

Such an identification would require a date long enough before the suffect elections of 130 B.C. to allow Appius to have returned to Rome in time to stand. This would be (just) consistent with the chronology proposed by D.: he dates the decree to early 130 B.C. An earlier date is more likely, in my opinion. D. notes that Publius, Gaius, and 'Papus' are described as 'in charge of the troops' (τοὺς ὄντας ἐπὶ τοῦ στρατεύματος), which D. understands to allude to Roman troops, requiring a date no earlier than 131 B.C., since Roman legions first arrived with P. Licinius Crassus, consul of that year. We should not rule out the possibility, however, that these Roman officials, like Oppius at the outbreak of the First Mithridatic War (cf. *Aphrodisias and Rome*, doc. 2), were compelled by circumstances to assume command of a hastily gathered allied force. Thus it is possible that Publius, Gaius, and Appius were three members of the commission of five sent in late 133 B.C. to organize Asia, a possibility that D. rejects (42) because of the supposed presence of Roman troops. (This point is owed in part to a discussion with J.-L. Ferrary, who will soon address this question in greater detail.)

Whatever one makes of this chronology, there is no denying either the importance of this text or the erudition and good judgement of the edition and commentary. Scholars in all fields will appreciate the speed and efficiency with which the authors have brought these important texts to the public.

McMaster University

CLAUDE EILERS

G. SCHÖRNER, *VOTIVE IM RÖMISCHEN GRIECHENLAND* (Alturtumswissenschaftliches Kolloquium 7). Stuttgart: Steiner, 2003. Pp. xviii + 638, 100 pls, 16 figs. ISBN 3-515-7688-3. €90.00.

With his comprehensive work on Greek votive monuments of the Roman period G. Schörner is presenting the book that many have perhaps been waiting for without daring to hope that anyone would ever embark on such a difficult task. S. focuses on stone monuments and buildings that are securely identified as votives by their inscriptions, or, in the case of votive reliefs, by their iconography. These artifacts are likely to be hidden away in museums and, if found in isolation or in small numbers, they are difficult to put into a wider context. The long list of acknowledgements at the beginning of the book hints at how much effort went into just gaining access to the monuments presented in this book, an impressive 1,240 inscribed dedications and 100 *Weihreliefs*. The monuments are all documented in an extensive catalogue: one wonders, however, why S.'s database was not attached to the book on CD which would have made his catalogue searchable while at the same time being cheaper to publish.

The evidence is presented with great care: after a short introduction, 158 pages are taken up by a very detailed discussion of the material. S.'s insistence on interpreting monuments and inscriptions together is particularly welcome. We are introduced to the different types of monumental votive dedication and then S. discusses the images presented on many of the monuments, with a special focus on the iconography of the gods. This is followed by a detailed documentation of who dedicated the monuments, and which divinities they were dedicated to. S. employs quantification to illustrate changes over time and differences due to the social context of dedications. This approach seems somewhat problematic, as, in fact, S. himself seems to suggest at times (e.g. at 162, discussing Zeus), because the numbers almost have to be skewed by differences in dedicatory practice and especially in research in different regions and on different sites. Large, extensively excavated sites, such as Olympia and Epidauros where many votive monuments have been discovered, must surely make overall statistics for Greece somewhat doubtful. At the same time, a more thorough analysis of the geographical distribution than the short overview offered at 219–20, if possible with at least one map, would have been very welcome.

The great potential of S.'s research only shows in his three short chapters of analysis (187–224): it is difficult to understand why he does not take more time to explain and discuss the many ideas that are, it seems, just touched upon in this section. Interesting interpretations are just suggested or alluded to without taking the time to explain them in any detail or to follow them up with a discussion of their impact on our wider understanding of society in Roman Greece. What is so tantalizing about this part of the book is that S. gives the impression that he is aware of the full potential of his material but he simply does not follow up the leads he is presenting. Perhaps this should be expected from a work that promises 'eine ausgewogene, material- und nicht

thesenorientierte Behandlung' (Introduction, 8). In short, S. has done all the hard work, but he seems to be willing to let others reap the rewards. It would be particularly interesting to follow up the many connections between the monuments and texts of the Second Sophistic period, particularly Pausanias' *Periegesis*, which offers so much geographically specific information on votive monuments. A further geographical analysis of S.'s catalogue might yield interesting results, and it would also be interesting to look at votive monuments in the context of the local sacred landscape.

Nevertheless, there are many insights to be gained from S.'s conclusions. His work offers an insight into changing ideas about the nature of the relationship between man and gods, changes that can be detected from the development of iconographic preferences as well as from trends in the wording of inscriptions. S.'s material also represents a tendency towards archaism in Roman Greece, a phenomenon that is also well documented in the texts. It is particularly fascinating to see the many forms an allusion to the past could take, both in the form and content of the inscriptions and in the decoration and design of a monument. S. also detects subtle variations in the relationship between local, provincial (Greek), and imperial religion, and more generally, in the attitudes of Greeks to their imperial rulers. These insights are a truly valuable contribution to an ever more complex picture of Roman Greece: let us hope that the author will find an opportunity to share further insights and interpretations based on his intimate knowledge of Greek votives.

Somerville College, Oxford

MARIA PRETZLER

B. BURRELL, *NEOKOROI: GREEK CITIES AND ROMAN EMPERORS*. Leiden: Brill, 2004. Pp. xviii + 422, 37 pls, 1 map. ISBN 9-0041-2578-7. £139.00.

Smyrna was the second city within the Roman province of Asia to receive the title of *neokoros* ('temple warden' and *koinon*-centre for worship of the reigning emperor). Tacitus describes the city's victory in the contest for that privilege (*Annals* 4.55–6). Eleven cities applied, and their ambassadors were heard by the Senate and the emperor Tiberius over several days. Some were discounted because of honours held already; Hypaipa, Tralles, Laodikeia, and Magnesia 'were passed over as not up to it' ('ut parum validi'); 'there was some hesitation over the Halikarnassians, who claimed that their home had never been shaken by earthquake in 1,200 years, and that the foundations of the temple would be in living rock'; in the end only Smyrna and Sardis were left to battle it out, with a mixture of genealogical arguments, claims about the clemency of their climate and about their past loyalty to the Roman people — arguments which look at first sight rather inconsequential to modern eyes, but which are perhaps not so far removed in spirit from the more idealistic elements of modern Olympic bids, with their appeals to historical heritage and tourism potential.

One of the things Burrell's book shows most compellingly is the enormous amount of energy which was devoted by the Greek cities to gaining and advertising grants of *neokoria*. The pleas made by the eleven ambassadors of Tacitus' narrative were probably far from unusual. From what we can see, the same story of rivalry for honours was endlessly repeated over the centuries which followed, as different cities scrabbled for successive *neokoria* grants, and advertised their successes in their coin issues and inscriptions. This was not a system which sprang up ready-made, nor was it uniform. Tiberius' grant to Smyrna was only the second step (the first *neokoriai* had been granted by Augustus to Pergamon and Nikomedia) in a long ladder of *ad hoc* adaptations. We see innovations and idiosyncratic treatments of the institution by a range of emperors: for example, Hadrian's unprecedented (but later standardly imitated) decision to grant more than one *neokoria* to a single province — Asia — as part of his wider policy of obsessive attention to traditional Greek cities; and Septimius Severus' systematic use of *neokoria* grants to reward cities supportive of him (and his removal of *neokoros* status from those who had opposed him).

B. also shows, however, that we should not be thinking only about imperial decision-making here. What we see instead is a dynamic process of ongoing negotiation involving city, *koinon*, Senate, and emperor, with solutions thrashed out through passionate and often painstaking debate (although the degree of conflict varied, and was likely to be less intense within *koina* which had one city in a place of uncontested pre-eminence). Often the impetus for change in imperial policy seems to have come from the cities themselves. That conclusion will not be a surprising one — it is fully in line with recent insistence on seeing the relationships between cities and imperial