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 Jonathan Hall agrees with David Clarke that 'archaeology is not history' (212), in so far as historical documents and archaeological evidence sometimes require different analytical methods.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/S0075435815000830 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mediterranean sites and, scarcely, territories further afield where H. is less sure-footed. The claim (196) that 'Josephus (*Jewish Antiquities* 18.9) tells us that the Jewish community in Babylon was all but annihilated by the emperor Gaius' is evidently untrue. Neither was Gaius responsible for the massacre, nor does Josephus claim that he was, nor was ancient Babylon within or even close to the Roman frontiers then, and the passage refers to Babylonia, not just to Babylon (cf. T. Rajak in J. Wiesehöfer (ed.), *Das Partherreich und seine Zeugnisse* (1998), 314–17). Whilst one admires the authoritative knowledge with which both Greek and Roman case studies are otherwise presented, one wonders why the Greek and Roman world is geographically reduced to such a narrow core, hardly representative of the Roman Empire, the vast realms of Hellenistic kings or even the Greek world prior to Alexander.

H. argues (216–17) that it is 'unrealistic to expect' that one can acquire an in-depth familiarity with the 'unwieldy abundance of data, methods, techniques and approaches' in classical archaeology as well as what is expected of the ancient historian, notably in terms of mastering relevant languages. Is it really unrealistic to master some of these at least to the level that the meaning of key terms and statements can be interrogated whilst also knowing archaeological techniques and data? Many examples to the contrary could be cited. H. urges classical archaeologists to consider 'the availability of textual documentation … a cause for celebration rather than — as inexplicably often seems to be the case — a source of embarrassment' (215). Surely, this is explicable precisely through the growing unfamiliarity of archaeologists with documentary evidence, a state of affairs unlikely to improve if we accept H.'s argument that archaeologists and ancient historians have to go their separate ways and focus on their preferred methods. *Artifact & Artifice* makes a rather half-hearted plea for marginal improvements on the status quo. The division of scholars of the ancient world into ancient historians and archaeologists is here to stay, but more dialogue is much to be encouraged (219). Since having advocated a much more radical approach a decade ago (E. Sauer (ed.), *Archaeology and Ancient History* (2004)), I have observed little headway in bridging the divide, just the odd step forward, the odd step back and most scholars venturing no further out of their comfort zone. H.'s expectations may be defeatist, but perhaps indeed realistic.

Edinburgh University EBERHARD W. SAUER
eberhard.sauer@ed.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435815000830

II. LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

B. MCGILLIVRAY, *METHODS IN LATIN COMPUTATIONAL LINGUISTICS* (Brill's Studies in Historical Linguistics 1). Boston: Brill, 2014. Pp. xiv + 231, illus. ISBN 9789004260115. €98.00/ US$127.00.

Work in computational linguistics has until recently dealt almost exclusively with modern languages. Most known techniques in computational linguistics rely on statistical models that first have to be generated on the basis of data that has been correctly annotated. Only then can they can predict the analysis of unseen data. Manual annotation of a dataset is a very time-consuming and costly endeavour, and while computational linguistics has numerous applications that readily attract commercial funding, few customers demand that their new mobile phone should give them directions in Latin.

Given the focus on modern languages, it makes good sense to write a book about the challenges involved in applying computational linguistic techniques to historical languages. Philologists, linguists and computer scientists have to learn from each other (and understand each other's research priorities) to make this possible. Barbara McGillivray has taken this idea one step further and written a book specifically about computational linguistics applied to Latin. This too makes sense, not because Latin is unlike any other historical language, but because some of the resources that make it possible to analyse Latin linguistic data computationally have recently become available. We now, for example, have morphosyntactically annotated corpora of Latin texts, which are freely available for anyone to use.

M.'s goal is to illustrate the advantages of a computational approach and to show how well-known computational methods can be applied to Latin linguistic data. She explicitly states that the book is a methodological contribution and the reader should not expect novel linguistic

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435815000830 Published online by Cambridge University Press