and so on; but he meditates, too, on how 'non-elite' Romans might have viewed more expensive acts of patronage. Notoriously the 'non-elite' make little noise in the literary record: Clarke searches for soundings in legal documents, epitaphs, graffiti, papyrus scraps and anonymous doggerel, but often he has to rely on his own instinctive sympathies. So he explains the children represented on the Ara Pacis in terms of their value as 'human interest' – like seeing the President with his dog, or Prime Minister *en famille* – and he develops the idea (launched by Burkhard Fehr) that Trajan's Column strives to show how military logistics reflect the order of civilian society, and encourages aspirations of upward mobility. Occasionally this method seems overstretched: Clarke's contention, for example, that the man whose 'modest house' had a peristyle decorated with scenes of the AD 59 riot in and around Pompeii's amphitheatre was an unrepentant hooligan who enjoyed seeing social order 'turned upside down'. And throughout the book, a reader might feel haunted by the suspicion that the 'ordinary Roman' remains as elusive as today's 'man in the street': we know that slaves and freedmen could be more literate than their masters, with Trimalchio looming as the satirical caveat against any over-deterministic analysis of Roman class-structure. Nonetheless, Clarke's evident enthusiasm for his topic, complemented by some good photography, sustains the narrative. And together with the other two books noticed here, this study offers a robust answer to the old academic problem of how to define the *Romanitas* of Roman art. Roman art is constituted by those images the Romans chose to live with. The key part of that definition lies in the choosing.

NIGEL SPIVEY

*Religion*

In a recent interview with some members of the Magic *equipo* at the University of Málaga, in their new journal MHNH, Christopher Faraone rightly claimed that magic is now a 'hot field' in the United States. But until now it has been difficult to find a suitable collection of materials for undergraduate teaching: Georg Luck's *Arcana Mundi* (1985) is excessively intellectualist, and contains almost no documentary texts; Hans-Dieter Betz's *Greek Magical Papyri* and John Gager's *Curse-Tablets*, both admirable, are too specialized for the purpose. In many ways, Daniel Ogden's new reader rises admirably to the challenge.[1] It offers more than twice as many texts as Luck (300), intelligently selected with an eye to discussions in the recent literature. It is well sign-posted, so that themes and topics can easily be followed up. The commentaries are succinct but helpful; and there is a (generally) excellent bibliography, usefully assorted under individual topics. The latest or best editions have been used, and all the passages have been heroically re-translated by the editor. There are also some – rather grainy but adequate – illustrations (but no list of them in the fore-matter). Despite the care taken to make the book user-friendly, there are inevitably one or two blips. If, for example, one looks up 'Ephesia grammata' in the index, one draws a blank; likewise with 'Androcydes', the most important commentator on these magical words. The entry '*voces magicae*' lists, forbiddingly, 24 items, most of which are bound to be simply magical papyri in which such words occur, so one had rather try looking under the best-known text relating to the

[1] *Magic, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. A Sourcebook. Edited by Daniel Ogden. Oxford U.P., 2002. Pp.+ 353. Hardback.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/51.2.272 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Grammata: Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.8.45.2. Not there. But wait, there is a text from the *Stromateis* listed: 6.45 (sic); and if one has the curiosity to look it up, one finds at last Androcydes' commentary. But one might easily have given up earlier: I only persisted because I had already seen the text, and knew it was there somewhere. Moreover, none of the other important texts relating to the Grammata, which happen to be the topic of a recent article by Alberto Bernabé, is included. Much more serious than such blips, however, is Ogden's over-valuation of the role of ghosts and the undead in ancient magical practice. Given his previous work in this area, on the curse-tablets and necromancy, this comes as no surprise, but it tends to nudge the entire selection in a particular direction, and falsely insinuate that 'magic' meant 'malign magic'. The result is that the collection includes material on the Archaic 'shamans' (Pythagoras, Abaris, Aristeas), and ghost-stories, material which ought, if anything, to illustrate the marvellous; but no non-fantastic account of ordinary root-cutting (Theophrastus), popular divination (for example sieve-diviners), or charms (Önnerfors is actually missing from the bibliography). In fact one would hardly suspect that the great bulk of ancient magic, including divination, was healing or defensive magic. Another result is that, of the hendiadys 'drugs and incantations', which was the usual manner in antiquity of denoting magic, both terms are neglected; which is hardly promising. Ogden also projects on to antiquity his own distaste for theory, and excludes virtually all ancient speculation about how magic might work – no Pythagoras of Rhodes, no Origen, Plotinus, Porphyry, or Iamblichus. In general, the magical papyri and the gems are under-represented, and many important items here are missing from the bibliography. Late-antique texts are mingled indiscriminately with earlier ones (but perhaps there really is no satisfactory solution to the problem of how to combine themes and time-lines). On the other hand, the major figures, Circe, Medea, Persian mages, Apollonius of Tyana, Apuleius are all well-represented, as are the topics curse-tablets, love-magic (oddly labelled here 'erotic magic'; Deianeira is even counted a witch), poppets (referred to as 'voodoo dolls'; but this admittedly is the usual US-American term, and the book's market is American) and the law. Apart from the 'shamans', I found only one text (no. 233) which certainly ought not to have been included. Despite some reservations, then, Ogden has put together a useful reader for teaching-purposes, which deserves to be widely taken up, and has regained, with me at any rate, a good deal of the credit he lost with his book on necromancy.

Just over twenty years ago, Pierre Debord offered a general sketch of the social and economic history of the great temples of Anatolia in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, in which he argued that an earlier contrast between indigenous sanctuaries and Greek cults had, by the time of the early Principate, gradually given way to a contrast between urban and rural sanctuaries. Great urban temples were fully subordinated to the control of the ruling élites of the *polis*, rural sanctuaries enjoyed some independence. The unforgiving epigraphic evidence relating to these issues has now been re-examined by Beate Dignas, a former pupil of Simon Price at Oxford, who argues for a tripartite model, according to which *poleis*, central authority (kings; governors; emperors), and temples each sought to maximise their different interests, which often in practice meant that the wealthy temples invoked the centre to protect themselves from attempts by the local *polis* to divert sacred funds.[2] For

[2] *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. By Beata Dignas. Oxford U.P., 2002. Pp. xiii + 364. Hardback.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/51.2.272 Published online by Cambridge University Press

all that he is frequently the object of her criticism, Debord wrote well, and had a clear idea of what he was arguing; unfortunately neither can be said of Dignas. There are, especially early on, many confused and confusing sentences, and too often the argument runs into the sand or gets lost in the (often highly obscure) details of the inscriptions – a PhD thesis that has not quite navigated the passage to a book. Instead of imposing order upon the material, she has has too often allowed the latter to dominate. It is, for example, never made quite clear how one is best to classify the different sorts of temples she discusses; nor what prompted the sale of priesthoods (uniquely) in Asia Minor, and why the practice ceases by the mid-second century AD. The book's value thus lies primarily in its – often insightful – discussion of individual texts. Nevertheless, she has succeeded overall in showing that Debord's dichotomy between urban and rural is too simple; and one chapter, on Roman aims when intervening in disputes, is outstanding. Like most people, I have always – albeit reluctantly – taken it for granted that the cult of Attis provides the strongest, if also the only, evidence in favour of the Mannhardt-Frazer dying-rising god scenario. The co-existence of an iconography of the emasculated/dead Attis with one of the dancing, joyful Attis; the apparent connection at Rome between the *dies sanguinis* and the *Hilaria*, which fell on 24th and 25th March respectively; the explicit association between Attis and grain offered by Firmicus Maternus, *de Errore* 3: what conclusion could be more natural, especially in the version offered by Giulia Sfameni Gasparro? In a brilliantly-argued intervention, however, Maria Grazia Lancellotti, already known from her book on the Syrian Naassene Gnostics (2000), has produced an alternative account of the cult, which systematically lays bare the inadequacies of the old.[3] In her view, advances in Anatolian studies now make it possible to re-read the fuller of the two main variants of the Attis-myth, the so-called 'Phrygian' version, in a political sense, such that Attis becomes a sterile anti-king who subverts the normative model of dynastic legitimacy. The myth would thus have been invented, or heavily adapted, during the third century BC as a justification for the political independence of the Pessinus temple under the leadership of the castrated 'Attis'. No cult of the god is known outside Phrygia, except perhaps at Athens, until the Claudian reform at Rome, where the cult combined a re-affirmation of the necessity of individual death – Attis dies and remains dead – with a ritual means of self-identification with the god, namely the tauro- or criobolium, whose function was to turn the dedicant (male or female) into an honorary *gallus*, who, thanks to the special relation to the Great Mother so created, is entitled to this-worldly divine favour. The remainder of the book explores the ways in which Roman Attis' rejection of sexual union became 'good to think', stimulating intense interest not merely among the Naassenes (a powerful exegesis here of the Attis-hymns of Hippolytus *Ref.* 5.6–11) but also among the Neo-Platonists, including of course Julian, and Christian apologists. It is among these writers, all working with their own agendas, that the motif of other-worldly salvation emerges. All the evidence relating to this question has been repeatedly sieved and interrogated, almost to the point of fatigue; building to some extent on suggestions by Philippe Borgeaud and Robert Turcan, Lancellotti has managed the apparently impossible: a systematic, genuinely original, account of the cult of Attis. Finally, yet another divinity from the East. The Lucianic *De dea Syria* has always bitterly divided opinions. Jane Lightfoot, now of New College, Oxford, has provided us both with a reliable new text and translation, and

[3] *Attis between Myth and History*. King, priest, god. By M. G. Lancellotti. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 149. Brill, Leiden, 2002. Pp. xiii + 207.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/51.2.272 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with an astonishingly learned and diverting commentary, which will decisively influence all subsequent discussion, even if, in the nature of the case, not all her conclusions are equally plausible.[4] It is however a demanding, even daunting, read. The introduction surveys what is known of Atargatis from other, mainly archaeological, sources, but is rightly mainly devoted to the difficult, perhaps (as I am inclined to think) unresolvable, problems of authorship. The commentary repeatedly confirms the familiar point that much of the detail seems to be corroborated by our other sources, which implies a documentary intention at some level. But the elaborate double self-distancing, the pseudo-Herodotean Ionicism, and the professed 'Orientalism' ('I write as an Assyrian'), to say nothing of the exaggerations for effect, constructs a literary mask so effective that even Lightfoot's tentative acceptance of its attribution to Lucian seems too determinate. That also means that, despite Polanski's ingenious arguments, we cannot finally agree on the tone either. But none of this uncertainty diminishes the value of Lightfoot's contribution to the history of religions, and especially her convincing and subtle account of the genesis of the goddess and the character of the cult. And her remarks on 'Hellenization' (pp. 72–83) will become required reading.

RICHARD GORDON

[4] *Lucian, On the Syrian Goddess*. By Jane L. Lightfoot. Oxford U.P., 2003. Pp. xx + 606. Hardback.

*Philology and Linguistics*

*Bilingualism in Ancient Society*[1] is a collection of fifteen essays arising from a conference on bilingualism in the ancient world held at the University of Reading. Its scope is broad, covering a wide temporal span and a range of languages: seventeen besides Latin and Greek are listed in the introductory chapter. This gives a good overview of the ground covered by the different contributions and draws out some recurrent themes. The remainder of the book is organized into four sections, the first concentrating on methodological issues raised by the nature of the evidence for bilingualism in ancient society. The second section is concerned with Greek-Latin bilingualism, and draws on a range of different types of evidence: literary texts, including the writings of Cicero, the epigraphic legacy of the Jewish community at Venusia, and the inscriptions of the *negotiatores* of Delos. A recurrent theme is the motivations underlying particular language choices: Swain, for example, argues that Cicero's use of Greek is a conscious device designed to signal appropriation and subordination of the language, rather than unconscious intrusion. Adams suggests that the traders of Delos were deliberately trying to project a collective double identity in their use of bilingual inscriptions, and of morphological and syntactic interactions between the two languages. Biville explores the range of competence in Greek attained by individual Romans, reflected in the labels *semigraecus, graeculus*, and *graecus,* and the associated social implications. The rest of the book contains case studies of the interaction between Greek and other languages and, in a much smaller section, between Latin and other languages. A common interest is linguistic interference resulting from the contact situation. Several authors are keen to

[1] *Bilingualism in Ancient Society*. Language Contact and the Written Word. Edited by J. N. Adams, Mark Janse, and Simon Swain. Oxford U. P., 2002. Pp. x + 483. Hardback £65.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/51.2.272 Published online by Cambridge University Press