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/53.2.400 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Forty-one items of evidence which fall before the death of Aristotle accordingly appear here, with translation, context, and commentary, as *Teil III* (T2–T42 = pp. 167–478), *die sonstigen Testimonien.* (A further two texts, P. Oxy. 2637 and Hesychius [etc.] on the supposed legislator Kerameus, are relegated to the status of *pseudo-Testimonien* (pp. 510–17) by rejecting modern claims, shown to be falsified and/or ill-founded, abour their bearing on ostracism.) Except for T4 (with figs 10–12), the Ashmolean's red-figure bowl from the 460s which appears to depict the counting of ostraka, all are literary. The order is rigidly chronological in respect of the source itself, from Pindar's *Seventh Pythian* to [Demosthenes] 26. This rules out a diachronic treatment of the actual subject-matter, and it calls for much cross-referencing (duly provided) if one is to aggregate the data on, say, the ostracism of Themistokles (T3, T8, T15, T25, T27). Much-discussed passages like Androtion *FGrH* 324 F6 (T31) and ?Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 22 (T39) rub shoulders with less familiar material, and even adepts in the (source-)chronology of the classical period may need to bookmark the relevant section (pp. 9–12) of the *Inhaltsverzeichnis*—especially for an item such as T26, the 'Themistokles Decree', where a dating of *c*. 370–350 (placing it between Plato's *Gorgias* and Demosthenes 23) is scarcely self-evident. Periodic overviews, on [Andocides] 4 (T18–21) and on Aristotle and the *Ath. Pol.* (T34–41), are a welcome bonus in this multi-authored section.

Before it, a single author, Stefan Brenne of Tübingen, fills *Teil II* (pp. 36–166, introduced by its own, subsidiary *Inhaltsverzeichnis*) with 'T1'; this is how S. and his colleagues have chosen to refer to the ostraka themselves. (Ostraka, as S. notes on p. 32, are *praktisch unzerstörbar*. The Athenians, unlike the Syracusans [Diod. Sic. 11.87], did posterity a favour in preferring potsherds to leaves. For illustrations see figs 1–9.) But subdivision, unsurprisingly, is necessitated. 'T1' actually becomes T1/1 to T1/164, and even T1/1 itself is not a single datum but instead what many users of this section, and indeed of the volume as a whole, will find its most valuable component: an alphabetical dossier (pp. 43–71) of all known ostracism 'candidates', about seventy of them in all, with figures (Agora, Kerameikos, and the occasional '*sonst.*' separately) for the numbers of preserved ostraka cast against them, and succinct bibliographical resumes appended. By contrast with this, T1/2–23 and T1/24–34 present one individual at a time but sometimes more than once—because here the organizing principles are thematic: 'Verbindungen zwischen Ostraka' and 'handschriftliche Übereinstimmungen', respectively. So it is not until T1/35 that there begins (under the heading of *Zusatzbemerkungen*) a long sequence of discrete ostraka *qua* texts. Here non-specialists can benefit from Brenne's intimate knowledge of this material in general and (summarized at pp. 40–3) the Kerameikos finds in particular, dozens of which are published here for the first time; and Brenne subjoins to the texts themselves a section (pp. 148–66) of *systematische Betrachtung*, under forty-nine summary heads which flag up overall terminological and substantive issues (e.g. medism and *Tyrannisverdacht*). The richness and diversity of this material is striking, even to those like me who have tried to keep generally abreast of developments in this field, and Brenne's scholarly overviews are likely to stimulate further study and speculation in all sorts of areas. More will surely be said, for example, on the intriguing 'Hunger' (Λιμός) ostraka, now seven in number (T1/75–81 here), and dating apparently from 471—that being, of course, the date assigned to the *Grosse Kerameikos-Fund* as a whole. Is Limos a personified abstraction, which these voters wished to see their city rid of, or a personal name? When Brenne and Franz Willemsen published the first of the group, Λιμός Εὐπ{ρ}ατρίδες (*AM* 106 [1991], 153), no precedent for Limos as a personal name existed, but it was subsequently construed as such by Michael Osborne

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.400 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and Sean Byrne in *LGPN* ii (s.v.). However, Willemsen himself (*ap.* R. Thomsen, *The Origin of Ostracism* [Copenhagen, 1972], p. 104 n. 342) had already championed the alternative, and Brenne here presents a measured case for this. To my mind the case convinces, but there is probably more to be said either way; and if this is, as suggested, a personification, one would very much like to know what was, or was deemed to be, *hochwohlgeborener* (T1/75 alone) about it. Other puzzles include: whether *Βόῶν Κάσōνος Θορικοῖ οἰκôν* (T1/39) was a metic (cf. generally D. Whitehead, *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic* [Cambridge, 1977], 31–2, 72–5) or simply someone having his citizenship impugned; the meaning and implications of *δημοτεύτης* (T1/44); why Leagros deserved the epithets *βάσκανος* (T1/72) and *μέλας* (T1/73); what Megakles had to do with 'Rhoikos' (T1/86), why he was not to go to Eretria (T1/94), and what was objectionable about his (?)new hairstyle (T1/107–108); the meaning and implications of *ἀφελής* (T1/119–130), and much else about Menon Menekleidou of Gargettos; and the identity (Themistokles? Xanthippos?) of 'Xanthias the kithara-player' (T1/151–2).

Surrounding these two substantive parts of the volume are two others: *Teil I* (pp. 25–35), which is S.'s own, introductory *Forschungsgeschichte*, and *Teil IV* (pp. 479–509), where S., Heftner, and Scheidel ruminate to advantage on various general aspects of this pre-Hellenistic testimony. Underpinning the project as a whole is a core bibliography (pp. 17–24, with addenda pp. 518–20); it has missed very little demanded by its purposes, and individual contributors naturally cite a broader range of material where the need arises. (See, for example, Brenne at p. 99 n. 104 on the religious/ritual aspects of ostracism.) The volume ends with a convenient *Zeittafel* (p. 521; Kimon's alleged premature return from ostracism in the 450s [T28] is there but, oddly, not the ostracism itself, for which see T19 and T25) and laudably lavish indexing. All in all, then, a valuable resource-bank and *vade mecum* for serious work on this perennially fascinating phenomenon.

The Queen's University of Belfast DAVID WHITEHEAD

ANTIDEMOCRATIC IDEOLOGY IN ATHENS

T. MORAWETZ: *Der Demos als Tyrann und Banause. Aspekte antidemokratischer Polemik im Athen des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* Pp. 186. Frankfurt am Main, etc.: Peter Lang. Paper, £22. ISBN: 3-631-35591-2.

This lightly revised Munich dissertation addresses two related aspects of anti-democratic propaganda at Athens: representation of the typical member of the demos as *banausos*, and the equation of the demos with a tyrant, since both enjoy the capacity to do or live as they please. Morawetz identifies the former as a fourth-century development, and argues that the *banausos*, lacking leisure, military capability, and, indeed, given his economic dependence, genuine freedom, is an ideological construct that served as the antithesis to a positive self-assessment among the élite, rather than corresponding closely to any social or economic reality.

The second aspect is a more complicated story: for M., the identification of demos and tyrant originated in criticism of the new radical democracy, expressed first in veiled form with reference to unruly individuals and then with increasing directness, so that by the time of Pericles' pre-eminence, there is talk both of a tyranny of the demos

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.400 Published online by Cambridge University Press