In conclusion, the three *CIL* II[2] fascicles concerning Tarraco constitute an outstanding example of A.'s mastery in the edition of Latin inscriptions and one of his most illuminating contributions to the understanding of the Roman world.

University of Zaragoza FRANCISCO BELTRÁN LLORIS
fbeltran@unizar.es
doi:10.1017/S0075435815000350

F. DE ANGELIS (ED.), *REGIONALISM AND GLOBALISM IN ANTIQUITY: EXPLORING THEIR LIMITS* (Colloquia Antiqua 7). Leuven: Peeters, 2013. Pp. xvi + 362, illus., maps, plans. ISBN 9789042926691. €78.00.

Connectivity, movement, networks and globalization are all words that are very much in fashion. This edited collection of fifteen papers, resulting from a conference in Vancouver in 2007, ambitiously attempts to shed light on these phenomena by sampling research from across the field of Classical study. In the introductory chapter, De Angelis sets out the aims of the volume to examine the movement of ancient phenomena through time and space, and to address two well-entrenched yet problematic interpretive models: diffusionism from centres to peripheries, and Mediterraneanism. As D. points out (1–2), 'diffusionism' derives from European nineteenth-century colonial discourse, and ought to be replaced by models that allow for multiple centres — in other words, to conceive the ancient world as a 'polycentric periphery' (to borrow from the sociologist J. Nederveen Pieterse). Likewise, the notion of 'Mediterraneanism', which presents the Mediterranean as distinctive, unified and unchanging, is similarly critiqued (3–4) in light of P. Horden and N. Purcell's *The Corrupting Sea* (2000), which recognizes diverse micro-ecologies and distinctive forms of Mediterranean connectivity. D. goes on to make the case for studying globalization in the ancient world, which provides 'a more nuanced analytical framework, in which the temporal and spatial dimensions of the past are not viewed, as Mediterraneanism and diffusionism would have them, as entirely identical and always directed from a single favoured source' (4). According to D., the essence of ancient globalization was interconnectivity between regions, underpinning the relationship between globalism and regionalism, and allowing us to conceive of local developments in terms of regional and 'global' pictures. Crucially, a case is made for globalization as permitting the ancient world to be viewed from many more perspectives, promoting cross-cultural and comparative studies, and bridging disciplinary divides (4–5).

Following this opening statement, the content of the other fourteen chapters is rather puzzling. Only the final contribution by M. Sommer mentions globalization, leaving an impression that the remaining thirteen papers do not directly tackle the aims of the volume. Other relevant chapters include A. Nijboer on the varied influence of the Near–Eastern Marzeah on Mediterranean convivial practice, A. Nicgorski's consideration of the contemporary yet far flung use of the so-called Heracles knot in mid-fifth-century B.C. statues of Apollo, and J. Walsh's reading of patterns of ceramic consumer choice in ancient Sicily. These examples demonstrate that *contra* common perception, globalization, whether ancient or modern, is not simply about homogenization. Rather, it is a much more complex phenomenon, in which the spread of notionally 'global' or universal forms have equal potential to form the basis of shared cultural practices and/or be re-appropriated in local value systems. Globalization, then, is fundamentally about the 'universalization of the particular' hand-in-hand with the 'particularization of the universal'. These ideas resonate closely with M. Sommer's chapter, which uses the related concept of 'glocalization' in the examination of the Roman Empire in the third century A.D. This paper does, however, raise the question of whether the term 'de-globalization' (used by M. Sommer in his original conference paper title) is more appropriate to discuss the regionalization ushered in with Late Antiquity. While other relevant themes are also addressed, such as Z. Archibald's investigation of innovation networks in the ancient world, one is left with the impression that more radical approaches are missing, notably the application of Actor Network Theory, as demonstrated elsewhere in consideration of Gallic pre-sigillata production (A. Van Oyen, 'Towards a post-colonial artefact analysis', *Archaeological Dialogues* 20 (2013), 81–107).

Much of this volume suffers from a lack of engagement with the agenda set out by D. This is most notable in G. Tsetskhladze's essay on the origins of the Bosporan kingdom, which explores an interesting historical question, but seemingly offers little to the wider debate on globalism and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435815000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

regionalism. More worryingly, several contributors effectively re-state the same position of 'diffusionism' that D. is at pains to critique in his introduction. C. Wastlhuber's analysis of supposed prestige gift exchange between Egypt and the Levant effectively only considers the importance of objects' 'Egyptianness', thus ignoring the likelihood of material culture acquiring new meaning through circulation in new cultural contexts (following A. Appadurai, *The Social Life of Things* (1986)). Likewise, C. Blonce's chapter on the rôle of honorary arches to aid the spread of *Romanitas* and imperial unity is similarly out of place in stressing the flow of cultural symbols from centre to periphery. While valid, these studies surely represent missed opportunities to test the capacity and versatility of globalization thinking to bring fresh perspectives.

This volume illustrates in microcosm the somewhat muted impact of globalization thinking in Classical disciplines to date. It is clear that the study of classical antiquity has yet to undergo the kind of paradigm shift that globalization has brought to (world) history, following the efforts of A. G. Hopkins and others. Nevertheless, as the positions of D. and others demonstrate (for example, M. Versluys, 'Understanding objects in motion: an archaeological dialogue on Romanization', *Archaeological Dialogues* 21 (2014), 1–20; J. Jennings, *Globalizations and the Ancient World* (2011); and T. Hodos, 'Globalization and colonization: a view from Iron Age Sicily', *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 23 (2010), 81–106), it is surely no longer tenable for this eclectic toolbox of approaches to be ignored.

University of Exeter MARTIN PITTS
M.E.J.Pitts@exeter.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435815000088

J. M. HALL, *ARTIFACT & ARTIFICE: CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE ANCIENT HISTORIAN*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, 2014. Pp. xvi + 258, illus., maps, plans. ISBN 9780226313382 (bound); 9780226096988 (paper); 9780226080963 (e-book). £87.50/US$125.00 (bound); £31.50/US$45.00 (paper).

Artifact & Artifice is concerned with the relationship between the archaeology and the history of the ancient world. Jonathan Hall agrees with David Clarke that 'archaeology is not history' (212), in so far as historical documents and archaeological evidence sometimes require different analytical methods. Yet 'history' is not just the discipline that studies texts, but the human past as a whole, irrespective of whether documentary or material evidence is used: 'There is no a priori reason why historical narrative cannot, or should not, be written on the basis of archaeology alone' (215). The relationship is explored via nine case studies, an introductory and a concluding chapter.

H. examines both the material and written evidence for each case study authoritatively and in commendable detail. The case studies represent a somewhat arbitrary selection, over half of them centred on hypotheses that stations in the life of famous figures, or their final resting places, have been traced through archaeology, be they Romulus, Numa Pompilius, Socrates, Macedonian royalty, Augustus or St Peter. H. is able to demonstrate that the evidence is invariably not quite as strong as some would have us believe. He argues persuasively that it is sometimes more fruitful to regard literary traditions as attempts in antiquity to make sense of ruined antiquities on view (for example, 141–2). Yet, one cannot help the impression that case studies are picked to prove the hypothesis that material and written evidence are hard to reconcile and tell different stories. That is often true, but not always. One would have wished for a more balanced selection, featuring, for example, one of the mausolea or victory monuments whose identification is not in doubt. We indeed 'should not assume that scattered literary notices and isolated archaeological features are the inevitable reflex of one another' (207), but it should have been emphasized also that neither should we assume that they are not. Might, to cite just one example, the recently discovered Harzhorn battlefield, far beyond imperial frontiers in northern Germany, not be best explained with the, previously dismissed, reports in the *Historia Augusta* (*Maximini* 11.7–12.11) and by Herodian (7.2) that Maximinus Thrax ventured deep into enemy territory (cf. H. Pöppelmann *et al.* (eds), *Roms vergessener Feldzug* (2013))?

Commendably, H. repeatedly refers to modern scientific techniques, be they analyses of spring water and gas emissions at oracular sites, human osteology or modern dating techniques. Radiocarbon dating — indeed of limited use during the eighth- to fifth-century B.C. plateau in the calibration curve — is referred to. In other respects it is a rather traditional account. Case studies are taken exclusively from Greece and central Italy with the occasional reference to other

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435815000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press