

ORANGES (A.) *Euthyna: Il rendiconto dei magistrati nelle democrazia ateniese (V–IV secolo a.C.)* (Quaderni di Erga-Logoi 13). Milan: L.E.D., 2021. Pp. 292. €35. 9788879169639. doi:[10.1017/S0075426922000672](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922000672)

This book has been revised from a doctoral thesis written at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan under the supervision of C. Bearzot.

After an introduction to the subject of Athens' accounting procedures for officials and the evidence for and scholarship on it, Oranges devotes the bulk of her book to a discussion in chronological order of all instances of the procedure in the fifth and fourth centuries (summarized in a table on pages 269–76: 23 certain and nine possible instances). This was well worth doing, and has been done thoroughly and intelligently.

Many points remain uncertain, and inevitably there are some on which I agree with her and some on which I do not. On the Areopagites before Ephialtes' reform, Oranges makes the interesting suggestion that their trials were occasioned by their activity as members of subcommittees (25–29); she believes in a 'Peace of Callias' with Persia in the mid-fifth century, whereas I suspect it was invented in the fourth to be contrasted with the King's Peace (35–41); she refers Androtion's account of the *euthunai* (examination) of Phormio to his campaign in 429/8 whereas I think it belongs to some earlier occasion (49–59); we agree that Eratosthenes, the member of the Thirty, submitted to *euthunai* and was attacked by Lysias then (91–97); I am willing to believe as she is not that Nicomachus the reviser of the laws was reappointed in 403 to the position he had held before (98–108); she thinks that Iphicrates, Menestheus and Timotheus were tried at the end of their year of office after the battle of Embata in 355, while I am not sure whether they were tried then or deposed and recalled (128–38); we agree that Lycurgus held the position *epi tei dioikesei* (in charge of financial administration) from ca. 336 to ca. 324, but she thinks, as I do not, that he held the office in person for the last four years as well as the first four (154–59).

In chapter 5 (165–201) Oranges discusses in general the Athenian system of the fifth and fourth centuries, and argues effectively against the view that there were major differences between the two. There are problems in the text of *Ath. pol.* 48.4–5, where we sometimes agree and sometimes disagree. We agree that there is no good basis for the argument that in the fifth century the *euthunoi* could themselves impose fines of up to 500 drachmae (as they could not in the fourth), and that the 'thirty *logistai* (accountants)' of some fifth-century inscriptions were different from the *logistai* who were involved with the financial accounts of officials. Oranges makes the credible suggestion that the system known to us began after the reforms of Ephialtes in 462/1.

She next summarizes her conclusions (203–08). I am happy with her general approach, and her view that *euthunai* was an initiatory procedure, which could develop into a *dikē* (private suit) or *graphē* (public suit), or an *eisangelia* ('denunciation') as appropriate. Members of a board were examined not together but individually, sometimes with differing outcomes. She suggests that generals who were re-elected had to undergo *euthunai* not every year but only when they were not re-elected but demitted their office (and that must be true at least in cases where a general remained abroad from one year to the next).

In an appendix (209–25) Oranges turns back to Solon, at the beginning of the sixth century, and there we disagree: she wants to accommodate Aristotle's *Politics* (2.1274a15–21, 3.1281b32–4, and find a role for the assembly and a lawcourt as early as that, whereas I think that *Ath. pol.* 8, from a detailed source, supersedes what had been written earlier in the *Politics*.

There is an extensive bibliography, and a series of indexes.

Oranges' study of Athens' accounting procedures for officials in this way was a well worthwhile undertaking, and it has been very well performed.

†P.J. RHODES  
University of Durham  
Email: [p.j.rhodes@durham.ac.uk](mailto:p.j.rhodes@durham.ac.uk)

MARGINESU (G.) **Callia l'Ateniese: metamorfosi di un'élite, 421–371 a.C.** Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2016. Pp. 198. €52. 9783515115520.  
doi:[10.1017/S0075426922000684](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922000684)

This slender but dense book offers the first monographic study of Callias III of the Ceryces (ca. 455–365 BC), presented as an important figure in Athens' transition, from aggressive imperialism to a new peace-seeking attitude, over the 'secolo breve' ('short century', 13; why not a new Pentekontaetia?) of 421–371.

The introduction outlines the ancient stereotypes (horse fever, poor military record, fondness for sex and luxury) which resulted in the traditional view of Callias as a frivolous, self-indulging *bon viveur*; however, collecting all relevant sources (26–40), Marginesu also acknowledges the weight of Callias' prestigious public offices (*dadouchos*, torch-bearer priest at the Eleusinian Mysteries, ambassador and *proxenos* for Sparta) and acquaintances among great philosophers. Epigraphic evidence is as critical as problematic, and I find it hard to agree with Marginesu's tendency to favour the low dating of 422/1 for IG I<sup>3</sup> 52 A (which both OR 144 and AIO now assign to 434/3). Regardless of the date, the name Callias is so common that its simple epigraphic occurrence is hardly useful in reconstructing the career of a specific individual; yet Marginesu (for example, 35–36, 49, 75–77), although extremely cautiously, attributes this and other important decrees proposed by *some* Callias, such as IG I<sup>3</sup> 36 and 53–54, to Callias III.

Chapter 1 outlines strongly recurring features within Callias' *genos*, such as the onomastic tradition and the ties with Eleusis. Family wealth (43–53) is treated chronologically through the various exponents, but perhaps greater emphasis on distinguishing two contrasting traditions, one insisting on the questionable, treacherous origins of the fortune (for example, [Them.] *Ep.* 9.5–6 Cortassa; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 6.2–4 and Plut. *Sol.* 15.7–9), the other on its rather virtuous sources and/or destination (for example, Hdt. 6.121; [Andoc.] 4.15), would have best illustrated how the family tended to polarize attention. Discussion (61 n.134) of the Aristotelian treatment of τὸ νεμεσῶν ('righteous indignation', *Rh.* 2, 1386b8–1387b21) perhaps deserved more space, as wealth, birth, marriages, beauty, etc. are all frequent topics in sources on Callias.

Chapter 2 offers a biographical profile. The limits of the documentation occasionally result in summaries of major events in which Callias may, or may not, have played a role. Marginesu uses Callias' acquaintance with the sophists to question the assumption of his indifference to politics. Callias' relationship with both a woman and her mother (86–88), likely a parody of his priesthood of Demetra and Kore (Andoc. 1.124), might have led to a wider exploration: Andocides calls the mother a γράυς ('old woman'), perhaps hinting at a comic/slandering tradition which is found also for Callias II's wife Elpinice (Plut. *Per.* 10.5, *Cim.* 14.5: Stesimbrotus? Possibly cf. the γράϊδιον in Ath. 12.537c, discussed separately by Marginesu at 124).

Chapter 3 digs deeper into the family reputation. Many points are accurately discussed, but most do not seem particularly distinctive: sexual intemperance, wealth and luxury were all aristocratic clichés, as were envy, derision and slanders of them; the rich section on the body and demeanour (137–44) probably presents Callias' most peculiar traits.