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/53.1.205 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in using paraphrases (e.g. 'the priests who watch the birds'), while the bulk of the references to augurs was *per comparationem*, using derivatives of *οἰωνός* or *ὄρνις*. *Μάντις*, also found frequently, is more problematic because of its generic nature. In this connection, V. displays responsible acumen in sorting out the sparse testimonia, both Greek and Roman, that suggest the occurrence of *auspicatio* and *immolatio* before meetings of the Senate. At the same time, it is clear that nuances such as *auspicia impetrativa* and *oblativa* were lost on Greek authors, or the authors felt they would be lost on their audience; a discussion of these alternatives, and of the presumed audience, would have added perspective.

This all the more so as the next chapter on the augurs and their *disciplina* takes up issues that are confusing or inconsistent enough in our Latin sources, such as the *rex sacrorum*, the *auguraculum*, augury (performed by Romulus and Numa) before there were augurs, and the sacred chickens. V. spends considerable time trying to make some sense of the muddled references to the augural procedures for the installation of the kings. Since make-believe, however, is endemic to the regal tradition, one may wonder whether that is worth the effort, especially since Dionysius does not have a grip on many of the augural facts anyway, as V. documents throughout his study. Dio was different: he showed, for instance, interest in priestly elections, and some of his testimonia are helpful for problems such as the deposition of augurs (it could not be done) and some of Caesar's actions that required augural consultation.

The last chapter deals with the public auspices and the question of the tribunician auspices. Once more, it is clear that Dionysius did not get it and elides crucial details due, in part, to his preference for generic terminology. V. usefully compares the Greek and Latin accounts of augural *vitia*, such as that of the elder Tiberius Gracchus and the augural machinations of Caesar and Bibulus in 59 B.C.; the Greek sources do provide complementary information. As for the auspices taken by the tribunes, V. offers a useful clarification of *templum*.

'On the whole', V. states in the final paragraph of his conclusion, 'I have not found the present subject an easy one'. Neither did the ancients, including the Romans. A contributing factor can be cited: by the time of Octavian's accession the augural system was receding in importance and writers of the imperial period could hardly be expected to pay much attention to it.

University of Texas at Austin KARL GALINSKY

PAGANS IN PALESTINE

N. BELAYCHE: *Iudaea Palaestina. The Pagan Cults in Roman Palestine (Second to Fourth Century)*. Pp. xxiv + 386, ills. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001. Cased, DM 178. ISBN: 3-16-147153-9.

This book forms part of a *dossier d'habilitation* (three volumes), translated from the French. This volume concentrates on the pagan cults of Roman Palestine, often neglected by scholars in favour of the two major monotheistic religions, Judaism and Christianity.

Belayche's twelve-page preface to the work is invaluable, for it impresses on the reader the need to put Roman Palestine into context: 'a Roman province to study as a Roman province'. All too frequently modern works use the terminology Holy Land or

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.205 Published online by Cambridge University Press