Naturally much in the book is controversial. For one thing, it challenges the view of Messenian ethnogenesis put forward by Hall in 'Dorianization'. More generally, several of L.'s arguments may well be challenged, such as the adoption of Bauslaugh's view ('Messenian dialect and dedications of the "Methanioi"', *Hesperia* 59 (1990) 661-8) that the 'Methanioi' who dedicated two fifth-century spear-butts at Olympia and at Longà/Ayios Andhreas respectively were Messenian rebels in the war of the 460s, or the assumption that the myth of a tripartite division of territory among Heraklids originated in the early fifth century. After the liberation of Messenia the greatest part of our evidence comes from the city of Ithome/Messene, and developments in the other smaller cities are largely unknown, as L. admits: how far conclusions about the great central city can be generalised is uncertain. (The current remarkable excavations on the site of Ithome/Messene will, at least in the short term, make the imbalance even more pronounced.) However, much in the book is persuasive, and it has the very great merit of showing what needs to be discussed about ancient Messenia, with clear and compelling arguments on many of the central issues.

James Roy University of Nottingham

Emily Greenwood and Elizabeth. K. Irwin (eds.), *Reading Herodotus: A Study of the* Logoi *in Book 5 of Herodotus'* Histories, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. xv + 343 pp. ISBN 9780521876308.

This volume represents a fresh and welcome approach to the reading of Herodotus, which should be adopted by future studies, namely, a literary analysis of the *Histories* which examines each of the work's books individually, but not as a commentary. Based on a Colloquium held in the Faculty of Classics at Cambridge University in July 2002, this volume contains twelve chapters written by different contributors, surveying a variety of *logoi* from Herodotus' Book Five and exploring their content, logic and language.

The position of Book Five in the middle of Herodotus' work and its role in marking a shift between the foregoing ethnographic accounts of non-Greek groups and the beginning of the Persian War narrative are the reasons why it was chosen to be the subject of the present volume (pp. 9-19). But this reasoning is somewhat compromised by the editors' reluctance to accept the traditional book partition as originating with Herodotus himself. This stance is somewhat puzzling, especially since both editors acknowledge that there is no positive evidence to prove that the divisions are not Herodotus' (p. 14 n. 31) and are aware of the book's thematic (pp. 17-8, 25-40) and stylistic unity (p. 47) and of its obvious literary closure (pp. 11, 16, 142). After all, Book Five begins with the description of a multitude without a leader in Thrace (5.3), and ends in the same region with the account of the death of Aristagoras (5.126), a leader without followers. The attempt to evade a decisive conclusion on the origin of the book division results in an apparently unnecessary apologetic remark on the allegedly artificial endpoint of Book Five (pp. 15-17, culminating with the note that 'Herodotus himself could hardly have been unaware of the format ... in which his work would be circulated' [p. 16]). Furthermore, this vagueness leads to a curious view that the unit analyzed in the volume has a tentative frame 'which some reader (not excluding Herodotus himself) at some time marked formally by a book division ...' (p. 19 n. 47). Here the editors might have clarified matters by taking a bold step further to claim that the book division is indeed Herodotean.

Consciously echoing the character of Herodotus' own endeavour (p. 13, 16), the volume aims to house many diverse voices, emphasizing the various contexts of the *Histories* (religious, historical and otherwise), thus making it possible to read and interpret the original text in varied manners. Book Five is thus divided into twelve parts of uneven lengths that are meant to represent

the original *logoi*, each assigned to a different author. In this fragmentation the key notion is that of *logos*, which, despite the overt intention to keep its definition open-ended (pp. 5-6), is treated in the present volume more as a textual section than as a theme or a recurrent pattern. The formal borderlines separating the *logoi* may, in theory, be construed as arbitrary or artificial, because they depend on the interpretative outline set by the editors. In practice, though, one hardly finds an overlap in the division of the narrative into segments (the exception being the last chapter of the volume), since most authors seem to identify the same junctures as invitation points to pause, that is, as markers of a beginning or an end of a passage.

Polyphony, however, can easily deteriorate into cacophony. This pitfall is skilfully avoided by the editors in two ways. First, they provide interconnections between the various chapters, and, second, they trace the relevance of the subject matter of each chapter discussion to the greater narrative context — be it Book Five as a whole or the entire *Histories*. This attitude corresponds to the significance Herodotus manifestly gives to the *logoi* as individual units of narrative that work independently as well as in concert (p. 6). Like the audience of the original text, so the reader of its academic study as well, is meant to be sent continuously back and forth, thus emphasizing the fact that the segments should not be considered apart. Given the need to associate the different *logoi*, an attempt parallel to — and indeed to some extent part of — the endeavour of linking their various interpretations, it is quite natural to find the recurrent metaphor of a 'bridge' (Irwin, pp. 12, 43; Fearn, p. 98; Greenwood, pp. 128-145; Munson, p. 146; Pelling, p. 198; Moles, p. 264), or even a 'website' with its hyperlinks (Pelling, p. 179) applied to passages, places, and characters throughout the volume.

The editors' introduction (pp. 1-40) presents the background to the volume and its format alongside the themes of Book Five. One is taken to be the political flux in Greek cities, especially the contingency of autonomy and other constitutional changes. Another theme is the shifting definition of Greek ethnicity, applying to Ionian or Dorian identities in particular, but also to the expressions of Greek ethnicity in relation to groups which are at some undefined point on the spectrum between barbarians and Hellenes, namely, Thracians, Macedonians and Cypriots. Another theme is that of historiographic overtones and the author's self consciousness of his project, noticeable in some elements: the reference to the very invention of writing (5.58), the mention of the historian Hecataeus (5.36), an awareness of the use of history for political ends, and an ironic connection of the narrative to the realities of his contemporary audience, who experiences different 'Ionian revolts' against another Empire (namely, Athenian). Though by no means comprehensive, these points are inventive and raise many insightful questions about the *Histories*. Since the first two themes are not exclusive to Book Five, their particular features here should be explored. One might find them in Herodotus' play of disparities and similarities between the one and the many, resounded predominantly in the treatment of the Athenian democracy/tyranny — a motif alluded to by the editors (pp. 27-8, 49), but not sufficiently emphasized.

E. Irwin's paper, '"What's in a Name?" and exploring the comparable: onomastics, ethnography and *kratos* in Thrace (5.1-2 and 3-10)' (pp. 41-87), deals with the Paeonian defeat of the Perinthians and the description of Thracian customs. As its title suggests, it is a multi-dimensional essay, which succeeds in tracing the manner in which Herodotus interweaves distinct intellectual discourses in an allusion to contemporary Athens. One of its themes, that of Herodotus' play on names and words, reappears in later contributions (in particular, the double meaning of *archē kakōn* in 5.97 as 'beginning of ills' or 'empire of ills', Irwin, p. 47 n. 16). The motif of power is picked up by R. Osborne in 'The Paeonians (5.11-16)' (pp. 88-97), to the point where he conceals his own perceptions on the relationship of individual and community and on the movement between Europe and Asia while focusing on this narrow aspect. D. Fearn's 'Narrating ambiguity: murder and Macedonian allegiance (5.17-22)' (pp. 98-127) is an ingenious study about the interplay of ethnic stereotypes set in the intriguing middle ground of Alexander's

kingdom, and the ironic use made of mythological archetypes. This chapter is also inventive in showing how Herodotus creates a gap between the professed aim of a narrative and its details which undermine and challenge it.

'Bridging the Narrative (5.23-7)' by E. Greenwood (pp. 128-145) evokes a spatial-geographical interpretation of the *Histories*, using the image of a bridge to illuminate the opportunities provided by the narrative for cross-reading and for pointing out patterns and connections between characters and actions throughout the work. Certain characteristics of the passage, however, which the author brilliantly explores — such as a speech which is made to convey one message to the internal audience and a different one to the external readers of the text and many subtle ironies — perhaps cannot be covered by this metaphor. R.V. Munson's contribution, 'The Trouble with the Ionians: Herodotus and the Beginning of the Ionian Revolt (5.28-38.1)' (pp. 146-167), focuses on Herodotus' interpretation of the role of the Ionians in the history of the Greeks, from the Persian wars to the historian's time. Drawing attention to the Ionians' passive position and relative insignificance, Munson highlights the comic aspects of the causes of the Ionian revolt as well as the triviality of the scenes that led to it. S. Hornblower's 'The Dorieus episode and the Ionian Revolt (5.42-8)' (pp. 168-178) dwells on the interconnectivity between the eastern and western Mediterranean and between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars in the story of Spartan involvement in Italy and Sicily.

The historian's disorienting play with familiar national stereotypes is emphasized in C. Pelling's 'Aristagoras (5.49-55, 97)' (pp. 179-201). In 'Structure and Significance (5.55-69)' (pp. 202-225), V. Gray makes important comments on Herodotus' narrative patterns, in particular the function of digressions which are longer than the main account. Quite appropriately, she believes that the disproportional amount of space given to these side stories, such as the lineage of Hipparchus' killers — at the expense of the killing itself, and the reforms of Cleisthenes of Sicyon rather than those of his Athenian grandson, is intended to enhance our understating of the meaning of the principal storyline.

Another digression is analyzed in J. Haubold's 'Athens and Aegina (5.82-9)' (pp. 226-244). The passage, in fact, is interpreted as offering reflections on the nature of the past itself and providing different conceptions of it, i.e. divine intervention vs. human agency. J. Moles addresses the rhetorical merits of Socles' oratory with respect to its different audiences (the Spartans, the allies, and readers in Herodotus' day) in '"Saving" Greece from the "ignominy" of Tyranny? The "Famous" and "Wonderful" Speech of Socles (5.92)' (pp. 245-268).

In her fascinating study, 'Cyprus and Onesilus: an Interlude of Freedom (5.104, 108-16)' (pp. 269-288), A. Serghidou considers how Herodotus manipulates the role of Cyprus in the Ionian Revolt, toying with the significance it bears on the latter, and interplaying between the local and national importance of the event and its agents. While Pelling rightfully stresses the unique character of the *Histories* and allows alternative readings to coexist (p. 200), authors of subsequent chapters tend to attribute a certain single-mindedness to Herodotus and a clear ideological ('libertarian text': Moles, pp. 267-68) or methodological ('proving his point': Gray, pp. 211, 220-1) agenda. This approach interprets Herodotus' words too literally, barely leaving room for an ironic reading. Yet pushing the text in the opposite direction, as in J. Henderson's impressionistic '"The Fourth Dorian Invasion" and "The Ionian Revolt" (5.76-126)' (pp. 289-310), may also not hit the mark for Herodotus, who was probably more serious in his playfulness than is portrayed in this chapter.

Nevertheless, Henderson's paper is a proper ending for a volume which frequently lays emphasis on the historian's reworking of the rhetorical boundaries between Greeks and barbarians. By presenting the various interpretations, the editors not only demonstrate that this revisiting of stereotypes, subtle ironies and play between past and present contexts make the *Histories* a very slippery text, but also indicate the fact that its understanding is not static but requires a constantly changing interpretation from its readers. From this point of view, the present

volume is significant as it puts the act of reading Herodotus in the spotlight.

Eran Almagor The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Polly Low, *Interstate Relations in Classical Greece. Morality and Power*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 313 pp. ISBN 978-0-521-87206-5.

This book, which owes its origin to a Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, employs theoretical approaches from the field of International Relations (hereafter IR) to challenge the widely held view that Greek interstate relations and diplomatic practices were excessively unrestrained, anarchic and violent, and that the contemporary theories of interstate behavior were correspondingly under-developed and unsophisticated. Polly Low (hereafter L.) contends that, quite to the contrary, during the period under examination (roughly 479-322 B.C.), a developed normative framework did exist, which shaped the conduct and representation of interstate relations and was underpinned by complex thinking. She concedes, however, that this thinking did not amount to the sort of highly developed IR theories that exist in modern times.

L. starts her presentation with a survey of the dilemmas and debates that accompanied the formation of IR as an academic discipline in modern times. In the wake of World War I, the so-called "idealists" believed that a liberal state of mind could supersede pure military power in the conduct of interstate relations and serve as a basis for a stable world order. The conspicuous failure of the brainchild of this conception, the League of Nations, seemed however to vindicate the claim of their rival "realists", who held that moral considerations were and should be irrelevant to the study of relations between states, as these are, and were, dominated by nothing but naked force. Ancient history intersected with IR right from the beginning, not the least thanks to the enthusiasm of Sir Alfred Zimmern (author of 'The Greek Commonwealth'). Zimmern freely drew analogies between the British and Athenian empires, and recommended the application of ancient history, in particular Thucydides, to the study of IR. Following World War II, a whole series of further "debates" ensued, without however producing a theory that could save the discipline from the humiliation of failing to prognosticate the collapse of the communist regimes in the late 1980s. For the latter part of the twentieth century, neo-realism dominated the scene. In the U.S., in particular, human nature was viewed as uncompromisingly egotistical and inclined to immorality. In the absence of an overall sovereign power able to curb excesses, international relations were thought to be more or less synonymous with 'spying, deceit, bribery, disloyalty, ingratitude, betrayal, exploitation, plunder, repression, subjection, and genocide' (25). British scholars, however, identified the operation of another force, the dim perception of common interests and practices by the actors involved in the game. They argued that the alleged anarchy that prevails in relations between states might be caused not so much by selfishness and brutality as by the relativity of these actors' moral judgments.

Shifting focus to ancient Greece, L. shows that an international society of states did exist. It is evinced in our sources above all by a network of reciprocal relationships which manifested themselves in the form of *philia* ('friendship') or *sungeneia* ('kinship') between states, and in grants of citizenship by one state to the citizens of another. All these relationships operated in interpersonal, domestic political, as well as external, contexts, and were often supported by *eunoia* ('goodwill') and *homonoia* ('fellow-thinking'). For the formation of multilateral groupings of states, further principles were often brought into play, such as ideology (e.g., the division of Greek states into democrats who favored Athens and oligarchs who favored Sparta during the Peloponnesian War), ethnicity (e.g., the case of the ethnically based leagues and federations) and Panhellenism (which urged the Greeks to see Greece as a "shared homeland" or "one polis"). The problem of the often-shifting boundaries of this society of states (e.g. 'of where Greece stops and