on a citizen's religious duties, on virtue and literary culture; a proximity that functioned partly as a challenge, partly as a gesture of imitation and dependence. Its assertion of difference never undermined its openness to collaboration. Displacement never disguised compatibility. Even the heroism of the martyr foreshadowed debate (after Constantine) about the appropriate relationship between the religious and the secular.

So, what were the differences? What set Christianity apart from other 'elective cults'? Self-sacrifice counted for most, the author thinks: a readiness to die for one's beliefs, and a readiness (in varying degrees) to 'give to the destitute'. The notion of 'philosophy', of commitment to a moral régime, was also more broadly defined—not least because of Christianity's greater attachment to a large corpus of religious texts. Christian philosophers were also more subtle (the author argues) in their attention to 'thoughts', to distracting emotions and consuming desires, which traditional men of virtue had been more eager to ignore than to resolve.

More pages are devoted here to those convictions than to theology in any narrow sense. The author believes that 'orthodoxy' was defined, at least in part, by people's readiness to concern themselves with the spiritual well-being of others—although she presents a convincing argument that 'orthodoxy', as eventually defined, was essential to the maintenance of a coherent salvation narrative; a narrative that described, explained, and preserved a lasting bond between the human and the divine.

And what of Constantine, of the 'triumphant' church? Here, 'difference' was first betrayed in the emperor's interference over the Donatist affair; and the implications were then played out through the century that followed. The resulting stresses within the Christian community (deplored, I may say, as much by bishops as by anchorites) counted for more than any attempt to supplant the old religion.

I value in a book like this a certain detachment from doctrinal strife. Where it falters is in failing to ask how the inner structures of the Christian community supported its expansive and idiosyncratic approach to cosmology, morality, and the intellectual life. There is little here about leadership and authority in the early phases, about the construction and impact of liturgy and art, about dreams, prayers, fears, and the imagination. C. opens her survey with the question, 'How did a tiny, politically suspect, religious splinter group become the dominant religion of the Roman world?' (p. 1). The question is, of course, spot on, and, as we read the book, we can see the process taking place, thanks to the author's breadth, verve, and clarity. But 'how', and certainly 'why', are questions left in the air: C. ends with what purports to be Augustine's opinion: 'religious believers cannot separate themselves from the society of which they are part' (p. 117). Just how seriously, one wonders, did they try?

Catholic University of America PHILIP ROUSSEAU
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni350

PAUL'S WOMEN

B. W. WINTER: *Roman Wives, Roman Widows. The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities*. Pp. xviii + 236. Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003. Paper, US$26, £18.99. ISBN: 0-8028-4971-7.

For many years the Divinity School at Vanderbilt University has maintained a superbly equipped library. There is almost nothing by way of texts, commentaries, or

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni351 Published online by Cambridge University Press

studies of the ancient Christian authors and their cultural context that it has not acquired, or would not purchase upon request. But there are limits to its generosity. The works of the emperor Julian, for example, are relegated to the sparser and scattered Classics collection in the main library. This division signifies of course the wall erected long ago between the professional disciplines of classical studies and religion, a wall that my colleagues at Vanderbilt and elsewhere have done much to undermine in recent years. Bruce Winter, an expert on the writings of St Paul, seeks to build a bridge across this divide with his pioneering and significant new book on wives and widows.

W.'s main concern lies in elucidating four key passages in the Pauline corpus, one from *1 Corinthians* (11:2–16), two from *1 Timothy* (2:9–15 and 5:11–15), and the last from *Titus* (2:3–5: only the first of these epistles is securely attributed to Paul) dealing with these types of women. His method is to deploy in service of this goal the evidence of Latin literature, Roman law, and Stoic and Pythagorean philosophy, as well as recent work in these fields. The book deals with some questions of crucial importance, of which two rank foremost. Did women in the Roman world have a history? Did the impact of Roman rule in the Greek East extend to sexual mores and family values? W. is certainly correct to assert that such an approach stands to reap benefits for both disciplines. His book illustrates much of the promise, and some of the peril, inherent in this enterprise.

Success in scouting the territory of an alien field depends in part on choosing the right guides. W. resorts to an important article by Phyllis Culham ('Did Roman Women Have an Empire?', in M. Golden, P. Toohey [edd.], *Inventing Ancient Culture: Historicism, Periodization, and the Ancient World* [London, 1997], pp. 192–204) in answering the first question with a resounding affirmative. He shrewdly recognizes that to describe the status of Roman women in the late Republic and early Empire in terms of enslavement or emancipation does scant justice to the evidence. But in his reliance on the idea of the 'New Woman', a modern construct concocted largely out of Latin lyric and elegy by scholars decades ago and still favored by a few, W. in my view risks taking the representation of Roman women for the reality.

The question of Romanization is an even more controversial issue among classicists. And with W.'s argument we are in no way concerned with such familiar themes as the spread of gladiatorial games, the popularity of bath houses, or the use of Latin, but something far more fundamental. It is always refreshing to see the Romans accused of corrupting the Greeks. The notion that Roman morality was no monolith is both sophisticated and persuasive. W. is alert to the fact that Rome's subjects in the East were highly eclectic in their adaptions of Roman culture, in essence 'cherry picking' those features most agreeable to them.

W. might have taken greater care all the same to set forth the how and why of Roman influence on women's status and rôle in the eastern part of the Empire, where Catullus and the elegists are unlikely to have loomed very large. More exploration is needed of both the mechanisms of cultural influence and the reasons behind Greek acceptance of Roman mores, traditional or not. W. leaves unexamined an alternative explanation of moral developments in the eastern and western parts of the Roman world, namely that some at least took place independently of each other. When the author of the pastoral epistle addressed to Titus invokes Epimenides to illustrate the bad character of the Cretans (1:12), this implicitly excludes a theory of Roman influence, at least for the worse. By the same token, the coincidence in some aspects of Roman and Christian morality does not guarantee the strength of the connection that W. wishes to draw between them. Augustus and Paul (and his epigones), for example,

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni351 Published online by Cambridge University Press

present less of a united front against behavior they deemed immoral than at first may appear to be the case.

These criticisms do not mean that W. is entirely incorrect to argue for such influence, only that the picture he draws may need further refinement. His survey in the final chapter of the rôle played by women, especially those from the eastern part of the Empire, in what moderns call the 'public sphere', suggests that this was broader than it might have been but for the Roman presence. This idea certainly merits further exploration.

To an extent various minor errors are to be expected from a scholar who dares to venture forth from the confines of his own field. There are some of these in W.'s book, though they are for the most part inconsequential and will not be noted here. I see little point in compiling a list of bibliography W. has missed. Even specialists have difficulty keeping up with this, despite the fact that the intensive study of women in antiquity is barely three decades old. Granted, the book might have benefited from pre-publication vetting by the right kind of specialist. Classicists might do better in my opinion, however, to focus less on such matters than on the contributions of a book that contains much of interest for them and whose biggest drawback perhaps is that it is sometimes generous to a fault with views that so many of them have expressed.

Vanderbilt University THOMAS A. J. MCGINN
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni351

GRATIAN'S RELIGIOUS POLICIES

V. MESSANA: *La politica religiosa di Graziano.* (SEIA NS 3.) Pp. 101. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1998 [1999]. Paper. ISBN: 88-7689-156-0.

Gratian is not an emperor who usually attracts attention in his own right, but more often lurks in the shadows cast by his more distinguished contemporaries, notably Theodosius I and Ambrose of Milan. The topic of his religious policy, however, is important. He was the first emperor over whom Ambrose sought to wield influence. Moreover, by his rejection of the title *pontifex maximus* and his removal of the altar of Victory from the senatorial *curia* in Rome, he signalled an important change in the attitudes of Christian emperors towards paganism. It is a virtue of M.'s short monograph that it seeks to investigate the topic from Gratian's vantage point. Yet this is a difficult task, given that most of the extant sources tend to focus on individuals other than Gratian. His attitudes and policies must be elucidated from texts written by others, often (as is particularly the case with those penned by Ambrose) with a particular polemical agenda. For all these problems, there is a general consensus among scholars that Gratian's religious policies were characterized at first by tolerance, but later manifested overt hostility towards paganism and the enemies of Nicene orthodoxy. With one important exception, this is a portrait with which M. broadly concurs.

M. begins by establishing the context within which Gratian's religious policies were formed. He identifies the court of Gratian's father Valentinian I as (unsurprisingly) influential, in that its lack of a 'dogmatically motivated ecclesiastical policy' existed

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni351 Published online by Cambridge University Press