Failing to find clear literary evidence for nucleated settlements, J. curiously regards them as 'unsubstantiated' (e.g. p. 123) despite acknowledging the substantial architectural remains found by archaeologists at such places as Halai Aixonides.

That Athenians distinguished between 'urbane' and 'rustic' types is not in dispute (J. explores images of the countryman in his Chapter 6). But the existence of such types does not establish that there was a general division between those dwelling within the wall and those dwelling outside it. The Kleisthenic trittys composed of demes 'around the *astu*' included fifty-five demes, of which only five were within the walls; such a trittys division could serve no useful purpose were there a marked break between urbane and rural types occurring at the walls. J. acknowledges that the Rural Dionysia took place inside as well as outside the Themistoklean walls, but attempts to justify this by insisting that it should be termed the Agrarian Dionysia and that the town versus country dichotomy is here secondary to the festival's cultural orientation (pp. 126–7). Yet earlier (p. 8) J. suggests that the walls of Athens constituted the significant physical, social, and cultural barrier between the town and the 'fields' alluded to in the title of the Agrarian Dionysia. The truth is surely that 'urban' and 'rural'/'agrarian' were not technical terms for the areas inside and outside the walls of Athens, but were broad designations that might be variously used of physical space or social and cultural attitudes.

J. is clearly right that the experience of living miles from the Acropolis in a small agricultural community was very different from the experience of living as a hermoglyph in the centre of Athens (though his use of Hesiod to illustrate the life of a classical Athenian farmer is questionable). But the experience of the poor who lived in the town was also very different from that of the rich. Wealth, occupation, family history, *genos* affiliation, all these, as well as place of residence, divided the Athenians. J.'s strained arguments provide a better demonstration that town and country was not the privileged division than that it was.

King's College, Cambridge ROBIN OSBORNE
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni320

ATHENS UNDER THE MACEDONIANS

O. Palagia, S. V. Tracy (edd.): *The Macedonians in Athens 322–229 B.C. Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the University of Athens, May 24–26, 2001*. Pp. xii + 266, maps, ills. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2003. Cased, £75. ISBN: 1-84217-092-9.

We are told in the editors' preface that the conference that gave rise to this collection aimed to 'illuminate various aspects of Athenian art, archaeology and history' of the period between the end of the Lamian War in 322 B.C. and the departure of the Macedonian garrison from the Piraeus in 229 B.C. The twenty-eight papers published in this volume use literary, numismatic, epigraphical, sculptural, architectural, ceramic, and metallic evidence to re-evaluate the issues that have traditionally dominated the history of Athens in the early Hellenistic period (democracy and the undermining of democratic institutions; euergetism and community; royal domination and *polis* freedom; cultural influence and imitation, tradition and innovation in religion). Limitations of space prevent me from even mentioning all of the contributions, but I shall describe those that contribute most to the expressed intention of the volume.

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni321 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The collection opens with Peter Green's overview of the impact of Macedonian power on Athens in the period 323–307 B.C. Green highlights the sustained attraction of *eleutheria* as a slogan in Hellenistic Athens. Three other papers deal closely with questions about the history of Athens during the years 323–318 B.C. Brian Bosworth argues that the Athenians lost the Lamian war because of their lack of manpower; Elizabeth Baynham assesses the effects of Antipater's settlement after that defeat. Through a close analysis of epigraphical publication and documentary formulae, Graham Oliver reassesses the political climate and institutions of Athens under the oligarchic regime installed by Antipater. He shows that the surviving inscribed decrees indicate the dominance of the *ecclesia* over the *boule*. Furthermore, he makes the important point that prolific epigraphical publication of decrees was not a phenomenon restricted to democratic governments.

Other historical papers deal with Athens in the third century B.C. Christian Habicht announces that the work of Roland Oetjen has won him over to the idea that Antigonos Gonatas returned Rhamnous and Aphidnae to Athenian control in 255 B.C., giving meaning to Eusebius' statement that Antigonos gave *eleutheria* to the Athenians. This view is compatible with Stephen Tracy's point that Antigonos Gonatas' interference in the domestic workings of Athenian democracy justify his being named *basileus* in a decree of Rhamnous. Ioanna Kralli suggests the context of the *isotheoi timai* granted to the same king was the immediate aftermath of the war against Alexandros, the renegade governor of Corinth and Euboea, in 245 B.C. Michael Walbank makes changes to the archon list of 268/7–228/7 and discusses the context of a thiasotic decree (*SEG* ii 9). Kevin Clinton suggests that a contract for a *stoa* by the southern wall of the sanctuary at Eleusis, *IG* II^2 1682, previously dated to 285/4 B.C., should be redated 354/3 B.C. The most wide-ranging historical paper is Manuela Mari's discussion of the nature of *asebeia* in early Hellenistic Athens. In an important contribution to our understanding of that concept, Mari relates it to the Athenians' changing views on political ethics at the time.

Two papers in particular make a contribution to Plutarchian studies as well as history: Robert Lamberton offers a reading of Plutarch's *Life of Phocion* that focuses both on Plutarch's anti-democratic stance and the intertexts to Socrates. Pat Wheatley's contribution also makes extensive use of Plutarch, and uses his comments on the courtesan Lamia as the starting point for an exploration of an individual's effect on the wider picture. Wheatley too emphasizes the intertexts with another historical character: Lamia emerges as Demetrius Poliorcetes' Cleopatra.

Halfway through the volume, the discussions shift away from literary and documentary focus, to gauge the effects of Macedonian domination on Athenian material culture or use that material evidence to interpret the aspects of the Athenian response to Macedonia. Rhys Townsend interprets the Philippeion at Olympia and the choregic monuments of Athens as victory monuments betraying the erosion of egalitarian democratic values. A sensitivity for architectural forms and their significance for understanding the socio-political climate of Greece emerges also in Bonna Wescoat's analysis of references to Peloponnesian and Attic forms and building methods in Royal building projects at the sanctuary of the Great Gods on Samothrace. Relief sculpture can also attest to Athenian hostility and resistance to the Macedonians, as Carol Lawton's interpretation of anti-Macedonian sentiment on Attic document reliefs shows. Iphigeneia Leventi suggests that Attic dedicatory reliefs of the late fourth and early third centuries attest to the proliferation of cults offering euergetism, security and other benefits to Athenian public and private individuals.

Two articles suggest historical contexts for problematic artifacts: Olga Palagia

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni321 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/bni321 Published online by Cambridge University Press