'baroqueness' in Silver Latin descriptions (p. 226). This chapter is rather dismissively entitled 'epilogue', although it is not the last. The volume closes with a useful, but short, survey of material evidence for wounds and their treatment, including skeletal remains, surviving surgical instruments, and iconographical material.

Medical treatment and literary 'treatment' remain largely separate topics in this book, even if S. does have a quick stab at integrating the two with her suggestion that it was not empirical observation, but the preconception that cowardly wounds in the back were fundamentally different from heroic wounds in front, which led medical writers to believe that the two kinds of wound would produce different complications—painful convulsions in the back; delirium, stitch, and dysentery in the front (p. 177). This intriguing theory is not quite enough to make *The Treatment of War Wounds* more than the sum of its parts, but that is no great failing when it manages to make so many of its parts so surprisingly interesting.

University College London HANS VAN WEES

POLIS FESTSCHRIFT

P. Flensted-Jensen, T. H. Nielsen, L. Rubinstein (edd.): *Polis and Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek History.* Pp. 651, maps, ills. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2000. Cased, £40. ISBN: 87-7289-628-0.

Mogens Herman Hansen has transformed not just our understanding of Athenian democracy but the terms of the debate about it. He has brought Athenian demography into the modern age. He has organized the most massive enquiry ever into the Greek *polis*. He has, above all, been the most determined and good natured of controversialists and the firmest of friends to younger scholars, whether or not they agree with him. How does one honour such a man?

Hansen's protégés here present him with a collection of essays dominated not by themselves and their contemporaries (no editor contributes a paper), but by Hansen's own near contemporaries and seniors. They organize the collection around the headings 'The Polis' and 'Politics in the Polis', even though twenty of the thirty-five chapters are about Athens. In doing so, they much reduce the engagement with Hansen's own work, since even the keenest of critics of his *polis* project must await its monumental completion before they can reasonably assess what most needs to be demolished (although Murray's contribution here is an assessment of Hansen on the *polis*). The frontispiece shows Hansen in focus in a field of out-of-focus wild flowers; by contrast, this volume focuses very little on Hansen's importance, but gives an excellent view of the other flowers in the field in which he has spent what we hope will be just the first half of a long academic career. Dominated (24:11) by English-speaking scholars, this is a very Germanic product to honour a man whose academic attitudes bridge continental and Anglo-Saxon traditions.

Some papers primarily bring together or survey data: Golden on work on demography, Camp on city walls, Perlman on pre-Roman Gortyn, Fischer-Hansen on ergasteria in the western Greek world, Gehrke on how tribes, phratries, and *ethne* relate to the early *polis*, Piérart on Argive democracy, Ostwald on oligarchy, Gauthier on officals with the job of counting votes, Rhodes on who ran Athens, Schuller and

© Classical Association, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.310 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dreher on the judging of dramatic competitions at Athens, Gagarin on the rôle of the *basileus* in Athenian homicide trials.

Most papers wield an argument. Some argue about details—Skydsgaard about the meaning of *polis* in Thucydides 2.16.2, Funke about whether the normal eastern route from Attica to Boiotia went through Dekeleia or not, Roy about the Arkadian frontier with Elis, Jameson about the nature of the sacrifice offered by a *thiasos* of Herakles, or Boegehold about the text of Lysias 1.23. Many are more ambitious, if not so uniformly convincing: Gabrielsen denies that a single Rhodian state was created by physical synoikism in 408/7; Burkert helpfully elucidates the new Selinous sacred law to reveal an unusual interplay between private and public ritual; Raaflaub argues that Thucydides and Herodotus can mislead us by using the political terminology of their own day when referring to past events (he argues that *autonomia* was not in play in 479, and that no god was *Eleutherios* in the late sixth century); Stephen Miller links the equalizing effect of nudity in athletics with democracy, not just at Athens but particularly at Kroton; Strauss argues that Athenian naval tactics normally minimized casualties and maximized the contribution of (poor) oarsmen, but that for Eurymedon Kimon increased the rôle of marines and that subsequently this led to high casualties (as noted at *Ath. Pol.* 26.1), particularly among the more wealthy who supported Kimon; Hedrick argues that the explosion of epigraphic evidence after the end of the rule of Demetrios of Phaleron was an attempt to embrace what was taken to be a democratic tradition of 'free access to information'; Millett takes issues with Hansen over whether fourth-century democracy was more moderate than fifth-century, and argues that labels like 'radical' or 'conservative' belong to the nineteenth century, cannot be simply transferred to Athenian democracy, and are part of a mistaken notion that Athenian democracy was like democracy today; Hornblower argues for a fourth-century date for the Old Oligarch, turning him into an implausibly sophisticated reader of Thucydides rather than a contemporary who picked up ideas going around in the circles in which Thucydides moved; Cartledge explains how the constitution of the Boiotian confederacy worked and argues for oligarchic egalitarianism being at its heart and the source of its longevity; Buckler reasserts at length his position that there was no *synedrion* in the Boiotian confederacy of 378–335, since the allies who make the *dogma* referred to at Xenophon *Hellenica* 7.3.11 were not members of the Boiotian confederacy, and the Byzantine *synedroi* of *IG* VII 2418 were simply 'selected commissioners' rather than members of a *synedrion*; Badian argues so forcefully for the difficulty of establishing Kleisthenes' tribe, trittys, and deme system that he makes his own preferred long chronology look as problematic as the currently fashionable short chronology: some things that Badian thinks improbable must have been true; Harris argues against the authenticity of the speech *On Peace* attributed to Andocides, suggesting that, since longer passages contain more historical errors than the shorter summaries of the same points that appear in Aischines, Aischines must be earlier, and that the meaning of *presbeis autokratores* in *On Peace* is unprecedented, concluding that we no longer have grounds for believing in a Peace of Epilykos; Michael Osborne argues that the archonship of Philinos occurred in 259/8, and reconstructs a full sequence of archons for the years 261/0–248/7; Ober argues that the argument of the *Crito* about the duty of the citizen to obey the law was one that Socrates could accept, because the way of making laws at Athens allowed the opportunity for persuading the city otherwise, and that Socrates' behaviour under the Thirty did not breach this duty since the Thirty's commands were not, in his eyes, 'law'; Bers emphasizes the ritual involved in Athenian courts and argues that [Demosthenes] 25.10–11 shows that Athenians believed the lot god-given; MacDowell argues, against

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.310 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Worthington, for Hansen's view that a public prosecution at Athens took just one day; Wallace argues for Demosthenes' Areopagos decree having been passed between 346 and 340 to strengthen the fight against Macedon; M. B. Richardson argues that the subject matter of Athenian laws determined where they were set up.

There is something to interest almost every Hellenist in this collection but, unlike Hansen's own works, the whole is not more than the sum of the parts.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford ROBIN OSBORNE

PROPAGATING THE *POLIS*

M. H. Hansen (ed.): *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures. An Investigation Conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre.* (Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter 21.) Pp. 636. Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 2000. Cased, DKK 600. ISBN: 87-7876-177-8.

Readers of this journal will by now be familiar with the main lineaments of what has been hailed, with some reason, as probably the most important single project at present being undertaken in the field of ancient Greek history: the Copenhagen Polis Centre (CPC), ably directed by the intensely active and efficient Mogens Herman Hansen. I myself reviewed three books produced under the auspices of the CPC in *CR* 50 (2000), 465–9. That review dealt with aspects of the larger of the project's twin objectives, the compilation and analysis of an inventory of all Greek *poleis*, so labelled in ancient sources or reliably to be so labelled, between *c*. 600 and 322 B.C. The volume, or rather tome, under review here addresses and indeed goes much of the way towards fulfilling the other objective, that is to say, a comparative survey and evaluation of the world's known 'city-state cultures' or 'civilizations'.

There are problems with this enterprise, serious problems, and these are honestly stated and faced by the editor himself both in his 'Introduction: The Concepts of City-State and City-State Culture' (pp. 1–34) and in his 'Conclusion: The Impact of City-State Cultures on World History' (pp. 597–623), as well as in his own chapter on 'The Hellenic *Polis*' (pp. 141–88). Apart from the fundamental problem of defining what a city-state and a city-state culture/civilization are, there is the scarcely less fundamental methodological issue of normality or typicality: to what extent can 'the Hellenic *polis*' of the Archaic and the Classical periods, supposing we should grant that to be in and of itself a heuristically useful model or Weberian ideal type, serve as a, or rather the, comparandum for other putative city-states or city-state cultures/civilizations in other places and at other times? Or, to put that question the other way round, 'What is Greek about the *Polis*?'.

That question does not just happen to be the title of Oswyn Murray's contribution to the Festschrift offered to H. on his sixtieth birthday in late 2000, *Polis & Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek History* (Copenhagen, 2000), edd. P. Flensted-Jensen, T. H. Nielsen, and L. Rubinstein. For that is a revised version of Murray's original response to the original version of H.'s 'The Hellenic *Polis*' that was presented to the colloquium held at the Royal Danish Academy in January 1999 on which *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures* is based. Actually more scholars—forty-two from fifteen countries—were involved in this colloquium than are involved in the ongoing purely Greek *polis* inventory (thirty-five from twelve countries). They

© Classical Association, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.310 Published online by Cambridge University Press