

quod sine dubio olim fuit signum, insertum est inter nomen gentilicium et cognomen (cf. e. g. *Virius Audentius Aemilianus*, PLRE I Aemilianus 4). – 1477: Verba *O crudele funus! Qui nunc attingit mihi renovatus o dolor!* non possunt verti "Ach, welch grausames Begräbnis, das mich nun erneut traf", cum pronomen *qui* referendum sit non ad *funus* sed ad verba quae sequuntur *renovatus ... – o! – dolor.* – 1656sq.: Addi potuerat Numerios Publilios plures inveniri Romae (*CIL* VI 5282, 12939, 20504, 22095, 25169, 25180, 25190, 25198). – 1661: Nomen gentilicium *Rubena* non video cur sit corrigendum in *Ruben[i]a*, cum habeo rationem nominum *Alfenus/Alfenius*, *Passenus/Passenius*, *Volusenus/Volusenius*, etc. – 1678: Nomina cum scripta sint casu genitivo, nescio an legendum sit *tutor(is) optim(i) b(ene) m(erentis)* potius quam *tutor(i)* etc. – 1684a: Titulum hunc omnino ineditum ita legit Alföldy: *C. Tettius C. [f. ---] / Herennul[us ---]*, at cognomen *Herennuli* cum alibi non inveniatur videndum, an hic titulus intellegi possit ita, ut in versu secundo mentio fiat non cognominis sed *Herennuleiae* cuiusdam, fortasse coniugis eiusdem Tettii. Nomen *Herennuleii* in Hispania invenitur certe Barcinone (*CIL* II 4572 = *IRC* IV 173). – 1701: Vocabulum *exornando* in *Saturninus ... tumulo exornando curavit* (quae locutio mihi videtur esse valde notabilis) fortasse corrigendum est in *exornandum* (scil. Rogatum eum, cui hic titulus positus est). – 1703: Ego certe non dixerim nomen *Varaei* idem esse ac nomen notum *Varii*; neque *Annaeos* eosdem esse ac *Annios* putare velim. De forma *Varaeia* cf. *Peducaei* in titulo *CIL* II² 5, 743.

Liber totus scriptus est lingua Latina satis eleganti et quae facile intelligatur. Observavi tamen etiam quaedam quae mihi minus Latine dicta esse videbantur. Ut exempla quaedam proferam, nota haec: 1207: Verba *mihi re ... contemplata ... videtur* etc. mihi minus bene videntur esse dicta ideo, quod *contemplari* est verbum deponens. – 1303: "Recognovi a. 1985 et interdum inter reposita ... collocatam ... a. 1998": hic Alföldy videtur uti vocabulo *interdum* pro "inzwischen", id quod non putaverim esse probandum. – 1360: "ubi corona incipitur" (pro *incipit*). – 1419: "nescio, qua causa scripsit" (pro *scripserit*). – 1660: "(titulus) Tarraconis paganus postremus" (melius fuisset *inter Tarraconenses*). Typographo potius quam ipsi Alföldy attribuenda sine dubio sunt 1360 "in ea altitudine ... ad undum (= ?) recipiendum" vel 1587 "Litt(eram) T altera omisit" et similia.

At haec quae supra dixi omnia sunt minoris, nisi minimi, momenti, et, ut iam finem faciam huic censurae, concludendum sine dubio est agi de libro non optimo solum sed etiam utilissimo, qui honori erit tam memoriae ipsius Alföldy quam Academiae Berolinensi, cuius "consilio et auctoritate" editus est.

Olli Salomies

Ancient Ethnography: New Approaches. Edited by ERAN ALMAGOR – JOSEPH SKINNER. Bloomsbury, London – New York 2013. ISBN 978-1-84966-890-3. VIII, 279 pp. GBP 58.

This rich and inspiring new collection of articles, counting among its contributors the foremost scholars on ancient ethnographical writing, is a timely demonstration of the state of research in a field which is not only naturally diverse in subject matter, but also undergoing some very significant realignments. Aptly, the editors' compact but incisive "Introduction" is well annotated and forms a valuable introduction to the study of ancient ethnography (pp. 3–12). Even more importantly, the book is true to its title in calling into question many of the received wisdoms of previous scholarship,

and opens up important new questions. That only some of these can be explored within the scope of its sections, simply underlies the many-sided attention deserved by – and in the future, hopefully devoted to – this complex subject.

As the editors stress, the root of any fruitful modern study of ancient ethnographical writing is to recognize that we are not dealing with a self-standing genre or form of enquiry, but rather with an assemblage of textual registers and literary conventions that provided a bountiful toolkit for writers in many different modes for advancing their authorial strategies. Taken together, the book very much manages to provide a welcome middle-of-the-road view about ancient descriptions of foreign populations between the often starkly-painted and barely reconcilable modern studies – very much the sort of study, in fact, which the reviewer was left hoping for in the wake of Isaac's *The Invention of Racism* (Princeton 2004) and Gruen's *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity* (Princeton 2011); see *Arctos* 45 (2011) 235ff.

Structured in four parts, titled "Beginnings", "Responses", "Transformations", and "Receptions", the book does a better job than some edited volumes in linking together the contributions which otherwise could have appeared rather disparate. The first part, unlike the rest, consists of only two (rather than of three) chapters, the first of which is Huyn Jin Kim's "The Invention of the 'Barbarian' in the Late Sixth-Century BC Ionia". In his current contribution Kim, a specialist on Herodotus whose 2009 monograph was reviewed in *Arctos* 47 (2013), situates the roots of the Greek-barbarian dichotomy in Persian-ruled Ionia, thus backdating Edith Hall's contextualization of this process within the slightly later Athenian drama. As Kim demonstrates, the Ionian intellectual interactions with the Eastern Mediterranean, particularly the 'proto-ethnographical' categorization of their subject peoples by the Persians, could have been quite crucial for the emergence of the imagery of βάρβαρος, and even the word itself (pp. 32–6). The same geographical sphere, though in its Herodotean guise, is the setting for Kostas Vlassopoulos' "The Stories of the Others", which very much follows the broader outlines of his recent *Greeks and Barbarians* (Cambridge 2013), which focuses on the concrete globalizing/glocalizing connections between cultural spheres and politics of the Levant. By examining examples of the various ways that stories from the 'middle ground' between the Greeks and other groups ended up in Herodotus' text, Vlassopoulos shows very convincingly how individuals and groups exchanging stories, forging cross-cultural careers, and jostling for prestige shaped the pool of lore from which Herodotus took large amounts of his 'ethnographic' material.

"Looking at the Other: Visual Mediation and Greek Identity in Xenophon's *Anabasis*" (Rose Harman) casts an eye on Xenophon's techniques of using 'gaze' and acts of looking to construct and deconstruct ethnic representations. The Ten Thousand are not only Greeks in a sea of barbarians, building their Hellenic identity through the recognition of being the objects of the barbarian gaze, but as Harman well demonstrates, the audience is also frequently called to question the image of a unified or uniform Greek identity as well as their relationship to their foreign employer, Cyrus. Even so, this competent examination of the different cases could perhaps use more analysis concerning the extent to which Xenophon's authorial, retrospective intentions have shaped the description of actual displays and acts of viewing between Greeks and barbarians.

Paul Kosmin's "Apologetic Ethnography: Megasthenes' *Indica* and the Seleucid Elephant" is a fascinating approach to one of the most famous and influential ethnographic monographs of antiquity, focusing on its political subtext. Kosmin reads the 'elephant politics' of the Seleucids

with great acuity, and provides, among other valuable points, a well-argued interpretation of the Hellenistic propaganda behind the so-called Adulis Inscription (pp. 107–8). In this, Kosmin's contribution augments very nicely the recent monograph by Glen Bowersock (*The Throne of Adulis*), who misses the chance to explain that the focus on the Indian elephants of an undefined enemy in Ptolemy III's inscription is precisely a reflection of the Seleucid-Lagid pachyderm rivalry. In terms of ancient ethnography, what is obtained is a nuanced picture of the techniques available for writers in the ethnographic register to modulate and foreground different elements in order to propagate a particular political agenda.

Jacek Rzepka devotes his "Monstrous Aetolians and Aetolian Monsters" to a technically Greek group that nonetheless was frequently cast as semi-barbarian or barbarian, the Aetolians. By examining variant traditions about individual Aetolians, especially the shepherd-strongman Titormus and the (anachronistic) Aetolarch Polycritus, Rzepka uncovers convincing traces of Aetolians offering their own, doctored perspectives on certain figures, and negotiating their own inclusion in the Greek sphere through such stories. The same certainly seems to have happened with the Aetolian manipulation of narratives connected with the Gallic attack against Delphi (see Champion *AJPh* 116 [1995] 213–20).

"Ethnography and the Gods in Tacitus' *Germania*" (Greg Woolf), a nuanced exploration of one of the most famous pieces of ethnographic writing with a particular attention to matters of 'religion' (a category that Woolf succinctly reminds us is in its ancient guise far more complicated than usually supposed). Woolf notes how the vocabulary of Tacitus, while also partly carrying over choices made already by Caesar, nonetheless often evokes similarities with Roman expressions and terminology, even when it offsets the descriptions with the familiar tropes of 'hard primitivism'. Tacitus' ethnographical 'Darkest Europe' (p. 144) turns out to be full of ambiguities, and Woolf's analysis of the passages on Nerthus, the Suebian "Isis", and the Alci reveals very well the inconsistencies inherent in its description. As Woolf points out (p. 146), despite the parallelisms with actual archaeological remains of Iron Age religiosity of North European groups, *Germania* should not be read as a work of religious ethnography: its aims and focus is somewhere else altogether.

The contribution of the co-editor Eran Almagor, titled "'But This Belongs to Another Discussion': Exploring the Ethnographic Digression in Plutarch's *Lives*" turns our attention to a very important aspect of ethnographical writing – namely, the textual framing of an ethnographical digression. The case studies under closer scrutiny are the *Lives* of Camillus, Theseus, and Pompey, with the ethnographical elements focusing, respectively, upon Gauls, Greeks themselves, and the Caucasian Albanians and Amazons. Understanding how ethnographic excursions are introduced and closed brings clear benefits, among other situations, in those cases where ethnographical elements from a fragmentary author need to be correctly recognized and delineated; one obvious example of this would be Posidonius. Even more importantly, however, Almagor reveals how in Plutarch's case the digressions are skilfully organised and sampled to constitute a crucial layer of signification within the biographical texts. This well-written case study of Plutarch only highlights the need to explore the form and role of ethnographical digressions in other authors' *oeuvre* with equal attention.

"Ethnography and Authorial Voice in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*" (Katerina Oikonomopoulou) looks at a text which has preserved a delightful but in many ways extremely challenging

selection of ethnographical snippets from a range of fragmentary authors. Hence, the importance of understanding Athenaeus' technique of selection and reference is plain to see. Mimicking the flux of ideas of associations that would have taken place in a convivial or symposiac setting, as well as the encyclopaedic breadth of the peoples covered, Athenaeus' ethnographic elements are very usefully linked by Oikonomopoulou to Imperial miscellanistic writing. She also demonstrates how the sophist's authorial presence is much heavier in the ethnographical section of Book 4, casting Athenaeus himself as an inheritor of Herodotus, yet also a writer constructing new significations for his inherited elements.

Focusing on a completely different setting than his recent *The Invention of Ancient Ethnography* (Oxford 2012), the co-editor Joseph Skinner's richly annotated contribution to this volume, "Imperial Visions, Imagined Pasts: Ethnography and Identity on India's North-Western Frontier", is a study that rewards the reader with several new insights, especially when it comes to mediating 'middle-ground' imaginings of an ethnographic nature (especially in Kafirstan, whose inhabitants were argued to be descended from Alexander's Greeks). The chapter demonstrates very well how the contents of ancient ethnographical writing could be transformed into something approaching scholarly mythologies within the nascent, imperialist-sponsored fields of ethnography and anthropology (cf. p. 206). British India, Afghanistan, and Persia likewise form the backdrop to the next chapter, Thomas Harrison's "Exploring Virgin Fields", which charts the varying reception of Orientalist tropes in the ethnographical vision of the famous Rawlinson brothers – one, Henry, practical, the other, George, theoretical. Despite all their circularity and essentialism in writing about contemporary peoples (especially the Persians) through their classically-tinted glasses, what Harrison brings out very well are the surprising nuances and ambiguities that emerge from their views.

Emma Dench's short, incisive closure to the volume, "The Scope of Ancient Ethnography" is perhaps the most thought-provoking chapter in the book. It manages not only to summarize many of the approaches and results of this wide-ranging work, but also charts things the previous contributors sidestepped: the challenges and pitfalls in our conception of the boundaries of ancient ethnographical writing. She doesn't hesitate to point out oversimplifications found in current scholarship, and the reader is left feeling grateful for this. Overall, this volume wisely refrains from defining the limits of ancient ethnography, and in so doing manages to dispel many long-standing dichotomies between barbarians and non-barbarians, and between 'literary' and 'factual' types of ethnographical knowledge.

Antti Lampinen

New Perspectives on Ancient Warfare. Edited by GARRETT G. FAGAN – MATTHEW TRUMBLE. Brill, Leiden – Boston 2010. ISBN 978-90-04-18598-2. XIII, 372 pp., 26 figs. EUR 140, USD 199.

The book is an offspring of the AIA/APA conference Joint Panel in 2007, reinforced with a few specially commissioned articles. The contributions take a wide look at different aspects of ancient warfare from chariots of the early first millennium BCE to Caesar and the Helvetian campaign. The articles do not address a specific set of debates or issues but are instead stand-alone pieces, although very good as such. Consequently, no conclusions are presented that would tie the articles together.