sacrifice in the public and daily life of the ancient Roman without suggesting that these religious practices made Roman religion devoid of belief. Alongside the civic practices he sets private religious and divinatory