suggests that the horse and groom *stele* (Athens NM 4464) might be the funerary monument of Phocion, and Hans Goette suggests that the Hellenistic extension of fortifications at Sounion took place after the liberation of 229 B.C.

The collection clearly asserts the symbolic significance for both Athenians and Macedonians of the Athenian Akropolis in the early Hellenistic period. Petros Themelis surveys Macedonian dedications on the Athenian Akropolis, while Ralf von den Hoff surveys portraits and dedications at that same site and suggests that the Akropolis remained a display-case of Athenian identity where, increasingly, Athenian aristocrats advertised their achievements. Extending the analysis across the whole city, Thomas Brogan's examination of Antigonid victory monuments in Athens shows how the Athenians linked their new Antigonid superheroes to Athenian heroes particularly of the Persian wars. The collection closes with Judith Barringer's wide-ranging discussion of the Panathenaic Games and Amphorae. She suggests that the declining prestige of the Athenian games over the course of the third century B.C. was accompanied by the growing tendency for festival officials to earn profile in the commemoration of the games.

The collection is user-friendly, providing a comprehensive *index locorum* of literary, epigraphical, and papyrological sources; the illustrations, diagrams, and maps are all highly appropriate and referred to extensively by the authors.

This volume makes contributions to the reconstruction of the narrative history of the period, various aspects of Athenian religion, the significance of historical memory and commemoration (in particular the commemorative landscape of the city of Athens), the history of the slogan *eleutheria*, exemplifies how material evidence can augment an understanding of historical processes, and also contributes to epigraphical and literary scholarship. Notably absent is any discussion of late comedy: Menander's bust appears on the back cover only by virtue of the fact that it was a product of the workshop of Kephisodotus the Younger, the subject of Peter Schulz's article. But Susan Lape's *Reproducing Athens: Menander's Comedy, Democratic Culture and the Hellenistic City* (Princeton, 2004) has already done a great deal to show the significance of new comedy for the history of Athenian political culture of Athens in the period of Macedonian domination, and can be read in conjunction with this collection.

University of Manchester PETER LIDDEL
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni321

A LESS HEROIC ALEXANDER

I. WORTHINGTON: *Alexander the Great: Man and God*. Pp. xx + 251, maps, ills, pls. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2004. Cased, £19.99. ISBN: 0-582-77224-9.

Ian Worthington is best known for his *Historical Commentary on Dinarchus* (Ann Arbor, 1992) and his edition, with text, translation, and commentary, of some speeches of Dinarchus and Hyperides (Warminster, 1999). More recently he has edited *Alexander the Great: a Reader* (London, 2003), which provides a very full compilation of primary source material, in translation, together with a selection of key articles and chapters of books by leading Alexander scholars. This biography complements the *Reader*, and his corpus of specialist articles in the field.

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

W.'s intention was a 'serious and authoritative' book that would make a contribution to Alexander scholarship (p. xii), but would at the same time be 'accessible to a non-specialist readership'. His publisher was insistent that accessibility should not be compromised by annotations that were 'monographic in style', so the book is intentionally much fuller than, say, E. E. Rice's *Alexander* (Thrupp, 1997), but less comprehensive in its engagement with scholarly controversies than Bosworth's *Conquest and Empire* (Cambridge, 1988). The publisher's brief suited W.'s concern to produce a work 'less pompous in style than some [biographies of Alexander], and less dry than others' (p. xii). So he feeds the Alexander myth by dwelling on the Homeric allusions in the sources, e.g. Alexander's visit to Troy (pp. 52–3), and goes beyond that in developing scenes where Alexander appears as an Homeric hero. But this rattling good yarn is offset by critical evaluation of the record, especially in Chapter 15, which is an adaptation of his previously published paper, 'How "Great" was Alexander' (*AHB* 13 [1999], 39–55). Here the approach differs somewhat from the chilling interpretations of the cold war era, as W. focuses more on macro-politics, Alexander's personal weaknesses (including self-delusion, binge-drinking, the surrender to romantic longings), and Philip's baleful influence (a theme developed in Chapter 16). W. believes that he has produced 'a less 'heroic' (in the modern sense) Alexander than is the norm' (p. 5).

W. prudently sidesteps the myths relating to Bucephalus, and the Amazon queen (pp. 116–17), though the latter might merit a note on what lay behind the myth. Reticence might have served W. better with regard to the battle narratives, where historiographical and geographical problems abound. On the battle of the Granicus the account at p. 54 does not square with the graphic (Fig. 2) adopted with due acknowledgement from N. G. L. Hammond's *Alexander the Great*. On the movement of the two armies before the battle of Gaugamela, the narrative at p. 95 does not square with the map reproduced on p. 94; and the battle narrative does not completely gel with the graphic similarly adopted from Hammond. There appears to be some confusion of orientation and the sequence of events on p. 94. On the casualty figures for Gaugamela, W. appears to draw on the fragment of an historical text (*POxy.* 1798; *FGrH* 148 F44. col. iv), but that must refer to the casualties at Issus, not Gaugamela. Still W. can be commended for making a serious effort to elucidate the traditions on the major battles. Elsewhere the narrative would be easier to follow if the accompanying maps were fuller in detail: maps at pp. 104 and 146 lack names mentioned in the text, and the Beas is incorrectly labelled on the main map at p. 151.

The study gets surer as W. moves from the military history into the more political history of the later years. W. may well be right that there was no deification edict in 324; less certainly right about when Hypereides became keen on war against Macedon; less obviously right in his suggestions that Alexander's plans for the invasion of Arabia were in part motivated by his belief in his own divinity (p. 205), and that Alexander was planning to move the capital of his empire from Pella to Babylon (p. 203).

W.'s extensive experience of lecturing on Alexander studies, is reflected most obviously in the way the book is studded with questions, some rhetorical, some journalistic, some open, like the closing sentence of the text: 'Alexander the Great or Alexander the Accursed: how do you like your Alexander?' (p. 221). The illustrations provide a useful resource, though the image of Alexander from the 'Alexander mosaic' is unfortunately reversed. Errors in the text affect the date of the Common Peace, 387

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(p. 210), and the spelling of Esagila (p. 101), Hydraotes (pp. 158 and 162), and in Berve's book title, prosopographischer (p. 239).

At the end of Chapter 15 W. raises the question whether it would not be better to follow the Zoroastrian tradition and label Alexander 'the Accursed' (p. 217). But, if Greatness is not Goodness, and one has to judge by the extent of the impact made on world history, Alexander merits the label the Great (pp. 220–1). This is not a post-colonial text, and not wedded to political correctness. So W. breathes new life into the myth of the heroic Alexander, albeit a flawed hero.

University of Cape Town JOHN ATKINSON
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni322

ALEXANDER VS. THE NOBLES

S. MÜLLER: *Maßnahmen der Herrschaftssicherung gegenüber der makedonischen Opposition bei Alexander dem Großen*. (Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe III, Band 974.) Pp. iv + 309. Frankfurt, etc.: Peter Lang, 2003. Paper. ISBN: 3-631-51224-4.

This book is a slightly revised dissertation that acknowledges its debt to the noted Alexander historian Gerhard Wirth, but is never far removed from K. Kraft's *Der 'rationale' Alexander* (1971), and E. Badian's portrait of the king. It has all the merits and disadvantages of the genre: copious notes, excellent scholarship, overly expansive or digressive discussion, and no index. Nevertheless, it is a highly useful book for anyone interested in the politics of the king and his administration.

Sabine Müller's goal is to investigate Alexander's methods of securing his rule, their effectiveness, and their psychological background. She argues that before his victory over the Persians at Issus, Alexander's power was much constrained by the Macedonian nobles, especially Parmenion and Antipater, who may have been more powerful than he. Considering the nobles and the king at odds, the author asserts that Alexander worked to confirm and increase his power both by undermining the opposition and by seeking military victories, which legitimized his rule. Conquering Persia, however, was detrimental to the nobles' power and interests. Alexander's victories emboldened him to move against Parmenion, whom he assassinated after charging his son, Philotas, with conspiracy against the king. M. stresses that normally, however, Alexander used legal traditions and institutions in protecting himself and his new autocratic power structure. Cleitus, who for M. represents the old conservative aristocracy, was killed by a raging and drunk Alexander, whose wine, however, made him do only what he wanted to do (p. 121). The murder was legally sanctioned. Then the cause of the nobles' opposition was taken up by the historian Callisthenes, who opposed Alexander in the *proskynesis* affair, and by the 'page' Hermolaus and his friends, who conspired against him. M. makes the intriguing suggestions that we should distinguish between what Callisthenes the propagandist wrote on the king and what he personally thought of his policy, and that Alexander's disparaging his own proclaimed divinity was intended to appease the opposition. Alexander used the principle of governing by *nomos* rather than force with the Persians also when, for example, he presented himself as Darius' successor, punished

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni322 Published online by Cambridge University Press