The second chapter worthy of particular praise is the final one, 'Julia in the Judgement of Posterity'. Here F. discusses Julia's reception in antiquity and modern times, and opens up some very interesting debates. The historical legacy we have of women in antiquity is based largely upon the perception of male writers; often this means we have no conception of a woman such as Julia as a person. F. skilfully uses the evidence to demonstrate how conflicting portraits given of Julia could indicate that political manipulations may have been responsible for her downfall. F. concludes that perhaps Julia's worst offence from birth to death was to have been born a woman, and to have become an 'endangered adult in a conspiratorial court'.

This book is highly recommended for anyone interested in the Augustan period, and will appeal to both scholar and lay-reader. The work encourages the adoption of fresh attitudes and casts fresh light on some important historical issues relating to gender studies.

University of Wales, Lampeter SUSAN SOREK

E. DENCH, *ROMULUS' ASYLUM: ROMAN IDENTITIES FROM THE AGE OF ALEXANDER TO THE AGE OF HADRIAN*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. Pp. xi + 441, illus. ISBN 0-19-815051-2. £60.00.

This book offers an extremely rich exploration of a topic the complexities of which are flagged up by the plural in the main title. The style is discursive and the analysis decidedly open-ended as suggested by the title of the epilogue ('Closure?'). The reader is left in no doubt of the difficulty of generalizing about what it may have meant to be 'Roman' when period, place, and social viewpoint all combined to tell different and sometimes conflicting stories; current debates about 'Britishness' come to mind.

Unsurprisingly, given Dench's earlier work, 'The Idea of Italy' features prominently, but judiciously, as the centrepiece of the five chapters around which D. organizes her theme, preceded by 'Roman Ethnographies' and 'The Character of Roman Citizenship', and followed by 'Flesh and Blood', including a discussion of somatic attitudes, and 'Languages and Literature', which takes Catullus and Josephus as contrasting case-studies. These headings sum up the approach, which reasonably enough concentrates on ancient cultural and political tropes which directly addressed issues of Roman-ness, rather than seeking to characterize 'identity' inferentially from, say, Roman law or samian ware. The approach is inter-disciplinary in the sense that D. is open to the full range of available evidence, including literary production, her handling of which conveys her alertness to the artfulness of the genre, especially poetry. The index includes an entry for 'archaeology', in connection with which D. has some forthright comments on current theoretical approaches of the post-colonialist sort (84–5), but not for 'architecture', although Augustan theatres get a thorough airing in a thoughtful discussion which has wider geographical implications than Italy and the West, to which D. confines it (205–7).

This is not to suggest that Greekness is neglected by D.: inevitably it provides the central pole around which she organizes her treatment of Roman responses to alien cultures over the centuries, and Athens is perceptively analysed in terms of Rome's 'altera ego' (see now F. Dupont and E. Valette-Cagnac (eds), *Façons de parler grec à Rome* (2005), on Roman atticism and its cultural and moral significance). D.'s wide reading (the bibliography covers forty-four pages) gives the text an extremely up-to-date feel and helps account for its density, as room is found to pack in a great deal of *en passant* comment and reflection on the views of modern scholars. Given the 'melting-pot' image which the Romans themselves sometimes deployed in characterizing their origins, D. is unsurprisingly alert to the multi-cultural dimension to her theme. In evoking *Black Athena* both at the beginning and the end (9, 363), she may have mainly had in mind her readership in North America, where Bernal's work had far more impact than, to date, it has had in Europe.

D. is particularly good on what might be called the 'agglutinative' dimension to Roman-ness, its conscious incorporation of new peoples and cultures. This gave rise in the case of the Greeks to an 'imperial style of signalled incorporation', as in the formulation '*Graecus ritus*' and in the whole story of the Roman engagement with Greek culture, nowadays characterized as an asymmetrical appropriation, although as D. reminds us (324), Horace's famous line suggests the hesitation of the Romans themselves on the matter of the Roman capture of, versus conquest by, Greece. With the foundation of the imperial monarchy this cultural signalling became more explicitly political, and helps to explain why Plutarch, himself a Roman citizen, could see the adoption of the culture of the conquered as one of the managerial tools available to ancient rulers.

Although the discussion of Josephus (344–61) is evidence enough of D.'s general breadth of approach, inevitably the perspective of the book tends to favour the view from Rome and Italy, notwithstanding the inclusion of the much-travelled Hadrian in the title. But there is much food for thought here about the impact of imperial incorporation not only on Italy but also further afield, including the East itself. D. emphasizes (90–1) that the Romans themselves saw their own imperial power as 'pro-active' and 'intrusive', a view shared by a number of leading scholars (Paul Zanker for instance) when confronted with the material evidence for 'Romanization', especially under Augustus. D. also stresses the moral focus of Roman identity, especially in the age of recovery from cosmic and social chaos under Augustus.

There is an excellent discussion of early imperial 'reluctance' over grants of citizenship (142–3), where D. rightly sees the parallel with the early imperial 'refusal' of honours. Augustus was held up as a model of rigour in these matters, as on the occasion when he insisted on interviewing personally a Greek candidate for the *civitas* in order to assess his worthiness (258, citing Suet., *Aug.* 40). One would love to know more about the Augustan definition of these *merita*. Given the historiographical challenge of explaining Greek acquiescence in Roman rule, it would be of interest to know whether Greek notables of the Augustan age not only trimmed with the political wind but actually identified with Augustan morality and its stress on piety, family, aristocracy, and ancestral example. The epigraphic, literary, and archaeological data can all be construed as offering an affirmative answer. How far, in other words, did grants of citizenship in early imperial times help to define a class of eastern provincials who embraced a 'Roman' outlook at the moral as well as the political level (if that distinction is valid), quite apart from knowing Latin, the medium by which 'Roman-ness' was mainly communicated linguistically and which was also a qualification for the *civitas* in this period (138, 303–4)?

One approach to the problem is reflection on some of the prosopographical 'blanks' of this period, figures known purely from epigraphy such as the Gnaeus Cornelius Nicatas, Epidaurian Augustan priest of the emperor and a first-generation *civis* whose son, grandson, and great-grandson (Plutarch's dedicatee) all bore the good Latin/Roman *cognomen* 'Pulcher' and on the epigraphic face of it could be 'Roman' as much as 'Greek'. What was at stake here? Another approach is to reflect on Strabo and Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the marked penetration of their thought by the Roman-ness of Augustan Rome.

D. offers one of the most learned, sophisticated, and full discussions of her theme in recent years, and one which, as the above remarks suggest, succeeds admirably in stimulating debate. It will be essential reading for all those interested in the thorny question of 'identity' in antiquity, both 'Roman' and 'Greek'. The inverted commas say it all.

Newcastle University A. J. S. Spawforth

L. M. YARROW, *HISTORIOGRAPHY AT THE END OF THE REPUBLIC: PROVINCIAL PERSPECTIVES ON ROMAN RULE*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. Pp. xiv + 396. ISBN 0-19-927757-0. £65.00.

The writings of intellectuals from the Roman Empire's provincial communities offer an indispensable opportunity to see how members of the provincial élite responded to the coming of Rome and the political changes following Roman hegemony in their local community. At the end of the Republic and the beginning of the early Empire, as Roman influence became ever more pronounced in the Mediterranean basin and in the Hellenized East, provincial historians devoted a still larger part of their attention to the history of Rome and her attempts to enlarge further the empire. Compared to those numerous inscriptions set up to honour locals integrated into the Roman administration — inscriptions which give an impression of a generally favourable attitude towards Roman rule — literary texts written by provincial intellectuals offer a more nuanced understanding of how members of the provincial élite saw and judged Rome as the dominant power. The study of the relationship between provincial intellectuals and Roman rule has mostly been devoted to Greek authors writing in the Second Sophistic, at a time when Roman rule was consolidated in the eastern part of the Empire. Yarrow's book, on provincial historians writing in the last years of the Republican period and the beginning of the early Empire, is therefore a vital contribution to our understanding of how provincial intellectuals responded to Roman rule at a time when the Roman hold, particularly in the eastern part of the Empire, was still fragile. Y.'s choice of the writings of Nicolaus of Damascus, Memnon of Heraclea Pontica, Diodorus, Trogus, Posidonius, and the author of 1 Maccabees is an interesting one: her analysis of how these authors