

Whether Athens contained distinct “pockets of legal formalism” requires more argument (175). Athenians more likely saw jury discretion as a natural outgrowth of the people’s political power in a *demokratia*.

Nevertheless, Lanni shows that Athenian popular courts aimed for justice under the law. Seemingly prejudicial arguments are explained by Athenian preference for jury discretion in seeking justice over safeguards ensuring consistent verdicts. Athenian democracy and “popular justice” may have necessitated rejecting formal legalism, but they did not obviate jurors applying law.

**Kyle Lakin**  
Stanford University

---

Caroline Williamson, *The Laws of the Roman People*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004. Pp. 534. \$75 (ISBN 0-472-11053-5).

Caroline Williamson has written a monumental work, monumental in scope and in learning. Her goal, to examine the interrelationship between public lawmaking during the Roman Republic and the Republic’s expansion and eventual decline, is ambitious but one she achieves. By closely examining the more than five hundred Republican public laws in the context of Roman Republican literature and history, Williamson manages to convey both the details and the significance of lawmaking in this crucial period.

Perhaps the most valuable part of Williamson’s work is her ability to explain the social function of the various laws within the greater context of Roman political and economic networks. She understands the importance, for instance, of Roman legions to their commanders not simply in terms of brute force, but, also, as a pool of loyal voters who, in the later Republic, could easily outnumber the civilian voters. She understands and explains the importance, in particular, of Roman public laws on the distribution of land. Through a careful analysis of Cicero’s *De Lege Agraria* along with the numerous public laws on the subject of land ownership and use, Williamson can demonstrate the ways in which the Roman state was able to incorporate its Italian neighbors as well as placate its own growing citizenship during periods of territorial expansion. Another example of the Roman genius for state-building through expansion, discussed by Williamson, concerns legislation designed to create an infrastructure of roads and other civic building throughout areas of territorial expansion, thereby demonstrating in a very practical way the advantages of being Roman.

Much of the book is very properly concerned with the Roman use of the extension of citizenship as a means of expansion and state-building. Here, as Williamson brilliantly discusses, is the great irony of the Roman Republican expansion. In the early years of the Republic, the extension of citizenship to allies and others was a crucial aid to the successful incorporation of new territories and peoples. But, in the first century, when Rome decided to grant citizenship to virtually all Italian peoples in order to put an end to a devastating peninsular war, the great increase in the numbers of citizens and the concomitant decline in community consensus

that followed led ultimately to the period of unrest and civil war. This, in turn, made possible the rise of demagogues and tyrants, which led, ultimately, to the downfall of the Republic and the beginning of the empire. The citizenship figures cited by Williamson speak for themselves. In 204, the census listed 214,000 men. In 115, the census figure had grown to 394,336. By 70 the figure was an astonishing 910,000. This vast increase in voting citizens, many from remote areas with little knowledge of Rome or Roman political mores and many whose loyalties lay with their military commanders, smoothed the way for men such as Sulla, Pompey, and Julius Caesar.

Not to be ignored is Williamson's epilogue, which draws comparisons between the experience of Roman imperial expansion and that of British imperial expansion and, thereby, provides a series of fascinating leads for other scholars to follow. All those interested in modern imperial history should read this epilogue.

Williamson has written a very good book, one that every scholar of Roman law, Roman history, and imperial history must read.

**M. H. Hoefflich**  
University of Kansas

---

Golfo Alexopoulos, *Stalin's Outcasts: Aliens, Citizens, and the Soviet State, 1926–1936*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2003. Pp. 256. \$45.00 (ISBN 0-8014-4029-7).

Why, one might reasonably ask, would anyone living in Stalin's USSR care about being denied the right to vote? Although carefully staged elections for central and local state bodies took place with much fanfare in the 1920s and 1930s, it seems counter-intuitive to think that most residents of the USSR would brave the potential dangers involved in protecting their right to participate. Yet, as Golfo Alexopoulos shows in this fascinating book about the "disenfranchised" (*lishentsy* in Russian, literally those "deprived" of voting rights) in the decade 1926–36, Soviet citizens did just that, in massive numbers—complaining, supplicating, or impassively petitioning state officials in order to secure the right to vote and, along with it, the economic and social benefits that came with full membership in the Soviet polity. Alexopoulos's book will become the standard English-language account of Soviet policies toward the disenfranchised, as it exhaustively covers the evolution of this legal and social category from its introduction shortly after the 1917 Bolshevik revolution to its formal abolition by the USSR Constitution of 1936. Yet Alexopoulos's account goes far beyond legal and institutional history, analyzing the practice of disenfranchisement as it related to the formation of Soviet social identities, Soviet social engineering schemes, and modes of interaction between state and individual that characterized the Stalinist dictatorship. She shows that voting rights functioned as a marker for a broader boundary between citizen and alien and hence became the object of vigorous contestation by all involved, from top Party officials down to the disenfranchised themselves. Methodologically sophisticated and firmly grounded in a rich source base, this study—part legal history, part social