about equal rights for every citizen; a dichotomy that is paralleled by the symbolic values attached to metals and coins. As it turns out, modes of distributing women within a society serve to illustrate ideas within the political discourse. The next chapter considers games, in particular the contrast between opinions about some established games and possibly newly emerging ones. The last chapter returns to coinage and the language of metals: it shows how Athens, the established democratic city, reverses the old symbols and uses terms connected with her reliable silver coinage to express the values that define her ideal citizen.

This book is a truly engaging study of texts, Herodotus, and the archaic poets; the level of complexity reached in telling apart different layers of meaning is impressive and leads to results that illuminate vital aspects of archaic culture(s). At times the reader might find the argument reaches a degree of sophistication that is difficult to follow. When Herodotus has to stand for three different strands of the argument, let us call them conservative, progressive, and his own opinion, it becomes hard to tell whose voice he is using at any particular moment; moreover, élite ideals and popular ideas cannot have been clearly defined at any given time. The interpretation of fragmentary works of some archaic poets whose whole corpus may just consist of a few dozen lines also causes problems, especially when the possible meaning of a particular passage has to be reconstructed through a complex combination of arguments (e.g. p. 226). Nevertheless, K.'s method of 'oblique reading' is valid, and it leads to results that are interesting and relevant. The study of ancient games is least convincing: here K. has to deal with very vague sources from all periods of antiquity, and her photograph of game pieces cut from geometric pottery seems an odd choice when juxtaposed with her argument that competitive board games (reconstructed on very shaky ground) are comparatively late and reflect the new ideals of the *polis*.

At the end of her introduction (p. 37) K. claims that her study is divided into two parts, the first concerned with discourse, and potentially more interesting to literary scholars, the second dealing with 'the lowly stuff of culture', and therefore more attractive to historians and archaeologists. This division seems artificial: the basic source material remains the same, and so does the method. It is true, K. does use the evidence of Attic vases, especially for her discussions of *hetairai*, but this aspect of her study remains somewhat marginal. It would, in fact, be worthwhile to test her image of archaic society and culture change by reference to the archaeological evidence, for example by looking at the changing iconography on Attic vases or dedicatory habits in sanctuaries and, more generally, objects of prestige. In any case, more illustrations would have been an improvement; pictorial evidence seems restricted to the bare minimum, or less: not all vases discussed in detail are shown (e.g. pp. 205ff.), and some comparative examples would have been useful, especially where alternative iconographies are discussed in the text (pp. 199, 272). The traditional dichotomy between literary- and material culture-based studies of the ancient world is continued, rather than remedied, by K.'s work.

All in all, *Coins, Bodies, Games and Gold* definitely constitutes a valuable contribution to our understanding of the archaic world. A study that manages to correlate social, economic, and ideological aspects of cultural change in a coherent way should be welcomed; even more so if it manages to demonstrate a complicated method in an intelligible way (jargon is mainly restricted to the introduction). Finally, since K. says (p. xi) that her work is *not* a book about Herodotus, her successful illustration of the sophisticated arguments and ironic wit of that author should be considered as a very positive side-effect of her efforts.

St John's College, Oxford MARIA PRETZLER

F. S. RUSSELL: *Information Gathering in Classical Greece*. Pp. viii + 267. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1999. Cased, £31. ISBN: 0-472-11064-0.

Between introduction (pp. 1–9) and conclusion (pp. 226–34) R. covers tactical (pp. 10–62) and strategic information (pp. 63–102), spies (pp. 103–39), how information was conveyed and interpreted (pp. 140–89), and counterintelligence (pp. 190–225). There are two appendices ('Objects of Verbs of Learning', pp. 237–8, and 'Types of *Kataskopoi*', p. 239) and a useful glossary (pp. 241–3).

This book is well researched, well written, and overall well produced (occasionally works cited in the notes do not appear in the bibliography, e.g. Hirsch at p.110 n. 17). It takes a revisionist line on an interesting subject, arguing that the Greeks were keenly interested in and reasonably efficient at information gathering, *contra* the prevailing view of, say, Adcock or Pritchett.

Some methodological questions can be raised. Is the focus of the study too wide? Are the criteria for the inclusion of material rigorous enough? Although R. points to changes over time (e.g. p. 226), is it a good idea to treat the fifth and fourth centuries as a block, and thus reach general conclusions about classical Greek theory which cover Greek *poleis* from before the Peloponnesian War and Alexander's Macedonians? Should evidence for a practice be drawn indiscriminately from sieges, naval war, and open battle (e.g. p. 5 n. 6)? The dynamics of siege warfare demanded information (the technology of the defences, supplies, and motivation of the defenders) in ways open battle did not, especially the ritualized complicity of a hoplite battle (W. R. Connor, 'Early Greek Land Warfare as Symbolic Expression', *Past and Present* 119 [1988], 3–29).

Taking a construct from one culture and looking for it in another can be fruitful. New patterns can emerge as sources are read in new ways. But it can also lead to sources being read in odd and predetermined ways, giving a false centrality to the construct. R. is aware of the dangers (e.g. p. 5), but might be considered to sometimes fail to avoid them. To say that Xenophon 'alone went so far as to study the gathering and evaluating of information as a field in its own right' (p. 6) gives a strange impression of the contents of the *Cavalry Commander*, let alone the *Education of Cyrus* and the *Memorabilia*. R.'s admirable knowledge of modern intelligence gathering seems at times to induce him to systematize the *ad hoc* arrangements of the Greeks. For example, he claims that 'reconnaissance units in interpolis warfare were relatively small and did not engage the enemy. They typically numbered two or three for covert operations, around thirty for general duties' (pp. 17–18). The evidence produced for these 'typical' figures turns out to consist of one, perhaps two historical examples from the period for 'thirty', and none at all for 'two or three' (p. 18 n. 26; references for the latter consist of Homer, Plutarch's *Aratus*, and Arrian's *Against the Alans*).

The reader might have gained a clearer picture had a sharper distinction been drawn between information gathering from other Greeks and from other peoples. Alexander wanted to know about the nature of Scythian territory, their numbers, arms, and customs (p. 127). How relevant would any of this be when, say, the Eleans fought the Arcadians (Xen. *Hell*. 7.4.28–32)?

A more certain judgement on the importance of information gathering for Greek states might have been obtained if R. had used his skills in comparative history to produce a systematic comparison of Greek practice and theory with those of another pre-industrial polity, possibly Rome (R. uses N. J. E. Austin, N. B. Rankov, *Exploratio* [London and New York, 1995] here and there) or traditional China (for which R. D. Sawyer, *The Tao of Spycraft* [1999] is now available).

This is a scholarly and thought-provoking work, but whether its revisionist line will win general acceptance remains to be seen. Some might still prefer to regard as typical the attitude to intelligence exhibited by the Thirty at Athens in the events which led up to their overthrow (Xen. *Hell*. 2.4.1–7; cf. R. p. 213). The Thirty failed to notice, or failed to do anything about the muster of armed Athenian exiles in Boeotia, even though the Thebans had passed a decree of clear relevance to the position (Dinarchus, *Against Demosthenes* 25; Plutarch, *Pelopidas* 6.4). Although the area was notorious as the venue for raids from Boeotia into Attika (Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 1023), the exiles were able to occupy the fort at Phylae. The first expedition sent by the Thirty in midwinter obviously lacked equipment for inclement weather, and had to return when it snowed. The second, sent out with the express purpose of watching the exiles, was surprised and routed by a dawn attack on its camp.

Somerville and Trinity Colleges, Oxford HARRY SIDEBOTTOM

J. Bleicken: *Cicero und die Ritter.* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, dritte Folge, 213.) Pp. 128. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995. Paper, DM 42. ISBN: 3-525-82602-8.

The aim of this book is to use the evidence of Cicero to refute the view—chiefly associated with the name of Claude Nicolet—that the definition of an *eques Romanus* was that he was (or had been) mounted on a horse at public expense, *eques equo publico*: (p. 72) 'it is highly likely that C. Gracchus . . . equated membership of the equestrian *ordo* only with wealth'. B. makes a number of powerful points: (p. 43) that Cicero has almost nothing to say of the centuries of *equites equo publico*; (p. 49 n. 87) that the usage of Cicero himself implies that in the period

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.430 Published online by Cambridge University Press