

CRITICA

Walter DONLAN: *The Aristocratic Ideal and Selected Papers*. Bolchazy–Carducci Publishers, Inc. Wauconda, Illinois, 1999, 364 pp.

W. Donlan's monograph of 1980, *The Aristocratic Ideal in Ancient Greece* has been re-published. As the author did not change the text the following remarks by A. R. Burn are still valid: "D. has read faithfully not only his sources, showing himself an excellent scholar, but a good deal of modern sociology... The book is also an excellent anthology of quotations, familiar and not so familiar, in translation with key Greek words transliterated, expressing early Greek views on both social classes and popular moral philosophy generally; and one may guess that, irrespective of agreement or disagreement, many purchasers may long value it as a 'golden treasury'."¹

Research has progressed a lot since 1980, as Donlan states in the Preface: "I have come to believe, as others have, that the step from the pre-state society to the city-state society, though momentous in terms of later Greek history, was not a mysterious process, but rather a rapid sequence of political change within an existing social structure whose outlines are fairly clear to us. I would assert, therefore, that for historians concerned with the origins and early development of the *polis*-state the most fruitful line of inquiry bears on the nature of and the changes in the relations of power among the levels of the society and the attitudes generated by those changes."

The novelty of the volume is the re-edition of eight papers of Donlan's concerning the topic, written between 1970 and 1994 (Changes and Shifts in the Meaning of *Demos* in the Literature of the Archaic Period, 1970; The Tradition of Anti-Aristocratic Thought in Early Greek Poetry, 1973; The Structure of Authority in the *Iliad*, 1979; The Unequal Exchange Between Glaucus and Diomedes in Light of the Homeric Gift-Economy, 1989; The Pre-State Community in Greece, 1989; Homeric *temenos* and the Land Economy of the Dark Age, 1989; Duelling with Gifts in the *Iliad*: As the Audience Saw it, 1993; Chief and Followers in Pre-State Greece, 1994).

The valuable work is concluded by a bibliography of works by W. Donlan.

György Németh

ELTE University
Dept. of Ancient History
H-1088 Budapest, Múzeum krt. 6–8.

¹ BURN, A. R.: Donlan, W. *The Aristocratic Ideal in Ancient Greece*, CR 33, 1983, 147.

José Miguel ALONSO-NÚÑEZ: *Die Archäologien des Thukydides. Xenia*. Konstanzer Althistorische Vorträge und Forschungen; Heft 45. UVK. Konstanz, 2000, 114 S.

Das Ziel des Verfassers ist, einige wichtige Fragen der drei Archäologien des Thukydides bzw. des sogenannten Methodenkapitels zu behandeln. Dies wird in den Anmerkungen mit der reichlichen (obwohl nicht ausführlichen) Darstellung der Sekundärliteratur, mit Chronologien und Landkarten vervollständigt. Den auch von Alonso-Núñez behandelten Fragen – wie die Rolle der Wirtschaft in der Archäologie von Thukydides, die Thalassokratie, das Verhältnis zwischen dem Werk von Thukydides und dem von Herodot usw. – wurde in der Sekundärliteratur schon auch bisher große Aufmerksamkeit gewidmet. Neue Ergebnisse verspricht (nach der Einleitung von Alonso-Núñez) die „übergreifende Betrachtung“ der drei Archäologien, wenn man sie also zusammen studiert. Die Anordnung des Textes „hat auch den Charakter eines Kommentars“, da sie der thukydideischen Reihenfolge folgt.

Die Form eines Kommentars ist viel versprechend, es kann ja auf diese Weise ein lebendiger Dialog mit dem antiken Text zu Stande kommen. Doch hier ergibt sich diese Form vor allem aus den Mängeln der Strukturierung. Es ist dem Leser zumindest nicht klar, was zum Beispiel diese Anmerkung dem Verständnis von Thukydides hinzufügt: „Akragas erhielt seinen Namen ebenfalls von einem Fluß.“ Währenddessen wird die Tatsache (die auch von der Dor-Ion-Frage her interessant ist und Alonso-Núñez besonders beschäftigt), dass Archias von Korinth, der Gründer von Syrakusai Heraklida war, nicht einmal erwähnt. Ein weiteres Problem verursacht, dass der Verfasser bei der inhaltlichen Darstellung von Thukydides oft vom griechischen Text abweicht. Zum Beispiel: „Weiter fügt Thukydides hinzu, daß der Egoismus und die Isolierung der verschiedenen griechischen Städte sie unter die Tyrannis brachte (I, 17).“ Die Verwendung der Begriffe ist ebenfalls problematisch. Dass Alonso-Núñez den Lelantischen Krieg einen griechischen Bürgerkrieg nennt, kann eventuell auf Grund stilistischer Gesichtspunkte gerechtfertigt werden. Aber es ist unverständlich, warum er für das Wort *chremata* Geld als Äquivalent gebraucht; besonders in einer Arbeit, deren zentrale Frage die Wirtschaft ist. Zum Beispiel: „Auch Pelops wurde dank dem Geld, das er aus Asien mitbrachte, ein mächtiger Herrscher.“

Die interessanteste Fragestellung dieses Heftes ist, was die übergreifende Analyse der drei Archäologien zum Verständnis der Gedanken von Thukydides und seiner Methoden als Historiker beiträgt. Leider wird die Neugier des Lesers nicht befriedigt. Jeder Gedanke von Alonso-Núñez (ob wir mit ihnen einverstanden sind oder nicht) ist schon auf Grund der Archäologie des ersten Buches abgefasst worden. Das Bemühen, die Archäologien des zweiten und des sechsten Buches mit der des ersten zu verknüpfen, hat sie aus ihrem natürlichen Kontext gerissen und einen entstellenden Gesichtswinkel ergeben.

Die Arbeit von Alonso-Núñez wirft eine Menge interessante Fragen auf. Der dichte Text der Archäologien von Thukydides ist für das Kennenlernen der griechischen Geschichte unerschöpflich und er soll die Wissenschaft zu erneuten Fragestellungen anregen. Die von Alonso-Núñez aufgeworfenen Fragen sind spannend, deshalb ist es schade, dass seine Arbeit den Mangel einer sorgfältigen Strukturierung und vielleicht auch die Kürze der der Bearbeitung gewidmeten Zeit widerspiegelt.

György W. Hegyi

Lehrstuhl für Alte Geschichte
Universität ELTE
H-1088 Budapest, Múzeum krt. 6–8

Detlef LOTZE: *Bürger und Unfreie im vorhellenistischen Griechenland. Ausgewählte Aufsätze*. Herausgegeben von W. Ameling und K. Zimmermann. Altertumswissenschaftliches Kolloquium 2. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, 2000, 318 pp.

This volume was published to celebrate the 70th birthday of D. Lotze and contains 19 of his important studies written between 1958 and 1997. The bibliography found at the end of the volume is especially remarkable as it is the mirror of the career of a great scholar, which had its strange turns. In 1959

Acta Ant. Hung. 43, 2003

Lotze burst into ancient history with his dissertation written under the supervision of Helmut Berve (*Metaxy eleutheron kai doulon*), and only five years later his *Habilitationsschrift* was published (*Lysander und der Peloponnesische Krieg*). Then his next book was awaited for another 30 years (*Griechische Geschichte*, 1995). The author's bibliography contains 78 items, including 5 books, 33 papers and 39 reviews. From 1966 to 1986 there were years when he did not (or was not allowed to) publish anything but book-reviews. What he did write, however, was such ripe writing and free of trying to comply with the usual requirements of the GDR, that two thirds of it could be included in the present volume unchanged.

The studies were divided into four larger groups in the volume: I. Unfreiheit und archaische Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse; II. Gesellschaftliche und staatliche Strukturen der klassischen Polis; III. Soziale und politische Grundlagen des Staates der Lakedaimonier; IV. Entwicklung und Strukturen athenischer Demokratie. The usefulness of the volume would have been largely enhanced by an index.

I have two personal reasons why it is a special honour and joy for me to review a significant collection of studies by this great classical scholar suppressed for so long. First, in 1980, while still as a student, I had the privilege of attending a course of Detlef Lotze's in Jena, entitled *Geschichte des Altertums*, and ever since we have been meeting on a regular basis either in Jena or in Budapest, thus I could see what a different task it was to preserve the professional and personal righteousness and clean personality in the GDR, that is and has always been characteristic of Lotze. Second, the volume contains two studies published in Hungary, one of which (*Die sogenannte Polis*) was published in this very journal, *Acta Antiqua* in 1992.

György Németh

ELTE University
Dept. of Ancient History
H-1088 Budapest, Múzeum krt. 6–8.

Virgilius Maro Grammaticus: *Opera omnia* (Ed. by B. LÖFSTEDT). *Bibliotheca Teubneriana*, 2003, 270 pp.

Great expectations preceded the publication of the new volume of the *Bibliotheca Teubneriana*, the long awaited complete edition of the works of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus edited by Bengt Löfstedt, as the works of this mysterious author, Virgilius Grammaticus, difficult to access so far can reach their proper place on the bookshelves of research centres and collectors.

Two late antique–early mediaeval grammatical works were preserved under the name of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus, the *Epitomae* and the *Epistolae*. The former one may originally have consisted of fifteen chapters, of which twelve are extant, while the latter one includes eight letters addressed to a certain *Julius Germanicus diaconus*. The topic of the writings is basically Latin grammar: letters, syllables, parts of speech, constituents, rules of verse and etymologies are discussed. Beyond this very prosaic framework he presents a peculiar mixture of strange teachings sometimes quite far from linguistics; linguistic phenomena are illustrated by humorous, sometimes bizarre examples and the author refers to non-existent 'authorities' and 'masters.' He mixes invented words, strange verses and riddles with his serious topic, he creates a secret language, that renders his work in a sense a parody in contrast to traditional, dull grammar books. His mentality reflects the effects of obscure, mystical trends as well as of Christian teachings. He approaches his subject from a philosopher's point of view, his goal, however, is probably the defence and spreading of divine teachings, even if in a clandestine way, hidden behind the camouflage of grammar. If we take into account the fact that in his age the only surviving liberal art was grammar, which was thus promoted to be the antechamber of all disciplines, indeed it represented the totality of philosophy, *Sapientia*, taken in the Virgilian sense had to be closely related to writing, that is – just one step further – to the Scriptures. Thus his work can be interpreted not just as a grammar book, but also as a thesaurus of contemporary wisdom.

It was more than two centuries ago that readers saw the Virgilius Grammaticus's name in print on pages 426–427 of the 1794 edition of *Sedulius* by Faustinus Arevalus. A few decades had to pass until

Acta Ant. Hung. 43, 2003

Cardinal Angelo Mai found and published the first continuous text in his series *Classici auctores*,¹ which was followed after over 50 years by the first edition of a more complete nature from Teubner by Johann Huemer.² This was attacked by Thomas Stangl³ in less than five years, still almost a hundred years went by before a new bilingual critical edition based on all the available texts was published in 1979 by Giovanni Polara in Naples.⁴ There were many attacks against this edition as it is superficial in many places, moreover it does not take secondary textual tradition into account at all. Still, no-one undertook the task of a new edition up until now, even though for some time there have been obscure allusions to a grandiose scheme in studies concerning the author.

The material collected by Bernard Bischoff was finally processed by Bengt Löfstedt, as we learn from the Latin preface. On page X the editor gives an account, in a style worthy of Virgilius, of how his master bequeathed on him his notes collected through more than twenty years of diligent work to gather and publish them: “*ita me maesta voce adlocutus est: «Mein ganzes Leben habe ich Material gesammelt, um den Virgilius herauszugeben. Ich sehe jetzt, dass mir die Zeit nicht ausreicht. Nehmen Sie dies, und machen Sie die Edition».*” Naturally it took several years’ work for the disciple until the fruit of his work, the volume we hold in our hands today, ripened.

Polara’s work has not only become difficult to access by now, but there were other reasons for a new edition as well. In a possibly too short preface the author does not explain this by the manuscripts found in recent years, but with the well-known shortcomings of Polara’s apparatus. The work of the Italian authors does not consider the secondary textual tradition of the grammars, almost at all, which, together with the sources of Virgilius may be taken to be the most neglected field of study up until the past few years. Thus it is with even greater joy that we greet the publication of the Virgilius fragments from the *Florilegium Frisingense*⁵ as well as the *Index auctorum* and the *Index grammaticorum* at the end of the volume. The compilation of these is the result of careful philological work, but, unfortunately even such care has its shortcomings. Hrabanus Maurus, the ninth-century grammarian is missing from the *Index grammaticorum*, who, in his *De computo*, included etymologies closely related to those of Virgilius.⁶ Also missing from the list of authors Jerome⁷, so highly estimated by our author, or Cassiodorus⁸, one of the probable sources of the etymologies in Epitome X. Among the quotations from Virgil he does not mention the phrase *urbem Fidenam* found in the second Epitome⁹ (what is more, it is in connection with a certain Turnus), which reminds us of line 773 from canto VI of the Aeneid: *Hi tibi Nomentum et Gabios urbemque Fidenam, / hi Collatinas imponent montibus arces*.

The *Index Sacrae scripturae* has no more than three parallel loci either, even though with a more detailed study one can even find double the number.¹⁰

Polara’s edition was concluded by four indices, among those the one entitled *Indice delle parole notevoli*, which, with a few exceptions contains the same forms as the *Index verborum et formarum* found on pages 258–266 of the new edition, strangely enough, however, the latter one omits a few inter-

¹ MAI, A.: *Classici auctores ex Vaticanis codicibus t. V*. Romae 1833, V–XXVIII; 1–149; 349 n. 1.

² HUEMER, I.: *Virgilii Maronis grammatici opera*. Leipzig, Teubner 1886.

³ STANGL, Th.: *Virgiliana: Die grammatischen Schriften des Galliers Virgilius Maro*. München 1891.

⁴ POLARA, G.: *Virgilio Marone Grammatico: Epitomi ed Epistole*. Edizione critica (traduzione di L. Caruso e G. Polara). Napoli, Liguori 1979.

⁵ See 246.

⁶ See 234, 145–235. 165 – cf. Hrab.Maur.: *De comp.* I, 9, 7; I, 19, 1; I, 21, 5; I, 34, 24–31.

⁷ Out of the several dozens of citations (even if they are not word by word) let us quote here one: as an example of one of Virgilius’ twelve Latros, the *spela*, the author cites the following: ‘*sobon, hoc est lepus*’ (242, 72–73). Cf. Hier.: *hebr. nom.* 20, 29: *safan labium uel lepus aut ericius*.

⁸ See 234, 147–150. cf. Cassiod.: *in psalm.* I, li. 233: *Nox autem dicta est, eo quod noceat aspectibus siue actionibus nostris*.

⁹ 112. 57–59.

¹⁰

Gen 1, 10	cf. 228, 45–46.
Gen 27, 24	cf. 243, 93–96.
Isa 51, 4	cf. 148, 157.
Eccl 15, 19	cf. 171, 161–162.
2Reg 4, 17	cf. 181, 146.

esting hapax words, such as *gresus*¹¹ or *arctura*¹². The list of cited “(pseudo-)authors” is also missing, which was there at the end of the Italian work and it did not lack all interest.

The apparatus of the present edition is not perfect either, sometimes it does not even present Polara’s very different versions¹³, but there is even such a locus, where he neglects the problematic readings of the manuscripts, thus he does not comment at all on the word ‘*campus*’ even though in manuscript N it is a very difficult reading and it rather seems to be ‘*cumpas*’ whereas S. Krauss¹⁴ suggests *campio*. Besides the version *caluistis* in line 48, 251 he, just as Polara, does not give the reading *calescuistis* of manuscript N, though it might actually be better to correct the form *caluisti* in the previous phrase to *calescuisti*, as Virgilius quotes this as an example to the fact that the starting form can be in any conjugation even in indicative perfect. The range of literature used is also quite limited, omitting for example the study by Paul Lejay¹⁵ primarily discussing Virgilius’ poems, in which he suggests a number of (more or less successful) corrections. Even though Polara intended his bibliography to be complete at the time, it would have been worthwhile to review and list the literature published since 1979 despite of or exactly because of its chaotic nature.

The most apparent novelty of the volume is that Professor Löfstedt reversed Polara’s order and placed the *Epistolae* before the *Epitomae*. Even though this order is found in the Naples codex (*Neapolitanus*, IV.A.34), the only complete manuscript, which contains the *Epistolae* as well and which was made to be the basis for the edition, based on internal arguments Polara’s way seems to be more fortunate, as it seems that Virgilius himself referred in the pages of the *Epistolae* to the *Epitomae* written earlier: *quod etiam in XV epitomarum Affricam missarum ad Fabianum puerum meum peritissimum ac docillimum, tunc gentilem nunc autem fidelem baptisate purificatum, eodem scribendi more fecisse memini*¹⁶. It is also remarkable that he only mentions his students in the *Epistolae*, therefore we may suppose that he wrote the *Epitomae* earlier, still as a student, taking notes of the teachings of his masters, epitomizing in his individual way (hence the title), while the *Epistolae* were – as he himself writes in the *Praefatio* – collected upon the request of his pupil, *Iulius Germanus*, when having grown old he himself was considered an authoritative master. It can also be noted that a Christian influence is only present in the *Epistolae*, thus we may infer that our author was converted to Christianity only after having written the *Epitomae*.

Even though B. Löfstedt’s corrections are convincing in a number of points, it is unclear why he corrected the consistent forms *inchogativa*, *inchogari* in codex N to (47, 216 *et semper*) *inchohativa*, *inchohari*, even though the former ones were not non-existent forms resulting of spelling “mistakes” but were much rather vulgar versions of existing terms with a hypercorrect *g* filing the hiatus¹⁷, which otherwise, in an inverse way, is a testimony of the weak or null pronunciation of the intervocalic *g*.¹⁸

I do not find valid the solution of the widely contested phrase in the beginning of Epitome V either: “*cum in Hibernorum eloquione et compositione primatum tenere aestimatur verbum*”¹⁹ as the reading *Hibernorum*, supposed by Löfstedt (and others) is alien to Virgilius’ usage. Having rejected the reading *Hebreorum* preferred by others (and Polara) it would have been better to stick to the reading *hibonorum* of the most reliable manuscript P. The question leads very far, to the much debated and basically still unsolved problem of locating Virgilius geographically and would thus by far exceed the framework of the present review, therefore we shall refrain from discussing it in detail.²⁰

¹¹ See 121, 84.

¹² See 122, 115.

¹³ See 68, 699: *propatalum* – in Polara *propatulum*; or 72, 792: *ire* – according to Polara’s and Mai’s suggestion *iri*.

¹⁴ *Les gloses hébraïques du Grammairien Virgilius Maro*. Revue des Études Juives XXXVIII (1899), 231–241, on this question see p. 238.

¹⁵ *Le grammairien Virgile et les rythmes latrins*. Revue de philologie XIX (1895), 45–64. The restructuring of the verse in lines 221, 142–143, for example, on the basis of the rhyme seems convincing: “*Fortis ensem Aeneas in nu forti portabat / pelta fidens ma tuta tela virum vincebat*”.

¹⁶ 4, 59–62.

¹⁷ Cf. the transcription *pisteugo* of Greek πιστεύω.

¹⁸ H STOTZ, L. P.: *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*. Band 3. Lautlehre. 1996, Band 4. 204f.

¹⁹ See 137, 3–138, 6.

²⁰ On the question, among others, see: TARDI, D.: *Les Epitomae de Virgile de Toulouse*, Paris 1928, p. 147; GROSJEAN, P.: *Quelques remarques sur Virgile le Grammairien*. In: *Medieval Studies Pre-*

In another infamous example of the textual criticism on Virgilius, in the beginning of Epitome II, instead of the usual reading, "*bigerro sermone clefabo*" Löfstedt, in agreement with the 1970 study by M. Herren²¹ gives the version "*bigerro sermone defabo*"²². According to the interpretations preceding Herren the word *bigerro* derives from the place name Bigorre, that is, it would refer to a region of Aquitaine where Basque is spoken²³, but a question may realistically arise: why would the author want to speak about this topic "in a Basque way" and then why would he continue in Latin? Herren's explanation is indeed a lot more logical, that is *bigerro* (*bigerro* in codex N) is a compound of *bi* + *ger*, that is its meaning is "double, twofold" and *clefabo* is a copyist's mistake for *defabo* from the verb *for, fari*, thus the meaning of the phrase would be: "I shall tell this with two words," which fits the text much better. However, a derivate of the same root *clef* appears at another locus of the *Epitomae*: "*'loquillae' diminutivae sunt quasi simplicia clefia*"²⁴, where Löfstedt prints this form, even though one either has to consider a mistake for *defia* in this case as well (which is less likely), or the first explanation and correction are not absolutely right. Herren himself revised his view in 1979²⁵, saving, that *clefabo* is not a corrupt form of *defabo*, but might be a derivate of Old English *cleofan* (to split, to cleave), and then the meaning is not "I shall explain this in Basque" but I shall "*split the answer into two*". H. A. Strong on the other hand relates the verb *clefo* to German *klopfen*,²⁶ but it may also not be excluded, that Greek γράφω was corrupted into *clefo* where the changes *g/c* and *r/l* would not be unique, cf. *gryphus/glifa, glifosus*.²⁷

As far as punctuation is concerned, the new edition has a number of attractive, good solutions, unlike breaking up the poem in 119, 51/56 into short lines, as it is brought forward by Virgilius as an example of the so-called *perextensus* (long) verse, which "*pene usque ad XII metra pervenium*"²⁸, that is these may be as long as 12 words.

It is a minor formal mistake that the edition is inconsistent as regards the printing of quotations, sometimes they are marked by italics, sometimes by quotation marks, and sometimes no way at all.²⁹

A major deficiency of the new edition is that it presupposes that the reader knows and uses the previous edition. It sounds strange when one reads in the preface of such an edition, intended to be authoritative, sentences like: "*Operae pretium non est a Polara aliisque relata referre*"; or "*plura si quis scire vult, eum ad Polaram delege*". It would have been worthwhile to discuss these questions more in detail, as Polara's edition is not readily available, in Hungary, for example, it cannot be found in any library.

Despite of all the above remarks we must receive B. Löfstedt's work with joy, as it fills a gap, which enables the work of researchers in the field of Virgilius philology, and we must also express our hope, that as attention was turned towards this strange oeuvre upon publishing the previous editions, the present edition might also bring new ideas, can set forth new directions of research, which will help in the birth of a new, even more perfect edition.

Klára Kisdi

H-1141 Budapest
Szenice utca 1.

sented to A. Gwynn. Dublin 1961, p. 396; HERREN, M.: *Some New Light on the Life of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus*. Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy LXXIX C, 1979, p. 56; Ó'CROINÍN, D.: *The Date, Provenance and Earliest Use of the Works of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus*. In: *Tradition und Wertung. Festschrift für Franz Brunhölzl zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. B. Günter et al.). Sigmaringen Thorbecke 1989, p. 13; LAW, V.: *Serious Aspects of the Wordplay of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus*. In: *L'héritage des grammairiens latrins dans l'antiquité aux lumières* (ed. R. Irène). Paris 1990, p. 130.

²¹ HERREN, M.: *Bigerro sermone clefabo: Notes on the Life of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus*. *Classica et Mediaevalia* XXXI fasc. 1–2 (1970), 253–257, cf. on the question 254.

²² See 110. 30.

²³ HUEMER, I., 1886, 182. (*index verborum*): "*Bigerrico = Aquitanico*".

²⁴ See 130, 225.

²⁵ HERREN, M., 1979, 48.

²⁶ *Excerpta from the Vocabulary of the Grammarian Virgilius Maro*. *Classical Review* XXV (1911), 201–202, on the question see 202.

²⁷ See 46, 192; 214, 31.

²⁸ See 118, 49.

²⁹ The method used in lines 25, 43–44 and 25, 49–50 for example is controversial.

Angelos CHANIOTIS–Pierre DUCREY (Eds.): *Army and Power in the Ancient World*. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, 2002. Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien. (Hrsg. Géza Alföldy) Bd. 37.

The 19th international congress of historians was held between 6–12 August 2000 in Oslo. Its only section on ancient history bore the title *Army and Power in the Ancient World*. Preparatory works of the round table were carried out by Ekkehard Weber, Angelos Chaniotis and Pierre Ducrey, and the two latter scholars edited the volume containing the written versions of the presentations of the round table in the series of the Institute of Classical Studies of Heidelberg University.

In the introduction of the volume (pp. 1–2) the reader is informed of the circumstances of preparing the conference and choosing the topic. The goal of the lectures was to examine the role of the army in grasping and exercising power in various ancient civilisations. Papers covered a significant part of ancient history from the second millennium B.C. to the fall of the Roman Empire.

Walter Mayer (*Armee und Macht in Assyrien*, pp. 3–23) examined the relationship between the Assyrian army and power. As no historical works exist, only various epigraphic sources (royal correspondence, official documents and king lists) and visual representations are at our disposal, still a few very significant conclusions can be drawn concerning the examined question.

Romila Thapar (*The Role of the Army in the Exercise of Power in Early India*, pp. 25–37) examines the role of the armies of Indian rulers in creating a unified Indian state.

Pierre Briant (*Guerre et succession dynastique chez les Achéménides: entre 'coutume perse' et violence armée*, pp. 39–49) examines the relations of army and state in the Achaemenid era up to the campaigns of Alexander the Great.

Pierre Ducrey (*Armée et pouvoir dans la Grèce antique, d'Agamemnon à Alexandre*, pp. 51–60) surveys the problems of interrelationships between army and power in the main periods and turning points of Greek history (Mycene, Homeric epics, hoplite revolution, Sparta, Athens and Macedonia).

Hans van Wees (*Tyrants, Oligarchs and Citizen Militias*, pp. 61–82) examines the relationship of Greek political systems and citizens in military service. According to Greek political thinking (and mainly Aristotle) certain branches of military service can be linked to certain social strata, thus there is a correlation between the individual Greek forms of government and social strata. This widely accepted theory, however, is not backed up by practice as in Archaic age Greece the army did not play a significant role in exercising political power as various political systems cannot be linked to social strata but rather to small companies of friends, political clubs, which often employed mercenary forces as well to grasp and keep power.

Vincent Gabrielsen (*The Impact of Armed Forces on Government and Politics in Archaic and Classical Greek Poleis: A Response to Hans van Wees*, pp. 83–98) cites various examples from Greek history which prove Aristotle's theory on the one hand and that of van Wees on the other. In Athens, for example, a significant part of the free population possessed their own armour as a consequence of the timocratic system, and these armed citizens played a significant role in various political systems coming into power and later falling at the end of the fifth century B.C. On the basis of this evidence a subtler of the relationship of political systems and the army in Greek poleis will have to be drawn.

Angelos Chaniotis (*Foreign Soldier – Native Girls? Constructing and Crossing Boundaries in Hellenistic Cities with Foreign Garrisons*, 99–113) examines a still timely issue, that of the relations of occupying armies and garrisons to the local population in the Hellenistic age. There were a number of sources for conflicts between occupational forces and the local population, e.g., the different legal status, religious, cultural differences. In spite of all these, according to epigraphic sources, quite significant relationships (e.g., marriages) formed between these groups thus forming a new community.

John Ma (*"Oversexed, Overpaid, Over here": A Response to Angelos Chaniotis*, pp. 115–122) cites a few further examples which illustrate the differences and relations between occupational forces and the local population.

Géza Alföldy (*Kaiser, Heer und soziale Mobilität im Römischen Reich*, pp. 123–150) presents the Roman army in his paper as one of the most important means of social mobility. It can be concluded on the basis of epigraphic sources that for the leading groups (the *ordo senatorius* and the *ordo equester*) the army played a role in building their political careers, while for lower social strata it was a means of upward social mobility and of growing wealthier.

Yann Le Bohec (*L'armée romaine et le maintien de l'ordre en Gaule (68–70)*, pp. 151–165) starts from the famous locus in Tacitus (“... evulgato imperii arcano posse principem alibi quam Romae fieri.” Tac. Hist. I. 4. 2) to examine the role of the Roman army stationed in Gaul in the civil war of 68–69 A.D. and in Vespasian's acquiring power. The army in Gaul and the Gauls themselves (the aedui and averni) played an important role in Nero's fall and the later fights for succession.

Brian Campbell (*Power without Limit: 'The Romans always win', pp. 166–180*) examines the Roman army as an occupational force. Even though historical works do not discuss this topic at all, based on epigraphic and papyrological sources a number of conclusions can be drawn concerning the occupying strategies of the Romans. The army, grown to huge proportions under the emperors was, of course, besides the defence of the provinces, a means of sustaining internal order and ensuring Roman rule.

Benjamin Isaac (*Army and Power in the Roman World: A Response to Brian Campbell*, pp. 181–191) argues that the prime task of the Roman army was to ensure imperial control over the population of the provinces. In order to accomplish this task the army did not refrain from physical terror or exercising pressure on the leadership of the province.

Péter Forisek

University of Debrecen
Dept. of Ancient History
H-4010 Debrecen, Egyetem tér 1.