

case-by-case basis, and second, it attempts to establish, again case-by-case, a distinction between votive objects and objects offered for other purposes. Each of these attempts faces difficulties stated succinctly by P. Archaeological evidence for rites sometimes is ambiguous, as in the case of tables supposed to be altars. The distinction between votive objects and others is difficult to establish without literary evidence. Among the objects whose purpose is doubtful are some found in or near foundations of sacred buildings. In interpreting the wells in the shrine of Demeter on Acrocorinth, P. holds that the objects deposited in these wells served as preliminary offerings allowing worshippers to draw near to the altar.

Chapter 4, 'Les offrandes et l'autel', asks whether the emphasis on the destruction of offerings, especially animals, has overlooked items deposited on altars without being intentionally burned. Here P. presents not a series of terms or problems, as in her previous chapters, but four unsolved cases: *agalmata* put on the altar of the Despoina at Lycosura, the lack of fire marks at the horn altar of Apollo at Dreros, the burned objects in the wells beside the altars in the chthonian shrine at Agrigentum, and the pyres at Eleusis. In each case the norm of destruction by fire does not apply. At Lycosura, there is no evidence of burning, and the rite in which the *agalmata* were deposited remains unidentified. At Dreros, evidence of burning again is missing, and the horn altar should be described as a table for sacrificial remains. At Agrigentum, wells were depositories, but some objects found in them bear traces of a fire ritual. At Eleusis, the best-known of these cases, scholars have debated whether the pyres in fact were altars, and whether the sacrifices were Olympian or chthonian. P. envisions a ritual that annihilated offerings in order to transfer them to the gods. These rites were preliminary, like the deposit of offerings on Acrocorinth.

Chapter 5, 'Dépôts d'offrandes et dépôts sacrificiels', addresses the problem of distinguishing sacrificial deposits from remains left by a sacrifice or by a meal in a shrine. P.'s analysis implies (although P. does not say) that where deposits are concerned there is no such thing as sacrifice. There are only deposits of offerings and, on the other hand, remains without any sacrificial or offertory character. Most of the chapter deals with the issue of chthonian and Olympian ritual, with P. observing that *chthonian* refers to gods or spirits, not any kind of ritual, and that terms for chthonian rituals, such as *bothros*, are poorly defined, as is the term *megaron*, used of rites during the Thesmophoria.

Although P.'s subtitle refers to 'gestes' as well as 'contextes', gestures are seldom her concern. She wishes to show – and succeeds in showing – that the archaeology of offerings presents ambiguities and surprises that prevailing notions of sacrifices and offerings cannot accommodate. She does not present a schema for offerings, as opposed to a survey of settings. For this reason, Rouse remains unreplaced. Why can we not have a collective volume that would replace him, with P. as a contributor or a co-editor?

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

F. S. NAIDEN Q1
naiden@email.unc.edu

DEMOSTHENES

WORTHINGTON (I.) *Demosthenes of Athens and the Fall of Classical Greece*. Pp. xxviii + 382, ills, maps. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013. Cased, £22.50, US\$35. ISBN: 978-0-19-993195-8.
 doi:10.1017/S0009840X1300303X

W.'s biography of Demosthenes is the first written in English for about a century (with the exception of R. Sealey, *Demosthenes and His Time* [1993]). His approach is essentially

historical: other studies (such as D.M. MacDowell, *Demosthenes the Orator* [2009]) focus on the treatment of rhetorical aspects in the Demosthenic corpus. The book sticks to a linear chronological structure, following the main stages of the orator's political career. The life, work and above all the political activity of Demosthenes are presented in a very accessible way. Numerous quotations of Demosthenes (translated into English) are inserted into the text. Fifty pictures and maps illustrate characters and places and two appendices summarise the ancient coinage system and the months of the Attic year. The narrative is aimed at non-specialist readers, as attested by several sections dedicated to general aspects of Athenian politics, Macedonian history and Greek sexual habits.

The title, *Demosthenes of Athens and the Fall of Classical Greece*, is somewhat old-fashioned because the destruction of the independent *poleis* following the battle of Chaeronea is essentially a historiographical *topos* of the nineteenth century, influenced by a *post eventum* point of view of some ancient writers (mainly Justin, author of an *Epitome* of Trogus' *Philippic History*). Moreover, the title is not really representative of the central question developed by W. in his preamble: were the actions of Demosthenes motivated by his 'patriotic' spirit or by his political and personal ambition? This may sound like a very modern question (thinking about the contemporary political situation), but it is actually an old issue, already present in a judgement by Theopompus (F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 115 F 326) and in the trial of the Harpalus affair in which Demosthenes was accused of bribery. Unfortunately, W. does not use any specific arguments to ascertain whether the political action of Demosthenes was guided by a personal career plan or by a real intention to defend the freedom and interests of Athens. He interprets the thematic change in the orations of the late 350s as a research of the best way to become a first class politician. However, this reading has two problems. First, since not all Demosthenes' speeches of this period have been preserved, it is difficult to draw any conclusions on the basis of an incomplete corpus. Second, there is another (easier?) interpretation of the facts: Demosthenes' actions were guided by the principle of *realpolitik*. It is possible that the best way to preserve Athens's power was to adapt the political line to the circumstance of the day. The best example is the oration *On the Peace* (too briefly mentioned by W.), in which Demosthenes pleads for the *status quo*.

The fragility of the central demonstration of this biography is a mirror of W.'s historical methodology. The book is widely based on modern studies and not on a first-hand critical approach of the sources. All ancient authors are quoted at the same level of authority, and without a proper discussion (even in footnotes). As a result, examples of over-interpretation or inaccuracies can easily be found. For example, W. argues that the decree *IG II² 130* attests the deployment of Athenian troops at the city of Methone (p. 68). Clearly this is not what the inscription says and Demosthenes himself (*Phil.* 1.35) testifies that the Athenian troops arrived too late to save Methone (as W. writes a few lines later). On p. 96, W. writes 'The Theban general Pammenes at the head of an amphictyonic army defeated him [Philomelus] at Neon'. This is another unverified affirmation, because no source says that Pammenes was the Theban commander at Neon, and the army is presented as Boeotian and not as Amphictyonic (see Diodorus 16.31.3–4 and Pausanias 10.2.4). On p. 153, W. writes that the city of Abai was in Boeotia, when it was a Phocian town (Pausanias 10.35.1–4; see also J. Oulhen, *Phokis*, in M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen [edd.], *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* [2004], p. 408). On p. 180, W. argues that the Athenians lost to Philip their right of *promanteia* as a consequence of the amphictyonic peace. But only Demosthenes mentions this, in a problematic passage of the *Third Philippic* (*Phil.* 3.32), according to which the Athenians were not the only people to lose this advantage. This question is very controversial and should not be presented as a well-established fact.

These are only some examples but the presentation of historical hypotheses as well-demonstrated realities often occurs. This is undoubtedly intended to make the reading easier but is very problematic for the scholarly reader.

The same problem appears for the chronology of the Third and Fourth Sacred Wars which is highly speculative, mainly based on the work of N.G.L. Hammond, while other chronological schemes could widely modify the interpretation of the facts.

The bibliography contains few non-English language books. For example, the treatment of Delphic questions (discussed very briefly) ignores the recent works of French scholarship (F. Lefèvre, *L'Amphictionie pyléo-delphique: histoire et institutions* [1998]; P. Sánchez, *L'Amphictionie des Pyles et de Delphes. Recherches sur son rôle historique des origines au II^e siècle de notre ère* [2001]) which analyse many of Demosthenes' orations (especially Sánchez's book). There is, however, a comprehensive listing of all recent studies in English.

The volume has too many weaknesses in its historical analysis to become the new work of reference on Demosthenes. But it remains, especially for the non-specialist reader, an accessible introduction to the life and political action of the great Athenian orator.

University of Namur, Belgium

FRANÇOIS-DOMINIQUE DELTENRE Q1
francois-dominique.deltenre@unamur.be

GREEK AND LATIN EPIGRAPHY

DAVIES (J.), WILKES (J.) (edd.) *Epigraphy and the Historical Sciences*. (Proceedings of the British Academy 177.) Pp. xxvi + 346, figs, ills, map. Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 2012. Cased, £75, US\$135. ISBN: 978-0-19-726506-2. doi:10.1017/S0009840X13003041

The International Society of Greek and Latin Epigraphy (www.aiegl.org) has convened at more or less regular five-year intervals since 1938, when it assembled for the first time in Amsterdam. No papers were published to mark the occasion, but subsequent proceedings have usually been issued in ponderous volumes, some interval of time after the conference. The organisers of the 13th Congress, held in Oxford 2007, have departed from tradition by publishing only the 'titles and summaries of 162 papers given at 39 thematic panels' in a slim 'booklet' of 116 pages (p. xi), which they were able to produce in time for the meeting itself. Here, in a volume published under the auspices of the British Academy, just in time for the 14th Epigraphical Congress in Berlin (www.congressus2012.de), are the plenary papers of that 13th Congress.

Few professional historians these days will have more than the haziest understanding of what epigraphers do: *experto crede* – I have polled my colleagues. Some older ones remember and admire the work of Arnaldo Momigliano or Moses Finley, I think because both were comparativists who worked at a readily accessible level of generalisation. Epigraphers, on the other hand, are particularists, and to outsiders may seem mandarin savants – relics of the age of aristocratic dilettanti. Certainly none of my colleagues had heard of that prodigy of erudition, Louis Robert. Momigliano himself regarded Robert as a great historian, but uncategorisable; Carlo Ginzburg, had he noticed Robert, would have recognised him immediately as a 'microhistorian'.

The organisers of this conference aim to confront the particularism of epigraphical research with the generalising tendencies of the contemporary 'historical sciences' – or