positive light. She argues that this portrayal reflects the real possibilities open to upper-class women to use their resources and influence for a variety of causes. An inscription from Samos, which claims that the privileges Augustus gave to that island were prompted by the intervention of his wife Livia, serves to illustrate the historical reality behind the texts.

In chapter 3 Matthews turns to Acts. Here she takes on the long-standing debate about 'god-fearers'. She chooses a middle ground between those who would have us believe that 'god-fearer' became a technical term describing gentiles sympathetic to Judaism who have not fully converted, and those who think they are nothing more than a rhetorical device in the Book of Acts. While she believes that epigraphic evidence amply proves the first position, she is indeed convinced that god-fearers in Acts are nothing more than rhetorical tools. Luke (the author of Acts) mentions 'high-standing women' coupled with men as the objects of Paul's missionary activity at least three times. Matthews rightly wonders why it is necessary for Luke to mention women at all in these instances, and why he emphasizes their noble status. She answers both questions by claiming that 'women were prominent among early Christian converts' and this 'is suggested by a variety of sources. Luke's appropriation of the topos of high-standing gentile women supporters is his desire to deflect attention from the numerous women of less reputable backgrounds affiliated with Christianity' (p. 71). Luke, according to Matthews, uses the same rhetorical devices employed by Josephus to mask a similar historical situation.

In a chiastic mood Matthews ends her book with a story from Acts about the town of Philippi, reminiscent of Josephus' stories discussed in chapter 1. Here too a respectable woman, who converts to Christianity, is contrasted with a contemptible slave woman, who does not. Matthews nicely places the story of Lydia's conversion within the framework of Dionysiac missionary traditions. She shows how the worship of Dionysus was intrinsically tied to women and was not always viewed as promiscuous. Her examples include a fascinating reading of a famous text taken from Philo on the sect of the Therapeutai. Lydia's story she contrasts with the story of the possessed slave woman, who identifies Paul as a true servant of God. Luke downplays her prophetic character and, as Matthews shows, casts her in the mould of Apollo's Pythia, viewed negatively by Christian authors, rather than in the tradition of the (positive) biblical prophets and prophetesses. Again as in chapter 1, a positive woman is of high standing while a negative woman is a slave.

In her summation Matthews repeats her conjecture that women served as a rhetorical device for representing Jewish and early Christian missionary activity in antiquity. This fact, she argues, should not deter us from acknowledging 'the powerful roles of women as functionaries and innovators in missionary religions of antiquity'.

In sum, Matthews' book is beautifully written, easy to read and full of exciting historical and literary insights. It is an important contribution to the library of women's history in antiquity.

Tal Ilan Freie Universität, Berlin

G.S.P. Freeman-Grenville (tr.), J.E. Taylor, R.L. Chapman III (eds.), *The Onomasticon by Eusebius of Caesarea: Palestine in the Fourth Century AD*. Jerusalem: Carta, 2003. 214 pp., 8 maps. ISBN 965 220 500 1.

Eusebius' Greek work, *On the names of the places in the Sacred Scriptures*, usually known as the *Onomasticon*, together with Jerome's Latin translation and revision, are vitally important documents for the study of the Holy Land in late antiquity. Writing some time around the turn of the fourth century (scholars disagree about the date), Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, lists alphabetically some hundreds of sites mentioned in the Hebrew Bible and rather fewer in the New Testament and gives their contemporary identifications. Late in the fourth century Jerome translated the work in Bethlehem, adding to it and updating it in the light of his own local knowledge, so we can

see the changes which occurred in the Holy Land after Constantine. Neither Eusebius' work nor the translation-adaptation by Jerome has ever before been translated into English. Thus a translation is eminently desirable, and Freeman-Grenville, Taylor and Chapman deserve our thanks for their attempt.

The book consists of an introduction by Taylor (T) with a history of the *Onomasticon* and an assessment of its significance, a translation by Freeman-Grenville (F-G) of the Greek text of Eusebius and the Latin of Jerome, an annotated index by Chapman (C) with a brief bibliography, and two excursuses by T and C on the indications of the direction and location of sites and the distances used by Eusebius. The book ends with coloured maps of Palestine in the fourth century according to Eusebius' *Onomasticon*, following Avi-Yonah and the *TIR* (*Tabula Imperii Romani: Iudaea-Palaestina: Eretz Israel in the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine Periods: Maps and Gazetteer*, Jerusalem, 1994). The authors base themselves on the text of Klostermann (Vienna 1911).

In her introduction T writes that there is no positive evidence that Eusebius' predecessor Pamphilius 'walked the roads of Palestine in search of Biblical places, but the evidence that Eusebius himself did so is clear throughout the *Onomasticon.* He carefully notes distances in milestones, and directions, to ensure that the exact placements of villages and towns he considers "Biblical" are recorded'. T does not give any consideration to the possibility that Eusebius could have obtained his material from written or other sources. Yet Eusebius as bishop of Caesarea was located at the administrative capital of Palestine, and he could easily have had access to documents with information about sites and milestations without having to move from his seat. Lists of roads and the sites and distances along them are extant from Antiquity — for example the mid-third century Antonine Itinerary provides this sort of information for much of the Roman empire, including Palestine, presumably to aid in tax collection. It is not beyond the bounds of belief that even more detailed documents listing villages and their situations existed in the administrative archives in Caesarea. Eusebius, in fact, specifies on a number of occasions that villages belong to the territory of certain cities, information which is much more likely to come from official documents than from walks along the roads.[1]

It is also clear that, even when Eusebius writes *deiknutai* 'is pointed out', he is not always writing of places which he has visited himself — sometimes he is quoting Josephus, for example, as in the entries on Ur and Ararat. In fact if we look at Eusebius' use of *deiknutai* or equivalents (more than 30 uses) we find that most of the examples refer to large and well known holy sites such as Bethel or Golgotha, apart from a number of places over the Jordan, mostly in the neighbourhood of Heshbon, where he refers to both large and small sites. It would be straining our credulity somewhat to suggest that Eusebius actually took an unrecorded journey over the Jordan to look at milestones — it would seem much more likely that he used documentary evidence about this area. It has indeed been pointed out[2] that Eusebius appears to have four cities of reference: Eleutheropolis, Aelia, Legio and Heshbon. While we might have expected Eusebius to relate especially to Aelia and even Eleutheropolis, the use of Legio, where there had been a Roman camp, and Heshbon over the Jordan suggests the use of official Roman administrative documents. There is, however, evidence that Jerome did visit many places in the Holy Land, although here too Wilkinson has shown that there is no evidence for a large number of repeated exploratory trips.[3]

All this is properly part of the scholarly debate on the *Onomasticon.* But this edition presents problems of a different kind. The idea of an annotated index was a good one, and could have pro-

---

1 See the very convincing case made for this by B. Isaac, 'Eusebius and the Geography of Roman Provinces', in D. Kennedy (ed.), *The Roman Army in the East* (Ann Arbor, 1996) 153-67 = id., *The Near East under Roman Rule: Selected Papers* (Leiden 1998), 284-309, giving the history of this debate.

2 C. Wolf, 'Eusebius of Caesarea and the Onomasticon', *BA* 27,3 (1964) 66-96.

3 J. Wilkinson, 'L'apport de Saint Jérôme à la topographie', *RB* 81 (1974) 245-57.

vided a real resource for scholars. Unfortunately the limited sources used by C (mostly Avi-Yonah and the *TIR*) rather curtail its usefulness. And even these resources have not been fully utilised. C adds to many of his brief entries a note of whether each is an excavated or unexcavated site. The usefulness and reliability of such comments will be apparent when we note that Diocaesarea/ Sepphoris/Zippori appears as an unexcavated site! Even if C was unaware of the widely publicised recent excavations that have taken place since the 1980s, with their outstanding architectural and mosaic finds, he should at least not have missed the report of the Michigan expedition in 1931, which is noted in the *TIR* entry which he cites.[4] After this it will not come as a surprise to find that Diospolis/Lydda/Lod or Eleutheropolis/Beit Guvrin and Mampsis/Qurnub/ Mamshit also figure as unexcavated sites, although all of them, as well as Sepphoris, not to mention other smaller excavations, appear in the 1993 English edition of the *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* to which C refers.

But perhaps more serious are the problems with F-G's translation. T writes in her introduction that the '*Onomasticon* may not be the most exciting work from antiquity to read cover to cover; it is a kind of exegetical encyclopaedia'. As such, the least we can expect from a translation is accuracy. The subject of the identification of places in Holy Scriptures was of considerable importance to both Eusebius and Jerome: the truth of the Bible was no trivial matter for them. Thus their terminology deserves careful and accurate translation. Unfortunately it has not received this here. F-G has not taken care to translate each term consistently. Eusebius has three words which he uses throughout to refer to sites in his contemporary fourth-century Palestine: *polis*, *polichne* and *kome* (There are also a number of other terms which appear on only a few occasions: *metropolis*, *phrourion*, etc.). A *polis* was a city, which had a specific legal status under the imperial administration; a *polichne* was a smaller settlement without this status, a town, and a *kome* was a village. Unfortunately F-G does not always preserve these distinctions — for example while he usually translates Eusebius' *polichne* as 'small town', in *On* 130,8 he translates it as 'small city'.

When it comes to the translation of Jerome the situation is somewhat more complex. As a translator Jerome is very aware of the need for accuracy,[5] but he is also the product of a Roman rhetorical education which recommends *variatio*, variation for the sake of elegance, in translation. Thus in his translation of the *Onomasticon* he might use two words where Eusebius used one (*urbs* or *civitas* for *polis*) but they both preserve the same meaning. He uses four words for Eusebius' *kome*: *villa, vicus, villula, viculus*, but he is consistent in his use of these, and the meaning is the same, since by the fourth century the diminutive form *villula* or *viculus* had lost its diminutive force and become just an elegant variation.[6] Where Jerome differs from Eusebius is when he corrects him — and this is almost always about a site he has actually visited according to the route he describes in his letter 108 or which is on a road he must have taken to get there. So we should expect F-G to reflect this in his translation: either he should translate all Jerome's four terms by 'village' or he should try to reflect the *variatio* by using different English terms such as village, hamlet etc. but using these consistently for each of Jerome's four terms, so that for example *vicus* is always village or *villula* always hamlet. Sadly, F-G does neither, and sometimes translates *vicus* as 'hamlet' (e.g. *On* 47,19) while at other times translating *vicus* as 'village' (e.g. *On* 49,6). Similarly F-G usually uses 'town' to translate Jerome's *oppidum*, but in *On* 21,23 he translates it as 'city'. This can thus produce artificial differences between Jerome and Eusebius, as when F-G translates Eusebius' *polichne* as 'small town' but Jerome's *oppidum* in general simply as 'town'. Thus the reader without Greek or Latin who wants to obtain real information from the *Onomasti-*

---

4 L. Waterman et al., *Preliminary Report of the University of Michigan Excavations at Sepphoris, Palestine, 1931* (Ann Arbor 1937).

5 Cf. Jerome *ep.* 57,5.

6 On the diminutive as a meaningless variation, especially in Jerome, see G.M. Bartelink, *Hieronymus: Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (epistula 57): Ein Kommentar* (Leiden 1980) 39 with bibliography *ad loc.*

con is likely to be misled. F-G makes his own comment on Jerome in his forward, 'Jerome's present work now translated represents his thoughts on Eusebius' work rather than a precise translation', into a self-fulfilling prophecy. F-G also seems unaware of other changes in fourth-century Latin: the term *castellum* is translated by him as fortress, castle or fort. This may be reasonable where Eusebius has *phrourion*, but not where he has *kome*. Mayerson has pointed out that by the fourth century *castellum* often simply means a village, no longer necessarily a fortified one.[7] Thus as well as being inconsistent these translations are misleading. The Latin term *via publica* was a technical term, referring to an official Roman public highway with milestones. Unfortunately F-G only sometimes translates this as public highway, and at others merely as highway, thus misleading his reader.

There are also omissions (*On* 175,25-26), and additions to the text (e.g. *On* 9,6-7) where F-G adds the description of 'city' to the fort (*castellum*) called Thamara, where Jerome has nothing (Eusebius calls Thamara a *kome*.)

More examples could be given of F-G's lack of consistency in translation, but one further mistranslation (showing a surprising lack of familiarity with the biblical text) should be mentioned. Chasbi (*On* 172,6 = 173,9) is noted by both Eusebius and Jerome as the site where Tamar bore her sons to Judah, referring to the well-known biblical story (Gen 38:5) where Judah is seduced by his daughter-in-law Tamar dressed as a prostitute. F-G's translation of Eusebius is correct: 'here children were born to Judah'. However Jerome, as is his wont, adds some extra information to Eusebius, writing *ubi geminos Iudae filios Thamar edidit* — 'where Tamar brought forth twin sons to Judah'. F-G translates this as 'where a son called Tamar was born to Judah'.

T finishes with an interesting excursus and discussion of what she identifies as Eusebius' exact use of prepositions showing the location of sites. It is a pity her collaborators have not been more exact in their use of the material. *Caveat lector*!

Susan Weingarten Tel Aviv University

Matthew W. Dickie, *Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World*. London and New York: Routledge, 2001 (paperback 2003). 392 pp. ISBN 0 415 24982 1.

The study of magic and magicians in the Greco-Roman world is a popular subject nowadays, with many scholars delving into the enticing mixture of sorcery, sex and popular religion which emerges from the ancient descriptions of magic by writers who often viewed it unfavorably and from the artifacts and texts produced by its actual practitioners in Antiquity. Such materials enable contemporary Classicists and ancient historians to put to good use all the questions, perspectives and comparanda provided by such disciplines as anthropology, sociology, psychology, literary criticism, cultural studies and gender studies, and to turn the study of ancient magic into a cross-cultural, interdisciplinary affair. Conscious of this growing trend, Dickie deliberately turns his back on all the buzz and returns to the tried and true methods of Classical Studies, namely the meticulous philological analysis of the Greek and Latin texts of Antiquity and the construction of the historical picture that emerges from this analysis. As his specific topic he chooses the identity and social location of the practitioners of magic in the Greco-Roman world. True to his philological-historical method, he orders his enquiry chronologically, beginning in the fifth century BCE and reaching up to the seventh century CE (though he himself prefers the older labels, BC and

7 P. Mayerson, 'The Saracens and the *limes*', *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 262 (1986) 45 n. 4 = id., *Monks, Martyrs, Soldiers and Saracens* (NY/Jerusalem 1994) 281 n. 4.