

Oranges' study of Athens' accounting procedures for officials in this way was a well worthwhile undertaking, and it has been very well performed.

†P.J. RHODES
University of Durham
Email: p.j.rhodes@durham.ac.uk

MARGINESU (G.) **Callia l'Ateniese: metamorfosi di un'élite, 421–371 a.C.** Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2016. Pp. 198. €52. 9783515115520.
doi:[10.1017/S0075426922000684](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922000684)

This slender but dense book offers the first monographic study of Callias III of the Ceryces (ca. 455–365 BC), presented as an important figure in Athens' transition, from aggressive imperialism to a new peace-seeking attitude, over the 'secolo breve' ('short century', 13; why not a new Pentekontaetia?) of 421–371.

The introduction outlines the ancient stereotypes (horse fever, poor military record, fondness for sex and luxury) which resulted in the traditional view of Callias as a frivolous, self-indulging *bon viveur*; however, collecting all relevant sources (26–40), Marginesu also acknowledges the weight of Callias' prestigious public offices (*dadouchos*, torch-bearer priest at the Eleusinian Mysteries, ambassador and *proxenos* for Sparta) and acquaintances among great philosophers. Epigraphic evidence is as critical as problematic, and I find it hard to agree with Marginesu's tendency to favour the low dating of 422/1 for IG I³ 52 A (which both OR 144 and AIO now assign to 434/3). Regardless of the date, the name Callias is so common that its simple epigraphic occurrence is hardly useful in reconstructing the career of a specific individual; yet Marginesu (for example, 35–36, 49, 75–77), although extremely cautiously, attributes this and other important decrees proposed by *some* Callias, such as IG I³ 36 and 53–54, to Callias III.

Chapter 1 outlines strongly recurring features within Callias' *genos*, such as the onomastic tradition and the ties with Eleusis. Family wealth (43–53) is treated chronologically through the various exponents, but perhaps greater emphasis on distinguishing two contrasting traditions, one insisting on the questionable, treacherous origins of the fortune (for example, [Them.] *Ep.* 9.5–6 Cortassa; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 6.2–4 and Plut. *Sol.* 15.7–9), the other on its rather virtuous sources and/or destination (for example, Hdt. 6.121; [Andoc.] 4.15), would have best illustrated how the family tended to polarize attention. Discussion (61 n.134) of the Aristotelian treatment of τὸ νεμεσῶν ('righteous indignation', *Rh.* 2, 1386b8–1387b21) perhaps deserved more space, as wealth, birth, marriages, beauty, etc. are all frequent topics in sources on Callias.

Chapter 2 offers a biographical profile. The limits of the documentation occasionally result in summaries of major events in which Callias may, or may not, have played a role. Marginesu uses Callias' acquaintance with the sophists to question the assumption of his indifference to politics. Callias' relationship with both a woman and her mother (86–88), likely a parody of his priesthood of Demetra and Kore (Andoc. 1.124), might have led to a wider exploration: Andocides calls the mother a γράυς ('old woman'), perhaps hinting at a comic/slandering tradition which is found also for Callias II's wife Elpinice (Plut. *Per.* 10.5, *Cim.* 14.5: Stesimbrotus? Possibly cf. the γράϊδιον in Ath. 12.537c, discussed separately by Marginesu at 124).

Chapter 3 digs deeper into the family reputation. Many points are accurately discussed, but most do not seem particularly distinctive: sexual intemperance, wealth and luxury were all aristocratic clichés, as were envy, derision and slanders of them; the rich section on the body and demeanour (137–44) probably presents Callias' most peculiar traits.

Marginesu makes a good case for a peace-seeking attitude within the *élite* in 421–371, but one wonders if exactly the practical failure of (and opposition to) such an ideology might explain the need to frequently negotiate or renew treaties. The gaps in the documentation leave some wider problems unsolved, such as the reasons behind the family priesthood, or Callias' own conduct during the government of the Thirty *vis-à-vis* his ties with important personalities of the time and with Sparta. Given the recurrence of stereotypes in sources on Callias, the analysis could have considered further cross-contaminations between some of his signature traits: was the tradition on Callias' perversions affected by his horse fever (53–57), given the lustful fame of horses (Arist. *Hist. an.* 6, 575b30–1)? What about the links between horse breeding and oligarchic sympathies (*Pol.* 4, 1289b35–8 and 6, 1321a8–11), the onomastic traditions of other important families (Hippias, Hipparchus?) and the *hippo* puns for over-the-top tastes and manners (*Ar. Nub.* 1070, *Ran.* 821 and 929)?

The volume reads smoothly, despite the strange paucity of internal cross-references; sometimes, a passage is quoted and (re)discussed in several places, such as bits from *Ath.* 12.537a–c (at 47, 124, 133, 145), which, all being parts of Heraclid. *Pont. fr.* 58 W., should perhaps be considered together; I believe the correct passage referred to at 103 n.179 is *D.S.* 14.79.6. Some anachronistic modern terminology, for example, 'conservatore' vs 'democratico' (97, 'conservative' vs 'democratic') or 'partiti' (115–19, 'parties', in inverted commas) does not suit Marginesu's otherwise admirable prudence in treating his difficult subject matter.

Marginesu's Callias emerges as a complex, prominent character, able to generate widely diverging opinions among the sources, but the frustrating unreliability of crediting him with important epigraphic documents weighs heavily on any attempt to reconstruct his career. Nevertheless, this study is successful in rehabilitating an apparently 'minor' character (13) in the wider contexts of his ancestors, peers and period.

MATTEO ZACCARINI

Università di Bologna

Email: matteo.zaccarini2@unibo.it

BARBATO (M.) **The Ideology of Democratic Athens: Institutions, Orators and the Mythical Past** (New Approaches to Ancient Greek Institutional History). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2020. Pp. xii + 252, illus. £90. 9781474466424. doi:[10.1017/S0075426922000696](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922000696)

This book makes a valuable contribution to current scholarly debates about Athenian civic ideology and social memory. Barbato applies to a range of relevant Athenian settings a productive methodological framework derived from the New Institutionalism in the social sciences (which 'envisions institutions as ensembles of rules, practices and narratives which condition the behaviour' of those operating within them: 10). The annual public funeral, the lawcourts and tragedy are front and centre for Barbato, but he also pays significant attention to the non-logographic speeches of Isocrates and (where possible) to evidence from the Assembly and Council, and makes some use of historiography, mythography and art. Chapter 1 sets out the book's aims and methodology, chapter 2 demonstrates how many opportunities classical Athenians had for immersion in their city's mythology and chapter 3 surveys the discursive parameters of the individual institutional settings. The core of the work (chapters 4–7) consists of a series of examinations of how four major Athenian myths are treated across specific institutional and extra-institutional contexts, and how the values they promote (for example, Athenian resistance to hubris) are inflected accordingly. These case studies underpin Barbato's main contention in this