about 0.5 m in diameter, of embossed 'Macedonian' type. H. (p. 71) identifies him as a peltast, and suggests that the peltasts were a regiment of the main body of the phalanx. He is undoubtedly correct. It follows that this type of 'Macedonian' shield is the shield 'of eight palms width' recommended by Asclepiodotus (*Tactics* 5.1) for his ideal phalanx, in contrast to the much bigger examples which have been actually found (e.g. p. 42) or which are shown in other representations. It follows that the size of the Macedonian shield was variable (pp. 65–6). The peltasts numbered 5,000, of whom 2,000 constituted the *agema* (pp. 66–9). The rest of the phalanx consisted of two regiments, the *chalkaspides* and *leukaspides*, which could be mobilized up to a total strength of 12,000 each in the times of Perseus (p. 75). H. was unable to make use of the representational information. Otherwise he might have cited the painting of the heavy infantryman in the Hagios Athanasios tomb carrying a shield of the 'Macedonian' type painted white (p. 64) as evidence to support his contention that the *leukaspides* were heavily armed members of the phalanx.

The second part of the book contains important conclusions on recruitment. H. elaborates Livy 33.3.1–5, informing us that Philip carried out a levy throughout all the towns of the kingdom from recruits aged 16 to those of veteran age. From the newly published epigraphic material H. establishes that military service began at 15 and lasted up to a maximum age of 55. Recruitment was normally carried out on the basis that each family group supplied one soldier, while the remaining males remained in the reserve (p. 114). The different regiments of the line army were then formed according to the mobilized contingents of different cities and regions. In the final part of the book H. (pp. 132–5) suggests that the *ephebeia* lasted from 18 to 20, and that the *neoi* were aged from 20 to 30. The latter remained members of the *gymnasion* up to at least the age of 22. Previously the workings of the Macedonian army required elaboration through comparative information from better-known ancient armies. Its secrets are progressively being revealed through cumulative epigraphic discoveries.

Łódź NICK SEKUNDA

THE LYCIAN LEAGUE

R. BEHRWALD: *Der Lykische Bund. Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und Verfassung*. Pp. ix + 269. Bonn: Dr Rudolf Habelt GmbH, 2000. Cased, DM 120. ISBN: 3-7749-3035-X.

Behrwald's doctoral thesis, the first monograph concerning the Lycian League for more than 100 years, is divided into two parts, the first of which (pp. 9–159) deals with its history, while the second (pp. 161–228) examines its federal constitution. He begins with the classical period to show that the Lycians were late in developing political institutions which followed the Greek model; it was first Carian dominance and later the rule of the Ptolemies that prevented the Lycians from adopting Greek constitutional concepts. Only when they were subjected to and tried to liberate themselves from the Rhodians were they able to institute a common organization.

From the sixth to the fourth centuries, Lycia was divided between several at first independent dynasts, although Xanthos seems soon to have played a leading rôle, which shifted to Limyra in the early fourth century. Persian rule changed matters as little in this respect as did Lycia's consequent membership of the Athenian League and

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.147 Published online by Cambridge University Press

its subjection under Caria after the satraps' revolt. A differentiation in political organization between types of settlements, which can be seen during this last stage, developed further when Lycia came to belong to the Ptolemaic empire. B. rules out the foundation of a federal organization, but infers from the mythical genealogy of the heroes Tlos, Pinara, and Sidyma that the cities named thus formed a sort of an alliance approximately at this time. And he is right in stating that the indication of the origin of Lycians by the formula 'Lycian from (city)' is not a sign of a federal state. After the short-lived Seleucid rule, the Lycians seem to have claimed Hellenic origins in order to gain independence from any foreign domination. Even if we cannot completely trust the account and chronology of Polybius, it seems clear that the Romans faced a dilemma between freedom for the Lycians and gratitude towards the Rhodians. In the end, the Lycians were subjected to Rhodian rule, but this eventually forced them to unite in a new kind of organization, a federal state. B. follows those who see the constitution modelled after the Achaean federal constitution and holds that the cult of Roma also played a part in uniting the country. A thorough examination of the famous Orthagoras inscription (*SEG* 18 [1962], 570) and of the Lycian coinage indicate a date in the early 180s for the foundation of the league. The history from the liberation in 167 B.C. until Roman rule is, due to insufficient sources, necessarily sketchy, but it seems clear that Lycia enjoyed a period of stability and even enlargement after the successful resistance against Mithridates.

The League came under Roman rule in A.D. 43. Its internal structure was transformed into that of a provincial *koinon*, and the federal offices of military character were abolished. Apart from this, many details of the history of Lycia under the Romans is still controversial. B. holds that Lycia was combined with Pamphylia to form a double province right from its subjection under Rome, and was detached from its neighbour again after A.D. 313. He sees no need to suppose a new *lex provincia* under Vespasian or any other great change in constitutional matters in the first three centuries.

In the second part, B. discusses the constitution of the League. The two main sources for this are not compatible, i.e. Strabo's account of the constitution of the Hellenistic League, derived from Artemidorus, and the mainly epigraphical evidence of the imperial period. The lack of sufficient material is again responsible for still numerous unsoluble problems. Despite this state of affairs, B. tries to draw some conclusions. It is clear that the Hellenistic Lycian League was organized on the basis of a proportional principle, known also from most other federal states. Problems start with the fact that the number of the member *poleis* of the Hellenistic League is unknown; there must have been 31 or 36 in imperial times. Of these, Xanthos, the most important city in the pre-Hellenistic period, might have been the federal sanctuary, while Patara became the administrative capital. Most institutions seem to reflect late developments, perhaps from the last century B.C. The council, for example, seems to have evolved from a body of officials, and the assembly could be an invention of the imperial period. On the complicated question of whether the offices of provincial high priest and Lyciarch were one and the same, he argues against; as explanation of the fact that many men are known to have held both offices, he puts forward the original idea that the latter was taken over in the year following the first.

B. is aware of the sometimes speculative character of his solutions, which could be overturned whenever a new inscription is found. However, the careful and thorough examination of the existing evidence makes his conclusions on the whole reliable and sums up what we can reasonably know about the Lycian League.

University of Oxford THOMAS CORSTEN

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.147 Published online by Cambridge University Press