relatives, repair of existing monuments, aqueducts, streets, baths, public works in general, etc. The eighth chapter consists in a series of ten self-contained discussions of the evidence S. has adduced. The themes of these discussions include aesthetics, morals, *liberalitas*, religion, quality of life, ideology/politics, and social status of the writer.

As noted above, this book is a valuable work. It is incredibly useful to be able to gauge the reception of any one particular monument or type of building activity across all the authors who have written about it. The discussion of Augustus' forum (pp. 62–9), for example, brings together the *Res Gestae*, Ovid, Pliny the Elder, Velleius Paterculus, Virgil, Suetonius, Dio, and SHA. But what pleases comes at a price. The book's determined focus on chronology and projects of individual emperors does not make for an enticing narrative thrust. Also, the presentation of the testimonia contiguously necessarily decontextualizes them and places side by side evidence from contexts that have widely diverging objectives (consider, for example, SHA and Velleius together). But to be fair, there surely was no other way, and the reader should regard this book as one to consult. Three indices (literary sources, ancient persons, and general subject [Latin and German]) make such an approach to the book viable.

A final thought about the book: toward the end of the introduction (p. 26), S. briefly elaborates a theoretical basis for her study. The names of Iser and Eco appear, as well as a reference to Reader Response Criticism. For a moment there is a frisson at the thought of theoretical engagement on the horizon. This engagement does not eventuate; had it done so, the book would have been prohibitively long. But an effect remains: the evocation of the sender of the message, its recipients, and variations in the horizons of expectation (*Verstehenhorizontes*) in recipients depending on when and where they lived makes this reader question the ability of the categories S. uses (aesthetics, morals, liberalitas, etc.) to function as stable categories of analysis. Will not these categories be as contingent as the witnesses of the buildings? How can aesthetic appreciation of an imperial monument be separated from its political effects? But I surely ask too much; let these complaints be taken as encouragement to further scholarly work on the evidence S. has ably provided.

Hamilton College MARK MASTERSON

SOLON

A. J. Domínguez Monedero: *Solón de Atenas*. Pp. 301, ills. Barcelona: Critica, 2001. Paper. ISBN: 84-8432-298-X.

The aims of this book are historical. Domínguez Monedero is not concerned to analyze Solon as poet or to examine the relation of Solon's poetry to archaic poetic traditions. D.M. summarizes his aims as follows: to analyze the figure of Solon and his work in Athens, as well as the conditions of Athens in the sixth century and the consequences of Solon's legislation for later Athenian history. D.M. does not set out to establish a revolutionary new interpretation of Solon's contributions to Athenian society, but more modestly to establish the state of the question, and to make some suggestions in regard to the problems of interpretation. Thus the primary contribution of this book is its comprehensive presentation of the issues, evidence and scholarly controversies. D.M. has thorough control of his sources, is balanced in his assessment of the issues, and is up-to-date (with a few exceptions noted below) in his knowledge of scholarship. In short, this is a useful summation of the evidence and bibliography on Solon and sixth-century Athens.

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The book is divided into two parts, the first containing an analysis of Solon in his historical setting, and the second, surveying and analyzing the textual sources for Solon's activities. Though the author admits that the order should be reversed, this reviewer would argue that the two parts would be better integrated since one cannot analyze Solon's historical rôle without simultaneously considering the nature of the sources, as D.M.'s own analysis in Part I shows. Indeed, one of the strengths of D.M.'s historical analysis is his keen awareness of how later traditions about Solon manipulated the historical figure according to their political and social agendas. It is somewhat surprising, however, that D.M. does not engage with recent scholarship on the generic features of archaic lyric and elegy, features which some have argued undermine the historical value of poetry such as Solon's (see, for example, the arguments of G. Nagy, *Pindar's Homer. The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* [Baltimore, 1990], pp. 52–115, with the response of K. A. Raaflaub, 'Solone, la nuova Atene e l'emergere della politica' in S. Settis [ed.], *I Greci* [Turin, 1996], pp. 1038–42).

D.M. adopts a fairly traditional interpretation of the crisis of Solonian Athens. According to D.M., the chief problem facing Solon was the increasing debt and dependence of the lower classes as a result of the greed of the ruling élites. For D.M., Solon was a moderate who established curbs to the ambitions of the élites in order to ensure their continued power. D.M. therefore distances himself from more radical interpretations of Solon as anti-aristocratic (cf. R. W. Wallace 'Solonian Democracy', in I. Morris and K. A. Raaflaub [edd.], *Democracy 2500? Questions and Challenges* [Iowa, 1997], not cited by D.M.). D.M. does diverge from standard interpretations, however, in his view that Solon actively aspired to power. For D.M., the idea that Solon had power handed to him is a product of Solon's skillful self-presentation as well as fourth-century legend.

D.M. accepts a standard interpretation of the *hektemoroi* as those who failed to repay their loans and became the dependents of their creditors. Though D.M. is aware of the arguments of T. W. Gallant ('Agricultural Systems, Land Tenure, and the Reforms of Solon', *ABSA* 77 [1982], 111–24) that the *hektemoroi* were free farmers who were required to work the land of their rich patrons in addition to their own land, D.M. dismisses this view because 'there is nothing in the tradition about the hektemoroi which suggests this possibility' (p. 220 n. 26).

D.M.'s dismissal of Gallant's interpretation raises the issue of D.M.'s method in approaching archaic Greek history. D.M. is very thorough in his treatment of the textual sources for Solon's activity, and is admirably well read in recent interpretations of the archaeological evidence. Nevertheless, D.M. does not himself attempt to go beyond this meager evidence by using, for instance, comparative or anthropological approaches. Some recent notable examples of such approaches (besides Gallant's) include Foxhall's use of property sizes and production figures from modern Greek subsistence farmers to estimate the property holdings required by each of Solon's classes ('A View from the Top. Evaluating the Solonian Property Classes', in L. Mitchell and P.J. Rhodes, *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece* [London, 1997], pp. 113–36), and Manville's explication (*The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens* [Princeton, 1990]) of Attic landholding patterns through comparison with ethnographical accounts of contemporary agrarian societies (both cited by D.M.). Though these approaches are not without problems, one might argue that they are useful in illuminating the possible interpretations of the scanty data for archaic Greece, and pointing out the inadequacies of standard interpretations. In this latter regard, one might note Sancisi-Weerdenberg's use ('Solon's Hektemoroi and Peisistratid Dekatemoroi', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg et al. [edd.], *De Agricultura* [Amsterdam,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1993], not cited by D.M.) of examples of share-cropping agreements in modern Iran to show that the relatively modest rent of one-sixth is concordant with the working of land of marginal fertility. Sancisi-Weerdenberg's suggestion raises the question of the extent to which new land was being brought into cultivation in sixth-century Greece, and the degree to which archaeological survey supports such interpretations (see L. Foxhall, op. cit., pp. 122–9), both questions which D.M. does not address.

That said, D.M. is admirably sensitive to the ideological implications (and not just the politico-juridical aspects) of Solon's legislation. Following Manville (op. cit.), D.M. argues that Solon's activity resulted in the creation of a new concept of citizenship which combined formal obligations and privileges with a new sense of community. In sum, D.M. presents a well-researched and plausible (if not innovative) interpretation of Solon's activity in Athens and its impact on the later development of the Athenian *polis*.

University of Michigan SARA FORSDYKE

PUBLIC LIFE IN ATHENS

M. RAUSCH: *Isonomia in Athen: Veränderungen des öffentlichen Lebens vom Sturz der Tyrannis bis zur zweiten Perserabwehr*. Pp. xiii + 416. Frankfurt am Main, etc.: Peter Lang, 1999. Paper, £36. ISBN: 3-631-33648-9.

The internal political development of Athens between the end of the tyranny and Xerxes' invasion is notoriously under-documented in our principal literary sources, which amount to a few chapters apiece of Herodotus and *Ath. Pol.*, the latter mainly concerned with Cleisthenes. In this Vienna dissertation, Rausch sets out to redress the position by assembling and scrutinizing the full range of archaeological, epigraphic, and literary evidence for developments in public life in the period under nine headings: the definition and development of the Agora; state cults, particularly those of the tyrannicides and the new tribal heroes, the elaboration of the cycle of Theseus' deeds, and the introduction of cults linked to military activity; public dedications (all associated with military success); state festivals and associated competitions; extension of conspicuous private burial to a wider group, combined with a reduction in its elaboration; the corresponding inception of public burial and commemoration of Athenians killed in war; military affairs, especially the recreation of an Athenian army; foreign policy, including settlement abroad; and constitutional and administrative changes, such as the adoption of publicly sanctioned weights and measures and 'Schriftlichkeit', and the introduction of ostracism.

As R.'s conclusion (and the associated chronological table) makes clear, this was a dynamic period: activity began immediately after the fall of the tyranny, even before the reforms of Cleisthenes, but a more decisive watershed was the resistance to Isagoras and Cleomenes, in the aftermath of which Athens' need for the military capability to defend herself and maintain her independence became pressing. This military agenda is central to R.'s interpretation of the period: cults such as those of Theseus and the tyrannicides provided models for the newly mobilized hoplite class and promoted ideological solidarity, new festival competitions such as races in armour supported the drive for physical training while building solidarity in the new tribal groupings, public commemoration of those lost in war appropriated honorific mechanisms previously monopolized in private aristocratic burials, and the resulting

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.123 Published online by Cambridge University Press