BOOK REVIEW

In the Land of a Thousand Gods: A History of Asia Minor in the Ancient World. By CHRISTIAN MAREK. Translated by STEVEN RENDALL, with collaboration from PETER FREI. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016. Pp. xix + 797. Hardcover, $49.50. ISBN 9780691159799.

Marek's book is a translation of the 2nd edition of his 2009 *Geschichte Kleinasiens in der Antike*, an overview history of Anatolia in Antiquity which is intended to reach a general audience while still satisfying the academic's need for rigor. Briefly put, this effort is a resounding success. It is uncommon to find an overview that does not befuddle the general reader nor upset the specialist, but Marek succeeds.

In the English version, the five hundred pages preceding the substantial end-matter are split into a mere 8 chapters (plus a short introduction and epilogue) with two particular chapters (6 and 9) of great length. There is an organizational change for the last four chapters, separating political history from other aspects. For example, religious changes in Anatolia, despite the English title of the book, are largely concentrated in the last 50 pages. The maps provided are excellent, but uneven in placement and focus, with many concentrated late in the book to illustrate shifting Roman provinces, but lacking an attempt to delineate satrapies or the extent of the Hittite states even in a broad sense.[1] Marek endeavors to give the current state of the field, rather than engage in debate (and particularly chronological debate). This is an eminently sensible decision, necessary to keep the work to a reasonable size. Marek presents Anatolia as a land torn between admiration of the east and of the west, and the role of Anatolia as both a bridge between east and west and a mixing-ground is a reoccurring theme (e.g. 3–4, 131–133). There is, however, a tendency to give disproportionate space to certain areas (e.g. Pergamum) that cannot be entirely explained by the quantity of evidence.

After a brief excursus on physical geography in Chapter 1, Marek covers not only the excavation history of Anatolia, but also provides an interesting survey of

[1] Marek provides an explanation of this decision (84), made for the sake of precision (and the inability to be precise for earlier periods).

travelers' accounts from the fourteenth to the nineteenth century, which contributed to archaeologists' attempts to locate particular ruins. The sheer quantity of unexamined and under examined classical coins and inscriptions Marek notes speaks to the obvious value of future work in this field. In the following chapter on prehistory, no attempt is made to hide the necessarily tentative nature of some conclusions made, which is refreshing. Anatolia contains some of our earliest excavated settlements and Marek outlines some basic similarities in settlement planning, but Marek raises many unanswered questions here. On the third and early second millennium BCE, Marek is less tentative.

In chapter 4, in addition to the history of the Hittites and neo-Hittites, Marek expands on some modern controversies on the second millennium, Luwians and Mycenaean Greeks and political geography in general. Somewhat surprisingly, very little space is given to the theories around the 'Sea Peoples'. Discovery sites of cuneiform or alphabetic tablets are often noted along with short discussions of language. Here, Marek includes the fascinating tidbit that most Carian writing is found not in Anatolia, but left by soldiers in Egypt. The importance of Anatolian gold and copper are noted throughout in this chapter, but fades from view in the later chapters. The second half of chapter 4 is subdivided more by region than chronology, an organizational shift that also happens later in the book at times.

Chapter 5 examines interactions between Greeks, Persians, and native Anatolians from the 6th to the 4th century. Marek provides succinct accounts of Herodotus and Xenophon, along with some archaeological details to support aspects of the narratives. The latter part of the chapter shifts to discussion of Persian administration and culture. Marek marks this period (the late fifth and fourth century) as the beginning of overt cultural change, with knowledge of Greek mythology, philosophy, and science heading east, and knowledge of accounting and administrative practices heading west. Of particular interest may be the ways the Persians employed local elites in their administration (like the Hekatomnids of Halicarnassus). This chapter closes with a brief account of Alexander's conquest of Persia.

Chapter 6, though stretching across 300 years, remains more focused within Anatolia, using the Roman defeat of the Seleucids to serve as a midpoint organizing feature. The Macedonians largely kept the Persian system in place and added to it (as did the Romans). For the Hellenistic states, managing and organizing military manpower was a complex problem, and Marek hints at this with

references to the employ of mercenaries (185, 191) and settling of military colonies (e.g. 195, 200). It is in this situation that the Galatians enter a chaotic Anatolia, and Marek gives us an evenhanded discussion of the Galatian invasion, though somewhat downplays the Galatians' role in subsequent Anatolian politics (though noted a few times at 214, 224, 247-248). Many treaties are recorded in inscriptions, and Marek provides a number of these in his narrative. Much of the chapter is invested in describing Pergamum, Rome, and the Pontic kingdom of the Mithridatids. Perhaps in keeping with Marek's avowed avoidance of controversy, little is recorded on recent study (post-Maroti 1970) on Rome's Cilician campaigns or Pompey's resettlement of the pirates.

Chapter 7 covers another 300-year block of time (Augustus to the Tetrarchy) in sparser detail, focusing on the role of the client-kingdom of Armenia, imperial visits to parts of Anatolia, and Rome's wars with Parthia. This chapter examines the organization and reorganization of cities and provinces in Anatolia under the Roman Empire, which is complicated by the differing status held by one city or another, by the emperors' influence, or by the locations and size of Roman garrisons in eastern Anatolia. Many clients and allies in Anatolia were absorbed into the empire also, mainly under the Julio-Claudians, and thus the period saw a tangled succession of redrawing of provincial boundaries that may have functioned as much to balance power as to efficiently administer the area. Marek argues that this period was, overall, a very prosperous one for Anatolia.

In chapter 8, Marek does not continue to advance the timeline, but returns to cover 'lower' administrative details not covered in the previous two chapters. Chapter 8 presents a much clearer history of the organization of provinces and towns at a lower-level, complete with discussions of taxes, infrastructure and military recruitment. Here we have records of governors and prefects tasked with improving infrastructure and physical evidence of infrastructure, but it can be hard to make particular links between the two. Marek nevertheless tackles this, illustrating the variety of lower officials delegated to particular projects. Unlike earlier periods, Anatolia apparently lagged behind other regions in military recruitment for the Roman Empire.

Chapter 9 is a fascinating oddity. In it, Marek provides a variety of social, cultural, economic and other histories (trade, architecture, literature, religion, demography, etc.), with more emphasis on the Imperial period. The cities' competition for Imperial favor informs our understanding of many developments, especially it terms of the cities' financial outlays (e.g. 436), and it is again clear that

many institutions were centuries old with only cosmetic changes. Archaeology provides us hints of housing, funeral rites, and religion, which Marek presents clearly and concisely. The individual sections are very clear, and it is certainly very useful to examine the longer-term chronological changes in these areas, but this comes with a tradeoff. By separating discussions of 'Greco-Roman' and Persian and Hittite culture (which were more closely integrated with the overall history of those periods) to different parts of the book and arranging them differently, Marek may be damaging his own attempt to present 'Anatolian' culture on its own terms. The short epilogue serves to hint at what happens in Byzantine Anatolia and explain Marek's reasons for not continuing into the Byzantine period.

The end matter consists of several useful appendices, a substantial body of endnotes, indices and bibliography. The thematic bibliography contains over 700 works, approximately 10% of which are new additions since the first edition. The organizational and inclusion principles of the bibliography escape me, but repeatedly used sources also appear in the bibliography (which is subdivided by subject area).[2] While the specialist academic will have little trouble finding the references, an explanation of the referencing system would have made this more accessible to the general reader, as might a short 'for further reading' essays at the end of each chapter. Moreover, references made are generally made to specialist literature, perhaps limiting general readers' ability to pursue further examination. At the same time and for the same reasons, the copious references will be of use to academics.

While the general reader will be able to follow the narrative, in some cases complex knowledge is assumed. For example, readers of chapter 6 and 7 are not told precisely who the Diadochi were and are given little explanation of the major Roman magistracies. They will have a significant wait to learn where and what Commagene and Sophene actually are and may be readily confused by varying descriptions of Cappadocia (admittedly difficult to define). Marek also tends to assume the reader's familiarity with the writings of Cicero and Pliny the Younger.

I would also be remiss to not add a few remarks on the translation. Though I have not read the two German versions in any thoroughness, Rendall's translation is largely a felicitous rendition, and avoids becoming trapped in the arcane

[2] It is unclear to me how often a work is to be cited before appearing in the bibliography. For example, works cited repeatedly in the notes but not included in the bibliography include Eck's 1998 Die Verwaltung des Römischen Reiches in der Hohen Kaiserzeit and Syme's 1939 Observations on the Province of Cilicia.

and interdisciplinary jargon of Hittite studies, epigraphy, archaeology, and Classical studies. Typographical errors and other infelicities are relatively few.[3] Use of measurements, especially distances, can be inconsistent and sometimes infrequent.[4] To make the text still more accessible to the general reader (or academics in other fields), a short explanation of inscriptional references might have been worthwhile, especially as inscriptions (with translations) are increasingly available online. In comparison with the German text (2nd ed.), there have been some rearrangements and corrections,[5] but the most significant difference appears to be the inclusion of additional references and bibliography.

Despite a few misgivings as to its ease of use by the general reader, Marek's book is a clear survey of Anatolian history that will surely become an essential first stop for those writing on Ancient Anatolia. Though not apparently intended as such, I suggest this could also be an altogether appropriate textbook for an upper-level history or archaeology class on Anatolia. Moreover, this thorough and weighty tome comes in at a quite reasonable price for general readership and for classes. Marek and Rendall should be praised for making this book available to an English-speaking audience.

AARON L. BEEK

University of Memphis, albeek@memphis.edu

[3] Examples: an end parenthesis is missing on pg. 83, missing italics on p.652 (n.53), the reference on page 676 (note119) refers to [549] instead of [550]. More substantial, but still minor: the pro Murena and pro Flacco are described as speeches addressed to them, rather than on behalf of them (180). Use of 'Diadochs' and 'Epigones' vs 'Diadochi' and 'Epigoni' is not consistent, and 'Diadochi and Epigones' also appears (292, 490). Puzzlingly, Scipio Africanus, accompanying his brother Lucius to Asia, is described merely as 'a member of his staff', and several subsequent mentions of 'Scipio' are unclear as to which brother is meant (e.g. two mentions on 224 are ambiguous but imply Publius, but the Scipio on 226 refers to Lucius). Delos, though nominally Athenian in 88, had far stronger ties to Rome than Marek would lead the reader to believe (see 275). Troop 'mobility' on page 413 surely stands in for troop 'movements'?

[4] Distances are usually (but not always) converted from miles, stades, or parasangs into kilometers. I believe 'miles' refers to the Roman measure. Dealing with the smaller measurements is understandably complex, but one does not normally expect to see the measurement given as eight by twenty ells (378).

[5] e.g. the Urartian fortress at 39 and the coin of Philetairos at 210 have been moved there from different sections.