Portus,[4] an Anglo-Italian (but wholly Anglophone) report on intensive survey conducted with a primary aim of clarifying the structure and function of the grand Trajanic plan for a port that would serve not only as economic hub to the great wheel of empire, but also a symbol of Rome's logistical genius. Passengers on flights in and out of Rome's Fiumicino airport will often be granted a clear aerial view of the inland hexagonal docking area created perhaps by Trajan's innovative Greek architect, Apollodorus. But how were goods – notably the staple foodstuffs originating from Rome's provinces in Egypt and north Africa – stored and moved onwards to the capital? Using magnetometers to sense the existence of foundations no longer apparent on the surface, the teams of researchers (prominent among them Martin Millett, the successor to Snodgrass at Cambridge) have elucidated the ancient practicalities of warehousing and canal systems around the hexagon, while keeping sight of its symbolic purpose. As Anna Gallina Zevi, current Soprintendente of Ostia, remarks in her overture to the book, 'modern landscape archaeology' cannot solve all of the problems involved in our understanding of Rome's imperial organization. But this survey of Portus shows, once again, the unique potential of Classical archaeology to augment, qualify, or even contradict our historical tradition.

doi:10.1017/S0017383507000228 NIGEL SPIVEY

[4] *Portus. An Archaeological Survey of the Port of Imperial Rome*. By Simon Keay, Martin Millett, Lidia Parioli, and Kristian Strutt. Archaeological Monographs of the British School at Rome, 15. Rome, The British School at Rome and The Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici di Ostia, 2005. Pp. xviii + 360. Paperback £49.50.

Religion

It must be mere fancy, but since *L'Année philologique* abolished their lemmata *Histoire religieuse*. *Religions et mythologie grecques et mycéniennes/Religions et mythologies romaines et italiques* in favour of *Religions. Religion grecque/Religions de Rome et de son empire* in vol. 67 (1999) there seems to have been a decline in the number of offerings on mythology. Perhaps such items have only migrated to other categories such as 'mentalités et vie quotidienne' or 'vie intellectuelle et artistique', but it is not unthinkable that, after twenty years of post-structuralist eclecticism, the intellectual attraction of working on myth has diminished. However, the university curriculum, especially in the United States, has an inertia of its own, and will presumably continue to evoke introductions and *prises de position* for years to come. Among students taking such courses, Eric Csapo's entertaining and well-written *Theories of Mythology*, the fruit of long experience at the University of Toronto (he now teaches at Sydney), is likely to be in pretty constant demand.[1] The introduction makes three excellent points: that theories of myth have no privilege but are best themselves seen as (new or re-) mythologies of the tales they purport to account for; that in place of failed essentialist definitions we need, if anything, polythetic ones; and that theories of myth, from their origins in Herder's romantic nationalism (Vico and Heyne make no appearance here), always have hidden agendas. This sets the stage for his own preliminary Greimasian definition, that myth is a narrative considered important in a specific society, and told in such a way as to allow the collectivity (he prefers 'collective' as in *kolkhoz*) to share a sense of that importance. The book provides an always

[1] *Theories of Mythology*. By Eric Csapo. Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2004. Pp. xiii + 338. Hardback £60; paperback £17.99.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S001738350700023X Published online by Cambridge University Press

intelligent, and often brilliant, overview of the four approaches that have dominated the subject since the 1850s: comparativism, psychology, ritual theories, and structuralism. Because of his admiration for Pierre Macherey, Csapo himself seems to have a soft spot for psychological approaches (he offers the thought that "there is much in the tale of Perseus and the Gorgon to confrm a central pre-occupation with the castration complex", p. 102), though I was surprised to find no discussion of the most sustainedly brilliant of such accounts, Philip E. Slater's *The Glory of Hera* (Boston, 1968), now out of favour because of its notorious claim that Greek mythic mothers exercised a dominant – castrating – influence over their sons (though it is in the bibliography). The chapter on ritual thankfully skirts A. E. Cook, S. H. Hook, E. O. James, and all the Scandinavians to concentrate on Ellen Harrison and Walter Burkert. The confusions of the former are well brought out, as is the self-defeating quality of the latter's 'genetic explanation'. To my mind, however, the supposed guilt induced by killing animals ('[Der] Schock, den der Anblick fließenden Blutes hervorruft...') is still allowed too much weight, compounded by citation of the old chestnut of the *Diïpolia/Bouphonia*, which is dragged in as a 'particularly ancient and guilt-ridden' ritual, without a word being lost concerning the inconsistencies and tainted context, namely Porphyry's representation in *De abstinentia* 2.29, 30.4–5 of Theophrastus' *Peri eusebeias*, of this supposedly primitive nugget. The two finest chapters are chapters 2 (Comparativism, 1850s–1920s) and 4 (Structuralism). The first suggestively locates the success of Max Müller and Frazer in the overt and covert demands (beneficent imperialism; science versus Christianity) of their middle-class readership. The second is a clear account of the ideas behind structuralism – granted we have already had so many – starting from Saussure and Jacobson, and distinguishing 'syntagmatic' options (essentially Propp, to whom perhaps too much space is allowed, but no doubt this is really a swipe at folkloristics; the critique is mainly taken from Lévi-Strauss's essay) from 'paradigmatic' ones (essentially Lévi-Strauss and Greimas), ending with a highly sympathetic account of Vernant's analysis of the Pandora myth. Chapter 5 is a tour de force, moving from a compelling presentation of the logic behind Detienne's *Jardins d'Adonis*, understood as a world of fixed and totalizing meaning (which is what so many of the older humanist generation hated about it, though they claimed it was all about his pick'n'mix method), through the reaction to structuralism by the generation of 1968 to the now dominant perception of myth as ideology: in retrospect, Barthes' little *Mythologiques*, which in the early sixties looked like a clever anthropology of French advertising culture, proves to have spawned an entire library of ideological criticism (I cannot however share Csapo's evident enthusiasm for the work of Frederic Jameson, who must be one of the world's most plodding stylists). Csapo ends by contributing his own analysis in this vein, an account of the myth of Herakles strung between *ponos* and transcendance, offering something to almost everyone in an ideologically fragmented world but ultimately endorsing the aristocratic value of *kleos*. The student will not find many exemplary analyses of Greek myth here, or indeed much directly connected with such a course as usually conceived, but s/he will find something much more useful, an inspirational account of what might be at stake in thinking about a given myth. Indeed, I found the book so skilfully written that it was hard to put down. And, on a purely trivial level, I was amused, though on reflection not surprised, to learn that Joseph Campbell served as mythological adviser to the first *Star Wars* film (320). Graham Anderson's *Greek and Roman Folklore*, which forms part of a series on world folklore published by

https://doi.org/10.1017/S001738350700023X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Greenwood,[2] also offers the reader bits of trivia: his mother, for example, believed it was wrong to cut one's nails on a Sunday. Otherwise, however, the contrast with Csapo's book could hardly be greater. It is almost as though the gods wished to manifest the contrast between the high professionalism of the modern North American academy and the breezy British amateurism of yesteryear in as cruel a manner as possible. Given that in his younger days Anderson wrote creditable books on aspects of the Greek novel, I find the metamorphosis difficult to understand. At any rate, on this showing the students at the University of Kent must often have wished they had been able to attend the University of Toronto. The defensive, querulous tone is manifest early on: 'Classicists tend to associate folklore with Stonehenge and Maypole dancing and little else, and look to anthropology, post-modern approaches to just about anything, or mantras of culture and ethnicity to fill the gap' (24). The book contains a childish denunciation of structuralism, whose aims and achievements are travestied, but only the sketchiest account of folklore studies: the phrase 'German romantic nationalism' does not occur, nor does 'Russian formalism'; there is no reference to Propp's *Les Racines historiques du conte merveilleux* (1946, tr. 1983); nothing is said about the institutionalization of folklore studies in Germany (where many universities have departments of Volkskunde, and where the International Folklore Bibliography has been published by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde since 1977, retrospective to 1973), in Denmark (where the subject is called Etnologi), or in Switzerland (the editors of the *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, 1927–42, were Swiss); nor about the failure of its institutionalization in both Britain (Dorson wrongly imagined this had to do with the bloodletting of the First World War) and France, despite the efforts of Paul Sébillot and widespread admiration for Van Gennep's great *Manuel de folklore français* (1937 ff.). Far more serious however is the failure to draw upon the German and Danish traditions to provide some theoretical grounding for the study of folklore or 'ethnology'. Anderson, whose orientation is apparently rather to the heavily under-theorized folkoristics of North America, is quick to tell us that this or that passage in ancient literature is 'obviously' folklore, but never stops to explain why that should matter or how the observation provides insight, or into what. It is not for nothing that in Denmark the subject is limited to the period 1600–1950; yet Anderson never questions the applicability of the category 'the folk' to antiquity, even when disguised as 'popular culture'. When Ernest Rieß, the author of the article 'Aberglaube' in *RE* 1 (1894), wrote in the same vein, he merely reflected his times. While reading, one often feels trapped in the mad world of Anna Rooth's *The Cinderella Cycle* (1951), or in the exhausting triviality of *Popular Belief and Superstitions from the Collection of Newbell Niles Puckett*, ed. by W.D. Hand, et al. (1981), or of Eugène Rolland's multi-volume *Faune populaire* (1967). Nor is there a word on the conceptual problems inherent in the notion of comparison of tales. As for the tone, Anderson does not seem to take his implied audience seriously but constantly writes down, while betraying no hint that his mind is in fact furnished with deep, challenging thoughts. References and bibliography too show signs of carelessness (there is actually a reference to Dittenberger's *Sylloge*[2] [1898–1901], when the third edition, with quite different numeration, was published in 1915–24; C. Lévi-Strauss

[2] *Greek and Roman Folklore. A Handbook*. By Graham Anderson. Westport, CN, and London, Greenwood Press, 2006. Pp. 248. Hardback $55, £31.95.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S001738350700023X Published online by Cambridge University Press

apparently wrote three volumes of *Mythologiques*; the co-author of *Supplementum Magicum* is R.W. Sanile [recte: Daniels] . . .). In a word, if he meant seriously to demonstrate what folklore studies might have to offer in a post-structuralist world, which I take to be a possible if not a very probable mission, Anderson has missed his target by miles. If the conversation turns to supplication, most people still think of John Gould's elegant article 'Hiketeia', *JHS* 93 (1973) 74–103, which responded to the Zeitgeist by setting up a structure, a ritual 'system', whose rules were tacitly recognized by all participants. His view was all the more attractive in that it confined 'true' supplication to the Archaic and Classical periods, with the implication that later *asylia*, the right over which eastern Mediterranean cities competed so vigorously (K. Rigsby, *Asylia* [1996]), and Roman *ad statuam confugere* (cf. J. Derlien, *Asyl* [2003]), were somehow completely different. If we ignore Walter Burkert's sociobiological account, which explains both too much and too little, and Kevin Crotty's over-literary *The Poetics of Supplication* (1994), it was not until Manuela Giordano's *La supplica* (1999) that the weaknesses of Gould's account began to be apparent: she argued that, even in Homer, the gesture of touching the knees was neither necessary nor binding, and that the addressee always has a choice of responses, whether or not the ritual has been properly performed: supplication in fact is not so much a 'ritual' as a social act. Her main emphasis was on something Gould's model had no space for, namely the rhetoric of the supplicant's appeal to the supplicated. Here she discerned five main parts: apostrophe, allusion to one's own situation (normally by referring to the gesture), request, persuasion, anticipatory thanks. One weakness of her book, the reluctance to distinguish the social act from its literary representations, has been tackled, in relation to Attic tragedy, by Jonas Grethlein's *Asyl und Athen* (2003). Another, the under-emphasis on the response of the supplicated, has now been answered by F. S. Naiden's fine *Ancient Supplication*,[3] which amounts to a pretty fair demolition of Gould's entire model. Basing his work on a collection of more than 100 supplications at altars and 600 personal supplicatory acts in Greek and Latin authors and documents listed in Appendices 1a–c (not continuously numbered, unfortunately), he argues that, though supplication has legal, moral, and religious elements it is a 'mixed' form, so we should not be tempted to press any one analogy too hard: for example, it resembles prayer to the gods, but (with the only apparent exception of asylum at the altar) is addressed to a particular individual or community, who or which has to be present in some sense. Likewise, supplication sets up an asymmetrical relation between two parties, in which moral claims and arguments, but also legal status, and treaty obligations, are crucial; it often fails but the failure is not (usually) seen as a crime or wrongdoing: the supplicated always has the right finally to decide the merits of the case. Although Naiden sets up a convincing four-part scheme – approach, gesture, request, decision – he rightly insists that they are far from standard or invariable: the presentation of each varies with genre, author, medium, and legal context. The first three are discussed in Chapter 2, the fourth, which is most complex, in Chapter 3. Chapters 4 and 5 discuss the constraints and possibilities offered by Greek law, especially at Athens, and the rather different world of *deditio* and *confugere* in Roman practice. The book is therefore a

[3] *Ancient Supplication*. By F. S. Naiden. New York, Oxford University Press, 2006. Pp. 440. Hardback £32.50.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S001738350700023X Published online by Cambridge University Press

work of ancient history, where often complex moral and legal considerations take precedence over literary analysis. The great merit of such an approach is its emphasis upon social action in a violent world of steeply asymmetrical power and rights, and it gains added point from the discussion of an incident, and grisly photographs, from the war against the Taliban in Afghanistan in 1991 (292–95). The suppliant is revealed as someone who has a good idea of where power is located, calculates between different options (individual or altar?), knows what types of appeal may work, the considerations on which to lay stress, takes risks; in a word, has his own strategies. The addressee (for whom Naiden coins the unattractive 'supplicandus') reviews the claims and arguments, sets them against other claims, considerations, and obligations: has the suppliant broken the law? has he violated social norms? do I have special responsibility for him? do women and children have a special claim on me? what are the implications of contracts and treaties? Though one could have wished for more acknowledgement of the differences between Greek and Roman practice, and certainly more discussion of inconvenient cases such as Theramenes, who was 'dragged from the altar' in the *bouleuterion* by Satyros and his men in 403 BC (Xenophon, *Hell.* 2.3.55), which he does not even mention, Naiden has given us a fine account of a fascinating topic at the meeting point of religious practice, law, and moral feeling.

One of the more striking intellectual habits among historians in the seventies was the search for an apparently insignificant incident or topic whose analysis would illuminate an entire age. Mark Munn, already known for his *The School of History* (2000), seems to be attempting something similar in his new book, which started life as a thought in the earlier one, on the religious expression of sovereignty in the Archaic and Classical world.[4] The ostensible *point de départ* is the apparently trivial question of why the Athenian public archive was housed in the temple of the *Meter theon*, that is, Cybele. Homer A. Thompson argued in 1937 that the goddess received worship already in the Old Bouleuterion, and indeed even before 480 BC; and continued to argue for a high date in his later history of the Agora written with R. E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora, 14. The Agora of Athens* (Princeton, 1972), 29–38. Many others, however, such as J. S. Boersma and Robert Parker, have argued that the temple must have been built much later in the fifth century. Munn argues that her cult, 'so openly that of an oriental deity', was only introduced at the time of Alcibiades' return to Athens in 408 BC, when he had spent a month at Sardis at the court of Tissaphernes. The true significance of the admission of the cult was, however, that it marked the point at which the Athenians said they were sorry for having put to death the *metragyrtes* or *gallus* who, as an emissary of Darius, allegedly attempted to explain the grandeur of Cybele to the Athenians as well as demanding earth and water. Not content with thus over-interpreting the very late, vague, and undated accounts of the *metragyrtes* (the earliest account is indeed Julian's), Munn wants to go much, much further by drawing a grand contrast between the alleged Archaic Greek readiness to accept the Mermnad dynasty of Lydia as a representative of a grand or spectacular form of rulership, namely tyranny, and a later conception of sovereignty, based on mutability and impermanence, that emerges only after the Persian conquest of Lydia in 546 BC. In order to validate this contrast, he explores

[4] *The Mother of the Gods, Athens, and the Tyranny of Asia. A Study of Sovereignty in Ancient Religion*. By M. Munn. Berkeley, CA, University of California Press, 2006. Pp. 476. Hardback £32.50.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S001738350700023X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lydian kingship (chap. 2); sacral marriage (chap. 3); Cybele-Attis, sexual perversion, and Greek tyranny (chap. 4); and the clash between Asiatic and Hellenic conceptions of sovereignty during the Persian Wars (chap. 7). The mere recital of such claims (and there are many more, such as the interpretation of Pythagoreanism – Pythagoras came from Samos, remember – as an attempt to fill the void created by the collapse of the Archaic concept of sovereignty; or the difference discerned between the symbolic roles of Delos for Athens and Sparta) is enough to give a flavour of the swashbuckling style of argument. It is one thing to claim that Lydia and the Achaemenids had an important, and varied, symbolic role for the Archaic and Classical Greeks, including the provision of patterns for evaluating political action – indeed, it is obvious from a reading of Herodotus; quite another to raise the spectre of a generic contrast between types of *sovereignty*. The more Munn attempts to incorporate Cybele into his notion of 'Asiatic sovereignty' the more elusive it becomes. Moreover, I see no justification either for the claim that Greek tyranny, as a historical phenomenon, is intimately linked to Asiatic models or for the claim that the Persian Wars represent a watershed in Greek thought about the relation between humanity and divinity. If anything, Herodotus proves that the reverse is the case: quite traditional conceptions of necessity, divine ethics, and human choice were perfectly adequate both before and after. Above all, one resists the piling up of speculation after speculation, bold reinterpretation after bold reinterpretation, as though the historian's task were to amaze like a thaumaturge or prestidigitator rather than to convince through illuminating interpretation of evidence. As we shall see later, speculation can look quite different. The book does admittedly evince an admirable determination to ask big questions; but one cannot rid oneself of the impression that Munn has produced a sort of mythopoeic version of Karl Wittfogel's old monster on hydraulic societies (i.e., the 'Asiatic mode of production'). One of the people he thanks for reading the Lydian section is Lynn Roller, a scholar well known for her competent and careful discussion of the complex traditions relating to Cybele in Phrygia and Lydia. One would very much like to know what she really thinks of this book.

Around forty years ago, Georges Dumézil published a learned appendix on Etruscan religion in his *La Religion romain archaïque* (1966). Hitherto it had been usual to start a book on Roman religion with a chapter on Etruscan religion, but Dumézil, finding it hard to fit what he knew about the Etruscans into his tripartism, wrote them off as 'origin unknown' (knowing that Luvian, Lydian, and Lycian were Indo-European languages) and so skirted a possible challenge to his grand scheme. What was familiar about Etruscan religion they had learned from the Latins; of Villanovan culture, not a word. The irrelevance of this view was demonstrated a decade later by the great Austrian Etruscologist Ambros Pfiffig, who wrote what remains one of the outstanding syntheses of the topic, drawing on philological, epigraphic, and archaeological materials, *Religio etrusca* (1975). Since then, Italian archaeologists have added a great deal of new material, some of it presented in the famous exhibition in Rome, *La grande Roma dei Tarquini* (1990), and some available in handy but scattered form in the entries in *LIMC*, which included articles on Etruscan deities. However, no up-to-date synthesis has been available in English. This lacuna prompted the University of Wisconsin Press to commission Jane Whitehead, an archaeologist at Valdosta State University, Georgia, who has herself excavated at Carsulae and elsewhere in Italy, and happens to teach French, to translate and edit the well-regarded recent synthesis by Jean-René Jannot, *Devins, dieux et démons. Regards*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S001738350700023X Published online by Cambridge University Press

sur la religion de l'Étrurie antique (1998).[5] This she has done with great success. The original was written in the inimitable style of Gallic *haute vulgarisation*, full of flowery vaguenesses – in this case of course often made advisable by our sheer ignorance of fundamentals – which she has generally succeeded in restraining and concretizing, though enough odd sentences have escaped to allow the reader to see the amount of work involved. The whole amounts to an entirely new version, since not only has the text been revised and corrected but thematic bibliography, footnotes, illustrations, and captions have all been changed and greatly improved (indeed, there are references to items not yet published); Jannot himself suggests that if a second French edition were ever needed it would be best to translate this one back into French – praise indeed. The whole has been well designed and carefully proofread. There are just a very few blips: for example, Joh. Lydus is referred to oddly as John Lydos, neither fish nor fowl. Though the illustrations have been well chosen, there is no map and no chronological chart. As for the book itself, it was clearly felt preferable to translate a work by a single author aimed at students and the general reader than the obvious competitor, the proceedings of the Paris conference of 1992, edited by F. Gaultier and D. Briquel, *Les Plus religieux des hommes* (1997). Jannot goes about his work in a clear and infectiously vigorous manner, starting with the various departments of the *disciplina etrusca* (chaps. 1–3), followed by funerary rituals and architecture. Chap. 6 surveys shrines and temples; chap. 7, votive religion. The two last chapters survey what is known of Etruscan divinities. In all cases our ignorance is fairly emphasized. Some speculation is necessary to keep such a subject alive; although, sometimes, as in the case of funerary games, Jannot seems to me off-beam, his argument is never pushed for all it is worth. One reads with a will. The one major desideratum would have been a survey of the historical development of the topic, and its various inspirations, since E. Gerhard's *Etruskische Spiegel* (1864). In short, an introduction that can be thoroughly recommended. I happen recently to have translated Jörg Rüpke's stimulating introduction to Roman religion, mainly in the Republican period, *Die Religion der Römer*, which should appear at about the same time as this piece. Rüpke hardly mentions the role of women in Roman religion: the topic is simply not thematized, and one is left to suppose that it was confined to the domestic sphere. This may well be a reaction to Jean Gagé, who, in his *Matronalia* (1963), happily gave the impression that the issue was one that concerned only the dim obscurity of Coriolanus' mother and the conflict between Venus Verticordia and Fortuna Virilis (Ovid, *Fasti* 4.133–62). Given that the neglect is quite general in books on Roman religion, however, one suspects other factors play a part. It is therefore extremely welcome that a competent young scholar, Celia Schultz, has turned her attention to the topic in her *Women's Religious Activity in the Roman Republic*.[6] The book is a revised version of her Bryn Mawr thesis; some of it seems rather elementary, as though written for a student audience, with English translations of even the briefest votives, and actually of Mommsen's one-sentence (and rather inept) commentary on *CIL* VI 337. Quite how this sits with the tone of the remainder, which presupposes a fair degree of familiarity with Roman institutions, is not clear to me; but I suppose she knows what she is doing in relation to an American audience. A particular

[5] *Religion in Ancient Etruria*. By Jean-René Jannot. Transl. by Jane K. Whitehead. Milwaukee, WI, University of Wisconsin Press, 2005. Pp. 256. Hardback $70; paperback $29.95.

[6] *Women's Religious Activity in the Roman Republic*. By Celia E. Schultz. Chapel Hill, NC, University of North Carolina Press, 2006. Pp. 234. Hardback $39.95.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S001738350700023X Published online by Cambridge University Press

strength of the book is the extensive use of epigraphical and archaeological evidence. The concordance of inscriptions lists 49 texts from Degrassi, *ILLRP* (excluding nos. 705–46, the *magistri*-inscriptions from Minturnae), and almost 180 from *CIL*, in each case mainly (but by no means all) by women, though of course virtually all the first are also to be found among the second. This enables her to show, for example, that, though the stereotypes hold *grosso modo*, women did make dedications to Jupiter, Apollo, or Hercules, for example, just as men did to Bona Dea, Diana, or Juno Lucina: gender distinctions within Roman votive religion have been greatly overstated. A discussion of the evidence of the anatomical votives from central Italy, soundly based on the work of Annamaria Comella, argues that these deposits are not rigorously divided along gender lines (95–120). Both the epigraphic and the archaeological chapters, however, are marred by inadequate attention to geography and, to a smaller extent, periodization: it is quite unclear whether the book's focus is upon Rome, or Latium, or Campania and Latium: what is 'Roman religion' here? Something should have been said, for example in context of the discussion of the Bacchanal affair (82–92), about the ways in which the Senate might intervene and seek to control local religious practice as far away from Rome as Tiriolo in Bruttium. The main point, however, is well taken: women were regularly, or at least frequently, involved in the practice of Roman worship in public contexts, and not merely in connection with 'fertility rites' (a category she dismisses), and that more attention needs to be paid to status in this regard: 'in every instance, a woman's activity outside her home advertised to those around her the position she held in her community' as well as her marital status (149 ff.). In the context of domestic cult, she argues that women were not only responsible for much of the equipment and paraphernalia required, but also had the right to conduct animal sacrifice (the same of course holds good in the case of public priesthoods, such as those of Ceres, held by women). Some special pleading, perhaps, but the old stereotype has indeed been shaken.

The first edition of Georg Luck's selection of texts on magic and the occult, *Arcana Mundi*, published in 1985, thanked the D. M. Robinson Fund and the Andrew Mellon Foundation for financial support towards the publication.[7] At that time a reader on *magika* must have seemed risky. The book having sold so well over the years, the publishers had no need of financial support for this new edition, and simply refer to that former generosity on the flyleaf. It has indeed been translated into German (1990), Italian (1994), Spanish (1995), and again into Italian by Claudio Tartaglini, in a completely new, two-volume format together with the texts in the original languages (1997–99). The Spanish translation contained a new general essay, which was also a survey of recent publications. It was published in English in Luck's collection *Ancient Pathways and Hidden Pursuits* (2000) and is reprinted here as a General Introduction (1–29). The new edition is not only jollier looking than the old (the murky old cover has gone) but is much fatter (568 against 395 pages). This is partly cosmetic: the new edition is easier on the eye, the lines are slightly further apart, the margins are larger, the sections are separated by full-page headings. Another welcome innovation is that the introduction to each passage is now printed in bold type, and thus clearly distinguished from the texts themselves. The main

[7] *Arcana Mundi. Magic and the Occult in the Greek and Roman Worlds. A Collection of Ancient Texts*. By Georg Luck. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006. Pp. 568. Hardback £43.50; paperback £16.50.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S001738350700023X Published online by Cambridge University Press

chapters: Magic, Miracles, Daemonology, Divination, Astrology, and Alchemy remain unchanged. I count no exclusions, and nine new passages: Hippocrates, *De morbo sacro* 1–4 Jones (no. 2); Aesop §56 Perry (no. 4); Phlegon of Tralleis, *Mirab.* 1 (no. 56); Maltomini & Daniel, *Suppl. Mag.* 13 (no. 75); a Greek migraine amulet from Carnuntum with a *historiola*, first published by Alphonse Barb in 1925 (no. 76); Cassius Dio 49.43.5 and 52.36.1–2 (no. 103); Firmicus Maternus, *Math.* 2.29.10–12 (no. 114); Manetho, *Apotel.* 4.271–85 (no. 120); and Theophrastus, *de odor.* 8.14–16, and 21–23 (no. 131). There are a number of other improvements: for example, the confused references to the magical papyri (nos. 18–27) have been straightened out; the passages of the *Hieroi Logoi* of Aelius Aristides are taken from Kroll's edition (1898) not Dindorf's (1829); of Eunapius from Giangrande instead of Boissonade; but in no. 115, the passage from Ptolemy, *Tetrab.* 1.2.1–8, which read 1–3 in the first edition ought to read 1–5 Robbins; and in nos. 123 ff. Vettius Valens is still cited from Kroll's edition (1908) instead of the late David Pingree's (1985). Twice we read of a mysterious Dittenberger, *Syll.*^{4}, when there were never more than three editions. The introductory material to the chapters and the individual passages remains, as far as I can tell, unaltered. Apart from the General Introduction, there are really four substantial alterations: there is a new 'Epilogue' on the survival of magic into the Christian Empire; a shortened version of a paper in the Spanish journal devoted to the history of astrology and magic, *MHNH* 3 (2003), 29–54; an appendix on 'psychoactive substances' in religion and magic (479–92), mainly in fact about aromatics; a sensible list of Greek and Latin words, briefly defined (493–518); and a largely new bibliography that omits much of the outdated older material in the first edition (though the news that Hubert and Mauss, 'Ésquisse' [1902–3] was translated by Robert Brain in 1972 under the title *A General Theory of Magic*, with the omission of Hubert's name, does not yet seem to have reached Baltimore). The major omission, linked to the absence of illustrations from both versions, is the entire genre of magical amulets, and indeed defensive magic *tout court*. Those who have used the first edition for teaching purposes will be aware of the strengths of the collection: its wide range of materials, from the marvellous to alchemy, covering many genres, styles, and dates; its sensible and unpretentious introductions to the passages; its interest in ancient explanations; its refusal to attempt distinctions – Homer's Circe rubs along with Iamblichus, *De mysteriis*. All this gives the teacher considerable scope for adjusting the volume to his or her own teaching aims. These advantages (and their concomitant disadvantages) remain with the new edition. Daniel Ogden, whose rival reader (2002) I reviewed here a couple of years ago, apparently assisted with this revision. His own, more historical, effort contains many more documentary texts and gives a very different impression of the topic, but his over-emphasis on ghosts and necromancy is a decided disadvantage. For mythology and classical civilization courses, Luck's new volume perhaps retains an edge. In Germany, before the recent SPD government foolishly abolished the Habilitation even in the humanities without providing an adequately thought-out alternative entry into the academic profession, the real aim being to reduce academic salaries, it was a beneficial rule that the second dissertation should be on a different topic from the PhD. In the United States there seems to be no such requirement of a second book; at any rate, Mark Chancey of the Southern Methodist University, Dallas, has written a second monograph narrowly focused on Galilee at the time of Jesus, and in the same series. The first, published in 2002, was on the demography of the area; this one is on the claim, apparently

https://doi.org/10.1017/S001738350700023X Published online by Cambridge University Press

widespread since the appearance of Martin Hengel's *Judentum und Hellenismus* (1969, Eng. tr. 1973), that Greek, or Greco-Roman, cultural influence upon Galilee at the turn of the eras was extensive.[8] Chancey is by no means incompetent, and he has read widely in the relevant literature, but, despite the efforts of scholars such as Stanley E. Porter, the original thesis was so unhistorical and so flimsy that his demolition of it is all too easy. The blurb announces that this is the first ever book-length treatment of the topic (though Jonathan Reed, who has worked extensively at Sepphoris, wrote a similar one in 2000), and we may well wonder why, career needs to one side, such a simple case needed to be made other than in an article. The truth is that, given the present state of excavation in the area, there is virtually no relevant archaeological or epigraphic evidence for this early period, so there is nothing to say either way, except to express the plausible suspicion that Galilee, which was forcibly Judaized and/or settled with Jewish peasants either by the Hasmonean Aristoboulus I in 104/3 BCE (Josephus, *AJ* 13. 318 ff.) or by his brother Jannaeus (103–76), was a complete backwater until the installation of *VI Ferrata* at Legio after the Bar Kochba revolt; even thereafter the northern area was to all appearances hardly affected by Graeco-Roman culture. Chancey has, however, made an effort to extend his enquiries to Palestine as a whole, so that the book is in fact a detailed, critical account of the evidence for Hellenization/Romanization of the area under the headings architecture/landscape (it is not clear to me why these chapters are so divided), the use of Greek (and Latin), coinage, and art – despite the latter having been the subject of a competent book by Stephen Fine as recently as 2005. Overall, the sceptical argument is surely correct. However, I have quite a number of reservations about presentation. The most important is the complete absence of archaeological thought: Chancey claims that he is writing an archaeological account, but, aside from a single small-scale map, which omits half the places referred to in the text, there is not a single site-plan, ground-plan, photograph, or pie chart in the book; the approach is completely logocentric. There is no survey of the pottery, imported or local; no distribution map of texts in the various languages. Not a coin is illustrated. Then again Chancey steht auf dem Kriegsfuß with Greek: suspiciously enough, not a single epigraphic text in Greek is printed (though Aramaic words are), nor is there an appendix listing such items with the texts; there are some weird unexpanded majuscule coin-legends, full of errors (sometimes taken over from earlier publications); we find numerous oddities such as *philocaesar*, *autonomous* and *epi Vespasian* printed in italics as though they were transliterations, to say nothing of words such as 'Romanophile' which would never have occurred to someone competent in Greek epigraphy. I was also struck by the lack of interest in providing a more than rudimentary explanation of the limited nature of Romanization in the area: no discussion of the nature of civic elites, land tenure, or market orientation, and no attempt to find a means of supplementing the constantly invoked 'lack of evidence' (which sometimes appears to be a protective mantra); the absence of honorific inscriptions from the entire area, which surely speaks volumes, is mentioned, but not set into a wider discussion. This lack of interest compares oddly with the book's introduction, which makes an effort to relate the rather narrow world of NT studies to the world of Roman imperial history. For his next book, Chancey would be well advised

[8] *Greco-Roman Culture and the Galilee of Jesus*. M. A. Chancey. Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series 134. New York, Cambridge University Press, 2005. Pp. 304. Hardback $90.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S001738350700023X Published online by Cambridge University Press

to take on something more challenging. I happen to be writing this in Copenhagen, where in 1859 Moses Mielziner, an emancipated German Jew, published the first modern discussion of ancient Jewish slavery, drawing on biblical and talmudic sources. Unsurprisingly the message was that, since the Israelites had been freed by God from captivity in Egypt, no ancient society was as much inclined as the Jews to ameliorate slavery, so that the ancient Israelites should by rights be seen as the initiators of the modern emancipation movement. Despite this early start, and despite the now vast amount of work on ancient slavery, no detailed study has yet been devoted to the role of the institution in the society of Jewish Palestine. Catherine Hezser, formerly at TCD and now at SOAS in London, who is one of the foremost contemporary experts on the Jerusalem Talmud, who has written fine studies of the sociology of Palestinian rabbis (1997), of Jewish literacy in Palestine (2001), and of Rabbinic law (2003), and who has worked with Peter Schäfer in Berlin/Princeton, has now filled this gap in masterly fashion.[9] If a book could be definitive, this would be it. Although the Jerusalem Talmud is so full of references to slavery as to make it an obvious topic of study, and she has already devoted several articles to the issue, I was interested to find that one of her immediate motives was to contribute to a discussion I had never heard of, namely the canard that Jews played a singularly large role in the Atlantic slave trade. The study is soundly based on a knowledge of modern work on the sociology of chattel slavery. This is appropriate to the material not merely because of the almost total absence of evidence for Jewish slaves outside Palestine ('epigraphic disappearance') but also because of the 'generic' character of the two main Talmudic traditions, tannaitic (I–II^{p}) and amoraic (III–V^{p}), which were preserved orally, and thus constantly modified, over long periods. Moreover, because of their theoretical cast and their literary and rhetorical features, these sources require very sensitive handling. The main argument is that slavery in post-Biblical Jewish society in Palestine is to be understood not as something *sui generis* but as a local inflection of the Graeco-Roman institution (she argues that it would be inappropriate to include materials from the Babylonian Talmud because their context is the social and legal institutions of Sasanian Mesopotamia more than of Rome). Rules relating to slavery found in the Torah ceased to have much binding force. For example, despite frequent mention of the sabbatical and the Jubilee years, when theoretically slaves had to be set free, it is seems clear that in practice slaves would only be manumitted if they purchased their own freedom with their *peculium*. Insofar as the Torah injunctions had any force at all, they constituted moral advice, not a precept, let alone a rule. Again, the earlier acceptance of the legitimacy of children born to concubines gave way to greater emphasis on the slave status of such children, and an evident assumption that women of this status were little better than common prostitutes. On the other hand, the rabbis seem to have disagreed, for example, over the status of a child born to a free Israelite woman who had slept with a gentile slave. The very wide-ranging and interesting (often diverting) material is set out in four main sections: legal and social status (noting the existence of a clear hierarchy of slaves, from those of the Patriarch, who might themselves be wealthy, to rural debt-slaves); domestic and sexual slavery; the role of slaves in the economy of Palestine (including two chapters on falling into slavery); and slavery as theological metaphor and parable for the relationship between

[9] *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity*. By Catherine Hezser. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005. Pp. 452. Hardback £55.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S001738350700023X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Israel and God, or between the rabbis and the people. In each case, the evidence is presented and discussed in a methodical and easily comprehensible manner, the conclusions are articulate, nuanced, and reasonable. Dr. Hezser's book thus provides an important and welcome complement to existing studies of slavery in the Roman Empire: Palestine is, after all, with the exception of Egypt, the only province for which a special study like this can be prepared. The only important topic that I miss is some discussion of the recent claims by Roman demographers (mainly Walter Scheidel) about the implications for slave populations of urban mortality rates, though this issue may in fact be marginal in the case of Palestine. The book has been nicely produced by Oxford, with just a scattering of computer blips, though unfortunately Peter Schäfer's first name appears in the bibliography as ETER. This allows me to deplore the intrusive modern habit of supplying scholars' first names spelled out in full in bibliographies; but at least we have been spared publishers' names. My final title, *La Fin du sacrifice* by Guy Stroumsa, one of the professors in the (graduate) Department of Comparative Religion at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, can appropriately be placed here since it suggests that the shift from a largely pagan to a largely Christian world could hardly have occurred without the Jews, above all without the Jews of the period after the destruction of the Temple in AD 70.[10] The book presents the text of what must have been highly stimulating lectures given at the Collège de France in February 2004 on the invitation of John Scheid. In his search for an explanation, or rather an account, of this transformation, Stroumsa has little time for the opposition between polytheism and monotheism, which has attracted such attention in England, preferring to set the shift that concerns him in the context of Karl Jaspers' notion of an *Achsenzeit*, a period of general cultural change, of which religion is just one manifestation. This is not the only evidence of a relation to Arnaldo Momigliano; indeed, the book might well be thought of as an exploration in depth of the implications of Momigliano's late essay 'Religion in Athens, Rome and Jerusalem in the first century BC'. Stroumsa calls attention to four major changes that contributed to the internalization and subjectivization of religion: the idea of a new sense of self, building on, but also opposing, Foucault's *souci de soi*; the emergence of silent reading and of the idea that true religious knowledge can (only) be obtained through the book; the spiritualization of ritual as the meaningfulness of animal sacrifice came into question; the inversion of the value of the contrasts sacred and profane, public and private. The contribution of Judaism lies mainly in two of these developments. The first is the emergence of the religion of the book, where Stroumsa uses the important work of B. Holdredge, *Veda and Torah* (1996). With the first exile, it had become necessary to elevate the Torah to a new status in order to maintain Jewish identity; during the Second Temple, sects and groups came to define themselves (much as Protestants did later) through their differing interpretations of the Torah; with the destruction of the Second Temple and the abandonment of animal sacrifice the book became central to the synagogue and, albeit in a completely internalized form, since they did not read the Torah but knew it by heart, to the exegeses of the rabbis. Christianity absorbed this value accorded to the book and, despite its general hostility to the Jews, protected at least their sacred writings. The second area, the transformation of sacrifice, is familiar from Porphyry's *De abstinentia*

[10] *La Fin du sacrifice. Les Mutations religieuses de l'Antiquité tardive*. By G. Stroumsa. Paris, Odile Jacob, 2005. Pp. 214. Paperback €27.90.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S001738350700023X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(and, of course Theophrastus before him). But the abolition of representative or normative sacrifice after AD 70 meant that prayer became the major mode of communication with God in Judaism and ritual was forced to take on new shapes, which Stroumsa summarizes in the formula 'le rite s'est transformé en récit du rite, en quelque sorte en mythe' (121). One can follow the same transformation in the various forms of Christianity, including 'gnosis'. There is very much more in this short but highly suggestive book, which draws upon a dazzling array of recent, mainly Continental, work. It is full of brilliant aperçus that reward reflection (though, especially in the early pages, one shake one's head at the thought of the evidence that might be needed to sustain them). The last chapter, an appendix, reflects on the transformation of the relation between the pagan philosopher and his pupils into the 'magical emptiness' of the desert fathers. Stroumsa has the gift of making ideas exciting; whether he is right about the place of the Jewish experience is of course another question. But Momigliano's triangle, Athens, Rome, and Jerusalem, has acquired bold new significance.

doi:10.1017/S001738350700023X RICHARD GORDON

General

It is a commonplace that Greek and Roman literature is the near exclusive domain of men: written and consumed by a ruling male elite. Roger S. Bagnall and Raffaella Cribiore have given voice to a normally silent section of the Classical world, whose words have endured not because of their inclusion in any literary canon, but because of the simple happenstance of their survival in the sands of Egypt.[1] *Women's Letters from Ancient Egypt* comprises translations of over three hundred texts written in both Greek and Egyptian from the fourth century BC to the eighth century AD, divided both into different archival groups and also into different themes from health to literacy to religion. Each translation is helpfully accompanied by concise notes on the scribal hand and on features of style. A useful introduction in the form of ten brief chapters helps to locate the letters within their social, cultural, and specifically epistolary contexts. Though it is Bagnall and Cribiore's explicit intention to allow the women whose letters they reproduce 'to speak to the present without the burden of faulty generalizations', they are wise enough to acknowledge the problems inherent in this position. As they say, there is 'no such thing as an entirely innocent way of presenting these materials'. However, though we are told by the blurb on the inside cover that 'only in their private letters can we discover unmediated expression of their authentic experiences', one wonders about the position in this process of male scribes, to whom many of the women seem to have dictated their letters. Women's voices are again brought to the fore in Isobel Hurst's *Victorian Women Writers and the Classics*,[2] which examines the role of classical literature in the writings of women in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Hurst challenges our preconceptions about the exclusively male context of classical education, by demonstrating the importance of classical learning for women at this time. Furthermore, she argues that

[1] *Women's Letters from Ancient Egypt, 300BC–AD 800.* By Roger S. Bagnall and Rafaella Cribiore. Ann Arbor, MI, The University of Michigan Press, 2006. Pp. xiv + 421. Hardback £41.

[2] *Victorian Women Writers and the Classics. The Feminine of Homer.* By Isobel Hurst. Pp. viii + 253. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006. Hardback £45.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S001738350700023X Published online by Cambridge University Press