geographia (i.e., it is comprehesive and panoramic, dwelling on the description of the earth (*ge*) in general outline, the distances between sites and their size), while the description of each country is a *chorographia* (i.e., it focuses on a certain region (*chora*) and includes many particular details) (pp. 154-6). She also stresses the encyclopaedic and pragmatic propensities of Strabo (pp. 156-61), in aiming his work at statesmen, men in high social positions, and an educated audience. Following Dubois, Dueck claims that this readership comprises both Greeks and Romans (pp. 161-5). In the last sections of her book, Dueck presents her views on the 'Strabonian problem', attributing originality to Strabo mainly in the assembly and ordering of material. This ordering results, according to Dueck, 'from a calculated and defined plan' (p. 166). Several systems of arrangement are exhibited, from the progression of a *periplous* to the sequence of traditional geographical and ethnographic approach (first the country, then its inhabitants), and in accordance with several other conjectured suggestions of order (pp. 165-8). Moreover, because of regional differences and the use of a variety of sources, every one of the 17 books demands a different approach and methodology, so Dueck proceeds to describe the unique tone and stylistic characteristics of each (pp. 168-78). Dueck briefly surveys *Quellenforschung* in modern studies of Strabo, specifying the presumed authorities of each of the 17 books of his work (pp. 180-6). The inclusion here of the scholarly bibliography, especially the updated items, in accordance with the books of the *Geography* they treat, is very helpful. The book ends with a final note on Strabo's ideal of a geographer. Dueck concludes that Strabo is not far from his own model (pp. 186-7).

Describing his *Geography*, Strabo states at the outset: 'in this work ... I must leave untouched what is petty and inconspicuous, and devote my attention to what is noble and great, and to what contains the practically useful, or memorable, or entertaining' (1.1.23). Dueck succeeds in writing a book that accomplishes Strabo's aims. Her book entertains and is of use. And while concentrating on particular details, it also provides the general picture. Strabo called his *Geography* a 'monumental work' (*Kolossourgia*). It still awaits a monumental study. However, Dueck's book on this elusive geographer will certainly be the first corner-stone in such a future enterprise.

Eran Almagor The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Strabone e l'Asia minore: Incontri di storia della storiografia antica e sul mondo antico, X Collana: Publicazioni dell' Università degli Studi di Perugia, a cura di Anna Maria Biraschi e Giovanni Salmeri, Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane 2000. ISBN 88 495 0151 X.

This series of essays is the product of the 10th conference on ancient historiography and the ancient world held at Perugia in 1997. Perugia has for more than two decades been a centre for Strabonian studies, and this volume contains 23 contributions from Italian scholars, preceded by an introductory paper by Glen Bowersock.

The preface situates the work amongst recent efforts to rehabilitate the author Strabo and to see him as more than a very useful compendium of no longer extant sources. Attention has turned to the geographer himself and the mode of employment of these sources. Asia Minor takes on special importance in such work, since it is both his original home and his cultural base. In Italy this type of study of Strabo's links with Asia Minor started at the end of the nineteenth century with the work of Ettore Pais. His conclusion that the work was written for Pythodoris, queen of Pontus, rather than for a Roman audience, has been widely rejected, but not the notion that the eastern origin of the geographer is a crucial datum, recently reemphasised in Syme's posthumous *Anatolica* (Oxford 1995).

Bowersock in his paper on the *patria* of Strabo emphasises Asia Minor as the author's spiritual home, but explains the prominence of Pythodoris and her family in terms of mutual links with Nysa in Caria, where at least some of Strabo's early training occurred. Amasya, which Strabo

describes carefully as his own polis, is not seen as so critical, despite the geographer's close links with the local aristocracy.

The main body of this new volume is devoted to studies of aspects of Books XII-XIV of the *Geography*. There is some incidental coverage of Book XI. In these books a major interest is antique history, especially Homeric history, as well as early migrations and displacements. Greek cults and sanctuaries, distinguished individuals, especially scholars, are also prominent, and there is an accent on recent history connected with the Mithridatic wars and the activities of Pompey. Individuals and their histories are seen as part of the geographical reality of particular locations here more than in other sections of the *Geography*. Strabo above all in his introductory books records the value of the geographical tradition, and one of his roles is to transmit that tradition, and its view, from a Hellenistic perspective, of the oldest phases of geographical thinking.

The paper of Paolo Desideri deals with the theme of Strabo and Asian culture and asks whether Strabo in the Asian books is motivated by different intentions from elsewhere. The key to this may be found in the historical and cultural interests revealed by the treatment. Desideri gives the history of the Aristotelian library prominence. My own work has insisted that the passage is included because of Strabo's own interest and feeling of involvement in contemporary developments in the text of Aristotle (*RhM* 140 [1997] 290-298). In the present paper other cultural factors including the origin of Tyrannio from Amisus, not far from Amasya, are also canvassed, as is a sub-text of criticism of the decline of philosophy at Athens. It is this argument, that Strabo is trying to reduce the importance of Athens as the centre of Greek culture, which is crucial to this paper, since it is used to justify the importance placed by Strabo on Asia Minor as the centre of Hellenistic thought. This is also given a political dimension, relating the approach to Strabo's personal biography and his relations with the Roman world of his own time. Desideri believes that this celebration of the cultural achievement of Asia Minor goes further; he suggests that there is a positive attempt to diminish the cultural importance of contemporary Greece, and that this is an explanation of the decadence that is constantly to the fore in the description of Greece.

Anna Maria Biraschi turns to the use of Homer in the books on Asia Minor. She points out that for Strabo Homeric discussions are an integral part of the *palaia historia* of the places where they are located, and that the Homeric materials represent part of a cultural history which has especial richness in Asia Minor, and are seen by the author as having special relevance for the *politikos aner*.

Strabo provides a comprehensive defence of Homer, but it is noted that in many of the instances where Strabo engages in debate over knotty Homeric problems, he has not himself visited the sites. Clearly there is an enormous debt to sources such as Demetrius of Scepsis and Apollodorus of Athens, but he insists on the defence of Homer against their criticisms. This critical reaction seems to have a Stoic dimension, and may derive from Posidonius. The criticism of Apollodorus is often couched in terms of the confrontation with contemporary geographical issues, which could not have been known to Homer. Leaf notes in relation to the Troad that Strabo passes over contemporary cities of importance clearly preferring the remote Homeric past. Strabo is wrong to insist on contemporary devastation in the Troad — it was not even true in the time of Demetrius of Scepsis. Moreover, Ilium had been revivified by Augustus; Strabo is not interested, since he rejects its identification as the Homeric Troy. This process has been heavily influenced by Strabo's reliance on Demetrius, who is anti-Roman and concerned with local historiography. His desire to turn Scepsis into the real home of Aeneas clearly contradicted the claims of the Julian family to Trojan descent. Biraschi notes the length of the treatment, which may be a significant attempt by Strabo to reaffirm his version of historical reality. There is also much attention in other parts of the treatment of Asia Minor to names included in the Trojan catalogue and confrontation with subsequent reality — there are for example discussions of the fate of the Cilicians, Leleges and Eneti. All this material is a product of the clearly extensive Hellenistic scholarship on the appropriation of Homeric names. Strabo conducts his discussions with constant recourse to the

text of the poet — and indeed often shows his own Homeric erudition in relation to contemporary issues. Biraschi detects an insistence on the priority of Greek culture and sees an author who would disagree with the viewpoint of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and his theory of the Greekness of the Romans. A picture of Strabo with slightly belligerent cultural superiority emerges from this paper.

Ambaglio notes that Asia Minor is at the centre of Strabo's world and the books treating this geographical region therefore take on special significance. He reviews citations from Greek historiography in Books 11-14 of the Geography; discussion includes the range of classical and more recent sources employed, and he identifies certain areas of concern which have been derived from Greek historiography. Examples are polemics on geographical themes, physical geography and flora and fauna, interest in anthropology and ethnography, antiquities and historical issues. The main premise of this account is that history is employed by Strabo to further his geographical ends and that few passages show tendencies that are truly historiographical. Most of the materials revolve around 4 critical periods:

1. The Trojan war and its relation by Homer
2. The period of Alexander the Great
3. Parthians and the contrast with the Romans
4. The recent past and the present

The paper is important in highlighting the fact that Strabo, for all his personal background in historiographical writing, when he turned to writing geography, kept the new geographical aim at the core of his treatment.

Prontera provides a review of the overall handling of Asia Minor in geographical terms in the light of the conservatism of the geographers, and specifically of Strabo. The author situates the conception in relation to Herodotus and Eratosthenes. Prontera suggests that Strabo's use of the designations inside and outside the Taurus may represent an element of conservatism in fact superceded by the Eratosthenic system of talking about the North and South of the continent.

In discussing the lexicography of settlement in Asia Minor, Boffo identifies the need for Strabo to develop a specifically geographical repertoire to assist in describing human settlements. The model is the *polis*, which is never precisely defined. Nevertheless the ideals of a *polis* can be understood in terms of the *pronoia* and *phusis* Strabo isolates in relation to favoured centres — a Posidonian inheritance. There clearly are distinctions of substance between a *polis* and a *phrourion* or *emporion*, and these are explored. The conclusion is that Strabo does not use the terms with terminological exactitude but does relate the size of all settlements to his conception of a *polis*. It is not closely defined in terms of specific identifiable features, but rather through a global assessment of the community's cultural achievement.

Foraboschi gives an analysis of economic factors in Strabonian descriptions — some prominence is given to the relevance of his description of his own city, Amasya, as well as the types of information he gathers. It is noted that he is in fact no economist but does look at a limited range of categories affecting the prosperity of major hubs.

Salmeri introduces the theme of the fit between geographically determined regions and the peoples and languages to be found within them. After discussing the resuscitation of Strabo, which started with the work of de la Blanche and Dubois in the 1890s, he covers the difficulties Strabo encountered in identifying the precise geographical boundaries relevant to the ethnic division of Bithynians, Phrygians and Mysians. The problem was that geographical confines did not necessarily correspond to ethnic integrity, and ethnic groups could indeed extend across purely geographical boundaries. Strabo believed that the contrast between past and present ethnic situations was the product of constant changes of leadership. Pompey's activity in Pontus was a clear example of how political arrangements could cut across ethnic divisions. In Cappadocia, Strabo conspicuously identifies language as an important cultural indicator — specifically in the context of the occlusion of local language in Cataonia. Strabo is also interested in language at Cibyra,

where four languages were current, but have by his time atrophied (13.4.17), and at Dioscurias, another multilingual centre (11.2.16), where linguistic complexity is seen as a sign of poor political management. Salmeri's analysis isolates Strabo's use of linguistic discussions to further geographical aims.

Trotta's paper looks at the by now well worn path of Strabo's interpretation of *politeiai* and relative grades of civilisation, here with specific reference to Asia Minor. Strabo's interest is both in the antiquity of political arrangements in the cities and in those cities with the richest traditions. As in other books of the Geography, Strabo is averse to nomadism and piracy, and in some cases also sees language as a significant cultural indicator. Key positive terms include *euanthropia*, *pronoia* and *eunomia*. *Pronoia* is in Trotta's view defined as the capacity of man to better his conditions of life. Platonic ideas have been influential, and Trotta sees no need to think that Strabo consulted the Laws through an intermediary.

Freedom (*eleutheria*) is a theme as well as quality of government (*eunomoumene*). It is important to keep both Greek and Roman dimensions of the political situation in mind here. Amisus is a good example, a Greek city which had numerous Roman interventions to assure its independence. The Augustan intervention after Actium is seen as critical, and it is notable that in this case *eleutheria* is not seen as incompatible with *basileia*.

Clearly the reference point for Strabo is the classical interpretation of good *politeiai*. At Mazaca there are laws of Charondas and the appointment of a *nomodos*. In Selge there is the influence of a Spartan foundation and role of Calchas. But such matters do not always come to the fore, as in the case of Cibyra and Nysa. In the case of Selge, the emphasis on Spartan origin is already prominent in the pre-Strabonian tradition, notably Polybius. Other cities where he might have mentioned this, but does not, include Synnada and Magnesia on the Maeander. In Cibyra, *eunomia* is to the fore even though the Spartan background is ignored.

Nicolai reviews problems in the textual tradition of books 11-14. As far as these books are concerned, the main authorities remain Kramer, Meineke, Aly, Jones and Leaf, as well as Lasserre on books 11-12. The aim of the study is to provide a brief history of the text of books 10-17, and identify the types of textual problems arising. Books 11-12 are seen by Lasserre as dominated by lacunae, while Meineke and Kramer both identified the incorporation of glosses into the text as a problem in books 13-14. Nicolai suggests that Lasserre is sometimes astray in identifying lacunae, while there are some identifiable problems in the glosses as well. The methods employed in citation by Strabo are also reviewed to try to identify a method of isolating the beginning and end of a citation. Certain passages on topographical issues are also subjected to close scrutiny and relatively conservative solutions are proposed.

Nicolai and Traina cover the process of translating Strabo. Here there is an emphasis on a move corresponding to the move away from *Quellenforschung* in relation to the process of translating the text of Strabo. Special emphasis from these authors is on books 11-12. The combination of two strands of geographical thinking in Strabo — physical geography and descriptive geography — has led to some deviations of style, only partially to be accounted for by differing sources. Nevertheless this lack of homogeneity rubs off on the style of the author and needs to be communicated in translation. Geographical terminology presents its own problems for a translator. Janni's work is respected in this area. Directional indications as well as terms indicating relative location are particularly important. Outmoded and specifically Italianised forms of names of locations are to be avoided, and Greek transliteration is to be preferred, but inevitably not all problems can be thus resolved. Strabo himself creates some problems when he gives a Greek etymology for names which are plainly of Iranian or Anatolian origin (e.g. Niphates mountain). A final problem is administrative terminology — an example here is *eparchia*, where Strabo is apparently inconsistent, but this may be a product of our own inadequate understanding of the term.

Belucci talks of Strabo's unified cultural vision in regard to historical themes and to regional divisions. Nevertheless there are varying relationships in his thought and writing between

indigenous, Greek and Roman elements. His capacity to write on Asia Minor derives in part from his own life experience and voyages. Continuity and the past are as important as the present.

On the Aegean coast his account of the cultural history derives from geographical and historical sources mostly of Hellenistic date. An interest is the value of human life as a formative influence on landscape. There is also an attempt to see Asia Minor not as a series of isolated communities but as an integrated whole.

In Cappadocia, Pontus and Galatia, Strabo has recognised the role of temple-states and their continued importance in the aftermath of political change — even change as significant as that encompassed between the end of the Mithridatic period and the emergence of Roman supremacy. What is demonstrated is the capacity of this world to continue independently of Roman activities. In these provinces he is also interested in the influence of Pompey and Augustus, and the impact of changes in the recent past. The recent past is also the main interest in relation to the Milesian colonies on the Black Sea, Heraclea, Amisus and Sinope.

In Cappadocia descriptive geography is more significant, but Strabo also shows an interest in language and ethnicity, more so than in artificial divisions inflicted by Roman rule. The loss of dialect by the Cataonians is seen as ethnically crucial. Also critical is the slight penetration of urban culture in Cappadocia — only two cities, Tyana and Mazaca — but plenty of *phrouria*, *erumata* and *polichnia*. Consequently the temple-states take on significance comparable to that of the cities.

In Galatia, Strabo gives priority to the temple-state of Pessinus as well as Tavium. He sees the region as a series of cantons with an effective level of historical continuity as a result of economic and religious factors. Lycaonia and Pisidia, while being seen as traditional areas for brigandage, also are beginning to emerge as civilised centres, but conflicts continue with groups such as the Isauri and Homonadeis as city life develops.

In Mysia, Phrygia, Lydia, and some of Bithynia and the Troad, the Homeric world dominates. The process of unravelling the ethnic and cultural mix in this myth-historical world is of some difficulty because of complex local traditions. Further south the emphasis on Greek colonies may be a product of the influence of Artemidorus of Ephesus.

Franco in writing on the Troad emphasises that for Strabo Homer was not simply the most significant authority, but the reason for the treatment of the area. Strabo's reading of Homer on the Troad is by way of local historiography — specifically employing the 30 books of Demetrius of Scepsis on the Catalogue of the Trojans in Iliad 2.816-77.

Homer is used as a substitute for autopsy, and it is interesting to note how Strabo emphasises a destroyed environment when he describes the existing scene (e.g. 13.1.1). This has been seen as a natural consequence of his insistence on Homeric primacy, but may not be his own emphasis — as already noted, it has often been suggested that Demetrius already had this emphasis.

Franco sees the richness of the past in the Troad in terms of Strabo's interest in integrating geography and history — a process to be viewed within the Classical Revival of the Augustan age. On this approach, the status given to Homer can be seen as justifiable in terms of the readership — the *andres politikoi*. Franco alerts us to the pursuit of like interests by a Germanicus (Tac. *Ann.* 2.54).

The length of the treatment is in Franco's view determined by the numerous Greek and Barbarian migrations, and the fact that precision escaped even local luminaries of the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC. Consequently discussion begins with definition of the boundaries (13.1.2-4), and Strabo unlike Homer does not include the future Aeolis in his Troad. There is ample evidence for the use of a *periplous*, which was probably Artemidorus of Ephesus. Within the Troad he is interested in relief — primarily Mt Ida — and also hydrography, as well as Homer and Demetrius. Deficiencies are only too evident — there is no concern with roads, and cities are only covered on the basis of their Homeric fame, with little notion of contemporary centres of substance. Alexandria Troas is a particularly glaring example of this, perhaps given little credit by Demetrius who

lived in the rival city, Scepsis, which had been synoecised by Lysimachus. Scepsis itself attracts disproportionate interest.

His main interests emerge from this approach: *metabolae*, war, destruction, and synoecism. Illustrations are provided in the form of discussion of the true Ilium, inhabitants such as Leleges and Cilicians, Thracian and Aeolian colonisation, and the impact of these movements on the Troad. The Lesbian tyrants and the Persian domination also figure — but there is little interest in the Peloponnesian war. Likewise the age of Alexander gets in, but the Seleucids are largely ignored. The Attalids get some sporadic attention, notably in the notice regarding Aristotle's library. Economic notices, which are prominent elsewhere, are relatively sparse, although the availability of marble and wine is noted. Works of art in the cities do attract some attention, but less than in other parts of Asia Minor.

Ragone in a detailed treatment discusses the Aeolid and starts with Strabo's own apology for *polylogia*. The length of the treatment in Strabo is partly a product of a pre-existing literature. Ragone looks at the physical articulation of the treatment (the sequence of places etc.) for evidence of joins between these divergent accounts, and uncovers some compelling examples. The essential coordinates for locating the Aeolid are outlined at the beginning of Book 13 of the Geography, but minutiae take on the greatest significance for Strabo (12.4.4; 12.8.2 etc.). Several population movements are seen as crucial to the cultural history of the region. Examples are the process of colonisation, the invasions of the Treri and Cimmeri, domination by the Lydians, Persians and Macedonians, and finally problems generated by the Galatians (12.8.7). Strabo particularly stresses the need not to ignore the past (*palaia historia*), by which he means especially the Catalogue of the Trojans. He thus justifies his polemic against Apollodorus, which of course has an important relationship to his employment of the text of Demetrius of Scepsis. His treatment generally is sequential, following the *periploi*. In addition to the Aeolian archaeology, another feature of the treatment is the quite extensive and largely contemporary prosopography. Several events circa AD 17 also crop up. Where there are errors, such as that over the location of Smyrna, these may have an antique genesis, and not be merely Strabonian. However these errors do seem to preclude autopsy. Ragone points out that *Quellenforschung* is in this area of little help in identifying the source of some errors which have crept into Strabo's account.

Luraghi points out that Strabo is only now emerging from the status of surrogate for lost authors, largely as a result of work emanating from Perugia. For a long time it has been doctrine that Strabo's main debt in Asia Minor was to Artemidorus of Ephesus, but the theory is fragile and has recently been challenged by Castelnuovo on the grounds that Artemidorus shows few signs of the rich historical material evident in Strabo.

Strabo's Ionia (14.1) deals with the coast from Miletus to Phocaea — a Hellenised zone full of *apoikiai*. There are some parallels with Magna Graecia over the question of how much space to devote to the past. In this part of the Geography, mention is made of numerous *literati* of every genus; it is speculated that their identity was the subject of some work of Hellenistic scholarship known to Strabo — surely an unnecessary hypothesis for a man of his education and background, although it is possible to agree with Aujac that their prominence is a product of the geographer's self-identification with the group. Their cultural and political involvement is relevant to the present of Strabo and his audience. Another feature of this section of the geography is the frequency of poetic citations, which include especially the lyric poets of the archaic age.

Strabo provides geographic coordinates and proceeds to a rapid historical panorama. There is interest in Androcles son of Codrus, then notes on Ephesus and its central role. There is only more material on Miletus and a related Homeric digression. The rise of the Ionian decapolis is seen as a unified event, and Luraghi notes parallels with Pausanias on Ionia (7. 1-5).

Some information employed on the oikists may be significant. It shows the employment of diverse and contradictory sources. What results is a fair reflection of Hellenistic and Roman

Ephesus as the centre of the contemporary province. This may partially reflect the link with Artemidorus of Ephesus.

Samos produces some interesting variations. There is a picture of the flowering of Samos under the tyrants and a hostile view of the struggles with Athens. What does not appear is an account of Samos in Hellenistic times, symptomatic of gaps in the coverage of Strabo's sources.

In relation to Miletus, the centre of the picture is the decline of the community; here there are similarities to the coverage of Magna Graecia. The reason for this focus on decline is seen as closely related to the Braudelian *longue durée* approach. Luraghi notes the likely presence of Strabo in Pausanias' library, and the slight regard in which Strabo held Herodotus; there is little evidence of the use of Herodotus in constructing the Strabonian description.

Fabiani traverses some fifty passages which refer to Caria or Carians apart from 14.2. Strabo has an emphasis on the grand antiquity of the people of Caria and their precedence over mainland Greece as Lelegi. He supports the identification of Carians with Lelegi. The phrase *Cari barbarophonoi* in Homer attracts Strabo's attention. His favourable interpretation of the phrase is attributed to his schooling under Aristodemus. Fabiani believes that Herodotus is a source perhaps filtered through Callisthenes. The discussion shows that Strabo did not in every case know where Caria ended and where contiguous regions started. Only after the Treaty of Apamea did the name Caria include on the eastern side areas proximate to Pisidia. These additions related to Rhodian control and continued to have importance under Roman domination. Robert saw a division between *Carie carienne* and *Carie pisidienne*. After the liberation from Rhodes in 167 BC, Caria was integrated into the province of Asia, probably at the end of the 1st Mithridatic war. Caria was administered under two *conventus*, Alabanda and Mylasa — later, from the Augustan age onwards, the latter was replaced by Halicarnassus. Alabanda became the true centre. The Treaty of Apamea was the moment of great change in Caria — the breaking of the ethnic boundaries which causes Strabo problems for his descriptive geography (14.1.3). The real problem is that the Greek geographer wants a description *kata phula*, but it may be that he was already faced with a division in Roman political terms from Artemidorus of Ephesus. Only a small number of cities are deemed *axiologoi*, and few coastal cities rate a mention. For Strabo Caria is a restricted area, but important in politico-religious terms for the *ethnos*. Strabo is interested in the ethno-cultural rather than political divisions. The *koinon* of the Carians probably had chief sanctuaries in the form of that of Zeus Carios at Mylasa and Zeus Crisaoreos near Stratoniceia. These federal sanctuaries are Strabo's focus, and only these are seen as truly Carian. The new political identity that was emerging was not yet complete in the age of Strabo.

Thornton notes that both Strabo and Polybius acknowledge the impossibility of autopsy of the entire *oikoumene*. There is indeed a renunciation of the claim to precision over details. This would make it unjust to be excessively taxing over omissions in the account of Lycia. In fact Strabo only provides major rivers and settlements. Some Homeric interests do emerge. The obscurity that kept the interior of Lycia concealed until the time of the 18th century travellers is something of an excuse for Strabo's own gaps on this remote area, away from the main routes. Dependence on Artemidorus is charted by Thornton and some attempt is made to search out other influences on the *periplous* style of description. Some Strabonian omissions — at least in terms of thoroughness — include Tlos and Cibyratis. However, reasons of a cultural type can be found to justify this. There were traditional conflicts of long duration between the competing regions. Trade can be seen as a bone of contention, as elsewhere in Asia Minor (Prusa-Apamea). Inscriptions such as that of Araxa and the stele from the Letoon at Xanthus demonstrate this. We should not imagine an end to all this with the annexation of Cibyratis by the Lycian league (see Appian *BC* IV 79 (32)). Careful distinction is made between the wildness of Pamphylia and Cilicia and the civilised status of Lycia — despite similarity of physical geography. The link that is important is the ancient view that a sound constitution leads to political stability — notice how this has been taken up by modern advocates of the same theme. Thornton shows that the Strabonian image of the

Lycians as conservatives has spilled over into modern interpretation, notably that of Syme who, ironically, in this instance seems to have been seduced by the image presented in Strabo. Thornton denies that the conflicts between Cibyratis and the Lycians should be attributed to external forces such as the intervention of Rhodians, and prefers his notion of conflicts of *longue durée*.

Arena identifies the limitations of the treatment of Pamphylia in Strabo's text. The area is characterised as primarily urbanised, and the description follows the traditions of the *periplous* literature. The Pamphylians traditionally had their origins as followers of Amphilochus and Calchas. Here Strabo uses the hydrographics to assist in locating cities, as originally noticed by Pédech. Already Bunbury highlighted difficulties experienced by Strabo in dealing with inland locations. Strabo's account of distances can be highly significant as in the case of Olbia where the information already assisted in identifying the site in the time of Spratt and Forbes, but has only been confirmed as the most reliable guide relatively recently. As for the links of Attaleia with the Pergamene dynasty, mentioned by Strabo, these do emerge from the epigraphy of surrounding centres. Arena also notes that possible links between Strabo and Servilius Strabo of Nysa may explain references to Servilius Isauricus. Strabo has a brief reference to Perge and the visibility of Sillyon from this site, as well as to the unlocated temple of Artemis Pergaea. Aspendos gets very short shrift, but Strabo does note its mythical foundation by the Argives. Side is identified as a foundation out of Cyme — Arena provides some discussion of the term *apoikia*. Cibyra Minor is mentioned by Strabo but its site is uncertain, although numismatically known. The whole account is highly dependent on a *periplous* and not as elsewhere on autopsy. Various methods are employed within this scheme including words indicating proximity, visibility etc. (Janni) — the obvious source is Artemidorus and it is no surprise that these authors (i.e. Strabo and Artemidorus) are named in one breath by Marcianus of Heraclea. Scylax of Caryanda might also be mentioned in this context. It has been noted that the emphasis is more on human geography than on exact rendition of the physical geography, both here and in Cilicia.

Campanile highlights difficulties over the double ethnicity of Phrygia — Phrygia Epictetus and Greater Phrygia, and also notes difficulties in attaining precision over the frontiers. This difficulty has been increased by the Roman practice of organising *conventus* not according to *ethne* but employing other criteria. Strabo himself shows uncertainty in some of his attributions. There is an exploration of the textile industry resulting from the treatment of wool at Hierapolis and nearby centres including Laodicea. Various other features of Phrygia are explored, but the paper is quite limited in its scope.

Panichi in her detailed discussion of Cappadocia notes Strabo's priorities in geographical terms: Armenia has precedence over Cappadocia as the first element of Asia Minor. Linguistic elements are also important as a mode of arriving at geographical determinations, as are changes resulting from population movements (12.4.6). In this part of Asia Minor there is a relative lack of antique materials, although there is the extended debate with Apollodorus (14.5.27).

In describing Cappadocia Strabo shows interest in the relationship to the Anatolian peninsula, and also to political arrangements of the 3rd Century BC. Concerns include length, breadth and major physical landmarks. Typical here is the discussion of Mazaca and Mt Argaeus — Strabo provides evidence on the rumblings of the now extinct volcano. There are other observations on the spurs of the Taurus and (as Baladié notes) there is growing interest in orography in this period — this had emerged in the period after Alexander. Strabo is also interested in river systems and his description of the gorge through which the Pyramus flows has been thought to be that of an eyewitness. His account of the Halys is also valuable, as is his account of fertile and non-fertile parts of Cappadocia. Panichi relates the failed dam projects undertaken by Ariarathes V to cultivation of grain, which can thus be seen as related to Strabo's interest in the economic viability of the region. There is also a full survey of notices which indicate products of the country, whether animal, vegetable or mineral.

Temple-states and religious traditions are also an important feature of Strabo's treatment. Others temple-states are known in Pontus, Phrygia and Pisidia — all areas in which a priest had

jurisdiction over matters religious, political and economic. The structure had Mesopotamian antecedents. Strabo himself had visited the temple-state at Comana in Cataonia (12.2.3) — where the cult of Ma was conducted — known through assimilation at Rome as Bellona. Its political importance as second after the king is highlighted. His Cataonian subjects however looked to him first. What is to be underlined is the Iranian origin of all this (Beneviste; Volkmann).

Strabo notes contacts between Cappadocia Taurica and Pontica in the context of the similarities between the two Comanas. Venasa is also treated. Another similar complex was near Tyana (12.2.6). Strabo notes the hierarchy operating in this world. Religious traditions are also manifest at Castabala, where Artemis Perasia was probably originally Persian, despite Strabo's attempt to link this with Hellenic themes (Orestes etc). What could be emphasised more strongly in this analysis is the extent to which Strabo Hellenises institutions which clearly do not have a Greek origin.

Panichi notes that there were numerous forts, dating from the Persian era. Many of these were in Cataonia and Melitene. Only Pontus exceeded Cappadocia in the number of its forts — some 75 (12.3.28). The role of the forts was to defend the land route from Mazaca to the Cilician gates. Strabo makes special mention of the strategic importance of Tomisa. Another important type of location was the treasury, exemplified by Nora (12.2.5). Only 2 cities are included — Mazaca and Tyana.

In the case of Mazaca (12.2.7-9) it is important to notice that it is not today located exactly in the same place as the ancient city. The ancient city was 2 kms south of Kayseri. Negative characteristics are emphasised (but see also 12.2.9). Some have seen the description as entirely the work of Posidonius, surely unnecessarily. Comments on the use of the army and its relationship to the king are of interest. Tyana is different in being a fortified city — the titulature of Eusebeia was taken by both, probably in honour of Ariarathes V. The titulature of Caesarea, apparently under Archelaus, dates from the period 12-9 BC and seems unknown to Strabo. Panichi canvasses the fortunes of various other centres to assess the date of his knowledge.

An interest for Strabo is the function of the Cilician gates and he is aware that Mazaca is located at a crucial crossroads. In general administrative geography is not a major theme for Strabo, but in Cappadocia some detail is provided in relation to the *strategiai*. This was a Seleucid inheritance. We do not know if the *strategiai* continued after Roman annexation on the death of Archelaus.

A central datum is the past of Cappadocia and Pontus as Persian satrapies. There is in effect an admission of not knowing earlier history. Strabo also seems to distort in making the Mithridatic and Ariarathid dynasties so distinct. Ariarathes III has the title of king in Cappadocia from the turn of the 3rd century BC, and this is confirmed by numismatics. At this time he annexed Cataonia (12.1.2), probably the dowry of the Seleucid princess Stratonike. A lot of attention in Strabo falls on Ariarathes V, the man with the failed dams. There are some other sporadic references to the dynasty.

The role of Rome is also a theme (12.2.11), but Strabo does not here deal with details, which had perhaps formed part of his account in the *Historica hypomnemata*. Archelaus and his family are very prominent as a result of links with Comana Pontica and Strabo's own family (12.3.34-35; 17.1.11). The marriage to Pythodoris may also be especially significant if it had Augustan sanction (12.3.29). It could be added that Strabo's residence at Nysa early in his life is quite sufficient to explain his interest in the fortunes of the family of the Asiarch Pythodorus.

Panichi notes lack of system in Strabo's treatment. Nevertheless, there is an attempt to provide a profile of the region, its economics and viability, its religion, myth and history. There are composite cultural elements, including language and the presence of the Magi. After Macedonian conquest there was a gradual process of Hellenisation. Robert's studies would lead one to expect a greater level of Hellenisation than Strabo reports.

Gnoli, in his article on Pontus and Bithynia, points out the illogicality of suggesting that Strabo could have made serious mistakes over the history of Heracleia; the evidence of the local

Memnon has often been preferred. It is suggested that Memnon can be reinterpreted in view of his clear desire to exculpate Heracleia from involvement with Mithridates, and that although Heracleia and Tieium were ethnically Bithynian, Strabo is right to say that they formed part of the Mithridatic kingdom at its greatest extent. The argument is important since it rescues Strabo's claim that Pompey subsequently divided these kingdoms into 11 principalities and gave these out to favourites.

Questions of the authorities employed by Strabo are canvassed, and his dependence on Artemidorus and Posidonius is carefully reviewed — also Theophanes of Mytilene. Strabo's thinking demonstrably takes its foundations from his background as an historian — as exemplified by his process of looking at the extent of Mithridates' kingdom. This is used to explain inconsistencies of approach. Main structural considerations are *paralia* and *mesogaia* — but interrupted by a discussion of an Homeric issue — the Chalybes. Another point is that Theophanes is clearly a major source in the Armenian section; but Gnoli also believes that Lasserre does not give the geographer sufficient credit for autopsy when he discusses topographical, anthropological and economic factors close to Amasya. This seems indubitable.

Salmeri provides a conclusion to the two groups of papers which focus on methods and specific sections of Asia Minor. He points out that interest in Strabo at the time of the Reformation is exemplified by Casaubon's edition of 1587, but there was little systematic study until the influence of Napoleon was sufficient to encourage a French translation and some exemplary studies (Gosselin; Letronne). This took some time to come to fruition elsewhere in Europe — Niese's work is an exception — but Dubois in 1891 produced a work in which he claimed for Strabo a role in relation to geography similar to that of Polybius in relation to history. Meanwhile there was work from Pais in Italy, a very thorough attempt to locate the man in time and space. Pais placed primary emphasis on the perspective of a Greek from Asia Minor and the lack of real contact with the world of leading Romans. Salmeri points out that this is still a vital issue, and the precise intended audience of the author still prompts diverse responses. The trend more recently has been to look for individuality in his treatment of cultural questions (van der Vliet and Thollard) and in his approach to Homer (Biraschi). Some recent work has focussed on the specifically geographical approach of Strabo, following Dubois and van Paassen (Prontera and Clarke), and making comparisons to the concerns of contemporary geographers. The importance of the school of *Quellenkritik* can be excessively minimised, and we need to understand how they came to their conclusions. Translations have their benefits and disadvantages — sectionalisation tends to some level of distortion. Some similar problems emerge in highly regionalised approaches such as that of Baladié — looking at the role of the mythical past for the structure adopted. Books 12-14 take on special importance for the questions asked by Pais, and form the centre of the current volume.

The division has been between general studies, looking at structures and methods of composition, and regional studies with a specified focus. These are not comprehensive, since studies of Pisidia and Galatia are lacking. An overall aim has been to show individuality rather than dependence within the author.

Marcaccini's paper is not on Asia Minor. This discussion looks at the reasons for the positive cultural evaluation of certain inhabitants of Thrace, the Moesians in the region of the Danube. As usual, the question of the individuality of Strabo and borrowings from sources comes up. Clearly these people are culturally more acceptable to Strabo because of their appearance in Homer, and indeed this fits with his recurrent attempts to vindicate the utility of Homer on contemporary geographical questions. This article argues that the entire structure of the argument in this case guarantees the autonomy of Strabo's approach, which has as its main aim the confutation of Apollodorus of Athens. What is clear is that there was ongoing debate in the Hellenistic period about many of the issues covered by Strabo, and his perspectives should not always be attributed to a major source such as Ephorus or Posidonius. His participation in larger intellectual debates

seems to be provable, and under these circumstances it is unlikely that he cribbed entire arguments from his authorities.

Petrella discusses an unusual aspect of the treatment of Pamphylia, noting the complete lack of information on leading citizens as supplied in the case of cities elsewhere in Asia Minor. This corresponds to the geographer's perception of Pamphylia as a centre of low cultural achievement reflecting its involvement in the pirate trade. The ideal against which this is measured appears to be that of the Greek *polis*, but city life did develop early in Pamphylia, although linguistic individuality remained important. Precise understanding of integration is hampered by sporadic archaeological work, but the topographical importance of Pamphylia in the age of Strabo and beforehand is to be emphasised. Some of these points can be demonstrated from the epigraphic record. Attaleia is typical with a mix of *negotiatores italici* and veterans, many of whom originated from Pisidian Antioch. There is a review of the considerable number of notables known from the major centres. Sometimes this exploration deals with individuals well beyond Strabo's own age, and their relevance is to understanding an acme of city life in Pamphylia rather than to an exact match with what Strabo claims is the debased quality of the country as a whole. Petrella thinks the evidence is sufficient to show that these cities continued for a long time to operate under the empire in an unchanged environment, autonomous cities maintaining their Hellenistic magistracies, and their own coinage.

Overall, it can be seen that this volume from Perugia treats an enormous range of material, and will be indispensable for serious students of Strabo's *Geography*, especially those with a primary interest in the books on Asia Minor.

Hugh Lindsay University of Newcastle, Australia

Fergus Millar, *Rome, the Greek World, and the East*, Volume I: *The Roman Republic and the Augustan Revolution*. Ed. by Hannah M. Cotton and Guy M. Rogers, Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 2002. xxii, 383 pp. ISBN 0 8078 4990 1.

Without any doubt, Fergus Millar (M.) is one of the most influential ancient historians of the 20th century. The sheer number of his articles in journals, congress proceedings and other collections is impressive; many of them were innovative, and some of them even triggered off ongoing international debates on central topics of Roman history. These contributions — as well as his famous books on Cassius Dio, on the emperor and his role(s) in the Roman world and on the place and development of the Near East in this world[1] — have greatly enhanced our understanding of Rome and her provinces from the last century B.C. to late Antiquity. Indeed, it is impossible to overestimate the importance of M.'s work for our conception of the Empire, its city-state centre, and its society (or rather societies), of emperor(s) and citizens, structures and events as well as of persons, politics and policies (if there were any, something which M. has called into question).

As a consequence, it goes without saying that a comprehensive collection of these contributions will be warmly welcomed by the international community of classical scholars. We are especially indebted to the editors Hannah Cotton and Guy Rogers who have done an admirable job, in more than one respect. The reviewer, for one, is firmly convinced that it was the right decision and indeed absolutely necessary to provide English translations of quotations in Greek and Latin as well as of certain technical terms — after all, the most important goal of this project is to make M.'s lasting contributions accessible not only to a new generation of students and future Roman historians, but also to the widest audience possible. This purpose is also served by the *Index* (377-83), compiled by the editors according to a well-considered systematic pattern: it does

1 *A Study of Cassius Dio*, Oxford 1964; *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC-AD 337)*, London 1977; *The Roman Near East, 31 BC-AD 337*, Cambridge (Mass.) etc. 1993.