KLEISTHENES AND ATHENIAN DEMOCRACY – VISION FROM ABOVE OR BELOW?


David Pritchard

This article reviews the recent book of Greg Anderson and contributes to ongoing debates about the significance of Kleisthenes and the development of Athenian democracy. Anderson demonstrates exhaustively that Athens of the sixth century lacked any significant military capacity, making it vulnerable to invasion and a minor player in Greek affairs, and was afflicted with limited and ineffectual public institutions. Thus public life largely consisted of unfettered rivalries between leaders of a handful of elite clans, who competed for preeminence through conspicuous consumption, private alliances, the leading of private military ventures, and the securing of magistracies and religious roles for themselves and their fellow clansmen. This could be a high-stakes contest that sometimes resulted in one or another leader and his clan forced out of the city by their rivals, with public life eventually breaking down into the long tyranny of Peisistratos and his sons. If we fast-forward to 490 BCE, Anderson reminds us how everything had changed. At the battle of Marathon Athens deploys an army of 9000 citizen hoplites, far larger than that of any other city-state (including Sparta), and, with this unexpected victory over the Persians, confirms its status as a dominant power in the Greek world. Moreover, the decision to go to war, like others concerning foreign affairs and an ever-increasing range of public activities, was taken in the new popular boulē (‘council’) and ekklesia (‘assembly’). Although political proposals, in 490, were still made by elite Athenians as part of their efforts to be first among their peers, it was now the dēmos (‘people’) ultimately deciding which proposal the city should pursue. This popular adjudication reduced the traditional instability engendered
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by elite competitiveness, with the people themselves now reserving the right to expel
prominent members of the elite through the new institution of ostracism.

This general picture of the transformation of late archaic Athens has been drawn
before and probably represents the consensus position of those scholars currently working
in the period. Nonetheless things start to get very interesting when Anderson considers
why archaic Athens was so weak and when exactly this transformation took place. The
novel argument of his book is that Athens of the sixth century was far from properly
integrated with its surrounding region: the effectiveness of city-based institutions and
leaders fell a long way short of the borders of Attike, no mechanism existed to register the
free male inhabitants of the region as citizens of Athens or to involve them in its political
and military affairs, and these inhabitants had no sense of being part of a collectivity
covering all of Attike. Additionally non-elite Athenians played no part politically or
otherwise in the public life of the archaic city. Anderson rejects the standard view that the
involvement of non-elite Athenians in politics and warfare and the integration of Athens
and its region were gradual, long-term processes, involving reforming leaders such as
Solon and Peisistratos. Instead he believes they were achieved only as part of the tribal
and political reforms of Kleisthenes and his associates in 508/7. Even then, Anderson
maintains, for non-elite Athenians a sense of shared Athenian identity and of being part of
the dēmos took much longer to develop, being as it was the result of the mixing of citizens
in tribal activities, their experience of new political institutions and the cultural programme
of Kleisthenes and his successors (pp. 22, 40, 81, 83, 119, 124-5, 197, 216).

With the notable exception of Frank Frost, no other scholar has argued that Athens
was so lacking in basic state organization and political processes until the very end of the
sixth century. Anderson’s new timetable might challenge orthodoxy, but few scholars

\[2\] For this standard view see, for example, W.G. Forrest, *The Emergence of Greek
Democracy: The Character of Greek Politics* (London, 1978), pp. 143-203; M. Ostwald,
*From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of the Law: Law, Society, and Politics in

History*, 1 (1976), pp. 66-75; ‘Politics in Early Athens’, in G.S. Shrimpton and D.J.
McCargar (eds.), *Classical Contributions: Essays in Honour of M.F. McGregor* (New
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would disagree with him that the Kleisthenic reforms were a historical watershed. Since Attike was around fifty times larger and more populous than the average-sized khōra (‘countryside’) of a Greek city, Kleisthenes effectively consolidated ‘not so much a city-state as a region state’ (p. 3). By doing so he laid one of the foundations for the military might of fifth-century Athens. Nonetheless Anderson returns to scholarly iconoclasm by mounting a detailed case against the influential and recently made interpretation of Josh Ober that the impetus for these reforms came not from Kleisthenes but from the dēmos itself. Instead Anderson maintains (p. 81): ‘...the new order was not the spontaneous creation of a popular revolutionary fervor, however much the support of nonelite citizens might have been crucial to its success. Rather, it should be seen as a massive, ingenious, and artfully self-conscious exercise in social engineering – the product, in short, of a vision from above, not below.’ While privileging Kleisthenes as the creator of the institutions that would be responsible for the military might and full democracy of classical Athens, Anderson acknowledges and explores how the Athenians quickly forgot what he did, preferring to see the mythical king Theseus as the one who unified Attike and founded – along with Solon – the democracy.

STRENGTHS

There are four reasons why this book will be received as an important study and essential reading for ancient historians, research students and researchers in the social sciences seeking qualitative case studies of nation-building before the modern period. Firstly, the book is timely. It is only one of three monographs on Kleisthenes to appear in more than three decades. And since Anderson studies in some detail the century or more before 508/7, in order to gauge the significance of the Kleisthenic reforms, and extends his analysis down to 490, his book is even rarer still: a monograph-length discussion of archaic

---


5 The others are P. Siewert, Die Trittyen Attikas und die Heeresreform des Kleisthenes (Munich, 1982) and M. Rausch, Isonomia in Athen: Veränderungen des öffentlichen Lebens vom Sturz der Tyrannis bis zur zweiten Perserawehr (Frankfurt, 1999).
Athens. Secondly, Anderson’s engagement with relevant evidence, publications and ongoing scholarly controversies is extraordinarily thorough. Thus there are 78 pages of endnotes and bibliography compared with only 217 of text. Thirdly, this work of political history does not confine itself to legal and political institutions as ancient historians have been wont to do. For the sake of fully understanding the political transformation of archaic Athens, Anderson factors in social practices, self-identities of elite and non-elite Athenians, and the imprints of political change on mythology, religion and public art and architecture. Finally Anderson’s employment and negotiation of what is challenging evidence is exceptionally good. He intelligently draws on material culture to balance out limited literary sources, which are frequently contradictory and far from contemporary with the events they describe. Anderson also shows great touch in his evaluation of solitary ancient references or well-established scholarly interpretations, usually weighing each against both the entirety of evidence and its probability in light of what else is known of archaic practices. As a result, he often shows ancient sources to be of little evidentiary value and hoary old arguments to be shibboleths.

SUMMARY AND CRITIQUE

This book breaks down into three parts. Part 1 (chapters 1-2) considers the new institutions and practices Kleisthenes and his associates introduce and demonstrates how they represented a clean break with the past. Part 2 (chapters 3-4) explores the impact of the reforms on the city’s political and religious centres, the agora and Akropolis respectively. Part 3 (chapters 5-9) analyzes how mythology, hero cult, religious festivals and the celebration of recent events were used to constitute, represent and legitimize the reforms.

PART 1: POLITICAL CHANGE

In chapter 1 ‘From City-State to Region-State’ (pp. 13-42) Anderson overturns the scholarly consensus that Athens and Attike were politically unified in the archaic period. The most compelling aspect of this critique is that even in the sixth century the ambit of the city’s politics and laws did not extend to regions beyond the plain surrounding Athens (pp. 24-34). This is borne out by his close and very original consideration of the exile of the Alkmeonids from approximately 600 to 560 and 546/5 to 525/4 (pp. 24-30). Anderson
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6 In this respect the only book to which it might be compared is P.B. Manville, *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens* (Princeton, 1990).
shows that when the city-based families of this clan were expelled by their rivals, they did not leave the country – as scholars have traditionally assumed – but settled near Sounion on the coast in south-eastern Attike. There, contrary to a law of Solon against excessive mortuary expenditure, the Alkmeonids erected monumental *kouroi* as grave markers. Anderson makes a good case too for Peisistratos, whose family had been long based in the city, spending his first period of exile (approximately 561/0 to 556/5) within Attike, most probably at Brauron (pp. 30-4). Perceptively he points out that these internal exiles do more than evince the disunity of sixth-century Attike. They also call into question the often-made generalization that the elite rivalries of the period had a regional dimension (pp. 31-2). This is based on the ancient tradition that each of the contending leaders of mid-sixth-century Athens had regional supporters, with the Alkmeonid Megakles leading the ‘men of the coast’, Peisistratos the ‘men of the hills’ (including Brauron), and Lykourgos the ‘men of the plain’ around the city. But critical details here do not fit with what Anderson has already established: the Alkmeonids and Peisistratos had long been based in or around the city, spending only their periods of exile in the ‘coast’ and ‘hills’ respectively. Anderson plausibly suggests that this ancient tradition was an attempt of the mid-fifth century to account for memories of the links of Megakles and Peisistratos with these regions at a time when it was believed that Attike had always been properly unified.

Chapter 1 closes with a concise analysis of how the reforms of Kleisthenes finally unified Athens and Attike by co-opting the demes into political and military administration, grouping these villages and suburbs from three different regions of Attike into ten tribes, and using the latter as the subdivisions of a new popular council and city-based army (pp. 34-42). In so doing Anderson strengthens the case against the well-known argument – made most frequently by Greg Stanton and the late Peter Bicknell – that Kleisthenes gerrymandered the assigning of demes to tribes in order to give his *genos* political advantage over others (pp. 37-9). Apart from repeating the good observation of

---

7 *Ath. Pol.* 13.3-4; Herodotos 1.59.

Kurt Raaflaub that the broad support Kleisthenes gained for his reforms speaks against such a partisan manipulation, Anderson points out that we know too little about the local affiliations of other Athenian genē to determine whether they were disadvantaged by the tribal reforms (p. 38).⁹

In chapter 2 ‘In Search of Popular Government’ (pp. 43-84) Anderson mounts a strong case against any significant involvement of the Athenian dēmos in political life before the reforms of Kleisthenes. Of course non-elite Athenians, from the later fifth century, and most elite writers of the next century saw things rather differently: the mythical king Theseus and the early sixth-century lawgiver Solon were somehow or another both founding fathers of the democracy (pp. 44-50).¹⁰ In this chapter Anderson is again arguing against a scholarly consensus; for most ancient historians – as he acknowledges (pp. 59, 235 n.1) – accept the literary testimonia for Solon’s instituting of a Council of Four Hundred, whose purpose was to draft proposals for the assembly.¹¹ Such a council presupposes the involvement of non-elite citizens in politics, as ‘the very need for such a body implies that the Assembly met regularly and played a meaningful role in the conduct state business’ (pp. 59; cf. 54). Anderson gives us three new arguments putting beyond doubt – as far as this reviewer is concerned – that this council was invented by the Athenian oligarchs of 411 as part of their efforts to legitimate the undemocratic Council of Four Hundred they were imposing on the city.¹² Firstly, as the Athenian assembly, before

---


¹² In addition to the ones he takes over from C. Hignett, A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford, 1952), pp. 92-6.
508/7, is attested to have met only once and to have had only two political functions – the election and review of magistrates, a council to help with such modest roles hardly seems necessary (pp. 59, 63). Secondly, the extant poetry of Solon suggests this reformer had no interest whatsoever in empowering the dēmos politically (pp. 63-6): he claims to be maintaining the status quo between rich and poor and suggests that the people must follow their leaders and be restrained with a sharp goad. Finally Anderson’s investigation of the years from ca. 561 to ca. 546/5 as a case study of public life in sixth-century Athens reveals no trace of a popular council or the political participation of non-elite Athenians it presupposes (pp. 67-76). Instead politics was by and large a contest of the leaders of two or three elite clans for recognized pre-eminence. Although leaders certainly got ahead by winning magistracies for themselves or fellow clansmen, their rivalry was pursued largely outside of the city’s rudimentary political and legal institutions: they sought the esteem of peers through conspicuous consumption in the form of religious dedications, family tombs, and chariot-racing; priesthoods and religious benefactions, especially in relation to their city-protecting deity, Athena Polias; and the leading of private military ventures. Alternatively they negotiated private alliances between each other, often sealing these with marriages of convenience.

Anderson details how the evidence for the involvement of non-elite Athenians in politics begins only in 508/7 (pp. 52-7, 76-83). At this time the Athenian people welcomed Kleisthenes’ proposals for tribal and political reforms (p. 52), played an active role in preventing his rival Isagoras from establishing a partisan oligarchy with Spartan aid, and supported the proposed reforms once they had recalled Kleisthenes and his clan from exile. The reforms formally involved the Athenian dēmos in politics by making every law or public action of the city dependent on the approval of the assembly and the new popular Council of Five Hundred – institutions which would remain the core of what would become, by the 450s, a fully-elaborated direct democracy. Within only a few years the Athenian people were taking full advantage of this new power by making decisions about activities once pursued privately by elite Athenians (pp. 54-6). Around 506 we have the first ever extant decree of the Athenian assembly, giving directions to the city’s magistrate on Salamis (p. 56). Certainly in 499 (and probably even in 507) we find the dēmos
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determining the foreign policy of Athens.\footnote{Anderson cites only Herodotos 5.96-7 concerning the Ionian revolt of 499 (p. 56). There may well be an earlier example at Herodotos 5.66 where Athenian ambassadors, in 507, are severely censured by the people for having made a peace with the Persians on their own initiative.} And before the century’s close they gained the sole right to expel prominent citizens through the new institution of ostracism (pp. 53, 233 n.17).\footnote{Anderson overlooks a classic study of ostracism and the date of its introduction: D.J. Phillips, ‘Athenian Ostracism’, in G.H.R. Horsley (ed.), \textit{Hellenika: Essays on Greek History and Politics} (Sydney, 1982), pp. 21-44.}

Anderson finishes chapter 2 by building on the critiques of Ober’s interpretation of 508/7 by Raaflaub and David Ames Curtis (pp. 76-83; cf. 9, 51-2, 220 n.9).\footnote{For Ober’s original statement of his interpretation of 508/7, see n. 4 above. It is the main subject of debate in an exchange of chapters between himself and Raaflaub: Raaflaub, ‘Power in the Hands’; J. Ober 1998, ‘Revolution Matters: Democracy as Demotic Action (A Response to Kurt A. Raaflaub)’, in I. Morris and K.A. Raaflaub (eds.), \textit{Democracy 2500?: Questions and Challenges} (Dubuque,1998), pp. 67-85; and K.A. Raaflaub, ‘The Thetes and Democracy (A Response to Josiah Ober)’, in I. Morris and K.A. Raaflaub (eds.), \textit{Democracy 2500?: Questions and Challenges} (Dubuque,1998), pp. 87-103. For the critique of Ober by Curtis, see P. Lévêque and P. Vidal-Naquet, \textit{Cleisthenes the Athenian: An Essay on the Representation of Space and Time in Greek Political Thought from the End of the Sixth Century to the Death of Plato}, translated and edited by D.A. Curtis (Atlantic Heights, 1996), pp. xiii-xvii.} In view of its inadvertent misrepresentations of Ober and its own ambiguities, this is the weakest section of an otherwise impressive chapter. Ober of course sees as a historical turning point the three-day siege of the Akropolis by the Athenians in 508/7, which forced King Kleomenes of Sparta and his troops to leave Attike and prevented Isagoras and his supporters from setting up a narrow, partisan oligarchy. On the basis of what this reviewer believes is a sound evidentiary base, he explains that this siege was a spontaneous uprising of non-elite Athenians, who acted independently of elite leaders, such as the exiled Kleisthenes and his clansmen, and whose actions alone ensured that the proposed reforms of the Alkmeonid would be enacted.\footnote{Ober, \textit{The Athenian Revolution}, pp. 38, 43, 51.} For Ober this is the moment when poor Athenians ‘stepped onto the
historical stage’ and was predicated on their new perceptions of themselves as the dēmos of Athens and as deserving of a say in the city’s public affairs.¹⁹ Like Raaflaub, he believes that non-elite Athenians formed this new identity in the course of the sixth century.²⁰ Ober also concedes, in response to Raaflaub’s critique, that it took decades after 508/7 for the institutions of democracy and for its core concepts, such as political egalitarianism, to be fully elaborated.²¹ Nonetheless, as the new institution of the Council of Five Hundred and the reformed assembly made non-elite citizens the arbiters of public policy and laws, Ober believes that the Kleisthenic reforms mark the true beginning of Athenian democracy and the preconditions of its future development. Therefore, believing that the impetus of these reforms came not from above but from the people itself, he concludes: ‘…dēmokratia was not a gift from a benevolent elite to a passive demos, but was the product of collective decision, action, and self-definition on the part of the demos itself.’²²

Anderson’s strongest reason for rejecting Ober’s view of 508/7 is that lacking any formal role in the politics of sixth-century Athens, non-elite Athenians could not have developed ‘their own independent political agenda’, making it impossible for them to drive and shape the Kleisthenic reforms (p. 79). Thus the ‘contents’ of the reforms were not ‘the spontaneous products of any revolutionary mass fervor’ (pp. 9; cf. 81). Anderson argues that with a ‘popular mandate’ in hand Kleisthenes and his fellow reformers simply ‘…saw a historic opportunity to author a series of initiatives that would not merely reward their nonelite supporters but help to resolve perhaps the two most fundamental and intractable problems that faced the Athenians at this time: chronic military vulnerability and recurring political turmoil’ (p. 82). The self-identities of the residents of Attike as Athenians and the dēmos were instead the products of the institutions Kleisthenes created and the subsequent cultural programme (pp. 81, 83; cf. 22, 40, 119, 124-5, 197, 216).

Here unfortunately Anderson misrepresents what exactly Ober believes the dēmos and Kleisthenes did in 508/7. Ober readily admits that the people’s ‘new vision of society’ was ‘inchoate’ and that Kleisthenes played ‘an innovative and indeed essential role
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²² Ober, The Athenian Revolution, p. 35.
as...[the] designer of institutions capable of framing and stabilizing a new ideology'.

He also believes – like Christian Meier – that the new political aspirations of the Athenian people would never had been realized without the institutions Kleisthenes worked out. Moreover, Anderson’s own book, despite its explicit criticism of Ober, strongly suggests that non-elite Athenians played a decisive role in the uprising of 508/7 and the subsequent defence and development of democracy in the next few decades: for example, he writes of ‘the crucial part played in the events of 508/7 by nonelite citizens’ (p. 79) and details how, within only a few years, they were asserting their power to make decisions on foreign affairs and public administration (see above). Thus his book ends up confirming that the reforms of Kleisthenes were no mere scraps thrown from the aristocratic table and would not have stuck without being taken up by non-elite Athenians.

His other two reasons for rejecting Ober’s interpretation of 508/7 are still more problematical. The first is that the Kleisthenic regime was not a democracy proper, as sub-hoplite citizens were not yet recognized as equal members of the citizen-body (p. 79). Here Anderson is repeating the well-known thesis of Raaflaub (cf. p. 80) that Athens only gained a democracy with the reforms of Ephialtes, in 462/1, when sub-hoplite citizens ‘came to enjoy full political equality and participation’ in recognition of their important new role as sailors in the city’s war fleet. Critically this militarily determinist explanation of Athenian democracy can no longer be sustained; for recent scholarship has effectively challenged the evidentiary basis for constitutional changes following changed modes of combat in ancient Greece. Moreover, no evidence exists for non-elite Athenians

believing – as Raaflaub assumes – that a citizen’s attainment of political and legal equality depended on his ability to contribute militarily to the city. Finally, Raaflaub misconstrues the nature of the reforms of Ephialtes: they did not extend rights to sub-hoplite citizens but rather gave new political and legal powers to *all* citizens. The last reason Anderson gives is that the Akropolis siege of 508/7 could not have been, as Ober writes, ‘the signal event in the history of democracy’, since classical Athenians never saw it as such (p. 80). In subsequent chapters, however, Anderson provides a critique of just such reasoning: classical Athenians did not grasp the momentousness of the Kleisthenic reforms, since, from 508/7, they preferred to see the reforms as a restoration of a pre-existing order founded by Solon and Theseus.

There is also some ambiguity whether Anderson sees the reforms of Kleisthenes as marking the beginning of Athenian democracy. He argues that we ‘should probably agree with Raaflaub’ that democracy was only realized after the reforms of Ephialtes, in 462/1, when sub-hoplite citizens were finally integrated fully into politics (p. 80). But Anderson also explicitly agrees with Ober that the reforms of Kleisthenes were much more important than those of Ephialtites and provided the ideological and institutional framework for the democracy (pp. 80-1). Even more contradictorily he writes that the passing of the Kleisthenic reforms brought *dēmokratia* to Athens (pp. 52, 57).

**PART 2: PHYSICAL SETTING**


29 Raaflaub believes that Kleisthenes was certainly not the founder of Athenian democracy (‘Power in the Hands’, p.33): ‘My thesis is that the ‘isonomic’ system introduced in the late sixth century by Cleisthenes ought to be distinguished quite sharply from the democracy that evolved, under fundamentally changed conditions, two generations later: it was only at this later stage that the unique features of Athenian *demokratia* – full participation in power and government by all citizens – was realized.’
In chapter 3 ‘The Agora: Showcase for a New Regime’ (pp. 87-103) Anderson suggests that the transformation of the agora into the city’s undisputed civic centre, after 508/7, constitutes underutilized evidence for how contemporaries perceived of and sought to represent the reforms of Kleisthenes. Following the traditional dating of the American excavators, Anderson attributes the clearing of what would become the political and commercial heart of classical Athens to the initiative of Peisistratos (pp. 88, 240 n.2). This new square remained a focus of attention for Peisistratos and his descendants: they probably lived in the domestic complex around so-called Building F (p. 88, fig. 6); Peisistratos himself, according to Pausanias, built the square’s fountain house in the 520s (pp. 89; cf. 22-4); and his grandson and namesake built its Altar of the Twelve Gods, which Hippias used as the centre point for his system of milestones recording the distance between Athens and each of its villages.\textsuperscript{30} Anderson simply rejects the earlier, standard suggestions that the square was built to accommodate the newly introduced agōnes of the festival of the Great Panathenaia or the changing political culture under the tyrants (pp. 90-1).\textsuperscript{31} Instead it was another of the self-promoting projects of sixth-century Athenian leaders and served as ‘an advertisement for the public munificence, power, and wealth of its sponsors’ (p. 91). However public works – consistently dated by Anderson to around 500 – soon changed the character and functions of the square. Horoi or boundary markers were laid down to delineate it as sacred and state-administrated space (pp. 95, 243 n.20). Nearby, on the hill of the Pnyx, the city’s first-known assembly-place was constructed, while in the agora itself the so-called Old Bouleuterion was built for the new popular Council of Five Hundred. This monumental building – along with the so-called Stoa Basileios that served as the square’s headquarters for the king archon (pp. 97-8, fig. 11) – were constructed in the Doric order. Also set up, in the last years of the sixth century, was the group of bronze statues by Antenor showing the Tyrannicides, Harmodios and Aristogeiton, on the point of assassinating Hipparkhos in 514/3 (pp. 94-5, fig. 9; cf. 199-206).

\textsuperscript{30} Pausanias 1.14.1. For the Altar of the Twelve Gods, see Thoukydides 6.54.6-7. For its use by Hippias, see Herodotos 2.7.1-2; Plato Hipparkhos 228b-9d; IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2640.

Anderson makes the original suggestion that the post-508/7 structures of the agora – notwithstanding their bold condemnation of the tyrants and reflection of new political realities – deliberately evoked ideas of traditionalism and continuity. For example, the Doric order of the Old Bouleuterion and Stoa Basileios suggested ‘traditional practices and cultural permanence hitherto built in this medium’ (p. 102), the Altar of the Twelve Gods was re-modeled so that it could duplicate the religious functions of the Prytaneion of the so-called old agora (pp. 92-3), and the probable residence of the tyrants was actually re-used for a political function and linked architecturally with the Old Bouleuterion. These features suggest to Anderson that ‘…Cleisthenes and his associates consciously refrained from presenting their experiment at face value. Rather, they chose to emphasize its reassuring continuities, real or imagined, with Athenian political tradition’ (p. 103).

The Achilles heel of this suggestion is that the dates of the square’s political buildings are now highly contested. The traditional date of around 500 was thrown into doubt when Homer Thompson – one of the pioneers of the agora excavations – belatedly changed his mind and down dated the Old Bouleuterion, Stoa Basileios and the Pnyx to the second quarter of the fifth century. A decade later Leslie Shear Jr. re-asserted the traditional dating of the Old Bouleuterion and Stoa Basileios (but not the Pnyx) after concluding that none of the potsherds in the construction fill of either building could be later than 500. Unfortunately this has not been the end of the matter, with the traditional

32 This contestation is well summarized by Raaflaub, ‘The Thetes and Democracy’, pp. 93-5.
34 T.L. Shear Jr., ‘The Persian Destruction of Athens: Evidence from Agora Deposits’, Hesperia, 62 (1993), pp. 383-482. Somewhat disingenuous is the suggestion of Anderson that the dating of the first phase of the Pnyx to ‘the final years of the sixth century’ is ‘majority opinion’ and ‘the consensus’, despite Thompson’s change of mind (pp. 96, 253 n.26): two of the authors he cites simply follow the original high date of the original excavators, with the third providing no reasons for declaring his support of the traditional position (Camp, ‘Before Democracy’, p. 11). Thompson explains that no archaeological or any other evidence for the first phase of the Pnyx exists, with the excavators (including himself) relying only on historical probability for suggesting the high date they did (Thompson, ‘The Pnyx’, 136).
high dating of individual buildings and even the square itself continuing to draw flack – most recently from John Papadopoulos.\footnote{See, for example, S.G. Miller, ‘Old Bouleuterion and Old Metroon in the Classical Agora at Athens’, in M.H. Hansen and K.A. Raaflaub (eds.), \textit{Studies in the Greek Polis}, Historia Einzelschriften 95 (Stuttgart, 1995), pp.133-56; and J. Papadopoulos, \textit{Ceramicus Redivivus: The Early Iron Age Potters’ Field in the Area of the Classical Athenian Agora}, Hesperia supplement 31 (Princeton, 2003), pp. 260-97.} Anderson relies on Shear’s work (pp. 243 n.7, 244 n.31) but does not explain why it should be preferred to the dating of others. While he is understandably reluctant to engage with the often heated debates of archaeologists (p. 7), in this chapter he needed to do so: its conclusions stand or fall on dating.

In Chapter 4 ‘The Acropolis: New Departures among Old Certainties’ (pp. 104-19) Anderson considers the lesser impact of the Kleisthenic reforms on the city’s religious centre – the Akropolis. He begins with a useful summary of the site’s history of use after the Mycenaean period (pp. 105-9), stressing that major building in this sanctuary begins only in the second quarter of the sixth century (p. 106). This includes the monumental ramp up its west entrance, the Sanctuary of Athena Nike, and the so-called Bluebeard Temple. Anderson tentatively suggests that the former two were commissioned by the \textit{genos} of Lykourgos, who controlled the priesthood of Athena Polias, while the latter was put up by their rivals, the Alkmeonids (pp. 106-8; cf. 70-1). In the same period there appeared on the Akropolis private treasuries of the city’s clans and votive dedications in unprecedented number and extravagance (p. 107). Although conceding that this surge of activity must be linked with the founding of the Great Panathenaia in the mid-560s, Anderson does not account for it in terms of a burgeoning religious sensibility or identity (pp. 107-8): rather it is a product of a ‘spirit of rivalry’ between elite leaders and clans. Private dedications and buildings continue after 508/7, but, within only a few years, monuments of the new political role of the \textit{dēmos} appear (pp. 112; cf. 157-8), such as an assembly decree concerning Salamis (see above) and the votive dedication of their military victories over Khalkis and Boiotia in 506.\footnote{\textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{3} 50; Herodotos 5.77.} Anderson presents the so-called Old Athena Temple as another of the commissions of the newly politicized Athenian people: while acknowledging its traditional date to the 520s, he cites recent publications dating its construction closer to 500 (pp. 110, 247 n.17). This temple has numerous stylistic archaisms (pp. 110-11). Anderson concludes that such ‘retro design features’ – along with the continuities in the private use of the sanctuary – again prove that ‘the new order’
wanted to stress its ‘reassuring conformity to the traditions of Athenian government’ (p. 115).

PART 3: IMAGINED COMMUNITY

In Chapter 5 ‘Tribes, Heroes, and the ‘Reunification’ of Attica’ (pp. 123-46) Anderson argues that Kleisthenes and his associates also employed myths and cults of pre-existing Attic heroes as part of their programme to legitimize and naturalize their tribal reforms. The assigning of Athenians to ten tribes was of course a ‘brazen new scheme’, which, far from simply providing subdivisions for the new Council of Five Hundred and the hoplite army, helped ‘foster the growth of a collective consciousness’ by bringing together residents from very different parts of Attike (p. 125). Anderson reminds us how the reformers obscured this novelty by giving the ten new tribes ‘a certain patina of antiquity’ (p. 128). The eponymous figurehead of each was an established demi-god with pre-existing myths, whose cult continued to be administered by the clansmen that had traditionally provided its priesthood even if they were not members of the new tribe (pp. 127-9, 131). Moreover, Kleisthenes did not abolish older groupings of Athenians such as the four Ionian tribes and the genē (132). While Anderson’s discussion here is again a useful summary of relevant scholarship and ancient evidence, its main observations have been made before by Denis Roussel and Emily Kearns.38 Chapter 5 goes on to develop the case that the myth of the unification of Attike by Theseus was invented and promulgated by Kleisthenes and his associates.39 The earliest source for this myth is

37 Despite this care of the reformers, Guy Olding marshals the evidence suggesting that it took two generations, until the 430s, before the ten tribal heroes became fixtures in civic ideology and public art and the objects of religious dedications by private individuals (G. Olding, ‘Don’t Judge by Tribes’: History and Context of the Athenian Tribal Heroes’, Classicum, 30 (2004), pp. 9-14).


39 A case others have also made: see, for example, E. Kearns, The Heroes of Attica, BICS supplement 57 (London, 1989), pp. 117-8. Kearns comments (ibid., 117): ‘The
Thoukydides, who also writes of the festival of the Synoikia as a commemoration of this achievement of Theseus (pp. 134-5).\textsuperscript{40} It must have been coined at a time when the unification of Attike was contentious, since the ‘primary purpose’ of political myths is ‘to help legitimize an action that is in some sense problematic’ (p. 136). For Anderson Attic unification was only ever an issue immediately after 508/7. He draws support for associating the story with Kleisthenes from the changing depiction of Theseus in the pottery painting of sixth-century Athens. Between 550 and 510 Theseus appears more frequently than before and is painted performing new exploits, such as his victories over the Bull of Marathon and the Krommyomian Sow, which are clearly inspired by the famous labours of Herakles (p. 138). Anderson suggests that the Peisistratids promoted this new version of Theseus as a local Herakles as a way to get ahead in their rivalry for preeminence locally and across Greece. Theseus becomes even more popular on pots after 510; he now appears more often than Herakles and is given several new exploits – all linked with the territorial integrity of Attike, with some pots now presenting his exploits as a coherent narrative (pp. 139-42). For Anderson this upsurge of interest in Theseus and systematization of his mythology are the work of Kleisthenes and his associates: to strengthen their presentation of Theseus as the unifier of Attike, they gave him a more germane and ordered set of deeds (pp. 142-3). While this second flowering of the Theseus saga certainly does correlate with the post-508/7 reforms, this reviewer is unconvinced that Kleisthenes and his associates invented the synoecism myth. Apart from the simplistic top-down model of culture change that Anderson assumes, there were other moments when this myth could have been coined. For example, Peisistratos and his sons also tried to strengthen links between Athens and its \textit{khōra} (pp. 23-4). And this possibility of an earlier articulation of the myth finds support in the festival commemorating the synoecism: despite Anderson’s special pleading (pp. 143-5), evidence of the archaic pedigree of the Synoikia exists – the involvement of the four pre-Kleisthenic tribes (p. 144).

In chapter 6 ‘The New Order at War’ (pp. 147-57) Anderson considers Kleisthenes’ creation of the first city-based army and how the unprecedented mobilization of non-elite citizens this required was represented. He begins by rehearsing the strong case of Henri van Effenterre, Frank Frost, Henk Singor and others that Athens did not have a formal theory that Theseus as we know him is in a sense the creation of the supporters of Kleisthenes is too well known to need elaboration.’

\textsuperscript{40} Thoukydides 2.15.1-2.
army during the sixth century (pp. 149-50, 259 nn.9-12). Before Kleisthenes military ventures were small, irregular and infrequent affairs, manned by predominantly elite volunteers and initiated – not by the rudimentary political organs of the city – but by leaders of the aristocratic clans. Indeed by enrolling the free, male residents of Attike in its demes and consigning the latter to the ten tribes, each of which provided a unit of hoplites for the new army, Kleisthenes gave the city its first-ever mechanism for mass mobilization (p. 150). Thus it was only after 508/7 that the Athenians had ‘a way to exploit the manpower potential of their region to the full’ (my italics). Nonetheless it paid dividends almost straightaway when, in 506, an Athenian army of elite and non-elite hoplites defeated those of Khalkis and Boiotia in successive battles. For representations of this military revolution Anderson turns to the monuments of these battles – the epitaph and burial mound of the Athenians killed fighting Khalkis and the epigram and bronze four-horse chariot set up on the Akropolis as a votive dedication to Athena for the two


42 A criticism of this otherwise very good summary of the post-508/7 military reforms is that it belongs with the discussion of the other institutions and practices Kleisthenes introduced in chapters 1 and 2. Another is that in writing of the tribes turning ‘all citizens’ into soldiers (pp. 150, 153 – but note the contradiction with 45) he overestimates the ambit of the Kleisthenic tribes and the extent of their non-elite participation. The navy and lightly-armed corps of fifth-century Athens were not organized along tribal lines and sub-hoplite citizens did not participate in tribal or tribally-organized activities. See D. Pritchard, ‘Tribal Participation and Solidarity in Fifth-Century Athens: A Summary’, *Ancient History*, 30 (2000), pp. 104-18; ‘Athletics, Education and Participation in Classical Athens’, in D.J. Phillips and D. Pritchard (eds.), *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World* (Swansea, 2003), pp. 293-349, pp. 328-30; ‘Kleisthenes, Participation, and the Dithyrambic Contests of Late Archaic and Classical Athens’, *Phoenix*, 58 (2004, in press).

43 Herodotos 5.74-7.
victories.\textsuperscript{44} The former, Anderson explains, copied the ways the private tombs of sixth-century aristocrats depicted individuals killed in action: the Homeric phraseology of the epitaph and the monumentality of the mound styled the dead as warrior heroes of epic poetry (pp. 151-5). But it also broke with the past by being a publicly-commissioned and collective tomb and giving a heroic status to all war dead, regardless of social class (pp. 152-3). The same status is also given to all and sundry by the votive offering of 506 (pp. 155-7). In conclusion Anderson stresses that the continuity and traditionalism of these monuments dovetailed with the general cultural programme of Kleisthenes (pp. 154-5, 157). No less remarkable for this reviewer is the egalitarianism informing these war memorials: while democratic equality required several more decades to be clearly expressed (see above) and the link between this concept and honours for the war dead even longer to be made explicit, here, in the first years of the democracy, we have implicit evidence for this strong principle already re-organizing traditional representations of warfare.\textsuperscript{45}

In chapter 7 ‘The Festival of All of the Athenians’ (pp. 158-77) Anderson argues that the festival of the Great Panathenaia was significantly enhanced after 508/7 in order to represent and buttress important outcomes of the Kleisthenic reforms. This four-yearly festival was founded in the mid-560s when athletic, equestrian and musical \textit{agônes} and a procession to escort to the Akropolis the new robe for Athena Polias were added to a pre-existing sacrifice for the goddess (pp. 160-2, 265 n.14), with extra contests for rhapsodes added by the tyrants in the 540s.\textsuperscript{46} Just as he does with the new \textit{agora} and Akropolis building of the mid-sixth century (see above), Anderson shies away from a political or religious explanation for the appearance of this festival (pp. 163-4, 166-7): Lykourgos, whose \textit{genos} had the priesthood of Athena Polias, simply introduced contests modeled on those of the new circuit of Panhellenic festivals as part of his struggle for preeminence locally and across Greece. Nonetheless Anderson goes on to argue that between 508 and 490 new contests were deliberately introduced to give the festival ‘political content’ for the first time (pp. 165-74). These included the \textit{apobatê\i} or chariot-dismounting race and the

\textsuperscript{44} For the first monument, see \textit{Palatine Anthology} 12.26; and for the second, \textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{3} 50 and Herodotos 5.77.

\textsuperscript{45} For this late recognition of the link between egalitarianism and honours for the war dead, see, for example, Euripides \textit{Andromakhe} 693-8; fragment 360.32-5 Collard, Cropp and Lee.

\textsuperscript{46} Plato \textit{Hipparkhos} 228b; cf. \textit{Ath. Pol.} 18.1; Lykourgos 1.102.
tribally-organized team events of the torch race, manly beauty competition and pyrrhic dance. Anderson repeatedly describes these as ‘‘warrior’ contests’ and argues that they helped to flaunt the new military power of the city and its ultimate source – the solidarity wrought by the new tribal and political reforms (pp. 170, 173). For this reviewer this is not a strong argument, since the dating of these contests to the early fifth century, their signification as strongly martial, and the organization of each team event by tribes are very from certain.\textsuperscript{47}

In chapter 8 ‘Ritual Ties between Center and Periphery’ (pp. 178-96) Anderson argues that three other religious festivals were used by Kleisthenes and his associates to consolidate the formal integration of Athens and Attike. He begins by strengthening the good case of Robert Connor that the Great or City Dionysia was not founded during the tyranny, as some continue to maintain, but, after 508/7, in the last years of the century (pp. 178-84).\textsuperscript{48} This festival staged a re-enactment of the mythical transfer of the cult of

\textsuperscript{47} Anderson acknowledges that the torch race of the Panathenaia can only be dated securely to the 420s (pp. 168, 268 n.27). With the tribal boat race and the manly beauty contest he accepts the case Jenifer Neils makes for several images on early fifth-century pots being metaphorical or metonymic depictions of victory in these events (J. Neils, ‘The Panathenaia and Kleisthenic Ideology’, in W.D.E. Coulson et al. (eds.), The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy (Oxford, 1994), pp. 151-60). However, other no less plausible interpretations of these images have been made, while the literary evidence points to the introduction of these events in the later fifth or early fourth centuries respectively (e.g. \textit{IG} II\textsuperscript{2} 2311.74-5; Plutarch \textit{Themistokles} 32.5). Anderson makes clear that his description of these events as ‘‘warrior’ contests’ is based on the prize list of a Great Panathenaia of about 370 (p. 166), where they are listed under the title ‘prizes for the warriors’ (\textit{IG} II\textsuperscript{2} 2311.58). This surely is not sound evidence for their signification more than a century earlier. Finally convincing critiques of the common claim that the pyrrhic dance of this festival was organized according to tribes continue to appear (see, for example, J.K. Davies, ‘Demosthenes on Liturgies: A Note’, \textit{Journal of Hellenic Studies}, 87 (1967), pp. 33-40, pp. 36-7; and especially P. Ceccarelli, ‘Dancing the \textit{Pyrrchē} in Athens’, in P. Murray and P. Wilson (eds.), \textit{Music and the Muses: The Culture of \textit{Mousike} in the Classical Athenian City} (Oxford, 2004), pp. 91-118, pp. 93-9.

Dionysos from the village of Eleutherai, on the border with Boiotia, to Athens itself, while the actual transfer and its aetiology go back to when this village voluntarily joined Attike because of its hostility to the Thebans.\textsuperscript{49} Anderson sensibly suggests that the most likely moment for the annexation of this village was the border conflicts between Athens, Khalkis and Thebes in 506 (p. 181). However he does not show the same touch with the religious dimensions of the festival when he argues that it was founded – not because of ‘the peculiar power and appeal’ of Dionysos – but simply as a way to commemorate the annexation of a Boiotian village and the new territorial unity of Attike (pp. 182-3). By contrast, Peter Wilson recently established that dithyrambs, always performed by tribal teams at this festival, were knowingly and deliberately introduced by the cities of archaic and classical Greece in order to harness the divine power of this god to ward off civil strife and encourage civic solidarity.\textsuperscript{50} In view of its ongoing political instability late-sixth-century Athens also required such magico-religious aid.

Turning to the Eleusinian Mysteries (pp. 185-94), Anderson highlights the massive rebuilding of its two sanctuaries at Athens and Eleusis in the decade after 508/7 (pp. 186-7, 274 nn. 26-7). This – along with the pre-existing pompe between the two – meant ‘the festival now visibly underscored the new order’s efforts to affirm the political integrity of the region and build a sense of collective mission among its citizens’ (p. 192). Nonetheless Anderson does acknowledge the earlier, parallel building at both sanctuaries, in the second quarter of the sixth century, and the ceramic depictions, from around 540, of the Eleusis-related myth of the spreading of Demeter’s gift of agriculture by Triptolemos, which deliberately styled the Athenians as benefactors of mankind (pp. 186-7, 189-90, cf. 275-6 n.39). Anderson again does not see evidence of any burgeoning Athenian self-identity here. Rather both of these mid-sixth-century developments were products of the ‘yearning’ of the Eumolpidai and the Kerkyes, the two gene controlling the priesthoods of the Mysteries, ‘for Panhellenic recognition’ (pp. 190-1). Finally Anderson makes a very good case against the traditional dating of the foundation of the Brauronia to the tyranny of Peisistratos: what archaeological evidence there is suggests that this festival of Artemis, ritually linking Athens with Brauron, was created just after 508/7 (pp. 194-6; cf. 22).

\textsuperscript{49} Pausanias 1.38.8-9.

In chapter 9 ‘Change and Memory’ (pp. 197-211) Anderson finishes his consideration – started back in chapter 2 (pp. 44-52) – of the ways the Athenians of late archaic and classical periods understood the political tumult of the late sixth century. In particular he brings together the testimonia for the so-called Tyrannicides, Harmodios and Aristogeiton, before asking why these two aristocrats, whose assassination of Hipparkhos in 514/3 did not end the tyranny, were honoured so highly by the post-508/7 regime (pp. 199-206, 278 nn.16-17; cf. 94-5).51 True to iconoclastic form, his answer challenges the current scholarly orthodoxy that the Tyrannicides were honoured because they were considered the promoters or founders of the democracy (pp. 204-7). Anderson explains that earlier chapters of his book show how Kleisthenes and his associates – out of a concern that their reforms would be perceived as revolutionary – misleadingly presented what they had done ‘as no more than the restoration of an older, ancestral order that had been suspended or dismantled by the Peisistratid ‘tyrans’’ (p. 205). Although the most important event in this preferred narrative was the expulsion of the tyrants in 511/10, they could not commemorate it, as the Spartans, who had tried to stop the reform process in 508/7, actually provided the force to expel Hippias and his family. As a result, Kleisthenes and his associates had to use two locals, Harmodios and Aristogeiton, as the restorers of the old order. Anderson concludes that the Tyrannicides then were ‘a device created by leaders to help deflect attention from the novelty of recent innovations’ (p. 206).

The model of culture Anderson assumes here strikes this reviewer as improbable and simplistic. Suddenly, in 508/7, non-elite Athenians became an independent political agent and, in short order, began to appropriate the elite’s previous monopoly of political and military affairs (see above). These developments speak against Anderson’s view that ordinary Athenians meekly accepted what they were told about the past, making it more likely that popular culture was already a product of a dialectic between elite performers and non-elite spectators.52 More serious is that Anderson’s book – even if we accept the validity of all its arguments – actually does not evidence that Kleisthenes and his associates misrepresented their reforms in the way this chapter asserts. Certainly the book does put beyond doubt that the reformers of 508/7 and the new democracy sought to maintain cultural continuities and associate themselves with pre-existing traditions. It can also be said that these dispositions most probably contributed to the popular forgetting of Kleisthenes and his reforms and the emergence of Solon and Theseus, by the last decades

51 For the assassination of Hipparkhos, see Ath. Pol. 18-19; Thoukydides 6.53-9.

52 For this dynamic of cultural production in classical Athens, see n.10 above.
of the fifth century, as the founders of the democracy. But to argue that Kleisthenes and his colleagues presented their reforms as ‘the restoration of an older, ancestral order’ (p. 205) is an inference which clearly goes beyond the evidence Anderson presents.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This book is a convincing critique of the prevailing ‘gradualist approach’ to the history of archaic Athens (p. 213), which sees the institutional integration of Athens and its countryside and non-elite citizens into politics as drawn out processes, taking most of the sixth century to complete. Instead Anderson establishes beautifully that this double integration was achieved very quickly, right at the end of the century, as a result of the reforms of Kleisthenes. This finding alone is a significant contribution to scholarship on archaic Athens. Nonetheless for this reviewer Anderson pushes his revisionism too far when arguing that the residents of Attike only gained a common sense of identity as Athenians and the ἄδημος as a consequence of these reforms and the related cultural programme. Similarly, while the book does show that Kleisthenes was the first to develop the institutions and practices that unified Attike effectively, it goes too far in suggesting that he was the first Athenian leader concerned with territorial unity.

This interpretation of Kleisthenes as a unifier not just institutionally but also culturally depends on a very narrow of reading of developments that are better (and more often) understood as examples of a burgeoning Athenian ‘nationalism’ well before the reforms of 508/7. A good example is how Anderson accounts for the introduction, from the second quarter of the sixth century, of religious infrastructure and rituals for Athena, such the monumental ramp up to the Akropolis, the Bluebeard Temple, the Sanctuary for Athena Nike, and the contests and procession for her new four-yearly festival. For Anderson these were some of the self-promoting projects Athenian leaders used in their struggles for preeminence locally and across Greece (see above). Critically, this reading overlooks the significant ways the festivals of archaic Greece crystallized, developed and broadcast communal identity and civic ideology. In particular François de Polignac shows that solidarity between dispersed residents of a specific territory and different social classes was first formed and articulated in the shared worship of a community-protecting deity, such as Athena Polias, and that this common religious identity actually engendered the
Therefore, the abovementioned projects for Athena would also seem to be attempts by local aristocrats to style themselves as the benefactors, not just of a city-protecting goddess, but also of her community of worshippers across Attike. In short, they were competing with each other through ‘nationalist’ gestures, which also happened to articulate and reinforce an emerging regional identity. Moreover, the new festival of the Great Panathenaia can be interpreted as prefiguring the neutral, political space beyond elite rivalries that Kleisthenes came to strengthen and institutionalize: it brought large numbers of Attic residents into Athens out of a concern for the religious protection of the community, its agônes gave elite individuals a rare chance to win publicly-adjudicated preeminence, and these contests – presumably along with the procession and the prizes – were administered by a board of magistrates.

Anderson’s book details further evidence for this Athenian ‘nationalism’ and a general concern for unifying periphery and centre well before the reforms of Kleisthenes. The mid-sixth-century appearance of myths about the local heroes, Triptolemos and Theseus, are not simply the products of elite rivalry, as Anderson suggests (see above): they are usually seen as the first articulation of the claims of the Athenians, ‘that are dominant in the ideology of fifth-century Athens’, to be benefactors of mankind and the


masters of Attike itself.\textsuperscript{55} Anderson also discusses two festivals, predating the reforms, that helped to underwrite the integration of Athens with its \textit{khôra} – the Synoikia and the Eleusinian Mysteries (see above). Before 508/7 Athenian leaders did concern themselves with integrating Athens and Attike more closely: for example, while their efforts may have been ‘very modest and piecemeal’ (p. 23), Peisistratos sent out judges to Attic villages and his son, Hippias, set up milestones marking the half way point between each village and the Altar of the Twelve gods in the city’s marketplace (see above).\textsuperscript{56}

Inadvertently the book also evinces that non-elite residents of Attike shared this burgeoning regional identity and probably already saw themselves as the \textit{dēmos} before the last decade of the sixth century. Anderson discusses the ceramic evidence of this religiously-articulated ‘nationalism’, such as pots with pictures of Triptolemos and Theseus and miniatures of the prize vases of the Great Panathenaia, which date from the mid sixth century (pp. 137-8, 162-3, 169-70, 190). Since non-elite residents of Attike, during classical times, appear to have admired and purchased finely painted pots from local workshops, we cannot rule out that in the sixth century the same social class purchased these pots because of the attractiveness of their ‘nationalist’ imagery.\textsuperscript{57} That non-elite citizens of mid-sixth-century Athens did have a shared communal identity is confirmed by their actions in and immediately after 508/7. Anderson himself details ‘the crucial part played by in the events of 508/7 by nonelite citizens’ (p. 79) and how, within only a few years, they were asserting their new right to take the community’s decisions on foreign affairs and public administration and committing themselves to regular military campaigns (see above). This political and military activism of non-elite citizens presupposes that they already had political aspirations and communal identities as Athenians and the people \textit{before} 508/7. Since these would have taken decades to crystallize and strengthen, they


\textsuperscript{56} For these Attic judges, see \textit{Ath. Pol.} 16.5.

could not have been – as Anderson repeatedly argues – the products of the institutions, practices and cultural programme Kleisthenes and his associates introduced.\textsuperscript{58}

In conclusion, details of this book undercut one of its main theses that Kleisthenes was responsible for creating the communal identities and political aspirations of the Athenians or – to paraphrase Benedict Anderson – ‘an imagined political community in ancient Attica’.\textsuperscript{59} Well before the reforms of Kleisthenes, elite and non-elite residents of Attike saw themselves as Athenians and as the people of Athens and desired a new style of public life, even if these self-perceptions clashed with older local and class identities and were not necessarily held as strongly in some parts of Attike as others. Therefore, the great innovation of Kleisthenes was not to invent the Athenian imaginary but rather to turn it into a concrete reality: he took pre-existing communal identities, concerns about territorial unity and political aspirations and gave them form as city-based institutions and practices. In turn, these new realities underwrote the regional and political self-identities of the Athenians, which had to become predominant if the new style of politics and warfare were to last. That this book inadvertently provides detailed evidence for this contrary interpretation bears witness to the scholarly rigor and honesty of its author and its status as an important study of archaic Athens.

\textsuperscript{58} Certainly such a timeframe has been required for the formation of ethnic communities and the national identities and states they make possible in the modern world (see, for example, A.D. Smith, ‘The Formation of National Identity’, in H. Harris (ed.), \textit{Identity: Essays Based on Herbert Spencer Lectures Given in the University of Oxford} (Oxford, 1995), pp. 129-53). Smith concludes (\textit{ibid.}, 153): ‘…modern national identities are not the products of recent developments and revolutions alone. They depend on various kinds of pre-modern ethnic cores and are shaped by different routes and agents of national transformation, often over long periods. This means that without the initial networks of ethnic ties underpinning the competition of states, modern capitalism, bureaucracy, and communications could not have conjured into being the world of nations that we know. Even where these are of more recent origin, pre-existing ethnic ties and sentiments, myths and memories, symbols and traditions provide fertile soil for bureaucrats, intelligentsias, or others to plant the national idea and bring it to fruition.’