

In each, R. begins with an assessment of the literary evidence for the reign (Herodian, Cassius Dio and the *Historia Augusta*) before proceeding to a detailed analysis of the use of divine imagery on coinage. She frequently links coin issues to specific historical events (e.g. imperial visits, wars) and she contextualizes the divine ideology evident in coinage within imperial building projects in Rome. Reactions of individuals or provincial communities in the form of individual dedications or civic coinage then complete the picture. Each reign is analysed chronologically in great detail and only the broad conclusions of the use of divine sanction in imperial ideology can be summarized here.

While military success was the most prominent theme in Severus' coinage (23 per cent), R. argues that Liber Pater and Hercules had a small but significant presence (3 per cent). She shows that these divinities were part of the larger visual language of the reign, and on the basis of archaeological and numismatic evidence she argues for a colossal temple of Liber Pater and Hercules on the Quirinal in Rome. She explores the connection with Lepcis Magna, but also emphasizes Hercules' association with Commodus and argues that Severus' adoption into the Antonine dynasty was a factor in his close alignment with Hercules. She concludes that there is no evidence for the general adoption of the cult of Liber Pater and Hercules in the provinces. In Caracalla's reign by contrast there is a clear drop in the percentage of victory iconography (to 2 per cent) and an increase in depictions of deities. Throughout his reign there is an emphasis on Sarapis, while for discrete periods Aesculapius and Apollo become prominent, apparently connected to visits by Caracalla to Aesculapius at Pergamum and perhaps Apollo Grannus in Germany and Apollo at Claros. Indeed the patronage of provincial cults emerges as a central part of Caracalla's public image. Coinage for the reign of Elagabalus is particularly important given that other evidence was destroyed following *damnatio memoriae*. R. concludes that there was a strong emphasis on Elagabalus' position as high priest of the Emesene deity Elagabal on the basis that 23 per cent of the total silver coinage in the hoard sample depicts him as such. It remains an open question as to whether this was part of a concerted effort to change the nature of the Principate to a hereditary priesthood. However, the epigraphic and numismatic evidence does not suggest a centralized effort to impose this cult on the provinces. Following Elagabalus' unsuccessful religious innovations, coinage under Alexander Severus is characterized by a return to tradition, exemplified by the prominence of Jupiter (13 per cent) and Mars (17 per cent) with a variety of epithets. Overall, R. concludes that, with the exception of Elagabalus, the Severans operated within a traditional religious framework, and she emphasizes the dynamism and flexibility of divine ideology within the context of fundamental continuity. R. does, however, acknowledge that while her study focuses on innovations in divine patronage on coinage, these were in fact a minor aspect when viewed within coinage production as a whole.

One of the strengths of the book is the way that coinage is interpreted within the broader cultural and visual context. R. is not interested in materiality and visibility *per se* — indeed there is scope for further engagement with the coin images and monuments. What she offers is a narrative history of the Severan period primarily through detailed and systematic analysis of coinage. It is a fluent and convincing book with a plethora of hard facts and statistics, and it is hoped that similar detailed numismatic studies of other reigns will be forthcoming. R.'s book will be very useful to scholars of the Severan period, those engaging with imperial ideology and numismatics more generally.

King's College London
and Corpus Christi College, Oxford
alexia.petsalis-diomidis@kcl.ac.uk

ALEXIA PETSALIS-DIOMIDIS

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000422

A. GANGLOFF (ED.), *LIEUX DE MÉMOIRE EN ORIENT GREC À L'ÉPOQUE IMPÉRIALE* (Echo 9). Bern/Oxford: Lang, 2013. Pp. xiv + 395, illus. ISBN 9783034313759. £40.00.

This volume publishes the proceedings of a conference held in Lausanne in 2011, focused on places of memory in the imperial Greek East. It consists of nineteen short papers, the majority in French, with three in English. The introduction by Gangloff reviews the recent bibliography on cultural memory studies, outlining especially recent work on places of memory in the Roman world, and the link in the Greek world between sacred places and the creation of memory. A short paper by Jequier, outlining the concept of 'places of memory' in modern scholarship and practice since the work of Pierre Nora in the late '70s and '80s, is followed by the conference papers, grouped into five thematic sections.

Section One on the imaginary geography of Greek memory comprises two papers on Philostratus. Bowie demonstrates how Philostratus constructs his own image of Greece through the places visited by Apollonius or mentioned in the *Life of Apollonius*, privileging cities which reflect the Classical past over those of Hellenistic fame. Mestre discusses the *Heroikos*, and the way in which it puts place as the guarantee of tradition, transferring authority away from Homer towards material landscape as the proof of Protesilaos' history and continuing presence.

Section Two turns to the construction of places of memory in rhetorical and iconographical discourse. Gómez discusses the place of Marathon in the Greek imagination, through a discussion of Lucian and Plutarch, while Billault turns to Dio's *Borysthenic Oration* (36), examining how Dio presents Borysthenes both as a souvenir of its own history and also as a living embodiment of Greek culture, albeit in a Scythian frame. The third paper in this section, by Michaeli, turns to art, looking at allusions to the Nile in ancient art in Israel. Though she presents an interesting collection of images, it is less clear how the Nile here acts as a place of memory, rather than as a more general allusion to the ideals of fertility and abundance.

Section Three, on places of memory and civic identity, comprises three papers. Bérard discusses the rôle of epigraphy in creating civic memory, focusing on the Heroon of Opramoas at Rhodiapolis in Lycia. The tomb of this wealthy benefactor also acted as civic archive, bearing on its walls a series of inscriptions which underlined Opramoas' own wealth and importance, as well as the successes of his city. Horster turns to Eleusis, looking at the honorific monuments and inscriptions which were visible in the imperial period. She argues that these represent a conscious selection from the past, which presented a particular picture of the previous centuries, as well as showing changes in commemorative patterns in the imperial period. Gengler turns to the sanctuaries of the southern Peloponnese, questioning the evidence of Pausanias, and looking at how a confluence of interests allowed local élites as well as emperors to support certain sites and maintain them as spaces imbued with the presence of the past.

The first paper in Section Four (Sacred Topographies), returns to the reliability of Pausanias. Jacquemin looks at the buildings and monuments of Delphi which are archaeologically attested but missing in the literary sources, most notably Pausanias and Plutarch. Strikingly, the rebuilding of the Temple of Apollo, and individual monuments such as that of Daochos, are omitted by these writers, a lacuna which Jacquemin suggests may be due to their particular agenda. Raschle's paper turns to a different sanctuary of Apollo, that at Daphne near Antioch. Tracing its history in the fourth century A.D., he shows how the sanctuary became a site of conflict between pagans and Christians, transforming the sanctuary from a site of pagan religious memory to one commemorating the Christian defeat of the emperor Julian. Christian memory is explored further in the paper by Caillou, which looks at the traditions regarding the burial site of Christ.

The final section addresses the involvement of emperors in places of Graeco-Roman memory. The first two papers form a pair focused on the city of Nicopolis and its Aktia festival. Guerber looks at the significance of city, monument and festival for Augustus, while Hoët-van Cauwenberghe and Kantiréa focus on Nicopolis' enduring importance for later emperors in the creation of memories of both triumph and philhellenism. The next two papers look at the significance of Cilicia as a place of memory. Lebreton looks at the associations held by the Gates of Cilicia as a mental frontier, not least due to its associations with the campaigns of the Alexander the Great, while Blonce analyses the commemoration of Septimius Severus' defeat of Pescennius Niger at Issos. The memory of Alexander also provides the focus for the final paper in this section: Bérenger's examination of Caracalla's homage to places imbued with the memory of Alexander. A final paper by Bielman provides an excellent synthesis of the book, drawing out some common conclusions and observations and identifying interesting areas for further research.

The collection works well as a whole with several strands binding the papers together. Several consider the agenda of our literary sources, and the ways that writers like Philostratus (Bowie, Mestre), Pausanias (Jacquemin, Gengler), or Dio (Billault) use space as a way to create their own Hellenic memory map, and for the creation of their own self-image. Others consider the rôle of place in interactions between individual and group identities (Bérard, Horster, Raschle, Caillou). The rôle of festivals and sanctuaries as spaces for memory is another repeated theme (Horster, Gengler, Guerber, Hoët-van Cauwenberghe and Kantiréa, Blonce).

Overall this is a most stimulating collection. The individual papers are detailed and insightful and add greatly to our understanding of the importance of place in the creation of memory. Memories of the past were especially important in the imperial Greek East, as studies on the so-called Second Sophistic have shown so well. It would have been useful to have a more specific engagement with

this scholarship in the introduction, to justify and explain the parameters of the conference. Despite this, the collection makes a real contribution to our knowledge of the thought-world of the Greek East in the imperial period, and the ways in which individuals and groups could invest places with the memory of a past tailored to their specific self-interests and identities.

University of Warwick
Z.L.Newby@warwick.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435814000434

ZAHRA NEWBY

G. FORSYTHE, *TIME IN ROMAN RELIGION: ONE THOUSAND YEARS OF RELIGIOUS HISTORY* (Routledge studies in ancient history 4). New York/London: Routledge, 2012. Pp. xiii + 207, illus. ISBN 9780415522175. £80.00.

Anyone writing a book on a topic straight after Denis Feeney risks walking deep in his shadow and will go to some trouble to distinguish their account from his — or so I thought beginning Forsythe's *Time in Roman Religion*. His tactic is a startling one: the first, and only, time I found Feeney's 2007 *Caesar's Calendar* was in the bibliography, though his 1998 *Literature and Religion at Rome* does get a single mention (49, n. 1) in a footnote that lists previous bibliography on the *ludi saeculares*. Feeney is not the only living Romanist to get this kind of treatment: one solitary 1979 article by North accompanies Beard-North-Price's 1998 *Religions of Rome*; Beard gets two articles, Rüpke's 1995 *Kalender und Öffentlichkeit* seasons the text so lightly as to be barely detectable ... the list could go on for some time. It is not carelessness or the polite omission of a particular modern text here and there: it is virtually systematic.

F. thus effectively evades most approaches to religion and the calendar that postdate the mid-twentieth century; we are not unlikely to find ourselves amidst Victorian debates when modern (if that is still the word) scholarship is discussed. My first impression was that F. was engaging for the most part in the kinds of speculation and argument that characterized the world of Frazer, Fowler, Rose and their contemporaries but even this is not the case: *The Golden Bough* gets very cursory mention. Thus, for example, on p. 48, we are reminded that Mannhardt's 1877 interpretation (*Wald und Feldkulte*) of the *argei* was disputed by Frazer in his 1929 commentary on Ovid's *Fasti*. Even then, F. wants to keep both: 'Frazer's latter point is quite valid, but the parallels adduced by Mannhardt are equally compelling'.

Ignoring the way that more than cursory mention of secondary scholarship generally peters out before getting much further than the 1980s, the forward-from-1850 perspective is surprisingly distracting. In order to engage with F.'s account, the reader must repeatedly touch base with their own sense of bigger questions more than should concern them at any particular moment: which questions should *matter* in religion? So with the *argei* I was wondering what rôle *should* speculations about etymology and vegetation spirits play in a discussion. He lost me when we met 'baffled ... antiquarians of the late Republic and early Empire ... contriv[ing] fanciful explanations' (48). Whereas I was thinking that their comments were quite interesting in their own right — they can convey a little more to us than just 'bafflement' if we give them a chance.

This profound lack of contemporary discussion makes it very difficult to make judgements about F.'s speculations which are, I should stress, based on a genuinely detailed knowledge of the ancient sources but presented with almost no reference to the ways we currently make sense of religion or texts. For instance, we get virtually no sense of how particular sources might be positioned — the kind of thing that Feeney, for instance, does so well. This vacuum means that F. is generally offering pieces of a jigsaw puzzle we are no longer especially concerned with assembling: the questions have changed and so it is difficult to know where to put his answers even if you find them persuasive.

A review is no place to outline virtually *ab initio* the kinds of arguments a contemporary discussion could or should involve: to engage in debate here would require me not just to outline F.'s position but to contextualize it in more recent work before finally offering comment. I indulge only briefly with regard to one theme already alluded to (which haunts much of the book): 'authenticity and coherent meaning *only* at time of origin' and its ever-present sidekick 'religion in decline' is a pair of workers that not many of us miss: after all, they rarely pulled much of the weight they promised.

F. gives us six chapters, connected loosely by an interest in details of the Roman calendar: a preliminary examination of the calendar; the 'days after and other curiosities'; the *argei* (with