

L.'s discussion of naturalisation shows that there was a rival strain of openness in Athenian citizenship norms. In everyday life there was probably far more co-operation between citizens and non-citizens than is consistent with deep racism (cf. E. Cohen, *The Athenian Nation* [2000]). Even in explicit rhetoric, 'hereditary' reasoning with regard to individuals' democratic or non-democratic tendencies could be challenged (Lysias 25.8).

Moreover, individual Athenian institutions could reflect the simultaneous influence of hereditary and other thinking about citizenship: although disenfranchisement for public debt could be inherited, it remained reversible on payment of twice the debt (p. 75). Greater comparison with Athenian citizen rhetoric in cases further removed from 'racial' concerns would sometimes have modified particular arguments: for example, Apollodorus' boast that he had performed more liturgies than necessary was hardly an exceptional claim, straightforwardly reflecting the distinctive uneasiness of a naturalised citizen (p. 217).

Putting her argument in a wider context, L. offers interesting hypotheses about the functional role of Athenian 'racial' citizenship. First, she suggests that Athenian 'racial' identity made possible the solidarity necessary for democracy: it offered an apparently immutable foundation for political equality and fraternity; and, by analogy with a suggested function of white racial identity in nineteenth-century American society, it compensated for acute socio-economic inequalities, giving the poor a sense of pride and thus stifling discontent (pp. 41–4, 202–3). Second, L. contends that 'racial' arguments enabled Athenian citizens to resist the integration of outsiders: they were a means of reconciling existing restrictive citizenship practices with the presence of large numbers of non-citizens seemingly capable of political virtue and entitled to a share in democratic equality, since they made true political virtue exclusive to hereditary citizens (pp. 5–6). Further investigation of these alleged ideological operations, including consideration of the wider ancient Greek world, is necessary in order to test the disconcerting claim underlying this book: that the Athenian democratic system relied for its survival and success on something significantly similar to modern racism.

All Souls College, Oxford

BENJAMIN GRAY
benjamin.gray@all-souls.ox.ac.uk

OSTRACISM

FORSDYKE (S.) *Exile, Ostracism, and Democracy. The Politics of Expulsion in Ancient Greece*. Pp. xvi + 344. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2005. Cased, £29.95, US\$45. ISBN: 978-0-691-11975-5.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X11001491

F. presents a detailed, clear and thoughtful investigation into the practice of ostracism in ancient Greece and particularly in Athenian democracy. In response to previous scholars, who have labelled ostracism as 'bizarre', 'exotic' and 'odd' (cf. pp. 1 and 144), F. argues that 'the institution [of ostracism] makes sense in its own historical context and culture' (p. 280). The book unfolds first by exploring what F. terms the 'politics of exile' in Greece during the archaic period, before focussing on the emergence of democracy in Athens and the practice of ostracism.

F. subsequently examines individual cases of ostracism during the fifth century B.C. and puts them into the context of other instances of exile as punishment in the Athenian democracy down to the oligarchic revolutions of 411 and 404 B.C. In the final two chapters, F. first looks at Athenian handling of exile in the empire and then examines how ostracism is constructed and manipulated in the ancient sources. The text is followed by three appendices, which cover the difficulty of dating the 'law of ostracism', possible cases of ostracism in other cities around the Mediterranean, and discussion in more detail of the evidence for the practice and place of exile at Sparta.

The three key points of her argument are as follows. First, that ostracism in democratic Athens developed specifically as a way to assert democratic control over the 'politics of exile' previously exploited by the archaic elites. Second, that within Athenian democracy, ostracism was a heavily symbolic, high-profile and yet rare and moderate institution. Third, that concepts of exile, including ostracism, played an important role in Athenian accounts of the past and the justifications of democracy.

In the Introduction (pp. 1–14), F. sets out her argument, alongside her methods, approaches and definitions. In particular F. laudably underlines the need to put material evidence back into the text-based study of ancient history, alongside suitable anthropological theories particularly of social evolution and state formation, to help understand the history of archaic Greece (p. 4). Her subtle work on definitions of exile (pp. 7–11) is let down by her more rudimentary definition of elite versus non-elite (particularly given the important role this definition will play in her argument): 'by definition, all those who were not among the elite were non-elite' (p. 12). In this section F. justifies the time frame of her study, finishing with the death of Socrates in 399 B.C., by arguing that the oligarchic revolutions of 411 and 404 and the 'democratic restraint in the use of exile following the restoration of the democracy were the most important turning points in the Athenians' own understanding of the meaning of exile' (p. 14).

In chapters 1 and 2 (pp. 15–78), F. argues through the examination of several case studies (Mytilene, Megara, Samos and Corinth) for the development of a 'politics of exile' during the archaic period in which elites used exile as a means of intra-elite competition, resulting in continual political instability (p. 78). Chapters 3 and 4 (pp. 79–204) examine the politics of exile in archaic Athens, the introduction of democracy and the institution of ostracism, along with an account of the use of the institution in practice during the fifth century B.C. F.'s crucial argument here is that ostracism represents a means by which the people could exert power over a traditionally intra-elite tool of conflict (p. 136), thus breaking the politics of exile (a process begun for F. under Peisistratus and continued, following a democratic uprising, by Cleisthenes' reforms which included the law of ostracism [see Appendix 1]). The democratic credentials of ostracism – and its distinction – from the former elite 'politics of exile' were reinforced by the legal, moderate and rare nature of the process in practice (only ten occurrences during the fifth century B.C. for which we have evidence, to which F. sees no reason to add more). She rightly points out, however, that the particular cases need to be understood within their full and individual historical and political contexts rather than as part of an immutable civic institutional practice (p. 161).

Chapters 5 and 6 (pp. 205–77) argue first that there are parallels between the practice of ostracism in Athenian democracy and the moderate fashion in which Athens intervened in decisions about exile in cities which were part of the

Athenian empire, and second that exile played an important role in historical, literary, oratorical, philosophical and political accounts of Athens' past and the nature of democracy itself. These two chapters are perhaps the most problematic in the book. F.'s argument on Athens and her empire tends to see Athenian 'moderate' actions on questions of exile from an Athenian point of view rather than that of the allied cities (e.g. pp. 215, 219). Her chapter on the position of exile in the ancient sources ranges widely from Herodotus to Aristotle, via, amongst others, Isocrates, Xenophon, Lysias and Plato. While they provide interesting insights into how ostracism was conceived, most of these sources come from the fourth century B.C., a time period outside F.'s study. If, as F. claims in her introduction as justification for her time frame, there was a fundamental shift at the end of the fifth century in the meaning of exile, it should not surprise us that these fourth-century sources construct differently the nature and purpose of ostracism. To give this material its full weight and historical context, F. should have continued her study into the fourth century and tackled the question why ostracism falls out of favour within the new democracy of the fourth century B.C. (she treats this briefly on p. 174, but the need for more detail is apparent from the fact that she makes only two references to what is often said to be ostracism's fourth-century counterpart, the *graphê paranomôn*).

Despite this, F.'s core arguments provide a very engaging and convincing way of understanding the emergence and use of ostracism in the late sixth and fifth centuries B.C. in democratic Athens.

Darwin College, Cambridge

MICHAEL C. SCOTT
mcs45@cam.ac.uk

MORALITY AND BEHAVIOUR IN DEMOCRATIC ATHENS

HERMAN (G.) *Morality and Behaviour in Democratic Athens: a Social History*. Pp. xxii + 472, figs, ill., maps. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Cased, £73, US\$141 (Paper, £35, US\$60). ISBN: 978-0-521-85021-6 (978-0-521-12535-2 pbk).

doi:10.1017/S0009840X11001508

H. undertakes a comprehensive and in-depth analysis of Athenian culture during the Classical period. His approach is eclectic, combining elements from the Classics, Cultural Anthropology, Social Studies and Psychology. H. maintains that no other treatise on this subject has examined 'the Athenians' moral ideas *and* behaviour (or, in contemporary language, the "unwritten laws") that the Athenians developed to make democracy practicable'. H. looks broadly at issues such as politics, culture, economy, slavery, family, women and religion and attempts to study them as parts of an integrated whole. This has been a failing of Classics generally, inasmuch as the individual issues have been addressed in existing scholarship but not their totality. This book may be regarded as a social history of democratic Athens.

Another lack that H. seeks to redress is what he perceives to be a disparity between the conceptual tools that classicists and ancient historians employ to investigate moral norms in antiquity and those used in adjacent fields of research. He asserts that the former, such as the late Professor Sir Kenneth Dover and those who