comedies produced by B. for that series, the other being the *Self-Tormentor* of 1988. As he fulsomely acknowledges, he has been able to benefit, in this edition, from Barsby's recent Cambridge edition of the *Eunuch*. The notes are full and very clearly written and the translation reads well. This is no small achievement since it is impossible to catch the colloquial tone of Terence's language without sacrificing something of the literal meaning. B. does seem to have steered a good path here and has not been afraid to use the notes to alert the reader to the problem. H. is dealing with a more controversial author; Seneca's tragedies notoriously excite very different reactions from different readers. H.'s informative and detailed Introduction steers a most judicious course through the standard controversies but leaves the reader with the distinct impression that, in the final judgement, his sympathies lie with his author – and so they should; for an author is surely entitled to a sympathetic editor. He is judiciously agnostic on the wearying question of the staging of Senecan plays. The translation is straightforward and the notes are clear, answer the right questions and show appropriate sympathy with the author. The third edition of H. R. Fairclough's Loeb *Virgil* (Volume II, with revisions by G. P. Goold)[8] follows volume I which was reviewed by Monica Gale last year (*G&R* 47 [2000], 245). In this volume, as in the first, there are constant minor changes to translation of and footnotes to the *Aeneid*. The *Appendix Vergiliana*, however, as well as attracting constant minor changes to the translation, has been given an entirely new Introduction and Bibliography and the old Appendix (occasional notes on *Aen.* 7–12 and a very out-of-date general discussion of the *Appendix Vergiliana* in general) has been entirely deleted. The order of the various poems has also been radically altered.

D. E. HILL

NOTES

1. *Slaves, Masters and the Art of Authority in Plautine Comedy*. By Kathleen McCarthy. Princeton U.P., 2000. Pp. xiii + 231. £28.50.
2. *Virgil on the Nature of Things*. The *Georgics*, Lucretius and the Didactic Tradition. By Monica R. Gale, Cambridge U.P., 2000. Pp. xiv + 321. £40.00.
3. *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage*. The Joan Palevsky Imprint in Classical Literature. Classics and Contemporary Thought VII. By Phebe Lowell Bowditch. University of California Press, 2001. Pp. xi + 281. Hardback £36.50, paperback £14.95.
4. *The Politics of Desire*. Propertius IV. The Joan Palevsky Imprint in Classical Literature. By Micaela Janan. University of California Press, 2001. Pp. xi + 244. Cloth £30.00, paper £12.50.
5. *Ovid, Metamorphoses Book XIII*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Edited by Neil Hopkinson. Cambridge U.P., 2000. Pp. ix + 252, with 1 map. Hardback £40.00, paperback £14.95.
6. *Terence, The Eunuch*. Edited with Translation and Commentary by A. J. Brothers. Aris & Phillips, Warminster, 2000. Pp. vi + 213. Cloth £35.00, limp £16.50.
7. *Seneca Medea*. With an Introduction, Translation and Commentary by H. M. Hine. Aris & Phillips, Warminister, 2000. Pp. vi + 218. Cloth £35.00, limp £16.50.
8. *Virgil, Aeneid 7–12, Appendix Vergiliana*. LCL 64. Translated by H. Rushton Fairclough, revised by G. P. Goold. Harvard U.P., 2000. Pp. 590. £12.95.

Greek History

Never mind the bicycling monarchs of Europe or jogging presidents of the United States: in Sparta, kings received petitions while taking their daily bath in the river (Xenophon, *Hellenica* 5.4.28). Imagine, if it is not too distressing, standing on the

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/48.2.235 Published online by Cambridge University Press

riverbank at dawn, waiting in line to hand your application to The Prince's Trust directly to Prince Charles himself, while he is skinny-dipping in the Thames. Sparta remains a remarkable place, even if the more extravagant myths surrounding it have now been thoroughly debunked, not least thanks to the outstanding work of Stephen Hodkinson, culminating in his masterly new book on [B]***Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta*.[1] H. takes to pieces the traditional consensus, which goes back at least to Thomas More's *Utopia*, that all landed property in Sparta was equally divided and controlled by the state. This modern notion in turn goes back to Plutarch, who drew heavily on sources influenced by late third-century revolutionary propaganda and gave these his own characteristic twist. Turning instead to contemporary evidence for the 'long classical period' (4) from 550 to 350 B.C., H. demonstrates that the ownership of land, helot labour, and moveable wealth was in fact private and unequal. Sparta did differ from other Greek states in asserting a range of 'communal rights over private possessions' (205), but these were of more symbolic than practical significance. Among the highlights of this part of the book are a clever new explanation of the puzzling 'ancient portion' (85–90), a defence of the theory of 'universal female inheritance', which is later strikingly vindicated by means of a computer simulation showing that this practice actually tends towards greater equality of property-owning (98–103, 400–5), and a discussion which makes our confusing information about Spartan mess rations fall neatly into place (193–6). The Spartans' status as military role-models takes a knock with the revelation that they drank no more than the equivalent of 'almost three pints of modern beer' a day (196). A series of minutely detailed and fascinating studies proceeds to show how rich Spartans used their wealth – and how some uses of wealth were inhibited by law or convention – in daily life, at weddings and funerals, in making religious dedications at home and abroad, competing in chariot- and horse-races, extending patronage, and engaging in politics. Sadly, the cherished notion that Spartans put death in childbirth on a par with death in battle bites the dust (260–2). Happily, the proposition that growing Spartan austerity is reflected in the material record of dedications is demolished in an impressively sophisticated analysis from which archaeologists could take lessons (271–302). H. concludes with an investigation of the economic situation of ordinary Spartiate households, and convincingly argues that a structural drift towards property concentration, aggravated by 'contingent developments' such as the earthquake of 464 B.C. and Sparta's political and military (mis)fortunes, led to a growing polarization between rich and poor, a notorious citizen manpower shortage, and ultimately the emergence of an overtly plutocratic society in the early third century. The most contentious element in all this will probably prove to be H.'s picture of the helots as farmers who are more or less left to get on with it, provided they hand over the required share of the crops. They sort out their own labour shortages and surpluses, involving their masters only in 'some degree of negotiation' (124–5), and derive on average about half their subsistence from fishing, gathering, and hired labour (386–8), in what must have been a moonlighting economy beyond Spartan control. These are radical ideas, given our image of the helots as severely oppressed, and they can do with defending in a study announced for the future (145 n. 1). In several chapters, the author is revisiting old haunts, but he does not rely on mere reprints or lazy restatements of previous work. Critics are given their due – H. is not afraid to recant where he has been persuaded that his earlier arguments were 'insensitive to the diverse layers of post-classical evidence' (62 n. 21) or even 'built upon sand' (418) – and each individual piece

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/48.2.235 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is reshaped to fit a tightly structured new context. It goes without saying that this volume is a must for all students of Sparta; those who have no interest in Sparta at all should read it anyway, to see just how much can be achieved with acute source criticism, attention to detail, and a judicious use of models and comparative evidence. Comparisons help dismantle myths also in the opening paper of B★★*Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*,[2] in which editor Brian Bosworth gets extra mileage out of the parallels between the Macedonian conquest of the East and the Spanish conquest of Central America previously explored in his splendid *Alexander and the East* (reviewed in *G&R* 44, 2 [1997], 234–5). Among other things, he shows how the victim's eye perspective available in the case of the Aztecs can cure us of being 'immune to the casualty figures' and having 'the impression that nobody was really hurt, just as in some Disney cartoon' (38). B. returns for a substantial encore later in the volume with a reinterpretation of the *Liber de Morte*, containing an account of Alexander's death and will, as a Ptolemaic propaganda tool fitting the precise political circumstances of 309/8 B.C. Fellow-editor Elizabeth Baynham reinforces this new dating with her observation that the *Liber*'s reference to the monstrous birth of 'a dead human male child' (or 'boy', as we say in English) with the lower halves of a lion, wolf, panther, dog and boar can be understood as a hint at the five Successor kingdoms which had been established only a couple of years earlier (256). Subtler propaganda is discovered by Olga Palagia in images of the royal hunt which served to advertise the Companions' closeness to their king. Her case is well made, even if it is probably going beyond the call of duty to defend the idea that a Vergina hunting fresco represents a game park in Babylon with the argument that 'the Greek-looking trees' – to give them their full botanical name – might well have been planted there by Alexander (199–200). The generic vegetation and rocky landscape surely existed nowhere but in the painter's imagination. In other chapters we hear of the 'master plotter' Alexander's exploitation of (alleged) conspiracies (88, Badian), his pervasive and not merely cynical use of Panhellenism in justifying present and future conquests (Flower), his self-elevation to the newly invented post of 'King of Asia' instead of formal accession to the throne of the King of Persia (Fredericksmeyer), and his manipulation of the troops' loyalty by casting himself as not only their heroic leader but also their 'flirtatious' lover (277–8), Carney). The relative neglect by modern scholars of general Greek histories in favour of 'Alexander historians' is highlighted by an investigation of the nature and origins of Polybius' cool-ish sentiments about Alexander (Billows), and in a final paper the sources dating to the early empire are set in their historical context (Atkinson). All these original and carefully argued papers add up to a valuable volume. Poor Philip III Arrhidaeus, though, gets an even rougher deal than usual: as if it is not bad enough being dismissed as a 'mentally incompetent' (279, 321) 'idiot king' (209), he suffers the indignity of speculation about his beard: perhaps he grew it early because 'he was not allowed to use razors being half-witted' (196). Two books which could not be more different despite their shared interest in the Athenians' interpretation and political use of their national history are Tom Harrison's B★★*The Emptiness of Asia*[3] and Mark Munn's B★★*The School of History*.[4] Harrison's is short, snappy, and energetically polemical in advocating a reassessment of the nature and reception of Aeschylus' *Persians* which resists over-subtle and over-speculative readings; Munn's is long, leisurely, and as unpolemical as it is possible to be while advocating an interpretation of Thucydides' history which is out there on the wilder fringes of scholarship. H. argues that Aeschylus' version of the Persian Wars is neither a straight historical record, nor propaganda, nor a

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/48.2.235 Published online by Cambridge University Press

challenging meditation on war, empire or Otherness. The first proposition will meet little resistance, since there can hardly be a historian left who thinks that there *is* such a thing as a straight historical record. The idea that the *Persians* was a party-political broadcast on behalf of Themistocles, however, has been quite widespread among historians, while among literary critics it appears to be almost universally assumed that every Athenian play worth its salt must have been 'profoundly questioning' (114) of crucial norms and values. H. tackles both approaches with much success, arguing that each in its own way tries to read too much into a text which merely 'reflects and develops the shared prejudices and assumptions of author and audience' (57). Much the same shared ideas about Persians, Greeks, Athenians, and Athenian imperialism, it is shown, circulated in contemporary oral traditions as later recorded in Herodotus' *Histories*. The *Persians* emerges as precisely the kind of thing that literary critics have not wanted it to be: a patriotic work which, though 'not quite pure jingoism' and certainly not 'unsubtle', would 'surely have sparked tingles up the spine of a contemporary Athenian audience' (56). Just occasionally, H. picks soft, elderly targets for his polemic and indulges in point-scoring rather than real debate when addressing more robust recent scholarship – quoting a section on 'Visual and Aural Dimensions' from Edith Hall's commentary and complaining that it discusses the play only in terms of its visual and aural dimensions is an example (42–3) – but generally his criticisms and arguments are important and presented with style and wit. A concluding warning against reading modern liberal values into Greek texts for the sake of 'validation of Classics as a discipline' (114) fully justifies the dust-jacket promise of a book with 'a mighty sting in its tail'. Mightier yet is the sting in the last 15 pages of Munn's tome, in which it is revealed that Thucydides wrote his history in 396 and 395 B.C. as a briefing document for Athenian government officials trying to decide whether or not to start the Corinthian War (315–23). The text lay gathering dust among all the other memoranda filed in the city archives for 30 or 40 years before it was eventually published as a literary work (327). Oh, and the history/memo stops as abruptly as it does because the author did not regard subsequent Athenian history as relevant to the issues in hand (323–7). The impact of this is all the more stunning because the previous 300-plus pages have been leading up to it so very gently. The opening chapter outlines ways in which Athenians traditionally referred to their past as narrated by poets and dramatists. (M. argues here, incidentally, that the two plays which formed a trilogy with the *Persians* also alluded to the Persian Wars: *Phineus* to the battle of Artemision and *Glaucus at Potniae* to Plataea, 30–2). After further introductions to the upper class ('aristocracy') and political system of fifth-century Athens, we are treated to a 150-page narrative of Athenian political history from 415 to 403 B.C., throughout which runs the theme of how a developing democratic form of authority, based on written records and accurate research, was pitted against the traditional authority of the elite, based on personal qualities and unwritten rules. The years from 403 to 399 are then analysed in terms of this contrast, with a chapter on the role of newly codified law in the process of restoring the democracy, followed by a chapter on the backlash against spokesmen for traditional elite authority, represented above all by Socrates. All this is interesting and presented with an eye for intriguing detail. The main theme is perhaps somewhat overstated – the innocent reader might well get the impression that Greeks could not read or write before the Peloponnesian War – but on the whole the first twelve chapters present a respectable, if at times idiosyncratic, interpretation of this period in Athenian history. The only inkling of what is to come in

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/48.2.235 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the final chapter is the startling suggestion that, in need of advice on how to handle the crisis of 415, the Athenians turned to Herodotus for reliably researched information, asking him to read to the Council and Assembly some relevant material from his *Histories*, which had been written over the previous decade in direct response to Athens' current situation (114–18, 191, 315). In arguing this, as in defending his views on Thucydides, M. displays much ingenuity, but the evidence which he manages to scrape together is hardly strong enough to support a fundamentally implausible scenario. In Thucydides' case, we are asked to believe that he gathered extensive notes on speeches delivered from 433 onwards (306–7), but kept no record of events, since he had no intention of writing a history until 37 years later, and that his 'archaeology' was not, as he said, an attempt to prove that the Peloponnesian War was the greatest war ever, but a veiled discussion of the relative positions of Sparta and Athens on the eve of the Corinthian War (316–18). We are implicitly asked to accept also that Thucydides regarded, say, the Corcyrean civil war of 427 as more pertinent to Athens' current political situation than the Athenian civil war of 403, or the effects of the plague on Athenian society as more relevant than the impact of Persian support on the international balance of power. And finally, we are asked to assume that the same people who normally let themselves be guided by mythical precedent, or by the dollops of scrambled history spooned out by the likes of Andocides (3.3–12) and Aeschines (2.172–6), were on occasion so moved by a concern for historical accuracy that they would – apparently – commission the longest briefing paper ever written and sit listening for days to absorb the last little detail of Demosthenes' Acarnanian campaigns or the finds of 'Carian' pottery during the purification of Delos. It is not easy to imagine a world in which historians are treated with such respect – not to mention paid more than a talent of silver to read selections of their work (386 n. 51). But what a wonderful world it would be.

HANS VAN WEES

NOTES

1. *Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta*. By Stephen Hodkinson. Duckworth and the Classical Press of Wales, London, 2000. Pp. xiii + 498, with 26 figures. £48.00.
2. *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*. Edited by A. B. Bosworth and E. J. Baynham. Oxford U.P., 2000. Pp. ix + 370, with 18 figures. £35.00.
3. *The Emptiness of Asia*. Aeschylus' *Persians* and the History of the Fifth Century. By Thomas Harrison. Duckworth, London, 2000. Pp. 191. £40.00.
4. *The School of History*. Athens in the Age of Socrates. The Joan Palevsky Imprint in Classical Literature. By Mark Munn. University of California Press, 2000. Pp. xvi + 525, with frontispiece and 11 illustrations and 4 maps. £23.50.

Roman History

The theme of old *versus* new is insistent, cheeringly not to the detriment of the latter, and two wishes for the future emerge. Most conspicuous is the new edition of Volume XI of the *CAH*, sixty-four years on with the triumphalist title *The Imperial Peace* transformed into [B]★*The High Empire*,[1] and different contents: wars and frontiers are present, but yield before demography and literacy. Note too that Egypt, Christianity, and Law are allocated to neighbouring volumes. Gestation was long, the baby a heavyweight. Libraries and scholars will buy, students take it down for essays, laymen consult it confidently, if with

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/48.2.235 Published online by Cambridge University Press