to say even when treating the most familiar material. Undergraduates will enjoy this work immensely, but, I fear, will be tempted to use it not as a foundation on which to build but as the ultimate authority on the works discussed. Of course, all secondary material runs that risk but this does seem especially seductive from that point of view. There is one further oddity; at the end there is a useful collection of suggestions for further reading and a list of 49 suggested translations; of these, 25 were published by O.U.P., 14 are Loebs, seven are Penguins; the last three are from Baltimore, Leeds and Liverpool.

D. E. HILL

Greek History

Gambling, GBH, rent-boys and a cast of characters including 'Stammering' Demosthenes, Hegesippus 'The Hair' and Timarchus 'The Tart' (270): *Against Timarchus* has all the ingredients of a cockney gangster flick. (Minus the expletives but with the added bonus of cock-fighting and quail-tapping scenes.) Yet – or should that be therefore? – so far there has only been one English translation of this speech and no commentary 'in any language' (v). Nick Fisher's B★★*Aeschines: Against Timarchus*[1] fills the gap admirably, with a fluent translation, a 68-page introduction which offers, amongst other things, a significant contribution to the debate about Greek homosexuality, and a 239-page commentary which addresses a wide range of social, cultural and other historical problems, rather than primarily grammatical or literary issues. I hasten to add that Fisher does not indulge in the cheap sensationalism to which I so readily resorted in my opening sentences: he positively rejects 'rent-boy' as being 'in too low a register' (41) and chooses far more responsible translations of the nicknames bandied about (203, 265–7, 270). Notable features are a detailed treatment in the commentary (191–6) as well as in an appendix (357–62) of the organisation of gambling in Athens, and extended discussions of the role of honour in Athenian sexual and social relations. (See also Cynthia Patterson's account of the *moikhos* in the new paperback edition of ★★*The Family in Greek History*,[2] unchanged from the hardback reviewed in *G&R* 46 no. 2 (1999), 241.) The ethics of honour were a minefield in ancient Greece and their interpretation has become no less of a minefield in modern scholarship, but Fisher negotiates it by defusing rather than avoiding explosive issues such as the much-debated morality of buggery, and emerges unscathed. The fact that this commentary was created from scratch – unlike most modern commentaries, which can draw on a string of predecessors (see below) – makes its scale, depth and polish all the more remarkable. The only slip I noticed is the claim that 'the great majority of Attic vases . . . have been found in Etruria, not Greece' (33), a remark which I cite primarily as an excuse to pass on to you the results of a couple of hours of on-line fun with the Beazley Archive which I had the other day: actually only 5% of Athenian vases were found in Etruria, though at its peak in the second half of the sixth century the proportion did reach a whopping 10%. If Aeschines scored points off Demosthenes by having Timarchus con-

[1] *Aeschines: Against Timarchus*. Translated with introduction and commentary by Nick Fisher. Clarendon Ancient History Series, Oxford, 2001. Pp. xv + 397. Hardback £50.

[2] *The Family in Greek History*. By Cynthia B. Patterson. Harvard U.P., Hardback 1998; paperback 2001. Pp. 286, with 6 figures. Paperback £13.95.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.248 Published online by Cambridge University Press

victed, Demosthenes won by a knock-out with his speech *On The Crown*, which made Aeschines give up politics and leave Athens altogether (12). In stark contrast to the neglect of Aeschines, Demosthenes has had no shortage of editors: Harvey Yunis' Cambridge edition of [B]******On The Crown*[3] contains about the twentieth commentary to appear on that speech alone. Its immediate predecessor, Stephen Usher's edition for Aris & Phillips (briefly reviewed in *G&R* 42 no. 1 (1995), 90–1), appeared less than a decade ago, and had much the same scope, which is to say that both works are rather more interested in linguistic and literary than in historical matters, although the latter are certainly not ignored. Yunis' concise style allows him to pack in an even more impressive amount of grammatical explanation and stylistic analyis than Usher managed to do in roughly the same space, and in the rare cases where he does not say something helpful he will refer the reader to a recent article or book which does. Insights into Athenian popular morality and political ethics are perhaps not always as sharp as they might be: in context, Philip's *megalopsychia* (68) is surely not mere 'boldness'; it is cited by Demosthenes more to shame the Athenians by comparison than to criticize their enemy (150). Similarly 'the *phronēma* of the city' which the jurors are urged to 'pick up along with their staff and token' (210) ought to mean something more like 'pride' than merely 'way of thinking' (225, 228). The only other minor disappointment in this fine work is the omission of all but one of the documents cited in evidence, on the grounds that the usual printing in square brackets has not prevented 'scores of readers' from being 'misled' (31). Only the very last document, an epigram for the dead of Chaeronea (289), is included and provided with a critical exegesis to show why it must be spurious (270–1). Judging by Yunis' expert handling of this text, it would have been good to have his take on the others – and, genuine or not, it seems a shame to miss out the magnificent decree (181–7) claiming that eternal rivals Athens and Thebes had in fact been close kinsmen and firm friends since the days of Oedipus. *Against Timarchus* is for the Greekless; *On The Crown* strictly for those with Greek. Wayne Ambler's ******The Education of Cyrus*[4] is for those who want to understand Greek without learning it. Ambler is a political scientist who aims to make Xenophon's thought accessible to his colleagues and interested academics in related fields by not so much translating the *Cyropaedia* as transposing it into English. That is to say, he follows the Greek as closely as he can, down to the word order, and adopts near-total consistency in translating key nouns, so that the reader can almost always tell from the English which of the Greek words explained in annotations and a glossary was used in the original. So, for example, the line 'What are you doing, man?', spoken by an exasperated drill-sergeant to a dim recruit (2.2.7) is rendered with deadly accuracy as 'Human being, what are you doing?' (69). Yes, Xenophon uses *anthrōpos*, not *anēr*, and there is a difference, yet 'man' in this instance conveys just the right nuance, whereas 'human being' is just weird. One can see what the translator is trying to do, and one may applaud his noble ambition, but the result is barely readable, and certainly does not convey any of Xenophon's style and humour. A batch of testimonials on the back cover praise this 'definitive', 'absolutely reliable', and 'very impressive English translation' as 'far superior to any other I have

[3] *Demosthenes: On The Crown*. Edited by Harvey Yunis. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge U.P., 2001. Pp. xiii + 314, with 1 map. Paperback £16.95.

[4] *Xenophon: The Education of Cyrus*. Translated and annotated by Wayne Ambler. Cornell U.P., Ithaca, London, 2001. Pp. x + 304, with 1 map. Hardback £29.50; Paperback £12.95.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.248 Published online by Cambridge University Press

seen'. Personally, I came away with a renewed appreciation of the virtues of the Loeb and Everyman translations, which, given that these both date to 1914, is saying something. Xenophon's works on horsemanship suggest that he would have approved of *There Are No Problem Horses, Only Problem Riders*, by M. Twelveponies (23 n. 22), but he might have drawn the line at the sort of rhapsodizing about the mystic union of man and horse with which Robert Gaebel ends his [B]★★*Cavalry Operations in the Ancient Greek World*.[5] (Not to mention the pseudo-classicizing closing quotation from a Dick Francis novel: 'The Great God Pan lived in racehorses', 311.) Until he reaches the home straight, however, Gaebel keeps his enthusiasm on a tight rein, and presents a sober account of the changing uses of the cavalryman from 'a rather timid javelin-throwing annoyance . . . to an aggressive, spear-wielding, hand-to-hand mounted fighter' (277). The beginning and end of this story are most effectively covered, with three short opening chapters on 'the Greek horse', Bronze Age chariots, and the Assyrian origins of cavalry proper, and four long and substantial concluding chapters on the roles of cavalry in the battles of Alexander, his successors, and Hannibal, arguing that the dominance of cavalry under Alexander was due to a temporary 'asymmetry' of forces and that the 'symmetry' achieved under his successors meant that the role of cavalry was reduced to much more modest proportions (261–2, 301). The middle section may be a bit sketchy and oversimplify both the history and the historiography of warfare in archaic and classical Greece, but its sheer chronological range and its measured assessment of Hellenistic military developments make this book a worthy contender in the crowded field of cavalry studies. Even more striking changes in Hellenistic warfare are identified by Nick Sekunda, who has travelled a not uncommon road, but in the opposite direction, by publishing his work in a popular format several years *before* producing a full-dress academic version, in [B]★★*Hellenistic Infantry Reform in the 160's BC*.[6] 'It is a commonplace of military history that successful armies are always imitated, but the imitation is usually quite superficial', he points out. 'Armies across the world' adopted Prussian helmets, without also adopting a Prussian infrastructure (116). But in the mid-second century BC something unusual happened: Hellenistic armies were thoroughly Romanized in equipment and organization, comparable to 'the westernization of the Ottoman and Egyptian armies during the nineteenth century' (ibid.). Inscriptions and papyri from Ptolemaic Egypt do indeed reveal the existence of a unit remarkably similar to a Roman legionary century, incorporating the Greek equivalent of a centurion, standard-bearer, *tesserarius* and *optio* (though its two *pentekontarchoi* had no Roman counterpart, 33). At higher levels of organization the parallels seem more tenuous, however, and the iconographical evidence for the adoption of Roman equipment, although carefully discussed and well-illustrated, is unconvincing. The case rests essentially on a single possible mail corslet, and on shields said to be of Roman type, but to my eyes distinctly smaller and more oval in shape, in short, exactly like normal Hellenistic *thureoi*. For the Seleucid army, there is explicit literary evidence for the creation of at least one Roman-style contingent by Antiochus IV, and much erudite and

[5] *Cavalry Operations in the Ancient Greek World*. By Robert E. Gaebel. University of Oklahoma Press, Oklahoma City, 2002. Pp. xiv + 345, with 7 maps. $34.95.

[6] *Hellenistic Infantry Reform in the 160's BC*. By Nicholas Sekunda. Studies on the History of Ancient and Medieval Art of Warfare, Volume V. Oficyna Naukowa MS, Lódz, 2001. Pp. 189, with 36 figures. £25.00.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.248 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ingenious effort is directed towards showing that the introduction of Roman equipment and organization did not stop there but spread to the rest of the forces. Again the evidence is thin, and the appearance of Macedonian- and Roman-style units side by side in the army of Mithridates the Great as late as 86 BC (176) might seem to suggest that Hellenistic kingdoms resorted to partial, not wholesale, adoption of Roman military practice. The thesis of complete Romanization of Hellenistic armies thus rests on wobbly foundations, but a more restricted version of it would seem perfectly tenable, and at the very least it has the great merit of raising important questions about a body of material that deserves to be more widely known. We are all tempted to press our sources a little too hard at times, but Maria Aubet's treatment of Ezekiel 27.12–13 really makes the pips squeak. 'You were once an exemplar of perfection, full of wisdom, perfect in beauty; you were in Eden, in the garden of God', says the prophet to the king of Tyre. 'Ezekiel refers to the fertility of the coastal strip near the island', Aubet explains (75). I suppose the next line – 'a thousand gems formed your mantle' – refers to the Phoenicians' high-camp dress-sense, and the bit about walking amid red-hot coals on the mountain of God to their fondness for outdoor challenge weekends. Also unusual is her beefing up of the evidence for Greek attitudes to trade by citing the same passage from the *Odyssey* twice, first as 'words addressed to Odysseus', then as a 'still worse' accusation levelled 'before the court of Antinous' at 'Ulysses' (128). B★★*The Phoenicians and the West*[7] is an important and already very successful synthesis of archaeological and literary evidence for the city of Tyre, its trade, and its settlements abroad, so one's first reaction is to welcome this updated and expanded second edition (while noting that the update extends only to 1994, when the original Spanish version of the second edition came out). Curious passages such as the above, however, do give pause for thought, especially since Aubet sometimes offers only the vaguest allusions to the literary sources ('says Homer', 134; 'in the well-known Achilles episode', 140) and gives virtually no indication of her sources for the archaeological evidence beyond a list of titles in a section-by-section bibliography. The wealth of material assembled here would be so much more useful with some indication of where it all comes from, and breezy claims along the lines of 'population growth gave rise around the tenth century BC to genuine demographic pressure on resources' (76) would inspire more confidence if the reader were not expected to take the author's word for it. For all its strengths, which include a willingness to engage in general debates about the nature of exchange in ancient economies and models of overseas expansion, this book thus makes for frustrating reading. What we really need is a third edition with footnotes – and, while we're at it, with the names of Anfilocus, Atenaios, Curcius, Polibius, Porfirius, Timeus and others converted back from their Spanish form, and the English titles restored to the likes of Finley's *El mundo de Odiseo* or Casson's *Los antiquos marinos*. At the opposite extreme stands one of the most heavily annotated volumes I have ever seen, B★★*Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit 332–30 v. Chr*,[8] with a 93-page bibliography listing well over 3,000 items. The 'student assistants who uncomplainingly carted books around' and the man who wrote up the *Literaturverzeichnis* 'in a very short time' really deserve their

[7] *The Phoenicians and the West*. Politics, colonies, and trade. Second edition. By Maria Eugenia Aubet. Cambridge U.P., 2001. Pp. xv + 432, with 106 figures. Hardback £47.50; Paperback £17.95.

[8] *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit 332–30 v. Chr.* By Werner Huß. C.H. Beck, Munich, 2001. Pp. 885, with 4 maps. Hardback DM 168.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.248 Published online by Cambridge University Press

acknowledgements (9). Werner Huß writes the political history of Egypt from the conquest of Alexander to the occupation by Rome, Ptolemy-by-Ptolemy, in 700 pages, not counting a 'prehistory', starting with the Saite dynasty, in 40 pages with 304 footnotes. As these last figures suggest, it is the annotation which makes this book so very long: the narrative and discussion as such are generally quite concise and would probably take no more than 300 pages, despite covering everything from big issues such as dynastic struggles, war and diplomacy, economic policies, patronage of the arts, religious innovation, and relations between conquerors and conquered, to the fine nuances of royal titulature and the question of whether the Single White Bear in the Ptolemaic zoo was of polar origin or a Thracian albino (319 with n.120). As a work of reference, this is invaluable; it is hard to see how it could have been done more comprehensively or thoroughly. As a work of historical interpretation, it tends to leave the reader wanting more: possible views are sketched only briefly, sometimes excessively briefly. Was Polybius right to say that the role of native levies in the battle of Raphia triggered friction and ultimately revolt? 'Maybe', is the one-word answer (445; a later page devoted to the roots of native revolts implies that this means 'not really', 448). In particular, one might have liked to see some sort of overall assessment of historical developments in the period by way of conclusion, even if only to amplify the model of a 'flowering' followed by a 'crisis', 'decline' and 'fall' which is built into the chapter titles. Instead, the last page comments on cult titles adopted and abandoned by Cleopatra VIII (better known as VII; Huß has his own system of numbering Ptolemies and Cleopatras, 11) and then just stops with the words *Hic finis libri*, the educated person's equivalent of writing THE END in big letters with triple underlining. An alternative pre-history of Alexander's conquest of Egypt is presented by Phiroze Vasunia's B★★*The Gift of the Nile*,[9] which traces Greek attitudes to things Egyptian from Aeschylus to Plato and explores how this intellectual background influenced the actions of the conqueror. With its acknowledged models in the work of Michel Foucault and Edward Said, the project sounds quite exciting. Unfortunately, we get *faux* Foucault and *ersatz* Said; that is to say, much talk about alterity, spatiality, temporality, 'writing' this, and 'reading' that, and a good deal of name-dropping, but not many insights. Not untypical is Vasunia's summary of Aeschylus' *Suppliants* as 'white men saving black women from black men', followed by the suggestion that the latter 'are vehicles for the exploration and realization of Greek men's covert desires' (38). This bit of pop psychoanalysis is then dignified with the confession that it is 'indebted, in part, to the Lacanian analysis carried out by Slavoj Zizek on Alfred Hitchcock's film, *Rear Window*' (72 n. 104). A favourite rhetorical strategy is not to argue a proposition but to reiterate it so often and in such a variety of ways that the reader loses the will to wonder whether it is true. In a single opening paragraph on the subject of writing in Egypt the reader is told at least half a dozen times that for Herodotus this country is 'the graphic space par excellence', 'the locus of graphic activity', 'the site of a graphic energy of such intensity' that no Greek can think of Egypt without also thinking of its writing system, and so on (138–9). After such a battering, it takes a great effort of will not just to give in when the author presents his evidence, even if that amounts to no more than Herodotus' repeated appeals to Egyptian

[9] *The Gift of the Nile*. Hellenizing Egypt from Aeschylus to Alexander. By Phiroze Vasunia. Classics and Contemporary Thought. University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 2001. Pp. xiv + 346, with 8 figures. Hardback £29.95.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.248 Published online by Cambridge University Press

written records and the gratuitous assumption that *logioi* means 'record-keepers' (139–40). The role of Egypt in Greek discourse becomes more and more abstract as the book proceeds, with the chapter on Isocrates' *Busiris* concerned only to establish the genre of the text (parody, 183–215), without actually saying anything about Isocrates' image of Egypt, and the next chapter mainly interested in Plato's use of an Egyptian source for his Atlantis stories as a narrative strategy. Not surprisingly, these discussions contribute little to the closing assessment of the influence of Greek ideology on Alexander's conquest: Alexander sent out an expedition to find the sources of Nile because Greek authors had long been interested in this question (275–82); he visited the oracle of Ammon because there had been a long literary tradition of such visits by Greeks (272–5); in founding Alexandria he 'bridged the divide between East and West' as a 'perfect realization of Herodotus' notion . . . of Egypt as an in-between country' (268–72); and he invaded Egypt in the first place because 'as much as military strategy, everything he had heard and seen about Egypt made it too enticing for him to ignore' (265–6). All fair enough, but a disappointing tally for a study with such great aspirations. What promises to be an exciting discussion of Greek literature as 'an auxiliary to empire-building' (12), ends up as an exercise in intellectual colonization which exploits ancient texts, Herodotus' *Histories* in particular, for the relentless production of lifeless postmodern metaphors. Even Herodotus' greatest fans must admit that he *sometimes* tells a duff story. Take the 'grim dairy tale' (170) of why the Scythians blind their slaves. It begins promisingly with the revelation that these nomads employ slaves to extract mare's milk by a bizarre technique which involves blowing air through a hollow bone into the mare's genitals – and then grinds to a sudden halt, without the slightest indication of why this work is performed blind (4.2). Alan Griffiths suggests that this and other unsatisfactory stories may represent the mangled remains of traditions which originally made better sense but were misunderstood by Herodotus or his sources. Since the slaves' ancestors had slept with their masters' wives, the original point of the story was perhaps that their blinding was punishment for seeing their mistresses naked, and their milking method represented a shamingly grotesque reenactment of their ancestral crime (168–72). On the basis of clues in the context, Griffiths ingeniously and wittily suggests improved versions for several stories, not least that of Darius' irrigation racket (3.117), which is quite a good tale about imperial exploitation as it stands, but becomes even better when understood as a parable about his usurpation of power (173–7). Nothing else in ★★*The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*,[10] edited by Nino Luraghi, is quite so entertaining, but there is much else of interest on Herodotus' sources and methods. Oswyn Murray's seminal paper 'Herodotus and oral tradition', reprinted at the start and revisited in conclusion, book-ends studies of Herodotus' conception of Greek and barbarian local knowledge (Luraghi), his reshaping of oral tradition to create a new portrait of Themistocles as a paradigm of Athenian power, deeply patriotic while on the defensive and deeply exploitative once in power (Blösel), and the development of local traditions in Cyrene (Giangiulio) as well as Greece at large (Gehrke). Particularly important are two chapters re-evaluating Herodotus' efforts to transcend the chronological limitations of oral tradition (Thomas) and to construct a universal chronology on the basis of Egyptian history (Vannicelli, whose

[10] *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*. Edited by Nino Luraghi. Oxford U.P., 2001. Pp. x + 340. Hardback £50.00.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.248 Published online by Cambridge University Press

persuasive argument leads him perilously close to contradicting his own published views, which presumably explains the uneasy position he ends up adopting: 240; cf. 320). Add discussions of Herodotus' written sources – archaic elegy (Bowie), mythography (Fowler), Hecataeus (Bertelli) – and rival accounts of ancient history – Hellanicus' construction of an alternative, Argos-centered, universal chronology (Möller), Thucydides' Archaeology (Nicolai) – and you have an impressive collection indeed. Herodotus, finally, also provides the title for B★★*Miletos, The Ornament of Ionia*[11] (5.28), an interesting but somewhat uneven local history of a city which certainly deserves a monograph to itself. A clue to its unevenness may lie in the book's own genesis: 'this whole project arose as a result of a seminar paper I wrote for Martin Ostwald about the Athenian Regulations for Miletos', then grew into a 'doctoral dissertation about fifth-century Miletos' (vii), and finally exploded into a volume covering a millennium's worth of the city's social, economic, cultural and political history, c. 1400–400 BC. The parts closest to the original focus work best. Here the author, Vanessa Gorman, really has something to say, as in her scholarly and often convincing reconstructions of Miletus' savage civil wars and obscure constitutional history during the archaic and classical periods (88–121, 216–36). The rest of the book contains very useful surveys of archaeological, epigraphic and literary evidence for the city, its cults, colonies and most celebrated citizens, but tends to give the impression of having been tacked on for completeness' sake. Miletus' roles in overseas settlement and in the Ionian Revolt, for example, are treated at length, but the discussion is half-hearted and marked by a notable reluctance to engage in the sort of source criticism which Gorman applies so successfully elsewhere. Thus, the Lelantine war counts as 'reliably recorded' (51) and literary evidence for foundation dates is also 'generally reliable' (65), so that we must accept even the very tenuously attested 'first foundation of Sinope before 756 BC' (71), while *à propos* of Herodotus' account of the meeting of Ionian tyrants on the banks of the Danube we are warned that 'if we start doubting reports about fairly recent times that are both detailed and plausible, we find ourselves on a slippery slope, not knowing when and how to stop' (131 n. 3; cf. 146). And here I was thinking that slippery slopes are the ancient historian's natural habitat, and the ability to totter down to the edge of the abyss without falling in the very essence of her skill.

HANS VAN WEES

[11] *Miletus, the Ornament of Ionia*. A History of the City to 400 BCE. By Vanessa Gorman. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 2001. Pp.viii + 304, with 7 maps. £42.50.

Roman History

These books enter two by two, but led by one for those discomfited by stress on Roman 'democracy'.[1] Henrik Mouritsen, in B★★*Plebs and Politics in the late Roman Republic*,[2] argues that meeting areas were exiguous (chapter 2, crying out for a plan); addressing a hostile crowd was nearly impossible; Roman practice contrasts with Athenian, lip-service with behaviour; there were conflicting claims on a 'respectable'

[1] E.g., F. Millar, *The Crowd in Rome in the late Republic* (Ann Arbor, 1998), and A. Yakobson, *Elections and Electioneering in Rome* (Stuttgart, 1999), both reviewed in *G&R*.

[2] *Plebs and Politics in the late Roman Republic*. By Henrik Mouritsen. Cambridge U.P., 2001. Pp. vi + 164. Hardback £55.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.248 Published online by Cambridge University Press