Like Todd and Meiggs and Lewis, R. & O. give a detailed commentary on each text, but they go well beyond the sorts of details that these previous editors provided. R. & O. give a wealth of background information on each inscription, and their discussion is incisive and thought-provoking as we would expect from these two scholars. Occasionally it would be nice to know why they prefer their view rather than an opposing one. For example, R. & O. 49 (= Tod 150) is a decree of 357/6 that exiled Philon and Stratocles from Amphipolis. In their commentary, R. & O. say that 'presumably' (p. 244) this happened after Philip took the city, but they cite Errington's *History of Macedonia* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1990), in which he suggested that the decree could be before then. They do not say why they disagree with his view. Indeed, do we have the right context for this decree? While Diod. 16.8.4 says that Philip exiled those who were unfavorably disposed to him when he took Amphipolis, were his opponents only Philon and Stratocles? According to Dem. 1.8 (cf. Theopompus, *FGrH* 115 F 42), Hierax and Stratocles had requested Athenian aid, but there is no mention of Hierax in this inscription.

I suspect that the only real criticism of this collection will stem from those upset at what was excluded, but that is inevitable. I must admit disappointment at not finding *IG* ii^2 329 in the book. This is commonly believed to be Alexander's renewal of the Common Peace treaty after he ended the Greek revolt in 336, although I think that both date and context are wrong. Given that we have only a handful of inscriptions from Alexander's reign and that we know so little of his relations with the Greek states when he became king, this inscription becomes doubly important. R. & O. do refer to it in their commentary on *IG* ii^2 236, the Common Peace of 338/7 (= R. & O. 76, on p. 379, accepting the *communis opinio*), but it would have been good to have had its text and their comments on it.

Few books are such a welcome and especially needed addition to scholarship as this one. It contains something for everyone, and it will remain one of the standard collections of fourth-century epigraphical material for many years to come.

University of Missouri-Columbia IAN WORTHINGTON
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni174

A SYMPOSIUM ON ATTIC EPIGRAPHY

D. JORDAN, J. TRAILL (edd.): *Lettered Attica. A Day of Attic Epigraphy. Proceedings of the Athens Symposium, 8 March 2000.* With a memoir by Johannes Kirchner. (Publications of the Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens 3.) Pp. viii + 167, b/w and colour ills. Athens and Toronto: Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens/Athenians Research Project, Victoria University, Toronto, 2003. Cased, Can$60, US$50. ISBN: 0-9685232-5-0.

This volume publishes papers on Attic epigraphy given at the one-day symposium in the Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens on 8 March 2000, together with a memoir by Johannes Kirchner, editor of *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriores* (Berlin, 1913–40). This publication is indicative of the underlying principles and standard of epigraphical publication that might be expected in the forthcoming republication of post-404 B.C. Athenian state decrees (*IG* II^3).

I shall deal with each of the papers in turn. Byrne's 'Early Roman Athenians' joins

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni175 Published online by Cambridge University Press

two fragmentary lists of names from the post-Sullan period (*Ag*. 15.285 and 299) to form part of a single catalogue of *prytaneis* of the tribe Erechtheis and publishes the resulting text with epigraphical commentary. Byrne places the document in a wider context by a survey, on the basis of data collected from the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, of the people with Roman names appearing in Athenian public inscriptions to *c*. A.D. 40. For the period 86 B.C. to A.D. 40 he observes that a high participation rate of Romans in Athenian affairs at a low level was sustained alongside a low rate of ascension to senior positions. Working from a photograph taken at some point before the Second World War, David Jordan publishes a text of a lead tablet which purports to be a letter from Pasion asking a certain Satyrion to prosecute some rivals. The victims include Nikostratos, who appears in Dem. 53 as a rival of Apollodoros, son of the same Pasion. The letter casts doubt on Apollodoros' claims in that speech to have naively placed unquestioning trust in Nikostratos (Dem. 53.4–18). An appendix collects the twelve other Greek personal letters on lead. In 'Rereading the Acropolis Dedications', Catherine Keesling contends that as for dedications, there was no certain development towards a pure *stoichedon* style from the end of the sixth century B.C. Consequently, given the ornamental and monumental intention of the pure *stoichedon* style (which sometimes results in irrational word-divisions), she argues that we cannot assume that any lack of regard for the legibility of inscriptions developed from this date. Keesling presents her paper as a contribution to the 'literacy debate'; in common with her coadjutants (cf. Stroud, *Hesperia* Supplement 29 [1998], 46 with n. 95), she relies on some degree of amplification of Rosalind Thomas's position (R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* [Cambridge, 1989]; *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* [Cambridge, 1992]). Discerning readers must decide for themselves the true nature of the 'literacy debate'. Stephen Lambert publishes an amended text of an Athenian state decree honouring priests and *hieropoioi* of perhaps 338/7 B.C., and discusses the connotations of his re-reading of its place of publication. As the Athenians feared for the safety of the city after the battle of Chaironea, the decree was originally to be set up in the theatre of Dionysos at Piraeus. However, before the erection of the decree, the text was amended and the decree was set up in the city Dionysion. Graham Oliver argues, by way of re-reading the publication clause of *IG* II^2 448, that the original version of the decree for Euphron of Sicyon was set up with one copy on the Akropolis and with the other in the Agora beside the altar of Zeus *Soter*. Oliver and Lambert's articles achieve insightful interpretations of Athenian honorary decrees through a consideration of their original topographical contexts.[1] Other articles elucidate previously unclarified matters. Eran Lupu identifies the offering of *maschalismata*, mentioned on the *lex sacra* of the deme Phrearrhioi, as the placement of scraps of raw meat from the shoulder of sacrificial offerings on the thigh-bones that were to be burnt on the altar. Andronike Makres suggests that the three *sophronistai* mentioned on a deme decree of Aixone presided over a local youth club whose establishment may have predated the establishment of the central *ephebeia*. Angelos Matthaiou collects the evidence for the cult activity of Apollo *Delios* in the centre of Athens, and suggests that it took place within the sanctuary of Pythian Apollo. M. B. Wallace's paper (read by Adele Scafuro at the symposium) reconstructs phrases that appeared on the lost inscription recording the terms of the Thirty Years' Peace of 446/5 B.C. John Traill's contribution reflects on the far-reaching effects of the

[1]For a complete catalogue of the places of publication of Athenian state decrees, with analysis, see P. P. Liddel *ZPE* 143 (2003), 79–93, an article instigated in Athens at the time of the conference.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni175 Published online by Cambridge University Press

computerization of epigraphy, and explains the uses of the database of Athenian prosopography available on Website Attica (http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/attica). As Jordan promises in the preface, the contents of the volume under review will also soon be available online. Kirchner's memoir, though lacking any historiographical introduction, provides insight into the life and background of one of the most important Attic epigraphers of the twentieth century. One is reminded, at the end of this piece, that scholarship does not take place in a political vacuum:

> On September 25th I celebrated my 80th birthday. After the University of Athens had already given me an honorary doctorate shortly before, on the occasion of my reaching this point in life, the *Führer* bestowed the Goethe Medal for Art and Science on me, to my delight. With thanks to God, I can look back with satisfaction on a long life that is rich in experiences. (p. 160)

Each paper makes some contribution to one or more aspects of Attic epigraphy. Collectively, the relevance of the volume is that it documents the way in which the study of epigraphy overlaps with the writing of ancient history, the study of religion, philology, prosopography, archaeology, topography, the history of scholarship, and developments in information technology. Accordingly, it serves as a good gauge and introduction to the study and applications of Greek inscriptions at the start of the twenty-first century.

Trinity College, Dublin PETER LIDDEL
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni175

THE CHRONICLE OF LINDOS

C. HIGBIE: *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of their Past*. Pp. xvi + 320, map, ills. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Cased, £65. ISBN: 0-19-924191-0.

The Lindian Temple Chronicle, which originally stood in the sanctuary of Athena (Doric: Athana) on the Acropolis of Lindos, is an unusual inscription. Its long but not fully-preserved text lists dedications to Athana by mythical and historical persons; that list is followed by three stories, each narrating an apparition (epiphany) of the goddess during a time of civic distress in Lindos. It adds to the unusual character of the document that it is the product of research in literary works and archival materials, which are meticulously cited as sources especially for the votives—their nature, the occasion on which they had been dedicated, and the inscriptions they carried. Heading the list is a decree of 99 B.C. that authorizes the research project and lays down the procedure to be followed by two named Lindians who had been appointed to the task. Thus one inscription covers a wide range of topics and is at the same time a piece of history writing, an inventory, a collection of inscriptions, and the transmitter of a public decision. The great interest of the Chronicle to specialists in various fields was recognized long ago by C. Blinkenberg, who in his *La Chronique du temple lindien* (1912) presented the first edition of the text together with extensive commentary; then, in his *Die lindische Tempelchronik* (1915, repr. 1980), Blinkenberg offered an improved text, with almost as copious a commentary, which formed the basis for his final publication, *I.Lindos* no. 2, of 1941.

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni175 Published online by Cambridge University Press