computerization of epigraphy, and explains the uses of the database of Athenian prosopography available on Website Attica (http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/attica). As Jordan promises in the preface, the contents of the volume under review will also soon be available online. Kirchner's memoir, though lacking any historiographical introduction, provides insight into the life and background of one of the most important Attic epigraphers of the twentieth century. One is reminded, at the end of this piece, that scholarship does not take place in a political vacuum:

> On September 25th I celebrated my 80th birthday. After the University of Athens had already given me an honorary doctorate shortly before, on the occasion of my reaching this point in life, the *Führer* bestowed the Goethe Medal for Art and Science on me, to my delight. With thanks to God, I can look back with satisfaction on a long life that is rich in experiences. (p. 160)

Each paper makes some contribution to one or more aspects of Attic epigraphy. Collectively, the relevance of the volume is that it documents the way in which the study of epigraphy overlaps with the writing of ancient history, the study of religion, philology, prosopography, archaeology, topography, the history of scholarship, and developments in information technology. Accordingly, it serves as a good gauge and introduction to the study and applications of Greek inscriptions at the start of the twenty-first century.

Trinity College, Dublin PETER LIDDEL
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni175

THE CHRONICLE OF LINDOS

C. HIGBIE: *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of their Past*. Pp. xvi + 320, map, ills. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Cased, £65. ISBN: 0-19-924191-0.

The Lindian Temple Chronicle, which originally stood in the sanctuary of Athena (Doric: Athana) on the Acropolis of Lindos, is an unusual inscription. Its long but not fully-preserved text lists dedications to Athana by mythical and historical persons; that list is followed by three stories, each narrating an apparition (epiphany) of the goddess during a time of civic distress in Lindos. It adds to the unusual character of the document that it is the product of research in literary works and archival materials, which are meticulously cited as sources especially for the votives—their nature, the occasion on which they had been dedicated, and the inscriptions they carried. Heading the list is a decree of 99 B.C. that authorizes the research project and lays down the procedure to be followed by two named Lindians who had been appointed to the task. Thus one inscription covers a wide range of topics and is at the same time a piece of history writing, an inventory, a collection of inscriptions, and the transmitter of a public decision. The great interest of the Chronicle to specialists in various fields was recognized long ago by C. Blinkenberg, who in his *La Chronique du temple lindien* (1912) presented the first edition of the text together with extensive commentary; then, in his *Die lindische Tempelchronik* (1915, repr. 1980), Blinkenberg offered an improved text, with almost as copious a commentary, which formed the basis for his final publication, *I.Lindos* no. 2, of 1941.

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni176 Published online by Cambridge University Press

However, since then, the Chronicle has not received a study of its own, while a complete translation of the text has been lacking all along.[1] Carolyn Higbie's book comes at a good time to fill this gap, especially in view of the current scholarly interest in the way ancient communities used representations of their past to construct their identity, a theme which was not at the centre of Blinkenberg's concerns, but to which the Chronicle is endowed with the potential of making its own contribution.

This book is divided into two halves. In the first half, H. gives the Greek text with a parallel translation and a commentary; an introductory chapter outlines the history of Lindos and describes the spatial organization of its acropolis. In the second half, which consists of three chapters and aims at a broader readership, H. sets the Chronicle into a larger context with a view to showing how a culture 'creates and recreates its past' (p. vii). Following a conclusion, there is a bibliography, an *index locorum* and a general index, but no index of Greek words. All Greek texts are translated into English.

With regard to the book's first half, one must ask how much of it is new. The Greek text is almost identical with that printed by Blinkenberg in 1941, including the division into sections (A–D) and subsections (I–XLII). H. registers alternative readings, a few of which are based on autopsy, the remaining deriving from Blinkenberg's previous editions. *I. Lindos* offers a lengthy bibliography on the inscription, H. gives none. The translation is indeed something new. In many places it is faithful to the Greek text, but in equally many places H.'s aim to be 'as literal as possible' (p. vii) is pursued either too vigorously or not at all, which has unfortunate consequences. I offer a few examples (my references are to sections and lines of the inscription). In decrees, *εἶπε* means 'proposed', not 'spoke' (A2); for *ἀρχαιότατον* it is best to use 'the most ancient' instead of 'the most archaic'; *ἄρχων* (D13–14, cf. p. 143) is a 'magistrate', not a 'ruler'; in a book concerned with the Greek identity, *βάρβαροι*, referring to the Persians (D10, 21, 33), must be translated as 'barbarians', rather than as 'enemy'; *Λινδοπολίτας* (A2, 12) is not a 'citizen of Lindos' but a Lindian demotic; *κυρωθέντος τοῦδε τοῦ ψαφίσματος* (A5) does not mean 'with the authorization of this decree', but 'when this decree has been ratified' (cf. *C&M* 45 [1994], 117–35). The number of such inaccuracies is alarmingly high and so also is that of inconsistencies: for example, *ποτήριον* is 'drinking cup' in B18, but 'goblet' in B43; the title of Gorgon's book, *περὶ Ῥόδου*, is at B39–40 translated as 'work on Rhodes', but elsewhere (B14) as '*About Rhodes*'; Eudemos' *Λινδιακός* is sometimes '*Lindian Topics*' (C67–8), at other times '*About Lindos*' (D87–8). H.'s translation is not entirely reliable.

Technically, the commentary is carefully prepared and covers a variety of matters: uncertain readings of the text, the grammatical peculiarities of the Doric dialect, the references or allusions in the Chronicle to religion, myth, and historical events, the sources used by the compilers and not least the dedications themselves. Often these are usefully put into a broader context through reference to known parallels and at the same time are supplied with an updated bibliography. Especially those interested in myth will appreciate H.'s comments. Those interested in history and constitutional matters will be greatly disappointed. The commentary on the dedications made by rulers, for instance, contains little historical substance: pp. 133–5, on Alexander; p. 132, on Ptolemy II, whose rule started in 283 not in 285 B.C.—on p. 137 the date is pushed back to 308 B.C.; and p. 137, on the Ptolemy of C110–11, who, if Soter I, cannot have ruled from 367/6 B.C. Excessively lavish, on the other hand, is H.'s commentary on

[1] Except for C. Blinkenberg's Danish translation: *Oversættelse af den lindiske tempelkrønike* (undated booklet in the library of the Danish National Museum).

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni176 Published online by Cambridge University Press

matters for which brief references would have sufficed (on the *chrematismoi* [pp. 56–7], several epigraphic texts are quoted, each with a translation), or which are trivial (p. 53: the formula used for Timachidas' name 'would reflect the traditional Greek practice of naming a son after his grandfather'). H. knowledge of basic issues of Rhodian constitution is strikingly poor: the *damos* in C85, 97, as Blinkenberg recognized, refers not to the citizens of Lindos, but to those of Rhodes. Worst still, throughout the book Lindos is misleadingly called a 'town' (pp. 146, 237) a 'small town' (p. 289), or even a 'tiny village' (p. 291). H. seems to be unaware that Lindos had retained its status as a *polis*, whose territory occupied the largest third of the island of Rhodes. For a thorough treatment of the sources used by the compilers, finally, one must still consult Blinkenberg's editions, with his useful *Quellentafeln*.

The second half of the book is a blend of an extended commentary and an attempt at a historical synthesis. Even though repetitions abound in these three chapters, H. makes several interesting observations, e.g. about the structure of the entries of the Chronicle and the votives (Chapter 1), about how the Lindians exploited epic traditions and 'holes' in Homer in order to establish special connections between mythological heroes and their city (Chapter 2), and about the relation of the Chronicle to similar sources (Chapter 3), especially the inscribed poem glorifying Halikarnassos (S. Isager, *ZEP* 123 [1998], 1–23). Less convincing are her views on the genuineness and fate of the objects catalogued, an important but intricate question which she answers by wrongly harmonizing (i) the phrases introducing the votive inscriptions ('these had been inscribed', for the first thirty-three, and 'these have been inscribed', for the remaining six objects: pp. 65, 174, 188); (ii) the statement in the decree that most of the objects had been destroyed 'on account of time' (A4); and (iii) the mention in the first epiphany of the destruction of the objects by fire in the fourth century (D40–2). Thus, in H.'s opinion, the first thirty-three objects did not exist in 99 B.C. (if they ever existed), because they had been destroyed by the fire, and Hagesitimos' proposal aimed at rescuing these lost votives from oblivion. But there is no way of telling whether, as H. claims, the last six objects (but not the rest) existed in 99 B.C.; and Hagesitimos proposed the inscription of *all* offerings, not only of those from the pre-fire period (p. 258). In these chapters too (esp. Chapters 2 and 3), H. argues one of her central points. By 99 B.C. there had occurred a change from memory and oral tradition to documentary evidence. In a world increasingly under Roman influence, Greek scholars developed new historical methods through which to document a glorious past, thereby laying the roots for the Second Sophistic. Hence the book's main thesis that the Lindians, having fallen into decline, found a new source for their status; focusing on their sanctuary, they sought to convince especially Roman admirers of Greek culture of the importance of their past by erecting a stele which by documenting their lost relics supported their claims to prominence. Besides starting off the Second Sophistic, the Lindians thus exploited 'these traditions of literacy to create a document inscribed on durable material . . . to advertise to any future visitor the importance of their past' (pp. 287–8, cf. p. 242).

As an attempt at a historical synthesis, H.'s book fails on several counts. Lindos' (and Rhodes') political status and internal affairs in late Hellenistic times (all crucial for reconstructing the motives and intentions for publishing the stele) are barely treated at any length, while the Romans, so important for the argument, make only short entries (pp. 240–2, 243, 291–2). Literature central to the themes treated here is missing (G. Konstantinopoulos, *Ο Ροδιακός Κόσμος, Ι: Λίνδος* [Athens, 1972]; A. Bresson, *Mythe et contradiction. Analyse de la VIIe Olympique de Pindare* [Paris, 1979]). H. only superficially draws on the comparative studies announced on p. vii, and

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni176 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the 'anthropological approaches' never make it from the blurb of the book into its contents. Works that could have provided the concepts required in a study such as this (e.g. J. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* [Cambridge, 1997]; A. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* [Oxford, 1986]), let alone the concepts themselves, are deplorably absent. More importantly, H.'s main argument is fatally flawed. A (shorter) catalogue of votives existed long before the Romans appeared on the scene, i.e. in the Lindian archives and in the letters sent by the priests of Athana Gorgosthenes and Hieroboulos to the Rhodian Council and to the Lindian *mastroi* in the fourth century B.C. What we are asked to believe, moreover, is this: one of the compilers, Timachidas, had for some time been cultivating his own antiquarian interests (p. 61), until his father proposed the initiation of the very research project which aimed at documenting to the world Lindos' glorious past, and which was to be published (just one month after the proposal) on a stele that, once in place, would have impressed the visitor by the 'awe and intimacy' which characterized the special relationship claimed by the Lindians between them and the goddess Athana (pp. 292–3), but nonetheless a stele whose text, according to H. (p. 156), would have been extremely difficult for a visitor to read, if, indeed, any such found cause to 'come to the tiny village of Lindos' (p. 291). Ultimately, then, not only did Timachidas quite coincidentally produce what his 'fatherland' needed most urgently, but also the Lindians went to all that trouble for, and put their hopes in, a stone that was largely illegible.

In sum, because of this book's uneven quality, readers are generally advised to use it with great caution. The Chronicle still awaits proper treatment.

University of Copenhagen VINCENT GABRIELSEN
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni176

THIRD-CENTURY EPIGRAPHIC HANDS

S. V. Tracy: *Athens and Macedon. Attic Letter-Cutters of 300 to 229 B. C.* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 38.) Pp. xxii + 205, ills. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 2003. Cased, US$75, £49.95. ISBN: 0-520-23333-6.

Tracy's work on cutters is one of the most important recent developments in epigraphy. Identifying the cutter dates an inscription to within a generation and facilitates the joining of fragments by narrowing the pool of candidates typically from hundreds or thousands to less than fifty: dating and joins—two of the epigraphist's central tasks. T. is not the first scholar to identify an epigraphical hand, but he is the first to have pursued the study on a systematic basis. Over the years he has made innumerable joins (and disjoins) and redatings, and every Attic epigraphist is deeply in his debt—one might say every serious historian occupied with Athens, for inscriptions are the most important source for Athenian history in the *longue durée*. The present book fills the gap between his *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86* (Berkeley, 1990) and *Athenian Democracy in Transition, Attic Letter-Cutters of 340 to 290* (Berkeley, 1995) (*ADT*). If the harvest is less abundant, it is because he has already identified the two most prolific cutters of the period, those of Agora I 3238 and of *IG* II^2 788, in an earlier study. T. now adds 10–20 new items to their dossiers, presents six (rather unprolific) cutters for the first time, identifies three smaller groups of two or

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni176 Published online by Cambridge University Press