rather different writer. A substantial part of his work is direct quotation of previous texts, whereas this is rare in Theophanes. Theophanes was meticulous in recording every year with its titulature of rulers and metropolitans, even when he had no events to report under it, whereas there are many gaps in George (e.g. only sixteen years are recorded between AM 5700 and 5776). The difference in attitude towards Eusebius is also striking. For George, he was totally objectionable, a devotee of Origen and an adherent of Arius, as well as chronologically misguided. In Theophanes, although one error is noted (AM 5827) and his doctrinal instability admitted (AM 5829), the latter criticism is qualified since Eusebius has just been praised for attacking opponents of Christ's divinity and his rejection of Arian views is upheld by reference to Socrates. Most significantly, in AM 5818, Eusebius' defence of the Nicene creed is recorded as well as the testimony attributed to Athanasius that he accepted the term 'consubstantial'; Athanasius more than outweighs Theodoret, who is cited as a link between Eusebius and Arians.

A limited survey of the translation (focused on non-Eusebian passages) suggests that this is pretty accurate. There are inevitably niggles: φονικώτερος 'murderous' (436.8, Mosshammer) is distinguished from φονικώτατος 'bloodthirsty' (437.14), as is γνώμῃ 'instance' (443.8) from γνώμην 'will' (465.24) in similar contexts; βασιλεύει (437.15) is, misleadingly, translated as (succeeded to) 'the principate', in contrast to 'was emperor' for ἐβασίλευεν (436.7), and 'principate' is also used for ἀρχὴν (474.3) as opposed to the more common 'rule', 'power', or 'empire' (467.14, 312.24, 465.23). For σπουδαῖος (436.15) 'commitment/enthusiasm' is preferable to 'considerate', and provides a better explanation of the subsequent military revolt; for τυραννήσας (437.20) 'set himself up as usurper' is better than 'as tyrant'; ἱεροῖς (445.15–16) is omitted; 'betrayal' for προδοσίαν (466.12) represents what happened better than 'surrender', as does 'captured' for χειρωσάμενος (470.5) rather than 'vanquished'; 'Portus by Rome' is more accurate than 'in Rome' for κατὰ (438.7). Such things are a reminder that, as ever, the text should not be forgotten, even though this very impressive volume will be the version of George consulted by most people in the first instance.

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS?

S. HODKINSON: *Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta*. Pp. xiii + 498, maps, ills. London/Swansea: Duckworth/Classical Press of Wales, 2000. Cased, £48. ISBN: 0-7156-4030-7.

The Spartans were not equal. They had no pool of state-registered farms, assigned to individuals for life. They were not banned from buying and selling. They were not forbidden to possess gold and silver coinage (except in the early fourth century B.C.).

At the outset of his book, Stephen Hodkinson traces the extraordinary hold exerted over the modern imagination by the fraudulent portrayal of Spartans as self-denying, egalitarian, even communistic. A few earlier sceptics, such as Voltaire, perceived the inequalities. Almost no one, however, least of all professional historians, has doubted that there was a Lykourgan land division, Grote being an honourable exception. Since Nazism and communism both held up Sparta as a paragon, the belief in Spartan equality remained unshaken in the twentieth century.

Chapter 2 shows how this idealization developed. Herodotos clearly refers to rich

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.397 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Spartans; Thucydides says they modified their lifestyle to blend in with the rest. Xenophon is the first to refer to a ban on gainful activity, Polybios the first to mention equal landholdings. Aristotle criticized flaws inherent in the system, but was ignored; others attributed Sparta's decline to recent moral corruption. The idea of equality derives mainly from propaganda surrounding the third-century reforms of Agis and Kleomenes. Lykourgos's abolition of debt appears first in Plutarch's life of those kings; his land division, and the invented *rhetra* of Epitadeus, emerge from the same milieu. Plutarch's Spartan writings crystallized the misconception of Sparta for later generations.

Four chapters cover the property system. Archaic and classical Spartans had unequal, private landholdings that they could give away or bequeath. Inheritance was partible, daughters perhaps receiving half as much as sons. Marriage practices such as brothers sharing one wife minimized the dispersal of inheritances. The obscure 'ancient portion' was (following Lazenby) not a kind of land but the helots' tribute. Land ownership cannot have remained unchanged; there must have been a redistribution, perhaps of newly acquired land, to poorer citizens in the seventh or sixth century.

Helots were not state slaves but a self-reproducing population. Spartans may have been able to transfer ownership, but would normally keep helot families on a farm permanently, even if it, and they, changed hands because of inheritance. Some helots cultivated the fragmented holdings of more than one landowner; elsewhere, especially in Messenia, several families farmed one large estate. Like Spartans, helots were not homogeneous. Though not sharecropper tenants, they paid a fixed share of produce as rent. The Pseudo-Platonic *Alkibiades I* shows that fourth-century farms were typically larger than in Attica and had mixed economies. They covered wide areas of Laconia and Messenia, perhaps extending into perioikic territory (though some settlements regarded by H. as perioikic were, I think, non-perioikic dependent settlements of Sparta).

Chapter 5 reviews evidence for private possessions and the uses of movable wealth. Sparta was not unusual in not minting coins. Iron currency may have been traditional before 404, but iron spits are first found in Plutarch; weights of iron are more likely. Iron currency did not entail isolationism; there was an exchange rate. Some state payments involved foreign currency, and individuals possessed foreign coin and bullion before the futile ban of 404. Spartans were relatively uninvolved in commerce, but not immune to profit. Market exchange of agricultural surpluses was indispensable, and those with large flocks of animals often turned them into cash. Monetary and non-monetary transactions coexisted.

Chapter 6 examines public rights over private property. Spartans paid *eisphorai* like Athenians, but these may also have applied to non-Spartiate land (H. thinks of perioikic land, but I doubt that *perioikoi* paid tribute; might it be kings' land?). Mess contributions were high; a citizen contributed far more than he could consume. The resulting surplus supported the army on campaign, the boys' messes, and guests, but not helots or poor Spartans. Social symbolism, not redistribution, was the purpose of mess dues; the same goes for the entitlement to borrow another man's helots or animals, and for the (regulated) stealing practised by boys.

The next part of the book is an innovative examination of the uses of private wealth. Full Spartiates, by definition, had enough land to pay their dues. We find nothing comparable to Athenian liturgies, though the rich sometimes provided cavalry horses. Restrictions extended to clothing—boys did not literally have just one garment a year, but neither did they accumulate a wardrobe to suit different seasons. Public

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.397 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nudity was not employed significantly more than in other *poleis*. Private festivities existed, but after the archaic period the *syssition* promoted equal consumption and individual contributions to the table were modest. Standardized armour and haircuts were fifth-century innovations. Women's athletic training, though not uniquely Spartan, seems unusually emphasized. Weddings became low-key.

This picture of increasing restraint clarifies the nature of 'Spartan austerity': a restriction on the display of wealth, not its possession. Lavish burials ceased in Sparta by *c*. 600, and during *c*. 550–*c*. 200 there are no identifiable burials at all. Funeral rituals were curbed, and male burials lacked non-perishable grave-goods, though H. shows that this is only a stronger version of the austerity seen elsewhere. The ban on gravestones for those who did not die in battle ruled out only inscriptions in Laconia, not tomb commemoration in general. The *en polemôi* gravestones found in Laconia commemorate soldiers buried abroad, who sometimes received lavish monuments where they fell. There is no evidence for differentiation between rich and poor women's burials. After the archaic period, only kings received elaborate funerals.

Chapter 9 examines wealth deployed through dedications, using bronzes as a pilot study. Warning us against reading art simplistically as an index of social change, H. tabulates known votives. Only at Artemis Orthia and the Menelaion do they decline markedly after *c*. 550. This roughly coincides with the peak in dedications of lead figurines, though these were not simply a cheap substitute. The decline also parallels developments in other *poleis*. At other Spartan sanctuaries, bronzes continued to be dedicated until the early fourth century. The sixth-century fall in dedications of jewellery is also seen elsewhere in Greece. The rise in statuettes and similar votives on the acropolis, probably including women's dedications, emphasizes *polis* ideology. The late archaic period sees the rise of athletic and equestrian victory dedications. Wealthy Spartans also evaded social restraints by dedicating expensive votives outside Laconia.

H. next investigates competition further. The famous Damonon stele flouts convention, but is unique. Equestrian success at Olympia concentrates in the later fifth and early fourth centuries. Increasing élite interest in horse racing and especially horse breeding reflects economic differentiation, but the absence of epinician poetry reflects the suppression of individual fame. Victory monuments are found at the place of competition, not in Sparta. The élite, however, was now more assertive *vis-à-vis* the kings, provoking Agesilaos's promotion of his sister Kyniska. He unwisely reinforced an élitist conception of the kingship.

Chapter 11 investigates the use of wealth in social and political relations. The sources record patronage by Spartans towards their servants (e.g. *mothônes*), *perioikoi*, and poorer Spartans (e.g. *mothakes*). *Xenia* with foreigners was exploited by ambitious men, but was the mainstay of the Peloponnesian league. The Spartan upbringing was far from egalitarian in its operation. While we cannot be sure Spartans took more bribes than others, patronage and friendship were important for careers, particularly in late classical times.

H. then models the size and calorific needs of Spartiate households. Their outgoings were low. An average Spartan owned *c*. 18 ha, a large estate by Greek standards. Helots numbered *c*. 162,000–187,000, but each family had less than 4 ha. Such meagre holdings could be made viable only by strategies such as house sharing, the use of dependent labour, mixed economies, and exploiting wild resources. Both helot and Spartan societies created inequality; those at the bottom of either heap became a destabilizing force.

Finally, H. suggests that the decline in Spartiate numbers and the élite stranglehold on land were exacerbated by the earthquake of *c*. 464, whose effect on land ownership

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.397 Published online by Cambridge University Press

was more important than its demographic impact. The need to draft helots into the phalanx a generation later implies that their labour was now surplus to requirements because of changed land use and increasing estate size. Overseas campaigns and new sources of wealth accentuated the trends. By the early fourth century Sparta was a plutocracy, the élite ignoring their obligation to society. Unlike their archaic predecessors, poor Spartans could not enforce change. Sparta's contribution to political theory was only an idealized, invented tradition of egalitarian austerity.

H. has refined his earlier challenges to the Spartan stereotype and augmented them with studies of material culture. The treatment of evidence is exemplary. Analytical methods are drawn from many disciplines, such as demography, geomorphology, and social anthropology. A wide range of crucial problems in Spartan history (not all of which can be mentioned here) receive illuminating and convincing treatment. H.'s 220,000-word *tour de force* not only forces us to think differently about Sparta, but serves as a manual for how to research social change in Greece.

University of Leicester GRAHAM SHIPLEY

OSTRACISM

P. SIEWERT (ed.): *Ostrakismos-Testimonien I. Die Zeugnisse antiker Autoren, der Inschriften und Ostraka über das athenische Scherbengericht aus vorhellenistischer Zeit (487–322 v. Chr.)*. (Historia Einzelschriften 155.) Pp. 555, ills. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002. Cased, €100. ISBN: 3-515-07947-5.

The genesis of this enterprise, as its *Vorwort* explains, brings Viennese scholarship on Athenian ostracism a pleasing full-circle back to its Raubitschekian origins. In 1980, Siewert inherited from A. E. Raubitschek (1912–1999) the residue of four decades of work, by himself and Eugene Vanderpool, on the institution; five years later, a *Gastsemester* by Raubitschek in his alma mater brought about the formation of a research group whose labours are reflected, in part, in the present volume. (*Testimonien II*, covering the post-classical material, is in [slow] progress, S. kindly informs me.) Besides the editor himself and his four principal collaborators, Stefan Brenne, Birgitta Eder, Herbert Heftner, and Walter Scheidel, there are named contributions from Peter Grimanis, Wolfgang Hameter, Katharina Knibbe, Norbert Loidol, Christa Mayer, Bernhard Palme, Christina Papasatamati-von Moock, Philipp Stefanek, and Hans Taeuber.

What these fourteen scholars proffer is not ostracism for beginners. Students (and others) coming to the topic as novices should still—in the anglophone world at any rate—aim to get their preliminary bearings from Douglas MacDowell's entry in the *OCD* (s.v.), and then dig deeper with the help of David Phillips' survey in G. H. R. Horsley (ed.), *Hellenika* (North Ryde, 1982), pp. 21–43, and Harold Mattingly's article 'The Practice of Ostracism at Athens' in *Antichthon* 25 (1991), 1–26. Professional scholars, for their part, will know Alain Martin's *bibliographie raisonnée* in *REG* 102 (1989), 124–145. They will also know that time has marched on, bringing in this instance the publication of more ostraka and the need (*vis-à-vis* the Kerameikos) to publish still more. This volume meets that need (see below), but also juxtaposes specimens from the burgeoning mass of actual ostraka—*c*. 11,000 to date—with a comprehensive presentation of the literary evidence.

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.397 Published online by Cambridge University Press