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BOOK REVIEWS


In the past century various aspects of the ἅμοι of Attica have been thoroughly investigated. Topographical fieldwork, notably by A. Milchhoefer and E. Vanderpool, has connected physical remains to written evidence for the location of known demes. Other scholars have analyzed the demes' role in the Cleisthenic constitution; a recent milestone was John Traill's *The Political Organization of Attica,* Hesperia suppl. 14 (Princeton, 1975). Oddly, the study of the political and social role of the demes in the Athenian state has not enjoyed similar attention; B. Haussoullier's *La vie municipale en Attique,* published in 1884, remained the standard work for one hundred years. The almost simultaneous appearance of two new books on this subject is therefore somewhat surprising. Happily, there is little redundancy (Whitehead had access to a copy of Osborne's book in proofs; Osborne to an earlier draft of Whitehead's book), and each book stands on its own merits. Together they illustrate the broad range of evidence and the variety of approaches that can be brought to bear on this neglected topic.

In *The Demes of Attica,* W. reexamines, and frequently overturns or revises, Haussoullier's conclusions. W.'s main evidence for this undertaking is the mass of Athenian inscriptions found in the last century, although the Aristotelian *Athenion Politeia,* unavailable to Haussoullier, and methodological advances also contribute to W.'s new picture of the internal and “national” life of the demes.

*Demes* begins at the beginning, with Cleisthenes' constitutional creation of the demes. W. argues that the demes were “natural” in that they were based upon existing villages; Cleisthenes gave these villages a constitutional role by making deme membership (as opposed to kinship) the basis of citizenship. The probable registration procedure (standardized from 508/7 onward) is described, with a nice appreciation for the practicalities of the matter. W. then turns to the

---

Permission to reprint a review in this section may be obtained only from the author.

---

1. Hence, as W. (pp. 27–30) notes, ὀποτ to demarcate the demes were seldom necessary. W.'s conclusion is strengthened by O.'s argument that villages, not farms, typified Athenian rural settlement; see below. Similar conclusions regarding settlement and the general absence of deme ὀποτ were reached by G. R. Stanton, “Some Attic Inscriptions,” *BSA* 79 (1984): 304–6.
question of sources and method, emphasizing the need for extreme care in moving from specific and isolated evidence for practice within any given deme to the general notion of “deme practice.” This concern is predicated upon a recognition of the biases in the epigraphic record and is a central organizing principle of the book.

The second major part of the book looks “Inside the Deme.” Individual chapters treat residents (citizen and noncitizen, including an interesting section on the position of women), deme assemblies (held ad hoc within the deme to deal with local concerns and to enroll new citizens), officials (especially the demarch, who as the only “nationwide mandated” official served as intermediary between deme and polis), finances (taxes, liturgies, rents, and expenses), religion (finance and personnel, sacred calendars, and the rural Dionysia), and deme society. This last is perhaps the most innovative chapter of the book. The deme is viewed as an “idealized community,” in which the members knew each other by sight and name and supported each other in a variety of ways. Within this community individuals and families gained influence by various strategies; but (contra Haussoullier) most demarchs were not “notables.” The deme encouraged active participation in local affairs by ordinary citizens and generosity by the upper classes through honorary decrees stressing φιλοτιμία. W.’s sophisticated analysis of the ideology of φιλοτιμία on the local level and the level of the polis was, for this reviewer, the high point of the book.

Part 3 turns to the vital question of “Deme and Polis,” looking at the relationship of central authority to local authority in government and politics. In the sphere of government the central authority was always preeminent, but local and central aspects of government were intricately and deliberately interwoven. The difficult questions of representation and the procedure for selecting βουλευ-ταί and magistrates are treated fully and carefully. W. concludes that the demes lost the right to proportional representation on boards of magistrates (though not in the βουλή) in the second quarter of the fourth century. The section on local politics, concentrating on litigation (inevitably, given the nature of the sources), provides a counterweight to the concept of the “idealized community.” W.’s analysis of the relationship between local and city politics yields surprisingly negative conclusions: politicians did not favor their fellow demesmen, nor did they depend on demesmen for political support, and (contra Haussoullier) prominent politicians do not seem to begin their careers in deme politics. On the other hand, the deme did serve as a training ground in political processes for the average citizen. A chapter entitled “The Deme in Comedy” attempts to understand the polis “as the consummation of its individual demes in... a psychological sense” (p. 327), but never fulfills its promise; this is the only really unsatisfying part of the book. A concluding chapter argues that many demesmen were still living in their ancestral demes in the fourth century, and that social and political aspects of deme life remained alive and vital through the second half of the fourth century but broke down rapidly in the course of the third.

W.’s purpose was to redo Haussoullier; he has, without a doubt, succeeded. Demes will become the standard reference work on the internal political organization, the personnel, and the finances of the demes; in short, on the institutional
life of the demes. His treatment of deme religion and society, if not the final word on the subject, is an important contribution. His judicious analysis of many thorny problems of law and procedure will be appreciated by students of legal history. W. seldom refers explicitly to theoretical models, although he is not averse to using theory-based explanation in certain circumstances (e.g., p. 256). His conclusions are generally based on traditional forms of philological and historical analysis; only occasionally does he use statistics to support an argument (e.g., pp. 236–41, on the status of demarchs, the proposers of honorary decrees, and the honorands; p. 365, on the word ὁδῆμος). W.’s documentation of the sources for any given topic is typically exhaustive; his reading in the secondary literature is immense. The argumentation is, for the most part, clear; his prose is pleasant, even leisurely. W. has translated most Greek passages in the text, which will tend to make the book more accessible to students, although undergraduates may be put off by untranslated passages in German and French. There is inevitably a good deal of backtracking and retracing of steps, as the same group of inscriptions or speeches is adduced to answer various questions; but the reiteration is in the interest of clarity and never becomes irritating.

Dem racism is the magnum opus of a scholar at the height of his powers who has taken on a large and important topic and has given it the attention it deserves. I found very few factual errors or spurious arguments. On page 286 there is a fallacious archaeological “argument from paucity”: in fact the few συμβολα found in the Agora excavations prove nothing about the total number that once existed; “used” συμβολα may have been collected and dumped in an unexcavated part of the city. It is incorrect to write (pp. 351 n. 6, 356, 358 n. 35) of the “two evacuations” of the Peloponnesian War: between 431 and 425 there were five evacuations, each lasting little longer than the fifteen to forty days the Peloponnesian army remained in Attica; long-term evacuation was unnecessary before the Spartan fortification of Decelea in 413. Nor do I think it is correct to suppose that the city population outvoted the rural residents in the debate that led to the strategy of evacuation in the first place. But these are minor points.

Given the overall excellence of the book, further comment can only concern what the author has not done—a form of criticism that is inevitably subjective and, in a sense, unfair. But with a study of this scope, perhaps it is not untoward for a reviewer to mention a topic he wishes the author had chosen to illuminate. So, at risk of appearing not merely unfair but perverse, what about non-demes? Why, for example, were the villages of Salamis not given deme status? What of the northwestern village of Eleutherae, Boeotian until voluntarily coming over to Athens (in the later sixth century?), one of whose residents is described on a casualty list of 447 (IG 12.943 = IG 13.1162) not by tribal affiliation but as Εἰλευθερανατεφειν? Why were some villages incorporated into giant demes, like

2. Cf. the large cache of ostraca recently found by German excavators in the Ceramicus, far from the Agora where the ὅμισσικοςφόρασκε took place.
Acharnae and Aphidna, while other tiny villages, too small to send an annual representative to the βουλή, achieved deme status? Answers to these questions would obviously clarify what Cleisthenes did and did not intend in 508/7. I suspect that W. chose not to ask these (and similar) questions because no certain solution is possible, and he was determined not to engage in too much speculation (no matter how interesting that speculation might have been) in a volume intended partly (p. xiii) as a manual.

O.’s Demos, a revised version of his Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, differs in method, scope, and achievement. O. is not, for the most part, concerned with institutional matters (e.g., p. 83); he is less interested in demes than in the motivations of demesmen, less concerned with the constitutional issue of deme and polis than with the relationship between countryside and town. It is no accident that W.’s title is in the plural, O.’s in the singular: whereas W. is very conservative in his general conclusions, O. hopes to work “at a higher level of generality” (p. 13) than previous, constitutional studies.

O.’s premise is that the Athenian polis was neither a city nor a state in modern terms and was exceptional among Greek poleis in size, resources, and political development. O. desires to replace the ἄστυ-centric (my term) and constitutionalist view of Athens with a view emphasizing integration of town and country into a complex social, economic, religious, and political system that provided a framework for the actions and decisions of individual Athenians. Chapter 2 argues that the settlement pattern of Attica, which changed little from the sixth through fourth centuries, was highly nucleated. Thus, Athenians lived in villages, not on isolated farms, and this pattern was determined by sociopolitical, not geographic factors. Private wealth was based mostly on landholding and was unevenly distributed across Attica. Chapter 3 attempts to prove that most Athenians, including wealthy landowners who possessed numerous small plots (not manorial estates), owned land in their ancestral demes, evidence of a strong identification with the deme. Chapter 4 looks at the political significance of demes as social groups, arguing that demes served a vital role in mitigating economic inequities by forcing rich and poor demesmen to work together; the trittyes mitigated the geographic inequity inherent in the location of some demes farther from the political center than others. O. includes a brief discussion of deme officials and assemblies, arriving at conclusions quite similar to W.’s.

The next four chapters are “supporting studies” on quarrying (local stone was typically preferred for building projects, a demonstration of local loyalty); on silver mining (landowners found mining more profitable than did mine lessors; often neither landowners nor lessors were locals, although landowners and, to a smaller extent, lessors tended to be from demes on the routes to the Laurion district); on kin and neighbors (kinship was more important than locality in determining patterns of marriage, adoption, and burial, but neighbors were agricultural co-workers); and on religion (rural cults were not co-opted by the central political authority and dealt with experiences the polis could not control; the physical distance of rural cult centers from the ἄστυ iterated the psychic distance of initiates from the role of citizen associated with the ἄστυ). The final chapter concludes by stressing the importance to individual Athenians of locality. The ἄστυ did not exploit the countryside politically, economically, or socially, and the demes were vital to democracy.
Many of these conclusions are original and, if they could be proved, would go a long way toward O.’s goal of revolutionizing the modern view of the Athenian polis. The evidence is, of course, limited. Like W., O. uses inscriptions and literature (especially fourth-century oratory), but O. gives greater attention to nonliterary, archaeological remains in his argument concerning village versus farm and in his chapter on quarries. More notable, however, is O.’s employment of theoretical models. As Keith Hopkins has demonstrated, models are powerful tools for analyzing ancient society.5 But O. occasionally succumbs to the temptation of forcing his evidence to fit the conclusions that he believes his models should yield.

O. uses studies of modern rural societies to elucidate aspects of Attic country life (e.g., pp. 37, 41, 47, 62, 144, 152), an approach W. (p. 223, n. 1) eschews. Structuralism provides much of the basis for O.’s chapter on religion. Most striking, however, is O.’s use of statistical models. Here O. runs into difficulties, in part because the statistical bases he is forced to employ are very small and often biased. O. is aware of the problem (e.g., pp. 129–30, 159), but when drawing conclusions he often seems to ignore it. O. suggests that samples too small and biased to be statistically meaningful are “heuristic” (p. 129), but they may mislead readers who look to the conclusions without checking the numbers for themselves. This danger is exacerbated by O.’s tendency to refer to percentages without quantifying the raw data from which the percentages are derived. For example, on page 69 O. never mentions that his percentages are based on forty-seven cases—a sample too small to prove his geographic-political conclusion. The reader must determine the sample size by counting symbols on map 5.

Furthermore, O.’s numbers sometimes fail to support the conclusions he draws from them. An egregious example is his comment on the “prominence of local burial” (p. 131). The reader willing to add up the numbers on pages 130–31 for himself will find fifty-two examples of local burial, as against forty-five examples of nonlocal burial—pretty weak evidence for the “prominence” of a custom! In arguing for local property ownership, O. looks at six classes of evidence: two of these (literary evidence and the Attic στῆλαι) suggest an absence of local links; three (πολίται-lists, leases, and ὄροι) suggest weak links; and only one source (the mysterious ἔκτασιαι-inscriptions) suggests a strong link. The evidence is thus ambiguous at best and significantly biased toward the wealthy class; but this does not deter O. from concluding (p. 142) that “landowners both small and large had scattered fragments of property and based themselves on their ancestral villages.”6 Similar objections may be raised against some of his other statistically based arguments and the conclusions drawn from them.

O. allows conclusions to gain strength with distance from their evidential base. In the chapter on quarries, O. rightly notes the high cost of transporting stone as an important factor encouraging building with local stone (p. 108); but he later (p. 125) suggests that the “doggedly local exploitation of stone . . . emphasizes

6. Cf. similarly strong conclusions on this subject on pp. 114, 120, 124.
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the peculiar rôle of discrete social units” and, by page 152, is prepared to state that “local solidarity . . . [was] manifested by the insistence on using local stone resources.” The chapter on mines does not present evidence to demonstrate that “they are a revisionary force, undermining long established and deeply rooted values” (p. 125). The general conclusion that Athens “emerge[s] as a polis with no abiding city, where ‘true’ democracy is only found on the small scale of the deme” (p. 188) finds precious little support in the preceding discussion.

Among smaller irritations: the conclusion that “the men who appear on different sides in a court of law are men who are already involved with each other in one way or another” (p. 5) seems obvious (the contrary proposition would be rather silly) and hardly requires the complicated fabric of supposition and dubious hypothesis that precedes it as “proof.” Third-century inscriptions should not be used to prove fourth-century practice (p. 141). On page 98 we read that the ρίτοι Άγραλεικοί of Athenian inscriptions are “almost certainly to be identified with Kara limestone,” but the footnote to this sentence (p. 239, n. 21) informs us that “this identification is not at all certain.” I found the constant use of double negatives a grating stylistic quirk. Some readers may be put off by the grandiosity of O.’s claims, for example, his plan to “put the study of religious practices at Athens on a new footing” (p. 11; cf. pp. 13–14, 42, for other examples).

On the other hand, O.’s wealth of ideas and his ability to pose important questions in sophisticated terms is impressive. His attempt to go beyond traditional constitutionalist interpretations is timely; his descriptions of the three-tiered power structure of Athenian decision-making (assembly, proposers of motions, societal norms) and of the function of local society as a vertical network are succinct and persuasive. The argument for villages as opposed to farms is strong, although the archaeological evidence is still insufficient to prove the point. The suggestion that neighbors may have formed mutual aid networks for agricultural labor is a new wrinkle in the old debate on slave versus free labor.

The basic problem with Demos is that O. formed his conclusions too quickly. His evidence often cuts against his localist conclusions. For example, map 7A, presenting the origins of men who owned property in the mining district, illustrates (albeit on the basis of a very small sample) a concentration of owners in demes on routes between the city and Laurion. Indeed one might invert O.’s general conclusion, that locality remained vitally important, by arguing that his failure to find strong statistical evidence for local links in economic activity (with the possible exception of agriculture), marriage, burial, or cult demonstrates how thoroughly integrated the Athenian polis really was.

From their very different perspectives, W. and O. have shed much light on the demes. They differ in many particulars. For example, O. believes that the deme-connections of the politically active were much more important than does W.

7. O. notes (p. 37 with n. 71) that surveyors elsewhere in Greece have found evidence of isolated farms and contrasts this to the absence of such evidence for most of Attica. But the surveys he refers to are intensive scientific surveys, and similar surveys are still rare in Attica. The continuing investigations of, for example, M. H. Munn and M. L. Zimmerman Munn in the Skourta plain (“The Countryside of Panakton on the Attic-Boeotian Frontier: First Season of the Stanford Skourta Plain Project,” AJA 90 [1986]: 195); S. Van de Maele along the line of the Koulouriotiko Monopati west of Eleusis (“La route antique de Megare á Thèbes par défére du Kandili,” Canadian Classical Association Meeting, Winnipeg, 2 June 1986), and H. Lohmann in south Attica (“Landleben im klassischen Attika,” Ruhr-Universität Bochum Jahrbuch [1985]: 71–96) should provide new evidence on the matter.
These differences are, however, often a result of their divergent points of view, the one approaching the problem from an institutional perspective (since national politicians did not serve as deme officials, the demes were not their political base), the other speculating on less formalized contacts and connections (since an individual received his political identity from his demesmen and could lose it if they chose to disavow him, the Athenian politician was constrained to stay in touch with his deme). While the student of the Attic demes will turn to W. for documentation and sober judgment, he will miss much if he fails to look to O. for questions and provocative ideas.

In the end, we are struck anew by the amazing success of Cleisthenes’ reforms in creating a central government by retaining the political importance of local groups. Far from “replacing” Athens, both books illustrate the political and social origins of the primary loyalty citizens felt toward their fellow Athenians. This loyalty was not inevitable—the Boeotians, for example, never achieved it and suffered the consequences of maintaining genuinely strong local bonds—but it was a necessary precondition for the creation of the classical Athenian state.

Josiah Ober
Montana State University


The period that Richard Bauman considers is “transitional” in two respects: first, republican forms of government gradually crumbled and gave way before the virtually monarchical institutions of the early Principate; second, the Roman jurists assumed an increasingly pivotal role in the adjudication of private law suits, thereby inaugurating the classical period of Roman jurisprudence. It is tempting to posit a connection between these two “transitions.” By chance, B.’s monograph was published a few months after my own book, *The Rise of the Roman Jurists* (Princeton, 1985), which deals with the same period. But B.’s focus differs profoundly from mine; whereas I was concerned with the internal impact of late republican turbulenece and social changes on the emergence of the classical Roman legal system, B. is interested chiefly in the public and political part played by the late republican jurists.

B. divides late republican jurisprudence into two broad periods. The first begins approximately in 82 B.C. with the assassination of Q. Mucius Scaevola, who had been substantially responsible for creating Roman legal science. By about 70 Ser. Sulpicius Rufus had emerged as the preeminent Roman jurist, and he dominated the field until his death in 43. The second period, from 43 until early in the reign of Augustus, is more complex, in that no single jurist had Servius’ commanding stature; instead, Roman law was characterized by friendly competition among Servius’ many students (especially Alfenus and Ofilius), his