interested in the Massiliot case will need to go directly to *Études Massaliètes* and the other French works noted above. Something similar applies to the discussion of relations between Greeks and the interior, a matter of intense current interest to prehistorians. Again, H. spares his popular audience the prestige-goods' economies, the down-the-line trade, the interaction spheres, and the ethnography of alcohol. References in the notes to the work of Dietler and many others show H. is well aware of these debates, and that the decision not to engage with them is a deliberate one. Here, H. perhaps underestimates the tolerance and interest of popular audiences for such detail: Barry Cunliffe's *Greeks, Romans and Barbarians. Spheres of Interaction* (London, 1988) covers some of the same ground in a narrative that is equally exciting but sacrifices less of the results of current research. Much the same could be said of the current debates on the nature of Greek colonization, and on the palaeoeconomy and settlement history of the late Iron Age in Mediterranean France. Very occasionally the decision to go with traditional wisdom does have a further detrimental impact on H.'s interpretation. Chapters IV and V, for instance, follow historical sources in stressing constant tension between Greek and Etruscans, and conversely early good relations between Massiliots and the surrounding populations. Yet, as H.'s account of the archaeology of Marseille and especially St Blaise reveals (e.g. pp. 118, 143–4), there seems good evidence for amicable relations between some Etruscans and some Greeks, and also for less comfortable ones with some natives. The political history of Marseille, if it could be written, would without doubt be more complex than either foundation myths or popularizing narrative demand. And the foundation myths themselves must be read rather differently after Carol Dougherty's *The Poetics of Colonization: from City to Text in Archaic Greece* (New York and Oxford, 1993).

But if H.'s professional audience will feel disappointed at times by H.'s decision to put the needs of popularizing his subject ahead of their interests, they will benefit in other respects enormously from his painstaking work. Chapter III, on navigation, is a gripping introduction to the complexities of tides and winds in the north-west corner of the Mediterranean. The discussion of exploration in Chapter VIII is also extremely good, and H. is a cautious and thoughtful commentator on many sites. He also knows not to overvalue the subject of his study. If he begins with 'Massalia, the Oldest City in Western Europe', he concludes by comparing it to Dawson City in the Klondike, and wondering whether both modern scholars and Greek writers have over-rated its significance. This reader was left with the strong impression that archaeological rather than historical researches were most likely to lead to a new appraisal, and that any adequate one must be grounded in as profound an understanding of the geography of the southern French littoral as H. displays in this work.

University of St Andrews GREG WOOLF

SOURCES FOR ALEXANDER

A. B. Bosworth, E. J. Baynham (edd.): *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*. Pp. viii + 370. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-19-815287-6.

This important collection, the record of a conference held in Newcastle, New South Wales, in 1997, faces up to a central question in Alexander research, the problem of

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the sources. Several of the essays are major contributions which may prove to be turning points in the study of the subject.

It has become a truism to observe that we are bereft of almost all primary source material for the reign and expedition of Alexander. All our accounts are filtered through later writers, all of whom must have imposed their own interpretations on their sources. Those very sources were of widely differing character, from the alleged sobriety of Ptolemy to the glamorous adventure story told by Cleitarchus and the adulatory tone of Callisthenes. A writer like Curtius then imposes fiction and rhetoric upon fiction and encomium so that the truth recedes from view. In the case of Alexander there are relatively few contemporary records in the form of inscriptions and coins to act as a check on the literary accounts, and very few of these assist in matters of interpretation.

Faced by this *aporia*, one might be tempted to decide that the reception of Alexander is all that we have, and that that reception and influence, all-pervasive in Western culture and history as it is, is more important than the historical achievement. That would, however, be a distortion of Alexander's importance, since his was a reign that did without doubt change the world, and it is important to understand how.

A. B. Bosworth's introduction discusses this problem of the sources: 'our view of A. has been primarily determined by material emanating from him or his court' (p. 17). It is a virtue of this book that it pays closer attention than previous discussions to the propaganda material associated with A.'s last days, notably the *Liber de Morte*, as well as the visual evidence of the Vergina tombs. It would have been welcome if some consideration could also have been given to the earlier parts of the *Alexander Romance*, which certainly preserves some near-contemporary Egyptian reactions, as well as one episode (the interview with the Gymnosophists) which perhaps did more than anything else to fix the philosophical image of A. for centuries to come.

Bosworth's opening chapter, drawing parallels between the campaigns of Hernan Cortes and Alexander, is the least relevant to this theme. However, Bosworth's other chapter in the book, 'Ptolemy and the Will of Alexander', is probably the most important and illuminating study published to date of this difficult document, which is inserted at the very end of the *Alexander Romance*, to which it is certainly not integral. Scholars in the past have assigned this work to various milieux, but Bosworth shows convincingly that the beneficiaries of its provisions would not be Perdiccas (as argued by Ausfeld and Merkelbach) or Polyperchon (Heckel's view), but Ptolemy; nor does he accept Seibert's counsel of despair that the work is a fiction without purpose. We thus have access, in this work, to a document which, along with the 'Last Days' (treated by Bosworth in *CQ* 21 [1971], 112–36), comes closer in date to the reign of A. than any other source. It shows how one route to understanding A.'s impact is through the uses that those left behind made of his memory.

The other study in the book which looks at a near-contemporary document is Olga Palagia's chapter on 'Hephaestion's Pyre and the Royal Hunt of Alexander'. Palagia shows how integral the hunt is to Macedonian ideology. The study culminates in a discussion of the battered fresco in Tomb II at Vergina, which Palagia argues (following Borza) to be that of Philip III Arrhidaeus and his wife Adea Eurydice. She identifies the participants of the hunt as, among others, Philip III, Alexander himself, and Cassander and his brothers: the conclusion being that the fresco can be interpreted as a statement by Cassander of his legitimacy as successor to A. Thus this document too shows the memory of A. being manipulated by his successors almost immediately after his death.

Elizabeth Baynham's article on 'The Prodigy in the *Liber de Morte*' suggests that the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.103 Published online by Cambridge University Press

five beasts joined to the stillborn child that portends the death of A. may be intended to represent the five successors Ptolemy, Cassander, Lysimachus, Antigonus, and Seleucus. 'All of these generals had emerged as clear contenders by 309' (p. 256), and thus the *Liber* as a whole (and not just the will) may be regarded as a document from a period less than twenty years after the death of A.

The remaining papers in the volume do not bring us as close to the time of A., but they consider the various ways in which later writers—or their sources—presented A. according to particular interpretations: from the Homeric behaviour and the set of Parmenio-anecdotes discussed by Elizabeth Carney to the constraints of a monograph like Curtius' in contrast to the world histories of his predecessors (the subject of John Atkinson's paper).

Ernst Badian's article, 'Conspiracies', returns to a favourite theme, and emphasizes (p. 75) A.'s fear of conspiracies—a point supported, I might observe, by A.'s anguished statement to Dandamis in Palladius *On the Brahmans* 2.33, 'How far must I fear those who protect me even more than the enemy? . . . By day I torment the nations, but when night comes on I am tormented by my own reflections, my fear that someone may come at me with a sword.'

Ernst Fredricksmeyer argues that A. created himself King of Asia rather than adopting the title of King of Kings. His discussion pushes the evidence, and might have looked with benefit at the parallel question of whether A. was crowned as pharaoh or not. In the end, the question is one of semantics rather than of the realities of power.

Michael Flower shows how Callisthenes' adulatory account of A. was a central part of the 'spin' put on his career for the Greeks, while Richard Billows's discussion of Polybius' view of A., which has to be pieced together from scattered fragments, argues that the topoi he inherited concerning the favour of Fortune and the faults of A.'s character go back to Demetrius of Phalerum; these, which became the leitmotif of Roman thinking on A., thus developed in parallel, I would say, to the Onesicritean treatment which turned him into a 'Cynic hero'.

In sum, the book represents a powerful advance in the study of A., both by its concentration on near-contemporary sources and by its elaboration of the slipperiness of all the evidence that we rely on for what we think we know about Alexander.

Institute of Classical Studies, London RICHARD STONEMAN

THE POLITICS OF MUSIC

A. C. Cassio, D. Musti, L. E. Rossi: *Synaulia. Cultura Musicale in Grecia e Contatti Mediterranei*. Pp. 320 . Naples: AION, 2000. Paper.

Greek music has long been the preserve of antiquarians and reconstructionists, distant successors of Aristoxenos, whom Lactantius accused of 'having a heart that was blind' (*Div. Inst.* 7.13) because of his soulless, technical approach. But as proper account is taken of the historical and social conditions of cultural production in other areas of Hellenic studies, so the *disiecta membra* of *mousike*—the dance and

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.103 Published online by Cambridge University Press