Francis Cairns; 6. 'Antonomasia and Metonymy in the Proem to Virgil's *Georgics*' by Helen Peraki-Kuriakidou; 7. 'From the *Metamorphoses* to the *Fasti*: Catalogues of Proper Names' by Stratis Kyriakidis; 8. 'Bilingual Word-play on Personal Names in Martial' by Daniel Vallat; 9. 'Onomata-poetics: A Linear Reading of Martial 7.67–70' by Niklas Holzberg; 10. 'Proper Names as a Linking Device in Martial 5.43–8' by Robert Maltby; and 11. 'Naming the Characters: The Cases of Aristomenes, Socrates and Meroe in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* 1.2–19' by Andreas Michalopoulos. Various indices, including one on places cited, will ensure the utility of a work that will also be of much general interest. Oliver Lyne's[31] sad and premature death has persuaded his many friends to organize the republication of almost all his published papers (nineteen in all) in a handsome OUP volume. His limpid style shines from every page, as does his passionate desire to understand Latin poetry. Readers will especially appreciate the index of passages cited, which will be of great value to those who can remember that Lyne wrote on a particular passage but have forgotten where. There is also an affectionate tribute in the form of an introduction by Gregory Hutchinson. The much neglected Christian epic poets, Juvencus, Sedulius, and Arator,[32] have now attracted the attention of Roger Green, who has prepared a full-scale study of their work. These poets saw their task as reconciling Classical epic to the Bible and, as such, made a major contribution to the way that Christianity developed. The two indices of citations, (a) from Classical epic and (b) from the Gospels and *Acts*, will, as I have continuously observed elsewhere, greatly enhance the utility of this work.

doi: 10.1017/S0017383507000356 D. E. HILL

[31] *Collected Papers on Latin Poetry*. By R. O. A. M. Lyne. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007. Pp. xx + 418. Hardback £65.

[32] *Latin Epics of the New Testament. Juvencus, Sedulius, Arator*. By Roger P. H. Green. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006. Pp. xx + 443. Hardback £68.

Greek History

After around a century since the last full commentary on Herodotus in English (that of How and Wells), I hope it does not seem a personal indulgence – in my last outing as *Greece and Rome* reviewer – to lead with the publication (long, long anticipated – by me, at least) of the first instalment of the translated Lorenzo Valla commentaries.[1] This volume contains revised versions of the Italian commentaries of David Asheri (Books 1 and 3), Alan Lloyd (Book 2), and Aldo Corcella (Book 4), all 'completely updated' to the point of David Asheri's death at the turn of the millennium. I must admit that this 2000 cut-off (Corcella, in actual fact, refers to work at least as far as 2001) came as something of a disappointment. The editors could not, of course, have presumed to judge what Asheri, in particular, would have made of subsequent bibliography, but, given the lunatic flurry of scholarship on Herodotus since 2000, they might perhaps (as Pietro Vannicelli has done in his revisions of Asheri's later volumes

[1] *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I–IV*. By David Asheri, Alan Lloyd, and Aldo Corcella. Edited by Oswyn Murray and Alfonso Moreno, with a contribution by Maria Brosius. Translated by Barbara Graziosi, Matteo Rossetti, Carlotta Dus, and Vanessa Cazzato. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007. Pp. lxxi + 721. Hardback £165.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383507000368 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in the Italian series) have included bibliographical updates in squared brackets in the text. The different books (like their Italian ancestors, of course) are also uneven in approach. Though splendidly full of antiquarian detail, Lloyd's revised version of his shorter Italian commentary cannot have the same level of detail as his three-volume Leiden version, and certainly does not cover the same range of content as its stablemates. The main glories of this volume, however, are Asheri's beautifully crafted and sane introductions, both to Books 1 and 3 and to the *Histories* as a whole, and in particular his vision of the relationship of part and whole: for example, in his remarks on Book 1 as a 'tour of the archaic world' or on the leitmotif of Book 3, 'the metaphysical and moral conflict between falsehood and truth'. A transition from Herodotus to Pericles would once have seemed a natural, even a self-evident one. The thesis of Herodotus' 'philopericleanism' has now been deconstructed (as Asheri notes), and so, I would have thought, has the Age of Periclean Athens. Loren Samons II's *Cambridge Companion*[2] certainly does not subscribe to old clichés of a Periclean Golden Age. (On the contrary, he ends on an admirably cynical note, emphasizing that Athenian *power* was the pervading theme of Periclean speeches, not Athens' open society.) The contributions, I should say also, are uniformly of a high quality, clear and compelling, with many addressing their themes at refreshing angles. But it is somehow symptomatic that it is only in conclusion that the construct of Periclean Athens (and of its later reception and interpretation) are really addressed. Was the Athens of Pericles really distinct at all, except in so far as our sources (primarily Thucydides and Plutarch) made it so? Should those authors not be addressed head on? Some of the chapters are cleverly framed around Pericles (so, notably, Kurt Raaflaub begins and ends his discussion of warfare with Thucydides' Pericles' assessment of Athenian resources at the end of book 1), but, at other times, the Age of Pericles seems just a handy excuse for taking so many thematic snapshots of the late fifth century. From the United States and Old Europe, meanwhile, two new treatments of Athenian democracy, both centrally concerned with its relationship with contemporary political culture. The collection *Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece*[3] seeks to reflect, with the benefit of critical distance, on the great deluge/efflorescence of studies of Athenian democracy associated with the 1993 anniversary of Cleisthenes' reforms. The main shift is a welcome one away from focusing on any single defining moment in the foundation of Athenian or Greek democracy. As Robin Osborne has done in another edited collection, *Rethinking Revolutions*, the authors assess instead a series of 'breakthroughs', as well as the pre-existing conditions for democracy. The work here is unfailingly thoughtful and accessible, and some of the contributions (notably, Raaflaub's piece assessing the 'mid fifth-century breakthrough') really do show a fresh perspective. In other cases, however, such as Ober's 'Democracy's Revolutionary Start' (borrowing freely, as he freely admits, from his famous 1993 article), you have to wonder whether the circle of discussants might usefully have been wider. As it happens, José Antonio Dabdab Trabulsi's *Participation directe*

[2] *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Pericles*. Edited by Loren J. Samons II. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007. Pp. xx + 343. Hardback £45; paperback £17.99.

[3] *Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece*. By Kurt A. Raaflaub, Josiah Ober, and Robert W. Wallace. With chapters by Paul Cartledge and Cynthia Farrar. Berkeley, CA, University of California Press, 2007. Pp. xii + 242. Hardback £22.95.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383507000368 Published online by Cambridge University Press

et démocratie grecque[4] also follows on from the work of Ober (and of Ellen Meiksins Wood). For the most part, this is a fairly conventional survey of Athenian democracy: notably rich in quotations from ancient sources and oriented to the question of the extent of popular participation. More striking, however, is the political end to which this treatment leads, a plea – notably more urgent and less, somehow, comfortable, than that of *Origins of Democracy* – for the (re)engagement both of the study of antiquity with the modern world (otherwise Classics will end up like Church History, 'which no longer interests anybody…') and of people with the political process: 'if we close our eyes, if the City is not repoliticised, these liberties will soon be only a distant memory'. Sara Forsdyke's *Exile, Ostracism and Democracy*[5] begins from the observation (derived from Robert Darnton) that when we discover an institution as apparently inexplicable as ostracism 'we know we are on to something'. She proceeds then to set the institution of ostracism in its 'deep historical context' by reconstructing a ubiquitous 'politics of exile' in the archaic Greek world, from which the Athenians (uniquely, it is suggested) diverged: a limited and legally circumscribed period of exile was not designed narrowly to address tyranny or treason, but to prevent the proliferation of intra-elite conflict and also to assert the authority of non-elite Athenians, confirming that 'a permanent solution to the problem of exile…could only be found through the greater involvement of the non-elites in the allocation of political power between elites'. Not all aspects of Forsdyke's book are equally convincing. I have doubts, in particular, that the process that she describes, the appropriation and transformation of traditions of exile, is necessarily as Athenian or even democratic as she holds (or that Herodotus is as 'Athenian' as she contends). But with its impressive integration of literary and material evidence (including the ideology of exile as represented in Athenian literature), and with its willingness to look at old questions through new lenses (for example, the compelling case for ostracism as collective ritual) this excellent book provides fresh insights on much of archaic history. Forsdyke's claims for Athens are as nothing to those of Gabriel Herman in a new study of Athenian *Morality and Behaviour.*[6] Athens' achievements in other fields have usually, he claims, been balanced by their moral system being deemed of an 'extremely unimpressive character'. On the contrary, he holds, in their elevation of self-restraint into an ideal, 'the moral system that supported the Athenians' political and cultural achievements displayed a remarkable level of sophistication', perhaps surpassing those of the societies that created 'the moral code of the west'. Herman's is a magnificently ambitious study, one which seeks to reconstruct both a broadly consistent moral system and its working out in lived experience, and which is richly informed by analogies from anthropology and behavioural sciences. The vibrancy of Herman's thought is reflected also in countless figures and diagrams: tables illustrating 'a typology of Euphiletus' reaction to Eratosthenes' provocation', or series of vase images illustrating 'ethnic and social types'. As this last example or the identification of a western moral code might suggest, there is also, however, a

[4] *Participation directe et démocratie grecque. Une histoire exemplaire?* By José Antonio Dabdab Trabulsi. Besançon, Presses Universitaires de Franche-Comté, 2006. Pp. 265. Paperback €25.

[5] *Exile, Ostracism and Democracy. The Politics of Expulsion in Ancient Greece.* By Sara Forsdyke. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 2005. Pp. xiv + 344. Hardback £27.95.

[6] *Morality and Behaviour in Democratic Athens. A Social History.* By Gabriel Herman. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006. Pp. xxi + 472. Hardback £60.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383507000368 Published online by Cambridge University Press

breeziness to Herman's treatment that sometimes leaves one dumbfounded. I was struck, for example, by the assertions of the Athenian 'movement to break away from religion and tradition' or that Athenian egalitarianism and the sophistic view of nature made the life of Athenian slaves 'less unbearable' than that of slaves in other cities. Athenian imperialism is revealed, in a section entitled 'A very unusual empire', as another manifestation of Athenian self-restraint, a product of the 'idea that for the sake of the public good one should give more than one has been given and hurt other people less than one has been hurt'. But, no matter how it infuriates sometimes in its blinkered dogmatism, it is never less than richly rewarding. After Herman's Athenolatry, reading about the conspiratorial mindset of the Athenians, of plots real and imagined, comes as something of a relief. Joseph Roisman's *The Rhetoric of Conspiracy in Ancient Athens*[7] was inspired by observing the ubiquity of conspiracy theories in Athenian sources while he was researching his *Rhetoric of Manhood*. Roisman certainly draws analogies from modern 'conspiracism', but he eschews Freudian interpretations, and the cheesiest parallel from the modern world is a reference to the bumper sticker 'Humpty Dumpty was pushed!' (no mention of JFK). His conclusions are also restrained and well judged: that conspiracy theories emerge especially in periods of crisis, and that they allowed for the affirmation of both shared values and the 'existing system'. A flexible system of moral principles – one which bends to different contexts and power relationships – is also the conclusion of a new study of interstate relations in the classical period by Polly Low.[8] Like Herman on a larger canvas, Low is seeking to counter the Greeks' poor reputation in this area. (As she quotes Adcock, 'the foreign policy of the Greeks was the foreign policy of the Kilkenny cats, and so the less said about it the better'.) The absence of explicit theorizing 'does not entail an absence of complex thinking', Low points out; the lack of a clear dividing line in Greek thought between domestic and interstate morality means also that we have been looking in the wrong place. Low covers some familiar themes – ritualized friendship or kinship between states and individuals – but crucially she covers a much wider body of evidence, literary and epigraphical (resisting the sponge-like ability of Thucydides, as she puts it, to draw all the attention) and handles it with a superbly delicate touch. In its fruitful engagement with International Relations theory (as she points out, usually a one-way street with the traffic coming the other way), this might well prove to be a landmark. It is hard to imagine any contemporary classicist being honoured with a funeral and memorial in Westminster Abbey, let alone being summoned by the head of the BBC to address the nation in the wake of a national crisis. But both were true of Gilbert Murray, now reassessed in a volume of essays edited by Christopher Stray – which should stand as a model of meticulous, sympathetic biography.[9] Lord Reith called on Murray, after the end of the 1926 General Strike, as a household name who was capable of seeming above the fray; his address, in which he appealed 'Let there be no

[7] *The Rhetoric of Conspiracy in Ancient Athens*. By Joseph Roisman. Berkeley, CA, University of California Press, 2006. Pp. xiv + 199. Hardback £29.95.

[8] *Interstate Relations in Classical Greece. Morality and Power*. By Polly Low. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007. Pp. x + 313. Hardback £50.

[9] *Gilbert Murray Reassessed. Hellenism, Theatre, International Politics*. Edited by Christopher Stray. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007. Pp. xii + 400. Hardback £65; paperback £27.50.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383507000368 Published online by Cambridge University Press

taunts, no shouts of victory', was met with a flood of requests for reprinting. The public side of Murray – his involvement in the League of Nations Union, as an apologist for the Great War, or as a public intellectual – is only one, however, of those addressed in this volume, which also examines his scholarly career (the influence of his ritual reading of Greek tragedy, the disappointment of his textual editions, his idealization of 'imagination' in scholarship) and his personal relationships (revealed not least in wistful memoirs from his grandchildren, Alexander Murray and Ann Paludan). The contributors are impressively objective in their assessments of Murray's weaknesses as well as his evident strengths: in the area of his 'psychic research', for example, explored by Nick Lowe, or in his attitude to the 'small dark Latin nations' that made up too much, in his view, of the 1921 League of Nations Assembly. What emerges, above all, however, is the utter conviction of his faith in the relevance of classical education (and more generally of a liberal, non-vocational education) to the modern world. This is not a faith that is blind to the faults of Classics or to others' perceptions. In a 1910 letter to the *Times* on the compulsory status of Greek, he strikingly admits that 'classical education has been in many ways narrow, oppressive – even obscurantist'. But where now, only a half century after his death, we *protest* the relevance of Classics, Murray's voice carries an extraordinary confidence and consent.

Regular readers of these pages will by now be fed up of my being fed up of books on Alexander. Carol Thomas' venture into this crowded field, *Alexander the Great in his World*[10] does not initially inspire confidence. Its Unique Selling Point, according to its modest preface, is that the author is a non-specialist who was talked into it by Blackwell's enterprising publisher. ('Coming to the subject without a fixed idea of Alexander's character, motives, wishes, and dreams' might be an advantage, he told her.) The particular line adopted by Thomas is that Alexander can best be explained by his context: so there are chapters on Macedonia, on the Macedonians' relationship with their Greek neighbours, and so on, each working round to the implications that this aspect of Alexander's environment might have had on the man himself. These conclusions *can* verge on the banal: that living in mountainous terrain, for example, makes one good at negotiating mountainous terrain, or that Alexander went east rather than west because it was the direction with which he and his fellow Macedonians were familiar. But, at the same time, Thomas' approach is refreshingly broad and sensible. So, for example, she makes clear at the beginning (unlike some specialists who dive headlong into psychological speculation) that we simply cannot know what Alexander thought he was doing; she settles instead for a chapter of 'basic facts, generally uncontested'. I think this scepticism could be taken further (I would like to see the contexts that explain Alexander's 'actions' include historiographical/ideological contexts), but on balance perhaps the publisher was right. There is a note on which to end.

doi: 10.1017/S0017383507000368 THOMAS HARRISON

[10] *Alexander the Great in his World*. By Carol G. Thomas. Blackwell Ancient Lives. Oxford, Blackwell, 2006. Pp. 254. Hardback £60; paperback £19.99.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383507000368 Published online by Cambridge University Press