Greek History

Sex and sport are two things men will most happily pay to watch and read about – not me or you, of course, but other men – so Thomas Scanlon ought to be on to a winner with his illustrated *Eros & Greek Athletics*.[1] There is actually not much to titillate in this book, which treats both subjects in a sober, scholarly manner, unless one counts a brief reverie about Odysseus 'standing naked before the maiden Nausikaa' (126). The 'sublime eroticism' of a nude man covered in brine crawling out of the undergrowth on a remote riverbank may be more obvious to men than to women. Nausikaa, at any rate, began to fancy Odysseus only after he had cleaned himself up and put on some clothes (*Odyssey* 6.242–5). Academically most exciting is an engaging chapter which comprehensively surveys connections between sex and sport in Greece, taking in everything from athletes as sex-symbols and sexual abuse by athletics coaches to ancient techniques for avoiding unwanted erections and 'nocturnal emissions' (199–273). With its amusing observations on aspects of sex and sport in the modern world, such as the fact that halfway through the Sydney Olympics the energetic competitors had already used up 30, 000 condoms (200), and its prefatory remarks about the nature of ancient sexuality, this chapter was presumably originally designed to open the book. If it needs saying 'by way of brief preface that . . . many adult males pursued sexual relations both with women . . . and with other males', it certainly needs saying earlier than page 202. Placing all this near the end instead has the unfortunate result that it repeats quite a bit of the material which had already been covered in more detail, yet sometimes with less up-to-date bibliography, in earlier chapters. (Compare, for example, the two separate treatments of the Solonic law banning slaves from exercise in the gymnasium on p. 88 with n. 118 and pp. 212–13 with n. 49). Four other interesting chapters offer revised versions of previously published articles, one on the Olympics in the Roman era (which seems to have little to do with the rest of the book, 40–63) and three on sport for girls, in Spartan education, and in ritual settings at Olympia and Brauron (98–174). Among the most attractive suggestions here is the idea that the girl's 'race' at Brauron was a game of tag in which one girl, pretending to be a bear, snarling and raising her hands as if they were paws, tried to catch the others (152). The remaining five chapters, almost entirely new, on topics such as sport and religion, sport and initiation, and the myth of Atalanta, strike me as rather rambling, but they do contribute to Scanlon's sympathetic overall agenda, which is to show that Greek athletics and pederasty cannot be explained as survivals of prehistoric Indo-European rituals but need to be understood as part of an educational system which developed in response to historical circumstances specific to archaic Greece. His answer to the question of what these historical circumstances were is somewhat vague and predictable – a checklist of 'the establishment of hoplite warfare, the growth of the polis, and the continued influence of Homeric poems and the Olympics' (96) – but at least he is chasing down the right track. Judith Barringer does for *The Hunt in Ancient Greece*[2] what Scanlon does for Greek sport, as in her opening chapter she tries to identify a historical context for its growing prominence. She argues that the popularity of pictures of boar and deer hunting in sixth- and early fifth-century Athens was linked to aristocratic attempts to hang on their social prestige in the

[1] *Eros & Greek Athletics*. By Thomas F. Scanlon. Oxford U.P., 2002. Pp. viii + 466, with 53 illustrations. Hardback.

[2] *The Hunt in Ancient Greece*. By Judith M. Barringer. Johns Hopkins U.P., Baltimore 2002. Pp. xiii + 296, with 110 illustrations. Hardback £33.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/50.2.250 Published online by Cambridge University Press

face of changing political realities. This is supported by an analysis of 121 vase-paintings, many illustrated, meticulously presented in tabular form (60–9, 172–3). Barringer leaves it to the reader to check her interpretations against the tables, rather than spelling out their statistical basis, and unfortunately this reader felt that the ideas did not always tally with the data. The claim that the peak periods of production were 560–550 and 520–470 BC (and thus reflect responses to the tyranny of Peisistratus and the reforms of Cleisthenes, 15, 123) is hard to substantiate: if one takes deer- and boar-hunts together and dates the vases to quarter-centuries, as is conventional, the period 500–475 actually shows a dramatic decline from 525–500 (from 46 down to 16 vases), and the numbers for 550–525 are higher than 575–550 (22 against 13). Against the claim that 'beginning *c.*520 and particularly after 510, cups and other drinking vessels are nearly the only shapes on which hunting imagery occurs' (showing that they begin to feature exclusively in sympotic and therefore 'aristocratic' contexts, 18) one might observe that during 525–500 non-drinking vessels actually account for 61% of the total. The similar claim that 'beginning *c.*520 and more commonly in the first half of the fifth century' hunting scenes increasingly feature hoplite armour, swords and hunting cloaks draped over the arm as if they were shields, and are thus associated with warfare (21, 42–3) meets the objection that the only definitely military element in all this is hoplite armour, and that there are at most five scenes in which a hunter wears any armour: these scenes are dated to 540, 520, 510, 505 and 490 BC. Iconographic studies such as this are undoubtedly an important way forward in our discipline, but we should not fall into the trap of letting what little we happen to know about political history dictate our reading of the images. The rest of the book by and large steers clear of these pitfalls, offering wide-ranging and well-illustrated surveys of artistic representations of hunting myths, hunting imagery in funerary art, and allusions to the hunt in pederastic courtship scenes. The latter is particularly interesting and attractively suggests that the animals which often feature – from dead foxes to live leopards – represent, not the spoils of hunting, but the qualities attributed to the 'hunter' and 'hunted' in erotic pursuit. 'I have not yet come to the end of the prolegomena' are chilling words at the start of a third chapter (63), especially when the second chapter has already been a virtual repeat of the first. When Chapter Five goes on to announce that it will 'slow down the tempo of the enquiry – erudition, even when reduced to a minimum, is slow' (123) the reader may well lose patience with *The Divided City*[3] and its distinguished author, Nicole Loraux. The papers collected in this volume, the majority previously published but adapted so as to forge them into a coherent book, explore the intriguing idea that conflict and inequality in power, always inherent in politics (sorry: 'the political'), were acknowledged in Greek vocabulary as the very things that constituted the political community, yet were suppressed in classical political discourse, which concentrated on harmony, equality, and collectivity and in a variety of ways sought to 'forget' about division. Loraux offers many an interesting observation on topics ranging from Hesiod's genealogy of Strife and Oath, via the abolition of the second day of Boedromion in Athens as a day of divine strife, to the elaborate reconciliation attempted by Nakone in Hellenistic Sicily. It is just a pity that all this is discussed at snail's pace and in overwrought language ('indeed we do advance, at first, on the tips of our toes –

[3] *The Divided City*. On memory and forgetting in ancient Athens. By Nicole Loraux. Zone Books, New York, 2002. Pp. 358. Hardback £20.50.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/50.2.250 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sometimes even on points, like a dancer – and then more and more out in the open', 63), and a little disconcerting how often arguments rest on the precise meaning and etymology of single words rather than more substantial bodies of evidence: the term *stasis* gets a lot of attention, but Aristotle's analysis of *stasis* in the *Politics* gets none. The opening chapters wage a polemic against the 'tired' approaches to Greek history and society 'offered by universities in the 1960s' (51), denouncing the kind of history which 'excludes from the political everything in the life of the city that is not an event, as well as any event that cannot be explained, however vaguely, by invoking Greek "reason"' (19). I doubt that this was a legitimate target any longer when these papers were first written in the 1980s, and to repeat the attack now seems like kicking a straw man when he is down. *The Divided City* ends with a good discussion of how Athens after the civil war of 403 BC tried to put itself back together again, which happens also to be the subject of detailed treatment in Andrew Wolpert's *Remembering Defeat*.[4] Careful scrutiny of many Athenian speeches and a few inscriptions from the aftermath of the oligarchic regime shows that what the Athenians chose to remember about their recent past and what they chose to forget helped gloss over divisions and create a new collective identity. One central conceit was that hardly anyone outside the immediate circle of the Thirty had been an active, blameworthy participant in events: 'the restored democracy was now composed of opponents of the Thirty, their victims, and innocent bystanders' (140). Another key notion was that the entire people had joined the resistance of the 'men of Peiraeus' (91–5) and that no particular individuals or groups could claim special credit. Wolpert points out that these were not mere rhetorical commonplaces but ways of exploiting and channelling genuine 'anger and fear in the community' (139), a point which he briefly reinforces with examples drawn from modern history. Stylistically a complete contrast to Loraux, Wolpert's tone is, if anything, a little too plain and understated to bring home with full force his point about the deep trauma with which the Athenians were trying to cope, but he nonetheless presents a readable and illuminating study of reconciliation. Still on the subject of civil strife, Jonathan Price's *Thucydides and Internal War*[5] suggests that the historian portrayed the whole Peloponnesian War as if it were a civil war writ large. The amoral, partisan speeches and selfish or otherwise flawed motivations which Thucydides attributed to belligerents, and the brutal and sacrilegious events to which he devoted special attention, all conform to the polarized patterns typical of civil war as described in his famous analysis of *stasis*. Price argues – with notable fluency and clarity – that this is not a straightforward reflection of the brutality of warfare and politics at the time, but the result of selection and characterization by means of which Thucydides conveyed his view that Greece was more-or-less a single community and that war between Greeks was therefore a form of civil conflict. I find this pretty persuasive, even if it perhaps does not give enough weight to other intellectual trends and personal experiences which may have helped shape Thucydides' bleak vision of the war. As a bonus, Price's discussion of Panhellenism helps explain Thucydides' notoriously patchy coverage of Persian material: he made a point of showing the humiliating consequences of Greek disunity by listing all instances of Persians meddling in Greek affairs, but left out any episodes

[4] *Remembering Defeat*. Civil War and Civic Memory in Ancient Athens. By Andrew Wolpert. Johns Hopkins U.P., Baltimore 2002. Pp. xviii + 190. Hardback £29.50.

[5] *Thucydides and Internal War*. By Jonathan J. Price. Cambridge U.P. 2001. Pp. xi + 410. Hardback £47.50.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/50.2.250 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which did not fit this agenda (368–9). Has the mystery of the missing Peace of Callias just been solved? No, Lisa Kallet would presumably answer. In her view Thucydides' main theme is not internal division but 'financial considerations, in particular the nuts and bolts of financing a naval war' (277; cf. 289), and the Peace of Callias would presumably count as a shining example of what could be achieved with a properly funded fleet. Kallet's previous book, *Money, Expense and Naval Power* (or *Money*, as she calls it for short) traced these themes through the Archidamian War, and now *Money and the Corrosion of Power in Thucydides*[6] (or *More Money*, as I like to think of it) follows the thread through the rest of the History. Despite being initially motivated 'by a sense of duty to complete the study promised in the first book' (1–2), the sequel shows no sign of repeating a tired formula but bubbles with enthusiasm and imagination. The most prominent new angle is Thucydides' idea that the Athenians stopped using their wealth to increase their power and began to use their power to increase their wealth (e.g. 41), and that their real financial problem in the second half of the war was not a lack of money as such but 'their inability to know how best to get it and use it' (290). A long but lively running commentary takes the reader through all references to money and resources in the story of the Sicilian Expedition and Ionian War, with the aid of methods ranging from intertextual comparison to a mathematical calculation based on a 'semiellipsoidal formula'. The latter is deployed to show that the four hollow shields filled with the money carried by the survivors of the Sicilian expedition could have held about 12 talents worth, 'a paltry amount' to which Thucydides' alluded for the sake of an ironic contrast with the opulence displayed at the start of the campaign (174–6). Actually, the sum amounts to an average of 12 drachmas petty cash per man, which, at this late stage of the expedition, might equally be regarded as rather a lot and as confirmation of how much the Athenians had brought along at the outset, but never mind that: what matters is the care which Kallet has typically taken over the passage, mobilizing mathematicians and numismatists, not to mention someone who knows how to word-process complex formulas, to elucidate what had previously seemed a useless piece of information. In this mostly historiographical study, one chapter strays into the financial history of the Athenian empire and, amongst other things, suggests yet another explanation for the notorious Standards (aka Coinage) Decree: it was designed to facilitate the collection of the 5% harbour tax which Athens imposed on its allies instead of tribute in 413 (195–225). I wish could proclaim another mystery solved, but the theory that Thucydides did not mention the decree in connection with the tax because he chose to report only 'irrational' financial decisions (the tax), not sensible ones (the decree; 225–6), seems a bit of a stretch. Straining harder still is the idea that the Spartans held a congress at Olympia in 428 BC because they were betting that *Dorieus* of Rhodes would win the *pankration* and hoped to exploit the propaganda value of Olympic games in which 'the Dorian' would be 'all-powerful' (103–4). Get it? I should add immediately that this flight of fancy is untypical of, and indeed not all that relevant to, *Speaking the Same Language*,[7] Paula Debnar's monograph on speeches delivered by and to Spartans in Thucydides' History. This is not as slim a volume as the Spartans' legendary taciturnity and short attention spans ('We have forgotten the first part of your

[6] *Money and the Corrosion of Power in Thucydides*. The Sicilian expedition and its aftermath. By Lisa Kallet. University of California Press, Berkeley, 2001. Pp. xiii + 347. Hardback £37.95.

[7] *Speaking the Same Language*. Speech and audience in Thucydides' Spartan debates. By Paula Debnar. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 2001. Pp. x + 254. Hardback.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/50.2.250 Published online by Cambridge University Press

speech') might lead one to expect. Debnar's main contention is that in writing his versions of these speeches, Thucydides carefully tailored them to their original audiences, and that he built into them indications that Spartan speakers and audiences were changing: they began the war as stereotypical 'orderly and obedient' Dorians (194) but by the end found themselves open to speeches full of 'audacity and sophistry' (203), in short, 'ready to play the part of Athenians' (219). The speech-by-speech analysis in support of this line of argument is at times surprisingly casual in its citation of evidence. In order to demonstrate, for example, that the word 'moderate' (*metrios*) is typically Athenian, it is hardly enough to cite a single use of the term by an Athenian ambassador (57), nor does a single occurrence of the word in a speech by Spartan ambassadors seem enough to show 'their willingness to become more like Athenians' (160; cf. 184). Again, it may well be true that Brasidas uses 'a relatively high number of abstract nouns, particularly of the *-sis* type, a feature of Athenian rhetoric', but I am not bowled over by the force of the one example cited in the footnote, which compares an Athenian reference to 'our embassy' (*presbeusis*) with Brasidas' reference to 'my mission' (*ekpempsis*, 184 n. 40). Perhaps the evidence is so overwhelming that Debnar felt able to confine herself to a couple of illustrative examples. If so, she has discovered yet greater subtlety in Thucydides' characterization through speech; if not, the subtlety is all her own. A different Thucydides may emerge from every new book on the man, but there is only one Antiphon. Antiphon the speechwriter, Antiphon the sophist, and Antiphon the dream-interpreter are one and the same person: *Antiphon the Athenian*.[8] Michael Gagarin argues effectively that the stylistic differences between the works of the sophist and those of the speechwriter, which led Didymus the Grammarian in the first century BC to distinguish at least two Antiphontes (45), may be due to their different purposes and audiences, rather than to different authorship, and that they make sense as a single body of work by a versatile author in the sophistic mould. Even the fragments on dream-interpretation can be fitted in, on the assumption that their counter-intuitive explanations were not to be taken seriously, but wittily illustrated how a clever interpreter could make dreams mean anything (sample: when a runner dreams of riding in a four-horse chariot, this does not mean that he will win, but that he will lose, because there are four runners in front of him, 100). Sandwiched between chapters which set Antiphon's career in its context, the bulk of the book is devoted to a close analysis of the *Tetralogies*, the three surviving court speeches, and the fragments of *Truth* and *On Concord* (texts and translation of these latter are included in an appendix) to show that they have more in common than first meets the eye. Gagarin has inevitably become quite an admirer of Antiphon – as was Thucydides (8.65) – whom he presents as a proto-Socrates, martyred for his philosophy (162). It is perhaps worth recalling, though, that our hero was an active member of a thuggish oligarchic regime (which barely rates a mention here). And perhaps I've been watching *The Sopranos* too much, but the evasive line of defence he adopted for the client on trial for the murder of Herodes, allegedly sleeping with the fishes after having had his head bashed in with a stone ('I know nothing about it. He must have had an accident') sounds awfully familiar. Should Gagarin's trinity be joined by Antiphon the mob lawyer? Almost equally anachronistic identities have been attributed to another executed sophist –

[8] *Antiphon the Athenian*. Oratory, law and justice in the age of the sophists. By Michael Gagarin. University of Texas Press, Austin, 2002. Pp. xi + 222. Hardback £30.50.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/50.2.250 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lucian's word for him (*Peregrine's End* 13) – Jesus of Nazareth, who, as José Ángel Fernández Canosa points out, has variously become 'a Cynic, a hippie, a counterculture guru' in the hands of modern theologians (82). This is not the kind of subject matter you would expect to come across in a Greek history review, or indeed in a book on *Fronteras e identidad en el mondo griego antiguo*,[9] but the topic of frontiers, boundaries, and identities is nothing if not broadly defined in this all-Spanish collection of conference papers. Jesus is joined by Hesiod, Thales, and the Catalogue of Ships in an opening section entitled 'Method and Myth', while the two closing papers, bracketed together under the heading 'Feminine Identity', deal with 'intramural boundaries in Xenophon's *Oikonomikos*' and 'reflections on the iconographical significance of the motif of the snake in some scenes on archaic Greek pottery'. In between, two sets of five papers cover more central topics such as territorial and ethnic boundaries, frontiers in the colonial world, and representations of the barbarian. Since I understand only as much Spanish as some knowledge of other Romance languages and repeated viewing of *Fawlty Towers* enables me to decipher, I had better not presume to give a full critical assessment of these papers. Whatever else this volume offers, it serves as a prominent reminder that ancient history in Spain is not entirely monopolised by Romanists, and that can only be good news. ¿Right?

The study of Greek identity takes a big step forward with the publication of Jonathan Hall's *Hellenicity*,[10] which outlines the development of Greek ethnicity from the Bronze Age to the Hellenistic period, no less. At the core of it lies the argument that Dorian, Ionian, Achaean, Aeolian, and Hellenic ethnic identities developed in the archaic period rather than in or before the period formerly known as the Dark Age, and that this happened in response to shifting relations between groups of Greeks, rather than between Greeks and barbarians. After the Persian Wars, ethnicity, in the sense of an identity based primarily on a perception of shared descent (9–19) began to decline in importance, and Greek identity was increasingly based on the perception of a shared culture, which came to dominate completely in the Hellenistic world. This is an attractive model, and it is set out with great flair, learning, and originality. Given the nature of the evidence for the earlier periods, there is inevitably plenty of room for disagreement on individual points of interpretation. A passage from the *Iliad* (13.685) cited as evidence that Ionian identity was forged first in Asia Minor and only later extended to Athens (69–70), for example, surely cannot be used in this way: the context makes it perfectly clear that the 'Ionians with trailing tunics' in question are in fact Athenians. More importantly, Hall's thesis that Hellas and Ionia were territorial entities well before Hellenes and Ionians became ethnic groups is based on little more than a linguistic argument (70–1, 131–2), which seems not much of a weapon to brandish in the face of opponents who would defend the common evolutionary scheme which has kinship precede territory as a basis for social organization. On the other hand, most of Hall's theories are eminently plausible, and I am particularly taken with the idea that confining the Olympic games to Hellenes was driven by a desire to exclude not so much barbarians as subject populations within Greece (167–8). *Hellenicity* is the 144th book which I have reviewed in these pages, but

[9] *Fronteras e identidad en el mondo griego antiguo*. III Reunión de Historiadores. Edited by Pedro López Barja and Susana Reboreda Morillo. University of Santiago de Compostella/University of Vigo, 2001. Pp. 301. Hardback.

[10] *Hellenicity*. Between ethnicity and culture. By Jonathan M. Hall. The University of Chicago Press, 2002. Pp. xx + 312. Hardback £35.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/50.2.250 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I can find no excuse to wheel out my ready-made puns about 'gross' errors. As luck would have it, for once this is a book which deserves its ecstatic dust-jacket blurbs. The Greeks were so fond of bad puns that they put them on their coins: think of Phocaea and its seal (*phokê*), Rhodes and its rose, Trapezus and its banker's table (*trapeza*) groaning under a pile of coins. This last image adorns the jacket of *Money and its Uses in the Ancient Greek World*,[11] in which editors Andrew Meadows and Kirsty Shipton bring together historians and numismatists to produce a fine collection of papers with a mostly Hellenistic focus. Two chapters show that coinage did not become a symbol of political sovereignty in the Greek world until the time of Antiochus IV, who took over the idea from the Romans (Oliver, Meadows); two chapters interestingly explore the extensive and varied use of coinage in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt (von Reden, Rowlandson); and one chapter, more than twice as long as any other, is devoted to a massively detailed publication of the coin issues of Rhodes, 408–190 BC (Ashton). Classical Athens is well served by a couple of chapters on the 'owls' as democratic symbols (Trevett) and on the investment patterns revealed by records of mine- and land-leases from which Shipton conjures up a series of suggestive pie-charts which hint that, for all their supposed love of land, the Athenian élite were more inclined to put their money into mining enterprises. Archaic Greece gets exciting pieces by John Davies, on the nature and uses of temple funds and their rapid monetization in the early fifth century (perhaps related to the 'horrendous costs' of trireme fleets, 125), and Henry Kim, who alerts us to the early existence of small denominations, non-coin money, and precision weighing- and measuring-systems, all of which require us to revise our simplistic ideas about the rise and impact of coinage. Jane Rowlandson's conclusion that money 'is not as distinctive as it appears' but can easily be incorporated into a range of different social and economic structures (154) nicely sums up the gist of much of this volume. The contributors may not agree on whether Moses Finley's ideas about the political versus economic roles of coinage were a good thing (23), or 'by now rather obsolete' (66 n. 10), or even 'unfortunate' (1), but one way or another they all help move forward the debate which he kick-started. For thirty years, Finley's classic work on the ancient economy has so cornered the market that no one has dared produce another book on the whole of that vast and tricky subject, but Walter Scheidel and Sitta von Reden have now set a brave example with an excellent reader called simply *The Ancient Economy*.[12] A second edited volume with the same title is in press and a *Cambridge Economic History of the Graeco-Roman World* is forthcoming *c.*2005. There must be something in the air. The reader is a model of its kind, with two new pieces (by Leslie Kurke and Richard Saller) and a judicious selection of recent work – the oldest item being Paul Halstead's famous article on 'traditional and ancient rural economy in Mediterranean Europe' from 1987 – most of which has not been widely accessible to students because it appeared in obscure journals, or in hugely expensive edited volumes, or in French. Between them, the twelve chapters thoroughly cover the eternal primitivist-modernist debate (not just a battleground, but 'an academic Hundred Years' War' as Dominic Rathbone puts it, 156), with particular emphasis on the key issues of markets and growth, and of course such methodological matters as Keith

[11] *Money and its Uses in the Ancient Greek World.* Edited by Andrew Meadows and Kirsty Shipton, Oxford U.P., 2001. Pp. xx + 167, with 19 plates. Hardback £55.

[12] *The Ancient Economy*. Edited by Walter Scheidel and Sitta von Reden. Edinburgh Readings on the Ancient World. Edinburgh U.P., 2002. Pp. xxi + 282. Hardback £45; Paperback £16.99.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/50.2.250 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hopkins' remarks on why neither the Welsh dwarf gambit nor the Mount Everest gambit (195) are valid against models which are properly constructed on the principle of a Red Indian wigwam (193). No, really, it makes perfect sense in context. The editors top this all off with a range of helpful introductory matter, including a glossary for those who don't know their *artaba* from their *aroura*. Gary Reger's chapter on prices in Hellenistic Delos actually quotes a bit from a review I did in my first year as *Greece & Rome* subject reviewer (136), which leaves me torn between a sense of closure and a sensation of vertigo at the thought that I have just reviewed a quotation of a review cited in a reprint of an article based on the book which was reviewed in the first place. The time has clearly come to stop. Now.

HANS VAN WEES

Roman History

Lacking the courage of the BBC, which sent Lord Nelson, the late Princess of Wales, and eight others into competition as 'Great Britons', I shall put one outstanding work at the head and order the rest on other principles, such as newness. First then comes an enthralling, informative book, R. Sallares' *Malaria and Rome*.[1] The author, boldly writing when genome research is poised to transform understanding of the *falciparum* parasite, possesses the skills required to be intelligible about the disease (his glossary might have been more extensive) and acute about the ancient world, illuminating it from later history and insisting on continuity. He changes ideas of the extent, effects, and complexity of problems caused by various parasites and poses questions for those who put their faith in model life tables, as well as for political historians (C. Gracchus' road-building promoted malaria (95)). Beginning with a typology and history of malaria (always with us, it may return), he turns to Italian ecology, which is patchy, paradoxical, and affected by the presence of other diseases. There is a gripping comparison with malaria's demography in England before the author goes on to particular hot-spots, the Pontine Marshes, Tuscany, Rome, Campagna, Apulia. A final chapter analyses results and their implications. Minor scepticism persists: 'Cato knew all about . . . malaria' (244). About *malaria*? And that leaves room for other diseases. Because old Vespasian succumbed to 'fevers', can we be sure that they were malarial (3 n.6; cf. B. W. Jones on Suet. *Vesp.* 24)? 'Mass chattel-slavery was an adaptation to malaria' (254), but the rôle of malaria in pre-Gracchan peasant depopulation (196) cannot be quantified.

Next, a collection of fine essays delivered in honour of Fergus Millar and accompanied by portrait and bibliography, all edited by A. K. Bowman and others: *Representations of Empire: Rome and the Mediterranean World*.[2] Such is the range of Millar's work that it would have been impossible to put tributes under one title. This one is misleading. Readers need to know what they get: from J. North's trenchant reassessment of Roman – and academic – democracy we pass to A. Kuhrt's lucid analysis of accounts of Sennacherib's siege of Jerusalem; then S. Mitchell directs a brilliant searchlight onto the

[1] *Malaria and Rome*. A History of Malaria in Ancient Italy. By Robert Sallares. Oxford U.P., 2002. Pp. xvi + 341, with 37 plates, 7 maps, 9 tables, 1 fig.

[2] *Representations of Empire*. Rome and the Mediterranean World. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 114. Edited by A. K. Bowman, H. M. Cotton, M. Goodman, and S. Price. Published for the British Academy by the Oxford U.P., 2002. Pp. xii + 196, with frontispiece, 3 maps, 3 tables, 17 figs.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/50.2.250 Published online by Cambridge University Press