face by reaching an acceptable compromise, and therefore only those cases where the challenge had not been accepted would reach court.

The final two chapters treat the methods by which prosecutor and defendant claimed the sympathy of the jury, by reference to their benefactions to the state or appeals for pity. The conclusions here are more straightforward—the statistical analysis seems over-elaborate to demonstrate that defendants asked for pity more then prosecutors—but the direction of the argument is to highlight the rôle of the jury as 'third party' in any dispute. Because the jury received claims on their goodwill as citizens over liturgies performed, and supplications from the powerful and wealthy, J. argues that the jury courts were one of the mechanisms which reproduced a civic identity as Athenians, and as democrats.

The one aspect of J.'s argument which seems disputable is his assertion that because Athens was too big to be a 'face-to-face' society, most litigants and the events of their case were unknown to the jurors. This implies that there were no external sources of information available to the jurors, and therefore social factors such as reputation played no part in their decisions, allowing J. to argue that court cases were judged solely on the rhetoric of the speakers. This is surely something of an over-simplification, since although the citizen body of Athens was large, it comprised many different local, political, and religious associations. If details of longstanding disputes between prominent families could be widely known, then the jury was not simply a blank slate for the narratives of the prosecution or defence, a factor which might in fact add weight to J.'s comments about the competition to define the dispute.

Despite the occasional oddity of style (the use of capital letters after colons, and 'elite' used to mean 'a member of the elite'), this is a valuable and interesting book, which, with its emphasis on the social meaning of litigation, breathes new life into well-known texts.

University of Wales Cardiff SIAN LEWIS

WAR WOUNDS

C. F. SALAZAR: *The Treatment of War Wounds in Graeco-Roman Antiquity.* (Studies in Ancient Medicine, 21.) Pp. xxvii + 299, 8 figs. Leiden, etc.: Brill, 2000. Cased, $78. ISBN: 90-04-11479-3.

Troglodytes the Mouse 'hobbling' away from the battlefield after Limnocharis the Frog hit him in the neck with a stone (*Batrachomyomachia* 212–13, 247–8), and Odysseus and Diomedes 'hobbling' to the assembly the day after being injured in battle (*Iliad* 19.47) are among the few walking wounded to be acknowledged in ancient sources. The injured, especially the permanently disabled, are often an embarrassment in war, an uncomfortable reminder that not every soldier either dies a heroic death or survives unscathed. Nevertheless, there is a fair amount of ancient evidence for war wounds, and Christine Salazar's study, which aims to shed light both on the treatment of wounds in medical practice and on the 'treatment' of the wounded in literature, gathers and discusses much of it (sadly not including our heroically limping mice and men).

She begins by setting out systematically, in two chapters, the evidence from medical writers on the kinds of wounds and possible complications a physician might encounter, and the range of surgical and pharmacological procedures open to him. These sixty pages are essentially a catalogue, but one with many an attention-grabbing

© Classical Association, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.308 Published online by Cambridge University Press

entry, including the instructions for shoving back a patient's intestines and sewing up the wound (p. 51). The evidence cited is predominantly of Roman Imperial date; Hippocratic treatises are included, of course, but are often less forthcoming on the subject than the later material. Here and elsewhere, S. tends to assume that medical practice in dealing with wounds remained essentially the same from the late fifth century onwards. An attempt to trace historical developments, however limited, might have added further interest to this section, and more might also have been made of those who, before and after the rise of Hippocratic medicine, did not consult the treatises *On Bandages* with their 'astonishing' array of quaintly named dressing techniques to choose from (pp. 52–3), but sang 'incantations' to stop wounds from bleeding. (Such spells are briefly mentioned on p. 86, but without reference to, say, *Odyssey* 19.457–8.)

Two particularly interesting chapters proceed to investigate the development of medical services in ancient armies (never more than an unspecified and undifferentiated number of 'healers' in Greece, but something more organized and substantial among the Romans; pp. 68–83), the considerable spread of at least some basic medical knowledge among laymen, and the nature of ancient medical terminology.

The rôle of wounds in literature is the subject of the next four chapters, which between them discuss 'wounding as a code'. In a detailed study of the *Iliad*, S. makes the notable suggestion that in this poem degrees of heroism are expressed through the heroes' way of coping with injury (pp. 146–56)—much the same convention, I would add, as one finds in action movies. Diomedes, who continues to fight despite a painful shoulder wound, and later scornfully pulls an arrow from his foot, is the ancient equivalent of the Die Hard-style battered hero who refuses to lie down. Glaucus, who regards an arm-injury as an excuse for not defending a dying comrade, rates at the level of minor baddie, eliminated with a single blow. These analogies are not meant to ridicule S.'s argument, which is well presented and interestingly developed, but to suggest that modern conventions may have shaped it more than she realizes. Fainting and 'groaning' are assumed to be marks of wimpishness (pp. 147, 151–2), but no one groaningly faints more often (*Iliad* 11.355–9; 14.409–39), or recovers more painfully slowly (15.10–11, 240–2), than Hector, who is hardly a weakling. And it is certainly not true that Glaucus utters 'the only complaint about a wound in the entire *Iliad*' (p. 148). Diomedes, of all people, insists that he and the other walking wounded cannot return to combat, and wise Nestor categorically states that 'there is no way for a wounded man to fight' (14.63, 129–30). It seems to me that Homeric heroes are in fact strikingly *unlike* the action men of modern popular fiction. Even the greatest epic warriors groan and faint without shame, and almost always pull out as soon as they are injured (see A. B. Lloyd [ed.], *Battle in Antiquity* [London, 1996], esp. p. 7).

In this respect, they are quite different from antiquity's answer to Bruce Willis, Alexander the Great, whose many wounds have a chapter to themselves. S. plausibly argues that the emphasis and detail of descriptions of the king's injuries were part of a heroizing enterprise which built up episodes of wounding to compensate for the lack of the glorious battlefield death which Alexander ideally should have had (pp. 186, 208). A chapter bridging the chronological gap between Homer and Alexander provides a good survey of the well-known debate about what constitutes a 'beautiful death', but fails to link this at all closely with attitudes to the wounded, and gives the impression of having been inserted for the sake of completeness more than anything else. The same goes for S.'s discussion of the representation of wounds after Alexander, which maintains, in sum, that for centuries nothing changed, other than a growing

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.308 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'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/51.2.308 Published online by Cambridge University Press