Passalacqua's texts are accompanied by two apparatuses. The first one contains variant readings in earlier editions, as well as mistakes in the quotations of classical authors in the main text (thus supplementing Keil's app.). The second one gives parallels in other Latin grammarians. In her introduction, p. XXV, the editor admits, that the enumeration of parallels is not complete, and her choice of parallels cited makes a haphazard impression indeed: Why is Charisius cited at pp. 49 and 50, but omitted on p. 51, 2-3? Charisius provides an equally adequate parallel for these lines on p. 335, 9 ff. (ed. Barwick). Sometimes her choice of parallels is a disappointment: at p. 49 for instance the Latin text is treating *verba inchoativa*, being a part of the *formae sive species verborum*. Passalacqua gives one parallel from Priscianus, not taken from his treatment of this section, but from his section on the *significatio sive genus verborum*. Yet much more and much better parallels are to be found in Priscianus' treatment of the *species verborum* (Keil-Hertz, GL II, pp. 427-434), one of them (GL II, 428, 7-8) confirming Keil's choice to maintain the manuscript reading *labo labasco* at p. 49, 16. Passalacqua prefers to emendate to *labor labasco*.

The general conclusion about this book can be, that readers who are interested in the introduction of this book or who do not have enough money to purchase Keil, GL IV & V, might buy this book. Readers having Keil on their bookshelf might decide not to buy this book.
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We all learned our Greek History beginning, so to speak, with the kings, whether they were figures of heroic stature but dubious historicity like Agamemnon, Odysseus and the rest, or more scholarly but bloodless derivatives of later institutions like the Athenian *archon basileus* whose very title seemed to point to a former age of kingship. Before there were magistrates in Greece, there had been kings—this is, or should we say: has been such a matter of common handbook knowledge that the disappearance of those kings in the Late Geometric and Early Archaic periods has been the
subject of some learned debate (cf. Ch. G. Starr, The Decline of the Early Greek Kings, Historia 10 (1961), 129-138). All this should now be drastically revised, according to Robert Drews. In short outline his views come to this:

Early Greek kingship (in the post-mycenaean period) is mainly a fiction of historians ancient and modern, dating back as such to at least the fourth century B.C. or even the fifth. In the Greek polis there were from the beginning (i.e. from the 12th century—pp. 109-113) basileis (plural) or ‘small groups of hereditary leaders’ (p. 5), aristocrats or ‘highborn leaders’ (p. 102), to be replaced in the 8th and 7th centuries by one or two or even more annual magistrates one or sometimes all of whom might still have the title of basileus. Only in some areas where the ethnos prevailed over the small but independent poleis an institution developed which one might compare with something like real kingship but which was even so primarily a military command and therefore, although held for life and often hereditary as well, still a form of magistrature, e.g. the Spartan kingship or the archaic basileiai in Argos or Cyrene.

The author presents his arguments along two lines of approach. In the first ‘The Kings Reported in Greek Tradition’ (pp. 10-97) are exposed as being spurious. This regards the oikists and some of their successors in the cities of the Eastern Aegean and Asia Minor (pp. 10-36), as reported mainly by late sources like Strabo, Pausanias and Plutarch. The conclusion is that in later times those founders of cities were merely believed to have been ‘kings’ and that in most cases very soon in the ‘succession’ the constitution was supposed to have changed to a ‘normal’, i.e. republican form. The same holds true for the, admittedly few, traditions concerning kings in Sicily and Magna Graecia (pp. 36-40). As for mainland Greece, the kings here were either oikist-like or eponymous figures deriving their shadowy existence in tradition from the legends of the Return of the Heraclids, or pure inventions by chronographers as in the cases of the Argive and Corinthian kinglists and the list of the Athenian ‘kings’ from Codrus onwards, the latter being the work of Hellanicus (pp. 86-94). It was only in those regions where instead of the polis the ethnos was the dominant political force that the military leadership assumed the title of basileia; the basileus here, although strictly speaking a magistrate, was nevertheless a monarchical figure of some sort. This can be said of Dark Age Achaia (pp. 42-43), Arcadia (pp. 71-74), Messenia (pp. 74-78) and