

According to Joho, Thucydides' representation of the Athenians' dynamism after the Persian Wars reveals the city's goal of consolidating power, not a conscious plot to reduce their Greek allies to subjection. Imperial domination rather resulted from developments that were largely not subject to Athenian control, given the impossible choice of 'ruling or being ruled' (100–01). Seeking power and wealth, escaping poverty and enslavement, the arrogance of an almost personified hope, these are all natural impulses that drive people to undertake bold actions, commit transgressions and (as argued in Diodotus' speech and the Melian Dialogue, discussed on 121–25, 156–57) even risk self-destruction.

According to Joho, Dionysius' analysis of Thucydides' prose already bears strong indications that his abstract style (his tendency to treat persons as things and things as persons) is not just designed to produce an elevated form of discourse, but is strictly related to content; that is to say, related to the meaning that Thucydides wishes to ascribe to the events that he reports. The question then arising from this preliminary assumption is this: does Thucydides represent human behaviour as determined by events and changes (rather than the other way around) and regulated by the permanent essence of the human condition? Joho provides a lucid and detailed survey of previous scholarly opinions on this much-debated question. He shows the ways in which a combination of compelling factors, not clearly distinguishable between external and internal, play a substantial role in Thucydides' discourse on causation. Objective circumstances, psychological, cultural or universally innate impulses such as represented by the famous triad of honour, fear and advantage, or eternally valid natural dispositions expressed by the terms φύω/φύομαι ('to grow/be by nature') even resemble daemonic forces that replace what other authors represent as more or less personalized divine agents controlling human affairs (especially in Euripides; although I do not understand the author's claim that the *Hippolytos* alludes to Ariadne's 'betrayal of Dionysus' (131)). At the same time, Joho argues that although outcomes are 'compulsory' and to some extent predictable, they are not inevitable in an absolute sense. Impersonal constraints leave enough room for individuals or states to exercise free choice based on morality, foresight or pragmatism. The most important example of the power of γνώμη (defined as mental activity, intelligence, planning and resolve, 282) to confront irrational emotions or unexpected circumstances is Pericles, even while his rhetorical style, like Thucydides' own, demonstrates a sharp awareness of the extent to which natural necessities challenge human deliberation.

Joho gives credit to several earlier scholars who have analysed Thucydides' prose, both explaining their positions in some detail and engaging with them in agreement or disagreement. Having these scattered opinions re-examined all together is in itself helpful. On the whole, this is a valuable and granular analysis of one of the most arduous texts that students and scholars of Greece are likely to encounter.

ROSARIA VIGNOLO MUNSON

Swarthmore College

Email: [rmunson1@swarthmore.edu](mailto:rmunson1@swarthmore.edu)

JÖRDENS (A.) and YIFTACH (U.) (eds) *Accounts and Bookkeeping in the Ancient World* (Philippika 55.2; Legal Documents in Ancient Societies 8). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2020. Pp. xvi + 324; illus. €68. 9783447111980.  
doi:[10.1017/S007542692300085X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S007542692300085X)

This volume contains 18 mostly short papers from a 2016 conference. Eight relate to the host project to study the state processing and management of population and land data in

Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt; the other ten are miscellaneous contributions about records in the ancient Near East and wider Greek and Roman worlds. There is no introduction to draw out common interests or themes. Three of the ten general contributions discuss new texts: Manuel Molina argues that foremen at Ur (c. 2000 BC) fiddled their labour records; a fourth-century BC ostrakon from Athens, according to David Lewis, records contributions from members of an association; Ornella Salati discusses a military account from Egypt (second century AD) which refers to the property of two Roman soldiers who have died by suicide. Daniel Fleming suggests that written records were an adjunct to temple management at Emar (c. 1200 BC); Melanie Groß surveys the types of lists surviving from neo-Assyrian palaces (eighth–seventh century BC); Julia Lougovaya reviews the role of *tamiai* ('attendants') in Homeric epic. Miklós Könczöl shows that Cicero's references to Verres' accounts as governor of Sicily are more rhetoric than documentation, while Éva Jakab discusses Cicero's attempt to paper over embezzlement by his staff when governor of Cilicia. The most substantive contribution is Cristina Carusi's study of the building accounts from Classical Athens, along with Véronique Chankowski's summary of the Delian accounts. They agree that 'sacred' and civic finances cannot be separated, and that their stone 'accounts' had been extracted from various records on wood or papyrus. Chankowski questions whether these costly inscriptions were symbolic rather than practical, but Carusi argues strongly that the changes of form and content in the Attic texts, adding detail but losing clarity, and the fourth-century switch to inscribed specifications, imply that public celebration of the state's financial support for temples was the primary motive for their inscription.

Of the eight studies from Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt, two are terminological: Willy Clarysse reports on his database distinction between 'accounts' and 'lists', more optimistic than practical, and the Greek words besides *logos* used of 'accounts'; Patrick Sängler wonders why the registry office at Tebtunis sometimes called rules of associations *cheirographiai* ('documents') rather than *nomoi*. Sandra Lippert and Maren Schentuleit review the numerous and mostly unpublished Roman-period temple accounts in Demotic from Soknopaiou Nesos. An unexpected practice which they signpost is the costing of disbursements of foodstuffs in cash 'at the estimated street price', perhaps to facilitate preparation of the annual monetary account of income and expenditure required by the Roman administration. There is hidden treasure here for economic and accounting history. Andrea Jördens compares accounting in the Heroninos archive with Zenon's accounts and some others to illustrate how problems of survival and context impede conclusions about management.

The other four papers deal with state processing of data. Katelijn Vandorpe and Nick Vaneerdedewegh try to explain the flow of data from second-century BC Arsinoite village surveys of land and crops to nome level, but the detail in their tables is overwhelming, and although the one nome-level account, from Edfu, shows some elimination of specifics, it seems that the full surveys were also copied to nome level. Nicola Reggiani provides an exhaustive survey of the types of identifier used by individuals in making declarations of people or property to the Roman administration, and notes which were retained in higher-level summary lists; more interesting would be which identifiers, and how, were used to create summary lists from the declarations. Thomas Kruse and Uri Yiftach discuss monthly reports by the collectors of cash taxes which list payments by individual taxpayers at second-century Theadelphia and Karanis, respectively. Kruse probes how these relate to the 'target' registers of taxpayers with their tax dues and the collectors' working accounts. While at Theadelphia the registers of taxpayers, to whose columns the monthly reports refer, were clearly arranged in first-letter alphabetical order, at Karanis they were not; Yiftach proposes that the order used at Karanis was topographical, but more likely is a grouping by the mysterious 94 'klerouchies' used there for taxation of land. Taken together, there is some useful spadework in these four studies, but little advance in general understanding. They do, however, challenge the research assumption of a selective flow of data from village to nome 'level': the Roman-period officials and tax collectors who created

the village records, secondary as well as primary, were metropolitans operating from the nome capital; maybe there was a single nome-wide process, which also produced the nome summaries sent to Alexandria, again accompanied by full copies of the basic accounts. To understand management, we should perhaps work top-down, for example asking what fiscal decisions a Prefect might make at a nome *dialogismos* ('reckoning') and on the basis of what evidence.

D.W. RATHBONE  
King's College London  
Email: [dominic.rathbone@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:dominic.rathbone@kcl.ac.uk)

JUDSON (A.P.) **The Undeciphered Signs of Linear B: Interpretation and Scribal Practices**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. Pp. xx + 352, illus. 50 figs, 21 tables. £90. 9781108494724.  
doi:[10.1017/S0075426923000812](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426923000812)

Decipherment of any writing system means essentially the assignment of sound values to phonograms. Although often recorded in the history of scholarship as 'events', decipherments are commonly longer analytical processes, whose apex is represented by the point where assigned values make the identification of the language and at least general interpretation of texts possible. Linear B (henceforth LB), the Aegean syllabographic script used ca. 1400–1200 BCE to render an early Greek dialect and serve the book-keeping needs of the administrations of the Mycenaean 'palaces', is an example of such a process: Michael Ventris accomplished the decipherment of the majority of the signary in 1952; following his further collaboration with John Chadwick, the values of a few more signs were identified during the early years of Mycenaean studies (e.g. \*85 <au>), but a few signs remained unidentified. Anna Judson's excellent monograph, based on her PhD thesis (Cambridge 2016) is precisely about those 14 LB phonograms (syllabograms) that still resist decipherment attempts and on whose values no consensus has yet been reached. Prospective readers must note from the outset that this work does not aim to 'complete' the decipherment of LB: its focus is on a balanced assessment of value assignment prospects for these signs and how such assessments may contribute to a better knowledge of the structure of LB phonography and decipherment methodology.

The book unfolds in six chapters. In the introductory Chapter 1 (1–35) Judson succinctly presents the main features of LB phonography, its place within the Aegean-Cypriot 'family' of syllabic scripts and the progress of decipherment through the history of Mycenaean studies with an important discussion of the methodology of value assignments in the post-decipherment era (31–35). Chapter 2 focuses on the 'categories' of LB sign values, going beyond the common C(onsonant)V(owel) structure which constitutes the 'core' of LB phonography into a discussion of the representation of antevocalic aspiration, diphthongs or semi-consonants set between stops and vowels. Her discussion (82–86) of the exceptional <pte> sign (currently *sui generis* and generally accepted to have been originally \*<pye>) is interesting, as she supports that the sign had an original <pte> value, therefore generating the anticipation of a *pt-* series of signs. Judson's aim is to provide a *general* configuration, assessing the place of *deciphered* LB signs as well as 'vacancies' in LB phonography (the latter being the potential 'slots' where values of undeciphered signs may lie).