

hardly be said, for example, that the marriage between Philadelphus and Arsinoe II was 'inequitable' on the basis that Philadelphus declined to adopt her son by Lysimachus (p. 94).

One could wish that H. had kept a tighter grip on his methodology. It surely behoves any dynastic study to be forthright and clear about what principles of succession (if any) it holds to obtain. H. does not do this. He is happy to invoke 'legitimate heirs' (implicitly constructing a supposed illegitimacy for the obscure figure of Ptolemy the Son), but does not tell us what he thinks this highly problematic and question-begging term implies (pp. 42, 88). It is one of H.'s central contentions that Philadelphus, for misguided propagandist reasons, fooled his subjects into overestimating Arsinoe II's power at court, and that this had a dramatic effect on the future culture of the dynasty, leading, in short, to full-blown sister-marriage and all that that entailed. But it is a priori difficult to accept that we, at such a remove as we are from Philadelphus' court, have the means to see beyond the curtain of his propaganda in a way that his subjects did not. H. depends heavily upon coins to penetrate behind the supposed curtain to the truth of the court, but coinage surely belongs to the world of propaganda more than almost any other product does.

H's accuracy can suffer when his eye moves from strictly Ptolemaic matters (although note Soter's Artacama becoming 'Antakama' at p. 106). It is curious, in any case, to find Trophonius of Lebadeia and Amphiarus of Oropus invoked to demonstrate the identification of kings with Zeus, but even more curious to find them referred to as 'Amphiliaros at Orphos . . . and Trophonios at Labadea' (p. 91).

University of Exeter

DANIEL OGDEN

HELLENISTIC HIERAPYTNA

F. GUIZZI: *Hierapytna. Storia di una polis cretese dalla fondazione alla conquista Romana*. (Memorie, Serie 9, Vol. 13, Fasc. 3.) Pp. 167 [278–444], map. Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 2001. Paper, €12.91. ISBN: 88-218-0846-7.

G. offers a short survey of Hierapytna (southern coast of East Crete) that will interest principally Hellenistic historians and Cretologists. Perhaps the lack of evidence has discouraged book-length studies of individual Cretan *poleis*, but G. shows the value of such operations in this volume based on a doctoral dissertation.

The historical period of Crete is enjoying a revival. Archaeology flourishes. G. uses the Kavousi–Thripti survey (Haggis, *Hesperia* 65 [1996], 373–432; the pagination is incorrect in G.'s bibliography). More could be made of the Ziros survey (K. Branigan et al., *BSA* 93 [1998], 23–90) and work in and around Praisos (J. Whitley in W. Cavanagh et al., *Post-Minoan Crete* [London, 1998], pp. 27–39 and subsequent *Arch. Reports*, latest notice is 2002–3, 85). A new series, *Cretan Studies*, is dedicated to the island (see e.g. M. Baldwin Bowsky, 'Cretan Connections: The Transformation of Hierapytna', *Cretan Studies* 4 [1994], 1–44). More recently, S. E. Alcock (*Archaeologies of the Greek Past. Landscape, Monuments, and Memories* [Cambridge, 2002], pp. 91–131) has suggested that the treatment of the local Cretan past in Hellenistic Crete is much stronger and differs from the rôle of memory in the Roman era on the island. Civic aetiologies and a local community's place in history are themes found elsewhere in the Hellenistic period, e.g. the Parian marble and Lindos Chronicle (see

C. Hicks, *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of their Past* [Oxford, 2003]; T. S. Scheer, 'The Past in the Hellenistic Present', in A. Erskine [ed.], *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* [Oxford, 2003], pp. 216–31; Alcock, *Archaeologies*, p. 119 n. 39).

The history of Hierapytna necessarily depends on a patchwork of evidence. The city expanded in the Hellenistic period when it took over Oleros at the start of the third century (pp. 310–12; on Istron, see p. 314 n. 41). The important treaty between Hierapytna and an Antigonos specified conditions for sending military aid within thirty days (*Staatsverträge* 502, see S. Ager, *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337–90 B.C.* [Berkeley, 1995], no. 48 (and no. 47); G. restores ll. 27–32, p. 388). G. offers an interesting discussion of mercenaries but does not have the same confidence that the Antigonos is Doston, as identified by Buraselis and followed by Chaniotis. The second century is a fascinating period not least for the relations between Cretan cities and the rôle of Rome. Disputes in eastern Crete between Knossos and Gortyn embroiled their respective allies, Itanos and Lato (Knossos) and Hierapytna and Olos (Gortyn). In 145 Ptolemy VI Philometor died, and the Ptolemaic garrisons on Crete were withdrawn. Hierapytna destroyed Praisos and extended control over land around the Sanctuary of Zeus Dikte (previously disputed between Praisos and Itanos). In Hierapytna's struggle with Itanos, Rome intervened twice (143–141 and 113–112 B.C.), and Magnesia on the Meander arbitrated in 140, in favour of Itanos. When the contest came to a head again, Rome called on Magnesia to arbitrate. Itanos was favoured for a second time. The arbitration (Ager, *Interstate*, no. 158) is an exceptionally rich document and has been used to illustrate the judgement of Rome in handling such matters (see R. Morstein Kallet-Marx, *Hegemony to Empire* [1995], pp. 177–80, who finds the Magnesians guilty of bias).

The book is organized thematically. In Chapter 1, G. discusses the origins of Kyrba, the original name of Hierapytna, founded by Kyrbas (Strabo 10.3.19, C 472; pp. 283–4, 298–9), and offers the period of tension with Praisos as one of the two possible contexts for the propagation of legend (p. 302). Praisos was an Eteocretan city, and in the second century, Eteocretan inscriptions in Crete disappeared. Legends and civic histories had real value in the Hellenistic period. In their dispute with Itanos, the people of Hierapytna claimed that the land around the sanctuary of Zeus Dikte was sacred. In the course of their arbitration, the Magnesians heard various forms of evidence including documents recording boundary agreements, but also poetic and historic writings, letters from Ptolemy and other states (Ager, *Interstate*, pp. 443–6). One wonders how much history and perhaps the memories of the past played in this dispute. The remaining chapters concern the *polis*'s institutions (Chapter 3), economy (Chapter 4), and interstate relations (Chapter 5). G. relies mostly on literary and epigraphical evidence. The chronological thread ends in 67 B.C., when Hierapytna fell to Rome, marking the end of the Cretan cities' involvement in the Mithridatic war and their independent status *vis-à-vis* Rome (Dio 36.19.1–3; Livy *Per.* 100). A more comprehensive study of Hierapytna could develop in several directions, many of which are contained in helpful footnotes such as those on local commodities, wine, and mercenaries (p. 352 n. 53). More analysis of the archaeological evidence would help such developments. Territorial expansion in the second century B.C. stimulated settlement in the Kavousi–Thripti survey area and displaced people from Praisos may have established permanent settlement in new areas south-west of Praisos (Alcock, *Archaeologies* 107; Branigan's Ziros survey). G. shows the enormous potential for (micro-)regional histories in Hellenistic Crete.

University of Liverpool

G. J. OLIVER