

say about the Alexandrian aspects of the sixth Eclogue, and little to say about the poetry of Gallus in the tenth. While the latter omission is at present more welcome than not (at least, if one believes as I do, that Virgil created Gallus and not the reverse), it is surely impossible to understand the poetic world and the poetic claims of the *Eclogues* without explaining in more detail than Alpers attempts what the contents of Silenus' song signify, or without discussing Callimachus in that context. It is perhaps indicative of this gap in Alpers' work that the seventh Eclogue, which is deeply concerned with the poetics of Virgilian pastoral, is barely mentioned in the book.

The limits of Alpers' use of the literary background to the *Eclogues* make it impossible to see his work as a definitive interpretation, but a work of such complexity is not likely ever to receive one. In his introduction Alpers expresses the hope that his book will both draw the attention of students of modern literature to the *Eclogues* and provide something for classicists as well. As far as the latter class is concerned, it is certainly successful. Despite some flaws and omissions, the intelligence and literateness of Alpers' interpretations make it a book to be reckoned with, to be both read and consulted. As far as students of modern literature are concerned, I have less ability to judge; but it manages to make an extremely difficult work accessible without oversimplification, and there are few books that I would sooner recommend to a student of literature who wants to know why to study Latin.

Both the dedication and the final pages of *The Singer of the Eclogues* declare Alpers' debt to the late Reuben Brower, a great and good man who taught innumerable students at Amherst and Harvard how to read literature, and whose books have taught many more. Brower studied and taught both classics and English literature, and his own writing demonstrated again and again the value of each for the other. The dedication of this book is one of which he would have had every reason to be proud.

JAMES E.G. ZETZEL

Princeton University

A History of Macedonia, Volume II: 550-336 B.C. By N.G.L. HAMMOND and G.T. GRIFFITH. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979. Pp. xxii + 757, 3 plates; maps on endpapers. \$65.00.

This massive volume brings the enterprise some two centuries forward. It is composed of two unequal and very different parts: Macedonia from the mid sixth century to the accession of Philip, by Hammond; and the reign of Philip II, by Griffith. In all, 190 years occupy 200 pages, while 25 years take 500 pages: a reflection of the comparative abundance of our sources and of Griffith's broad conception of his task. With the book's thorough documentation, good subject-index (but no source-index), and maps, it will be a reference work of great utility for the foreseeable future; in the long run the fact that Hammond's part was terminated in 1974 is a minor factor.

Part One, the first four chapters (Hammond also wrote Chapter XX on institutions), begins with one on 'The Traditions and the Languages of Early Macedonia,' dealing with royal houses, genealogical traditions, legendary material, and languages, seeking all the while to put the Macedones into context. Hammond defends the Dorian origin of the Temenids (he rejects 'Argeads', though many ancient sources use this name for the royal house); argues for close ties to the Lyncestian royal house; and attributes to the Temenids the molding of the Macedones into an expansionistic kingdom.

On language Hammond argues forcefully for Macedonian as a Greek dialect; he bases his conclusions on general considerations rather than on the actual linguistic remains (which he regards as insufficient for meaningful analysis). I suspect that his view that the Macedonians spoke 'standard' Greek most of the time and Macedonian 'only on special occasions' is not justified. We would rather expect the use of Greek when in situations where non-Macedonians were present, but Macedonian at home. Alexander's army was very much a mixed body, and Greek was the natural medium there.

The summary of Macedonian expansion which follows covers political, social and economic growth, as well as institutional history. The treatment is detailed and highly argumentative. As a result, it is often hard to follow the thread of narrative and equally hard to read the dense prose. The collection of numismatic and archaeological material is particularly useful but, one feels, not quite fully digested. The reader has to do more of the work than is normal in a magisterial work like this. All the same, the unmistakable picture of a state with some potential strengths but, usually, many more present weaknesses, emerges through it all. The summary at the end of Chapter IV is clear and persuasive.

The larger part of the book is Griffith's. Where Hammond's part draws its interest (and its difficulty) in large measure from the collection of scattered evidence, much of it not adequately used before for historical study, Griffith's has little in the way of new evidence to offer. What we have instead is a retelling and analysis of Philip's reign, in great detail, from previously known sources. For such an account to have value, it must distinguish itself by acumen, viewpoint, and style: this history does.

The story of Philip is told here from the Macedonian point of view, but that vantage point is broadly conceived as including all of Greek affairs which might interest a Macedonian king. Philip is, of course, a fascinating figure, about whom neither his contemporaries nor modern writers have managed to be dispassionate. Griffith plainly admires Philip's abilities greatly; but unlike most of Philip's admirers, he does not fall into supposing him to be unaggressive, disinterested, or particularly benevolent. Both psychological and political realism prevail. Griffith consistently tries to get at motives, yet he hardly ever mistakes his imputations for knowledge. To this is added a lively style, full of precision, elegant analogy, and humor. To avoid heaviness and dragging in a narrative of this length and complexity is no small accomplishment.

Since this account will be indispensable reading for Greek historians (and ought to be for anyone concerned with fourth-century Greece), there is no need to attempt an impossible sketch of Griffith's views. I may mention a few highlights, like the brilliant characterization of what interest Greece had for Philip (pp. 261-63)—not money; the useful analysis (p. 292) of the value of the *perioikoi* of Thessaly for a ruler of that region; the pithy summary (pp. 383 ff.) of Macedonian kingship with fine realism about its practical consequences; and the complex and subtle discussion (pp. 678 ff.) of the marriage with Cleopatra and Philip's subsequent (or consequent) death, which Griffith does not quite resolve (he criticizes the marriage very sharply, but disbelieves a role in the murder for Alexander).

Almost alone of modern scholars who have attempted a synthetic treatment, Griffith does not confuse recognition of Philip's greatness with a belief that he was good for Greece: "Those who distrusted him at this time (346) feared the worst; and in the longer term the event was to prove them right" (p. 458).

Despite unevennesses here and there, and (inevitably) places where any reader will find views or emphases to disagree with, this is a fine book and a great contribution. At \$65 it will seem expensive, but one gets a great deal for the money.

ROGER S. BAGNALL