

two unequal parts. While the opening section of the dialogue shows that neither sophists nor politicians can render Theages σοφός, the final section gives as an alternative Socratic συνοουσία, which — working not with dialectic, but simply by proximity and contact — can at least *improve* him (i.e., make him ὡς βέλτιστος). This is accomplished, as we saw, largely through the operations of τὸ δαιμόνιον, which works independently of Socrates' will and which (as in the *Alcibiades* of Aeschines [fr. 11 Dittmar; J. 42f.]) is closely connected or even identical (97n.80) with *Eros*. As such, Socrates (in contrast with his sophistic rivals, who accomplish nothing) is the ἐρωτικὸς ἀνὴρ (11) 'concerned for the welfare of his young associate[s]' (cp. *Phdr.* 248D3f. and 249A1-2 ἢ [sc. ψυχῆ] τοῦ φιλοσοφήσαντος ἀδόλως ἢ παιδεραστήσαντος μετὰ φιλοσοφίας, not cited by J.). In other words, the dialogue is not really 'about' the divine sign in any strict sense at all; it is primarily concerned with education.

Despite the criticisms offered above, this is certainly an important book and will be of enormous interest to students of Plato, regardless of their views on *Theages*. The commentary in particular contains an astonishing wealth of valuable material on various Platonic idioms. If J.'s edition thus offers any hint of the future of Platonic studies (especially in the English-speaking world), then students of the dialogues can count themselves quite fortunate indeed.

Alexander Tulin

Howard University

Vanessa B. Gorman, *Miletos, the Ornament of Ionia. A History of the City to 400 B.C.E.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2001. viii + 304 pp., 7 maps. ISBN 0 472 11199X.

The rise and fall of a great city of the Classical world remains a fascinating topic — in spite of the warning by the late Sir Moses Finley that any attempt to write what I might call *A Tale of One City* — that is, a self-contained history of an *individual* ancient town — is bound to lead into a '*cul-de-sac*, given the limits of the available (and potential) documentation'. Finley passed a harsh verdict on what he described as the 'spate of pseudo-histories of ancient cities and regions' and their 'anachronistic antiquarianism' which necessarily created nothing but 'a morass of unintelligible, meaningless, unrelated "facts"'. As a consequence of their 'lack of conceptual focus or scheme' and their 'descriptive and positivistic' approach, which Finley called the 'tell-all-you-know technique', just 'everything known about the place under examination' would appear 'to have equal claim — architecture, religion and philosophy, trade and coinage, administration and "international relations"'.¹

Despite Finley's equally eloquent advocacy of a systematic and comparative study of 'ancient urbanism', that is the 'closely interlocked town-country unit of the city(-state)' as the 'pivotal' institution of the Graeco-Roman world,² his warning was rejected as grossly overstated or simply ignored — and the book under review here is no exception. In fact, many studies of individual cities and regions of the ancient Mediterranean published in the 1990s do have some sort of

¹ M.I. Finley, 'The Ancient City' (1977), in *idem, Economy and Society in Ancient Greece*, ed. by B.D. Shaw, R. Saller, London 1981, 3-23, at p. 20; *idem, Ancient History. Evidence and Models*, London 1985, 61ff., esp. 61, 63, 65 and 108.

² The present state of the discussion is now fully documented in *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures*, ed. by M.H. Hansen, Copenhagen 2000. Interdisciplinary approaches were also (successfully) put to the test in *City States in Classical Antiquity and Medieval Italy*, ed. by A. Molho, K. Raaflaub, J. Emlen, Stuttgart 1991; *The Archaeology of City-States. Cross-Cultural Approaches*, ed. by D.L. Nichols, Th.H. Charlton, Washington etc. 1997.

'conceptual focus' — trade and other forms of 'interaction' between '(peer) polities';³ territoriality, the interconnection of city and hinterland, centre and periphery⁴; 'urbanization' and 'urbanism' in the narrow sense of the concept,⁵ and topography and 'landscapes' of cities, spatiality and material culture⁶ seem to be the favourites, at the moment, at least.

Against this backdrop, Professor Gorman's (henceforth G.) idea of deliberately avoiding what she calls 'the tight focus', which prevented previous works from 'offering an integrated view of Milesian history', and her own concept of a 'modern, comprehensive history' of this 'remarkably important city' (4f.; 10) look strangely 'conservative', if not a trifle old-fashioned. This is certainly true for her deliberately 'antiquarian' approach: she claims to have 'collected and scrutinized the sources about Miletos and their interpretation for the years from its first signs of habitation until 400 B.C.E.' (10) — an ambitious project, as 'the site was nearly continuously occupied from at least 1700 B.C.E.' (14). This concept, at least in the eyes of this reviewer, stands in need of some justification — not least in view of Finley's magisterial statement, which more than two decades ago made the awkward fundamental problems of this sort of comprehensive approach all too clear. It is plainly no longer enough simply to adopt what has been called 'the old laborious methods, of collecting evidence and interrogating it with an open mind'⁷ — whatever that means.

However, this is exactly what G. wants to do, and, obviously unimpressed by all this theoretical and methodological fuss, she resolutely goes about her business. I hasten to emphasize that at the same time, she seems to be fully aware of the fundamental difficulties that she has to confront. G. knows very well that 'pertinent literary and inscriptional evidence is relatively scarce' (5) — and that is putting it mildly: in fact, the literary sources for the history of Miletos before 494 BCE (in G.'s words, 'the shadowy region of pre-500 B.C.E.') are not only patchy and disparate, but also late; they are difficult of access and interpretation, ambiguous, sometimes misleading and, as a result, hardly reliable when it comes to 'facts' and chronology. Once again, Moses Finley laying down the law to the rest of us was right — and this time, G. does quote him: 'The plain fact is that the classical Greeks knew little about their history before 650 BCE (or even 550 BCE), and that what they thought they knew was a jumble of fact and fiction, some miscellaneous facts and much fiction about the essentials and about most of the details'.⁸ Against considerable odds, G. is determined to take on 'the challenges inherent in the primary sources' (9), and she is even prepared to go to some lengths 'when dealing with incidents that are clearly mythological' —

³ *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-political Change*, ed. by C. Renfrew, J.F. Cherry, Cambridge 1986; K.-J. Hölkamp, 'City and Territory, War and Trade in the Ancient Mediterranean' (review article on G. Shipley, *A History of Samos, 800-188 BC*, 1987), in *Mediterranean Historical Review* 5, 1990, 72-81. Valuable recent contributions include A. Möller, *Naukratis. Trade in Archaic Greece*, Oxford 2000.

⁴ Cf. e.g. N. Morley, *Metropolis and Hinterland. The City of Rome and the Italian Economy 200 B.C.-A.D. 200*, Cambridge 1996; *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community*, ed. by M.H. Hansen, Copenhagen 1997; *Stadt und Umland. Neue Ergebnisse der archäologischen Bau- und Siedlungsforschung*, ed. by E.-L. Schwandner, K. Rheidt, Mainz 1999.

⁵ Cf., e.g., *Urbanization in the Ancient Mediterranean in the 9th to 6th Centuries BC*, ed. by H. Damgaard Andersen, H.W. Horsnaes, S. Houby-Nielsen, A. Rathje, Copenhagen 1997; *Roman Urbanism. Beyond the Consumer City*, ed. by H.M. Parkins, London etc. 1997; R.M. Rothaus, *Corinth: The First City of Greece*, Leiden etc. 2000; *Recent Research in Late-Antique Urbanism*, ed. by Luke Lavan, Portsmouth 2001.

⁶ Relevant titles include *The Greek City. From Homer to Alexander*, ed. by O. Murray, S. Price, Oxford 1990, Part B; *Ancient Rome: The Archaeology of the Eternal City*, ed. by J. Coulston, H. Dodge, Oxford 2000.

⁷ M. Frederiksen, Review of M.I. Finley, *The Ancient Economy* (1973). in *JRS* 65, 1975, 164-71, at p. 171.

⁸ M.I. Finley, 'Myth, Memory and History' (1965), in *idem*, *The Use and Abuse of History*, London 1975, 11-33, at p. 18, cited by G. at p. 6.

after all, she declares, 'there are so many instances in which myths have been shown to contain some kernel of historical truth that we can scarcely discard them unmentioned. Often certain broad features ultimately prove to be remarkably accurate, but those features cannot be identified *prima facie*' (9), and even 'material that is unexpected and inexplicable may well be true' or contain 'reliable components' — such as the tradition of the return of the Heraclidae which she takes to be 'the main outline of the Dorian invasion myth' and accepts as 'probably correct' (10). I am not sure about the nature and quality of those 'broad features', 'reliable components' and 'outlines' on the one hand and about a methodologically sound way of identifying authentic elements in such complex traditions on the other (and I cannot resist asking what authenticity and 'historical truth' mean in these post-modern days). Anyway, G. wants to take the obvious way out and 'use other evidence' as 'outside confirmation' in order to identify 'the element of truth contained in what is otherwise fantastic', namely inscriptions and 'comparative evidence, especially from Ionia and from the Milesian colonies' (9) and above all 'archaeological data', which 'take on an even greater significance for historians of Miletos' than, say, for those interested in 5th-century Athens (5). G. is confident that it will thus be possible 'to draw the most accurate picture of events in the city' (9).

The question how to reconstruct 'events' from archaeological evidence remains unanswered, and the vexed problem of whether or not it is methodologically feasible to combine fundamentally different kinds of sources is never systematically dealt with. On the contrary, and her phrasing is rather revealing, G. just declares her intention 'to employ, *in addition to literary sources*, inscriptional evidence, building remains and artifacts' (9, my italics). This statement is indeed programmatic for the argument of the whole book.

The overall structure of the book is conventional as it roughly follows the usual chronological sequence. In Chapter 1 ('Foundations', 13-46), which also includes an excursus on Milesian territory, G. gives a survey of the archaeological data concerning the sequence of settlements from the Bronze Age to the end of the Geometric period. At the same time, she is always on the lookout for a 'kernel of truth' in the various foundation myths, and she regularly uses later (literary as well as epigraphical) evidence in order to substantiate her claim that 'the principal feature of the myths' — e.g. about Athens and her leading role in the so-called Ionian Migration — 'is almost certainly historical' (34). In Chapter 2 ('Trade and Colonization', 47-85), G. not only traces the various activities that made Miletos 'the greatest of all Greek mother cities' (71), but also presents the place 'as the foremost intellectual center of the Greek world' (72); both parts as well as the Appendix on individual colonies (243-58)⁹ are basically sound, sometimes pedestrian discussions of the available ancient evidence and modern interpretations without really new insights. By contrast, G. offers new interpretations of the notoriously complex tradition on archaic institutions such as the *aisymnetai*, on the early tyranny and oligarchy (or rather tyrannies and oligarchies) in Chapter 3 ('The Archaic City', 87-128), and she proposes a new relative chronology of *staseis*¹⁰ and régimes (120f.), which deserves further discussion. Chapter 4 ('Ionian Revolt and Refoundation', 129-63) is once again a conventional narrative closely following Herodotus, with some interesting observations on the orthogonal plan and 'Hippodamos'. In Chapter 5 ('Archaeology and Cult', 165-213), the emphasis shifts back to the presentation of what we know about settlement patterns and the city wall(s), temples, other architectural remains and artefacts,¹¹ this time

⁹ N. Ehrhardt, *Milet und seine Kolonien*, Frankfurt etc. 1983, second ed. 1988, remains fundamental.

¹⁰ Cf. K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *Schiedsrichter, Gesetzgeber und Gesetzgebung im archaischen Griechenland*, Stuttgart 1999, 211ff. (not mentioned by G.).

¹¹ The important survey by F. Lang, *Archaische Siedlungen in Griechenland. Struktur und Entwicklung*, Berlin 1996, is also missing from G.'s bibliography. Cf. now also the comprehensive treatment of territory, environment, natural resources as well as material culture from the prehistoric to the 'post-

interspersed with detailed discussions of important epigraphical evidence such as the Molpoi Decree. The concluding Chapter 6 ('The Fifth Century', 215-42) is also based mainly on a fresh discussion and re-interpretation of well-known (and much treated) inscriptions — such as the Athenian regulations for the city and the so-called Banishment Decree. G.'s reading of these documents results in a revised chronology and a new view of the relations between Miletos, the Delian League and its hegemonial power and the disastrous *staseis* of the 5th century.¹² Once again, G.'s observations are well worth serious consideration, although her conceptualization of 'oligarchy' and versus 'democracy' has an old-fashioned pseudo-Aristotelian ring and would have benefited from critical reflection.¹³

In sum, the book (which contains a fairly comprehensive and therefore valuable bibliography, 259-79), has quite a lot to offer, not only detailed expositions of the present state of research, but also and above all original, carefully argued and often interesting interpretations of individual pieces of evidence — it is certainly here that G. is at her best. However, I have serious doubts whether reading myths as a sort of 'mauvaises chroniques' or 'broken mirror' reflecting 'bad history'¹⁴ of early history or even events is permissible, and I remain sceptical about the feasibility of the overall plan of a fully fledged 'history' of any Greek city — even if the 'hero' is the 'ornament of Ionia'. This brings me back to the beginning of my review. A Tale of One City is just not enough.

Karl-J. Hölkeskamp

Universität zu Köln

Nina L. Collins, *The Library in Alexandria and the Bible in Greek*, Leiden — Boston — Köln: Brill (Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*, vol. LXXXII), 2000. 214 pp. ISSN: 0083 5889 ISBN: 90 04 11866 7.

Well, now we know: the translation of the Septuagint took place between approximately 10 Ellul in the year 281 BCE (earlier if the translators did not work during the nine (sic) days between Rosh ha-Shanah and the Day of Atonement) and 8 Tevet, some 116 days later, or around New Year 280 BCE. They were religious Jews, so they can not be supposed to have worked on sabbaths or holy days, nor on days of New Moon, which is why we have to allow roughly 116 days for their task, not the traditional 72.

Dr Collins arrives at her very exact date for this enterprise by an analysis of the material on the date provided by a variety of ancient sources. She tells us that of eleven sources which she studies here in some detail, nine depend on just two, but she uses the material of all eleven nonetheless somewhat indifferently. Indifferently in more than one way: she tells us (28) that Epiphanius states that the translation was completed 'in his (=Ptolemy II's) seventh [regnal] year,

archaic' period (with a few rather short and cautious historical excursuses): A.M. Greaves, *Miletos. A History*, London etc. 2002.

¹² Cf. H.-J. Gehrke, *Stasis. Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Munich 1985, 114ff., 221ff. with the best comparative analysis of the Banishment Decree (not mentioned by G.); his systematic study of internal and external causes, conditions and patterns of civic discord and 'internal war' (201ff.) remains fundamental for the understanding of the nature of politics, 'parties' and political controversy in Greek *poleis* in general.

¹³ Cf. K.-W. Welwei, "'Demos" and "Plethos" in athenischen Volksbeschlüssen um 450 v. Chr.', in *Historia* 35, 1986, 177-91 (= *idem*, *Polis und Arche*, Stuttgart 2000, 197-211), not cited by G.

¹⁴ I. Morris, *Archaeology as Cultural History. Words and Things in Iron Age Greece* (Oxford, 2000) 190-1, who uses a remark by M. Bloch on poetry mistakenly viewed as a 'miroir brouillé': 'Critique historique et critique du témoignage', in *Annales ESC* 5, 1950, 1-8, at p. 8.