

color map (the lack of which was a shortcoming in volume 1).

The second and more extensive part of the book was written by G. T. Griffith and concerns the reign of Philip II. As Griffith observes, the major problem confronting historians is: how did Macedonia, heretofore a weak, divided state of negligible political and military importance, become during Philip's reign the ruler of the Greek world? The answer for Griffith and a great many others is that Philip himself was largely responsible for this achievement. Consider the situation in Macedon at Philip's ascension in 359 B.C. The former king Perdiccas had just been killed and the Macedonian army annihilated in a catastrophic battle against the Illyrians who were now preparing a major invasion of the country. Other neighboring Balkan nations were pillaging Macedonian territory. At home, Philip faced no fewer than five would-be usurpers, some supported by powerful states such as Thrace and Athens, which controlled much of the Macedonian seacoast. Griffith meticulously documents how Philip, by a shrewd combination of diplomacy, military intervention, and bribery gradually transformed his nation into the most formidable power in the Western world. Few will quarrel with Griffith's contention that Philip was instrumental in this transformation.

Of course, there is much controversial material here, and not everyone will accept all of Griffith's conclusions, especially concerning Philip's assassination, admittedly a frequently debated topic. Griffith accepts Aristotle's statement that Philip was killed for the private revenge of the assassin Pausanias, because Aristotle (who had close connections with Philip and Alexander) would never write such a statement if it was not generally known to be true. But how much knowledge did anyone really have of Pausanias's motives since he was killed within minutes after the assassination? Also, although there is a detailed chronology of Philip's plans to invade Persia, we are left quite in the dark about the reasons for Philip's decision. What events in Persia contributed to the decision to intervene?

But these are trifles. We are all in the authors' debt for the skillful and comprehensive way they have elucidated such a difficult period of Macedonian history.

DONALD ENGELS
Wellesley College

HEINZ KREISSIG. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im Seleukidenreich: Die Eigentums- und die Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse.* (Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur der Antike, number 16.) Berlin: Akademie. 1978. Pp. 133.

Heinz Kreissig's little book is an essay in structuralist interpretation; it aims to define the forms of ownership of the means of production and the social and juristic status of the producing classes in the Seleucid kingdom. Mostly this means agriculture, but Kreissig treats crafts and trade as well. The conclusions may be summarized: the Seleucids found a state in which "ancient Oriental" patterns predominated, did not aim to alter the situation, and in fact left things much as they found them. Farmers were mostly free but tied to the royal land they worked; slavery was almost unknown in production. The Greek cities founded or developed in the area had only a modest impact in introducing the private ownership of land and use of slavery characteristic of the polis. Kreissig is a minimizer, who sets himself against the more sweeping interpretations of his predecessors. The corrective is valuable, and Kreissig's overall judgment is probably not far from correct.

All the same, the book is not very satisfactory. Many pages are occupied in repeated discussions of the same handful of inscriptions and literary passages, broken up by the artificial organization of the book, and these discussions have little new to add. The inscriptions in Welles's *Royal Correspondence* are the most important evidence, and little is added to Welles's thorough and intelligent commentary, partly because Kreissig shows none of the needed philological acuity (the widest divergence, page 85 on RC 3, is simply wrong). The remarks on the *technical* of Dionysus (p. 81) are an irrelevant howler. Bibliography is sketchy and references not always up-to-date: Dura parchments, for example, are cited by the first edition (1926); the pertinent volume of the Dura final report (1959) is listed in the bibliography but ignored throughout the book (to its detriment).

The decision to treat the Seleucid empire separately was unwise. The evidence is insufficient and scattered—too much can be and is made of many items—and almost all long known; Kreissig repeatedly must adduce evidence from other monarchies (Antigonos, the Attalids, the Maccabees) to flesh out the picture. Better to have taken all Asia (i.e., the former Persian Empire) for the entire Hellenistic period. Kreissig ignores Ptolemaic Egypt—the one kingdom about which we know something substantial—altogether, except for borrowing its terminology for land tenure (which he admits is mostly not attested in the Seleucid kingdom). Only token notice is taken of archeological material, especially in the section on settlement patterns (pp. 17–31).

A rewriting of Rostovtzeff has—wisely—not been attempted, but what we have is too little and too much. An article would have sufficed to set out the gist of the argument and its slight novelty. Eco-

conomic historians and those interested in the Hellenistic East will want to read this essay for its points of interest; but the student or scholar wanting to learn about the subject will do better to read Rostovtzeff (*Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*) and Welles's *Royal Correspondence* for synthesis and evidence.

ROGER S. BAGNALL
Columbia University

ION HORĂȚIU CRIȘAN. *Burebista and His Time*. Rev. ed. (Bibliotheca Historica Romaniae Monographs, number 20.) Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România. 1978. Pp. 252.

This abridged version of the second Rumanian edition, translated by S. Mihailescu, details the life of the great Dacian chieftain Burebista, who was an ally of Pompey the Great and enemy of Julius Caesar. Social reformer, military strategist, and conqueror, he held sway from ca. 82 to ca. 44 B.C. over the northeastern areas of the Roman "barbaricum" from the river Tisza (Theiss) to the Black Sea, an area somewhat larger than that of Greater Rumania.

In the introductory chapters the author surveys the development of an autochthonous Geto-Dacian culture in Transylvania that he considers to be the foundation for Burebista's power. He shows how Dacia, in the crossroads between East and South, could resist for centuries turbulent tribal movements and was able to rise against Roman threats under Burebista, "the first and greatest of Thracian kings" (Syll.I.G.³ 762). Relying on available literary evidence (a brief account by a contemporary of Burebista, Strabo the geographer, and four additional, indirect references), the author discusses Burebista's life and his internal and external policy in three chapters. Three concluding chapters deal with the territorial limits of the area under Burebista's control, fifty-eight fortified settlements and fortresses within this area, and the culture of their peoples. The author assumes that Burebista was assassinated by disgruntled aristocrats shortly after the assassination of Julius Caesar.

The book is historical detective work *par excellence*. The few data about Burebista's life are treated with expertise. Specialists in the field should find valuable the discussions of Burebista's alliance with Pompey (pp. 46 ff.) and his campaigns (chap. 5). Regrettably, exciting new archeological evidence set forth in the book is not focused on Burebista's age. Pottery, small finds, and architectural data fall into a broad chronological span between the fifth century B.C. and the third century A.D. They are indirect and less than satisfactory allusions to the

much disputed hypothesis of Daco-Roman continuity (R. W. Seton-Watson, *A History of Roumanians* [1934], pp. 9-13). Consequently, many of the author's conclusions remain hypothetical and, occasionally, tendentious. Neither Dacian cultural originality beyond the natural borders of Transylvania, nor the existence of a Geto-Dacian state above an advanced tribal order appear to be proven by the evidence proffered. An index would have been a useful addition. For non-Rumanian readers, special problems are caused by the lack of a detailed map with generally known toponymy.

G. J. SZEMLER
Loyola University,
Chicago

ALDEN A. MOSSHAMMER. *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition*. Lewisburg, Pa.: Bucknell University Press. 1979. Pp. 366. \$24.50.

Alden A. Mosshammer argues that Eusebius' *Chronicle* is important as "the earliest work extant in anything like its original form that deals with early Greek chronology in a continuous and comprehensive manner" (p. 16). Largely complete before 303, the work was half "raw materials" (much is lost), half synchronized lists. Neither part survives except in translation or re-edition, but enough remains so that by peeling off Jerome's additions one can get close to the original. In spite of Eusebius's Christianity he gives twice as much information for pre-Christian times as for post.

In this study we learn of Jerome's arrangement in columns, Greek chronography in general, Eusebius in particular. Mosshammer denies that the earlier Christian Africanus gave Eusebius an Olympic victor list. Indeed, there is little in the *Chronicle* from Africanus anyway.

After analyzing Eusebius' sources, Mosshammer turns to the dates assigned to various personages in early Greek history from Lycurgus to Euripides. In each discussion he examines Eusebius' date(s) and possible sources, their contaminations, and his or their errors. The upshot is likely to shake faith in Eusebius's skill and judgment, in spite of the author's soothing remarks. Take Hesiod. One date, 1017, is due to Africanus, who synchronized with Solomon; Eusebius further synchronized with the thousandth year after Abraham. The date 913 from *Latina historia* obviously comes from Jerome. This leaves 809, from Porphyry (who set Homer in 909, Hesiod a century later), and 767. Mosshammer shows that the last date was based on Sosibius's 867 for Homer, to which Eusebius himself added Porphyry's century. Another case: Thales. Here both Eusebius and Mosshammer seem on firmer ground,