organization of religious activities and the varieties of religious specialists. He argues that *collegia*, with their religious associations, were modeled on the élite priestly colleges, and constituted part of the growing spectrum of possible religious experiences in Rome. Thus within R.'s concept of widely distributed religious competence, the system is both restricted by élite control and open to influence from a variety of other religious personnel, including even such prophets who clearly crossed the boundaries set by the élite.

In the concluding chapter, R. summarizes the problems inherent in writing a single religious history of the empire, and offers up a number of models to make sense of the complex religious and social developments which occurred after the fall of the republic. This is what R. does best: situating Roman religion in its social context with the help of anthropological models, and comparing it to the religions of other cultures. While one may argue with an approach that treats the details of élite religion as relatively unimportant, but cites Horace and Ovid as reliable evidence of wider religious experience, it is easy to see R.'s point in challenging our embedded models and interpretations, indeed what we take for granted under the very category of Roman religion. From the perspective of classics, this theoretical challenge is the crux of R.'s volume, which is essential reading for those interested in paradigms of and comparative anthropological perspectives on Roman religion.

Boston University ZSUZSANNA VÁRHELYI

. . . AND ITALY

E. Bispham, C. Smith (edd.): *Religion in Archaic and Republican Rome and Italy: Evidence and Experience*. (New Perspectives on the Ancient World, 2.) Pp. xiv + 199, ills. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000. Paper, £16.95 (Cased, £45.00). ISBN: 0-7486-1431-1 (0-7486-1430-3 hbk).

In his introduction to this new volume that originated from a conference at the University of Edinburgh in 1997, Edward Bispham considers the paucity and difficulty of documentary evidence for early Roman religion and the growing scholarly skepticism towards grand theories to be a challenge, to which the contributors respond using a variety of approaches and evidence. In the most methodologically introspective contribution, Andreas Bendlin reviews the *Forschungsgeschichte* of Roman religion, arriving via Hartung and Wissowa at what he calls the 'new orthodoxy' of civic compromise in Beard, North, and Price, *Religions of Rome* (Cambridge, 1998). Bendlin criticizes the latter's close association of social élite with religion in favor of a market-place model of individual choice that ends up not very different from North's version. However, Bendlin's emphasis on the varied experience of ritual is relevant, upheld by the contribution of anthropologist Nicole Bourque, and fits well with the inclusive agenda (e.g. of Romans and non-Romans) of the volume. Bourque discusses anthropological concerns in the study of contemporary ritual and how they differ from studying a past culture, and invites classicists to engage in a mutually critical discussion with anthropological studies.

Archaeological finds are the basis of the first set of studies. Vedia Izzet traces the development of Etruscan religious sites from sacred landscape through the ambiguous buildings at Roselle and Tarquinia to the architecturally codified sanctuary buildings

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the late sixth century. After an excellent review of earlier archaeological and historical studies she discusses how the form and decoration of the temples might have shaped the religious experience of their visitors (even though her framework, citing Seneca's views on Etruscan religious meaning, appears to me extraneous). Fay Glinister collects an interesting subset of republican archeological deposits, the 'sacred rubbish' of architectural elements, which she persuasively argues were saved after accidental destruction or restructuring, and even in wartime, for later purification. However, the only related case attested in literary evidence (the Livian story of Q. Fulvius Flaccus, who in 173 B.C. had to return the marble roof tiles to the precinct of Juno Lacinia near Croton, stolen for his own temple to Fortuna Equestris in Rome) also raises important (and unresolved) problems about the historical relation of religious and political motifs in defining the sacred. The fact that Croton had been a colony since 194 and thus part of the Roman sphere of influence might be quite significant, as Glinister recognizes and Olivier de Cazanove emphasizes in his discussion of the 'religious Romanization' of Italy before the Social War. Torelli first pointed to one identifiable homogenizing trend: the anthropomorphic (mostly anatomical) terracotta *ex-votos*, which spread from central Italy to the North and South primarily through the Latin colonies in the third century B.C. Now de Cazanove argues that instead of Asclepius worship (which was limited in Roman Italy, where the *ex-votos* went to a variety of divinities, including Jupiter, Hercules, and Minerva), the growing popularity of healing cults in general, from the fourth century onward, was responsible for this phenomenon. But how exactly these *ex-votos*, which de Cazanove sees as the most visible form of private devotion in mid-republican Italy, fit into the larger context of the spread of Roman colonies, which he calls the 'religious staging posts of Roman expansion', is left open.

In the second half of the volume, the complexities and discrepancies of republican evidence take center stage. Emmanuelle Curti studies the introduction of Concordia to Rome in 304 B.C., which left no surviving contemporary trace. Based on the Greek associations of the cult and its new *aedicula*, and the date of the festival on July 25, Curti offers an interesting hypothesis regarding the new cult's political associations with the struggle of plebeians and patricians. Developing an understanding of the particular trends in our sources and of what Curti rightly calls the complex stratigraphy of information can be helpful, and John North returns to the historiographical problem he first raised over a decade ago regarding the absence of prophets from Roman historical tradition. (On the possibly related scarcity of religious references in Polybian historiography now see Jyri E. Vaahtera's paper in C. Bruun's new conference volume, *The Roman Middle Republic* [Rome, 2000].) Collecting evidence for such prophetic texts, like the prophecy of Vegoia and the *carmina Marciana*, North compellingly suggests that there could have been lively traditions of producing and collecting such texts in mid-republican Italy. In an excellent combination of miscellaneous evidence, Peter Wiseman uses a coin series of 78 B.C. celebrating the major games, including those of Hercules, and two late republican inscriptions attesting lesser games of Hercules organized by *pagi*, to offer a historical hypothesis about how the status of the games diminished in response to their political association with Sulla.

The concluding paper, by Christopher Smith, commendably aims at pulling together various threads in the contributions by taking up the issue of 'evidence and experience' in the long problematic cult of Mater Matuta in Rome. His argument, that religious experience and its description share the patterns of literary intertextuality and allusiveness as discussed by Stephen Hinds, is thought provoking, but may need more

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.203 Published online by Cambridge University Press

refinement to deal with the complex varieties of historical evidence. In sum, although the double footnote system is somewhat confusing and the index not quite reliable (e.g. references to the Bacchanalia scandal on p. 107 by North and p. 113 by Wiseman are missing), this volume offers stimulating reading for anyone interested in sources and methodologies for the study of archaic and republican religion.

Boston University ZSUZSANNA VÁRHELYI

AUGURS THROUGH GREEK EYES

J. VAAHTERA: *Roman Augural Lore in Greek Historiography. A Study of the Theory and Terminology*. (Historia Einzelschriften 156.) Pp. 194. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2001. Paper, €38. ISBN: 3-515-07946-7.

The accurate rendering of Roman institutional terms and concepts into Greek was always a challenge, even in official documents. Translation into comparable equivalents could be misleading, due to differences rooted in culture and practice. Multi-dimensional terms, such as *auctoritas*, were virtually untranslatable, as Dio admits at one point (55.3.5).

Vaahtera's study focuses on the phenomenon with specific reference to augural terminology in the works of Greek historians, notably Dionysius, Plutarch, Appian, and Dio. It is a limited topic, and the resulting contribution is a valuable one within those parameters. Dionysius turns out to be the most problematic of the lot: time and again he really is not cognizant of important distinctions, such as the different functions of augurs and haruspices. A corollary characteristic is that, in contrast to the others, he uses a whole gamut of terms for augurs and their practices, which tends to blunt precision yet more. At the same time, splotchy as they may be, some Greek accounts throw valuable additional light on debated issues, such as the religious preliminaries to a meeting of the Senate and the augural powers of the tribunes.

Copious the Greek sources are not. Accordingly, V. does not take up the subject of augural terminology until a third of the way through the book. A chapter on 'Greek Historiography and Roman Institutions' precedes and does not yield much that is new. The information presented on historians before Polybius is routine and fills no real need in this book. The only connection V. can establish with his main topic is the statement that Timaeus was 'the first Greek historian who, we are allowed to assume, may well have had something to say on augurs' (p. 19). Polybius, despite his well-known pronouncement that religion was the major cohesive force in the Roman state (6.56), remained remarkably reticent about auguries and auspices, and V. makes a reasonable argument *pro silentio*. The remainder of the chapter concludes with the useful finding that the Greek historians of the Roman period, with the exception of Plutarch, drew almost exclusively on other historians rather than on antiquarians, such as Varro, let alone *commentarii augurales*.

The following chapter, 'Greek Names for Roman Institutions', starts with a concise survey of the pertinent translation practices, centering on the taxonomy established by David Magie in his 1905 Leipzig dissertation: *per comparationem* (by means of a cultural equivalent), *per translationem* (literal translation), and *per transcriptionem* (transliteration). Obviously, only the last two apply to the *augures*; of the thirteen instances of *αὔγουρ* twelve are found in Plutarch. Plutarch also is the most resourceful

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.203 Published online by Cambridge University Press