preferable term to describe the appointment of a *Princeps Senatus* in 115 B.C. (p. 129) rather than the more formal process indicated by 'election' (cf. Broughton, *MRR* I, pp. 531-532, 533 n. 2). It is inaccurate to suggest (p. 207) that nothing was heard of Julius Frontinus in the later years of Domitian’s reign (cf. C. P. Jones, *Phoenix* 22, 1968, 120). The use of the post-Roman England (p. 237) to describe Britain is an anachronism from the pen of a Caledonian whose nationality is betrayed in the extravagant claim that Mons Graupius was as final for its generation as Culloden (p. 65). An index of abbreviations would be a thoughtful courtesy to encourage the junior student to pursue the many fascinating trails opened in the extensive bibliographies. And surely, if numerical references are the only practical means of denoting forts on the maps, the key should appear on the page opposite rather than at the end of the book, but larger fold-out maps with legends are preferable. Trivial details, to be sure, but they are worth correcting in a work destined for wide use for many years to come.

VANCOUVER, University of British Columbia

J. RUSSELL


Greek history is usually studied as a history of city-states. Yet the federal states did not emerge suddenly in Hellenistic times. They were an important factor on the political map of the archaic and classical periods, either as survivals of ancient tribal communities or as new political creations. To study their history means a partial reevaluation of traditional ideas about Greek particularism and polis-exclusivism.

To rewrite Greek history from this point of view asks for a supreme command of documentary material, a great capacity for catching *obiter dicta* and interpreting scrappy evidence. Though much of the material has been treated by others, an exhaustive analysis and interpretation was still lacking. Professor Larsen has accomplished two things: a thorough analysis of institutional developments of confederacies and an account of their history within the framework of Greek interstate history up to 146 B.C.

The great dividing line between the two parts of the book is the King’s Peace of 386, described as the greatest break in the history of Greek federalism. Each part consists of a predominantly systematic and a predominantly historical analysis; in the systematic parts the internal and constitutional developments are dealt with,
together with local history; in the historical parts the relations of confederacies with external powers, other confederacies, city-states, Macedonia, Rome are described. These chapters are preceded by a most interesting introduction, in which the author attempts to define the nature of the federal state. This could only be done by a kind of 'working-hypothesis' on the base of empirical evidence, since ancient authorities do nothing to help us; even Polybius described the Achaean confederacy in terms of the city-state. Federal states are considered as states with a local and federal citizenship and, accordingly, a dual jurisdiction (Political unions like symmachies were entirely different). At the origins there is usually a sense of kinship or geographic propinquity, leading up to a 'tribal state'. The development of city-particularism may contribute to a more highly developed political federation. Usually, Greek federalism is 'inclusive': narrow ethnic boundaries are easily overstepped and members of other tribes admitted. Furthermore there are some recurrent factors and analogies in federal institutions, boards, taxes, officials, armies, the capital, etc.

Professor Larsen is not the kind of scholar who overstresses his discoveries or theories, or who makes his readers float agreeably on the waves of verbose generalisations. Packed with details, the book makes no easy reading. Sometimes interesting themes are too modestly hidden within circumstantial analytical descriptions. One of those themes is the idea that democracy was the fashion in the early 4th century and that this prevented the rise of representative government in federal states like Boeotia and Arcadia. What exactly is the meaning of democracy in this context? There can hardly be a great similarity of meaning between Athenian democracy and the participation in state affairs by the common man in Arcadia or Aetolia. One of the difficulties of the book is the somewhat artificial separation of local and general history. On page 188 we read that the strategos and the magistrates of the Arcadian Confederacy could be called to account and brought to trial by the Ten Thousand after their term of office was over. "The proof for these statements will be found below in the account of events leading to the fragmentation of the confederacy . . ."; a specific reference to a page would have been more convenient.

Another and more formal question is, whether the very circumstantial description of general Greek history between 250 and 146—albeit centered around the federal states—does not transgress the frame of this book, being a specific contribution to our knowledge about federalism. But, for that matter, one could hardly find a safer guide through this complicated period than Larsen. His dealing with the rebellion and ruin of the Achaean league in 146 is a real masterpiece of historical analysis.