

answer provided by K.'s hypothesis, when extended into this field, is that they do not pour libations at all, but rather that they accept them, the extended phiale held out in a gesture of symbolic reception.

In Chapter 7 ('Fifth-Century Portrait Statues on the Acropolis' — pp. 165-98), K. tackles the origins of Athenian portraiture with spectacular results. In 1986, Frank Brommer suggested that most Archaic free-standing statues represent human subjects while most Classical free-standing statues represented the gods. K. argues forcefully for the modification of this developmental scheme and shows quite convincingly that votive portraits were dedicated as early as the sixth century and that this tradition continued unchecked well into the Hellenistic age. Of particular importance here is K.'s dismantling of the connection between 'physiognomic likeness' and 'portraiture' as a genre. For K., the focus for identifying portraits lies not in *Kopienkritik* or in the testimony of Pausanias, but rather within the inscribed statue bases. This class of evidence, K. shows, creates quite a different picture of the genre, a picture that is firmly embedded in the deep contexts of the Acropolis itself.

This is a very important book. Keesling has produced a wonderful volume that will remain relevant for many years to come.

Peter Schultz

American School of Classical Studies, Athens

B. Dignas, *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. xiv + 364 pp., 5 maps. ISBN 0 19 925408 7.

The thesis of this accomplished book on the position of temples in Asia Minor in the Hellenistic and Roman periods stands in opposition to the widespread assumption that the respective cults were completely integrated within the *poleis* on whose territory they were situated. Instead, Dignas proposes to analyse the relationship among cities, sanctuaries and central rulers in terms of a so-called 'triangle', with emphasis on the independent economic and political significance of the sanctuaries and their representatives. From her examination of the epigraphic documentation of religious centres in Asia Minor (with one notable excursion into the Near East, based on a dossier from Baetocaece, present-day Hosn Suleiman in the Jebel Ansariyeh, cf. J. Seibert in *Antike Welt* 34, 2003, 365ff.) she concludes that, cultic particularities and developments over time notwithstanding, the triangular model continued to characterize the way in which Greek *poleis*, sanctuaries and Hellenistic kings or Roman emperors behaved towards each other.

The starting point is Dignas' observation that the blur of religious and secular elements in Classical civilization, traditionally contrasted with the uncoupling of church and state in the modern world, may not have been such a blur after all. Naturally, 'Greek religion' and 'Greek politics' cannot be considered separately, but 'it is possible to establish qualities of a "sacred sphere"' (vi). And the area where these qualities can be established most clearly, 'without having to rely on vague terms of "sacredness"' (4), is that of the financial affairs of temple complexes. Dignas discusses in detail three factors of this economy of the sacred (ch. 1): the balance between a cult's income and spending, land owned and exploited by a temple, and the management of sacred finances. As she acknowledges, a coherent and detailed body of economic evidence is lacking, and what we do have 'does not allow us to estimate the overall value of sacred land or temple treasuries' (13). The focus is therefore on the qualitative position of sacred wealth, and the evidence goes to show that 'the sanctuaries were run and their activities shaped by individuals who identified themselves with this task and saw themselves *interacting* with the secular world of the *polis*' (33).

The central rulers over Asia Minor often acted as arbitrators in the event of a clash between city and sanctuary. In the case studies of the particular cult sites, which are diachronically split up

into sections dealing with the Hellenistic (ch. 2) and the Roman (ch. 3) period, Dignas shows that the general attitude towards the cults on the part of the Hellenistic kings and the Roman authorities was one of sympathy. In any case, that was the message they aimed to convey. Specific terminology in both royal (e.g. 39 n. 11) and imperial (e.g. 121-2) correspondence was used to demonstrate piety, but if necessary, or for whatever reason desirable, such ethics could be thrown overboard easily (cf. 43 on aggression by Hellenistic rulers; 120 on booty taken by emperors).

The very way in which Dignas, displaying familiarity with many of the sites under discussion (e.g. 6), presents the stories of the individual cults makes clear why each of them has to be interpreted first and foremost within the framework of its own particular historical and geographical circumstances. At Hellenistic Labraunda (59-69), disagreement raged continually between the temple of the local Zeus and neighbouring Mylasa about the administration of so-called sacred land and its produce, to which both cult and city laid claim. In the late third century, the king of Macedonia, Philip V, sent a letter in response to the petitioning priest of Zeus Labraundeus. The letter was addressed to the Chrysaoreis (according to Strabo, *Geogr.* 14.2.25, a religious league of Carian villages). In a context which remains unclear, but apparently as a result of its collaboration with the priest, the civic authorities of Mylasa banished the league from the temple complex at Labraunda, where it had assembled since earlier in the century. At Roman Aezani in central Anatolia (177-88) the story of the Hellenistic period, when a sanctuary of the local Zeus together with its related settlement had received land from two kings, continued. Under Hadrian, when Aezani had become a proper *polis* with Zeus on its coinage, tensions came to a head when, surprisingly, civic and sacerdotal authorities joined forces to appeal to Rome to settle a dispute with individual citizens who held land originally allotted to their ancestors.

An enigmatic religious institution of native villagers in one case and individual citizens who may have been descended from the earliest tenants in the other seem to show that one should not stick to the triangular model too rigorously. As Dignas herself states on more than one occasion, it 'may have to be differentiated' (186). And after analysing the controversies surrounding the administration of the temple of Artemis at Ephesus (188-204), she adds that 'the complex structures of a highly urbanized Greek city ... require a modification of the triangle' (222). Among the discernible factors that would justify further refinement of the model are the relative strength of indigenous traditions, varying degrees of urbanization and different modes of Greek culture (ch. 4). One problem that stands out in particular is the line taken by the representatives of the sanctuaries. Priests, who 'possessed a group identity and did not merely represent civic magistrates' (33), nonetheless occupied different kinds of offices in their cities as well, at least during other periods of their lives. Sacerdotal positions on sale ensured that all members of a certain class could, in principle, come to occupy 'a special role in the *polis* according to the characteristics of their office' (267), usually for longer terms. But a city could also apply a certain scheme to appoint priests in order to have a finger in the pie.

Dignas' study establishes that, both in the Hellenistic and in the Roman periods, a dividing line could be drawn between 'sacred' and 'public' finances of the Greeks, even if they 'were less meticulous distinguishing sacred and profane aspects of their civic life' (175). The continuity of this attitude is brought out above all by the diachronic epigraphic dossiers themselves (273-8), which show how 'rulers relied on rulers' decisions' (277). But it ought to be remarked as well that, by their very nature, these dossiers (which of course always record successful pleas) only register situations in which a controversy had seriously damaged a society's functioning, and as such impose limitations on how we can use them. Absence of evidence is not evidence for absence, but it cannot automatically be assumed that similar disputes went on everywhere.

*Economy of the Sacred*, written in a confident style — 'This book claims that "this is how it must have been"' (2, cf. 242) — is not an easy work to read, but fortunately it is accompanied by two helpful indices. The epigraphic texts that lie at the foundation of the book are integrated within the text in such a manner as to guide the reader through the various stories told, although

occasionally the distribution of the constituent parts of the dossiers over the Hellenistic and Roman sections can have a bewildering effect. I add two corrections to the otherwise fine presentation of the inscriptions: the second half of line 22 of the text presented on 75-7 is missing in the translation on 77 ('according to the boundaries that existed before'), and Hesperus, whom the governor of Asia orders to select surveyors (178-9, l.10-11), is himself an imperial *procurator*, not a surveyor (correct at 179 bottom).

Dignas admits that there are numerous elements in the stories presented that do not fit the proposed model neatly, but argues that this 'should rather invite us further to differentiate the triangle than to be content with the bilateral relationship between rulers and cities' (222). She does not aim to have the last word on the categorization of temple complexes in Asia Minor, but she certainly has put important new questions and instructions on the agenda which deserve to be fully absorbed.

Ted Kaizer

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

Edward Champlin, *Nero*. Cambridge, MA — London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003. xii + 346 pp. ISBN 0 674 01192 9.

The first thing that must be said about this intriguing, readable, and often brilliant account of all-that-you-ever-wanted-to-know-but-never-dared-to-ask about a Roman Emperor is that it has the wrong title. From a book entitled *Nero*, a reader would normally expect a biography of the Emperor Nero, which treats the events of his life and the motives for his actions, and may even give an inkling of the historical context — of the attitudes, issues, problems of Rome and its empire — which would enable the reader to understand and judge those events and motives. But the author abjures all intention to instruct in these matters (246).

On the other hand, it is hard to suggest a better title. *The Afterlife of Nero* or *Nero the Hero* might seem better, since the fundamental question asked is 'Why is Nero so fascinating?' (236) and the heart of the book is the belief that Nero is a 'folk-hero', defined as a figure believed not to have died or to be able to return from the dead, who incorporates good and bad traits, yet is popular with a large section of the people. But the later tradition about Nero is only surveyed in the first chapter and then only in any detail up to the fifth century. Moreover, though we are initially told that, to explain this 'folk hero', it does not matter what he was like, just what folks believed (23), we later have our attention directed to how Nero might have wished his actions to be perceived (35) and, at the end, the author gives as his aim to explain 'what Nero might have meant by the deeds and misdeeds that have made him notorious for so long' (236). The implication seems to be that Nero's own view mattered because he ultimately put it across, first in his own day because 'much of what he did resonated far more with contemporary social attitudes than our hostile sources would have us believe' (36), then to posterity, though hostile sources and the popular imagination transformed 'the hero of his own story into the monster of history' (237).

In support of this view, Champlin undertakes a scholarly and imaginative analysis of the ancient evidence. He believes that Nero's series of extravagant public gestures made sense, that he was rationally calculating the effects of his actions on his audience, who knew how to read the polytheistic and mythological symbols he employed. Thus Nero's artistic ventures progress explicably, not only from private amateur to public professional, but from lyre-playing to tragic-acting after his departure for Greece in 66 (the contrast between Piso and Nero in *Ann.* 15.65.2 is shrewdly adduced) to pantomime in 68. Similarly, Nero's interest in associating himself with particular gods develops from identification with the lyre-playing Apollo starting in 59, to a further identification with the charioteer Helios after the Great Fire of 64, to an assimilation to Heracles for his labours on behalf of mankind. The price of this second schema is perhaps too high, for it