

RelBib

Bibliography of the Study of Religion

<https://relbib.de>

Dear reader,

This is a self-archived version of the following review:

Author:	Rüpke, Jörg
Title:	“Schultz, Celia E./ Harvey, Paul B., <i>Religion in Republican Italy</i> “
Published in:	The ancient history bulletin (Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte / Revue d'histoire ancienne). Chicago, Ill. [u.a.]: Loyola Univ., Dep. of Classical Studies
Volume:	22
Year:	2008
Pages:	167 – 169
ISSN:	0835-3638

The article is used with permission of [Loyola Univ., Dep. of Classical Studies](#).

Thank you for supporting Green Open Access.

Your RelBib team



Celia E. Schultz, Paul B. Harvey (eds.), *Religion in Republican Italy*. Yale Classical Studies 33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Pp. xiv + 299 (including index and bibliography). ISBN 978.0-521-86366-7.

The intensity of archaeological research (unfortunately not always matched by the speed of publication of the findings) in Italy has driven a recent intensification of research in the history of Italy in the second half of the first millennium BC. Whereas larger historical accounts have been attempted (in regional as well as temporal terms),¹⁵ larger accounts of the history of religion for the same period and geographical breadth are still lacking.¹⁶ In such a situation, conferences and collective publications will be primary instruments to further research—and are still rare.¹⁷

The volume brought together by the two editors is giving even more stress to Italy outside of Rome than earlier contributions. It is difficult to map a history of pre-Roman Italy without any reference to the Roman expansion and its unifying hegemonization of

¹⁵ E.g. Massimo Pallottino, *A history of earliest Italy*, Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1991; Henrik Mouritsen, *Italian unification: a study in ancient and modern historiography*, London: Inst. of Classical Studies, 1998; *Italy and the west: comparative issues in Romanization*, ed. by Simon Keay, Nicola Terrenato, Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001.

¹⁶ All the recent handbooks and introductions (Mary Beard, John North, Simon Price, *Religions of Rome*, Cambridge: University Press, 1998; John Scheid, *Roman Religion*, 2004; Jörg Rüpke/Richard Gordon, *Religion of the Romans*, Oxford: Polity Press, 2006; id. (ed.), *A Companion to Roman Religion*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2007 – with the exception of the contribution of Olivier de Cazanove) are concentrated on the city of Rome for the Republican period.

¹⁷ Edward Bispham, Christopher Smith (eds.), *Religion in Archaic and Republican Rome and Italy: Evidence and experience*, Edinburgh: University Press, 2000, still is the most important contribution to name; for further bibliography see the recurring multilingual “Forschungsbericht Römische Religion”, *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 2 (2000), 283-345; 5 (2003), 297-371; 9 (2007), 297-404, by Andreas Bendlin et al.

Italy after the Social War, but the editors focus on Roman, Etruscan and other Italian societies at the same time. Italian influence on Rome (not only vice versa) is stressed (p. 4). All contributions aim at historicizing religion, thus implying a major advance in comparison to the usual ethnical classification (“Etruscan” or “Oscan religion”), which always tends to de-historicize by attributing an unchangeable “identity” (by the way a recent trend in political dealing with religion). Historicizing has two implications. First, the authors undertake close analyses of regional or local findings. They talk about religion at Minturnae, not about “Italic religion”. But at the same time, secondly, they attempt at generalizations, at identifying change and at modeling the analysis and description of historical change by periodization. A special emphasis on ritual is formulated by the editors in their introduction (p. 4), thus—adequately, I think—stressing their notion of religion. In my review, I shall concentrate on those chapters with major contribution to such a history of religion.

Ch. 1 (Fay Glinister) addresses and attacks the notion of “religious Romanization” by re-analyzing the temporal and regional distribution of healing sanctuaries and anatomical votives. She successfully questions the view that Rome is the origin of the spread of such votives from the fourth century onwards. Rather, we are dealing with an Italian “koiné”, based on a “hybridized Hellenistic culture” (26), spreading for reasons of private initiative and fashion (33). Her account of the problems to interpret anatomical votives—that are religiously generic rather than medically specific and might be offered before or after receiving of the divine favor, might constitute or only record the human response—at least implicitly demonstrate the necessity for a collaboration with an “archeology of religion” that is only slowly coming into shape.

Ch. 3 (Jean MacIntosh Turfa) offers an overview of sources and phenomena of Etruscan religion. The spread of terracotta votives and the presence of mythological scenes are the most important markers of change. However, the chapter does not convincingly argue for the specificity of these changes and their connection to other phenomena of social, political, or religious developments. “Watershed” as used in the title is justified neither by chronological precision nor by the range of provable change.

Valentina Livi (ch. 4) and Paul B. Harvey (ch. 5) offer detailed studies of localities (Minturnae and Pisaurum) that offer material to study the interaction of local tradition and Roman influence or immigration. However, a *caveat* on some methodological points must be uttered, concerning the transposition or generalization of religious institutions of the city of Rome. A *bidental* is not a “place of ritual purification” (98), but a place of a lightning stroke demanding religious acknowledgment. *Ritus graecus* (and *Romanus*) is a category valid at Rome. Combinations of gods attested at Rome do reveal hardly anything about the same combination at other places (118). “Pantheon” is a problematical concept in any case. It should not be use for a rather fortuitous group of deities venerated/attested at one particular place or even specific period (124). Finally, if the concept of “civic deity” is useful at all (which I doubt), it could not be opposed to the cult of a “private” association (119). Such inaccuracies attest to the marginal importance given to religion in the academic formation in classics. They are of no large consequence here, but produce serious flaws elsewhere. Thus I would signal reservations about the

results of ch. 2 (Lesley E. Lundeen on the title *hatrencu* for women) due to a problematic differentiation of “priesthoods” and “magistrates” on the basis of criteria that are hardly adequate to contemporary notions.¹⁸ The same holds true for ch. 10 (A. E. Cooley on Augustan religion) that reads the local copies of Augustan *fasti* as locally specific compilations and Ovid’s commentary on the Roman calendar as a calendar itself.¹⁹

Here, the observation of John Muccigrosso (ch. 8) on the overlap of domestic and public space in the ritual (and other) use of villas are more to the point (181-6). The second, rather independent part of this chapter convincingly argues for political display being the central factor in the topographical placing of temple foundations, religion not being unimportant, but simply no constraint. This is in marked contrast to the universalist-phenomenological reasoning on the sacredness of water displayed in the previous chapter (ch. 7) by Ingrid Edlund-Berry. Muccigrosso, instead, strengthens his general hypothesis by a detailed study of foundations around 300 BC.

In ch. 9 Celia Schultz offers a fine analysis of the history and the political significance of the cult of Iuno Sospita, in particular for the period of the *bellum sociale*. The Roman magistrates’ approach exemplifies what the author calls Romanization by incorporation (223), that is reflections and representation of expansion and related concerns in the hegemonic centre (this concept should have been used for a more detailed analysis in ch. 10, too). Her prosopographical and iconographical argument leads to a hypothesis about the agents that will inform any further discussion.

The achievements and weaknesses of the volume are best visible in ch. 6 (W.E. Klingshirn) who attempts at a periodization of lot divination in Italy. His hypothesis about the formation of the term *sortilegus* as analogy to the Greek *chresmologos* is attractive. His attempt at periodization—identifying a process of a commercialization of lot divination and a growing independence of its practitioners from established oracles—is attractive, too, but might be mistaken due to the scanty evidence, offering more evidence for individual specialists in later sources. Hypotheses and models will characterize the field and be constantly replaced. But one has to attempt them in order to advance research. For that, the editors and contributors must be thanked. After all criticism, I am sure, many of those published here will stand further discussion.

Jörg Rüpke

Max Weber Centre, University of Erfurt, Germany

¹⁸ Cf. John Scheid, *Religion et piété à Rome*, 2nd ed., Paris: Albin Michel, 2001; J. Rüpke, „Organisationsmuster religiöser Spezialisten im kultischen Spektrum Roms“, in: Corinne Bonnet, id., Paolo Scarpi (edd.), *Religions orientales – culti misterici: Neue Perspektiven – nouvelle perspectives – prospettive nuove* (Potsdamer altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 16), Stuttgart: Steiner, 2006, 13-26.

¹⁹ See J. Rüpke, *Kalender und Öffentlichkeit: Zur Geschichte der Repräsentation und religiösen Qualifikation von Zeit in Rom*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995; id., „Ovids Kalenderkommentar: Zur Gattung der Libri fastorum“, *Antike und Abendland* 40 (1994), 125-136; id., „Les archives des petits collèges: Le cas des vicomagistri“, in: *La mémoire perdue [2]: Recherches sur l'administration romaine*, Rom: Ecole française de Rome, 1998, 27-44.