

peacemaker and realist, and in this *perfectus Epicureus*, as Cicero described Titus Albicius, the first recorded Roman convert to Epicureanism. In the civil war Caesar's principal opponents among Epicureans belonged to the great Roman families, whereas his Epicurean supporters (who generally remained attached to the idea of the *res publica*) were all *equites*: class division was the fault-line. What B. thinks they mostly shared was the *lenitas* Cicero criticised in Pansa, which translated into 'une politique de clémence' (p. 316). Was that a manifestation of their Epicureanism? B. thinks it more likely a mark of Hellenisation. He notes that stress on the need for such qualities as *philanthrôpia* was a commonplace of 'on kingship' literature in general – but is then quick to insist that the point applies to *anyone* who exercises power, recalling Cineas' description of the Roman senate as an assembly of kings (Plu. *Pyrrhus* 6).

What did it mean for a member of the Roman elite to profess Epicureanism (or any other philosophical allegiance)? Here B. could have probed more deeply and explored more fully. To take just one example, he sees Atticus' quietism as reflecting a radically subversive Epicurean choice of the life of *otium*, justified to Romans – by someone of whom there were no hereditary political expectations – as ranking *priuatam officium* (B.'s term) over political involvement of various sorts, while yet remaining the position of someone who stayed 'jusqu' au bout un partisan de la République des *boni*' (p. 168). A tricky stance, one would have thought; but B.'s plan of campaign prevents him from pausing and puzzling further.

*St John's College, Cambridge*

MALCOLM SCHOFIELD  
m.schofield@joh.cam.ac.uk

## MAINZ AMPHORAE

EHMIG (U.) *Die römischen Amphoren aus Mainz*. In two volumes. (Frankfurter Archäologische Schriften 4.) Pp. 547, maps, b/w & colour pls. Möhnesee: Bibliopolis, 2003. Cased, €128. ISBN: 978-3-933925-50-3 (set).

doi:10.1017/S0009840X06003817

This is without doubt one of the most important works on Roman economic history to have appeared in the last twenty years or so. Starting from the catalogue of finds from the Mainz area, which consists of nearly 5,000 items, and forms Vol. 2, Dr Ehmig has been able to transform amphora studies in the north-western provinces of the Roman Empire. Fully in control of the appropriate statistical techniques, she demonstrates that the pattern of distribution of Roman amphorae, geographical and chronological, is substantially the same in August and Kaiseraugst to the south, in the Middle Rhineland, and on the Lower Rhine, with imports concentrating on olive-oil and olives, wine and fish-sauce: this last was, interestingly, sometimes exported in bulk from its areas of production to the south of France and packed in amphorae there. E. then goes on to show that the amphorae and their stamps wholly fail to support the pattern claimed by Remesal Rodriguez, of specific – presumably commercial – links between particular producers of olive-oil and the areas of its eventual distribution. In other words, producers did not produce for particular local markets.

But the hammer-blow to traditional work comes with the proof that substantial quantities of amphorae, visually almost indistinguishable from Dressel 20 olive-oil

amphorae from Baetica, are in fact local products, perhaps used for the transport of beer. If the amphorae are broken in such a way that it is possible to observe the technique by which the handles were attached to the body, the difference is visible, otherwise not; and the proof of local origin comes from clay analyses. We are a large step further on the essential road of abandoning classification of amphorae by shape, Dressel 20, Pe'lichet 47, Lamboglia 2, etc., etc. This classification served its purpose in the nineteenth century as a way of beginning to sort vast quantities of material that no one had ever attacked before; but by the late twentieth century it was already long out of date. It is unwieldy, bewildering and unserviceable, and a move to a classification of Roman amphorae by area, site and kiln-identifier is long overdue. It is not surprising that production, use and distribution of Greek amphorae is much more integrated into discussions of Greek economic history than is the case for Rome. I also wonder, with the current funding regime and obsession with generic training in my country, whether a dissertation of this quality will ever again be produced here.

University College London

M.H. CRAWFORD  
imagines.italicae@sas.ac.uk

## EARLY ROMAN BRITAIN

CREIGHTON (J.) *Britannia: the Creation of a Roman Province*. Pp. xii + 180, figs, ills. London and New York: Routledge, 2006. Cased, £55. ISBN: 978-0-415-33313-9.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X06003829

In the Preface, Creighton explains that this is 'in many ways a successor' to his *Coins and Power in Late Iron Age Britain* (Cambridge, 2000). In the Introduction (pp. 1–13) the key contention is set out: that between Caesar and Claudius both main kingdoms in southern Britain were ruled by dynasties 'implanted' by Rome. He conjectures that the sons of British kings spent time at Rome as *obsides*, returning thoroughly imbued with Roman ways. As he notes, *obsides*, usually rendered 'hostages', conveys a slightly misleading impression. He could have suggested *pignora* instead; cf. the Parthian king Phraates, who 'filios suos nepot[esque omnes] misit in Italiam non bello superatu[s], sed amicitiam nostram per [libe]ror[um] suorum pignora petens' (*RGDA* 32).

As British affairs in the period are less well documented than those of Parthia, interpretation of the main evidence, the coinage, is far from clear. It has long been recognised that the kingdom established in Sussex, Berkshire and Hampshire by Caesar's former agent Commius and his successors, each styled *Commi f(i)lius*, Tincomarus, Eppillus and Verica, was pro-Roman, not least from REX on Eppillus' and (repeatedly) Verica's coinage. (See C.E.A. Cheesman, 'Tincomarus Commi filius', *Britannia* 29 [1998], 309–15, not cited here, on the name previously read as Tincommius.) However, in some modern works the larger, eastern kingdom, of Tasciovanus and his son Cunobelinus, 'became a source of opposition to Rome' (p. 8). C. quotes G. Ashe, *Kings and Queens of Early Britain* (London, 1982), p. 31: 'On some of his coins [Cunobelin] put an ear of barley as a retort to Verica's vine-leaf, opposing British beer to imported wine. Fragments of many wine-jars in his own country suggest that his nobles did not live up to this sturdy patriotism'. Yet, C. continues,