

Rathbone argues that at a petty level Tebtunis ‘fits better with a free market model than, say, a “bazaar” economy’ (p. 140). His approach is novel not least for its focus ‘on private transactions rather than public charges’, but also for interpreting ‘Kronion’s accounts against the background of the coins in circulation at that time’ (p. 129), i.e. prior to Nero’s issue of new copper *drachmae* (so-called *chalkinê*). His stimulating observation concerns the coexistence of several monetary standards of reckoning — that of the state, alongside a range of private ones — all used simultaneously, based on the nature of the transaction and the status and relation of the parties involved.

To sum up, the volume under review looks at market interaction in the Roman world and beyond. It encourages a re-examination of the notion of “Market” within the study of Classical Antiquity, and as such is a welcome contribution. The volume gathers studies based on a wide and varied basis of evidence, from literary and legal sources, to papyrology, epigraphy, archaeology and numismatics. Although the studies derive from different scholarly traditions, the quality of articles remains consistent. In dealing with the methodological problem at the heart of scholarly dispute, namely the ‘unavoidable dependence on prior interpretative frameworks’ (Morley, p. 109), the volume supports the current trend in Economic History of Antiquity of following the theoretical framework offered by NIE. The general agenda arising from many of its contributions favors some applicability of universal principles, which allow comparison between ‘economies of historical societies without transferring concepts of specific institutions from one particular society to another’ (Ruffing, p. 225). Overall, this is a worthy contribution to the debate on the Roman economy and a useful example of how the field may develop beyond the long-existing dichotomous debate between “primitivists” and “modernists”.

Merav Haklai

Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Tønnes Bekker-Nielsen, *Space, Place and Identity in Northern Anatolia*. *Geographica Historica* 29. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2014. 271 pp. ISBN 978-3-515-10748-8.

Historical geography has always been a default mode for studying Asia Minor in antiquity, and the tradition can be traced through classic works from W.M. Ramsay, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (1890), through Louis Robert, *À travers l’Asie Mineure* (1980), to David French, *Roman Roads and Milestones of Asia Minor*, which has been published in seven major on-line volumes between 2012 and 2014 (<http://biaa.ac.uk/publications/item/name/electronic-monographs>). It is entirely appropriate that the studies assembled here appear in the series *Geographica Historica*, edited by Eckhardt Olshausen, himself the contributor of a useful paper ‘Pontos: profile of a landscape’ (pp. 39-48). The book’s title cautiously prefers the neutral name northern Anatolia to that of Pontus, as ancient Pontus was a notoriously protean monster, changing shape and evading definition according to different usages and perspectives. There is no agreement among the participants about what the entity “Pontus” was, although the focus is on the Anatolian region rather than the Black Sea basin as a whole. Bekker-Nielsen in his editorial introduction groups the papers by Brian McGing, Olshausen, and Marco Vitale as discussions of regional spaces. Olshausen accepts Strabo’s definition of the region’s boundaries, but projects them back to the supposed foundation of a Pontic kingdom c. 300 BC (p. 47); McGing, in an excellent survey of cultural identity in Mithridates’ kingdom which has previously appeared in a Russian version, prefers the view that the regional definition of Pontus was largely determined by Pompey’s organisation of part of Mithridates VI’s kingdom into a province in 63 BC (pp. 21-22); Vitale emphasizes the fragmentation and diversity of all the evidence for Pontic *koina*, and the many meanings and usages of the term Pontic which defy any systematic classification (p. 61). These are justified grounds for the editor’s preference for northern Anatolia.

None of the papers in the volume is concerned with the western, Bithynian end of the Anatolian Black Sea region, but it does include three extraneous papers, a short essay by Nicola

Zwingmann on the myths and landscapes of Phrygian Apamea (pp. 157-173), a largely abstract discussion by Louise Revell of how the relationship between local and global may be read into civic architecture of the Roman empire (pp. 89-97), and a general discussion by Arjan Zuiderhoek about patterns of urban building in Roman cities of Asia Minor based on epigraphic evidence (pp. 99-108). These papers essentially address the problem of trying to define the political and ideological culture of Roman cities through an understanding of their architectural landscapes. They sit awkwardly in the volume as a whole, as the evidence for civic public building in the Roman cities of northern Anatolia is almost non-existent. This point is implicit in Latife Summerer's paper 'Topographies of worship in northern Anatolia' (pp. 189-213), which points out that architectural evidence for temples in cities of the region is currently confined to four possible examples, none of which has been adequately investigated: at Trapezous (Corinthian capitals and bronze statue of Dionysus), Sinope (probably Hellenistic, but not, as previously suggested, a Serapeum), Amastris (very uncertain identification), and Tieium (a small, perhaps prostyle Corinthian structure).

In the absence of archaeological evidence, a good deal of weight has to be placed on the numismatic evidence. Vera Sauer's paper 'Urban space, the evidence of coins' draws information from the systematic corpora that now exist for several of the Anatolian Pontic cities, and reviews the ways in which the regional coinage in Pontus, as indeed in the rest of Asia Minor, represents or implies the geographical or built environment of the cities and their territories (pp. 108-124). Her preliminary remarks also raise interesting questions about both the intended and actual regions in which civic coins were distributed, but the paper does not present information about coin circulation. Julie Dalaison complements this with a longer and discursive discussion: 'Civic pride and local identities: The Pontic cities and their identities in the Roman period' (pp. 125-155). The general historical background is drawn from earlier studies, and her view of the Pontic *koina* differs from that developed in Vitale's paper. The issues of the two cities which took the title *metropolis*, Amaseia and Neokaisareia, provide an insight into the familiar theme of civic rivalry. Coin types are a rich source of evidence for local cults, and those of Comana depicting the warrior goddess Ma, those of Sebastopolis, which are exclusively concerned with the city's legendary founder Heracles, including depictions of the hero's labours, and those of Trapezous depicting Mithras, rare otherwise in Asia Minor, provide a noteworthy flavour of regional distinctiveness.

Dalaison and Summerer's papers devote some discussion to one of the most remarkable sacred sites of Pontus, the hilltop sanctuary of Yassıçal (Ebimi), about ten kilometres east of Amaseia, which is treated at more length in a separate paper by Christina Williamson, 'Power, politics and panoramas' (pp. 175-188). The site, discovered by Franz Cumont and further explored by David French, appears to consist of a large trapezoidal altar at the centre of a large circular *temenos*, which contained inscribed marker stones carrying geographical names of villages and regions, all probably in the territory of Amaseia. Much is uncertain about this fascinating site which still remains a place for ritual veneration (illustrated by a photograph accompanying Summerer's article (p. 208 fig. 20). It is generally assumed to be a sanctuary of Zeus Stratiotes, and, although almost all the remains are of the Roman imperial period, has been identified by some as the location where Appian reported Mithridates VI's Achaemenid-style victory sacrifice after defeating Licinius Murena in 82 BC (Appian, *Mithr.* 67, 70). All aspects of the sanctuary warrant much closer study, not least since a so-called rescue excavation, carried out within the *temenos*, has yet to be published. Williamson's paper is based on the assumption that the structure should be treated as a fire altar (as in Appian's description), and reconstructs the intervisibility (viewshed) of the site and the surrounding territory. David French drew a parallel between Yassıçal and Nemrud Dağ in Commagene, but unlike Nemrud Dağ, the rounded hilltop near Amaseia was not a striking summit, visible from almost all parts of the surrounding region. Williamson hypothesizes therefore that the regional impact of the sanctuary depended on a smoke column, extending 750 metres (or more) above the site of the altar which would have been visible from most of Amaseia's territory, thus advertising the moment of the sacrifice not simply to the delegates on the

mountaintop but to all the inhabitants of the territory. GIS technology enables this to be plotted on a map, but of course does not resolve the core questions. Was fire or smoke at the heart of the ritual? Did it take place in daytime, or at night? Did the participants simply come as chosen delegates from the villages and regions, or in large numbers? And what was the religious object of the cult?

Tønnes Bekker-Nielsen himself and Jesper Madsen confine themselves respectively to documentary and literary evidence to look at historical issues. Strabo describes the city of Neapolis in the Phazimonitis region, east of the river Halys as part of Pontus, whereas Ptolemy assigned the city, in its later guise of Andrappa-Neoclaudiopolis, to Paphlagonia. Bekker-Nielsen's article 'To be or not to be Paphlagonian?' (pp. 63-74), prefers Strabo, but has to deal with the problem that Neoclaudiopolis' later inscriptions used the same era as a group of cities that lay west of the Halys in Paphlagonia. This still creates a strong *prima facie* case for believing that at the time when the era began, in 6/5 BC, all these cities then belonged to the same administrative unity (in this case the former 'Paphlagonian' kingdom of Deiotarus II Philadelphus), whatever earlier or later territorial labels were attached to this space. Madsen's paper, 'An insider's view. Strabo of Amaseia on Pompey's Pontic cities' (pp. 75-86), takes Strabo's use of the term *polis* to be relatively value-free, without substantial implications as to whether a community in a region such as Pontus was heavily hellenized or not. Accordingly Madsen distinguishes between Strabo's accounts of the coastal cities of Pontus, which explicitly drew attention to their Greekness, and those of the Pompeian foundations of the interior, which lacked the heritage on which such Greekness rested.

Only one paper looks beyond the classical period to Byzantine Pontus. Burcu Erciyas, 'A middle Byzantine citadel at Komana' (pp. 215-225), reports on excavations which reveal extensive but unpretentious remains of the eleventh century, relating to occupation, manufacture, storage and consumption of goods, but only indirectly to the wider ethnic, religious or cultural characteristics of the inhabitants of the region when it was on a contested frontier between Christians and Turks. This is one of the rare excavations in the entire region. Gradually the results of such pioneering field work will need to be integrated into Bryer and Winfield, *The Byzantine Monuments and Topography of Pontus* (1985), and other major work on the region of the medieval period. The book ends with a collective bibliography and extensive indices, which are useful to the reader, but, like Bekker-Nielsen's thoughtful introduction, do not completely disguise the heterogeneity of the contents.

Stephen Mitchell

University of Exeter

Nicola Cusumano, Valentino Gasparini, Attilio Mastrocinque, Jörg Rüpke (eds.), *Memory and Religious Experience in the Greco-Roman World. Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge*, 45. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2013. 223 pp. ISBN 9783515104258.

This volume collects selected papers delivered in two panels organized during the 9<sup>th</sup> EASR (European Association for the Study of Religions) Conference and IAHR (International Association for the History of Religions) Special Conference organized by Giulia Sfameni Gasparro at the University of Messina in 2009. The two panels, organized by Nicola Cusumano on the one hand, and Attilio Mastrocinque together with Jörg Rüpke on the other, dealt with 'Memory and Religion in the Greek World' and 'Religious Experience in Sanctuaries in the Roman World' respectively. Joined together, we now have *Memory and Religious Experience in the Greco-Roman World*, even if no paper deals with topics of both memory and experience, and only a fair few concern overtly both Greek and Roman world (Gian Franco Chiai being the notable exception). Papers delivered in other panels of this (gargantuan) event, we learn from Sfameni Gasparro's interesting report (pp. 11-14), were subject of further publications – those who wish to trace down destinies of papers delivered in other panels may wish to cross-check the