Gradually, Augustus toned down and modified its content to reflect the *Lex Julia de maritandis ordinibus* recorded in 18 B.C.

The second half of the work documents the literary and epigraphic evidence to support the author's claims. V. has collected a total of 123 excerpts from Latin and Greek sources, as well as his own translations in Italian. Following each translation, a parenthetical reference guides the reader back to part one of the book where V. quotes the citation in question. Each author or epigraphic source comes with a brief biographical and contextual discussion of the material. For inscriptions the author has opted to omit editorial conventions for uncertain or fragmentary readings (e.g. *Res Gestae* or the *Tabula Larinas*). He also provides a select up-to-date bibliography at the end of the work that covers monographs on Augustus, as well as Augustan Roman law and social history.

Problems with this useful resource are few. As far as content goes, those who may have an interest in the ramifications that the marriage laws had on the freed slave will not find much information here (pp. 16, 24–25). This work focuses primarily on the house of Augustus. There are a few editorial quibbles. Unfortunately, there is no index of terms, subjects, or proper names to help the reader look up pertinent topics of interest. Sometimes a parenthetical reference is inserted into the text, yet there is no complete citation in the select bibliography (e.g. M. R. Gale, 1997, p. 15). In places, accent marks curiously appear on Latin legal terms (e.g. *bona cadúca*, *delàtor*, p. 17).

University of Calgary LISA A. HUGHES

EMPEROR WORSHIP

I. GRADEL: *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*. Pp. xvii + 398, maps, ills. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002. Cased, £55. ISBN: 0-19-815275-2.

This is an important book in an essential area of Roman religion and politics. It is audacious and innovative, putting forward a straightforward but highly contentious theory: emperor worship in the city of Rome was perfectly in keeping with tradition. This is a bold step away from much of current discussion on emperor worship. Gradel's model is as simple as it is controversial: 'the man–god divide in the pagan context could also be taken to reflect a distinction in *status* between the respective beings, rather than a distinction between their respective natures' (p. 26). The question, as G. succinctly puts it, is one not of 'zoology', but of gradation within one 'species'. Worship was not given to honour divine nature, but to placate those who were of importance for the Roman state.

If G. is right, it changes the ground significantly. It was not because the concept of worshipping humans was abhorrent to the Roman mind that nobody was so honoured in the Republic, but simply because nobody was sufficiently important to warrant worship in the public sphere (Chapter 2). The only exception was the triumph—a leftover from an era in which kings did rule supreme (p. 35). Here G. chooses to ignore a relevant detail: the slave who went with the 'triumphator' reminded him: 'respice post te, hominem te esse memento' (Tert. *Apol.* 33.4). If the problem is not *being* a god, why then this reminder? Perhaps the answer is given in the emphasis G. places on the state cult. '*Publica sacra* . . . covers cults performed on behalf of the whole individual city . . . by city magistrates at city expense . . . In the case of Rome, such cults may be termed state cults or collectively the "state cult" ' (pp. 9–10). State cult was not given to

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.426 Published online by Cambridge University Press

individuals in the Republic, and perhaps generals needed reminding during their triumph. The only individual to receive 'state cult' was Caesar.

Disregarding much modern literature on the subject, G. points out convincingly that ancient evidence shows Caesar receiving from the Senate a temple, priest, and the title of Divus Julius (Chapter 3). These showed his supreme status—whether Caesar 'was a god in an absolute sense . . . was simply irrelevant' (p. 72). But 'state cult' disclosed Caesar's dominance, which led to his assassination and formed a warning to his successors.

Much of the rest of the book is dedicated to showing that further emperors did not receive 'state cult'. They received divine honours, like any powerful individual, but the emperor 'could become a state god only after he had left this world' (p. 161). G. demonstrates the popularity of emperor worship 'beyond Rome' (Chapter 4). Civic worship of the emperor was abundant, whatever Dio 51.20.6–8 says. The analysis of epigraphic material and G.'s confutation of Lily Ross Taylor's classic *Genius*-theory (*The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* [1931]) leave little doubt that imperial cult existed unproblematic in Italy. Dio is either wrong or mainly claimed 'that no emperor had dared to establish a cult of himself, which functioned on behalf of Italy' (p. 76). If, then, divine worship was a normal reaction in Italy, 'the problem of interpretation is shifted . . . to the sphere where emperor worship was not to be found . . . namely that of the state cult in Rome' (p. 102).

The analysis of imperial behaviour towards 'state cult' is set out in Chapters 5 and 6 ('The Augustan Settlement' and 'The Augustan Heritage'). G. points out that the famous statements in Suet. *Aug*. 52 and Dio 51.20.6–8, often used as evidence by scholars who argue 'almost to the point of a mantra, that there was no imperial cult, no divine worship of Augustus, in Rome in his lifetime' (p. 110), make a legal point, and only say that Augustus was never voted a temple. This may well be right, but G. treads a fine line when he argues that Tacitus' statement that 'worshippers of Augustus ('cultores Augusti') were maintained in all the great houses' in A.D. 15 (Tac. *Ann*. 1.73) must mean that 'this reflects conditions in his later years as well' (p. 110). His argument that 'such widespread establishment . . . since Augustus' death seems inconceivable' is unconvincing, and the further point that Augustus is not styled 'divus', 'so the associations must date from his lifetime' (p. 204 n. 17) fails to take into account that only a few paragraphs later (Tac. *Ann*. 1.77) the inhabitants of Tarraco were granted the right to build a 'templum Augusto'. Still, the passage is put into a further context in Chapters 8 and 9 (pp. 198–233), in which G. amply illustrates that there was private worship of the emperor in Rome.

The Augustan political settlements were mirrored in the religious ones. The power of the emperor was clear, but hidden behind a constitutional façade. Thus, Augustus' reorganization of the *Lares Compitales* in 7 B.C. according to G. only shows 'the tight shutters between the servile, popular level of the compital cults, and the constitutional level of the state cult' (p. 130), since only the 'Laribus augustis' were mentioned, not the 'Laribus publicis'. The emperor was never explicitly worshipped by the state as a whole. G. argues that this absence of 'state cult' continued throughout the principate. Divine aspirations of 'mad emperors', like Gaius, Domitian, and Commodus, resulted in private cults 'which had no consequences for [their] place in the formal "constitution" of the Roman state' (p. 159). Even if G. is right from a legal point of view, one wonders to whom that mattered. Was it important that Gaius' temple was paid for privately, when all priests were members of the imperial family or senators (p. 153)? Did people realize that when senators awarded Commodus the official title 'Hercules Romanus' they did not grant him 'state worship' (p.161)?

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.426 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Short chapters on the Emperor's 'Genius' (Chapter 7), 'Numen' (Chapter 10), and a local parallel to developments in the capital (Chapter 11) precede the final chapter of the book. With a length of 110 pages, this chapter almost forms a monograph in itself. In it, the 'state apotheosis of dead emperors' is placed in 'the same context as that of worship of the living ruler' (p. 369). Again, there is much of value here. G. places apotheosis in a system of mutual obligation, in which being declared a god was a reward for being a good emperor. Attention to detail and use of a wide range of evidence characterize this chapter, and the book as a whole. Ultimately, the confusion and fluidity following from the notion of relative divinity (p. 302: 'if the reader is at this stage confused and fed up with the argument, this is exactly my point') seem more convincing than the clear boundaries between 'state cult' and wider worship. That does not make the argument less challenging and interesting.

It should be noted that G. has not incorporated modern literature published after 1998. This is a pity, but it would be unfair to end this review on a negative note. G.'s book will give rise to dispute and new ideas. For that, it is to be recommended. This is a highly original contribution to the study of Roman religion. It should be read.

Merton College, Oxford OLIVIER HEKSTER

THE SYNAGOGUE AT OSTIA

B. Olsen, D. Mitternacht, O. Brandt (edd.): *The Synagogue of Ancient Ostia and the Jews of Rome. Interdisciplinary Studies*. Pp. 202, ills. Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag, 2001. Paper. ISBN: 91-7042-165-X.

This book is the first fruits of a project on 'The Ancient Synagogue: Birthplace of Two World Religions' at the University of Lund. It includes some very important work on the synagogue of Ostia, which is what this review will concentrate on; the articles on the Jews of Rome summarize the state of research without adding much that is new.

The longest and by far the most significant article is Anders Runesson, 'The Synagogue at Ancient Ostia: The Building and its History from the First to the Fifth Century'. This represents the most thorough synthesis so far of all the published material on the synagogue, together with R.'s own observations from the site. The synagogue was first excavated in 1961. The excavator, Maria Floriani Squarciapino, is credited with reading R.'s manuscript, and it is frequently stated that the article is intended to serve as a stopgap until the appearance of her final report. R. notes that this was expected to appear 'soon' in 1972, and that he was told that she was still working on it in 1998. Her most recent publication (in J.-P. Descoeudres [ed.], *Ostia, port et porte de la Rome antique* [Geneva, 2001], pp. 272–7) makes no reference to it, so it can probably be assumed that R.'s will remain the definitive work for the foreseeable future. R. is able to correct a number of mistakes and misunderstandings in the publications of L. Michael White, who has recently been the most prolific writer on the synagogue. There has been an ongoing debate between him and R. in *Harvard Theological Review*, and Floriani Squarciapino's new article largely endorses R.'s views.

R. argues that the synagogue was purpose-built in the second half of the first century A.D., rather than being converted from a private house, and that the adjacent

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.426 Published online by Cambridge University Press