One final quibble: in the transition from German to English version the bibliography has been insufficiently revised. There are too many references to German-language studies for an introductory book of this kind, and some notable omissions of valuable English works, such as G. Vlastos's *Socrates: Ironist and Moral Philosopher* (Cambridge, 1991), M. Burnyeat's *The Theaetetus of Plato* (Indianapolis, 1990), and E. TeSelle's *Augustine the Theologian* (London, 1970).

University College London G. J. P. O'DALY

WOMEN AND LAW

A. ARJAVA: *Women and Law in Late Antiquity*. Pp. xii + 304. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. £35. ISBN: 0-19-815033-4.

It may be regarded as brave of an author to start a book by volunteering in the very first sentence that he conceivably should not be writing it. But this turns out to be symptomatic of A.'s style throughout, which is filled with an uncompromising delight in identifying and assessing problems and lacunae in the source and subject-matter, and meeting them head-on—often to conclude that nothing can be known for certain, and the problem will in fact admit of no solving. Thus the dilemma A. highlights at the outset of the book, with the question he asks but does not answer—how valid a study of women's history can be if written by a man. All I would wish to say in this connection is that a refreshingly cool and clear-eyed take on the topic such as this book presents will always be a most welcome addition to a fast-growing field.

This is an interesting and painstakingly thorough study of legal attitudes to women (and female experiences of the law) which quite deliberately takes a broad-brush view of 'late antiquity in its widest possible sense' (p. 1), i.e. as ranging from the second to the seventh century. Lucidly written and methodically presented, on this wide band A. considers the evidence of a comprehensive range of legal, literary, and ecclesiastical sources, presenting chapters on Historical Setting and Sources, Fathers and Children, Mothers and Children, Married Women, Separation and Single Life, Sexual Relations outside Marriage, and Women and the Society of Men, followed by some General Conclusions; each chapter is clearly subtitled and its general arguments restated succinctly in a closing 'Summary and Conclusions'. Throughout each section A. proceeds methodically from legal theory to a general assessment of practical arrangements, and then to individual cases, in a most accessible format, giving a commendably clear picture of female rights and obligations, well leavened by actual experiences. The clarity of layout and thinking is, however, occasionally undermined by odd opacities of language—for instance, a sentence such as 'There were also the fathers who did not manage to produce a single child.' (p. 71) could stand more clarification than is given. There is a full and useful bibliography; but the index is oddly perfunctory and unhelpful.

A. commences with a comprehensive summary of the evolution of the legal material used, offering a calm and logical assessment of the disputes surrounding some of the sources. The advantage of legal texts as source matter is that 'there is no other group of evidence which one could follow continuously' (p. 1) through such a period; the weakness of it is that it can seem to bear little resemblance to what its subjects actually did. A. is perhaps at his strongest in examining critically the validity and level of purchase of the laws as they were made and modified amongst the

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

citizenry they were meant to address, and seems most successful in fact in showing how the law often lagged behind real life, in following the populace's actual habits, e.g. on the evolving custom (contrary to previous legal ruling) of gifts and property transfer between spouses, and on the gradual erosion of *tutela mulierum*. 'One might be tempted to conclude that the law simply did not matter' (p. 25)—again, perhaps a brave statement in a book dedicated to the study of law as it affected life, but also an acknowledgement of the difficulties of following the effects of the subject-matter. He has some similarly pertinent points to make on the different levels of effectiveness that must have obtained in the widely diffused areas this legal decision-making was required to cover; that such Roman attitudes as those towards property rights of women (uniquely liberal compared with many cultures) might be particularly alien to its 'new citizens' (p. 132); and has some sharp observations on the possible effect of such widely divergent peoples in their turn on the 'vulgarization' of Roman law. Where I have serious reservations is in his assessment of the effect or otherwise of Christianity on society; the only judgement that he seems able to offer with any real eagerness is that 'the Christians simply did not have any distinctive behaviour pattern of their own' (p. 257), which I found highly questionable—though I feel duty-bound to report that this conclusion was greeted with enthusiasm by at least one other reviewer (P. Walcot, *Greece & Rome* 44 [1997], 114). While he makes a cogent point that Christianity as superimposed on much of the legal activity of later antiquity is something of a veneer, I am less convinced that he has demonstrated that it did not change things, particularly in the areas of private and sexual morality—which on his own admission is less well reflected in the legal sources. To show that nothing changed in Roman law as a result of Christianity is not necessarily the same as to show that Christianity changed nothing in Roman life, but when A. departs from his legal brief he is rather less persuasive. Considering how rigorous is his examination of his legal sources, he has a curiously literal attitude to his Church source-material: for instance, using, as normative evidence on attitudes to marriage, statements taken from patristic treatises on virginity (p. 30); and, still more bizarrely, offering Jerome as evidence of a sincerely tolerant attitude towards multiple marriage (citing from the notorious diatribe to Pammachius the famous passage on octagamy, *Ep.* 48.9—mis-cited as 49.8).

These difficulties aside, this is nonetheless a most informative and fascinating book overall, written with exemplary clarity, and considerably easier to read and follow than many on its subject. If some of his conclusions are less than convincing, they are never less than thought-provoking, and this is still a most helpful and approachable treatment of the issue.

Edinburgh GILLIAN CLOKE

THE LATIN VERB

S. MELLET, M. D. JOFFRE, G. SERBAT: *Grammaire fondamentale du Latin, sous la direction de Guy Serbat: Le signifié du verbe* (Bibliothèque d'études classiques). Pp. 474. Louvain and Paris: Peeters, 1994. Paper. Belg. frs. 1800. ISBN: 2-87723-165-8; 90-6831-645-1.

This large, well-presented book sets out, first, to offer an analysis as complete as possible of the Latin verbal system as revealed by a corpus running from Plautus

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to Tacitus (the items are not listed), with a summary of developments in Late and Vulgar Latin in a different, and smaller, typeface at the end of each chapter (in the event very brief and in only twelve of the eighteen chapters); and, second, to shed new light on the Latin facts by taking into account current linguistic theory. It will serve as a discursive (420 pp.) complement to the relevant sections of Kühner–Stegmann (250 pp.), Hofmann–Szantyr (109 pp.), the admirable Ernout–Thomas (87 pp.), and the remarkably efficient fifty-four pages of Chapters 10 and 11 of Pinkster's *Latin Syntax and Semantics*. In both layout and approach, it offers an interestingly different view of the Latin verb compared with either 'traditional' grammars or more recent work based on, say, Generative or Functional Grammar.

lt is good to have in a single volume a synthesis of some of the instructive work of the three co-authors, to each of whom in various measure we owe already numerous publications on the Latin verb. This book is largely the work of Sylvie Mellet, who is probably known best for her monograph on the imperfect indicative in classical Latin (Paris, 1988). Of the eighteen chapters here, M. has contributed all or part of fourteen: on the imperfect and pluperfect indicative, future and future perfect; meaning, use and tenses of the subjunctive; imperative; future participle; infinitive; use of auxiliaries; and, jointly with Marie-Dominique Joffre, on the perfect indicative; nominal forms of the verb; gerundive; supine and gerund. J. independently has written three chapters (on the present participle; the participle in *-tus*; and grammatical voice), and Guy Serbat one (on the present indicative).

It does not read like a comprehensive grammar but like a rather uneven series of essays. The style is generally plain and clear and perfectly readable, although the opening chapter (on the present indicative) is given, not unattractively (but slightly incongruously?), to rhetorical flourish. Lists of examples, all of which are translated, are kept short but individual examples are as long as is necessary to reveal all the relevant context, and are occasionally discussed in some detail (also with reference to style). Another characteristic feature is the quoting of statistics, many of them evidently new and potentially very informative (e.g. p. 305: the history of *-tus* forms), but not always clearly defined or cogently exploited (e.g. p. 268: do these counts of future versus present imperative refer to cases where the future imperative might have been used?; p. 428 n. 7: and does a range of 57–78% represent 'une écrasante majorité'?). A persistent, related, failing is in the absence of bibliographical reference to claims and allusions, some controversial, some just uninformative (e.g. p. 10: Guillaume, Marouzeau; p. 61: 'les linguistes', 'Pline le Jeune'; p. 275: the infinitive is an old locative case-form; p. 82 n. 12: on the type *Quid tibi hanc curatio est rem*?; p. 303 n. 1: Greek superlatives and ordinal numbers in *-τος* show reflexes of the same Indo-European suffix as do Greek and Latin verbal adjectives in *-tus*/*-τος*; p. 378: E. Risch is given the last word on the relation between gerund and gerundive (note now H. Hettrich in *Fs. H. Rix* and G. Meiser in *Fs. J. U. Untermann* [both Innsbruck, 1993]).

The proposed analyses are presented as the fruit of a constant to-and-fro between linguistic theory and minute examination of the texts. The theoretical framework adopted here (briefly sketched, in part only, in the introduction, pp. 10–17) is inspired by the 'linguistique énonciative' of (especially) Antoine Culioli. (A collection of his articles, with bibliography and bilingual index of technical terms, is accessible in *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation. Opérations et représentations, i* [Paris, 1990].) Given present space-constraints, I will say only that this approach appears to combine a form of pragmatics (the relation of utterance to context) with a formal set of operations for

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

transforming predication into utterance. For verbal categories chief among these operations is the fixing of a reference point (repérage'; 'point de repère') in respect of time, aspect, mood, person, and diathesis, which anchors the predicate to the situation of the utterance. (Incidentally, this leaves me puzzled as to why this volume contains [Chapters 10–16] the nominal forms of the verb under the one title ['signifié du verbe'] and in particular why they separate Chapters 17, on the use of auxiliaries, and 18, on voice, from 1–9 on tenses, aspect and mood—but I may have missed something.) To ascribe, as is here attempted, a single basic invariant meaning (supposedly real in some sense for speakers) to a derivational or inflexional marker which shows synchronically a significant range of meaning is likely to be arbitrary unless supported by diachronic evidence. Yet, despite the emphasis on the context of utterance, there is little, if anything, on the theory of language change (although the main corpus spans about 300 years), nor, if the corpus is meant to represent a synchrony, on language-maintenance, which crucially involves sociolinguistic factors (J. and L. Milroy in P. Trudgill [ed.], *Sociolinguistic Patterns in British English* [London, 1978]). Any judgement on the contribution of the theory to the description and explanation will be in part a matter of taste. For the most part, it does not obtrude unduly and often a happy balance is struck (e.g. by M. on the imperative, by J. on the *-tus* participle, by S. on the present [with a rich history of theories on this category]).

The bibliography is generally rich and will often be well worth consulting, even though it is most unhelpfully divided between each of the eighteen chapters and five sections at the end of the book. Understandably (and beneficially for anglophones), it shows something of a French bias; unfortunately this extends to the treatment of German names, so that one is referred to (e.g.) J. B. Hoffmann and Dag Nordberg. There are some notable omissions, I mean of important collections of material or of bold, but not obviously mad, views: for example, in the chapter on voice, there is no reference to E. Dahlén's studies of reflexive verbs (Gothenburg, 1964 and 1977), to L. Feltenius' of intransitive use of transitive verbs (Uppsala, 1977), or to Philip Baldi's view that Latin had a middle voice (*ZVS* 90 [1976]); and, given their importance in typological and historical linguistics, 'active' and 'ergative' systems should have been at least mentioned (the former already in Norberg's *Beiträge*—cf. F. Plank [ed.], *Relational Typology* [Berlin, 1985], pp. 269 ff., and C. Lehmann in the same volume, pp. 243 ff.). There is nothing to compare with Pinkster's helpful topic-by-topic guides to the bibliography, including surveys, and further reading.

Most regrettably, it is not indexed: an inarticulate 'index rerum' with long lists of page-numbers after each of only 41 headwords (e.g. 'aspect, aspectuel' and 81 figures) does not, in my opinion, constitute a usable index. On the other hand, the (sub)sections of individual chapters are clearly and sensibly labelled so that, with the help of the 'table des matières' at the back, as opposed to the 'sommaire' at the front, it is just possible to use this book as a work of reference: inclusion of chapter- and section-number in the running header would have made this much easier.

The *Grammaire fondamentale du Latin* is apparently envisaged as a 'collection' and will comprise an unspecified number of volumes produced by various authors under the direction of Guy Serbat. Serbat's own *La syntaxe des cas* appeared in 1994 and reference is made in the present work (p. 362 n. 27) to a forthcoming volume on complement clauses ('complétives'). It is puzzling that (at least the review copy of) this volume says nothing about the *Grammaire* as a whole; other features, too (index, bibliography and [cross-] referencing) raise doubts about the sureness of conception of the whole enterprise—unless I have misinterpreted the 'fondamentale' in the title: are we talking just of the basic meanings of the various grammatical categories?

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

However, this volume may with due caution be recommended to Latinists as a complement to existing grammars.

Wolfson College, Oxford D. R. LANGSLOW

LATIN GLOSSARIES

J. HAMESSE (ed.): *Les manuscrits des lexiques et glossaires de 1'antiquité tardive à la fin du Moyen âge*. (Textes et Études du Moyen âge, 4.) Pp. xiii + 723. Louvain-la-Neuve: Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'Études Médiévales, 1996. Paper, Belg. frs. 2450. Obtainable from Editions BREPOLS, Steenweg op Tielen 68, B-2300 Turnhout, Belgium.

This volume was designed to provide an account of how far specialists have got with making available for general study those works which were used in Western Europe between the collapse of classical civilization and the invention of printing as dictionaries and aids to understanding texts in Latin, unfamiliar forms of Latin, and other languages of culture like Greek and Hebrew, and also to offer some guidelines for future editorial labour. Fourteen chapters claim to display between them the evolution of the dictionary down to *c*. 1348. Three more deal with special lexica, and five with bilingual collections. The introduction, composed by Jacqueline Mamesse, and a final summing up by Giuseppe Cremascoli push hard the notion that the lexicography of a period can shed light on that period's culture.

The chapters of the volume stem from papers delivered at a lengthy conference planned with some care and held in the Centro di Cultura Scientifica Ettore Majorana at Erice, 23–30 September 1994. Some of those invited kept to their brief and some did not, while others failed to come or to supply a manuscript. Hence the usual kinds of omissions and irrelevances of a committee production. Particularly striking is the absence at one end of the volume of a chapter on the medieval transmission of the twenty books of Sextus Pompeius Festus' *De uerborum significatu* and the epitome made in the eighth century at Monte Casino by Paul the Deacon, and at the other end of chapters on the so-called *Liber glossarum*, Papias' *Elementarium doctrinae rudimentum*, Guillaume le Breton's *Expositiones uocabulorum Bibliae*, and Uguccione's *Liber deriuationum*.

Most of the material treated, like the Juvenal glosses, does not add to our knowledge of pagan antiquity. Some, like that in Isidore's *Etymologiae* and *Differentiae*, does, but not from the aspect from which it is considered. Although we do not have Festus' *De uerborum significatu*, Nonius' *De compendiosa doctrina*, or Aelius Donatus' commentaries on Terence and Virgil entire, the occasional Dark-Age centre probably or possibly did. Hence readers of this journal might expect to find something in the volume of interest to them. Four chapters in fact may be singled out as worth their attention.

Louis Holtz describes how glossography (in the proper sense) and lexicography related to the art of grammar in antiquity. He discusses the importance in the development of the glossary/lexicon both of the teacher's way of explaining literary texts and the scholar's interest in questions of linguistic science, the changes which the social instability of the beginning of the fifth century wrought on the content of the school syllabus, the widening at this time of the whole field of the art of grammar,

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the extension of the sense of the word *glossa*, and the way that glossography became incorporated within the redefined art.

Johannes Kramer surveys what has been found in Egypt in the way of mono-, bi-, and trilingual lists of words and of texts glossed in another language or kind of language, and sketches the linguistic and cultural situation of the country from the Roman to the Arab conquest. He does not, however, take up the question of how this might have differed from the situation of those parts of the Empire where Latin was the dominant language, of Italy, Gaul, and South Germany, for example, where the extant Latin glossaries seem to have been compiled. He lists the remains of Latin–Greek and Greek–Latin 'glossaries' at present recognized as such in papyrological collections, suggesting that much more awaits recognition.

Paolo Gatti considers how the *De compendiosa doctrina* of the North African schoolmaster Nonius Marcellus—during the eighth and ninth centuries a work much used as a dictionary in the monasteries of north-eastern France, in recent times the principal quarry of those collecting the remains of the lost works of third-, second- and first-century B.C. Latin literature—might be better edited. He reports Bernhard Bischoff's placing and dating of the pre-eleventh-century codices, which seem to demand a redrawing of Lindsay's stemmata and further collating of some codices, and draws attention to the importance of the 'Nonius glosses' transmitted in cod. Leiden, Bibl. d. Rijksuniv., B.P.L. 67 F, ff. 142^{r}–148^{r}, in the margins of the Nonian codices of Lindsay's second family, and in various interrelated glossaries from France and South Germany.

Some of the collections of words and explanations made in Latin-using monasteries between *c*. 600 and *c*. 1200 contain literary and paraliterary material put together much earlier. This fact has occasionally led students of classical antiquity to take an interest in them. A. C. Dionisotti believes that some can illuminate educational and managerial continuities between the Empire of Diocletian and that of Charlemagne. Her chapter argues that W. M. Lindsay, with whose name the Latin glossaries are associated in Anglo-Saxon lands, left much work still to be done in making them available to the public and that Lindsay's own work was marred by a failure to comprehend the variety of their sources, the dissimilarity of their mode of transmission from that of literary texts, and the amount of curtailment, augmentation, and rearrangement they suffered, by unreal hopes of recovering lost elements of Festus' *De uerborum significatu*, by a readiness to indulge in premature hypotheses and conjectures, and by certain peculiarities of moral temper. The claim that study of material neglected by Lindsay can explain much is backed by consideration of a number of particular cases, the most striking and suggestive of which is that of the *Expositio notarum*, a collection of *c*. 1800 glosses carried by a central Italian codex of around A.D. 1000, Oxford, Bod. Libr. Add. C 144, ff. 132^{v}–144^{r}. Historians of scholarship will value Dionisotti's sober account of how the Germans Gustav Loewe, Georg Goetz, and Gotthold Gundermann went about the business of editing the glossaries.

There are indices of ancient and medieval authors (not as full as some might want), of modern authors, and of manuscripts. Anonymous works, even one as important as the *Liber glossarum*, will have to be hunted down by the user of the volume himself.

Kidlington, Oxfordshire H. D. JOCELYN

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LATIN GRAMMAR

R. HOFMAN: *The Sankt Gall Priscian Commentary: Part 1*. (Studien und Texte zur Keltologie, 1.) Volume 1: Introduction; Books 1–5; Volume 2: Translation and Commentary; Indices. Pp. 330; 416. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1996. Paper, DM 175. ISBN: 3-89323–611-2.

J.-W. BECK: *Zur Zuverlässigkeit der bedeutendsten lateinischen Grammatik: Die 'Ars' des Aelius Donatus*. (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichhen Klasse, 1996, 8.) Pp. 54. Mainz and Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996. Paper, DM 32. ISBN: 3-515-06960-7.

Donatus and Priscian are the best known writers and the most important authorities in the preservation and the transmission of classical learning, and particularly of the study and teaching of Latin from the classical period through the Middle Ages into the modern world. They have earned their designation as 'the schoolmasters of Europe' (H. Waddell, *The Wandering Scholars* [London, 1926], p. xxix).

Donatus (fourth century A.D.) wrote two short Latin grammars known as the *Ars minor* and the *Ars maior*, both dealing primarily with the morphology of the Latin word classes (parts of speech), on principles originating in the *Technē grammatikē* of Dionysius Thrax (c. 100 B.C.), a work still extant in a later and altered form, probably from around the third or fourth century A.D.

Priscian (*c.* 500 A.D.), working in Constantinople, wrote a much larger, comprehensive grammar of Latin, running to more than 1,000 printed pages today. This work, the *Institutiones grammaticae*, deals first with Latin orthographical phonetics and syllable structure, but its greater part, volumes 2–16, gives an exhaustive account of the morphology of the eight word classes of the language, leaving the final two volumes, 17 and 18, to Latin syntax. These last draw heavily in theory and exposition on prior Greek syntacticians, notably Apollonius (*c.* A.D. 200), who left us with the first systematic treatment of Greek syntax within the mainline tradition. Priscian repeatedly expressed his debt to him.

By an irony of history Priscian's grammar turned out to have very different results from its author's intentions. As is made clear by its frequent references to Greek, it was designed at an early stage in the Eastern (Byzantine) Empire to provide the resources for teachers of Latin to mainly Greek-speaking pupils. At this time Constantinople was still envisaged as 'New Rome', with official titles drawn from Roman days and with Latin the intended language of governmental appointees. In the event Latin inevitably died out by the seventh century, except among scholars; but once the *Institutiones* had become widely known in the West from around 800 it soon became the standard authority for the teaching of Latin. Summarized and commented on during several centuries, in the later Middle Ages it was taken as the official Latin database by the late medieval scholastic grammarians, the Modistae, in their philosophical exposition of universal grammar. The popularity of Priscian's grammar is evidenced by the number of separate manuscripts known to have existed.

The Sankt Gall manuscript is one of the extant copies of the *Institutiones*. It is a beautiful example of medieval book production and it is on regular display in the Sankt Gall Monastery Library. One feature of this manuscript is the number of

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

glosses, the Commentary, written in the margins and above the lines of the text and coming from several sources.

The work here reviewed, Part One, comprises two volumes separately paginated and covering volumes 1–5 of the *Institutiones*. H.'s vol. 1 contains the preface and introduction (pp. 5–95), followed by the Latin and the Irish glosses; there are six photographic copies of the manuscript itself. Throughout references are given to the text of Priscian edited by M. Hertz for H. Keil's *Grammatici Latini* (Leipzig, 1855). Vol. 2 contains the English translations of the glosses with some further comments by H., and the various indices.

The introduction gives a brief description of the Sankt Gall text (pp. 5–39), a characterization of the glosses (pp. 40–9), their sources (pp. 50–80), and the principles guiding the present edition of them (pp. 81–95).

In the course of his introduction H. points to the importance of Irish glosses for the study of Old Irish, but his main concern is with the glosses themselves and the textual lemmata involved with them.

Of a total of 9,412 glosses just over one-third (3,478) are in Irish, the rest being in Latin. Priscian's text first became known in Ireland in the seventh century (p. 7), and in his review of the question where the Sankt Gall text was written H. agrees with the assumption that it was a product of Irish scholarship first produced in Bangor (Ireland) or Nendrum (p. 23).

The Sankt Gall glosses include repetitions of earlier ones in other manuscripts. Among the quoted sources are the Latin grammarians together with Isidore. Among classical Latin authors Virgil is the only one cited or quoted; he has numerous references as a consequence of the earlier Virgilian commentaries of Donatus and Servius. There is nothing from or about Varro or of Stoic theory in the comments, indicating that at this time, despite some mentions of them in the *Institutiones* itself, the Varronian–Stoic line in Latin grammar had disappeared in the early Middle Ages.

H. divides the glosses into five main types (p. 84) as follows:

1. On prosody, length, and metre, e.g. i.114 *pisco)samque Cni(don* 'a dactyl; the *Cn* allows the preceding syllable to remain short, as it is a liquid' (ii.26). These are quite rare.
2. Lexical glosses, Latin synonyms, or Irish translations, e.g. i.115 *soni* 'foguir' (Irish translation) (ii.28).
3. Notes to guide the reader of Priscian, e.g. i.163 *antecedenti* 'in the dative case' (ii.96).
4. Syntactic glosses, explanations of word groupings, and ellipses, e.g. i.163 *nec . . . licet* '*nec* constructs with *licet* after a break of six words' (no reference in vol. ii) and i.204 *Dixit i. Virgilius* 'i.e. Virgil said' (ii.153).
5. Explanatory glosses on Priscian's text, e.g. i.145 *Ajax* 'proper noun', *uiden* 'i.e. *uidesne*' (ii.69, 70), and i.330 *transitione, i. non ad unam personam ablatiuus et nominatiuus alterius personae pertinent* 'the ablative and the nominative, which concerns another person, do not refer to one person' (ii.368).

In this last example the point made is that in an ablative absolute construction there is *transitio personarum*, because the ablative and the nominative do not refer to the same NP. *Transitio personarum* and *transitio actuum* (with transitive verbs) were to become key concepts in scholastic grammar, leading to the terms 'transitive' and

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'intransitive' in modern grammatical analysis. It may be noted that at this point H. adds thirteen lines of additional comment to his translation.

This book has been meticulously edited. For readers otherwise unfamiliar with the Priscianic tradition of Latin grammar teaching in the early Middle Ages the introduction will provide a concise summary of the linguistic situation. The study of the individual glosses will require close reading, with both volumes of Part One and the relevant books of Hertz's edition of the *Institutiones* available together. Note must also be taken of the *Editorial Principles* and the *Conspectus Siglorum* (vol. 1: 81–98) before examining the individual glosses in detail. But when the whole of the Sankt Gall glosses have been edited and published in subsequent parts, it will provide historians of linguistics and of western classical scholarship with an excellent insight into the grammarians' work in a vitally important period.

B.'s book, like the texts he is criticizing, is much shorter, directed primarily at the first two chapters of the *Ars maior*. Its main burden is to stress and to illustrate the need for Donatus' exposition of the facts of Latin grammar to be more critically examined than heretofore in comparison with the works of the other Latin grammarians, including Servius.

B. argues that Donatus may have escaped some later criticism because of the early recognition of his authority as one of the teachers of Latin grammar, supplemented rather than replaced by the much larger grammar of Priscian. An example of this is the use of his name as the title for a grammar book in another language, as in a thirteenth-century grammar of Provençal, *Donatz proensals*. The ready and frequent praise by subsequent grammarians, including Priscian, down to modern historians of linguistics, such as L. H. Holtz (*Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical*, 1989) and Kaster, have all contributed to his authoritative standing (pp. 8, 12).

The four points which B. concentrates on, all phonetic questions, are the definitions of the consonants (pp. 16–19), the doubling of the letter *i* in spellings (pp. 20–32), the definition of *h* (pp. 33–7), and the relationship between *k* and *q* (pp. 38–42). He is also critical of Donatus' chapter on the syllable (pp. 43–5). His argument is that these descriptions, when analysed in relation to ancient and medieval comments, are unsatisfactory and that they have not been taken sufficiently into account by later writers, and he asks for a reappraisal of Donatus as a grammarian. Hence the title of this book.

As it stands, B.'s short book seems rather isolated as a separate publication. It could easily have been included as a longish article in a specialist periodical. It would, in fact, be interesting to see from this author a full critical analysis of Donatus' two grammar books together with all the relevant passages from the other Latin grammarians.

This review appears in a periodical devoted to classical scholarship, and it might be worth emphasizing the vital importance of the Late Latin Grammarians, especially Donatus and Priscian, in the transmission of Latin grammar teaching and Latin grammatical scholarship through the Middle Ages. Without them would we have had the Renaissance as we have had it?

University of London R. H. ROBINS

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

A. D. RIZAKIS (ed.): *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East: Social and Political Aspects* (Proceedings of the International Colloquium organized by the Finnish Institute and the Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity, Athens, 7–9 September 1993). (MELETHMATA, 21.) Pp. iv + 277, ills. Athens: Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity, National Hellenic Research Foundation, 1996 (distributed by De Boccard, Paris). Paper. ISBN: 960-7094-88-3.

No one will deny that the study of ancient onomastics has progressed considerably during the past few decades. Increasing cooperation between scholars with different backgrounds, historical, linguistic, or strictly philological, has made it possible that Greek and Roman names, nomenclatures, and onomatological issues can be better understood as products of time, place, and society. Besides such an encouraging interdisciplinary approach, students of onomastics should also be grateful for new research tools such as dictionaries, repertoires, and various kinds of indexes registering Greek and Roman names (e.g. *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* [Oxford, 1987–]; *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum* [Hildesheim, 1994^{2}]). Regarding the collection and (re)organization of ancient onomastic material, the research is indeed far advanced now, though a lot still needs to be done. The present volume offers an overall approach to one of the less-studied areas of ancient onomastics, namely the presence of Roman names in the Greek-speaking East. The twenty-four papers (including the concluding remarks by M. Corbier) followed from an international colloquium held at Athens in 1993 and organized by the Finnish Institute together with the Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity (National Hellenic Research Foundation). The contributions concern both regional and more general issues, thus dealing with the onomastic evidence from many Greek-speaking areas, provinces, and cities, but also focusing on Roman citizenship, military diplomata, and bilingual inscriptions, as well as the computerized listing of names.

Considering the remarkable, though often less-exploited, epigraphic and onomastic evidence from the eastern provinces (especially the Greek peninsula and Macedonia), particular stress has been laid on regionally specific papers (pp. 81–259), which often include prosopographic discussions and remarks on the diffusion of Roman citizenship in the East. The cities and regions dealt with are the following: Naples (M. Leiwo, pp. 81–7; language and names attested in some family tombs from the first century B.C. to the first century A.D.); Epidamnus-Dyrrhachium, Apollonia, Bouthrotos (P. Cabanes, pp. 89–104; collection of the onomastic material with some comments on the status of the cities); Macedonia (A. Tataki, pp. 105–9; statistical analysis of the relevant material, with a presentation of the gentile names occurring either rarely or frequently in Macedonia); Thessalonica (P. Nigdelis, pp. 129–41; two leading families, the Geminii and the Claudii, in the later Principate); Chalcidice (L. Loukopoulou, pp. 143–7; new evidence of the Roman presence in Anthemous and Mygdonia, with a discussion of the *conventus c. Romanorum* of Akanthos); Aetolia and Acarnania (C. Antonetti, pp. 149–55; the Roman presence and the diffusion of Roman names in those regions); Thespiae (C. Müller, pp. 157–66; Roman names from the second century B.C. to the *Constitutio Antoniniana*); Corinth (A. Spawforth, pp. 167–82; the formation of the governing class in the early Empire); Argolis

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(L. Mendoni, pp. 183–90; Roman names and people in this region); Eleia (S. Zoumbaki, pp. 191–206; diffusion of Roman names); Arcadia (C. Hoët-van Cauwenberghe, pp. 207–14; Romanization and Roman citizenship in Arcadia); Delos (M.-F. Baslez, pp. 215–24; the first Roman presence on the island, with an onomastic catalogue); Rhodes (A. Bresson, pp. 225–38; slow Romanization of Rhodes exemplified by the dilatory reception of Roman names); Syria and Arabia (M. Sartre, pp. 239–50; Roman citizenship in these provinces); Gerasa (P.-L. Gatier, pp. 251–9; Romans and Roman names in the city of Gerasa, Syria/Arabia). Despite a slight unevenness of quality between the works of individual authors, all these papers offer much of interest to read, but their major importance lies in the geographically arranged presentation of a great bulk of names. This evidence almost exclusively derives from inscriptions, so that the present volume at once constitutes a collection of studies on Greek epigraphy. (Note also the first publication of two inscriptions of Imperial date from Callipoli [Antonetti, p. 15] and Thessalonica [Nigdelis, p. 130].)

Besides the regional approach, the volume includes other articles focusing on more general issues: A. Dusanic (pp. 31–42) discusses the recipients' Roman name-formulae attested in military diplomata for the auxiliary soldiers from the Hellenophone provinces. Refuting a theory put forward by A. Mócsy and others, he comes to the conclusion that a recipient with a Roman name probably had the status of a Roman citizen even before his applying for the document; J. Touloumakos (pp. 43–54) asks whether the reason for erecting bilingual dedications was more connected with the dedicant's self-image depending on his or her social and ethnic derivation than with a simple desire to receive more publicity. Basing his observations on a number of epigraphic documents from various parts of the ancient world, he discusses in the first place the variation between the onomastic forms adopted in the two versions of bilingual texts; K. Buraselis (pp. 55–63) presents three interesting notes originally prompted by observations he has made on some inscriptions from Lesbos (1. the functions and significance of *Spurii filius* = *Σπο(υ)ρίου υἱός* in names of children born from an illegal marriage. B. maintains that to some extent it may have been an advantage to be or to remain of spurious origin; 2. analysing certain abbreviation forms for the Roman-type filiation in inscriptions from Lesbos, B. argues that the inhabitants of Roman Lesbos were capable of combining traditional local symbols with imported onomastic habits; 3. the connection of the combination *M. Aurelius* with the *Constitutio* of A.D. 212); O. Salomies (pp. 111–27), with his unchallanged knowledge of the diffusion of Roman gentile names, discusses the possibilities of establishing the origin of some people with non-imperial *nomina* in the Greek East, especially Macedonia. Not only are the contacts between Macedonia and Italy interestingly depicted, but also those between Macedonia and Asia Minor (especially Cyzicus); B. Lörincz (pp. 73–9) touches on the difficult problem of how to establish the origin of a person who is known from an inscription in some province. Five examples from the Hungarian *Nomenclator provinciarum Europae*, etc. (1983) are given to show that onomastic analysis can provide a clue; M. Hainzmann (pp. 65–72) writes on the qualifications of the electronic elaboration of onomastic data, naturally a most important theme these days.

The volume opens with the introductory papers of H. Solin and A. Rizakis, the former a general view of the perspectives and problems of ancient onomastics (pp. 1–9), the latter a useful survey of most of the items and problems concerning the rôle and use of Roman names in the Greek-speaking part of the Roman Empire (pp. 11–29).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In conclusion, this is an important tool for anyone pursuing a study in onomastics and epigraphy, whether Greek or Roman, and I am convinced that those who are interested in the eastern provinces (especially Macedonia) will read this book with delight. Regrettably, however, two papers have been published in Greek. I am not faulting the language itself but simply noting that those important contributions will probably be neglected by many foreign readers. As is normal with proceedings of this kind, the quality and substance of individual articles is somewhat uneven, but on the whole this collection, which has been well edited by R., is no doubt a considerable step towards a better understanding of the reception, establishment, and history of Roman names on Greek soil. Some minor slips (e.g. in the onomastic tables and indexes) and a number of misprints do not disturb the overall positive impression.

University of Helsinki MIKA KAJAVA

TEACHING GREEK HISTORY

N. DEMAND: *History of Ancient Greece*. Pp. xviii + 397, 15 maps, ills. New York, etc.: Overture Books, MacGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., 1996. Paper. ISBN: 0-07-016207-7.

This book has been written as a student textbook rather than as a guide for the general reader. It has been developed out of D.'s lecture courses at Indiana University, and includes regular 'source analysis' sections, where the reader is presented with material to read and think about. D. assumes that readers will have their own copies of Herodotus, Thucydides, and some Aristophanes plays, but provides the rest. Prehistoric source analysis involves looking at site-plans, and archaic and classical analysis is of texts, so although there are illustrations of pots in appropriate places, there is no attempt at art-historical source analysis. Each chapter ends with a list of important places, and suggestions for further reading. There are maps throughout, which are simple and clear.

The book covers Greece from early prehistory to the death of Alexander the Great, a time-span hallowed since the days of Grote, and the same as that of the most enduring textbook, J. B. Bury's *History of Greece*, originally published in 1900. However, D. devotes more space to prehistory than do her predecessors, with more than a quarter of the book discussing the period before the eighth century. The first four chapters deal with the prehistoric period, from the late Palaeolithic down to the Early Iron Age: D. focuses on the most important material, describing the evidence and presenting clearly the different interpretations offered by modern scholars. She explains the historical background to the discovery and interpretation of prehistoric Greece, and also demonstrates familiarity with the most recent scholarship, at least up to 1994, often leaving it open to the reader to decide which interpretation is more convincing.

The presentation of the archaic period is rather more traditional: D. downplays the difficulties involved in writing a narrative history of the period, although some of the 'source analysis' passages invite the reader to challenge the foundations of her version of events. For example, she chooses Corinth as a case-study for archaic tyranny, accepting the sources' negative picture of Periander at face value, but also sets Herodotus 5.92 and 3.48–53 as passages for analysis, asking in the first case about folktale elements and literary context, and in the second about political invective. D. has to be selective in her coverage, and it is hard to argue with her

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

selection throughout. A general chapter on the archaic period, covering colonization and tyranny in particular, is followed by one on Sparta, with an interesting section on 'Spartan Women and the Downfall of the Spartan State', and one on Athens down to Kleisthenes. Persia is given reasonable space, with chapters on 'Archaic Ionia: Greeks and Persians' and 'The Persian Wars and the History of Herodotus', the latter emphasizing the importance of the sources, as does the later chapter 'Thucydides and the Peloponnesian War'. Between these two there are two very well presented chapters: 'Athens: the Development of Empire and Democracy' brings out the relationship between the two, and discusses drama, architecture, and sophism within a historical context; 'The Other Greeks: Women, Metics, Slaves' discusses the economic basis of Greek life—in particular agriculture—as well as its named subjects. If any area is underplayed, it is the development of the Athenian democracy in the fourth century: the Attic orators are introduced as sources for the Athenian economy in the fourth century, but that is all. The fourth century is dealt with more briefly than the fifth, no doubt because the sources are considered less valuable. The half century after the end of the Peloponnesian War is dealt with in eight pages of a chapter on 'Greece in the Fourth Century', and Philip and Alexander receive a chapter each.

The preface includes a 'note to students' which begins: 'The reader who plays the game will get most out of this book—it's really important to take time to do the exercises in the source analyses. But don't stop there . . .' (p. xvi). This is good advice but it raises the question of how useful the book might be to students outside Bloomington: the structure might be a bit inflexible for lecturers in Greek history at other universities. I suspect that, in Britain at least, the book might be ideal for A-level ancient history, either as a basic textbook or as a resource for teachers: it might even allow J. B. Bury to slip into well-earned retirement. The book is not without some irritating errors: Naukratis (as it appears in the index and on p. 110) is several times rendered 'Naucratus', Martin Bernal becomes 'Bernals' in the notes, and there are other typographical errors. However, it is to be welcomed as a contribution to the teaching of Greek history.

King's College London HUGH BOWDEN

THREE-BARRED SIGMA

H. B. MATTINGLY: *The Athenian Empire Restored: Epigraphic and Historical Studies*. Pp. xvii + 561. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996. £55/$72.50. ISBN: 0-472-10656-2.

This collection of thirty essays represents M.'s contribution over the past thirty years to the study of the Athenian empire, whereby, through the redating of a number of crucial Athenian decrees, he has sought to rewrite our understanding of fifth-century Athenian imperialism. His attack has been aimed in large part at 'the orthodoxy of the three-barred sigma': no inscription containing a three-barred sigma could be dated after 445 B.C. As M. rightly claims in his Introduction: 'Much is at stake, since if only one document with three-barred sigma can be dated so late [as 418/17 B.C.], others must also be down-dated where there are good historical grounds.' Thus he has argued for a 420s and later dating for a number of decrees which have generally been dated to the 440s on the basis of the three-barred sigma orthodoxy. In this he has always been controversial, and has often stood alone.

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Now, however, it is claimed a new breakthrough has been made. Through the use of modern photo-enhancement and laser technology by an American-based research team on the Egesta decree (*IG* i^3 11), it is alleged that M.'s reading of the archon's name as Antiphon (418/17 B.C.), rather than the orthodox reading of Habron (458 B.C.) has been proved right. In the foreword to the collection, Mortimer Chambers, who first published the results of the Californian team, asserts: 'With the establishment of the date 418 B.C. for an inscription containing three-barred sigma, we are freed from the long-accepted canonical view that this letter was not used in official inscriptions after 446. Harold Mattingly, who seemed to be fighting a lost battle for a generation, has been proved right.'

This is a grand claim, and its consequences are far-reaching. But M.'s arguments do not rest on the question of the three-barred sigma alone. A constant theme of the essays is that controversial decrees should not be dated only on letter forms, but that other formal factors (such as spelling, grammar, idiom, formulae, and vocabulary) should also be taken into account, as well as historical probabilities. On this basis, M. would redate, for example, the Standards decree (*IG* i^3 1453) from *c.* 450 to *c.* 425/4 B.C., Kallias' financial decrees (*IG* i^3 52) from 434/3 to 422/1 B.C., and the first decree for Athena Nike from a date in the early 440s to a date in the early 420s (*IG* i^3 35).

Such redatings force a radical rethinking of fifth-century Athenian policy and imperialism. M. argues throughout the collection (among other things) for an Athens whose imperialistic drive did not belong to the mid-fifth century, but which only really began after 431 and was largely the work of Pericles' successors in the 420s; for an interest in Sicily and the West which was slow to develop, really only begins with the foundation of Sybaris/Thourii, and belongs to the period of Kleon; for an Athenian financial recovery between 421 and 415; and for the dissipation of the spectre of a peace with Persia in 449, and the identification of the Peace of Epilycus with the Peace of Kallias.

M.'s argument is detailed and persistent, and emerges slowly throughout the collection. Occasionally, M. is forced to retract or modify an earlier claim (for example, he backs down from associating the Sigeion decree with the Egesta decree [p. 272]), but is then generally able to produce a new angle for arguing the main thesis. Individual points often depend on arguments made elsewhere, and here the cross-referencing does not always help. Although reference is made in footnotes to previous articles, these are cited by their original publication details and page numbers, and not by the page numbers in this volume. (Although original page numbers are given in brackets on page headers, the original publication details are only included in the first note to each article and not given in the Table of Contents, making individual arguments sometimes difficult to track down. To what, for instance, does n. 77 on p. 136 refer?) Furthermore, M.'s line of argument is often elaborate, nor is it always as clearly set out as it might be (for example, the shift from the Miletos decree to the Brea decree [pp. 87–8] is not self-evident, although its significance does emerge later in the essay), and it often depends on highly speculative arguments from probability. One suspects, in fact, that, although the overall thesis is often provocative and interesting, it could have been made more economically.

And yet this is an important collection which brings together into one volume a significant and detailed attack on current orthodoxies concerning fifth-century history, as M. offers us a picture of the Athenian empire not only restored but also refigured. The question is whether M. has indeed been 'proved right' as has been claimed—the justification given for the republication. And here we are not on firm ground. Although both Chambers and M. himself claim that most scholars are now

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

persuaded by the 'new evidence' of the Egesta decree, this is far from being the case. Henry, for example, has provided a substantial reply to these so-called conclusive findings (see esp. A. Henry, *ZPE* 91 [1992], 137–46; ibid., *CQ*^{2} 45 [1995], 237–40 in reply to M. H. Chambers, R. Callud, P. Spanos, *ZPE* 83 [1990], 38–63 with plates 1–3 and colour plates A, B [= *Acta of the International Seminar in Greek and Roman Epigraphy*, ed. I. Worthington, Bonn, 1990, 38–63]; M. H. Chambers, *ZPE* 98 [1993], 171–4). The question of the archon's name in *IG* i^3 11 is by no means settled, and M.'s case cannot be said to be proved. And yet as regards some alleged epigraphical and historical orthodoxies there are grounds for reasonable doubt (far more interesting than *IG* i^3 11, although only given passing mention in the Introduction, is the new copy of the Standards decree from Hamaxitos), and M.'s work does represent an important contribution in the questioning and undermining of many issues which are too readily taken for granted. With the new debate which has been stirred up over the Egesta decree, the republication of this collection of essays has been timely, and, as M. himself hopes, should 'serve in some way as a guide and inspiration' for taking a fresh look at Athenian imperial politics of the fifth century.

Oriel College, Oxford LYNETTE G. MITCHELL

PEOPLE POWER

J. OBER: *The Athenian Revolution: Essays on Ancient Greek Democracy and Political Theory*. Pp. ix + 212. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996. $29.95/£23.95. ISBN: 0-69101095-1.

Despite having been written over a decade, this important collection of ten published articles with new introduction by one of the leading historians of Greek democracy coheres well in extending and reformulating the central thesis of O.'s major work of 1989, *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People*—namely, that democratic rule in Athens was a reality, that power lay with the demos, whose will was expressed and enacted through discursive interaction with élite speakers in the political institutions of the Assembly, Council, and courts.

O. throws much new light on well-worked issues, and proves repeatedly the great value of his approach to the operation of rhetoric in Athens, and of his project to write a history of ideologies linking historical reality, ideology, practice, and theory (O.'s methodology is fully explicated throughout). Ancient theory is the principal newcomer to O.'s historiographical horizon. Chapter 10 inaugurates a new project to contextualize the critics of democracy. Like so much else, Greek political theory was, according to O., generated by the demos. It arose as a response to the established hegemony of the masses, and democracy's 'tolerance' of criticism helps explain its stability and power to change. Consciously articulated democratic theory, on the other hand, did not need to exist, because its principles were constantly reworked pragmatically in public debate. The western tradition of political theory is thus given proud origins as a form of non-violent resistance, a fruitful move in the 'struggle over the means of the production of political knowledge' (p. 145).

This history of criticism will not be without its critics. The emphasis on the flexibility of institutions and democracy's willingness to contemplate change may seem to overstate the case in light of the fourth-century democracy's extensive moves to entrenchment, the powerful strand of conservative resistance to change and idealization of the past, and the prominence of the *graphe paranomon* in politics. And

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

O.'s eirenic image of political theory's origins sidelines some of the historical context he is usually so careful to excavate: there is no space whatever for the two 'traditional' (anti-democratic) Athenian revolutions in the index to this 'Athenian Revolution'. These surely were important in shaping fourth-century democracy, and might be usefully viewed as 'pragmatic political criticism'. One would also like to hear more about the links between text and historical reality in the end of democracy. Demetrios of Phaleron (a villain whose name appears nowhere in this book) offers perhaps the best case of a 'theoretician' of sorts, of Aristotelian formation, who had the chance to put theory directly into practice. Breaches in democratic history must be critical moments for the history of democratic criticism.

Chapter 4 is O.'s revisionist 'Athenian revolution', the most important and challenging for historiographic orthodoxy. O. argues that the 'Kleisthenic' revolution was in fact a properly 'demotic' uprising. In its violent opposition to the conservative forces behind Isagoras' occupation of the Akropolis after their attempt to 'abolish the Council', the demos entered history as the agent of its own destiny. O.'s is a welcome shift away from a sanitized view of these obscure events, in terms of 'constitutional reforms', to one that recognizes the messiness of the forces at work. The entire 'demotic' thesis, however, rests on three words of Herodotos. The relevant passage (5.72) reads: 'The Council resisted and refused to obey, whereupon Kleomenes and Isagoras and his partisans seized the Akropolis. The rest of the Athenians thought the same and besieged them for two days, . . .' O. translates the all-important *τὰ αὐτὰ φρονήσαντες* 'being of one mind'. An equally possible interpretation, and one which may sit better with the passage's move from the Council's primary act of resistance to what 'the rest' did, translates 'being of the same mind [as the Council]'. The *loipoi* remain the followers rather than demonstrating a 'highly developed civic consciousness' (p. 44). O. pushes his line so far as virtually to exclude a rôle for the Council at all (p. 49), and here his rhetoric of 'literal interpretation' becomes as coercively eloquent as those speakers so important to O.'s democracy.

Chapter 7 is another important piece. Here O. defends his thesis through a reading of a single major speech (the approach of *Mass and Elite* was synthetic and thematic), Demosthenes' speech against Meidias for punching him in the face in the theatre as he served as khoregos. This is an appropriate choice, since Dem. stakes so much of his case on a panoply of democratic tropes which cast Meidias as the anti-democratic, hybristic élite individual out of control, himself as a democratic Everyman on the protection of whose physical integrity rests the security of democratic citizenship. Indeed, Dem. predicts the overthrow of the democracy itself if Meidias is not pre-emptively executed by it. O. attempts to establish a clear opposition between things which Dem., and democratic discourse generally, regularly confuse: what O. calls 'citizen dignity' (effectively the privileges, duties, and responsibilities that went with full civic status) and 'personal honour' (the non-, indeed anti-egalitarian pursuit of one's personal prestige that the élite continued to engage in under the democracy). According to O., the Athenians normatively consigned the latter to the 'private' realm, while the former was the very core of citizenship. 'Honour' only became a matter for *public* concern when conflict over it 'threatened to disrupt the public peace' (p. 87), as it had with Meidias' assault. Yet the distinction simply does not hold up in this critical test case: most problematically, it requires treating the khoregia as a strictly 'public' position. O. takes on Dem.'s own tendentious definition of it in these terms (p. 102), assimilating it almost to a form of civic office, so eliding the degree to which its performance was motivated by intensely 'private' demands for honour. Aristotle knew that the khoregia was not an *arkhe*, and mused on the difficulty of placing it in terms

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of civic participation (*Pol.* 1299a15–20), because as well as being a service required by the demos, the khoregia was pre-eminently an occasion for precisely the kind of élite display of wealth and cultural know-how that produced non-egalitarian 'honour'—which, according to O., was something available only in the private sphere. Yet there was nowhere more public than the theatre of Dionysos. Dem.'s motives in serving as khoregos and producing this speech with its effusively democratic rhetoric were certainly open to interpretation by his contemporaries as rather more individualistically oriented than his text would have us believe: 'you are rich and serve as khoregos to your own pleasures', claimed Aiskhines some years later (3.240), in a speech which also makes it likely that Dem. never proceeded fully with the prosecution of Meidias, and so abandoned the demotic crusade on which his case was founded. The point is important, and insoluble. O. dismisses Aiskhines' allegation that Dem. 'sold the *hubris* against him and the preliminary vote of the demos for 30 mnai' (3.52) as a 'vague bribery story' (p. 94), but the claim is hardly vague. It implies either that money had been exchanged privately to avert the trial (a 'bribe' or a 'gentlemen's agreement'?); or that Dem. proceeded, was successful, but when the court came to assess the penalty, the calls to do away with this enemy of the people turned into a very moderate fine—probably through the perceived insignificance of the charge. Aiskhines certainly implies some well-known compromise of Dem.'s demotic stance. Was the prosecution all a bluff in what was principally a feud between rich men in the first place? Or did his hearers simply not share his view as to the threat posed by Meidias to the democracy? Whatever the case, the context of production and reception of Dem. 21 are not so secure as to offer up the speech unproblematically as a transparent example of democratic rhetoric in action.

O. is an engaged, polemical writer: methodological opponents are sometimes sketched in extreme terms ([neo-]Symian 'crypto-oligarchists' are bludgeoned with some especially blunt critical instruments). Others may be straw men ('naive positivists', for instance). And there is the hint of a dangerous—because not fully articulated—tendency to conflate methodological with political positions. The other side of this coin, however, is the commitment, almost zeal, which rings through the entire book: to a belief in the importance of the issues of ancient democratic politics, then and now.

University of Warwick PETER WILSON

CITIZEN-SOLDIERS

L. A. BURCKHARDT: *Bürger und Soldaten: Aspekte der politischen und militärischen Rolle athenischer Bürger im Kriegswesen des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr*. (Historia Einzelschriften, 101.) Pp. 300. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 3-515-06832-5.

Flustered by the assembly's shouting down of his peace proposals, Aeschines made the mistake of exclaiming 'that many were prepared to shout, but few were prepared to fight when called upon'. Three years later, the citizens of Athens are still resentful of this slur on their bravery. 'You remember it, of course', says Demosthenes, adding: 'I suppose that he himself is a marvellous soldier, by Zeus !' (19.113). Aeschines tries to recover from his *faux pas* by assuring the Athenians that he has no wish to boast, while at the same time listing his military achievements to prove that he is indeed 'a

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

fine soldier'. For good measure, he cites the service records of his brother and brother-in-law, too, pointing out that these contrast favourably with that of his opponent, whom he accuses of being a *kinaidos* and of 'laying claim to being a man—for I would not dare say that you *are* a man, since you were prosecuted for desertion' (2.148–51, 167–9). All this carefully targeted mud-slinging goes to show that B. is right to argue that in late fourth-century Athens the ideal of the citizen-soldier remained alive and well.

In the last and longest part of his book, B. combs through the speeches of Lysias, Isokrates, and Demosthenes, and finds much to corroborate this central argument: the military rôle of individual citizens is often at issue, as it is in the episode just cited (see pp. 236–9); the citizen-army is treated throughout as vital to the defence of the country; and the Athenians are constantly exhorted to follow the warlike example of their ancestors. B. repeatedly describes it as 'amazing' (*erstaunlich*, pp. 195, 259) that hoplite and cavalry service should dominate the discourse while there is barely a mention of trireme crews or rowers. The observation is not new, of course, but it bears repetition, and one might wish that he had gone further towards trying to explain this feat of ideological distortion.

The middle section of the book surveys the actual deployment of forces by Athens between 404 and 321 B.C. in order to disprove the dark mutterings of some of our sources about mercenaries doing all the fighting on behalf of apathetic citizens. B.'s main problem here, as he freely admits, is that it is often difficult to tell what kind of troops Athens sent out on any given occasion. With due caution, if not always entirely avoiding circular reasoning, he nevertheless manages to establish that citizen-armies were indeed the norm as well as the ideal, and that mercenaries were employed in addition to, not instead of, Athenian soldiers, especially on longer and more distant campaigns. 'It is hardly possible to quantify these assertions . . . but they must be basically correct' (p. 140). This is the most original and important part of the argument, though I should point out (since the author does not) that B.'s chapter in Walter Eder's collection *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (1995, pp. 107–33) had already presented the same material—at less than half the length without being notably less effective.

The case is clinched by the examination of the *ephebeia* with which the book opens. Even after being fatally defeated at Chaeronea, the Athenians did not abandon citizen-soldiering as a lost cause, B. argues, but on the contrary took steps to rescue it. Whatever the significance of ritual elements and black-hunter symbolism in the *ephebeia* (and our author offers good reasons for not overestimating either, pp. 53–7), its reform in the 330s was a pragmatic attempt to improve military training and extend it to a broader section of the population, to create a force large and skilled enough to keep up with mercenaries and Macedonians while hanging on to the notion that a city should be defended by its own amateur soldier-citizens.

Each of these topics is addressed with the scrupulousness one expects and dreads in a *Habilitationsschrift*. No ephebic issue is passed over without conscientious discussion, even if it is marginal to the matter in hand, and the author has little to contribute to the debate. No Athenian expedition goes unnoticed, regardless of whether it tells us anything helpful about the citizen:mercenary ratio. The discussion of the orators is particularly slow-going, since (with the welcome exception of one section, pp. 211–29) it proceeds speech-by-speech and passage-by-passage, rather than thematically. In doing so, B. hopes to highlight differences between speeches, but the slight variations spotted now and again are hardly exciting enough to relieve the tedium of repetition.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The persevering reader is rewarded with a valuable corrective to elderly but still standard works on mercenaries in the fourth century B.C., which were written at a time when it was widely held that this period marked the decline and fall of the Greek *polis*. Since most contemporary scholars have a quite different outlook on the fourth century, B.'s conclusions will not seem altogether surprising, but it is good to have one's suspicions confirmed by such painstaking research: earlier rumours of the death of the citizen-state were indeed greatly exaggerated.

University College London HANS VAN WEES

ALEXANDER

N. G. L. HAMMOND: *The Genius of Alexander the Great*. Pp. xiii + 220, 16 pls, 19 figs. London: Duckworth, 1997. £35. ISBN: 0-7156-2692-2.

This is H.'s fourth full-dress study of the man 'who did more than any other individual to change the history of civilization' (p. x): three earlier versions appeared under the title *Alexander the Great: King, Commander and Statesman* (1980, 1989, 1994). H. proceeds in his usual workmanlike fashion, but as the present version is intended for the undergraduate and the general reader, the narrative has been cut to the bone, most references have been eliminated, and the bibliography reduced to a list of books in English (p. xiii).

The first problem in the interpretation of Alexander is that of the sources, which H. studied in *Three Historians of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge, 1983) and *Sources for Alexander the Great* (Cambridge, 1993). There H. dealt with the 'Vulgate' sources and the 'official' version of Arrian, analysing their texts from the angles of fullness, accuracy, and military and political detail, as well as their conception of the central theme, to distinguish separable groups of narrative. For each group an author of the same general qualities was identified as the hypothetical source. This methodology is applied here (esp. pp. 41–58).

The most controversial feature of H.'s source-criticism is his revival of the now generally abandoned view that the narratives of Arrian's principal sources, Ptolemy and Aristobulus, derived their information primarily from the *Royal Journal* or *Ephemerides*. The idea is attractive, given the immense amount of convincing detail that survives in Arrian: in books 1–6, 147 orders issued by Alexander are reported and precise intervals in terms of days are recorded seventy-eight times (p. 42). H. bases his argument for the *Royal Journal*'s availability and comprehensiveness on Polyaenus' observations on the *Royal Journals* of Antigonus Gonatas: *Historia* 37 (1988), 129–50. But H. extends the scope of Polyaenus, *Strat*. 4.6.2—which refers to Antigonus' consultation of the *Royal Journals* to establish the details and personalia of earlier embassies in order to impress current ambassadors with his supposedly prodigious memory—to support the claim that all Macedonian kings kept very detailed *Royal Journals*. The probabilities are that the *Royal Journals* were mere lists of appointments and audiences, like the Court Circulars in *The Times*, rather than the full accounts of military operations and other activities that H.'s thesis requires.

The better view is to recognize Callisthenes, Alexander's 'official historian', as the source of the material underlying Ptolemy's account—and, indeed, that of Aristobulus as well. As I argued in 'Alexander's Propaganda Machine: Callisthenes as the Ultimate Source for Arrian, *Anabasis* 1–3', in I. Worthington (ed.), *Ventures into*

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Greek History (Oxford, 1994), pp. 89–102, analysis of the battle-narratives in Arrian shows that they fall into two groups as regards both the vocabulary utilized and the level of understanding of the events narrated. Where Ptolemy is clearly the primary source (as for the Hydaspes), the tactical terminology corresponds closely to that of Hieronymus of Cardia as preserved by Diodorus, books 18–20, while those passages for which Ptolemy would have had access to Callisthenes' 'official history' (i.e. for the Granicus, Issus, and Gaugamela) are characterized by a 'classicizing' usage like that of Xenophon, Thucydides, and Herodotus. Ptolemy and Aristobulus would have had no reason to consult Alexander's *Royal Journal* when they could simply transcribe or rewrite the text of Callisthenes, expanding on it from their own memories. Arrian thus represents a source-critical layer-cake of considerable complexity.

H. is a military historian of distinction, well-equipped to judge Alexander's campaigns and great battles, and he rightly stresses Alexander's tactical coordination of all arms. H.'s battle plans are among the most detailed available, and should be studied in comparison with those in, say, Sir John Hackett (ed.), *Warfare in the Ancient World* (London, 1989), pp. 104–29 to appreciate the range of possible tactical exegeses. H.'s reconstructions of Alexander's battles are based almost exclusively on Arrian, and details from the Vulgate sources are generally rejected. For the Granicus, H. accepts the canonical 20,000 Greek mercenary infantry and its 2,000 survivors of Arrian (p. 68): cf. the convincing lower figures of Polyaenus: Devine, *Phoenix* 40 (1986), 265–78, esp. 270–1. H.'s topography of the battlefield of Issus with a narrower coastal plain (p. 88) remains controversial. H.'s account of the siege of Tyre (pp. 94–5) obscures the fact that Alexander built two separate causeways at divergent angles to the island-city. *Pace* H. (p. 109), Darius' 'general advance' at Gaugamela was limited to movements on the flanks or merely on the Persian left. H. attributes the creation of the gap in the Persian left centre, through which Alexander penetrated, to the attack of the lancers and other flank-guard units which engaged the enveloping Bactrians on the Persian left, whereas it resulted from Persian cavalry on the left centre moving leftward (Curt. 4.15.20). H. accepts the story of Alexander's turning back in response to Parmenion's call for assistance, but limits the king's intervention to a clash with the cavalry of the Persian right centre. H. accepts Arrian's relatively high figures (5.15.4) of 30,000 infantry, 5,000 cavalry, and 200 war-elephants for Porus' army at the Hydaspes (p. 164), though Plutarch's 20,000 infantry and 2,000 cavalry *(Alex*. 62.2) are more likely. Likewise H. accepts the high casualty figures that Arrian gives for Alexander's enemies, e.g. 17,000 dead and 70,000 prisoners (5.24.5) at the siege of Sangala (p. 167).

H.'s Alexander is not the proto-Hitlerian megalomaniac of Schachermeyr, Badian, and Bosworth. He is chivalrous and compassionate, his love for Roxane and his remorse for the killing of Cleitus are genuine. Despite his enthusiasm for reconciliation between his Macedonian and Persian subjects, Alexander remains the Macedonian throughout, uncorrupted by Oriental ideas and luxury. He combines 'extraordinary practicality' with a visionary, spiritual dimension which stemmed from religious beliefs' (pp. 200–1).

Written in a clear and unpretentious style, this book represents the distilled experience of seven decades of hands-on scholarship by one of our pre-eminent Hellenistic historians, himself a legend in his own lifetime.

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto A. M. DEVINE

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

HELLENISTIC CONSTRUCTS

P. CARTLEDGE, P. GARNSEY, E. GRUEN (edd.): *Hellenistic Constructs. Essays in Culture, History and Historiography.* (Hellenistic Culture and Society, 26.) Pp. vii + 319. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1997. Cased, £40/$50. ISBN: 0-520-20676-2.

Hellenistic Constructs is the latest in a series of essay-collections dedicated to the period, in many ways the most impressive yet. It originated in a seminar series celebrating the eighty-fifth birthday of Frank Walbank in Cambridge in 1993 and is dedicated to him. The high quality of the contributions, usually situated within succinct appraisals of current and central debates, and making imaginative use of new and old materials to suggest promising lines of investigation, is a symptom of the respect he commands. In the introduction Paul Cartledge eschews any attempt to survey current trends, focusing instead on polarized images: the optimism and creativity emphasized by Walbank versus the brief summer and endless autumn of Peter Green; the colonial apartheid regimes of Will versus the multiculturalism stressed by recent research on e.g. the Seleucids; the decline of the *polis* versus the spread of civic institutions. The twelve mostly short essays that follow generally fall into pairs. If a single theme unites them it is of the compensatory relationship between control and helplessness, the monuments of bureaucracy, power, reason, and representation sitting Canute-like amidst the inexorable waves of resistance, forgetfulness, confusion, and reality.

The first pair examine the Hellenistic attachment to the heroic age. Together they can be read as the basis for a new-historicizing approach to myth and epic in Hellenistic literature. A clear and convincing essay by Susan Alcock investigates the intensification of heroic cult in the period, beginning with the Hellenistic 'tholos' on Samothrace. She suggests four factors to account for the phenomenon: élite legitimation, civic prestige, symbolic protection, and a sense of communal identity. Peter Green, in a stimulating and useful piece, by far the longest, surveys treatments of the Argonaut myth up to Apollonius. Apollonius' bold refusal to rationalize emerges as a distinctive characteristic, a boldness which reflects a humble and precarious notion of man's place in the world, in itself, he suggests, a very Greek perspective.

The next two essays deal with Jewish responses to the Greeks. Erich Gruen suggests that examples of Hellenization should not be seen as evidence for subjection, but may go hand in hand with nationalism and resistance. Hellenizing texts should really be seen as Jewish attempts to situate themselves in the wider world, often at a superior level. It is the assimilation of Hellenism to Judaism, not the other way around. Fergus Millar, meanwhile, looks at the pseudo-prophecies of the Book of Daniel and recommends them to ancient historians as a view from the 160s of four centuries of near-eastern history from the conquest by 'Darius' to Popilius Laenas' intervention in Egypt and beyond to the coming of the Angel Michael and the Day of Judgement. From the distant past 'Darius' emerges as a terrible tyrant, a precursor of Antiochus, demanding worship of himself alone. More recent Hellenistic history is fitted into a symmetrical pattern of four kingdoms with most attention given to relations between the 'kingdom of the north' and 'of the south', representing the Seleucids and the Ptolemies respectively.

Jean-Louis Ferrary's essay on relationships of patronage between Romans and Greek states is of major significance for the study of Roman imperialism, presenting a

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cogent reappraisal of foreign *clientelae*. Roman patronage assumes much more obligation and much less equality than Greek *proxenia*, but it remains a personal relationship, designed to win support in senatorial debates or to avoid gubernatorial exactions. References to the patronage of Rome itself represent occasional metaphorical extensions of this personal relationship, not a philosophy of interstate relations. H. Mattingly moves on to a close examination of Athens' relationships with Kings from 229/8 to 129. Athens was very successful in provoking benefactions while maintaining a precarious neutrality, trying to be everyone's friend. Even her strong bond with Rome did not prevent her being discreetly friendly with those out of Roman favour. Her unforgiving hostility to Macedonia after 200 is unusual and reveals the depth of the trauma suffered at Philip's hands. Her support for Mithridates is quite out of character and unexpected.

Posidonius' account of this episode is the subject of an essay by Klaus Bringmann. He argues that the historian deliberately conflated the successive tyrannies of Athenion and Aristion in 88, in order to make a moral-political point. The argument is detailed, but it depends ultimately on the belief that Posidonius was willing and able to radically distort very recent history. Some other solution to the crux must be preferable. Peter Garnsey also stresses the moral philosopher over the critical historian in an examination of Posidonius' account of the 'slavery' of the Mariandyni. It looks at first as if the Stoic philosopher is applying Aristotelian ideas of natural slavery, but the text contains enough philosophical terminology to determine that they are in fact conceived as Stoic *phauloi* 'inferiors' (or ordinary mortals) and that their slavery is really contractual serfdom. The weakness of the argument is the implication that their masters, the Heracleots, were therefore the equivalent of Stoic wisemen, but Garnsey thinks this is Posidonius' problem, not his. The search for the Middle Stoa's attitude to natural or legal slavery is very inconclusive, but there is a nice summary of the important issues.

Polybius provides the material for the next two essays. A. M. Eckstein argues explicitly against W. V. Harris that Polybius does not consider the Romans by nature to be more ferocious, warlike, or militarily gifted. It was their institutions that made them great. That Polybius considered the Romans 'recognizably ordinary human beings' seems indisputable, but Harris argued that it was an entire system, not 'nature', which encouraged warlike qualities at Rome. Eckstein sometimes seems to conflate categories that might be more usefully separated, such as military prowess and brutality, and argues around oppositions—between a practical history and a moral history, for instance—which may reflect the terms of the modern scholarly debate, but seem to be thoroughly intertwined in Polybius himself. As I have argued elsewhere, Polybius must be understood primarily in terms of the narrative process rather than essences. To isolate qualities such as 'self-indulgence' from the logic of the plot leads to distortion. In particular Polybius is interested in the dialogue between action and reception. 'Characteristics' are often adopted for public display. The famous animals sliced in half, for instance, are interpreted not as reflections of Roman nature or Roman society, but as *demonstrations* of brutality for the purpose of terrorizing enemies. Roman ferocity in this context emerges as not merely distinctive, but deliberate and self-conscious. Polybius also gives emphasis in his study of Roman institutions to Roman use of historical exempla, such as the story of Horatius, and in his account of the return of prisoners of war after Cannae stresses the stunning impact of the gesture on Hannibal. This too is presented as a very Polybian *coup de théâtre*. The Romans are exemplary Polybian actors, exemplary pupils of history, and exemplary manipulators of the war scene.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gabriel Herman uses Polybius in an entirely different contex, applying the theories of Norbert Elias to Hellenistic court society. This is presented as the first stage in a giant enterprise, but perhaps Polybius, who is so much of a geo-political historian, was not the best place to start on a social anthropological project. What emerges is an attempt to identify court factions and their operations often by means of outcomes. The application of Elias's model has potential, but here at least seems to throw no new light. In particular more emphasis is needed on forms of sociality. Oswyn Murray has identified a tension between absolutism and the structural mutuality of the symposium in Alexander's reign, a tension which might be central to the notion of a king's friendship. It would be interesting to see how banquets functioned at court, in the *Ptolemaieia* for instance, and how these tensions were resolved as the period progressed. Herman seems to reject 'curiosities' of court life in favour of major political incidents, but perhaps it is in the curiosities that the most interesting discoveries will be made.

In the next essay, Roger Bagnall bravely takes on the whole idea of a colonial anthropological model for Ptolemaic Egypt, focusing on an article of Edouard Will's. I found his argument difficult to pin down, as if he were reluctant to say what he really meant. He refers to the chaos in Algeria, for instance, as possibly 'reawakening French sentiment that letting that land go was a mistake' and even cites Edward Saïd in this context for a critique of post-colonial governments' tendency to blame everything on the colonizing powers (p. 227). The question raised, however, that the Egyptians might have been 'better off' under the Greeks, is not addressed, although the burden of Greek colonialism is generally de-emphasized. He cites a peasant-flight in response to a new tax-assessment scheme based on grain futures, but says it is more complicated than Will's notion of 'passive resistance'. Egyptian farmers were very ready to make new contractual arrangements, but 'only in their own way, not with the outsiders' new management techniques' (p. 238). Finally, in an unexpected Foucauldian turn, he quotes an example from post-colonial literature of Indonesia, arguing that modern novels might be more useful than modern socio-political critiques for giving access to how colonialism was '*experienced*', but then suggests that the oppression found in the novel might have more to do with hierarchies in general rather than colonialism in particular, and anyway he does not think the Greeks were as brutal as the Dutch. There is no attempt to sketch an outline for an ancient *dispositif* of colonial experience, however, nor to articulate criteria to take further the distinction between the oppressive techniques of a foreign invader and of élites in general, or between peasant resistance and national resistance.

There is perhaps something of an impasse in studies of ancient imperialism/colonialism, as in studies of the position of women, between an emphasis on the techniques of oppression on the one hand and celebrations of their inefficiency and of resistance to them on the other (an emphasis which risks making oppression seem less oppressive). Ultimately, Bagnall, I think, is attempting to escape the impasse by referring to a more generalized notion of power. This is fine, I think, as long as we do not play down the concrete structures—'police', army, taxes, officials, laws, privileges, punishment—which divided the population on ethnic grounds and kept them within the web of power, structures which often appear rather ghostly in documents but would have been very real on the ground. Sometimes power really is to be discovered precisely where it is manifested most visibly. In comparison with other regimes ancient and modern, the Ptolemaic regime may have been more '*douce*' but the chances that trangression would be detected, surely, were unusually great.

In the final essay, Dorothy Thompson discusses new evidence from cartonnage for

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

census and tax-collection in the second half of the third century. It is necessarily an introduction to the possibilities of the material, but Thompson emphasizes certain features. Taxes are miniscule but very widely imposed. Despite this she thinks they may have led to hardship, whereas Bagnall considers them a very light burden with a mainly symbolic value (p. 246, cf. p. 234). On the one hand, the records themselves are very accurate with few errors, implying a tightly controlled and cross-checked body of scribes. On the other hand, occasionally dramatic fluctuations in the tax-base from year to year are ascribed to bureaucratic inefficiency rather than disaster. In this period dues seem to be being reduced and more exemptions are offered, perhaps as a (Reaganomic?) response to tax-resistance. Hellenization was encouraged by tax-exemptions ('Hellenes' accounted for 16% of adults in the Arsinoite nome), which were also offered to the 'police' in lieu of wages, the latter group drawn apparently from Hellenizing Egyptian families and perhaps comprising two to three per cent of the adult population. Overall, Thompson is impressed by the system. It is not hard to detect a shift back towards Rostovtzeff's *étatisme*, when she refers to 'the efficiency of the Ptolemaic administration, as the Macedonian rulers of the third century B.C. developed their control over the population at large . . . New land was brought under cultivation, new crops introduced and new settlements established in rural areas . . . The early success of this system is to be seen on the military front in the Syrian wars, as well as in the quality of entertainment provided at Philadelphus' great festival in Alexandria . . .' (p. 257).

University of Warwick JAMES DAVIDSON

CRETAN TREATIES

A. CHANIOTIS: *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in der hellenistischen Zeit*. (Habes, 24.). Pp. xiv + 523, 7 maps. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996. ISBN: 3-515-06827-9.

C.'s book examines treaties and agreements concluded between Cretan communities during the third and second centuries B.C. For methodological reasons C. excludes treaties with non-Cretan states (for these the author refers to S. Kreuter, *Außenbeziehungen kretischer Gemeinden zu den hellenistischen Staaten im 3. und 2. Jh. v. Chr.* [Munich, 1992]), as well as treaties dating from the classical period, which he nevertheless considers in his interpretation. Owing to the lack of an up-to-date and comprehensive corpus, the work's main focus is not a systematic account of the subject but the catalogue of texts itself, preceded by some synthetic chapters. C.'s work, however, excedes this aim: as it stands, Part Two (B) provides a self-contained interpretation of Cretan Hellenistic diplomacy.

The book is divided into three parts. Part One (A) is concerned with the geographical, social, and economic conditions that created the distinctive character of Cretan society and Cretan–Cretan relations. C. emphasizes that the cities of Hellenistic Crete, in which archaic social structures continued, were extremely vulnerable to factors such as population growth, drought, war, loss of territory, or revolts of a dependent population. Not surprisingly, the communities were constantly aiming at defending their old and conquering new territory, and perceived their neighbours as potential or real enemies.

In Part Two (B) C. establishes and characterizes nine categories of interstate agreements. Although hardly any of these are found separately but rather form

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

aspects of more extensive agreements, the definition of each aspect proves helpful not only for the student of Greek law. C. describes, for example, the structure of bilateral *symmachy*-treaties and thereby illuminates the origins and character of *hegemonial alliances* and of a problematic institution like the *Cretan Koinon*. His observations are important both for the characterization of a distinctively Cretan society and for the policies and status of Greek *poleis* in general, whether he is pointing to the fine difference between property *de iure* (*χώραν ἔχειν*) and property *de facto* (*χώραν κρατεῖν*), or setting out the possible ways of establishing *isopolity* or *sympolity* (pp. 92f., 101–8). Part Two furthermore examines the structure and formal elements of the documents, as well as the quasi-legal significance of the epigraphic record.

C.'s evaluation of the material is surprisingly parochial in its outlook: it is above all the character of specific Cretan institutions and local conditions with which he is concerned. He forcefully argues (pp. 169–75) that the clauses about military cooperation, the multifaceted means to strengthen friendship, the arrangements between sovereign cities and dependent communities, and the guidelines for economic cooperation illustrate a desire of Cretan *poleis* to find solutions to an economic and social crisis. On the basis of C.'s analysis, the proverb and initial 'problem' *ὁ Κρὴς τὸν Κρῆτα* ('The Cretan cheats on the Cretan') resembles no longer a prejudice about the character of the Cretans but a faithful expression of inner Cretan conflicts and relations. The treaties thus illustrate the crucial significance of the social and geographical conditions set out at the beginning of the study. But apart from revealing existing power structures, the treaties themselves established organs for the expansionist policy of a few powerful Cretan states. Only when this expansion was concluded by the end of the second century were there the conditions for a permanent peace and for an end of the intense diplomacy collected in Part Three of C.'s book.

C.'s emphasis on Cretan conditions is very valuable; his observations, however, have a more general interest than might appear from the title and should be drawn on for many studies of diplomatic contacts between the cities of a region.

Part Three (C), the catalogue of texts and testimonies, is the longest part of the work, and itself consists of four groups: treaties between Cretan cities (nos. 1–62), agreements between sovereign *poleis* and dependent communities (nos. 63–9), sympolities (nos. 70–4), and texts concerning alliances and leagues (nos. 75–82). Each group of documents is organized in chronological order, with the treaties moreover being assigned to three phases in the Hellenistic history of Crete (C 11–3). The grouping reflects the author's strong interest in Greek law. As the agreements are interdependent and only in their sum reflect the policy of a community, one might argue for a grouping by cities. The chronological order of the texts may also be questioned, if only for the reason that dating the texts is difficult and uncertain.

The texts are edited with great care. Where possible, C. provides the reader with a detailed description of the stone and letter forms, in each case with helpful references to previous editions, with the text itself, apparatus, translation, and commentary. The documents are placed in their historical context (the author always makes an effort to date a text) and the lines examined meticulously. While the commentary follows a certain pattern, it is not mechanical but considers the special features of each text. Very helpful are the frequent cross-references to Part Two (B), which facilitate a general understanding of terms and avoid repetition. Apart from illuminating Cretan relations, C.'s comments throw light on key terms and institutions found in the epigraphic record of *poleis* in every part of the Greek world.

The bibliography is as extensive and helpful as the indices and concordances. The

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

book ends with seven maps illustrating the political geography of Hellenistic Crete. Maps four and six are slightly unclear, and would profit from cross-references to the catalogue or to the date and purpose of the information they convey.

Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford BEATE DIGNAS

HELLENISTIC ATHENS

C. HABICHT: *Athens from Alexander to Antony*. (Translated by D. L. Schneider.) Pp. x + 406. London and Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997. Cased, £26.50. ISBN: 0-674-05111-4.

Anglophone scholars will welcome this prompt translation of H.'s excellent *Athen. Die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer zeit* (Munich, 1995). Although the new title (reminiscent of Peter Green's *Alexander to Actium* [London, 1990]) admittedly describes the book's chronological parameters more precisely, this further indication of English-language publishers' fear of the word 'Hellenistic' is dismaying.

The need for a new serious general history of Hellenistic Athens cannot be doubted, given that the last was W. S. Ferguson's *Hellenistic Athens: an Historical Essay* (London, 1911). Nor can it be doubted that H., the distinguished epigraphist and veteran of many technical studies in this area, is the man for the job. New accounts of the subject have been discouraged not only by the difficult and technical nature of the epigraphical evidence, upon which the history of Hellenistic Athens primarily depends, and by the frankly unedifying nature of political life in the city during the period, but also by the outstanding and authoritative nature of Ferguson's own achievement (with which Claude Mossé's brief and readable *Athens in Decline 404–66 B.C.* [London, 1973] did not claim to compete [see p.168 of that work]). And Ferguson's shadow falls still over H.'s book. H. appropriately makes Ferguson his starting point (p. 1). His one major disagreement with Ferguson is his insistence that Athens maintained friendly relations with the Ptolemies consistently throughout the period, and this is clearly flagged (pp. 221 and 280); even so, he is careful to indicate that the new thinking depends in part upon evidence discovered subsequent to Ferguson (p. 128). H.'s treatment focuses upon, and his footnotes allude primarily to, epigraphy, and in particular to the more recently discovered material and to reinterpretations of older material. He does not attempt to give systematic citations of the literary sources such as they are; thus at pp. 8–10 and 216 we have prolonged tracts of narrative derived from literary sources with few citations; and at p. 59 a significant and explicit discussion of an assertion by Duris of Samos (*FGH* 76 F10) goes unreferenced. H. therefore intends his readers to keep Ferguson in their other hand as they read.

The selection of topics within the subject is also broadly reminiscent of Ferguson. A series of chapters of largely sequential narrative takes us through the fourth and third centuries: Chaeronea, the Hellenic League, and Lycurgus (Chapter 1); the Lamian war, Antipater's imposition of the Munychia garrison, Athens' attempts to play off Cassander and Polyperchon against each other, and Cassander's imposition of Demetrius of Phalerum (Chapter 2); Demetrius Poliorcetes' almost accidental 'liberation' of the city and his subsequent indirect ruling of it (Chapter 3); the attempts to shake Antigonus Gonatas out of the Piraeus, ending in the back-firing Chremonidean war and the return of the city itself to Macedonian control (Chapter 5); life under Antigonus Gonatas and Demetrius Aetolicus (Chapter 6); the paying off

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the Macedonian garrison in the confusion after the death of Aetolicus and the subsequent attempts to maintain neutrality by currying favour with all the kings alike (Chapter 7); and the Roman alliance with its initial easy profits for the city and the close but crucial choice for Rome rather than Antiochus III (Chapter 8). A triad of chapters then covers the peaceful second century more thematically, with focuses upon Athens' relations with the kings and other states (Chapter 9), the Athenian control of Delos (Chapter 10), and relations with Rome (Chapter 11). We then return to a more sequential ordering of material for the first century: the city's condition at the end of the second century (Chapter 12); the disastrous decision to drop the long alliance with Rome and opt for Mithridates, and Sulla's consequent sack of the city (Chapter 13); the constitution and political life after the sack (Chapter 14); Clodius' inclusion of supposedly still independent Athens in the province of Macedonia and the relatively safe course steered by the city through the Roman civil wars (Chapter 15). There is also a thematic chapter on Athenian high culture in the earlier Hellenistic period (Chapter 4).

H. sees the internal political organization of the city as his central theme (p. 366), and this is made clear by the orientation of his chapter on high culture (p. 98). He is impressed by the 'admirably good order' in which Athens kept her internal affairs (p. 2), a conclusion perhaps determined by the bureaucratic character of the available evidence. Highest praise is reserved for the leaders who distinguished themselves in accountancy, Lycurgus (pp. 8, 23–7) and Demetrius of Phalerum (p. 59). The good moral order of the educated upper classes is also appreciated: the disappearance of obscenity from comedy is attributed to the abolition of the *theorika*, which meant that 'playwrights perhaps needed to make fewer concessions to lower-class or rural tastes' (pp. 101–2). The only major alterations to the text of the German edition reflect important work by John D. Morgan requiring the down-dating of the archons between 240 and 200 (pp. v–vi). It is a pity that no room could be found for the German edition's Hellenistic dynastic stemmata (pp. 375–80). The several indices of the German edition have been replaced with a shorter unified one. It is irritating that a single and unqualified entry of 'Salamis' should now take one both to Cyprus and the Attic coast, and 'Lamia' likewise to the city and the courtesan. The bibliography remains categorized by chapter.

Deborah Schneider's translation reads well, although the German origin of the text sometimes peeps through: 'Deinarch' (p. 33 etc.), 'Phylarch' (p. 78 n. 40, but 'Phylarchus' at p. 57), and 'Perinth' (p. 125). Latinization has been inconsistently applied in the process of translation, e.g. 'Lampsacus' (p. 80) but 'Lampsakos' (p. 87) and 'Cyzicus' (p. 307) but 'Kyzikos' (p. 87). H.'s true claim that nine comedies of Aristophanes are extant from the fifth century (German edn., p. 105) has become the false claim that seven are extant from the classical period (p. 99) via the double-whammy of dittography and mistranslation. I noticed few typographical errors (but 'strugggled', p. v). Some minor points. Contrary to p. 184, Athens' first (known) contact with Rome occurred not in 228 but in 454, when Sulpicius Camerinus came to examine the city's laws (T. S. Broughton, *Magistrates of the Roman Republic* i [1951], 43). H.'s decision that Demetrius Poliorcetes' wife was called Euthydice (p. 65)/ Euthydike (p. 78) as opposed to Eurydice is unconventional and should have been flagged. And his claim that Antigonus Doson married Phthia is far too controversial to go unreferenced (p. 176).

Center for Hellenic Studies/University of Wales Swansea DANIEL OGDEN

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

GREEK GASTRONOMY?

A. DALBY: *Siren Feasts: a History of Food and Gastronomy in Greece*. Pp. xv + 320, 37 figs. London and New York: Routledge, 1995. £35.00. ISBN: 0-415-41620-1.

Of all Hellenists with the exception of the reviewer, D. is least likely to object to the title 'the Athenaeus of our times'. Unlike Athenaeus, D. writes beautifully and to the point; he is systematic, clear-sighted, and constructive in criticism. Again, unlike the rambling books of Athenaeus, *Siren Feasts* is condensed into 211 pages, with 55 pages of notes (there are also indexes of sources and Greek and English terms for reference). D. shares Athenaeus' enthusiasm for research in a survey spanning over 2000 years of Greek history from Homer to Byzantium, and millennia of prehistory. His study promotes neglected authors preserved largely or exclusively in Athenaeus (e.g. Lynceus of Samos, Archestratus of Gela, Philoxenus of Cythera [not of Leucas according to D.], and Heracleides of Pontus) and such authors as Theophrastus, Simeon Seth, and Galen. A chapter is devoted to Athenaeus, who is the principal author for the present study.

D. presents much evidence on species and varieties, drawing on a wide range of sources, both ancient and modern, and testing them by archaeological criteria for the preliterary period and literary and philological criteria subsequently. He amply fulfils the claim on the elegant dust jacket that he 'pays special attention to the range of foods that were available in the Classical, Hellenistic and Roman periods, to their place on the menu and to the local specialities for which cities were admired'.

His chosen area is the Aegean. The book is divided into nine chapters, the first establishing the social and religious context of eating, the rest following a chronological sequence. The second investigates the prehistoric Aegean, the next three the 'food and gastronomy' of the classical Aegean, three more the food and gastronomy of the post-classical Aegean, and the last, 'the Byzantine and later Aegean'.

D. uses Athenaeus well since literature is his main medium, Homer, Hipponax, and Ananius in the archaic period, and comedy, treatises, and cookery books in the fifth and fourth centuries. From literary sources he traces availability, regional variation, trade, foreign influences, the seasons, and new techniques.

All of these decisions carry difficulties with them. The concision creates more brevity than the reader might wish; the chronological survey gives at least the impression of development; the social setting is very brief and straightforward. D. declares in the preface (p. xi) that 'no one this century has set out to guide others to what is known and to provide a starting point for further research'. He provides more than a starting point but does not define sufficiently the relationship between 'gastronomy' and literature. The *OED* defines gastronomy as the 'art and science of delicate eating'. D. gives the impression that there was little 'gastronomy' in the prehistoric period (though honey, grapes, figs, and olives are described as luxuries in early Greece [p. 49]: 'luxury' also requires definition) or in Homer. Gastronomy developed in the fifth and fourth centuries. But it may be that literature developed its interest in foods in those centuries and that the 'art and science' resided there rather than in eating itself. D. takes Hipponax' reference to *muttotos* to indicate a possible Lampsacene influence on Athens, parallel to the *kandaulos* and *karuke* of Lydia reflected in comedy (pp. 107–8). The poetic cookery books of the fourth century together with comic cooks are taken to indicate a development in eating beyond the

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

supposed 'poverty' claimed after the Persian War (p. 124). Again, these may be literary developments mapped onto patterns of eating that may, for the sake of argument, have been stable from 500 to the time of Alexander. Cookery books may well reflect greater sophistication in eating but we need to be shown how. Foreign influences may come within the discourse of luxury, contrasting with claims to traditional simplicity that were important to Athenian political identity; cookery books may similarly appear in comedy as that genre exploits unease between public and private practice. D. plays down political elements, but these cannot be ignored. His survey of Greek cities (pp. 124–9) includes Sparta, where there is evidence for good produce, as in many other cities. Nobody in the early fourth century thought of Sparta as a gastronomic paradise, which demonstrates that ideology has as large a part to play as horticulture. D. is aware of the power of discourse, referring, for example, (p. 58) to 'the foods that Athenians ate and liked to talk about. That last clause is all-important.' Quite so.

D. states at the outset that 'public and municipal entertainment . . . is not the concern of this book' (p. 13; cf. pp. 12 and 215), but it is not possible to study this topic entirely in the 'private' domain. The public domain was of concern to Athenaeus. To what extent did prytaneia offer the reverse of earlier regal entertainment? Did courts promote 'gastronomy'? What of symposia? Is Archestratus a 'gourmet' (p. 27) reflecting gastronomic development or writing new sympotic literature—or both? Did the rôle of *mageiroi* change after 400 (pp. 113–14) or merely their representation? How had they become a subject for comedy? D. finds growing gastronomy in the Athenian fish market (pp. 27–8)—but how far is this the ideological development of the discourse of luxury?

These reservations aside, I gained the greatest pleasure from this fascinating study whose text and illustrations demonstrate both a deep love for Greece and the need to extend classical studies beyond the traditional canon.

University of Exeter JOHN WILKINS

KATOPTROLOGY

F. FRONTISI-DUCROUX, J.-P. VERNANT: *Dans 1'oeil du miroir*. Pp. 298. Paris: Éditions Odile Jacob, 1997. frs. 145. ISBN: 2-7381-0497-5.

Why is it taken for granted—in ancient Greece—that a menstruating woman clouds any mirror she looks into? Why is it shocking that the orator Demosthenes is said to have had a full-length mirror before which he practised his speeches? Is a mirror a useful tool, as Socrates claimed, to observe the philosophical injunction to know oneself? Comments, anecdotes, and detailed discussions about mirrors are multiform and extensive in ancient writing. Coupled with an extremely rich material record, they raise a set of profound questions about how an apparently everyday object is to be comprehended in its cultural and historical specificity. In what ways can—should—the development of optical science, with its interest in reflection as a process, be linked to the ideology of gender relations, with its worry about females' use of their own reflections, or to philosophical concerns with introspection and self-reflection? In what ways does the material culture relate to the discursive construction of mirroring? Does it make sense to talk of a history of mirroring? Modern critical debate has set 'mirroring' firmly on the agenda, be it, say, R. Rorty's *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* (Oxford, 1980), Lacan's 'stade du mirroir',

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Freud's narcissism, or postmodern obsession with 'specularity'. This is the first book to look at the mirror broadly in classical culture, and although it does not make any attempt even to allude to such contemporary discussions, the volume is exemplary in its awareness of the range of questions involved in thinking about the mirror. It explores how the mirror's cultural value depends on and instantiates ideas about vision, the self, gender, beauty, science, and the regulation of everyday life (at least). It looks at the representation of mirrors in art and writing, and at mirrors as objects with decorations. It focuses largely on the classical period, but travels as far forward as the second century C.E. and is framed by a discussion of Homer. Since V. from his earliest published work has been fascinated by the *eidolon* and the problem of the double, and since F.-D.'s most recent book, *Du masque au visage* (Paris, 1995), is a brilliant exposition of the reciprocity of the gaze in Greek culture, it would be hard to imagine a better pairing to analyse the mirror. Indeed, this book is a distinguished contribution to the particular brand of cultural history associated with its authors and the Paris school.

The book is a sandwich: the thinly sliced bread is a pair of brief articles by V. on the *Odyssey*. The meat is a 200-page essay on the mirror by F.-D. Homerists will instantly recall that there is no mention of 'mirrors' and 'mirroring' in the *Odyssey* or *Iliad* (for all its talk of weaving, beautification, and other accoutrements in its trips to the women's quarters). V.'s chapters are concerned rather with looking and the construction of identity—and Odysseus' identity in particular—through the eyes of others. As he notes, 'le statut social et personel d'un individu—ce qu'il est aux yeux d'autrui et aux siens propres—n'est pas separable de son apparence', and indeed the *Odyssey* is repeatedly and tellingly taken up with the plays and lures of recognition in both a perceptual and an authorizing sense. V.'s discussion is clearly expressed and neatly frames D.'s work, both by offering a historical depth to her largely classical and post-classical discussion, and by showing how the central issues of mirroring can be rearticulated in other areas of Greek culture. There is little to surprise the scholar of the *Odyssey* here, however, and even granting the essay form, there is scant acknowledgement of the relevant work of other Homerists. (There has been much excellent discussion, particularly in America, of recognition, memory, the Homeric body, and the gender discourse of the *Odyssey*.) There are some surprising gaps in the texts discussed too: 23.90–5, when Penelope and Odysseus first see each other after the slaughter of the suitors, but do not look at each other's faces, are notoriously difficult lines, thoroughly germane to the theme. Nonetheless, V.'s frame constantly reminds the reader through the course of F.-D.'s more detailed and technical discussion that the mirror inevitably leads to the idea(l)s of social and personal identity.

The weight of the book is D.'s extension of her previous discussion of reciprocity and the visual. It is divided into twelve sections, each of which deals with a discrete aspect of the subject. Thus, one chapter looks at the similarity of the representation of the distaff and the representation of the mirror in vase painting of the classical period, and asks what this apparent difficulty might imply for the representation of the good woman, and the construction of the image of the female between the household worker and the *kalon kakon* of Hesiodic mistrust. Another chapter looks at Aristotle's easy acceptance—and complex explanation—of the menstruating woman's effect on mirrors. Another offers a lengthy reading of Narcissus in Philostratus, Callistratus, and Ovid. Each chapter is brief and briefly annotated, and in some cases adds little to already published material (Elsner on Narcissus, for example, or Beard on good women and their distaffs/mirrors). What is most impressive, however, is the incremental weight of the argument. F.-D.'s final chapter is a remarkably intelligent

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and compelling panoptic view of how the mirror sets at stake ideas about subjectivity and gender in ancient Greek culture. It is a wonderful example of why such cultural history must be done if the everyday of ancient Greece is to be understood. You will not look at a mirror the same way again.

King's College, Cambridge SIMON GOLDHILL

GREEK AGRARIANISM

V. D. HANSON: *The Other Greeks: the Family Farm and the Agrarian Roots of Western Civilization*. Pp. xv + 541. New York, etc.: The Free Press, 1995. $28. ISBN: 0-02-913751-9.

As I write, the smoke of 5000 beacons, signalling the start of Britain's Countryside March, the great rural revolt against the imposition of urban values on the countryside, still hangs in the air of the agricultural community in which I live. H. is a man with a mission with which I fundamentally sympathize, despite grave doubts about the particulars of its execution in this book.

The vision underpinning the study is 'agrarianism': 'an ideology in which the production of food and, above all, the actual people who own the land and do the farmwork, are held to be of supreme social importance' (p. 7). This, H. argues, was created by the Greeks of the eighth century part and parcel with the *polis* itself, for which 'agrarianism' serves as an overarching explanation.

The details of 'agrarianism' are developed in Chapter 2 using as a case study the farm of Laertes (Homer, *Od*. 24), whom he views as 'a representation of an entirely new class of farmers' (p. 49). According to H., it manifests a number of agrarian practices largely unknown in Bronze Age and Dark Age Greece: homestead residence, irrigation, slave labour, diversified crops, the incorporation of marginal ground, and localized food processing and storage (p. 50). Critical was the integration of tree crops into these agrarian regimes, perceived by H. as an innovation dating to the eighth century. These new farmers had been liberated from the palace-centred 'complex societies whose imperial directive and bureaucracy strangle agriculture' (p. 29), a sentiment echoing the frustrations of running a family-based farm in an American political economy dominated by agribusiness and big government (pp. 184–5). (The stream of infuriating paperwork relating to the British beef crisis arriving at our house from the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food has to be seen to be believed.)

Chapters 3 and 4 expand the particulars of 'agrarianism' to cover Hesiod (*WD*) and the farmers of classical Greece. H. eschews the term 'peasant' as a misnomer. These 'homesteaders' are 'a novel group of middling yeomen' (p. 79), fully independent property-owners. Though they were egalitarian in outlook, outsiders were excluded from their ranks. 'Middling farmers' take on the rôles of producers for and defenders of the *polis*, the backs on which the urban superstructure rests. Their dominance forms the basis of social stability in the city states of ancient Greece, and offer 'the *only* conditions out of which successful broad-based constitutional government can arise' (p. 398).

Chapter 5 explores the political implications of these arguments for the development of egalitarian ideals within *poleis* in general, and in relation to democracy in

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

particular. Chapters 6 and 7 focus specifically on the impact of 'agrarianism' on the growth and practice of hoplite warfare. Chapters 8 and 9 sketch the demise of 'agrarianism' as a basis for the society and economy of the *polis* in the fourth century B.C. and later. Chapter 10 follows the legacy of 'agrarianism', summed up as 'twelve fundamentals of Western civilization that originated exclusively in the agricultural practice of the polis' (pp. 411–12). The book concludes by poignantly and personally reviewing the implications of the demise of both family farming and classics in a modern America which has turned its back on a heritage of 'agrarianism'.

This is a stimulating and moving book, well worth reading as a meta-history of Greek (and American) agrarian life despite the practical and methodological criticisms which can be levelled at it. There are some editorial infelicities: the most serious is that Oliver Rackham appears as 'Rackman' throughout. However, H.'s perspective as both farmer and classicist provides some genuinely new insights, for example on irrigation (pp. 60–3), and on the problem of accidents and ill health (pp. 147–8). Unlike many modern scholars from (sub)urban backgrounds, he acutely distinguishes what is typical of rural life in a great many times and places from what is uniquely Greek.

The most serious practical flaw is his lack of detailed, first-hand archaeological knowledge. Though he has used archaeological conclusions, he has not worked through the raw data, and this often gives his arguments an old-fashioned feel. For example, he promotes the evolutionist idea of a pastoral Dark Age, which few would now uphold. Sometimes his citations are out of date (e.g. his early date for coinage). It is difficult to know whether the lack of illustrations reflects his overall use of archaeological data or the publisher's budget.

Similarly, H.'s assertion that the eighth century sees movement of farmers onto marginal lands is not borne out by survey evidence. The spread of small rural sites is largely a phenomenon of the fifth–fourth centuries B.C., though there is considerable regional variability. Nor is it self-evident, as H. assumes, who lived in these sites, for how much of the year, nor even whether all were simultaneously occupied. Rather, these are fundamental questions about the interpretation of survey data much debated by the archaeologists who generate them.

On the methodological front, we are presented with a distinctly American viewpoint. The 'homesteader' of early Greece sounds disturbingly reminiscent of the pioneer, displaying atomic, absolute independence which was uncharacteristic of the former. H.'s model is built on a notion of individualism which is entirely modern and thoroughly American. It does not fit the intricate, complex hierarchical relationships between individuals, families, and classes manifest in the countrysides in which I have worked and lived, and I think it is fair to say that such an American notion of individualism exists in few (if any) European societies, ancient or modern. Many may find the underlying political agenda difficult. If read at face value, it appears disturbingly right-wing. In fact, one might better understand it, like the motivations behind the British Countryside March, as a 'ruralist' agenda, not focused on a single, coherent set of issues, nor easily categorized as 'left' or 'right' despite the attempts of many sectors of the political spectrum to appropriate it. More precisely, it is a political agenda of desperation and survival, neatly summed up in the placard caught by a *Farmers Weekly* (6–12 March 1998, 14) camera: 'I'm a Young Farmer, but for how long?'.

University of Leicester LIN FOXHALL

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ÆGEAN GEOLOGY

M. D. HIGGINS, R. HIGGINS: *A Geological Companion to Greece and the Aegean*. Pp. xvi + 240, ills. London: Duckworth, 1996. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-7156-2722-8.

As the title implies, the purpose of this book is to provide an account of the geology of the Aegean and surrounding areas to show 'how geology influenced the development of the ancient civilisations of this region'. Aimed at archaeologists and others without specialized knowledge of geology, the book begins with a chapter about geological phenomena and processes in general, followed by a chapter describing the geological evolution of the Mediterranean area. From these, it is clear that the Aegean area is one of current geological activity, including earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, tsunamis, uplift and subsidence of the land relative to the sea, rapid erosion and sediment accumulation, etc., and that this activity has been continuing, virtually unchanged, for at least the past 20,000 years. Climate during this period, however, has changed dramatically.

After these two introductory chapters, the book changes character and the following thirteen chapters provide a systematic account of the geology, region by region, to cover all the sites of ancient civilization. Five chapters are devoted to Athens, Attica, and the Peloponnese, and a broader review is then given of western and northern Greece, western Turkey, the Aegean islands, and Crete, in a clockwise tour of all the major sites. Within these chapters, the reader is left to discover which geological factors were the key to determining the success and/or failure of the ancient communities. The siting of a city is paramount: strong rock foundations to support buildings shaken by earthquakes—seismic waves are amplified by weak, unconsolidated sediments so the shaking is stronger; appropriate topography to give strategic advantage for defence against attack; an assured, good quality water supply sufficient to withstand a siege; fertile plains nearby for agriculture to supply food and clothing; nearby sources of timber and building stones. Mineral resources, particularly iron, lead, silver, and gold, created the wealth for a community to flourish, and good lines of communication were essential for trade. But there were dangers too, the most omnipresent throughout the area being earthquakes, which proved the downfall of so many cities (Sparta 464 B.C., Helice 373 B.C., Rhodes 222 B.C., and Olympia A.D. 552), combated to an extent by the earthquake-resistant design of buildings. Rockfalls and landslides were common hazards in the steeper terrain of the more mountainous regions, floods in the lower foothills and plains, and tsunamis along certain coastal areas. For certain of the Aegean islands which are active volcanoes, there is the additional hazard of an eruption. The style of vulcanism leads to a tendency for unpredictable, explosive eruptions that are immensely destructive. The Minoans of Thera must have gone through much the same problems and uncertainties as the population of Montserrat today. With so much geological activity taking place, uplift or subsidence of the land, accompanied by global, climatically induced changes of sea level, created changes in coastline which resulted in the siltation of once flourishing ports such as Ephesus. An early chapter explaining how these factors could influence the growth and decline of communities in the ancient world would have given guidance to the reader through the systematic coverage of the regions: a final, brief chapter on geological hazards is too little, too late.

For the reader who wishes to learn about the geology of a particular site and its environs, and uses this book as a reference and as a source for further reading, it

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

will no doubt be of considerable interest and help. The archaeological aspects are clearly authoritative. The descriptions of the local building-stones, topography, sedimentology, and seashore changes since 2500 B.C. are well done. The account of the Minoan eruption on Thera is excellent, well balanced, and even-handed in explaining the conflicting evidence of its precise date. But a geologist would find much of the explanations of structural evolution obscure (e.g. isopic zones, meaning thrust sheets) and outdated. Much of the fault movement in the area results from extension which causes blocks of the upper 10 km of the Earth's crust to rotate. As it tilts, one corner of the block rises whilst the other subsides, bounding faults representing its movement as it slides against adjacent blocks. Many of the Aegean islands are the uplifted sections of tilted fault blocks. Many of the 'grabens' described in the book are sedimentary basins formed from the subsiding sections, better described as half-grabens. The majority of geological papers cited for reference are well over ten years old, as are the general references to geological texts. Ziegler, *Geological Atlas of Western and Central Europe* (2nd edn, London, 1990), might be more appropriate for the geology of Europe; Skinner, Porter, *Physical Geology* (New York, 1987), might be recommended as a more up-to-date general textbook of geology; and Bolt, *Earthquakes* (3rd edn, New York, 1992) for a readable account of earthquakes. In all, it is a useful book that fills a niche, if read with some geological caution.

Royal Holloway, London D. J. BLUNDELL

NEWS

S. LEWIS: *News and Society in the Greek Polis*. Pp. ix + 206. London: Duckworth, 1996. Paper, £13.99. ISBN: 0-71561268912.

News is unfamiliar information about a relatively recent event or newly current state of affairs in which one has reason to be interested. Characteristic of the modern world are systems delivering copious information very regularly—in principle we select what satisfies personal interest, though the system's dynamic (including coexistence of news-reporting with expression of opinion) and human curiosity tend to extend the category for any individual. Because selection of the 'newsworthy' is done by those who collect and disseminate news, the system is potentially manipulative, and liberal societies strive to separate news-traders from state agencies. This reinforces presentation of gathering/dissemination of news as a noble service to responsible citizens, not a branch of the leisure industry—hence tabloids which relish leisure industry 'events' also use more strident public-interest rhetoric. Historically the big questions are: what proportion of the news reaching an individual lies in the realm of 'public interest' (affects duties imposed by the state or social norms), how detailed is the public interest information received, what are the agencies producing that information, how do they resemble or differ from agencies producing news which is *not* within the realm of public interest, and how much news of the latter sort is there?

L. aims 'to indicate [how] the ancient Greek concept and exploitation of news differed from twentieth century conceptions. Examining how and why news and information were disseminated . . . offers a new perspective on the *polis*, and fresh interpretations of Greek society . . . I will expose the ways in which Greek ideas about

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

information structured social and political life' (p. 3). This bias towards the *polis*/news nexus is fully realized: for while Chapters 1–2 consider news outside political control and the ways information dictated relations between inhabitants of different states, *polis*-control of news-dissemination by official and unofficial messengers occupies Chapters 3–4, and the conclusion—'most news arrived . . . through unofficial messengers and means, and . . . there was resistance to creating official channels for news'—launches further reinterpretation of *polis* institutions in Chapters 5–6.

Three general observations. (a) This bias is undefended. L. simply chooses not to attempt imaginative reconstruction of the individual's (male *and* female) vicarious contact with or curiosity about the outside world—a pity, as tension between ideologies enjoining publicity while distancing the citizen from the extra-*polis* world and natural human curiosity/sociability might be damagingly sharp (cf. pre-1989 Eastern Europe?). (b) The modest rôle of comedy in L.'s documentation seems odd. (c) 'News' is such a distinctive modern category that a discussion of ancient phenomena with 'news' in its title should continually refer to what we mean by 'news': examining antiquity in its own terms is fine, but a model like 'news' creates obligations which L. does not entirely meet, and discussion of e.g. travel and information or inscriptions is not tied sharply enough to the specific news agenda.

Specific observations. (a) News is spread by gossip (women's 'had a . . . role . . . in policing the morality of [other women]'—what about men's?). The place of shops/*ergasteria* as loci of male gossip—and the presence there of non-citizens—needs more emphasis. So does the fact that gossip is *the* original paradigm of news-dissemination—crucial where there is no Fourth Estate, the distinction between government, executive, and citizenry is slippery, and the Assembly is not a straightforward news forum. (b) 'News as determinant of status' (p. 7) turns out to mean that women and slaves are theoretically news-starved. But what was the relation between being 'up with the news' and public status—was there much difference between being interested in 'the news' and being politically active? (c) L. connects Athenian news-hunger with the city's commercial centrality—and with Athenian intellectual sharpness. 'Appetite comes with eating', indeed, but most communities were probably greedy for news (even at Sparta, L. argues, lack of inscriptions there does not reflect secretiveness). Sheer absence of news was surely at least as big a frustration as unreliability—and contributed to the difficulty of evaluation which L. stresses. (d) Failure to show circumstantial knowledge about foreign cities reflects an ethic which regards good citizens as non-travellers, so is unsurprising in orators (cf. pp. 102ff.)—and *perhaps* even in comedy? The social reality remains elusive. (e) L. denies that heralds permanently criss-crossed the Greek world carrying news (does anyone believe this?) and sees the absence of rapid-transit systems for letter- or news-carriers as reflecting association of such systems with autocracy and of writing with deceit and undemocratic privacy/secrecy. Did private individuals *really* conform with this latter imperative (the claim that Greek mercenary graffiti suggest 'writing was to put a name on a monument but not to communicate with loved ones at home' seems arbitrary!) and, since an *adequate* road-network did exist (L.'s discussion obscures this), it is the lack of interregional political authority that matters. But discussion of panhellenic festivals—largely useless for official dissemination of new news—might have considered the Panathenaea, a festival which *did* unusually match unified political authority with festival catchment area. (f) L.'s objections to seeing the assembly as a news agency—somewhere notifications and announcements are made—may underestimate our tendency to hear about crisis-laden assembly meetings. Surely officials might sometimes announce things which many citizens had not yet heard

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

elsewhere, including public-interest material not exciting enough to have spread rapidly among the citizen body by other means.

L.'s book stimulates thought and provokes as yet unanswered questions, and, while it should certainly not be taken as gospel on all matters, its arrival is certainly good news.

University of Liverpool CHRISTOPHER TUPLIN

THE ILLUSTRATED GREEK WOMAN

E. D. REEDER (ed.): *Pandora: Women in Classical Greece*. Pp. 431, 400 ills. Baltimore and Princeton: The Walters Art Gallery, Princeton University Press, 1995. Cased, $95/£70 (Paper, $35/£30). ISBN: 0-691-01125-7 (0-691-01124-9 pbk).

Once in a rare while one is asked to review a book which is quite outstanding. This is such a book. While the field of the study of ancient Greek gender relations, and of women in particular, is now several decades old, the enormous wealth of iconographic and archaeological evidence is still, relatively speaking, little appreciated and actively employed by traditional, literary-based classicists and ancient historians. Part of the problem lies in that traditionally trained classicists and even historians rarely have sufficiently keen archaeological or art historical expertise. Several recent works have tried to set the balance straight: witness Ann Koloski-Ostrow, Claire Lyons, *Naked Truths: Women, Sexuality and Gender in Classical Art and Archaeology* (London, 1997). This present book, however, is a landmark in studies on Greek women, for it is the collaboration of scholars who have made it their goal to incorporate artistic evidence fully into studies of ancient gender and society. The contributors are all famous and well-respected experts: Reeder herself, Mary Lefkowitz, Helen Shapiro, Froma Zeitlin, Margot Schmidt, John Oakley, Andrew Stewart, François Lissarague, Sally Humphreys, and Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood. Each of these scholars offers a clearly written, perceptive, and important study of a wide range of aspects of Greek women's lives, with special focus upon religion and the family (not surprisingly, given traditional Greek gender rôles).

R. starts by offering an excellent introductory piece on male–female relations in classical Greece. Greek heroines are popular at the moment: witness the two recent books by Jennifer Larson (*Greek Heroine Cults* [Wisconsin, 1995]) and Deborah Lyons (*Gender and Immortality: Heroines in Ancient Greek Myth and Cult* [Princeton, 1997]). Complementing these works, Lefkowitz and Shapiro analyse the religious, social, and political rôle of young girls in Athens. Zeitlin offers another piece on Pandora, echoing her essays on this elsewhere, e.g. in her *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature* (Princeton, 1996). Schmidt focuses upon that popular anti-heroine, the sorceress. Oakley analyses depictions and ideologies of marriage, while Stewart questions images of rape. Female symbols, signs, and metaphors are discussed by Lissarague. Humphreys urges us to question images of women in an effort to decode obstructed or diffused messages. Finally, Sourvinou-Inwood offers another general essay, framing R.'s, which examines women's rôle in public and in private, and discusses whether such oppositions are helpful in societies different from our own. These essays comprise about 100 pages of the book. The rest

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is devoted to the exhibition catalogue from the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, which drew on art from more than fifty collections in fourteen countries, some works previously inaccessible.

The essays alone are valuable as pieces of scholarship and contribute much to our understanding of the issues they discuss. However, by far and away the best thing about this book is the fantastic range of material illustrated. No other book exists which offers such indispensable riches! Here we see examples of all the most important artistic sources for reconstructing women's lives in ancient Greece. Whatever your personal interest, be it sculpture, epitaphs, vase painting, clothing, toys, depictions of mythology, or drama: it is all here. Family life of immortals and mortals are here to savour. Any teacher of gender studies at whatever level ought to have this book in their library (in multiple copies) and own a copy themselves. The quality of the photographic production is excellent. The book is produced on thick, high-quality paper, and securely bound, even in paperback. The price is extraordinarily good value, affordable even by keen students. This may sound like hyperbole, but if you have seen this book, you will surely agree. The bibliography cited for each entry is extremely helpful and scholarly. Apart from the pictures of the exhibits and their individual descriptions, the catalogue is interspersed with splendid, brief thematic summaries of motifs which allow ease of reference. A neat little glossary of technical terms also opens the book up for use by non-specialists. My only grumble is that no one compiled a composite index for the book, which would have made it much more serviceable. Nevertheless it is such a pleasure to read, to look, to gaze at. Buy it!

Royal Holloway, London RICHARD HAWLEY

AUGUSTANISM

K. GALINSKY: *Augustan Culture: an Interpretive Introduction.* Pp. xii + 474, 6 pls, 174 ills. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996. Cased, $39.50/£26. ISBN: 0-691004435-X (0-691-05890-3 pbk).

A chameleon-word is 'culture', shifting its meaning slightly ('the arts and other manifestations of human intellectual achievement regarded collectively', 'the customs, civilisation and achievements of a particular time or people' [*Concise Oxford Dictionary* s.v.]), and its tone hugely ('a man of culture', 'the culture of the masses'), according to point of view. And all the more appropriate for that, as the title of G.'s engrossing study of the ethos of the Augustan age and the part played in its creation by Augustus himself. For one of G.'s two basic contentions is that the very essence of Augustanism in all its forms was 'polysemy', 'multivalence', 'nuance', and 'flexibility'. The other is that there was never any systematic agenda, drawn up and overseen by Augustus himself throughout, but rather an abiding and all-pervasive susceptibility to his *auctoritas*, which resulted in continual 'experiment', 'fusion', 'evolution', and 'reciprocity'. These two ideas, constantly reiterated and highlighted, are the fixed points of orientation in an 'interpretive' journey of exceptional range, challenge, and revelation.

The journey crosses fairly predictable terrain, but by an unusual route and sometimes disguised approaches. The central chapters on Art and Architecture, Augustan Literature, and Religion are preceded by preliminary explorations of (a) the workings of *auctoritas*, (b) the meaning of *Res Publica restituta*, and (c) the connections between the three main cultural spheres as seen through 'Ideas, Ideals and

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Values'. (c) has a somewhat unexpected coda: a full-blown reappraisal of the motives behind Augustus' moral legislation. Following the three main chapters is one whose title ('Central Characteristics') seems to promise a retrospective summary, but which in fact, under one of its subheadings, 'Tradition and Innovation', tackles a whole new area: government and administration. Even in the summative 'Epilogue' proper, at journey's end, new ground-plans of areas affected by Augustus' building projects appear. There are scores of fascinating 'sights' along the way in the form of lavish and informative illustrations (including six 'three-star' colour plates), and modern back-up services are provided by commendably restrained notes and a selective but bang-up-to-date bibliography.

Few nowadays will dispute that Syme's picture of Augustus as a ruthless, scheming tyrant is excessively one-dimensional—understandably influenced by the dark politics of inter-war Europe. Nearly sixty years on, then, what sort of Augustus does G. give us? One who enjoys low-brow entertainment (mime and pantomime [pp. 265, 361]) and cracking the odd crude joke (e.g. calling Horace *purissimum penem* [pp. 197, 253]). An enlightened 'multiculturalist' (happy to see civic monuments combining Roman artistic motifs with Greek and other foreign or ethnic elements [pp. 147–8]). A promoter of wider access to positions of responsibility (witness his appointment of freedmen as *vicomagistri* to administer the once-disruptive lower-class cult of the Lares Compitales [pp. 300–1, 308–12]). A respecter of private property (whether lost through confiscation [p. 7] or transferable by inheritance [pp. 26–8]), but also a sponsor of ultra-stylish public buildings and spaces, loaded with cosmopolitan significance (e.g. the Forum Augustum [pp. 200–2]). A moral leader in every sphere (by virtue of his *auctoritas* [p. 12]), supportive of conventional religious observance (through his temple-restoring and building activities [pp. 295–9]), but sensitively tolerant of provincial rites and practices (not least in relation to his own cult [pp. 325–6]). An unostentatious family man (with a 'relatively' modest private house [pp. 187, 220] and normal-looking youngsters up-front on the Ara Pacis [p. 152]). Above all, an inveterate decliner of personal honours and titles (notably those of censor and dictator [pp. 156, 318, 376]). Unless I am much mistaken, this is a 'politically correct' Augustus, in his way just as much a figure of his investigator's own times as the Symian fascist of 1939. And yet, for all that, probably an Augustus we should at least consider alongside, if not to the exclusion of, the other(s).

At the same time, however, is there not something suspiciously Utopian about the idea of the makers and partakers of 'culture' of every hue and at every level—painters, sculptors, metalworkers, architects, poets, and historians, peasant to aristocrat, city-dweller to local worthy—uncoerced and undirected (except by the moral legislation, which even G. is disposed to see as interventionist), all falling over themselves to sustain an ethos which, though 'multifaceted', was nevertheless remarkably coherent? Significant to my mind *inter alia* is G.'s almost total silence in his literary section on the *Amores* and *Ars* of Ovid, for he, in those poems at least, did not just reinterpret the Augustan ethos to suit himself (as G. argues that Tibullus and Propertius did), but actively trivialized it—and (coincidentally?) came to a sticky end.

Belatedly (pp. 370–5) G. concedes that Augustanism is not without its 'contradictions' and inconsistencies. Nor is his own work. Take the subtitle for a start: 'interpretive' *par excellence* the book undoubtedly is, but 'introduction' it is not. Or, at any rate, not for every reader, all of the time: as a non-expert on any kind of iconography, I found the chapter on Art and Architecture extremely user-friendly, but I cannot imagine that the highly allusive and selective chapter on Augustan Literature was equally accessible to those not already very familiar with the texts

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

discussed. Further, on matters literary G. runs the risk of alienating both conservative and modern camps, with anxious nods in the direction of the modish theorists (pp. 228, 231) juxtaposed with surprisingly 'retro' historical, if not exactly biographical, criticism (pp. 226, 228). Finally, from the champion of polyvalence and open-mindedness the occasional unquestioning *ex cathedra* pronouncement is disconcerting: [Augustus' advisers] 'include the poets' (p. 154. *Do* they? Who says?); 'heightened realistic emphasis [in portraiture] was designed to convey the Roman ethos . . . witness that formidable tribune of the people in 68 B.C., Antius Restio' (p. 66, with a reproduction of his grim visage as depicted on a coin: but what if the poor fellow simply *looked* like that?).

The foregoing queries and criticisms, however, should be taken as indications of G.'s capacity for provoking engaged response. I count myself fortunate to have been invited to review this book, which has been a pleasure to read and which I am delighted to possess.

University of Wales, Swansea JOAN BOOTH

ACTIUM

R. A. GURVAL: *Actium and Augustus: the Politics and Emotions of Civil War*. Pp. xiv + 337, 6 pls. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995. $45. ISBN 0-472-10590-6.

G.'s stated aim is to 'perceive more clearly the Augustan image of Actium, a mixed portrait of victory and defeat, joyful celebration and bitter sorrows, a public ideology, slow, if not reluctant to emerge, and a wondrous and inspiring myth shaped more by the verses of individual poets, elated, angry, and at times indifferent, than by the concerted actions and directives of an imperious and vainglorious ruler' (p. 17). The reader, already unsettled by the sensationalist prose-style, has a sense of *déjà vu*. G. can hardly claim originality by staking out his position in opposition to an image of Augustus few have countenanced for a good half century or more.

Through his reappraisal of ancient evidence, G. in fact attempts to do several different things. First of all, he challenges the emphasis placed by Syme (as G. interprets him in his *The Roman Revolution* of 1939) and Zanker (in his *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, originally published in German in 1987) on the use of Actium as a turning-point in Augustan ideology (pp. 3–5). G. seeks to play down emphasis on Actium in contemporary sources for the years immediately following the battle by appeal to a number of arguments, some of which look more like special pleading than others: either Actium is not mentioned at all, or it is attributed a status no more special than, say, the battle of Naulochus, or it is given special prominence only in the east, where they do things differently: 'The serious and considerable distinctions between the Greek-speaking East and the Latin-speaking West remained, and perhaps increased, during imperial Roman rule' (p. 85). Such a statement has implications which are far too serious to be left at that. In G.'s view, such emphasis as there was on Actium belongs rather to somewhat later years: it is Virgil who introduces the figure of Actian Apollo within Latin poetry, and who creates a 'political myth' of Actium by making the battle, as portrayed on the shield of Aeneas, the 'last act in the destiny of the epic's hero' (p. 246). G. is surely right to suggest that scholars must not jump to conclusions about either chronology or symbolism when, for example, they look at the CAESAR DIVI F or the IMP CAESAR coin series,

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reading in allusions to Actium when there are other possibilities (pp. 47–65). One problem, however, is that his scathing comments in the text about modern scholarship are laid open to question by his own footnotes: something disturbing is going on when the statement 'subsequent scholars, almost without exception, have been quick to accept these interpretations [i.e. the relationship between this coinage and Actium specifically]' (p. 47) has to be modified by a footnote thirty-two lines long detailing these exceptions (n. 53). Moreover, in arguing that Actium is either absent or played down in either contemporary representations or selected later accounts, G. fails to confront adequately serious methodological problems of his own. For example, he is keen to create a more precise stratigraphy for Actian ideology, spurning the retrospective views of Velleius Paterculus, the 'fawning Tiberian chronicler', Tacitus, 'the more censorious author of the *Annales*', and Cassius Dio, 'the later Greek historian of the Severan Age' (pp. 1–2), but later in the book is happy to put weight on what Dio says and does not say (e.g. pp. 40, 70ff., 122), and prefers Plutarch to Valerius Maximus without sufficient explanation (pp. 98–9). Equally seriously it is one thing to argue that something cannot necessarily be deduced from a piece of evidence and quite another thing to argue that silences about Actium, Actian Apollo, and the like demonstrate that the victory was passed over quietly in the earliest sources or in Augustus' own *Res Gestae* (e.g. pp. 103, 110, 135).

Secondly, G. takes us through a number of poems, or passages of poems, showing poets grappling with the theme of Actium: Horace 'preferred tactful silence' on the matter (p. 165); Propertius' earlier treatments in Books 2 and 3 emphasize the problem of civil war (p. 208); Virgil's treatment within the context of Aeneas' shield 'complicates his reader's emotions as the displays of righteous pride and public jubilation fail to eclipse the episodes of cruel violence, irrational strife, and individual sorrow' (p. 244); in 4, 6, Propertius offers a critique of 'whatever comforts and assurances this [Virgilian] myth may have granted' (p. 278). G. is better at doing down the opposition than at building up new models: many scholars would agree (and, indeed, have agreed) that 'panegyric' is an unhelpful label for poetic treatments of Actium, and that Augustan poetry in general is complex and interesting, and raises difficult questions about the relationship between poet and princeps. But in the 1990s, this is surely not the place to *end* any serious new discussion of the problems.

All in all, the book is narrow in focus and the presentation of material somewhat laborious: the fact that it originated as the author's doctoral thesis is a little too obvious. It is always good to be encouraged to ask questions about ancient evidence, but one might have expected more suggestions for a way forward in a book-length study.

Birkbeck College, London EMMA DENCH

EMPEROR AND SUBJECT

M. VIELBERG: *Untertanentopik: zur Darstellung der Führungsschichten in der kaiserzeitlichen Geschichtsschreibung.* (Zetemata, 95). Pp. 172. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1996. Paper, DM 72. ISBN: 3-406-40699-8.

This Göttingen *Habilitation*, submitted in 1991 under the supervision of Carl Joachim Classen (and influenced by a year at Oxford in 1986/7), traces the changes in the way the relationship between the emperor and his subjects was described in narrative historiography. There is detailed discussion of Tacitus, Dio, Ammianus,

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and Procopius, and more cursory treatment of Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Orosius, and Augustine.

V.'s method is to examine the semantic field used by each particular writer to identify sets of *topoi* linked in the writer's mind, linking his thoughts with the world he is describing, linking him with his predecessors, and linking each generation of historians to the thought of their contemporaries ('zu der Suprastruktur des Epochendenkens', p. 28). It will be clear from this how V.'s concerns are derived from, or a response to, those of German academic philosophy (he feels it necessary to explain that 'topos' in the sense first used by E. R. Curtius has nothing to do with Aristotle's sense; and also, in a curious footnote [p. 27 n. 114], to deny that he is reconstructing 'mentalities' like those 'influenced by sociology or by French social history': cf. also n. 116 on p. 54)—though what he says, and the clarity with which he says it, make this a very accessible study.

His conclusion, not surprisingly, is that the Augustan system constituted a shift from the public 'political' culture of the republic to a 'court' (in Norbert Elias's terms), from a world of 'citizens' to one of 'subjects' and 'courtiers'. Those families which inherited republican tradition had to save face while accepting the reality that the new system excluded them from decision- and, to some extent, money-making. Effectively, they were 'silenced'. For those whose preconceptions were those of Roman senators, it was hard to find a response which avoided either abject sycophancy or outright opposition. Identifying that middle way between *adulatio* and *contumacia* is the central problem confronting Tacitus (while *obsequium*, *libertas*, and *moderatio* are potentially compatible for Seneca). In Dio's narrative, *kolakeia* is one central focus of the relationship between subject and emperor (V. promises to trace that *topos* back beyond Nicolaus of Damascus and Josephus on a future occasion, p. 38 n. 93). Another is *parrhesia*, freedom of speech, which is both an obligation of the good courtier (Maecenas), and can be interpreted or claimed as opposition; it is a pity that V. does not look at the important rôle that *parrhesia* plays in Dio's account of the republic as well (indeed, it could be seen not so much as a quality of courtiers as of the advice-giving of the Roman *consilium* in general). For Ammianus, there is little place for open, honest advice in the plotting within the nebulous circle of those 'qui plus poterant in palatio', which now constitutes the stuff of political history: the word *fiducia* is only occasionally used, usually as the quality of an exceptional courtier. By the time of Procopius, freedom of speech has become a privilege which the emperor awards to those advisors he wants to listen to. The imperial council's rôle can be seen in one of its new titles: *silentium*. The shift in the vocabulary used by historians reflects that in the rôle of a Senate whose only corporate function had become to acclaim the emperor's utterances. Where freedom was now to be found, as V. shows in his section on Christian historiography, was in resisting the devil (replacing the *delator*: pp. 105ff.) and asserting moral and theological truth: an internalization of freedom which could usefully have been compared with Stoic views generated long before principate or dominate. Being subject (to God's will, if not always the emperor's) has become a virtue, an aspect of *humilitas*. In Orosius and Augustine (and Ambrose) a radically new attitude towards 'being subject' has replaced classical Roman ideas (again, it was beyond the scope of this dissertation to take a detailed look at how *libertas dicendi* functions beyond the sphere of Christian historiography: e.g. in Ambrose's letters 40 and 51 to Theodosius, Synesius' address to Arcadius, or even Symmachus' *Relationes*).

V. touches all too briefy on other broader contexts of historians' *topoi*. Thus he notes that descriptions of external appearance could signal a person's attitude to the *princeps* ('tristitia': p. 18); but more might have been said here about the shared

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

symbolism of panegyric both as a mode of communication between subject and emperor in the 'real' world and in terms of its influence on historiographical characterization. Other points also are rather superficially treated (cf. V.'s broad judgement of late antiquity on p. 67). As V. notes, there is more to be done: 'Die gattungsgeschichtliche Erforschung der Historiographie steckt noch in den Kinderschuhen' (p. 23). This particular *topos* is a limited, but exemplary, first step.

University of Nottingham THOMAS WIEDEMANN

CHURCH AND THRONE

T. D. BARNES: *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*. Pp. xx + 343. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1993. ISBN: 0-647-95067-3.

B.'s contribution to late Roman studies has been of the first importance. He often plays the rôle of devil's advocate, scrutinizing our preconceptions about the period and provoking us to think again about issues of central importance. Whether or not we agree with him, we must admire the scrupulous honesty with which he presents a clear account of the sources on which his reconstructions are based. For the tetrarchic and Constantinian periods he provided a new starting point with *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA, 1981) and *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, MA, 1983). In both volumes—and in many articles since then—he presented an account of imperial policies built upon a painstaking reconstruction of emperors' movements around their territories. Imperial itineraries, B. has shown, are important indicators of the motivation and direction of emperors' policies. Moreover, the intense interpenetration of imperial and ecclesiastical politics in the fourth century means that these journeys are important also to our understanding of the relationship between the emperor and the Church. In undertaking these painstaking reconstructions, B. has contributed not only to our knowledge of the events of late Roman history, but also to our understanding of how the late Empire worked.

Now B. has provided us with another masterpiece of historical reconstruction. A lucid narrative is supported by appendices and notes so detailed that they take up more than one-third of the book. As with his studies of the age of Diocletian and Constantine, B.'s analyses have proceeded from a thorough re-examination of the sources for the period. But B. has been called upon not only to examine the movements of emperors and their entourages. The Christological controversies of the fourth century compelled bishops to move around the Empire too, whether as participants at Church councils, as exiles accused of heresy, or as hangers-on of the imperial court. Bishop Athanasius of Alexandria, whose career unites B.'s narrative, was at various stages all of these.

This is, of course, an immense undertaking. Athanasius' lengthy episcopate (328–73) spans many of the most complicated phases of the Christological controversy. Athanasius himself was an important witness to these events, producing numerous polemical works in support of the Nicene cause (or his version of it). Yet there is a huge quantity of other material besides: that B. has managed to read and digest so much is a breathtaking achievement. Even so, there is an important difference between B.'s approach to Athanasius and that he adopted to Eusebius. He confesses that he 'makes no attempt to do justice to [Athanasius'] doctrinal, homiletic,

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ascetical, and exegetical writings', concentrating instead on 'those works which are sometimes called Athanasius' "historical writings" ' (p. 5). This stands in contrast to the annoyance B. once expressed for those 'historians of the Roman Empire and its institutions [who] decline to read Eusebius' theological, exegetical, and apologetical works' (*Constantine and Eusebius*, p. v). One cannot help feeling that the imbalance which B. sought to redress for the Constantinian age has remained unchecked for the careers of Athanasius and Constantius.

In a study that focuses so much on Athanasius as a man of letters, I find myself unconvinced by some of B.'s analyses. B. argues strongly that Athanasius was not a member of a leisured, cultural élite; rather, he 'was a man of the people' (p. 13) whose early years were shaped by Christian moral instruction and not by a traditional 'classical' education (pp. 10–14). His polemical works were not constructed according to rhetorical rules; rather they were 'spontaneous' products of 'native wit' (p. 126). This goes against many standard views of Athanasius; but is B. right? I have my reservations. If Athanasius' education did not comprise the traditional classical curriculum, then it seems odd that he could appropriate 'the language and ideas of Greek philosophy without embarrassment' and employ 'the prevailing terminology of Middle Platonism' (p. 12). Indeed, it is strange that, so soon after telling us of Athanasius' reliance on 'native wit', B. should discuss his 'rhetorical elaboration' in the *Historia Arianorum* (pp. 129, 130).

Such criticisms, however, can be seen as nit-picking. No review can really do B.'s work justice and it is impossible not to admire its richness. The book examines much more than the stormy relationship between Athanasius and Constantius II: there is material here on that shadowy emperor Constans, on the usurpation of Magnentius, on the formulation of Christian creeds. The appendices themselves are a rich source of data and interpretation: those on the ecclesiastical historians Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret (pp. 200–11) are important studies of their writings; that on imperial residences and journeys (pp. 218–28) provides a convenient summary of much of B.'s most meticulous research. Running through all this detail, moreover, are broad theses about the nature of Athanasius as an author and what this shows about the relationship between the emperor and the Church, and the rôle of the bishop in society. These are themes of central importance to late Roman history, and B. here puts forward his own distinctive interpretations. His most important point is surely that these social and political changes were driven by the interaction of forceful personalities. In so doing, B. vindicates his meticulous approach. At a time when such studies are unfashionable, it is good to know that they have a defender of remarkable calibre.

University of Manchester MARK HUMPHRIES

GALLIC BISHOPS

S. BAUMGART: *Die Bischofsherrschaft im Gallien des 5. Jahrhunderts: Eine Untersuchung zu den Gründen und Anfängen weltlicher Herrschaft der Kirche.* (Münchener Arbeiten zur alten Geschichte, 8.) Pp. 220. Munich: Editio Maris, 1995. Paper, DM 88. ISBN: 3-925801-16-2.

B.'s study, which is based on a 1990 Ludwig-Maximilian University of Munich dissertation, considers the rôle of bishops within Gallic society in the fifth century,

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

against the background of an extended consideration of developments in relation to episcopal power in the fourth century. Several aspects of the rôle of bishops are considered by B., and her observations are generally judicious in an area where a synthesis of this kind is rendered particularly problematic by the complex political and social changes of the period. However, the most serious criticism of this study is that, although published in 1995, no account is taken of any work published since 1990. The author therefore makes no use of the monographs of Harries on Sidonius Apollinaris (1994), Klingshirn on Caesarius (1994), and Sivan on Ausonius (1993), or of the collection of essays edited by J. F. Drinkwater and H. Elton, *Fifth-Century Gaul: a Crisis of Identity?* (Cambridge, 1992).

B. discusses in Chapter 1 the growth of imperial participation in Church affairs in the fourth century, together with the Church's development of autonomy in regard to the organs of the state. Imperial intervention in Church affairs and the privileging of the clergy are contrasted with the rise of scepticism concerning the benefits of such intervention as the support and sympathy of certain emperors for the Arian cause became apparent.

In Chapter 2 developments in ecclesiastical legislation regarding the status of bishops are considered, particularly in relation to the Council of Serdica, which was concerned to define and control the position and influence of bishops. Changes in the Church's attitude to military service are also discussed, and it is suggested that the attitude of toleration found in conciliar decisions eventually prevailed over the greater scepticism found in individual theological writers.

In Chapter 3 episcopal activities and status are examined in the context of the changing social relations in Gaul with regard to the underclasses, the cities, and the senatorial aristocracy. In the first section B. discusses bishops' relations to the slaves and the *plebs rustica*. The difficulties faced by the Church in overcoming its urban origins and perspectives are also highlighted.

The second section examines the participation of bishops in urban affairs. Bishops were the focus for many demands from the urban population which brought them into conflict with the traditional aristocracy. They acted as diplomats on behalf of their communities to both the new barbarian rulers and the imperial court. They were also ready to rebuke the immorality of their urban congregations.

The third section focuses on the relations of the bishops with the senatorial aristocracy. Bishops were closely implicated with the members of the senatorial aristocracy of Gaul, but Salvian could criticize harshly the corruption of office-holders, and similar sentiments were also expressed by Sidonius and Hilary of Arles. Despite these criticisms, it was the aristocracy of Gaul who came increasingly to monopolize episcopal office in this period. B. highlights five reasons for this development: the inhabitants of the cities increasingly looked for bishops who had formerly held secular office, since they could be expected to protect them in times of crisis; the advent of the Germanic kingdoms limited the opportunities for holding public office; hagiographical texts had demonstrated the spiritual achievements of ascetically oriented bishops; the theology of Pelagius, which acquired wide support, emphasized a performance ethic, which could be manifested in the accomplishment of a spiritual career; and many aristocrats turned to the Church after losing their property to the conquerors.

B. finally considers the evidence for the permanent withdrawal of aristocrats from the cities to the protection afforded by their rural villas, but probably underestimates the extent to which some members of the aristocracy chose to stay in their cities, and to continue to hold important non-ecclesiastical positions of responsibility.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In Chapter 4, B. examines three aspects of the spiritual competence of Gallic bishops: their *caritas*, *ascesis*, and *charisma*. Bishops were now the administrators of considerable properties, and the misuse of such wealth is correspondingly attested by Sidonius and Caesarius. Bishops also sought to increase the Church's property by promoting the benefit of donations among their communities. The most distinctive way in which the bishops used Church property was in the ransoming of prisoners of war.

In the final sections some diverse aspects of the bishops' activities are considered, including their contribution to the rise of asceticism, their attitudes towards heretics, pagans, and Jews, and their use of the sign of the cross, consecrated oil, and the host in the performance of wonders. B.'s suggestion that the cult of the saints played a minimal rôle in the development of episcopal power pays insufficient attention to the bishops' contribution to the construction of martyrs' shrines (cf. R. Van Dam, *Saints and Their Miracles* [Princeton, 1993], Chapter 1).

University of Wales, Aberystwyth IAN G. TOMPKINS

THE AGE OF JUSTINIAN

J. A. S. EVANS: *The Age of Justinian: The Circumstances of Imperial Power*. Pp. xiv + 345, 2 maps. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. £45. ISBN: 0-415-02209-6.

E.'s work will prove to be a most useful introduction for students of the eastern Roman Empire in the sixth century. It gathers together much recent research on the period and concentrates more on 'the age of Justinian', as the title indicates, than on the emperor himself—a breadth of focus which is to be welcomed. The book is divided into five chapters, several of which are dauntingly large. The first, for instance, sets the scene for the accession of Justin I in 518 over 85 pages (not including end-notes); all the chapters are extensively subdivided, however, rendering them easier to use. Following the introduction, which briefly considers the literary sources for Justinian's reign, the first chapter provides an extensive and engaging history of the eastern Empire from the fourth century to the sixth; it does this less by narrating a series of events (such narratives being easily found elsewhere in any case) than by a consideration of the state of the Empire in the sixth century and how it came to be so. The city of Constantinople is described at length (pp. 23–30), for instance, with interesting excursuses on the supplying of the city with water and grain. The imperial bureaucracy and the army are discussed in some detail (pp. 41–52); the Church too receives thorough treatment (pp. 65–78), as do the peoples with whom the Empire had to contend (pp. 78–95). The remaining chapters analyse the reigns of Justin and Justinian; the fifth concludes with a consideration of the emperors who succeeded Justinian and an (on the whole positive) assessment of Justinian's reign. The chapters on Justinian's reign are based on extensive reading of the primary texts, which is both an advantage and a disadvantage. It means that the accounts of the course of the Vandalic and Gothic wars are (for the most part) a résumé of Procopius, but the author makes intelligent and frequent use of the emperor's legislation. Worthy of note in these chapters is the section on the emperor's building programme (p. 215–25), concluding in an upbeat assessment of the Empire's defences (p. 225), and one on the condition of the Empire's cities in the sixth century (pp. 225–31).

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The chief criticism which might be levelled at the work concerns its structure. It is a thematic treatment of Justinian's reign, with some chronological divisions (e.g. the last chapter on 'the final years' and the second on the reign of Justin). This allows a certain flexibility and offers the author a chance to put Justinian's measures into a wider context; but it inevitably leads to some repetition (e.g. the raid of the Kotrigur Huns reported at pp. 29 and 253–4; likewise on the Tritheists at pp. 192 and 262, both passages referring to the conversion of John Philoponus) and perhaps to artificial divisions of themes (e.g. secular and religious), even if E. is aware of Justinian's perception of the unity of the two.

A few criticisms of detailed points, chiefly relating to the eastern frontier, may be mentioned here. They should not, however, detract from one of E.'s more important emphases (pp. 165, 269)—that Justinian did not neglect the eastern frontier in favour of his western ambitions, an accusation which has not infrequently been made (e.g. by Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* [New Brunswick, 1969], p. 71). E.'s assertion (p. 38) that Justinian was the only patron of the Blue faction in Late Antiquity is mistaken: Malalas (p. 368) clearly states that 'Marcian favoured the Blue faction in every city' (tr. Jeffreys). The discussion of relations between the Arab allies of the Romans in the sixth century at p. 87 appears somewhat confused (al-Harith the Ghassanid chief is said to have succeeded the Kindite chief al-Harith, for instance). On relations between the Romans and the Ghassanids in particular the reader should turn now to I. Shahid, *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Sixth Century*, I.1–2 (Washington, DC, 1995), with M. Whittow, 'Rome and the Jafnids: Writing the History of a Sixth-century Tribal Dynasty', *JRA* 10 (1997), both unavailable to E. On p. 89 the death of the Persian king Peroz is erroneously placed in 482 instead of 484; nor is it certain that his capture by the Hephthalites occurred in 469. E.'s assertion (p. 90, cf. p. 259) that the Romans agreed to a regular annual payment to the Persians in the aftermath of the Anastasian War also lacks the authority of any ancient source, as I have argued in *Rome and Persia at War, 502–532* (Leeds, 1998), p. 118. The Huns with whom Kavadh was in conflict after the Anastasian War (p.91) were not Hephthalites but Sabirs, cf. Greatrex, op. cit., p. 110 n. 104. E.'s reference to the Derbent pass as the 'Caspian Gates' (p. 93) overlooks the ambiguity of this term, on which A. R. Anderson, 'Alexander at the Caspian Gates', *TAPA* 59 (1928), 130–63, should still be consulted. E.'s statement (p. 105) that 'Egypt was lost, though that was not yet apparent' is puzzling: he is discussing the rise of Monophysitism at this point, and has just stated that its fortunes were rising during Anastasius' reign. The implication of his sentence is therefore that Egypt was lost to the Monophysites, which was clearly not the case. The province had perhaps been lost to the Chalcedonian cause by this point, although Justinian did attempt to impose Chalcedonian patriarchs on Alexandria in the late 530s. The identification of the *magister militum* Sittas with a certain Ursicinus (p. 15 and n. 71), attested only in an unreliable tenth-century hagiography, is too conjectural to be worthy of mention: it was rightly rejected by H. Rubin in his *Das Zeitalter Iustinians* I (Berlin, 1960), p. 508 n. 1010. The battle of Dara took place a stone's throw from the city (Proc. *Wars* I.13.13), not 3.5 km away (E., p. 117). Lastly, the attempt to build a fort at Thannuris/Minduos took place in 528, not 527 (*contra* E., p. 221).

These quibbles notwithstanding, E.'s work will provide a helpful supplement to Jones' *Later Roman Empire* for the sixth century in the east; the well-researched and up-to-date bibliography is particularly to be commended. The imbalance in the work (almost 100 pages to set the scene, and only about 160 on Justin and Justinian) in no way detracts from its usefulness, although those wishing for a detailed consideration

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of all Justinian's policies will have to continue to content themselves with Stein or Bury.

University of Wales, Cardiff GEOFFREY GREATREX

APULIA

P. DESY: *Recherches sur l'économie apulienne au II^e^ et au I^er^ siècle avant notre ère*. (Collection Latomus, 221.) Pp. 246, 4 ills. Brussels: Latomus, 1993. Paper, Belg. frs. 1,750. ISBN: 2-87031-161-3.

Modern understanding of ancient Apulia, and indeed of the whole of the Mezzogiorno, has been hampered by a fundamental problem of evidence and methodology, which has significantly distorted the history of the region. All too often, ancient sources have been accepted at face value in their assessment of the social and economic history of the region, with little allowance for chronological development, or for the distortions imposed by literary form and convention and by the author's purposes. As a result, a received view of the economy of southern Italy has evolved in which many of the more doom-laden pronouncements of ancient authors are taken as evidence of deep economic decline and depopulation in Apulia from the second century B.C. onwards. Increasingly, archaeological evidence is forcing a reappraisal of this, as is the trend towards a more sensitive interpretation of literary sources. This need to reinterpret received ideas about the economy of south-eastern Italy is the principal focus of this volume.

Unusually, D. places the emphasis on the economy of southern Apulia, which was primarily agrarian, rather than on the often-studied sheep-rearing regions of the Tavoliere. The opening chapter (pp. 9–17) explicitly highlights this prioritization of the north of the region over the south as a major problem. It also provides a useful critique of previous work on the economy of the south and its methodologies, and traces the history of economic research in the region down to the late 1980s, stressing its negative tone and arguing for a more positive approach. The alternative model, which is applied in the rest of the book, combines a detailed critique of the literary sources for the Apulian economy with the evidence for trade in wine and oil provided by Apulian amphorae, and is a concerted and welcome attempt to escape from the negative view of the Italian economy in the late republic and early Empire.

The argument is principally structured around the literary sources. D. intersperses an account of the region in the late third and fourth centuries B.C. and a review of the amphorae from the region with discussions of Strabo, Varro, and the Augustan poets. Archaeological and epigraphic evidence is not ignored, but it takes a back seat, and is not given sufficient discussion in its own right. The emphasis is on using close analysis of literature to refute the negative interpretations of Kahrstedt, Toynbee et al. on their own terms. A long narrative chapter on the Hannibalic war (pp. 41–73) attempts to refute the notion that the devastation which occurred between 217 and 203 B.C. was the root cause of a fundamental change in the agrarian structure of the region and of a rapid and permanent decline. Much of it is in fact taken up with a year-by-year summary of events for the years 217–207, but the remainder provides a useful discussion of the possible effects of the war. D.'s conclusions are that the devastation and demographic stress, particularly among the cities which remained loyal to Rome, was probably overestimated by Toynbee. In this, he is in tune with other recent

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

research on the long-term effects of ancient warfare on the economy. Where this chapter fails is in his unwillingness to get to grips with the problematic question of *ager publicus* and the extent of land confiscation among the rebel states. This problem is addressed to some extent in the chapter covering the post-war history of the region up to the Spartacus revolt. In many ways this is the best integrated section of the book as it seeks to mesh together the evidence from aerial photography, excavation and survey, and epigraphy in considering the impact of the Gracchan settlement programme. The conclusion, that colonization involved substantial changes to the agrarian structures of the region but that the arrival of new population injected vigour into the economy, sounds entirely plausible but perhaps deserves fuller discussion than it receives.

The rest of the book is devoted to specific topics or sources and is somewhat fragmented in approach. There are good discussions of Strabo and Varro, notably getting to grips with the difficult problem of Strabo's sources and the tendency of some modern authors to dismiss his evidence as mere copying from fourth-century sources. The examination of Apulian trade is less satisfactory, and is based mainly on the use of the career of G. Rabirius Postumus as a case study of a *negotiator*, and on Apulian amphorae as evidence for production and export of olive oil.

Overall this is a somewhat uneven work but is, nevertheless, a useful addition to the literature on Apulia and on the Italian economy. Its conclusions—that Apulia remained significant as a producer of grain and olive oil until well into the Empire, that the economy underwent structural change but not serious decline, and that large estates were principally a phenomenon of the late Empire—corroborate findings from other regions of Italy and will help to undermine the notion of a region dominated by *latifundia*. Its weakness is its unevenness of coverage and relative paucity of non-literary material, but it is a brave attempt to take on Kahrstedt and Toynbee on their own ground, by undertaking analysis of the literary sources.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne KATHRYN LOMAS

CAPUA AND CANUSIUM

G. D'ISANTO: *Capua romana. Ricerche di prosopografia e storia sociale*. (Vetera. Ricerche di Storia epigrafia e antichità, 9.) Pp. 343. Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1993. Paper. ISBN: 88-7140-064-X.

F. GRELLE: *Canosa Romana*. (Saggi di Storia antica, 5.) Pp. 272, 6 ills. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1993. Cased. ISBN: 88-7062-782-9.

These two volumes both belong to a tradition and genre which has a long and honourable tradition in Italian scholarship, and which has accumulated into a valuable resource for scholars working in all areas of Roman and pre-Roman Italy. Studies of this type, of individual cities, are invaluable in collecting together material on particular sites and making the data readily available for consultation. If reliably carried out, this type of volume is an essential tool for anyone researching in the field of Italian history, and particularly in the history of urban development. It is a characteristic of this type of monograph that the emphasis is on comprehensively

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

collecting and presenting source material, and on undertaking detailed analysis rather than on providing a broad overview of a subject or a large-scale reinterpretation of the evidence. The focus is very firmly on the detail. Within the scope of this type of study, both of these books succeed admirably, and provide a valuable addition to the literature on Canosa (anc. Canusium) and Capua respectively.

Both of the cities studied were important centres in Roman Italy. Capua, the better known of the two, reached the height of its power before the Hannibalic war, rivalling Rome in strength and significance during the fourth century B.C. and only being eclipsed after the destruction of its political independence by Rome in 209 B.C. The focus of D'I.'s work, however, is not the pre-Roman city but the development of Capua under Roman rule. This is interpreted in the widest sense as stretching from the recapture of the city by Rome during the Punic wars, in 211 B.C., to the early medieval period. Of the two studies, it is much the more limited in its ambitions and much the more technical in its content, with an emphasis on the specifics of prosopographic research. A brief first chapter (pp. 15–44) provides an outline of Capuan history from the foundation of the city to its abandonment in A.D. 856, with an emphasis on the city's administrative and structural development, but this largely provides a context rather than any radical reappraisal of Capuan history. The substance of the volume lies in the second section, a detailed and comprehensive prosopographic study of Capua. This collects together the Capuan inscriptions published in *CIL* X and adds new material culled from *Année Epigraphique* and numerous other sources. However, it stops far short of being a full-scale epigraphic study of the city and concentrates instead on identifying as many of the *gentes* of Roman Capua as possible and producing a prosopographical listing. Each *gens* comes with a short introduction, placing it within the history of the city and detailing links with neighbouring communities, but otherwise this is a collection of relatively raw data. Within each gentilicial group, each individual attested has a unique number and is accompanied by details of date, social status, occupation (if known), relationship to any other listed person (given by reference number), and bibliographic reference. The format is an effective storage system and is enhanced by the analytical lists included at the end of the volume, but it may not be the easiest form to use if one is trying to reconstruct relationships outside the immediate *gens*. There is also relatively little detail given about each individual. The result is an admirable compilation of data but is perhaps most useful as a pointer to more detailed sources and as a statistical snapshot of Capuan society. This was, in fact, the intention, as both the author's introduction and the series editor's preface make clear. It is designed to plug a very specific gap in scholarship on Campania, namely a detailed corpus of reference data on Capuan epigraphy and prosopography to accompany volumes already completed on other nearby cities. It does not attempt, and does not claim to attempt, any major re-evaluation of the material. However, it will provide a very welcome research tool for other scholars working on the social history of Campania.

G., in contrast, has produced a much wider-ranging and analytical study of Roman Canusium. This smaller and less well-known centre in northern Apulia was, nevertheless, a very significant settlement within the region, and, unlike Capua, its importance was only enhanced after the Roman conquest. Its position on the road system of Apulia, its importance as a centre of the wool trade, and the colony founded there in the Antonine era were all factors in boosting its significance in the middle and late Empire. Its importance to the historian of Italy is that, like Capua, the life of the Roman city is documented by an extensive body of epigraphic evidence. Much of this has already been collated, published, and analysed for its prosopographic content in

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

monographs by G., Chelotti, Silvestrini et al. (*Epigrafia romana di Canosa*, I and II), but this volume represents an attempt to use this data to give a profile of the city and its development.

G. provides a thorough and informative history of the city, with each chapter presenting a digest of the literary evidence and an impressive grasp of epigraphic detail. Pre-Roman history and the Daunian origin of the city are covered only briefly as background to the main narrative, and even here the emphasis is mainly on the Romanization of Daunia following the conquest of the region in the 320s B.C. The main focus is on the history of the Roman *municipium*, the foundation of the Antonine colony, and, in particular, Canusium in Late Antiquity. There is also a strong emphasis on administrative structures and on economic changes connected with Roman settlement and redistribution of land. While it is true that these are important elements in the municipalization process, the result is that the social history of the city and later colony is perhaps swamped under the wealth of administrative detail. That said, the range of evidence for land use and pastoralism, and the detailed examination of some key epigraphic texts is impressive. In particular, there is an extensive and detailed appendix on a major late imperial inscription from Trinitapoli. One particularly irritating feature of the layout of the book, however, is the lack of a consolidated bibliography. The text is massively footnoted and G. includes a vast and comprehensive bibliography in the notes, but this format makes the material very difficult to use. Overall, the content of this volume is largely descriptive in nature and it is stronger on detailed analysis than on more wide-ranging interpretation. The approach is very traditional and driven by the evidence; it will certainly not change our understanding of how the ancient city worked, or add anything to the methodologies and theoretical models available for studying urban history. Nevertheless, it presents an impressively well-documented history of an important Roman *municipium* and is a valuable addition to the literature on Canusium.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne KATHRYN LOMAS

ROMANIZING NAPLES

M. LEIWO: *Neapolitana: a Study of Population and Language in Graeco-Roman Naples*. (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, 102.) Pp. 236, 2 ills. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1995. Paper. ISBN: 951-653-272-1.

One of the vexed questions for anyone studying the Greek colonies of Italy in the post-Hannibalic period is the apparent 'disappearance' of much of the Greek population of the region. The literary sources speak of decline and devastation in the wake of Hannibal's defeat; the epigraphic evidence indicates that this was by no means total and that many of the cities of Magna Graecia survived as Roman *municipia* after the Social War. The problem is that the vast majority of the inscriptions from the region date to the first three centuries A.D., by which date both the language and the onomastics are overwhelmingly Latin. There is, therefore, a huge gap covering the period of Roman assimilation and the problem of how to account for the seeming disappearance of the Greeks. There is no doubt that the demographic upheavals of the Hannibalic war and the Roman colonization in parts of the region would have accounted for a genuine level of population

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

movement, but there is a serious question to be addressed about whether the Latinized epigraphic evidence represents a wider change of population or a change of culture.

This monograph addresses precisely this question, using the best-documented and most complex example, Naples, as a case study. Naples is a particularly intriguing subject for a study of this type as it has several ethnic groups represented in the population. In addition to the original Greek colonists and the later Roman incomers, there was a substantial minority of Oscan-speaking Campanians who were absorbed into the city in the late fifth century B.C. The Greek culture of Naples is widely celebrated in the literature of the early Empire, Greek institutions (e.g. the ephebeia, gymnasia, phratries, and a Greek festival) survived, and there are a significant number of Greek inscriptions. The purpose of this work is to study the linguistic and onomastic changes at work in Roman Naples, and to reach some conclusions about the nature of the cultural and demographic changes which these represent.

The first sections comprise a brief history of Naples from its foundation to the Roman municipalization (pp. 13–32) and a summary of the evidence for the cultural life of the city in the early Empire (pp. 33–48). These are largely descriptive in content, providing a context for the more technical epigraphic analysis, and add few new insights. The problem of the extent of Hellenism there in the early Empire and the enormously important question of what Hellenism actually meant to an educated Roman of this period are touched on (pp. 40–1) but not fully explored. L. concludes, on the basis of the poetic evidence and in particular that of Statius, a native of the city, that Hellenism may have survived only in a limited form and was largely restricted to the province of high culture. While this may well be true, it has wide-ranging implications for the cultural history of Naples which deserve much fuller exploration than they receive.

The majority of the book is, however, dedicated to a linguistic and onomastic study of the epigraphy of Naples, the aim of which is to test out the extent to which Naples was still ethnically and culturally Greek, and to chart the process of cultural change. Simply in terms of providing a scholarly resource, this is a valuable body of material as it systematically brings together both Greek and Latin inscriptions in a corpus of texts complete with dates and provides sophisticated linguistic analysis of the contents. As a linguistic and epigraphic survey, it is admirable and produces some intriguing results. Perhaps the most notable finding is the large number of regional peculiarities in the use of Greek and in the personal names, revealing a surprising degree of linguistic and onomastic isolationism. There are, however, problems in some of the underlying assumptions behind this research and in the conclusions drawn from it. L. rightly stresses that the choice of language is determined largely by context and register, and that Greek and Roman language and culture continued to coexist until well into the Empire. However, this is undercut by his search for a demographic explanation for the decline of Greek epitaphs and personal names in favour of Latin ones in the early Empire. This implies an oversimplistic equation between language, personal names, and ethnic origin which is difficult to sustain. There are many factors which can influence language choice, as L. himself stresses. The issue of choice and form of personal name is, if possible, even more problematic, and can be modified by a vast number of social and cultural factors. The shift from Greek to Latin in this respect is surely not so much an indication of demographic displacement of a Graeco-Oscan population by a Roman one as a reflection of the process of acculturation. Overall this is a somewhat problematic volume; the epigraphic and linguistic analysis is of a very high order and illuminates

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the history of Roman Naples in some surprising ways, but this is combined with some unsustainable and even contradictory assumptions about demography, ethnicity, and processes of acculturation.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne KATHRYN LOMAS

IMAGINES

H. I. FLOWER: *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Pp. xvii + 411, 19 figs, 8 pls. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-19-815018-0.

In this timely contribution to ancient cultural history, F. focuses on Roman ancestor masks as a unique phenomenon in the ancient Mediterranean. In the introduction, F. lays out her interpretation of the *imagines* as vehicles for aristocratic self-promotion and then devotes the first two chapters to the significance and nature of the masks. In the succeeding chapters she considers the *imagines* in a variety of contexts: elections, funerals, funeral orations, *tituli* and *elogia*, the principate under Augustus and Tiberius, and, finally, subsequent imperial history. Each chapter ends with a brief summarizing conclusion, and the last chapter recapitulates the main points of the argument and highlights its implications. Five appendices supplement the text: the literary testimonia, arranged alphabetically by author and accompanied by translations; the epigraphic evidence, also with translations; a table of coins with ancestral themes (although the numismatic evidence is somewhat inscrutable, as F. herself points out); a discussion of the possible origins of the *imagines* (including Etruscan influence and the Italian context); and stemmata of the Caecilii Metelli, the Cornelii Scipiones, and Augustus' family, somewhat pruned. There are indices of persons, ancient sources, and general items.

F. aims to be as comprehensive as possible; in the course of her argument she treats everything from Marius' speech in Sallust and the *S. C. de Cn. Pisone patre* (in order to establish the centrality of the *imagines* in Roman political life) to narrative historical painting (presented as a genre parallel to the masks in their function as purveyors of aristocratic values). The following remarks touch on only a few aspects of the book, which can be profitably consulted for the various topics incorporated in the argument as well as for the interpretation of the *imagines*.

Three major points emerge early on. Dismissing as a starting-point what have generally been taken as accurate physical representations of *imagines* (the Barberini statue, the wax bust from Cumae, grave reliefs), F. grounds her interpretation in written references, and uses the material evidence not to reconstruct the *imagines* but to illuminate their purpose. Secondly, F. insists on a political understanding of the masks, based on their unparalleled function as representations of office-holders displayed at funerals and in the most public part of aristocratic homes. Thirdly, closely associated with the emphasis on the political significance of the masks is a consistent rejection of any religious importance: they are not death masks (p. 2) and, as she later shows, they are never associated with worship or cult (pp. 102–3 and 208–11).

In the individual chapters, F.'s argument is most persuasive when she is looking at the *imagines* in what she acknowledges to be their central context, the funeral. The

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

first half of Chapter 4 reviews the Roman funeral and emphasizes its political aspects: the public procession, the *laudatio* in the forum, the actors in their masks and magisterial costumes. Viewed this way, the use of the *imagines* renders the ceremony an opportunity for a family to celebrate and, in F.'s terminology, 'advertise' its civic and military accomplishments. Equally compelling is the discussion in Chapter 8 of Augustus' development of the funeral. Though F.'s conclusions were adumbrated by Price (on p. 62 in D. Cannadine, S. Price [edd.], *Rituals of Royalty. Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies* [1987], noted by F. on p. 237 n. 63), she offers a full-scale exploration of the topic, from the models provided by Julius Caesar's exploitation of funerals to Augustan innovations such as the introduction of *imagines* of men not related to the deceased (F. suggests this is the parallel Dio refers to [at 54.28.5] between the funeral of Agrippa and that of Augustus himself) and the addition of a second speech when Octavia died. Augustus' experiments culminated in the rites he orchestrated for his own funeral, and F. concludes by connecting his successful appropriation of other families' *imagines* with the political eminence he achieved in the competitive Roman aristocracy.

Given F.'s willingness to press the evidence and speculate, it is perhaps not surprising that some sections and chapters are less persuasive than others, particularly where the connection between context and *imagines* is rather tangential. For example, in the chapter on elections, F. repeatedly refers to the *imagines*' decisive impact on the way citizens voted, and yet, after a résumé of Roman electoral procedures, the bulk of the chapter treats representations of aristocratic ancestors in such media as public statues, *imagines clipeatae*, curule chairs, coins, and gems. After this, even the softened conclusion that the *imagines* 'were used as a pivotal element in a wide array of family advertisements' (p. 90) fails to convince. In general, F.'s maximalist approach does not always shed much light on the *imagines*. The chapter on *elogia* and *tituli* offers both autopsy and an elegant synthesis of previous scholarship on the Scipionic tombs, but the discussion seems disproportionately extended in comparison with the reasonable conclusion that the *tituli* there may be analogous to those attached to the *imagines*, for which no direct evidence survives. Further, while the chapter on the *imagines* in the home quite justifiably gives extensive coverage to the *atrium* as their locus, it is hard to see what the discussion of the *tablinum* contributes to the overall argument. More profitable might have been deeper consideration of responses to the *imagines*. As F. points out in passing (e.g. pp. 83 and 126), the inhabitants of late Republican Rome were skilled readers of political messages. Would it be possible to focus more on their reactions to the advertising she identifies as the *imagines*' main function? Helpful here would be Gregory, *JRA* 7 (1994), 80–99, which apparently appeared too late for the book. These reservations notwithstanding, the impact of the argument is considerable.

Despite the still murky origins and decline of the *imagines*, their evolution as presented here accords with the outlines of Roman political life: having acquired ever greater value within the mutually agreed terms of traditional aristocratic competition, the *imagines* were then co-opted by Augustus in the transition to Empire, and subsequently provided a link to the Republican past. Thus, in thoroughly reconsidering an important element of Roman culture, this book reaffirms its profoundly political nature.

Middlebury College JANE D. CHAPLIN

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CONCUBINAGE

R. FRIEDL: *Der Konkubinat im kaiserzeitlichen Rom: von Augustus bis Septimius Severus*. (Historia Einzelschriften, 98.) Pp. 417. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996. Paper, DM 140. ISBN: 3-515-06871-6.

This is by no means the first study on concubinacy in the Roman world—F. has been able to trace published work on the field as far back as 1713, and in the last 20–30 years in particular the development of the study of Roman social history has produced numerous articles, and chapters in books, bearing directly or indirectly on the subject. It was high time for a reassessment, and a drawing together of threads: rather more, however, is offered, both in the scope of the material deployed and in the clarification of concepts.

First, the scope. Relatively little epigraphic material was available to P. M. Meyer for his *Der römische Konkubinat* (Leipzig, 1895), and his successors have tended to concentrate on the epigraphic record of lower-class life in the city of Rome (particularly influential have been the seminal articles of B. Rawson, *TAPhA* 104 [1974], 279–305 and S. Treggiari, *PBSR* 49 [1981], 59–81 and *Phoenix* 35 [1981], 42–69)—either on that, on the personal lives of serving soldiers, or on the few problematic juristic texts on the subject. F. embraces all of these, but also surveys such epigraphic evidence from other parts of the Roman Empire—not the whole, but specifically the north-western provinces and Italy—as was available to him up to the time of writing. The work was finished at the end of 1993, and so, although some recent work on Roman social history is unavoidably missed, the epigraphic coverage of the West is pretty comprehensive. A feature of the book, with obvious usefulness for future research, is the series of appendices, occupying eighty-five of the 417 pages (about 20% of the whole), comprising a detailed analytical index of the epigraphic evidence for various distinct types of relationship which F. isolates and identifies.

The main body of the book consists of an analysis of various kinds of non-marital and/or cohabitational relationships found in the Roman world. This is divided into three main types: *contubernium* (where at least one partner is a slave), *concubinatus* proper (where both partners are free from the start), and relationships with servicemen. Each of these categories, especially the latter two, comprises various subcategories which in their turn are listed and discussed.

Although inevitably a good deal of time is spent covering already familiar ground, F. has a number of important new findings and insights. Space prohibits mentioning all of them, but one may in particular draw attention to the following:

Concubinacy as a deliberately chosen alternative to marriage is found relatively seldom—rather more often it is the only available option, because of legal barriers, and is tantamount to a *de facto* marriage (for which F. would prefer to avoid the term *concubinatus*). This applies particularly to those groups affected by the Augustan marriage laws, and to serving soldiers.

There is no support for the notion (attributed by F. to Veyne, *A History of Private Life* [Cambridge, MA, 1987], p. 85 but perhaps deriving from Finley 'The Silent Women of Rome', in *Aspects of Antiquity* [London, 1968], pp. 129ff.) that ex-slaves were uninterested in getting married.

On soldiers, F. has found, contrary to expectation, relatively little evidence for *de facto* marital relationships, especially with freeborn women, and rather more for relationships with women unlikely to have been chosen, had the men been free to marry, as marital partners, i.e. the soldiers' own slaves and freedwomen.

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In addition, F. usefully reminds us (p. 184) of the difference in perspective between legal sources, which overrepresent the upper levels of society, and epigraphic, where the lower classes preponderate.

On the whole F. is careful and sensitive in his handling of evidence, though noticeably uneasy in dealing with legal sources, particularly those on attitudes to freeborn women as concubines, in the light of the *lex Iulia* on adultery (pp. 193–8). Here F.'s treatment is cursory compared, say, with that of T. P. McGinn, *TAPhA* 121 (1991), 335–75, and he misses much of the significance of the texts because of failure to attend to their context. Other flaws include the apparent assumptions (p. 56) that *all* divorces, not merely those by husbands avoiding prosecution for *lenocinium*, required seven witnesses (p. 70), that freeborn Romans were forbidden by Augustus to marry prostitutes (the evidence of Ulpian *Reg.* 13.2 is suspect), or (pp. 91–2 n. 39) that we know that the *lex Iulia* itself originally set any minimum level for estates to be liable to inheritance tax (according to F. it was 'reintroduced' by Trajan); on this, it may also be noted that neither Gaius 3.42, concerning patrons' rights of inheritance from freedmen, nor the Gnomon of the Idios Logos §§30 and 32, concerning *capacitas* of the unmarried and childless in Egypt to inherit, both cited by F., are relevant. F. appears to subscribe (p. 206) to the odd notion that *operae* included any kind of sexual rights for patrons over freed slaves. He also misrepresents (p. 161) *Digest* 23.2.24: 'war die Prostituierte eine *ingenua*, so war nur ein Konkubinatus möglich'; what Modestinus actually says is that living with a free woman (*liberae*, not necessarily 'freeborn') is to be regarded as marriage, not concubinacy, if she does not make money from prostitution.

Presentation is marred by a number of minor slips. Without conducting any kind of systematic survey, I was aware of a number of wrong textual references, and Tim Parkin will doubtless be surprised to find his *Demography and Roman Society* (Baltimore, London, 1992) attributed to T. G. Rankin.

These quibbles apart, however, this book is to be welcomed as a systematic and comprehensive study of an important topic. Its appearance is timely.

University of Reading JANE F. GARDNER

WIDOWS (AND ORPHANS)

J.-U. KRAUSE: *Verwitwung und Wiederverheiratung. Witwen und Waisen im römischen Reich I*. (Habes, 16.) Pp. xi + 304. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1994. Paper. ISBN: 3-515-06400-1.

J.-U. KRAUSE: *Wirtschaftliche und gesellschaftliche Stellung von Witwen. Witwen und Waisen im römischen Reich II*. (Habes, 17.) Pp. viii + 357. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1994. Paper. ISBN: 3-515-06401-X.

J.-U. KRAUSE: *Witwen und Waisen im frühen Christentum. Witwen und Waisen im römischen Reich IV.* (Habes, 19.) Pp. vii + 154. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1995. Paper. ISBN: 3-515-06403-6.

The first two parts of K.'s substantial four-volume work look at the extent of widowhood in the Roman world, the position of widows, and the nature of remarriage. Some of the material has already been dealt with in other studies of marriage and the family, but the focus on the widows themselves is new and welcome. K. also adds an

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interesting if necessarily speculative demographic angle. One of his work's main strengths is his phenomenal knowledge of the more obscure source material, especially papyri (usefully summarized in the appendices) and Christian writings. Much of the work takes a synchronic approach, and Plautus can turn up in the same footnote as Paulinus of Nola. Some of the material is very densely packed: on many pages, lists of examples appear in smaller print, and most of the more interesting anecdotes from the papyri are crammed into these sections.

A problem of the source material is how to separate widows from other husbandless women. Many women acting alone in papyri were no doubt widows, but some must have been divorcees, or even never-married. In most cases the background is now irrecoverable, but it should be remembered that not all the widows identified by K. were necessarily actual widows. Occasionally, he describes as a widow someone who was not: e.g. Publilia (vol. I, p. 91) was divorced from Cicero, not widowed; Pliny's aunt-in-law Calpurnia Hispulla is claimed as a widow although there is no evidence that she was ever married (vol. II, p. 7).

In medieval Europe, widowhood could provide women with independence for the first time in their lives. K. argues convincingly that Roman widows did not experience the same benefits. A Roman woman whose husband died lost the family breadwinner (often while she still had young children to bring up), had no access to charitable support unless she was a Christian, could only look for work in a very restricted job market, and gained little independence above what she had while married.

Volume I begins with the demographic aspects of widowhood. K. reconstructs a 'typical life cycle': married at 18 to an older man (although he notes surprisingly that in papyri 7–8% of women are older than their husbands), widowed at 33–35, living as a widow for 10 years. The large number of widows on the marriage market, combined with the number of unmarried men who for various reasons were not in the market, meant that remarriage was not a readily available option. K. suggests that 25–30% of the female population at any given time were widows.

Remarriage appears to have been commoner for men than for women. The need for maintenance was the obvious reason for a widow to remarry, but K. discusses other motives: loneliness, health, desire for children. A widow's chance of remarriage decreased sharply with age, or if she already had children. She might need to offer a higher dowry than a woman marrying for the first time (thus prejudicing the interests of the children of her first marriage), or might be obliged to marry 'downwards'. Ideological opposition to remarriage was due to the Church Fathers, but the remarriage of widows, especially young ones, remained acceptable if no vows were broken. Legislation increased the protection of the children of the first marriage, but was not intended to deter remarriage.

In Vol. II, K. first addresses the question of household structure. A widow might go to her father's or brother's household, and women of advanced age buried by their parents are probably widows (K. does not acknowledge that commemoration patterns do not necessarily reflect where people actually lived). Widows and adult sons often lived together, especially if the son was unmarried but sometimes afterwards. Living with a daughter was much rarer. The dowry could be essential for a widow's maintenance, even if that was not its primary function. However, in Roman Egypt the dowry was not usually enough to support a widow. A husband could also provide for his widow in his will, although this was entirely at his discretion and was subject to legal limits; she did, however, have a claim to remain in his home if she did not remarry. In practice, a widow was most likely to have to rely on the support of her children, especially sons. K. argues that some Christian miracle stories emphasize that

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

someone was a widow's only son because readers would know that he was also her only means of support.

An able-bodied widow might enter the labour market, but employment opportunities were very limited. Textile work is well documented but it was apparently difficult to earn a living from it. Widows are recorded as nurses, midwives, traders, innkeepers, housekeepers, matchmakers. Their widespread lack of success in maintaining themselves by work, either through lack of opportunity or through physical incapacity, is highlighted by the many references to widows begging or, increasingly, relying on the support of the Church. Property-owning widows could experience difficulties in managing their own affairs, especially if their husbands had run everything for them. However, there is evidence, especially in the papyri, of very economically active widows involved in making and receiving loans, buying, selling, and leasing. Widows were exempt from some of the fiscal burdens placed on men, but could also be victimized by government officials at all levels, and could suffer violence from neighbours and relatives. Even the limited protection which the law offered was not always available in practice.

The final part of K.'s work deals with widows and orphans in early Christianity. The title proves to be somewhat misleading: orphans are the subject of only half a chapter, and 'early Christianity' extends to the sixth century. Since the earlier books made considerable use of Christian material, there is a certain amount of overlap, but K. looks at widows and orphans specifically in the context of the Church.

The early Church was attractive to poor widows because of the charitable provisions it made. These depended on voluntary contributions, so its capacity to help was limited, and bishops had to decide whom to support. Standard criteria gradually emerged: a 'true' widow must be over 60, married only once, with no children to support her, and of exemplary character.

Younger widows were encouraged to find work; older ones could take pride in not being a burden to the Church, as was recorded on one woman's epitaph at Rome. There was much scope for charitable initiatives from wealthy individuals, including members of the imperial family, and K. believes that the effectiveness of maintenance by the Church should not be overstated. The structural causes of widows' poverty were not addressed. Orphans should only receive temporary charity. Boys would be taught a trade; girls would have marriages arranged for them by their bishop. The first orphanage was founded at Constantinople, and the institution only became common from the late fifth century, and only in the East. To some extent, monasteries and convents served as substitute orphanages. Constantinople also had homes for the aged, but these remained rare.

Widows had a high status in the very early Church. However, K. does not believe that they originally had a prominent rôle in the Church from which they were gradually removed; he claims that their function was always limited. Hippolytus of Rome, like many Church councils after him, expressly rejected the ordination of widows. K. does not note that the frequent repetition of this prohibition may be evidence that women were in some sense being ordained, and he pays no attention to heresies such as Montanism where women clearly became official leaders. According to K., the rôle of widows was expected to be largely passive; even the document known as *Testamentum Domini Nostri*, which gives them the widest competence, restricts them to limited functions such as tending the sick, praying, fasting, and supporting younger women.

Asceticism offered a new choice for widows. Those who took up the ascetic life usually stayed in their own homes until the fourth century in the East, fifth or sixth

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

century in the West, sometimes living with virgin daughters. Poorer ascetic widows might still have to work; the practice which K. labels *Syneisaktentum*, where an ascetic man and woman lived together, was one way of ensuring the woman's maintenance, although it gave her the same domestic duties as a married woman. Richer widows began to found convents. Many left bequests to the Church, a practice frowned upon by relatives and the state, but much encouraged by some Church Fathers. Some clergy were accused of profiteering from gullible widows, and legislation tried to prevent them from visiting their houses. However, K. rejects Jack Goody's claim that the Church actively encouraged widows to disinherit their own families. He also believes that asceticism was not such an advance for women as is sometimes argued; many virgins were pressured into an ascetic life by their families just as they would previously have been pressured into marriage, and only some widows had a free choice. The rich ascetic widows who attained most influence, like Paula and Marcella, would have been influential anyway because of their wealth and connections. The spread of Christianity, K. argues, did not cause a general improvement in the position of widows.

University of Wales, Lampeter DAVID NOY

THE WORLD OF ROME

P. JONES, K. SIDWELL (edd.): *The World of Rome: an Introduction to Roman Culture*. Pp. xvii + 399. Cambridge, New York, and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Cased, £45 (Paper, £15.95). ISBN: 0-521-38421-4 (0-521-38600-4 pbk).

This is a collaborative work, designed as a companion to *The World of Athens* and as a background book to *Reading Latin*: besides the two editors seven other contributors are responsible for the ten chapters (several of them joint undertakings), epilogue, three appendices, and forty-one pages of indices. J.&S. are to be congratulated on putting together a coherent and informative collection of thought-provoking articles in a lucid and remarkably homogeneous style. They acknowledge that some divergences have been left: this is rarely a problem, although there is some overlapping and occasionally disagreement: e.g. the succession of Tiberius in ¶90/188 ('He referred every matter, whether important or insignificant, to the Senate' / 'Tiberius' . . . disinclination to use [the senate]'). Two levels of subheadings at frequent intervals in all chapters helpfully summarize, although occasionally they seem determined by the scheme rather than the actual content: e.g. 'The retainer' (¶208) before 'The client and the slave' (¶212), although the focus of ¶¶208–11 is really 'small-scale private violence'. The paragraphs are all numbered for ease of cross-referencing, but some of the links are rather tenuous (e.g. from ¶209 on violence in Rome's streets to ¶489 dealing with architecture after the great fire). Each chapter reads very well on its own, although perhaps not always at a very introductory level. Much of the strength of the book lies in the way that all its contentions have been instanced and backed from primary sources, including inscriptions: in their preface the editors declare that they aimed 'to provide a very broad intellectual framework for understanding the Roman World . . . and to illustrate and argue from specific evidence'. This they have certainly achieved.

Part I (Ideology, History, and Administration) starts with two chapters outlining

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the history: eighty pages of succinct, sober, but eminently readable narrative and comment take the reader from Iron-Age huts on the Palatine to Actium, and from Augustus and the Julio-Claudians through, with increasing brevity, to A.D. 476; the authors' interests are marked by the opening reference to St Paul's citizenship and the greater space devoted to Romanization than to individual emperors (who are listed in Appendix 1). Chapters 3 and 4 deal with constitutional history in greater detail; the idea of *imperium* leads to detailed consideration of the magistracies, the political career of the nobility, and developments which pointed the way to the principate. Chapter 4 turns to the 'democratic' and 'oligarchic' elements of the 'mixed' constitution, including an excellent account of the working of the senate, and then to the army, *provinciae*, and imperial administration. Inevitably this approach leads to some repetition (e.g. on the *lex Gabinia* in ¶64/152), but allows a faster narrative in Chapters 1 and 2, followed by a coherent, well-structured, and tightly argued analysis in Chapters 3 and 4. Cross-referencing can be seen to advantage here: e.g. from triumphs in ¶121 to Titus' reign in ¶104, Romans and Jews in ¶380, and Titus' arch in ¶485.

Part II (Society and Economy), offering perhaps the most distinctive insights, contains chapters on 'The Life of the City', 'Production and Consumption' and (its authorship unattributed in the list of contributors, which also made no mention of J. himself) 'The Roman Family'. Social life is considered in terms of movement and stability, urban and rural. On the economy, do not expect details of the 'huge ships' (¶269), for instance, or coin denominations, but rather evidence of trade and the availability and impact of coinage on daily life at various social levels. Housing as well as relationships and such things as the legal framework are considered under the family.

Part III (The Roman Mind) starts with a chapter on Roman self-identity, drawing on Cicero and the younger Pliny, and looking at religion, education, attitudes towards other groups, philosophy, and law. The focus is on attitudes to religion more than details of priesthoods, cults, and festivals. The chapter on literature is similarly focused, with valuable sections on publication, composition, and interpretation (by Romans); details of actual Latin (and Greek) authors and their works are found in Appendix 2, where, for example, Horace (nearly a page informatively outlining his life and various works) rubs shoulders with Henry VIII (four lines) and St Jerome (three lines). Chapter 10 surveys Roman art and architecture; the emphasis is more on style and significance than on civil engineering, with the importance of concrete discussed, but little on the arch as such.

Over 100 interesting, and largely less familiar, illustrations further enhance the book: e.g. 6.10, the funerary monument of fish auctioneer L. Calpurnius Daphnus, described in ¶284 and providing, with information from the surviving records of L. Caecilius Jucundus from Pompeii, the specific detail which is so much the style and substance of this book; unfortunately no date is given, even in the Acknowledgements for Illustrations. 7.1 is another striking image (a coin of Caesar showing Aeneas carrying Anchises and holding the Palladium), but it does not match the text of ¶301 'and his young son in his hand'. Some photographs, especially those of wall-paintings like 6.6, suffer from being too dark (and too small and not in colour) for the detail to be appreciated. A few lack sufficient explanation, such as 6.1, an aerial view of the port of Ostia with the city itself disappointingly 'off the photograph'.

The rarity of occasions when an author has nodded (e.g. 'sugar' for 'honey' sweetening Lucretius' 'medicine' [¶1433]) underlines how reliable and careful the text is: a stimulating work of modern scholarship, whose intellectual weight constantly

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

challenges conceptual thought. Any slight blemishes do not significantly detract from the value of a book to which I have warmed, and which will greatly enhance the perspectives of any student of Latin literature.

Oundle PETER BARKER

NO CLIMAX

D. MONTSERRAT: *Sex and Society in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Pp. xi + 238. London and New York: Kegan Paul International, 1996. Cased, £45/$76.50. ISBN: 0-7103-0530-3.

History used to be about politics, war, and great men; although that fashion is reviving, everyday and private life is here to stay, and how more private, one might think, and everyday can one get than sex? Of course, those very assumptions are open to question. As M. says (pp. 13–14), his aim is to study the sexual practices of Roman Egypt as a cultural index: how far, sexually, was the society of Roman Egypt similar to or different from other societies, ancient and modern, how far was it internally homogenous or divided in this respect, and what does all this contribute to our general historical understanding of Roman Egypt? This is serious, original (for Roman Egypt), and potentially important history. M. has extensive knowledge of the texts on papyri and other evidence, and has read widely in the specialist modern literature. The book is a mine of fascinating examples of sexual and other aspects of life in Roman Egypt. Why, then, does it disappoint in its main aim? There is some sloppiness right from the opening 'crise de foi{e}'(?) and bungled Latin (p. xiii), continuing in disjointed and differing analyses of the same text (e.g. pp. 7, 70, 116), sometimes suspect translations or interpretations (e.g. pp. 102, 130–1, 165), and ending with the exaggerated, if not erroneous, claim that erotic art and writings died out with the spread of Christianity (p. 224). More important are the problems posed by the evidence. Although we have thousands of 'private' documents from Roman Egypt, uniquely in the ancient world, few of them are very revealing about personal matters, including sex. This M. recognizes, albeit without further discussion of the implications of the fact. So it is a pity that, while effective use is made of Clement, other Alexandrian authors from Philo onwards are ignored. Sadder still is the underexploitation of archaeological evidence: birthing-stools and rooms are missing where they are needed (pp. 29–31), although the latter are briefly mentioned later (pp. 47–8); the erotic terracotta statuettes produced and found in enormous quantities in Greek and Roman Egypt (e.g. at Naukratis and Athribis, but outside the Delta too) are barely displayed and have no entry in the index. Instead there is recourse to the old trick of filling gaps in the record with nice texts from other periods—a Pharaonic tale, for example, and a late nineteenth-century novel in the case of prostitutes (pp. 114–15, 122)—which destroys any chance of identifying what was specific to Roman Egypt. A connected problem is presentation. M. organizes his study by themes, some trendy ('The Social Body'), some traditional ('Homosexuality'). Apart from intrinsic problems, such as the separation of marriage from other *rites de passage*, this maximizes disappointment because M. constantly has to confess that there is inadequate evidence for his advertised topic. M. is quite right that a holistic perspective is necessary, but he could still have focused on the topics for which there is enough evidence to begin to draw conclusions. What seems to have

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

diverted him is the wish, or perhaps the publisher's requirement, to package his scholarship for a wider prurient readership. Arch asides, naughty frissons and titillating speculations permeate the book (p. 137 provides some classic examples). The question actually asked is the voyeur's 'What was it like for them?' To which, in a few individual cases, we can give an answer of sorts: enough for an entertaining lecture, but not for a book. The main question goes completely unanswered; there is no conclusion, not even a climax. M. could use his knowledge and skills to rewrite this as an unapologetically scholarly attempt to answer his main question. Meanwhile, some useful prolegomena and many interesting references can be extracted from this volume.

King's College London D. W. RATHBONE

HELLENISTIC JUDAISM

L. H. FELDMAN: *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*. Pp. viii + 677. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996. ISBN: 90-04-10418-6.

This collection of previously published articles by one of the most eminent contemporary scholars of the Graeco-Roman Diaspora comes rapidly after F.'s *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* (Princeton, 1993), a book which has attracted much admiration but little support for its optimistic thesis of largely good Jewish–pagan relations in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds or its belief in the resistance of Judaism to outside influences. Many of the same themes and arguments emerge in *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*, although the scope of the new book is much wider, including studies of 'The Influence of Josephus on Cotton Mather's *Biblia Americana*', 'The Jewish Sources of Peter Comestor', and 'Philo's Views on Music'.

Studies in Hellenistic Judaism is not quite such a representative sample of F.'s whole opus as it may appear at first sight. Of the twenty-three papers included, two are from the 1950s and one from the 1960s, but the others are all from 1981 or later, with the most recent having been published elsewhere in 1996. Eleven of the articles deal with Josephus; the others, divided into some rather artificial sections, include discussions of Judaism and Christianity, Jews in Roman literature, and Romans in Jewish literature. Seventy pages of indices greatly increase the accessibility of the contents. A complete bibliography of F.'s publications would have been a welcome addition, even if it would have added substantially to the book's already considerable length.

The scholar cited most often in the 'Index of Modern Scholars' is Menaḥem Stern, confirming the crucial rôle of the three volumes of Stern's *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Jerusalem, 1974–80) for all work on Jews among Greeks and Romans. According to F. in *Jew and Gentile*, p. 124, of the comments by pagans on Jews and Judaism in Stern's collection, 18% are substantially favourable, 59% more or less neutral, and 23% substantially unfavourable. This statement is repeated in no fewer than seven of the articles in *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*; future students of Feldmaniana may be intrigued to find that three of these use a slightly different calculation which makes only 17% of references favourable. F. claims that Christian attacks on Jews and Judaism were much more strident than pagan ones because Judaism was a serious rival to Christianity (p. 316), although elsewhere he seems to see it as a serious competitor to paganism too, through successful proselytizing.

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Another characteristic of the book is the unexpected interpretation of well-known literary passages. 'Josephus, far from exonerating Titus actually admits that Titus was responsible for setting the Temple ablaze' (p. 3). Apion and others who identified the Jews as renegade Egyptians were actually acknowledging the antiquity of the Jews (p.189). The paper entitled 'Is the New Testament Antisemitic?' effectively comes up with the answer 'no'. The misanthropy attributed to the Jews by, for example, Tacitus and Juvenal was also attributed to the Spartans (p. 195), and was therefore not necessarily a bad thing. Tacitus' tenuous association of the Jews with Saturn would have been regarded as complimentary (p. 391). This approach can be taken too far, as when F. suggests (p. 227) that 'the pro-Jewish intimations in the ever-popular Apion' attracted proselytes and sympathizers to Judaism. If Tacitus' description of the Jews' being forced to leave Ethiopia reminded his readers of Dido fleeing from Phoenicia (p. 397), likening the Jews to the Carthaginians would hardly have endeared them to Roman readers.

F. has a fairly high opinion of Josephus' historical reliability: 'our motto should be, I believe, suspect but respect' (p. 6). Josephus was evidently less popular with ancient than modern readers: only one papyrus fragment is known; seven of only eight known Greek manuscripts of *Contra Apionem* go back to a single source and all have a substantial part of the text missing. Sometimes F. sees the circumstances of Josephus' own life affecting his representation of the past: Josephus has mixed feelings about the Hasmoneans because they were the forerunners of the revolutionaries of his own time (pp. 144–5), although he admires Judas Maccabaeus. A detailed discussion of 'The sources of Josephus' *Antiquities*, Book 19' offers some interesting suggestions, and more on Josephus' sources elsewhere would have been welcome.

Rabbinic literature is also defended as a source of historical information: 'I start with the assumption that they [the rabbis] are reliable unless proven otherwise' (p. 28). This is the opposite of the approach led by Jacob Neusner, which rejects the use of rabbinic sources for history; F. deplores this view. Again, F. may have gone as far to one extreme as his opponents have to the other. He cites Talmudic evidence for confirmation of the conversion of upper-class Romans to Judaism (p. 228), but the cases actually mentioned are 'Hadrian's nephew', a senator who wanted to stop the Senate's decree to kill all Jews in the Empire, and Nero (!). When rabbinic writings are used to illustrate attitudes to the Roman Empire and its judicial and taxation systems, or the reactions of visitors to the city of Rome, as in the paper on 'Some Observations on Rabbinic Reaction to Roman Rule in Third Century Palestine', they are more convincing.

Conversely, F. is suspicious of how helpful archaeological and epigraphical evidence is (pp. 30–1). The paper on 'Diaspora Synagogues: New Light from Inscriptions and Papyri', which relies on this sort of evidence, contains some factual errors: Roman officials did not contribute to the synagogue at Berenice in Cyrenaica (p. 585); no Jewish *presbyteroi* are known at Rome (p. 590); more than two rabbis are recorded in inscriptions from Roman Italy (p. 595).

Despite these reservations, the book contains some of the most important recent work on Josephus and on the Jews in the Roman Empire. Most readers will not read it from beginning to end, and therefore will not be irritated by the lack of any adaptation of the articles to their new setting, or by the occasional overlaps and repetitions. Instead, they will be grateful that so many of F.'s publications have been made so readily accessible.

University of Wales, Lampeter DAVID NOY

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CYPRO-ARCHAIC ARCHITECTURAL GRAVE-MONUMENTS

Δ. Χρηστου: *Κυπρου–Αρχαϊκη Μνημειακη Ταφικη Αρχιτεκτονικη*. Pp. xii + 241, 51 pls, 80 figs. *Λευκοσια*: *Τμημα Αρχαιοτητων και Τυπωθηκε στα Τυπογραφεια Προοδος*, 1996. ISBN: 9963-36-422-5.

'I saw hundreds of tombs cut in the rock. . . . They all seem to have been opened, probably centuries ago, and as I said before, are now fast disappearing.' So the American antiquarian L. P. di Cesnola had noted already in discussing the built-tombs at Amathus in *Cyprus*, a general study of the island's antiquities published in 1877. The appearance 120 years later, therefore, of this volume, written by Demos Christou, formerly Director of the Department of Antiquities in Cyprus, is especially to be commended for its careful study of the few Cypriot architectural grave monuments still extant and closely dated within the Cypro-Archaic period.

The author's presentation and methodology are clear. After identifying twenty-seven tombs scattered over ten sites, he describes the monuments and then arranges them in approximate chronological order on the basis of associated finds. This sequence forms the basis for conclusions regarding the typological development of Cypriot tomb-architecture and possible foreign influences.

Throughout, line-drawings and plans accompany the text. The site-maps are especially valuable, since it is not possible in any other reference-work to see immediately the relationship between the necropoleis and the settlements—or what one often simply assumes to have been the original settlements. It is still unfortunately axiomatic to Cypriot archaeology that architectural analyses depend almost entirely on the evidence of the former, in the absence, for the most part, of significant results in the excavation of the latter. Photographs have been gathered together at the end of the volume. The ones in colour are handsomely produced, as are most of the half-tones. A few of these appear blurred, but are nonetheless useful. The illustrations in the final chapter would have benefited from captions additional to their identifying numbers.

Current excavation and survey-work, notably at Amathus, Athienou, Idalion, and Tamassos, will no doubt clarify and refine the architectural development proposed here for the Cypro-Archaic tombs. More extensive comparisons with Cypro-Geometric cemeteries such as the one in Palaepaphos, which continued in later use at least in part, might have been made to elucidate the problem. Furthermore, since it is not possible to establish the chronology of any single monument closely enough within the Cypro-Archaic period, it is best to assume significant chronological overlap between each tomb-type.

It seems unlikely, however, that the typological development was necessarily a linear progression from simple to complex forms. Economic or social circumstance would presumably have played a rôle in determining the construction of a particular tomb-type. But these, as well as other geographical or historical factors, have been largely ignored as mechanisms that potentially explain differing details of tomb-architecture throughout the entire island.

In an attempt to establish the origins of Cypro-Archaic tomb-architecture, the final chapter lists as comparanda rock-cut grave monuments from elsewhere around the Levant, Aegean, and Mediterranean. The geographical range of examples includes sites in Syria, Phrygia, Lydia, and Crete, in addition to Etruria and Sicily further west.

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In a vast chronological sweep, the author takes note of Neolithic and Chalcolithic times, as well as Minoan and Mycenaean graves from Crete, and Iron-Age examples from Asia Minor. But the list seems unduly indiscriminate, as if the contents of the entire trove were of equal value. It is difficult to understand the relevance of examples from the western Mediterranean and items dated to early prehistoric times. It may be correct to suggest that the Cypro-Archaic built-tombs result more from indigenous practice and Aegean contact rather than from Near Eastern influences, but the current absence of comparative material from Syria and Phoenicia roughly contemporary with the Cypriot monuments may well be an accident of excavation, since sites of the eighth, seventh, and even sixth centuries in these areas remain notoriously unexplored.

For the period with which it is concerned, however, C.'s book is excellent and certainly an advance over the earlier compendia of A. Westholm in 1941 and P. Dikaios in 1960. The volume may also be taken as complementary to G. R. H. Wright's larger and more general study of Cypriot architecture published in 1992, in that it provides a more concentrated examination of a particular architectural phenomenon within the island. This book should inspire further work on the architecture of ancient Cyprus, for which detailed monographs with measured drawings and plans are especially needed for all chronological periods.

Groton School A. T. REYES

DOCUMENT RELIEFS

C. L. LAWTON: *Attic Document Reliefs: Art and Politics in Ancient Athens* (Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology). pp. xxi + 167, 96 pls. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995. £65. ISBN: 0-19-814955-7.

L.'s monograph, based on her 1984 Princeton dissertation, is the first complete collection of Attic document reliefs, a genre peculiar to the Classical and (in much reduced numbers) the Hellenistic period. In her introduction, L. gives the history of previous scholarship on the subject, and notes that document reliefs constitute a unique body of securely dated Greek sculpture' (p. 4). She believes that 'they constitute the only genre of Greek art that explicitly and consistently refers to contemporary events in the political sphere'. The necessity of placing these reliefs fully within their historical, political, and artistic context is rightly emphasized by L., and she carries out this promise in an exemplary manner throughout.

Chapter 1 ('The Stelai') discusses the two main categories of document relief, and the conventions applied to their formulae. The earliest certain document relief is of 426/5 B.C. (cat. no. 1), although no. 63 may date to the mid-fifth century. The peak of the type is the mid-fourth century, and the sumptuary law of Demetrios of Phaleron is presumed to have been responsible for the sharp diminution of numbers in the last quarter of the fourth century, although they continue sporadically until the second half of the second century B.C. L. traces the change in recipients of honorary decrees of Athens, from predominantly foreigners working in the interest of Athens in the fifth century to foreign heads of state in the early fourth century and the mid-fourth century concentration on Macedonia. Deme decrees, where traceable, usually concern 'the deme's major cult' (p. 7). The next commonest category covers political and

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

economic agreements—not all of them treaties or alliances—between Athens and foreigners, dating to the mid-fourth century. All the agreements of the fifth century are concerned with the Athenian Empire, those of the first half of the fourth century mainly with reciprocal alliances. L. discusses reliefs relating to accounts and inventories, notably those concerned with treasurers of cults (p. 9).

L. provides a detailed discussion of the physical appearance of the document reliefs, their format ('fairly constant' throughout, although with some development in the addition of pilasters or antae); material (always marble, usually Pentelic, and with only rare use of metal attachments); and polychromy (standardly employed, often for unsculpted elements, and best evident on cat. no. 143). Such details are of inestimable value to students of ancient sculpture where, as on the reliefs, evidence for paint is all too scanty. L. also considers location: document reliefs were placed mostly in sanctuaries, in Athens primarily on the Akropolis; although the place where they were to be set up is specified on several reliefs (e.g. no. 19), the exact original location of most is unknown. Observing that documents which were committed to stone were the exception, original documents being kept on perishable material (p. 27 and n. 116), L. concludes that 'probably the most important reason for publishing these documents in sanctuaries was the propagandistic value they acquired from their presentation as votives' (p. 28).

Chapter 2 ('Iconography') shows that the figures depicted are, in the main, gods, heroes, and personifications of cities, and, where one can tell, they bear a close, often propagandizing, relationship to the contents of the inscriptions. L. disagrees with the common notion that there is a close link between the figures on the document reliefs and known (but lost) statues. Instead, she suggests, the reliefs may derive their figures as much from architectural relief or monumental painting. A detailed survey follows of representations of each deity in turn (the Athena Parthenos occurs six times, alluded to rather than copied), heroes and personifications (both 'civic' and 'place'), mortals, animals, and other symbols.

In Chapter 3 ('Style and Chronology'), L. warns against using document reliefs as close models for tracing the development of contemporary sculpture, stressing that they must be assessed by criteria not necessarily applicable to other sculpture. Her discussion of the process of sculpting a document relief, the distribution of work, and the rôle of the workshop is valuable—particularly intriguing is the unique case of nos. 12 and 13, which are duplicates—but necessarily inconclusive because of the very limited evidence.

The second half of the book is taken up with the catalogue, divided into those reliefs which are securely dated (one-third of the total) and those which are only approximately dated. It consists of 187 entries, each of which is a model of thoroughness. L. describes the material and physical appearance of each relief, along with the measurements not only of the relief fragments but also of the letters. The text of the inscriptions is not given—regrettably, although their inclusion would have considerably lengthened the book—but the contents of each are summarized and discussed in detail, with appropriate parallels and comprehensive bibliography for each entry. Ninety-six plates show all the reliefs in fine photographs (although the typesetting has gone awry on pls 18–22, misplacing the inventory number and date of each piece).

This is a very thorough and approachable study, and will surely remain the standard work on the subject for a long time to come.

King's College London K. W. ARAFAT

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

FOURTH-CENTURY ATHENS

B. HINTZEN-BOHLEN: *Die Kulturpolitik des Euboulos und des Lykurg: Die Denkmäler- und Bauprojekte in Athen zwischen 355 und 322 v. Chr.* (Antike in der Moderne). Pp. 182, 21 pls. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1997. DM 280. ISBN: 3-05-003030-5.

It has long been a matter of regret that Boersma's *Athenian Building Policy* stopped at the end of the Peloponnesian War. R. F. Townsend's dissertation on *Athenian Architectural Activity in the Second Half of the Fourth Century* B.C. has never been published, and an account of building from 355 to 320 is much to be welcomed.

After a brief introduction H.-B. collects, but does not translate, the literary texts which ascribe cultural monuments (buildings but also sculptures) to Euboulos or Lykourgos. Almost half the book then consists of a detailed account of those and of other cultural monuments of the period known only from archaeology (an appendix collects together the bibliography for each monument). The continuous prose accounts of the buildings and sculptures do not give information as accessibly as Boersma's catalogue does, but the discussion is more detailed. H.-B. deals sensibly with controversies, insisting, for instance, independently of the latest work, which appeared too late for her to know it, that Pnyx III must indeed be Lykourgan. H.-B. also picks up on monuments often neglected in the discussion—the Acanthus column at Delphi being the most important example here. Essentially synthesis, with no sign of any input from fieldwork, the accounts are perhaps longer than a summary need be, yet not complete enough to replace the standard publications of the monuments in question. The fourteen figures (mostly plans) are quite inadequate; there is no map of Athens (contrast Boersma) and only two sculptures are illustrated, although H.-B. stresses the inclusion of sculpture as one of the particular features of her account.

The second major chapter is concerned with the interpretation of the archaeological monuments and looks at materials, techniques, building styles, town-planning, and 'style'. H.-B. is good on the way the use of materials in these buildings differs from the use of materials in earlier buildings, stressing the use of conglomerate for foundations, of poros for foundations, walls and, in the Nikias monument, metopes, and of limestone: economy is a mark of these buildings and marble is limited to columns, antae, and the upper parts of buildings. It is in this chapter that the absence of a wider perspective begins to show: H.-B. manages to claim (p. 77) that use of colour-contrasts in buildings begins in this period (ignoring the use of dark stone in the Erechtheion and Propylaia) and (p. 80) that fifth-century architecture was almost wholly a matter of temple building (later she shows herself aware of the pioneering work of fifth-century Athenian architects in stoas).

The final chapter uses the archaeological monuments 'as a mirror of politics', looking first at Euboulos and stressing the way state expenditure was carefully directed, in particular at the Athenian navy (Philo's arsenal, shipsheds), and then at Lykourgos, bringing out the degree to which the monuments of his era were privately funded. In the account of Lykourgos the emphasis falls on religious monuments (compare now R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: a History* [Oxford, 1996], pp. 242–55) and on the building of facilities for the good citizen—enlarged assembly place, training ground for ephebes, stadium, development of theatre. Just as in the discussion of building style, so here H.-B. is able to bring out both ways in which Lykourgos drew upon and imitated his fifth-century predecessors and ways in which he made new developments.

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It is disappointing that the archaeological descriptions and the political interpretations contribute so little to each other. Except for a very interesting discussion of the statues of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides put up in the theatre by Lykourgos (pp. 128–9), the account of Lykourgan and Euboulan politics could virtually have been based on written sources alone. This is partly because the archaeology and the political analysis are too narrowly conceived. We are given scant archaeological or political background, and H.-B. cannot decide whether or not to treat Attica as well as Athens: Eleusis and the Amphiaraon get discussed, but the selection of grave stelai briefly listed but then never further discussed (pp. 62–6) is entirely of monuments from Athens. The (difficult to date) fourth-century building work in Athenian fortifications—at Rhamnous, Phyle, etc.—is ignored.

H.-B. writes within a German scholarly tradition. On general matters only German scholarship is cited, and even on particular monuments recent scholarship in English is missed—the discussions of the statue of 'Demokratia' from the Agora and of the street of the Tripods, for example, would have been transformed had she known W. Coulson et al. (edd.), *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy* (Oxford, 1994) (she cites German publications from 1995). But English scholars, equally inclined to ignore what is written in foreign languages, will benefit from the evidence collected together here.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford ROBIN OSBORNE

FIVE CLASSICAL SCULPTORS

J. J. POLLITT, O. PALAGIA (edd.): *Personal Styles in Greek Sculpture*. (Yale Classical Studies, 30.) Pp. xi + 187, 131 pls. Cambridge, New York, and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1996. £37.50/$59.95. ISBN: 0-521-55187-0.

Adolf Furtwängler's *Meisterwerke des griechischen Plastik* (1893) pervades this collection of essays, intended, as the dust jacket says, 'to identify and evaluate the distinctive styles of five important ancient Greek sculptors whose work is discussed by ancient writers'. In her preface, Olga Palagia characterizes *Meisterwerke* as 'a systematic attempt on a grand scale to recapture the style of the great sculptors by combining the evidence of ancient sources with the vast and anonymous corpus of alleged reproductions preserved in marble statuary and the minor arts'. J. J. Pollitt, in his introduction, significantly entitled 'Masters and Masterworks in the Study of Classical Sculpture', discusses 'resurrecting a particular sculptor's style through the use of literary sources, inscriptions and illustrations on coins and gems in combination with sculptures that are supposedly Roman copies of Greek originals' (p. 1).

These quotations omit surviving originals, and here lies the book's major difficulty. Attempting to assess individual styles inevitably becomes an exercise in *Kopienkritik*, here acknowledged most explicitly in Adolf Borbein's chapter on Polykleitos. The chapter suffers, however, from making only passing references to W. G. Moon (ed.), *Polykleitos, the Doryphoros, and Tradition* (Madison, 1995).

Aileen Ajootian's treatment of Praxiteles brings out the problems inherent in the book's subject. While saying that of fourth-century sculptors, Praxiteles 'is perhaps the most widely recognized as a distinct creative personality' (p. 91), A. acknowledges

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that grounds for assessment are limited, since 'we may learn something about the personal style of Praxiteles' only from the Knidian Aphrodite (p. 99, cf. pp. 127–8). Surprisingly, then, she discusses the Knidian Aphrodite for only five of thirty-eight pages (apparently without access to C. M. Havelock, *The Aphrodite of Knidos and her Successors* [Ann Arbor, 1995]). It is also revealing that she says 'it is really the stylistic features of the Hermes at Olympia that persist in the modern critical tradition as "Praxitelean", rather than those of the Knidian Aphrodite' (p. 109), and spends more time on the Hermes and associated statues than on the Aphrodite. In view of these varied signals, perhaps A.'s conclusion is not unexpected: 'traits we usually consider "Praxitelean" may actually not derive directly from works by the sculptor'. Similarly, Evelyn Harrison refers to 'types *not by Pheidias* which have been influential in the general assessment of his personal style' (p. 64).

Harrison squarely faces the problems arising from Pheidias' acquired status as 'legend' and 'magician-artist' (p. 16 and n. 1), occasionally noting where we *cannot* deduce Pheidias' personal style (e.g. pp. 37–8, 48, 51), culminating in 'it is beyond the scope of this discussion to guess, which is all one can do, how the personal style of Pheidias may have been expressed in the Zeus and its appurtenances' (p. 60). A tone somewhere between apologetic and helpless regularly occurs in the book, and reveals the inherent difficulty of the topic. Here the reader may miss a detailed discussion (ideally in Pollitt's introduction) of the rôle of the patron. Harrison sensibly notes that 'the iconography of the Amazons on the [Parthenos] shield is not the free invention of Pheidias alone but must have been approved as part of the political program for the Parthenon as a whole' (p. 48). This principle should be considered for all commissioned art.

Ajootian and Harrison attempt explicitly and consistently to answer the question set by the editors. Other chapters vary. Borbein's on Polykleitos is essentially, as noted, an exercise in *Kopienkritik*. Charles Edwards's posthumous chapter on Lysippos aims 'to define the contribution of Lysippos of Sikyon to the development of Greek sculpture', rather than to assess Lysippos' personal style. It would be churlish to assess it in the same terms as the other essays. However, the absence of the Poulydamas base is particularly unfortunate, not only because it is the nearest we have to a Lysippan original, but also because it would have provided useful comparison with the Praxitelean Mantinea base (pp. 122–4).

The final chapter, Petros Themelis's on Damophon, also appears not to have been commissioned for this book, being a broader version of his paper in K. Sheedy (ed.), *The Archaeology of the Peloponnese* (1994) in a different translation. Comparing the two versions shows some important changes: on p. 155, the temple 'of Messene' was previously 'apparently of Messene'; the adoption of the name 'Asklepieion' is here Neronian but previously probably Tiberian; p. 158, cat. 3, previously anonymous, is now identified as Machaon. There are several other such examples, few explained.

In terms of the present book, Themelis's is the most successful chapter because it deals with originals, found at Messene and identified through Pausanias, and because Themelis writes with the authority of the excavator. Here, at last, are genuine manifestations of a personal style: 'lips are full in a small mouth with dimples on both sides—a Damophonian characteristic common in most of the Lykosoura heads and the head of Apollo from Messene' (p. 158); 'the stylistic affinity of this foot . . . with the sandaled left foot of Artemis . . . is striking' (p. 161), etc. An important point is implicit in cat. 1 (p. 162), identified as Damophon's Herakles on '*technical* and stylistic criteria' (my italics; cf. p. 166). Technical criteria above all are lost in Roman copies,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

especially when we do not know the material of the original statue (e.g. the Athena Lemnia, p. 52).

Themelis's chapter points up the difficulties in other chapters of assessing personal styles, which lead to a much wider approach than the title of the book implies. Indeed, each chapter (above all, Harrison's on Pheidias) may be highly recommended as a thorough, well-documented introduction to the life and works of each sculptor. Had the book been entitled 'Five Classical Sculptors', *vel sim.*, the reader would have known what to expect. But the thematic coherence of the book is limited, and the impression of a half-hearted attempt is reinforced by the absence of a concluding chapter, index, or consolidated bibliography. There are no cross-references between chapters, and some significant inconsistencies, e.g. Ajootian's apparent unawareness (p. 107) of Themelis's dating of the cult group for Lykosoura (p. 170; it is also symptomatic that the place name is inconsistently spelled). One is also left wondering why these five sculptors. The editors twice cite George Despinis's work on Agorakritos (pp. ix, 15). Understandably, Despinis declined to contribute to this volume because his published work has already covered the ground; but his inclusion would have enhanced this volume, primarily by bringing more originals to the debate. Without them, as the book demonstrates, true assessment of a sculptor's personal style is unfeasible.

King's College London K. W. ARAFAT

APULIAN POTTERY STUDIES

A. CAMBITOGLOU, M. HARARI: *The Italiote Red-figured Vases in the Museo Camillo Leone at Vercelli*. (Studia Archaeologica, 85.) Pp. 55, 52 pls. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1997. Cased. ISBN: 88-7062-964-3.

G. SEMERARO: *ἐν νησί: Ceramica greca e società nel Salento arcaico.* (Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche—Università degli Studi di Lecce: Beni Archeologici—Conoscenza e Tecnologie, Quaderno 2.) Pp. 452, 302 text-figs. Lecce, Bari: Martano-Edipuglia, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 88-7228-198-9.

In the first and slighter volume listed above, two experienced operators bring their considerable knowledge of Italiote red-figured vases to bear on 35 unprovenanced pieces (29 Apulian, six Campanian) acquired by a nineteenth-century Piedmontese collector. It is freely admitted that '[o]n the whole the collection does not include vases that are remarkable either stylistically or iconographically' (p. 7). Nevertheless, as the *oeuvre* of the late A. D. Trendall taught us (*BICS* 41 [1996], 1–30), the value of attributing even unremarkable specimens to individual hands is not in doubt: the present work achieves this in the approved manner, and deftly incorporates the new insights thus obtained into the ongoing (and never-ending) revision of *RVAp* and *LCS*. Each piece is properly illustrated, and it is good to learn that all these vases have been newly cleaned and restored in the process. It remains to note that the only 'important' vase in Vercelli has already been published elsewhere: the column-krater depicting Achilles and Troilos (cat. no. 1: *c.* 420–10), attributed to the Apulian Painter of the Berlin Dancing Girl and discussed at length by C. in relation to other

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

representations of the same characters in Italiote vase-painting (*Studies in Honour of T. B. L. Webster* II [Bristol, 1988], pp. 1–21; see too S. Steingräber, *Etruscan Painting* [New York, 1987], p. 350, where their appearance *c.* 530 in the Tomb of the Bulls at Tarquinia is identified as the only clear instance of a Greek story in Archaic tomb-painting there).

The first two words in S.'s title are Hesiod's (*Op.* 634). They are well chosen to herald a study of the pottery imported during the Archaic period from the Greek world to Messapia: in the crucial years between *c.* 600 and *c.* 480, a great many ships must have reached the harbours of the Sallentine peninsula, situated *ad discrimen Ionii et Hadriatici maris* (Pliny, *NH* 3.100), and hence a significant meeting place for the eastern and western sectors of the Mediterranean as a whole. No Greek colonies were founded there, which means that S.'s task is the daunting one of assessing the nature and social effects of the changing priorities in foreign contacts, relationships, and exchanges enjoyed by the resident native communities.

This is far from easy. A series of major excavations conducted over the last three decades has left us with the indelible impression that these vicissitudes were more complex than they appear from the ancient written sources (English readers can catch up with the story so far in the splendid bilingual report on the Australian excavations near Salve: J.-P. Descœudres and E. Robinson, *La 'Chiusa' alla Masseria del Fano* [Lecce, 1993]; cf. S. pp. 103–7). At the same time, the database selected for analysis here, namely the incidence of Archaic Greek pottery on thirty sites in Messapia, suffers from all the problems inherent in the interpretation of archaeological distribution maps everywhere: not only the 'aree vuote' (p. 311) that have not yet been reached even by the indefatigable Francesco D'Andria and his colleagues and pupils (of whom S. is one) at the University of Lecce, but also the 'caratteri di fortissima asistematicità' (p. 403) that are the inevitable concomitant of (literally) differing breadth and depth in excavation on those sites that have been investigated. The fact remains that there is now significantly more evidence than there has ever been for what happened, and why, in the period and area considered. Any attempt at analysis requires two qualities above all: the ability to identify and attribute the ceramic material correctly; and a willingness to adopt new data-processing methodologies (cf. S., *Archeologia e Calcolatori* 1 [1990], pp. 111–63). Fortunately for us all, S. possesses both qualities in abundance, along with the strength of mind to accept that she has not said the last word on her chosen subject, and that no-one ever will.

That said, the *passo avanti* achieved by this admirable monograph is considerable: and there can be no going back now. The Catalogue of contexts and material is rightly accorded most space (pp. 35–307). Arranged in alphabetical order of site, from Alezio to Vaste, it contains 1172 entries arranged internally by individual context and, within each context, by category: Corinthian; Laconian; Attic b.f., r.f., and black glaze; *anfore commerciali*; Chalcidian; East Greek; black glaze; banded ware. It should be noted that three sites account for two-thirds (782) of the total number of *schede*: Cavallino (101; pp. 49–67), Oria (576; pp. 134–236), and Vaste (105; pp. 287–307); and that the number of actual *reperti* used in the two chapters of statistical elaboration (pp. 309–400) is estimated at *c.* 11,000 (p. 9; p. 323, fig. 261a). Space does not permit detailed comment: suffice it to say that the Catalogue is a mine of useful and reliable information in its own right, not only on individual pieces but also on the contexts and categories to which they belong; and that everything worth illustrating is accorded either an excellent line-drawing or a good photograph. Of the conclusions (or rather 'linee di tendenze': pp. 401–12), by far the most interesting are those based on the correlation of category of material with type of site (settlement, cult place, or

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cemetery). Here too summary is difficult, but we can now see in detail that there is far more to the story of Greek–native relations in Messapia than eventual violent conflict with Taranto (Hdt. 7. 170): this fascinating study offers us a much wider picture of the intricate processes of culture contact and culture change within which such conflict could come about.

In their very different ways, these two books demonstrate that lasting progress in archaeology still depends on the meticulous study of material no less than on excavation and survey. While old collections rightly (or wrongly: but inevitably) continue to have an honoured place in our thinking, the application of the traditional methods of classification and attribution to provenanced material can be profitable in a very different way, and one that is entirely compatible with new methods and new priorities.

University of Edinburgh DAVID RIDGWAY

CVA: GB 18

E. MOIGNARD: *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, Great Britain, Fascicule 18*: *The Glasgow Collections: The Hunterian Museum; the Glasgow Museum and Art Gallery, Kelvingrove; the Burrell Collection*. Pp. 54, 60 b & w pls. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. Cased, £55. ISBN: 0-19-726168-X.

This is M.'s second Scottish *CVA* fascicule, and follows the convenient format established by her Edinburgh volume (GB 16, 1989), with plates bound in with the text; she has again worked with the photographer Robert Wilkins, this time assisted by Jenny Lowe. The fascicule covers Greek and Italian vases from the three major Glasgow collections, all of which 'are of interest as examples of individual taste and accidents of acquisition'. The contents of the Hunterian Museum began life as the private collection of physician William Hunter (d. 1783), becoming the property of Glasgow University in 1807, since when it has been much enlarged, most recently benefiting from the dispersal of the Wellcome Collection (1981). The civic art gallery and museum at Kelvingrove includes the largest group of Sicilian red-figure vases in Britain, collected by industrialist James Stevenson while working in the Lipari islands and left to the city in 1885. Sir William Burrell's vases were more deliberately acquired, mostly being added to his collection in the last ten years of his life (d. 1958). Despite the collections' backgrounds, the range they cover between them is wide, if uneven; the Hunterian and Burrell Collections have a particularly good selection of Attic black figure, which coincides nicely with M.'s own specialist interests. As M. points out, all three collections include some notable pieces not previously published, and many more which have not received the attention they merit.

The three collections are treated in a single sequence, in the conventional divisions of fabric and shape. M. has not followed the system adopted by Dyfri Williams in the last British *CVA* volume (GB 17, 1993) of giving each vase a running number, but simply follows the plate numbers through, which seems the most economical approach; drawings are helpfully incorporated into the text rather than being in a separate sequence of figures. Each entry gives details of previous owner and bibliography, where applicable, followed by a meticulously detailed but concise

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

description of the piece (unlike the rather more discursive comments of Williams's volume), ending with a note of any added colours, a date, and any attribution; helpful comparanda are frequently provided, as with the Edinburgh volume. Cross-section drawings show the construction of twenty-three of the vases, and half a dozen graffiti. The plates are of the usual good standard; it is a pity that details of a single vase are not always shown together on one plate, but this is doubtless due to practicalities of space.

The remit of *CVA* fascicules is of course to offer description rather than interpretation, and M. has for the most part kept strictly to this, only occasionally characterizing a whole scene, e.g. 'Departure of hunter', 'Conversation piece' (pl. 28, A and B), 'Komos' (pl. 27.1–5, A); I could not help feeling that a little more such help with the iconography might be useful in a few cases. An example which appealed to my own particular interests is the scene on the only Attic red-figure alabastron in the Burrell collection (pl. 31.8–11). This includes a number of iconographic clues suggestive of wedding preparations in progress—the central woman wears a conspicuously embroidered veil, holds a sandal (one of a pair of *nymphides*?), and is surrounded by signs of her womanhood *(kalathos* for wool-working, alabastron for perfume, jewellery box), while an attendant woman and young girl seem to be urging her towards a decorated door, the girl holding a torch in one hand and a fillet or belt in the other, and yet M. studiously avoids any mention of weddings in her description. Some reference to J. H. Oakley and R. H. Sinos's *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* (Wisconsin, 1993) would assist understanding of the iconography, even if not providing any close parallels in terms of shape and date (cf. especially pyxis, London E774, figs. 32–5).

Any such criticism, however, is more of the genre than of this particular instance. M.'s eye for detail can hardly be faulted, and is matched by a lucid style of description which is easy to follow even for details which cannot be seen in the photographs. I am glad to have been introduced to pieces of such quality and interest as the East Greek head vase (pl. 3. 1–3), the pair of Attic black-figure amphorae showing Theseus and the Minotaur (pl. 12.1–2 and 3–4), the Nikosthenic amphora (pl. 14), and the Sicilian calyx krater with phlyax scene (pl. 46), to single out just a few examples. This fine volume should go a long way towards making the Glasgow collections as well known as they clearly deserve to be.

University of Wales, Lampeter EMMA J. STAFFORD

THE ALEXANDER MOSAIC

A. COHEN: *The Alexander Mosaic: Stories of Victory and Defeat* (Studies in Classical Art and Iconography). Pp. xiv + 279, 100 half-tones, 13 colour plates. Cambridge, New York, and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1997. £45/$60. ISBN: 0-521-56339-9.

Subject-matter, scale, and technique combine to make the Alexander Mosaic an impressive work of art by any standard. Its depiction of a battle scene teeming with detail and human interest, through the medium of millions of tiny tesserae across a vast canvas, makes for an arresting image and gives the viewer plenty to contemplate. Its fascination is further enhanced by its intriguing history, its double life: the mosaic itself is a late-second-century B.C. floor decoration from the 'House of the Faun' at

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pompeii, but it is generally accepted that it is a copy of a Hellenistic painting from the late fourth century, and it is one of the strengths of the present study that it endeavours to do justice to both these 'levels of existence'.

The first three chapters deal with matters preliminary to detailed analysis of the mosaic's content. C.'s general approach, outlined in Chapter 1, is that of an art historian, less concerned with the positivist questions traditionally posed about the mosaic, more interested in the mosaic as a construct which 'presents not a battle, but the interpretation of one. It does not duplicate a pre-existent reality, but on the basis of one, it creates its own' (p. 18). She is particularly concerned to avoid 'narrativizing the image' through importation of unwarranted assumptions from literary sources. From this perspective, the mosaic is 'not historical in the strict sense of the word but historical in a poetic sense, . . . present[ing] a generalizing and universalizing history' (p. 22). Chapter 2 places the mosaic in the context of Greek (and Roman) representations of warfare, highlighting both the influence of tradition in terms of the duel (here, Alexander versus Darius) and the mosaic's novelty in terms of its realism and attention to detail. C. does not challenge the assumption that the mosaic is an accurate copy of an early Hellenistic painting, but she is keen that this not simply be taken for granted, and therefore sets out in Chapter 3 a wide range of forceful supporting arguments.

Chapter 4, the longest and in many ways the central chapter of the book, takes up the interpretation of the mosaic in its 'first level of existence', as a reproduction of an early Hellenistic painting. C. argues against approaches which privilege the ancient textual sources over the mosaic itself, most obviously by trying to make the mosaic's content 'fit' the literary accounts of Alexander's battles in one way or another; the mosaic should instead be 'read' on its own terms. Many of the individual arguments she adduces in support of this view are persuasive. C. highlights difficulties arising from attempts to identify patron and painter on the basis of Pliny's attribution of a famous painting of one of Alexander's battles to Philoxenus of Eretria working at the behest of Cassander (pp. 14–15, 138–42), while the futility of trying to attach names to particular individuals in the mosaic (other than Alexander and Darius) is well argued (pp. 92–3). Despite the dust jacket's describing the cover illustration as 'Mosaic showing the Battle of Issus', C. argues (in my view, successfully) against the mosaic's representing a specific battle from Alexander's campaign, appealing (among other things) to interesting analogies from more recent history. Rather, the mosaic 'distill[s] a number of battles and resorts to its own fictitious, albeit well-informed, account of the essence of what happened' (p. 136). C. sees that essence as comprising 'text' (Alexander's power) and 'subtext' (sympathetic portrayal of Darius and the defeated), the latter reflecting Alexander's adoption of a more favourable attitude towards Persian kingship and culture after Gaugamela (pp. 119–23).

There is much good sense in all this, but I did have reservations about some elements of C.'s analysis. Constraints of space restrict me to two examples. C. sets up a contrast between the noble Darius of the mosaic and the cowardly Darius of the literary sources (pp. 91, 202), but in her eagerness to disengage the mosaic from the texts, she has oversimplified the picture of Darius presented in written accounts of the battles. While Arrian undoubtedly portrays Darius as a coward at Issus and Gaugamela, the vulgate tradition shows him remaining in the thick of the fighting until his life is directly threatened and only then escaping from the battlefield, with, moreover, incidental circumstantial detail in Arrian actually lending support to the vulgate view (cf. Bosworth, *Historical Commentary on Arrian* 1 (Oxford, 1980), pp. 215–16, 307–8). I was also unconvinced by C.'s challenging the traditional reading

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the mosaic as epitomizing a reversal of fortune (*peripeteia*) on the basis that 'we do not know that things were going well for [the Persians] a moment ago' (p. 90—part of her polemic against 'narrativization'). Granted that the mosaic does not depict a specific battle and that we must beware of importing information from the literary sources, there were nevertheless only two battles at which both Alexander and Darius fought, and at the outset of both the Persians enjoyed overwhelming numerical superiority; background knowledge of such a basic sort must have been widely known in antiquity and been brought to bear in ancient viewers' reading of the picture.

Chapter 5 proposes viewing the mosaic as an example of a 'dramatic' image lying midway between the two poles of 'narrativity' and 'iconicity'. But while some elements of the ensuing discussion were enlightening, I did not find this approach as a whole advanced my appreciation or understanding of the mosaic greatly, and similarly with the next chapter, on the relationship of 'the narrative and the descriptive' (where the brief allusion to gender issues [p. 174] misses the opportunity to engage with Andrew Stewart's recent reading of the mosaic in terms of sexual domination [*Faces of Power* (Berkeley, etc., 1993), pp. 142–4]).

The final chapter shifts the focus to Pompeii and sets what is known about the character and ownership of the 'House of the Faun' against Hellenization in Italy during the second century B.C., with a view to arriving at some sense of the mosaic's significance in its Pompeian context. Various avenues of enquiry are intelligently explored, but in the absence of more detailed contextual data, C. is reluctantly left with the less-than-startling conclusion that the mosaic was primarily a way of displaying social prestige in Pompeian society. (The schematic summary of all the figural mosaics recovered from the 'House of the Faun' [Figure 81, p. 196] is a valuable feature here.)

Overall, C.'s pursuit of alternative approaches sometimes results in only limited gains or even, on occasion, proves counter-productive, but her critique of positivist approaches and assumptions of the past is welcome and is complemented by many valuable insights of her own.

University of Wales, Lampeter A. D. LEE

ATHENIAN LAMPS

A. KARIVIERI: *The Athenian Lamp Industry in Late Antiquity* (Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens). Pp. ii + 328, 39 figs, 56 pls. Helsinki: Finnish Institute at Athens, 1996. Paper, 300 FIM. ISBN: 951-95295-X.

This long-awaited study reviews, updates, and broadens what has hitherto been our main reference publication, J. Perlzweig-Binder's 1961 study of the Roman lamps from the Athenian Agora. K.'s catalogue includes a selection of about 300 lamps, mainly from the Agora and Kerameikos excavations, out of a corpus of 6000 which has been studied (including material from the Athenian Agora, Kerameikos, Isthmia, Corinth, and other smaller collections). This selection forms the basis for examination of the organization and working methods of Athenian lamp production in late antiquity, and for evaluation of its place within the broader framework of

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contemporary lamp workshops, with particular reference to the Corinthian lamp industry. K. is fully aware of the limitations of such a study (p. 41), imposed by the vast amount of scattered or unpublished material in museum storerooms.

The book is organized into eight chapters. The first comprises a review of scholarship, summarizing the major Athenian lamp publications to date (which are also K.'s main reference sources). A useful update of technical information on lamp parts and manufacture follows (Chapter II), revising information on plaster and clay moulds (pp. 22–3), lamp prototypes (pp. 21–2), and production of copies (pp. 24–5), as well as details of decoration and finishing, including workshop signatures (pp. 25–30). A rather short but necessary synthesis of the main Roman lamp industries of late antiquity is made in Chapter III, focusing on workshops in Corinth, Asia Minor, and North Africa (pp. 31–9). A discussion of the quantity, provenance, contexts, and classification of the material is given in Chapter IV, together with an overview of the major periods of lamp production in Athens from the third to the seventh century A.D. K. reviews the main scholarly arguments which surround the complex question of the enormous expansion of the Athenian lamp industry during the third century A.D. (pp. 44–7). She attributes the contemporary decline of Corinthian lamps partly to their inferior quality and partly to an increase in the number of lamp-makers in Athens, many of whom may have come from Corinth. At the same time, she does not rule out the economic prosperity of Athens as a university town (p. 45). Along with the historical overview of late Roman Athenian lamp industry, the author discusses some characteristic deposits from Athens and Corinth upon which her later analysis is essentially based. The discussion of lamp production from the late fifth century A.D. onwards involves the closure of earlier workshops and the identification of new ones, with discussion of their locations, production, and influence. An iconographical survey of the material follows (Chapter V), beginning with the disc patterns which are presented according to subject-matter. Rim and nozzle decoration, together with descriptions of different types of handles, bases, and signatures, are also discussed with reference to their chronological development.

There is a complete list of Athenian workshops in alphabetical order in Chapter VI, where the laborious job of updating former bibliographical records has been successfully achieved. Each shop is presented together with its decorative repertoire, and within its chronological and geographical framework. The study of the latter, however, is considerably limited by the restricted use of Greek bibliography. The following chapter (VII), which represents more than one-third of the book, includes the catalogue. The entries are efficiently treated and are arranged alphabetically according to disc decoration. Full and good quality photographs and drawings have been used throughout, making the catalogue pleasant to follow. Although none of the major lamp publications is missing from the references, these are heavily mainland-Greece based, while certain areas, such as the Aegean islands (with the exception of Delos), which are most published in Greek excavation reports, are rarely included among the comparative material of the catalogue. This is also evident in the rather short last chapter (VIII),which discusses the distribution of late Roman lamps and the organization of their industry and trade. The discussion of the latter is accompanied by maps indicating the main production centres. Issues concerning the authorized or unauthorized copying of Athenian exported lamps in Roman provinces (pp. 276–7), comparison of local lamp production in a variety of regions with Athenian imports (pp. 274–5), and also the mechanisms of the organization of this industry with particular reference to Roman brick production (pp. 273–4) offer

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interesting insights into the place and significance of the lamp industry in late antiquity.

The list of technical terms and conventions, as well as the discussion of working methods in a workshop, are valuable contributions to the subject, and to my knowledge the first extensive contributions published in English, following the earlier studies of French scholars. The updated index of the Agora deposits which appear at the end of the book provides firm ground for the chronological treatment of this and any future study on late Roman lamps. On the whole, K. has indeed accomplished a massive task of reconciling the existing bodies of published Roman lamp typologies with large—though surely not exhaustive—amounts of unpublished material. Her comparative, *in situ* examination of the material from the major late Roman lamp workshops has resulted in the compilation of a sound reference book for late Roman Athenian lamps.

Royal Holloway, London EVA PARISINOU

ETRUSCAN TOMBS

L. CAVAGNARO VANONI: *Tombe tarquiniesi di età ellenistica: Catalogo di ventisei tombe a camera scoperte dalla Fondazione Lerici in località Calvario*. (Studia Archaeologica, 82). Pp. 402, 69 pls, 126 figs. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1996. ISBN: 88-7062-920-1.

Between 1966 and 1977 the Fondazione Lerici identified over 1300 tombs in the Monterozzi cemetery at Tarquinia using remote sensing techniques. This remarkable labour was in the vanguard of the use of non-intrusive methods in Italian archaeology. Figure 1, the general plan, gives some indication of the scale of the task involved. It is unfortunate that no adequate account of the survey methodology is provided. It would have been interesting to compare today's practices with those used when remote sensing was a novelty.

A sample of 112 tombs was excavated. The present volume publishes the contents of twenty-six tombs, of which all but six were robbed. The remaining tombs or associated groups of tombs all contained Etruscan red-figure pottery. Inevitably, most of the material is fragmentary. The action of tomb-robbers has further confused matters by mixing the contents of different tombs. Add to this the Etruscan practice of reusing tombs, often over long periods of time, and the density of tombs in the cemetery, and some idea of the complexity of the archaeological record emerges. The bulk of the material dates to the later fourth to second centuries B.C., but many of the tombs had later phases of use—some extending into the first century A.D.

The book's primary focus, and its strongest feature, is the publication of the artefacts (mainly ceramics) from the tombs. However, for each tomb there is a location map and a useful discussion of its form and dimensions. Plans and sections, combined in many cases with photographs of the chambers, provide further information on the context from which the artefacts originate. This information derives mainly from the site records, as most of the tombs have now been backfilled.

The artefacts are treated at length, with full discussion of their typology and comparanda. All the reconstructable artefacts are illustrated. The cataloguing of the

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

artefacts is meticulous, as is the indexing. Less satisfactory is the de-contextualization of some other aspects of the funerary assemblage. The worked-stone artefacts—mainly fragments of sarcophagus lids and sarcophagi—are treated in a separate appendix. Sarcophagi are as much a part of the original deposition as funerary offerings and the tomb itself. Likewise, the few previously unpublished inscriptions are treated in a separate appendix. While there is a place for a full discussion of the epigraphy and linguistic aspects, which may deserve a separate appendix, surely one must see the inscriptions as an integral part of the original tomb. The inscriptions are most meaningful in their original context, while the grave assemblage is incomplete when discussed without the inscriptions. Perhaps the worst example of this kind of problem is Tomb 5512, which is a painted tomb with inscriptions. The paintings and inscriptions have each been published separately elsewhere, so only a brief, unillustrated account is given here. Thus, the tomb's form and artefactual content are entirely divorced from the paintings and inscriptions. On its own, none of the publications can provide a full account of the surviving parts of the original funerary assemblage.

More problems exist with treatment of the human bones. Most of the tombs lack skeletal material. However, the six intact tombs produced nine inhumations and five cremations. No full account of the physical anthropology is offered, but brief information is provided. What is surprising is the level of detail. All five cremations are sexed. The sexing of complete skeletons is not without its problems; the sexing of cremations is usually all but impossible. No information is supplied on how these sex attributions were obtained. For the whole skeletons we have estimates of stature in eight cases. These are given in centimetres, with an accuracy to two decimal places. Estimates of stature may be obtained by a number of different formulae, but none produce this level of precision except in a purely arithmetical sense. More surprising are the estimates of the age at death. In the case of five inhumations estimates of the age at death are given not just to a precise year but to a specific number of months. Thus, the occupant of Tomb 6100, for example, is said to be an adult male, of 171.44 cm in height, who died aged 45 years and 3 months. Most physical anthropologists are extremely wary of ascribing exact ages to skeletons, normally preferring age ranges. If there is some basis for this level of accuracy, then it must be explicitly stated. These problems perhaps derive from some confusion in the original site records, but this is hardly an excuse.

The cemeteries of Tarquinia are vital for our understanding of Etruscan culture. The Hellenistic period presents fascinating and complex problems connected with the assimilation of Roman culture, before and after the conquest. Sadly, no discussion of how this material contributes to our attempt to unravel these complexities is offered. Similarly, there is no discussion of how this material casts new light on Etruscan funerary ritual. Instead the volume contents itself with being simply a catalogue of finds.

Despite the criticisms discussed above, one should not lose sight of the important body of data published here. Making these data available contributes to our knowledge of Hellenistic Tarquinia and will provide useful comparanda for other archaeologists in the field. As purely a catalogue of the artefacts from the twenty-six tombs under discussion, the volume has little to fault it, but it could have been much more.

Royal Holloway, London EDWARD HERRING

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ETRUSCAN ARCHITECTURAL PAINTING

A. NASO: *Architetture dipinte. Decorazioni parietali non figurate nelle tombe a camera dell'Etruria meridionale (VII–V sec. a. C.)*. (Bibliotheca Archaeologica, 18.) Pp. 497, 313 figs, 20 col. pls. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1996. L. 500,000. ISBN: 88-7062-929-5.

This is the first study ever made of the painted architectural decoration of Etruscan tombs. Of the nearly 300 examples considered here, hardly more than a third appeared in S. Steingräber's indispensable 1986 *Catalogue of Etruscan Wall Painting*; and nearly all the others were totally or virtually unpublished. This situation justifies the emphasis given to the catalogue, which precedes the analysis devoted to the interior architecture of the chambers and to the individual structural elements picked out in paint (beams and rafters, gables, door-frames, etc.); brief conclusions are followed by *Addendum*, abbreviations, bibliography, and indexes.

The area covered in the catalogue (Chapter 1, pp. 17–297), limited by the boundaries of modern Southern Etruria, is divided into five sections: Veii (five tombs grouped in three entries for the city, and one in its territory: pp. 17–28); Caere (fifty tombs in thirty-six entries, and nine in seven entries for the territory: pp. 29–183); Tarquinia (196, plus one in the territory: pp. 183–224); Vulci (three tombs, plus two in the territory) together with Tuscania (nine tombs in three entries) and the Volsinian territory (part; three entries); and finally nine sites which could not be fully documented ('Segnalazioni', pp. 243–97). Apart from Section 3 (Tarquinia), all entries are arranged in chronological order within their subsections, and each contains full description, date, bibliographical and/or archival references, and abundant (mostly new) illustrations: ample general information is provided for the less familiar sites and cemeteries, with a number of maps. All these features would be enough on their own to give the book an enduring reference value over and above the specific subject of the investigation.

The tombs at Tarquinia are arranged in alphabetical and numerical order, and their descriptions are drastically abbreviated. This differential treatment depends on practical considerations; but it also demonstrates unequivocally the focus, and indeed the major interest and novelty of N.'s book, which is essentially concerned with defining the rôle of Caere as regards the beginning and early diffusion, at least from the Middle Orientalizing period, of the practice of decorating with painting the interior of the funerary chambers—an art not attested at Tarquinia before the early decades of the sixth century.

Chapter 2 (funerary architecture: pp. 301–40) updates the classification achieved over twenty years ago by F. Prayon (*Frühetruskische Grab- und Hausarchitektur*, 1975): besides the early corridor type, single-chamber tombs are assigned to one type, while eight different types are identified for the multi-chamber examples (which are virtually absent at Tarquinia). In Chapter 3 (pp. 343–424) the painted decorations are examined, from the ceiling to the walls and the carved furniture, with ample discussion of the original wooden structures of the real buildings above ground—essentially houses—they are meant to reproduce. Here, special attention is paid to selected topics, notably the representation of gables with their varied types of *columen* supports (subsection 3.1.5: pp. 368–94), for which the simple assimilation to altar forms is rejected, and their progressive transformation into purely decorative motifs is noted. The quest for origins and parallels, for this as for other aspects of both architecture and decorations, ranges widely from Italy to the Aegean and Anatolia.

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The conclusions that emerge from the analysis (Chapter 4, pp. 427–31) are worth summarizing. In Italy, the practice of decorating the funerary chambers with paintings, both figured and structural, started at Caere in the second quarter of the seventh century, in parallel with the spectacular achievements there of a funerary architecture (and sculpture) which obviously reflected developments above ground in the city of the living. By the end of the century, the use seems to be common at Caere, also spreading south to Veii and to the north touching Vulci (where an independent local school is at work), as well as various centres of the hinterland (from San Giuliano to Bisenzio). In the first half of the following century there are no examples at Veii, more in the Caeretan area (including Tolfa), and some at Tarquinia as well. From the last quarter of the sixth century the latter city becomes the undisputed leading centre of the art, which tends now to decline at Caere and to be abandoned altogether in the rest of Southern Etruria. For N., all architectural painting disappears (except at Tarqinia) during the fourth century, and is replaced by the wave pattern. This last diagnosis concerns a period and a set of problems that are clearly alien to the core of the present research, but deserve nonetheless—together with the whole corpus of the *Tarquinian* paintings down to the Hellenistic period —their own independent analysis, which could show *inter alia* how the wave pattern (already attested in the fifth century) itself represents a type of architectural decoration, often associated with (false) doors and other 'traditional' architectural elements, and meant to emphasize the lower part (dado) of the walls rather than their top and ceiling. At the other end of the sequence, incidentally, I regret N.'s decision (explained in the introduction, pp. 11–14) to exclude from the catalogue the Tombs of the Ducks (earlier than any at Caere) and Campana at Veii, and of the Painted Animals and Painted Lions at Caere.

I have already alluded to the great reference value of this work, well supported by the tightly structured organization of both the catalogue and the analytical chapters. It is a pity that the publisher was not able to devise clearer typographical distinctions (such as differentiated layout and fonts) between the various sections, subsections, individual entries, and accessory lists of N.'s long and complex study. Much would have been gained, too, if the illustrations had been collected together at the end, with fuller captions. Even so, it is warmly to be hoped that the general and particular results of this investigation will soon be absorbed in new syntheses concerning ancient (and not exclusively pre-Roman) Italy and the Etruscans.

University of Edinburgh F. R. SERRA RIDGWAY

IMPERIAL WOMEN AS GODDESSES

T. MIKOCKI: *Sub Specie Deae. Les impératrices et princesses romaines assimilées à des déesses. Étude iconologique*. (*RdA* Suppl. 14.) Pp. 311, 37 pls. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1995. L. 750,000. ISBN: 88-7689-111-0.

The rôle of women in Roman society has received increasing attention of late, but the physical representation of deification and divine honouring of the women related to the imperial family has hitherto had no comprehensive treatment. M.'s 1988 dissertation, revised and expanded in 1995, has changed this. Individual empresses have been dealt with (e.g. F. Ghedini, *Giulia Domna tra Oriente e Occidente. Le*

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

fonti archeologiche [Rome, 1984]), or individual gods (e.g. S. Ritter, *Hercules in der römischen Kunst. Von Anfangen bis Augustus.* Archäologie und Geschicht 5 [Heidelberg, 1995] or B. S. Spaeth, *The Roman Goddess Ceres* [Austin, 1996]), but here we are presented with a monograph that attempts to present the available material evidence on the subject of divine assimilation of all the women related to the imperial family from the time of Augustus to Constantine.

The book consists of an introduction, three main written sections, a catalogue, bibliography, notes, and indices for ancient literary sources, inscriptions, and museums. Finally, most of the catalogue material is depicted on a number of well-produced b & w plates. The first written section contains first of all a brief discussion of the interpretation of the literary and epigraphical sources, of the numismatic and the sculptural evidence. This is followed by a chronological survey, running from Livia to Helena, based on the material presented in the catalogue, and systematically presenting which gods were popular under the individual women of the imperial families. The second part of the book changes direction and approaches the material from the angle of the individual gods, and finally, the third part assesses the different categories and purposes of/for assimilations.

M. sets out to answer three main questions: why the Romans assimilated these women with gods, what the criteria were for the choice of god, and which occurrences were reflected in the assimilations (p. 7). In the light of several books on the propaganda aspect, this hardly comes as a surprise as being the main reason for the assimilations. However, M. is able to divide the assimilations into seven categories which very eloquently answer these three questions (pp. 145–6). First of all the assimilations serve to magnify the emperor and his family, to provide them with a superhuman dimension, which can be seen as an introduction to deification also for the living members of the imperial family. Secondly, the succession of the dynasty of course plays an important part, and thirdly, the propaganda of merits, like peace and prosperity, is important. The fourth feature is the emphasis on political and military success, the fifth the qualities of the family or concord. Then follows the religious propaganda, where the affiliations and propagation of specific cults are emphasized. Finally, a universal ideology is present in all periods, first of all seen in assimilations with Juno. And on the final page (p. 148) M. concludes that, although the origin of the ruling families' assimilations with gods is Hellenistic, it becomes a heterogeneous phenomenon during the Roman Empire with two main directions: the official propaganda is predominant in the capital, from where it was imposed on the provinces, and secondly, the local traditions in the provinces regarding the deification of sovereigns may be considered as official images *sub specie dearum* and as the actual realization of the original Roman ideological concept.

It is extremely satisfactory to be able to obtain a good overall view in a single book of the indeed large subject matter concerned, and this furthermore in a comprehensible manner. M. should be applauded for this accomplishment.

However, the division of the book presents a number of overlaps which might be slightly frustrating for the reader when the whole volume is read through. Furthermore, a critical presentation of the material evidence included, and of how in particular it has been accumulated, would have been appreciated. The material in question consists of inscriptions, coins, gems, and sculpture, and although M. discusses these in the first part, he does not seem to present any criteria for his selection and inclusion of material in the catalogue. In relation to the epigraphical material, it might have been advantageous to search databases for possible further examples of assimilations in support or dismissal of the other evidence, which would

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

have been quite interesting in relation to the overall conclusions drawn. A similar case is embedded in the numismatic evidence with reference to U. Hahn (*Die Frauen des römischen Kaiserhauses und ihre Ehrungen im griechischen Osten anhand epigraphischer und numismatischer Zeugnisse von Livia bis Sabina.* Saarbrücker Studien zur Archäologie und Alten Geschichte Bd. 8 [1994]). She can present two further examples of coins from Alexandria with Athena on the reverse, understood as a personification of the empress, respectively Domitia in A.D. 90/91 (op. cit. p. 242 with cat. no. 249; cf. A. Geissen, *Katalog Alexandrinischer Kaisermünzen der Sammlung des Instituts für Altertumskunde der Universität zu Köln* [Opladen, 1974–1983], pp. 369, 370) and Sabina in A.D. 121/122 (ibid. p. 285 with cat. no. 297; cf. Geissen, p. 824).

M.'s impressive monograph might have become even more comprehensive if the critical discussion of the sources in the introduction had been extended with a discussion of who the very different sources of material were aimed at. The difficult nature of interpretation of the gems is mentioned briefly in the introduction (p. 17) and in the final conclusion (p. 147). But the whole idea of some images created for the general public and others for the imperial family itself or for the élite is not really discussed in relation to the choice of subject and the choice of the media for the representation!

A very useful feature of the volume is a chart (p. 125) showing the wide range of goddesses and a few personifications in relation to the women of the imperial family. However, as is almost always the case with graphic representations, it only shows some very general tendencies, and if read out of context it elevates perhaps uncertain identifications to secure ones, which should have been emphasized more clearly in the adjacent text. Furthermore, the picture also becomes slightly distorted with only two groupings: a small diamond shape for one example and a larger diamond shape for two or more assimilations. Obviously this visually equates two examples with, say, fourteen. However, the totals are mentioned in the text columns, so the problem is minor. In relation to charts, the reader would have benefited from having the geographical dispersion of gods and periods in which they appear incorporated in a map as a supplement to the eight double-spaced pages of text.

Finally, a minor comment on interpretation should be made. The point concerns the interpretation of Minerva, who is basically understood as the warrior goddess (pp. 105–6). However, in the case of Julia Domna it is also possible to interpret the use of Athena/Minerva for a portrait statue in Thessaloniki (cat. no. 439) as an allusion to her intellectual qualities, praised in the literary sources. Although the statue fragments were found used as building material in a later context, they were hardly moved far from the original place of erection. The area where they were found was in the second-century A.D. Agora of the city, where a large library was located (C. Bakirtzis, 'Peri tou synkrotematos tes Agoras tes Thessalonikes', in *Archaia Makedonia* II [1977], 257ff., esp. 262–3), so the statue of Julia Domna as Athena might have stood here. This is, of course, a guess, but an interesting and quite possible one, which shows that a lot of the individual material can still benefit from careful study when a contextual assessment is being attempted. This should, nevertheless, not deter anyone from making good use of the book, which, in conclusion, is a very impressive and welcome study.

University of Copenhagen BIRTE LUNDGREEN

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CAMPUS MARTIUS

F. COARELLI: *I1 Campo Marzio. Dalle origini alla fine della repubblica*. Pp. x + 676, 145 figs. Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1997. Paper. L. 95,000. ISBN: 88-7140-106-9.

C.'s one-man industry of writings on the monuments of the Roman Republic, and especially on the topography of Rome itself, has become almost legendary. The bibliography of the volume under review lists no fewer than forty-seven items under his name, extending back to 1967 and including substantial works, such as his archaeological guide to Rome in the Laterza series and his major topographical studies *I1 Foro Romano. Periodo arcaico* (1983), *Il Foro Romano. Periodo repubblicano e augusteo* (1985), and *Il Foro Boario* (1988). *Il Campo Marzio* is the sequel to these and represents his most ambitious work to date. Like all his writings, it is characterized by an encyclopaedic knowledge of the source material—archaeological, literary, and epigraphic—and by scintillating displays of deductive argument. In this case, however, he is dealing with a region particularly close to his heart—the region in which he lives, and to which he has devoted many of his more significant studies.

The problems of the Campus Martius are manifold. It forms the heart of the old quarter of modern Rome, and the ancient monuments are overlaid by, or incorporated in, buildings of the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance, as well as later periods. Much of the material evidence is therefore in the form of *disjecta membra*, and identifications depend heavily on the Severan marble plan (the Forma Urbis Romae), itself fragmentary and relating to a period over two centuries after the end of the Republic. Many issues, such as the whereabouts of Statilius Taurus' amphitheatre, cannot yet be resolved. Particularly problematic is the historical dimension. C. does not simply try to pinpoint buildings, he also tries to trace their origins and early development, a quest which inevitably involves extensive speculation from sparse literary testimonia. It is only in the later phases that the picture acquires greater definition. That we can now locate a number of the buildings of the late Republic with some confidence is due in no small measure to the work of C. himself.

This is not to say that he is always right. He himself admits mistakes in his earlier work. The so-called Altar of Domitius Ahenobarbus, assigned in an important article of 1968 to a temple under the church of San Salvatore in Campo which he then ascribed to Neptune, but which was subsequently identified by F. Zevi as that of Mars in Circo, is now given a different provenance; moreover, its reliefs, the census frieze in Paris, and the three sea-*thiasos* friezes in Munich, are now associated not with M. Antonius, victorious in campaigns against Cilician pirates in 102 B.C., but with Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, the censor of 115 B.C., who (according to C.'s reconstruction) had won a sea-battle against the rebel Aristonicus in 129–8 B.C. This new attribution has an important corollary. Rejecting Wünsche's idea that the marine reliefs came from an Asian source and were imported to Rome as *spolia*, while the census frieze was a new piece made to match, C. argues that both were specially commissioned by Ahenobarbus, but that they were produced at different dates, the first after the victory over Aristonicus, the second after the censorship of 115. This theory, designed to explain the evident stylistic differences, is ingenious but unconvincing, and I prefer Wünsche's reading, which has been reinforced by a major paper by Ann Kuttner not known to C.: see P. J. Holliday (ed.), *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 198–229. C.'s additional inferences—that the

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'altar', actually a statue base, carried the temple of Neptune's three cult-statues of Neptune, Thetis, and Achilles, referred to by Pliny; that the inclusion of Achilles in this triad is because of his veneration in the sanctuary of Artemis Tauropolos on the island of Ikaros, off which C. places the naval battle between Ahenobarbus and Aristonicus; that Ahenobarbus may also have been involved in reconstructing a *heroon* of Achilles at Tenos which could have served as a model for the refoundation of the temple of Neptune in Rome; that the cult-statues at Tenos perhaps inspired the marine *thiasos* on the Rome base; and, finally, that the actual statue of Achilles may have survived in the form of the so-called Ludovisi Ares in the Terme Museum—all take us still further into the realms of conjecture. But C.'s arguments, like them or not, are always presented with relentless logic, and it is a delight to follow them as layer after layer is peeled off, as in some magnificent dance of the seven veils, to reveal an 'inescapable' conclusion. This is a highly stimulating book, and one which represents a milestone in the study of Rome's topography.

University of Manchester ROGER LING

THE GIANICOLO

E. M. STEINBY (ed.): *Ianiculum—Gianicolo. Storia, topografia, monumenti, leggende dall' antichità al rinascimento.* (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae, 16.) Pp. xv + 259, figs, ills, 4 col. pls. Rome: F.lli Palombi srl, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 951-96902-5-5.

The Finnish Institute is one of the most recent arrivals among the foreign schools in Rome, established only in 1954. This volume presents, with the odd subtraction and addition, the proceedings of a colloquium held in 1994 to mark the fortieth anniversary of the Institute, and the impressive scholarly activity conducted in its home, the Villa Lante on the Gianicolo.

The Villa Lante is one of the best-known buildings on the hill. It was built for Baldassarre Turini (1485–1543), an important figure on the papal staff of Popes Leo X and Clement VII. The architect was Giulio Romano, pupil of Raphael and Bramante, one of many leading artists and architects patronized by Turini. Both patron and architect are considered within the context of their cultural milieu (see the contributions of Frommel, pp. 119–40; Conforti, pp. 189–98; Peroni, pp. 199–204). The design and decoration of the Villa Lante are even more fully treated, naturally enough given the *amour propre* of the Finns for their home, and the elegance of the building (Frommel, loc. cit.; Bruun, pp. 141–62; Lilius, pp. 205–17; Viscogliosi, pp. 219–24; Sricchia Santoro, pp. 225–36; Gnann, pp. 237–59). The iconography of the decoration was in part deliberately chosen to contextualize the villa itself within the nexus of Roman myth and history which characterized the Gianicolo (Lilius, loc. cit.; for the classicizing ideology behind Renaissance villas see Keller, pp. 111–17).

In antiquity the Ianiculum was somewhat marginal, not officially integrated into the city until Augustus made it part of his *Regio* XIV. Attention has focused on the *urbs* across the river, on the political stage. A major limiting factor is our ignorance of the archaeology, and thus the topography, of the Ianiculum. Coarelli's Laterza

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

guide *Roma*[2] (Bari, 1995), pp. 412–14 lists only one site on the hill itself, the so-called Syrian sanctuary (discussed in an indifferent and inconclusive paper by Calzini Gysens, pp. 53–60). Today (as in Martial's day, 4.64) the Ianiculum is a viewing platform for the city (the view from the Villa Lante is second to none); lovers park their cars where once Tanaquil had a moment of inspiration in Lucumo's cart (e.g. Livy, 1.34.8–9).

Deeper examination reveals an intriguing place, as emerges clearly from the studies of its myths and cults (Liverani, pp. 2–12; Coarelli, pp. 13–27; Zannini Quirini, pp. 63–70). Ianus ruled it, and took in the fugitive Saturn; Furrina, one of the oldest Roman deities, was worshipped here; here C. Gracchus killed himself, and Numa was buried. Little new material is presented in these contributions, but ideas and interpretations challenge and provoke. Where was the Ianiculum? Liverani has an answer (pp. 7–12); he also notes that it is spoken of as a city or an *arx*, a city opposite, and opposed to, Rome: Pliny (*NH* 3.68) calls it Antipolis. This theme is variously developed in successive contributions, but the alterity of the Ianiculum in myth and history is best explored by Zannini Quirini (loc. cit.; this otherness is cleverly used, to explain suitability of the place for the burial of Numa *and* his books, by Piccaluga, pp. 71–6—one is still left asking, however, *when* the tradition of burying Numa and his books on the Ianiculum arose, and *why*; P. does not really differentiate the traditions about the burial from those concerning the rediscovery).

Unfortunately very rarely do these treatments attempt to sort out different strands of tradition, to separate antiquarian from other material, for instance, or allow for heterogeneity of viewpoint in the sources. There is a clear tendency to present them as easily susceptible of resolution into a homogeneous whole, and to sweep disagreements under the carpet: but if one thing emerges from these studies, it is that the Ianiculum was a complex and contradictory place. It certainly invites further study, and almost all the essays presented have the additional merit of providing fruitful points of departure.

This volume, often lavishly illustrated (but lacking a clear overall map of the Gianicolo), is not intended as a comprehensive treatment of the Ianiculum in either the Renaissance or in antiquity (one area hardly touched is its development from Augustus onwards, though there is some discussion of imperial *horti* by Bianchi, pp. 36–46). The common topographical theme unifies the studies of both periods surprisingly well; nor are the Middle Ages neglected (see Bianchi, pp. 29–51; Checchelli, 101–7). Indeed, the volume exceeds its chronological brief with two of its most interesting articles: a study by Mac Bell, of the American Academy, on the interpretation and possible origins of an archaic Greek bronze statuette found near Porta S. Pancrazio (pp. 77–99); and J. Rasmus Brandt on the rather frigid and brutal plans to redevelop the Ianiculum, especially the eastern slopes, in a more monumental fashion, between Unification and Fascism (pp. 167–85). Such utopian visions would hardly have been fitting memorials to Ianus and Saturn. The wild and untamed aspect of the Ianiculum, with its cults of Fons and the nymphs, was part of its alterity and its appeal in antiquity (Zannini Quirini, pp. 63–4); and parts of the hill are like that today, with parks and gardens which are *simplices munditiis* (see also on the Gianicolo botancial gardens: Bucci, pp. 163–5). As Brandt remarks, we have much to be grateful for in the failure of the proposed redevelopments. The same is true of this birthday volume for the Institutum Romanum Finlandiae.

University of Edinburgh E. BISPHAM

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

RELIGION AT OSTIA

J. T. BAKKER: *Living and Working with the Gods: Studies of Evidence for Private Religion and its Material Environment in the City of Ostia (100–500 AD)*. Pp. ix + 311, 100 pls, 26 figs. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1994. ISBN: 90-5063-056-1.

Ostia must be one of the most extensive archaeological sites in the Mediterranean, yet it remains largely unstudied and unpublished. It has been seen in the past as a place where we can study the living conditions and housing, in particular, of those who did not belong to the élite, but this generally held view misses the point. The excavations at Ostia, as B. points out, provide us with a detailed view of where certain activities occurred in the Roman city. B.'s interest is religion and, in particular, private religion. His book gives us a thorough record of the worship of deities in houses, apartment blocks, store buildings, workshops, bars, and *collegia*. As he stresses, he wishes to highlight who worshipped the gods and where they were worshipped, rather than what was the nature of the gods worshipped. He provides us with a thorough catalogue and accurate locations of the evidence, useful for an examination of the evidence for religion at first hand on site at Ostia.

However, the book is not simply a catalogue of the evidence. Many pages are devoted to the major concerns of the study of ancient urbanism. In the opening pages, we find a discussion of the nature of private religion and the ancients' conception of the private as opposed to the public, beginning with the definition of Festus (p. 245) that public religion was conducted for the populus with public money or was sanctioned by the populus. In contrast, private religion was conducted in the name of individuals, families, and clans or artificially created bodies—e.g. *collegia*. As B. points out, this is rather rigid, and he puts forward an alternative definition, based on the distinction between restricted and unrestricted worship, that he sees corresponding to the distinction between private and public. Thus for B., the cult of the local *compitum* is seen as private since it is restricted to the members of a set neighbourhood. Therefore, the definition of private in this case covers a variety of instances. The very nature of privacy is brought into question in his discussion of what he sees as a street name in two inscriptions from the Semita dei Cippi (pp. 197–8) *HAEC SEMITA HOR PRI EST*. B. reads this as 'This is the depot path' and cannot explain PRI; a better reading might be 'This path to the depot is private'. Similar inscriptions defining paths and roads as private are not uncommon (compare, for example, *ILLRP* 489). If this is the case, a street, an area that we instinctively regard as public space, is in fact private with an effort in writing to confirm its privacy. Such evidence highlights how the ancients' concepts of public and private were fluid and in a way justifies B.'s inclusion of both the *compita* and Mithrea in his book on private religion, just as these might also be included in another book under the heading public religion. Basically, what is excluded from B.'s book are the major temples of Ostia. It could be argued that B.'s definition of private religion is at best artificial.

Some will find B.'s evidence disappointing: in many cases it comes down to a series of wall niches. But to ignore such data would be a mistake, as B. shows. The niches are thoroughly documented in the book; in many cases, they were set up after the buildings had been constructed, hacked out of the brick-faced concrete walls. The builders of the insulae of Ostia did not make it their business to decide which room should contain the niche for the household gods. Such adaptation came later once

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the inhabitants had moved in. Thus, we see in the evidence the adaptation of dwelling-units to the religious needs of the inhabitants.

Readers of the book looking for a more complete artefactual record of private religion at Ostia are well rewarded in B.'s discussion of the Sacello del Silvano, with its paintings closely dated to 214–15 C.E., which are discussed by the art historian Eric Moorman in an appendix to the book. The shrine in a building containing seven mills and four kneading machines points to the nature of religion in Ostia, which was closely associated with the workplace as well as home itself. B. provides a useful plan (p. 146) of the shrine giving the positions of the deities associated with it; these include: a *Lar*, Silvanus, Isis, Harpocrates, Fortuna, Amiona, Alexander, the Emperor, and the Dioscuri.

There is much more in this book than just private religion; B. discusses the wealth of evidence from Ostia, including the nature of the archaeological record and its excavation, the development of the town, and the nature of the economy of the town after the third century C.E. More importantly, the chapters concerned with religion in houses, workshops, shops, etc., all contain discussion of recent debates on these subjects and, given the lack of publication in English on Ostia, the book will fill this gap for the time being. Students, however, might find this book infuriating in places. For example, rather than provide the reader with a distribution map of Mithrea in Ostia, B. refers the reader to Becatti's plan published some forty years ago—many readers will not have immediate access to this material. Finally, it should be noted that, since the appearance of this book, B. has made further material on Ostia available via the World Wide Web (http://www.ostia.communicate.it).

University of Reading RAY LAURENCE

SICILY

T. FISCHER-HANSEN (ed.): *Ancient Sicily*. (Acta Hyperborea, 6.) Pp. 316, 6 figs. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 1995. Paper. ISBN: 87-7289-298-6.

This is the sixth volume of an ongoing series based on the papers of periodic seminars on aspects of classical archaeology held at the University of Copenhagen. As with most other volumes in the series, its theme is a very wide one, and the constituent papers consequently reflect this breadth. Coverage extends from the Neolithic period to Roman Sicily, although the papers fall broadly into three chronological groups—prehistoric, archaic, and Hellenistic/Roman. It is also notable (and very much to be welcomed) that although this volume appears as part of a series on classical archaeology and has a primarily archaeological focus, it also includes papers which are largely linguistic or historical in content.

The stated purpose (pp. 7–8), within this broad remit, is to examine the rôle of Sicily as a cultural bridgehead and the processes of cultural interaction between colony and mainland, between the Greeks and the other colonial and indigenous populations of Sicily itself, and between Sicily and the Romans. Significantly, it also gives due weight to the prehistory of Sicily, devoting two chapters to the development of the island before the arrival of the Greeks. Inevitably, given this important but

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

vastly ambitious theme and long chronological range, the coverage afforded to any particular aspect is patchy, and the volume does not appear to reach any specific overall conclusions about the processes of cultural transmission or the way in which Sicily mediated between mainland Greek culture and that of Italy. Nevertheless, the individual contributions address some important questions and make valuable contributions to the research on these issues. Oddly, however, the volume contains a supplementary section unconnected with the main theme of the rest of the book, comprising additional papers on nuraghic culture in Sardinia and on distribution of Rhodian amphorae, together with a discussion forum and a listing of current Danish fieldwork projects. While these are useful and informative items in their own right, they do sit rather strangely with the rest of the contributions. An Editor's Note (pp. 7, 10) in the Introduction referring to the non-submission of a number of conference items for publication may explain the inclusion of this extraneous material, and serves to illustrate the complexities of the editorial task on these occasions, but its presence does somewhat undermine the cohesiveness of the book.

The opening chapters present two aspects of the development of indigenous populations during the Neolithic and Bronze Ages, well before the arrival of the Greek colonists. Procelli's contribution summarizes the social and cultural developments taking place in Sicily during this period, while Albanesi Procelli concentrates on systems of contact and exchange, examining both local networks of exchange and the external contacts implied by the presence of Mycenaean pottery on the island. Both seek to examine the major social and cultural changes which took place during the Bronze Age, and Albanesi Procelli also attempts, although with no definite conclusion, to get to grips with the problem of identifying social mobility from the evidence of artefacts.

The second group of papers focuses on aspects of the archaic history of the Greek colonies and their relations with their environment. All four papers discuss the possibility of using specific aspects of urban development or architectural forms to draw conclusions about the relationship between the colonies and the rest of the Greek world, and the difficult problem of cultural and ethnic interaction within Sicily. Of these, the most ambitious in intent is that of Shepherd, who tackles the issue of colonial culture and its relation to that of the rest of Greece head on. Recent research is gradually undermining the notion that the culture of mainland Greece was, of necessity, the determining influence on the development of the colonies, and there is a perceptible move towards the view that Greek culture was much more regionalized and much more modified by external influences than previously recognized. Shepherd's study of burial practices in the colonies adds a further piece of evidence that colonial culture was shaped as much, if not more, by local customs than by the practices of the founding cities. Other papers on the archaic theme reassess the early urban development of Selinus and examine the distribution of the *pastas* house as an indicator of social structure. The non-Greek population is represented by a study of Morgantina, although this does not reach any certain conclusions about the important question of whether it was a Greek or a Sicel city.

The final group of papers is much more diverse and moves away from a specifically archaeological focus to include a historical study of fourth-century tyranny, the coin iconography employed by Timoleon, and a study of non-Greek languages in Sicily. Two papers on the structure of the Roman *domus* in Sicily, and on patterns of land tenure after the Roman conquest, complete the volume.

Despite the uneven coverage of the topic—almost inevitable given the context of a volume of conference papers and the enormous breadth of the topic, this collection

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contains interesting insights into some of the major issues facing scholars studying the history and archaeology of Greek colonization.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne KATHRYN LOMAS

BAETICA

A. T. FEAR: *Rome and Baetica: Urbanization in Southern Spain c. 50 BC–AD 150* (Oxford Classical Monographs). Pp. xii + 292, 3 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. £40. ISBN: 0-19-815027-X.

The province of Baetica was one of Rome's oldest overseas possessions. It is also an area of considerable interest for our understanding of the urbanization of the Roman Empire. The rich epigraphic evidence from this region, exemplified by the recently discovered *lex irnitana*, *tabula siarensis*, and *senatus consultum* of Piso, is fundamental to our understanding about how the Roman urban form was introduced and applied in the western provinces. F.'s book makes an important new contribution in this field. In the first instance, he syntheses much of the recent epigraphic evidence in the context of broader cultural considerations. Secondly, he uses urbanism as an index of gauging cultural change in southern Spain, and the degree to which it was a product of Rome's policy or local initiative.

In many ways the first part of the book is the most successful. F. begins with a chapter in which he sets his agenda, namely to gauge the nature of Rome's impact upon Baetica through the paradigm of the city. This is followed by a generalist chapter dealing with the nature of Roman urbanism as can be gleaned from the texts and inscriptions. The following chapters (3–6) then deal in some detail with epigraphic evidence for urban development in the region. In Chapter 3 (The State of Southern Spain *c.* 50 B.C.), he discusses the broad spread of Roman cultural influences during the last years of the Republic and the ways in which they 'prepared the field' for the eventual adoption of the Roman urban mentality by southern Spanish communities. He then in Chapter 4 (The Coloniae of Roman Baetica) looks at the principal Roman urban influence in the province. He sees the coloniae as being instrumental in the dissemination of Roman urban ideas, and as prime-movers in the broader process of cultural Romanization. In some cases, those aspects of Roman law and architecture adopted by native communities were close imitations of Roman practice, while others were interpretations drawing upon pre-existing native traditions. This needs to be said because our understanding of the urbanization of Roman Baetica is all too often founded upon an excessively literal reading of the primary written sources, whether literary or epigraphic. This raises questions about the degree of Romanization in the province during the first century A.D. The next chapter (From Caesar to Vespasian: Problems of City Status) develops the theme. It highlights the paucity of available information for the first half of the century and reminds us that the number of status-bearing towns that can be identified with confidence is small. F. points out that according to Pliny's list over 68% of Baetican towns were still unprivileged communities and that over 73% of Roman towns lacked Roman status. Chapter 7 deals with the problems surrounding the Flavian municipal law, and the transformation of the urban structure of the province. F. suggests that this was an

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

emergency document drafted at the start of Vespasian's reign, which may have needed restating under Domitian. He suggests that at least fifteen Baetican communities are recorded as having taken the title (in fact a considerable underestimate) and alludes to the archaeological evidence for hints of the redevelopment of many towns. As in earlier chapters, F. again cautions against too mechanistic an interpretation of the epigraphic evidence and suggests that the Flavian law would have been implemented with a degree of '*interpretatio peregrina*'.

The remaining two chapters reveal a less convincing command of the evidence, even though the essential message they convey is borne out by more recent archaeological evidence. Chapter 7 deals with the archaeological evidence for the towns and provides an essential complement to the legal and other epigraphic information for gauging the degree of *urbanitas* achieved by Baetican communities. Chapter 8 deals with a range of sources of evidence for looking at non-rural cultural forms in the province. F. is surely correct in stressing the degree of native *interpretatio* shown in this evidence and that, as a consequence, Romanization and urbanization was a 'down-up' process brought about by élite motivation rather than a Roman urban policy. In all, this is a valuable addition to the current debate about the impact of Rome in Iberia. However, it would have been enhanced by provision of more detailed maps and town plans, as well as appendices listing the different towns and their statuses.

University of Southampton SIMON KEAY

MUNERA

M. FORA: *Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'Occidente Romano. IV. Regio Italiae I: Latium*. (Vetera, 11.) Pp. 160, 28 pls. Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 88-7140-090-7.

This is the fourth volume of a collection which aims to bring together all the inscriptions from the Roman West relevant to the study of the gladiatorial *munera*. Each Italian volume groups together or splits up *regiones* according to quantity of material. This volume by F. is limited to Latium; two others are announced that will complete *regio I*.

The volume under review starts appropriately with Silvio Panciera's tribute to Patrizia Sabbatini Tumolesi, 'fondatrice e curatrice di questa serie', who died suddenly early in 1995 in her fiftieth year (pp. 7–9; her bibliography, pp. 10–11). Like previous volumes, this one is divided into two main parts: the catalogue (pp. 23–90) and a general discussion (pp. 91–105). This is followed by detailed indices (pp. 107–29) and twenty-eight plates.

The catalogue includes forty-nine inscriptions and is divided into four sections: administration of *munera* (nos. 1–6); *munera*, *venationes*, and *lusus Iuvenum* (nos. 7–42); gladiators and gladiatorial schools (no. 43); and amphitheatres and their annexes (nos. 44–9). None of these documents is new, but about a third were published after *CIL* X and XIV, and were scattered in various publications. F. improves readings at several points, for example in no. 29 (Ostia), where he is justified in interpreting *AGON[- - -]* at line 6 as a name rather than a reference to an *agon* or *agonotheta*. He also provides detailed apparatus and valuable discussions. The bibliography for each inscription is extensive. References are not limited to the gladiatorial context but are also provided for municipal institutions, local cults, archaeological remains, etc. This section of the volume should therefore prove

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

invaluable for anyone concerned in any way with one or some of the terms or issues contained in it.

Several of the inscriptions are relevant for the study of *munera* in the city of Rome rather than Latium, particularly the fragments of the *fasti Ostienses* recording imperial *munera* and *venationes*. On the other hand, several inscriptions that are relevant for the entire Roman West (including Latium!) are to be found in other volumes in this series—for example, the *tabula Heracleensis* and the *S.C.* from Larinum in volume III. It is to be hoped that at the end of the series a general index will be produced.

Part II begins with tables that provide a useful summary of the material in the catalogue. The general discussion of the evidence which follows is one of the best so far in this collection. Topics discussed include the imperial and municipal *munera*, and the somewhat problematical *curatores munerum*; in the specific case of the *curatores munerum publicorum*, F. is right to insist that his no. 21 ('quod curam muner(is) publici splendide administraverit') supports Sabbatini Tumolesi's thesis that they administered, to the exclusion of any personal increment, public money for the organization of gladiatorial shows (p. 103).

The indices are very detailed. That of the 'parole notevoli' contains even entries such as 'cura', 'do', and 'edo', and conveniently provides all occurrences, with context, of those key terms. The plates with few exceptions are very good. Pictures of the inscriptions have been provided whenever possible.

My criticisms are few. It seems to me that some texts have been excluded too precipitately ('esclusioni', pp. 25–7). It is unlikely that *retiarius* in *CIL* VI.37843 means 'maker or trader of nets' since no parallel for the alleged meaning exists. *CIL* XIV.110* of a *procurator Ludi Gallici* is dismissed as a forgery by simply repeating Dessau's claim that it was reported by Ligorio alone. The criteria for identifying partial letters in the fragments of the *fasti Ostienses* seem to be those of L. Vidman's edition (*Fasti Ostienses* [Prague, 1982]) rather than those followed elsewhere in this volume and collection. At no. 11 line 6 read: *coep(it)*; no. 12A line 3: *Circ[o]*; p. 65 line 11 from bottom: the reference is to *CIL* X.3704, not IV.2508.

There is no doubt that F.'s volume, and the collection to which it belongs, constitute a milestone in the study of *res gladiatoriae* in the West. Moreover, the high standards applied to the presentation of each document assure us that the collection will remain in use for years to come.

McMaster University G. CHAMBERLAND

P. OXY. 64

E. W. HANDLEY, U. WARTENBERG, R. A. COLES, N. GONIS, M. W. HASLAM, J. D. THOMAS (edd.): *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Vol. LXIV.* (Graeco-Roman Memoirs, 84.) Pp. xii + 209, 19 pls. London: Egypt Exploration Society (for the British Academy), 1997. ISBN: 0-85698-129-X.

With the present volume the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* continue to provide their usual mixture of texts both literary and documentary, the former represented for the most part by material contributing to the textual history of established authors rather than completely new texts, the latter serving to broaden our overall understanding of

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

life in Roman Egypt. The first part comprises six fragments of St Matthew's Gospel edited by David Thomas, their meagre dimensions being compensated for by their early dating (five of the six being no later than the first half of the fourth century, in three cases possibly late second century) and a number of interesting variant readings. Take, for instance, the omission of ὀπίσω μου from III 12, attested in Latin, Coptic, and Syriac versions, but never before in Greek MSS. Indeed, a number of the fragments here involve versions that have not hitherto appeared in Greek papyri.

In Part II, which contains the publication of Greek comedy fragments, the most significant contribution is undoubtedly Eric Handley's final version of the fragments making up virtually all that we have of Menander's *Dis Exapaton*. These are of vital importance insofar as they provide us with the longest passage of Greek comedy that can be directly compared with its Latin version, Plautus' *Bacchides*, and reveal not only how Plautus shifted emphasis within scenes for the sake of producing his own comic effects, but also how he dealt with the 'problem' of the Greek choral interlude. Lines 11–30 and 91–112 were first published in H.'s 1968 inaugural lecture at University College London. Lines 47–63 and 89–90 were added in Sandbach's *OCT* (1972, 1992^2) and Arnott's Loeb edition, but until now there has been no available version of the 113 lines which make up the total, even if some of these amount to no more than a single letter. Their appearance here provides not only long-overdue completeness but also new readings for lines previously known (18, 22, 24). The Menandrian element continues with a tattered fragment of *Misoumenos* (152–9), coinciding with POxy 2656 (Sandbach's O10), with apparent discrepancies between the two, though these are as likely to be the result of problematic readings as of true variation. What the fragment does supply, however, is a better understanding of who the speakers at this point are. Greater certainty surrounds the anonymous comic lines of 4409, which bear some affinity with the *Fabula Incerta* of the Cairo Codex of Menander and PSI 1176, though after examining the points of similarity Handley cautions against deriving them from a single play.

Other sizeable literary fragments (4413–14) come from Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*, with the fragments confirming a correct reading otherwise found only in *Etymologica*, corroborating conjectures by Fränkel, Platt, and others, and indicating the antiquity of still other variant readings. Following Apollonius Rhodius come the remaining papyri of Aratus' *Phaenomena* so far identified in the stock of the Egypt Exploration Society, adding substantially to the poet's representation on papyri (4423–6), small fragments of Callimachus' *Aetia*, Lycophron's *Alexandra*, Theocritus' *Idylls*, and the commentary on them.

The documentary papyri making up Section IV, the majority of which (like most of the Apollonius Rhodius fragments) were first edited in Ute Wartenberg's 1990 D.Phil. dissertation, continue to provide illuminating insights into the workings of law in Roman Egypt and the burden of local administration. They include acknowledgement of receipt of a bequest involving household furniture and utensils dating from the reign of Hadrian, a receipt for military clothing which links together for the first time two garments that previously seemed separate items, rulings on the legal status of minors from the reign of Septimius Severus (which may be a Greek translation of something first issued in Latin), a private account for wine, a third instance (cf. 1405 and 3105) of a petition addressed to Aurelius Leonides (A.D. 229–36) by men surrendering their property rather than fulfil the liturgies assigned to them, an application for registration of a house, a contract for the loan of barley, and a list of fishermen in the service of the temple of Athena Thoeris. The final sequence of entries

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

consists of a series of reports to the *Logistes*, including a doctor's description of the injuries suffered by individuals as the result of assault and lists of buildings needing repair drawn up by the guild of builders.

As ever, students of antiquity owe a considerable debt of gratitude both to the volume's editors for their care and exactitude, and to the printers for the skill with which they routinely produce these complex texts. As is often the case, the importance of the fragments lies not so much in their individual significance as in the cumulative information they provide for further research.

University of Warwick STANLEY IRELAND

THE DERVENI PAPYRUS

A. LAKS, G. W. MOST (edd.): *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus*. Pp. viii + 204. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. Cased, £30. ISBN: 0-19-815032-6.

The absence of a reliable text of the papyrus discovered at Derveni in 1962 remains a frustrating obstacle to serious research on this fascinating text. Scholars have been forced to rely largely upon the unauthorized and inadequate transcription in *ZPE* 47 (1982), after 300, because of the long delay in publication of an authoritative edition by the papyrus's proprietor, Kyriakos Tsantsanoglou. In an effort to lead the way out of this cul-de-sac, L.&M. brought together an impressive group of authorities for a colloquium at Princeton University in April 1993, out of which the present volume has developed. It contains an introduction by the editors, their provisional translation of the papyrus, an English version of Maria Serena Funghi's general presentation of the papyrus in the *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini* III, revised versions of eight papers presented at the colloquium organized into two groups, a bibliography of the papyrus (to which now add: Laks, *Phronesis* 42 [1997], 121–42), and indices.

The editors' translation, while accommodating those unfamiliar with the papyrus, is admittedly only a stop-gap. Nevertheless, it is based in certain parts on important new information. Tsantsanoglou's own essay presents an authoritative text of the papyrus's first seven columns: frr. B and A and cols. I–III in the *ZPE* edition plus the extremely fragmentary remains of two entirely new columns from the beginning of the papyrus (resulting in a definitive renumbering of its columns). He provides a detailed commentary, adducing a wealth of comparative material, on these columns' predominantly eschatological themes. In addition, Tsantsanoglou has checked against the papyrus the texts of cols. XII, XX, XXII, and XXV, which are quoted in full in the essays, and he has offered numerous suggestions for the translation of those columns for which the *ZPE* text must still be relied upon. If the editors overstate their case somewhat in claiming that their translation supplies 'a more secure basis for working on the papyrus than the only edition in Greek currently available', it remains the case that the volume marks a significant advance in our knowledge of the text.

The first group of essays seeks to advance understanding of the author's character and to move beyond viewing the treatise as a simple 'commentary' or pre-Alexandrian *ὑπόμνημα*. Dirk Obbink examines col. XX's criticism of those failing to profit from the words of the professional initiators/*τελεσταί*, and he links this with the author's criticisms of those readers of Orpheus' poetry who fail to understand its recondite nature. Stopping short of identifying the author as himself a *τελεστής*, Obbink does

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

suggest he was no mere exegete but viewed his elucidation of cosmology as potential instruction for mystic initiates. Charles Kahn asks whether Euthyphro may have been the treatise's author by showing that Plato's characterization of Euthyphro suggests certain Orphic, Heraclitean, and Anaxagorean predilections resembling those of the author and by comparing the *Cratylus*' Euthyphro-inspired etymologies with aspects of the author's own interpretative practice. Claude Calame analyses the exegetical strategies employed in the text's comments upon ritual practices and the generative phases of the Orphic cosmo-theogony to argue that the distanced objectivity of the author's voice, his preoccupation with teaching and learning, his addresses to an audience of initiates, and the theological/philosophical character of the knowledge required of those initiates all combine to suggest a goal of 'scholarly' rather than purely ritual initiation. Martin West presents a convincing picture of the author as the learned exegete of an Orphic–Bacchic cult society who expounds the meaning of their rituals and sacred texts, and he makes several comparisons with the tradition of commentary on theological poems and ritual practice among the scholar-priests of Mesopotamia.

In addition to Tsantsanoglou's contribution, the final part of the volume contains three further essays discussing specific columns. David Sider examines the newly restored col. IV's contribution to our knowledge of Heraclitus and offers a reconstruction of the sequence of ideas that may have framed the column's excerpt. Sider proposes that the author belonged to a Lampsacan circle of allegorizing Anaxagoreans who would have recognized Heraclitus' adaptations of Orphic themes and so mined his work to understand the Orphica. Luc Brisson presents a philological and historical commentary on column XII designed to undermine the view that it indicates that Chronos and the primordial egg featured in the Derveni theogony as they do in the later Orphic *Rhapsodies*. He thereby raises serious doubts about the feasibility of employing the *Rhapsodies* as an aid to reconstructing the events of the Derveni theogony and suggests that the version of the Orphic theogony in the papyrus is that known to Aristophanes and Eudemus. Walter Burkert, finally, discusses col. XXV's consideration of the possible formation of other worlds from the celestial material left over after the formation of our own and the explanation that *ananke* and the will of the god who created the world as it is prevents this happening. He suggests that the column supports the idea that Anaxagoras likewise considered the counterfactual possibility of the development of other worlds.

Each of these essays is a notable contribution to our understanding of the papyrus. The volume as a whole marks an important milestone in the rather unfortunate history of the Derveni papyrus and will, it can only be hoped, encourage the final appearance of a definitive edition.

Clare Hall, Cambridge JOHN A. PALMER

ALEXANDER'S COINAGE

H. A. TROXELL: *Studies in the Macedonian Coinage of Alexander the Great*. Pp. 161, 31 pls. New York: The American Numismatic Society, 1997. Cased, $85. ISBN: 0-89722-261-X.

The coinage of Alexander the Great is marked by a bewildering complexity of subsidiary symbols and style, and an enormous output from an array of mints that stretched from Macedon to Babylon, yet all this within a system remarkable

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for its uniformity of overall typology. Understanding the development and interrelationship of such coinage, therefore, has long been an ambition of numismatic scholarship. In this the work of the American Numismatic Society with its incomparable collection of material has long held pride of place, beginning with Newell's major publications in 1912 and 1923 and continuing through to Troxell's present study of Macedonian production, or rather that traditionally ascribed to the 'Amphipolis' mint. The importance of the ANS collection for any detailed study of Alexander's coinage was well recognized indeed by Martin Price in his monumental and comprehensive 1991 study of the coinage (*The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus* [London]), which will long remain the standard work of reference on the subject.

Overall, T.'s work divides into two, the first part devoted to silver, the second to gold, with the first part further subdivided between the issues in Alexander's own name and those issued in his lifetime but in the name of his father, Philip II.

T. begins her study, predictably enough, with Alexander's tetradrachms, building on the grouping of issues established by Newell (A–K), which had as its foundation the interrelationship of reverse markings and obverse die links within each group. To this she adds a twelfth group (L), not found in the 1905 Demanhur hoard used by Newell as the basis for refining his own study. In dealing with this aspect of the material it is very much to T.'s credit that she encapsulates in tabular form the complex interweaving of obverse and reverse detail, following it with a discussion of the relative size of the groups and a comparison of her own findings with those of Price.

From the tetradrachms T. moves on to the smaller denominations, subjecting them to a similar sequential analysis and systematization. An important by-product that close study of the ANS's holdings has yielded is to make possible for the first time the association of issues which lack reverse symbols with those where symbols are present. In this way those issues without reverse symbols can now be located within the whole sequential pattern. This is of particular significance for drachms, triobols, and diobols with the eagle as reverse type, since they have traditionally been associated with tetradrachms issued by Alexander in his father's name and struck on the Macedonian standard, rather than with the Attic-weight tetradrachms where T. now locates them.

Chapter 3 moves from the particular to a discussion of the relative chronology of Alexander's coinage, using as criteria obverse links, symbols shared with later Philip II issues, the use of *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ* as part of the inscription, and repetition of reverse markings. As T. explains, the chronological relationship of some groups is complicated by the fact that the same obverse dies were at times used for more than one group, but in a way that reversed their chronological relationship—for example, a die first used for group B and only subsequently for group A.

From the specifically Alexander coinage T. turns in Chapter 4 to the post-323 Philip II tetradrachms, concluding that most of the groups established were issued simultaneously and display an internal coherence, in marked contrast to the Alexander groups. This is followed by a study of the smaller denominations, often regarded as fifths and tenths of a tetradrachm, as well as the Attic-weight drachms.

The final section on silver is given over to the question of absolute chronology. In 1982 Orestes Zervos revived the thesis that Alexander's Zeus reverse was based initially on the seated figure of Baal found on staters struck by Persian satraps at Tarsus, and that in consequence such issues can only have begun after the victory at Issus and the capture of the city. Though the criteria on which Zervos based his

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

conclusions were questioned by both Price and Troxell, T. herself now puts forward her own arguments for linking early 'Amphipolis' issues with the iconography of Tarsus and concludes similarly that Alexander's coinage can only have begun in 333 or slightly later. It is noticeable, however, that in this T. not infrequently has recourse to terms like 'appear', 'possible', and 'probable', and admits (p. 90) that guesswork must remain a factor in reaching any conclusion. Another vexed point concerns the introduction of *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ* as part of the reverse inscription. Price (pp. 32–3) argued briefly for its first occurrence *c*. 324, i.e. during Alexander's lifetime, a date similar to that proposed by Newell. T., in contrast, prefers more radically to see the title applied not to Alexander the Great but to his young son by Roxane, Alexander IV, paralleling the issues produced at a number of mints for Philip III and thus serving to validate the succession. The subsequent disappearance of the title T. naturally attributes to the deposing and murder of Alexander IV at the hands of Cassander. Again, T.'s case is cogently argued, but it remains very much a moot point whether the numismatic evidence alone can ever be sufficiently precise as to locate events with the exactitude needed here. If such questions are ever to be answered, I very much feel that it will not be the coins themselves that provide the answer.

The second, and shorter, part of the book concentrates on the gold currency, which untypically for ancient coinage cannot be related by means of issue marks to the output of silver. Rather, the gold of both Philip II and Alexander repeats subsidiary motifs time and time again, making any detailed attribution to individual mints or even a reasonably accurate chronology an elusive goal.

Rounding off the volume are appendices containing analyses of four hoards, together with thirty-one plates. These latter have been well produced, though greater contrast might have made some features more clearly visible, an important factor in a work where reference is often made to minute differences of detail.

It was, I suppose, inevitable that any work following Price's two volumes on the coins issued in the names of Alexander and Philip Arrhidaeus would find itself either frequently in agreement with Price or obliged to justify those points on which it diverged. To this end T.'s notes of comparison between her own work and that of Price will prove a useful refining tool, and overall her analysis of the 'Amphipolis' issues with their complex die links promises rapidly to become a standard reference work in its own right.

University of Warwick STANLEY IRELAND

COINS AS MONEY

K. W. HARL: *Coinage in the Roman Economy, 300 BC to AD 700* (Ancient Society and History). Pp. x + 533, ills. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996. £41.50. ISBN: 0-8018-5291-9.

The stated aim of this book is to provide the reader with a more than numismatic history of Roman coinage over the course of a millennium. Other books, the author rightly says, have treated this history in a primarily taxonomic perspective rather than looking at coins either as fiscal instruments or as the generally used means of

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

exchange in the Roman world. H. thus attempts to address this lack by covering all these aspects, an ambitious task in which he succeeds more often than not, but at the cost of some simplification.

H. begins with a brief review of the debate on the nature of Roman coinage and the possibilities and pitfalls offered by the use of coin evidence in writing the history of coin circulation and coin use. For H., Roman coinage was 'the money of the Roman economy', while the unbroken history of Roman coinage over a thousand years is evidence for the solid persistence of 'Roman monetary ways', i.e. the habitual reckoning of public and private monetary obligations in coin. Coinage was in widespread and continual use in the Roman world as money, and was always valued and perceived as such by both state and people throughout the period covered in the book.

These preliminary remarks form the theoretical backdrop to the account given in the subsequent seven chapters of the history of Roman coinage from 300 B.C. to A.D. 700. The periods chosen are more or less conventional—Roman Italy 500–200 B.C., the denarius and the Republic 200–30 B.C., the Augustan coinage 30 B.C.–A.D. 235, together with a separate chapter devoted to the currencies of the Roman East in the same period, the third century and the age of debasement, the fourth and fifth centuries, and, finally, an account of the 'loss of Roman monetary ways' from A.D. 400 to A.D. 700. H.'s work is unusual in extending its chronological range so late and in the detail which it provides, both in the text and the bibliography. Considerable visual help is to be found in the plates, which are of a high quality.

This is a story full of uncertainties concerning both motive and consequence, but H.'s choice of a narrative rather than argumentative style often leads to the representation of modern opinions as unproblematic and anciently attested fact. Further enlightenment can sometimes be found in the footnotes but, to take one example, there is no extant ancient authority cited, indeed none exists, for the statement on p. 52 that the Senate suspended the minting of aurei after Sulla's retirement because it regarded gold coins as the money of kings.

The second part of the book consists of a series of thematic treatments of various aspects of 'Roman monetary ways'. Chapters 9 and 10 deal with coin production and use from the viewpoint of the government and the governed respectively. The crucial rôle of coins in both public and private sectors is constantly emphasized. This is, of course, a perfectly tenable opinion. Some central notions are left unexamined, however. The use of vague and undefined expressions such as 'financial departments' (p. 207), 'the Republic' (p. 213), 'the Roman public' (p. 289), or 'the Roman state' (*passim*) as agents in Roman monetary history is not helpful and serves merely to immobilize 'Roman' attitudes towards money and coinage through time and space. H. has a clear view of what these attitudes were, but he does not so much argue his way towards this view as state it at the outset, and then accumulate evidence to demonstrate its validity.

Chapter 11 deals with the rôle of coinage in articulating prices and wages, and particularly with the occurrence of inflation in the Roman world. The final chapter (12) discusses the behaviour of Roman coins beyond the frontiers and the question of 'specie drain' to the north and the east. H. is of the interesting opinion that much of the coin that left the Empire for Persia eventually returned in trade with Roman merchants (this is why few Roman coins are found there), while the inhabitants of northern Europe used Roman coins as money within a trading network and not as prestige goods for non-monetary purposes. It was the disruption of this commercial network due to northern migrations that impoverished many German tribes and led

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

them to invade the Roman Empire in search of land and fortune, whereupon they reverted to older habits of exchange and treated coins as treasure or jewellery rather than money (pp. 296–7). This highly questionable view is presented without references to other arguments, giving the impression, perhaps unintentionally, that there is no debate on the matter. There is no concluding chapter to the work as a whole which makes the ending somewhat unsatisfying.

To conclude, one unfortunate mistake: the Greek for tetradrachm is *tetradrachmon*, not tetradrachma (which is used throughout). The same goes for *didrachmon* (not didrachma).

This book sometimes overreaches itself by trying to cover too much and, as a consequence, is too categorical where it should be more even-handed. As such it tends towards being both too detailed and too simplistic. That said, H. has successfully identified the need for a synthetic review of numismatic and archaeological research in this area of Roman studies and goes a considerable way to fulfilling it himself. The reader of his book will gain a thorough knowledge of the history of the coinage and of the Roman Empire.

British Museum J. H. C. WILLIAMS

EASTERN ALEXANDER

M. BRIDGES, J. C. BÜRGEL (edd.): *The Problematics of Power: Eastern and Western Representations of Alexander the Great*. (Schweizer asiatische Studien/Études asiatiques suisses, 22.) Pp. 236, 14 pls. New York, etc.: Peter Lang, 1996. Paper, £26. ISBN: 3-906750-35-3.

This is an absorbing collection of fourteen essays on the ambivalent afterimage of Alexander the Great in a wide range of medieval literature and the arts. In both East and West alike, representations of the conqueror have served to affirm the cultural values of the author or artist as well as to question them. This capacity to be simultaneously a version of the self and of the other corresponds to the standpoint of the East–West dichotomy. This duality is maintained by the contributors to this volume by the identification of the East with Islam and the West with Christianity, though it is subverted to some extent by their cross-cultural stress on the relativity of power. All the contributors show that, in both East and West, Alexander has been represented as 'an empowering version of the self, as well as an ambiguous other, whose strangeness serves to problematize the political and cultural values of the artist's world' (p. 232).

Florens Deuchler writes on the western medieval hero-cult of Alexander from the tenth to the sixteenth century (pp. 15–26); Hartmut Kugler discusses Book 10 of the Alexander Romance of Ulrich von Etzenbach and its author's view of the potency of discovery (pp. 27–44); Margaret Bridges, in her paper 'Empowering the Hero: Alexander as Author in the *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem* and its Mediaeval English Versions' (pp. 45–59), argues that this centrifugal narrative uses the morally neutral and culturally equivocal Alexander as a formal principle of organization, linking the objects of observation in a glorified travelogue; André Hurst examines the idea of Alexander as the mediator between Europe and Asia in the *Alexandra* of

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lycophron (pp. 61–8); W. J. Aerts considers the assessment of Alexander in the Byzantine Alexander Epic (pp. 69–85); Andreas Schmidt-Colinet discusses the tomb allegedly built for Alexander in Memphis in association with the temple of Nectanebo II (pp. 87–90); J. C. Bürger analyses the themes of war and peace in the Alexander Epic of the twelfth-century Persian poet Nizami (pp. 91–107); Mario Grignaschi comments on the Graeco-Arabic texts of the pseudepigraphical correspondence between Aristotle and Alexander (pp. 109–23); Charles Genequand discusses Alexander's rôle in Islamic literature, seeing it as expressive of the tension between religious wisdom and military power (pp. 125–33); in the essay 'Sword of Conquest, Dove of the Soul: Political and Spiritual Values in Ahmadi's *Iskandarnāma*' (pp. 135–47); Caroline Sawyer concentrates on the enhanced prominence of Islam in this early Ottoman Alexander Epic (composed just after the Ottoman victory at Kosovo in A.D. 1390), which goes so far as to have Iskandar fulfil the requirements of the *ḥaǧǧ* pilgrimage; François de Polignac writes on the Islamic legend of the universal ruler, the Cosmocrator, who unifies and then closes the world to outsiders by building the great wall to keep out Gog and Magog (pp. 149–64); Claude-Claire Kappler interprets the rôle of Alexander in the *Shah Nama* of Firdousi in terms of the contemporary dichotomy between the masculine and feminine aspects of the self, expressed respectively in world-conquest and the search for spiritual values (pp. 165–90); Faustina Doufikar-Aerts examines 'Alexander the Great and the Pharos of Alexandria in Arabic Literature' (pp. 191–202), and detects in the famous lighthouse one of the two horns of Dū l-Qarnayn; and Robert Hillenbrand, writing on 'The Iskandar Cycle in the Great Mongol *Šāhnāma* (pp. 203–30), discusses the political and cultural context of the book-paintings that traditionally illustrate the *Šāhnāma* or 'Book of Kings' of Firdawsi, the earliest surviving large-scale account of Alexander in Persian poetry, completed around 1010, as exemplified in a copy produced for Abu Sa'id in the 1330s.

It is those essays which examine the Islamic view of the great Western conqueror which must inevitably be of the greatest interest to the Western reader when, at a time of Islamic resurgence, he strives to come to terms with Muslim sensibilities and the historical experience from which they spring. In the Middle Eastern tradition Alexander is more than the supreme warrior and seeker after knowledge—he has a religious dimension, being equated with the enigmatic figure Dū l-Qarnayn ('He of the Two Horns'), who appears in the Koran (18:83ff.). In the Koran, God gives Dū l-Qarnayn power over the whole earth and enables him to travel to the furthest east and furthest west. For the peoples of the far north he builds a rampart against their tormentors, the savage tribes of Gog and Magog—thus closing the *oikoumene* to the irredeemable alien—and preaches to the people of the West on the punishment awaiting the unrighteous and the reward for the virtuous. Dū l-Qarnayn is thus both a prophet and the archetype of the just ruler whose power derives directly from God. But his failed attempt to ascend into Heaven, presaging Muhammad's achieved ascension, places him in the middle ground between merely worldly ambition and true prophethood. In Aḥmadi's *Iskandarnāma*, Iskandar is invested with universal rule by an angel who gives him a sword saying, 'Allah gives this to you./ The sword is Allah's; draw it/ Against anyone who acts an enemy towards you./ Go and make war against sultans,/ For East and West, from end to end, are yours' (ll. 942–4). Alexander's victory over Darius is glossed with the assertion that 'Dārāb (Darius) is the self and Dū l-Qarnayn, the soul./ Weaken the self, for that is victory for the soul' (l. 1085). In the end, the Iskandar legend bespeaks a this-worldly spirituality, expressed in submission to the Law in a self-conscious righteousness and devotional practice,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

rather than the self-abnegating search for union with the godhead which underlies and is the ideal of traditional Christian spirituality.

Pontfical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto A. M. DEVINE

BURCKHARDT'S GREECE

R. STEPPER: *Leiden an der Geschichte. Ein zentrales Motiv in der* Griechischen Kulturgeschichte *Jacob Burckhardts und seine Bedeutung in der altertumswissenschaftlichen Geschichtsschreibung des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*. (Studien zur Geistesgeschichte, 21.) Pp. 269. Bodenheim: Philo Verlagsgesellschaft, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 3-8257-0051-8.

Wilamowitz was being honest when he slated the posthumous publication of Burckhardt's lectures on *Griechische Kulturgeschichte* by his nephew Jakob Oeri in 1898, on the grounds that lecture notes do not necessarily warrant publication even by a relative. But his intemperate attack on B. for 'his ignorance of the scholarship of the previous half-century; Burckhardt's Greece had no more existence than the classicising aesthetics which he might have been justified in polemicising against fifty years ago' (*Griechische Tragoedien* II, 7: p. 146 n. 520) suggests that he also felt threatened by B.'s representation of classical Greece as less than perfect, by his explicit attack on the idealization of Greece in the tradition of Winckelmann and Humboldt as a massive misrepresentation ('eine der allergrössen Falschungen des geschichtlichen Urteils, welche jemals Vorgekommen'). B.'s emphasis on the downside effects of the culture of what he called 'die erbarmungslose Polis' (GK I, 153) is obvious to any reader; where earlier commentators spoke of B.'s pessimism, S. sees the 'Leidensmotiv', the emphasis on suffering, as 'the key to understanding Burckhardt's negative evaluation of Greek history' (p. 7).

The first of S.'s three sections consists of a summary (many pages consist more than half of direct quotations) rather than an analysis of B.'s judgements of the costs of *polis* culture: enforced synoikism, the subjection of individuals to the needs of the 'Staat', the identification of public religion with the 'Staat', the monopolization of education by the *polis* (most extremely in Sparta), the dominance of sycophants, identified by B. with 'public speakers (rhetors, demagogues)', the 'persecution of all those individuals who could be of any significance' (such as Socrates), and the failure of the Greek cities to unite as a nation. She also highlights B.'s interest in the psychological costs of *polis* culture: the suffering of the losers, envy, suicide, lack of respect for old age, the fixation of exiles on returning to their *polis* rather than constructing a new entrepreneurial life elsewhere. (Curiously, the only appearance of B.'s discussion of slavery and its consequences at GK II, 2.4 comes later with reference to the influence of Fustel de Coulanges, drawn from Jennifer Roberts's *Athens on Trial*: n. 416 on p. 123 [listed under 'Tolbert' in S.'s bibliography].)

It is the aim of S.'s second section to show that B. was far from the first to have discussed these aspects of Greek culture in negative terms. She cites Schlegel on rhetors and sophists, Arndt on the killing of infants and cripples, Niebuhr on envy and on the lawlessness of tyrants (seen by B. in contrast as exercising the legal rights claimed by the *polis*), and Boeckh (whose lectures B. had attended at Berlin in 1839) on the wasteful public expenses and on the negative effect of jury service on citizens' attitude to work; other examples are culled from Gottfried Herrmann, Max Duncker (with no discussion either of his political or of his academic career), Ernst Curtius,

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and Fustel de Coulanges. That B. found all of these details in his predecessors is surely true: but we get little sense of why he selected them, and how and to what extent he succeeded in contextualizing them within the model of the *agon*-centred *polis* which he himself constructed.

To the modern reader who (in the English-speaking world partly through the mediation of Finley) takes for granted that model of a competitive *polis*-culture largely alien to us and responsible for imposing suffering and exploitation on most of its population, the most jarring element in B.'s picture is his hostility to democracy, but in that respect he was hardly an exception. As S. shows in her third section, ancient historians in the German-speaking world quarried his remarks about the horrors of Greek democracy until well after 1945 (while e.g. his criticism of *polis*-culture for impeding national unity generally became less interesting than other factors, such as the polarity between Greek and 'oriental'). She begins with Nietzsche, and the academic historians she has selected are Robert von Pöhlmann, Julius Kaerst, Fritz Taeger (who condemned B.'s reservations about *polis*-totalitarianism as those of a nineteenth-century liberal), Helmut Berve, and Hans Schaefer—together with, curiously, the Viennese writer and drama critic Egon Friedell. S. certainly shows that she has conscientiously read the texts she has selected; we are left wondering whether for some of them the principle of selection was anything other than that their titles contain the word *Kultur*. A final chapter glances more briefly at the use of B.'s ideas about the *polis* by Victor Ehrenberg, Moses Finley, Franz Hampl, Hermann Strasburger, and Christian Meier.

It is frustrating that there is no attempt to reconstruct the political and intellectual context of these writers. S. almost apologizes for referring to the Nazi context of Taeger's utterances (p. 176). Even the dates of the texts she discusses are hard to elicit: there is, as one would expect in a German dissertation, a copious bibliography—eighteen pages—but throughout we are given details only of the edition used by S. herself—including the 1977 edition of the *Griechische Kulturgeschichte*. The reader has to go elsewhere to find the date of Curtius's lecture on competitiveness ('Der Wettkampf'). Since S. does not think it necessary to give the original dates of Berve's publications, it is perhaps not surprising that she makes no attempt to distinguish between his pre-Nazi, Nazi, and post-Nazi writing.

S. explicitly excludes a study of the Leidensmotiv in B.'s other works (p. 8, though in fact there is an interesting comparison of B.'s negative comments on the Greek city with his positive evaluation of the city states of the Renaissance on pp. 41ff.); as she says herself, that would go beyond what would be required of a Potsdam student dissertation. Nevertheless it seems ironic that B., the scholar who created cultural contexts, should so frequently be read without reference to his own specific cultural context: that of the élite mercantile families (many of them Huguenot exiles like the La Roches with the entrepreneurial ethic B. so missed in antiquity) of Basel, which in the mid-nineteenth century was maintaining its civic autonomy at the same time as being at the forefront of Swiss national integration; a culture which still today puts a high value on individual enterprise, the separation of public life from religion and private morality, absolute discretion in family and financial affairs, and no public discussion of anything controversial (let alone of sexuality)—in other words, a culture markedly unlike that of the Greek *polis*. What we need to understand how B. developed that model of the *polis* which we now take for granted is actually a *Kulturgeschichte von Basel zur Zeit Jacob Burckhardts*.

University of Nottingham THOMAS WIEDEMANN

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

VENICE AND THE CLASSICAL HERITAGE

M. F. SANTI (ed.): *Venezia, l'Archeologia e l'Europa: Congresso internazionale, Venezia 27–30 Giugno, 1994*. (Supplementi di Rivista di Archeologia, 17). Pp. 207, 68 pls. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1996. ISBN: 88-7689-123-4.

This volume comprises thirty conference papers that explore various aspects of Venice's rôle in the transmission of the heritage of antiquity. Throughout the medieval and early-modern periods, the city enjoyed strong contacts with the eastern Mediterranean. Whether by trade or rapine, Venice was able to acquire an unrivalled collection of antiquities. It is these antiquities which form the basis of discussion for most of the papers in this volume.

Some of the contributors limit themselves to art-historical or archaeological discussions of items in Venetian collections: various classical sculptures are examined by E. Lesopo, G. Zampieri, B. Palma, and T. Mikocki; while late antique artefacts are considered by R. Polacco, A. Z. Ruggiu, and M. Lesnizkaia (on the Venice tetrarchs). Such essays have their uses and here they serve to highlight the diversity of antiquities in Venetian collections. Yet they are overshadowed by those contributions which address the question of Venice's rôle as an intermediary in the European rediscovery of the ancient world. To this end we have some very fine essays indeed. Several contributors examine the acquisition and distribution of antiquities. There are essays by I. Modrzewska on the interaction of Poles and Venetians at Constantinople, and by E. D'Amicone on the birth of Egyptology. P. Fortini Brown ponders Venetian attitudes to antiquities, and A. J.-M. Loechel considers the impact of discoveries on Venetian self-perceptions. The traffic in artefacts went both ways, of course, as M. Vecchi highlights in her study of Venetian sculpture found in Crete.

Such discoveries allowed the wealthy families of the Venetian Republic and its neighbours to create for themselves a lifestyle which owed much to the splendour of antiquity. C. Franco examines Venetian imitations of ancient iconography of apotheosis; while L. Beschi, L. Faedo, and G. Traversari examine how classical designs were employed in the embellishment of private homes. Among the most interesting papers in the entire volume are those on the use of ancient sculptures for the decoration of public spaces in north-Italian cities in the Renaissance and Baroque periods: L. de Lachenal considers what impact the bronze horses of St Mark's might have had on the design of equestrian monuments; while A. Giuliano provides an excellent analysis of ancient statues which were set up in honour of saints and *condottieri* throughout the Veneto.

This accumulation of artefacts in Venice made it one of the pre-eminent centres for the study of antiquity in early-modern Europe. The experiences of visitors to Venice are examined by I. Favaretto and R. Chevallier, while essays by M. Rekowska and A. Sadurska consider the experiences of Polish travellers in Venice, and the study of Venetian antiquities in Poland. On a related theme, M. G. Marzi suggests that some pieces of ancient pottery depicted in Zoffany's famous painting *La tribuna* may be identified in modern collections in Florence. Venetians also played a rôle in publicizing antiquities through their literary enterprises. A. Carraciolo Aricò, G. Bodon, and A. Corso examine manuscripts, while G. Ghirardini Santinello uses correspondence to show how Venetians kept abreast of the latest archaeological discoveries. Finally, the Venetian publishing industry—especially the richly illustrated antiquarian works of

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Zanetti cousins—comes under scrutiny in two instructive papers by R. Bandinelli and A. Sacconi.

All in all, this is a useful contribution to literature on the classical tradition. In particular, many of the essays are a reminder of just how haphazard was the survival, discovery, and interpretation of antiquities. The volume, as one would expect from this publisher, is beautifully printed, and the plates are a joy to behold. Yet I have some complaints, because despite its undoubted richness, the volume fails to present a coherent picture of the contribution of Venice to the European rediscovery of antiquity. I should dearly love to know what rationale prompted the editor to assemble the papers in such an arbitrary fashion. For example, the two papers on the Zanetti cousins and those three on the interaction of Poles and Venetians are scattered randomly through the volume, rather than arranged in thematic groups. In addition, I should have liked an essay—even a short one—synthesizing the material assembled in this volume. When so much effort has been expended by the contributors and the publishers, these editorial shortcomings are a shame.

University of Manchester MARK HUMPHRIES

OCD[3]

S. HORNBLOWER, A. SPAWFORTH (edd.): *The Oxford Classical Dictionary: Third Edition*. Pp. lv + 1640. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. Cased, £70. ISBN: 0-19-866172-X.

The publication of *OCD*[3] is a landmark in classical studies; however, the true value of the volume could never begin to be gleaned from a mere review, but will crystallize over the coming years and decades. Nevertheless, it is my bitter-sweet task to articulate an early reaction, which I feel I must preface with two aspects of *CR* policy: first, the convention of not allowing an author or contributor to review their own work has meant that '364 of the world's top classical scholars' (as it says on the dust jacket of *OCD*[3]) had to be passed over in the search for a reviewer, and secondly, *CR*'s request to reviewers to provide the reader with a general account of the scope and quality of the publication will be in vain when the book in question is 'an authoritative one-volume guide to all aspects of the ancient world—political, economic, philosophical, religious, artistic and social' (dust jacket again). Thus this woefully underqualified reviewer begins to attempt the impossible . . .

A whole generation has passed since the publication of *OCD*[2] (in 1970). We are told in this latest edition (p. vii) that the entry on 'Thucydides' is reprinted from Wade-Gery's article in the 1949 *OCD*[1] (with updates on later research), so enduring a classic is it; cross-reference between the list of contributors to the new edition (pp. xvii–xxv) and the list of contributors to the two previous editions (pp. xxv–xxviii) reveals that a number of scholars have been involved in the *OCD* phenomenon for over a generation. (Despite the very forward-looking character of *OCD*[3], this inclusion of the names of contributors to *OCD* over the years, some of whose work is superseded by *OCD*[3], is very respectful of our scholarly heritage.) In the select band of veteran-contributors from *OCD*[2] we have some of the figureheads of classical scholarship since the late sixties, and with apologies to those I have missed, no-one can be surprised to see names such as Geoffrey Arnott, Ernst Badian, Ewen Bowie, Alan Cameron, Averil Cameron, John Chadwick, Kenneth Dover, John Kelly, Douglas MacDowell, David Ridgway, Donald Russell, Martin West, John Wilkes, and Michael

© Oxford University Press, 1998

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Winterbottom featuring in 1970 and 1996. These are scholars who have helped to direct classical studies, both intellectually and politically, in the intervening years and beyond, and whose enduring influence is neatly underlined by their appearance in both *OCD*[2] and *OCD*[3]. But can anyone manage three? Again, with apologies for any oversight, further cross-referencing throws up one name only—Nicholas Hammond, who, as a contributor to *OCD*[1] and *OCD*[3] and joint editor of *OCD*[2], has performed a unique service to the project over five decades. How neat that he is a Cambridge man.

H. & S. must have faced difficult questions at every stage—how do you decide whom to ask to contribute? how do you decide what to cover? how do you decide the word-count for each entry?—and the result is a monument, of course, to world classics, but also to the editors' own personal and professional qualities. Their decision to delegate was sensible, and the sixteen further area advisors, eight of whom are from Oxford (p. xv), were doubtless very influential. H. & S. set out their ambitions clearly—*OCD*[3] aims to be specific, interdisciplinary, broad-reaching, thematic, accessible, and international (pp. vii–ix). These targets are met without ostentation.

There can be no doubt that a new *OCD* was needed. A quick glance at the list of new entries (pp. xi–xiv) shows quite how far and fast classical studies have moved since 1970. The 'Vindolanda tablets' entry is a prime example of a new discovery, but in *OCD*[3] we can also find some items which now have so secure a position in the discipline that a time before their currency seems almost unthinkable: 'homosexuality', 'narrative, narration', 'euergetism', 'hospitium', 'literacy', 'orientalism', and many more are now firmly established in classical studies at many levels. The 1996 snapshot of classical studies that *OCD*[3] represents gives us the opportunity to reflect upon the pioneering work done in areas such as these since 1970. Besides, how did we cope before without entries such as 'Ionian Revolt', 'Demagogues', 'Tragedy, Roman', or 'Trajan's Column'? (The last two, in fact, did have some coverage previously, but not in dedicated articles.)

Inevitably, *OCD* is getting bigger. The first edition effectively stopped at 337 and generally excluded Christian writers; *OCD*[2] covered 'more places, peoples and persons' (p. v) than *OCD*[1], recognizing in particular the increasing attention paid to archaeology and late antiquity. In turn, *OCD*[3] is 30% bigger than *OCD*[2]. All three editions start at 'abacus' and end with 'Zosimus' (no aardvarks or Zulus in classical antiquity). The process of revision has included the addition of many new items and expansion of old ones, but very little from the earlier editions has been excluded from *OCD*[3]. Acknowledged exceptions are the entries for individual Greek pot-painters (p. vii), but what else might have been left out? One possible category would be terms that are now obsolete. An interesting example is 'Scipionic Circle'; Andrew Erskine charts the history of this modern term (the fluctuating fortunes of which can be plotted conveniently from the entries of George Whittick in *OCD*[1] and Alan Astin in *OCD*[2]), and concludes with scepticism about its validity, 'today it is regarded with suspicion'. However justified the scepticism, is it a function of the *OCD* to act as a corrective to the misconceived trends of earlier research? Need the *OCD* attempt to embrace the details of the history of classical scholarship? If so, why is there no entry (nor has there ever been) for 'Dominate' (although it is mentioned under the entry for its old sparring-partner, 'Principate')? Another candidate for omission from *OCD*[4] is the new entry 'Horatii, Oath of the': H. himself tells us that this subject was 'made up' by a painter in 1785. Why it merits an entry in *OCD*[3] is left unclear. 'Careers' is another case in point. In this new entry, Barbara Levick warns us on more than one occasion of the unsuitability of the word in respect of the classical world. Is the article included

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to highlight a marked difference between the ancient and modern worlds? Or perhaps to act as a check on our undeniably careless use of the word?

The new entries are flagged on the dust jacket and in the preface, and the list of them makes interesting reading. I suspect that in practice fewer and fewer readers will consult this list as the years go by, so it is important that the two systems of cross-referencing within the body of the dictionary—asterisk or 'see' plus appropriate headword—are fail-safe. My very amateur test runs suggest that almost invariably they are. Any reservations I have about the many genuinely new entries are not based on a belief that they do not merit inclusion—far from it—but on the practical consideration that some readers will not think to look them up. For example, John Wild's rewriting of 'silk' might profitably have been assembled with the new articles 'cotton', 'linen', 'wool', and 'textile production' in a single, longer entry ('textiles'?) with subheadings. Likewise, 'childbirth', 'midwives', and 'breast-feeding' ('obstetrics'—or is that too technical to be user-friendly?). Perhaps such integrated articles would be unwieldy, but they might find more readers (that is, more readers might find them). The advertised new entries 'drought' and 'theatre production, Greek' do not in fact materialize, and the entry for 'mountains' seems too short to be of much value.

Such observations cannot detract from the volume's laudable ambition; it is hugely enlightened and enlightening to have in a classical work of reference entries such as 'ecology', 'capitalism', 'ethnicity', 'Marxism and Classical Antiquity', 'propaganda', and 'translation'. There are four new entries on economics. The number of entries on legal issues has been increased significantly. Among several new entries relating to food, we have 'costus', 'spices', 'dining room', 'famine', 'fig', 'food supply', 'granaries', and even 'cannibalism'—but no 'vegetarianism' (despite some references in the new article 'animals, attitudes to'). The revival from 1949 of an entry for 'scholarship, classical, history of' is welcome after its exclusion from *OCD*^{2}. Medical-ethical issues are represented with new entries such as 'abortion' and 'vivisection'. Funerary art, both Greek and Roman, makes its *OCD* debut in this edition. Three area advisors, Martin Goodman (Jewish Studies), Helen King (Women's Studies), and Amelie Kuhrt (Near Eastern Studies), have directed the *OCD*'s expansion into their important fields, so that *OCD*^{3} has no stuffy or élitist character. Of course, many new items to varying degrees reflect contemporary preoccupations, and it will be interesting to see how they age. Some no doubt will inspire further research and require revision before too long. Some may become classics to sit beside Wade-Gery's 'Thucydides'. But what, if anything, will fall by the wayside?

Happily, the accessibility of *OCD*^{3} is achieved even financially. Despite being the largest of the three *OCD*s to date, this volume is exceptionally good value for money. This dictionary will be the envy of other subjects.

St Andrews University ROGER REES

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/48.2.428 Published online by Cambridge University Press