disappoint. Fate (*Tyche*) is an odd concept for such a humanist as Polybius, but it ties up in some way with his ideas on empire, and less than a page of analysis is a strange brevity. The rest is full of close reading and interesting argumentation. There is a good discussion, for instance, of the pretexts for war (*prophaseis*) (73–7). If pretexts are 'decent' (*euskhemon*) they create 'the veridical appearance of justice', which brings with it practical advantages. Is B. perhaps too anxious to exonerate the Romans? His interpretation of fragment 99 B-W is certainly benign: he argues that it means 'the Romans took great care not to commit injustice and aggression, but to make people see that they were in fact acting in self-defence' (73). A darker alternative seems much more convincing to me. Unbelievable pretexts seem to annoy Polybius. The Aetolian excuse for inviting the intervention in Greece of Antiochus III — they wanted to free the Greeks (3.7.3) — was particularly unreasonable and false, but I am not sure I agree with B. (92) that it was false because Polybius believed the Greeks were already free (after Flamininus' declaration). Polybius just did not like the Aetolians and their actions manifestly had nothing to do with freeing anyone: they were relentlessly aggressive and now seeking to get back at Rome for what they regarded as her mistreatment of them.

The freedom of the Greeks does raise an interesting problem which B. recognizes: how can Rome have extended its dominion over Macedon at the same time as leaving the Greeks free? (92) I am not convinced that Polybius was distracted by his pleasure in seeing the Antigonids and Selucids removed from the Greek sphere. Missing from the intellectual context set out in such detail in Part I is any discussion of what 'freedom' meant — and the discourse had a long history, as manifested both in literary texts and inscriptions. What did Polybius understand by the term 'freedom'? Could you, in fact, be free while under Roman rule? Philopoemen seems to have thought not (24.11–13), and I do not think Polybius had reconciled empire and freedom either.

There is much that is old-fashioned about this book. But B. has spent a career studying his author, and his detailed arguments on this important topic warrant our closest attention.

Trinity College Dublin BRIAN MCGING
BMCGING@tcd.ie
doi:10.1017/S0075435813000154

C. SMITH and L. M. YARROW (EDS), *IMPERIALISM, CULTURAL POLITICS, AND POLYBIUS*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. Pp. xiv + 351, illus. ISBN 9780199600755. £75.00.

Although not explicit in the title, this collection of essays by students of the late Peter Derow is very much a *Festschrift* in his memory. The chapters derive from a conference held shortly after his death, originally intended to celebrate his sixty-fifth birthday. They fall into three even sections of five chapters dedicated in turn to Polybius, Hellenistic imperialism, and Hellenistic culture.

The introduction by the editors briefly sketches Peter Derow as a teacher and scholar. The editors abruptly leave Derow, however, after two pages and launch into a polemic against Arthur M. Eckstein. In the debate on Roman imperialism, Peter Derow saw, and the editors see, Rome as 'an unusually ruthless and determined player' (11), rather than one of many aggressive states in an anarchic political system, as Eckstein argues on the basis of Realist international relations theory. The editors discuss several points of disagreement with Eckstein and briefly critique Realism as a theory. They provocatively claim, however, that Eckstein's remarks about September 11 drive '[his] book towards the justification of a policy rather than an academic argument' (9). Whether September 11 or 'the dismal events following' it justify Realist pessimism, as argued by Eckstein, is debatable, but the insinuation that through his scholarly work Eckstein advocates the policy of unilateral aggression behind the American invasion of Iraq under President George W. Bush — surely a triumph of Fantasy rather than Realism — is unwarranted.

Andrew Erskine opens Part I with a valuable essay that questions rosy characterizations of Polybius' detainment in Rome. Although privileged to be in Rome, Polybius probably did not enjoy great freedom of movement, and analysis of Polybius' own language reveals that he saw his detainment in Rome as a flagrant injustice. Brian McGing offers a modest corrective to the view that Polybius either ignored or was ignorant of Herodotus. Despite certain similarities of approach, though, the extent to which Polybius consciously engages with Herodotus remains uncertain. Tim Rood argues that Polybius 'engaged with Thucydides in a far more extensive and suggestive way than has been appreciated' (51). Rood draws attention to similarities between Polybius' narrative of the First Punic War and Thucydides' account of the Sicilian expedition. It is unclear, though, whether similar passages reflect Polybius' literary motives or the similarity of

historical situations. Georgina Longley reviews the methodological similarities between Thucydides and Polybius and explores Polybius' emphasis on human actors and behaviour in the unfolding of history. David Langslow surveys some of the more prominent quirks of Polybius' Greek, touching on the question of Polybius' place in the transition from Classical Greek to Koine and the influence of Latin on Polybius' vocabulary and syntax.

Part II of the volume turns to imperialism. Andrew Meadows argues plausibly from epigraphic evidence that the Ptolemies acquired their empire in Asia Minor not through a hypothetical war but through the voluntary submission of cities threatened by their rivals (which he loosely calls by the Roman term *deditio in fidem*). David Potter argues that Rome had no coherent policy of expansion at the date of the proclamation of Greek freedom and the dispatch of two praetors to Spain. Potter assumes that because Illyrian cities performed *deditio in fidem* that their territory became *ager publicus*; the Romans will thereby have extended into Illyria the system of alliances it created in Italy (138–9). But he overlooks the fact that cities who performed such *deditiones* voluntarily generally received their land back; his translation of Pol. 7.9.13–14 in support of his argument renders τοὺς οἰκείους ('friends') incorrectly as 'lands' (138). Amy Russell meditates on the literary possibilities of Polybius' account of Aemilius Paullus' tour of Greece after victory at Pydna, drawing insights from gaze theory. Liv Mariah Yarrow contributes an outstanding discussion of the institution of the ten *legati* sent by the Senate to assist in the organization of conquered provinces. The institution was in fact far more flexible than scholars, and even Cicero looking back to the second century B.C., generally allow (180). Yarrow insightfully observes that 'the institution comes to represent an ideal of shared governance amongst the elite' (183). Olivier Hekster takes up a provocative list (drawn up by Peter Derow) of cases of 'regime change' engineered by the Romans: many kings depended on Roman beneficence, but the senatorial discord of the Late Republic made the process of obtaining Roman support far more complicated.

Part III is diverse. Nikola Čašule argues against the view that the Romans knew little about Illyria at the time of the First Illyrian War. He relies, however, on scanty archaeological remains and epigraphic evidence that could date anywhere from the late third to even the first century B.C. John Ma, taking Oropos and Priene as case studies, discusses how honorific statues and accompanying inscriptions represent local agency in defining relationships between Hellenistic cities and rulers and between local magnates and the citizen body. Ma emphasizes the civic constraints on members of the local élite and practical physical limitations that qualified the prominence of statues placed ἐν τοῖς ἐπιφανεστάτοις τόποις. Hugh Bowden offers an explanation of the origins of the Roman cult of the Magna Mater in Pessinous (not Pergamum) by connecting it to the visit of a priest ('the Battakes') from Pessinous in 102 B.C., but his conclusions are very speculative. Bruce Gibson explores how Polybius exploits the rhetorical potential of festivals in his historical narrative for moralizing reflections on the historical actors. Gibson gives a brilliant analysis of Polybius' depiction of Perseus' popularity in Greece in light of an anecdote about Olympic boxers (274–6). The final essay, by Jonathan Williams, cogently demonstrates that Polybius does not advocate the protection of 'cultural property', for which his remarks on the sack of Syracuse are often cited. Polybius objects above all to sacrilege; he characteristically sees no practical benefit in the appropriation (or destruction) of art.

A bibliography, index locorum, and general index complete this wide-ranging volume. Although many chapters are excellent, the editing and proofreading are poor throughout and hardly inspire optimism — e.g. 'is a super illustration' (10: read 'superb', I hope); 'Ptohemy' (115 n. 4); 'if a province' (151: read 'of a province'); 'Q. Lutatius Cerno' (180 n. 45: read 'Cerco'); 'Antoine-Chrystostôme' (278: read 'Antoine-Chrysostôme'); an entire translation is printed twice (115 n. 4). Virtually every chapter that cites Greek contains errors, especially of accentuation — e.g. οἱ κατεχομένοι (21); initial ἔ and ἕ in particular are very frequently confused (e.g. 36, 38, 68, 71, 74, 94 etc.) — and spelling — e.g. ἀροισθέντος (38: read ἀθροισθέντος); τὸ γὰρ τῆν ἡμετέρας (73: read τῆς); καιντῶν (75: read καινῶν); ἠθτῶν (82 n. 33: read ἠθῶν); τοῦ νικᾶν ἅλον (273: read τοῦ νικᾶν ἆθλον). If OUP no longer has the resources to proof polytonic ancient Greek, perhaps it should ignore accents, as is done in some schools, or resort to Latin transliteration.

Peking University JOHN NOËL DILLON
john.noel.dillon@gmail.com
doi:10.1017/S0075435813000166