

clear maps she estimates production rates and argues that the coins were distributed more widely as time went on. The Pan type was introduced around the time of the Chremonidean war, Poseidons in the aftermath of the naval victory at Andros. Gonatas, Demetrios II, and Dosoan 'did not aim to provide currency for international or large-scale national commerce', neither was there a Ptolemaic-style monopoly. Production was too low to fund known military ventures, implying that a mixture of coinages was employed. New types were introduced for ad hoc political and economic reasons.

Part 6, 'Destinations', rounds off the book with papers that widen the viewpoint. Jeremy Paterson picks up Rostovtzeff's unfulfilled intention to include Rome in his Hellenistic study. Emphasizing local and regional factors in economy and settlement, P. invokes his own typology of 'natural', 'political', and 'market' economies. He points to recurrent 'natural' patterns that reassert themselves, notes economic intentions behind Roman laws and policies (such as road-building), and makes the link between empire and increasing (average) wealth. Archibald concludes with a juxtaposition of Rostovtzeff and Finley. Reflecting on the preceding papers, she calls for investigations of minorities (i.e. non-subsistence actors), the nature of change, and relations in space and time.

This volume does not offer a harmonious research agenda, and there are inevitable gaps in coverage. There is almost nothing on Old Greece and Magna Graecia, where many field surveys have yielded important data, and there are irreconcilable theoretical differences between contributors. But there are important, if sporadic, theoretical reflections, and the wide mix of datasets itself makes the book a key text on ancient economies. Tutors might even exploit the ideological spread of views pedagogically, encapsulating different positions within key debates. In the end, the most persuasive voices are those that privilege (in the manner of Horden and Purcell) regions and localities as units of analysis. Davies's programmatic essay seems to make the case for a general methodology for reading and combining classes of evidence, rather than for some account of change that would strait-jacket the interpretation of different places. We do need rules of evidence, otherwise we run the risk of excessive regionalism, of un-joined-up thinking (and writing).

University of Leicester

GRAHAM SHIPLEY

AFTER ALEXANDER

A. B. BOSWORTH: *The Legacy of Alexander. Politics, Warfare, and Propaganda under the Successors*. Pp. xiii + 307. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Cased, £42.50. ISBN: 0-19-815306-6.

The full title is a fair description of the scope of this latest, and most valuable, book by Bosworth, though the cataloguer would need to add, as subject entries, chronological and geographical considerations.

In the chapter on the politics of the Babylon Settlement, Bosworth is at his best in reconstructing the geometry of the political relationships of the key players over time and the alignment of the (virtually lost) primary sources. If, as B. argues and Curtius indicates, Arrhidaeus was indeed capable of political initiatives, and if he consciously decided that Ptolemy should be satrap of Egypt and confirmed him in that position, and if of his own volition he parted company with Polyperchon in 318 B.C. and went over to Cassander, with whom Ptolemy sided, then the favourable presentation of

Arrhidaeus in Curtius leads back to a source in the Ptolemaic camp, clearly Cleitarchus. Of course, Curtius' deviation from the standard line on Arrhidaeus can be explained in another way, if Curtius wrote during, or after, Claudius' reign. Furthermore Curtius' use of Cleitarchus for Book 10 does not depend on the validity of B.'s string of arguments, but B. does contribute to the profiling of Cleitarchus. Where I should differ from B. is in the approach to Curtius' account of the political turmoil in Babylon after Alexander's death. B. assumes the imminence of historical reality in the narrative; but the counter-view is that the Roman colouring is so strong that for elements not directly matched in the other sources the intertextual references to Roman episodes have first to be identified and appropriately discounted.

In Chapter 3 B. returns to the numbers game, addressing the arguments raised by Badian, Hammond, and Billows against his famous article in *JHS* 1986, where he argued that Macedon's manpower shortage after Alexander's death was more the result of Alexander's demands for reinforcements and wastage of lives than the consequence of the Successors' ruinous ambitions. A crux is Diodorus Siculus 18.12.2, where the large numbers of Macedonian troops attributed to Antipater appear to conflict with the following comment on the demographic crisis created by Alexander. B. offers a textual emendation which is inspired, if not wholly convincing palaeographically.

Chapter 4 deals with the momentous events in Asia in 317/6 B.C. which led to the arrest of Eumenes and the desertion of his army to Antigonos' camp. B. applies to historical narrative the discipline of the commentary, and brings the narrative to life by meticulous attention to detail, close analysis of the texts, and constant examination of the geographical and physical realities. This chapter would be easier to follow if a map was provided, especially for the assumed areas of Paraetacene and Gabiene, and if there were sketch maps showing the disposition of the armies of Eumenes and Antigonos before the key battles. Confusion of right and left is an ever-present hazard in military contexts, but, unless I have misunderstood B.'s point of orientation, he contradicts himself and Diodorus, when on p. 149 he puts Eumenes on the right wing at Gabiene, and Philip on the left. In the absence of agreement on the identity and topography of the two key battle sites, and with the inadequacy of the ancient references to the battles (one could hardly call Diodorus' treatment of Gabiene a battle narrative), reconstruction of the narrative calls for some imagination, as B. acknowledges just before he conjures up a picture of the clash of the elephants at Gabiene (p. 152).

A brilliant chapter on Hieronymus' ethnography deploys encyclopaedic information to illuminate Hieronymus' account of the *sati* of Ceteus' younger wife (D.S. 19.33–4), and Hieronymus' digression on the Nabataean Arabs. The digression was set in the context of Antigonid operations in Nabataean territory in 312/1. B. then offers a full discussion of the dating of events over the period 312–310 in a chapter on the rise of Seleucus, where a key conclusion is that the battle of Gaza should be set in spring 312, as indicated by Hecataeus of Abdera (pp. 226–7), against the traditional dating to autumn 312.

The final chapter examines the Hellenistic monarchies in terms of 'success and legitimation'. The date of the assumption of the royal title by Antigonos and his son is not germane to the theme of this chapter, but he sets this event in 306, and implies that those who followed suit took royal titles in the same year (p. 246). But Diodorus is an unreliable guide, and the Parian Marble, a Babylonian king list, and documentary evidence from Egypt point rather to 305. Still, a major focus of this chapter is on Demetrius, and therefore more on the period after the battle of Ipsus. Factors that

counted for or against the kings fall into the Weberian categories of charisma, tradition, and law, and to the familiar material (each case here firmly contextualized) B. adds interesting points about the relationship of territory to kingship (Demetrius at one point needing territory because he was a king: p. 264) and the imperative of reciprocity (pp. 258–9, again with reference to Demetrius).

An appendix on the chronology of events between 323 and 311 B.C., a full bibliography and a comprehensive index all add to the value of this informative and challenging book.

University of Cape Town

JOHN ATKINSON

POLITICS IN EARLY HELLENISTIC ATHENS

B. DREYER: *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des spätklassischen Athen: 322–ca. 230 v. Chr.* (*Historia Einzelschriften* 137.) Pp. 487. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999. Paper, €89. ISBN: 3-515-07531-3.

This lengthy Göttingen dissertation offers a reinterpretation of the political history of Athens between the Lamian war (323–322 B.C.) and final liberation from Macedonian rule in 229 or 228 B.C. (I am grateful to Dr A. Bayliss and Dr I. Kralli for help with certain points of Athenian history. Responsibility for the opinions expressed in this review, however, is entirely mine.) Actually, the main sections, each comprising up to four chapters, deal almost entirely with the middle of that period. The title embodies D.'s unusual conception of the classical period as extending—in Athens—into the third century. Although we all recognize period divisions as arbitrary, this seems an unnecessary over-complication. In any case, since D. believes that effective democracy did not outlast Alexander there is every justification for starting a new period in the late fourth century, as is conventionally done.

The introduction (pp. 13–17) distinguishes between the democratic ideal to which Athenians continued to subscribe after Chaironeia, and the practical restrictions that led to a fundamental diminution (as D. sees it) in 'real' democracy. This runs counter to Habicht's view, now widely accepted, that democratic participation remained high and that 'Even if Athens . . . often had to follow the dictates of Macedonia, and later Rome, in foreign policy, the Athenians never relinquished control of their own internal affairs' (*Athens from Alexander to Antony* [Cambridge, MA and London, 1997], p. 2). D. argues that the term 'democracy' was elastic or extendable (*dehnbar*, p. 15). Maybe so, but the evidence seems to show that though the Athenians' external freedom of action was restricted, their commitment to both the ideals and the practice of democracy remained strong. While internal political freedoms were repeatedly infringed, the Athenians restored their democracy on each occasion and continually tried to free themselves from Macedonia.

The first main section (pp. 17–110) deals with the tyranny of Lachares in the early 290s. The so-called coup that turned him from the notionally democratic *prostates* of a conservative but pragmatic regime into a full-blown tyrant is redated to April 295. D. argues that the regime was only 'perverted' after Cassander's death. (A chronological table, on pp. 75–6, helpfully draws together the details.)

Though entitled 'Athens under the rule of Cassander and the Antigonids', the second section (pp. 111–95) deals mainly with the second period of rule by Demetrios I (294–287 B.C.) and the character of different periods of Antigonid rule. Though the title of Chapter 2 of this section (p. 149) promises a comparison of the various