to Traill's work in an article dealing with tribes, *trittyes* and the like. There can be little doubt that members of the elite feature heavily in our record of ostraka. Elite behaviour in another geographical and chronological environment is probed by Dreyer, who focusses on mid-Hellenistic Pergamum. As the first editor of the impressive double honorary decree for Apollonius of Metropolis (*I.Metropolis* 1), Dreyer is well acquainted with the intricate modes of interaction between local elites and Hellenistic monarchs. Here, his response to the bibliography promptly generated after the publication of *I.Metropolis* 1 is rather constricted, presumably because he lacked the time needed to articulate an overall response. His methodological overview, however, and especially his argument that Roman interference in Asia Minor did not mark a rupture in the behaviour of city elites, is sound. In a lengthy and well-documented study that straddles history and political philosophy, Mitchell investigates the concepts of equality and friendship in ancient politics. Of particular interest are the Successors' *friends* (*φίλοι*), for whose good will the Greek cities so often strove, as Hellenistic epigraphists know very well. A typical method of cajolery involved the granting of tax exemption (*ἀτέλεια*). Such grants are the focus of Rubinstein's analysis, who upholds as methodologically useful the distinction between honorary and incentive-related grants and highlights a paradoxical conflict of interest between communities granting *ateleia* and tax-farmers acting on behalf of the same political entities. Conceptual aspects of the epigraphy of honouring constitute the crux of Whitehead's paper, which continues a series he opened almost thirty years ago. Not only epigraphists but students of philosophy and cultural history as well should take heed of his demonstration that in Attic approbatory language the term *ἀνδραγαθία* gradually came to be used in lieu of 'the epigraphical absentee *ἀνδρεία*', i.e. in the sense of military prowess, and that it was semantically distinct from the (increasingly democratised) *ἀρετή*. Finally, the enigma of the conspicuous absence of the Council of the Five Hundred from Thucydides' *œuvre* is Hornblower's homage to Rhodes's landmark *The Athenian Boule*. That administrative instrument of stability, Hornblower submits, had no place in Thucydides' biased grand narrative, in which the misguided masses would persistently take erroneous decisions.

Not only Hornblower, but every single contributor, owes a scholarly debt to the honorand in one way or another. I can only guess that P.J. Rhodes would approve of most, if not all, of what can be found in this volume. In fact, much of the material could easily have been produced by him. As far as Festschrifts go, this is a case of total success.

University of California at Berkeley NIKOLAOS PAPAZARKADAS
papazarkadas@berkeley.edu

CITIZEN IDENTITY

LAPE (S.) *Race and Citizen Identity in the Classical Athenian Democracy*. Pp. xiv + 341. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Cased, £55, US$90. ISBN: 978-0-521-19104-3.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X1100148X

This book represents a lucid and provocative challenge to attempts to present the Classical Athenian democracy as a model for modern liberal democratic imitation, in which norms of tolerance and inclusivity were strongly influential. Although L.

is sometimes tentative about using the term 'race' (pp. ix, 3–4), her most distinctive argument, which advances debate about Athenian autochthony and exclusivity beyond Loraux's framework, is that Athenian citizen identity had a significant and overt 'racial' component. Expectations of compliance with a well-defined Athenian 'racial' identity strongly constrained Athenian citizens' language and action. Moreover, Athenian 'racial' identity enabled, or made necessary, 'racist' prejudice and discrimination against those who could be presented as lacking inherited membership of the autochthonous Athenian community (pp. 32–3).

Chapter 1 skilfully interweaves a critical account of modern theories about racial identity with a narrative of relevant Athenian attitudes and practices, from Draco to Demosthenes. L. follows K.A. Appiah in regarding a claim to a distinctive collective biological inheritance as intrinsic to any racial identity, departing from the more inclusive concept of racial thinking favoured by another recent attributor of significant racism to the Greeks and Romans, B. Isaac.[1] She distinguishes racial from ethnic identity on the grounds that a racial identity is necessarily entwined with claims to political power (pp. 36–7). The almost inevitable accompaniment is racism, the attribution of 'political or moral salience' (p. 32) to claimed racial characteristics.

L.'s attempt to make the notion of racial identity useful for the analysis of Classical Athenian citizen identity thus requires her to identify an essential core in the modern concept: a claim to a racial identity is a power-oriented claim to biological inheritance of distinctive collective characteristics. It is necessary for her argument that this essential core can be isolated from prevalent features of modern racial identities lacking in Classical Athenian citizen identity: strong concern with skin-colour; the division of all humanity into separate races, usually large and internationally-spread; and an 'altero-referential' orientation, under which the inferiority of outsiders, not the privileged position of insiders, is primary (pp. 31–41).

L.'s strategy is controversial: it is debatable whether these features of modern racial identities can so easily be reduced to contingent accretions. If not, the Athenians' racial identity was probably more their Greek identity, defined in opposition to the notion of the barbarian. However, L.'s clear account not only provides a firm foundation for the book, but also provokes questioning of concepts: even if it turns out that 'politicised ethnicity', or similar, is more appropriate than 'race' for analysing Athenian citizen identity, L. will have made discussion much more sophisticated.

L.'s argument for the prominence of 'racial' claims in Athenian political discourse is made through the narrative in Chapter 1, which stresses Cleisthenes' reforms and Pericles' Citizenship Law, and three subsequent thematic chapters. Chapter 2 discusses comedy and oratory; Chapter 5 tight Athenian regulation of citizen status, through deme procedures and the civic courts; and Chapter 6 both Athenian naturalisation procedures and the role of 'racial' identity in post-403 reconciliation.

A forceful running argument is that Athenian democrats did not merely co-opt or adapt aristocratic 'good birth' (εὐγένεια), but developed their own ideal: bilateral descent from the autochthonous founders of the Athenian *polis* (cf. Hyperides 6.6–7), not membership of a line of noble, heroic males. Chapter 5 shows that the resulting 'racial' identity made possible, or even motivated, volunteer political and legal interventions against alleged outsiders; there is a good discussion of

[1]B. Isaac, *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (2004), esp. pp. 17–38.

the rhetoric about birth, work, wealth and marriage in Dem. 57 and [Dem.] 59. Similarly, Chapter 2 successfully associates with 'racial' citizenship the pervasive attribution of foreign blood (especially in the maternal line) to political opponents in comedy and oratory.

However, L. is probably too ready in Chapter 2 to associate with 'racial' assumptions all the discussed accusations that particular individuals showed vice or disloyalty to the democracy consistent with their ancestry (note, in particular, pp. 71–9). First, although in some cases the transmission of characteristics and attitudes from ancestors was explicitly presented as biological (e.g. Dem. 25.48), it was more commonly left ambiguous whether it was due to blood or to the relevant individuals' upbringing and/or fidelity to family traditions (e.g. Lys. 14.40; Aesch. 3.172). As elsewhere, L. could have dedicated more attention to the Athenian emphasis on education and self-improvement (cf. pp. 75–7), a counterweight to biological determinism. Even regarding the reproduction of collective 'Athenian' characteristics, Athenian speakers could make imitation central (cf. p. 145).

Second, comic poets and orators were often more obviously concerned with the quality of an individual's family, even if it was undisputably Athenian (cf. Lys. 14.35–40), than with his membership or non-membership of an autochthonous Athenian community: 'aristocratic' concern with individual family lines persisted. Here, as elsewhere, greater engagement with inscriptions could have helped: fourth-century honorific decrees for foreign benefactors commonly re-affirm ancestral privileges, sometimes commenting that the foreign honorand, unquestionably an outsider to the Athenian autochthonous community, showed goodwill to the democracy comparable to that of his ancestors (e.g. Rhodes–Osborne *GHI* no. 77, ll. 9–11; cf. no. 98, ll. 23–9, regarding a descendant of 'Pharnabazos and Artabazos').

The intermediate chapters, 3 and 4, address the engagement of literary authors with Athenian 'racial' identity. In Chapter 3, L. argues strongly against the prominent modern argument that the plot of Euripides' *Ion* represents veiled criticism of Athenian preoccupation with autochthony. In Chapter 4, by contrast, probably the book's most original, L. argues persuasively that Herodotus and Thucydides reacted against, and challenged, Athenian claims to autochthony and associated historical interpretations:[2] Herodotus presented even supposedly unified descent-groups, including the Athenian, as constructed and fluid; Thucydides identified universal human characteristics, under whose influence individuals strategically manipulate identity arguments. Chapter 4 throws new light on central passages, showing, for example, how Herodotus presents Cleisthenes' Athenian tribal reforms as a politically-motivated importation of a foreign model, which radically altered supposedly immutable Athenian 'racial' identity (pp. 161–4). The juxtaposition of Chapters 3 and 4 does, however, weaken L.'s denial of irony to Euripides in Chapter 3.

Throughout the book, L. emphasises that 'racial' claims were only one of many components of Athenian civic identity (e.g. pp. 3, 52–3). None the less, she could have discussed in greater detail the nature of those other components and their relationship with 'racial' ideas, along the lines of J.K. Davies' 'The Descent Group and the Alternatives'[3] and her own discussion of varied possible grounds for naturalisation of foreigners (pp. 240–9).

[2]Cf. C.B.R. Pelling, 'Bringing Autochthony Up-to-Date: Herodotus and Thucydides', *CW* 102 (2009), 471–83.

[3]J.K. Davies, 'Athenian Citizenship: the Descent Group and the Alternatives', *CJ* 73.2 (1977/8), 105–21.

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, 'hereditarian' 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 hereditarian 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.