excerpts at 9 pages, broken up into snippets to support individual points. For comparison, the already heavily excerpted version in Hubbard's *Homosexuality in Ancient Greece and Rome* (2003) is 22 pages, with numerous notes. [Demosthenes] *Against Neaira* has been cut here to 4 pages, as compared with the 12 pages in Lefkowitz and Fant's *Women's Life in Greece and Rome* (1992). Though they have been well chosen and carefully translated, the 'documents' here are too brief to use this book as a sourcebook with accompanying essays. The decision to list them alphabetically by author's name rather than by genre or chronologically does not help matters.

Criticisms notwithstanding, this book is successful and a pleasure to read. R. is to be congratulated for discussions of great clarity on difficult topics. I recommend this book to novices and scholars alike for its sensitive treatment of sources and brilliant condensation of complex scholarly debates.

Oberlin College KIRK ORMAND
kormand@oberlin.edu

STATUS GROUPS IN ATHENS

KAMEN (D.) *Status in Classical Athens*. Pp. xvi + 144. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2013. Cased, £24.95, US$35. ISBN: 978-0-691-13813-8.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X14001231

This book offers a comprehensive investigation into the different status groups co-existing within Classical Athens. In so doing, it seeks to challenge the validity of the traditional division of Athenian society into groups of citizens, slaves and foreigners, and instead to support the idea that there was a much broader and more complex spectrum of status identification within Athenian society (following the work of Moses Finley). At the same time, it argues that despite the existence of this broader and more intricate spectrum of identity, the Athenians themselves, particularly in the surviving literary sources, were keen to gloss over/contradict both the complexity and permeability of the different status groups.

The book's focus is on the 'Classical period', which is defined as 451 B.C. – 323 B.C. (p. 1). As such, its investigation into Athenian identity starts after one of the most important pieces of status legislation in Classical Athens – Pericles' citizenship law. While this is an understandable divide, as a result the book misses the opportunity to think about how status in Classical Athens changed dramatically during the last decades of the sixth century and first half of the fifth.

In Chapter 1, K.'s focus is on chattel slaves and in Chapter 2 on privileged chattel slaves. These chapters look, amongst other issues, at the problem of slave numbers; the use of slaves in battle (the prevalence of which K. asserts the Athenian sources underestimated, p. 17); their social and legal rights, including protection of chattel slaves under *graphe hubreos* (p. 12); and the number of possible gradations and shades of freedom from slavery. It would have been good to see more discussion of sources like the Old Oligarch (p. 18), and particularly his assertion of the way slaves in Athens fared differently from those in other *poleis*, as well as more discussion of the chronological differentiation between the fifth and fourth centuries.

In Chapter 3, K.'s focus is on freedmen with conditional freedom (slaves freed with strings attached either by individual masters or by the *polis* in return for services in battle). In Chapter 4, K. examines the position of metics; in Chapter 5, that of privileged metics; in

Chapter 6 bastards (*nothoi*); in Chapter 7 disenfranchised citizens (those who are *atimoi*); and in Chapter 8 naturalised citizens.

Not only are these fascinating categories, some of which are not often discussed or acknowledged within the study of Athenian society, but they are also all categories which overlap with one another in different ways – and it is on these issues of overlap that K.'s book should be most commended, not least for encouraging further reflection. A freed slave could be a metic, if given official resident status in Athens. But to what extent would a freed slave metic have felt different from, and been treated differently from, a metic who was a free-born foreigner (p. 43)? Just how long would the stain of slavery last on the reputation of a freed slave and influence his status within Athenian society, especially if that freedom came with certain conditions? As K. points out, in Attic oratory there are plenty of examples of freedmen being labelled as 'still slaves' (p. 54). Equally, given that the relationship between metics and their *prostatai* (patrons) changed quite dramatically between the fifth and the fourth centuries B.C. (p. 47), what effect did that have on the status of these individuals within Athenian society over time?

K.'s categories of privileged metics, bastards, disenfranchised citizens and naturalised citizens (Chapters 4, 5, 6, 7) point to another interesting series of overlaps which, as K. makes clear, would have been on view to differing degrees in different spheres of civic life (p. 68). In the religious sphere, *nothoi* had the same role as metics (as they did in the military), yet *nothoi* it seems were also particularly susceptible to attacks in the law courts for pretending to be citizens (p. 67). On the other hand *atimoi* were still technically citizens and could do military service, but were banned from many sanctuaries. Those who were made citizens had all the legal rights of citizens in the law courts, but were often referred to not as *polites/astos* (as a normal Athenian male citizen would be), but as *demopoietos* (p. 84), reinforcing an ongoing distinction between those who were born and those who were made in the social and political sphere. Equally those 'made' citizens were admitted into demes and tribes, but not phratries (p. 80), to which born-citizens were *first* admitted in the years immediately after birth.

What K.'s work also highlights is the frequent and ongoing potential for status mobility in Athens amongst these status categories. But whereas metics could rise up the spectrum of Athenian civic identity towards the 'ultimate goal' of citizenship, by being given 'privileges' such as the right to pay the *eisphora*, the right to own property (at least from 410 B.C. onwards – another interesting chronological difference to investigate) and to serve in the Athenian military, Athenian male citizens it seems could only descend in status by losing their privileges (p. 102 – especially as demes were regularly voting on the citizenship status of individuals on their registers). This could be by falling foul of new citizenship laws (Pericles' 451 B.C. law was officially called the law 'on *nothoi*'), as well as a punishment for particular offences (those who became *atimoi*) – punishments that could last for a particular length of time and be cancelled at any time.

This nuanced spectrum of status in Classical Athens is only complicated further by the categories of female citizens (Chapter 9) and full male citizens (Chapter 10), particularly since the full male citizen was distinguished – from the time of Solon – into further subgroups not only in terms of wealth class (which in turn had different rights ascribed to them over time), but also age.

What to take away from this investigation? First, I think we need to be more nuanced in our status distinctions than even K.'s categories allow: not only thinking about different statuses in social, political and legal terms that changed over time, but also in terms of how the perception and experience of status was affected by individual reputations and ancestry.

Second, given the face-to-face culture of Classical Athens, we need to investigate further the ways in which these often overlapping and heavily permeable status groups must have

created, in different spheres of public activity, an ongoing sense of potential unease and instability within Athenian society. How did a full citizen male of the *thetes* class feel in comparison with a privileged metic for example? And what implications did that have for how these two groups acted and interacted within Athenian society, and the strategies they adopted for status differentiation and display? One effect may well have been the creation of a 'gap' between the reality and the rhetoric of Athenian status, as identified by K. (p. 111), which sought to paper over the 'problem' of Athenian status. But this book should also encourage us to investigate further the way in which the intricacies inherent in the Athenian status system were not only covered over, but also actively perceived by, and in turn affected the experiences and actions of, individual Athenians at every point on the spectrum.

University of Warwick MICHAEL SCOTT
m.c.scott@warwick.ac.uk

CULTURAL MEMORY

FRANCHI (E.), PROIETTI (G.) (edd.) *Forme della memoria e dinamiche identitarie nell'antichità greco-romana*. (Quaderni 2.) Pp. 308. Trento: Università degli Studi di Trento, Dipartimento di Filosofia, Storia e Beni Culturali, 2012. Paper, €13. ISBN: 978-88-8443-447-0.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X14000444

The past several decades have seen an increase in historical studies, inspired by Assmann's conception of cultural memory and Gehrke's 'intentional history', centred on how the Greeks conceived of their past and how these conceptions produced (and were products of) contemporary ideologies (see most recently the excellent J. Marincola et al. [edd.], *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History Without Historians* [2012]). The present edited volume collects essays on this topic from the Seminario Permanente di Storia Antica of the Università degli Studi di Trento, which was originally established by Maurizio Giangiulio, whose influence is felt throughout the contributions. The thirteen papers (ten in Italian, three in English, all with English abstracts) are separated across three thematic divisions (anthropologically informed approaches to Greek memory; cross-cultural interaction in Roman Greece; and the function of memory in oral and semi-oral cultures), and employ various approaches to the question of Greek memory and identity formation, including several comparative accounts of orality in Aboriginal Australian contexts. This book usefully draws together previous work in the field of Greek historical memory and suggests several areas for furthering this field of study.

P. sets the tone for the first section with a succinct survey of the most important developments in the theoretical approach to Greek identity, in particular Barth's notion of ethnic boundaries and Assmann's cultural memory. The latter, she argues, is less useful for archaic Greece (pp. 18–19), though the idea of 'hot memory', a type of history which constructs an identity for a group, allows some access to the Greeks' engagement with their past. She concludes by addressing Greek ethnic identity, stressing that it is best conceived as a 'situational construct' dependent on historical context. Drawing on these methodological considerations, F. investigates a specific instance of identity formation, the archaic battle of Hysiae. She argues that the account, only preserved by Pausanias, is best understood as an instance of 'us-identity' formation by Argive elites in a Second Sophistic context, comparable to the identity that Spartans constructed for themselves in the face of Roman rule so as to situate themselves in a position of leadership in the Peloponnese. The first section concludes