argues that women did sacrifice animals not only during the Thesmophoria but at other occasions as well. In this section (114–117) D. comes to blows with the prevalent paradigm in a remarkable way. He has omitted to inform the reader of the fact that women were not allowed to «wield the sacrificial implements» according to current historiography. This only turns up on the very spot (116) where he quotes M. Detienne, who more than any other historian has put his seal on the ‘prohibition’-rule, in order to show that this view is unfounded. In other words, D.’s attack is well under way before the reader knows what exactly is being attacked. Moreover, in the endnotes to this section Osborne’s 1993 article on this matter is not mentioned, although it is included in the bibliography. In a book that on the whole is clearly argued and well organized, this muddle is a sign of something unusual. Apparently, here D. had to conclude that the ‘prohibition’-view is based on no evidence at all, that it is amply contradicted by both written and visual sources which have been bluntly disregarded. It seems to me that he could hardly believe his own eyes and hence found it difficult to render the issue in a way that would be both just and respectful.

In many respects, then, GWCGR is a highly instructive and valuable book. This applies to the wealth of the collected material and to the useful references, as well as to the interesting questions it provokes on the current historiography on women in classical Greece.

Josine Blok


It is often said that each generation writes its own history of the past in accordance with its own interests and concerns. The best representatives of such a generation admit that in doing so they stand on the shoulders of their predecessors. S. definitely depends heavily on what predecessors have collected and interpreted (Greek inscriptions and representatives of the second Sophistic) but tries to bring their results under the blanket of the popular concept of ‘(self)-identity’. ‘Identity’ and ‘otherness’ are trendy concepts heavily indebted to growing concerns about globalization and Europeanization. Increasing migration-flows stimulate research-projects focusing on such concepts; they are doing very well in the fierce competition for funds provided by government-sponsored research-organizations and private institutions alike.

S.’s study is a nice illustration of the above trend. His project was part of a Sonderforschungsbereich in which ‘Alterität’ and ‘Identität(en)’ were the keywords. In a substantial introduction (ch. 2) in which he perpectively draws upon modern sociological analyses of the identity-concept, S. points out that a ‘collective identity’ is a matter of «being aware of belonging to a given collective identity». He distinguishes this awareness from what the Egyptologist J. Assmann has called «das Bild, das eine Gruppe von sich aufbaut». This seems to me somewhat over-sophisticated.

Assmann’s definition seems to me to take S.’s awareness for granted; being aware of one’s identity nearly always leads to filling that awareness with content. In the end S.
comes up with a very sensible question which supersedes all controversies about definitions: «Wer beansprucht in welcher Situation wem gegenüber mit welchen ‘Argumenten’ welche kollektive Identität» (40). As will be seen, various assumptions will have to be made if one wants to answer all five questions posed in this one sentence. Moreover, given the scarcity of relevant sources for preindustrial societies not all these questions can be answered. Evidence concerning the identity of guilds in Asia Minor is hard to come by. A recent sophisticated analysis of their role shows that they proudly accepted their position in the urban hierarchy and by a process of imitatio domini made the best of it (O. M. van Nijf, The civic world of professional associations in the Roman East, Amsterdam 1997).

As to the sources used by S., the authors of the second Sophistic and inscriptions play a dominant role. S. (31/32, 257) rightly is sceptical about the value of archaeological material for problems of collective identity. The historian needs statements or «symbolische Äußerungen» for his attempts to pinpoint such identities. The incorporation of Roman architectural elements in Greek buildings, the appearance of Roman toga in funerary reliefs, or the use of Roman terra sigillata in house and kitchen point to changing tastes rather than to a new identity (a different approach is that of H. Halfmann who writes about Pergamene members of the elite who «die Umsetzung hauptstädtischer Architektur bewußt als politisch-ideologische Identifikation (italics are mine, H. W. P.) mit der römischen Weltmacht zelebrierte» [Stadttypologien im römischen Kleinasien: Pergamon und Ephesos als Modell, in E. Schwertheim – E. Winter (edd.), Stadt und Stadtentwicklung in Kleinasien, Asia Minor Studien Band 55, Bonn 2003, 111–126, especially 119]).

In two long chapters (3 and 4; 42–113) S. offers a sketch of the relations between the Roman authorities (emperors; governors) and the cities (petitions to the emperor; governors touring in their province for jurisdiction in the conven-
tus-capitals), followed by a detailed but hardly new analysis of the political structure of the cities in Asia Minor. City-life was dominated by a ‘Honoratiorenregime’, which through membership of the urban council, controlled urban politics and formulated political ideals. Control of the polis was achieved through lavish benefactions and the holding of magistracies. Respect among the fellow-citizens was the reward for the generosity and ambitions (φιλανθρωπία) of the urban aristocracy. The benefactors-magistrates expressed their «kollektive Identität als Mitglieder der besten Kreise» (82). Who precisely belonged to those «Kreise» («beste» or «erste Kreise»; elsewhere «beste Zirkel» or «Aristokratie, Oligarchie»; 82, 85, 87, 111/112) is not entirely clear.

On the one hand S. seems to believe that this group is identical with the bouleutic oligarchy. He writes about competition within the oligarchy, i.e., between men who in principle are «gleichrangige» (83); combining this with what he writes on 87 about the «Angehörigen der besten Kreise» being the same as the bouleutai, one may conclude that S. thinks in terms of competition within the bouleutic oligarchy as a whole. In this context those who wanted to rise socially («aufsteigen»; 112) are likely to have been people just outside the boule who occasionally managed to penetrate into the boule. S. writes about competition between social climbers and those who have made it («zwischen denen, die aufsteigen und ’dazugehören’ wollen»; 112). In other passages one gets the impression that S. identifies the «beste Kreise» not with the bouleutai tout court but with the top-group within the boule, the primores or, to borrow a term used by Hadrian, the primores. Competition was a matter of a group of leading families within the boule. In this version the «Aufsteiger» are likely to have been the inferiores (or pedani) in the boule, i.e., the homines novi who, just like Cicero in the senate par excellence, managed to penetrate not only into the boule but also into the group of primores. I prefer the latter version and hope that S. means the same. On 112 S. lists the criteria, to be met by those who claimed to belong to «the first men of the city»: membership of a respectable family; fulfillment of important magistracies; a correct attitude towards city and emperor; winner in the competitive benefactors-race. Those qualities were only claimed by part of the bouleutic elite; and, if my
interpretation of S.’s prose is identical with what S. himself actually thinks, this implies that we must assume that, notwithstanding some allusions in literary sources and even in a few inscriptions to conflicts within the boule, overall the inferiores subscribed to those values and were prepared to identify themselves together with the πρωτοί/primores as the urban elite tout court.

Was the ‘collective identity’ which the members of the bouleutic elite expressed in their inscriptions, an aim in itself or rather a means to an end? The latter seems to be the case. In the long fifth chapter (114–260) S. argues, hardly surprisingly, that the focus of the urban elite was the city itself, the γλυκυττή πατρίς. The elite-collective, after having construed its own identity, proceeded to confess its love for their own polis and in the process shaped the image which they wanted to impose on the city and which the latter was supposed to accept.

In this context I refer to A. Chaniotis who recently wrote about a von der Elite geförderte kollektive Identität in the city of Aphrodisias (Vom Erlebnis zum Mythos: Identitätskonstruktionen im kaiserzeitlichen Aphrodisias, in E. Schwertheim – E. Winter (edd.), Stadt und Stadtentwicklung in Kleinasien, Asia Minor Studien Band 50, Bonn 2003, 69–84, especially 83; see also P. Weiß’s article in the same volume). Coins (often carrying city-specific images and references to a mythological past), festivals, contests, and processions all served to express the collective identity of a city. All those media were controlled and filled with content by the elite; this raises the problem duly recognized by S. (121 and 140), of the extent to which the citizens at large shared these views about the city’s identity. To the extent that various subdivisions of the population participated in or were spectators during the ceremonies organized during urban festivals (sacrifices; processions; contests), S. not unreasonably assumes that there must have been zahlreiche Wechselwirkungen zwischen den Vorgaben der Festorganisatoren und dem Selbstverständnis der Bürger (140). Inter-urban rivalry often concerned the official titulature to which cities felt themselves entitled. Such titulature expressed the pre-eminence of a city in a province and, in the case of the νεωκόρος-epithet, the loyalty towards the emperor. S. quotes a passage from Dio of Prusa’s 40th oration which testifies to the clear involvement of the urban population at large in such seemingly trivial rivalries. In an attempt to buttress his theory about the representativeness of the elite-controlled images of the city S. adduces various dedications and epitaphs in which the erectors refer to their mother-city. The problem is twofold. On the one hand it is not always clear that the dedicants and erectors of epitaphs actually belonged to non-elite groups; on the other, it is one thing to refer to one’s city by adding an ethnikon to one’s name and to make clear that one loves the γλυκυττή πατρίς; however, this general, emotional statement does not necessarily entail full acceptance of the content which the elite gave to their focus on the city through its control of the relevant media. Did the common man, who happened to add his ethnikon to his name, really bother about the messages issued by the elite on coins and in festivals? When a Smyrnaean citizen dedicates a statue to Apollo Nisaeus in the city of Nisa (162), we do not even know whether the dedicator by adding his ethnikon to his name, expressed his pride on being a Smyrnaean or simply gave a piece of information to the passer-by; whether he shares the ideological constructions of the elite about Smyrna, remains fully unknown. Incidentally, it is a waste of paper to print the complete text of a Smyrnaean epitaph (with German
translation), when the only relevant word is the ethnikon Συμφωνοῦν. The same applies to many other inscriptions presented in full but only relevant to the argument for a small part.

S. neglects somewhat the role of the numerous ἀθλῶνες as identity-creating institutions. On 122–124 he writes about a large agonistic market of 300 to 400 contests (in the meantime raised to ca. 520 by W. Leschhorn in his article in Stadion 24, 1, 1998, 31–57), and points out that urban contests admittedly were not daily but certainly not rare events. On 124/125 contests (ἀθλῶνες) are subsequently listed as one of the core-elements of a festival but there is no further elaboration of their relevance for collective identity. It is significant that S. duly quotes Aelius Aristides writing about ἀθλῶνες γαίρει ταῖς ἀθλῶνες ἄφθους but in the German translation in note 26 fails to translate the last four words! Now it has recently been argued that it was precisely on the local, urban level, where the ἀθλῶνες was an essential feature of urban life, that«athletic performance was a crucial element in the self-representation of the local elites» (O. van Nijf, Local heroes: athletics, festivals and elite self-fashioning in the Roman East in S. Goldhill [ed.], Being Greek under Rome. Cultural identity, the Second Sophistic and the development of empire, Cambridge 2001, 306–314, especially 307). Young athletes from the (upper)middle and elite class in society were educated in the γυμνασίον and were proud of victories, first in gymnasial, later in local urban and finally, if talent and training permitted, in ‘international’ contests. Given the popularity of the γυμνασίον among the relatively well-off and that of the ἀθλῶνες among the population at large, it is not too speculative to assume that one element in the process of identity-building was the agonistic success of scions of the city. Cities are known to have supported promising athletes and to have identified themselves with them; inversely, athletes identified themselves with their mother-cities.

S. wonders whether for the urban elites there was something beyond the polis and its identity. First, he refers to the accumulation of citizenships by Honoratioren, successful athletes and artists. The honorary citizenships of members of the elite reflect the possibility of actually exercising influence in other cities but for the rest it is a matter of widening one’s horizon rather than ignoring one’s own city.

S. emphatically separates the athletes from the Honoratioren. The former admittedly enjoyed much prestige but are not to be put on a par with the political elite. This approach ignores the fact that a number of star-athletes actually were scions of families of the elite and that as a result honorary citizenship had the same value as for other members of those families. S. suggests that the ridicule heaped upon the athletes by authors like Philostratos shows that athletes did not belong to the Honoratioren: the latter could not have been ridiculed in such a way. However, in the same vein one could argue that the fundamental criticism by authors like Plutarch of the extravagant ‘benefactions’ of members of the elite, duly quoted by S., shows that such benefactors could not have belonged to the urban elite. Needless to say, S. does not draw that conclusion; and rightly so. On the contrary, he argues that Plutarch’s views did not reflect the overall ideology of the elite.

A brief section on the many foreign visitors at festivals and on ἄστρωγμαλος-oracles reacting on questions concerning the desirability of a stay abroad is hardly relevant. Awareness that the world was bigger than one’s own city is to be distinguished from a less intense perception of that same city as the main focus of one’s life. The oracles often predict a safe return to one’s city; occasionally a stay abroad is not recommended at all.

In the remainder of chapter 5 S. discusses the possible existence of supra-local identities: regional, pan-Greek (Greekness) and Roman. As to regional entities S. convincingly argues that, whereas Strabo in various passages describes «potentielle Identitätshorizonte» (183), study of the regional Κοινό, their coins, festi-
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vals and athletic contests, leads to the conclusion that the regions provided platforms for self-representation of members of the elite of participating cities rather than media for new collective identities. This picture is confirmed by the fact that there are very few private dedications and epitaphs in which persons mention the name of their ethnos (e.g. Βηθυνυς).

Occasionally S. is not aware of the pitfalls of Greek epigraphy. He interprets Μαίονιον in TAM V 202 and 240 (more texts mentioning Μαίονιος, ibidem on 163) as referring to the region Μαίονια; but in the period of the inscription the term refers to the city of Μαίονια (see also P. Debord, REA 87, 1985, 351–355). In L. Klaudiopolis 58 the dedicating athlete styles himself Βηθυνυς καὶ Ἀθηναῖος. The former is the ethnikon of the city of Bithynion, not of the province of Bithynia; we have an athlete accumulating citizenships. In other inscriptions references to ethnos and city occur together, thus clarifying the deficient geographic knowledge of passers-by. The numerous inscriptions mentioning citizens of Nikomedia, Nikata and Prousias on the Hypios abroad, never seem to contain a reference to the Bithynian region or ethnos. The ethnikon of the city sufficed. Finally, there is evidence for Κοσόω disappearing in the course of time. The Κοσόω of the Myssians, consisting of various village-districts, is attested in Hellenistic times; in the first century A.D. it fell victim to urbanization and vanished (Debord, art. cit. 449–352).

Was the identification with one’s city jeopardized by a strong focus on a common and glorious Greek past and/or by a strong orientation towards Rome and its empire? S. devotes ca. sixty pages (199–262) to this problem. The evidence he adduces is familiar to the addressee, and his answer is basically correct but again far from new: the urban elites managed to combine love of their own polis with admiration for and embedding the city in a glorious pan-Greek past; in its turn the latter was combined with a positive attitude towards, though not identification with, Rome. This reminds me of L. Boffo’s recent study on Greek inscriptions from Aquileia expressing an «ideologia civica greca ‘integrata’ nell’impero» (see SEG Vol. 50, 1936). In this way S. supports what C. P. Jones recently termed the «accommodationists» approach. The elites «were content to accept their roles as weaker partners in the empire, so long as they maintained their position as domi nobiles»; there was no question of Greeks «retreating into their glorious past, or using the past to express covert dissatisfaction with the present» (Mouseion [formerly Echos du monde classique] 45, 2001, 365; M. Koenjak, Publikum und Redner (Zetemata. 104: München 2000) 58–60, wrote about an imaginary identity shared by the audience and the rhetor). Roman citizenship (tria nomina), emperor cult, Roman magistracies, membership of senate or ordo equester, were status-symbols for Greek members of the elite. Identification with Roman culture or with an imaginary overarching ecumenical power was not sought: «Das Bewußtsein, Angehöriger des Imperiums zu sein, blieb auf die praktisch-politische Sphäre beschränkt» (259; J. Nollé, Chiron 33, 2003, 481, finds evidence for the «Einbezug von Reichsidentität in das religiös-politische Selbstverständnis der Stadt Ephesos»; he refers to the cult of Victoria Romana and the so-called Partner-Monument in the city).

A long concluding sixth chapter (261–328) is devoted to the other side of the ‘identity’-coin, i.e. to the ‘Alterität’, the ‘otherness’ in Asia Minor. S. explores the «Grenzen der Integration» in two paragraphs. One deals with the world of the village in Asia Minor, the other with the Christians. Since, notwithstanding some inscriptions which show that individual Christians managed to strike a compromise with their pagan community, the early Christians as such are an
easy prey for preachers of 'otherness', I restrict myself to the identity as ascribed by the city-people to villagers and perceived by the latter themselves. S.’s conclusion is clear: «Im Vergleich zu den Poleis war das ländliche Kleinasien eine andere Welt» (294).

This conclusion may not be applicable to all villages in Asia Minor. The extent to which a region was urbanized may well have been a crucial factor in this respect. S. adds many inscriptions recording the cult of and the special mentality connected with indigenous, rural deities. Confession-inscriptions from the Katakekaumene are a case in point; dedications to rural gods protecting the harvest, the trees and cattle constitute a second category on which S. heavily relies; epitaphs and dedications in which the erector/ dedicator adds the toponym of his village to his name, indicate a ‘village-awareness’, a tendency to identify oneself with one’s village and the concomitant religious mentality. Most inscriptions come from sparsely urbanized areas (Lydia; Phrygia) or from villages admittedly attached to a city but, because of the large size of the urban territory, quite distant, geographically and mentally, from the city. As to village-toponyms, the recent catalogue of votive stelai from various Turkish museums (see SEG XLIX 1855) provides a large number of new village names, all from very rural Phrygian areas. In other villages, duly mentioned by S. but not easily accommodated in his general above-mentioned conclusion, we see a sort of imitation urbis (cf. also SEG XLIX 2497 for this phenomenon). Summae honorariae were paid, assemblies issued decrees, eponymous magistrates were used for dating purposes, γεμίστος and bathhouses were built and athletic contests organized. We seem to have pseudo- or micro-towns which occasionally even managed to acquire market-rights by sending ambassadors or petitions to the prominent governor. Villages ‘de-ruralized’ themselves so to speak. As a result, a more diversified and nuanced conclusion concerning the alleged ‘otherness’ of the village in Asia Minor is appropriate.

Villages on the territory of Saittai have reserved seats for their inhabitants in the urban theatre (SEG XL 1963). In the territory of Kyzikos villages issued honorary inscriptions for benefactors who had organized and financed theatrical performances and contests and offered drinks to their fellow-villagers. The texts are dated by the eponymous magistrate of the city, and the deity, in whose honor the festival took place, was Zeus Soter, equally worshipped in Kyzikos itself (SEG XL 1124–1127). True, occasionally villagers may have been harassed by urban policemen (πολιτικός; OGIS 527) but the identity, in most cases expressed by the village-elite, was probably not affected by this phenomenon.

Summing up: S. has written a well-organized study on a theme which has been discussed in sundry earlier studies under the general heading of city- or village-life and which now gets a sharper focus with the current concepts of ‘Identität’ and ‘Alterität’. In the end the conclusions may not be startling or new but the focus helps to pinpoint specific features of the mentality of urban elites and, if the evidence allows, of certain groups lower in the social hierarchy.

To the best of my knowledge, in the reviews I have written so far, I have never drawn the reader’s attention to printing-errors, wrong accents vel sim. There are, however, limits, even for the present reviewer. Without having read the book with the eyes of a corrector I have noticed 155 misprints and wrong accents in Greek. On 35, 58 and 120 words are either missing or superfluous. On 153 the strange Syngennaia probably stands for Συγγένεια; the city is Blaundos, not Blaundeis, and Thyateira instead of Thyatera. I doubt whether the computer alone should plead guilty. The distinguished publisher and the readers deserve more accuracy.

Oegstgeest

H. W. Pleket