dispute both among ancient Greek historians and in the wider academic community over the precise definition and applicability of the concept of 'state': see recently, for example, Michael J. Braddock's *State Formation in Early Modern England, c. 1550–1700* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 11–20, for a discussion of a number of possible definitions (plural) . . . H. at all events is still not entirely free of what a hostile critic might want to label 'statism' (e.g. in his views on 'sovereignty', p. 28; contrast M. Berent, 'Sovereignty: Ancient and Modern', *POLIS* 17 [2000], 2–34), although he is now prepared to concede that 'it can no longer be claimed that a state is a state and that, in principle, all states are equal' (p. 613; cf. his general comment on the necessary artificiality of all conceptual grids, p. 600). Yet more acceptable, to me anyhow, is the claim that 'the defining characteristic of a city-state is . . . self-government' (p. 19), even where a city-state is also dependent politically on a more powerful entity (p. 618 n. 45). I, though, would lay more stress than he does (p. 608, but see p. 165) on citizenship as a (or the) criterion of differentiation among city-state cultures; this is one of a number of key themes that can be pursued through the most helpful 'General Index' (pp. 624–5).

As for the notion of a 'city-state culture' or 'city-state civilization', it is conceded that the precise identification of such is 'always a matter of definition' (p. 22), but the—defensible—point of trying to define or identify one is to distinguish between a city-state culture and what is usually called a 'territorial' state, or macro-state. For H., in other words, size does matter (see e.g. p. 601); the city-state is by definition a micro-state, and the governing maxim or ideal is that small is beautiful. That does not quite square with the mass of the book under review, perhaps, but its onlie begetter would doubtless have no difficulty or hesitation in excogitating a suitable, and speedy, defence of its appropriateness in this particular case. Not the weakest of his arguments, presumably, would be the observation that the modern form of political culture in macro-states today has its roots in the decision-making by majority verdict practised in the ancient city-state cultures (p. 612), not least those of the Hellenic and Roman worlds.

Faculty of Classics, University of Cambridge PAUL CARTLEDGE

RE-IMAGINING ATHENS

MARK MUNN: *The School of History. Athens in the Age of Socrates.* Pp. xii + 525, maps, figs. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 2000. Cased, £23.50. ISBN: 0-520-21557-5.

EDWARD E. COHEN: *The Athenian Nation.* Pp. xx + 250. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000. Cased, £25. ISBN: 0-691-04842-8.

What probably was, in all likelihood; what must have been, without a doubt: two books on Athens of the fifth and fourth centuries, very different in the questions they ask and the manner of argument, each of them finding a way to contribute, significantly, to a crowded field.

Munn begins with Thucydides, and the desire to find what the historian had '*in common* with his contemporaries' (p. xi), and comes back to him at the end: his history was not the product of anomalous genius, but grew out of widespread cultural and political tendencies. Thucydides, then, is less the subject than the goal; his history turns out to be an example of the Athenian desire, evident already in tellings of the

© Classical Association, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.314 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tyrannicide and the Persian War battles, to understand the present (and for M.'s Thucydides that present is the Corinthian War) by reconsidering and, increasingly, setting down in written form significant events of the past. Hence, *The School of History*. It is in this context, and toward this end, that M. builds his political and cultural history of late fifth-century Athens. The first section, 'The Spirit of Democratic Athens, 510–415', examines Athenian use and reuse of three culturally defining events: the tyrannicide, and the battles of Marathon and Salamis. In the second, 'The Crisis of Athens, 415–403', we might lose sight of M.'s larger goals in the detailed narrative account; but this will certainly remain the most influential and oft-cited section of the book. No one will want to consider the career of Alcibiades henceforth without recourse to M., and the Persian influences throughout the latter stages of the war receive deserved attention. The third section, 'Resurrecting Athens, 403–395', brings us to the eve of the Corinthian War, with topical treatments taking the place of narrative. Along with the discussion of Thucydides, there is brief consideration here of the trial of Socrates as an illustration of Athenian unwillingness to tolerate one who places himself above the written law.

For whom is the book intended and, related to that, for whom is it suited? The specialist will find conclusions to query on almost every page; conveniently, M. himself supplies all the critical apparatus needed to make those queries. (Endnotes, four appendices, full bibliography, and excellent indices, general and *locorum*, constitute over a third of the volume.) M. acknowledges (as on p. 96) that his interpretations often enter the realm of speculation, and offers no apology, claiming instead that his interpretative flights will have been useful if they draw new attention to the questions he addresses. Agreed, but what of the general reader, attracted by the Raphael on the cover, and the name of Socrates in the subtitle? They will find the book eminently accessible: all Greek is transliterated and translated, notes are discreetly relegated to the end of each paragraph, and M. even apologizes (p. 264) for material that might seem 'essential only to specialists'. Throughout, the argument often suppresses the obelus of critical uncertainty in the interests of uninterrupted text. (See e.g. p. 283, for five statements of likelihood and probability in an eight-line paragraph.) M. knows what he's about and invites challenges, but there is a danger in putting these conclusions, and this form of argument, into the hands of the uninitiated. Take, for example, his discussion of Thucydides' tyrannicide digression in Book 6 (pp. 114–18). In the reference to knowing about the tyrannicide by hearing, *epistamenos* suggests precise understanding, and must therefore refer to a written source, which 'can only be the account of Herodotus'. M. factors in Plutarch's report that Herodotus once, for some unknown reason, received a public reward on the proposal of the orator Anytus, and concludes that Herodotus' account of the tyrannicide was widely known because it had been introduced as expert testimony in the crisis of 415. Thus, Anytus with his proposal, and Herodotus with his history, contributed to the recall of Alcibiades from Sicily. But an oblique reference to Anytus in *Thesmophoriazusae* 809 (if we accept the emendations of Maas and Küster) reveals that the orator soon fell out of public favor, a sign that Athenians had come to regret their treatment of Alcibiades five years earlier. This is extreme, but not entirely uncharacteristic of M.'s ingenious use of sources. The stakes are higher, for M.'s overall argument at least, in his claims about the composition of Thucydides' history. M. concludes that the history is 'a deliberative brief composed to instruct officers and members of the Athenian Council as they devised policy to present to the Athenian *demos* and its allies facing war again with Sparta in 396–395. . . . As such, it is part of a tradition of expertise, committed to writing, placed at the service of the Athenian democracy' (p. 323). Thucydides' work is

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.314 Published online by Cambridge University Press

thus a longer and more literary example of the *syngraphai* that had been appearing with increasing frequency and importance throughout the Peloponnesian War. M. bases this conclusion not only on his construction of Athenian literacy, but also on new readings of Thucydides' own programmatic statements (primarily 1.22.1 and 4). Once again, not all will be convinced, and the tender might be misled, but it is a dull reader indeed who will not be provoked by M.'s arguments.

Cohen's is a more streamlined treatise, an argument in six chapters against the 'relatively recent obsession with Athens as polis' that has caused us to ignore 'the overwhelming majority of the permanent population resident in Attika' (p. 9). As in his last book (*Athenian Economy and Society: a Banking Perspective* [Princeton, 1992]), C. relies heavily on evidence from the lawcourts, and not surprisingly, given C.'s proven expertise in the area both in and out of the academy, arguments turn often on economics.

Contrarian exercises like this one run the risk of devolving into negativity. C.'s polemic is saved from that by his constant and careful recourse to ancient sources, and by his steady focus on his own alternative explanations. Chapter I, beginning with considerations of ancient usage of the words *polis* and *ethnos* (neither described Athens neatly), ends with scrutiny of the (still) underappreciated rôle of women in Athens. While C. does not take them out of the *oikos*, he does elevate the *oikos* to new heights of social, political, and especially economic significance. That focus on the *oikos* economy recurs in Chapter V, where C. argues that slaves were indeed able to maintain their own property, and even become quite wealthy. Those who have denied this are blinded by their preconceived notions of slavery from seeing the 'plain meaning' of the texts. Strong words, but justified by his readings. Two related chapters (II and III) take on 'the shibboleth that Athenian *politai* constituted an impenetrable group of scions of *politai*, an autochthonous club sealed forever by doubly endogamous barriers . . .' (p. 63). Instead, citizenship was available to those born of *astoi* ('locals'), not just *politai*, and the two terms are indeed different. Long-term permanent residents of Attika could, thus, become politically integrated, despite their non-autochthonous stock. Chapter IV takes on the 'Modern Myth' that Athens was village-like, where all knew each other and each other's business. The evidence suggests, on the contrary, that even within demes there was considerable confusion about identity, background, and personal property. Finally, Chapter VI takes issue with the current political interpretation of sexuality. Joining Davidson, whose work appears often in the notes, and Kurke, whose latest reconfiguring of sex and politics was too late for consideration, C. describes a sexual marketplace driven by economics and personal inclination, rather than political entitlements and prohibitions. Thus, even slaves enjoyed legal protection from sexual aggression, and even citizens engaged in prostitution.

This is a tremendously learned (no question about the audience for this one), largely persuasive, and provocatively new view of fourth-century Athenian society. Two options, as I see it, are available to those who would, and undoubtedly will, respond: either to return to the individual passages and words on which C. builds his Athens, or else to emphasize the limitations, chronological and ideological, of the speeches that generate most of those passages. Bibliography is impressively full, indices both general and *locorum*. C. has given us a healthy correction, not an alarm that we should liquidate our holdings in the Athenian *polis*, but a strong recommendation that we substantially diversify our investment in it.

University of Missouri DAVID J. SCHENKER

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.314 Published online by Cambridge University Press