Locris and Zeus Homarios in Achaea, other regions like Boeotia and Thessaly appear to have a number of sanctuaries of regional significance and experienced major conflicts about the control of the federal state and its sanctuaries. But perhaps the most significant issue emerging from this volume is the crucial role of historical change and major differences between periods. Freitag shows how the difference between the classical Acarnanian *koinon* centred on Stratos and the later Hellenistic *koinon*, in which Action emerges as a major federal sanctuary; Funke explains how the expansion of the Aetolian *koinon* led to the emergence of the federal Panaitolika festival, in addition to the central role of Thermon for the original *koinon*; Bouchon and Helly explain the difference between the classical multipolar Thessalian *koinon* and the centralised Hellenistic *koinon* based on Larissa. In conclusion: not only will this volume be of interest for scholars in various fields of Greek history, it also raises major questions for future research.

Kostas Vlassopoulos University of Nottingham

Corinne Bonnet, *Les enfants de Cadmos: Le paysage religieux de la Phénicie hellénistique*. Paris: Éditions de Boccard, 2015. 606 pp. ISBN 978-2-7018-0371-5.

In this insightful and brilliantly written study, Corinne Bonnet (henceforward CB), a senior member of the Institut Universitaire de France who teaches ancient history in Toulouse, offers a remarkable synthesis of the transformation of the religious landscape of Phoenicia in Hellenistic times. None of the parameters of such a study is easily defined: Phoenicia was never a single, unified political entity, and its ethnic and linguistic character may be found in a very broadly spread diaspora all around the shores of the Mediterranean. In her study, CB goes North up to the island of Arados, near the shore of Antarados (modern Syrian Tartus), and South down to Oumm el-Amed, just north of Rosh ha-Niqrah. Byblos, Sidon and Tyre are the other main sites analyzed in depth, together with the Phoenician sites in Athens and Delos.

By referring, in the title of her book, to the idea of “religious landscape”, CB highlights the fact that she did not intend to write a full-fledged history of Phoenicia in the Hellenistic age, a history which the dearth of contemporary written sources (if we exclude the lapidary inscriptions — some of them bilingual), renders an almost impossible task (Lucian’s *De Dea Syria*, while obviously a key text, dates from a later period). But what exactly is a religious landscape? This locution, which seems to be particularly prized by French scholarship (see for instance John Scheid and François de Polignac, ‘Qu’est-ce qu’un ‘paysage religieux’?’, *Revue de l’Histoire des Religions* 227 [2010], 427-434), reflects the space dimensions of public cults in societies: temples, grottoes, etc. Religious landscapes, then, constantly transform themselves in some fundamental way. In a land such as ancient Phoenicia, which has left us only sporadic texts from the Hellenistic period, the religious landscape remains perhaps the most tangible witness of the drama ignited by Alexander’s conquests and continued by the initial clash and eventual accommodation between different cultures and religions. For CB, religious landscapes are the result of multiple interactions and include political, social and economic dimensions.

The complex contacts between Greece and Macedonia, on the one hand, and Phoenicia, on the other, are but a chapter of the long saga of the relations between East and West in the ancient world, a saga extending from the time of the Achaemenids to the Islamic conquests. However, it is a particularly interesting one, as it tells of the people who had given the Greeks the alphabet, and whose diaspora, spread throughout the Mediterranean, eventually including Rome’s arch enemy, Carthage.

In its first part, the work follows the coastal cities and their hinterland, analyzing the various temples and other archaeological remains. In those chapters, the author deals with some of the most famous aspects of the *interpretatio*, such as Eshmoun/Asclepios, Baal Hammon and Tanit, Hadad and Athagartis, Adonis, or Melqart/Herakles. After this rich, detailed and lively *tour d’horizon*, CB reflects on what one might call the *translatio* of Greek religious landscapes to the

Near Eastern coast. The final part of the book deals with two of the most important Phoenician diasporas: the archaeological evidence left from temples belonging to the Phoenician communities of Athens and Delos.

Throughout the book, 117 pictures offer concrete illustrations of the landscapes, inscriptions, stellae, sarcophagi, coins and other documentation analyzed in the text. Sixty pages of bibliography and indices ease access to the riches of the volume and permit further study. The above description of just a few chosen topics examined in the book, as cursory as I have been, is in itself sufficient to make us realize that we are dealing here with a major study of Hellenistic Phoenicia. Indeed, this work represents the synthesis of thirty years of research by CB on the Phoenician world and on its contacts with the Greek world. She intended, she says, to encourage dialogue between two fields of research too often examined in isolation from one another in the academic world comprising fields where either scholar knew little about the other's area of expertise.

CB's work is thus dedicated to two traditions of research: one relating to the locus, the other to the period. The first, obviously, is the study of ancient Phoenicia. To a great extent, the birth of modern Phoenician studies goes back to Ernest Renan's *Mission de Phénicie* (1874), comprising the results of his year-long study tour that originally brought him to Phoenicia and Palestine. For Renan, however, Phoenicia was ultimately disappointing, as it represented a "lower" Semitic tradition, polytheistic, and hence impervious to the "miracle juif", i.e., biblical monotheism.

The second is that of the Hellenization of ancient Near Eastern cultures under the impact of Alexander's conquests. Here, the foundational text is Johann Gustav Droysen's *Geschichte des Hellenismus* (1836-1843). For Droysen, the intensive contact and exchange between cultures in the Hellenistic world resulted in what he called a *Verschmelzung* (fusion), in which the pristine purity of Greek culture was mixed with "oriental", (and hence, for him, inferior) cultural traditions. The other side of the coin, however, was more positive: for oriental cultures, Hellenization represented of course a positive trend, elevating them, as it were, closer to Hellenism. As we know, Alexander's conquest of Phoenicia had been particularly brutal and resistance had been violent. Forced acculturation seems to have been the response to this resistance. We now know, of course, that the Phoenicians were in no way "pure" natives before Alexander's conquest. The whole region had been at various times now under Persian rule, now part of the New Egyptian Empire, now under Assyrian rule, and even under Hittite influence. Yet, Droysen's model was to have a major influence on scholarship. Hence Hermann Usener could, in his *Götternamen* (1896, pp. 337-340), define the syncretism so typical of Hellenistic religions as a mishmash of religions (*Religionsmischerei*). In the twentieth century, scholars such as Richard Reitzenstein and Franz Cumont would offer new approaches to explain the contacts between Greek and Western Semitic religions, rather less disparaging to "the East", but without ever questioning the concept of Hellenization.

It is precisely the validity of this concept that CB wishes to question. "Hellenization" implies an effort of a conquered people to adopt the higher cultural level of the conqueror. For CB, this represents a colonial reading of a historical reality, merely echoing the voice of the historical winners. In her book, she intends to restore the voice of those who lost. Rejecting the traditional concept of Hellenization entails offering a new intellectual tool kit: that of cultic multiculturalism. It is mainly in the writings of social anthropologists that CB finds applications of this perspective. In this regard, she singles out:- Marshall Sahlins, who worked on cultures of the Pacific Ocean; Nathan Wachtel, who sought to understand the transformation of Inca culture under the impact of the Spanish conquest,Serge Gruzinski for that of Aztec culture,and Richard White, whose work focused on the Great Plains Indians. In particular, she borrows from White the idea of "middle ground" to describe the new *modus vivendi*, or should we say, rather, *modus colendi*, achieved in Hellenistic Phoenicia. The double, great advantage of "middle ground" upon "Hellenization" lies in the symmetry it entails between the two parties, and in the creativity and agency it assumes on their part in achieving a new cultural or religious *koine*. Following White CB refers to "middle

ground," (also termed "hybridity"), thus opening up new possibilities of examination and avoiding binary confrontation as the only mode of interaction between two different societies.

As we now know, modernization and globalization do not destroy local cultures. Rather, they stimulate new patterns of creativity, producing something that one could call, in paraphrase of Hegel, a "cunning of culture". Indigenous cultures usually counter-attack the aggressions of cultural imperialism, and their subversive submission (we owe this term to the early modern historian Sanjay Subrahmanyam), giving rise to rejuvenation. Under such conditions, Hellenism was a medium, affording a new, eloquent voice to local and indigenous traditions. Far from destroying local cultures, then, cultural contact and global modernization strengthen them. Living together, cohabitation, middle ground, are all terms which seek to explain the nature of the complex processes that were taking place in the Hellenistic Near East better than the traditional term "Hellenization".

To a great extent, CB is correct to highlight the ambiguities of classical formulations, and to offer new approaches to what really took place in Hellenistic Phoenicia. Nonetheless, one is reminded of Arnaldo Momigliano's word of caution: 'As a rule terminological ambiguities should never detain a scholar for long.' ('J. G. Droysen between Greeks and Jews', *History and Theory* 9 (1970), 139-153, p. 139). After all, it is in excellent Greek that Syrian authors such as Meleager of Gadara would express pride about their ethnic roots. It is also through reinterpretations of Greek myths that the Sidonians insisted upon their anteriority to the Greco-Macedonians.

The religious story of Phoenicia in Hellenistic times is quite different from that of Palestine during the same period. To some extent, one could well imagine that much in the approach and the findings of CB would hold for coastal cities. Jewish reactions to Hellenism were of course highly diverse. In contradistinction to what happened in Phoenicia, they have left us very important literary traces. A by no means minimal benefit of CB's impressive work is that it allows us to reformulate comparative studies anew.

Guy G. Stroumsa — Hebrew University of Jerusalem
University of Oxford

A.G.G. Gibson (ed.), *The Julio-Claudian Succession: Reality and Perception of the "Augustan Model"*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013. 179 pp. ISBN 978-90-04-23191-7.

Among the numerous recent publications on Augustus in the context of the bimillenial anniversary of his death, this fine collection of eight essays, originating from a conference at St. Andrews in 2008, provides a salutary reminder of the importance of investigating not only the establishment of the principate under Rome's first princeps but also its continuity under the other Julio-Claudian emperors. How was the Augustan principate perceived, transmitted, adopted and modified up to the time of the last Julio-Claudian emperor? The question posed by this volume, which aims to foster a better understanding of the evolutionary nature and complexity of the Julio-Claudian principate, is certainly ambitious. The reader should be clear about the fact that this volume does not intend to provide (and, given its natural contraints, cannot provide) a systematic, comprehensive overview and structural analysis of the issue of succession and the political and institutional continuities and changes of the 'Augustan model'. What the editor, A.G.G. Gibson, aims to achieve is to add 'another dimension' (p. 15) to the scholarly discourse by specifically bringing to the fore how the various sources represent the transition of imperial power, the role of the princeps and the conception of the principate in dialogue with the 'Augustan model'.

The editor (pp. 1-17) sets the scene with general reflections on the constitutional position of the princeps, the concept of succession and the challenges which the emperor faced in maintaining power and passing it on to a natural heir. The eight essays that follow are arranged in chronological order. Josiah Osgood (pp. 19-40) starts with the Augustan period, focussing his analysis on how Suetonius deals with the idea of succession. He rightly draws attention to the lack