of political hopefuls. B. says 'the ancient sources we have largely pass [Thrasybulus] by'; but do they do so more than with many of his contemporaries? Conon is no better served, Archinus, Anytus, Epicrates, Cephalus, and Agyrrhius a good deal less well. B. alleges 'an attempt to supplant [Thrasybulus] by Archinus for the honour of the overthrow of the Thirty', but I am unclear about the evidence (it is a different matter from saying Archinus was a prominent figure after the overthrow), and about a further claim about Callistratus and other faction-leaders being credited with Athens' joining the anti-Spartan front in 395. And if the allegations of neglect do not quite strike home, neither do the suggested explanations, namely, that sources display anti-democratic bias, did not think what Thrasybulus did was significant, and/or regarded him as old-fashioned: the first would be more cogent if one could name Athenians whom sources overvalue because they are anti-democratic, the second just restates the problem, and the third only works as another way of saying Thrasybulus was boring compared with, for example, Alcibiades—as were most people.

In short, given the general understatement to which Athenian politicians are subjected by our post-Thucydidean sources, Thrasybulus does not come off badly. Perhaps B.'s book should really be seen as a protest about modern undervaluation. Great efforts have been expended extracting Callistratus or Eubulus, for example, from the shadows, whereas Thrasybulus is simply taken for granted. This is certainly unfair: no Athenian was more prominent both sides of 403/2, and his career might have made a good Plutarchan life. B. is no Plutarch, but he is right to remind us of what we have missed.

University of Liverpool C. J. TUPLIN

ROYAL WOMEN

E. D. Carney: *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia*. Pp. xiv + 369. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000. Cased, $42.95. ISBN: 0-8061-3212-4.

This excellent book will be welcomed by scholars of Macedon and of women in antiquity alike. In a series of some twenty articles published over the last two decades, Carney has established herself as the leading expert on Macedon's royal women and the dynastic issues associated with them. These lucid, meticulous, and open-minded pieces now find summation in this volume, which continues their virtues and also does much to consolidate other good work in the field by le Bohec, Heckel, and, in particular, Greenwalt (originally to be a co-author).

It is surprising that there has not been a general book on Macedonian royal women since 1932, when Grace Macurdy, to whom C. rightly refers as her 'distinguished predecessor', published her *Hellenistic Queens*, a book very much ahead of its time, however quaintly it may read now, and the scholarly depth of which is belied by its light use of references. The interval from Macurdy is all the more surprising given the rise of women's studies and the fact that Macedonian and Hellenistic royal women are among the very few individual women in the ancient Greek world about whom we actually possess a few connected facts. Perhaps C. is right to hold a feminist disdain for the élite responsible for this neglect.

Her book presents us with more or less everything that can be known about the women associated by marriage or paternity with the kings of Macedon in the Classical and Hellenistic periods. The first seven chapters skilfully integrate narrative history

© Classical Association, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.318 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with biography and prosopography. The story of the developing status of the royal women and their significance for the institution of the monarchy is embedded with discrete biographies of all the individual women. The biographies incorporate citations of all extant sources for their subjects, and are distinguished from the surrounding main text by fount and boxes. At the cost of occasional repetition and the splitting of the larger biographies into parts (such as those of Olympias and her daughter Cleopatra), this technique works well, and allows for an admirably clear exposition of the complexities of dynastic relationships. The pot of strong coffee such material normally requires may be dispensed with. The final two chapters are thematic and survey a range of important background themes, such as the cult worship of the royal women (where the strength of their association with Aphrodite is striking) and the development of the term *basilissa* after 306 B.C. (usually better translated as 'royal woman' or 'princess' than as 'queen'). The connecting thread of argument contends that the transformation of the Macedonian monarchy from the hereditary possession of the large Argead clan into a mere office contingently monopolized by the Antigonids can be traced through the rise and fall of the fortunes of the kingdom's royal women.

Perhaps the greatest significance of this book lies less in what it feels it must argue for than in what it feels able to assume, namely that the Macedonian and (at any rate earlier) Hellenistic kings were characteristically polygamous. While this position has been well established in her previous articles, along with those of Heckel and Greenwalt, it remains a rarely expressed one in the major monographs on Macedon, which still tend to cling to a sub-Belochian notion that the kings practised serial monogamy. One hopes that the view that these dynasties were indeed polygamous may now be universally accepted, along with a recognition of all the far-reaching consequences that the practice had for the structure of the dynasties, for (pseudo-) constitutional issues and sometimes even policy issues within them, and for the murderous atmosphere in which they existed.

The only general criticisms I would make are these. First, while C. is focally aware of the way in which the practice of royal polygamy in Macedon militated—at the top end—against the establishment of 'queenship', she does not equally accept that—at the bottom end—it tended to dissolve distinctions between wives, mistresses, and courtesans. While some women held to be 'mistresses' are allowed into the book, such as Alexander's Barsine, 'courtesans' tend to be screened out. And words 'legitimate' and 'illegitimate' are several times applied to royal children as if these were hard and fast legal or constitutional categories, which I doubt was the case. Secondly, the contention that the Antigonids were normally monogamous seems insecurely based, given the indisputable large-scale polygamy of Demetrius I, the certain polygamy of Demetrius II, which receives further support from C.'s own arguments, and the probable polygamy of Philip V. These two concerns meet in the almost complete exclusion from consideration of Demetrius I's courtesan Lamia, who actually bore him a child, Phila, and about whom much is known. Indeed, the remarkable rise to power of courtesans' children in three generations (Demetrius I's Phila; Antigonus II's Halcyoneus; Demetrius II's Philip V) is surely central to the social history of women at the Antigonid court.

University of Wales Swansea DANIEL OGDEN

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.318 Published online by Cambridge University Press