400. H. follows Dover and Andrewes in identifying a couple of contemporary allusions in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae*, probably performed only weeks before the coup, and then the constitutional college of thirty, the proposal for a council of 5000 and finally the disempowerment of the *ekklesia* in favour of the 400. This introduces the second excursus, on the so-called 'present constitution' and 'future presentation' (*Athenaion Politeia*, Chapters 30 and 31), which have to be related to the 'political reality' described by Thucydides. H. accepts that both documents came into existence at the same time and as part of one concept, a rather conservative 'present constitution' with the oligarchic 400 in control and a more moderate 'future constitution' with the 5000 including the two upper classes with the element of sortition for office to satisfy the disempowered *demos*. The downfall of the 400 is followed in the third chapter, through the failure of oligarchic agitation on Samos, the establishment there of a strong democratic consensus, and the repeated peace-missions from oligarchs at Athens to Sparta. This too is standard fare, but H. does show how Thucydides' scheme to explain the Peloponnesian War, through opposition between convinced democrats against oligarchs, is too simple: Athenians changed political sides to seek their own advantage, with independence as preferable to agreement with a regime. Alkibiades is the classic example, but the overthrow of the 400 is also relevant since it was not their political views but the treasonable construction of the fort at the Piraeus, a bridgehead for the Spartans, which prompted Athenians to rise against them.

The last chapter finally discusses the character of the constitution of the 5000, and whether it was ever implemented. H. weighs the different scholarly views carefully and analytically, tending to side with the *communis opinio* of Rhodes, Andrewes, and Bleckmann against the arguments of de St Croix and Gallucci, with the 5000 as a rather conservative *Hoplitespoliteia* rather than a *de facto* restoration of democracy. Finally, he tries to reconcile the two camps by seeing the council of 5000 as the governing institution, but with the *demos* retaining sovereignty by having the right to take a vote on the proposals.

H.'s conclusion is a clear and elegant summary of the previous discussions, so that the reader who wishes to avoid the density and technicality of some of the earlier chapters might focus on this part. Here H. also places the 400 in its historical context, making connections with the oligarchic coup in 404 when the distinctness of the political views were more developed and oligarchs as well as democrats had learned from their 'mistakes'.

H. has not come up with any revolutionary ideas on the 400, but has produced a thorough and competent overview over the state of research on all aspects of the 400. It is the comprehensiveness of his treatment which gives it value, since other scholars have tended to focus on specific aspects. His treatment of evidence is meticulous and his review of scholarly debates judicious.

University of Cologne INGO WITZKE

ADOPTION IN ATHENS

P. Cobetto Ghiggia: *L'adozione ad Atene in epoca classica*. Pp. vi + 371. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1999. Paper, L. 45,000. ISBN: 88-7694-372-2.

G. addresses the origins, history, procedure, and complications of adoption in classical Greece, mostly in fourth-century Athens, where forensic speeches yield by far

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.129 Published online by Cambridge University Press

most of our accessible data. In a preface he acknowledges the recent seminal work of Lene Rubinstein, and goes on to make his own way with a wider focus, including accounts of adoptions in myth and the Great Law Code of Gortyna. In general, he opposes to Rubinstein's view of adoption as essentially private and familial an insistence that the city has an abiding concern for the preservation of each and every *oikos*. In the main body of his text (but not in the footnotes) he translates into Italian all Greek passages at issue. Words such as *οἶκος*, *κλῆρος*, *εὐθυδικία*, and *διαμαρτυρία*, where a single word translation can only mislead, he transliterates or prints in Greek.

He begins (and ends on p. 316 with the phrase 'diretto ecale') with the *oikos*: it was a family in its widest sense, and its existence and authority were both prior to that of the *πόλις*. Adoption assured an *oikos* of a legitimate descent. For an *oikos* to continue to exist as a viable legal and economic entity in its relations with the *polis*, and above all in matters of religion, a male head of household was indispensable. Where nature was wanting, society contrived.

Chapter 1 explains testament and adoption, comments on recent work by Alberto Maffi, and discusses at length a law attributed to Solon and preserved variously in the Demosthenic corpus, Isaeus, Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia*, Plutarch, and Hypereides. Chapter 2 looks to columns X and XI in the Great Law Code of Gortyna for possible analogies. The oscillating identity of *ἐπιβάλλοντες* is noted, along with limitations on the rights of the adopted son. The actual adoption at Gortyna is simple and effected by announcement to the assembled people, quite different from the complex procedures at Athens. Chapter 3 presents excerpts from the *Suda*, Hesychius, *Etymologicum Magnum*, Harpocration, and the *Lexicon Seguerianum* showing a variety and some uncertainties of terms having to do with adoption in antiquity (e.g. *ἀποκήρυκτος* and *ἐγκάθετος*). Chapter 4, on the process of adoption, first surveys in detail who was, who was not, and who might be adoptable. G. posits three early stages of development in procedure: (i) archaic: a simple statement of intent sufficed, requiring no formalities; (ii) Solonian: Athenians have defined by law those who can adopt; adoption is still a private affair; and (iii) reform of Kleisthenes: phratry and deme become factors in the process (pp. 85–6). These last as factors in an adoption *inter vivos* lead to examination of the Demotionidai decree, where G. avails himself of recent studies by Charles Hedrick, Stephen Lambert, and David Whitehead. He reasons that to a degree participation of both phratry and deme are required for such adoptions. (The phrase *inter vivos* may at first glance seem superfluous, but it distinguishes this mode of adoption from the two others in use at Athens, namely testamentary and posthumous.)

G. analyzes instances of adoption *inter vivos* in Chapter 5 (Isaeus 2, *On the Estate of Menekles*, and 7, *On the Estate of Apollodoros*, Demosthenes 41, *Against Spudias*, Plutarch, *Themistocles* 32.1–3, Scholium, Aristophanes, *Ranae* 541, *Suda* s.v. *Δημάδης*^{3}, 416, 1–5); testamentary adoption in Chapter 6 (Isaeus 1, *On the Estate of Kleonymos*, 3, *On the Estate of Pyrrhos*, 4, *On the Estate of Nikostratos*, 5, *On the Estate of Dikaiogenes*, and 9, *On the Estate of Astyphilos*); and in Chapter 7, posthumous adoptions (Isaeus 8, *On the Estate of Kiro*, 44, [Demosthenes], *Against Leochares*, Isaeus 10, *On the Estate of Aristarchos*, 6, *On the Estate of Philoktemon*, 11, *On the Estate of Hagnias*, [Demosthenes] 43, *Against Makartatos*). G. provides a stemma at the head of each study, where he can.

Chapter 8, 'Conclusions', begins with hypothetical relationships behind the actions represented in [Demosthenes] 58, *Against Theokrines*, and 42, *Against Phainippos*. G. then offers reasons to view adoption *inter vivos* and posthumous adoption as serving the same end, namely to continue an *oikos*. The fact that in the latter case the adopter

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.129 Published online by Cambridge University Press

was dead was of no real importance so far as the city was concerned. These two, he believes, would have been the earliest modes of adoption, followed in time by testamentary adoption.

The bibliography is full and current. Documentation and footnotes, which in small print occupy more than half of many pages, are ample. The indexes are of sources cited, of laws and topics, and of persons. In that of laws and topics I miss e.g. *δικαστήριον*, the final arbiter of disputed cases of adoption, and *γηροτροφία*, a principal reason, some have felt, to undertake an adoption *inter vivos*.

Amherst College ALAN L. BOEGEHOLD

THE TOPOGRAPHY OF SPARTA

E. KOURINOU: *Σπάρτη: συμβολὴ στὴ μνημειακὴ τοπογραφία της* (*διδακτορικὴ διατριβή*) (*Ἡ μεγάλη βιβλιοθήκη*). Pp. xv + 296, pls. Athens: Horos, 2000. Paper, €60. ISBN: 960-85691-1-7.

Combining analysis of ancient sources with first-hand knowledge of rescue excavations carried out by the Greek Archaeological Service since the 1960s, Eleni Kourinou here revises many earlier points of Spartan topography and adds important new elements. After a valuable review of earlier work, a note on the physical environment, and a historical overview, the core of the book covers the city's defences and the organization of its space. Each subsection quotes the relevant ancient sources and reviews relevant travellers' reports and archaeological data. An *index locorum* is provided, together with topographical indexes (there is no general index), and the volume closes with a twelve-page summary in English.

Although Sparta acquired defences in the late fourth century, they were probably perishable since Justin's testimony is as yet unsupported by physical remains. Further temporary structures were probably erected in the first half of the third century. Since a permanent wall existed by 218, Livy's reference to the *tyranni* who fortified the city points to Kleomenes III as its builder. The first regulation of the city's water supply and drainage probably took place at the same time. Nabis strengthened the wall with a moat and palisade, and extended the circuit to the south. Philopoimen destroyed or breached the wall in 188, but it was rebuilt a few years later. Stamped tiles commemorate a major renovation programme in the first century B.C. Written and circumstantial evidence points to six city gates, though no archaeological evidence has yet come to light (K. convincingly modifies previous interpretations). In the third or fourth century A.D. the adjacent hills of Palaiokastro and the classical acropolis to its west were fortified separately.

The thorny problem of Sparta's bridges receives helpful clarification. Xenophon's bridge over the Eurotas was on the same spot as the one built by Eurykles in Augustan times, later repaired by Julius Paulinus, and replaced in the eleventh century by Nikodemos's bridge. Two bridges were built over the Magoulitsa ravine on the south-west side of the city: one reported by Leake, the other, further west, inferred from the existence of a south-west gate. A northern bridge must have crossed the Mousga ravine, but may have been a wooden structure.

As to Sparta's four villages (discounting the outlier Amyklai), the locations of Pitane (in the west and north-west of the city, including the acropolis) and Limnai (in the east) are known precisely, those of Mesoa (in the south and south-west) and Kynosoura (in the south-east, along the west bank of the Magoulitsa) less so. Burials,

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.129 Published online by Cambridge University Press