

Stephen Lambert. *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees 352/1-322/1 B.C.: Epigraphical Essays* (Brill Studies in Greek and Roman Epigraphy), Leiden: Brill, 2012. xii + 433 pp. ISBN: 978-90-04-20931-2 (and e-book 978-90-04-22852-8).

When the plan to produce a new edition of inscribed Athenian laws and decrees from 403 B.C. onwards, for a partial third edition of *Inscriptiones Graecae* ii, was formed, Lambert was one of the first scholars to be enlisted, and was assigned the period 352/1-322/1. He has been exceptionally single-minded and assiduous, not only in preparing his fascicle (fasc. ii, published 2012) but also in writing a substantial series of ancillary studies in which he has been able to go into more detail on individual texts and to discuss wider issues concerning those texts than is possible within the constraints of *IG*. Eighteen of those ancillary studies (twelve from the *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* and six from more recondite volumes) are now republished in this book — but without photographs, since they are available in his *IG* fascicle.

The first five chapters form a collection designated ‘Main Series’, and occupying about half of the book. Here Lambert works his way systematically through his texts in subject groups — decrees honouring Athenians; religious regulations; citizenship, proxeny and euergey for foreigners; other awards to foreigners; treaties and other texts — listing the texts in each group, discussing particular problems of reading, restoration and interpretation, and at the beginning of each chapter making general comments on the texts as a group. Here we see him “showing his working”, as in *IG* he cannot, and arguing his way to the results which have to be presented largely as *faits accomplis* in *IG*. I note from among many points the suggestion (on which Lambert follows A. P. Matthaiou) that *IG* ii² 330 + 445 honoured the secretary *tei boulei kai toi demoi*, who read documents to the council and assembly, and perhaps other secretaries; the conclusion (in connection with *IG* ii² 334 + *SEG* xviii 13) that the Little Panathenaea was celebrated every year, not only in the three years out of four when the Great Panathenaea was not celebrated; the reaffirmation that the fragments of *IG* ii² 207 (concerning Orontes) all belong together and are best dated 349/8.

There follow twelve ‘Other Prolegomena’, of various kinds. ‘Ten Notes on Attic Inscriptions’ (vi) are concerned mostly with persons, and are not all from Lambert’s defined period. ‘Fragmente athenischer Ehrendekrete aus der Zeit des Lamischen Krieges’ (vii; in German) deals with the various fragments printed as *Agora* xvi 94, and *IG* ii² 292. ‘The Only Extant Decree of Demosthenes’ (viii: on *IG* ii² 231) suggests that except in his opposition to Philip of Macedon Demosthenes was not as influential as the literary evidence leads us to suppose. ‘Fish, Low Fares and *IG* ii² 283’ (ix) studies a decree perhaps of c. 337 as the earliest of a series of decrees in which Athens honoured traders in the period after Chaeronea in its concern to secure its food supplies. ‘On *IG* ii² 546’ (x) suggests that that honorific decree belongs not to the aftermath of the Lamian War but to 332/1, and discusses problems in the Athenian calendar. ‘Afterwords’ (xi) adds to the discussions of *IG* ii² 417 and 1593 in Chapter vi. ‘*IG* ii² 410: An Erasure Reconsidered’ (xii) again adds to a discussion in Chapter vi, and asks why this decree, enacted perhaps immediately after Chaeronea, was originally to be published in the theatre at Piraeus but the location was changed to the theatre in Athens.

‘Greek Inscriptions in the University Museum, Oxford, Mississippi’ (xiii) begins with one previously unpublished text, of the third century A.D. and of unknown provenance, commemorating an Olympic victory, and then deals with five Athenian texts. ‘Restoring Athenian Names’ (xiv) proposes seventy-six new restorations in inscriptions, working from the principles that one should begin with an accurate reading of what is preserved, should avoid over-confident restoration where several names are equally possible, and should favour restorations which accord with rather than conflict with known patterns of nomenclature. ‘Polis and Theatre in Lykourgan Athens’ (xv) edits and discusses ten inscriptions honouring foreigners for services in connection with Athenian drama, noting that this focus on drama was one of the distinctive features of Athens

after Chaeronea. ‘Athens, Sokles and the Exploitation of an Attic Resource’ (xvi; on *IG* ii² 411) edits a decree which has commonly been linked with agriculture or the silver mines, but suggests that the resource may rather have been something such as salt, wild honey or resin, and that the decree is evidence of increasing intervention by the city in what had previously been considered private rights. ‘Inscribed Treaties ca. 350-321’ (xvii) notes that treaties with and honours for states become rare between Chaeronea and the Lamian War but honours for individual foreigners (including grain traders and men connected with drama: cf. Chapters ix, xv) do not: Athens could not play the same role on the international stage after Chaeronea as before, but its diplomatic activity was refocused rather than reduced.

On its own at the end we have ‘Athenian Chronology 352/1-322/1 B.C.’ (xviii), consolidating the discussions of chronology on many individual texts in previous chapters. Lambert notes that for the dates of particular texts the possibilities have more often been widened than narrowed, and updates what can be said for this period on various disputed issues: it is likely that ordinary and intercalary years were determined by Metonic cycles, and that the longer prytanies in each year were regularly at the beginning, as stated in *Ath. Pol.* 43. 2 (but in each case we cannot be confident that there were no exceptions), but the omitted day in hollow months may have varied according to the festivals prescribed towards the end of the month in question. An Appendix contains ‘Select Addenda and Corrigenda (2011)’; there are good indexes; a complete list of Lambert’s publications in the field would have been welcome (and cross references between chapters would have been improved by incorporation of the chapter numbers of this book).

‘This is a work for specialists’, to quote the opening words of the Preface of W. S. Ferguson’s *The Treasurers of Athena*. Greek text and detailed arguments abound, and this is not a book for the bedside of the “general reader”. However, Lambert is interested in and is good at investigating broader issues of importance as well as the *minutiae* of inscribed texts. He himself has plans to make translations of all his texts available on line, and to write a book devoted to the wider interpretation of the material. Meanwhile it is good to have so many of his articles collected in one volume. There is plenty here to benefit all those who work at an advanced level on Greek history in general, as well as those who are devoted to Athenian public documents, and it is to be hoped that they will disseminate the results in their teaching and writing.

P. J. Rhodes

University of Durham

Iris Sulimani, *Diodorus’ Mythistory and the Pagan Mission: Historiography and Culture-Heroes in the First Pentad of the Bibliothekē* (Mnemosyne Supplements 331), Leiden: Brill, 2011. 409 pp. ISBN: 978-90-04-19406-9.

Diodorus’ reputation has fluctuated widely over the centuries. The author of the largest surviving ancient Greek history, he was highly regarded as a historian from the rediscovery of the *Bibliothēkē* in the Renaissance through the eighteenth century. Beginning in the nineteenth century, however, Diodorus’ reputation declined precipitously and characterizations of him as “stupid”, “ignorant”, and an “incompetent compiler” became increasingly common. The value of his work according to scholars holding such views consisted solely in the quality of the sources he used in compiling it. As a result, scholarship on the *Bibliothēkē* was dominated by *Quellenforschung* intended to identify its superior but unfortunately lost sources.

Few trends in scholarship are permanent. The closing decades of the twentieth century were marked by a more positive reevaluation of Diodorus and his work, spearheaded by scholars such as Catherine Rubincam and Kenneth Sacks. In their studies the emphasis was placed not on identifying Diodorus’ sources but on elucidating his role as an author who actively shaped his