Worthington, for Hansen's view that a public prosecution at Athens took just one day; Wallace argues for Demosthenes' Areopagos decree having been passed between 346 and 340 to strengthen the fight against Macedon; M. B. Richardson argues that the subject matter of Athenian laws determined where they were set up.

There is something to interest almost every Hellenist in this collection but, unlike Hansen's own works, the whole is not more than the sum of the parts.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford ROBIN OSBORNE

PROPAGATING THE *POLIS*

M. H. Hansen (ed.): *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures. An Investigation Conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre.* (Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter 21.) Pp. 636. Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 2000. Cased, DKK 600. ISBN: 87-7876-177-8.

Readers of this journal will by now be familiar with the main lineaments of what has been hailed, with some reason, as probably the most important single project at present being undertaken in the field of ancient Greek history: the Copenhagen Polis Centre (CPC), ably directed by the intensely active and efficient Mogens Herman Hansen. I myself reviewed three books produced under the auspices of the CPC in *CR* 50 (2000), 465–9. That review dealt with aspects of the larger of the project's twin objectives, the compilation and analysis of an inventory of all Greek *poleis*, so labelled in ancient sources or reliably to be so labelled, between *c*. 600 and 322 B.C. The volume, or rather tome, under review here addresses and indeed goes much of the way towards fulfilling the other objective, that is to say, a comparative survey and evaluation of the world's known 'city-state cultures' or 'civilizations'.

There are problems with this enterprise, serious problems, and these are honestly stated and faced by the editor himself both in his 'Introduction: The Concepts of City-State and City-State Culture' (pp. 1–34) and in his 'Conclusion: The Impact of City-State Cultures on World History' (pp. 597–623), as well as in his own chapter on 'The Hellenic *Polis*' (pp. 141–88). Apart from the fundamental problem of defining what a city-state and a city-state culture/civilization are, there is the scarcely less fundamental methodological issue of normality or typicality: to what extent can 'the Hellenic *polis*' of the Archaic and the Classical periods, supposing we should grant that to be in and of itself a heuristically useful model or Weberian ideal type, serve as a, or rather the, comparandum for other putative city-states or city-state cultures/civilizations in other places and at other times? Or, to put that question the other way round, 'What is Greek about the *Polis*?'.

That question does not just happen to be the title of Oswyn Murray's contribution to the Festschrift offered to H. on his sixtieth birthday in late 2000, *Polis & Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek History* (Copenhagen, 2000), edd. P. Flensted-Jensen, T. H. Nielsen, and L. Rubinstein. For that is a revised version of Murray's original response to the original version of H.'s 'The Hellenic *Polis*' that was presented to the colloquium held at the Royal Danish Academy in January 1999 on which *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures* is based. Actually more scholars—forty-two from fifteen countries—were involved in this colloquium than are involved in the ongoing purely Greek *polis* inventory (thirty-five from twelve countries). They

© Classical Association, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

included archaeologists, anthropologists (one, the Africanist J. D. Y. Peel, an ex-classicist), sociologists, theologians, and philologists, as well as historians (by no means only ancient). Of the forty-two, thirty-two are represented directly in the published volume, one of them (one of just two women) having the distinction of being a direct descendant of a king of the Nigerian city-state of Kalabari (p. 544 n. 1).

Murray's is the only response published so far to my knowledge, and it usefully questions and develops a number of key features of the comparative exercise. A yet more intriguing contribution in prospect, however, is the 'alternative' view being proposed by one of the contributors, John Collis. Collis, an archaeologist and specialist in Roman Gaul, freely and rightly confesses that the ' "Celtic" oppida' he studies (pp. 229–40) do not satisfy the double-digit criteria for city-state (twelve characteristics) or city-state culture (fifteen) status that H. laid down to general—not universal—approval. That is also confessedly the case with three other 'null' cases included in the book, the Viking cities in Russia (pp. 263–75), the German Reichsstädte of the Holy Roman Empire (pp. 295–319), and the Indian mahajanpadas (pp. 375–91), so that the title of the volume does not quite do justice to its even more expansive contents. But something more than this is clearly felt to be at stake for Collis to be preparing an 'alternative' view of some sort. Perhaps he shares the unease of Jean-Jacques Glassner, author of 'Les petits États mésopotamiens à la fin du 4° et au cours du 3° millénaire' (pp. 35–54), who has stated that he believes H.'s model to be excessively Hellenocentric or Hellenotropic (pp. 31 n. 93, 35–6). But he—and anyone else who sees fit to challenge H.—had better be warned: besides the reply here (pp. 598–609), they can confidently expect a far more massive rejoinder from him in the not at all distant future. Indeed, H. himself mentions a proposed further volume on 'the theoretical aspects of the key concepts of the symposium' (p. 10 n. 3), which looks like a case of the pre-emptive strike.

As it is, readers already have their work cut out with the present volume, which really is a *tour de force*, far more ambitious than, say, the earlier comparative exercises in this field by R. Griffeth (a contributor here too, 'The Hausa City-States from 1450 to 1804', pp. 483–506) and C. G. Thomas (edd., 1981), A. Molho, K. Raaflaub, and J. Emlen (edd., 1991), and D. Nichols and T. Charlton (edd., 1997); all are, of course, cited in Hansen's as ever capacious bibliographies. The volume ranges in space from the Mixtec city-states in Mexico (pp. 567–80) to the Malay city-states in Indonesia (pp. 417–30), and from the Viking city-states in Ireland (pp. 251–62) to the Swahili city-states in Kenya and Tanzania (pp. 463–82), and in time from the fourth millennium B.C. to the twentieth century A.D. Readers of this journal would be defeating a key part of the object of the exercise were they to confine their reading to the 'Classical' chapters—apart from H.'s own 'The Hellenic *Polis*' (above), these are Mario Torelli's 'The Etruscan City-State' (pp. 189–208) and Tim Cornell's 'The City-States in Latium' (pp. 209–29). At the very least they might also tackle Hansen's fourth contribution, 'The Kotoko City-States' (pp. 531–2), the brevity of which belies the interest of this African people, whose city-state culture seems to have lasted in some form or sense from the twelfth century to the very end of the nineteenth.

For the sake of inclusiveness and comparability H. is keen to emphasize that the city-state concept is a 'modern heuristic concept invented by historians to describe not only the Hellenic *poleis*' (p. 9). Perhaps. But Giuseppe Cambiano's *Polis. Un modello per la cultura europea* (Rome, 2000) throws some little doubt on its alleged modernity, and at least one ancient historian, Wilfried Gawantka, has questioned whether the concept of *polis*—invented in essence, he contended in 1975, by Jacob Burckhardt—has any real purchase on ancient Greek actuality. There is, moreover, an ongoing

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/51.2.312 Published online by Cambridge University Press