

suggestions is that the tremendous growth of trade with India in the Augustan period was occasioned by the availability of money, coming in from the rich spoils acquired from the conquest of Egypt, and the Spanish and Illyrian wars, that required investment. The formation of new political powers in South India was another factor that facilitated the growth of Indian trade in the first century CE. One may ask what W.'s analysis of the Roman economy and Indian trade has to do with the subject of the frontiers. One possible answer is that it helps him to show that the frontiers were zones of symbiotic exchange. And indeed, W.'s aim is to present an updated view of Rome beyond the imperial frontiers, particularly in relation to India (20), and this allows him to look at the frontiers from a different perspective.

Chap. 9 is an admirable survey of European perceptions of the frontiers of the Roman Empire and the changes they underwent from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries. Two main views may be distinguished: the first argues that natural frontiers reinforced by fortresses or by artificial ramparts constituted the defense of the empire and became moral barriers of exclusion between civilization and barbarism; the second, that natural frontiers did not exist but were, according to one view, conventions imposed by the strong on the weak. They were zones, not lines, and were defined, according to another view, by language and race, not by territory. The once accepted relevance of the experience of the Roman Empire to modern political realities began to be contested in the nineteenth century. Modern realities, in turn, have transformed the orthodox perception of the Roman frontiers. The attack upon the existence of natural frontiers is supported, according to W., by archaeology which shows that they neither restrained expansion nor constituted defensive barriers, but were lines of communications and supply. Ultimately, W. raises the possibility that with the diminishing role of the nation-state, the very concept of territoriality and frontiers is also out of date.<sup>15</sup> Even in Europe this trend encounters difficulties and does not operate everywhere; as to the other parts of the world, his suggestion seems to be wishful thinking rather than a realistic assessment.

Lucidly written, the book abounds in insightful observations and thoughtful interpretations, even if they are provocative and controversial at times. W. is erudite and keeps abreast of most recent publications, and his approach is often oriented towards contemporary issues. All these make the book fascinating and instructive reading.

Mistakes and misprints are very rare, but note the following: Cicero's statement in the Third Philippic on Antony's deeds in 43 is quoted as an account of the Perusine war of 40 BCE (131), Pliny the Elder is described as a Roman admiral who died in 70 CE (155), on ix one should read P. Erdkamp, on 53 the correct date of the Alan settlement is 442 CE, and on 188 the right reading is Königsberg.

Israel Shatzman

Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Emma Dench, *Romulus' Asylum: Roman identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. 12 + 442 pages. ISBN 0-19-815051-2.

P.A. Brunt meets Monica Ali: this is a wide-ranging book, exhilarating and exasperating by turns. 'Roman self-perception as well as more recent perceptions of Roman identity', as D(ench) herself defines the topic. The Romans, that is, as perceived then, and now, by friends, and by foes, and by themselves, in terms of definitions, outlook and stories (or myths), allowing for historical and generic change, in terms of ancient perceptions or post-imperialist critiques. It is greatly to D.'s credit that she will tackle anything and anyone, from interracial hypocrisy in New Labour Britain, to Josephus (on whom I leave her competence to competent judges). Her readiness to be side-tracked is perhaps even greater than the reviewer's own and I would only urge her to address the

<sup>15</sup> W. follows here B. Badie, *La fin des territoires. Essai sur le désordre international et sur l'utilité sociale du respect*, Paris, 1995.

argument that India did much both to civilise Britain (cf. W. Dalrymple, *The White Mughals* for some detail, on, e.g., shampoo) and also in some sense to corrupt her (cf. Thackeray's portrait of the ex-nabob, Jos Sedley). Greece was defeated by Rome militarily, then comprehensively defeated her conqueror culturally (Horace, of course, D., 324); Troy was defeated by Greece, militarily, once, and then made a very thorough job of conquering *her* conqueror (cf. my n. on Virgil, *Aen.* 7.295, 11.282-92).

D.'s insistence on following Roman perceptions of identity and diversity in all detail is highly commendable: pigmentation, religion, accent, culture and dress are of parallel importance; any apparently trivial detail has the potential to be analysed, often most rewardingly, into crucial significance, though D. underestimates the moral significance of trousers (cf. my n. on *Aen.* 7.167, 11.769, with ample bibliography, and some thoughts on their moral and national significance). The 'Contents' page is miserably ungenerous; even the bare list of chapter subdivisions — and D.'s chapters are very long — would give some idea of the book's rich and varied contents (of which I am not about to provide a systematic account); the index, however, makes entertaining reading, though trousers have to be sought s.v. clothing. A book, in short, about *Romanitas*, a term D. does not shun.

Even an author so passionately embedded in the 'multi-culti' Britain of today sees quite correctly that the elder Cato created much of the myth of Roman identity in his own words and deeds: fr. 128 Malc. of Cato's *De suis virtutibus contra L. Thermum* contrives to be a key text both for the moral virtue of farming and the notion that anything is better if it is Sabine. We would agree, though, that about Cato there is much more to be said; even a book on Cato as myth would rest on ample material. And while the idea of the Alps as Italy's wall is simply Catonian (*Orig.* fr. 85P), we might suggest that the idea of 'lo stivale', the whole boot, as a unity was in fact created by the boots of Hannibal's armies, who traversed it from end to end and were finally driven forth; D. nowhere refers to Hannibal.

It would have helped greatly if there had, though, been more summaries of where the argument was going to be leading: a lot of the time, the texts, literary and epigraphic, to which D. is commendably, though imprecisely, loyal run, let us say, from East to West; if D.'s argument at a given stage is running from North to South, you are in for a long and tiring read. More help was called for. That said, the reader of this review would be right, pretty much, in thinking me interested, amused, stimulated and occasionally vexed. But this book is also significant, and depressing, as a symbol of what OUP now issues as a work of classical scholarship: younger classicists thinking, even dreaming, of publishing with Oxford should take note that they will be edited badly, if at all, if D.'s text is anything to go by. Errors of grammar, syntax and even, not infrequently, English spelling, misprints in all languages, Latin mistranslated, references in the footnotes not resolved in the bibliography (D. used the Cambridge / Harvard system), inconsistent references and forms of citation are likely to be let through by the bushel. Modern slang may be thought part of D.'s authorial *persona*, and may be thought to contribute to a bright, contemporary image: Heaven help a foreign reader trying to come to terms with 'glide' (a favourite term) and 'spin' (perhaps more familiar from the newspapers). Obscurity does result. Indeed, let me offer a very brief syllabus of the sort of thing that has provoked these Jeremiahs:

D. does not know the word 'calque' (*Bedeutungslehnewort, calco semantico*); she knows the phenomenon is not translation, but at 272, 299 needs the right word; a textual emendation should not be called an amendment (341, n. 130); at Cat. 39.11, the case that Cat. did *not* write *pinguis Umber* is very weak, not that that discourages D., who did not take sound advice. At 229 D. suggests that T. Frank's use of 'Orientals' (1920) reflects Lat. *Asiatici / Orientes. Orientales*, surely, but that is not a word actually used as D. supposes before the *SHA*. At 15f. she suggests that *faex* may be rendered 'dregs', 'rubbish', 'excrement', and plunges elsewhere for 'crap' (3, 109, 436). That is, well, simply rubbish, as a glance at *TLL / OLD* would confirm: *faex* signifies the impurities at the bottom of a dish, bottle, or cask, whence any sort of low impurity, whether literal or in

the state. Defecation does not enter into it. D.'s use of the single inverted comma is bizarre and exasperating. Cato's *Origines* survive in fragments (168), not 'fragments'; there is nothing in their survival that merits the editorial nudge, for Cameron's recent assault on the excerpts / abbreviations in *OGR* is hardly in mind here. 'Septuagint', even (311), as though the title were not as old as Ps.-Aristeas; cf. 298, 300, 304, 306, 346 for more; the exact distinction between Cicero and 'Cicero' entirely escapes me.

A risk of the Cambridge / Harvard system of references is that if you are not rigorously methodical you people your pages with ghosts: thus B. Campbell at D., 72 is a wandering ghost, for there is no reference to Campbell in *JRS* 1987, and since there is no reference in the bibliography to *L'Italie d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (*Coll. EFR* 198, 1994), all the contributions to that useful collection which D. cites are unreferenced. At 131 D. refers to the 'decimation' of Italy in the civil wars (cf. Brunt, *Italian Manpower*, 285ff.); though D. is a Roman historian, this is presumably a non-literal extension of the 'vulgar' use of 'decimate' in the sense of 'almost wipe out'. *Caveat lector*.

At this point it will come as no surprise that there are no proper, solid, traditional footnotes in the entire book, citing as they should the most important ancient evidence and the best modern discussions (which may be of the 1870's, while last year's colloquium paper may well be perfectly useless). There is a clearly marked disinclination (however explained) to cite older articles and manuals in German. The explanation of (difficult, epigraphic) *Laurentes Lavinates* is not to be sought in Ogilvie's *Livy* (202); by 1970 or so, Ogilvie himself was only too glad to leave that sort of problem to the reviewer and D. would find the discussion she perhaps needed in the *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* s.v. *Laurentes*. The interesting and unfamiliar material on the display of physical freaks (281ff.) seems unlikely to derive from the old manual discussions by Blümner and Marquardt, or (better) from Becker-Göll, *Gallus*. Presumably a reference to R. Garland, *The Eye of the Beholder* (1995) dematerialised at some point. But I resist the temptation to indulge in a display of competitive bibliography; except when it comes to racial insults and slurs, for which we have not only an excellent German survey (I. Opelt, *Die lat. Schimpfwörter*, 1965), but now A. Corbeill's thoughtful *Controlling Laughter* (1996).

As was to be expected, given D.'s admirable rules of evidence, Virgil was going to be important; she is right to sense that there is a great deal of serious, Augustan thought on major public / political issues in the poems (194, 213f., etc.); odd that she does not cite E. Adler, *Vergil's Empire; Political Thought in the Aeneid* (2003), but then D. is altogether shackled by the notions of political correctness that have dominated Virgilian studies for — let us be generous — forty years. For *G.*, she has used R. Thomas (195), for *Aen.*, largely Feeney and Lyne (103, n. 26): clearly many readers will share both the ideological standpoint that such reading presupposes and the conclusions to which it will inevitably lead. On, for example, the 'Trojan invasion of Italy' (D., 213) and the 'higher settlement' reached by Jupiter and Juno in bk. 12, D. could as well have consulted Adler, 184ff., V. Buchheit, *Sendung Roms* (1963), H.J. Schweizer, *Vergil und Italien* (1967), not to mention the reviewer, in *Vergilius* 1989, *et alibi* (e.g. on *Aen.* 7.38 for the 'ethics' of invading Italy). And it is odd, when she realises that clothing in *Aen.* is of such 'racial' importance, that she is satisfied with a miserable, amateur summary of 1994 (see 276), when there is such ample discussion at hand, not quite all of it by the reviewer (*supra*). D.'s 'frilly frocks' (as worn by the Trojans in *Aen.*; see 277) I can see is alliterative, but I am not familiar with the actual Latin (let alone Virgilian, hexametric Latin) for such foreign flounces.

There is a complex sub-plot in *Aen.*, by which only an outsider can marry Lavinia, and only an outsider can lead the Etruscan forces; the word used, *externus* (cf. *advena*, *alienus*), is enticingly flexible, and evidently this sub-plot is related to the story of (e.g.) the Sabine and Etruscan kings of Rome. This motif of *externi duces* was recently discussed (*Riv. Fil.* 119 [1991], 188ff.; cf. my n. on 7.424) and D.'s silence is unexpected. Odd that she is not interested, either, in the spread of 'Trojan origins' to remote corners of the Roman empire in the West (at e.g. 199; cf. my n. on *Aen.*

3.502 for some evidence). Mus. Naz. Napoli inv. 9089 illustrates Anchises not with a gambling board, but with a dice-box (clearly visible, J.P. Cèbe, *Caricature et parodie* pl. 19.1; cf. his discussion, 369f.). What about the detailed portrait of the negress at work on a smallholding in early imperial Italy (*Moretum*), if the location is Italy (cf. *CM* 52 [2001], 303ff.)? D. is also curiously reluctant to engage with Horace's Italy (on which there seemed once a fair bit to be said); farming, hard work, the Sabine countryside, the virtuous *contadino* are all useful myths, a bit less mythical than the story of Aeneas, and of fundamental importance when you are writing *inter alia*, and some of the time at least, about moral and national renewal in *G*.

But we need to be very clear: D. is sometimes extremely amusing, she has a startlingly wide range, she makes the reasonably attentive reader think, a lot, she is highly intelligent (of course — 38 — she is right to remark on the Persian/Seleucid tradition behind *Res Gestae*; add Nemrud Dagħ, if you will), she is independent: Romanisation of Italy here altogether without its usual tedious teleological trappings ('Romanisation was good; therefore it was carried out; Mazzini and co. only realised anew what the Romans had brought about': see D., 168) and she has an excellent nose for the obscure and significant detail: the state as elephant with the sage (*prudens*) as mahout is Ciceronian (*Rep.* 2.67; D., 59) and deserves a wider immortality. Note (e.g.) tactical changes of dress by Roman citizens during the Mithridatic Wars (from Athen., D., 278f.) or (D., 291, after Phrynichus) the figurines in tradesmen's booths, to avert the evil eye.

There is unusual and welcome theory here too: what Roman writers perceive and record is, as it stands, good raw evidence for states of mind; to D.'s sort of approach, as evidence no less valuable than 'institutional structures': it is good to see Petr. *Cena* enshrined alongside Mommsen *StR*. No serious Hellenist or Latinist seems to have been asked to read D.'s text, slowly and with care, and no publisher today was going to do the small-scale work for her. The serious flaws of detail that I have indicated are signs, one very much hopes, of naiveté, flawed training or haste, rather than actual contempt for good technique. There is still hope: readers of D., who have struggled, often enraged, to page 368 actually deserve (and perhaps not from OUP next time, please) the very good book that they thought they were going to get (and nearly got) this time. So thoughtful and passionate a study of Roman tolerance and prejudice towards 'them' (and 'them' is, over the ages, a strange and multiform beast), on the principle *fabula de te / narratur*, has evident contemporary relevance and for that reason alone, flaws and all, lays claim to wide and thoughtful consideration among the public of *SCI*.

Nicholas Horsfall

Dalnacroich, Wester Ross

J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, *Decline and Change in Late Antiquity: Religion, Barbarians and their Historiography*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006. xiv + 352 pages. ISBN 0-860-78990-X.

Despite retiring in 1992 from Nottingham University in England, Liebeschuetz continues to publish excellent work. A career total (to date) is five books (*Antioch; Continuity and Change in Roman Religion; Barbarians and Bishops; The Decline and Fall of the Roman City; Ambrose of Milan*) and an earlier Ashgate collection of articles, *From Diocletian to the Arab Conquests: Change in the Late Roman Empire* (1990). This volume contains a further 17 articles, divided into four sections, on Historiography, Religion, Barbarian Settlement, and Late Antiquity, covering areas of interest to L. As is usual with Ashgate volumes, there is an introduction and an index, but no attempt to create any coherence between the reprinted papers (all previously published). Original pagination is retained.

Reviewing such a volume is difficult, since its main value is in providing access to scattered materials in a single volume. The value of these reprints, indisputable a decade ago, is now under challenge from the rapid development of electronic access to periodical literature. This does not