Claudia Tiersch, ed., *Die Athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert: Zwischen Modernisierung und Tradition*. Steiner, Stuttgart 2016. 394 pp. €63. ISBN 978-3-515-11969-3 (paper).

This volume, the product of a conference that took place in Berlin in 2012, collects twenty papers all loosely related to the topic of modernization in fourth-century Athens (a process which the different contributors often see in very different terms). All of the contributions are solid enough (though some of them recycle previous work), and the best are cutting-edge. I don't have much space here, so I'll concentrate on the ones I found most interesting. I'll spend a bit more time at the end on Gabrielsen's piece on associations, since that's a topic I'm currently working on myself.

Harris in his piece makes the striking claim that *nomothesia* 'actually made it easier for the Assembly to pass new laws' in the fourth century, because a) in the fifth century, entrenchment clauses and the *graphe paranomon* stopped laws from being changed; and b) in the fourth century there was a new type of public action that meant old laws could be annulled to make way for new ones. This is interesting, but a) the entrenchment clauses studied by Lewis cluster in the second half of the fifth century, and the first *graphē paranomon* we hear of is in 415; and b) in the fourth century there also was a new category of laws (*nomoi*) that were especially hard to change, and there's an argument that these outweighed the decline in entrenchment clauses. All told, I'm still not convinced that it would be easier to change a law in the fourth century than in 430, let alone 480.

Shipton looks at two records of leases from the silver mines, from 367/6 and 342–339. What she finds is that the number of wealthy, well-connected men mentioned as investors declines from the first group of leases to the second. At the same time, the total number of investors increases. Shipton suggests that these changes can be explained by Periander's introduction of naval symmories in 357/6. The symmories incentivized men outside the traditional liturgical class to invest in the silver mines. But these new, less secure investors tended to be more risk-averse than their predecessors.

Allen concentrates on the political conflict of 330, as we know it through Lycurgus' *Against Leocrates*, Aeschines' *Against Ctesiphon*, and Demosthenes' *On the Crown*. What were these orators arguing about? Allen sees Sparta's revolt against Macedon in 331–0 as one of the main drivers of the dispute. Demosthenes tried to get Athens to join the revolt, but he was out-manoeuvred by Lycurgus, who handed out a cash dividend to the citizens. That would explain Demosthenes' claims that the Theoric Fund was enervating the citizenry. It might also explain Lycurgus' attack on Leocrates, who Allen sees as a proxy for Demosthenes.

Liddel analyzes honorific decrees for citizens and non-citizens in Athens, both those we know about through literary sources and those that survive as inscriptions.

There are fewer honours for military service as the fourth century wears on. There are also more honours for ambassadors, though that may just be because of texts like Demosthenes' *On the False Embassy*. There's also a steady trickle of honours to citizens who participated in committees. Liddel thinks that these patterns reflect an attempt to use honours to incentivize certain behaviours in the context of the struggle to preserve democracy in the face of the Macedonian threat.

Gabrielsen's valuable piece considers the changing nature of associations throughout the classical period. He argues that Cleisthenes' new democratic state co-opted previously-existing social networks to construct a public space, but that in the fourth century private associations returned in force, and even co-opted some of the language of the public sphere in their turn. This eventually resulted in the emergence around 300 of the Hellenistic association, one of whose markers was more non-citizen members, and of 'ethno-congregational' association in particular (a type of very large religious group consisting mainly of non-Athenians).

At various points Gabrielsen points to evidence for non-citizens in associations. This is an important topic, and I've tried to provide an exhaustive list in a forthcoming publication ('Non-Citizens in Athenian Associations,' in Canevaro, ed. *New Approaches to Greek Institutions*, Edinburgh). In the meantime, although the groups *IG* II^3 4, 633 and 634 almost certainly feature slaves (as Gabrielsen says), I'm not sure they involve any citizens, and so I don't think they're good examples of non-citizens in citizen associations.

Gabrielsen attacks Ferguson's distinction between citizen and non-citizen *orgeones*. He claims that 'our evidence discredits a sharp distinction between citizen and non-citizen *orgeones* in the fourth as well as the third century,' but the examples he gives of *orgeones* with non-citizens are almost all from the third century (the exception is from 313/2). So it may be that a distinction between citizen and non-citizen groups did hold for much of the classical period, but broke down at the end of the fourth.

Gabrielsen also attacks Lambert's theory that *orgeones* and *thiasoi* could be sub-groups of phratries. He claims that all Isaeus 2.14 suggests is that men could call on *orgeones* as witnesses that they had been introduced in a phratry; but what Isaeus says is that he was *inscribed* in his deme and 'among the *orgeones*' (εἰς τοὺς ὀργεῶνας), and he seems to think that proves he's is a citizen. He's not just calling on the *orgeones* as witnesses to his induction into a phratry.

Finally, Gabrielsen thinks that associations eventually came to challenge the state by introducing a 'fourth space,' in addition to the public, private and sacred, where citizens and non-citizens could interact. But while *SEG* 25.155, from Rhamnous, may well feature citizen/non-citizen interaction, its date (236/5) means that it doesn't tell us much about fourth century Athens. And (as I hope to show in my forthcoming piece) that inscription is actually the earliest good evidence we have for joint citizen/non-citizen associations in the demes.

Those were my highlights. I can only add that the volume as a whole is a success, despite some poor proofreading (one piece still contains a reference to 'this and the following chapter' of the book it was originally a part of!) Undergraduates won't find much to interest them in a volume like this, but for scholars of classical Athens it will be required reading.

JAMES KIERSTEAD
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON
james.kierstead@vuw.ac.nz