

the latter in C. is extremely full. The introductions opening the commentary to each of the fragments are good, but in a number of instances the text he prints and the relevant commentary present problems. I cite from Davies' enumeration with that of C. in brackets. In S17.7 (= fr. 1.7) C. prints $\pi\acute{\alpha}\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \tau\epsilon$ (Smyth's emendation), but $\pi\acute{\alpha}\iota\delta\alpha\varsigma \tau\epsilon$ in the commentary (as in Page and Davies). Such inconsistencies between text and commentary appear elsewhere. In v. 9 he prints his own emendations, which make adequate sense but result in a faulty metre. Here too he prints $\pi\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$ and in the commentary $\pi\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$. In S13.1 (= fr. 6.1) only a μ is printed in the text, whereas $\omega\mu\omega[\xi\epsilon\nu$ appears in the commentary without any indication of its source (apparently his own supplement). In v. 8 he prints $\tau\acute{o}\kappa\alpha$, but $\acute{o}\kappa\alpha$ in the commentary. In the same verse he prints supplements (again apparently his own), which he does not discuss in the commentary and which result in a grammatical construction that is baffling to me. Here and elsewhere he tends to print supplements much too boldly. One particular typographical error occurs throughout. When a word ends in two vowels and the second one is elided, the mark of elision is printed over rather than after the preceding vowel, as in $\delta\epsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa[\acute{\epsilon}$ (S11.6 = fr. 7.6). Apart from this, I have not noticed any misprints of significance, but on p. 118 read Simon. for Semon.

My overall assessment of the book is that it makes a valuable contribution not only to our understanding specifically of the *Geryoneis* but also to various aspects of the poet as a whole. My one major reservation concerns the commentary. Too often the defense of his restorations is inadequate, especially since some of them are quite extensive. I regret that C. decided to provide a new numbering of the fragments. He could easily have kept the standard enumeration and simply arranged the fragments in the order he considered most plausible.

Douglas E. Gerber

University of Western Ontario

Robin J. Lane Fox (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Macedon: Studies in the Archaeology and History of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, Leiden: Brill, 2011. xiii + 642 pp. ISBN 978-90-04-20650-2.

As its subtitle indicates, this volume does not aim at comprehensive coverage of Macedonian history, society and culture. Rather, in an introduction and twenty-eight chapters, it provides up-to-date discussions of the archaeology of several of the most important sites in ancient Macedonia, surveys of Macedonian art, studies of aspects of political and economic life, and a sequence of essays on the history of Macedon, focusing particularly on the fourth century. Robin Lane Fox (henceforth L.F.) himself provides the bulk of the historical material in five chapters, covering '399-369 BC' (209-34), 'The 360s' (257-69), 'Philip of Macedon: Accession, Ambitions, and Self-Presentation' (335-66), 'Philip and Alexander's Macedon' (367-91) and "'Glorious Servitude ...': The Reigns of Antigonos Gonatas and Demetrios II' (496-519). L.F.'s main concern is to establish a revised chronology for the reigns of kings from the death of Archelaus (400/399 BC) to the accession of Philip II (early 360/59 — that is, in 360), and to emphasize the weakness of Macedon at the time of Philip's accession, therefore maximizing the achievement of Philip himself. This is done through a detailed examination of the epigraphic and literary evidence, with a significant degree of trust being placed in the details provided by late chronographers and commentators. Frequently statements are accompanied by comments such as 'I accept', 'I suggest', 'in my view', and other similar indications that his conclusions are in opposition to those of some other scholars: it can generally be said that L.F.'s version of events is no less plausible than any other, even if sometimes the evidence is too limited to allow the reader to share his confidence. L.F.'s interest in Philip is brought out still more in his introduction to the volume (1-34), which, rather than giving an overview of ancient Macedon, concerns itself with the question

of who is buried in the royal tombs at Vergina, concluding that the most famous of these, Tomb II, is indeed that of Philip II.

The second most substantial contributor to the book is M.H. Hatzopoulos, who provides four chapters: the brief 'Macedonian Studies' (35-42) offers a rapid survey of the study of Macedonian antiquity from the sixteenth century to the early twenty-first; 'Macedonia and Macedonians' (43-9) and 'Macedonians and Other Greeks' (51-78) offer balanced discussions of the inhabitants of the region and their relations with their southern neighbours; 'The Cities' (235-41) is again brief, and discusses the civic organization of Macedonian cities. Hatzopoulos' own substantial research into Macedonian social organization is much in evidence in his footnotes, and his contribution to the practical organization of the volume is acknowledged at the start of L.F.'s introduction.

The real strength of the volume is in the chapters on the archaeology of a number of important sites, written generally by archaeologists who have been involved in the excavations. These deal with Aiani (93-112), Vergina-Aegae (three chapters, 243-56, 271-333), Pella (393-408), Amphipolis (409-36), Philippi (437-52) and Thessalonike (545-62), and provide information not otherwise available in English, and to some extent not otherwise available at all. Obviously what can be said about these sites varies considerably, from the detailed descriptions of the royal palace at Aegae, excavated in its entirety, to the meagre remains at Thessalonike, where the ancient city is entirely buried under its modern successor. All these chapters, and the three surveys of 'Classical Art' (179-207), 'Hellenistic Art' (477-93) and 'Art in the Roman Period, 168 BC-337 AD' (563-84) are supported by lavish illustrations, mostly in colour, bound at the back of the book and numbering sixty-nine pages. The art surveys discuss material found in Macedon, providing an overview of what was produced there, but not at any point developing a sustained argument about the role of art objects in Macedonian culture. Stavros Palaspas introduces his chapter on classical art by saying 'This chapter is intended to introduce to the wider scholarly community a range of important, recently discovered objects relevant to the cultural life of pre-Hellenistic Macedonia' (p. 179), and similar approaches are taken in the other two chapters.

For the rest there are chapters by Manuela Mari on 'Archaic and Early Classical Macedonia' (79-92), acting as a prologue to R.F.'s historical chapters, and on 'Traditional Cults and Beliefs' (453-65). This latter is to be welcomed because of its focus on the epigraphic and archaeological evidence from Macedonia itself, in place of the habit of scholars to base their discussions on references to religious practices drawn from the Alexander historians. Sophia Kremydi's chapter on 'Coinage and Finance' (159-78) has rather more to say about the former than the latter. There are chapters on Macedon's southern and western neighbours, 'The Kingdom of Macedonia and the Chalcidic League' (113-35), 'Chalcidice' (137-58) and 'Macedonia in Thrace' (467-76), and a slightly isolated, but illuminating chapter on 'Court, King and Power in Antigonid Macedonia' by John Ma (521-43). The final chapter, on 'Early Christianity in Macedonia' (585-99) is less valuable, essentially extracting references to Macedon from the *Acts of the Apostles*, Pauline letters, *The Acts of Saints Agape, Irene and Chione at Saloniki*, and a few writings of the early church fathers.

It should be clear from the above description that this is not a book aimed at those looking for an introduction to ancient Macedon. As noted above, it is not intended to be comprehensive, and most of its chapters assume some knowledge of Macedonian history and geography. It might also be described as traditional (or even old-fashioned) in its focus on political history and on the description of artefacts. There is no index entry for 'women' or 'gender', although there are entries for many named individual women of the royal house; on the other hand, the index entry for 'arms/armour' is not long, and mostly concerned with the grave goods in Tomb II. In another sense however, the book is very much up-to-date, in that it lays out the current state of knowledge and understanding about ancient Macedon. Both the archaeological chapters and the historical ones aim to offer a reliable basis of knowledge on which, presumably, other scholars can build their own theories. It will be especially valuable in raising the profile of Macedon in studies of the

Aegean world in the Classical period. The dates in the subtitle are a little misleading: some of the material touched on is earlier than 650 BC, and some later than AD 350; Roman Macedonia is reasonably well represented; but it is the fifth, and even more the fourth centuries BC, that are the main focus.

The volume has an index, but no consolidated bibliography. Hatzopoulos' chapter on 'Macedonians and Other Greeks', Karamitrou-Mentessidi's on Aiani, Drougou's on Vergina and Akamatis' on Pella have individual bibliographies, but otherwise references to modern works are only to be found in the footnotes of the various chapters. There is the occasional misprint, but production values are high. What this volume does, it does very well.

Hugh Bowden

King's College London

Vivienne J. Gray, *Xenophon's Mirror of Princes. Reading the Reflections*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. vii + 406 pp. ISBN 978-0-19-956381-4.

Vivienne Gray (henceforth G) is one of the leading scholars of Xenophon, having produced monographs on *Hellenika* and *Memorabilia*, as well as numerous shorter studies of these and other writings of Xenophon.¹ This book is her most ambitious to date. Here she makes use of her extensive knowledge of Xenophon's writings to offer a more comprehensive view of Xenophon as thinker and writer. The very idea of producing this kind of work is an important contribution in two ways. First of all, it helps emphasize the continuity between works that are often treated as belonging to separate genres. It is unfortunate that scholars working on Xenophon's historical writings often have little knowledge of his philosophical writings, and vice versa. This is especially lamentable because, as G shows, virtually all of Xenophon's writings belong to a single genre or at least display a single area of dominant interest: theory of leadership or human management. As G points out, Xenophon's greatest innovation in historical writing is precisely his conviction that leadership is the greatest achievement of all. In a series of acute observations she shows how this understanding explains many of Xenophon's authorial pronouncements, some of which have been mistaken for irony (see especially 80-83; 87-100; 111-118).

Secondly, G exploits the breadth of her Xenophonic knowledge to address what is perhaps the central conflict in Xenophonic studies today: his alleged irony. By bringing similar passages from different works together she reveals underlying literary patterns and political judgements. Her idea is that if Xenophon approves a mode of behavior in one work it stands to reason that he approves of it when he presents it in another work. There are of course dangers in such an approach. The researcher must be sure that there is no irony in the first passage and must insure that the second passage resembles the first in all the relevant ways. But these conditions usually hold, which means her conclusions are generally right.

One of the chief weaknesses of the ironic interpretations of Xenophon is the failure to begin with a clear assessment of what Xenophon does believe. G therefore begins with an account of Xenophon's theory of leadership, granting a special place to the Socratic presentation (9-24). This theory consists of the following central elements: communities are divided into leaders and followers; the aim of a good leader is the good of the community; this good consists in material increase and personal improvement; the ruler leads by inspiring willing obedience; the leader must

¹ See 'Xenophon's Defence of Socrates: The Rhetorical Background to the Socratic Problem', *Classical Quarterly*, 39, 1989, 136-140; *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenika*, London, 1989; 'Xenophon's Symposium: The Display of Wisdom', *Hermes* CXX, 1992, 58-75; 'Xenophon's Image of Socrates in the *Memorabilia*', *Prudentia*, 27, 1995, 50-73; *The Framing of Socrates. The Literary Interpretation of Xenophon's Memorabilia*, Stuttgart, 1998; *Xenophon on Government (Hiero, Respublica Lacedaemoniorum and Respublica Atheniensium)*, Cambridge, 2007.