

Pentateuch reflects usage before c. 150 B.C. Chapter 9 sums up: the central point is that the translators, in many places, directly eschew possible semitisms in favour of standard, even technical or idiomatic or new-fangled, *koine*. It could be objected that this fact does not in itself exclude the possibility of a 'Jewish Greek dialect'; but clearly it does exclude the possibility of a ghetto Greek quite cut off from the speech of non-Jewish contemporaries. Papyrologists might want to put more emphasis on another argument of Deissmann's, which L. does not develop: papyrus documents from Jewish circles (admittedly few, and few of those from Alexandria itself) show no trace of the supposed dialect.

Christ Church, Oxford

P. J. PARSONS

J. F. LAZENBY: *The Spartan Army*. Pp. xiii + 210; 13 plates, 14 maps and plans. Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1985. Paper, £16.

In a *polis* whose citizens were full-time hoplites the army dominated many aspects of Spartan life. As the medium for the extension of Spartan power abroad, it exerted an important influence upon other contemporary states. Consequently, no excuse is required for devoting a whole book to the subject, though exactly how it should be written may be a matter for dispute.

L.'s preface acknowledges the deliberately limited scope of his work, which examines the organization of the army and its use in warfare, but eschews discussion of its role within the Spartan state or the history of Greek warfare. Of the book's three parts, Part I, on the army's organization, is of greatest interest to students of Spartan society (such as the reviewer). It argues three novel propositions: first, that the army's structure remained basically unchanged from the seventh-century hoplite reform to the battle of Leuktra; secondly, that during that period it consisted exclusively of Spartans (hence the book's title); the gaps caused by declining Spartiate numbers were filled by *hypomeiones*, but the *perioikoi* were brigaded separately and not used against Peloponnesian enemies until after Leuktra; thirdly, that in the time of Thucydides and Xenophon the army was twice the size usually thought.

These are challenging conclusions which, if true, would compel a reassessment of several aspects of Spartan society. L. manipulates the notoriously contradictory evidence with no little dexterity, though in this difficult field where definitive proof is well-nigh impossible some conclusions inevitably appear more certain than others. For example, his arguments (48–52) against the existence of an obal army at Plataia or earlier are well aimed (although anticipated by D. H. Kelly, *GRBS* 22 [1981], 31–8, not noted by L.). His attempt (5–10; 41–4), however, to equate Xenophon's army of the *morai* with that described by Thucydides, which involves altering the evidence of both writers, seems less well-founded. Focussing on set battles alone (41), L. sees no reason for a reorganisation between 418 and 403; but this neglects the possibility that changes were made in connection with the need to station a portion of the army at Dekeleia. (I owe this point to Dr N. V. Sekunda.) L.'s theories about the size of the *mora* (7–10) and the exclusion of the *perioikoi* (14–16) merit serious consideration. A broader perspective would, however, have been helpful here because of the radical implications for the number of *hypomeiones* in the late fifth and early fourth centuries. L. discusses the evidence that *hypomeiones* fought within the army and the consequences for its efficiency (16–20; 60–1); but one also needs to consider the plausibility of the resulting picture of Spartan society, not least the implication that *hypomeiones* constituted 4,080 out of the 4,780 Spartan hoplites whom L. thinks participated at Leuktra (155).

Part II consists of discussions of battles from Thermopylai to Leuktra, in which L. employs a sound understanding of the practicalities of Greek warfare to emphasize the limited tactical flexibility of most hoplite armies. In contrast, the Spartan army demonstrated an unusual ability to perform a variety of manoeuvres even in the heat of battle. Although L. makes frequent comparisons between different battles, he attempts no overall analysis of the development of Spartan tactics. But the attentive reader can perceive from his account that the Spartans were continually modifying their practice of the art of war, as at Nemea when, building upon the

lessons learned at Mantinea, they moved their own troops to the right in order to outflank and 'roll up' the enemy line. The net effect is to cast doubt upon the supposed extreme conservatism of the Spartan military organization suggested in Part I.

Finally, Part III contains a short chapter which summarizes the evidence for the army and for Spartan commanders abroad in the late fourth century and Hellenistic period, both neglected subjects worthy of attention.

In spite of the criticisms above, L. has performed a valuable service in departing from the pattern of general histories of Sparta, of which several have been published in recent years, and focussing instead on the organization and role of this central institution of Spartan life. Whether or not one accepts the particular hypotheses argued in this study, it is this kind of re-examination of the precise working of its social institutions, and the debate it engenders, which is necessary to achieve a deepened understanding of the character of the Spartan state.

*University of Manchester*

STEPHEN HODKINSON

LUIGI GALLO: *Alimentazione e demografia della Grecia antica*. (Piccola biblioteca Laveglia.) Pp. 135. Salerno: Pietro Laveglia, 1984. Paper, L. 8,000.

This little book arrived for review at a time when Bob Geldof's face featured on every instalment of the television news, and when the world's concern was focussed, as never before, on general issues of 'alimentazione'. This concern is perhaps relevant to the large number of books and articles about Greek and Roman food supplies published since about 1980, the year of G. Rickman's *Corn Supply of Ancient Rome*. (P. Garnsey and C. Whittaker's *Trade and Famine in Classical Antiquity*, 1983, is the most important, and Garnsey is not only the co-author of a study in *JRS* 1984 of a remarkable Thessalian grain inscription, but has written a provocative piece about Athens' grain supply, on which more below. And Foxhall and Forbes on 'Sitometreia' in *Chiron* 1982 ought also to be mentioned).

Gallo attempts to determine the size of ancient Greek populations by the amount of food they imported and consumed. In fact his title is too broad because inevitably he soon narrows the enquiry down to Athens (the third and final chapter 'L'Attica: un caso privilegiato' takes up half the book, after two short introductory chapters). The approach is not new; and there is no new evidence. Gallo is concerned above all to defend the use of a very familiar text, Dem. 20. 31-2, which claims that the 400,000 medimnoi imported from Leucon of the Bosphorus equalled imports from all other sources. Gallo follows Gomme and others in accepting (p. 44) that Athens relied to an extreme degree on imported cereals. This view goes back of course to Demosthenes *loc. cit.*, but P. Garnsey, 'Grain for Athens', in *CRUX: Essays presented to de Ste Croix* (1985), pp. 62ff., has now challenged it. After reading Garnsey's p. 74 one may well feel uncomfortable about the way in which students of Attic population have pressed that figure of 400,000. Scepticism can only be reinforced by M. H. Hansen, *Democracy and Demography*, 1986, a book of 116 pages which dismisses the whole argument from grain consumption in 8 lines (pp. 24f.). I don't think that Gallo, to whom neither Garnsey's nor Hansen's latest treatments were available, offers any arguments which will surprise or convince either of the scholars I have just mentioned. Gallo does however reach the same conclusion as Garnsey about 329/8 B.C., the year of another key bit of evidence, the Eleusis first-fruits inscription: it was, contra Jardé, a bad year. And there are useful remarks about the 'Food Aid' inscription from Cyrene, Tod 196.

This book has plenty of interesting, and intelligent, incidental remarks in both text and the 40-odd pages of generous footnotes, and for that reason it is worth bringing to the attention of scholars in this country, although I do not think that the author has really achieved his aim of firming up the connexion between 'alimentazione' and 'demografia'.

*Oriel College, Oxford*

SIMON HORNBLOWER