and of Pericles himself. Then the tables were turned: acknowledging the Athenian Empire as a tyranny evoked at best uneasy pride, but the freedom of individual citizens to live as they pleased under democracy became in the same period an unequivocally positive slogan. However, the extrapolation of the demos's claim to complete freedom from constraint to corporate political action at the Arginusae trial dealt severe damage to freedom as an aspect of democratic propaganda. This was somewhat counter-balanced by the experience of real autocracy under the Thirty, which strongly influenced the fourth-century conception of 'tyranny': thus in the courts the upholding of the laws, now more firmly buttressed constitutionally, is opposed to the individual who in allegedly acting as he pleases aligns himself with the enemies of democracy. Critics of democracy correspondingly retrenched, revaluing democracy's freedom of choice in private life as the freedom not to be properly educated, to indulge in unnecessary pleasures, obliterate the proper distinctions between social classes and confuse values to create a topsy-turvy world. The argument over freedom thus became a dispute as to whether a distinct leisured élite was, as it believed, entitled to a privileged position by superior fitness for political life, especially proper education. Hence the blurring of status divisions in democratic ideology can be viewed as an active defensive strategy against such exclusive codes, though the levelling effect was not only upwards (slaves indistinguishable from citizens), and élite propaganda was directed as much or more against 'class traitors' who failed to uphold traditional values. The two aspects of fourth-century anti-democratic propaganda thus had a common foundation in élite self-perception (p. 167).

M.'s discussion is often acute and stimulating, and much of this looks very plausible, though he sometimes seems to press the sources and their expression rather hard, especially early in the second part, where the argument rests on the precise wording of brief passages in works often of uncertain date (S. *Ajax* 1081–6, *Ant.* 59–60, 506–7, [A.] *P.V.* 938–40, Hdt. 3.80.3); given the early identification of tyranny as the ideological antithesis of democracy, an alternative evolution from the inversion of a democratic slogan seems quite possible. Elsewhere, the lexical analysis could sometimes be refined—ἐξουσία (p. 135 n. 296, pp. 158–9) surely has a more negative resonance than ἐλευθερία, and χρῆσθαι ὡς βούλεται (pp. 108–9, p. 135) is not the same as ποιεῖν or ζῆν—and one sometimes misses an exploration of the wider ideological landscape (e.g. pp. 139–40 on oligarchy and the rule of law, p. 159 on pity at Athens).

Particular disagreements aside, this is a useful study and a welcome complement to more author-oriented works such as Ober's *Political Dissent in Democratic Athens* (*CR* 50 [2000], 509–11).

University of Leeds ROGER BROCK

GREEK CAVALRY

R. E. GAEBEL: *Cavalry Operations in the Ancient Greek World*. Pp. xiv + 345, ills. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002. Cased, $34.95. ISBN: 0-8061-3365-1.

Robert E. Gaebel's detailed and persuasive *Cavalry Operations in the Ancient Greek World* argues for a continuous advance in the effectiveness and use of cavalry beginning already in the late fifth century and culminating in the decisive use of cavalry by Alexander the Great. Rather than positing a sudden breakthrough by the

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.403 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Macedonians, he links the slow evolution of cavalry with the general tendency toward more varied and flexible armies: already in the Peloponnesian War cavalry played an important rôle as did other non-hoplite arms such as peltasts. G. also argues that the actual tactics of cavalry became more aggressive over time: by the time of Alexander cavalry were no longer content to throw javelins from a distance, but fought hand-to-hand, mainly with spears. After cavalry's apogee under Alexander, it continued to be an integral part of Hellenistic armies, but rarely decided battles.

To understand the rise and fall in cavalry's decisiveness, G. invokes the concept of military asymmetry. Asymmetry occurs when two opposing armies are significantly different in some respect. Such a difference opens the door to decisive victory (pp. 4–5). This theory helps in understanding the importance of cavalry: one does not have to insist that cavalry can succeed in frontal attacks on disciplined infantry—something cavalry has never been able to accomplish with any consistency—to explain why the use of cavalry spread. Rather, on G.'s account, armies without cavalry were vulnerable to attacks on their flanks or rear or whenever they were out of formation—even in the classical period and especially if they fought in large plains. This asymmetry ensured that, as the limiting conventions of hoplite warfare broke down, cavalry, already dominant in Persia, northern Greece, and Sicily, became an increasingly important arm of the combined armies of the city-states of central and southern Greece. Alexander and Hannibal—who sneaks in with a chapter—faced armies that were inferior either in disciplined infantry (the Persians) or in cavalry (the Romans). These two generals were repeatedly able to exploit this asymmetry to their advantage. In contrast, the battles of the Hellenistic kingdoms usually involved relatively evenly matched armies with strong infantry, cavalry to protect the flanks, and elephants, whose rôle in defense limited the scope for cavalry. The symmetry of forces meant that cavalry was rarely decisive. Hellenistic warfare was more often a matter of attrition—or of asymmetry of some other type.

To prove his argument, G. recounts virtually every battle attested in the ancient sources from the late sixth century on—a heavy dose of military history. He does find an impressive number of cases when cavalry decided or contributed to the result of a battle or campaign. Such a substantial book will, of course, contain the odd mistake, the missed journal article, and the overly speculative theory (p. 167). In general, G.'s work is sound and careful, with a helpful index. He also includes enough historical background to make it an accessible read for a non-scholarly audience—some of whom will probably be more appreciative than this reviewer of, according to the appendix, fifty-five battle narratives.

The book was clearly a labor of love, 'the perfect excuse for spending more time in the saddle' (p. xi). G. even thanks his 'Trakehner mare, Dynamik' in the preface. The reader may too. Some of the book's most interesting insights stem from G.'s familiarity with all things horsey. For example, G. notes the 'collected position' of horses depicted in vase-paintings. This suggests a style of riding, more controlled and maneuverable, that made sense in rougher country where cavalry closed hand-to-hand or threw javelins. In contrast, the gallop was more suited to large plains and horse archers (pp. 29–31). The horsemanship of the steppe peoples, who reputedly did everything from horseback, is the subject of another insight. It was in places such as Greece, where horses were rare and expensive, that horses' bonds with their riders and their training are likely to have been most intense. The warriors of the steppes were no doubt consummate riders, but their many horses were 'almost feral' (p. 21). In addition to these passing points, one of G.'s main arguments is that modern scholars do not appreciate the level of skill that a rider and horse can attain even without the treed

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.403 Published online by Cambridge University Press

saddle, stirrups, and horseshoes. He refers to bare-back displays in riding schools, Native American practices, and his personal experience to argue that changes in equestrian equipment were not as decisive as conventionally thought (pp. 12, 25–28, 56, 91). Even without this testimony, theories which make a sharp break in cavalry effectiveness depend on technological advances seem to founder on Alexander's decisive use of cavalry and on the continuing inability of cavalry to defeat disciplined infantry in formation, an inability that neither stirrups nor anything else ever overcame.

Cavalry Operations complements an already strong field of recent books on Greek cavalry and several of G.'s main conclusions are not new. Glenn Richard Bugh, *The Horsemen of Athens* (Princeton, 1988), focuses on the uneasy position of élite cavalrymen in the Athenian democracy. I. G. Spence, *The Cavalry of Classical Greece* (Oxford, 1993), argues that the use of cavalry in the classical period was limited primarily by social and cultural factors. His treatment of cavalry's military rôle is extensive and excellent. Leslie Worley's *Hippeis: The Cavalry of Ancient Greece* (Boulder, 1994), is more wide-ranging in time and geography. His conclusions about the importance of cavalry in Greek warfare and about the trend towards hand-to-hand fighting are, if anything, more extreme than G.'s. Of these books, G.'s battle narratives provide the most detailed evidence for the military significance of cavalry. Although G.'s section on archaic Greece is quite thin, his is the only book that takes the history of Greek cavalry through the Hellenistic age. Due in part to the view of cavalry presented by Bugh, Spence, and Worley, scholars today tend to present a more conditional view of the predominance of hoplite warfare than was popular ten years ago. (One might contrast the title of Victor Hanson [ed.], *Hoplites: The Classical Greek Battle Experience* [London, 1991], with his recent article 'Hoplite Battle as Ancient Greek Warfare: When, Where, and Why?' in Hans Van Wees [ed.], *War and Violence in Ancient Greece* [London, 2000].) G.'s concept of asymmetry, his observations based on personal experience, and his lively battle descriptions will contribute to popularizing this more balanced view of Greek warfare.

University of Colorado, Boulder PETER HUNT

WHAT WAS IT TO BE GREEK?

I. MALKIN: *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Pp. xiii + 418, maps, ills. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2001. Cased, £34.50. ISBN: 0-674-00662-3.

Ethnicity remains a hot topic. Alongside Hall's two provocative and stimulating volumes (*Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* [Cambridge, 1997] and *Hellenicity* [Chicago, 2002]), and a host of lively articles in a number of contexts, we have here a set of proceedings from a 1997 colloquium at the Center for Hellenic Studies. Few concepts have received the methodological attention which has been lavished on ethnicity. We are all aware of emic and etic definitions, the dangers of confusing a material culture with an ethnic group, the chronological contingency of self-definition, or definition by others, the centrality of the Other, and the danger of thinking in simple bipolarities. It is questionable whether we have not redefined, refined, and problematized ethnicity into a category of such methodological indistinctness as to be in danger of collapse.

For the most part, contributors to this volume remain positive about the value of

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.403 Published online by Cambridge University Press