trade was heavily invested with cultural symbolism. Part 2 takes the investigation into the archaic and classical *polis*. The author shows how the ability to act in the market, too, formed part of the ideology of autarky and status shaping so much of the world-view of the Greek communities. Finally, Part 3 attempts to situate the introduction of coinage firmly within the cultural and religious belief-systems of the Greek world.

In total, the study marks an important effort to develop further the inspiration from social and cultural anthropology in the study of the ancient Greek economy. By focusing on the 'thick description' of the culture of exchange, v. R. has managed to show how market activities took shape and colouring from the social, political, and cultural universe of the Greeks. As such, her book is invested with a robust scepticism of every kind of universal model. Economic phenomena are always treated as unique, products of a particular cultural context. While this is true, they should not only be seen as culture-bound. After all, markets, gift-exchange, and coins have been adopted by many different cultures. We also need to explain some of their general properties. The challenge ahead of us, therefore, is to devise an analysis of ancient markets which combines sensitivity towards particular cultural and historical conditions without shrinking away from generalization. Comparative, cross-cultural study of the institutions of exchange may suggest a way forward here.

University of Copenhagen PETER FIBIGER BANG
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni316

THEMISTOCLES' EXILE

A. KEAVENEY: *The Life and Journey of Athenian Statesman Themistocles (524–460 B.C.?) as a Refugee in Persia*. (Studies in Classics 23.) Pp. x + 179. Lewiston, NY, Queenston, and Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2003. Cased. ISBN: 0-7734-6809-9.

K. has gone over with meticulous care all the ancient of Themistokles' last, 'hidden' years from his condemnation and exile to his death in Asia, trying to sort out fact from fiction and come up with a plausible narrative of what actually happened.

Many (myself included) have tended to despair of ever reaching the truth about this particularly enigmatic period in a career in which even the earlier phases are often clouded by obscurity and contradiction, so time devoted to looking again at the sources is not misspent.

Here is how K. reconstructs events. Upon his ostracism in 471/0, Themistokles went to Argos which he used a base for drumming up opposition to Sparta in the Peloponnese. The Spartans tried to implicate him in a treasonous scheme with the Persian King for which they claimed to have found evidence amongst the papers of their now disgraced Regent Pausanias. Through the machinations of his enemies at Athens, Themistokles was tried on a charge of treason brought by *eisangelia* before the Areopagos and condemned to death (sometime between 469 and 466). He sensed that his days as a free agent in Argos were numbered and so he fled to Kerkyra (early 466), where he had built up good feelings by a previous benefaction. His intention to make a permanent home there was not to be realized, so he made his way to Epeiros and the Kingdom of the Molossoi. There through the good offices King Admetos's

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni317 Published online by Cambridge University Press

wife he found a temporary safe haven, and was joined by his wife and children from Athens. Admetos, whose feelings towards Themistokles had not been particularly friendly, was as good as his word; he rejected the demands of a delegation of Spartans and Athenians to surrender the suppliant, and instead gave him a safe conduct with a royal escort to Alexander I of Makedon at Pydna. From there, as a passenger aboard a merchant vessel, he traveled to Ephesos via Naxos (midsummer 465), spent a year learning Old Persian and possibly also Aramaic, and arrived in person before Artaxerxes in Sousa in late 464. He became an influential figure at court: the king bestowed on him the title of 'Friend and Benefactor' and assigned to him the royal revenues from several cities, especially Magnesia, where he enjoyed quasi-satrapal status and busied himself in civic and cultic affairs, constructing a temple to Dindymene Mother of the Gods and even issuing his own coinage. There is evidence also for activities, beneficial but unspecific, by his son Kleophantos at Lampsakos. When, in the early 450s, the Athenians supported an anti-Persian uprising in Egypt and the king in response called on Themistokles to make good on an earlier promise to promote the Persian cause in Greece, he was saved from joining in an enterprise that would have done violence to his still strong patriotic feelings, either by a natural death or by suicide (though certainly not by bull's blood, as Aristophanes would later have it). The date of his death cannot be determined with certainty.

K.'s reconstruction has nothing outlandish or incredible about it and, although readers may not agree with all of his decisions, most will probably judge that the grounds for his choices are for the most part sensible and well argued.

The book would have benefited from more careful proof-reading and occasionally a digression strays from the path of relevance to the subject at hand (e.g. pp. 42–8 on arrangements and protocol at the Persian court, and pp. 50–3 on Zoroastrian beliefs and practices—the suggestion is made that Themistokles received instruction in Zoroastrianism from the Magi, p. 60). Perhaps a little too much is made of the criterion for choosing or rejecting a detail that it fits in with the subject's acknowledged qualities of 'adaptability' (p. 49; performing *proskunesis* before the King) and 'flexibility' (p. 82; his adoption of Persian ways), or that the item in question is what we would expect of a man acknowledged to have been 'very much in control of his situation' (p. 32; his cautious approach to Artaxerxes). Of the three appendices, the most important is the first, on chronology (synopsized at p. 116). There is a useful digest of what is known at present about the Themistoklean coinage (pp. 81–2).

One advantage of an approach like K.'s, patiently going over ground no matter how well trodden it may appear, is that it reminds us to ask—and keep asking—basic questions. How much is it possible to separate fact from (more or less sensational) fiction in all of this? How are we measure the credibility of any of our sources, including the oldest and most respectable (Herodotos and Thoukydides)? Are there more satisfactory criteria than plausibility and internal coherence? (Variants of the phrase '. . . has an internal logic and consistency' [p. 107] recur frequently.) But it is reassuring that more than once, in deciding which version of a story to choose, he follows the convenient rule of thumb, 'When in doubt, go with Thoukydides'.

University of British Columbia, Vancouver A. J. PODLECKI
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni317

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni317 Published online by Cambridge University Press