
The Introduction by Maria Pretzler and Nick Barley portrays Aineias Tacticus as unique among classical Greek authors due to his focus on fourth-century Greece of the periphery, the small towns with modest resources, quite unlike the well-known Greek world of Athens and Sparta. Aineias’ genre is the military manual, but the technical side of siege warfare is not his central concern, rather the people as a town’s universal weakness and the need to exploit scarce resources at hand. Aineias’ method includes as exempla numerous vignettes of everyday life, mostly dated to the 370s and 360s, leading the authors to conclude that the text was written in the mid-fourth Century. Aineias’ language is more a forerunner of Koine than the standard classical Greek. Whether the author can be identified with the known Aineias of Stymphalos in Arkadia is left as an open question. The remainder of the Introduction provides summaries of the main themes of each of the chapters. The limited format of this review renders discussion of every paper not feasible, though all are of generally high quality. I have chosen a selection that may be of greatest interest to historians and historiographers. A Table of Contents follows.

Maria Pretzler (“Aineias and History: The Purpose and Context of Historical Narrative in the *Poliorketika*”) examines the problems that Aineias’ frequent “historical vignettes” present for the historian: contextualization, identification and dating. She approaches them on the basis of (a) Aineias’ provision of geographical data (city names) and (generally indirect) chronological information as well as mention of specific persons; (b) Aineias’ sources (primarily oral history, but also borrowings from Thucydides and Herodotus) and adaptation (he adds his own apparently invented material to the accounts in Thucydides and Herodotus to enhance the didactic value; (c) the use of vignettes with little historical context and emphasis on their didactic purpose; and finally (d) use of recent vignettes to enhance Aineias’ historical credibility, thus to appeal to his readers’ own memories of the events.

Marco Bettalli (“Greek Poleis and Warfare in the Fourth Century BC: Aineias’ *Poliorketika*”) examines Aineias’ depiction of fourth-century warfare, including the virtual absence of open field battles in the text and the significance of ambushes and use of light-armed troops. He contends that while Aineias’ work is “well known for its description of social turmoil . . . it is underrated from a military point of view” (p. 167) and the fact that Aineias’ topic is military defense of a fortified location should not disqualify it as evidence of the reality of the frequent need for such defense, characterizing the text as “full of cruelty” and “systematic massacre” (p. 169). Bettalli examines the recruitment criteria for citizen soldiers: free status, physical strength and political trustworthiness, and for those with leadership functions: intelligence and a vested interest in the status quo. He likewise observes Aineias’ particular
concern with information and communication, aspects of military operations which Bettalli argues grew in importance during the fourth Century. Finally, he argues plausibly against the common view that Aineias’ presentation of siege defense was left outmodeled by the changes introduced by Philip and Alexander, noting that Aineias’ defensive counter measures never became obsolete against the new \textit{mechanemena} of the later fourth century.

Nick Barley (“Light Infantry and Leadership in Aineias”) observes that Aineias’ view of siege defense takes the defenders well beyond their city walls, using surprise attacks and mixed forces to discourage and repulse invasions. Much of Aineias’ advice is to take the battle to the enemy. Meeting the enemy at the territorial borders is the first line of defense using light-armed forces particularly, with reconnaissance, maneuver and communication, while avoiding conventional direct combat. He sees Aineias as a major contrast to the vast majority of other sources whose emphasis is on pitched battle hoplite warfare. Rather he advocates attacking the enemy “from range and while [they are] intoxicated” (p. 184). Barley finds that Aineias posits “four areas of increasing proximity . . . to the centre of the polis”: territory, city walls, internal defense and, morale (p. 187). The flexibility of light-armed forces makes them a prime resource for scouting, quick response skirmishing and harassing in border territory. But they play little or no role in wall or internal defense, and Barley’s transition to the final area of morale and the role of the general in fostering it seems somewhat abrupt. Aineias’ general is a cerebral man, a “leader more than a fighter” (p. 192), with skills of planning, organizing, and communicating (the last closely linked to the general’s use of the skills of the light-armed forces), yet visible to the citizens and boosting morale through personal involvement with guards, patrols and gatekeepers.

James Roy (“Mercenaries in Aineias Tacticus”) examines the role of mercenaries in two categories — historical mentions and advice on how to use mercenaries — in the context of Aineias’ general concern with internal treachery. Aineias’ view of them is generally positive, with the caveat that the citizen force should outnumber the mercenary one. His advice is that no citizen should be able to recruit mercenaries without approval of polis magistrates, that compensation should be obtained both from private citizens and public funds, and that billeting should be the responsibility of private citizens. Roy notes that Aineias leaves a number of issues unclear: selection criteria, appropriate payment, and where they are to be recruited, as well as difficulties due to dialect differences, whether women and children accompanied them, and the nature and publication of punishments for offences.

Philip de Souza (“Raiders from the Sea: The Maritime Context of the \textit{Poliorketika}”) seeks to elucidate the maritime context and naval military activities in Aineias’ text. He accepts Gabrielsen’s contention that raiding for wealth and status was key to Greek military activity from 750 BCE and continued as a prime factor into the fourth Century. He favors the revisionist view of warships as predominantly troop carriers and the rowers as also functioning as light-armed infantry forces and finds no decline
in raiding activity in the fourth century. Hence Aineias lived at a time when raiding was still dominant. De Souza notes mention of harbor barriers against enemy ships, prohibition of ships mooring near city gates, and having harbor guards check incoming ships for cargo content. After an enemy raid on the polis Aineias’ proposed counter response, if ships are available, is a surprise counter attack by sea. Brief references to fleet maintenance include a boom for closing off the harbor, the ‘tackle’ of warships, and shipsheds which the enemy may try to set on fire. De Souza concludes with two hypothetical suggestions to flesh out the incomplete final sentence of the text (“There are two purposes of fleet operations” in his modified translation), namely “pursuit or ambush of enemy raiders” and “direct attacks, . . . or retaliatory counter-raids on enemy territory,” which would require different tactics and crews. One misses reference to Barley’s different interpretation of the same passage above (p. 200).

Tracey Rihll (“Technology in Aineias Tacticus: Simple and Complex”) focuses on defensive technical devices, primarily “civilian technologies which can be pressed into military service” (p. 265). She begins with a long list of the various physical objects mentioned by Aineias (from wagons to wound dressings) and notes the window this opens to fourth-Century material culture and its improvisation for military applications. There follows an analysis of the technologies of everyday life found in Aineias: two-wheeled carts rendered into a single improvised siege-shed, lanterns used by wall guards that are adapted to direct light in a single direction, a smooth cylindrical bolt used to keep gates shut, and baskets used as shields and helmets. A longer section is devoted to the ladder. Notable here is her new suggestion for Aineias’ “door-like wooden board” to push away the enemy’s escalading ladders, related to demonstration of the lower incline at which ladders were set in antiquity. She plausibly suggests the text requires a board on rollers pushed forward on top of the wall as an enemy ladder is put into position, seemingly (to the enemy) against the wall, but actually against the extended board. She also explores fire signals and suggests that Aineias’ “key innovation appears to have been the provision of a menu of user-defined messages from which users could select as appropriate” (p. 285).

The volume provides carefully researched and highly detailed analyses of central issues in this earliest extant military manual and at the same time offers a nuanced and exceptionally wide-ranging view of the broader implications of this unusual text and author. A number of the same topics are considered in different chapters, e. g. communications, but in most cases the authors offer different perspectives on these topics.
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