

V. Mordvintseva's historiographical study of how silver phalerae (roundels, presumably from bridles) came to be associated with an 'Oriental' warrior elite entering the northern Pontic steppes from the third century B.C. Mordvintseva exposes this migration as one of M.I. Rostovtzeff's more fanciful historical constructs, based on questionable inferences from the objects' style and a tendentious interpretation of the sources (notably Diod. Sic. 2.43.6–7). Westward migrations from a mysterious Iranian heartland were a key component of Rostovtzeff's interpretative framework of northern Black Sea archaeology, and his premises remain basically uncontested to this day. Further discussion along these lines could have revealed that northern Black Sea archaeology suffers, if anything, from an inverse form of colonialism which envisages Greek settlements at the periphery of vast, politically integrated steppe empires and tends to exaggerate cultural and spiritual 'influences' from the Orient (*Anabases. Traditions et réception de l'Antiquité* 9 [2009], 185–98 investigates the Rostovtzean origins of this mirror image of western colonialism, now known as Eurasianism).

While I appreciate the wider importance of trans-historical approaches in developing hypotheses, in this collection post-colonial critique has been introduced in such a universalising manner as to risk perpetuating a colonialist disregard for cultural difference and distracting the contributors from the source problem at the core of the subject: how can archaeology enhance our understanding of ancient multiculturalism without replicating the text-based (and in some remote sense 'colonialist') perceptions of ethnicity inherent in the discipline's classificatory systems? Overall, this is one of the most engaging collections on classical archaeology in the Black Sea area available. But given its core of excellent essays on perceptions of (ir)religion at Olbia, I would have preferred a consistent focus on ritual interaction and the formation of elite networks in a cross-cultural context, for which there is ample evidence further east and west along the shores of the Black Sea.

Birkbeck, University of London

CASPAR MEYER
h.meyer@bbk.ac.uk

EARLY IMPERIAL ATHENS

SCHMALZ (G.C.R.) *Augustan and Julio-Claudian Athens. A New Epigraphy and Prosopography. (Mnemosyne Supplementum 302.)* Pp. xvi + 369. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009. Cased, €125, US\$185. ISBN: 978-90-04-17009-4.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X10000806

This book satisfies a major and long-felt research need in the study of early imperial Athens. In the first half S. provides updated commentary and textual revisions for 298 Athenian inscriptions of the period from the battle of Actium to the death of Nero; the second part gives a detailed prosopography of that period. Given that the publication of *IG II²* was completed by 1940 and that the fundamental books of Paul Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste* and *Athènes de Tibère à Trajan*, appeared in 1927 and 1931 respectively, the usefulness of assembling widely scattered information in this way is obvious. The book under review is to be followed by a second volume, *Athens after Actium*, in which S. will provide narrative and discussion for the period. Some questions are impossible to answer before its appearance, in particular whether S. considers the end of the Julio-Claudian period an important

epoch in Athenian history, or whether he uses it merely as a convenient chronological division.

The epigraphic catalogue (pp. 7–225) includes texts that first appeared after the publication of the relevant *IG* fascicules and those texts from the *IG* that stand in need of revision or reinterpretation. The texts that remain unaltered from the *IG* are not catalogued (though most of them are referred to), a decision perhaps justified by considerations of space and cost. The same goes for the decision not to print the texts themselves where no textual corrections are proposed. As a consequence, this volume cannot be used without the original editions. It might have been better to reprint at least the texts which first appeared in journals: not every library will have a complete run of the *SEG* these days, and few people will have it on their desk. The strict separation of ‘commentary’ (incorporating views of earlier scholars) and ‘new analysis’ (incorporating the new suggestions of S. himself) provides clarity, but at times seems repetitive.

The prosopographic catalogue (pp. 227–318) includes the more important Athenians mentioned in the epigraphic sources and the Athenian archons of this period attested by Phlegon of Tralles (*FGrHist* 257 F 36). Foreigners (even archons in Athens, such as C. Carrinas Secundus, the infamous agent of Nero) are omitted. The catalogue is followed by the *fasti* of eponymous archons, hoplite generals and more important priesthoods (pp. 319–25). Somewhat inconveniently, the prosopographic entries are not numbered, and references to epigraphic evidence give original publications only, not the entries in the epigraphic catalogue. Each entry includes *testimonia*, separate discussions of the person’s family and status, and a brief bibliography (references to *LGPN* II and to the *Prosopographia Attica* are given, but strangely not to J.S. Traill, *Persons of Ancient Athens*). In some cases, the *testimonia* section is followed by an epigraphical note (largely repeating the discussion in the epigraphic catalogue). With the exception of Phlegon’s synchronisms of Athenian archons with Roman consuls, literary evidence is not listed in the *testimonia* section, even when it is discussed in the entry (e.g. p. 302, Polycharmus of Marathon).

I have certain reservations about this privileging of Phlegon’s evidence. As S. himself admits (p. 246), the name of the archon Deinophilus (*FGrHist* 257 F 36.22) is likely to be corrupt. Furthermore, S. is led by his placement of the archonship of C. Carrinas Secundus in A.D. 61/2 to move the archonship of Thrasyllus of Cholleidae (attested by Phlegon in the consular year A.D. 61) to 60/61, and thereby to abandon silently the synchronism between Phlegon’s consular dates and the first half of his archon years (e.g. J. Kirchner, *IG* II² 1737; P. Graindor, *Athènes de Tibère à Trajan* [Cairo, 1931], 207). This seems not entirely certain; Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.45, places Secundus’ mission in Greece in A.D. 64, and even if we accept Miriam Griffin’s re-dating of it, as S. does (p. 64), the archonship need not have followed immediately on Secundus’ arrival. If true, however, it should show that Phlegon was not consistently using any synchronism tables, and that his dates are far from being ‘absolute’ (p. 319).

Some observations on particular points. **P. 95 no. 116** (and elsewhere): I remain unconvinced that references to Augustus as *Θεοῦ υἱός* should necessarily date the inscription to the early years of his principate, before his last visit to Athens in 19 B.C. (cf. *IG* IX.ii 40, not earlier than 17 B.C.; *AEph* (1910), 354–61 no. 6, after A.D. 4). This hypothesis leads S. to assume that almost all the dedications to Augustus himself (as opposed to other members of the *domus Augusta*) pre-date 19 B.C., which is implausible. **Pp. 96–7 no. 119; p. 98 no. 123**: S. does not question the

restoration *θεῶι Σεβαστῶι* offered tentatively by the *edd. pr.* in these two inscriptions, which he places early in Augustus' reign. As he admits, it occurs only once more in the corpus of Athenian inscriptions (*IG II²* 3235, not republished here, and probably dedicated after Augustus' death). The restoration does not rest easily with his dating. **Pp. 101–2 no. 130:** the re-dating of the statue of Lucius Caesar (*IG II²* 3251) to after 2 B.C. carries complete conviction and is of some significance for Roman political history. **Pp. 113–14 no. 143:** a convincing re-attribution of *IG II²* 3241 to Julia Livilla, the sister of Gaius, adds another piece of evidence to the history of his reign. **P. 125 no. 155:** the explanation of Nero's title *αὐτοκράτωρ μέγιστος* in the Parthenon inscription as the translation of *princeps optimus* is unconvincing, particularly as the Latin title is not attested for Nero. More consideration should perhaps have been given to the attempt of V.J. Rosivach, *PP* 42 (1987), 277–8, to re-date this inscription to A.D. 67/8, especially since the date of 61/2 has been abandoned for the archonship of Thrasyllus. **P. 186 no. 237:** a legate of senatorial rank sent to advertise imperial adoptions in A.D. 4 seems unlikely. **P. 188 no. 240:** I have doubts concerning Augustan dating, advanced as certain by S.: there is no Vettius Sabinus attested who could be an adoptive father of the honorand, and the family does not otherwise appear in Roman prosopography until much later. The only Augustan Vettius makes a somewhat unpromising appearance in *Macr., Sat.* 2.4.10. The spelling *Ἀρήου* seems indeed to preclude the date in the second century A.D., but why not after the restoration of the proconsular status of Achaia by Claudius (cf. p. 200 no. 256)? **P. 198:** the appearance of the term 'senatorial province' is unfortunate. **P. 199 no. 255:** this inscription in honour of A. Didius Gallus (cf. A.R. Birley, *The Roman Government of Britain* [Oxford, 2005], 31–7) should date after (or, at least, during) his governorship of Britain in A.D. 52–7, rather than from c. A.D. 45.

The book is complemented by epigraphical concordances and detailed indexes. It is beautifully produced and a pleasure to use; misprints seem few and mainly not serious.

The minor criticisms made above should not detract from S.'s achievement. His second, interpretative volume is eagerly awaited.

New College, Oxford

G. KANTOR
georgy.kantor@new.ox.ac.uk

CIVIC LIFE IN THE ROMAN PELOPONNESE

LAFOND (Y.) *La Mémoire des cités dans le Péloponnèse d'époque romaine (IIe siècle avant J.-C. – IIIe siècle après J.-C.)*. Pp. 385, maps. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2006. Paper, €22. ISBN: 978-2-7535-0304-5.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X10000818

Memory and identity in Roman Greece are issues which have been much discussed in recent years, especially in the light of renewed interest in Pausanias' *Periegesis*. Pausanias has traditionally dominated the study of Roman Greece: inscriptions, coins and archaeological remains have all been investigated thoroughly in the context of various commentaries on Pausanias, not least the two series (Budé, Valla) currently in progress. S.E. Alcock in *Graecia Capta* (Cambridge, 1993) pp. 172–5 has pointed out the pitfalls of relying so heavily on one literary source for the interpretation