though running in parallel. I shall be returning often to a reading of visual narrative technique which has the enormous virtues of neatness and clarity, and sets up further possibilities in both the themes discussed here and for other storylines altogether.

University of Glasgow ELIZABETH MOIGNARD

ERETRIAN EPIGRAPHY AND EARLY HELLENISTIC HISTORY

D. KNOEPFLER: *Eretria fouilles et recherches XI. Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté*. Pp. 490, ills. Lausanne: Editions Payot, 2001. Paper, Sw. frs. 169. ISBN: 2-601-03270-7.

Eretria XI forms part of the ongoing series on the excavations and research at Eretria conducted by the Swiss Archaeological School in Greece since 1964. It is also the second of three Knoepfler books that has its origins in his tripartite doctoral dissertation on Eretria during the lifetime of the philosopher Menedemos (for a summary, see *Revue Historique* 273 [1984], 241–5). The first instalment is *La Vie de Ménédème d'Érétrie de Diogène Laërce* (Basel, 1991), and throughout *Eretria XI* (and elsewhere in K.'s publications) we are referred to the third (forthcoming) instalment, *La cité de Ménédème*.

For the faint-hearted, *Eretria XI* will be a challenge, but nevertheless a mine of information and detail. A determined reader will gain a vast amount from careful scrutiny of the highly involved text and nearly 2200 footnotes in the main body of the volume (there are also four appendices). The volume is not straightforward as an analysis of the institutions of *proxenia* and citizenship of Eretria. The conclusion succeeds in pulling together some themes and the text (again with the index) can provide answers. Nor is this a corpus of the city's proxeny and citizenship decrees (as K. explains, p. 20).

Epigraphy: The volume presents detailed treatments of all the known inscriptions from Eretria conferring *proxenia* or Eretrian citizenship: forty-nine decrees. A fiftieth (**XXXI**), *proxenia* for *theoroi* of Magnesia, comes from Magnesia on the Maeander. Decrees published completely with a full transcription and translation (**1–19**) are distinguished from those without a full text (**I–XXXI**; new texts are printed for **IV** and **XIII**). The decrees are presented in three sections (for a useful summary of the dates, see pp. 426–7, Fig. 101): **1–4** are followed by **I–V** (*c*. 430–323 B.C.), **5–14** by **VI–XXIV** (322–268/7 B.C.), and **15–19** by **XXV–XXXI** (*c*. 267–196 B.C.). This separation means some back and forth, such as for the only two decrees granting a combination of citizenship and *proxenia* (pp. 116–17), for Apollodoros of Macedon (**5**) and another for his father or son, Anaxidotos of Macedon (**XI**). K. provides excellent photographs of the stone or squeeze for all inscriptions, except two (**19** and **XXVI**, lost since the late nineteenth century). And for all inscriptions (including those without transcriptions) we are given technical lemma and publication history for the stone. At least a reproduction of the texts of **I–XXV** and **XXII–XXXI** would make the volume more user-friendly and facilitate the examination of the institutions (NB in **XXIII**, K. notes [p. 265 n. 1035] a slip in Ziebarth's published text at *IG* XII 9, 208, l. 22). Transcriptions: in the margin, letters indicating fragments float and should be placed as close as possible to the actual break (as in **IV** with *IG* XII 9, 204 on left margin, but cf. **4**, fr. B, l. 8, **5** fr. B, l. 10 etc.). Could we not have the editor's date for the decree at

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.454 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the top left of the transcription? Minor points do not detract from the sheer wealth of good onomastic arguments, issues of grammar and language, observations on architectural epigraphy, letter forms and inscribing practices, archaeological epigraphy, and topography (K. finds a new Eretrian deme, Panakton, pp. 155–8, Figs 32–3).

Institutions: As a presentation of proxeny and citizenship decrees, we might have expected a separate study of the formulaic language, particularly given that K. argues for an evolution of formulae (p. 272). A summary of the norms and variations would make many of K.'s chronological arguments for dating the decrees clearer, for the identification of patterns in formulae is problematic when the decrees cannot easily be dated on historical criteria. At some points, one might have to decide to prefer historical criteria for a date before all others. The fruitful proximity of Athens (noted by K., p. 23 with nn. 55–6) offers a parallel. Michael Osborne (*Naturalization in Athens*, I [Brussels, 1981], pp. 15–17) gives a clear breakdown of the formulae of citizenship decrees at Athens. The analysis of the Eretrian decrees in the conclusion (Fig. 101) is the closest thing on offer. Developments of formulae can often be reached via the index, s.v. *asylie*, *atélie*, *enktèsis*, *formulaire*, etc., but the wood is a little lost in the trees. Perhaps readers should start with the Conclusion to gain the overall picture before dealing with texts.

History: For the diligent historian of classical and Hellenistic Greece, K.'s work is always of importance. This volume has much to offer, with its first editions of complete decrees and new joins/associations, in addition to the exhaustive referencing, cross-referencing, and scholarship. These Eretrian decrees lack calendrical prescripts and often epigraphical features do not alone prevent an inscription being dated anywhere within a fifty-year period. Some of the dates K. assigns to the decrees need careful consideration. For example, K. suggests that *proxenia* for Antiochos of Lampsakos (*IG* XII 9, 216 = **XXII**) dates from *c*. 300–285 (p. 426); the date is discussed under the closely related **XXIII** (*IG* XII 9, 208). Antiochos received *proxenia* at Delos on the proposal of Glaukos son of Skylas, *agoranomos* there in *c.* 297 (*IG* XI 4, 518; p. 266); Antiochos was therefore made *proxenos* at Eretria and Delos at the very end of the fourth century or first decades of the third (pp. 164–5 with n. 362). The only factor pushing the *terminus post quem* down to 300 seems to be the moulding and inset acroteria. **13** is dated on its formulaic similarities with **XXII** and **XXIII**. In search of an evolution in formulae, and on that basis, **15** is placed after this trio, after 280–270 (p. 279), which should surely be after *c*. 300 (or earlier?)–280. But is this construction of evolving formulae consistent with other internal historical criteria?

15, the main attraction (?), is published in full for the first time. The decree for Proteas omits the honorand's origins, possibly because, according to K., he was exiled from his city (p. 281); by contrast *IG* XII 9, 221, ll. 2–3 and 7–8 (**VIII**) leaves a space after the honorand's name, Aristonous, for whom the exile explanation is irrelevant because of the honorand's notoriety (pp. 187–8). K.'s dating of the Proteas decree to *c.* 260–255 B.C. may raise discussion. Proteas has previously acted for Eretria with 'Alexander and Dioskourides' so that elections may take place in accordance with the laws (ll. 2–5). K. identifies Alexander as the son of Krateros and Dioskourides as an otherwise unknown subordinate officer (p. 296); he notes (p. 285) references in Diodorus Siculus in the late fourth century to an Alexander and a Dioskourides but does not explore the possibility in much detail. We might benefit from re-examining the possibility of an earlier date for **15**.

Shortly after Antigonos proclaimed (315 B.C.) that all the Greeks be free, not subject to garrison, and autonomous (Diod. Sic. 19.61.4), Alexander (son of Polyperchon) was sent back by Antigonos Monophthalmos to the Peloponnese with 500 talents (to

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.454 Published online by Cambridge University Press

join his father and Aristodemos; Diod. Sic. 19.61.1 and esp. 5, rare error by K., p. 285 n. 96; see also 19.62.5). A little later, Antigonos sends his own nephew, Dioskourides, admiral of the fleet, to protect the safety of existing allies and to win over islands who had not yet become allies (Diod. Sic. 19.62.9). There is a brief window of time when Alexander and Dioskourides could conceivably have received Proteas: before Alexander's betrayal of Antigonos and alliance to Cassander (Diod. Sic. 19.64.4; late 315; Alexander subsequently was killed at Sikyon, 19.67.1). The window is Alexander's return to Greece and campaign in the Peloponnese (19.64.2). Proteas' intervention on behalf of Eretria to both Alexander and Dioskourides may therefore fall in the second half of 315. That Dioskourides can be identified should therefore be given more consideration than K. allows.

Proteas could have operated with a known Alexandros and Dioskourides to ensure free elections at Eretria; his intervention secured political change in Eretria and the city was one of the first to respond to Antigonos' push for autonomy in the Greek cities (cf. Diod. Sic. 19.61.3).

The only problem with this reconstruction is discovering a reason why Proteas went to Alexander and Dioskourides to secure elections. It is possible that Eretria had become an oligarchy (again) by 315. However, the only evidence for such a change would then be **15** itself. K. has proposed that Eretria had installed democracy in 319/8 in the wake of Polyperchon's edict, and dates **VII** (highest honours to Timotheos of Macedon) to 318 and **VIII** (proxeny for Aristonous) to 318–316 [**VIII**: P. Perlman, *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece. The* Theorodokia *in the Peloponnese* [Göttingen, 2000]: 251–2 admires but rejects the identification of Aristonous as *theorodokos* of the Nemeia, cf. K. at pp. 189–90]. K. connects Polyperchon's encouragement to remove/exile oligarchs with the decision in **VIII** 'to give to Aristonous whichever of the houses of the exiles he wants' (**VIII** = *IG* XII 9, 196, ll. 23–5). If **15** refers to an event in 315, then we are required to see that the regime which passed **VII/VIII** was shortlived and had been replaced by oligarchy around 317, or 316 at the latest. A likely context for such change was Cassander's march through Boeotia in 316 and refoundation of Thebes (Diod. Sic. 19.53.1–54.3), or 317, when cities in Euboea may already have been sympathetic to Cassander (construction of boats in Euboea and Locris to carry the army to Thessaly, Diod. Sic. 19.35.1, with O. Picard, *Chalcis et la confédération eubéenne* [Athens and Paris, 1979], p. 258). Indeed, many Greek cities may have changed their political constitutions after 318, for Diodorus says that most of the Greek cities had rejected the two kings (Philip III Arrhidaios and Alexander IV) following Polyperchon's unsuccessful siege of Megalopolis in 318 and turned to Cassander (Diod. Sic. 18.74.1).

If anything is clear, it is the complexity of internal politics in Greek *poleis* after the Lamian war. Diodorus reports Argos as one of the cities that Polyperchon had targeted with his edict in 319/8 (Diod. Sic. 18.57.1). The new democratic (?) government probably reverted to oligarchy in 316 (Diod. 19.54.3), but in 315 there remained a significant number of Argives hostile to Cassander who appealed in vain to Alexander (?still on his way back from Antigonos, Diod. Sic. 19.60.1; 61.1; 61.5), for Apollonides, Cassander's general, returned to Argos before their appeal produced any result, and burnt to death 500 of the opponents in the *prytaneion* (Diod. Sic. 19.63.2). It may be the case that **15** refers to a more successful interchange between Eretria and Alexander (and Disokourides), the first of two services for which Proteas was honoured. If so, then Eretria was democratic *c.* 319/8, oligarchic by 317 (or 316), and democratic again *c.* (late) 315.

The second service is more difficult to specify: 'he himself also loaned money at

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.454 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interest again to the city at an opportune moment and joined in bringing about (loans) from other friends' (**15**, ll. 5–8). K. suggests the loan, in the 250s, was to pay tribute to Antigonos Gonatas (for the garrison in Eretria), a reasonable suggestion given K.'s possible date. But there are circumstances between e.g. 315 and 304 when Eretria had to borrow money. Perhaps a military context? A threat from Cassander (warfare in Euboea in 313, Diod. Sic. 19.77.4, or even *c*. 306–304 when Cassander was campaigning in Attica) or (less likely) from Polemaios (310, based at Chalcis, Diod. 20.27.3; on the chronology, see now P. Wheatley, 'The Chronology of the Third Diadoch War, 315–311 B.C.', *Phoenix* 52 [1998], 257–81). But a less sensational cause may have forced Eretria to borrow money from bankers: a civic project to drain the marsh of Ptechai (*IG* XII 9, 191; see now D. Knoepfler, 'Le contrat d'Érétrie en Eubé pour le drainage de l'étang de Ptéchai', in P. Briant [ed.], *Irrigation et drainage dans l'antiquité*, *qanâts et canalisations souterraines en Iran, en Égypte et en Grèce* [Paris, 2001], pp. 41–79). K. dates the contract to 318–315. But if the first of Proteas' services in **15** dates 315, one might have to date the Ptechai operation later, *c*. 310, a date which still fulfils K.'s chronological criteria (see 'Le contrat', pp. 66–7). The drainage scheme was clearly a financial burden. It is possible that loans were required from Proteas (and friends) because of subsequent financial difficulties, or perhaps even to finance the project itself. Limited public finances may have already forced the Eretrians to stop awarding crowns (with a specific price) sometime after *c*. 319/8 (**VII** for Timotheos, see p. 177). Note **3** ll. 5–6, might date sometime between *c*. 320 and 310 rather than K's *c*. 330–320 (pp. 62–3): one can retain K.'s restoration of 'Alexanders' to qualify the 500 drachma crown at l. 5, and a later date will also conform to the pattern of epigraphical references to 'Alexanders' appearing from the first years after the death of Alexander the Great onwards (see pp. 62–3 with n. 229), which K.'s earlier date would otherwise defy.

In **15** K. also offers an account of the war between Alexander, son of Krateros and Antigonos Gonatas (*c*. 251/0). The Athenian evidence is central to the chronology and affects some details of K.'s reconstruction (see pp. 293–4): attacks on Salamis (*IG* II/III^2 1225) and Rhamnous (whence an unpublished inscription for the Athenian general for the coastal countryside, Archandros son of Kallippos of Eleusis, will eventually reveal more, p. 293 nn. 159–60 and *Ergon* 1993, pp. 7–8). The crisis in Attica may have peaked in the archonship of Diomedon, when not only did Athens call on its residents (citizens and non-citizens) to contribute to a fund (*epidosis*) to protect the harvest (*Agora* XVI 213) but also Archandros protected Rhamnous and its territory from further attacks (and also contributed the maximum, 200 drachmai, to the fund). The crucial date is the archon Diomedon, 248/7, for which one can read a published argument (cf. p. 294 n. 165; M. J. Osborne, 'Philinos and the Athenian archons of the 250s BC', in P. Flensted-Jensen et al. [edd.], *Polis and Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek History* [Copenhagen, 2000], pp. 507–20, 510 n. 22). With Diomedon dated 248/7, it follows that Polyeuktos is 250/49 (for the anticipated impact of this sequence, p. 295 with n. 166). The Euboean city Histiaea (= Oreus) provides Antiphon as an Amphictyonic councillor in the Delphic archonship of Emmenidas (*CID* IV, 48 l. 7) but not subsequently in Nikodamas' archonship (*CID* IV, 52 ll. 2–4; 53 ll. 3–7); these years must now be sequential, i.e. 255 and 254 B.C. (so *CID* IV, p. 23), and the Amphictyonic *Soteria* is therefore held annually. Elsewhere (*BCH* 119 [1995], 137–59) K. has argued for a trieteric celebration and dated the Delphic archons Emmendias and Nikodamas 252/1 and 250/49 respectively, and therefore thought Histiaea had lost its seat because Antigonos installed a garrison in the city as part of the war against Alexander, some time between 252/1 and 250/49 (p. 293). Now that the chronology

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.454 Published online by Cambridge University Press

must change, K.'s reconstruction and hypothetical garrison can no longer explain the loss of Histiaea's seat on the Amphictyonic council (see now F. Lefèvre, *L'Amphictionie Pyléo-Delphique: Histoire et Institutions*, *BEFAR* 298 [Athens and Paris, 1998], p. 62 n. 675). This weakens his argument for the late date of **15**.

Eretria XI is a major work of scholarship with a significant number of important new decrees and new interpretations of inscriptions that have been known for a long time. K. has presented the academic community with a feast of detail, and we now await the third course, *La cité de Ménédème*.

The volume lacks a concordance of decrees: (*ed. pr.* = first published edition): **1** *ed. pr.* (majuscule text, *Arch. Delt*. 24 [1969], Chron. p. 197); **2** *ed. pr.*; **3** *ed. pr.*; **4** *IG* XII 9, 227 + *ed. pr.*; **5** *IG* XII 9, 205 + 226; **6** *ed. pr.*; **7** *ed. pr.*; **8** *IG* XII 9, 217 + 229; **9** *ed. pr.*; **10** *IG* XII 9, 199 + 230; **11** *ed. pr.*; **12** *ed. pr.*; **13** *ed. pr.*; **14** *BCH* 99 (1975) 89–93 (not in *SEG*); **15** *ed. pr.*; **16** *ed. pr.* + *IG* XII 9, 231; **17** *ed. pr.*; **18** *SEG* XXV 539; **19** *IG* XII 9, 238; **I** *IG* XII 9, Suppl. 549A; **II–III** *IG* XII 9 187A–B = *Syll.*^{3} 105–6; **IV** *IG* XII 9, 204 + Suppl. p. 178; **V** *IG* XII 9, 222; **VI** *IG* XII 9, 197; **VII** *IG* XII 9, 196; **VIII** *IG* XII 9, 221; **IX** *IG* XII 9, 195; **X** *IG* XII 9, 200 + Add. p. 176; **XI** *IG* XII 9, 206; **XII** *IG* XII 9, 211; **XIII** *IG* XII 9, 198; **XIV** *IG* XII 9, 210 = *Syll.*^{3} 348; **XV** *IG* XII 9, 214; **XVI** *IG* XII 9, 201; **XVII** *IG* XII 9, 202; **XVIII** *IG* XII 9, 203; **XIX** *IG* XII 9, 225; **XX** *IG* XII Suppl. 550; **XXI** *IG* XII 9, 209; **XXII** *IG* XII 9, 216; **XXIII** *IG* XII 9, 208; **XXIV** *IG* XII 9, 218; **XXV** *IG* XII 9, 212 + p. 177 + *IG* XII Suppl. p. 179 (cf. *ZPE* 96 [1993], 245–57); **XXVI** *IG* XII 9, 220; **XXVII** *IG* XII 9, 219; **XXVIII** *IG* XII 9, 215 p. vii, *IG* XII Suppl. p. 179; **XXIX** *IG* XII Suppl. 551; **XXX** *IG* Suppl. 552; **XXXI** *IG* XII 9, p. 162, no. 5.

University of Liverpool G. J. OLIVER

SAMNITE EPIGRAPHY

M. BUONOCORE: *L'Abruzzo e il Molise in età romana tra storia e epigrafia*. In two volumes. Pp. 1116, map, pls. L'Aquila: Edizioni Libreria Colacchi, 2002. €52.

Marco Buonocore, well known equally to those who frequent the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana and to those who care about the epigraphy and history of central Italy, here presents a selection from over twenty years of work in preparation for a new edition of *CIL* IX, a worthy offering to his teacher Silvio Panciera and to the shades of *his* teacher Attilio Degrassi, and of Mommsen and Borghesi. The work is divided into a general section and a section devoted to particular localities, according to the standard geographical order. Endnotes, often long, bring the articles up to date. I cannot in any case here do justice to the richness of a work that will be indispensable for any future discussion of ancient Samnium and the neighbouring peoples; I shall reflect rather on the nature of the enterprise, draw attention to some highlights, inevitably selectively, since however hard I try I cannot bring myself to be interested in such topics as the Augustales or the Carmina Latina Epigraphica, and comment on some points for discussion.

It may seem ungracious, when so much is given, to ask for more; but it is a pity that only a selection of the original illustrations could be included; that the way in which later material is referred to is not systematic (thus references in *AE* to the inscriptions published in the original articles are usually in round brackets, but at p. 908 n. 6 in square brackets; in the same note a cross-reference to p. 923 is missing, at p. 743 n. 38

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.454 Published online by Cambridge University Press