

small-group bonding for unit cohesion in this later period, while noting that more research is needed on military communities in this period.

The volume finishes with a paper by Rawlings, which explores how and why unit cohesion could fail in both Greek and Roman contexts. Drawing on a wide range of historical examples, Rawlings argues that breakdown on the battlefield could be influenced by pre-existing ('predispositional') attitudes as well as events that occurred during the battle itself ('precipitating'), highlighting a number of different factors, followed by a brief discussion of how loss of cohesion could spread through a beleaguered army.

The book is a welcome addition to the literature considering psychological aspects of the ancient military, and it does a good job of relating the abstract concept of unit cohesion to its impact on the battlefield. However, as several contributors note, the Greek and Roman historical sources are not always suited to this sort of interrogation, particularly those impacted by formulaic battle-narrative *topoi*. The volume would have benefited from some use of archaeological data, including battlefield and conflict archaeology, particularly in the context of the loss of cohesion, most vividly illustrated in the excavations at the site of the 9 CE 'Varus Disaster' Roman defeat at Kalkriese (Germany). However, the omission of archaeological data is the only real criticism of a volume that otherwise engages well with the question of what unit cohesion was in the ancient world, how it functioned and, most importantly, the impact it had on the battlefield; it can only be hoped that it inspires more research in this neglected area.

University of Liverpool

JOANNE E. BALL
jeball.archaeology@gmail.com

DEVELOPMENTS IN EARLY GREECE

BERNHARDT (J.C.), CANEVARO (M.) (edd.) *From Homer to Solon. Continuity and Change in Archaic Greece. (Mnemosyne Supplements 454.)* Pp. x+492, ill. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2022. Cased, €144, US\$174. ISBN: 978-90-04-51362-4.

BILLOWS (R.A.) *The Spear, the Scroll, and the Pebble. How the Greek City-State Developed as a Male Warrior-Citizen Collective.* Pp. xvi+267, map, colour pls. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2023. Paper, £24.99, US\$34.95 (Cased, £75, US\$100). ISBN: 978-1-350-28919-2 (978-1-350-28920-8 hbk).

doi:10.1017/S0009840X23002469

These two volumes engage with the question of how the Greek *polis* developed, focusing on how the *polis* as a male citizen collective took shape. Billows's single-author volume takes a big-picture approach to the question of *polis* development and works very much in the traditional narrative of the Archaic period as a precursor to the Classical, while the contributions in Bernhardt and Canevaro's edited volume seek to break from that teleological narrative by each tackling a specific question around legal, social and political developments in the archaic *polis*. As these volumes take diverging approaches to the

question, this review will begin with a summary of each volume and then discuss the two alongside one another.

The Spear, the Scroll, and the Pebble

Billows argues that the key features of the development of the *polis* as a male citizen collective and as exemplified by classical Athens are hoplite warfare, collective voting and mass literacy. Each of these components is represented by a token – the spear, the pebble and the scroll –, and, following two scene-setting chapters, each token receives its own chapter. Billows's approach is comprehensive, synthesising material from mostly mainland Greece into a narrative of *polis* development that spans the Archaic to the early Hellenistic periods.

Chapter 1 examines the political development of the *polis* and *ethnos*, focusing primarily on the area of mainland Greece; Billows moves through four political types: the *ethnos*, the centrifugal *polis* (Boiotia, Argolid), and the centripetal *polis* 1 (Sparta) and 2 (Athens). Chapter 2 turns to the question of economic development in the early *poleis*, when Billows argues for *polis*-economies as both producers and consumers and for the need to recognise a higher level of long-distance trade than has previously been admitted. Chapter 3 begins the examination of Billows's three tokens for *polis* development with the hoplite spear. Arguing for hoplite warfare as 'fundamentally egalitarian' (p. 92), Billows repeats the premise that the 'equal' armour of a 'middle class' of citizens helped shape the definition of the citizen body as a collective of middling, equal citizens. There is then a short discussion of fleets as empowering the lower classes through their participation in warfare. Chapter 4 turns to the issue of collective decision-making by the warrior collective of the hoplite phalanx (and fleet); here Billows uses Sparta, Athens and the Boiotian Confederacy as exemplary types of collective decision-making. The chapter ends with a review of Greek political theory and a reading of the Old Oligarch as a sophistic treatise in defence of democracy. Chapter 5 addresses the question of widespread literacy devoted to the purpose of political participation in Greek *poleis*. Billows begins with the economic purpose behind increasing rates of literacy to then switch tack and focus completely on the value of widespread literacy for mass political engagement. His arguments for the prevalence of literacy across the Greek world extrapolate from evidence for schools in small *poleis* such as Mykalessos (Thuc. 7.29–30) alongside references to schooling in Athenian literature. In the conclusion Billows reveals that he deems mass literacy as the key component to city-state development, focusing on this one token at the expense of the other two.

Overall, the book presents a review of the Greek *polis* that is accessible to a range of audiences and that, while not groundbreaking, presents interesting points. The discussion of Greek economies in Chapter 2 is solid, albeit Athenocentric, and could have benefited the overall narrative line of the book if the discussion of economic development and necessity had been a more consistent throughline in the chapters. Billows's arguments about literacy raise interesting points, particularly as he brings in material from neuroscience on the effects of reading (though, oddly, this is presented in the conclusion and not in Chapter 5), but these arguments are ultimately unsupported due to a lack of discussion on the effects of literacy levels, literacy in *poleis* outside of the Athenian zone, and how mass literacy rates interacted with the still largely oral culture of the Greek *poleis* in the Classical period (let alone the Archaic). More concerningly, the lack of clear timelines and recognition of period dynamics means that Billows blurs the lines between Archaic and Classical, even early Hellenistic, periods and institutions and that the Classical period stands as the 'norm' which the Archaic period must lead up to. There is also, despite the book's premise to examine the development of the Greek

polis, which would require engagement with Iron Age and Archaic period material, a privileging of classical and later source material; in Chapter 3, for example, Caesar's *Gallic Wars* are brought in alongside Homeric warfare, but Tyrtæus' poetry as evidence of archaic hoplite warfare is buried in the endnotes, while in Chapter 4 Billows jumps from Homeric evidence of collective decision-making to Herodotus, Thucydides and the Old Oligarch despite archaic evidence being available from the lyric poets and epigraphic traditions.

From Homer to Solon

This collected volume began as a Celtic Conference in Classics panel (2014, Edinburgh), and the book arising from that panel aims to highlight the 'most advanced lines of research' around the Archaic period in recent years (p. 7). This broad summary of the volume's intent is narrowed by the political focus of the individual chapters: after an initial review chapter, the contributions examine citizen-membership (Chapters 6–8) and governing structures (including laws and individual leaders, Chapters 2, 10–14), with an additional three chapters on slavery (Chapters 3–5). The 'continuity and change' that the title promises to examine, therefore, primarily refer to political developments, structures and how individual leaders can participate in the *polis*. The chapters share a methodological focus on archaic sources whenever possible and a long-range view of the Archaic period coming out of the Iron Age but not as a proto-Classical period.

There are five chapters in Part 1 ('Approaching Early Archaic Greece'). J. Bintliff's short chapter reviews what he argues are the most significant trends in studying the Archaic period (post-LBA population dynamics; class; relationships with the east; and figurative art). P. Zeller's chapter presents a case study for a comparative approach to elucidate the Archaic period, where he uses the Free Icelandic State period as a comparable society to archaic Greece and to discuss the position of the Homeric *basileis* and their historical counterparts. The final three chapters in this section focus on slavery. D.M. Lewis develops a Panhellenic, ideal type of slavery from epic poetry that can then be used in specific contexts (such as Sparta and the helots) to examine the local peculiarities of slavery in specific regions of archaic Greece. S. Zanovello's chapter establishes the right of ownership in epic poetry before then examining how manumission functioned for male versus female slaves, while J.B. Meister situates *Op.* 405–6 and Hesiod's advice to buy a female slave in the economic context and marriage norms of the Archaic period. The three chapters on slavery are the strongest of this section; Bintliff's chapter gives little rationale for or concerted discussion of the themes he raises, and, while Zeller's approach seems to bear fruit, he does not engage with other studies that incorporate a comparative approach (e.g. M. Wecowski, *The Rise of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet* [2014], pp. 21–3).

Part 2 ('Citizens and City-States') opens with A. Duplouy's chapter on *hippotrophia*, where he argues that citizenship in the Archaic period overall is something one does through participation in civic institutions, which, for the archaic elite, includes horse-rearing. G. Seelentag's chapter continues the discussion of citizenship as participatory, using Cretan social institutions to examine the process of defining citizenship through socio-political participation. T. Itgenshorst analyses early political thought as she demonstrates how 60+ archaic political thinkers present themselves as both inside and outside the *polis* since the appearance of independence and ability to critique is more important than actively participating and fixing the situation. E.M. Harris and Lewis end the section with a review of 181 law-code inscriptions to argue that early Greek law is primarily substantive (concerned with regulation) rather than procedural and as such is part of the back and forth of regulating intra-elite competition by mandating appropriate behaviour. This section overall is strong and demonstrates the range of potential evidence

for the period if one is willing to go beyond the epic tradition and the better-known lyric poets.

S. Scharff's chapter on archaic colonisation opens Part 3 ('Leaders and Reformers'), as he argues against having set rules for how archaic colonisation functioned by highlighting the range of options available to oikists and settlers. Scharff relies heavily on Thucydides' account of the settlement of Sicily and shows, at the same time, a thoughtful approach to using classical evidence within an archaic context. J. Taylor begins the turn to this section's primary focus on tyrants/tyrant-figures, examining how the form of archaic tyranny grows out of that of the Homeric *basileis* and then, as the 'rule of law' develops in the archaic *poleis*, how this model of single rule becomes increasingly unacceptable. L. Hübner's chapter argues for a two-streamed reception of Homer in the sixth century, one directed by or to tyrants (e.g. Ibycus and Polycrates) that then (in the second stream) spreads to and is adopted by the demos (e.g. Stesichorus, associated with the western colonies and Sparta). Canevaro and Bernhardt both turn to the figure of Solon in their chapters: Canevaro contextualises Solon's reforms as seen in the traditions around him and his poetry within concerns about excessive social mobility (up and down) in archaic Athens, while Bernhardt applies earlier arguments about Solon as a tyrant-figure (e.g. E. Irwin, *Solon and Early Greek Poetry* [2006]) to argue that Solon, as seen in his poems, laws and later traditions, was a failed tyrant who was co-opted into the narrative of democratic Athens starting in the 460s BCE. This section is, perhaps, the most traditional of the book, as it follows a variation on the Great Man of history narrative; it does offer interesting new readings of 'great men' (tyrants and Solon), though Canevaro's acceptance of the biographical tradition for poets other than Solon and Bernhardt's for Solon is more sanguine than some.

The volume overall is strong and presents engaging readings of archaic political development and citizen group formation. The contributions employ a range of evidence, though the balance still weighs to the literary and historiographical, and the geographical range of the chapters is (like Billows's book) narrow as, with the exception of Scharff's chapter, the contributions are predominantly concerned with mainland Greece despite the cultural importance of Ionia and widespread movements into the Black Sea and the western Mediterranean in the Archaic period. The volume's goal of bringing national conversations together was met, but it should be noted that the 'different national historiographical communities' (p. 7) involved are all north-western European (the UK, Germany, Netherlands, France and Switzerland).

The choice of title for the volume introduces a few contradictions. The title *From Homer to Solon* and the chronological range alluded to by it is much narrower than that of the Archaic period and the actual spread of the book, which, with Chapter 9, extends to c. 450 BCE. The focus on Homer and Solon in the title additionally undermines the goal of the collection to reassess traditional narratives around the Archaic period in general and the development of political communities in particular; as the majority of the contributions show, there is more to the Archaic period than the Homeric epics and the early political developments in Athens that eventually lead to Athenian democracy. Part 1 is a mishmash of topics; thus, the section title and contents do not fit easily together. As a final point, the bibliography is a little spotty; the publication date of 2022 means that there was the opportunity to bring in publications after the panel in 2014, yet a number of contributions show few if any publications after 2014–2017.

The Spear to Solon

To put my cards on the table: as someone who primarily works on the Archaic period, I am more sympathetic to the approach taken by the contributions in *From Homer to Solon*. This

volume attempts to push back against the teleological narrative that sees the Archaic period as notable for the epic tradition (particularly Homer) and as arranging everything in a line for democratic, classical Athens. *The Spear, the Scroll, and the Pebble*, on the other hand, embraces that narrative and uses it as a starting point for Billows's investigation of how his three tokens emblemise the Greek *polis*, by which he means classical Athens.

Yet in setting the two next to one another, the question of how much we can distance a history of the Archaic period from the Classical period and Athens arises: the final three contributions in Bernhardt and Canevaro all focus on figures integral to the narrative of the development of Athenian democracy, and the Homeric epics, which feature prominently in traditional narratives of the Archaic period, feature in three chapters as well. I raise this point not to say that we should not study archaic Athens or political developments in/through Homer, but because Bernhardt's and Billows's introductions offer two opposing takes on the question, and the answer is likely somewhere in the middle, if we might be permitted a Theognidean stance. Billows argues that a focus on Athens in the Archaic as well as Classical period is necessary due to the importance the *polis* holds in Greek history and political theorising; Bernhardt in his introduction to the volume argues for looking at the Archaic period on its own terms as a connected period to the Iron Age before it and not focusing on the break between Homer and classical Athens. Billows's approach disregards the fact that the majority of Greek *poleis* and citizen communities did not operate on the model of Athens or the other large *poleis*, while the risk with Bernhardt's is that we might fall back into the familiar focus if we do not critically engage with what we discuss and how the prominence of classical Athens in our source material and historical traditions affects our own historiographical choices (so, why is it that Solon has two chapters to himself in Bernhardt and Canevaro when there are other tyrant-ish figures and reformers?).

Both volumes ultimately focus on the male political communities of the Greek *poleis*, and for Bernhardt and Canevaro's volume the focus on male citizen communities follows the Celtic Conference in Classics panel title of 'Mass, Elite, and the Order of the *Polis*' more than it does the book's title. In summarising the Greek city-states, Billows highlights their 'communal deliberation and decision making', the 'self-equipped and self-motivated citizen militias' and 'their cultural and religious activities', which were collective, in the open and non-hierarchical (p. 1); yet of that list, religious activities make no appearance in the volume. In Bernhardt and Canevaro the place of women in the *polis* is excised completely (though female slaves in the Homeric and Hesiodic epics are discussed), while the question of slavery is addressed outside of the setting of political communities. The focus in Parts 2 and 3 on male citizen groups derives from a continued understanding of citizenship as political citizenship – the exertion of political rights and participation in running a *polis* (M.H. Hansen, *Polis* [2006], pp. 111–12) – rather than any other type of citizenship, such as religious citizenship (access to shared cult and sanctuaries, F. de Polignac, *Cults, Territory, and the Origins of the Greek City-State* [1995], pp. 124–5); Duplouy raises the contrast (p. 142). Duplouy's and Seelentag's chapters engage with other ways of expressing citizenship through social practices (horse-rearing, commensal institutions), but the understanding that these social and commensal citizenships result in political citizenship maintains the focus on the male citizen group. Both volumes, then, confirm this basic narrative of the Greek *polis*: that it was solely a community in which free, citizen men participated since the only functional form of participation is political citizenship. Yet expanding our study of citizenship beyond political citizenship to examine the collective participation of men and women, citizen and non-citizens, free and enslaved, in shared spaces and institutions offers the opportunity to look at 'circles of integration' (to use Seelentag's phrase) in *polis* communities and how participation

functions in those circles to examine how multiple groups could participate in a *polis* community and express varying degrees and types of citizenship. Understanding what the different types of citizenship are and how they interact, how they differ from *polis* to *polis*, may also help to accomplish the question Billows sets out to answer, namely, how male collectives of citizen warriors came to define themselves as the centre of their communities across the Greek world: political citizenship differentiates them from women where religious citizenship may not, while economic citizenship separates the citizen from non-citizen, the free man with rights of ownership from the enslaved person, and so forth. Together these two volumes have begun a conversation on (political) citizenship, the formation of citizen communities and the *polis*, but it is one that can still be pushed further.

Billows' *The Spear, the Scroll, and the Pebble* and Bernhardt and Canevaro's *From Homer to Solon* will be useful volumes, though for different audiences. Billows's volume, which has a broad audience in mind, will be helpful for students, though instructors seeking to diversify their Greek history and society courses may find it difficult to incorporate material outside of the citizen male collective alongside this volume, if only because of the apparently universal (and latent) conviction that, if something is not in the textbook, it is not important (on which: J.M. Bennet, *History Matters* [2006], p. 131). *From Homer to Solon* will, on the other hand, be useful for those working on the Archaic period and the various institutions and bodies of evidence discussed in the collection. Individual chapters could likely be incorporated into Greek history courses (Harris and Lewis' chapter, for example), but this would be on a case-by-case basis.

MacEwan University

JESSICA M. ROMNEY
romneyj2@macewan.ca

THE LAWS OF DRACO AND SOLON

SCHMITZ (W.) *Leges Draconis et Solonis (LegDrSol). Eine neue Edition der Gesetze Dracons und Solons mit Übersetzung und historischer Einordnung*. Unter Mitarbeit von Anja Dorn und Tino Shahin. 2 Bände. (*Historia Einzelschriften* 270.) Pp. xiv + x + 943, ills, map. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2023. Cased, €146. ISBN: 978-3-515-13361-6.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X23002779

Around 630 BCE Draco enacted laws for the Athenians, and in 594/3 BCE Solon repealed the laws of Draco except those about homicide and enacted laws on all aspects of life ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 7.1). The evidence for these laws has been preserved in many different sources, whose reliability varies. In some cases we know that laws enacted around 400 BCE were wrongly attributed to Solon (e.g. the laws about *nomothesia* at Dem. 20.93–4). In 1966 E. Ruschenbusch published a collection of the fragments of Solon's laws. D.F. Leão and P.J. Rhodes published a collection of the laws of Draco and Solon in 2015. S. has now produced a two-volume collection with *testimonia*, 143 fragments with German translation and extensive commentary, bibliography, a concordance with other editions, index of sources, and an index of names and topics. The fragments are discussed in nine chapters,