warfare' (p. 126), and whether Palestinian evidence shows a deterioration in *limitanei* in the fifth and sixth centuries. He answers both questions in the negative, the latter corroborating some of Whitby's conclusions, the former perhaps explaining 'why none of the wars between Byzantium and Persia was decisive in any modern sense' (p. 137). While his prioritizing of ideology and glory has much to be said for it, I did not find all his arguments equally persuasive—e.g., Diocletian's antagonism towards Persia in his anti-Manichaean edict suggests that attitudes had not necessarily become more hostile in later centuries.

Although James Howard-Johnston's substantial paper is entitled 'The Two Great Powers of Late Antiquity: a Comparison', his focus is firmly on the less familiar Sasanian empire. Beginning with an assessment of the available sources, of whose parlous state he is only too aware, he proceeds to exploit what is available with intelligence and aplomb, and provides an invaluable synthesis and critique of much recent research on both textual and archaeological evidence. At the same time, he offers important qualifications to some of the arguments in Isaac's justly acclaimed *Limits of Empire* (Oxford, 1992), and also takes issue with some of the conclusions of the next paper in the volume, Zeev Rubin's exhaustive discussion of the reforms of the great sixth-century Persian king, Khusro Anushirwan. It is very useful to have the literary sources for these reforms laid out so clearly and in such detail, even if by the end I found myself inclining towards Howard-Johnston's more sceptical conclusions.

This is an important volume, much of which warrants the attention of late Roman historians, especially the papers by Whitby and Howard-Johnston. The series in which it appears is also important, and it is to be hoped that the proceedings of the subsequent workshops will soon be published.

University of Wales, Lampeter A. D. LEE

EUXINE SITES

S. L. Solovyov (J. Boardman, G. Tsetskhladze, edd.): *Ancient Berezan. The Architecture, History and Culture of the First Greek Colony in the Northern Black Sea.* Pp. xv + 148, figs. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 90-04-11569-2.

G. R. Tsetskhladze: *Pichvnari and Its Environs 6th c BC–4th c AD.* Pp. 231, figs. Paris: Presses Universitaires Franc-Comtoises (Institut des Sciences et Techniques de l'Antiquité), 1999. Paper, frs. 210. ISBN: 2-913322-42-5.

S.'s text, completed in 1998, distils over a century of research, by premier archaeologists from the Ukrainian Institute of Archaeology and the State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg. Alas, this relationship is not set to continue (p. xiv). This is a very attractive publication, with excellent photographs, clear plans, and reasonably clear diagrams. John H. Pollock deserves congratulation for a thoroughly readable translation; ambiguities are rare. There are few typographic errors and the index is thorough. Figures are well referenced, but it would have been helpful to know whether the very interesting statistical diagrams (Figs. 17, 19, 23) were prepared

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.142 Published online by Cambridge University Press

specially for this book. Not least among the valuable additions which the author himself makes to the study of ancient Berezan is his own map of the island (p. 16, Fig. 6), which supersedes all previous attempts to locate the work of scholars who have worked there since 1884. The text summarizes the principal research questions which scholars have set themselves (pp. 1–9); outlines a growing understanding of the geography and topography of Berezan (which, for almost the whole of antiquity, was a peninsula, reverting to island status perhaps in the third to fourth century A.D. [p. 13]); and describes the development of field investigations (pp. 19–27), focusing on the most significant period of activity—the Archaic occupation—in considerable detail (pp. 28–97), less on the Classical (pp. 98–113) and Hellenistic to Roman periods (pp. 114–27), when activities diminished noticeably. This is an important book, admirable not only for the clarity and concision displayed by the author in presenting his own analyses, but also for his exposition of the work and views of other scholars. It should be read and re-read by anyone interested in what happened around the edges of the Mediterranean in antiquity.

T.'s is a very different kind of book. Whereas S. has had direct access to data and archive material, T. evidently has not, despite having been a member of the excavation teams at Pichvnari and Tsikhisdziri. This lies at the heart of many of the author's evident frustrations. The manuscript was submitted in 1993. As this is a book aimed at English-speaking readers, it is a pity that T. felt unable to refer, however briefly, to David Braund's treatment of the same material in *Georgia in Antiquity* (Oxford, 1994), esp. pp. 109–18, when he made additions to the bibliography in 1997. Illustrations of finds are generous (though sources are not acknowledged), but maps and diagrams are small and difficult to use. There is no index; typographical errors occur regularly, and the author seems unfamiliar with his ancient sources. These problems could have been avoided with stronger editorial control, which would, no doubt, have been easier had the manuscript been in French.

At the outset, T. states that his aim is not to write a comprehensive account, but to 'reveal what has been accomplished so far in the study of Pichvnari and the other sites nearby, to bring out the problems connected with this research and the gaps still needing to be filled' (p. 14). He begins with an account of the 'city-site' settlement at Pichvnari, which is thought to have extended over a minimum of 35 hectares (p. 17). T. describes local storage *pithoi* (pp. 18–19), and makes some interesting, though brief, observations about looms, and about the possible derivation of iron from copper working (p. 20). Woodworking techniques, at Pichvnari (p. 20) and elsewhere (pp. 34–7), are of considerable interest and deserve more detailed treatment. T. devotes much of his attention to finds, notably of imported Ionian and Attic pottery (pp. 24–30), and foreign coins (tabulated only; pp. 39–42, Table 1); and grave finds from Pichvnari (pp. 43–72), from 'Nadzhikhurali' (pp. 73–4), from Tsikisdziri, including an alleged gold hoard (pp. 78–81), and another gold 'hoard' from Gonio (pp. 89–97), recently studied by M. Treister. These discussions intersperse the site descriptions. In each case, T. is hampered by the limitations of the published material. At Namcheduri (pp. 31–8), a larger area of this putative 'tell'-like settlement has been investigated than that at Pichvnari 'city', and something similar is suspected at Batumis Tsikhe, perhaps connected with a port (pp. 81–5), as well as Kvashta (pp. 85–6). Gonio-Apsaros (pp. 87–91, 118–20) is treated more fully by Braund (op. cit. pp. 181–93).

S. has concentrated on the analysis of contextual information, particularly from the so-called 'dug-outs' at Berezan, in order to try and understand who their inhabitants were, and rehearses slightly different ways of describing what these structures might

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.142 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mean in cultural terms (pp. 3–4, 34–47, 101–10). S.'s reluctance to give simple ethnic labels to observed phenomena and his attempt to understand the history of Berezan as a series of complex interactions, involving local traditions, adaptations, and foreign derivatives, is a far more sophisticated approach than any other attempted so far, not just for Berezan, but for other Black Sea coastal sites. T. does not have this sort of contextual information at his disposal in the analysis of sites and burials. The graves at Pichvnari (pp. 43–62) have attracted the most controversy, because the excavators identified Greek and Colchian burials, in what might turn out to be a single cemetery (p. 61), on the basis of orientation and finds, without having articulated clear criteria on which such an ethnic division can be made. More detailed study and publication of the sites themselves, along the lines exemplified by S., will provide the sort of contextual data without which such questions cannot be satisfactorily answered.

University of Liverpool ZOFIA HALINA ARCHIBALD

A VIEW FROM ELSEWHERE

P. VIDAL-NAQUET: *Les Grecs, les historiens, la démocratie: le grand écart*. Pp. 284. Paris: Éditions la Découverte, 2000. Paper, frs. 160. ISBN: 2-7071-3305-1.

Inside the front cover of Pierre Vidal-Naquet's most recent book, or rather, collection of essays, talks, and prefaces, curious readers may peruse and marvel at the list of works 'du même auteur'. It is both long (twenty-five items) and distinguished—distinguished not least by its extraordinary mixture of the personal, the political, and the scholarly, and by its strongly collaborative (that is to say, cooperative) dimension. The list includes no translations. Anglophone readers of the present collection will want to be reminded of at least the following three: Andrew Szegedy-Maszak, *The Black Hunter* (Baltimore and London, 1986), Janet Lloyd, *Politics Ancient and Modern* (Cambridge, 1995), and V.-N. with Pierre Lévêque (translated—with a significant addendum; see below—by David Ames Curtis), *Cleisthenes the Athenian* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ, 1996).

In terms of genre, the nine chapters in this latest collection fall into two main groups: five prefaces, four talks (two lectures to more general audiences, two papers to more specialist gatherings). They range in subject matter from Homer and the founding fathers of Klio's republic of letters to the untutored but literarily inspired general of the Greek War of Independence, the Dorian Yannis Makriyannis, by way of the convoluted and contradictory reception of Greece in the French Enlightenment and Revolution, a 'grand écart' indeed. They embrace more or less straight history, more or less straight history of historiography (a mode which he, like Moses Finley, learned to practise from Arnaldo Momigliano—there, to be sure, is a suitably cosmopolitan triumvirate de *nos jours* to rival that formed by the no less enlightened but rather more insular Edward Gibbon, David Hume, and William Robertson), and Vidal's own distinctive 'croisement' of the two, full of 'variété' and 'détours'. Not for nothing did Marcel Benabou entitle his contribution to a sort of Festschrift for his former colleague 'PVN préfacier ou une forme latérale de l'histoire' (in F. Hartog, P. Schmitt, A. Schnapp [edd.], *Pierre Vidal-Naquet*, *un historien dans la cité* [1998]). These essays too have a festive air; they span almost exactly a quarter of a century and were published in the year that the author attained his three score years and ten.

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.142 Published online by Cambridge University Press