ARISTOTLE'S BIOLOGY

W. KULLMANN, S. FÖLLINGER (edd.): *Aristotelische Biologie. Intentionen, Methoden, Ergebnisse. Akten des Symposions über Aristoteles' Biologie vom 24.–28. Juli 1995 in der Werner-Reimers-Stiftung in Bad Homburg.* (Philosophie der Antike, 6.) Pp. 444. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1997. Cased, DM 196. ISBN: 3-515-07047-8.

This collection of papers presented at a conference held in Bad Homburg marks a revived interest in the biological studies of Aristotle. The intention of the organizers was to approach the subject from various angles, and the papers are thematically arranged in four sections. The first section contains studies dealing with Aristotle's methods of definition and demonstration in his scientific works. M. Wilson discusses the Speusippan model of the natural world, arguing that division is employed by Speusippos to dispel confusion (which W. rightly recognizes as the opposite of knowledge), and exploring the analogy between mathematical and natural realms. D. Charles, by concentrating on fish and their subspecies, points out several difficulties in Aristotle's discussion of the unity of biological kinds and the nature of their essential features, and proposes a line of interpretation, according to which Aristotle has modified in his biological works the assumptions made in the *Analytica Posteriora.* According to C.'s thesis, although the teleological cause remains central in the biological works in determining the common nature of fish, other explanatory models can be connected with it. The position of W. Kullmann, who sees the *Analytica Posteriora* as a *Propädeutik* for the students of the biological works, is stated along similar lines. K. stresses that the theory of Demonstration (*Beweistheorie*) as presented in the *Analytica Posteriora* is not exhaustive, and explores the methodological function of *οὐσία* as a supplement to the above-mentioned theory. W. Detel, in an article which the non-expert reader might find difficult to follow, tries a full syllogistic reconstruction of the explanation why all animals have a stomach from the starting point that 'Aristotle wanted scientists to present explanations that may not explicitly exhibit, but are at least puttable into, such (sc. syllogistic) form'. A. Gotthelf discusses the explanation of the elephant's nose by employing a similar model of analysis and concludes that this analysis 'shows how incredibly rich the logical structure of explanation is in Aristotle's biology, and how worth systematic study, from a philosophical point of view, the biological treatises are'. G.'s conclusion summarizes in a few words one of the main purposes of this collection, and one may hope that it will encourage further study of Aristotle's biological works. R. Bolton explores thoroughly the relationship between teleological explanation and material cause from a number of angles; however, many might disagree with the author's overconfident conclusion that Aristotle proves his teleology.

The second section contains studies on cause and necessity. A. Code considers the priority of final causes over efficient causes in natural science and the priority of the knowledge of the *οὐσία*, before one could state the function of the efficient cause. M. L. Gill explores material necessity with reference to *Meteorologica* 4.12. The author sees this passage as 'a bridge between Aristotle's works on inorganic matter and his works on biology', and, in accordance with the views expressed by other scholars in this volume, argues that, within a biological context, teleological explanation alone may not be able to determine fully all materials, without reference to the matter of which they are composed. J. G. Lennox studies the complexity and

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

importance of the use of the term 'nature' in *De Partibus Animalium.* H. von Staden's intriguing article illustrates Aristotelian teleology with reference to its employment and understanding by later medical writers, The author convincingly argues that Erasistratos' fusion of peripatetic teleology with Hellenistic mechanism was misunderstood by Galen, who had in mind a stricter, more Platonic, understanding of teleology, and thus accused Erasistratos of being a mere mechanist. According to von S., Erasistratos should be considered as a teleologist in the same sense as Aristotle, namely as a scientist who did not contend that it was possible to determine everything on teleological grounds alone. In this respect the understanding of Aristotelian teleology by von S. is in accordance with that by other scholars in this book. D. Depew's attempt to stress the similarities between Aristotle and Darwin is sometimes based on shaky ground, but admittedly the entire discussion is stimulating and informative.

The third section deals with Aristotle's physiology and psychology. P. J. van der Eijk touches on the difficult (and very modern, too) question on the extent to which psychic process and functions are biologically determined, and concentrates on the physiological process of thinking, arguing that, to a certain extent, Aristotle acknowledges a material aspect in thinking. A. Schmitt investigates Aristotle's understanding of the relationship between man and animals, concluding that, according to Aristotle, animals and humans share a soul and the same spiritual nature (*geistige Natur*), but they differ in potential. Differences of potential do not draw the line between animals and humans, as such differences can also be observed even between humans. A. Coles takes a similar approach, when he investigates animal and childhood cognition in Aristotle's biology, maintaining that different degrees of cognition are part of an integral conception of the *scala naturae*. V. Cessi discusses the study *De Sensu* and argues that it precedes the study *De Anima.* C. M. Oser-Grote investigates the anatomical and physiological views of Aristotle on the eye and the process of seeing in relation to his predecessors, and in particular to the author of the study *De Carnibus*, maintaining that Aristotle knew this study and had been influenced by it. The author may be underestimating the contribution of Alkmaion on the subject, but I agree with her that the state of the evidence on this particular author does not support conclusive arguments. J. Althoff focuses on the central rôle of indigestion in Aristotelian physiology and in particular in the reproductive process.

In the fourth section, entitled 'Empirical Research', J. Kollesch explores Aristotle's contribution to anatomy and physiology, convincingly arguing that, although Aristotle was not the first to study the field, he was undeniably a pioneer, as far as the methodology of anatomical and physiological studies is concerned, with his dissections of animals. S. Föllinger presents the Aristotelian studies on the propagation and gender definition of bees, making a helpful comparison with modern scientific views on the subject. G. Wöhrle enquires whether Aristotle had written botanical studies, and finally, C. Hünemörder investigates the purpose, date, and structure of the *Historia Animalium.*

I would say that the priorities of this book lie with philosophy rather than science. It seems to me that, for most of the authors, how or why Aristotle stated something is more important than what he said. However, science is not neglected and those interested in Greek medicine, biology, and related disciplines will find plenty of interesting discussions and remarks. I learned a lot from this book and, on the whole, found the approach to the subject from different angles enlightening. This kind of approach allows the reader to view the biological studies of Aristotle in their

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

complexity, as science, philosophy, logic, anthropological material, cultural history, and cosmology, all at once.

University of Glasgow K. KAPPARIS

ARISTOTLE'S *TOPICS* B

O. PRIMAVESI: *Die Aristotelische Topik: Ein Interpretationsmodell und seine Erprobung am Beispiel von Topik B*. (Zetemata, 94.) Pp. 293. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1996. Paper, DM 98. ISBN: 3-406-40686-6.

This book on Aristotle's *Topics* is divided into two main parts. The first deals with the notion of the *topos* and the dialectical syllogism; the second part is a commentary on Book B, 2–11. Whereas the second part is an excellent commentary on *Top.* B, I find the first part less impressive.

P. rightly stresses that of the three purposes of the treatise mentioned in *Top.* A2—exercise in disputation (*γυμνασία*), casual conversations and philosophical sciences—the first is primary (pp. 48–58). However, it seems to me that P. goes to the other extreme when he limits Aristotle's dialectic to verbal disputations. It might be right that Aristotle does not explicitly use the word 'dialectical' in contexts other than those involving live disputations, but he does use the related word *λογικός* (cf. *APst.* 82b35, 84a7, 86a22, where we find many topical arguments of the kind found in *Top.* Γ). Cf. also *APst.* B6 for *λογικὸς συλλογισμός* outside live disputations. Clearly, in Aristotle's works we find all the means that we find in the *Topics:* topical arguments (from relatives, etc.), induction, objections, aporias, etc. What word should be used to describe this method other than 'dialectical'?

P. interprets *topoi* as general rules according to which the conclusion is drawn from the premise (p. 82); the *topoi* are expressed metalinguistically as implications, just as categorical syllogisms are in the *Prior Analytics* (p. 76). Somewhat confusingly, P. does not formalize the *topoi* as rules but formalizes their metalinguistic expressions, and seems to consider them as material implications (p. 231)—Aristotle would certainly not agree.

As P. says, in a dialectical disputation, the questioner tries to refute the answerer. If he wants to prove the thesis p ('construction' of p), he has to establish a premise q which implies p; once the answerer has accepted q he has to accept the conclusion p. If he wants to refute p ('destruction' of p), he has to find a proposition q which is implied by p; once he has established that not-q, he can draw the conclusion that not-p (pp. 86–8, 99–101). The *topos* is a transformation-instruction ('Umformungs-anleitung', p. 89), with the help of which the premise q can be found by transforming the proposition p—either its subject or predicate or both. The implications $q \rightarrow p$ and $p \rightarrow q$ or the equivalence $p \leftrightarrow q$, are *not* stated explicitly as premises. Thus, the argument is either 'q, hence p' or 'not-q, hence not-p'. It seems to me that the implications have in fact to be stated explicitly as premises. P. rightly surmises that topical arguments are syllogisms as defined at the beginning of the *Topics.* But the arguments above do not fit the definition of the syllogism, as we only have one premise, not two and the conclusion does not follow formally from the premises. P. acknowledges (p. 88 n. 14) that sometimes *topoi* are established by induction and are then stated as premises—but allegedly only then. Later (pp. 221f., 251 n. 10) he seems to have changed his mind and says that induction establishes only a general proposition in which the rule is expressed, and not a premise. P. fails to see that the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

syllogisms we find in the *Topics* are forerunners of hypothetical, not of categorical syllogisms (pp. 81f.). For further reasons for interpreting *topos* as a hypothetical premise, cf. P. Slomkowski, *Aristotle's* Topics (Leiden, etc., 1997), Chapters 2 and 4.

Next (pp. 89–96) P. discusses the theory of predicables. He quite rightly distinguishes between the exclusive and inclusive interpretation of accident. However, his definition of genus as an 'A which expresses the very essence (*τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι*) of B and is not coextensive with B' is erroneous. The very essence of a thing is expressed by the definition, i.e. by genus and differentia together (cf. *Top.* E 4, 132b35–133a3), and is always coextensive with the thing; genus only expresses the essence (*τὸ τί ἐστι*) of a subject, which is the most important, but not the only part of the very essence (cf. *Top.* Z 1, 139a29–31)—that is why Aristotle uses the term *τὸ τί ἐστι* in the definition of genus (A 5, 102a32), and not *τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι*.

On p. 119 P. confuses species with things, which makes his comparison between homonymy and synonymy in the *Topics* and the *Categories* invalid. He interprets (p. 223) *Top.* B 8, 113b22–3 as expressing the contraposition of two propositions, whereas what is stated is the standard way of destruction by *modus tollens* (cf. e.g. B 9, 114b11; 10, 114b35; Δ 4, 125a31–2).

P. interprets the *topos* in B 4, 111b 17–23 with the help of the class calculus: 'A ⊂ B; x ∈ A; hence, x ∈ B' and 'A ⊂ B; ~(x ∈ A); hence, ~(x ∈ B)'. He is mistaken in making a distinction between class-inclusion and class-membership, which Aristotle does not do. The more important question here, however, is whether we have 'if q, then p; q; hence p', or rather 'If X is B, then X is C. X is B; hence, X is C' (and correspondingly in the case of destruction). I would be inclined to interpret it as the former. It would be surprising if Aristotle limited this particular *topos* to implications with the same subject in the antecedent and consequent, given that there is a large number of implications with different subjects; and an implication between atomic propositions was known to Aristotle (cf. *Θ* 1, 156b27–30). P. argues for the latter. The expression '(something) *εἶναι*' can indeed refer either to a proposition being true or to a predicate belonging to a subject (pp. 163–5). Now, in 111b20 Aristotle changes from *ὄν* to *ὑπάρχον*. If we interpret it as having the standard meaning 'to belong', then we have the latter argument; if we assume that it has here a non-standard meaning, which was used by later dialecticians (cf. e.g. S.E., P. II 186)—and a number of such words can be found in the *Topics*—then the former argument is described.

There are of course a number of other points that would be worth mentioning. On the whole P. delivers a very thorough and detailed commentary, with interesting philosophical and philological discussions.

University of Cambridge PAUL SLOMKOWSKI

HELLENISTIC PHILOSOPHY

R. W. SHARPLES: *Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics: an Introduction to Hellenistic Philosophy.* Pp. xiv + 154. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. Cased, £30 (Paper, £10.99). ISBN: 0-415-11034-3 (0-415-11035-1 pbk).

Professor Sharples has two sets of readers in mind: those who have no knowledge of the ancient world or of contemporary philosophy, and those who have some knowledge of either or both. He wants to interest both sets in Hellenistic philosophy,

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

whether as students of the ancient world or as reflective inhabitants of the modern world.

The book is organized not by schools but by topics. After a short first chapter on the aims of Hellenistic philosophy, its personalities, and the sources, we find longer chapters dealing successively with the following topics: epistemology, physical theories, the human soul and its faculties, the nature of happiness (*eudaimonia*) and how to achieve it, and relations with other people. Finally, there is a short Epilogue, mainly on the altered Stoicism of the Roman Empire.

Chapters 2 and 3 deal respectively with the three epistemologies and with the physical theories of the Epicureans and Stoics. Beside the usual topics, Chapter 2 gives an extended discussion of Stoic theories of the truth-conditions of conditional statements. Chapter 3 contains substantial treatments of the Epicurean theory of indivisible minima, and of the controversy between the Stoics and others over the argument to the effect that anything other than what is, or will be, the case is impossible (the 'Master Argument'). S.'s discussion of these issues is very clear, and gives pointers to further development.

Epicurean and Stoic theories of the human soul are in Chapter 4. After basic exposition, S. takes up two obscurities that seem to betray an unease in Epicurus about his materialism: the unnamed type of soul-atom, and the atomic swerve in relation to our responsibility for our actions. For the latter problem, S. sees no future in any interpretation that treats a choice as an effect of a random atomic event. Rather, atomic events and choices are to be somehow brought into a non-causal relation. S.'s closing remark (p. 66) to the effect that a choice may be a special nature taken on by a swerve in soul-atoms of the unnamed type sounds Aristotelian.

The problem of determinism and responsibility arises again in connection with the Stoics. S. shows that the Stoic ascription of responsibility to an agent depends on whether his or her character caused the reaction. If it did, the action was the agent's own. Disappointingly, there is no further discussion of this criterion. The chapter ends with a lucid presentation of Carneades' argument to the effect that the bivalence of future-tense statements does not imply the predetermination of the future.

Another Stoic topic that S. attends to is the theory of emotions or passions. Having stated the Stoic rejection of separate centres of motivation and practical judgement, S. wonders whether Chrysippus' comparison of a person gripped by a passion to a runner who wants to change direction but cannot straight off is compatible with his psychological monism. But being carried further than one rationally wants is not the same as pursuing an end that, to use the Platonic idiom, one has selected *qua* appetitive being but rejects *qua* rational being. And is this experience the same as that exemplified by the vacillations of Euripides' Medea?

Chapter 5 is about the three theories of the good life. On the Epicureans, the treatment includes an extended discussion of their attempts to cure the fear of death. S. concludes that their message was that we will be happier if we accept the inevitability of death than if we do not. But unless acceptance means no more than not thinking about one's mortality, it cannot ignore the arguments against the fear of death.

In the section on the Stoics S. gives extended attention to the controversy over the definition of the purpose of life in terms of selection rather than achievement, and to the differences between the sage and 'the ordinary person who is doing what he or she should' (p. 105) . Having made all possible allowances, he is inclined to judge that the sage is inhuman. He ends with the suggestion that the sage's lack of regret about

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'unsuccessful' outcomes is unsustainable without a belief in a providential cosmic order. And is the sage's inhumanity a consequence of the same belief?

Chapter 6 responds to the accusation that the Hellenistic moral philosophies recommended self-centred, self-interested, and anti-altruistic attitudes. S. replies that they are philosophies of enlightened self-interest which can accommodate regard for others in the forms of friendship and justice. The treatment of Epicurean justice is brief. S. asks how many of the obligations of friendship the Epicureans can justify, and whether they could have reasons for benefiting others without expectation of return. For the Stoics, concern for others is natural, but the sage's indifference to outcomes makes it difficult to attribute true friendship to him. On the political level, S. follows the theme of a world-wide 'community'.

This book invites comparison with A. A. Long's *Hellenistic Philosophy*. At 274 pages Long's book did not suffer constraints of space; but its substance is over twenty years old, and the Bibliographical Postscript of the 1986 edition is not a substitute for a unified, up-to-date introduction. Furthermore since 1986 we have had Long and Sedley's *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, which is not an introduction. This book fills a gap, in a reliable and lucid way. And S. has referred so extensively to Long and Sedley's translations that it cannot be seriously read without having their first volume to hand. This ought to invite further study. However, the intention of interesting reflective moderns in Hellenistic philosophy is perhaps less successfully achieved. For this, there might have been less about epistemology and physical theory, and more about modern philosophy, and the substantive moral judgements and therapeutic techniques of the Hellenistic schools. In a book of this length this was perhaps too much to expect.

University of Wales, Lampeter J. I. DANIEL

ROMAN PHILOSOPHY II

J. Barnes, M. Griffin (edd.): *Philosophia Togata II: Plato and Aristotle at Rome*. Pp. x + 300. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-815056-3.

In 1989 Barnes and Griffin edited *Philosophia Togata*, now to be called retrospectively *Philosophia Togata I*, as a collection of essays on philosophy and Roman society, concentrating on Hellenistic philosophy at Rome towards the end of the Republic. The papers arose from a series of interdisciplinary seminars, with contributions from academics in ancient literature, philosophy, and history, whose interests were reflected in the interchange of ideas based on Roman concerns with politics, ethics, and religion. The meticulous scholarship of the essays made demands on the reader, yet they could be recommended at undergraduate level for much needed supplementary reading on philosophy at Rome, concentrating, as one would expect, on these three areas. *Philosophia Togata II*, despite its title, is quite different. It claims to complement its predecessor, arising like it from Oxford seminars, and focusing on Platonism and Aristotelianism in the Empire. But the contributors are here mainly historically inclined, with even the philosophers poring over the minutiae of historical evidence, so that the result is not accurately termed philosophy, nor, since the individuals discussed are Greek (apart from Varro and Cicero), is it specifically *togata*.

The book is dominated by the first essay, by Jonathan Barnes, which is seventy pages long—more than a quarter of the whole. Its subject is mainly concerned with

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

downgrading Andronicus of Rhodes as editor of Aristotle. The most careful sifting and assessment of the available testimony reaches the conclusion that some at least of Aristotle's treatises were put together in something like their present form by Aristotle himself, that they were known as such to Aristotle's immediate successors, and that some were available in some consolidated versions in Cicero's time, with little to be attributed to Andronicus beyond some minor tinkering in the ordering and arranging. As B. says: 'I deal neither with the history of ideas nor with the history of philosophy; my subject is an episode in the history of books and the book-trade' (p. 1).

This essay is followed by Andrew Lintott's comparison of the approaches of Polybius and Cicero to the theory of the mixed constitution with their respective debts to Aristotle, their problems in stemming *popularis* agitation, and their attempts to incorporate the advantages of monarchic rule. Continuing with Cicero, Miriam Griffin concentrates on two letters, *Ad familiares* 11.27 and 28, the only extant correspondence addressed to C. Matius. They deal with the general theme of friendship and its claims set against those of *respublica* in the conflict of interests faced by men in public life in the events connected with the dictatorship and death of Caesar. Despite his avowed distrust of their philosophy, Cicero clearly found it congenial to discuss such problems with his learned, leisured, and sophisticated Epicurean friends, who, by definition, were out of mainstream politics. David Sedley's contribution also deals with the first century B.C., to which he dates his main text—the anonymous commentary on Plato's *Theaetetus*. S. elaborates on its author's intention, in the genre of Platonic commentary, to vindicate Plato's *auctoritas* in opposition to the Stoics, and, to a lesser extent, against the version of the Academy propounded by Antiochus. Thomas Tarver then goes back to Varro, and, after a detailed account of the nurturings of this antiquarian, suggests that his *De Philosophia* probably contained elaborate *divisiones* of opinions on the *Summum Bonum*—nothing original from Varro here, but a useful ordering of a key theme in Greek philosophy for the convenience of Roman *dilettanti*. The next essay, by Simon Swain, leaps forward to Plutarch, and discusses the cultural and political developments of this later period in the context of Plutarch's position as a Greek in dealing with Greeks and Romans, his relationship to Plato and the Academy, and his belief in the beneficent Platonic god still active in Rome, and responsible through Rome for the political ordering of the world. Following from Plutarch's Platonism, Leofranc Holford-Strevens writes on Favorinus, the famed mentor of Aulus Gellius and the friend to whom Plutarch dedicated two of his works, but who also aroused the hostility of Galen and was viciously attacked for his personal appearance and moral deficiencies by M. Antonius Polemo. H.-S.'s essay is subtitled 'The Man of Paradoxes', and there is lengthy comment on Favorinus as the Greek-speaking eunuch from Gaul who was tried for adultery. In the coverage on his philosophy Favorinus emerges from the meagre evidence as eclectic and, even more dubiously, as sceptic, for here 'there is no proof, only hypothesis piled on hypothesis' (p. 217).

The last two essays are on Porphyry and Celsus, and indeed, as Fergus Millar asks, 'Does Porphyry really belong in a volume dedicated to "Plato and Aristotle at Rome"?' (p. 242). M. is interested in ethnicity in relation to Porphyry, and again there is the admission that conclusions are tentative and all possibilities remain open. Of particular interest regarding Porphyry's cultural identity is its Greekness—his writings are in Greek, his oriental sources were available in Greek translations, and there is no evidence for a special relationship with Phoenicians or Syrians, or knowledge of any Semitic languages. Michael Frede, writing on Celsus, deals not with his Platonism but with the attack on the Christians, putting this in the general context of the threat that

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Christianity posed to Hellenism and thereby to the Empire. The evidence here too is dubious, since there is only Origen's report in his *Contra Celsum*, derived from Celsus' own text, and this is tainted by a misidentification with another Celsus who was an Epicurean interested in magic. However, from the Platonist standpoint, Celsus' attack on the Christians (in Origen's version) is concerned with the rejection of the doctrines of the incarnation, of the resurrection of the body, and of Jesus as 'divine man'. More significantly, despite a superficial similarity in their monotheism, Jews and Christians deny that their god is to be identified with that recognized by other ancient peoples, like the Greeks and Egyptians, who contributed to the ἀληθὴς λόγος of the pagan world.

The whole book is impeccably presented, and all the essays are of casual interest, but the core problems are only addressed tangentially—names like Lucretius, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius do not appear in the *index locorum*. The most useful item relating to the book's title is the detailed classified bibliography compiled by Maddalena Bonelli and Benjamin Morison.

University of Wales, Lampeter M. R. WRIGHT

WOMEN IN ROMAN RELIGION

A. STAPLES: *From Good Goddess to Vestal Virgins. Sex and Category in Roman Religion.* Pp. x + 207. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. Cased, £37.50. ISBN: 0-415-13233-9.

This book, a revision of Staples's Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, is constructed around an assertion and an assumption. The assertion is that Roman women, despite recent arguments to the contrary, played an important and even a central rôle in Roman religion. The assumption is that Roman religion is a system in which 'the different cults confer meaning on each other, and are related according to the various ways in which such meanings are generated' (p. 8) and that it 'had as its basis . . . the concepts of boundary and categorization' (p. 35). Following from this, the substance of the book is an analysis of certain aspects of Roman religion, within which S. includes both ritual and myth, that involve categories defined by gender and sexuality. The goal is to illuminate the nature of these categories and the way they were constituted within Roman religion, and ultimately to explain why Roman women, despite having important public rôles in the religious sphere, never attained any constitutional rôle.

The book consists of four chapters, each focusing on one set of categories and on one or more specific cults. The first deals with the cult of Bona Dea, which according to S. helped structure the proper relationship between women and men. She develops this argument by juxtaposing this cult, from which men were excluded, with that of Hercules Invictus, from which women were excluded, and analyzing the story of the latter's foundation. In the second chapter S. turns to the categories of *matrona* and prostitute, which she analyzes in the context both of myth (e.g. the birth of Romulus, the rape of the Sabine women) and of cult (specifically, those of Ceres and Flora). In the third chapter she examines cults of Venus, whose significance, she argues, lies in integrating the categories that the other cults kept separate: men and women, *matronae* and prostitutes. Hence myrtle, the plant of Venus, was carefully excluded from the rites of the Bona Dea, because the two cults represented antithetical ways of dealing with sexual categories. In the last and to my mind the best chapter, S. tackles the topic of the Vestal Virgins. She cogently argues that their specific legal and social

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

situation put them outside not only the normal gender categories of women, but the entire Roman system of classification; consequently, 'because they were set apart from the collectivity and could not represent any single ritual category, they were able to represent the whole' (p. 130).

S. succeeds very well in supporting her assertion about the importance of women within Roman religion, but I feel less certain about her assumption that Roman religion formed a system. She candidly admits that this is not susceptible of proof, but hopes that 'the richness of meaning' obtained thereby will provide its own justification; in other words, meaning is its own reward. But whose meaning is it? For example, did contemporary actors perceive the meaning in the exclusion of myrtle from the cult of Bona Dea? If it is perceptible only to modern scholars, what does it really tell us about Roman culture? These questions become more acute when S. relates different cultic elements, or even more, cultic elements and mythic narratives, that no one in the Roman world seems to have connected with each other. In these cases, I am not sure that the assumption that Roman religion formed a system is sufficient justification: systems may often lie in the eyes of the beholder. S. also has little interest in how this system was generated or controlled; rather, she implies that it formed part of the larger Roman cultural and ideological complex. Ideology, however, does not passively exist, but is generated in specific ways by specific power structures. It is perhaps the failure to address these issues that results in what strikes me as a somewhat tautological conclusion, that women's lack of a ritual identity independent of their relationship to men was a major factor in their failure to achieve an independent constitutional rôle (p. 160).

But these are criticisms that might be brought to bear on any broadly structuralist analysis like that employed by S., which is as much as to say that no approach can account for everything. Despite my reservations, I found many of her discussions interesting and enlightening. She makes a number of valuable points, such as the observation that the presence of men at the rites of Bona Dea is evoked through the ostentatious stress on their absence (pp. 42–3): hence it is wrong to say that they only concerned women. Her discussion of the Vestals is in particular an important contribution, and demonstrates clearly what her approach can achieve. In more general terms, her insistence on treating religion as both myth and ritual, if not to my mind fully worked out, is stimulating and worthy of further development. S. has been very successful in revealing a great richness of meaning in Roman religion, and her book can certainly be read with profit by anyone interested in ancient religion or issues of gender and sexuality.

York University, Toronto J. B. RIVES

JUPITERS

G. M. Bellelli, U. Bianchi (edd.): *Orientalia Sacra Urbis Romae: Dolichena et Heliopolitana: Recueil d'études archéologiques et historico-religieuses sur les cultes cosmopolites d'origine commagénienne et syrienne.* (Studia Archaeologica, 84.) Pp. 616, ills. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1997. ISBN: 88-7062-933-2.

The first part of the book (which forms nearly three-quarters of the whole) discusses the sources for the cults of Jupiter Dolichenus and Jupiter Heliopolitanus which

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

flourished at Rome particularly in the Severan period: literary, epigraphic, archaeological, iconographic, and archival. The second part addresses the nature of the cults, with the contributors in most cases looking at them on a broader scale than just Rome itself; information from outside Rome is in fact brought into some of the papers in the first part, e.g. S. de Bellis on votive triangles depicting Dolichenus (pp. 455–68). Discussion of the cults at Ostia by A. Pellegrino (pp. 561–80) has been placed in the second part. The contributors are nearly all Italian, but the papers have been translated into French, with numerous minor errors obvious even to an anglophone. The book is otherwise well produced, with many photographs, but it could have been more stringently edited to remove repetitions and add cross-references.

Dolichenus achieved much greater popularity at Rome than Heliopolitanus. G. A. Cellini (pp. 19–55) shows that the only literary evidence for the cults is a reference to the Dolocenum on the Aventine in the fourth-century Regionaries. P. Lombardi (pp. 57–86) catalogues the Greek epigraphic sources for Dolichenus and the 'Syrian Sanctuary' on the Janiculum, where the triad of Iuppiter Heliopolitanus, Venus Heliopolitana, and Mercury were worshipped along with other Syrian divinities (discussed further by J. Calzini Gysens, pp. 261–76). E. Zappata provides (pp. 87–255) a very substantial catalogue of Dolichenian inscriptions in Latin. Most come from two sanctuaries; she thinks the one on the Aventine was civilian and the one on the Esquiline military. At the Aventine, she suggests a division between 'clergy' (*notarius*, *pater candidatorum*, *sacerdos*) and 'laity' (*patronus*, *princeps*, *curator templi*), both organized hierarchically. In inscription no. 45, she shows that the cognomen of *Aurelius Teatecnus filius Hela* should be treated as 'son of the goddess' rather than as a mistake for *Theoteknos*; she suggests two rather complicated explanations for the second part of the nomenclature, and not the most obvious one, that it simply means 'son of Hela'. The Dolocena themselves are examined by G. M. Bellelli (pp. 305–28), who believes that another military one on the Caelian was contemporary with the Aventine sanctuary.

Representations of Heliopolitanus and Dolichenus from Rome, and other objects from their sanctuaries, are catalogued respectively by M. Ciceroni (pp. 357–66) and S. Sorrenti (pp. 367–453). These catalogues would have been easier to use if they had quoted the inscriptions on some of the items; the bibliographies give references to *CIL* or *AE*, but not cross-references within the book. Ciceroni concludes that Heliopolitanus was mainly worshipped by Syrians, in Trastevere, in the period from Commodus to Gordian III. Many divinities were honoured in the Dolocenum on the Aventine apart from Dolichenus himself, and Egyptian influence is clear in some of the objects found. Dolichenus was normally depicted at Rome standing on a bull, dressed as a Roman general but retaining some of the aspects of the Near Eastern Storm-God.

One individual recurs many times in the book: M. Antonius Gaionas, *Claudialis, Augustalis, cistiber* in Rome in the late second century C.E., with the cultic title of *deipnokritēs*. He or his family probably originated from Heliopolis. He is known from dedicatory inscriptions (induding one from Portus and one in Greek verse) and an epitaph, most of which give only his cognomen. He was active at the Syrian Sanctuary, which is discussed by Gysens (pp. 277–88), and by F. Duthoy and J. Frel (pp. 289–303; a plan would have been helpful). The building was destroyed by fire, possibly after an earthquake, and rebuilt in the mid-third century, with some change in divine personnel: an invocation of Jupiter Heliopolitanus was replaced with a dedication to the Phoenician Venus Caelestis. A wall blocked off the central west apse, creating a

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

space where a human skull was placed. When the building eventually fell into ruin during the fourth century, a small cemetery was created on the site.

Some additions have been made to the existing epigraphic corpora. E. Sanzi (pp. 257–9) publishes an inscription from a sarcophagus commemorating a priest of various divinities including *Iovis Ederanisve Dolchen.*; *Ederanisve* is understood as the Syrian name of the god's consort usually called Iuno Dolichena. Duthoy and Frel give two unpublished inscriptions from the Syrian Sanctuary (p. 290) and a new fragment mentioning Gaionas (p. 294). They suggest that some other inscriptions came from the same workshop as his. Pellegrino (p. 564) gives a new Ostian dedication to Dolichenus, with an unfortunate misprint in the text: for *adsignalit* read *adsignavit.* There is also a fragmentary Ostian dedication to Heliopolitanus (p. 567). The formula *pro salute* followed by the emperor's name or title was used in both cults there, as well as at the Ostian synagogue. Pellegrino thinks the Dolichenus cult was brought to Ostia from Rome, whereas Coarelli (p. 584) attributes it to Ostia's port function.

Two papers by Sanzi (pp. 475–543) look at the social and organizational aspects of the cults on an empire-wide basis, mainly by providing lists of the social statuses of dedicators (soldiers and artisans are explicitly excluded from the Dolichenus part, for no very obvious reason) and of titles held by individuals within the cults. This material is potentially very valuable; it could have been made even more so by indicating the language of individual inscriptions, and by making a direct comparison between the two cults. Sanzi notes the use of 'slave' terminology within the Dolichenus cult, an interesting parallel with Christian 'slave of God' inscriptions. Female participants are well attested in Dolichenus worship in Noricum and in Heliopolitanus worship in Syria, but are very rare at Rome.

University of Wales, Lampeter DAVID NOY

BACCHUS IN THE NORTH

I. TASSIGNON: *Iconographie et religion dionysiaques en Gaule Belgique et dans les deux Germanies*. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, 265.) Pp. 378, 52 figs. Geneva: Droz, 1996. ISBN: 2-87019-265-7.

Tassignon has produced a hard-working, straightforward and, above all, honest little book that will inform future research. She bases it on a substantial (pp. 172–290) Catalogue of all significant iconographic and epigraphical representations (nos. 1–304) of Dionysus/Bacchus/Liber and the Bacchus-myth found in the provinces of Gallia Belgica and Upper and Lower Germany and dateable to the period *c.* 200–400. She arranges this Catalogue intelligently and practically by theme, i.e. according to where each piece noticed fits into the Bacchus-story (thus: 'Bacchus et Mercure'; 'Scènes de l'enfance'; 'La chevauchée'; 'Bacchus seul'; 'Bacchus et la panthère'; 'Les bustes de Bacchus'; 'L'ivresse et le triomphe indien'; 'Bacchus, Ariane, Sémélé'; Bacchus et le thiase'; 'Les satyres'; 'Les Ménades'; 'Les panthères'; 'Les amours'; 'Animaux bacchiques, objets et scènes liturgiques'; 'L'èpigraphie'). She adds (nos. 305–397, pp. 291–322) supplementary lists of Bacchic busts found as items of decoration and of Bacchic emblems on gemstones, an extensive bibliography, indices, distribution-histograms and a distribution-map, and selected

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

illustrations. Before it she offers a long (pp. 21–167) text in which she introduces and reviews the material collected.

In this text T. first presents an excellent overview of the current state of research, deploring the relative neglect of the Bacchic cult in the provinces (though praising Hutchinson's work on Britain). She then provides a business-like and persuasive explanation of her manner of working, showing herself to be well aware of the problems involved in handling this sort of material. This is followed by a useful outline of what we know about origins, development, and spread of the cult of Bacchus. T. next moves to her longest section (pp. 39–141), a close discussion of the Catalogue items, by theme. In this respect she concerns herself mostly with the representations as artistic objects, discussing the materials in which they are worked (e.g. stone, ivory, bronze) and how they are to be identified, briefly describing them, assessing the artistic styles and techniques which created them, and commenting on their distribution. She ends with a short (pp. 143–67) synthesis and conclusion.

It is this closing section which reveals the strengths and weaknesses of T.'s approach. Her great strength is her refusal to force the evidence to carry more weight than it can bear. Her Dionysus/Bacchus is a powerful but slippery deity, whose 'personnalité multiforme' (p. 144) prevented him from being affected, still less absorbed, by local western traditions: he remained an 'international' god (pp. 146, 165) who, like modern international cooking (my comparison), belonged everywhere and nowhere. For this reason, T. is certain that what we have tells us virtually nothing about how those who commissioned and executed the extant artefacts in Belgica and the Germanies thought about Bacchus in religious terms. In fact twice within sixteen sides she states very firmly that there were probably as many views of this god as there were 'groupes "ethniques", sexuels et sociaux' (p. 152, cf. 167). But this leads her, even here, to return to comment on the materials and techniques of production of the items of her Catalogue. As a result, her wider conclusions (e.g. that Bacchus, as a fertility-god, may have attracted female worship [p. 149]; that the cult was a feature of urban living—an impulse and a measure of Romanization [pp. 153ff.]) are unsurprising and bland.

It is very difficult for modern Western Europeans to make sense of the workings of an ancient and sophisticated polytheistic religion, and still more so of the place within this religion of so seductive, disruptive, and enigmatic a figure as Dionysus/Bacchus, 'the Looser' of moral and social codes, and perhaps too of the soul. Although, as T. is at pains to point out, great problems are caused by the western passion for Bacchic emblems as, apparently, secular decoration, this should not tempt us to suppose that such usage reflects the tempering of the attraction of the cult: a story that could produce such popular art clearly had its own power. Historians of the Greco-Roman world must continue to attempt to understand how this, and other cults, operated in and influenced society, and an obvious first step is the collection of data. However, as I have said before, collection of data and its evaluation in relative isolation is but a beginning. I remain sure that significant progress will come only with the adoption of new approaches, in particular comparative study of ethnographically attested and contemporary polytheistic systems (see my review of W. Spickermann, *'Mulieres ex voto'. Untersuchungen zur Götterverehrung von Frauen im römischen Gallien, Germanien und Rätien* [1994], in *Gnomon*, forthcoming).

University of Nottingham J. F. DRINKWATER

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

GREEK LEXICOGRAPHY

J. CHADWICK: *Lexicographica Graeca: Contributions to the Lexicography of Ancient Greek.* Pp. vi + 343. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. ISBN: 0-19-814970-0.

John Chadwick, who died on 24 November, 1998, is probably first associated in the minds of most Classicists with the decipherment of Linear B and his subsequent work on Mycenaean Greek. Yet he had already served on the editorial staff of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* for six years in 1952 when he offered to help Ventris in developing his decipherment of Linear B, and lexicography has always remained one of his primary interests. This present book is partly published to coincide with the New Supplement to *LSJ*. C. has long been aware of shortcomings in the main dictionary (see his article in *BICS* 39 [1994], 1–11) and has been an active member of the committee overseeing the publication of the New Supplement to *LSJ.* This book aims in part to act as a justification for some of the corrections made in the New Supplement, and to suggest a large number of further corrections which could be made, as well as showing how a few of the longer articles in *LSJ* (e.g. *γράφω*, *θυμός*, *πέμπω*, *ψυχή*) could be profitably redrawn. C. also sets out his principles of lexicographical research in an introduction which gives a fascinating insight into his working methods.

The range of texts and subjects covered by this book is vast—the useful index of Greek citations at the back covers twenty pages. Scholars will find discussion of, and suggestions for, the interpretation of a number of well-known texts, ranging from the Dipylon Vase (pp. 218ff.), the Bellerophon story in *Iliad* 6 (pp. 79f.), and the phrase *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός* of the Gospels (pp. 32ff.). There are also detailed discussions of numerous less famous passages from familiar 'canonical authors' as well as a number of inscriptions, papyri, medical writers, and passages of the Septuagint. Students of all stages of the Greek language will also find that many issues, not just etymology, are touched on in this work.

C.'s approach to the elucidation of meaning is basically a contextual one, assisted by considerations of etymology and analogy. As many representative instances of a word's use as possible are gathered and sorted and examined until a grouping of meanings 'emerges'; the different meanings are compared and sorted so that they fit into a coherent whole, with particular care taken to avoid a proliferation of meanings. C. is particularly strong in cases where words have been held to be used in a special sense in a small number of passages, such as, for example, the meaning 'profane' assigned to *ὅσιος* in *LSJ,* and repeated by, among others, Émile Benveniste in *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes* II 198–9 (Paris, 1969). C. gives reinterpretations of these passages, avoiding any special or unexpected development of sense, thus in the case of *ὅσιος* he shows that a meaning 'religious dues' or 'revenues' for *τὰ ὅσια* (opposed to *τὰ ἱερά* 'religious possessions') fits better in context than 'profanities'.

C.'s reliance on the contextual method has the result that *Lexicographica Graeca* reads very like an annotated dictionary. After the thirty-page introduction, Greek words are discussed individually in alphabetical order, with a series of numbered paragraphs under each head-word. The same format is used for suggested rewritings of *LSJ* articles, and for detailed consideration of the interpretation of individual inscriptions or papyrus texts. C. further follows the lexicographic tradition in his reluctance to cite secondary literature, with the consequence that the reader may

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

remain unaware of some of the arguments that C. addresses or some of the recent discussions on particular words. For example, in his article on βινέω C. gives no indication of the very thorough study by David Bain on the word in *CQ* 41.i (1991), 54–62, nor of the attempt to find an etymological connection with γυνή by Charles de Lamberterie in *RPh* 65.1 (1991 [1993]), 149–60.

The absence of footnotes and secondary references does, however, have the salutary effect that the reader is forced to confront the original texts, and C.'s interpretation of them, directly. I often found myself initially in disagreement with C.'s discussion of a word or a text. This is to some extent an anticipated reaction: C. emphasizes in his introduction and throughout the work that he expects many of his claims about the meaning of various words to be controversial and to be met with some initial scepticism. However, C. gives such a generous selection of texts, and presents his case so clearly, that the reader is able to make an independent judgement. Consequently, even in the cases where I remained unconvinced by C.'s suggested interpretation, I was forced to reconsider and justify my own position. It is a great merit of this book that it challenges and inspires readers to become their own lexicographers.

Faculty of Classics, Cambridge JAMES CLACKSON

THE GREEK LANGUAGE

G. HORROCKS: *Greek: a History of the Language and its Speakers*. Pp. xxi + 393. London and New York: Longman, 1997. Cased, £48.00 (Paper, £19.99). ISBN: 0-582-03191-5 (0-582-30709-0 pbk).

The title of this book must be read more than once and allowed to sink in slowly, for it means what it says. It is an attempt to bring within the covers of one book of less than 400 pages the whole development of the Greek language from Linear B to modern dimotiki, viewed against the background of the socio-political history of speakers of Greek. It should be said at once that this is an extremely useful collection of material and analysis, well-informed, up-to-date, and surprisingly detailed, essential reading for all those interested in Greek. In most cases their knowledge is likely to have been confined by academic structures to only a few of its centuries, which need to be integrated into the full 3,300 year sweep of the language's recorded history.

The book is divided into three sections by conventional dates (the foundation and fall of Constantinople) and seventeen chapters, of which three have a largely historical focus while the rest are more concerned with language. There are more than 200 subheadings at four levels, which are used for innumerable (and essential) cross-references. Within each section the chapters represent different subjects, which are defined by three principal criteria: date, language level (e.g. 'Byzantine Belles Lettres') and the written/spoken divide (e.g. 'Written Greek in the Turkish Period'). The chapters, apart from those which are historical, usually include the following: a historical framework, a well-chosen series of brief texts supplied with a pronunciation guide and two translations (word-for-word and more conventional), and linguistic analysis using a range of the methodologies of historical linguistics. In the latter the writer keeps his promise to avoid jargon as far as possible, though there are some passages which many readers will find difficult.

This extraordinarily ambitious undertaking leads us into fields with very different characteristics as regards the extent and nature of the linguistic evidence and the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

intensity of academic study. In fact my first reaction was that uniformity of treatment tends to obscure these differences: there is less distinction than I would like between the well-trodden paths of the classical language and the Koine on one hand, and less accessible areas, like the late Byzantine and early Turkish periods. The problem may be exacerbated by the fact that Geoffrey Horrocks's primary expertise is in earlier and better-documented periods. Thus a reader like myself whose research is covered by Chapters 7–12 (on Byzantium) may feel that a standard of precision and certainty possible for classical Greek is being aimed at for times when contemporary evidence is scarce and annoyingly indirect, and modern bibliography far more limited. Section 8.4 in particular ('"Greek" Identity in the Later Empire: Linguistic Implications'), though well-informed, shows overconfidence in conclusions probably derived from the work of Roderick Beaton. This is fortunately moderated when the language of the period is described in detail in Chapters 11 and 12. There are even some hints that our picture of the language may be skewed by the fifteen-syllable verse-form in which most of the evidence survives (e.g. pp. 264, 276–7)—an issue which I believe crucial to the development of research into the Greek of this period.

Contemporary Modern Greek receives a much less complete treatment than earlier periods of the language. The relevant Chapter 17 recounts the end of the narrative of diglossia which has unfolded in previous chapters, with some emphasis (not so necessary as it once was) on the need to include influence on daily speech deriving from formal levels of the language. But the focalization of the narrative is clearly in the past: the formal abandonment of katharevousa a quarter-century ago appears on the last page as a happy ending (though not uncontested) to a story whose major events are long over.

Each chapter provides multi-faceted study presented in different visual ways of a largely chronologically defined subject in Greek linguistic history, using all the frameworks listed above. I wonder if I am the only reader to find himself unable to receive messages through so many different channels at once, especially since the information given in each case is limited to one chronological slice of linguistic history? I find that I have not read the book but consulted it, looking up subjects in the index and following them through, jumping from chapter to chapter following cross-references. If my experience is at all general, this may point to a different and even more successful publication to follow that under review. I could imagine a CD-ROM presentation of the material which would allow the reader to define the way in which it was used. Approaches offered could begin from the sample texts, or from the political history, or from the linguistic history, always allowing chronological progress in the same dimension across the borders of the current chapters whilst leaving open the study of one subject across all the dimensions, as imposed by the current book. Different forms of assistance in following the sample texts (especially the word-for-word translation, which is particularly intrusive visually on the pages of the book), might be switched on by the user during a familiarization period but then switched off to allow the following of other leads in an uncluttered way. Pronunciation of the texts could be heard in sound files. Above all, the historical-linguistic analysis that is the core of the book could be traced backwards and forwards chronologically without interruption at a choice of different breadths (e.g. verb morphology as a whole or future tenses or infinitive-type subordination).

H.'s book is an exciting experiment in finding a totalizing narrative in which to integrate linguistic history usually treated as a series of details. Its biggest problems derive from the limitations of the book form in which it is presented. The way

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

forwards is not to question the validity of the experiment but to transcend the inflexibility of the book.

University of Sydney MICHAEL JEFFREYS

GREEK SEMANTICS

M. Martínez Hernández: *Semántica del griego antiguo*. Pp. xx + 362. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 84-7882-304-2.

In spite of the title this is not a handbook dedicated to the semantic study of ancient Greek, but a collection of ten essays by the author spanning the period 1977–1995. They are all reprinted from other (sometimes quite obscure) sources. They are not chronologically ordered, but, in the words of the author, proceed from the general (semantic theory) to the particular (studies of specific areas of the Greek lexicon), the aim being to provide a working outline of the field. The author makes his theoretical position very clear from the start: he is a student of structural semantics, in the tradition of Trier and Weisgerber, and quotations from the great figures in this discipline are so abundant that at times the collection looks like a chrestomathy of semantic field-theory. The influence of Prague School phonology comes over very clearly in the terminology of distinctive features and 'archilexemes'. For a general discussion and critique of this position the reader is referred to linguistic handbooks such as J. Lyons's *Semantics*, vol. i (Cambridge, 1977).

The first two chapters are by far the longest, constituting together over half the book. The first paper, entitled 'Estado actual de la semántica y su aplicación al griego antiguo' (pp. 1–68), gives a general overview of semantics as a (relatively recent) discipline, and considers its application to the field of ancient Greek. The chapter falls into three sections: in the first the author gives a brief history of the investigation of word-meaning in modern scholarship and defines terminology; in the second he discusses the (then) state of semantic studies (including lexicography) in the field of ancient Greek; and finally he offers an analytical review of scholarship as applied to four semantic levels in Greek: the level below that of the word (phonaesthetics, morphemes, etc.), the level of the word, of the phrase, and of the text (for this level—essentially pragmatic analysis—the review, which dates back to 1984, is seriously out of date). The essay is packed with useful bibliography, though set out in an uneconomical way in large footnotes with cross-referencing: this is a book where a consolidated bibliography at the end using the author/date system would have been helpful. The second chapter ('El campo léxico de los sustantivos de «dolor» en Sófocles: ensayo de semántica estructural–funcional', pp. 69–188) is a practical application of the author's own structural principles. The study is a synthesis of Martínez Hernández's doctoral thesis, for which see the sensitive critique by M. Tichit ('Le terme ἄχος dans l'oeuvre de Sophocle', *REG* 97 [1984], 189–205), which challenges the author's position from a more traditional philological-contextual perspective. The present study is nevertheless an interesting and useful analysis. A nucleus and peripheral areas are distinguished within the lexical field: nuclear concepts include 'pain' and 'suffering', while peripheral areas cover 'sadness', 'misfortune', 'vexation', and others. Clearly this process involves some subjective decisions on the part of the investigator (the 'problem of delimitation'), but this does not seem to me to be a major criticism, since objectivity in any semantic analysis is a practically meaningless notion. The author then identifies thirteen 'semes' or

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

conceptual distinctive features. These include 'physical', 'psychological', 'relating to the absence or death of a loved one', etc.: each lexeme comprises a bundle of such features. Furthermore, the subjects of the 'dolor' are divided into classes (gods, personifications, male humans, etc.): a particular term will thus be related (in its application) to one or more of these classes. At the end of his analysis the author is able to present a summary of his findings in tabular form, where for each term one can see at a glance how the above-mentioned distinctions intersect.

Of the remaining eight essays, two (Chapters 3 and 6) are short theoretical discussions which continue and to a certain extent repeat the themes of Chapters 1 and 2, and the rest are focused semantic studies in the area of ancient Greek. Two of these deal with the prefix δυσ- (one with particular reference to the Hippocratic Corpus), one is a study of the *Lexicon* of Ammonius, and one looks at the phenomenon of antonyms (an important issue in structural semantics) in Plato. In the final essay the author returns to Sophocles in a comparative semantic study of Spanish translations of the first stasimon of *Antigone*.

This is a book which will probably be of interest to specialists only, though the author's care in starting his explanations from first principles makes it potentially accessible to any classical reader. The reprinting of the papers from sources which are difficult to get at outside Spain will make many of them accessible to an international audience for the first time. The principal peculiarity of the book is of course the structure: it represents the *Scripta Minora* of the author, and as such is repetitive and in varying degrees out of date. Nevertheless, this is a field of classical linguistics in which there are few dedicated monographs available, and the theoretical overview and bibliography which the author offers are a genuinely useful contribution.

Yale University STEPHEN COLVIN

PFEIFFER REVISITED

F. MONTANARI (ed.): *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*. (Entretiens sur L'Antiquité Classique, 40.) Pp. viii + 404. Geneva and Vandoeuvres: Fondation Hardt, 1994.

The Entretien at which the papers collected in this volume were delivered, held in 1993, was designed by its co-ordinator, Franco Montanari, to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the publication of the first volume of Pfeiffer's *History of Classical Scholarship*. Its aims, as spelled out in M.'s preface, involve both supplementation and respectful challenge: to update Pfeiffer's work in the light of more recent research, especially papyrological; to draw attention to areas and aspects of ancient philology ignored or undervalued by Pfeiffer, particularly by extending the chronological scope of enquiry forward to the Imperial Period; and to re-examine some of Pfeiffer's central emphases (above all, on the relative unimportance, as he saw it, of Aristotle and Peripatetic scholarship as an influence on the Alexandrians). The seven contributors were each assigned a distinct area of ancient scholarly activity on which to report, and seem to have been under instruction to privilege summary and survey over controversy (it is one of the minor recurring pleasures of reading the volume to encounter occasional signs of dissatisfaction with the way the tasks were defined and distributed by the organizer). Each of the contributors approaches his task lucidly and conscientiously. All have something worthwhile to

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

say, and most of the chapters can be recommended as at the very least informative and gently thought-provoking *tours d'horizon* of their respective topics. The exchanges following the formal expositions offer the expected mix of shrewd comment and semi-relevance, with the difference from the Hardt norm that each of them is prefaced by an extensive paraphrase of the preceding paper by the editor.

Nicholas Richardson, batting first, tackles the question of Aristotelian influence head-on, arguing for a different state of affairs in different fields of scholarship, but overall a much higher degree of connection than Pfeiffer was prepared to allow (in which he is supported in particular by Tosi and Schenkeveld among the subsequent contributors). Among other matters, R. reconsiders the curious story of the fate of Aristotle's library, and the effect it may or may not have had on knowledge of Aristotle's work in the Hellenistic period. So too does Jean Irigoin, who contributes a slightly under-referenced but otherwise highly informative survey of ancient editing and publishing, with useful remarks on such matters as the consequences for scholarly activity of the transition from roll to codex. This technical focus on the fine detail of scholarly activity, and our evidence for it, is maintained, and indeed deepened, in Herwig Maehler's meticulous discussion of the relationship between scholia on papyri and those in medieval manuscripts; the discussion that follows is perhaps the volume's best, with illuminating additions from the editor on the Homeric scholia and the *Mythographus Homericus*. Renzo Tosi handles the frequently neglected topics of lexicography and paroemiography, tracing a story from the crucial stimulus of the *Poetics* to late antique and Byzantine reworkings of Alexandrian material; both in the paper itself and in the discussion following there are some useful remarks about Atticism. Graziano Arrighetti's somewhat diffuse discussion of ancient literary biography, and of the biographical element in literary criticism, makes a valuable point about differences in aims and methods between ancient and modern scholarship. D. M. Schenkeveld's allusive coverage of ancient grammatical study underlines the importance of the Stoics' study of language and is a welcome warning against oversimplification. Finally, C. J. Classen's survey of the interplay between literary criticism and the study and teaching of rhetoric concentrates on the first and second centuries A.D., with shrewd discussion of Plutarch, Dio Chrysostom and (in particular) Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

In spite of the breadth of coverage, there are inevitably topics omitted on which it would have been good to see discussion. For instance, occasional references to recent work on Latin scholarship (e.g. Kaster's *Guardians of Language*) point up the absence of any chapter(s) on the social and institutional status of ancient scholars; the activities discussed in this volume did not take place in isolation from other social and political processes, nor were they conducted by a race of beings who stood aloof from the society of their day like Aristotelian contemplatives. Within its own frame of reference, however, this volume delivers a well-judged combination of hard detail with general interpretative comment, and will stand well next to Pfeiffer on the bookshelf. Given both the range and the detail, one regrets that the indexes are confined to proper names alone; a good index of topics and Greek words, along the lines of Pfeiffer's, would have increased the volume's usefulness immensely, allowing one to follow up scattered references to weighty issues as diverse as the use of alphabetical order and the physical formats of different kinds of ancient scholarly work.

King's College London MICHAEL TRAPP

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PHILOLOGIA PERENNIS (?)

F. GRAF (ed.): *Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie* (Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft). Pp. x + 725, 1 plan, 1 map. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1997. DM 76. ISBN: 3-519-07434-6.

This successor to Gercke–Norden still bears the overall title *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, but the integrated treatment of Greek and Roman culture thereby implied and at least partially realized in the original publication has been given up. That is a sign of the times as well as a concession to tidiness and editorial convenience; Eduard Fraenkel would no doubt have had something to say about it. However, the reappearance of the *Einleitung* after some sixty years raises other, and more fundamental, questions.

Who really uses and is substantially helped by works such as this? Of course all reference books begin to date even before they are published; the question in this case is whether this particular kind of book does anything that is not better done by periodically updated bibliographies, such as that of Messrs Poncet and Hannick (cf. *CR* 45 [1995], 310–12), and specialized introductory monographs. What was most valuable in the old Gercke–Norden was the select group of contributions that escaped to lead an independent existence, such as Wilamowitz's *Geschichte der Philologie* and Maas's *Textkritik*, both still going strong. Otherwise one may doubt if it has bulked very large in the consciousness of scholars generally since World War II. As a research student I can remember being aware of it, but I have never felt called on to direct my own students to it. (It is interesting and possibly significant that in Cambridge neither the University Library nor the Classics Faculty Library has a complete run.) How useful are students of the present day and their teachers likely to find its successor?

The editor announces its aim as unchanged: to provide a reliable guide 'zu den Methoden und Kentnissen einer Wissenschaft von der Literatur und Kultur Roms' (p. vi). Information, yes, we find plenty of that—but method? Some contributors, such as Josef Delz in his piece on 'Textkritik und Editionstechnik', fulfil their obligations admirably in that respect. When, however, one turns to literature, which takes up by far the longest section of the book and is the proclaimed centre of the whole undertaking (p. vi), one is confronted with a void. This section consists of a succinct history of Latin literature by various hands, plus a chapter on metre, of which more presently. Nowhere do we find a word on literary theory or on any of the many developments in critical approaches that currently enliven (and occasionally bedevil) the interpretation of Latin literature (cf. A. J. Boyle, 'Intellectual Pluralism and the Common Pursuit', *Ramus* 20 [1991], 113–22). Whatever reservations one may have about some of this activity, it cannot be simply ignored, and in a work aimed at students and teachers that proclaims introduction to method as one of its two prime purposes, such prelapsarian unawareness of or indifference to the world we actually live in will not do. Over a century ago August Boeckh showed himself more responsive to the needs of his age when he provided a substantial section on 'Theorie der Hermeneutik' in his *Encyclopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaften* (2nd edn 1886), and his example was followed by Gercke in the second edition of Gercke–Norden, though it was dropped in the third. More recently, M. R. P. McGuire, in his *Introduction to Classical Scholarship* (Washington, 1955), showed himself to be alive to his responsibilities in that area (pp. 37–42) (Poncet–Hannick ignore it), and *OCD*^{3} includes a substantial article on 'Literary theory and classical studies'.

In a work of this scope a reviewer in nit-picking mode will inevitably find a good

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

many small points to except. Most do not deserve to be specifically mentioned, but they do seem to betoken a certain slackness in overall editorial control. Nobody with experience of trying to co-ordinate collective enterprises such as this will underestimate the difficulties of bringing all the contributors to the scratch in time and getting them to toe the presentational line, but more could have been done to detect and correct obvious inaccuracies and omissions, for instance in the bibliographies of individual Latin authors, which are notably uneven. *Anthologia Palatina* for *Anthologia Latina* (pp. 265, 277) will mystify the neophyte, and while 'Oxford Classical Library' and 'A. E. Housman, *Critical Papers*' (p. 294) merely irritate, 'Goodman' for 'Godman' (p. 322) could have an enquirer tearing his hair. In a work published in 1997 there is no excuse for citing Ennius from Vahlen's edition (pp. 131–2; the Skutsch numeration at p. 175).

The editor's gravest mistake was to entrust the chapter on metre to Sandro Boldrini. In the earlier section on the history of the Latin language by Johannes Kramer there is hardly anything on phonology; presumably there has been a deliberate decision to leave this to B. He begins by baldly affirming that the Latin accent was originally one of pitch. The existence of the alternative and generally accepted theory in which a stress accent on the initial syllable was replaced by the classical penultimate pattern (see e.g. W. S. Allen, *Accent and Rhythm* [Cambridge, 1973], pp. 151–4) is ignored. B. simply asserts the 'French' position without argument and without documentation; the only bibliography provided is a brief list of the editions used. Somebody too should have realized that the statement that 'seit Lukrez stellt man in der Dichtung tatsächlich eine immer stärkere Tendenz fest, Wörter wie *inde*, *unde*, *nempe* usw. mit voller Aussprache vor Konsonant zu vermeiden' (p. 360) is on the face of it improbable; it is of course quite false. And where did B. find lurking the word *sublateo* (p. 161)? It is scandalous that stuff like this should be offered to students.

The book includes contributions by distinguished authorities on history, law, religion, philosophy, archaeology, and related disciplines, which I do not presume to criticize. In the areas where I have some competence to judge there are admirable contributions: Kaster on 'Geschichte der Philologie in Rom', Grafton on 'Philologie und Bildung seit der Renaissance', and Delz (already mentioned) need no recommendation from me. Apart from the methodological vacuum discussed above, the sections on literary history are of their kind perfectly competent, though Conte, for instance, would surely be more rewarding to students in his complete guise than in this potted version. But looking at the book as a whole, I am left wondering who is going to be really grateful for it, and how long it will be before it joins its predecessor in undisturbed repose in the library stacks?

Cambridge E. J. KENNEY

THE LATIN VERB

M.-D. JOFFRE: *Le verbe latin: voix et diathèse*. (Bibliothèque d'Études Classiques, 4.) Pp. 486. Louvain and Paris: Peeters, 1995. Paper, B. frs.1800. ISBN: 90-6831-744-X/2-87723-270-0.

The Latin passive is a problem for linguists. It has the appearance of a composite beast, embracing as it does the personal passive, the impersonal passive, and the deponent (as well as various subcategories). Theories which try to account for all of these in terms of a single basic 'signifié' are often, one fears, chimeras in a different

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sense. Those trained in a different tradition, who do not expect always to find a perfect mapping of semantic features on to morphological ones, may well be astonished at the determination with which the search for such a thing has been pursued (J. is only the latest of a long line), and may well think that some of the answers proposed are too abstract to have much explanatory power.

It appears that J.'s theoretical approach is largely owed to her supervisor, G. Serbat (cf. p. 237 n. 19). The approach starts off with an obvious advantage, in that it initially makes a clear distinction between morphology and semantics: 'voix' is reserved for the morphological distinction between active and passive, while 'diathèse' (a term originated by Benveniste) refers to the semantic distinction. Difficulties then begin. At least three different definitions of 'diathèse interne' are canvassed, according to whether the primary focus is on the deponent, the ordinary passive, or the impersonal passive. On p. 18 we seem to be told that 'diathèse interne' is the relation of a transitive verb to its object, or of a passive verb to its subject. However, this will clearly not do if deponent verbs are also to be classified as having 'diathèse interne', and in this connection there are clearly attractions in Benveniste's view that 'diathèse interne' means 'implication du sujet dans le procès' (p. 9, etc.). Benveniste's theory involves the well-known historical model according to which Indo-European originally had only the active/middle distinction, the passive being a subsequent development. J., however, rejects that hypothesis on the authority of P. Flobert (p. 232). It would have been better to provide arguments rather than authorities, and one wonders whether it is not going a little far to brand the Indo-European middle voice as 'parfaitement mythique'; it is no more mythical than many other hypotheses designed to account for certain sets of facts. Again, we are told first of all that 'diathèse' is a matter of the relationship between a verb and a noun, but then it is pointed out that passive morphology affects only the verb, and the impersonal passive is brought into play as a type of construction in which no noun is involved: there is no subject to be implicated in the process. It now follows (p. 208) that 'diathèse interne' is a secondary phenomenon brought about by a change of meaning in the verb. Eventually (p. 243) we are told that the 'signifié diathétique' has a 'caractère éminemment abstrait', which allows for all sorts of different meanings.

These theoretical manoeuvres are confusing and inconclusive. To put the problem at its simplest: given that one limits oneself to the evidence provided by actual Latin texts, is it possible to analyse, say, the meaning of *vereor* as distinct from *timeo*, or of *hortor* as distinct from *rogo* or *incito*, or of any other deponent verb, in such a way that the element analysed out is the same in all cases? If not, then there is no universal semantic constituent common to all deponents in Classical Latin, or at any rate none that rational methods can detect. If there were such a constituent, of course, it would make learning Latin much easier, because we could then predict which verbs would be deponent and which not. There is still much to be said for a version of Benveniste's hypothesis, that the deponents are survivals of the Indo-European middle voice (correspondences such as *sequitur*/ἕπεται/*sacate* suggest that deponents can be traced back to Indo-European), but there is no future in forcing a historical hypothesis to function as a synchronic one. On the other hand, the impersonal passive can be elucidated with reference to parallels in Celtic, where endings containing *r* are also found (this is nowhere mentioned by J.). The oddity of Latin is that it has simultaneously a category of deponents, like Greek or Sanskrit, and an impersonal passive like Celtic; and this does suggest that there may be something in the old view (e.g. of Meillet, *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine*, pp. 147–50) that Latin has amalgamated two originally different morphological categories. If this is true, then it

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

really is vain to look for a universal synchronic explanation of all the manifestations of passive morphology in Latin.

The book is, however, more useful than the above remarks might imply. J.'s assigned task has also involved the study of a substantial amount of concrete linguistic data, and although (as is often the case with doctoral theses) there is a degree of arbitrariness in the samples chosen, the book nevertheless embodies some useful observations. It is interesting to realize, for example, how relatively uncommon the impersonal passive is in some kinds of literary Latin. The samples analysed on p. 173 reveal two impersonal passives versus 79 personal in Plautus' *Aulularia*, and nine impersonal passives to 386 personal in Cicero's fourth *Verrine*. Of the authors chosen, only the historians, and Livy in particular, can be seen to use it more commonly. J. also usefully traces the development of pronominal constructions like *se vertit* (and the occurrence of intransitive active forms like *vertit*) in comparison with *vertitur*, at which point it is finally realized (p. 421) that 'diathèse interne' can be expressed even by the active (in certain verbs). As a result of this, J. concludes with some rather strongly phrased remarks about the irregularity of language (p. 422, 'ici encore, rien n'est regulier'). This may be the inevitable reaction of someone who is accustomed to think of language in abstract, systematic terms, and then comes to see that actual usage is not like that; but the truth, one feels, may lie somewhere between the two extremes.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne J. G. F. POWELL

MEDIEVAL LATIN (PLUS)

F. A. C. Mantello, A. G. Rigg (edd.): *Medieval Latin. An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide.* Pp. xiv + 774. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1997. Cased, £43.95 (Paper, £31.95). ISBN: 0-8132-0841-6 (0-8132-0842-4 pbk).

In 1988, work began on a replacement for Martin McGuire's 1964 *Medieval Latin Studies: A Syllabus and Bibliographical Guide* and its 1977 revision by Hermigild Dressler, which had been for many years the only available introduction in English for graduate students to this vast field. The editors of the new 'Guide' have tried to avoid the main pitfalls of the earlier work, both by a total rethink of the structure of the volume and by changing the way it is written, replacing summary headings with full introductions and giving care of these to experts in the various parts of the field.

The new work is divided into three parts. The first contains a general introduction (A) and a section on general reference and research tools (B). The latter is subdivided into: Bibliographical Guides and Surveys (BA), Latin Dictionaries (BB), Repertories of Authors, etc. (BC), Encyclopaedias, etc. (BD), Computer Resources (BE), Other Basic Reference and Research Aids (BF), Principal Series of Latin Texts (BG), and Periodicals (BH). The second part deals with Medieval Latin philology (C) and the varieties of Medieval Latinity (D, E, F). Under philology are: Introduction (CA), Orthography and Pronunciation (CB), Morphology and Syntax (CC), Vocabulary, etc. (CD), Metrics (CE), Prose Styles (CF), Latin and the Vernaculars (CG), and Humanistic Latin (CH). Under varieties comes everything from Christian and Biblical Latin (DA), the liturgy (DB), administration both ecclesiastical and secular (DC, DD) to science (E: including Magic [EM)], and technology and the arts and crafts (F). The third part is devoted to varieties of Medieval Latin literature (G, H). This is not

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

limited to standard genres (Epic [GC], Satire [GE], Drama [GG], Hymns [GJ]), but extends to such areas as Pastoralia (GQ), Travel Literature (GS), and Anthologies and Florilegia (GW). It also contains a separate section on medieval translations (H: from Hebrew [HA], Greek [HB], Arabic [HC], and the other vernaculars [HD]). There are two indexes, one of premodern writers and one of modern authorities. The chronological scope of the Guide is from *c.* A.D. 200 to 1500, and so both Late Latin and early humanist Latin are included. Each article is equipped with its own select bibliography, sometimes annotated, sometimes not.

In such a rich and diverse collection, it is invidious to select, especially since the level of contributions is high right across the board. I shall simply focus here on the philology and varieties of Medieval Latinity sections. In the philology section, Richard Sharpe's essay on 'Vocabulary, Word Formation, and Lexicography' (CD) is a model of clear exposition and its annotated bibliography will be very helpful to anyone who needs to try to penetrate this field. In the 'Varieties of Medieval Latinity' section, Daniel Sheerin's two contributions ('Christian and Biblical Latin' [DA] and 'The Liturgy' [DB]) are full and critical, and extemely informative. It is amusing (but slightly alarming in view of ethnic stereotypes) to learn that 'The English pax-brede or pax-board, called *pax*, *pacificale*, *instrumentum pacis*, or *osculatorium*, was a tablet handed around to be kissed by all as a replacement for an actual exchange of kisses of peace during the Mass' (p. 63). What makes all three of these pieces particularly attractive is their judicious use of citation, which gives flavour enough to excite the taste-buds but does not clutter the scene with too much detail. The same can also be said for Richard Sharpe's piece on 'Latin in Everyday Life' (DL), which takes us entertainingly and informatively from school textbooks to manorial and court records to reveal the method for teasing out from diverse and sometimes unpromising material details such as the nature of the *sparth* ('a long-handled axe, as we discover from [a] source about an assault in Dublin in 1294, committed with *una hachia quae uocatur sparth*' [p. 323]) and of the tragedy of poor Alice, wife of John Bert, who stole a shirt from the washing hung out to dry on a neighbour's hedge (p. 333). Especially enterprising (and especially challenging to this reviewer) is the whole section on Science (E). It is salutary to read that 'To date, there is no study of the latinity of *computus*' (Faith Wallis, 'Chronology and Systems of Dating' [EF], p. 386). There are many other places where topics for research are laid out for the picking. One great advantage of the decision to include very specialized areas in the guide is that a great deal of technical vocabulary is set out in context which would probably never be properly understood otherwise even by Medieval Latinists of long standing. An excellent example comes in the essay on 'Mills and Milling' by John Muendel (FM), where we learn 'In the early ninth century, the chancellery of Louis the Pious chose *molendinum* to designate a water-mill, and this became the standard term throughout Europe.'

A very few points of (potential) weakness emerge from a first reading. (1) Given that the book is for graduate students and that it contains an enormous amount of very technical Latin, it might have been useful to have excerpts translated (but of course, the book would have been even longer). (2) Occasionally (e.g. p. 338 paragraph 9), it is difficult to see the relation between an annotation in the Select Bibliography and the text of the essay. (3) The first index (premodern authors) limits itself to texts mentioned in the bibliographies. This cuts down the potential usefulness of the work as a first reference. For example, Raymond of Marseilles is mentioned in the text (p. 371), but not in the bibliography. Hence, a person who casually wishes to learn about him will miss the reference and a potentially enlightening contextualization of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

his astrological work. I do urge the editors to make good *this* limitation in the next edition.

The strengths of the book will by now, I hope, be obvious. They very far outweigh my niggles. Everywhere there is clarity, concision, judicious illustration, and careful selection of what is central. This guide is a major achievement and will serve Medieval Latin studies extremely well for the foreseeable future.

National University of Ireland, Maynooth KEITH SIDWELL

THE FOURTH-CENTURY *POLIS*

H. BECK: *Polis und Koinon. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Struktur der griechischen Bundesstaaten im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (*Historia* Einzelschriften, 114.) Pp. 316, maps. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1997. Paper, DM 128. ISBN: 3-515-07117-2.

L. G. MITCHELL: *Greeks Bearing Gifts: the Public Use of Private Relationships in the Greek World, 435–323 B.C.* Pp. xiv + 248. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Cased, £40/$59.95. ISBN: 0-521-55435-7.

It is interesting to find studies on fourth-century Greece moving away from solid military-political history to consider wider themes, and both these books take a broad approach to their topic. Both writers make their definition of Greece wide, drawing on a range of sources, Mitchell including Macedonia, Thrace, and Persia, and Beck Acarnania, Chalcidice, and Epirus, and both apply modern theoretical concepts to elucidate the actions of states. The most striking feature which these studies have in common is the central place afforded to the influence of the 'polis ethic' or 'polis ideology' on interstate interaction and control of its citizens' actions, as a largely negative or braking force.

Mitchell's *Greeks Bearing Gifts*, a revised Ph.D. thesis, is well written and well produced. M. expands on and refines ideas about *xenos* and *philos* relationships, offering explanations for the ways in which inter- and extra-polis relationships were played out. The time period chosen for the study is not explicitly justified; 435 was no doubt chosen so as to embrace Thucydides as well as fourth-century sources, yet M. rightly is not bound by this limit, and brings in topics and material from earlier. In this context it would be useful to have further discussion of the encounters between the Macedonian and Persian élites in the fifth century; M.'s approach could undoubtedly offer more elucidation here too.

The book falls into several sections, of which those on the use of personal relationships in the diplomacy of various states are the most successful; M. offers new light on interpersonal relationships, e.g. between Athenians and Thracians, demonstrating that the two sides brought completely different interpretations to bear on their interactions, and that accusations of treachery or duplicity arose from differing cultural expectations. The chapters on Macedonia, too, make understanding of *philos* relationships central to Athens' dealings with Philip, but here M. suggests a Philip who is consciously manipulating Athenian ideas of reciprocity with great sophistication. Discussion of the embassies to Philip in 346, and the actions of Aeschines and Demosthenes, is delayed to the final chapter, but here they are put to

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

very good paradeigmatic use: the argument here does advance the debate on Philip's actions. M. offers a subtle reading of Aeschines' dilemma, and Demosthenes' exploitation of it; Aeschines goes through the motions of reciprocal exchange, hoping to establish a relationship giving both to himself and Athens a claim on Philip's goodwill, but necessarily gives Philip the power to determine the nature of the relationship between them.

The chapter on Alexander, in contrast, is rather superficial, and disturbingly reliant on Curtius Rufus as the primary source. Some of the instances of Alexander's interactions with *philoi* do tend to be treated with a broad brush, when they could more usefully be examined in context: adoption by Ada, the satrap of Caria, for instance, implicated Alexander in a dynastic relationship where power passed through the female line; there is more to the episode than the establishment of kinship links and goodwill through adoption.

Chapters four and five, on the personal connections of magistrates and known office-holders at Athens and Sparta, are not so convincing, largely because of the difficulty of applying statistical analysis to such data. M.'s contention, that magisterial appointments were made on the grounds of potentially beneficial personal links with other *poleis*, has much to recommend it, but is very hard to prove on the current evidence. Percentages of magistrates with known connections are low, and by M.'s own admission, the figures are so faulty that their meaning is hard to judge. The argument is also in danger of becoming one-sided: other reasons for continued office-holding by a *strategos* could be offered, such as geographical knowledge of a particular area, or naval expertise. M. is obviously keen to re-examine the generalization that Sparta was closed to the outside world and Athens open, and provides a convincing argument for Spartan use of expertise, but the subsequent comment (p. 85) that Spartans disliked foreigners sits uneasily with her other conclusions. This is disappointing, when she has gone a long way to challenge received wisdom about Spartan relations with outsiders.

Greeks Bearing Gifts is in some ways a critique of the views of G. Herman in *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City State* (Cambridge, 1987); M. does not perhaps always do full justice to Herman's arguments, but ultimately she offers a refinement of his position: not all political relationships brought *polis* and *philos* into conflict, but under some circumstances the relationship could offer scope for exploitation by both Greek and non-Greek partners.

Beck, on the fourth-century federal state, also labours in the shadow of a predecessor, J. A. O. Larsen, whose *Greek Federal States* (Oxford, 1968) has established this territory as his. B. is keen to relate the idea of the federal state to modern political thought, since the principle of federalism has taken on much greater importance in recent years. His conclusion, however, is essentially negative, that the Greeks made no real contribution to the theory of federalism, and that the federal state as it existed in Greece is not a valid political model for the present day, although along the way the book sets out some useful information on the organization of the various federations.

Polis und Koinon is more obviously a revised dissertation than *Greeks Bearing Gifts*; the structure is rather choppy, with a first section detailing the organization and history of a range of federal states case by case, and a second examining the institutions of these states thematically. As one would expect, the documentation is thorough, and the examination of institutions very closely done. An appendix contains a very handy table comparing the features of each state; the maps, on the other hand, are too cluttered to be useful.

B. emphasizes that federalism in the fourth century was not the dawn of a new

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

political form, but rather that federal states were underpinned by the standard Greek belief in the primacy of the *polis*, and the desire for autonomy. These states endured constant tension, threatening to be torn apart by the ambition of individual *poleis*, or internal strife. Even within organizations like the Boiotian League, there was no overarching common principle; the aim of individual states was to rule, and powerful social groups were unable to subordinate their interests to those of the federation. Within this context of struggle, B. is most interesting on attempts to provide cohesion through the use of shared myths of origin and of festivals. Despite the historical background given in each case, the material is not put very clearly into its historical context, but the study illuminates very well the competing centrifugal and centripetal forces at work in the federal state.

These two books have in common the contention that an internalized ideal of the *polis*, and of behaviour appropriate to the citizen of a *polis*, was the most important factor affecting Greek behaviour at this period. M. sees the *polis* ethic as dominating the use of *philos* relationships, while B. argues that it was responsible for the failure to achieve a fully implemented federal state. M. and B. both present a vision of new movements drawing the Greeks into different modes of interaction, mostly non-competitive ones, but held back by the strength of the concept of citizenship and citizen loyalty.

University of Wales, Cardiff SIAN LEWIS

POLIS PAPERS

M. H. Hansen, K. Raaflaub (edd.): *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. (*Historia* Einzelschriften, 108: Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre, 3). Pp. 196. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 3-515-06969-0.

The study of Greek political structures must begin with the *polis*, but as the work of the Copenhagen Polis Centre has shown, the question of what the *polis* is has no simple and straightforward answer. In fact, it is implicit in this collection of essays (although by no means explicit) that there is not nor can there be any satisfactory, all-inclusive definition of a *polis*, beyond perhaps a general description of it as a political centre. That is not to say that there was not a political structure, generally associated with political organizations such as Athens and Sparta, which was 'independent and autonomous', and which enacted its own laws and pursued its own foreign and domestic policy. But what the Polis Centre has shown is that there was also a range of other political organizations not like this, or which shared only some of these attributes, but which could still be called *poleis*. It is in the opening up of the definition of 'the *polis*', the investigation of the variety of things a *polis* could be, and the exploration of these different '*polis*' structures that the value of the Polis Centre and this collection of essays lies.

Two important and linked themes which recur in these essays are the dependent *polis*, and the *autonomos polis*. Thomas Heine Nielsen surveys in some detail the types of dependent *poleis* in Arkadia, raising interesting questions about the level of dependency a *polis* could have and yet still be called a *polis* (although this is not a question which Nielsen directly addresses). To a large degree, Nielsen's account

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

remains descriptive, and it is left to James Roy in an excellent essay, which investigates the relationship between *polis* and tribe, to explore some of the complexities which Nielsen's essay suggests.

Antony Keen, on the other hand, asks 'Were the Boiotian *Poleis Autonomoi*?', concluding that '*autonomia* meant different things to different people' (p. 125). In this, despite Hansen's objections in his 'Reply' which follows, Keen must be essentially correct (although it must be wrong to regard the Spartan perioecic communities as *autonomoi*). As Keen rightly points out (p. 123), the main flaw in Hansen's argument (see especially, Hansen, 'The "Autonomous City-state". Ancient Fact or Modern Fiction?', in M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub [edd.], *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* [*Historia* Einzelschriften, 95: Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre, 2], [Stuttgart, 1995], pp. 26–7) is that he regards *autonomia* as an entity which can be closely defined and which is constant, and not as qualitative (just as dependency is also qualitative). The Thebans were not rejecting the Boeotian states' *autonomia*, but were asserting that there was a Boeotian *autonomia* which was consistent with federal organization. The reason the Thebans refused to swear to Agesilaus' specific clause for *autonomia* for the Boeotian cities (Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.32) was not because they wanted to deprive the Boeotian cities of their *autonomia*, but because they did not want to accept the Spartan interpretation of what *autonomia* meant. For what was actually at stake in the common peace negotiations (a point that does not appear to be appreciated by either Keen or Hansen) was the issue of what constituted a legitimate state organization. It was not just a question of whether or not there could be dependency or *autonomia*, but the level and kind of dependency and *autonomia* that could (as defined by Sparta) be allowed.

Other essays deal with other issues. Nancy Demand looks at how Cypriot political institutions, generally typecast as 'oriental despotisms', in fact followed the Greek model more closely than is generally allowed, and concludes by making some very pointed and apposite remarks (particularly in regard to some recent American studies) about how the drive to search out the roots of our own political ideologies has sometimes obscured our readings of ancient political institutions. Hugh Bowden follows with an excellent article on Naukratis, showing how the emporion (which is to be associated with the sanctuaries rather than the permanent settlement) was organized not by individual traders, but jointly by *poleis* (who each appointed officials) in conjunction with the Egyptian pharaohs. Thomas Heine Nielsen argues elegantly and convincingly against a fifth-century Arkadian Confederacy, suggesting a religious organization based on the Lykaia as an explanation for the fifth-century 'Arkadian' coin issue. Pernille Flensted-Jensen and Mogens Hansen consider Ps.-Skylax' use of the term *polis*, concluding that it conforms with usage found elsewhere. (However, that Ps.-Skylax identifies *poleis* in Hellas correctly is surely not remarkable; what is more interesting is the apparent 'mistakes' in 'the more remote regions', and here a consideration of how Ps.-Skylax designates non-Greek *poleis*—a question which they choose to lay aside—could have provided other important clues.) Finally Mogens Hansen shows how city-ethnics (bearing in mind the qualifications and limitations outlined at p. 195 n. 8) can be used to identify *poleis*.

This is an interesting collection of essays, which raises important and far-reaching questions not only about the *polis* but about Greek political structures more generally. However, as a collection it is in desperate need of an introduction (which it does not have) in order to draw out and tie together some of the themes of this collection and to link them to other work done by the Polis Centre. And, given the varied responses

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

these essays offer for what a *polis* is or could be, some comments, perhaps, are needed to tell us what a *polis* is not.

Oriel College, Oxford LYNETTE G. MITCHELL

A HISTORY OF DELIBERATION

F. RUZÉ: *Délibération et pouvoir dans la cité grecque de Nestor à Socrate*. (Histoire ancienne et médiévale, 43.) Pp. 584. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1997. Paper, frs. 210. ISBN: 2-85944-314-2.

The title of this book raises expectations which it is important to dispel from the start. The banner words 'pouvoir' and 'délibération' might be thought to imply a contribution to political theory or to cultural history. 'Pouvoir', since Foucault, is Everywhere, and the move from archaic structures to the *polis* is a story repeatedly told in terms both of shifting power relations and of new exercises in symbolic expression. The term 'délibération' marks a key juncture between political institutions as a form of power and the intellectual revolutions of the fifth-century enlightenment: the name 'Socrates' in the subtitle might be thought to indicate that the growth of philosophy and other signs of intellectual ferment (as outlined by G. E. R. Lloyd, for example) are to be explored as integral elements in the formation of the democratic subject. How do the different forms—and discussions—of 'délibération' interact, and relate to—or constitute—'pouvoir' in the *polis*? Indeed, there is a reasonable claim to be made that the interface between 'pouvoir' and 'délibération' is one of the defining issues of a democratic system—where questions of political agency, cultural norms, and legal regulation combine in the most fascinating manner. What is more, there are distinguished projects which have begun to outline such territory: Ober's *Mass and Elite*, Loraux's *Invention of Athens*, Osborne's *Greece in the Making* (among others).

This book, however, is an extremely long history of the different formal institutional mechanisms of reaching decisions within a narrowly described political process. Socrates' complex contribution to our understanding of 'délibération' and 'pouvoir' plays no rôle in this resolutely constitutional history.

The book falls into three broad sections. In the first, 'les héros d'Homère ont la parole', the Homeric poems are raided for all indications of formal decision-making bodies. The approach is based explicitly on the assumption that the Homeric poems 'respect the norms of a real society', at least when representing institutions (even, it appears, in places like Scherie): these norms construct a careful balance where a restricted oligarchic group meets in council, but rules only within the limits of the popular power of the assembled masses (*agora*). The focus of this section is largely on the representation of a council and assembly, and on trying to tease out their respective rôles in decision making. The second section, 'de quelques cités doriennes', investigates differently difficult evidence across a broad temporal scope and range of geographical locations—Crete, Corinth, Argos from the seventh to the third centuries—but inevitably focuses with most intensity on Sparta. The material from cities other than Sparta is lacunose, and involves a great deal of sifting— invention— to produce even a rather general picture of an institutional history (Aeschylus scarcely offers access to the Realien of Argos). The material from Sparta is often distorted by virtue of its Athenian provenance. The need to use late historians or political polemicists to construct earlier periods also brings its problems. The general

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

conclusion drawn from often detailed and intricate discussion is that from the seventh century for all these cities except Argos there exists a college of magistrates whose rôle it is to aid an assembly which makes decisions. Despite Aristotle's account, it is the Assembly rather than the magistrates which is, according to R., to be considered sovereign. The third section on Athens—'la lente maturation d'un modèle contesté'—draws on by far the richest evidence, but largely limits itself to the institutional relation of *boulê* and *ekklêsia*, the rôle of *prutaneis*, the regulations of *probouleusis*. Unlike many, R. also considers the constitutional arrangements under the oligarchic coups, and she worries how those who refused to abide by the decisions of the people were regulated (the work of Cohen, *Law, Sexuality and Society*; of Hunter, *Policing Athens*; and of Fisher, *Hubris*, which could be obvious starting points, are not cited, however). The explicit and provocative agenda of this wide-ranging account is that there is much greater similarity in institutional practice between oligarchies and democracies than is recognized by either ancient or modern writers.

The range of the book is thus wider than Mogens Hansen's magisterial and standard exposition of the institutions of democratic Athens—it rarely disagrees with Hansen with any conviction—and there is indeed a benefit in comparing and contrasting Athens with Homer and Dorian cities. There are many places where the evidence is so difficult that historians (who will consult this book) will inevitably disagree on points of detailed interpretation. But more worrying is the intellectual scope of the project. The decision to limit discussion to the institutional frame runs the risk of failing to account for 'pouvoir' or 'délibération' in action, when so much of ancient social practice spreads across the divide of formal and less formal contexts. What is more, when so much of the evidence is textual, much greater care must be taken with the ideological aspects of the topic. Both of these points are especially evident with Homer: the debate of *Iliad* 9, for example, is echoed repeatedly in the subsequent narrative, as is the scene of supplication: neither find a significant place in R.'s account. Homer's discussion of power and deliberation goes well beyond the institutions of policy making, and continues to have a force in later Greek culture as such. Yet Thucydides fares little better. Faced by his account of the *synoikismos*, R. comments—typically—'trois questions se posent: l'authenticité, la date, la réalité que recouvrent les mots' (p. 324). This is the regrettably familiar pose of a certain type of ancient history—the ideology is clear enough: authenticity, reality, date—but the failure to ask why Thucydides discusses this topic in this way at this point of his narrative—its rôle in Thucydides' rhetoric—undermines R.'s discussion. Even the 'criteria of citizenship' and the 'formation of the citizen' are discussed with a relentless focus on legal regulations.

There is undoubtedly a place for constitutional history, even when the evidence is so difficult, and R.'s conclusion that the opposition of democracy and oligarchy must be reconsidered in the light of an adequate constitutional history is stimulating. However, to discuss 'délibération' and 'pouvoir' without rhetoric and ideology, or constitutions without politics, or rules without social practice, must produce insufficient history.

King's College, Cambridge SIMON GOLDHILL

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CLERUCHIES

N. SALOMON: *Le cleruchie di Atene. Caratteri e funzioni*. (Studi e testi di storia antica, 6.) Pp. 272. Pisa: ETS, 1997. Paper, L. 28,000. ISBN: 88-7741–986-5.

After Figueira (*Athens and Aigina*, 1991) and Cargill (*Athenian Settlements*, 1995) on the nature (colonies? cleruchies?) of Athenian settlements abroad in the fifth and fourth centuries, S. now offers another and highly ingenious approach. After an introduction describing her approach, Chapter 1 summarizes her conclusions: this novel arrangement helps the reader follow S. through complex and detailed technical arguments (as do numerous cross-references). The heart of the book is Chapter 2, 158 pages on Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros in the fifth and fourth centuries. Then follow a reconstruction of fifth-century cleruchies elsewhere in the light of the conclusions of Chapter 2, and a brief study of colonial terminology, The work ends with twenty-nine pages of bibliography, indices of literary sources and epigraphic texts, and a general index. The book is well produced.

The views of S. on Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros can be summarized thus. Lemnos was conquered by Miltiades for Athens in the late sixth century and the natives removed; the island was then occupied by Athenian colonists, who lost their Athenian citizenship and became citizens of the new *polis*. Similarly Scyros was conquered by Cimon for Athens *c.* 476/5, depopulated, and colonized. Events at Imbros, though unattested, were probably similar. Lemnos (and probably Imbros) medized, but the three islands joined the Delian League. In 447/6 Lemnos was divided into two *poleis*, Myrina and Hephaestia. (Reduced tribute in 447/6 might mean that a cleruchy was sent to Lemnos, but a fifth-century cleruchy is not important in the argument.) Although not Athenian, Lemnos preserved the tribal system its colonists brought from Athens. Thucydides noted Lemnos and Imbros specially as allies of Athens in the Peloponnesian War. At the war's end, alliance with Athens ended, but the islands' inhabitants—not Athenian but now the established local population—were not affected by Lysander's policy of sending Athenians back to Athens. In the Peace of Antalcidas in 387/6 Athens recovered secure possession of the islands: Athens may have achieved *de facto* control some years earlier. Either in 387/6 or some years earlier the citizens of the three islands received Athenian citizenship, and the islands became part of Athenian territory, with the resident Athenian citizens (the islands' normal population) organized to handle local affairs. An Athenian garrison, made up of cleruchs, was then sent to protect Lemnos: residents probably ceded land for *kleroi* voluntarily to Athens, as in the Chersonese (except Cardia). Cleruchs were replaced in rotation after a short tour of duty; while on Lemnos they were maintained by the income from *kleroi* cultivated by local inhabitants, but did not own the *kleroi*, which were reassigned in due course to new cleruchs. Athens sent a hipparch annually to command the cleruchs, and occasionally a general; separately two *epimeletai* were sent to supervise Myrina and Hephaestia respectively. Lemnos thus had two separate groups of Athenians (as also for a time did Samos): those resident in Myrina and Hephaestia, and cleruchs. Athens retained possession of the islands, with interruptions, until Septimius Severus, but the cleruchy eventually disappeared.

The reconstruction has obvious problems. The central one is the lack of evidence for a grant of citizenship to the inhabitants of Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros. The king's words ὥσπερ τὸ ἀρχαῖον (Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.31) are hardly evidence of such a grant (pp. 70–1). (S. suggests ingeniously, but speculatively, that the statue of Athene

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lemnia on the Acropolis is to be associated with a fifth-century grant of citizenship to Lemnos.) It is also necessary to suppose on several occasions that evidence for one island also holds for the others. S. several times (e.g. p. 71) insists on close ties between Athens and the islands for which there is little evidence. Some texts need considerable explanation in order to fit the argument: e.g. [Aristotle] *Oec.* 1347a at pp. 203–8. Some things remain unexplained, such as how and why the community on Lemnos was divided in 447/6.

There are, however, great advantages. Cleruchs become purely military, and return soon to Athens to enjoy their citizenship. The cleruchy is not an attempt to provide for needy Athenians, and the presence of wealthy cleruchs is no problem. The exclusion of cleruchic holdings from the proposed assessment for trierarchic symmories (Dem. 14. 16) is because cleruchs do not own their *kleros*. Decrees passed on the islands are from the permanent Athenian populations, and *horoi* on Lemnos refer to their property, not to *kleroi*.

S. presents her case carefully and well, and has several notable insights: the argument (pp. 109–19) against identifying eponymous Lemnian archons with Athenian homonyms is particularly strong, and the analysis (pp. 37–45) of myth linking Athens with Lemnos and Scyros is striking. There is a useful section (pp. 175–88) on the islands' cereal production.

This is a major contribution to an old and difficult problem. It will certainly be challenged, but it must not be ignored.

University of Nottingham J. ROY

THE ATHENIAN HOUSEHOLD

C. A. Cox: *Household Interests: Property, Marriage Strategies, and Family Dynamics in Ancient Athens*. Pp. xx + 253. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998. Cased, $33.95. ISBN: 0-691-01572-4.

This is the most thorough collection to date of evidence for household formation among the propertied in Classical Athens. The choice of marriage partners, the relations between husbands and wives, between parents and children and between siblings, the factors leading to disruption of the household through more or less permanent absences of individual members, and the presence of non-kin within the household are successively examined, generally on the basis of close scrutiny of information from the orators. C. ends by concluding that the very nature of the *oikos* needs further investigation, but along the way many aspects of it have been newly illuminated.

The Athenian household has not been neglected by scholars in the past two decades, and many of the questions here are familiar ones. Much of the relevant data is, as is repeatedly acknowledged, already collected in J. K. Davies's *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford, 1971), and many of the arguments here complement those of other workers in the field (e.g. on the potential influence of women within the household). Given this, C.'s very thoroughness in documenting her case means that her chapters will not always be the most attractive means by which to introduce students to the area. The first chapter, on the families of the private orations, is a case

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in point: within a side we are into the complex history of the Bouselids, and it would be a rare student who could cope with this degree of detail to support the observation that most Athenian marriages reflected the patrilineal bias of Athenian law.

Already in the first chapter C. introduces local as well as kinship factors as important in the formation of marriage ties. No map is given and C.'s geography sometimes leaves something to be desired—she seems to think (p. 8) that Oinoe in Hippothontis would be passed by someone from the city *en route* to Eleusis, and that Eleusis was particularly close to the city (p. 16)—but her second chapter on town and country represents a distinct advance in consideration of the rôle of local links in marriage. C. systematically examines all gravestones which allow the demes of both husband and wife to be determined, and looks separately at stones found in the city and those found in different regions of Attica. This is a more dangerous procedure than C. acknowledges, since it is not impossible that people normally resident in the country might on occasion seek burial in the city (or vice versa), and it is quite likely that the subset of gravestones which mention the wife's deme of origin is not a randomly selected one. But the method is justified by the conclusion: C. discovers a clear difference between the high degree of heterogamy (marriage to someone from outside the deme or region) of those buried in the city and the higher rate of local endogamy of those buried in the rest of Attica, with some particularly strong pockets of endogamy in certain demes. It is unfortunate that, with few exceptions, gravestones allow a view of the behaviour of only one generation and do not allow comparison of siblings' choices, so that the factors producing this pattern can only be guessed at.

The strength of the book lies in the questions asked (often following the lead of work in more recent family history, which is frequently cited) and in the accumulation of examples relevant to answering those questions. While those examples are culled from gravestones or orators the procedure works well, although C. sometimes overlooks the fact that essentially speeches and gravestones tell us only about the rich, and that we can neither assume that the poor acted in identical ways nor assume the opposite. When, in looking at non-kin in the household, C. turns to prostitutes and accumulates large numbers of examples from the pages of Athenaeus, with only the most cursory nod towards this being a 'late source', there is cause for much more misgiving: the sources from which Athenaeus has gleaned his information and the forces which shape anecdotal evidence need very much closer and more critical examination. Keen to stress that the *oikos* is not the nuclear family, C. fails to take on board the equally important fact, demonstrated by MacDowell in *CQ* (1989), that *oikos* was not a term used in Athenian law and that the *oikos* had no legal standing. C. seems to think that one could legally belong to someone's *oikos,* and that Perikles' Citizenship Law excluded illegitimate children from the *oikos* (pp. 172–3). One of the good things about this book is that it offers discussion of marriage, inheritance, adoption, and so on in other than just dry legal terms, showing them instead as part of a household dynamic. It is unfortunate therefore that C. fails to see just how far the *oikos* was from being a legal category at all.

Princeton University Press fails in its attempt to print acceptable Greek, but otherwise typographic errors are few. The whole book is printed in a very small typeface, however, and the reader has to work hard for the rewards of C.'s exhaustive researches.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford ROBIN OSBORNE

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'ONLY CONNECT . . .'

J. PETER EUBEN: *Corrupting Youth. Political Education, Democratic Culture, and Political Theory*. Pp. xvi + 270. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997 (US), 1998 (UK). Cased, £37.50/$55 (Paper, £13.95/$18.95). ISBN: 0-691-01202-4 (0-691-04828-2 pbk).

Peter Euben, Professor of Politics at the University of California at Santa Cruz, is a doughty fighter for the cause of democratic education through political–philosophical enquiry. Nothing peculiar in that, perhaps, but his chosen weapons and the manner of their deployment may well be thought so—or at least peculiar to him. 'I have tried to suggest how our engaging "the" play [sc. the *Antigone*, or rather its multiplicity of possible and actual readings, modern rather than ancient] could become a ground for our collective enquiry and reflection about political ends . . .' (p. 178). 'The burden of this chapter [ostensibly on the *O.T.*] as of the book as a whole' is that an ancient Greek play can 'retain its distinctive power to provoke and "enlighten" ' and that 'we could do worse than make *Oedipus Tyrannus* companion reading for political science texts, methodological primers, and arguments about rational actors and theory' (p. 200).

Thus Attic tragedy, and Attic drama more generally (a reprinted chapter is devoted to Aristophanes' *Clouds*), retain here the special hermeneutic and agit-prop status accorded them in E.'s previous collection, *The Tragedy of Political Theory: the Road not Taken* (1990; rev. T. Saunders, *CR* n.s. 42 [1992], 67–9; and, more sympathetically, J. Ober, *Political Theory* [August 1991], 477–80), and in his earlier edited or co-edited volumes, *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory* (Berkeley, London, 1986) and *Athenian Political Thought and the Reconstruction of American Democrac*y (Ithaca, London, 1994). But his selection of focus texts is larger than just drama, embracing also three of Plato's Socratic works (*Apology*, *Gorgias*, and *Protagoras*), and his range of institutional and intellectual reference yet more catholic still: the chapter on 'Democratic Accountability and Socratic Dialectic', for example, begins characteristically by citing Dewey, Walzer, Allen Bloom, and Ben Barber before we get a mention of the *Apology*.

That chapter will also serve to illustrate his chosen method of exposition. E. is the most hospitable of critics. Not an opportunity is lost, indeed it would seem that opportunities are positively sought, to cite or quote a daunting kaleidoscope of mainly American and entirely English-language philosophers, social and literary critics, educationists, political and economic theorists. E. will then explicitly develop, measure and express his own highly individual positions or 'understandings' against this heterogeneous range of intellectual comrades-in-arms or (as often) adversaries.

Substantively, and predictably, E.'s densely complex book is very hard indeed to summarize, and impossible to précis adequately in a short space. Above all, perhaps, it may be read as a contribution to what George Steiner recently called 'the debate over the authentic meanings and validity of the condemnation of Socrates'. E. is no I. F. Stone, not only nor most importantly because he would have voted with the minority of the judges in 399, but because he sees the issues of Socrates' trial and preceding public, political life in anything but black-and-white terms. Nevertheless, for all his acknowledgement of Socrates'—or Platocrates'—principled hostility to democracy in its most fundamental articles, E. wishes nevertheless to recuperate Socrates as a democrat ('the culmination and severest critic of the Athenian political tradition as that was formed by the victory at, and the legend of, Salamis', p. 85); or, as we might

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

put it with Eubenesque paradox and irony, to make Socrates unsafe for democracy, ours no less than his own Athenian one. As with Alexander the Great, no doubt, we all tend to create the Socrates of our dreams. Yet this, surely, is to push autobiography too far, to try to have the cake of political correctness (little wrong with that, as far as this PC reviewer is concerned) as well as consume it.

Actually, the case for a really oligarchic historical Socrates is much stronger than E. would probably countenance, but that is a relatively small objection beside the charge that E. is wishfully reading out of—or into—Plato's Socrates(es?) the sorts of messages that he wants to hear. But also, to be fair, to deploy, most vigorously, on behalf of the pedagogy he applauds and recommends to an America riven with culture wars between (to polarize the warring factions in a thoroughly Hellenic way) the conservative canonists and the diehard multiculturalists. E., self-aware and self-critical as ever, knows full well how paradoxical it will seem to his principal target audience of American university educators in the humanities (not necessarily Classicists, by any means) to recommend that they return again and again to pore over old DWEM texts. But E.'s never pie-eyed message is a thoroughly plausible one, even if his chosen medium is not always conducive to its crystal clear delivery (the latter not helped, either, by the lamentably huge number of grammatical slips, false or incomplete references, mistranscriptions of Greek, etc.).

Look to the end. E.'s closing words are 'open question'. So too it is an open verdict that we, in the spirit of the democratic philosophizing and pedagogical politics that E. has insistently enjoined upon us, are bound finally to deliver on this notably—and nobly—provocative and visionary collection of essays.

Clare College, Cambridge PAUL CARTLEDGE

THE GREEK FAMILY

SARAH B. POMEROY: *Families in Classical and Hellenistic Greece: Representations and Realities*. Pp. x + 261. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-19-814392-3.

No sooner did I call for a new synthesis of the Greek family (*BMCR* 7 [1996], 722) than one appeared, and from a most desirable source at that. Sarah Pomeroy is the author of a pioneering work on women in the ancient world, another on women in Hellenistic Egypt, and the standard commentary on Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*. She has been fertile yet not (in Dorothy Parker's phrase) fecund rate. But every student of folklore knows how dangerous it can be to get what you wish for. How grateful should we be this time?

It must be said at once that this book is better than having a sausage stuck to the end of your nose. P. arranges her material in six chapters: (1) 'Defining the Family'; (2) 'Heredity and Personal Identity'; (3) 'Death and the Family'; (4) 'Some Greek Families at Work'; (5) 'Two Case Histories' (from fourth-century Athens, the families of Demosthenes and Apollodorus); and (6) 'Families in Ptolemaic Egypt'. Variation is much in evidence: 'history studies change over time' (p. 1); Greek communities differed; even within Ptolemaic Egypt, Zenon's milieu was not like that of Dionysius, son of Kephalas; better-off Athenians might bring their brides back to the family home or not. Nevertheless, patterns emerge. Some distinguish Greeks from Romans: endogamy, an earlier age of marriage for girls, tied to menarche, at fourteen or fifteen—for P., Hajnal's identification of differing marriage patterns in Western and

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Eastern Europe holds true for antiquity. In addition, slaves and freedpersons were not assimilated to the kin members of the *oikos* by naming and burial as they were in the Roman *familia*. The book's main unifying force, however, is a recurring theme, the interplay of gender, differing genres of evidence, and the relationship of the family to the larger community in which it was embedded. Here, P. notes, the usual dichotomy between public and private is inadequate. In fact, the Greek family existed in three versions. One was the pseudo-kin network of males—the phratry, the *genos*. (P. joins other recent writers in denying that the nuclear family developed from larger archaic kinship institutions, goes further in ascribing the phratry organization at Athens to Cleisthenes. 'The *polis* usurped the terminology of the family in order to appropriate its affective relationships' [p. 18].) The other two versions of the family included women as well as men. One had a public face, visible in honorary inscriptions and Ptolemaic census returns, in which men predominate; women are more prominent in the other, private family, a world glimpsed on carved tombstones and in papyrus archives, but not so much so as to supplant men. 'The history of the Greek family must be largely the history of an institution dominated by men' (p. 16).

There is much to admire here. P. is a perceptive guide to the nature of the evidence and the challenges it offers. She provides generous portions of texts in translation, some hard to find elsewhere. Conventions of iconography are elucidated without slighting exceptions. Archaeology plays a major rôle—J. L. Angel's work on skeletons is the basis of P.'s outline of Greek demography, and the skewed sex ratio of cemeteries is taken to reflect the realities of female infanticide and neglect; it is especially good to have up-to-date accounts of relevant finds from Rhamnous (pp. 135–9). Insights abound, on the ambiguities surrounding women above all. At Athens, married women were part of their husband's *oikos* but not his *anchisteia*, excluded from intestate succession to him, but eligible for legacies. Their ongoing links with their households of birth were reflected in ideas of descent: Greeks were basically patrilineal, but willing to consider the mother's kin if these were particularly distinguished (a point P. explores in an interesting discussion of the families of athletic victors, pp. 85–95) or disgraced (the Alcmaeonid curse). The case study of Demosthenes' family is particularly successful in bringing out the influence widows might wield, the rôle of maternal kin and the links between public and private in family life.

Too often, however, this book falls short of the standards of reliability and judgement to be expected from so accomplished a scholar. This is not just a matter of slips and typos, though there are plenty of those.[1] The handling of secondary sources is symptomatic. Some are ignored. P.'s Athenian women are as secluded as if David Cohen never wrote a word; judging by her bibliography, he never did. Some are seen but not heard. One means towards that seclusion was architectural, the *gynaikonitis* in which women, slave and free, spent much of their waking time and slept. P. here follows the literary sources, relegating discussion of the archaeological evidence, or rather of its scarcity, to separate quarters of its own—a footnote (p. 31 n. 25). This is all the more unfortunate in that Lisa Nevett's investigation of the sightlines of Greek houses would enhance the generally nuanced picture P. paints of women's position

[1]Among the most troublesome: p. 88, read Hom. *Il.* 23.707–37; p. 131 n. 111, read *IG* II^2; p. 176 n. 60, for Dem. 27.17, 28.118, 99 read 28.17, 18.99, 118; p. 190 n. 109, read *APF* 11672IX; p. 214 n. 81, for 342 read 242; p. 230, under Andrewes read 1–15; Herodotus is abbreviated as both Her. and Hdt. throughout. It says something about this book that Pomeroy admires Lacey's survey (p. 2) but can still get his initials wrong (p. 82).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

within the household. Finally, some scholars are misrepresented. Those curious to know what Lambert thinks about the involvement of women in Athenian phratries (p. 77 n. 37) or what Golden guesstimated on the prevalence of exposure of girls (p. 120) should check for themselves; in Lambert's case they will find a more careful and complete account than that on offer here.

Of course, P.'s treatment of the ancient evidence is more important. Space permits commentary only on some instances concerning Sparta. (1) 'The decision whether to raise babies was in the hands of the state immediately . . . (Female babies, apparently, were not subjected to such scrutiny.)' (pp. 48–9). The only relevant text cited, Plut. *Lyc*. 16.1–2, speaks of a scrutiny by 'the eldest of the tribesmen'—a mysterious group who were almost certainly not magistrates—of a newborn (*to gennēthen*, *to paidarion*). Even supposing that only boys are included, this cannot be pushed still further to show that 'there is no evidence for female infanticide at Sparta' (p. 55). (2) Spartan women 'did reject the burden of continuous child production. . . . According to Cicero, the women refused to bear children' (p. 49). Cicero (*Tusc*. 2.15.36) cites a few Latin verses of uncertain provenance which refer to Spartan girls' enthusiasm for exercise rather than *fertilitas barbara*—they are tough like Greek men, not like foreign women. (3) 'Not only were Spartan women fully integrated members of the *oikos*, but, as Xenophon (*Lac. Pol*. 1.9) observed, women ruled the *oikoi*' (p. 50). Xenophon has a specific context in mind, the sharing of Spartan women for procreation, and 'rule' is too strong a word for *katekhein*—Talbert's translation, which P. uses elsewhere, gives 'have' (*Plutarch on Sparta* [1988], p. 167).

This book is a useful supplement for recent work on the Greek family but no substitute.

University of Winnipeg MARK GOLDEN

THE SECOND SOPHISTIC

T. SCHMITZ: *Bildung und Macht. Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*. Pp. 270. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1997. Paper, DM 98. ISBN: 3-406-4285-7.

This is one of the most important books yet on the Second Sophistic. It is intelligent and judicious, and can be recommended to historians of any period who wish to investigate the relations between cultural and political movements.

The phrase 'Second Sophistic' comes from Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*. Here it refers to the classicizing, fictional oratory that became fashionable in the Greek world during the first century A.D. Since the *Lives* also charts the social status, wealth, benefactions, and political relationships of its subjects, 'Second Sophistic' may legitimately be used to describe the whole political-cultural profile of the flourishing Greek cities of the High Roman Empire. S. uses it thus.

Serious study of the Second Sophistic goes back to the great Hellenists of the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. After this most Hellenists retreated to the classics and the study of the Greek cities in the Second Sophistic was left to epigraphers and historians. The vast amount of inscriptions relating to local and provincial politics, the world of euergetism, and careers in local and imperial service, understandably evinced a Romanocentric approach. This extended into the cultural domain. When Millar called for investigation of the history of the Greek 'renaissance'

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in *Cassius Dio* (Oxford, 1964), p. 174, the result was Bowersock's *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969). The prosopographical agenda of this book drove unsuspecting sophists into an accumulation of Roman contacts. The effect was an impressive naming of trees without attending to the cultural nature of the wood and the political nature of the culture. If one examined the culture, as Bowie did in his famous *P&P* article of 1970, the Second Sophistic could be returned to the Greek context whence it came.

S.'s aim is to recover the operation of a system of power through the observation of a system of culture. He relies heavily on Bourdieu's theory of *habitus* and related New Historicist notions of symbolic 'power' and 'capital' (Chapter 1). Cultural and social systems are one. The actors in these systems do not act consciously, but have interiorized the rules from childhood. They play the game on the basis that their society is worthwhile and natural. The *Weltabgewandheit* (p. 31) of the Second Sophistic, i.e. its obsession with the past, is a way of making actors feel their system is autonomous. The evidence for this complex social system is public literature (the Greek novel is excluded because it belongs to the private sphere) and public epigraphical attestations of *paideia*. At the top of this system stands the sophist (Chapter 2). Here there is a slight problem. It is clear that 'sophist' was a term which some loved and some hated. Philostratus loved it and by means of the *Lives* sought to classify the leading rhetorical stars of his period as sophists. Some of these men accepted the term, as we know from epigraphy; others (Dio of Prusa, Aelius Aristides) repudiated it. Philostratus' reason for wishing to extend it has to do partly with the positive cachet it could bear and partly with the fact that he was a teacher himself, for the word has a strong sense of teaching. S. uses the term because his model demands an exclusive group within the élite. In Bourdieu-ian terms, the élite must 'delegate' the task of cultural display to a few specialists—the sophists. S. cites public-giving as a parallel: to the super-rich the wider élite delegates the task of benefaction.

These sophists lead a culture in which language is a 'badge' of élite standing (Chapter 3). Those without education are excluded. But S. argues that the lower orders were kept satisfied by benefaction, were entirely apathetic politically, and above all liked their place because their *habitus* made them believe they were part of an integrated social system. He cites good epigraphical evidence for association between claims to superiority based on giving and claims made on the basis of culture. He follows this (Chapter 4) with epigraphical testimony of the striving to be first in giving and in culture (admitting that claims to cultural precedence are far less frequent). This competitiveness is an intrinsic part of the idea of social 'distinction'. All this is important for anyone interested in the internal dynamics of the ancient city in this age. The next chapter refines these thoughts (with a strange idea about so-called 'late-learners') by suggesting that the sophists' obligation to give improvised speeches should be seen in Bourdieu-ian terms of seeking the appearance of naturalness.

Given S.'s ideas, it is important to establish a wide reception and acceptance of élite culture (Chapter 6). The evidence he presents of a broad, non-élite audience is to my mind quite unconvincing (pp. 160–75). What did élite and non-élite say to one another? Mythological and historical subjects loomed large in classicizing talk. They served to identify a 'Griechentum' that élite and non-élite could share in. There was never anything antipathetical to Rome in this talk—fine, but S. might have enquired in what ways the Greeks were *in favour of* Rome. The book ends by picturing sophists in the service of the élite's collective needs with regard to its control of the people and by considering the centripetal, normative function of the cultural tradition that regulated their ambition.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

S. is undoubtedly right to stress the vital political dimension of Second Sophistic culture. His thesis of its diffusion has things in common with Desideri in *Dione di Prusa* (Florence, 1978). The problem is that the evidence for the social breadth of the audience and the comprehension of the lower orders is not compelling. No one doubts the extent of communication between mass and élite; but classicizing rhetoric is better seen—on the whole (for there are no black-and-white rules)—as a communicative strategy inside élite life. As for S., specialist tools give specialist results. Bourdieu's model is driven by inclusion because it must universalize. One of its major failings is an inability to factor in social and ethnic inequalities, and this explains at least one unsatisfactory area in S., the implications of sophistic culture for relations with Rome. Nevertheless, no one who reads this book will have cause to doubt that the Second Sophistic is a Greek phenomenon in the Greek city. That is a significant advance.

Warwick SIMON SWAIN

LYCIA

A. G. KEEN: *Dynastic Lycia. A Political History of the Lycians and their Relationships with Foreign Powers, c. 545–362 B.C.* Pp. xii + 268. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 1998. Cased, $94.50. ISBN: 90-04-10956-0.

K.'s book is the first full-scale attempt at a narrative history of Lycia during this period since Otto Treuber's 1887 *Geschichte der Lykier* and immediately takes its place as an important synthesis of recent work on the Lycians in the years following the Persian conquest, not least for its impressive bibliographical grasp.

The opening chapters provide a useful guide to Lycian geography and the sources for Lycian history. However, the following brief account of Lycian origins (pp. 22–5) is overly credulous of Greek literary accounts, without posing the question of why such stories were told, and does not deal with an important cycle of myths recorded as early as the fourth century by poets such as Panyassis from neighbouring Halikarnassos. Moreover, Chapter 4, entitled 'Iranization and Hellenization', underplays the complexity of relationships between Greeks, Persians, and Lycians, and K. is sometimes naïve in his handling of arguments based on cultural habits, e.g. 'orientalizing motifs point to there being a time in Perikle's career when he was more pro-Persian than pro-Greek' (p. 155).

The meat of the book is political history, and here K. follows a chronological scheme. He makes a valuable attempt to bring order to the confused mass of dynastic names attested on coinage and inscriptions, and argues that the system of government found in Lycia under Persian rule, with a major dynast based at Xanthos, and a 'nobility' composed of less powerful dynasts without apparently fixed geographical locations, was in place before the conquest of Lycia by the Persians. In an appendix he suggests the conquest occurred sometime in the years 542–539 (pp. 222–4). K. convincingly argues that the most important of the dynasts, both at Xanthos and later in the fourth century at Limyra, referred to themselves as kings. Problems still remain, however, with the lesser dynasts. K. at one point unhappily refers to 'a feudal monarchy' (p. 52), but in fact the set of relationships is unclear. These dynasts minted in a variety of regions, and there is the added complication that certain cities were apparently minting their own coin.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This Xanthian dynasty eventually lost control of Lycia, and after 380 B.C. we find Artumpara ruling in the west and Mithrapata the east, both argued to be Persian (p. 153). Their control was apparently brief, since Perikle of Limyra challenged them militarily and adopted the title 'King of Lycia'. This rejection of Persian authority continued into the Satrap Revolt, at which point K. ends his detailed narrative, treating the renewal of Persian control exercised through the Hekatomnid satraps as the end of the dynastic system.

From the rest of the work several themes can be picked out. First, the importance of the Lycian coast. Several Lycian ports form ideal and necessary stopping points, both on the voyage between the eastern and western Mediterranean, and that from Egypt to the Asia Minor coastline. The plentiful evidence of shipwrecks off the Lycian coast, most famously the Bronze Age remains at Cape Gelidonya and Ulu Burun, shows this, and control of the sea is a theme running through K.'s account of Persian and Athenian interest in Lycia. The origins of the invasion of Lycia by Harpagos lie in the fact that 'conquest of Lycia was essential if Persian power was to be asserted in the West' (p. 72). Likewise, K. argues that the Athenian general Kimon's strategy during the Eurymedon campaign was to seize Lycia in order to 'deny the coastline to Persian fleets' (p. 102).

Second, the fifth century is seen as a period of oscillation between Greek and Persian spheres of influence, the high point of which was for Athens the much-disputed Peace of Kallias, which set Phaselis on Lycia's easternmost border as the limit of Persian influence. After this Athenian power declines; post-442 Lycia's appearance in the Tribute Lists is infrequent, and K. discusses Melesandros' unsuccessful campaign in Lycia in 430. By the end of the fifth century there is evidence for Spartan involvement in Lycia.

Third, the process of enlargement of the Lycian state in this period. K. follows the consensus that Lycia from earliest times was focused on the Xanthos valley, and traces how a number of cities and regions regarded as Lycian in the Hellenistic and Roman periods became so. Distinct groups came under Lycian rule: in the north the Milyas, where the well-known painted tombs discovered at Kızıbel and Karaburun in the 1970s should be seen not so much as Lycian but as evidence of 'an independent Milyan dynasty of strong pro-Achaemenid leanings' (p. 111), came under Lycian control in the fourth century. Also Telmessos, which K. argues was not brought into Lycia until the mid-to-late fifth century, an argument based on its separate appearance in the Athenian Tribute Lists, and a series of cities in what is termed the 'Lyco-Carian borderlands' (p. 122).

The proof-reading is sometimes careless, with mistakes in the index and bibliography; at random, Childs (1973a) is in *AJA* 77 not 87. On p. 161 K. refers to the '*koinon*' of the Pernitai but the inscription he is referring to is not the one he publishes but *SEG* 41.1379. 'Herophytus' (pp. 233, 236) should, of course, be 'Heropythus', and the reference to this author in *FGrH* is 448 not 786. Odd contradictions: 'Ultimately the strong Lycian national identity could not survive' (p. 175) is followed a few pages later by 'nonetheless, it is clear that the idea of Lycia as a nation persisted in this period' (p. 177).

Dynastic Lycia is so rich and tries to engage itself in so many different debates regarding Lycia—Hellenization, religion, the burial record—that it is often difficult to pick out dominating themes. It concludes with several useful appendices, e.g. on the evidence for the question of the connection of Lycia with the Lukka Lands, and on Lycian cult. This has the effect of making the work a rather odd amalgam of a narrative history with nods towards a more thematic approach. These are not,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

however, to be taken as criticisms of what remains at heart a painstaking and important work.

Christ Church, Oxford GEORGE WILLIAMSON

MACEDONIAN ADMINISTRATION

M. B. HATZOPOULOS: *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings.* (MELETHMATA, 22.) 2 vols. I: A Historical and Epigraphic Study; II: Epigraphic Appendix. Pp. 554, 4 maps, 148 figs, 78 pls. Athens: Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity, National Hellenic Research Foundation, 1996 (distributed by De Boccard, Paris). Paper. ISBN: Vol. I, 960-7094-90-5; Vol. II, 960-7094-91-3 (both vols, 960-7094-89-1).

If we were to take Aristotle's *Politics* as a guide, or Polybius' *Histories*, we might be deluded into thinking that the Macedonians had no institutions to speak of, at least not before the Roman settlement of 167 B.C., which followed the battle of Pydna. As a historian, H. has absorbed and reflected on the extensive literature concerning things Macedonian for many years. His curiosity has moved well beyond biography, topography, and military affairs, in which most of his peers find their pasture. As an epigraphist (one of the most distinguished of his generation), his preoccupations are the organizational mechanisms which articulated Macedonian society and its many constituent parts (Pliny refers to 150 self-governing units: *N.H.* 4.33). These two volumes are a magnificent achievement. Not only does H. provide, in Volume II, a corpus of ninety-three inscriptions which illuminate the kingdom's institutions, with critical apparatus, full bibliographies, detailed indices and very clear photographs (certain practical limitations on the form and content of the corpus are explained in the foreword, pp. 11–13); but he also offers, in Volume I, a monograph of admirable clarity and prescience which distils his model of pre-Roman institutions in Macedonia and its dependent territories, developed through the study of individual documents over the last twenty years.

All ninety-three inscriptions, H. argues, antedate the Roman settlement of 167 B.C. Well over half (fifty-four) can be dated to the fifty years prior to Pydna. A third are royal decrees, letters, or local decisions implementing the former. Of the remaining documents, an overwhelming number were issued by cities and communities east of the Axius River and therefore do not technically belong to Macedonia proper (Amphipolis, Cassandrea, Anthemus, Morrylus). The epigraphic archives of Vergina, Pella, Beroea, Dium, Pydna, and other cities of the kingdom are only beginning to be investigated and some fundamental texts, including the earliest known civic decree, from Dion, remain unpublished (App. no. 57; I.129ff). H.'s task was therefore far harder than this apparent profusion of documents might suggest. Unable to arrange a systematic historical survey, he has been obliged to proceed in piecemeal fashion and to consider information from later documents which might have a bearing on earlier social and political structures. He is acutely aware of the close connection between Macedonia's romantic leaders in the second half of the fourth century B.C. and the far less romantic, but no less fundamental, organs of everyday administration. A balance needs to be struck in favour of the latter if we want to understand the former (pp. 40–2).

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

H. first examines the political and territorial organization of Gazorus, north-east of Lake Cercinitis in the lower Strymon valley. A series of inscriptions, the earliest of which dates to the reign of Philip V (App. no. 39), shows that villages surrounding Gazorus shared fully in the political life of the 'city'. H. describes this arrangement as a '*sympoliteia*' which has analogies in western Asia Minor (I, p. 63). Further examples of such collective authority can be traced among the Bragylii and Letacans (pp. 66–9). Although the documentary evidence for such structures dates mainly from the Roman period, they are most unlikely to represent innovations but are rather survivals of long-established forms of organization. Macedonian (and perhaps neighbouring) institutions were indeed different from those of a nucleated city-state. Moreover, non-Greek-speaking 'natives' appear to be fully integrated with Macedonians. We do not know how this occurred. The documents simply present us with a *fait accompli* (pp. 70–3). Far from being a loose sort of organization, the Macedonian *ethnos* was made up of self-constituted units of mainly rural character, whose 'tribal' features were artificial formations, just like those in other parts of Greece (pp. 77–104). One has only to compare the sharp differences in prime land prices between Amphipolis and Mieza (p. 116) to see that this was no farming backwater either.

H.'s examination of rural organization is but one of many significant contributions this study makes to Macedonian history and culture. Throughout his survey H. has borne in mind two interrelated questions: What was the relationship between central and local administration? How were local and 'national' interests integrated? H. shows that scholarly debate has been based on ill-founded assumptions about royal control over cities and their affairs. His updating of the gymnasiarchal law from Beroea (App. no. 60) to the first third of the second century B.C. (on prosopographical as well as internal grounds) confirms H.'s earlier thesis that civic magistrates called politarchs were annual officials under the kings, probably acted as chief magistrates, as they did in Roman times (pp. 127–38), and in this capacity convened the assembly of citizens as well as sessions of a city's council. There is growing evidence of the range of magistracies in different cities, betraying their independent development, either as native Macedonian foundations or as colonies (pp. 149ff). The relationship between the civic boards of (usually two) *politarchoi* and the now well-attested *epistatai* is still uncertain. H. believes that the former superseded the latter. There is satisfactory evidence to show that *epistatai* were local men, intimately involved in local administration; the notion of their being royal appointees has thereby been eroded (pp. 156–8, 372–429).

The territorial organization of Macedonian land into districts is a more intractable problem, but H. has rightly insisted on treating this as a continuing challenge for the central government (pp. 167–260). This evolving regional division provided a framework for the Roman *merides*. By highlighting the workings of local administration first, H. can build up a more balanced picture of the Macedonian state than the conventional view—based predominantly on royal biographies—of autocratic kings with their own officials supervising local affairs. Constitutional kingship in Macedonia involved collaborative policy making in association with a council, composed of leading regional men (often referred to in the sources as *hoi protoi*: pp. 291–3), whose views could not be ignored, as well as royal appointees. This council could be expanded to include military commanders and local representatives. Such a structure has analogies in Epirus and Thessaly. H. is at pains to underscore a fundamental distinction between these monarchical, or quasi-monarchical, northern polities, and their southern, genuinely federal counterparts (Aetolia, Acarnania, Achaea), which had councils composed of elected regional delegates. Representative

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

councils appeared in the former only after the disappearance of monarchical structures, with regional organization retaining a fundamentally autocratic form until the intervention of the Romans (pp. 323–5, 487–96). Space does not allow me to mention other topics (revenues, *hetairoi*, Macedonia and Thessaly) which interlock with and enhance this model. Suffice to say that it will surely be seen as a major turning point in Macedonian studies.

University of Liverpool ZOFIA HALINA ARCHIBALD

PORTRAIT OF ALEXANDER

A. B. BOSWORTH: *Alexander and the East: the Tragedy of Triumph*. Pp. xvi + 218, 10 figs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. £30. ISBN: 0-19-814991-3.

Hot on the heels of the second instalment of Bosworth's *Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* (Oxford, 1995) comes the present volume, a series of essays dealing with selected aspects of Alexander's reign and campaigning in the period 329–325, during which he and his forces advanced from Bactria into India, then down the Indus and back towards the Persian heartlands. Its first chapter, the text of the Sixth Broadhead Lecture at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand, provides the immediate occasion for publication, but obviously the volume as a whole is closely related to, and grows out of, B.'s ongoing production of the *Commentary*. This does result in inevitable elements of overlap in the discussion of some incidents and issues, but these are comparatively minor and many of the episodes treated in *Alexander and the East* fall after the point reached in the *Commentary* to date (the mutiny at the Hyphasis in mid-326). Moreover, the *Commentary* explicitly concentrates on close exegesis of the text and eschews long excurses; by contrast, the essays in the volume under review allow B. the opportunity to be more discursive and to pursue themes and arguments in ways precluded by the constraints of the commentary-format.

As one would expect from the subtitle, the tone of the volume is sombre, as B. seeks, among other things, to highlight the human cost of Alexander's conquests. This theme is established in the opening chapter ('The Shield of Achilles: Myth and Reality in the Reign of Alexander the Great'), whose core is a discussion of the battle of the Hydaspes in which B. seeks to present its course and outcome as much from the point of view of the defeated as from that of the victors. Against a tendency in some ancient and modern accounts to present the encounter in an heroic light, B. emphasizes the uneven nature of the contest—'a stark massacre, the annihilation of a relatively small and inexperienced army fatefully embroiled in a battle it had no chance of winning' (p. 21). This theme is resumed in the concluding third of the volume, where Chapter 5 ('The Justification of Terror') stresses the sheer brutality of Alexander's treatment of communities as he progressed down the Indus Valley and Chapter 6 ('Alexander and the Desert') his disregard for the logistical impact of his crossing of Gedrosia on both local inhabitants and his own followers in his pursuit of selfish ambition.

Chapter 2 ('Windows on the Truth') uses episodes from the period in question (notably Ptolemy's attempt to present himself as Patroclus to Alexander's Achilles) to

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

illustrate the range of factors exerting distorting influences on the ancient accounts of Alexander's reign and to (re)state B.'s approach to these source problems, namely the need to 'operate only by cross-comparison [of the sources], painstakingly isolating common material, identifying and explaining variants, and arguing from general probability, that is, the appropriateness of the recorded details to the overall historical context' (p. 34). Interestingly, the chapter concludes that 'in comparison with many periods of ancient history, where we are at the mercy of a single source (and that includes the Peloponnesian War), the reign of Alexander stands out as an oasis of illumination' (p. 65)—an up-beat assessment that may surprise some readers. Although the chapter's explicitly methodological focus means that its links with the other essays are less immediately obvious, the approach outlined is clearly fundamental to B.'s evaluation and use of the ancient sources in the rest of the volume.

The middle two chapters develop two further substantive themes, which B. then relates back to that of the 'costs of conquest'. Chapter 3 ('Information and Misinformation') pursues the intriguing question of cross-cultural (mis)understanding, directing attention to the crucial rôle of interpreters and the propensity for indigenous informants to tailor their reports so as 'to accommodate the prejudices of the enquirer' (p. 70). Although B. also discusses cases where the Macedonians appear to have acquired largely accurate information, major attention is devoted to their failure to comprehend the caste-based character of Indian society, a failure which in turn contributed to the catalogue of Macedonian brutality in the Indus Valley. Chapter 4 ('The Creation of Belief') seeks to understand Alexander's evolving view of his kingship and personal divinity by placing it in the context of 'the cultural isolation of Alexander and his staff, particularly in the period of the Sogdian and Indian campaigns . . . [when] for weeks or even months his companions were his troops and immediate staff, and the range of perspectives available to him was limited' (p. 98), while also linking it back to the rôle of interpreters whose awareness of his interest in Dionysus, for example, led them to transform indigenous local traditions into evidence for the passage of Dionysus through these regions. This in turn served to justify his conquests, while his growing belief in his divinity led inexorably to increasingly autocratic and arbitrary behaviour.

B.'s main themes are important and he develops them well, with numerous trenchant and pithy observations. The portrait of Alexander he builds up is a sobering one, at times chilling. His forthright criticisms of the king will win him few friends among admirers of Alexander, but are a necessary antidote to the recurrent temptation to idealize him. Of the individual essays, I found Chapter 3 on cross-cultural understanding and misconceptions the most consistently stimulating and original. The discussion of the Gedrosian desert episode in Chapter 6, on the other hand, was somewhat disappointing, insofar as it essentially restates, albeit in expanded form, the main points already adumbrated by B. in *Conquest and Empire* (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 142–6.

A final distinctive feature of the volume worth noting is B.'s use of comparative evidence from the conquest of Mexico by Cortés in the early sixteenth century. He discusses this in the preface, where he acknowledges that his original hope of finding large-scale parallels was disappointed, but 'if the analogy did not work in macrocosm, it certainly did in microcosm' (p. vii), and in most cases the deployment of this comparative material is effective and enlightening.

University of Wales, Lampeter A. D. LEE

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ALEXANDRIAS

P. M. FRASER: *Cities of Alexander the Great.* Pp. xi + 263, 2 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. £40. ISBN: 0-19-815006-7.

Alexander's city foundations are a long-standing crux. In a well-known passage Plutarch claimed that 'Alexander founded over 70 cities among barbarian tribes, sprinkled Greek institutions all over Asia, and so overcame its uncivilised and brutish manner of living' (*de Alexandri Magni fortuna aut virtute*, 328E). This erudite and searching study has little time for such fantasies: Plutarch's passage only gets a few belated and dismissive references (pp. 130 n. 50, 181f., 188). It aims to establish as far as possible the factual record of Alexander's city foundations (excluding the many forts and temporary garrisons that were not planned as urban communities, pp. 73, 171). It starts from the premise that the many different sources and traditions on the subject are of very unequal value (Preface, pp. vi–vii), and that the ground must first be cleared of dubious or fictitious attributions (Chapters 1 and 2). Chapter 1 deals with the Alexander foundations listed in Stephanus of Byzantium, the earliest versions of the *Alexander Romance* and the Alexandrian *World-Chronicles* and *Annals* of the imperial period: the Alexandrias listed there have in common that they differ in number and identity from those mentioned by the historians and geographers (p. 16). The illuminating suggestion is then offered that the list of largely fictitious Alexandrias that lies behind them is ultimately of Ptolemaic origin (pp. 30–5, 39–46) and was part of the manipulation of the fame of Alexander by the early Ptolemaic kings in their long rivalry with the Seleucids. Chapter 2 traces the influence of this tradition in the later Iranian sources. The enquiry then moves to the world of the real Alexandrias, those mentioned by the historians, especially Arrian, the fullest source (Chapter 3), then those in the geographers (Chapter 4). But whereas the historians are relatively uncomplicated (Chapter 3 is the briefest and most straightforward in the book), the evidence of the geographers presents a series of difficulties, of a general nature or specific to individual writers, and these are discussed at length. Chapter 5, the longest, then considers in detail the identification and location of the Alexander foundations recorded in the historians and geographers, which have a chance of being historical, unlike those discussed in the first two chapters. Chapter 6 offers a general assessment of Alexander's foundations, the subsequent fate of which is briefly examined in the epilogue (Chapter 7).

Reading this study, Plutarch might have wondered how he could get it so wrong. A list of all the cities whose foundation was credited (rightly or for the most part wrongly) to Alexander falls well short of Plutarch's number, as may be seen from the useful table of Alexander-foundations (pp. 239–43), which only reaches a total of fifty-seven. Once the fictitious or doubtful foundations have been discarded the true list is much more modest, though Fraser does not provide an unambiguous statement of what he believes to have been the total. At the end of the enquiry (p. 201) only six cities are listed as genuine foundations: Alexandria in Egypt, Alexandria in Aria, Alexandria Eschate, Alexandria in Susiana, Alexandria-Bucephalia, and Alexandria among the Oreitai (Rambakia). This leaves out Alexandropolis in Thrace, the early foundation mentioned by Plutarch *Alex. 9*, which F. seems prepared to accept (pp. 26, 29–30; the Plutarch reference is incidentally not given); Alexandria in Arachosia (Kandahar), which earlier in the book F. took to be genuine (tentatively on pp. 132–40, positively on pp. 172 and 199); and Alexandria in the Caucasus, also accepted earlier (pp. 140–51, 172).

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As for Alexander's aims, and the effect his foundations are supposed to have had, Plutarch is again wide of the mark. Alexander's aims are argued to have been primarily political and economic, not cultural. The political aim is identified as part of Alexander's attempt to establish a Macedonian–Persian partnership in the rule of his empire: Alexandria in Aria, Alexandria in Arachosia, Alexandria in the Caucasus, and Alexandria Eschate are all located on or near Achaemenid fortresses or satrapal capitals (pp. 172f.; no reference is made to the debate on Alexander's 'policy of fusion' started by A. B. Bosworth in 'Alexander and the Iranians', *JHS* 100 [1980], 1–21). The economic aim is that hinted at in Arrian (*An.* 4.1.3–4; 6.21.5; *Ind.* 40.8): Alexander wanted to develop contacts between peoples and regions, to promote trade and to encourage settled agricultural life (pp. 174–7). He was also aware of the potential of the Persian Gulf and the sea route to India (pp. 177–80). F. repeats too readily in this context (p. 174) the old colonial cliché of the 'economic stagnation' of Asia under the Achaemenids; against see, for example, P. Briant *Histoire de l'Empire Perse* (Paris, 1996), pp. 820–4, 1065. As far as promoting Greek culture is concerned, F. argues that this does not fit with his and the Macedonians' suspicion of the Greeks, whom he regarded as a necessary evil (pp. 181–5). And whatever the initial aims of Alexander, the new foundations in the east, with the exception of Alexandria in Egypt, declined rapidly and left little trace in the record (Chapter 7). The task of founding Greek cities in Asia was thus left to the successors of Alexander, and especially the Seleucids, who had to start afresh and on a much larger scale than was possible for Alexander.

The book does not make for easy reading. The subject matter is technical, even at times abstruse, and the presentation makes few concessions to the reader (there is no use of subheadings except in the topographical discussion in Chapter 5). There is no consolidated bibliography to collect the numerous titles referred to in the footnotes (this is briefly justified p. x). But this is the most detailed study of Alexander's city foundations to have been attempted since Droysen, and the first on a large scale since Tarn's *Alexander the Great* II (1948), pp. 232–59, though it reaches very different conclusions from him (Tarn took the lists in Stephanus and in the *Alexander Romance* seriously, op. cit., pp. 241–7). It will be an essential work of reference and has besides a wealth of observations on topics related to the enquiry. The reader may at times have to search hard for the hidden gold, but this is an important work which more than repays the effort.

University of St Andrews M. M. AUSTIN

HELLENISTIC JEWS

B. Bar-Kochva: *Pseudo-Hecataeus* On the Jews: *Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora* (Hellenistic Culture and Society). Pp. xii + 396, 5 maps, 4 pls. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1996. Cased, $55/£45. ISBN: 0-520-20059-4.

Bezalel Bar-Kochva's interest in extracting extensive insights into Jewish and Hellenistic culture by close study of the brief extracts ascribed to Hecataeus by Josephus in *Contra Apionem* is exemplified in his fine contribution in Hebrew on the seer Mosollamus to the memorial volume for Menahem Stern published in 1996—similar arguments are found also in this volume (pp. 57–71), although without any reference I can see to the other publication in either work—but in the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

substantial monograph here reviewed B.-K. has succeeded in saying a great deal more. In marked contrast to the general view, best expressed by Menahem Stern himself in his *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, B.-K. argues that nothing in these passages was the work of Hecataeus himself, and that the old hypothesis of a Jewish reviser of Hecataeus' treatise cannot stand. On the contrary, B.-K. affirms with impressive certainty that the passages were composed by a Jewish forger from Alexandria in the late second century B.C. as a means to strengthen the morale of Egyptian Jews by confirming the legitimacy of continual life in the diaspora at a time when the Hasmonaean dynasty had re-established Jewish autonomy in the homeland (p. 247).

This is a clever hypothesis, argued with zest, ingenuity, and wide learning. The book is peppered with good observations about a myriad peripheral topics more or less pertinent to B.-K.'s main claims, and many of these views are discussed in exhaustive detail. The useful index and thorough bibliographical documentation will make the book a frequent source for reference.

B.-K.'s method is in essence unexceptionable. Having established Hecataeus' main interests as known from his other surviving writings, and especially from the passages on the Jews preserved by Diodorus, B.-K. compares with them the passages in *Contra Apionem*, highlighting the discrepancies which tell against authenticity and arguing that these discrepancies are integral to the arguments of the text as a whole; of these, the strangest anomaly is the statement in *C. Ap.* 1.193 that Hecataeus thought it just to admire the Jews for destroying pagan temples and altars (pp. 97–101). B.-K. then discusses in turn the date of composition; the origins and background of the alleged Jewish author; and the framework, genre, structure, contents, and purpose of his work. Appendix A, written with A. Kindler, contains some important observations on the Hezekiah coins.

A useful study, then, but not without weaknesses. The hypothesis about the nature of the alleged Jewish author is built up to a disconcerting degree on arguments from silence (e.g. p. 137: the lack of echo of Alexander Jannaeus 'cannot be accidental'; pp. 140–2: 'he could not have missed out'; p. 148: the lack of philosophical terminology in the extant extracts shows the author's lack of education; p. 230: 'the omissions of Moses and the Exodus could not have occurred accidentally'). Such a procedure seems rash when dealing with a work preserved by a later writer in fragmentary excerpts. At the least it seems desirable to stress the speculative nature of such arguments, whereas B.-K.'s tone is strikingly confident and a hypothesis (e.g. 'it may well be that the author wishes to express a negative opinion about the practice of the Oniad temple in Leontopolis', p. 166) elsewhere appears as a bald statement of fact (thus p. 147: 'The account of the Jerusalem Temple contains veiled criticism of certain practices in the Leontopolis temple'). The impression that B.-K. is making a case, as in a court of law, rather than trying dispassionately to account for the sources is confirmed both by his resort to some strong polemic against other scholars and by his explicit appeal, when thwarted by the lack of evidence, to modern parallels in his impressionistic picture of Egyptian Judaism (pp. 170–9; cf. p. 171 n. 118: 'It stands to reason that there was also a group of extreme conservatives, along lines somewhat similar to the extreme orthodox Jewry of the modern Diaspora'). On the other hand, explicit appeals to commonsense are preferable to assertions for which neither evidence nor argument is given: thus unwary readers might think that the statement that 'Groups and individuals who belonged to these two trends [i.e. Sadducees and Pharisees] immigrated to Egypt from Palestine during the Hellenistic and Roman periods' (p. 176) was based on evidence, but (so far as I know) they would be wrong.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

B.-K.'s positive arguments about the nature of the Jewish author of these fragments are too insubstantial to win universal acceptance, although the existence of views similar to those alleged for this author—that diaspora life was both legitimate in itself and useful for Jews in the homeland—is supported by other evidence collected in the study by Isaiah Gafni, *Land, Center, and Diaspora* (1997), which was published too late for B.-K. to take it into account. But this should not detract from B.-K.'s considerable achievement in his negative arguments. The demonstration that these fragments were not composed by Hecataeus himself is cumulatively persuasive, and it is important, for it will no longer be possible to use these passages as an early gentile witness to Jews and Judaism.

Wolfson College, Oxford MARTIN GOODMAN

ITALIAN MERCENARIES AND SOCIAL MIGRATION

G. TAGLIAMONTE: *I figli di Marte: mobilità, mercenari e mercenariato italici in Magna Grecia e Sicilia.* Pp. 294, ills. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1994. ISBN: 88-7689-118-8.

Published as part of the *Archeologica* series, this book is a welcome introduction to a topic which has been neglected for too long. While the theme of mercenary activity is highlighted throughout, the title is somewhat misleading, since the real focus of the book is social mobility among Italians between the seventh and third centuries B.C. Each separate region of Italy is surveyed, though only Picenum, the Sabina, Samnium, and Umbria are examined at length. Mercenaries from these regions are looked upon through the context of their service in Greek southern Italy and Sicily. Also taken up is the theme of ethnicity, as T. does a thorough job of searching for the origins of many of the peoples covered within his framework. He is thus well placed to discuss the cultural, social, and above all economic reasons behind this phenomenon of social migration through mercenary service. While literary sources are made use of, especially in the later chapters, they are at times either non-existent or too shrouded in mythology to be of any real value. Therefore, the main form of evidence comes from archaeology, specifically warrior burials from southern Italy and Sicily. Where neither written history nor archaeology can shed light on a period, modern anthropological and sociological works are consulted. Through this method, T. uses current constructs of 'traditional' or 'less technologically advanced' societies to decipher the reasons behind the behaviour of various Italian peoples.

The concept of the warrior and his place in a warlike society is first addressed. At the outset T. is successful, giving the reader a vivid picture of native Italian society in the seventh and sixth centuries. However, it is not long before firm ground is abandoned in favour of describing these cultures through current studies in anthropology. With little ancient evidence, T. describes in detail the structure of these warrior societies: their family groupings, their economy, and their military élites. There is little doubt over the significant rôle which armed conflict played in these societies; an examination of the archaeology alone is enough to deduce that motif. But T. goes much further. He presents a highly convincing thesis which claims that the economy was the single most important factor behind war. Very interestingly, and intentionally, he omits any possible political reasons behind the hostilities. Certainly, there would at

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

times be political reasons, but they are beyond our deduction. Indeed, his words pull us away from an examination of what may have been the sparks which acted as catalysts for wars, to their greater, and more important, overall causes. We are thus drawn towards the sound reasoning that the economy played a much larger rôle in the creating and fighting of wars and in social migration than did the military élites who ran these societies, according to T.'s modem anthropological lines of reasoning. On social migration more generally, T. also deals with the important ritual of the *ver sacrum*, which played a major rôle in the large-scale migration of the Samnite and Volscian peoples.

In his chapter on the fifth and fourth centuries, we at last arrive at the discussion of mercenary activity, a topic conspicuously absent from the previous two chapters. According to T., the invasions of various peoples, most notably the Samnites, has in this era transferred warfare from the warrior élites to the hands of the state as a whole, where all men of property and most men of fighting age became involved. Political turmoil in Sicily, usually in the form of Syracusan *stasis*, resulted in large numbers of Italians being hired as mercenaries. Because warfare in Sicily was so often of a civil nature, oligarchies and tyrants alike sought to secure the services of troops who were loyal only to their paymasters; and as the native Sikels and the Carthaginians of the island were often themselves at war with the Sicilian Greeks, these governments logically looked north for a supply of armed manpower. This, as well as the following chapter, which deals with the third century, are mostly narrative, presenting little analysis. The only exception is a fine survey of Italian mercenary service within the Roman army. The author does well with the mercenary revolt at Rhegium in the 270s, but makes no mention of the Gallic mercenaries of the First Punic War. Although lying outside the scope of the book, dealing as it does with Italian mercenaries, this band of Gauls is highly important, in that Zonaras (8.16) says these were the first soldiers ever hired by Rome. The work ends with a series of very useful appendices and plates which catalogue the available literary, epigraphic, numismatic, and some of the most important archaeological evidence.

The true contribution of the book must be measured in its innovative approach to Italian mercenaries. Most scholars have been content to treat mercenary bands such as the Mamertines as simply a group of hired soldiers who took matters into their own hands at Messana. The fact that they were in possession of the city for perhaps twenty-five years before their appeal to Rome has often been ignored. T. reminds us that the Mamertines were more than just mercenaries, they were an Oscan cultural unit who had by choice migrated to Sicily. Once out of the employment of Agathokles, return home was not a viable option. We must also remember that they were merely a part of the phenomenon of mass migration of Italians to the Greek areas of the west through mercenary service. That said, it should be pointed out that the peaceful settlement of mercenaries in Messana, as was the original case with the Mamertines once they left Syracuse, is not without precedent—Diodoros (2.76.4–6) describes a similar action occurring in 460. Although not enough to establish a pattern, overlooking this episode, as the author does, is simply unwise. The work also suffers from the approach taken to the Italian peoples. They are on the whole looked at in terms of the Greek world, and T. too readily assumes the existence of similar institutions in both a Greek *polis* and a native Italian tribal society. Perhaps this stems from the over-reliance on modern anthropological works, which causes T. to speculate far too much about archaic Italy. However, these criticisms should not detract from what is an extremely valuable contribution to scholarship. This well-researched book is the first of its kind, and its greatest contribution is that it treats Italian mercenaries

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in Greek service as distinct cultural entities, making it a most welcome addition to the scholarship of the period.

University of St Andrews JOHN SERRATI

METALS IN THE GREEK WORLD

M. Y. Treister: *The Role of Metals in Ancient Greek History*. (*Mnemosyne* Supplement, 156.) Pp. xiv + 481, 50 pp. ills. Leiden, New York, and Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1996. Cased, Hfl. 266.50/$167.50. ISBN: 90-04-10473-9.

Scissors-and-paste history is alive and well in Russia, judging by this revised and translated version of T.'s habilitation thesis, long stretches of which do nothing but string together extracts from the work of other scholars. A couple of random examples may suffice to indicate the depths of dependence too often plumbed:

> Treister, p. 121:
> S. C. Humphreys considers Archaic trade in the broad context of exchanges between the Aegean world and the oikumenoi [*sic*] in the course of which the export and import of manpower was of greater significance than any exchange of goods. The latter could not really be subdivided into 'trade' proper and the circulation of goods as the result of war, hospitality and gift-exchange.

> S. Humphreys, *Anthropology and the Greeks* (1978), p. 169:
> . . . archaic Greek trade should be seen as part of a much wider context of exchanges between the Aegean and the world beyond, in which the import and export of manpower were of greater moment than the exchange of goods, and upon which a rigid distinction between 'trade' and the transfer of goods through war, raiding, hospitality, and gift-exchange cannot be imposed.

(Compare the whole of p. 272, filled with a series of extracts from the same source.)

> Treister, p. 365:
> On the whole, the Hellenistic Greeks went one better than their classical predecessors in the matter of dedicating entire ships. Not only did they have ships much larger than the trireme to dedicate, which will made [*sic*] an even greater impact than before. But, as is shown by the ship dedications at Delos and Samothrace, the arrangements for ship dedications could be more elaborate and permanent than simply beaching and dedicating a captured ship on the shore nearest to the site of a naval victory

> E. Rice, in Rich & Shipley (edd.), *War and Society in the Greek World* (1993), pp. 243–4:
> The hellenistic Greeks, however, went one better than their classical predecessors in the matter of dedicating entire ships. Not only did they have ships much larger than triremes to dedicate, which will have made an even greater impression than before, but, as two particular monuments show, the arrangements for ship dedications could involve more elaborate and permanent preparations than simply the beaching and dedicating of a captured ship on the shore adjacent to the site of a naval victory.

The amount of slightly garbled paraphrase (not to use a stronger P-word) is embarrassing, but fortunately it is not all quite as bad as this, and T. does conscientiously

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

give references, although sometimes the relevant publication appears only as the last item in the footnote.

T. is not a particularly skilful cutter and paster. This is not a problem in the parts of the book which offer straightforward catalogues of mining sites, workshops, and finds of metalwork (separately for the Geometric, Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods), but where the extracts are supposed to contribute to an argument about 'the role of metals in Greek history' the disjointed presentation gives the reader a hard time. The conclusion, although largely a cut-and-paste job from the body of the text, does help make things clearer.

The most interesting argument is that the search for metals by mother-cities did not play a major part in Greek colonization. T. presents detailed surveys of mining in 'colonial' areas, Greek artefacts found in metal-bearing regions, and metal-working in Greek overseas settlements (pp. 146–81), all of which contribute helpfully to the debate, even if the key argument is not so much the material evidence as the plausible assumption that 'the primary consideration was the degree to which the site chosen satisfied . . . first of all the interests of the migrants, not those of the mother city' (pp. 178 = 399). Noteworthy also are a couple of challenges to suggestions made by Anthony Snodgrass. First, T. argues that metal was traded in the shape of ingots, rather than as ore, from *c.* 600 B.C. onwards (pp. 97–103, 260, 389). Secondly, and more importantly, he shows convincingly that the evidence from dedications does not, after all, indicate a change in bronze production from tripod-cauldrons to hoplite panoplies in the mid-seventh century (pp. 128–31, 392). T. thinks that he has thereby also disproved Snodgrass's theory that there was a shift towards the public display of wealth *c.* 700 B.C., but clearly he has not. It is a pity, moreover, that he fails to draw the more general conclusion that dedications provide evidence for patterns of consumption, but do not lend themselves to conclusions about levels of production—a point recently argued most effectively by Stephen Hodkinson (in *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, edited by N. Fisher and H. van Wees, if you will pardon the shameless plug).

Many other matters are treated in detail, including metallurgical and metal-working techniques, location and layout of workshops, specialization of labour, migration of craftsmen, coinage, and prices. It is not always clear that the author holds any particular view on these topics. The conclusion, for instance, that prices of metal were 'influenced by various factors linked both to its quality and relative accessibility and its cheapness' (p. 391), must be one of the least controversial things ever said on the subject. No metal-related issues have been left out, but some get less space than one might have expected: the discussion of metal grave goods, mostly borrowed from Ian Morris, adds up to only about two pages (pp. 115–16, 269, 369), or less than half the space allocated to 'technological redistribution', i.e. the practice of melting down metal objects (pp. 266–8, 367–9).

Since T. is Russian, it is understandable that his English, even as improved by Brill's editor, is less than fluent; since he is an archaeologist, he may perhaps also be forgiven for being less than word-perfect in Greek. He struggles with singulars and plurals ('a kuroi', p. 67; 'a bothroi', p. 113; 'one poleis', p. 223; 'another poleis', p. 241) and with personal names ('Pausanius' and 'Didyms' throughout; 'Nepo' [= Nepos], 'Agesilaes', 'Hyteion' [= Gytheion], and 'Cynadones' [= Kinadon] all feature on a single page, p. 224). There is a further hint of unfamiliarity with the ancient sources when T. notes the 120 slaves in the shield workshop of Polemarchos and the 120 slaves in the shield workshop of Lysias and his brother (whose property was seized by 'the Thirties') in

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the same paragraph, without realizing that the two books on which he draws are talking about the same thing (p. 219).

On the other hand, T. has read extremely widely and is very familiar with the archaeological record, as is evident throughout the book but nowhere more so than in his fifty-one-page bibliography, containing an estimated 1,400 titles, including thirty-six of his own publications. The sheer mass of the material—a good deal of it from Russian sources and thus inaccessible to most of us—is a major asset to the book, as is the exhaustive eighteen-page index, which even has a whole column devoted to entries for 'Greek' and 'Greece'—not for T. the weaselly '*passim*'. While it seems fair to say, then, that *The Role of Metals* is not so much a book as a stack of note cards, it must be said, too, that the stack is staggeringly large and that many of the cards are jolly useful.

University College London HANS VAN WEES

GREEK HISTORIOGRAPHY

C. AMPOLO: *Storie greche. La formazione della moderna storiografia sugli antichi Greci*. Pp. xiv + 162, 34 pls. Turin: Giulio Einaudi, 1997. Paper, L. 28,000. ISBN: 88-06-14403-0.

A. begins his history of the modern study of ancient Greece with the assertion that 'la storia della storiografia è disciplina riconosciuta in vari paesi' (p. ix). Yet until recently such discussions were often hidden away in arcane journals, and it is only with the publication of and reaction to Martin Bernal's *Black Athena* (which A. takes as the *terminus ante quem* for his study) that the debate on modern historiography of classical antiquity has impinged upon a more general audience. If the reaction to *Black Athena* was unavoidably polemical because of the social, cultural, and intellectual contexts in which it was formulated, A.'s *Storie greche* attempts a more measured response to the issues raised by Bernal. The result is not just a survey of modern histories of ancient Greece, but a distinguished contribution to studies of the intellectual traditions of modern European historical thought.

The book falls into two parts, one narrative, the other thematic. Part I (pp. 5–109) provides a comprehensive account of the development of modern historical writing on ancient Greece down to the early years of the twentieth century. A. begins very early indeed, with a brilliant sketch of the retreat of classical Greece from the historical consciousness of the late Roman and early Byzantine world. This oblivion was compounded by the development of a Christian view of history, which submitted knowledge about the ancient past to a sacred scheme drawn from Daniel's prophecy of four earthly kingdoms. This vision of the past was extremely enduring, and A. is right to stress its significance for all later developments. His history of the modern historiography of ancient Greece proceeds to set it against the major intellectual revolutions of the Renaissance and after. Humanism, the Cartesian assault on the sacred vision of the universe, and responses to the American and French revolutions all play their part in shaping the modern historical vision of ancient Greece. A. is careful to note also the important methodological advances that helped transform views of antiquity. To this end, he charts the demise of uncritical antiquarianism in the face of more rigorous archaeological, epigraphic, and philological approaches, and notes the significance of the rise of Greek history as a subject taught in universities.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Part II (pp. 113–149) comprises three thematic essays dealing in turn with universal history, the rise of economic history, and the implications of *Black Athena* itself (this last is an updated and expanded version of the review of Bernal's book A. published in *Quaderni Storici* n.s. 82 [1993], 261–5). The marriage between Parts I and II is not an entirely happy one. I wonder if it might not have been better to integrate these reflections into the main narrative text: as it is they stand somewhat uncomfortably as appendices with little direct relation to the rest of the book (there are no cross-references). This points to one of the deficiencies of the book: because A.'s narrative breaks off with the conception of the first edition of *The Cambridge Ancient History* (p. 105), it leaves the story of developments after World War II largely untold. I cannot help but feel that this diminishes the value of *Storie greche*.

One of the particular joys of the book is its use of illustrations. A. emphasizes their importance as visual metaphors for theories of history: Pl. 1, for example, shows Daniel's four monarchies embodied as the *Colossus Monarchicus*, whose helmet, cuirass, and legs are covered with lists of monarchs from Nimrod to the Austrian emperor Joseph II, by way of Alexander the Great and Augustus. While the inclusion of such matter is certainly a virtue, it points to another problem with A.'s vision of the formation of the modern historiography on antiquity. At no point does A. discuss in any detail the extent to which it compares with contemporary advances in other areas of intellectual enquiry. The stress A. puts on illustrations as visual metaphors could have been compared fruitfully with similar work that has been done on seventeenth-, eighteenth-, and nineteenth-century geological publications (see, for example, S. J. Gould, *Time's Arrow, Time's Cycle* [Cambridge, MA, 1987]).

It would be unfair to end on a negative note, however. With *Storie greche* A. has joined the first rank of historians of the modern historiography of the ancient world. Moreover, in a climate where such studies continue to be influenced by the ideological reactions to *Black Athena*, his calm approach deserves the highest praise.

National University of Ireland, Maynooth MARK HUMPHRIES

PUNIC WARS

B. D. Hoyos: *Unplanned Wars: the Origins of the First and Second Punic Wars*. (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte, 50.) Pp. xiv + 326, maps. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 3-11-015564-8.

In this closely argued but highly readable book Hoyos presents what is arguably the clearest and most detailed analysis, at least in English, of the origins of two of the most important wars of antiquity. Within a chronological framework, he gives an account, first, of the origins of the First Punic War, beginning with the early, friendly relations between Rome and Carthage, and ending with the escalation of hostilities in the war's early years (Chapters I–VII). He then discusses the inter-war relations between the two powers (VIII–XI) before coming to the clash over Saguntum which led to the Hannibalic War (XII–XV). He ends with a chapter of 'conclusions' (XVI), and a discussion of the ancient sources (XVII).

Broadly speaking, his conclusions are that both wars were unplanned by either side, and possibly avoidable. They were the result of an interlocking series of misconceptions and mistakes against a background of broader issues, but were not due to such

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'fundamental' factors as, for example, Roman imperialism or Barcid desires for revenge. I, too, am increasingly convinced that this way of analysing the origins of wars is the right one, and that Thucydides' famous distinction between profound and superficial causes really only obfuscates the issues. In so controversial a field it would be impossible to satisfy everyone, but such is the combination of acuteness and common sense with which H. sets out his conclusions that it is certainly difficult to argue that he is wholly wrong, and in the case of the second war, I am almost wholly convinced.

On the first war, however, I have two main, interrelated reservations. The first is on the question whether, when the Romans decided to help the Mamertines, they thought that they were, in effect, going to war with Syracuse and only later found they were embroiled with Carthage. The chief difficulty with this is, of course, that in Polybios, to say nothing of the other sources, it is Carthage that looms large in the debate from the first. It is possible that this is due to hindsight and that the debates were really about whether to risk war with Syracuse, but the unanimity of the ancient evidence gives one pause. H. admits (p. 57) that 'the Carthaginians were no doubt mentioned' and, more particularly, that 'the Romans had surely learned of the Punic garrison at Messana'. But, if so, did they not envisage the possibility of having to fight Carthage?

Second, would the Romans have perceived a Syracusan occupation of Messana as a serious threat? H. argues that the Carthaginians were not a threat, but that is not the point. The point is how the Romans perceived them, and it is turning common sense on its head to argue that the Romans were not worried by the fact of Carthage's occupying Messana, but were worried about the possibility of Hiero's seizing the place. They presumably had some idea of how far Carthaginian rule in western Sicily extended, and to find them suddenly in a town at its north-eastern tip is likely to have been more worrying than the prospect of Syracuse's simply extending its rule in eastern Sicily.

Two minor points are that the significance of the evidence for the activities of Romans in Sicily before the first war (p. 30) is perhaps exaggerated. In particular, Postumius the pirate was surely not a member of the patrician *gens Postumia* (p. 28), any more than was Postumius of Pyrge, one of the leaders in the insurance swindle of 214 (Livy 25.3.8ff.), and the milestone bearing the name of a consul Cotta (p. 282) can surely have nothing to do with the consul of 252 and 248, who would hardly be building roads in western Sicily in the midst of a war.

On the second war, my quibbles are even less serious, but it seems dubious whether the Barcid failure to build up their naval strength implies 'not a purely landbound war-plan, but no war-plan' (p. 153). To try to match Rome at sea would certainly have involved the home government, and, in any case, after his experience in 241, Hamilcar at least is likely to have viewed seapower with some scepticism. Revenge was probably not a principal cause of the war, but Carthaginian naval weakness is not a cogent argument against it. Similarly, it is true that Punic finds in southern France are weak evidence for Carthaginian garrisons, but it is an even weaker argument against their existence to argue that 'they never sought to impede' the passage of Roman armies to Spain (p. 270), since these went by sea.

Such considerations apart, this is a splendid book.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne J. F. LAZENBY

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CAESARIS ASTRUM

P. DOMENICUCCI: *Astra Caesarum: Astrologia e catasterismo da Cesare a Domiziano*. (Testi e studi di cultura classica, 16.) Pp. 191. Pisa: ETS, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 88-741-932-6.

J. T. RAMSEY, A. L. LICHT: *The Comet of 44 BC and Caesar's Funeral Games*. (APA American Classical Studies, 39.) Pp. xx + 236, 12 figs. Atlanta, GA: Scholars' Press, 1997. Cased, $27.95 (Paper, $17.95). ISBN: 0-7885-0273-5 (0-7885-0274-3 pbk).

Nobody has yet adduced Hale–Bopp, which appeared in March 1997, as a portent of Diana's death in August of the same year. Nonetheless (thanks to Elton John) we are capable of imagining an eschatology for her in astral terms: 'Now you belong to heaven, and the stars spell out your name.' In the case of Julius Caesar, the cometary portents of his death and the ensuing civil wars (Virgil *Geo*. 1.487f.) were both similar to the comet which, rising at his *ludi funebres* in 44 B.C., marked the passage of his soul to the stars, and necessarily differentiated from it. This dialectical process in cometary interpretation is marked out for us in two monographs, Domenicucci, and Ramsey and Licht (the latter a remarkable collaboration between a classicist and an astronomer).

The two books are largely complementary: for example, R. & L. concentrate on Pliny *N.H.* 2.93–4 and the historical sources derived from it rather than the more-or-less contemporary poetic allusions to the *Sidus Iulium*, while D., concentrating on the poetic allusions, scants the historical vicissitudes of the interpretation of Caesar's comet. D.'s study is wider ranging than R. & L.'s, being in essence a survey of the catasterism (enstarment) of emperors from Caesar to Domitian: nonetheless R. & L., despite their more circumscribed chronological ambit, have produced the weightier work.

The common ground between the two books lies in the questions they ask about Caesar's comet. First, the comet appeared at some *ludi* (so Pliny, supposedly quoting Augustus' memoirs composed *c.* 23 B.C.); but whose games were they, Caesar's or Venus', and were they held in July, Caesar's month, or September, the month of the Republican *Ludi Veneris Genetricis*? Then there is the problem of the comet's propitiousness (Virgil *Ecl*. 9.48 and Pliny *N.H.* 2.94), comets usually being for the Romans negative signs (cf. Manilius 1.874f.). Then that of the celestial region of the comet, which has to be deduced from a collection of sources which are all astronomically imprecise; and finally the question of whether Caesar's comet represented his catasterism in the sense that one might expect from Hellenistic literature on the subject, where astral mythology and quasi-scientific astrothesis go hand in hand, mythic characters or rulers becoming permanent and readily identifiable constellations. A comet is *ex officio* both unpredictable (the ancients had no grasp of periodicity) and ephemeral.

To take D. first, he nowhere refers to the work of Tamsyn Barton (*Power and Knowledge*, [Ann Arbor, 1994]; *Ancient Astrology* [London, 1994]; 'Augustus and Capricorn: Astrological Polyvalency and Imperial Rhetoric', *JRS* 85 [1995], 33–51), which is integral to his chapter on Caesar's comet. Nor does he cite Stefan Weinstock's *Divus Julius* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 310–84, 'Caesaris Astrum', which intersects directly with his own remarks on Hellenistic astral iconography in his introduction. D. seems a bit light on anglophone scholarship, as well as on recent bibliography generally. The

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

occasional ancient source is overlooked too: in his introduction, pp. 23f., for example, he mentions Callimachus fr. 110 Pfeiffer (the Lock of Berenice) but neglects fr. 228, the Apotheosis of Arsinoë.

In his three chapters, 'Cesare e le stelle', 'Il cielo di Augusto', and 'Il cielo degli imperatori da Augusto a Domiziano', D. is hampered by his relentless quest to place the catasterized emperors precisely on the star-map, rather than acknowledging the polysemy of the references to their catasterism. His treatment of the material is sometimes sketchy: Lucan, for instance, could have been milked far more in Chapter 3, perhaps to show that the Romans had an inherently ambiguous relationship with catasterism, a point which seems lacking in D.'s somewhat unitary view (compare, for example, his interpretation on p. 154 of Lucan's *laudes Neronis* at the beginning of *Pharsalia* I with Stephen Hinds's more subtle reading of the same passage in *Allusion and Intertext* (Cambridge [1998], pp. 87f.).

One should not, however, lose sight of the value of D.'s study. Chapter I Part 2 is an example of his opening up of a most fruitful area, the identification of the *De astris* attributed to Julius Caesar. D. also highlights the paradoxical nature of astronomy/astrology in the Empire. The Julian régime continued to venerate scientific astronomy even though the new calendar had rendered it superfluous in time-keeping; and the importance of astrology is to be deduced from the ambiguity of emperors' relations with the stars from the time of Augustus, who published his horoscope by edict in 11 B.C. (Dio 56.25.5), and whose régime saw the first in a series of edicts against astrologers by emperors, in order to prevent the destinies of imperial rivals, as foretold by *mathematici*, from impinging upon their own heavenly mandate.

Given the established rôle of the stars in the Hellenistic and late Republican discourse of power, one could be forgiven for seeing Octavian's exploitation of Caesar's comet as merely part of the fabrication of dynasty. The Harvard astrophysicist Brian Marsden hits this particular nail on the head in his introduction to R. & L. (p. xiii): 'Is the Roman observation entirely fictitious?' In fact, R. & L. is largely devoted to proving the historicity of Caesar's comet, with the help of Chinese cometary observations.

The book falls into two parts: (i) 'The Foundation of the *Ludi Victoriae Caesaris*', an intricate examination of the historical evidence for the name and date of the games at which the comet appeared, and (ii) 'Caesar's Comet', which builds up a picture of the nature, place of first appearance, and orbit of the comet from the literary record. The *tour de force* of the second part of the book is the construction in Chapter 6 of an orbit for 'Comet Caesar' from records of a Chinese sighting of it between 18 May and 16 June 44 B.C., and the Roman sighting of 20–30 July. With this, the comet blasts its way convincingly into historical reality.

R. & L. get very technical at times, and to understand some of the latter section of the monograph fully the ideal reader would possess knowledge of the two basic mathematical components of natural science, exponentials and logarithms. However, this is not essential, since the parts of the work written in the language of mathematical astronomy come complete with abstracts which refer directly to relevant diagrams. In addition, an invaluable part of the work for the classicist is Appendix I, where every historical attestation of the comet and poetic allusion to it is set out.

R. & L.'s own manipulations of the historical evidence (such as their treatment of Cicero) are well thought out, and provide an interesting example of how the facts surrounding the games and the comet's appearance continue to be reinterpreted in the modern period. If the hypotheses presented by R. & L. are right, then Octavian played a much greater rôle in shaping the *post mortem* image of Caesar, via his comet, than

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

previously thought. Caesar's image was a key device in Octavian's establishment of his own power. The fact that the comet was in a sense Octavian's 'political horoscope' is rightly adduced by R. & L. to explain Pliny's enigmatic 'sibi illum natum seque in eo nasci' (*N.H.* 2.94).

R. & L. are more subtle than D. in that they see in the comet a complex process of negotiation between Octavian and his opponents played out on the astrological field. Thus they show more convincingly the true worth in studying Caesar's comet.

University of Exeter EMMA GEE

MUNERA

C. DRECOLL: *Die Liturgien im römischen Kaiserreich des 3. und 4. Jh. n. Chr.* (*Historia* Einzelschriften, 116.) Pp. 401. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. Paper, DM 144. ISBN: 3-515-07151-2.

Administration in the cities of the Roman Empire was to a large extent performed not by paid officials but by private individuals who had volunteered or been conscripted to perform a particular task involving administration, or payment of money, or physical labour, or a combination of several of these, for a period which was usually one year. The persons who performed these so-called liturgies—munera in Latin—in no case received wages. Sometimes the expenses incurred were considerable. It was not only the administration of the city, and of the villages in its territory, that depended on these services. Liturgies were also a vital component of the structure of the Empire: the collection of imperial taxes, and in fact of all resources required by the imperial administration and army, depended on them. Men at every social level, decurions, shopkeepers-craftsmen, down to the humblest individuals, were liable to be conscripted for some duty or other according to his station and financial resources. In Egypt, about which we know far more than any other area, as many as perhaps a third of the inhabitants of a typical village may have been involved in some kind of compulsory public work at any one time. To date the only systematic study of these compulsory public duties has been F. Oertel's *Die Liturgie* (Leipzig, 1917), which deals exclusively with Egypt. Since 1917 many relevant papyri have been published or commented on, and there has been much detailed work about liturgies in various parts of the Empire. So it is obvious that Drecoll's book fills a gap.

The book begins with a discussion of qualifications, exemptions, and procedures for the appointment of liturgants. It then describes the liturgical duties exacted in Egypt, starting with those of magistrates like the *gymnasiarch* and the *prytanis*, and going on to a long and varied succession of other liturgical tasks. These include the collection of imperial taxes, policing, the staffing of archives and public banks, the running of the whole range of public services in the city, and the maintenance of embankments and canals. There is also an account of the compulsory duties specific to villages (summarized on p. 279). There follows a more cursory discussion, based on epigraphic evidence, of liturgies elsewhere than in Egypt. The testimony of Libanius is given a chapter—which is, however, rather superficial—to itself. There follows a discussion of the legal regulation of liturgies. The book ends with an interesting attempt to assess the pressure the system imposed on the men subject to it. D. concludes that the financial demands made on decurions were supportable, and not so

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

heavy as to bring financial ruin. He discusses the significance of the fact that liturgants and the men who nominated them had to pledge their property for the correct performance of their liturgy. He shows that this pledge did not mean what has generally been thought: the liturgant did not accept unlimited liability, so that for example a tax collector did not pledge himself to meet out of his own pocket any shortfall in the anticipated tax, no matter how large, nor a shipper to replace at his own expense the whole of a cargo lost through an 'act of God'. The pledge merely provided the authorities with a security against fraud. The liturgical system was remarkably uniform. All over the Empire liturgies were governed by the same regulations, their holders subject to the same exemptions, qualification, and sanctions, but liturgies were more numerous and more varied in the Greek East than in the Latin West (summarized on pp. 270–5). D. confirms the suggestion, made by other scholars, that by the fourth century Egypt was in the main administered on the same principles as the rest of the Empire, so that analogies from Egypt can be applied to reconstruct institutions elsewhere, and vice versa. D.'s book will surely become an indispensable work of reference.

The book is essentially a synchronic survey. It is much less good at describing, and explaining, change. The period covered was, however, one of great changes, and D. inevitably touches on these. He mentions the creation of a class of villages that were held collectively responsible for the taxes demanded from individual inhabitants. He suggests that for this category of village tax collection was transferred from decurions to officials. He links this with the confiscation of the civic estates and revenues by the imperial government, and an alleged merging of the financial office of the city with the imperial finance office of the *nome* to form a single imperial finance office at city level. He at least implies that the 'Byzantine' pagarchate also originated at this time. (On these developments see pp. 145–57, and summary on pp. 353–4). It seems to me that these topics require much fuller discussion than they have received here if the conclusions are to be taken seriously. For instance, *P. Caire* 67019 shows that in 551 Menas was only the ninth pagarch of Antaeopolis. The 'Byzantine' pagarch cannot therefore have come into being as early as the fourth century. The development of the financial administration of 'Byzantine' Egypt is still far from clear. (I have made some suggestions in *BZ* 89 [1996], 389–408.) There is also the problem of the decline of the *curiae*. This urban élite and its troubles receive much less sympathetic treatment today than they did from earlier historians. But sympathy apart, it is a fact that this class, which was still performing a key rôle for city and Empire in the fourth century, soon after faded into relative insignificance In other words, when the Empire came under pressure, and the demands made on the liturgants became heavier, the system was no longer sustainable. Why was that? It should probably be conceded that *curiae* did not fail because large numbers of decurions were actually forced into bankruptcy. What happened was rather that for all but a few exceptionally wealthy and influential individuals the risks of being a decurion became intolerable, at least if there were alternatives, as there were in the growing administration and the Church. That in the conditions of the fourth century the position of a decurion was uncertain and vulnerable in the extreme is shown quite clearly by the evidence, for instance, of Libanius and Synesius and others, which needs to be interpreted, but should not be simply discounted.

Nottingham W. LIEBESCHUETZ

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LATE ROMAN WARFARE

H. ELTON: *Warfare in Roman Europe AD 350–425* (Oxford Classical Monographs). Pp. xvii + 312, 23 figs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-19-815007-5.

This book is derived from E.'s 1990 Oxford thesis, which covered a somewhat longer period down to A.D. 500. These origins are evident in its dense learning and enormously detailed (and useful) footnotes. The reduction in scale has enhanced coherence, and the finished product is a work of real scholarship. For those familiar with the field, it provides a thorough insight into the working and nature of the Late Roman army and the enemies it faced on the northern frontier.

The focus in the first part is on German warfare and society. The semi-sedentary nature of the Germans at this period is emphasized in order to demonstrate why agricultural imperatives demanded that military operations in the north should be seasonal and of short duration. The large tribes which appear in the Roman sources really refer only to smaller groupings (*pagi*) inhabiting the same geographical area, each of which had its own king. These local kingships were based on power rather than heredity, and coalitions were rare. Thus attacks on the Roman empire normally took the form of shallow raids with little advance planning, were aimed at plunder, and were sometimes undertaken in winter by no more than a few hundred warriors of a single *pagus*. Pitched battles and prolonged sieges were the exception. The invasion which led to the Strasbourg campaign of 357 was highly unusual in involving four to six *pagi* and 35,000 men, including mercenaries, and ending in a major engagement. Raids were by no means annual occurrences and were often separated by significant periods of peace. Indeed, larger-scale warfare aimed at conquest and settlement only become frequent in the fifth century.

E. thus argues that the threat to the northern frontier has been overstated, at least for the fourth century, both in our sources and in modern interpretations. He also suggests that the importance of cavalry among the Germans has been exaggerated, with the mounted arm making up only one-fifth to one-third of their overall forces (though one might counter that the latter figure is, in fact, very large by any standards).

E.'s survey of the Late Roman army covers more familiar territory, though here, too, he plays down the size of the cavalry forces, noting that there were more mounted units among the *limitanei* than with the field armies. The army thus remained essentially a heavy infantry force, just as it had always been. E. also follows recent specialist work in stressing that the archaeological and iconographical evidence suggests that troops still wore helmets and armour, despite the assertions of Vegetius. He accepts that there were financial problems in paying for the army, especially in the West in the fifth century, as much because of a reduction in imperial income as an increase in the number of troops, but does not see the problem as overwhelming. Nor does he see barbarization as essentially destructive of the army's efficiency and loyalty although analysis suggests that up to one-third of officers were of barbarian origin.

Foreign policy is seen as showing little change from the Principate, being essentially defensive and reactive, employing diplomacy and exploiting internal divisions wherever possible. Strategy did change with the development of the field armies, which were used to conduct counter-attacks and even invasions of barbarian territory as a demonstration. But most raids continued to be blocked at the frontiers by *limitanei* who were well organized and effective. E. notes that, while they survived,

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

there were no recorded breakthroughs by any force of less than 400 men (an *argumentum ex silentio*, of course).

The picture painted by E. of the Late Roman army is essentially positive. The introduction of Goths and other peoples into the Empire did encourage them to form identifiable power groups to an extent which they had not attained while outside it. The loss of territory from the Western Empire, especially in Africa in the fifth century, resulted in a reduction of both manpower and financial resources. Growing external pressure and internal dissension among Roman commanders also took their toll. But the army itself, E. argues, did not suffer from structural failure, even at Adrianople, nor was it fatally weakened by barbarization.

One can take issue with individual parts of E.'s picture, such as the playing down of the significance of cavalry for both sides, or the claim that the Romans regularly used spies beyond the frontiers (p. 187), or the representation of the *limitanei* as a sort of customs force, charged with enforcing a ban on the export of weapons which did not exist, at least in this period (p. 205). But the overall argument is very well presented and cogent, and gives a vivid impression of the nature and operation of warfare in the late fourth century. As such, this is a worthy counterpart to A. Goldsworthy's *The Roman Army at War 100 B.C.–A.D. 200* (Oxford, 1996) which does much the same for the earlier period. It is a significant contribution to our understanding of the Late Roman army and the Late Roman period as a whole.

Production and proof-reading are mostly impeccable, but note that the graph in Fig. 8 has mistakenly used labelling from Fig. 9.

Royal Holloway, London BORIS RANKOV

STAFF OFFICERS

J. OTT: *Die Beneficiarier: Untersuchungen zu ihrer Stellung innerhalb der Rangordnung des römischen Heeres und zu ihrer Funktion.* (*Historia* Einzelschriften, 92.) Pp. 246, 15 maps, 5 pls. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1995. Paper. ISBN: 3-515-06660-8.

The study of Roman army staff officers who bore the rank of *beneficiarius* was considerably advanced in 1982 with the discovery of a sacred enclosure near the fort of Osterburken in Germany. This eventually yielded twenty-five complete and several more partial altars set up by *beneficiarii* of the governor of Germania Superior. The Landesdenkmalamt Baden-Württemberg, which carried out a meticulous excavation of the site in the 1980s, was subsequently awarded a grant of DM 150,000 from lottery funds to publish their findings. Part of this sum was spent in putting together a corpus of 959 known inscriptions recording *beneficiarii*, which appeared as E. Schallmayer et al. (edd.), *Der römische Weihebezirk von Osterburken I* (Stuttgart, 1990). O. was one of the editors of the project, and the present book arises out of his subsequent Frankfurt dissertation, submitted in 1993. He was also a participant and contributor at a related international conference held at Osterburken in 1990, the papers from which were published in *Der römische Weihebezirk von Osterburken II* (Stuttgart, 1994). Although O.'s book has appeared since that volume,

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

he was evidently unable to make direct use of its contents. This is regrettable, and helps to explain some of the book's shortcomings.

Beneficiarii varied enormously in rank and function, depending on the senior officer to whom they were attached (by whose *beneficium* they were released from ordinary duties): thus, a *beneficiarius consularis* on the staff of a provincial governor was concerned with far more important work and greatly outranked a *beneficiarius praefecti cohortis* on the staff of an equestrian unit commander. The *Osterburken I* corpus, understandably organized entirely geographically, was unable to take account of these distinctions. O. clearly recognizes them and lists the various types of *beneficiarii*, but he is locked into the overarching framework inherited from the corpus and is not always successful in keeping the different types separate. For instance, he discusses promotions to and from *beneficiarius consularis* in a legionary context rather than in the separate, though overlapping, context of the *officium consularis* (pp. 39ff.); he consequently overlooks the significance of the frequent, and apparently special, promotion of former *frumentarii* to this rank. Elsewhere, admittedly following Rostovtzeff, he regards the *beneficiarii tribuni* of *cohors XX Palmyrenorum*, supposedly posted at one of the gates of Dura Europos, as performing essentially the same function as outposted *beneficiarii consularis* (pp. 70–1), and apparently takes a *beneficarius* of the fort commander at Birdoswald as being on outpost there (p. 88). *Beneficiarii consularis* themselves are treated as if almost their only duty was to serve in such outposts or *stationes* (pp. 82ff.). While the great majority are indeed recorded in this context, this can be attributed entirely to the habit of making dedications to mark the completion of such an outposting. It is quite possible, and indeed from the evidence quite likely, that they actually spent most of their service at provincial headquarters.

There are other misinterpretations resulting from insufficient sensitivity in the use of epigraphic evidence or language. For instance, the quantitative overview of the distribution of *stationes* in the provinces (pp. 100–1) does not allow for the vagaries of epigraphic survival, while the chronological overview (pp. 101–3) ignores the distorting effect of the third-century 'epigraphic bulge', thus largely vitiating the conclusions that follow. Throughout, the term *statio* itself is taken to imply the existence of a specific building, whereas it is at least as likely that it normally means simply an outposting in the abstract. Another misunderstanding is the interpretation of *speculatores* of the Praetorian cohorts as judicial officials, like the *speculatores* of the *officium consulare* (p. 42), whereas all the evidence points to their being a special mounted bodyguard.

It will be clear from the above that the study of the *beneficiarii* is an epigraphic minefield which all scholars, including the present writer, enter at their peril. The best one can do is to tread very carefully and learn from the experiences of one's predecessors. This is by no means a bad book. It presents a great deal of information and draws attention to many of the problems associated with these officers and the solutions which have been put forward. It must, however, be used with extreme caution, especially by those new to the subject. Although the title suggests that this is meant to be the basic work on *beneficiarii*, those who wish to understand these officers in all their guises would be better advised to begin with the papers, including O.'s, which appear in *Osterburken II*.

Royal Holloway, London BORIS RANKOV

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

THE LATE ROMAN ARMY

P. SOUTHERN, K. R. DIXON: *The Late Roman Army*. Pp. xvii + 206, 83 figs, 19 pls. London: B. T. Batsford, 1996. Cased. ISBN: 0-7134-7047-X.

A book in English on the Late Roman army is long overdue. D. Van Berchem's *L'armée de Dioclétien et la réforme Constantinienne* (Paris, 1952) and D. Hoffmann's *Die spätrömische Bewegungsheer und die Notitia Dignitatum* (Düsseldorf, 1969–70) are both ageing and beyond the linguistic capabilities of the average modern undergraduate (or even postgraduate) student. The most detailed study in English appears in the chapters of A. H. M. Jones's *The Later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1964), which is nearly thirty-five years old, focuses on the army as an institution, and, naturally, leaves aside a whole range of topics, such as equipment and the archaeology of fortifications, which have been the subject of intense research in the last decades. The more recent surveys by R. S. O. Tomlin in P. Connolly's *Greece and Rome at War* (London, 1981; 2nd edn 1998) and J. Wacher's *The Roman World* (London and New York, 1987) are excellent but necessarily brief. In the light of this, the limited focus proclaimed for S. & D.'s monograph is to be regretted. Their stated intention is 'to document the physical presence and appearance of the army from an archaeological and historical point of view. Lack of space precludes any in-depth discussion of methods of warfare or the tactics of particular battles' (p. 1). Fortunately, the book does range further afield and addresses a wider range of issues than this modest programme might suggest.

After a brief review of the sources, S. & D. rightly choose to begin with developments of the late Principate, and, indeed, they might have gone back further still. The definitive work on the third-century army remains to be written, but the chapter is an intelligent survey which concludes that the links to the Late Roman army are likely to have been empirical rather than direct. S. & D. discuss the question of the survival of Gallienus' cavalry forces, but without coming down firmly on one side or the other. Similarly, they regard the problem of the nature of Diocletian's *comitatus* as either a small mobile field army or just a bodyguard as insoluble and likely to remain so. They do, however, attribute to Constantine the creation of the *comitatenses* as such, and they also give him due credit for maintaining the frontier defences built up by Diocletian. There is little on Constantine's immediate successors, but rebuilding under Valentinian, manpower problems, barbarization under Theodosius, the absence of sources for fifth-century developments, Justinianic reconstruction, and the emergence of *foederati* and *bucellarii* are all discussed, albeit briefly. Although there is nothing new here, we are at least presented with a useful overview of the modern literature.

The rest of the book is organized thematically, with chapters on recruitment, conditions of service, equipment, fortifications, siege warfare, and morale. The recruitment chapter looks more deeply at barbarization and inevitably repeats some of the earlier observations on *foederati* and *bucellarii* (partly the result, presumably, of dual authorship). The chapter on equipment is a useful introduction to the subject for the non-specialist, and the focus on this expanding area of military studies is continued in the chapter on siege warfare, which says relatively little about sieges as such. One of the most interesting chapters deals with army morale and its decline in the Late Empire, which is attributed to factors such as lack of training (hence the strictures of Vegetius), the growth of urban billeting, poor leadership, war weariness, and ever-increasing distrust between soldier and civilian. Ultimately, S. & D. see the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Late Roman army, for all its virtues, as an army in decline, which they attribute to a lack of *trained* manpower, and they firmly reject the notion that this is a period of transition rather than collapse.

The book suffers from some poor copy-editing, which not only overlooks occasional slips in the English (forgivable), but also several more in the use of Latin and Greek terms (unforgivable): *sacra comitatus* (p. 16), *scholae palatini* (p. 19), *aurem* (for *aurum*) *tironicum* (p. 67), *logothetes* for *logothetai* (p. 82), *kamerion* for *kamarion*, *klimekion* for *klimakion*, *cheiroballista* for *cheiroballistra* (pp. 153, 160), *legiones* for *legio* (p. 159), and *sambuci* for *sambucae* (p. 164). A few place-names are given incorrectly: Cipri for Cirpi (p. 35) and Berkasova for Berkasovo (pp. viii, 93, pl. 9, but correctly p. 119); and a sixth-century author is wrongly designated Joshua *of* Stylites. Historical slips are rare, but note that the *Strategikon* is normally located in the late sixth century (p. 2), and that it was Constantine III who withdrew troops from Britain in 407 (p. 55).

Overall, the book's coverage of the subject is, indeed, limited. To understand the army as an institution, one still needs to read Jones and look at the evidence he deploys. And to understand how the army functioned and what it did in the field, one should turn to H. Elton's *Warfare in Roman Europe A.D. 350–425* (Oxford, 1996); the issues considered there are central to S. & D.'s subject and should not have been left aside. Despite these reservations, the book is both readable and enjoyable, and it can be heartily recommended as a starting point for the study of the Late Roman army.

Royal Holloway, London BORIS RANKOV

FRATERNUM FOEDUS

C. J. BANNON: *The Brothers of Romulus. Fraternal* Pietas *in Roman Law, Literature, and Society.* Pp. xi + 234. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997. Cased, £25/$35. ISBN: 0-691-01571-6.

In a male-oriented society, one would expect brotherhood to occupy a dominant position—Rome was after all founded by brothers. It is the merit of B.'s study that it brings out the importance of this ignored Roman relationship, both within the family, and in other less obvious contexts. Further, she succeeds in her complex aim (pp. 7–8) of studying fraternal relations as a dynamic always moving between 'normal practice' and normative 'ideals' of *pietas*.

Chapter 1 is a socio-legal study of how Roman inheritance law shaped relations between brothers, enriched by comparative sociological studies from Chile to China (one might wish for more of the same). Chapter 2 considers the biological basis of the fraternal relationship, which, B. argues, transcended legal statuses; and the metaphorical transfer of the fraternal bond to non-sibling, especially sexual, relationships. Chapter 3 considers brothers in politics, through case studies of Cicerones, Scipiones, and especially the Gracchi (pp. 127–35). Chapter 4 views brothers in arms: above all on opposing sides, focusing on fratricidal symbolism in accounts of the Civil Wars; and ends with a discussion of Romulus and Remus, where B.'s fraternal viewpoint generates interesting observations, even in the wake of

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Wiseman's *Remus* (Cambridge, 1995). Chapter 5 moves into the imperial period, where new paradigms (Castor and Pollux, Eteocles and Polynices) emerge, exploited against the context of imperial succession strategies (the brevity of this chapter is lamentable, in view of the intrinsic interest of imperial brothers, and of B.'s stimulating treatment).

Any work on brothers should surely open with a clear statement of the incidence of the relationship. How likely were you as a Roman male to have a brother? More likely than not as a child, it seems, but also, much more likely than not to have lost him (or he you), by the time your father died (cf. p. 41). The comparative rarity of lasting fraternal relationships probably increased rather than diminished their value in Roman society. B. never directly addresses this issue: the relevant statistical projections are squirrelled away in footnotes and other odd corners. The book might have worked better had, *mutatis mutandis*, Chapter 2 (natural relationships) come first, followed by Chapter 1 (legal relationships). As it is, we start with the least accessible and least readable chapter. This is because B. thinks she has found something very important within the development of fraternal inheritance procedures.

This is *consortium*, an archaic procedure in intestate succession, whereby all brothers had full ownership of the whole estate. '*Consortium* was originally part of the process of intestate succession' avers B. (p. 14), bringing to bear a passage of Gaius (*Inst.* 3.154a, b). B.'s marshalling of literary evidence is generally deft; in this case, however, the reader should note that Gaius does not mention *consortium* explicitly. Indeed, it seems there is little certainty about what *consortium* was, or its relation to other inheritance practices, in the XII Tables or elsewhere: by p. 17, B. is back-pedalling.

B. is certainly right to stress the importance of brothers in succession, and to draw many of the conclusions she does. Yet, despite admitting (p. 25) that *consortium* generated little juristic comment compared with *patria potestas*, B. ends up over-estimating its importance. 'I do not attempt to reconcile all accounts of brotherly behavior under the rubric of *consortium* . . .', she writes in the introduction (p. 8); but compare the conclusion: 'After *consortium* was no longer a common legal practice, it came to represent the idealized relationship between brothers and the social norms that defined *pietas*' (p. 191). Whether or not this begs the question, statements such as 'the fraternal *consortium*, with its balance between self-interest and the common good, provided the Romans with a model for military ethics' (p. 141) surely go too far. Crudely put, B. quietly allows *consortium* to mutate from an institution which embodied an ideal, into the ideal itself.

She would have been better off taking *consors* as her starting point, and examining *consortium* against its semantic range. As it is, *consors* and its cognates recur in a wide variety of fraternal contexts, most of which are sensitively analysed by B. There are, however, occasions when the reader may feel that *consors* has no special fraternal reference, or that the metaphor is a dead one, and that a familiar horse is being flogged (e.g. p. 151 on Lucan, 1.89–93, where *consors* simply means 'partner').

Nevertheless, again and again B. offers interesting perspectives on what had seemed familiar ground: e.g. the context of Iugurtha's corrupt relations with the Roman Senate (pp. 141–5). B. succeeds in prompting reconsideration of the whole spectrum of masculine relations—political, societal, and sexual—because she has sensitively elucidated the parameters and influence of fraternal *pietas* in Roman literature. Only philosophical ideas of brotherhood are neglected.

This is a stimulating and well-argued book, in which B. displays significant competence in bringing together a number of areas of Roman studies. Its insights and

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

perspective will refresh specialists in social history, Roman politics, and Latin literature alike.

University of Edinburgh EDWARD BISPHAM

ROMAN GAOLS

J.-U. KRAUSE: *Gefängnisse im römischen Reich*. (HABES, 23.) Pp. vi + 365. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996. Paper, DM 96. ISBN: 3-515-06976-3.

Although I have some methodological reservations, I hasten to say at the outset that K.'s book is an invaluable addition to the repertory of works on the criminal justice system of the Empire. Nothing hitherto written on the subject of Roman prisons contains such a wealth of source material. Not only does he utilize Egyptian papyri and much Christian literature, but he even calls upon authors like Artemidorus and Firmicus Maternus for indications of people's feelings about imprisonment. Indeed, with such a rich collection of data it would have been helpful to have the kind of *Stellenregister* that K. provided for his earlier books in the same series. But, most importantly, K. gets away from the narrowly juridical approach characteristic of the Mommsenian tradition and demonstrates the yawning gap between the theoretical world of imperial rescripts and the often brutish realities of prison. Although K. does not diverge from the standard view that in law imprisonment was never a formal penalty—merely a method of detention for persons awaiting either trial or the infliction of punishment after sentence—he demonstrates that, particularly in late antiquity, the length of time spent in prison could amount to a form of punishment, and that in some cases, like the detention of convicted adulteresses in convents for life, imprisonment did become a *de facto* penalty.

After a short chapter on imprisonment in the Republic, the book is organized by topic: long chapters are devoted to the kinds of delinquent to be found in gaol and living conditions there. Shorter chapters handle such themes as the relationship between public and private justice, types of imprisonment for debt, the length of time spent in prison by inmates, and the treatment of women and the upper classes in respect of detention. General themes emerge: the rôle of private imprisonment decays and the only alternative to the state system becomes the Church courts. Prisons chiefly house lower-class detainees, though the number of upper-class detainees increases in the Late Empire. Detention is a weapon of the strong against the weak. The number of prisoners continues to increase, particularly in late antiquity.

Here I must enter a few reservations. Firstly, K. is a little too anxious to prove his points. L. Vettius, imprisoned in 59 B.C., was not a member of the *Unterschicht* (p. 20) but an *eques Romanus* ([Q. Cic.] *Comm. Pet.* 10, Dio 37.41.2). 'The number of prisoners even in the republic must have been considerable' (p. 21): K. here is concerned with public prisons and the city of Rome, but if he is right, where did they put the malefactors? There is no evidence for more than two prisons in Rome during the republican period—not even two if, as Rivière is the latest to argue ('*Carcer* et *vincula*', *MEFRA* 106 [1994], 585–6), Livy's *lautumiae* (32.26.17, 37.3.8) are extensions of the *carcer Mamertinus*. Doubtless, some prisoners were in private prisons; *contra* Mommsen and K., none of the 6,000 mentioned by Livy (23.14.2–4) and Val. Max. (7.6.1) as imprisoned and freed after the Battle of Cannae in order to serve in the army were awaiting trial in public prisons: they were either *addicti* for debt (Livy) or already

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sentenced on capital charges—*capitali crimine damnati* (Val. Max.). The *addicti* were the bondsmen of their creditors and the *c.c.d.*, as Kunkel plausibly argued, were probably likewise bondsmen assigned to their victim's agnates after a successful private criminal prosecution for murder. But in most cases private imprisonment is out of the question. The detention of Milo's slaves in the *atrium libertatis* after the murder of Clodius in 52 reads like an emergency measure to deal with a special situation.

Secondly, K. is over-confident of the evidential value of his sources. Only once (p. 25), in connection with the alleged increase in crime in the early Empire, does he recognize the existence of the things-are-so-much-worse-than-they-were *topos*. But not only does he soon forget that satirists are not writing social history—on pp. 72–3 K. uses as serious evidence for a dramatic increase in the prison population in the early second century Juvenal's assertion (*Sat*. 3.309–11) that there are so many prisoners in chains that there is a shortage of iron for agricultural implements—but he fails to notice that the 'Arsenal kulturpessimistischer Topoi' is a recurrent, not a purely second-century, phenomenon, and one that should also be taken into account in using fourth- and fifth-century literature.

This failure is symptomatic of what looks like a general weakness in K.'s (computer-led?) methodology. A reference to *carcer* or δεσμωτήριον is a reference, whatever the context or type of source. To take an example at random, K. (p. 287) cites three passages from John Chrysostom as evidence for prisoners' rags and unkempt long hair, but only one (*In Ioh. hom.* 60.4) is hardish evidence—an exhortation to prison visiting by Christians; of the other two, one is a merely possible inference and the other part of a simile of the procedure at the Last Judgement—not that one would expect to find precise information on Antiochene prison conditions in a homily on the Incomprehensible Nature of God (*PG* 43.733)! Furthermore, K.'s method leads to a certain incoherence: pp. 316–30 contain lists of ways in which Christians circumvented or ameliorated prison conditions or argued against the death penalty, and then on p. 330 we read that their efforts to humanize prisons were of little or no avail. K. may well be right, but, on the face of it, the type of evidence employed to support his conclusion does not seem very different from the evidence which suggests that the Christians did achieve something. There is an analogous change of direction (p. 69) when K.'s Egyptian material indicates that ordinary villagers, not only the *Oberschicht*, could get sureties and thus escape detention while awaiting trial. Another factor, neglected by K., which must have reduced the number of such prisoners is the increasing use of the so-called *litis denuntiatio* procedure, now attested in disputes at law between villagers living near the Dead Sea in 130 and 131 (P. Yadin 23 and 25).

A small point. I looked for some material on prison sanitation under *Schmutz* but apart from a vague reference to 'schlimme sanitare Verhältnisse' (p. 286) there is nothing; even the reference to Libanius as evidence for the 'Gestank im Kerker' (p. 287) (= *or*. 54.24) turns out to be to the smelliness of the more depraved prisoners, not the stench of the prison as a whole. I wonder whether K.'s evasiveness is due to the dearth of archaeological evidence for ancient prisons which would surely reveal the presence or absence of latrines.

My reservations about K.'s book should not deter any scholar or institution concerned with imprisonment in antiquity from acquiring it; it is crammed with information and there are many interesting *aperçus* (e.g. on Libanius' anticipation of modern ideas on imprisonment as a means of resocializing criminals). Above all, the German is lucid and not difficult for the foreign reader. Overall, I am impressed.

University of Leicester J. D. CLOUD

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

GREEK DANCE

F. G. Naerebout: *Attractive Performances. Ancient Greek Dance: Three Preliminary Studies.* Pp. xix + 451. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1997. Cased, Hfl. 160. ISBN: 90-5063-307-2.

Despite the well-documented importance of dance in ancient Greece, most studies of ancient Greek culture hardly mention dance at all. Furthermore, claims Naerebout, the specialist study of ancient Greek dance is at a dead end. This wide-ranging study seeks to redress the balance by proposing a research model to set scholars on a new course. The work is divided into three preliminary and interrelated studies.

The first part is a historiography of the work already done since A.D. 600 up to the present. This includes not only histories written about ancient Greek dance, but examples of how attempts to reconstruct or capture the spirit of the dance have influenced the development of Western theatrical dance. Landmarks include the sixteenth-century attempt to recreate Greek choral dance which led to the development of ballet, opera, and, N. should add, the English court masque. Interest in Graeco-Roman pantomime led to the eighteenth-century *ballet d'action*, ballet that incorporates mime gestures to tell a story; Isadora Duncan's attempt to recreate ancient Greek dance in reaction to classical ballet technique was an important contribution to the emergence of modern dance. However, since the 1930s a gap has opened up between scholars and the theatre. Lillian Lawler's invaluable work (1939–64) brought the study of ancient Greek dance into the mainstream of classical scholarship, but since the 1940s there has been increasing specialization and fragmentation.

The second part is a critical overview of texts and images as sources for the study of ancient Greek dance. There is a huge problem in moving from static text or image to movement; a picture only has worth as a historical document if accompanied by words of interpretation. From a formal point of view Greek dance is a lost art and will remain so as long as there is no new and radically different evidence. Apart from the second-century treatise *Peri Orchēseōs* attributed to Lucian, there is no other work extant dealing exclusively with ancient Greek dancing. No technical treatise dealing with dance is at present known to have survived. Nor, it seems, do any sources refer to a notation system or to any work providing a technical description of dance movements or choreographies. Dance was handed down exclusively by oral tradition; it is thus highly unlikely that actual dances could have been preserved unchanged down the centuries.

Greek painted pottery is the most important source of dance imagery, but we need to be sure that the artisan intended to portray dance. N. proposes a working definition of dance to decide whether an image depicts dance or not, and we need to take into account distortions and restrictions imposed by the medium. Texts and images should be collected systematically by category, bearing in mind that no static image can assist in recreating a single movement if that movement is not known beforehand. Scholars need to focus not on *how* the ancient Greeks danced but on the question of 'what dance was all about' (p. 273). For this, fresh source criticism and a model for future research is required.

Part three provides a theoretical framework for the study of dancing at public events in ancient Greece. The model is made up of four building blocks: dance (following N.'s definition of what constitutes dance); dance as a constituent part of public performances; the mobilization of the audience (performances have to attract

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the public); and communication. Public events contain multimedial performances which provide an effective means of communicating. Dancing plays an important part in these performances because of its non-verbal nature, but dance has meaning only within a specific cultural context, as part of an event. Because almost every performance is multimedial there is usually a verbal text, and since the actual dance movements of ancient Greece are hardly known at all, we should focus on the verbal sources of information in order to investigate the specific ways in which messages were communicated. As N. recognizes, there are many who consider dance to be a medium of communication in its own right, whether by means of structural or expressive qualities, as a celebration of enhanced vitality, and so on. Nevertheless, the way that signs are decoded is culture-specific and contextual, so that a rigorous analysis, categorization, and typology of sources can shed further light on what dance actually meant for the ancient Greeks.

This book is well documented with a Greek vocabulary of the dance, although there are a number of typos (including pp. 86, 206, 212 n. 478, 227 n. 521, 249, 267, 321, 350, 352, 347). There is also a frequent use of exclamation marks that detracts from scholarly discourse. In the section on iconography, non-specialist readers would appreciate illustrations showing, for example, the artistic conventions that differentiated athletic from dance movement. A specific example demonstrating the application of the model would have been welcome but, N. tells us, this will have to wait for future publications. N. regrets that specialist studies on dance produced by classical scholars are read only by other classical scholars. That is disputable, but since his own work is of interest to a wide readership, English translations of quotations should be given.

This book provides a useful overview of a vast subject, bringing together work done by dancers, dance historians, and classical specialists. It highlights the pervasive influence of ancient Greek dance on the development of Western theatrical dance, as well as the problems besetting attempts to reconstruct actual Greek dances. It is to be hoped that N.'s theoretical framework for future research will shed more light on the importance of dance as a mobilizing and communicating agent in ancient Greek society.

Ehime University, Japan FRANÇOISE CARTER

NON-ÉLITE GREEKS

A. POWELL (ed.): *The Greek World.* Pp. xiv + 622, ills. London and New York: Routledge, 1997. Paper, £30. ISBN: 0-415-17042-7.

Despite its succinct title, this book is not just a voluminous and conventional introduction to the subject, but rather an experiment: in twenty-seven papers, subdivided into four sections, the editor provides 'a demonstration of some of the most influential new approaches used by analysts of Greek history'. The focus is decidedly not on history from an upper-class perspective. Of course, the choice of contributors implies a certain pre-selection, and consequently it is hardly surprising that some approaches, especially outside the Anglo-American scholarly world, are not found. Nonetheless, one is confronted with a stimulating panorama, even though one might at times wonder what exactly is supposed to be new about certain approaches. The volume has a good index and each essay has its own bibliography.

The first section, 'The Greek Majority', refers to non-aristocrats and, so to speak,

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to the world that is complementary to conventional history. J. T. Hooker studies different social groups of the Mycenean world in 'Linear B as a Source for Social History'. In 'The Economics of Politics of Slavery at Athens' Robin Osborne analyses not only the rôle of slavery within Athenian democracy, but he also emphasizes its historical development (see now also W. Ameling, *Historische Zeitschrift* 266/2 [1998], 283–315). Nick Fisher deals with the legal protection for slaves in Athens in 'Hybris, Status and Slavery'. This practice is very telling with regard to the self-perception and ideology of the citizens. Alan Griffiths, in 'Non-aristocratic Elements in Archaic Poetry', focuses on texts by Homer, Hesiod, Theognis, Archilochus, and Hipponax, asking to what extent the non-élite population is represented. Rosalind Thomas ('The Place of the Poet in Archaic Society') deals with the various poetological genres and their function 'for preservation and memory, and for the conveying of wisdom'. J. R. Morgan ('The Greek Novel: Towards a Sociology of Production and Reception') presents reconsiderations of relevant fictional novels that try to respond to the anticipated audience and their expectations. In 'Politics and the Battlefield' Hans van Wees studies the development of military genres from Homer to Aristotle in correlation to the social status of the soldiers, to the different forms of government and to pressure groups within the poleis. Philip de Souza gives an impressive overview of 'Greek Piracy' and its connection with warfare and commerce, and also of attempts to fight the pirates. 'Medical Texts as a Source for Women's History' from the fifth century B.C. to Roman times are treated by Helen King, something she willy-nilly must do from the point of view of male authors, who at times incorporated women's voices into their works. In 'Women and Bastardy in Ancient Greece and the Hellenistic World' Daniel Ogden demonstrates that the differing treatment of illegitimate offspring in different Greek societies cannot be separated from the status of the mothers in question. The last article in this section ('Anti-feminine Rhetoric and Fifth-century Controversy over the Parthenon') is written by the editor himself. He tries to interpret Plut. *Per.* 12–14 as a source that has to be taken seriously regarding the differing attitudes towards the Parthenon within the Athenian citizenry.

The second section, 'Greeks (and Non-Greeks) at the Margins', is dedicated to topics that are concerned with the Greek perception of other cultures, and thus also with its own self-perception. Alan B. Lloyd ('Herodotus on Egyptian Buildings') presents a detailed analysis of Hdt. Bk. ii, asking which interests the author may have pursued with his description, which traditions he is referring back to, and how precise his descriptions were. A chronological leap forward is found in Jane Rowlandson's 'Women and Economic Opportunity in Early Ptolemaic Egypt', insofar as she presents the economic conditions encountered by the first generations of immigrant and indigenous women under Ptolemaic rule. Earl McQueen ('Why Philip Won') points out the factors which led to the successes of Philip II, even though the latter quite obviously did not manage to have Greek public opinion on his side. Kathryn Lomas analyses the wide range of influences the Greek East had on Rome between the fourth century B.C. up to approximately the second century A.D. In 'The Greeks in the West and the Hellenization of Italy' Andrew Erskine ('Rome in the Greek World') sheds light on the relevance of the name of the city and the goddess Roma for the perception of Rome's strength and the acceptance thereof.

The third section deals with the 'Greeks and their Physical Environment' in the interaction with everyday life and the ordinary inhabitants of the cities. Elizabeth Craik ('Diet, Diaita and Dietetics') compares the conventional Greek ideas and theory of diet to modern dietetic considerations, which makes antiquity appear extremely modern. Accompanied by numerous illustrations and plans, T. E. Rihll and J. V.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Tucker present 'Greek Engineering: the Case of Eupalinos' Tunnel'. They point out the importance of the project for our understanding of political, economic, and social aspects of Samian history. Sian Lewis studies an aspect of Athenian history in 'Barbers' Shops and Perfume Shops' and analyses these shops' function as communicative mediators between Oikos and Agora in the citizens' everyday life. Nigel Spivey in 'Bionic Statues', also with regard to Athens, deals with the differing semantic levels connected with the numerous statues which were omnipresent in antiquity. This is all the more instructive as poets and philosophers hardly ever say anything about the statues that surround them.

The fourth section, 'Religion and Philosophy', tries to counterbalance the aristocratically influenced view of Greek religion. A. M. Bowie ('Greek Sacrifice') is concerned with the wide range of evidence for blood-sacrifice. He does this against the background of the rites as described in the Old Testament, and establishes the necessary cultural context of Greek everyday life. Robert Parker treats 'Early Orphism' especially by using recent finds of Orphic books in order to illuminate doctrine, myths, and political meaning. Emily Kearns ('Order, Interaction, Authority: Ways of Looking at Greek Religion') tries to bring out in particular the relevance of religious thinking and meditation about religion for earthly existence. 'On Understanding of the Presocratic Beginnings of Science' by Edward Hussey aims at discussing the central categories of thought as well as bringing out 'abstractly conceived theories' as genuinely new. Simon Swain's article is dedicated to a subject that has been curiously ignored so far, i.e. 'Law and Society in Thucydides'. Thucydides' opinion as an observer of the effects of laws is treated here, especially his interest in the failure of law and in the causes of that failure in a social perspective. T. H. Irwin analyses 'Plato's Objections to the Sophists' by showing the philosopher's attempt to contrast his views to Socrates and the sophists, and placing the central passages of the conflict in the chronology of Plato's works. T. J. Saunders ('Plato on Women in the Laws') deals with the differing roles of women assigned to them in the *Polis* Magnesia, and he correlates these with historical practice. Saunders's conclusion is that successful female participation in government appeared indeed desirable.

All in all, the book certainly lives up to its claim to present 'windows on life in the Greek world as it was lived by the majority'. This has been achieved mainly by doing without a history that focuses solely on the élites.

Eichstätt Catholic University GREGOR WEBER

GREEK CIVILIZATION

B. A. Sparkes (ed.): *Greek Civilization, an Introduction.* Pp. xxi + 344, pls, figs, tables. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998. Cased, £55/$59.95 (Paper, £14.99/$29.95). ISBN: 0-631-20558-6 (0-631-20559-4 pbk).

General introductions to ancient Greece have to operate in a crowded market, and any newcomer will have a difficult job standing out from the rest. *Greek Civilization* tries to differentiate itself by combining a historical survey, which stretches from the Early Bronze Age to the present day, with a more thematic approach. The labour has been divided between a number of eminent contributors, who are all experts in their fields. However, these ingredients may not add up to a recipe for automatic success.

Eight chapters (of fifteen pages each) are dedicated to the history of the Greek lands through the ages. Long-term history, on a more Braudelian scale, is represented

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

by Sauerwein's chapter on the geology and landscape of the Greek lands, while Foxhall usefully charts the continuities in Greek agricultural practices throughout the ages in a later chapter. The historical survey proper, *The March of the Past*, starts with two chapters on prehistoric Greece by Barber and Dickinson. The focus is understandably on the material evidence, although the authors attempt to go beyond material culture, and claim to offer 'insights into the personal lives and attitudes of individuals' (Barber, p. 21). Shipley has the difficult task of summarizing 1,000 years of Greek history from the 'Dark Ages' until the Roman era in two chapters. The chapter on the Hellenistic world (written together with Parkin) is the less satisfying of the two: life in the 'new towns' of the Hellenistic and Roman periods is merely touched upon; and Greek history under Roman rule receives little attention (only two pages).

Classicists and ancient historians may be less familiar with Greek history in later eras. Averil Cameron picks up the historical thread in the fourth century with a clear account of late antique and Byzantine Greece. Political events are discussed, but the reader is also introduced to cultural and socio-economic developments, as well as to that other important Greek legacy, Orthodoxy. Greek history did not stop with the fall of Constantinople, of course: Wagstaff looks at the place of the Greeks in the Ottoman state, and charts the social and cultural developments which led to the uprising of 1821. Finally, Clogg takes us through the upheavals of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The cut-off point is the accession of Papandreou's PASOK government in 1981. One feels that a few lines might have been added to bring Greek history up-to-date by including, for example, the rôle of Greece and Greek nationalism in the current troubles in the Balkans.

The core of the book is taken up by ten thematic chapters on various aspects of Greek social history. Most authors focus on Classical Greece, and Athens in particular, even though one author warns us that 'Athens was an extremely unusual Greek state' (Shipley, p. 71). A greater attempt at diachronic discussion of the chosen themes might have been preferable. It is a pity, for example, that Blundell's engaging chapter on women and Sparkes's chapter on sex do not even try to cover developments in later periods. There are useful chapters on religion (Parker), literature (Dover), and philosophy and science (Hussey). Public life in the *polis* is discussed by Fisher. Three chapters discuss, not without some overlap, the material heritage of ancient Greece. Palagia's narrowly art-historical account focuses on monumental art; Sparkes looks at material culture in private contexts, and Burford discusses the place of artists and craftsmen in Athenian society. A chapter on social and economic life is unfortunately not included.

Despite its title, this is not an introduction to Greek civilization, but more narrowly a history of the country that we now call Greece. Although Greenhalgh has an interesting chapter on the Greek legacy in literature and art of later periods, there is not much consideration of issues connected with Greek cultural identity in earlier periods. A chapter on the Greek cultural renaissance in the Roman period would have been a welcome addition.

Although individual chapters can be more than adequate, it is hard to see who is going to be served by the collection as a whole. Much of the information in these chapters is readily available in standard surveys and handbooks of Classical Greece. The problem with this book is not that the individual articles do not live up to the reputations of their authors—they mostly do—but that the book lacks unity. The editor has allowed considerable overlap between the chapters, which is a pity in view of the limited number of pages available to each author. Moreover, cross-references are infrequent and imprecise. Too many chapters contain references to Greek terms

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and phenomena that the intended, novice, reader cannot be expected to know, and that she or he will not find in a glossary or the index. Maps tend to be rudimentary (with the exception of Chapter 17), and do not give all the places that are mentioned in the text. The illustrations are poorly reproduced, and it is not always clear how they are supposed to 'assist in understanding the text' (cf. p. xv). It remains to be seen whether this volume will manage to lure the intended readership away from the competition.

Faculty of Classics, Cambridge ONNO M. VAN NIJF

AUGUSTAN SPORTS

R. W. FORTUIN: *Der Sport im Augusteischen Rom: philologische und sporthistorische Untersuchungen (mit einer Sammlung, Ubersetzung und Kommentierung der antiken Zeugnisse zum Sport in Rom)*. (Palingenesia, 57.) Pp. 440. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 3-515-06850-3.

This book is a doctoral dissertation of the University of Saarbrücken. It consists of three sections: pp. 1–98, a general background to Augustan sports, beginning with a survey of previous literature; pp. 99–266, an examination of a number of passages from Augustan poetry that might give information about Augustan sports; and pp. 267–402, a number of passages with translation and brief commentary from Latin literature dealing with sports in Roman times. There is a bibliography—which omits such basic works as Ville's *La gladiature*—and three indices, including a list of passages in Section 3, and a general register.

Particularly in Section 2, there are many long passages in Latin, which are untranslated; Greek is also used, though often translated. An ability to read Latin is assumed. It is therefore not clear for whom this book would be useful.

The general survey in Section 1 does not replace the relevant sections in Ueberhorst's *Geschichte des Leibesubungen* II (1978). It makes many statements that have since been called into question or disproved: e.g. the 190 baths in Rome under Agrippa's aedileship (probably free bathing days); the first *munera* given by magistrates is still dated to 105 B.C. (an error by Valerius Maximus); the fish on the helmet of a murmillo (now certainly *pinnatus: Spettacolo in Aquileia* [Udine, 1994], p. 176 fig. 3); Piazza Armerina is ascribed to Maximian; the amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus is of stone (it was wooden, private, and unworthy of state spectacles) and there is far too great a dependence on *Sittengeschichte* and Daremberg–Saglio. More disturbing is the frequent mismatch between the statement in the text and the evidence of the footnote. On p. 39 F. tells us that there were 300 Hellenistic festivals, citing Pleket; but Pleket says, 'in römischer Zeit', and F. cites from the same paragraph in Pleket an inscription of 2 A.D. for the organization of Hellenistic festivals. On p. 40 we read that the cities of Asia celebrated in honour of Lucullus the Luculleia, with athletic competitions and gladiatorial combats. This is said to come from Plutarch, Lucullus 23.1 = text C5 in Section 3 p. 343, where of course there is no mention of gladiators. On p. 72 we read that Augustus created *collegia iuvenum* based on Greek ephebeia, but the source (Pfister) to which we are referred says rightly that they were based on traditional Roman institutions, and in fact on p. 256 F. says they were based on the Greek ephebeia and also on traditional 'vormilitärisch'—whatever that

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

means—sport activity. Sometimes no evidence is adduced. On p. 51 athletes are asserted to be *infames*, and F. seems ignorant of the *Tabula Larinas* and the problems associated with it. *Ludi Compitales* are said (p. 58) to be 'ländliche Volksfesten'. On p. 53 we find 'Athletenvereinigungen, z.B. der Dionysischen Künstler'! One's confidence in F.'s Latin is not bolstered by the *factio venata* (p. 34) or the statement that *pugil* and *luctator* were words used for every athlete (p. 11), with a reference to Stephanus's *Thesaurus*, which in plain Latin says nothing of the sort.

Christian polemicists may have written that gladiators were stuffed with food 'auf die Hypertrophie der Muskeln hin' (p. 36), but we would be foolish to believe them. Likewise F. does not seem to realize that his '*Ludi sevirales*' are the same as the *Martiales*, and they did not consist of (p. 33) military manoeuvres of the equites. But things become really seriously confused when F. tries to deal with the Aktia of Nikopolis, the 'Actian' games of Rome, and the Sebasta of Naples. On p. 88 he confuses the Roman games with the Sebasta. He dates the Aktia of Nikopolis to 27 not 29 (*AE* [1994], 1599), and does not face the much debated problems of chronology that result.

In Section 2 the following passages are discussed: Virgil, *Aen*. 5.104–699; Hor., *Od*. 1.8; 3.12 (held to be a *Rollengedicht* and a *Webelied*); Prop. 3.14; Ovid, *Met*. 9.1ff., 10.162ff., 10.560ff. The method is running comment very dependent on one or two standard commentaries, the optimistic aim being to unearth information about Augustan attitudes to sport. So F. concludes that there is nothing historical in Propertius' voyeuristic description of Spartan female athletics, but does not question Cynthia's ability to do the crawl at Baiae. That Apollo can kill Hyacinthus with a discus while hunting on the ridges of Taygetus elicits the comment: 'Im allgemein (!!) führen Jäger keinen Diskus' and more desperately (p. 241) 'Ovid is recalling . . . certainly contemporary sport accidents in Rome, e.g. during the lusus Troiae.' Or is Ovid having fun? Did he care?

The 140 pages of passages with translation and comment may be useful for some students, but would have been better published separately. But for the rest, one will seek in vain for an informed and critical discussion of Augustan policies.

Actian propaganda is now covered by R. A. Gurval, *Actium and Augustus* (Ann Arbor, 1995). Other comforting assertions, e.g. that Augustus organized the *collegia iuvenum*, are founded on no certain evidence, and require a careful discussion that looks behind the official senatorial disdain for things Greek, since the cultural clash between Roman and Greek attitudes to sport and athletic/military education is one which aroused the strongest feelings among the Roman authorities. Claudius' public denunciation of the *palaestricum prodigium* Asiaticus gives us a rare glimpse of the outrage that senatorial aerobics could unleash. Our odd lack of direct evidence for Augustan policy is probably not unconnected with the political difficulties of dealing with this whole issue; hence our scholarly difficulties now.

McMaster University W. J. SLATER

CULTURAL CHANGE

T. Habinek, A. Schiesaro (edd.): *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. Pp. xxi + 238. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-521-58092-7.

The present volume is a welcome contribution to the ongoing effort to wean

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Augustan studies away from the fixation on Augustus and to seek the reasons for cultural changes in particular in terms of broader causations than the will of one man. The title of this collection of essays, therefore, has been chosen pointedly: Syme's dated model of a political revolution to which literary and artistic changes are merely subservient is replaced by the view that all such changes, including political ones, are manifestations of a basic transformation of Roman culture.

There are eleven chapters, most of them by British and American scholars. The first three chapters are grouped under the heading of 'The Transformation of Cultural Systems' and aim to provide an overview of the process of cultural change. The rest ('Texts and Contexts') propose to 'consider specific texts and artifacts as they refract aspects of the cultural transformation of the period'. The usual considerations surface that are endemic especially to a short review of such an enterprise: it is impossible to allocate equal detail to each essay; some essays strike the reviewer invariably as more substantive than others; and several of the essays in Part II have only a slender connection to the stated theme of the volume and could be at home just as easily in another collection on Augustan topics. It makes sense, therefore, to concentrate on those that deal with or illustrate the process of cultural change in the Augustan period, or otherwise advance the argument markedly.

Andrew Wallace-Hadrill's lead-off chapter on '*Mutatio morum*: the Idea of a Cultural Revolution' admirably sets the tone and stakes out the programme. He briefly surveys current theoretical notions of 'culture', none being definitive, and then combines the traditional and important focus on *auctoritas* and *mores* with his major thesis: by the late Republic, the ruling élite had lost control and authority in central cultural areas such as the shaping of the *mos maiorum*, civil law, the calendar, and the Latin language. The shapers now were specialists and their authority was increased, once more at the expense of the senatorial oligarchy, by Augustus' adlection of them. This, in turn, reinforced his own political and social authority, and resulted in the establishment of a new cultural order in addition to the political one. Before Varro looms overly large, however, we need to add the realization that Augustus proceeded with his typical selectivity and refrained, for instance, from implementing many, if not most, of that expert's reconstructions of Roman cults. In other words, the *princeps*' rôle could be an active one, a reality that is de-emphasized almost too much in this volume, perhaps for fear of resuscitating the previous model.

Florence Dupont's '*Recitatio* and the Reorganization of the Space of Public Discourse' and Martin Bloomer's 'A Preface to the History of Declamation: Whose Speech? Whose History?' nicely complement each other. They view the phenomenon of changed public discourse from the proper perspective of a changing culture, including the increase in literacy and the access of non-Romans to *Romanitas* through the cultural prestige of old-time oratory; conversely, for the aristocrats *recitatio* became something of a rite of passage. The traditional clichés of decline, or of change equating decline, are thus successfully superseded. Additional contributory factors seem relevant, such as Wallace-Hadrill's adverting to the shift in outlook from the local to the universal: oratory may have been effective for decision-making in a city state, but was of lesser use for the government of an empire. Another aspect of *recitatio* and *declamatio*, as Dupont and Bloomer well note, is theatricality and rôle-playing; the connection with Augustus' final words springs to mind. Similarly, in her splendidly provocative chapter on 'Concealing/Revealing: Gender and Play in the Monuments of Augustan Rome', Barbara Kellum duly highlights the strong mimetic and ludic elements in Augustan culture. She does well to question 'the fixity of binary absolutes' and instead emphasizes 'the levels of play that can exist'. Her chosen vehicle

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is analysis in terms of gender, and some eyes will undoubtedly be rolled about the parallelism she posits between the shape of the Augustan Forum and the power of a certain anatomical image whose most recent resurgence is owed to modern pharmaceutical wonders.

Thomas Habinek grapples gamely with the same general subject ('The Invention of Sexuality in the World City of Rome'). The argument is elegant and Habinek has read his Foucault, but the evidence is limited: the discourse of an Ovid or Propertius is not necessarily representative of that of a larger populace for whom sex may have been more than a discourse; no doubt, however, that it was affected, as he posits, by a new set of economic and social conditions.

As for the rest, Philip Hardie's argument ('Questions of Authority: the Invention of Tradition, Ovid *Metamorphoses* 15') that Ovid's casting of the founding of Croton may be a parable for the principate does involve somewhat of a stretch. Closer at hand is Augustus' association with Numa: what, if anything, does Ovid make of it? Eleanor Leach ('Horace and the Material Culture of Augustan Rome: a Revisionary Reading') provides a welcome demonstration of the importance of material property in Horace's poetry. This could have been usefully related, and thereby been integrated more closely with the theme of this volume, to the function of the *res publica* (as articulated by Cicero) as the protector of private property, which was a vital aspect of the Augustan *res publica restituta.* Elaine Fantham's discussion of 'Images of the City: Propertius' New–Old Rome' centers on the tension between the enhanced Rome of Augustus and archaic Rome, a tension, to be sure, that is also negotiated in various ways by Ovid as it was, in fact, in the actual urban image of Augustan Rome.

It is one of the virtues of these essays that they rarely exhaust the subject and instead point to new directions for further work. In that respect and others, this collection serves its purpose well.

University of Texas at Austin KARL GALINSKY

LIFE AFTER FINLEY?

H. M. PARKINS (ed.): *Roman Urbanism: Beyond the Consumer City.* Pp. xiv + 227, ills. London and New York: Routledge, 1997. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-415-11771-2.

The mid-1970s saw the construction of a powerful consensus about the ancient city and its rôle within the 'ancient economy', foregrounded by M. I. Finley's Sather lectures of 1972. Based on a profound awareness of Weber's studies of the city in history, it seemed to offer an end to arguments about the household or state-based ancient economy, whose roots lay in the controversy between Bücher and Meyer in the late nineteenth century (which Finley had himself commented on in 'The Ancient City', *CSSH* 19 [1977], 305–27; and *The Bücher–Meyer Controversy* [New York, 1979]). Briefly, Finley argued that the ancient city was a consumer city, whose élites drew their wealth in rents or taxes from the surrounding countryside to be spent on their political ambitions or luxury. Any trade or service industry merely fulfilled these needs. The urban aristocrats were interested neither in the regulation of trade nor its maximization: their participation in trade was limited to marketing the produce of their estates or money-lending through freedmen or clients.

Towards the end of Finley's life this view was challenged by D'Arms (*Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome* [Cambridge, MA, 1981]) and by a collection of

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

essays edited by the 'Finleyites' Garnsey, Hopkins, and Whittaker which emphasized the importance of *Trade in the Ancient Economy* (London, 1983). Finley was constrained to respond to this work in a new final chapter to the 1985 edition of *The Ancient Economy*.

Since his death in 1986, the Finleyite position has been attacked by Engels, whose *Roman Corinth* (Chicago, 1990) in its subtitle proposed 'an alternative model for the Classical city'. Baldly stated, the Corinthia could not provide subsistence for the large population he estimates, and so staples must have been imported. In return, the city not only served as a major service and administrative centre, but also contained considerable trade and manufacture. His case for Corinth must remain unproven (see M. E. H. Walbank's review in *JRS* 81 [1991], 220–1), but an alternative, Finleyite model was restated by Jongmann in *Pompeii* (1988). Whittaker supported this position in an article in *JRA* 3 (1990), 110–18 and in his contribution to Cornell and Lomas's *Urban Society in Roman Italy* (London, 1995). In the former, he admits that the subject 'increasingly looks like a non-question' (117), and seems inclined to answer the question posed as the title of his 1995 paper 'Do Theories of the Ancient City Matter?' in the negative.

The time is therefore opportune for a collection of essays which goes 'beyond the consumer city'. Sadly, only four of the eight essays here do so, although the contributions of Alston and Allison provide useful glimpses of alternative approaches. The essays of Laurence and Lomas loosely address the question of urbanism, while Marshall's study of Cyrenaican symbolism seems out of place.

Morley's essay ('Cities in Context: Urban Systems in Roman Italy') subtly broadens the question of the consumer city by considering relations between cities; not just the monadic city–territory relationship beloved of supporters of the consumer city, but also the transport system necessary to enable goods and people to move to the urban centre, then to a larger central place, and ultimately to the metropolis. If this were so, some cities were not only consumers but also trans-shipment and procurement centres for larger consumers. These cities should be seen not as isolated units, but as members of a larger concept: the Roman economy.

Parkins's essay compares élite acquisition of urban property with their acquisition of rural property. She shows how small trades or industries might not only bring in considerable profit, but also be crucial to a family's strategic bestowal of property as dowries: as in Pompeii, where small shops are built into the walls of atrium houses, so these small businesses were intimately part of the Roman household. As Morley sets the city in its wider context, so Parkins reminds us that the city was the sum of its households, the sites for trading, and entrepreneurship. Thus we return to Bücher's concept of the household as the centre of production. Allison's essay uses archaeological evidence to examine the function of several rooms of the House of the Menander. These two papers strongly emphasize the economic importance of the household.

Mouritsen refutes the view that the town councils of Pompeii, Ostia, Puteoli, and Beneventum were relatively closed bodies until the second century A.D. (apart from the 'crisis' that allegedly bedevilled the Pompeian *ordo* between the earthquake and the eruption), showing that outsiders were always recruited, many of whom must have been traders, giving further support to D'Arms's thesis.

There is a conclusion from Mattingly which, although allegedly 'drawing the line beneath the consumer model', generally restates its validity. How, then, might we move 'beyond the consumer city'? Alston's useful approach shows how Egyptian cities under Ptolemaic, Roman, and Byzantine rule responded by morphological changes to

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

their incorporation into different systems. We should therefore think not of 'Roman urbanism', but urbanisms, spatially and temporally discrete. We should consider the countryside (which this volume does not). Different rural settlement patterns might support different types of city. We should also consider the effect of villas and their distribution in the landscape. M. Aylwin Cotton's excavations at Francolise, San Rocco, and Posto reveal villas (with further unexcavated villas nearby) apparently sharing resources in their production of wine and olive oil. What were their relations with the cities of Cales and Teanum? Here, at least, are rural centres, whose functions must be considered when discussing town–country relations.

Finally, it is necessary to engage with the debate on the late antique city. The literature on the city in the eastern Roman empire is dominated by the notion of the 'flight to the country' of the curial class. This is reflected in the changing urban morphology (Ward-Perkins in N. Christie and S. T. Loseby (edd.), *Towns in Transition* [London, 1996]). Similar changes are reflected in the countryside in the west (J. Percival, *The Roman Villa* [London, 1976], Chapter 9). Any move 'beyond the consumer city' must account for these changes in the balance between town and country to construct a more subtle view of Roman urbanism.

University of Wales, Lampeter KEITH HOPWOOD

ROMAN VILLAS AND SOCIETY

J. T. Smith: *Roman Villas: a Study in Social Structure*. Pp. xxxiii + 378. London and New York: Routledge, 1997. Cased, £60. ISBN: 0-415-16719-1.

In his 1978 article 'Villas as a Key to Social Structure' (published in M. Todd [ed.], *Studies in the Romano-British Villa* [Leicester]), J. T. Smith put forward two key propositions: firstly, that the plans of villas could reveal the relationships within and between the different groups that comprised society, and secondly, that study of the plans showed that these villas had been occupied by multiple households comprising a 'kin group' rather than being the seats of individual proprietors and their families.

The implications of these arguments for our understanding both of pre-Roman society in north-western Europe and of the whole process of the 'Romanization' of this society are considerable. S.'s hypothesis provoked widespread debate and discussion in what had previously been a rather stagnant area of study, although his conclusions were by no means unanimously accepted. A number of papers over the past twenty years have disputed the idea of multiple occupancy of villas, either at the level of the interpretation of individual sites or in more general terms, questioning many of the assumptions of S.'s argument (see e.g. G. Webster and L. Smith, *OJA* 6 [1987]; S. Clarke, *OJA 9* [1990]; R. Rippingal in E. Scott [ed.], *Theoretical Roman Archaeology: First Conference Proceedings* [Aldershot, 1993]). This book is clearly S.'s attempt to answer his critics or perhaps simply to overwhelm them, based as it is on a study of over a thousand villas and including plans of almost 500 of them.

I must confess that I was not convinced by this exhaustive and occasionally exhausting presentation of the argument. Indeed, I suspect that fewer people will be persuaded by this book than by the original article. S.'s hypothesis certainly offers one possible interpretation of any given villa plan; the traditional image of villas as the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

seats of individual landed proprietors can no longer be accepted without question. However, given our limited knowledge of most villas—above all, our ignorance in most cases of the location of doorways and hence of the 'lines of movement' within the building—other interpretations, including the traditional one, are always possible. We might remain unconvinced of the existence of separate 'units' within the villa, or we might interpret these as separate quarters for male and female occupants, or for family and servants rather than for different families. The problem with this book is that piling up hundreds of examples where multiple occupancy *might* be a valid interpretation does not actually make that interpretation any more convincing, especially as S.'s discussion of each villa is so brief and we are asked to take so much of his reconstruction on trust.

I cannot help feeling that the case for multiple occupancy would be (and, in the past, has been) better made through detailed discussion of a few well-documented sites—but I may be missing the point. The way that S. has constructed his book suggests that he is not content to argue that some villas contained multiple households, but rather wishes to assert that *all* villas did. He offers a typology of villas (simple and developed forms of hall houses and row houses, along with some 'problematic' house-types), largely (or so it appears to me) in order to argue that all types of villa fit his model of multiple occupation. This does seem extremely implausible. Accepting for the moment the hypothesis that all property in these societies was held by kin groups, is it likely that, at the point where they adopted a Roman style of architecture, *all* these kin groups contained two or three families—and then, apparently, managed to maintain this number over several centuries?

S. makes much of the comparison between pre-Roman Celtic society and that of pre-Norman or early modern Wales, where multiple occupancy has been documented as a response to the problems of partible inheritance. At times the argument verges on circularity; S. notes that 'the way hereditary land was held and transmitted in pre-Norman Wales accords with the proposed model' (p. 276)—a model which was developed on the basis of comparing villa plans with Welsh houses. Elsewhere, the problem is rather that S. does nothing to justify his use of comparative examples; he offers no discussion of what he sees as the crucial similarities and differences between the two societies, which must surely affect the evaluation of this material. Most importantly, however, the comparative evidence does not entirely support his main argument. Multiple occupancy of buildings is found in the Welsh context, but (so far as I can gather) it is by no means the rule; why, then, assume that *all* Roman villas must have contained more than one family?

S.'s book relates to two closely connected but separate areas of debate, on the interpretation of individual villas and on the process of Romanization in different areas of Europe. Somehow it manages to fall between these two stools. With regard to the first, S. makes a number of trenchant points about the assumptions of other scholars, particularly their wish to give all villas upper storeys. However, many of these points are swamped by the mass of material relating to his central thesis. I do not feel entirely qualified to comment on whether his typology of villas and the many plans provided will prove useful for archaeologists; my suspicion is that, since any attempt at categorization or reconstruction must be a matter of interpretation, their usefulness to anyone who does not accept S.'s ideas about villa organization will be limited.

As for his intriguing ideas about Romanization, these would surely benefit from greater consideration of evidence other than villa plans and from a more explicitly theoretical perspective (not least, a more sophisticated use of comparative material).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

S.'s ideas will continue to play an important rôle in the debate, but this book has done little to advance the argument.

University of Bristol NEVILLE MORLEY

READING AT ROME

E. VALETTE-CAGNAC: *La lecture à Rome: rites et pratiques* (L'Antiquité au Présent). Pp. 332. Paris: Belin, 1997. ISBN: 2-7011-1611-2.

This book is a useful contribution to a subject of much current interest. Literacy is news, and most recent studies of reading in the classical world have either dealt synoptically with Latin and Greek readers or have focused on Greek. It is high time for a full-length account of reading practices in the Roman world.

It is also good to have a study which moves with such ease through Classical Roman history to the Church Fathers and beyond. Christian late antiquity is a fashionable destination, and this is only one of the ways—one expects French scholarship to be theoretically informed, and Valette-Cagnac is—in which the book is impressively abreast of developments in other parts of the field. Such breadth is particularly valuable in a study of literacy, because although there is wide scholarly agreement that reading practices changed somewhere between Cicero and the Renaissance, as silent reading became the norm, there is much less agreement about when or how (let alone why) the change occurred. One possible break-point comes with Ambrose and Augustine. V.-C., however, is able to demonstrate that these two were drawing on practices attested since at least the first century B.C.E., and that developments in the European culture of the written word were more a matter of gradual modulation and piecemeal changes of habit than large-scale revolution.

The broad scope of the book and its contribution to the debate on silent reading mean that its potential audience is wide, and in general V.-C. makes it easy for even non-experts to use. Literary evidence is to the fore, with important passages reproduced in translation, and the whole is very fully referenced. Separate indices of names and things are useful, though the bibliography—potentially huge—is brief. My only regret, especially as they are much less accessible to non-experts, is that inscriptions are neither used nor referenced as fully as literary sources.

The analytical scope of the book is very large. In five chapters it describes the vocabulary of reading, the development of silent reading, 'speaking' inscriptions on funerary monuments and everyday objects, public *recitatio* by authors of their works, the public articulation of wills, military orders, diplomatic communications and various kinds of law, and 'double readings' of religious and legal texts. Two questions arise: why this balance of topics was chosen, and how one can possibly do justice to them all in 300 pages.

The first chapter on silent reading, on which V.-C. has a new and clear line to argue, is detailed and convincing. Thereafter, it is a little less clear why particular topics are chosen and how they fit together. From the physical articulation of texts we move to how people understand an inscription couched in the second person, how written texts are orally disseminated, and the legal impact of putting a law to a live audience. These are all immensely interesting subjects but they hang together by an equivocation on 'reading' to include recitation, interpretation, and aural reception. The juxtaposition would be richly rewarding if V.-C. were either to argue that all these different forms of

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reading had the same impact or exhaustively to explore their differences. She (rightly) avoids the former, but also the latter, so her interpretation gives an impression of incoherence. Moreover, there are important discussions missing: notably, of the rhetorical delivery of written speeches, and of the performance versus the private reading of plays.

The argument tends to focus on the author's own 'reading' of reading, rather than contemporary accounts. This is disappointing, as the sources make clear that different audiences—educated and uneducated, native and foreign, large and small—were expected to react in different ways to both the written and spoken word; we miss the nuances which would show why certain types of communication were favoured in certain contexts and at different times. V.-C.'s own reading is not always a satisfying substitute, as, for instance, when she concludes that the force of a funerary inscription is that the dead 'live on' in the reading of the living. In what sense? With what effect on the reader? Do all readers get the same message? Does a new funerary monument have the same impact as one a century old? Even given limited space, questions like these are fundamental to interpretation.

This book is by no means the last word on the subject (even if that were a desirable objective). But it presents a good deal of evidence in accessible form, and opens several new areas for debate. Everyone interested in literacy or in the 'reading' of the written word in the Roman world will want to take account of it.

University College, Oxford TERESA MORGAN

LATE MINOAN POTTERY

E. HALLAGER, B. P. HALLAGER (edd.): *Late Minoan III Pottery: Chronology and Terminology* (Acts of a Meeting held at the Danish Institute at Athens, August 12–14, 1994). Pp. 420. Athens: Danish Institute at Athens/Aarhus, Aarhus University, 1997. ISBN: 87-7288-731-1.

In the history of Minoan studies the Late Minoan III period has been relatively neglected. Sir Arthur Evans (and others after him) considered this an age of 'decadence', and it was only in the 1960s that the controversy over the date of the Knossos Linear B tablets sparked a new interest in this eventful period of Cretan history. On mainland Greece the situation has been the reverse: since the 1940s scholars have benefited from Arne Furumark's seminal work on *Mycenaean Pottery*, which has provided the basic framework for the relative and absolute chronology of the area (and, in turn, for other kinds of analysis), and has also been updated and improved by a number of scholars (especially P. A. Mountjoy). No such work exists for Late Minoan pottery, nor indeed for earlier periods in Crete, but the meeting held at the Danish Institute in Athens, and the publication of its proceedings, are a first step in this direction. For this effort alone B. P. and E. Hallager deserve much praise. One may wonder, however, whether 'LM III Pottery: Problems of Definition' or 'LM III Pottery: Towards a Definition' might have been more appropriate titles for this volume: apart from B. P. Hallager's contribution, only part of Vlasaki and Papadopoulou's paper dealt specifically with terminology, no paper dealt with

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

absolute chronology, and only a few papers (e.g. Kanta's and Borgna's) made extensive use of mainland correlates. Most of the volume consists of detailed presentations of pottery deposits—and much of its content will be appreciated only by scholars initiated into the mysteries of Late Bronze Age Aegean ceramics. There is also, however, much material, both in the papers and in the transcribed discussions, of a more historical character, especially concerning the LM IIIC phase, which emerges from this conference as one of the most intriguing periods in the history of the island (topics discussed include the problem of the arrival of the Dorians in Crete, and the 'environmental' versus 'historical' interpretation of the LM IIIC 'refuge' sites; see e.g. pp. 299, 331, 397–8).

Twelve papers were presented at the conference and have been published in the proceedings. The first, by B. P. Hallager, is the only one dealing with general themes, providing both a useful study of the development of the 'goblet', 'kylix', and 'footed cup' and a brave (but doomed) attempt to reach some uniformity in pottery terminology. This paper should be read in conjunction with a useful appendix ('LM III Pottery Shapes and their Nomenclature') by the same author. All the other contributions present detailed discussions of LM III pottery from various Cretan sites. East Crete is covered by papers on Pseira (Ph. P. Betancourt, E. S. Banou, and C. R. Floyd); Palaikastro (A. J. MacGillivray); Petras (M. Tzipopoulou); and Kavousi (M. S. Mook and D. F. Coulson). Central Crete is dealt with in papers on Knossos (P. M. Warren); Mallia (A. Farnoux); Phaistos (E. Borgna); and Kastelli Pediada (G. Rethemiotakis). West Crete is represented by the sites of Kamalevri Rethymnou (M. Andreadaki-Vlasaki and E. Papadopoulou); Sybritos Amariou (N. Prokopiou); and Kastelli Chanion (A. Kanta). (Note, however, that in the volume the papers are not arranged regionally or according to any apparent criterion.) Many of these sites have been recently excavated or are indeed still under investigation, and the—albeit preliminary—presentation of so much new material is in itself enough to ensure the usefulness of this volume (especially in view of the fact that the final publications may not be ready for some years to come).

As mentioned above, these papers are followed by an appendix consisting of a chart of common LM III pottery shapes and their nomenclature by B. P. Hallager. Although this is certainly helpful, it is regrettable that the terminology is, in effect, limited to the English language—a nomenclature including Greek, French, Italian, and possibly German terms would have been much more useful. It is also unfortunate that, in order to save very little space, a large stirrup jar appears among the 'alabastra' rather than in its proper group or 'family' (see pp. 409–10); that shape V ('incense burner') is followed by shape X (i.e. what happened to shape W?); and that group X itself, unlike all other shapes, has not been provided with a general descriptive term. Also, one wonders whether the editors could have produced another useful appendix comprising a list of deposits or pottery groups in their *relative* sequence, accompanied by the different chronological designations assigned by various scholars (in the papers and discussions it appears that there was a certain agreement on the relative sequence of deposits, while the disagreement mostly concerned period designations, which in turn depend on mainland correlations: see discussions, especially at pp. 102, 185–92, 329, 333–6). These, however, are quibbles, and, concerning the list of pottery groups, the editors may well have felt that this was premature, i.e. that this list might be more appropriate as an appendix for the proceedings of a future meeting, hinted at in their introduction, in which Cretan and mainland colleagues will exchange ideas on these matters. Birgitta and Erik Hallager must be warmly congratulated for organizing a most useful conference and for the speedy publication of its proceedings. One looks

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

forward to the proceedings of a Cretan-mainland conference on Late Minoan/Late Helladic III pottery in the near future.

University of Bristol NICOLETTA MOMIGLIANO

CORINTHIAN VASE PAINTING

D. A. Amyx, P. Lawrence: *Studies in Archaic Corinthian Vase Painting*. (*Hesperia* Supplement, 28.) Pp. xi +161, 64 pls. Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1996. Paper, $65. ISBN: 0-87661-528-0.

In this volume, material is both presented afresh and republished. In 'Aftermath', the late Darrell Amyx completes and updates his contribution to *Corinth* VII.2, which has proved indispensable since its publication in 1975. A. catalogues 161 pieces, following the format of *Corinth* VII.2, giving detailed descriptions and, where appropriate, an attribution; there are adequate, but often not comprehensive, photographs, and some figure-drawings. While appreciating consistency between the two publications, the reader may miss more detailed figure-drawings to illuminate the attributions, particularly since such attributions have been so advanced by A. himself. For example, Cat. 10, attributed to the Perachora Painter, surely requires a figure-drawing, for better appreciation and for comparison with other works attributed to the painter. Cat. 34, an EC aryballos with padded dancers, republishes *Corinth* VII.2, Cat. 32, with new fragments. It is shown in two photographs rather than the original one, but still without figure-drawings—a pity since it has now been attributed to the La Trobe Painter by A. himself (*CorVp* 109.A-7). As in A.'s part of *Corinth* VII.2, there are no profile drawings.

This chapter is what it claims to be, a supplement, following the original format. I do not criticize it for not being what it does not aspire to be, but I regret that it has not seemed appropriate to take more account of the work on painters and shapes that has been so prominent in the years since the publication of *Corinth* VII.2.

As to the vases (nearly all fragmentary), A. presents a wide selection of shapes covering the Archaic period, around 40% MC, a further nearly 25% EC, the rest fairly evenly distributed. All are accompanied by detailed and often lively commentary. The catalogue opens with what A. rightly calls 'truly a remarkable vase', a fragmentary MPC oinochoe with tendrils reminiscent of the Cumae Group, but with black-figure decoration of a delicacy beyond that. There is too much else of interest to pick out other specific pieces here. Without doubt, 'Aftermath' is worth its place alongside *Corinth* VII.2.

The remaining two-thirds of the volume are by Patricia Lawrence, who was also responsible for the other part of *Corinth* VII.2, the pottery from the Anaploga Well. Here she has two contributions, 'The Chimaera Group at Corinth' and 'Dodwellians in the Potters' Quarter'. The former (much the longer) is extremely valuable for many insights into the relationships between a number of potters and painters at Corinth in and around MC. Apart from a catalogue of works attributed to the Chimaera Painter and others in the Group, there are several detailed exegeses. 'Connoisseurship' (pp. 58–65) describes and discusses the Chimaera Painter's style, supported by photographs and figure-drawings. There follows (pp. 65–9) a discussion on how the Chimaera Painter relates to contemporary Attic work. L. stresses the separate nature

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Corinthian and Attic, but carefully documents the borrowings, e.g. an Attic foot moulding borrowed by Corinthian plate-makers (p. 65), or the Chimaera Painter's 'interest in Attic felines' (p. 66), matched by Sophilos' liking for the Chimaera Painter's lions, although not Corinthian lions as a whole (p. 69). This analysis judiciously documents influences and borrowings, reminding us that the process of influence is not always straightforward. Detailed discussion of other painters in the Chimaera Group amplifies the points made apropos of the painter himself, and adds much of interest.

L. then turns to chronology, both relative within the Chimaera Group and the wider issues of Corinthian chronology and classification by period central to the dating of archaic Greek art. Here, unsurprisingly, a large part is played by close comparison of profiles, specifically of plates, and L.'s discussion of typology, and of the decoration associated with each type, is detailed and well-illustrated. The foregoing is the essential groundwork for the 'Definition of the Chimaera Group' and the detailed catalogue that follows. What emerges from this study is a cautious assessment of our knowledge of pottery workshops and their place in the broader economy. L. not only suggests working relationships between specific painters, but also that plates were painted by their potters, pointing to the simplicity of the shape and the consistent matching of a specific scheme of banding with a specific profile (drawing, pp. 100–1). That such conclusions need to be argued for each case is clear from L.'s greater caution in speaking of flat-bottomed aryballoi (p. 110). L.'s conclusions are finely argued and documented. While many may be small points in themselves, their cumulative effect is to illuminate the Chimaera Group and to broaden our understanding of archaic Corinthian workshop practices.

The final chapter is also primarily concerned with MC, specifically with the Dodwell Painter and his circle. A fifteen-strong catalogue of pieces from the Potters' Quarter represents the work of what L. calls 'one characteristic group of animal-frieze painters in Middle Corinthian' (p. 141), reminding us that there are other contemporary trends.

L.'s chapters do much to illuminate MC vase-painting, and, in my opinion, to improve the reputation of MC. With A.'s wide-ranging 'Aftermath', this volume will be a valuable aid to all students of Corinthian vase-painting.

King's College London K. W. ARAFAT

GREEK PAINTED POTTERY

J. BOARDMAN: *Early Greek Vase Painting*. Pp. 287, ills. London: Thames & Hudson, 1998. Paper, £8.95. ISBN: 0-500-20309-1.

R. M. COOK, P. DUPONT: *East Greek Pottery*. Pp. xxix + 226, ills. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-415-16601-2.

The publication of these two books within the same academic year is fortuitous and useful; they both provide an expert overview of a fragmented field. East Greek pottery has not lacked scholars working on local styles, many of whom would probably like to see them given an integrated taxonomy. The Boardman book fills the pre-Attic black-figure gap in his series, to provide the backing fabric of the archaic patchwork quilt. It also provides, among other things, more illustrations of the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

material discussed by Cook, in a context in which it is possible, particularly, to see Orientalizing pottery styles from a wider variety of places displayed together.

C.'s book follows the format of his earlier *Greek Painted Pottery* (London, 3rd edn, 1997), one of the few textbooks to deal systematically with the output of the major centres from Protogeometric to late Classical, without special pleading for any particular local style. There, his neat descriptions are supported by critical bibliographies; there is a history of the study of the subject, and important chronological disagreement is neatly crystallized in a comparative chart. The book has been a reference text on which students cut their teeth for a long time.

East Greek Pottery has very much the same flavour, with illustrations embedded in the text. It establishes the outline history of the East Greek cities, and of the excavated evidence in its early chapters; the latter chapter takes into account the most recent physico-chemical evidence, as well as building on the author's long association with the archaeology of the area and knowledge of its difficulties and shortcomings. A disarming paragraph on the reversal of favourite assumptions paves the way for the expected section on chronology, complete with real dates and an evaluation of the rival systems set out in the accompanying table. The subsequent chapters move through the earlier, underpopulated Protogeometric and Geometric styles, via Bird Bowls, to the early Orientalizing styles, heterogeneous and localized. Human figures heave into view in some centres—there are some fragments from North Ionia (Fig. 7.3) with figures not unlike their counterparts in the roughly contemporary Black and White style of Proto-Attic, engaged in what was once a complex scene.

Much East Greek pottery belongs to styles which tend to have versions from more than one centre: the Wild Goat style dominated production of East Greek decorated pottery for around a century. C. distinguishes between Early, Middle, and Late stages, but relates them to local centres of production as the German dating system does; he traces stylistic cross-influences, and includes a section on the Swallow Painter, who produced Wild Goat in Etruria, on Etrusco-Corinthian shapes. Those who suspect a very direct connection between mainstream Wild Goat with the apparently more localized Fikellura style will feel vindicated by Fig. 8.27, which shows a Carian olpe decorated in both. Some of the defined styles which appear in the later chapters are far less familiar: Chian, Grand style or black-figure, now has to be considered on its own, not as a subdivision of Wild Goat. They both show human figures, and there is some indication of an interest in mythological narrative. Clazomenian black-figure and sarcophagi develop striking figure styles, with recognizable painting hands at work, as do the Northampton and Campana Groups and Caeretan hydriai.

Chapters on Ionian cups, which have a well-understood typology, and on other plain and banded wares, illustrated very fully with profile drawings, lead towards Pierre Dupont's chapter on the other major ceramic product from this area—the trade amphora—where a conspectus of the local types and the relationship between them was much needed.

Early Greek Vase Painting has a rather different purpose; Greek painted pottery was produced in a very widely spread collection of local styles, which gradually narrow to a small number of centres which made black and then red-figure. Boardman's earlier handbooks deal with the very intensively studied output of Athens in these styles. Here, among other things, he is providing for the student who needs an introduction to their forerunners. The format is the usual one—chronological chapters with a wealth of pictures at the end of each. A chapter each on the later history of some styles (Life After Athenian Red-Figure) and on painted pottery as a tool for the wider study of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Greek world are followed by the specialized bibliographies which enhance the more advanced usefulness of the earlier volumes.

The quality of illustration, as with the Cook volume, is high, even when very small. Old friends appear here—we are not deprived of Athens 804 or the Eurytios krater—but the author has exploited a wide range of contacts and publications to show us many less familiar and equally engaging items. It is good to find more obscure fabrics here alongside Corinthian and Laconian, including Cretan and West Greek, and not just the Aristonothos krater either. The East Greek Orientalizing section has the Wild Goats—sometimes the same ones—but it also has a wonderful Ionian heron-vase, every bit as striking as its Protocorinthian counterparts.

We are given a painless opportunity here to see the growth of those characteristics which come to dominate later Greek vase painting. Early attempts at figures, people, and animals surface in the Protogeometric period—we have the hunt and lion kraters from Teke; here, too, we see established the principles of decoration which lead to pictures in frames, pictures which are designed specifically to fit their pots, animals as wallpaper, myth as the imagery of the group ethic. Entertaining it certainly is, but also enlightening, and an authoritative text which provides a one-volume guide to the labyrinth apparent from the pictures fills a very long-felt want.

University of Glasgow ELIZABETH MOIGNARD

POTTERY FROM THE AGORA

S. I. ROTROFF: *The Athenian Agora: Hellenistic Pottery; Athenian and Imported Wheelmade Table Ware and Related Material; Vol. xxix, Parts 1 and 2 (ills)*. Pp. xxxvii + 574, viii + 106 figs, 148 pls. Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1997. ISBN: 0-87661-229-X (both parts).

Hellenistic pottery has historically suffered from not being Archaic or Classical—it is not capable (apart from the figured wares of Southern Italy) of being studied for its pictures, because it tends not to have any. Its makers could not meet the taste for polychromy to which surviving wall paintings testify, at any rate for everyday use, and before long even funerary vases were decorated with stock patterns rather than with scenes. Athens had ceased to be a centre of production whose output necessarily influenced developments elsewhere; the geographical spread of the Hellenistic world allowed for entirely independent developments of style and technique. Generalizations can be made about types of pottery produced in some centres and not others, but the study of local styles and painters is less appropriate here than that of workshop traditions.

Dating has been neglected, because the reconciliation of several systems seemed impossible or futile. Trendall's work on South Italian red-figure produced a chronology which tends to become blunted as the supply of figured vases dies out; the stamped black-gloss wares of central and northern Italy have an archaeological chronology with fixed points provided by the spread of Roman colonialism. The excavators of major Greek sites have leant heavily on an important article by Homer Thompson ('Two Centuries of Hellenistic Pottery', *Hesperia* 3 [1934]) which published the contents of five deposits from the Athenian Agora, there dated as ranging between the late fourth and the early first century B.C. Thompson's article retained its status as

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a reference point for excavators because it presented each of the five deposits wholesale, complete with domestic detritus, fine and cooking pot alike, explained his dating criteria, and conveyed the importance of the record as one of the conduct of everyday life.

In the late 1970s Thompson and T. Leslie Shear assigned Susan Rotroff the formidable task of publishing the whole Hellenistic ceramic corpus from the Agora excavations, with the intention that these volumes would replace the Thompson article. The first part of the project has already appeared as *Agora XXII, Hellenistic Pottery: Athenian and Imported Moldmade Bowls* (1982). *Agora XXIX* has the wheel-made fine wares: domestic and ritual vessels such as cups, plates, jugs, and also the miniature and specialized shapes used as votives. The cooking pots and plain wares will form the subject of a third volume.

The publication begins with a four-section introduction which deals with terminology, chronology, the state of current study of Athenian Hellenistic pottery, decorative styles, workshops, and motifs. In the first section R. deals with fabric and terminology. She continues Thompson's concern with the evolving fabric of everyday life in Hellenistic Athens, and arranges her material by function rather than in shape-categories, arriving at datable groups which reflect changes of usage. This approach allows for some interesting insights, not least the observation that the standard symposium grouping of cups, jug, and krater had changed by the mid-second century B.C.: Athenian potters were no longer making kraters, and the jugs were smaller, though the cups continued numerous and large. R. suggests that the central mixing of wine and water for a group had been abandoned in favour of allowing symposiasts to mix their own, reflecting an important change in the ethos of commensality.

The chronological section should become a standard referent for future studies of Hellenistic pottery; R. presents a revised framework which takes in such controversies as the dating of the Koroni finds and attempts, resisted here, to downdate Robinson's material from Olynthos by thirty years. The major contexts of importance are discussed, some because of the quantity of material, others because their relocation in the scheme has typological implications. The appendices—which also deal with shape chronologies, the incidence of imported wares, and the application of chemical analysis to a problem of origin—include a section adjusting the chronology of the lamps ubiquitous to Hellenistic sites.

The other two sections of the introduction discuss workshops and decoration in a more traditional way, and include a clear exposition of the development and chronology of the West Slope style. The style itself was widespread throughout the eastern Mediterranean; the Athenian version was at its height in the third century B.C.; its variety of decorative motifs, illustrated graphically in Appendix I, narrows to a much smaller repertoire after about 200 B.C., and by then the market for this and other wares seems to have been virtually entirely local.

The text which follows consists of detailed shape studies, with their descriptive catalogue entries; deposits are summarized in the final chapter. The advantage of such a quantity of material is that it allows the accurate charting of typological change. Meticulous observation harnessed to acute practical sense allows for the identification of meaningful change with implications for other sites. Here R. is able to support often very precise dating with recent evidence, much of it derived from coin studies and datable amphora-stamps.

R. defines the aims of this volume as the provision of a typology of Athenian Hellenistic ceramics and of a more accurate chronology, i.e. to provide a tool with

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which to engage in the investigation of the socio-economic and historical issues which lie beyond the scope of reports of this kind. In this her volumes fulfil the overall pattern of the series; the site itself is probably unparalleled for physical material and ancient documentation, and should receive publication of a quality which matches its importance; a large part of the value of this one is that although it will be a hard, and durable, act to follow, it makes its own vivid case for other artefact reports to adopt the strategies employed here.

University of Glasgow ELIZABETH MOIGNARD

GREEK VASES IN TEXAS

H. A. Shapiro, C. A. Picón, G. D. Scott (edd.): *Greek Vases in the San Antonio Museum of Art*. Pp. 287, ills. San Antonio: San Antonio Musem of Art, 1995. Paper, $39.95. ISBN: 1-883502-04-7.

This volume represents an exemplary publication of 185 vases, many previously unpublished or mentioned only in sale catalogues. They are wide-ranging in date and origin—mostly Greek, but some Cypriot and Etruscan—and treated by an all-star cast of scholars, with a preface by Dietrich von Bothmer and an introduction by Martin Robertson, in which the vases are deftly used to guide the reader through a brief history of Greek vase-painting. Robertson's introduction is complemented later in the volume by John Oakley's introduction to the later Attic red-figure (pp. 141–3) and by A. D. Trendall's introduction to the south Italian vases (pp. 199–203).

The reader is immediately struck by the wealth and range of the collection: the catalogue moves from third-millenium early Cycladic to third-century Centuripe ware, with most steps in between also represented. The few omissions are noted by Robertson, including eleventh-century Protogeometric (p. 35), although Cat. 137 looks likelier to belong to the second half of that century than to the published date of the ninth century. Later Protogeometric, along with Early and Middle Geometric, is missing; so too are prize Panathenaics. Otherwise, the collection is remarkably comprehensive, although phases are, of course, unevenly represented.

Every vase (with the exception of Cat. 133–85, which are presented in note form in two appendices) is fully described (including dimensions), with comparanda, bibliography, and, where appropriate, references to earlier publications. The writing is of a uniformly high standard, engaging, authoritative, and, while highly academic, still accessible, not least because every vase is pictured (and there are seventeen handsome colour plates), many with a refreshing awareness that the reader may well want to see the entire vase, not just a representative view (e.g. Cat. 15, 16). However, some details still escape, such as the animal frieze on the mouth of the column-krater Cat. 45, frustratingly noted by Alan Shapiro as unique at this period (*c*. 530–20); and the occasional habit of showing two views of the same vase at different sizes can be disconcerting, e.g. Cat. 18, 19, 26.

For a museum to be truly representative of Greek vase-painting, it must have examples of the mundane as well as the exceptional, and here the collection is limited, although Cat. 12, an MPC kotyle, reminds us that not all vases bore quality figure-work. There are many fine pieces, of which I have space only to pick a few of the particularly noteworthy hitherto unpublished vases. The Analatos Painter vase (Cat. 10) is a particularly fine piece. Gerald Schaus draws attention to the sphinxes and centaurs as 'new types in the Painter's repertoire' (p. 52); a pity, then, that the figures

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

are faint, and that there is no detailed photograph or figure-drawing (a figure-drawing would also have helped with Cat. 17).

Of the Attic red-figure, perhaps the most striking is a fragmentary new volute-krater attributed to the Painter of the Woolly Satyrs (Cat. 80). In a detailed and persuasive essay, Beth Cohen tentatively argues for the Dioskouroi on side A, along with the readily recognizable Athena and Nike, the latter on a chariot; and on B, Leda and Tyndareos, again with Nike, this time at an altar. Cohen moots the possibility that the vase reflects an unknown wall-painting in the Anakeion, which we know from Pausanias (1.18.1) was decorated by Polygnotos and Mikon at just this period. However, Pausanias' description sounds complete. Nonetheless, the vase may well reflect a growth in interest in the Dioskouroi in Athens in the second quarter of the fifth century, especially since, as Cohen notes, another work by the painter has been associated with lost wall-paintings (specifically from the Theseion).

Cat. 101, two joining fragments of a closed vase attributed by Trendall to the early-fourth-century Apulian Black Fury Group, is here tentatively interpreted by Erika Simon as showing Prokne and Itys and as deriving from Sophocles' *Tereus.* Simon uses Ovid, *Met.* 6, to assist in interpreting the vase, in the belief that 'Ovid depends on Sophokles' (p. 207); however, Hugh Lloyd-Jones cautions against using Ovid for detailed reconstruction of Sophocles' play (Sophocles *Fragments*, Loeb edn [1996], p. 290).

Certainly, if this does represent Prokne and Itys, it looks closer to the Acropolis marble group (contemporary with Sophocles) than to the more common moment of violence depicted in art (*LIMC* VII s.v. 'Prokne et Philomela'). Indeed, the closeness of the two figures on the fragments would suit the apparent protectiveness depicted on the sculpture; but equally, it gives encouragement to Simon's alternative interpretation, an Ilioupersis.

There is much here to stimulate both expert and dabbler, with maximum accessibility ensured by the bibliography, index, concordance, and two welcome glossaries, of terms and of shapes.

King's College London K. W. ARAFAT

APOLLO'S TEMPLE AT BASSAE

F. A. Cooper: *The Temple of Apollo Bassitas: Volume I: The Architecture; Volume II: The Sculpture; Volume III: The Architecture: Illustrations; Volume IV.* Pp. xviii + 447, xxi pls, ills; xiii pls, ills, plans; iv, pls, ills, maps, plans. Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1992–6. Vol. 1: $110; Vol. III: $90. ISBN: 0-87661-946-4 (vol. I); 0-87661-947-2 (vol. II); 0-87661-948-0 (vol. III); 0-87661-949-9 (vol. IV).

The sheer size and weight of this publication is daunting. Three volumes (I, III, and IV) represent the culmination of half a lifetime of devotion to a scholarly project which began for Cooper in 1962. Volume I is the text, vol. III is the catalogue of the architecture and plates, and vol. IV is an oversize volume of drawings (site plan, reconstruction, various views, etc.). Vol. II: *The Sculpture*, by Brian Madigan, is the only volume not authored by C. (he is a contributor), and presents a complete study in itself, dependent upon C.'s analysis of the temple architecture, but capable of

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

standing alone as a monumental work on the temple sculpture. The placement of the Ionic frieze and the interpretation of its iconography are not without controversy (see I. Jenkins and D. Williams, 'The Arrangement of the Sculptured Frieze from the Temple of Apollo Epikourios at Bassae', in O. Palagia and W. Coulson [edd.], *Sculpture from Arcadia and Laconia* [Oxford, 1993], pp. 57–77).

Vol. I: *The Architecture* presents a thorough study of the architectural remains of the temple of Apollo Bassitas in Arcadia. The breadth and depth of this publication far exceeds C.'s much consulted doctorate, which was published in 1978 and was primarily concerned with the history and testimonia for the temple and cult. C. draws from his own extensive field work and years spent meticulously documenting the numerous fragmentary remains of the temple. C.'s findings are based whenever possible on autopsy (he received a permit to lift all stones), and the results of previous studies, the most important of which remains Haller von Hallerstein's notebooks from his 1812 visit to Bassai. The extent of C.'s reliance on earlier investigations is set out in Chapter 1, 'Previous Scholarship', in which he acknowledges his debt to Haller and to a lesser degree to the work of Dinsmoor and Carpenter in the first half of this century. Chapter 2, 'Methods', is a brief section where he explains his survey methods. It is technical, and as C. states, it is written, 'for the benefit of trained surveyors . . . even though I address its message to archaeologists'. His message is about the necessity of employing professional standards. It is an important section since it allows future archaeologists or surveyors to recreate the steps that C. himself took to gather his data. This chapter, along with the earlier section entitled 'Conventions and Terminology' (pp. xxvii–xxviii), contain technical jargon which can be intimidating to the uninitiated, but in each case is brief.

Chapter 3, 'History and Cult', is a succinct account of the site's history and will be of value for the study of Greek religion. Appendix A provides the ancient passages (with translations) for this discussion. Chapter 4, 'The Archaic Sanctuary at Bassai', presents the archaeological and architectural evidence for some of the historical reconstruction made in Chapter 3. It draws in part on the previously published work of N. Kelly, *Hesperia* 64 (1995), 227–77, an important contribution to the study of Greek temple architecture in the archaic period. C. differs from Kelly, however, with his identification of a sequence of four temples (Apollo I–IV), as opposed to Kelly's three. C. restores Apollo III (which Kelly does not recognize) as a monumental late Archaic temple (*c.* 500 B.C.) from reused ashlars in the euthynerion course of the Classical temple. Kelly acknowledges only two earlier temples. Of particular significance is Kelly's identification in Apollo I and II of features (N-S orientation, adyton, and opening on the east side) that have been considered anomalies in the Classical temple.

Chapter 5, 'Geology and Quarries', offers detailed study of the types of stone used for the temple; often such reports are limited to scientific journals. It is noteworthy that it is included in the study of the architecture. Chapter 6, 'The State of Preservation', and Chapter 8, 'The Engineering', are testimonies to the achievements of the temple's architect. That the temple has withstood several strong earthquakes is no accident, as C. demonstrates in his discussion of the aseismic design of the temple foundations. In Chapter 9, 'The Refinements', C. (p. 148) claims that the temple of Apollo is missing '. . . five favourite "niceties", of both ancient aestheticians and modern scholars . . .'. These are entasis, upward curvature of the stylobate, inward inclination of the columns, outward inclination of the entablature, and thickened corner columns. The inclusion of the trapezoidal plan of the peristyle and sekos as a subtlety of design is not without controversy, and C. (p. 154) does so with reservations.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chapters 10–33 contain the core of the architectural study, with each chapter devoted to specific parts of the temple (the foundations, the entranceways, etc.). Chapter 23, 'The Marble Roof', is a contribution by Kelly.

In the final chapter, Chapter 34, 'Iktinos, Architect at Bassai', C. argues that the temple of Apollo was designed by Iktinos, the architect of the Parthenon. He accepts the attribution made by Pausanias, 8.41.9. C. disagrees with theories which would make the temple a pre-Parthenon project started by Iktinos but finished much later by an unknown, lesser-skilled architect, first proposed by W. B. Dinsmoor, *MMS* 4 (1933), pp. 204–476. Dinsmoor's reconstruction of events has received general acceptance. In addition to reviewing the literary evidence for Iktinos' career, C. uses the subtleties which he identified throughout the temple of Apollo as proof that a great architect designed the building. Appendix B supplies text and translation of the relevant passages from ancient sources.

There is much to digest in these four volumes, and there is already disagreement about C.'s interpretation. A study begun in 1975 by the Epitrope Epikouriou was unpublished at the time C. had completed his work, but reports have since appeared: see *Δ. Σβολόπουλος. Νάος Επικουρίου Απόλλωνος Βασσών. Αρχιτεκτονική μελέτη.* (1995). *Κ. Παπαντωνοπουλος,* '*Νάος Επικουρίου Απόλλωνος Βασσών. Μελέτη δομικής αποκαταστασέως*', in *Η συνάντηση για τη συντηρήση του νάου του Επικουρίου Απόλλωνος. Αθήνα* 18–20 *Μάρτιου* 1995 (1996), and present alternatives to some of C.'s analyses. Nonetheless, the core of C.'s investigation, the documentation of the extensive surviving architectural remains, provides scholars and students with an invaluable source of information from which to draw their own conclusions.

Royal Holloway, London BLANCHE MENADIER

HELLENISTIC ARCHITECTURAL SCULPTURE

P. A. WEBB: *Hellenistic Architectural Sculpture: Figural Motifs in Western Anatolia and the Aegean Islands* (Wisconsin Studies in Classics). Pp. xv + 225, 142 ills. Wisconsin and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996. £47.95. ISBN: 0-299-14980-3.

Architectural sculpture is a hybrid subject which is usually analysed and interpreted by art historians steeped in the study of sculpture rather than architecture. With a few exceptions (the Siphnian treasury, the Parthenon sculptures, the Altar of Zeus at Pergamon), architectural sculpture of a particular period is lumped together in one chapter in handbooks on ancient Greek sculpture (see e.g. R. R. R. Smith, *Hellenistic Sculpture* [London, 1991], Chapter 10). A notable exception to this practice is the work of Ridgway, who has relied on architectural sculpture for sorting out stylistic questions, since it is often easier to assign a date or range of dates to a building because of its archaeological context. W. follows in the footsteps of Ridgway with this publication.

W. performs the admirable task of cataloguing the variously scattered published evidence for architectural sculpture in western Anatolia and the Aegean islands, as his subtitle claims. W. states (p. 3), 'The purpose of this volume is threefold: to examine how figural sculpture was used in Hellenistic architecture—the types of structures on

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which it was employed, its distribution among the architectural members of buildings, and the variety and prevalence of the different figural motifs; to determine patterns of usage over the three centuries of the period; and to gain understanding as to why architecture was ornamented in this manner.' A second volume on sculpture from the mainland is forthcoming.

The book is divided into two parts, 'Overview' and 'The Sites'. The former contains a perfunctory analysis of Hellenistic architecture and a slightly more in-depth interpretation of the use and meaning of its adornment with figural motifs. Charts which demonstrate building trends during the Hellenistic period allow a quick overview of the chronological and typological range of buildings which W. investigates, as well as identifying patterns in construction. W. demonstrates, for instance, that most Hellenistic temples decorated with sculpture were constructed in the second century B.C., while civic buildings with figural motifs are more common in the Late Hellenistic period.

In regard to the decoration, more discussion of the possible meaning(s) of such motifs is wanted. The significance of lions on heroa in W.'s opinion may be a reference to Apollo and resurrection (p. 42), but the use of lions in non-Greek royal funerary iconography and its influence on later Hellenistic art is also worth considering; see B. Ridgway, *Fourth-Century Styles in Greek Sculpture* (London, 1997), p. 130. Similarly, I have no argument with the concluding statement in W.'s overview (p. 43), 'architectural sculpture was not merely a means of decoration; it was a means of consecration', but a deeper insight into the symbolism of consecration to be found in motifs such as akanthos figures and griffins might inform the reader. W. argues for the influence of eastern motifs and influences, but with minimal explanation about the adaptation of such elements into Greek iconography. Equally, the rôle of the archaic Ionic sculptural tradition could have been given more emphasis. The evidence from Kysikos for draped women (possibly dancing), for example, might be explored as a possible influence on the Sagalassos heroön, and the chariot scene also from Kysikos (Istanbul 525) might be examined as a predecessor of the Ptolemaion at Limyra in addition to the Mausoleion at Halikarnassos; note B. Ridgway, *The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture*, 2nd edn rev. (Chicago, 1993), p. 384.

Themes of Hellenistic architectural sculpture in the east are not clearly developed. For example, in addition to the Hellenistic tendency to decorate monuments with literary allusions, the obvious geographical reasons for applying Trojan War scenes to the temple of Athena at Ilion and to the temple of Apollo Smintheus at Chryse (modern Gülpinar) are omitted from discussion.

The second part of the book, the catalogue of sites, is very useful, providing a separate bibliography for each building and notes for each site. The catalogue includes a wide spectrum of buildings, from the Altar of Zeus at Pergamon, long recognized by scholars as a defining monument of Hellenistic sculpture, to the recently excavated monuments of Sagalassos, and finally, stucco decoration in private houses on Delos. One might add to the bibliography M. Kreeb's study, *Untersuchungen zur figürlichen Ausstattung delischer Privathäuser* (Chicago, 1988). W. is careful to include the architectural and archaeological evidence (references to pottery dates when available) for each building, and prefers such data in favour of strict stylistic analysis, which she rightly believes is a tricky business in the Hellenistic period. W.'s interpretation of the Altar of Zeus at Pergamon as a heroön for Telephos, the mythological founder of the Pergamene dynasty, opens up fresh debate on a familiar monument.

One hundred and forty-two illustrations, of varying quality, accompany the text.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The most impressive of these are the photographs of the sculpture from the Chryse museum. These are also the most tantalizing as W. notes that there are other scenes (the death of Patroklos and the building of the Trojan horse) which should be published soon. To sum up, this is a useful compendium which will be enhanced by the publication of the second volume.

Royal Holloway, London B. MENADIER

SAMISCHE QUELLENKRITIK, OR PROBLEMS ON THE NORTHERN LINE

H. J. KIENAST: *Die Wasserleitung des Eupalinos auf Samos*. (Samos, 19.) Pp. xiv + 215, 41 pls, figs, 1 map. Bonn: Dr Rudolf Habelt for Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, 1995. ISBN: 3-7749-2713-8.

This is the first part of the keenly awaited publication of the 'tunnel of Eupalinos' to be published; the second, by the initiator of the project, Ulf Jantzen, will deal with the excavation and finds. The current volume has been trailered in earlier articles by K., though his thoughts on the *Entwurf* of the project have developed, and we have here a volume in which what is likely to be the definitive interpretation of the whole is presented—even if described by the author (p. 91) as 'nur ein Versuch . . . der Bedeutung dieses Monumentes gerecht zu werden'. The reviewer must add that his own experience of the tunnel consists largely of a guided tour from the author long enough ago and rather late in the evening—'it is always dark in the tunnel'; memories are in part indistinct.

The water system is in three parts, the volume in two—a full description of the physical remains and an evaluation of their construction and history, supplemented with suitable material on geology, survey, epigraphy, previous investigations, and the like. The discoverers of the tunnel remain elusive, with no evidence available for the north end and confusion over the south, though it is clear that Herodotus' report was the reason why the whole system was brought to light, and indeed apparently refurbished in 1882, a project for which there seems to be no written evidence extant. There are four large-scale fold-out plans and numerous other smaller drawings, as well as good photographic coverage; one might have wished for drawings of a few more crucial details that seem to have been accessible to the draughtsman, though this is a minor matter. Throughout care is taken to elucidate what was not visible or accessible.

The major results of the work are clear and scarcely disputable. The most striking involve the changes necessitated in the original 'simple' plan. K. argues convincingly that the tunnel was cut first, *amphistomos*, from both ends, after simple surveying had laid its route; a channel for the water-conduit was cut in it, level with the floor at the north end, some four metres below at the south. This was to be fed by a dammed reservoir upstream; but the reservoir pressure shifted the water source to a lower point (its present source) and necessitated lowering the conduit by a further four metres; hence the great depth, and frequently tunnelled construction, of that conduit. The political will behind both the original plan, in the early days of major civic waterworks in the Greek world, and in the financially burdensome change of plan is remarkable, and as noted by K., fully in keeping with the monumental approach to many projects in pre-Polykratean Samos.

In this respect, it is noted that the end of the system lies virtually in the centre of the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

walled circuit of Samos, while the areas to the east, including the port, were fed by a different source or sources, as demonstrated by the recent discovery of similar cuttings and pipes, wholly unconnected with Eupalinos' work. His scheme would seem to envisage a population expansion (presumably not akin to the current seasonal variety), unless it was indeed merely a show of bravado.

The second substantial result is the reconstruction of the planning done on the hoof by Eupalinos to ensure the correct line of the northern tunnel after bad rock had forced a detour. The argument has already been outlined in previous articles, but is fully developed here, and the reasons for a final slight inaccuracy noted, if not explained—an original 0.60° deviation from the intended line. The deviation itself and subsequent stretches to the breakthrough point were closely calculated, based on an isosceles triangle with 20° angles. A slight haste to complete the north tunnel is evident and is explained by enthusiasm generated by the noise of those in the southern tunnel, who had to extend their already completed section by six metres to 'catch' the northerners.

The tunnel was cut using a unit measure of 2.06 m, not a length calculable from any known foot measure, and seemingly generated *ad hoc* by Eupalinos to divide the whole into 500 units. Reversion to the Samian ell is apparent in secondary work. This is a cautionary lesson, and one derived from study of the painted marks on the tunnel walls (or very rarely, ceiling), which are used in an exemplary fashion to underpin the strategic conclusions drawn from the rest of the monument. With these marks there is much that is still uncertain, especially the more loquacious markings with 'gang-leader' names in the genitive, which are difficult to connect with any single process, especially as they run consistently from S to N, past the breakthrough point. A form of xi is given in the text drawing which would otherwise be dated in the Roman period; a photograph here would have been a useful control. The marks K, K with added B, and E, set on the wall above the shafts leading down to the conduit cutting, also remain enigmatic.

With its many plans, careful summary, and thorough argumentation this is a volume which deserves attention from a broad range of experts and lay alike. An index would have helped them. K. notes the lack of paradeigmata for the publication of holes in the ground rather than structures in the air; he sets an example which is well worthy of copying, though one may note that there appears to be a good deal of *sui generis* about every project of Greek hydro-engineering.

University College London ALAN JOHNSTON

BUILDING ROME

J. C. ANDERSON JNR: *Roman Architecture and Society*. Pp. xxiii + 442. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997. Cased, £33. ISBN: 0-8018-5546-2.

A satisfactory book, which sets out to offer 'a synthesis of the current state of knowledge' about Roman architecture within its own society. The first half deals with the organization of building, with methods of construction, and the second with the organization of space, both planning and actual use. The evidence is largely archaeological, but Vitruvius' treatise *De Architectura* is also fundamental. We must also be grateful for the Roman habit of writing inscriptions on all sorts of materials about all sorts of events.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The first, more technical, part of the book starts with a description of the architectural profession and its training, closely following Vitruvius, whose notion of a suitable education for architects is rather exalted. Nevertheless, they were always required to be competent draftsmen. Career patterns seem to have been a liberal education followed by an apprenticeship to a master architect, or both training and a career in either the army or the imperial building and maintenance service. Anderson sets out as fully as possible the names and careers of identifiable architects from the second century B.C. until the time of Hadrian when, mysteriously, information on individual architects ceases until the sixth century. Imperial architects seem mostly to have been freeborn, although earlier many were Greeks, enslaved or freed, or sometimes visitors. Architects ranked with the humbler professions, such as teaching and medicine; they could be engineers or contractors, builders or designers, in the public service or private.

Discussing the 'business' of building, A. talks briefly about the expansion of the City before considering the position of *redemptores* and the partnerships they were part of. Certainly contracting out, even for public works, remained common into the second century A.D. A few legal errors struck me. For example, A. seems to think a freedman had, on the death of his patron, to attach himself to a second patron, and that a patron must be freeborn (p. 46); he refers to 'foreigners, probably classified as *peregrini*' (p. 48). In the architects' and builders' main area of contract, *locatio conductio*, he is more at ease.

Chapter 3 describes the supply of manpower and materials. Slaves provided the highly skilled labour, free men the more occasional muscle; one imperial motive for public works was to provide employment, in the interests of social stability (pp. 126f.). I found really fascinating the sections on the supply of materials (p. 127). Anderson deals with wood, tufa, concrete, brick, and marble. He points out that although wood for fuel undoubtedly became scarce, building timber remained available, even in the sixth century, probably through contract logging in public forests. Tufa was local stone, easy to obtain and easy to work, but lacking strength. Concrete revolutionized Roman building techniques; its strength and plasticity made possible the typical Roman vault. But the period of high fashion for concrete buildings faced with *opus reticulatum* was relatively short, from mid-first century B.C. to mid-first century A.D. Once kiln-dried brick became widely available, it became the normal facing, even though clay supplies were running low from the second century on, probably because of the enormous demands made by Nero's rebuilding programme after the Great Fire and Hadrian's determination to renew the City. By the third century brick making seems to have become almost an imperial monopoly. Marble, apart from the white Carrara marble, was largely imported from the eastern Mediterranean. It had become normal for grand buildings by the reign of Augustus, and was to remain so until the troubles of the third century led to the collapse of the marble industry. For industry it was, with indirect ordering, stock-piling, and prefabrication of standard cuts.

The second half of the book produced less that was new to me—and much with which I agreed; for example, the extent of the great urban sprawl, disguised from later visitors by the sharp boundary created by the Aurelian Walls. A. traces the development of urban planning in the City, starting with Sulla's limited attempts, and progressing through Julius Caesar, Augustus, Nero, Hadrian, and the Severan rebuilding after the great fire of A.D. 192.

Discussing, in Chapter 5, public buildings and their sometimes disputed sites, he strikes an intelligent balance, as, for instance, with the *atrium Libertatis* (pp. 260–2), because his primary interest is in function. He points out the importance of temples as

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

meeting places and as defining a locality. He remarks that Vitruvius wrote too early to discuss the great imperial leisure centres, the *thermae*, which were so much more than baths, and so important in the social life of Romans of every class, or rather status. Again, amphitheatres, an architectural form typical of the imperial period in the West, were too late for Vitruvius, unlike theatres.

Describing everyday life and its surroundings, A. illustrates very clearly and helpfully the nature of mixed housing, and the lack of zoning, by devoting some pages (pp. 293ff.) to a description of the *insula* of the Menander at Pompeii. He explains clearly how the word *tabernae* covers shops and workshops, as well as bars. He rightly points out the Roman lack of need for privacy, even on the latrine, but does not note that in sixteenth-century houses one room opened from another. Interesting is his thought about palaces: 'How the emperors lived in them, or whether they did so any more than was absolutely necessary, we do not know' (p. 304, where, incidentally, there was a misprint, as there was on p. 306, but I did not notice any others in a very well-produced book).

A. is concerned with 'the *realia* of Roman architecture'—'the people and organizations, planning and topography', not the 'monuments as artistic creations or for their aesthetics'. He wants to know 'who' and 'why' in the search for 'more knowledge of a fascinating subject's practitioners and practices'. In his hope to have provided 'a reliable initial summary of the evidence' he seems to me to have done the job admirably.

Law School, University of Glasgow O. F. ROBINSON

THE VATICAN CEMETERY

H. Mielsch, H. von Hesberg: *Die heidnische Nekropole unter St Peter in Rom: Die Mausoleen E–I und Z–Psi.* (Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia, Serie III: Memorie, 16.2.) Pp. 203 (72–275), ills. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1995. Paper. ISBN: 88-7062-903-1.

This publication of eight major tombs (with a few other associated structures) in the Vatican cemetery forms a sequel to tombs A–D published in 1986. Each tomb is considered individually under three headings: building, decoration, and (very briefly) loose finds. Significant portions of the tombs were destroyed or altered by later (especially Constantinian) building works (the front half of Z no longer survives, all ceilings were hacked down to varying extents, many features of the facades were mutilated). The original features are reconstructed as far as possible, but the Constantinian building phase is inadequately illustrated and rather difficult to follow. One feature elucidated is the function of the internal staircases of E, F, and H, giving access not, as previously interpreted, to the hillside or to an upper room, but to a roof terrace, possibly used as a triclinium. The complex patterns of the variously shaped niches in the main wall zones inside the late Hadrianic and Antonine tombs (E–I), with their architectural embellishments in stucco, are analysed and reconstructed in detail: in the later tombs (Z, Phi, and Chi) the arcosolia, arranged simply in two tiers, received little stucco ornament but were elaborately painted.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Colour schemes follow general trends, from the paler tones of tomb G, through the bolder contrasts of E, F, and I, to the virtual monochrome of the later tombs. Tomb H stands apart with its predominantly white stucco reliefs. The motifs and figured scenes of each tomb are itemized, while analysis of their stylistic characteristics aids dating. Their iconography is discussed at some length, but less space is devoted to their possible significance. Individual motifs predominate in the earlier tombs, though G has the only 'popular' scene in the cemetery (a 'reckoning' between a seated boss and a much smaller underling). The myths represented in paint and mosaic are those in vogue in contemporary funerary art: the rape of Proserpina, Herakles with Alcestis, Dionysus finding Ariadne and Mars with Rhea Silvia, a possible childhood of Dionysus, etc.—more unusual is the scene once identified as a Judgement of Paris but now interpreted as the Aglaurides with Hermes, a theme possibly popularized by Herodes Atticus. Sea-thiasos scenes include one in tomb Phi with two tiers of figures moving in opposite directions, while in Chi Aphrodite is unusually carried on a triangular cloth. The Egyptian motifs in Z, it is argued, were commissioned not by Egyptians living in Rome, but by Roman adherents of Egyptian cults.

The stucco decoration of tomb H merits the longest treatment. Inside the niches are statues of deities (Hermes carrying the infant Dionysus, Athena, Selene, Hypnos), of members of the family (C. Valerius Herma, his wife Flavia Olympias, and their daughter)—also of an elderly togatus, tentatively identified as Herma's patron, and of two philosophers, perhaps Herma's teachers, as he had literary interests. A series of herms (another reference to Herma's name) represent figures from the Indian Triumph of Dionysus, and there are further Dionysiac figures (maenads, satyrs, a Pan, and a Silenus) with appropriate attributes, mostly neo-Attic types also found on sarcophagi. Small pieces from the ceiling suggest a design of vines with grape-harvesting cupids, possibly with baetyli at the corners and a large bust of Dionysus (? and Ariadne). The most significant of the finds from the tombs are also from H. Two marble portrait heads are probably from a full-length, life-size relief of Valerius Herma and Flavia Olympias. Of the stucco busts, one plausibly represents Flavia Olympias and another may be her daughter Valeria Maxima, but a third gilded head of a small boy is thought *not* to represent the son Valerius Olympianus, as it belongs stylistically to the early third century. Finally there is a death-mask of a small child, and moulds for masks of a bearded man (Valerius Herma?) and a second child: casts taken from these moulds have been published previously, but not the moulds themselves.

Detailed description, reconstruction, identification of subject matter, and stylistic features are the main concerns and provide a valuable basis for further study, but broader considerations are kept to a minimum. As this is only part of a larger project to publish the necropolis there is no introduction, conclusion, or overview, and no plan of the cemetery as a whole. The inscriptions, ash chests, and sarcophagi are to be published separately, making it difficult to get a holistic view even of the individual tombs. The volume is copiously illustrated with black-and-white and coloured photographs, and has meticulous plans, cross-sections, and elevations. Even so, the illustrations do not always illustrate the text adequately, and their quality is at times disappointingly murky. It is also distressing to note that in several instances photographs taken at the time of the excavation show paintings no longer decipherable because of their deterioration.

University of Edinburgh GLENYS DAVIES

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

THE INSULA OF THE MENANDER

R. LING: *The Insula of the Menander at Pompeii: Volume I: The Structures.* Pp. xviii + 393, 62 figs, 131 pls. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. Cased, £85. ISBN: 0-19-813409-6.

This volume is the first of three planned (the second to be on the interior decoration and the third on the finds), publishing the results of an intensive survey carried out between 1978 and 1986 on the *insula* of the Menander (I, 10) at Pompeii. The programme of investigation and documentation—there was no further excavation—was initially financed from the profits of the *Pompeii AD79* exhibition of 1975–6; it is thus just and right that this first volume is dedicated to the memory of John Ward-Perkins.

As L. says in his introduction, the necessity of recording is apparent to any visitor to Pompeii. The *insula*, excavated in 1926–33, was restored at the time and again just before the 1980 earthquake; yet weather, vandalism, theft, and invasive vegetation seem to be winning all the time. There can be no more eloquent testimony to this truth than the fact that, of 100 items of pottery found in structural contexts listed in Appendix B (compiled in 1984), no fewer than ten had disappeared by 1992–3.

In published work as in reality (see the pie-chart on p. 242), the *insula* is dominated by the house (I, 10, 4) which gives it its name. But the great houses and public buildings have for too long dominated the scene. Here for the first time we have a full study of an entire *insula*, and an attempt to use the information gained to illuminate its social history and thus the social history of Pompeii as a whole.

The main body of the volume is divided into three. The short Part One introduces the reader to the *insula*, and discusses the history of its excavation and restoration, building materials and techniques, and problems of interpretation and dating. Over half the volume is taken up by Part Two, which takes each house in turn and describes its state in the final phase, its probable internal functioning, evidence for upper storeys, possible roofing arrangements, what is known of the occupants, and its structural history. Part Three attempts to reconstruct the structural history of the whole *insula* and presents an excellent final discussion. Chief among the six appendices which follow is the first, which provides a full gazetteer.

The concluding discussion highlights two aspects which strike the reader throughout. First, the continuous process of change which the various properties underwent; here L. effectively compares our current obsession with home improvements and house extensions, which he illustrates (p. 238) by the several changes his own house has undergone in as little as thirty-five years. The second, even more remarkable, feature is the 'degree of fluidity shown by property boundaries', as can be seen, for example, in the way in which the House of the Menander was at one point combined with the neighbouring *Casa del Fabbro* into a two-*atrium* house, only to be separated from it less than a century later.

L. divides the history of the *insula* into five phases, the first the 'Sarno-stone' period, and the second to fifth corresponding to the four styles of Pompeian wall painting. In this he differs from his views in the preliminary report of 1983 (*Antiquaries Journal* 63, 34–57) by bringing down the first two periods and dividing only the fifth period into two (before and after the A.D. 62 earthquake). Yet he remains aware of the limitations of such a chronology, refusing to be tempted into 'a degree of precision beyond what the evidence warrants' (p. 223). Indeed, a judicious and justifiable caution is seen in all the tentative conclusions. This is well exemplified by his

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

refusal to accept Maiuri's speculations about the identity of the skeleton found in room 43 of the House of the Menander or Della Corte's about the house's owner; he will only allow himself the conjecture 'that our householder belonged to the decurional class and was very likely at some stage a duovir' (pp. 142–4). And in his concluding discussion he is aware of the need to be 'cautious in reading sociological conclusions from the archaeological evidence' (p. 246).

The book is clearly laid out, with a plan and structure that are easy to follow; but in one respect it is cumbersome to use. In Part Two the plates are well integrated into the text and there are figures to illustrate particular points; but, with rooms continually referred to only by their number, it is awkward to have to turn sometimes as much as 100 or 150 pages forward to the first of the additional plates on p. 346 to find out which room is meant. When such expense has otherwise been lavished on production, it is perhaps a pity that plans of each house, showing room numbers, were not included nearer the points of reference.

L. has given us a vivid picture of the good, the bad, and the ugly sides of life within a Pompeian *insula*, and of 'the inequalities of wealth and power in Pompeian society' (p. 239). This is a major contribution to Pompeian studies, and the succeeding volumes can only be eagerly awaited.

University of Wales, Lampeter A. J. BROTHERS

ROMAN OSTIA REVISITED

A. G. Zevi, A. Claridge (edd.): *Roman Ostia Revisited: Archaeological and Historical Papers in Memory of Russell Meiggs.* Pp. xix + 307, ills. London: British School at Rome in collaboration with the Soprintendenza Archeologica di Ostia, 1996. ISBN: 0-904152-29-4.

Russell Meiggs's *Roman Ostia* still remains a starting point for any serious consideration of one of the most extensively excavated remains of a town in Roman Italy. Its recent re-issue points to the importance of the work. In fact, the totality of Meiggs's volume has caused many scholars to shy away from attempting to update the second edition published in the early 1970s or even to consider their knowledge to be extensive enough to begin such a task. The book under review does not so much reassess the work of Meiggs, but celebrate his achievement and foresight. The papers were delivered at a conference held at the British School at Rome in 1992 to pay tribute to Meiggs's contribution and to follow up some of his own findings with reference to more recent information made available in the last twenty years. Of the papers in the volume three discuss Meiggs's scholarship on Ostia, four deal with the period prior to the Social War, seven discuss the imperial period, and finally three papers bring the subject of Portus into sharper focus.

There is not space to discuss all the papers and the issues raised in depth in this short review. As Murray points out, Meiggs's work was characterized by an empirical or positivist outlook that was based on his wartime experience; in keeping with such an outlook, the papers in the volume have a similar feel. There are welcome additions

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to our knowledge of the archaic period of the city. Martin reports on excavations of the west wall of the *castrum* conducted by La Sapienza in the 1970s, Adembri's study of fourth century B.C.E. ceramics points to a close connection between Ostia and the Ager Faliscus in the middle Tiber valley, and Zevi makes an important contribution to our understanding of the shape of the Ostian street plan with reference to the pre-existing road system. To move on to the imperial period, some of the papers offer interpretations of evidence unavailable to Meiggs, for example Pavolini's statistical analysis of pottery found during the excavation of the Terme del Nuotatore with comparison to excavated deposits from Rome—to give one statistic: in the Flavian period the proportion of imported Gallic Sigillata to Italian Sigillata at Ostia was 1:5. New approaches to the evidence are also present in the book, not least DeLaine's application of cost analysis to the Insula of the Paintings. The paper is an interesting application of ethno-archaeology, which uses wherever possible numerical costs from the ancient world. The results should be treated with caution, since some of the figures used in the calculations need not reflect costs from the Hadrianic period of actual construction. Indeed, the figures should be regarded as a general guide to the order of magnitude of expenditure rather than as figures of actual cost. Mar's study of the changing use of space around the sanctuary of Hercules demonstrates how much can be achieved in terms of detailed attention to topography, and in particular the development of the Baths of Buticosus and housing close by. He also raises the important question of the ownership of property in the town by priesthoods and professional *collegia*. Some of the papers are disappointing. Coarelli's attempt via topography to locate the Forum Vinarium leads to no real conclusion—similarly, Pensabene's survey of building inscriptions updates the list but does not make any substantial conclusions about that evidence. In contrast, the papers on Portus open a new chapter in Ostia's history. Rickman points out that to speak of Ostia is to speak of Portus, and places the development of the two within the wider context of ports in the Mediterranean. Purcell outlines a framework to understand the interrelationship of Portus and Ostia. P. admits each of the thirteen sections could have become a paper in its own right—it is a shame he has not simply written the book of those papers! Finally, Coccia reports on his archaeological investigation of Portus in late antiquity and demonstrates that much was abandoned—clearly, more archaeological work at Portus would greatly improve our knowledge of the earlier periods as well.

The volume indicates what work has been done at Ostia in recent years. Disappointingly, it does not hold together, and lacks a general coherence and clear conclusions for the reader. Many of the papers read as though they have been published with few changes from the original delivery given at the conference itself. The editors have not pulled the themes together for the reader in any form of introduction or concluding chapter to highlight what has been achieved by the work conducted at Ostia since Meiggs's volume. However, it would be unfair to level such criticism specifically at this volume, since it could be applied to most collections of papers from such conferences. The subsequent conferences on Ostia have continued to provide a forum for the discussion of work on an urban excavation of as much importance as that of Pompeii. In this volume, we see a glimpse of what might be achieved in the future with further study.

University of Reading RAY LAURENCE

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

SURVEYING SEGERMES

S. Dietz, L. L. Sebaï, H. Ben Hassen (edd.): *Africa Proconsularis: Regional Studies in the Segermes Valley of Northern Tunisia.* 2 vols. Pp. 1–438, 439–799, ills. Aarhus: Collection of Near Eastern and Classical Antiquities, The National Museum of Denmark (distributed by Aarhus University Press), 1995. DKK 480/£60/$80. ISBN: 87-7288-740-0.

Archaeological field survey has expanded by leaps and bounds in Tunisia. Since 1980, nine projects have investigated portions of the country, and much additional research has been conducted in the context of the *Carte Nationale des Monuments Historiques et Sites Archéologiques*, a government-sponsored program to inventory all such places in Tunisia.

The Project Africa Proconsularis (also known as the Segermes Survey) combined environmental studies and excavation with one of the most methodologically rigorous of these recent surveys. A Danish–Tunisian collaboration, it stressed interdisciplinary approaches to the analysis of the ancient economy in its intensive study of 26 km^2 of a 150 km^2 area around the Roman *municipium* of Segermes (in northeastern Tunisia, 60 km south of Carthage). This two-volume publication serves primarily as the initial treatment of the data collected by the multi-period field survey; contributions from historians and the Tunisian team excavating at Segermes are planned to follow in other volumes. The project's directors are especially to be congratulated for the rapidity with which they have brought their results to publication and for the many issues they have given us to consider in the 800 pages presented here.

Ancient writers have conditioned us to regard Roman North Africa as a naturally fertile landscape, but we must remember that this statement applied, if at all, to only the more well-watered plains of northern Tunisia. In this sense the results from the valley around Segermes are salutary evidence of the difficulties inhabitants had to confront in order to turn this landscape, with an average precipitation of 400 mm/year, into a productive environment. Volume I begins with three chapters which address issues relating to the natural environment. Using comparative data on the modern climate, geographer Henning Mørch concludes that Segermes never could have been a reliable source of grain for the *annona.* Geomorphologist Eberhard Zangger evaluates the extent and causes of environmental changes in the Late Quaternary, arguing that human impact on the environment has been greater than that of natural climatic fluctuations. Palynologist Else Kolstrup attempts to reconstruct the Holocene vegetational history of the region and suggests that a wide variety of crops were grown in the Roman period.

Succeeding chapters focus on the description of the methodology of the survey and the documention of the ground covered and sites discovered in each season by the survey team. A structural survey team investigated all 193 sites in the region containing architectural remains, and the catalogue of these sites forms the longest section (200 pages) of this report. Finds from individual sites are here thoroughly presented, and the photographs, site maps, and artefact drawings in this section are of high quality. It is puzzling and disappointing that a similarly organized, if less lengthy, catalogue was not made for sites consisting only of a scatter of sherds; no map indicates the locations of these sites and their numbers are not clearly stated anywhere.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A third team conducted eleven small excavations at representative sites in order to evaluate the results of the survey. The excavations indicated that artefacts on the surface compared reasonably well to those below ground in hilly areas where there had not been much geomorphological change since antiquity. In zones of extensive flooding and colluvial deposition, however, the buried stratigraphy consistently dated to an earlier period than the surface finds. Despite the small number of sites excavated, the results suggest that the relationship between surface and subsurface assemblages is complicated; although this issue has caught the attention of archaeologists in the past, the data from Segermes argue that this problem deserves more sustained and systematic consideration by other projects.

The catalogue of pottery, in which John Lund presents all fine wares recovered from the project's various investigations, contains a helpful discussion of recent research on fine wares in North Africa, the problems of interpreting the material, and methods used in his study. The catalogue is detailed and informative, but it is a pity that it was not possible to include the coarse wares and amphoras, which amounted to 85% of the total ceramic material recovered by the project.

Separate chapters on prehistory, burial customs, water supply, coinage, evidence for Christianity, and other topics present varying amounts of evidence (those on architectural decoration and inscriptions are the most thorough), although they are somewhat disappointing due to their lack of integration with the other sections in the volumes.

The Project Africa Proconsularis has provided an impressive model for other surveys in many areas, including its integration of results from archaeological and natural science investigations, its high degree of collaboration between Tunisian and Danish researchers, its thorough discussions and plans of all sites with standing remains, and its presentation of exhaustive comparanda for dating fine ware pottery. The value of this report will only increase, especially as more of the recent Tunisian surveys are published at length. As individual members of this project plan to write further about their results, it seems appropriate to offer some suggestions on what is needed in future reports. First, while presentation of data and discussions of methodology are well represented in the volumes, there is less of an attempt at making overarching conclusions. Søren Dietz's final chapter is valuable in this respect, but still deals more with chronological trends than with explaining the characteristics of the region. Why in an area so close to Carthage do rural settlement numbers peak in the fourth to sixth centuries A.D. while limited rural activity takes place beforehand? The rather late development of the area in comparison with Carthage, the Tell, Tripolitania, the Sahel, or the High Steppe should make us consider seriously the extent of regional variation among North African landscapes. Secondly, more attention should be directed toward in-depth synthesis of common rural site types, such as cemeteries (with more than fifty discovered), hydraulic installations (50+), olive pressing facilities (36), and bath houses (22). A closer look at the cisterns, reservoirs, aqueducts, mills, and counterweights may indicate more clearly how rural investments produced surpluses, then expended on baths or mausolea. Finally, the study of the project's coarse wares and amphoras is essential—and also feasible now that extensive research on ceramic typologies at nearby coastal sites (Carthage, Sabratha, Uzita, and Leptiminus) should have made it relatively easy to find comparanda for the forms from Segermes. The coarse wares and amphoras will not only provide a broader range of evidence for dating the sites discovered around Segermes which may modify the conclusions in these volumes (only 56% of surveyed sites and 77% of sites with architectural remains contained datable

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

fine wares) but will add a rural and inland perspective to the work based at urban and coastal centers.

University of Michigan DAVID L. STONE

DIGGING IN ALGERIA

A. GROSLAMBERT (ed.): *L'archéologie algérienne de 1895 à 1915. Les rapports d'Albert Ballu publiés au Journal Officiel de la République Française de 1896 à 1916.* (Collection du Centre d'Études romaines et gallo-romaines. Nouvelle série, 16.) Pp. 421. Lyons: Diffusion de Boccard (Paris), 1997. ISBN: 2-904974-15-6.

The era of colonial archaeology in Algeria saw vast clearance operations which uncovered whole urban quarters of many major Roman sites. The director of the Service des Monuments Historiques de l'Algérie for twenty of these years was the architect Albert Ballu, and it is his annual reports to the Ministre de l'Instruction Publique et des Beaux-Arts, published in the *Journal Officiel*, which are reprinted in this volume. As these excavations are of great importance for the archaeology of Roman Algeria, yet have been little published, this book is much to be welcomed. The reports include the major excavations at Timgad (accounting for perhaps half the material), Lambaesis, Djemila, Khamissa, Hippo Regius, Cherchel, and many other sites, during 1895–1915. There is a very brief preface, and a short index; otherwise editorial intervention is minimal. Although G. explains this by not wanting to create an overlengthy volume, it is to be regretted, as the reader is given no background to the reports and little idea of the reliability of the information presented or of the circumstances and nature of excavations at the various sites.

Most of these reports are very brief summaries of large clearance operations; there are no plans, no drawings of artefacts, no stratigraphic information. The absence of illustrations makes it very difficult to follow site descriptions or make sense of the artefacts listed. Provenance of finds, if given at all, is given only in the most vague terms; for example, three pages of small finds from the excavations at Timgad in 1911 relate them only to the area of the city from which they came, e.g. 'maisons du Quartier Nord-Est' or 'fouilles côté Nord du Decumanus Ouest' (pp. 277–9). Very few discoveries are dated, except for those buildings whose date is given by inscriptions. The shortcomings of the reports are explicable in terms of the standards of French colonial archaeology of the period in general, and by Ballu's own background as an architect rather than an archaeologist in particular; but they deserve to be spelt out explicitly for the unsuspecting reader. Furthermore, much of the material presented here had already been published (largely verbatim, though with some truncation of detail regarding objects found) in the *Bulletin du Comité des Travaux Scientifiques et Historiques* for the years concerned (of which no mention is made in this volume), and, in the case of the Timgad excavations, in Ballu's monographs on that site (*Les ruines de Timgad* [Paris, 1903]; *Les ruines de Timgad, antique Thamugadi: Sept années de decouvertes* [Paris, 1911]).

That said, the reports constitute a mine of interesting information about the archaeology of Roman North Africa. There is evidence of a possible water distribution *castellum* at Cherchel, in the form of diverging channels and pipes near large cisterns (p. 23); an arsenal of projectiles at Lambaesis (p. 29); Christian

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

catacombs at Kherbet Bou Addoufen near Sétif (p. 32); houses at Cherchel with kitchens (rarely attested in other North African excavations, probably as a result of lack of attention to domestic architecture) (p. 48); an 'agricola bonus' inscription from Ksar El Kebir near Khamissa (p. 54); a large quantity of millet grains at Lambaesis (p. 55); many fulling establishments at Timgad (pp. 243–5, 274–5); delivery inscriptions on unused columns in the forum at Khamissa (p. 310); and interesting detail on groundwater collection systems and a foggara-type aqueduct at Madauros (pp. 284, 311).

Such nuggets of interest are, however, buried deep in lists of finds or reports of clearance and restoration work. The detail given is tantalizingly little, and accordingly this volume will be useful chiefly as a basis for further synthesis-discussion of Roman North Africa. The indices provided, of gods, emperors and other individuals, place-names, and other nouns are of some help, but the subject index in particular is inadequate to this task. This prompts the question of whether monograph reprints such as this are really the best way of making information on old excavations more widely accessible. Few readers are going to read all 421 pages of this book sequentially; most will dip into it as a reference work for particular sites or building types. Since the text had to be rekeyed anyway, it is a pity that the decision was not taken to make it available electronically on the World-Wide Web (ideally with each section of a report keyworded), which would make consultation vastly easier and the results more comprehensive. Perhaps future publication of old reports—especially nineteenth-century material, which tends to consist largely of text and few plans—should be considered in this medium; but in the meantime G. is certainly to be congratulated on reminding us of the importance of reports of early excavations.

Magdalen College, Oxford ANDREW WILSON

ROMAN(?) BRITAIN

M. MILLETT: *English Heritage Book of Roman Britain*. Pp. 144, 86 ills, 12 colour pls. London: B. T. Batsford/English Heritage, 1995. Paper, £15.99. ISBN: 0-7134-7793-8.

This volume is part of a series of popularizing but scholarly books produced by English Heritage and dealing with the sites of prehistoric, Roman, and medieval England. It is no surprise, therefore, to find that its focus is firmly archaeological and that its main concerns are the social, economic, and cultural history of this island under Roman rule. M.'s book in fact displays exactly the same strengths and weaknesses as his earlier work on *The Romanization of Britain* (Cambridge, 1990), namely a magisterial control of the archaeological evidence and its interpretation, coupled with a dismissal of the literary sources verging on disdain.

In practice, of course, M. cannot escape the written accounts. Indeed, the introductory chapter, entitled 'Britain and History', provides an historical outline which is entirely based upon them. The rest of the book, however, seeks to place 'the Classical texts within a framework defined by the archaeological evidence' (pp. 26–7). It is arguable whether, for Roman Britain, they can—or should—be disentangled in this way and subordinated one to the other. The significance and veracity of the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

literary texts for Roman Britain have always been examined in the light of archaeological discovery, while archaeological remains have always been interpreted in the light of what is known from literary evidence. M. does it himself many times in this book, for instance where he discusses pre-conquest exports to the Roman empire, overtly using archaeological evidence but relying also, without acknowledgement, on the narrative of Strabo (p. 39). M.'s prejudice against Roman literary sources is sometimes translated into a discounting of Roman influence upon the island, and even leads him into declaring in his first chapter that 'most of the population were probably never aware of the historical events previously outlined' (p. 33). This is unknowable, and unfairly begs a crucial question about the nature and extent of Romanization in Britain at the very outset of the book.

M.'s skilful analysis nevertheless provides many genuine insights. He carefully considers the varying impact of Rome on the regions of Britain: in the civilian south, economic development which produced a shift in the means of displaying wealth and power from status goods to art and architecture in towns and villas, Romanized dress and the use of Latin; in the north, where the army remained in control, the reduction of the native élite to subservience, an absence of towns and villas, and frequent revolts; and beyond the frontiers, especially in the Lowlands of Scotland, a development of native culture as a result of independent proximity to and intercourse with the Empire. Following recent scholarship, the influence of the army on the development of towns is played down, but the impact of army cash on the destabilization of the native economy and the development of a hybrid economy closer to a genuine market is duly acknowledged. Later on, changes in the system of tax involving the collection of taxes in kind and increased opportunities for the aristocracy to avoid payment led to a concentration of wealth in the hands of the élite and the growth of a peasant underclass.

The chapters on art and religion are the best in the book. M. notes that Celtic art had been stimulated by contact with the Mediterranean before the conquest, but after A.D. 43 status goods produced in traditional style were undercut and Roman styles were adopted, albeit mainly from provincial Romans who arrived in the army or as traders and craftsmen. The result was a Celtic interpretation of Roman forms, with aesthetic considerations of less importance than the display of the patron's 'Roman' taste. M.'s discussion of religion is not particularly reliable when dealing with Roman attitudes to foreign religions or the rôle of the imperial cult, but his account of the Romanization of Celtic religion is one of the clearest I have seen and makes a real attempt to explain how it came about and what *interpretatio Romana* meant to those who practised it.

Throughout, M. is least successful when discussing purely Roman institutions. Very little is said about the army and frontiers, or the central administration, and Chapter 3, which deals with these, is often unreliable in detail. In particular, the description of the emperor's tribunician power (p. 75 and cf. p. 138) is wholly misleading and, in fact, irrelevant.

This is a book, then, which has to be used selectively and with caution, and it is questionable whether its intended audience amongst the general public will be best equipped to do this. The more traditional aspects of the study of Roman Britain—the narrative history, administration, the army—are, in general, poorly served, even allowing for the professed aims of the volume. This is a pity, but the skill with which the other aspects are discussed and brought to life more than compensates. On the native experience of Roman rule, on the economy, on art, and on religion it is succinct, clear, and often outstandingly good. Like all the volumes in the series, it is superbly

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

illustrated. It certainly deserves a place on undergraduate reading lists (with some careful direction), and can be read with enjoyment and profit by anyone with an interest in the subject.

Royal Holloway, London BORIS RANKOV

A HARD LOOK

J. R. CLARKE: *Looking at Lovemaking. Constructions of Sexuality in Roman Art, 100 BC to AD 250.* Pp. xvii + 372, 107 figs, 16 pls. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1998. Cased, £27.50. ISBN: 0-520-20024-1.

It was clear to me from the outset that Clarke has produced a major book which contains much that is new, useful, and stimulating in terms of analysis as well as evidence. If not quite the last word on Roman 'erotic' art, it is certainly the *dernier cri*; C. melds contemporary theoretical insights and fresh primary data with a hard look at contexts—not only the original settings of the art works he discusses, but also the intellectual climates which have produced modern analyses. The result is a book which points in significant and unexpected directions. *En route* the reader is presented with many unfamiliar and striking images, such as the cycle of paintings from Apodyterium 7 in the Suburban Baths at Pompeii, which were only uncovered in 1986 (plates 9–16, discussed at length on pp. 212–40). Indeed, one of the book's many refreshing aspects is that it does not recycle the familiar repertory of objects and paintings. C.'s sampling of Roman art is representative, ranging from élite domestic paintings to lamp decorations and Arretine ware, without running the full gamut (there is nothing on coroplastics and very little on gemstones), thus providing a springboard for future work on different data sets.

In a useful introductory section (pp. 7–18), C. spells out the difficulties of reading sexual images from Roman culture and suggests some ways towards a more nuanced and contextually specific interpretation. The book's subtitle, 'Constructions of Sexuality in Roman Art', hints at his theoretical stance. The introduction and next two chapters (pp. 19–90) are certainly influenced by Foucault, but C. deploys him lightly and the book is largely free of the doctrinaire constructionism of other Roman studies of sexual behaviour. C. emphasizes the variability and difference of Roman sexual acculturation, and that the terminology usually used to describe Roman scenes of love-making is unhelpful in that it smooths over differences to create a world where ancient experience can be read against modern. Accordingly (and very sensibly), he rejects applying designations such as 'erotic', 'pornographic', 'heterosexual', and 'homosexual' to Roman art, as these are categories which would have been meaningless to the original audience. C.'s overall project is to reinstate the presence of that audience, and the following six chapters attempt, with varying degrees of success, to answer these questions about the production of sexually explicit images: '[i]n every case, with every object, I ask: who made it? (artist); when was it created'? (date); who paid for it? (patronage); who looked at it? (intended audience); where did people look at it? (physical context)' (p. 11). After the introductory material, C.'s approach is broadly chronological, with Chapters 3–5 concentrating on the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, and 6–7 focusing on the cities destroyed by Vesuvius. The concluding

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

chapter, on 'The Spread of Sexual Imagery through the Roman World,' is more broadly based. This structure of theoretical orientation + case studies and conclusion mostly works very well. Only Chapter 5, 'Sex and the Body of the Other', seems to sit a little uncomfortably. Since much of the material here has already been published (as 'Hypersexual Black Men in Augustan Baths: Ideal Somatotypes and Apotropaic Magic', in N. B. Kampen [ed.], *Sexuality in Ancient Art* [Cambridge, 1996], pp. 184–98) one questions its inclusion.

The attempt to restore the physical setting of these images is one of the book's most significant achievements. Many explicit images from antiquity are now divorced from context, preserved as small vignettes in which they become truly pornographic in the sense that they home in, like the pornographer's camera, on genitals and penetration. (And can it be a coincidence that the term 'pornography' was resuscitated in the mid-nineteenth century from a *hapax* in Athenaeus to describe the secret museum at Naples of sexually explicit images from Pompeii and Herculaneum?) This is demonstrated most effectively in Chapter 6, where C. ruthlessly dismantles the fictitious contexts that have been reconstructed for many ancient scenes of love-making. These are often assumed to have been located in bedrooms as a stimulus to venery, but, drawing on a spate of recent work on the undifferentiated space of the Roman house (including his own), C. shows that one cannot assume *a priori* that this is so. Then there is the relationship of the scene of love-making to the overall decoration of the room: the so-called *cubiculum* B of the Farnesina house in Rome is a case in point (pp. 94–107). C. demonstrates how the pictures of love-making in this room were not central elements of the whole decorative scheme but subordinate ones, located high above the eye-line and a fraction of the size of the principal paintings. Of course, this impression disappears once the erotic painting is removed from this context to become an art object in its own right. Now, it is possible to overstate this argument, since the Romans certainly realized the erotic potential of works of art (famously articulated in Clement of Alexandria's diatribe [*Protrepticus* 4.57–61] against the baleful influence of obscene paintings in bedrooms); and a couple is shown looking at an erotic picture in the Pompeian *lupanar* painting C. reproduces as fig. 83 (p. 201). But here C. has made an important contribution to considering questions of response and intent in Roman art, developing the work of (for instance) Bettina Bergmann and Jas Elsner. I was, however, surprised that the picture captions have no scale for the objects, although dimensions are usually given somewhere in the text. The Warren cup, for instance, is reproduced almost actual size, but you have to read C.'s discussion carefully before you find how big it is. This reduces the helpfulness of the illustrations in the crucial reconstruction of context since (as C. is at pains to point out in Chapter 5) size definitely does matter. But maybe this is owed to the publisher's house style.

This is a handsome book, very reasonably priced, and with high production standards. Typographical errors are rare, but the bibliography could have done with more careful checking: for example, the same book edited by Elaine Gazda (in which C. himself has an article!) is cited differently on pp. 338 and 341; Jack Winkler's *The Constraints of Desire* appears without its definite article on p. 358, and there are many more. But it seems unfair to level bibliographical pedantries at such an elegant and polished book, one of the most important contributions to studies of the Roman sexual experience.

University of Warwick DOMINIC MONTSERRAT

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ALBANIAN EPIGRAPHY

P. Cabanes, F. Drini (edd.): *Inscriptions d'Épidamne-Dyrrhachion et d'Apollonia: 1. Inscriptions d'Épidamne-Dyrrhachion.* (Études épigraphiques 2: Corpus d'inscriptions d'Illyrie meridionale et d'Épire, I.) Pp. 177, 587 pls. Athens: École française d'Athènes; Fondation Démétrios et Eglé Botsaris, 1995. ISBN: 2-86958-076-2.

P. Cabanes (ed.): *Inscriptions d'Épidamne-Dyrrhachion et d'Apollonia: 2. Inscriptions d'Apollonia d'Illyrie.* (Études épigraphiques 2: Corpus d'inscriptions d'Illyrie méridionale et d'Épire, I.2.) Pp. 150, 27 pls. Athens: École française d'Athènes; Fondation Démétrios et Eglé Botsaris, 1997. ISBN: 2-86958-094-0.

Pierre Cabanes has dedicated his career to the epigraphy of Albania and northwestern Greece. After several important publications, his efforts have now led to the first volume (in two parts) of the *Corpus d'Inscriptions d'Illyrie méridionale et d'Épire*; a volume with the inscriptions of Bouthrôtos is to follow, as is a third volume uniting the inscriptions of central and southern Albania. When in a few years time Albania will no longer represent a white spot on the epigraphers' map, it will be mainly due to C. The volumes are beautifully produced, but expensive at about £90 each. Might it not have been cheaper to have at least these two parts of the corpus, which so clearly form a unity, bound in one volume?

Visitors to the sites of Apollonia (A) and Epidamnos/Dyrrhachion (E/D) sometimes find it hard to suppress a feeling of disappointment: Sir Henry Holland, who visited the area in 1812, described the archaeological remains of A as 'very inconsiderable' (quoted by C. vol. 1, p. 11). A modern traveller, Paul Theroux, claims that at first sight 'nothing was right in Dürres'—the modern name of E/D—(*The Pillars of Hercules* [London, 1995], Chapter 12). The reader of the volumes under review may well experience a similar sense of initial disappointment. The inscriptions collected here are mostly short and rather uninformative funerary inscriptions that will be of interest mainly to specialists in the study of Greek and Illyrian onomastics. In fact, the editor himself admits to a sense of disappointment, when he writes—apologetically—that the two sites have not yielded any 'grands et beaux décrets' (vol. 1, p. 50). But decrees are not all that matter, and the persevering reader will find much useful information about these two Albanian sites.

Vol. 1 contains a selection of accounts by modern travellers to the site, as well as a large number of literary testimonia with emphasis on the political and institutional history. They show that E/D was at the centre of history only briefly in the period immediately preceding the Peloponnesian War, when it was the object of hostilities between Korinth and Kerkyra (Thuc. 1.24–6). Aristotle provides us with some information on the political institutions of the two cities. Unfortunately the inscriptions are virtually silent on these points. The literary testimonia referring to later periods (when the majority of the surviving inscriptions were set up) serve to show that the main events of history were usually happening elsewhere. The corpus also includes longer Greek epigraphic testimonia from sites with a stronger epigraphic habit than A and E/D. It would probably have been useful to include an up-to-date survey of Latin inscriptions, which now have to be gathered from *CIL* and *L'Année Epigraphique*. The artificial compartmentalization of Greek and Latin epigraphy is

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not very helpful here. There are not many inscriptions involved, but they would have given us a fairer picture of the epigraphic habits of these two Roman cities. Moreover, some Latin texts contain information on their social and political organization in the Roman period, revealing the existence of *Augustales*, of a local equestrian patron of the colony, and of an association of *fabri tignuarii*. There are also some Latin dedications to Diana, which complement the Greek ones to Artemis.

The Romans seem to have harboured their suspicions about E/D, which they described as the 'taberna of the Adriatic'. They appear to have objected also to the name of Epidamnos, and promoted the alternative of Dyrrhachion. There are some lively descriptions of economic life in the town (e.g. by Plautus), but the epigraphy has little to say on the commercial activities. There are a few epitaphs that belong to people involved in foreign trade, but that is all.

One aspect that is revealed by the publication of this corpus is the importance of the festive and agonistic traditions in these places. Literary and epigraphic testimonia record the names and deeds of a fair number of local athletes who made an impact abroad. Epigraphic finds in A have thrown more light on agonistic life there: the most striking example being a commemorative inscription for an agonothete on the *bouleuterion* of A (A.D. 2), also known as the 'monument of the agonothetes' (A 187 = *AnnEpigr* 1935, 1). Unfortunately there is no photograph of the inscription, or of the building which was partly re-erected by the Albanian archaeological service in the 1970s. The inscription is testimony to the strength of Greek athletic traditions in the Roman period. More on the fringes of festive life, we find A 226, the epitaph of a '*kinaidologos*' (a performer of obscene songs; C. does not explain the term). This text serves to remind us that traditional Greek festivals were not just a matter of serious high culture, but also provided ancient audiences with more uncomplicated fun.

One inscription deserves special mention: E/D no. 527 (= *SEG* 25, 711) from Edessa. It is the epitaph of Choiros, apparently a young porker from the Dalmatian coast. It had come along the Via Egnatia, and 'visited A and E/D' before it got killed in a traffic accident. The small epitaph is clearly a joke, with comic allusions to the language of agonistic life (cf. L. and J. Robert *Bull.* [1970], 363). The text has generated some debate among epigraphers, several of whom insist that the epitaph was really set up for a human being. C. does not explicitly state his own beliefs about the identity of the deceased. It is a pity, therefore, that he does not reproduce the photograph of the *editio princeps* which clearly shows the pig before, and after being trampled upon by a horse-drawn vehicle. Whatever the identity of young Choiros, the text serves to prove that even the meagre epigraphic record of these Albanian sites can yield texts that surprise or amuse us.

Cambridge ONNO VAN NIJF

SEG 43

H. W. Pleket, R. S. Stroud, J. H. M. Strubbe (edd.): *SEG: Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, Vol. XLIII (1993). Pp. xxxvi + 602. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1996. Hfl. 230. ISBN: 90-5063-237-8.

Since first appearing in 1923, *SEG* has become the indispensable compendium of the year's publications of Greek inscriptions. Its coverage has always been intended to be as complete as possible, and where there has been a breakdown in funding, as there was in the 1970s, *SEG* has been sorely missed. For the *SEG*'s rôle is first as a

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

disseminator of epigraphical knowledge: without the *SEG*, many important discoveries and publications made during the years of intermission have failed to reach a wide public. Since then *SEG* has, where opportunity arose, printed some of the texts it would have compiled had it been functioning at the relevant date, but naturally the full tally will never be made up.

Although *SEG* has always ordered the inscriptions following a simple geographical arrangement, in any such compilation the indexes are of paramount importance. *SEG*s have been upgraded and extended in the amount of information which they process, since the present editorial team under H. W. Pleket et al. took on the task. As well as the usual concordances and lists of names of men and women, kings, emperors, and their families we have come to expect—though these alone are immensely laborious to compile—there are patronymic adjectives, geographical names, Attic tribes and demes, non-Attic tribes and demes, religious terms both pagan and Christian (and very comprehensive), military terms from both the Greek and Roman world, separate sub-indexes for Latin words in each category, and important Greek words (20 pp.), Latin words, and Selected Topics (17 pp.).

It is in this aspect that the second main rôle of *SEG* appears as digester of epigraphical information; for in order to disseminate effectively the editors must first analyse and digest their material, distilling from it what is most relevant to the index and then to the entry in the body of the work. When one attempts to read all the 1,332 entries, one learns rather quickly that theirs has been a Herculean task.

In the Selected Topics index one can find, for instance, under 're-use (of statue bases)', a reference to and summary of C. Löhr's study of a series of bases still *in situ* at the Amphiaraion at Oropos, and of how the monumental space was changed over the course of the entire Hellenistic period. Under 'dialect' one can look up A. Morpurgo Davies's study of the linguistic development of Oropos and Laconia, and the complex relationship between political ascendancy and dialect. If one searches under 'woman' one finds, in a commendably long classified list of sub-headings, a reference to their rôle in the provincial high preisthood, as discussed among much else in a book by S. J. Friesen, *Twice Neokoros: Ephesus, Asia and the Cult of the Flavian Family* (Leiden, 1993). Under 'police' one is referred to 'local, in Arabia', to '(hypophylax)', and '(control of rural world by urban—)'. Such meticulous and thorough indexing as this minute sample shows is a priceless aid to the researcher.

In the index of Greek words, furthermore, one can find out that τε has been studied by K. A. Garbrah, who has shown it was used in inscriptions to distinguish clauses or items in an inventory, and this 'enumerative' use of τε also occurs in literary texts listing the extraordinary deeds of extraordinary persons—perhaps showing the influence of the original legal language of a decree—whilst in the same index there is also a reference to an item τί ('because') by G. H. R. Horsley, correcting a misunderstood passage from St Matthew's gospel. Though the mills of *SEG* grind slowly (the volume for 1993 appeared in 1997), yet they grind exceedingly small.

Clearly, *SEG* contains a veritable encyclopaedia of new knowledge about a huge range of aspects of the ancient world, which, but for the indexes, would be much less known to scholars. The editors do not confine themselves to printing Greek texts and provenances; they summarize numerous books and articles as well, where they touch on epigraphical themes. One can consult in brief a series of articles about Ephesus at no. 743ff., or a review of S. Mitchell's *Anatolia* (Oxford, 1993), at no. 1207. They even furnish an epigraphical index to A. Burford's *Land and Labor in the Greek World* (Baltimore, 1993), showing by example what the author ought to have done himself.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

On occasion, they correct errors in others' publications, and comment on perceived inadequacies.

Of the five functions, compilation, indexation, analysis, review, and criticism, the two last are the least essential. There can be no doubt that they involve the editors in considerable extra work. If one were looking for ways to cut the costs of production, and to reduce the intervals between publications, one could, for instance, concentrate more on the first two functions. In the past, *SEG* was produced by a sole editor, who necessarily confined himself to these; the indexes in those days were, however, much less informative.

The question of costs is raised by the current editors in their introduction. Even if, as is rumoured, the immediate crisis in funds for the next two years has been averted, there remains the problem of long-term funding of *SEG*. Changing the format from book to computer disk is no solution: access to the work would then depend on the compatibility of computers to the software used (a problem which becomes acute where ancient Greek is concerned), as well as on the availability of inexpensive computers having sufficient memory to process the complex *SEG* database at an acceptable speed. It seems obvious that, for the foreseeable future, the book form is by far the most accessible and efficient mode of production, so far as users are concerned. *SEG* cannot afford to become inaccessible. Given continuing production of *SEG* as a book, the editorial functions will have to change if production costs are to fall.

Beckenham N. P. MILNER

SINGLE LETTERS AND THE WIDER PICTURE

J. H. M. Strubbe, R. A. Tybout, H. S. Versnel (edd.): *ENERGEIA: Studies on Ancient History and Epigraphy presented to H. W. Pleket*. (Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology, 16.) Pp. vi + 170, 22 pls. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1996. Hfl. 60. ISBN: 90-5063-426-5.

This collection of eight articles celebrates fifteen years of *SEG* and the choice of subjects pays homage to Harry Pleket by focusing on areas which interest him. The wide range of topics handled in this collection well reflects the unusual breadth of the honorand's interests apparent from his impressive list of publications included in this book. Some contributions deal primarily with minutiae of epigraphic reconstruction and the detective work of comparing different copies and transcripts (G. Petzl, 'Vom Wert alter Inschriftenkopien', pp. 35–56), but always with an eye to the wider picture. J. Ebert ('Neue griechische historische Epigramme', pp. 19–34) identifies in a funerary inscription for a hoplite of the earlier fifth century the 'branders' (στικταισιν) as the same Persians who, according to Herodotus (7.233.2), branded Greek prisoners of war. P. Herrmann ('Milet unter Augustus. Erkenntnisse aus einem Inschriften-Neufund', pp. 1–18) uses prosopographic arguments to shed light on the emergence of the imperial cult in Asia Minor.

Archaeological research forms the basis of F. Kolb's contribution ('Stadt und Land im antiken Kleinasien: der Testfall Kyaneai', pp. 97–112). He reports on the German field survey at Kyaneai in ancient Lycia. This project aims at providing the first

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

complete field survey of the territory of an ancient *polis*, and in particular at collecting and interpreting specific data on settlement and cultivation patterns and the relationship between Greek and indigenous culture. The article, richly illustrated with several detailed maps, discusses the methodological problems involved in such an enterprise and outlines some results—for example, how the finds in the territory of Kyaneai reflect its transition from being a Lycian dynast's seat to being a Greek *polis*, how the small number of threshing barns suggests the predominance of olive growing and viticulture—and finally asks how representative these finds are for other Greek *poleis*. Kyaneai, at first sight a poor *polis* in a rather barren territory and with no source of water of its own (only cisterns), but where the archaeological evidence suggests intensive agriculture and production of a surplus, might challenge the usefulness of modern categories like subsistence and underdevelopment.

Peter Garnsey ('Prolegomenon to a Study of the Land in the Later Roman Empire', pp. 135–54) rethinks the methodological problems of understanding agriculture and economy in antiquity in a more abstract way and provides thus an interesting complement to Kolb's contribution. G. is torn between the wish to draw specific, sufficiently documentable, and meaningful conclusions and his doubts about the feasability of any such work. His article challenges speculative models and 'bland generalization about decline' (p. 139). He argues that the picture of agricultural production in the empire is not just that of a growing number of *agri deserti*, but that in the frontier provinces in particular imperial initiatives to settle barbarians inside the empire will have opened up whole new areas to agriculture or rejuvenated them. Certain specific aspects, such as the effect of taxation, possible intensification of agriculture, the nature of the labour force, and whether there might have been technical innovations, have not yet, claims G., received the attention they deserve.

The remaining three contributions too are concerned with wider themes in social and economic history. H. Kloft ('Ueberlegungen zum Luxus in der frühen Kaiserzeit', pp. 113–34) suggests that the preoccupation of the ancients with the moral aspects of luxury has led to neglect of the economic aspects of such consumption. K. points to the interesting study of the German economist Sombart (*Luxus und Kapitalismus*, 1913) and suggests that Sombart's questions about the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries should be asked about antiquity too. He demonstrates what he means by giving an example: the rôle of the *mensae citreae*, the ultimate in luxury furniture for the imperial élite. W. Harris ('Writing and Literacy in the Archaic Greek City', pp. 57–78) offers some further thoughts on the subject of his earlier book. L. Migeotte ('Les finances des cités grecques au-delà du primitivisme et du modernisme', pp. 79–96) explores ways of studying the public finances of Greek cities without yet again taking a stance in the fundamental debate between primitivists and modernists. He tries to make constructive use of research from both camps without getting too embroiled in problems of method, and argues that Greek cities in general had throughout a sensible pragmatic interest in economics.

Such a mixture of front-line research and reflexions on more general approaches to ancient history makes for varied and stimulating reading, and should not suffer the fate of so many Festschriften: it deserves a wide audience.

One can only hope that H. W. Pleket was more pleased with this enjoyable bouquet of contributions than the expression on his face (on the full page photograph at the beginning of the book) might suggest.

Glasgow MARGARETHA DEBRUNNER HALL

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ATTIC GRAMMAR ON STONE

L. THREATTE: *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions: Volume II: Morphology*. Pp. xxv + 839. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996. DM 590. ISBN: 3-11-014363-1.

The first volume (Phonology) was published in 1980, but rather than ask unreasonable questions about the sixteen-year interval, we should marvel at the tenacity that has produced this monument of painstaking erudition.

Contrary to vol. 1, all early inscriptions from *IG* are now cited from the third edition. Although Th. completed his manuscript in August 1993, this was made possible for the second fascicle of *IG* 1 by the late Professor David Lewis's allowing Th. to see the text 'well before its actual publication', a permission that received the necessary endorsement from the late Professor Heinz Wenzel of de Gruyter's.

For the early inscriptions, *IG* 1^3 takes precedence over all other references, which is the good order of things. One is in fact slightly but pleasantly surprised at the number of times additional publications (such as my *Carmina epigraphica Graeca*) are mentioned or taken into account.

Generally, it is very pleasing that Th. provides much interpretation to go with the facts he presents, and for that purpose does not simply reproduce what he finds in LSJ or other modern reference works. Thus on p. 89, *IG* 1^3.828 (*CEG* 1.266) *χρ*]*υσοτρία*[*ι*]*ν'* is interpreted as voc. *χρυσοτρίαινα*, in this case used as the nominative, like Pindar's *ὀρσοτρίαινα*. This has been understood correctly by epigraphists and others for more than a hundred years (and *PMG* 939.2, which has the almost inevitable scribal error -*ε* among three vocatives ending in -*ε*, had already been corrected by Hermann [whence Bergk; the correction was relegated to the apparatus by Page]). LSJ never caught up, staying with the impossible adjective *χρυσοτρίαινος*, made doubly impossible when we are required by implication to believe that the inscription had an elided -*ε* doing duty for nom. -*ος*. How easy it is to defer unthinkingly to authorities like LSJ can be seen in the index to vol. 1 of my *CEG*.

Similarly, on p. 630 Th. takes issue with the return to 'the unconvincing *Ἀ*<*λ*>*εξώ* reading' in *IG* 1^3.986. I feel obliged to side with Th., as readers of *CEG* 2 (no. 743) will realize, although I think that this is perhaps sacrilege, and that the sky may fall on my head.

The task of presenting the grammar of Attic inscriptions, giving *both* the 'normal' inscriptional forms with restricted but representative examples *and* the anomalies and exceptions in more detail, would seem to be both logically and practically nigh on impossible. Overall, it has been extremely well executed, although oddities that one is obliged to disagree with occasionally occur; e.g. p. 122 on *φρασίν*: 'the Attic example is metrical and may thus not be evidence for the normal spoken form'. Th. has not asked himself the basic question of whether there ever was a normal spoken form, which I very much doubt.

σοζ[in *IG* 1^3.732 (*CEG* 1.229) is discussed on p. 507. To me there seems little doubt that one is entitled to read *σο*<*ι*>*ζ*[(= *σωιζ*[= *σῳζ*[), as some do. This metrical text which includes a poetical form may indeed be 'of little significance for normal Attic prose', but it seems much more relevant to assume that we simply have one of the countless errors found in Greek inscriptions. If not convinced, the reader could contemplate what I have said on the subject of errors in *CR* 34 (1984), 287. *σωιζ*- has the iota in Attic inscriptions until about 100 B.C., and, surprisingly, in the Classical and Hellenistic periods, so does the aorist *ἔσωισα* (p. 528). Th. adds: 'The spellings *σώζων*,

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

σώζει, σωζόμενοι are all recorded in the Homeric texts, which may lie behind this spelling.' In fact, only σώζων comes from Homer (Od. 5.490 [σῴζων La Roche, σώων Buttmann]), who has no other case of (ἐ)σωζ- or (ἐ)σῳζ-, and it seems strange to invoke this solitary example from the quagmire of Homeric manuscripts and Homeric orthography for a possible explanation of the missing iota.

A similar case of reluctance to acknowledge the existence of 'misprints' in inscriptions is found on p. 394 concerning a late metrical text (s. III p.) 'replete with obvious copying errors', where Th. first mentions the obvious solution πολλάκι{ς} σεμνὰ θεοῦ ('the error could have been caused by the σ- of the following word'), but then proceeds to say: 'otherwise, in view of the late date, one might assume some irregularity in the scansion, intended or not, although this text is free of other such features'.

However, where there is a genuine choice of possible interpretations, I mostly find myself in agreement with Th.'s decision. Thus, on p. 266 στεφάνω *IG* 1^3.953 (*CEG* 1.317) means 'two crowns', and is not the title of an Eleusinian priestess. φιλοι *IG* 1^3.1241 (*CEG* 1.25) is φίλῳ, not pl. φίλοι, nor indeed fem. Φιλοῖ followed by another name.

This is not a book to read, but as a manual it is priceless. How many people are aware that the otherwise Doric termination -εῖα for -νῖα in the perfect participle is used to the exclusion of -νῖα in Attic inscriptions of the third and second centuries B.C., and then disappears again? (p. 470).

It should not go unmentioned that the massive array of forms in Th.'s two volumes provides a basis for assessing all sorts of details of orthography and morphology in texts transmitted in manuscript. Cf. e.g. pp. 471–501 'Verbal augment and reduplication'. In principle, this is of course nothing new; in 1912, Karl Hude wrote in his preface to the OCT Lysias: 'Orthographiam ad normam titulorum Atticorum . . . constitui', and proceeded to give a list of adjustments based on the third edition of Meisterhans. But the scale on which such adjustments are now possible is of quite a different order, and I think one should add that as Th. treats of inscriptions as late as the third century A.D., the benefits are not at all limited to Attic texts.

Leaving aside the unfortunate φαρθένη and παρθένη (with -η instead of -ε) on p. 3 of the introduction, *lapsus calami* and misprints seem to be few and far between.

The printing is as clear and attractive to the eye as that of the first volume, with one tiny purely aesthetic difference: the combination of a rough or smooth breathing with an acute or grave accent (e.g. ὅς, ὃς, ἥν, ἣν) does not form a unit above the letter in question, reflecting a problem in computer typesetting of Greek that I thought we had long since passed. But this is for pedants only, and few people are likely to be disturbed by it in this otherwise beautifully printed book.

21 Leckford Road, Oxford P. A. HANSEN

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

FfestschrIft for Koenen

Cornelia E. Römer, Traianos Gagos (edd.): *P. Michigan Koenen (= P. Mich. XVIII): Michigan Texts Published in Honor of Ludwig Koenen.* (Studia Amstelodamensia ad Epigraphicam, Ius Antiquum et Papyrologicam pertinentia, 36.) Pp. xxxiv + 416, 43 pls, ills. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1996. Cased, Nlg. 340. ISBN: 90-5063-127-4.

This volume celebrates the 65th birthday of Ludwig Koenen. It contains texts from the papyrus collection of the University of Michigan, where K. teaches, edited by former pupils and other colleagues. Of varied content, and of more than average interest, these texts make up a major papyrological publication: a fitting tribute to a scholar who has contributed so much to papyrology and the study of antiquity in general.

Among the most interesting pieces in the literary section (**759–68**) are those pertaining to Early Christianity. **763** is an early (second–third century) example of a homiletic work or *Gemeindebrief* with citations from the New Testament. There is a remote possibility that this is a fragment of a lost work of Origen, during whose lifetime **763** must have been copied, but what little survives cannot confirm this. **764**, of similar nature and date, is of special interest for its close affinities with *2Clem.*, a text possibly written in Egypt in the second century. **767** is 'an original document from the Arian controversy?'. The identification is tentative, and indeed difficult; but if correct, this would be the first text of this kind to appear. The reference to a Didymos, *ὁ τὸν Ὅμηρον μελετῶν*, apparently Didymos the Blind, is noteworthy. As for the other literary pieces, **760** comes from a work on geography (south Italy and Sicily), possibly Homeric. **765** was taken to contain medical prognostics, but it clearly comes from a handbook of divination, a genre already represented in papyri (Pack^2 2104–13). There are also fragments of Homer (**759**), of the *Alexander Romance* (**761**), mythography (**762**; cf. W. Luppe, *APF* 43 [1997], 233ff.), *materia Aesopica* (**765**), and a fever amulet (**768**).

Documentary papyri occupy the largest part of the volume. The Ptolemaic texts (**769–81**) were all recovered from the same cartonnage (NB: partial (?) publication of another text on p. 95 n. 10), and mostly relate to the village of Mouchis in the Fayum. **771–4** shed new light on the taxes known as *χρυσοχοϊκή* and *κόλλυβος*, **777–80**, which merit further study, on the workings of the beer monopoly. The whipping by the policeman in **773** and the 'report of violence' in **776** should be of interest to the social historian. **781**, a list of cleruchs, attests some interesting ethnic designations. The list of officials under Ptolemy V Epiphanes (pp. 94–6) is of special note also.

Of the texts of the Roman period, I single out the following. **782** is probably the earliest declaration of small animals from the Fayum. **784** combines a new fragment with PSI IV 320. **787** augments P.Mich. IX 616, and advances its understanding (in 55–56 **ἀνικνέομαι* is an *addendum lexicis*). **791** is an addition to the archive of Marcus Lucretius Diogenes. **793** furnishes the first instance of a postconsular date by the consuls of 380.

The last two documents should be of interest to Late Roman historians. **794** (late fifth century) is an order issued by the office of the **κουρεπιστουλάριος* (*cura epistularum*) of the *praeses provinciae Arcadiae*; see D. Hagedorn, F. Mitthof, *ZPE* 117 (1997), 187ff., who also sketch the contribution of **794** to our knowledge of Late

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Roman bureaucracy. The addressees, the Oxyrhynchite *defensor civitatis* and *riparii*, are ordered to compel the acting *curator civitatis* and a *protodemotes* (here one misses any reference to J. Gascou, *BIFAO* 76 [1976], 200ff., and P.Oxy. LIX 3987) to dispatch wreaths to Heracleopolis (the *prases*'s residence). The date, 23 December, made the editor think of New Year celebrations. **795** (fifth–sixth century) is a memorandum drafted in a *scrinium canonum* (the first attestation in papyri), apparently that of the sacrae *largitiones* (see *ZPE* 121 [1998], 144), concerning the oil supply of Pelousion. There are several uncertainties, but it is at least possible that the activities illustrated by this document relate to an *alimonium. Alimonia* of oil are known to have existed in Rome and Constantinople, and P.Mich. XI 613 (415) attests this institution at Alexandria. Pelousion was the chief city of the small province of Augustamnica I at the time; could we extrapolate such *alimonia* for all provincial capitals in the Late Empire?

796–8 are Coptic (literary). This is the first time that Coptica are included in a volume with Greek texts from Michigan: a reminder that post-Pharaonic Egypt should not be viewed through Greek eyes only.

Some details (I thank Dr P. Heilporn for checking my readings on the originals). **760** i.8 -*τύπως*; 8–9 *εἰ*]*κάζει*; ii.20 *'Εχέ*ῃ[*λη* in text. **766** It is a pity that a computer whim has eliminated all the *ι̣*. 6 *ὁ θάνα*[*τος* certain. **778** 10–11 read *ἔγγραπτα*; 24 *καυνάκην* in text; 25–26 *ἐπὶ του π..ντος*: *ἐπὶ τοῦ παρ̣ό̣ντος*?; 31 surely *τῶν καλῶς ἐχόντων*; 34 *τ̣ο̣ῦ̣τ̣ο̣* → *μο̣υ̣ τ̣ὸ*; *εἰ δὲ μή γε* is a self-contained elliptical expression, and *γε* should not be bracketed (likewise in **779** 16 *εἰ δὲ μή, γε-* → *εἰ δὲ μή γε*); 36 *επου* stands for *ὅπου* or *ε*<*ἴ*> *που* (*ἵνα* goes with *ἀποκαταστῆσαι*); 37 read *γενομένου*. **779** 4 *διοκητῆι* → *διοικητῆι*. **780A** The editors' dating, 205–204?, relies on a docket of uncertain import, and is at best a *terminus post quem.* 11–12 The editorial interventions are unnecessary. **781** 37 *'Αρκαδ̣ ὼν' ος* is a patronymic; after that, the uncertain [*Ἀ*]*ρκα*[*ι*]*ος* is an unlikely version of *Ἀρκάς*; 20 n. *ἐπισκέπειν*, not *ἐπισκοπεῖν*. **787** 40, 41a read *ἔκτοτε*. **788** 1–2 In the context, *Ἀντινοέ*]*ων πόλεως* (cf. 1 n.) is an unviable alternative; 9 *οὖ*] → *ἀφ'οὗ*]; 17 *ἀργυρί*[*ου δραχμῶν τρια*]*κ̣οσίων* → *ἀργυρί*[*ου δ*]*ρ̣α̣χμ*[*ῶν*, with the amount of the rent lost in the break; 18 the sublinear dot should follow *τοκάδων*. **789** 2 The man mentioned here seems to have had *tria nomina*; if so, his *praenomen* should be restored as *Γαΐ*[*ου*. **790** 1 *Πετεῦρι*[*ς*] → *Πετεῦρι*[; 9, 11–12 the restorations are at least too bold to admit into the text. **792** 8 *νῦν* → *ς*[*ο*]*ὺ ἐν*; 9 *π*[*όλιν*] → *Ϛ*[*ε*]*ρ*[*ῦφιν*]; 12 delete the restored *καί*: *λαβεῖν* (14) depends on *δ*[*ηλουμέ*]*νων* (13–14), and has no relation with *ἐ̣χηκέναι* (14); 13 <*διὰ*> → *δ*[*ι*]*ὰ*; 14 *ε*[*ἰς τὸ*] → *ἐ*[*κ τῶν*?]; 17 *πεντακω*[*σίας* → *πεντακος*[*ίας*; 26 supplement *ταῦτα* rather than *τάδε*, cf. P.Oxy. VI 908.37; 32 *Ἀθύ*[*ρ*] → *Ἀ*[*θ*]*υ̣ῤ*; 34 (PH) *π*[*ρό*]*χ*[*ειται* → *πρόχ*[*ειται*. **794** 9 *ἐκ* [*π*]*λήρους* is impossible, but I have not arrived at a plausible reading; 16 kala(ndas) → *Kal*(*endas*). Coptic indices: **ϲⲕⲉⲩⲟⲥ** is Greek. *παρριστα* is a *vox nullius*: **ⲡⲁⲣϩⲓⲥⲧⲁ** stems from *παρίστημι*.

Wolfson College, Oxford N. GONIS

BODLEIAN PAPYRI

R. P. Salomons (ed.): *Papyri Bodleianae I.* (Studia Amstelodamensia ad Epigraphicam, Ius Antiquum et Papyrologicam pertinentia, 34.) Pp. xxi + 398, 73 pls. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1996. Hfl. 340. ISBN: 90-5063-035-9.

A short review of a volume of papyri can only present preliminary comments upon content and quality. It remains for papyrologists and other scholars to gradually suggest corrections and new interpretations of individual documents. That this volume has already attracted much critical attention is an indication of its quality. In the first volume of a series, Salomons presents 171 papyri from the collection of the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bodleian Library in Oxford, dating from the Ptolemaic, Roman, and Byzantine periods. S. admits that he has chosen texts to edit 'more or less at random', which is an odd approach, but most receive their *editio princeps*, with a small number of re-editions. The volume is divided into three parts: texts, descripta, and a catalogue of documents from the collection by shelfmark (Mr. Gr. class a1 to c300). Herein lies one of the principal faults of the volume. Texts appear to be in a haphazard order, and descripta are arranged in order of shelfmark rather than date; this makes for a rather irregular presentation of the material. It would seem better to have presented the catalogue first, with an indication as to which texts would be included in the volume, with both inventory number and reference in the volume. Texts could then have been placed in the more conventional and logical chronological order.

Part One consists of fifty-three texts included in the conventional manner—a description of the fragment, Greek transcript, English translation, apparatus criticus, and a line-by-line commentary. The citation of parallel texts and modern bibliography is sometimes not full enough. For example, **14** is actually part of the archive of the strategos Damarion (S. Daris, *Aegyptus* 72 [1992], 23–59 with *SB* XX 14155–62). The texts come largely from the Arsinoite nome (the villages of Soknopaiou Nesos, Karanis, Theadelphia, and unprovenanced villages). Six main texts (**32**, **33**, **43**, **46**, **50**, and **51**) add to the growing evidence for the Great Oasis; those remaining come from the Hermopolite and Apollonopolite nomes. The texts can be grouped as follows: Biblical texts, an arithmetic problem, official documents, petitions to officials, property and census returns, legal proceedings, contracts, receipts, lists, and fragments.

Part Two comprises of descripta of 117 texts, which seems rather a large number. They are mostly transcribed in full, some with an apparatus criticus and all with a commentary. Unaccountably, the date and provenance of each document is stated, when known, in the description rather than under the text's heading. The lack of discussion of many of these texts means that many interesting details are lost. More importantly, it is certain that much more could be made of the texts themselves. Significant improvements have been made to **31** and **32** (R. S. Bagnall, *ZPE* 116 [1997], 149–51), **82** (A. Jördens, *ZPE* 116 [1997], 81ff.), **107** (F. Morelli, *ZPE* 115 [1997], 199ff.), and **63** and **64** (N. Gonis, *ZPE* 119 [1997], 148ff.).

There are a number of literary fragments of Homer and Apollonius of Rhodes, writing exercises, and mathematical problems. Also included are Ptolemaic fragments from Gurob and Hibeh, and from the Petrie collection. The majority of Roman texts date from the second century, but there is a fair spread of documents from the first to seventh centuries. Types of documents featured are official letters, petitions, contracts, lists, receipts, registrations, lists and registers, sales and leases, and private letters. In a number of cases (**61g**, **67**, **88**, **96**, **121**, and **154**) plates are included, but no transcription. This is surprising with **121**, for example—sales of donkeys are formulaic, and some attempt at a transcription should have been made. **61a** is an addendum to *BGU* III 702 = *M. Chr.* 333; it would have been better to have a new edition of the whole text, as S. does with **47** for *P. Grenf.* I 62. **75** is a list of persons paying one artaba in tax; S. seems unaware that there is a strong argument to suggest that the term *monartabia* is a modern invention and that this tax may not have existed as he understands it (see *P. Diogenes* 17, pp. 131ff.)—indeed only the abbreviation $\alpha\rho\tau\alpha$ appears on his text.

The catalogue making up Part Three is a useful tool for papyrologists, drawing as it does on previous handlists drawn up by Edgar Lobel and Revel Coles, listing papyri according to shelfmark number.

Overall the volume is a mixed bag. Of particular importance are: **14**, on military

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

supply; **16**, on the *vestis militaris*; **17**, five census returns; **20–4**, tax documents; **32** and **33**, mandates from the Great Oasis; **34**, sale of the monopoly of baking cakes; **36–8**, leases of property; **41**, a *paramone* contract; **46**, the earliest known deed of divorce from the Great Oasis; **66**, an *ephebeia* certificate from Alexandria; and **153**, a list of exotic foodstuffs. But texts of genuine interest are interspersed with those of comparatively little interest. Impressive to look at with its covers closed, the presentation of the contents is poor, and with dim plates, certainly does not reflect the cost of the volume. The important documents will stimulate debate and add to our knowledge; the descripta bring to our attention potentially important documents which will be improved by other scholars.

University of St Andrews COLIN ADAMS

RESPIRATION

A. DEBRU: *Le corps respirant: La pensée physiologique chez Galien.* (Studies in Ancient Medicine, 13.) Pp. viii + 302. Leiden, etc.: E. J. Brill, 1996. Nlg. 178.50/$112.50. ISBN: 90-04-10436-4.

A discussion of theories of respiration in ancient medicine opens up a series of questions which take the researcher from breath into the processes of life, and on to the nature of knowledge itself. From Homeric literature onwards, the idea that life and breath are linked has been expressed, even if the connection between them often remained unexplored. But how does breathing occur? Which organs are involved, and how do they share in making breathing possible? In what does 'life' itself consist? How does breathing relate to the digestive process? How does air relate to blood, and can the two substances mix? Ancient writers on physiology, unable to know what 'air' consisted of, and often holding the belief that arteries carry air and veins carry blood, came up with a range of answers to these questions.

In this work, D. has chosen to focus on Galen's contributions to such debates, not just because of the breadth and ambition of his own work, but because of his rôle as a source for otherwise lost ideas, both those he repeats and those against which he argues. Although she provides an excellent summary of previous attempts to criticize Galen for 'missing' the circulation of the blood or to give him credit for having noted the pulmonary circulation (pp. 7–10), she chooses not to read Galen alongside modern knowledge, but instead to attempt to situate him in the historical and textual context of his own work, and of ancient debates. She is well aware of the risks inherent in any attempt to reconstruct 'Galen's true views' by taking passages from different works and merging them, and prefers to emphasize the place of statements about respiration within the dynamics of particular Galenic arguments.

The book opens with a discussion of the linguistic and philosophical basis of Galen's thought, looking at the fluid vocabulary of the anatomical terms, and at the relationships between everyday language and technical neologisms. D. argues that Galen's attempts to reach a more precise terminology for respiration should be understood in the context of his belief that naming is an essential part of scientific activity. She then goes on to investigate the causes or instruments of breathing, the activity of the respiratory organs, and the 'use' of breathing. In Galen's account of respiration, it is not the heart but the thoracic muscles and their nerves that control breathing. Here Galen followed the Alexandrian anatomists rather than Aristotle, demonstrating the importance he placed on anatomy, and hence on dissection, in

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reaching explanations of bodily processes. For Galen, the main use of respiration was to control the innate heat, and D. shows how he used the arguments of his predecessors—reasoning, analogy, and observation—to prove his point. D. then examines the idea that breathing takes place through the whole body, looking in particular at skin-breathing. She traces its pre-Galenic history, examining its alleged Hippocratic precedents and looking at beliefs about the skin, the rôle of sweat, and 'blockage' as the cause of disease.

The book ends with chapters on the disorders of breathing and the maintenance of healthy breathing through gymnastic and vocal exercise. Here, D. examines the concepts of health and disease in Galen, defining the point where natural variation becomes pathology, and examining what constituted 'unhealthy' air for Roman writers. When looking at the use of vocal exercises for health, D. argues that we need to explore further the connection between breath and life in order to understand the possible religious background of practices in which there is deliberate retention of breath. Breathing can also expel residues, and thus purify the breather.

In this clearly structured and wide-ranging study, D. convincingly demonstrates both the richness of ancient concepts of respiration and the central rôle it plays not only in the specific treatises devoted to it but in Galen's work as a whole. She has many challenging points to make about wider issues in ancient medicine, such as the rôle of physiology within the medical enterprise, and about the methodology needed to study those materials which have survived; throughout, she argues passionately for the value of studying ancient medicine, advocating reading medical texts with the same precision and caution as is traditionally used for other areas of ancient literature. Her work shows clearly how Galen constructed his arguments, reusing his own work and making cross-references to his own treatises by a process of 'discrete falsification' (p. 259), and how he attempted to make sense of the complexity of the human body and of its relationship to the world in which it resides.

University of Reading HELEN KING

SPANISH LATIN DRAMA

E. Castro Caridad: *Introducción al teatro Latino Medieval: Textos y públicos.* (Monografías da Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 193.) Pp. 228. Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 84-8121-564-3.

E. Castro (ed.): *Teatro Medieval I: El drama litúrgico* (Páginas de Biblioteca Clásica). Pp. 319. Barcelona: Crítica, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 84-7423-800-5.

The *Introducción* is presented as an accessible and challenging treatment of the various aspects which are loosely classified under the indeterminate appellation of 'medieval theatre'. In fact, as soon becomes clear, Castro's main concern is with the anachronistically named phenomenon of liturgical 'drama': namely, to disentangle it from what is seen as a surrounding morass of presupposition and misunderstanding. This preoccupation governs the presentation which follows.

Taking its starting-point from Aristotle's *Poetics*, the introduction foregrounds the problem of generic definition through a discussion of Greek and Latin terminology.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It highlights the problems inherent in applying modern notions of theatre and draws a distinction between drama, defined here in terms of mimetic representation and literary text, and spectacle. This distinction is crucial to C.'s presentation of liturgical drama as an independent entity arising naturally from the inherent theatricality of ritual, and only subsequently perceived in the light of mimetic representation.

C. traces the development of critical approaches from the nineteenth-century desire to prove a direct link between medieval theatre and modern drama up to the present day, and argues for the value of postmodernist theories such as performance, reception, and alterity in addressing problems of generic determinacy. The key, it is argued, lies in the multivalency and polymorphism of medieval texts. This is followed by a discussion of ancient and medieval testimonies, accompanied by a synthesis of modern critical evaluations, with a view to establishing the proposition that during late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages there was no general agreement on what constituted theatrical representation and, more significantly, no ongoing tradition of Latin performance. The 'plays' of Roswitha of Gandersheim and the Latin comedies of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries are presented as learned aberrations, which, while demonstrating some awareness of popular tradition and capable of some form of representation, were of an essentially literary and imitative nature.

While the turning-point in the recuperation of the concept of drama is placed in the twelfth century, it is associated primarily with scholarly religious drama, of the type contained in the Fleury and Benediktbeuren codices. C. argues that these pieces, produced by authors familiar with the expectations and concerns of the Graeco-Roman tradition, distinguish themselves from liturgical drama by their degree of theatrical self-awareness. Among the arguments adduced are preservation of these texts divorced from liturgical contexts, use of significant terminology such as *persona* and *similitudo*, proclamation of authorship, and recognition of audience. At the same time a potential distinction is drawn between authorial intention and reception. The impact of these scholarly works on liturgical drama is argued to be limited, as demonstrated by the post-thirteenth-century tendency to revert to simpler forms.

The rest of the book, by far the greater part, is devoted to a careful study of liturgical drama, revealing the bias of C.'s interest. It is distinguished from the scholarly religious drama which grew out of it by its essentially devotional nature and its adherence to the liturgical context from which it emerged. Among the factors advanced to explain this emergence are the importation of rhetorical techniques into reading and preaching, the flowering of liturgical chant, and regional diversification arising from the popularization of certain ceremonies. This discussion is followed by a detailed analysis and description of liturgical drama according to type, following the classification established by K. Young, but rejecting his evolutionary theory. C. sifts and discusses all the available evidence relating to function and place of origin, and takes cognizance of recent theoretical and critical developments. For example, the multiple use of the Easter *Quem queritis* as trope, processional chant introducing the Mass, and integral part of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* ceremony is referred to the thesis of J. Drumbl (1981), which assigns its beginnings to ceremony rather than text, and places it from an early stage in two separate liturgical locations.

This is a stimulating and informative work. C.'s initial distinction, with its heavy reliance on Aristotle, may provoke disagreement, as may the assertion that the concept of mimetic drama disappeared from sight during the latter part of Classical Rome. Some readers, too, may be disappointed by the comparatively scant attention paid to secular Latin theatre. This is compensated for, however, by the detailed examination of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the place, nature, and function of liturgical drama. C.'s style is clear and attractive, the bibliography comprehensive.

The academic edition of Spanish liturgical texts makes a good companion to the more general work described above. C.'s selection is made according to two principles: those of optional rather than obligatory usage, and the capacity for performance within the church. It includes a *Peregrinus* from Vich, one of only ten examples of the type, and versions of two Easter sequences, *Victimae paschali laudes* and *Surgit Christus cum tropheo*, whose dramatized performance as independent chant is considered a Spanish innovation. The information contained within the texts is supplemented by a range of associated documentary material.

The texts themselves are provided with a Spanish translation, meticulously annotated and helpfully contextualized. Some of these texts, taken from Compostellan breviaries and including a *chant of the Sibyl*, represent a first editing; other material is referenced to the work of R. B. Donovan (1958) and W. Lipphardt (1975–1990).

This concern with detail is complemented by a scholarly introduction in which C. elaborates the position and hypotheses sketched out earlier. For example, two *Visitatios*, one emanating from Vich, the other from Silos, are adduced to support the strong association between liturgical drama and trope. The first of these, an elaborate original composition, is preserved in a context which reveals a prior use of the *Quem queritis* as trope. The second, of simple type, is found copied into the margin of a breviary, an example, according to C., of importation rather than assimilation. Similarly, C. addresses the value of music and rubrics as a means of establishing borrowings from scholarly religious drama.

This is an important and welcome edition, which provides a significant addition to the material available for the study of liturgical drama.

University of Reading G. R. KNIGHT

WELSH CLASSICISM

C. Davies: *Welsh Literature and the Classical Tradition.* Pp. xiii + 195. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1995. £20. ISBN: 0-7083-1321-3.

'Welsh literature' in this context means, as D. tells us, literature in the Welsh language. D. envisages two kinds of readers: Welsh speakers who wish to understand the classical influences on their own literature, and English-speaking classicists who desire to know more of Welsh literature and the influences which the classics have had on it. It might be in order for the reviewer to add some protreptic: there is a good reason, quite apart from the general desirability of cultural open-mindedness, why English-speaking classicists (not just those with Welsh connections) ought to be interested in the language and literature of Wales. The reason is that the Welsh literary tradition is one in which, as in the ancient world, complex formal techniques combined with intelligible content have been pursued to a high level. The medieval bards, in practice and even to some extent in theory, knew all about Generic Composition some centuries before Professor Cairns discovered it; while anyone who thinks Latin and Greek metres are complicated should try Welsh strict-metre poetry. (D. provides a short glossary of Welsh literary terms on p. xiii, but readers new to this kind of thing will need to consult more general works on Welsh literature in order to understand the terminology fully.)

The facts just mentioned create a singular situation when one considers the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

question of classical influence. While most European nations derived their ideas of poetic form, convention, and genre from the classics, the Welsh had their own ideas of these things, different of course from classical ideas and in some ways more limited in scope, but with nothing in the least homespun about them. Consequently they have tended to meet the Greeks and Romans on equal terms, retaining their own traditions and even, as sometimes in the eighteenth century, claiming superiority for them. Even when translating, they have often cast classical material into a pre-existing Celtic mould; and the negative effect has been that attempts to extend the range of Welsh poetry beyond the traditional bardic areas of panegyric or lament on the one hand, and the lyricism of love and nature on the other, have had to do battle with considerable conservatism. Even at the beginning of the present century, Sir John Morris-Jones's notable attempt to apply the principles of Aristotle's *Poetics* had to start from the premise that although Aristotle was mainly concerned with epic and the drama, his ideas must be taken to apply to lyric poetry as well, otherwise they would have no relevance to the Welsh tradition.

There have, in fact, been no more than three clear and successful infusions of classical influence into Welsh literature. First, the use of Ovidian love poetry by Dafydd ap Gwilym in the fourteenth century. Second, the rediscovery of classical traditions in the eighteenth century by Goronwy Owen and his contemporaries, resulting in clever adaptations of Horatian lyric and Virgilian pastoral, among other things, though not in the Welsh epic which it was Owen's great ambition to produce. Third, the effects of classical education and, one should add, readily available Mediterranean travel in the modern period. Other attempts to imitate classical models have left less lasting results; for example, Gruffydd Robert's attempt to write Ciceronian prose in Welsh in the sixteenth century has sometimes been seen as a watershed between medieval and modern Welsh prose, but the Ciceronian manner does not suit the genius of the language very well, and the real stylistic turning-point was the Welsh Bible of 1588.

All these areas are expertly charted by D., and more is offered besides. Each of the five chapters begins with an outline of the cultural and educational background of the period to be covered, giving an opportunity to survey the activities of Welshmen writing in languages other than Welsh, and especially in Latin (the field that D. has made particularly his own). This may not be 'Welsh literature' within the definition initially offered, but D. is right to emphasize it: the 'classical tradition' always went with the living use of Latin until our own century. At least until the most recent period of all, Welsh writers encountered Latin (if not always Greek) at first hand; there is no need to posit an intermediate transmission through English, even though English was the language of the schools in which Latin was taught.

In a sense the chronological arrangement is not ideal for the reader new to the topic, since the earliest period (the 'Roman Twilight') might seem to offer rather little that is directly relevant to the stated theme. Yet D. was right to begin at the beginning: the Welsh literary tradition cannot be properly understood without a view of its origins in sub-Roman Britain. Apart from anything else, as D. makes clear, Latin was a living literary language in Britain throughout this period; and the Welsh language itself, as it emerged in texts of the sixth century and later, is full of Latin words, although they have undergone much phonetic change. But the period is tantalizing because of the sparseness of the evidence, and it has proved particularly malleable for constructors of ideologies. Ideas of Welsh or Celtic identity have usually been rooted in some view of the more or less distant past, from eighteenth-century speculations about Druids (ideas which were themselves, incidentally, derived from classical sources) to the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

modern debate about the extent of cultural continuity between the Roman Empire and early Wales. D. is too objective a scholar to treat this otherwise than as a debate between historians, but this is an area where an examination of the motives behind particular historical reconstructions might well prove enlightening: it is difficult, in particular, to deny a link between the belief that the Welsh are 'really Romano-British' (cf. the epigraph to D.'s introduction) and the desire of certain Welsh patriots in modern times to show that they have a higher cultural lineage than their neighbours to the east.

From Dafydd ap Gwilym onwards, D. as a literary historian is in his proper element; some of the most successful moments (in my view at least) are those where the narrative breaks off in order to focus more closely on a particular poem or prose passage. The generous quotations (always, of course, accompanied by a translation) succeed well in conveying the flavour of the different authors and periods, and a literary analysis such as that of Saunders Lewis's poem *Marwnad Syr John Edward Lloyd* (pp. 135–42) casts a great deal of light on the fruitful interaction between Welsh poetry and the classical tradition: an interaction which is incidentally illustrated on the book's dust jacket, where lines from Lewis's poem are superimposed on a passage from *Aeneid* 6. Another attractive feature is D.'s demonstration, in the closing pages of the book, that classical influence is still very much alive in the latest generation of writers in Welsh, despite the decline of classics in schools. There is a certain irony in the fact that this decline has been particularly evident in Wales, because the obligation to teach the Welsh language has created an additional pressure on the timetable. The book ends with a quotation from a contemporary Welsh poet, Bryan Martin Davies, who on a visit to Athens hoped to find '*olau ei hystyr hen* / *i'n dyneiddio drachefn*': 'the light of her ancient meaning / to humanize us once more'. This kind of faith in the classics in their humanistic guise, and in their educative influence through the centuries, is the keynote of D.'s book.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne J. G. F. POWELL

MOVING IMAGES

A. Sütterlin: *Petronius Arbiter und Federico Fellini: Ein strukturanalytischer Vergleich*. (Studien zur klassischen Philologie, 97.) Pp. 239. New York, etc.: Peter Lang, 1996. Paper, £28. ISBN: 3-631-49311-8.

M. Wyke: *Projecting the Past: Ancient Rome, Cinema and History* (The New Ancient World). Pp. x + 237, ills. London and New York: Routledge, 1997. Paper, £12.99. ISBN: 0-415-90614-8.

The combination of classics and film studies is not a common field of inter-disciplinary research. This is surprising if one considers the large number of films that are in one way or another connected with antiquity. One reason is certainly the problem of competence: as always in the field of comparative research, one has to be an expert in two areas, and while classicists might—rightly or wrongly—feel at home in modern philologies, they could get slightly uncertain in the face of the methodological demands of film studies—film being the only art without ancient roots. There might therefore be good reasons to leave this work to the primarily

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

responsible disciplines. But if one holds that the reception of ancient culture in our times is a field where classicists also should be heard, there is no sound reason why films should be excluded.

The two books under review make very different contributions to this domain. Sütterlin's doctoral dissertation is a comparison between Petronius' novel 'Satyrica' and Federico Fellini's 1969 feature film *Fellini Satyricon*. S. does not show parallels of content, or speculate about where Fellini got the ideas for the differing scenes from. What he offers—as the subtitle 'ein strukturanalytischer Vergleich' suggests—is a careful analysis of the structure of the novel and (on a much smaller scale) of the film, especially with regard to the transitions between 'scenes' (S. calls the 'scenes' in the novel 'Textfelder'; he counts eighty-one of them). The boundaries between these fields are characterized by a change of pace between dynamic (entrances and exits of figures) and static scenes ('Stimmungsbilder' and reports). Through this approach, S. observes, for example, that the narrative structure is characterized by changes of rhythm and that one scene is motivated by another (pp. 162–3). For these not totally unexpected (and slightly circular) findings, S. makes high interpretative efforts (he even counts the letters in each 'Textfeld'—I hope he used a computer), and he inflates his scanty results with some interpretations that have nothing to do with his expounded method. There are some useful thoughts, e.g. on pp. 51ff. about the name Encolpius and the meaning of *pectus*, but S.'s complicated style makes it difficult to follow his arguments easily (e.g. when he argues for the neutr. sg. 'satyricon' as the original title of the novel, pp. 24ff.), and much of his work is purely descriptive. The same can be said about the book's second part, which deals with Fellini's adaptation of the novel. Like the novel, the film is divided into episodes that are successively interpreted. Here again, S. quite often loses the thread of his proclaimed methodological approach; sometimes he simply paraphrases a scene, sometimes he adds observations that are partly good, partly trivial. The main difference between book and film is, according to S. (p. 213), the rôle of the protagonist: in the novel, Encolpius is always a 'part in a complex action', whereas the film describes his gradual liberation from the entanglements of his life. The book closes with a synopsis of pieces of Petronian and Fellinian dialogue (parts of the *Cena* and the story of the Ephesian widow). There are some valuable points in S.'s work; unfortunately, he makes it quite difficult for the reader to find them. Everyone who wants to learn something about the basic structural patterns in Petronius' novel and Fellini's film will use this book with some profit, but it is by no means the last word on this subject.

Wyke starts out with thoughts similar to those with which this review opened. To her mind, an important reason for the low esteem of film studies in classics seems to be something like cultural arrogance, caused by a 'neo-conservative revival of the distinction between high and popular culture' (p. 8). She is very energetic in presenting her book as a 'challenge' to these tendencies; fortunately, she refrains from further polemic in her writing.

In four 'case studies', W. examines Italian and American films about Spartacus, Cleopatra, Nero, and the 'last days of Pompeii'. She has a big agenda (pp. 33–4): 'social, ideological, formal, technological, and economic' aspects are taken into account, the aim of the book being the exploration of 'the place of antiquity in twentieth-century mass culture'. Despite the relatively small size of her book, W. fulfils these propositions. She adapts Eric Hobsbawm's concept of 'invented traditions' for the use Italy and America made of Roman culture in constituting their national identities (hence the ambiguity of the title of her book); she does not overlook the influence of the novels on which some of the films are based, and describes carefully

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the different contexts of the films, ranging from ideological influences like the nationalism and anti-clericalism of the Risorgimento, and the anti-Communism of the Cold War, to commercial aspects that can be traced, for example, in the post-war remakes in Italy. It is amazing how totally different camps can occupy the same subject, and how many different interpretations of one figure are possible. Spartacus is perhaps the hero most open to interpretation (from a second Garibaldi to a suffering Communist partisan), since there is so little evidence about him in the ancient sources; the 1913 film even provides an unhistorical happy end for him, a thing that would never have worked for Cleopatra.

There are some obvious patterns (e.g. the 'orientalism' in the different versions of Cleopatra) but also some unexpected ones: when, for example, MGM's publicity for the film *Quo Vadis* (1951) painted Nero as the prototype of a Stalinistic dictator (p. 144) and simultaneously contained advertisements for (rather silly looking) shorts printed with Roman symbols under the heading 'make like Nero in *Quo Vadis* shorts' (pp. 110–11). Especially convincing is W.'s reading of the 1935 version of *The Last Days of Pompeii* as a gangster film.

In her concluding chapter, 'A Farewell to Antiquity', W. gives a brief outline of the development after the big blockbusters of the fifties and sixties—there seems to be no revival in sight. *Le Mépris*, *The Fall of the Roman Empire*, and *Fellini Satyricon* are briefly discussed (W. could have included them in the filmography at the end of the book). There is a rich bibliography and an index; the notes are a bit difficult to use: why are there no headings indicating the pages the notes are referring to?

It is not the least merit of this stimulating book that it gives a strong impulse to future research; after W.'s longitudinal sections, perhaps more synchronic approaches would be promising (the year 1913 in Italy seems to be especially fruitful). One is pleased to read (p. 32) that W. herself is preparing further studies on Caesar and Messalina.

University of the Saarland CHRISTOPH CATREIN

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.1.219 Published online by Cambridge University Press