defined as 'verbal gender', p. 257). Translations of Greek words and passages are regularly provided. There are few typographical errors.

Overall, this book is an important contribution to our understanding of Aristophanes' writings both from a linguistic and from a literary perspective; it contains the best and most thorough analyses yet produced of certain passages, as well as much new information on the interpretation of certain types of usage. At the same time it is an even more important contribution to the sociolinguistic study of ancient languages, a new but rapidly growing field in which a work of this depth is particularly welcome. Yet it does not attempt to be a complete study of the subject of Greek linguistic variation, even in Aristophanes; the few case studies examined are narrowly defined (as was necessary to make room for the thoroughness with which they are investigated), and possibilities for further work leap out at the reader from every chapter. It will take a good many more books to address all the issues that W. has raised here, and it is to be hoped that those other books will soon be written.

Columbia University ELEANOR DICKEY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni026

A HERODOTEAN CONFERENCE

P. DEROW, R. PARKER (edd.): *Herodotus and His World. Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest.* Pp. xiv + 378, maps, ills. Oxford University Press, 2003. Cased, £55. ISBN: 0-19-925374-9.

This is a very successful volume. It consists of nineteen papers, almost all on Herodotus, originally delivered at a conference held at Oxford in July 2000 in memory of George Forrest. While it would be wrong to claim that a single theme runs throughout, distinct trends do emerge. Several essays bear the mark of continuing worry about how to rescue important parts of Herodotus' narrative from being labeled 'outright fabrications' without at the same time lapsing into an uncritical acceptance of *logoi* that cannot, as they stand, be true. Bakhtin and 'dialogism' come up in two discussions. There are also a trio of papers on Herodotus' relationship to Athens. Oracles and religion form the subject of three other essays. And there are several papers that resist categorization, though four of these, which are rather technical in nature, can be usefully grouped together.

Stephanie Dalley and Miltiades Hatzopoulos present cases where the material record has in fact corroborated Herodotus' account, most notably in sections where he was faulted. Dalley's treatment of the absence of the Hanging Gardens (not in Herodotus because they were not in Babylon, but rather Nineveh) is provocative and learned, and her list of places where Herodotus and Ctesias have been vindicated by the research of Assyriologists is equally arresting (p. 189). There is also much to learn from Hatzopoulos' discussion of topography and the myth surrounding the foundation of the Macedonian kingdom. A related but different concern surfaces in three papers by Simon Hornblower, the late John Gould, and Irad Malkin.

Herodotean details verifiable by documentary evidence are not the issue in these essays, rather how we read Herodotus' stories with an eye also on the truth claim of his proem, to keep from oblivion the notable deeds of men. So, in what sense is the incredibly bizarre and lurid tale of Panionios true (Hornblower)? Or, can the supernatural occurrences of Herodotus' narrative be paralleled by modern experience

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Gould)? And should we throw out entirely Herodotus' account of the foundation of Cyrene (Malkin)? In each of these discussions we are given compelling reasons to think about Herodotus' text in more nuanced ways, ones that have Herodotus telling us something true in his fashioning of events, while at the same time perhaps reproducing false information or even fabricating material—proof, as Hornblower sagely observes, that 'stories can work and be true at more than one level' (p. 56).

Both Deborah Boedeker and Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood offer essays that, among other things, bring Bakhtin's dialogism to bear on the interpretation of Herodotus. According to Boedeker, Herodotus gives us a narrative that can be usefully thought of as 'dialogic', one that has the feel of being 'de-centered, in progress, heteroglossic' (p. 31). When it comes to representing death in battle, variety is the key, as well as the desire to give us the reasons for combat, in contrast to the great heroic deaths of Homer. Sourvinou-Inwood takes on the vexed passages dealing with the Pelasgians. She wants to show that ethnicity for Herodotus is a flexible concept, permitting even self-contradiction at points in his narrative, as with the Pelasgians, who begin as barbarians but end up as Greeks; 'dialogism' is useful to her insofar as it helps explain how he could give us accounts at variance with each other (p. 131).

The three essays on Herodotus and Athens move us in the opposite direction, away from theory and towards an appreciation of the historian and his context. John Davies, in an extremely important paper entitled 'Democracy without Theory', maintains that Herodotus' world 'was not being driven by a conscious outreach towards any identifiable "democratic" goals', but rather that what was called *demokratia* emerged from a set of mostly negative responses—policies aimed at preventing bad things from 'continuing or gaining a foothold' (p. 323). This is a sobering observation, one designed to counter those who need Athenian democracy to be more articulate about itself as well as intentionally designed. John Salmon provides a valuable discussion that covers some of the same ground. He considers to what degree the Corinthian tribal system influenced Cleisthenes' reforms at Athens, arguing that the Corinthian model was important, but clashed with intractable Athenian realities, especially the deme: note that while we seem to have planning, it is planning that runs into difficulties (see esp. p. 233). Robert Fowler reminds us that we risk oversimplification when we ascribe to Herodotus an Athenian viewpoint or bias, as if such a unitary view ever existed. A wonderfully sensible point.

Thomas Harrison leads off the section on religion by arguing that 'Herodotus' religious beliefs had a[n] . . . enabling effect' (p. 255), providing him with a moral compass that helped him organize what would have otherwise been a mere chronicle into a proper history with an end. Hugh Bowden contributes a thoughtful paper on chresmologues, as well as the political rôle of oracles in general at Athens. Marcel Piérart's essay is daring and ingenious: the 'common oracle' given to both the Milesians and Argives (Hdt. 6.19 and 77) was in fact originally only about Miletus, and was only taken later to apply to Argos as well because of a confusion regarding the force of 'Argives' in the oracle, which Piérart takes to mean 'Greeks'.

Roger Brock's essay on Herodotus' narrative voice is excellent: he charts very carefully those places where the historian's rôle as 'story-teller' is especially felt, noting the 'phenomena [that] bear witness to his concern to maintain constant contact with his audience' (p. 14). Peter Rhodes on Herodotean chronology is likewise valuable. Although his results are mostly negative, it is nonetheless vital that students of Herodotus know that his grasp of pre-500 events is extremely spotty. Eugenia Kiesling offers a military historian's view of Herodotus and comes up with an intriguing result: Herodotus turns out to be very much like the 'new' military historians with their

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

emphasis on the societal and cultural factors of warfare. In a terrific paper that will deeply trouble many readers of Herodotus, Dwora Gilula reveals several places where modern emendations of his text have led editors seriously astray. This will be must reading for everyone. Finally, José Miguel Alonso-Núñez examines how Herodotus prefigures later universal historians, and Angelos Matthaiou discusses Herodotus' account of Marathon and the topography of the site, bringing to this problematic issue important and (in some cases) new epigraphic evidence.

The quality of all the papers in this volume is very high. The warmth, informality and even humor found in many of them are refreshing, and bespeak the obvious affection with which the contributors hold the memory of their late mentor and friend.

University of Virginia JOHN DILLERY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni027

RELIGION IN HERODOTUS

J. D. MIKALSON: *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars*. Pp. xiv + 269, maps. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003. Cased, £33.50. ISBN: 0-8078-2798-3.

Herodotus, Mikalson plausibly claims, is our richest and most varied single source for Greek religion, and for no period of Greek history is the record of vows, sacrifices, epiphanies, cult foundations, and so on so abundant as it is for the Persian wars. *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars* seeks to bring in that double harvest. Thomas Harrison's *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (Oxford, 2000) appeared when a draft of M.'s book was complete, and with commendable self-sacrifice M. re-shaped his own work to reduce overlap to a minimum. In their broad approach M. and Harrison converge (see esp p. 198 n. 5, where M. politely rejects the rationalized Herodotus of Lateiner and Shimron); it is a pity that timing prevented M. from reacting to Rosalind Thomas's *Herodotus in Context* (Cambridge, 2000), a work which, though seldom in formal disagreement with him and Harrison, yet places its emphases very differently.

Most of M.'s slim book consists of 'A Religious Account of the Persian Invasions', a weaving together into a single narrative of the religious elements found in Herodotus and other sources (chiefly epigrams, Plutarch and Pausanias); a further chapter re-sorts the data with reference to the particular gods, heroes, and broader principles ('the divine') supposedly involved. The abundance of this material is indeed impressive, and to have it brought together in one package is interesting and useful. M. rightly observes that in this area the 'wie es eigentlich gewesen' is seldom attainable, but in many ways is not relevant: 'the precious thing which Herodotus offers us is a representation of the religious dimension of the Persian wars that was credible in the fifth century'. It is also true that 'the accounts of Plutarch, Pausanias, and Diodorus have their value in recording how these events were 'remembered' many centuries afterward'. But we still need to sift as best we can the many strata of 'remembering', to distinguish the representations of the fifth century B.C. from those of the second century A.D. and intermediate periods. And here it may be objected that M. has given the reader less assistance than is needed. Plutarch's *Aristides*, for instance, is full of vivid detail about matters of cult which scholars have found hard to believe go back to the fifth century. Some of their objections M. registers rather *sotto voce*, some not at

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni027 Published online by Cambridge University Press