



---

Review

Reviewed Work(s): Ἀττήνη. Forschungen zu Siedlungs- und Wirtschaftsstruktur des klassischen Attika by Hans Lohmann

Review by: Robin Osborne

Source: *Gnomon*, 1997, 69. Bd., H. 3 (1997), pp. 243-247

Published by: Verlag C.H.Beck

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27692470>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Verlag C.H.Beck is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Gnomon*

the importance of S.'s work. It offers an important tool in evaluating the relative weight of each of the province's districts.

Hebrew University, Jerusalem

Avraham Negev

\*

**Hans Lohmann:** Ἀττική. *Forschungen zu Siedlungs- und Wirtschaftsstruktur des klassischen Attika*. Teil I: Text; Teil II: Fundstellenkatalog. Köln/Weimar/Wien: Böhlau 1993. XXII, 348 S. 76 Abb.; S. 349–530. 140 Taf. 4 Ktn. 2°.

The Attic deme of Atene merits just three entries in the index of Whitehead's *The Demes of Attica*; on the basis of a decade of archaeological survey work L. is able to devote to Atene some 200,000 words, 2000 footnotes, more than 80 maps and plans, descriptions of thousands and drawings of hundreds of potsherds, and some 340 photographs. Nothing like this has been attempted before for any other Attic deme, and the current rate of destruction of archaeological remains by modern building, which L. stresses throughout the book, may well mean that nothing like it will ever be done again. The book's importance goes well beyond the confines of the deme of Atene: although its very size is likely to lessen its impact,<sup>1</sup> this work has the potential to make a major contribution to the archaeological debate about the significance of gaps in the surface archaeological record and to transform the historical debate about the relationship between the deme system visible in fourth-century Athens and that established by Kleisthenes.

In chapter 2, after a short introduction, L. describes the geomorphology and vegetation of the area surveyed, including the limited extent to which it has changed since classical antiquity, the methods involved in the survey, and the main types of find (survey archaeologists are likely to be amazed at the quantity of stone walls surviving and shocked at the paucity of sherds). With 12 sites per square kilometer the area ranks among the most densely exploited to have been explored by survey – although the statistic is inflated by the unusual survival of clearly ancient terraces. L. uses the fact that many slopes which are currently macchie show signs of ancient terracing to calculate from the extent of macchie on wartime aerial photographs the extent of olive cultivation in antiquity; the lack of a detailed map of the modern vegetation communities is, however, much to be regretted. L. tells how a valley-bottom site disappeared under the plough during the course of his work, raising unanswerable questions about site loss in such areas.

Chapter 3 is devoted to topographical studies of south-west Attica. For Atene L. here concentrates on the series of rupestral horoi inscriptions which his survey, with the help of local shepherds, uncovered. All have lunate sigmas and L. suggests that they date in the second half of the fourth century and mark the boundaries of the deme. L. also collects other rupestral horoi from Attica. For other parts of the area L., who has done considerable amounts of site-spotting outside Atene which he catalogues fully in volume 2, concentrates on discussing here the archaeological finds from each period, sometimes putting these in the context of finds for the

<sup>1</sup> For the thesis in briefer compass see H. Lohmann, *Zur Prosopographie und Demographie der attischen Landgemeinde Atene* in: E. Olshausen and H. Sonnabend, *Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur historischen Geographie des Altertums* 2, 1984 und 3, 1987, Bonn 1991, 203–258.

period in Attica as a whole, and on the precise location for classical demes. His conclusions, which are argued in detail, end up differing little from those of Traill.<sup>2</sup> Although it has no bearing on the history or interpretation of his survey area L. also includes an important discussion of the precise location of places other than demes which are mentioned in the mining leases. It is unfortunate that the maps which L. provides do not adequately illustrate his text: few will have ready access to Sheets 15 and 16 of the *Karten von Attika* or the 1 : 50,000 Geological map to which L. refers the reader. Nor does an adequate map accompany the Appendix of South Attic toponyms.

Chapter 4 is the meat: 150 pages of description of the archaeological remains from the survey area, period and for the classical period type by type, bringing out the significance of the sites described individually in the 180 page site catalogue.

L. puts the remains in the context of the archaeology of other parts of Attica (repeating some material from chapter 3). L. has some final Neolithic and early bronze age material, then little until some peak and cave sanctuary material from the seventh century which adds further to the dominance of seventh-century Attic archaeology by religious sites.<sup>3</sup> From the sixth century there is settlement material from 5 sites, but not until the fifth century are there extensive settlement remains. L. points out that archaic settlement remains are generally rare in Attica, although elsewhere in the sixth century archaic cemetery material is present beside the sanctuary material. L. emphasises the frequent small scattered archaic cemeteries elsewhere (notably in the Anavyssos area – arguing [124] that there is no reason to associate the Kroisos base, the Kroisos kouros and the Aristodikos kouros with the same cemetery – and around Spata in the Mesogeia), and suggests that their scattered pattern should be associated with scattered settlement. Evidence from the survey area peaks in the fourth century, with both settlement (34 scattered buildings, 9 of them with towers, and extensive terracing) and associated small cemeteries evident. L. argues that one cannot talk of any single ‘deme centre’. Many building remains are well preserved, their complete plan surviving on the surface, towers preserved to several courses of roughly dressed stone, and in some cases a room L. identifies as an ἀνδρῶν, with benches round the walls. L. compares the buildings with those excavated at Ano Voula, though contrasting the scattered settlement pattern in his survey area with the concentrated village there uncovered. Around 300 or a little later all sites are abandoned and apart from one coastal site at which mining refuse was reworked there is no further significant occupation in the survey area until the late-Roman period when numerous animal folds are constructed. Further abandonment followed, and the area was deserted when visited by Lepsius in the late-nineteenth century (266 repeating the passage quoted also at 28).

Chapter 5 is historical rather than archaeological, looking at all the individuals attested as belonging to the deme Atene, discussing their economic status (to show that there were some rich men of Atene), and exploring the likely population of the deme. L. uses the number of Ateneis whose gravestones have been found in Athens (or in one case Kephisia) or who are attested owning property near Athens as an indicator of the proportion of Ateneis likely to have been resident outside the deme.

This is problematic: not only can we not assume that everyone was necessarily buried where they lived most of their lives – or even where they died – but given that *all* the gravestones of Ateneis of known provenance come from outside the deme and that none of

<sup>2</sup> Demos and Tritts, Toronto 1987.

<sup>3</sup> See my *A crisis in archaeological history? The seventh century in Attica*, BSA 84, 1989, 297–322 and *Archaeology, the Salaminioi, and the politics of sacred space in archaic Attica* in: S. Alcock and R. Osborne ed., *Placing the Gods. Sanctuaries and sacred space in ancient Greece*, Oxford 1994, 143–60.

the other sources which name Ateneis indicate that they lived in Atene the relationship between the number of gravestones and the number of known Ateneis would seem to have absolutely no indicative value as to residential preferences. Nor does the long argument about population advance discussions of Attic demography. L. argues elaborately that one should multiply the bouleutic quota by 42, or perhaps 50, to arrive at the citizen population of a deme, and seems to imply that this will be true in either fifth or fourth centuries. But 50 citizens per Councillor implies a total population of 25,000, which is fewer than L. himself suggests for the fourth century (c. 30,000) and too small by perhaps a factor of 2 for the fifth century. It also ignores the possibility that bouleutic quotas came to be to any significant degree out of step with population, even though L. himself stresses the variable demographic course charted by different demes. L. finally opts for a total population, including slaves, living in Atene of 450, which he also expresses as 18 per square kilometer; that this figure, multiplied by 2650 (the area of Attica) gives 47,700 might be taken as proof that Atene was comparatively sparsely populated, but even when multiplied by  $\frac{4}{3}$  to account for those Ateneis resident elsewhere and by  $\frac{500}{3}$  (to be in proportion to Atene's share of the Boule) the resulting 100,000 figure is significantly too low (certainly by a factor of 2); L. himself repeatedly credits the Athenians with eating 50,000 t. of imported corn a year (where 200 kg a head is probably a decent allowance).

L. insists that Atene is not an unusual deme «Atene entspricht gleich in mehrerer Hinsicht einem 'idealen' Durchschnittsdemos» (224), pointing out that in land area and bouleutic quota it is close to the average. Indeed it is because he thinks Atene a perfectly ordinary deme that he can suggest in his subtitle that to study this deme is to study the settlement and economy of classical Attica in general. How convincing is this claim?

Atene's settlement history is very different from that of many Athenian demes: rather than being first settled, as many were, in the eighth century, Atene was visited for cult purposes alone until the late 6th century and had significant permanent human presence only from the fifth century. After the early third century it seems once more to have been deserted. That there is less evidence for settlement in Attica in the hellenistic than the classical period is generally true, but complete absence of middle and late hellenistic evidence is not at all so common. It would be rash to claim that no parallels for the settlement history of Atene can be found among other demes, but its settlement history was by no means universally shared and needs to be accounted for. L. himself brings out the fact that activity in the Laurium silver mines seems to have only begun on a substantial scale in the fifth century, to have peaked in the fourth century, and to be on a very low level in the third century. Is it by chance that the settlement history of Atene is so closely parallel to the history of exploitation in the mines?

Atene's classical settlement pattern is dominated by farms, most of them substantial establishments, many of them intervisible and many with towers. L. promises a further monograph on towers in Attica and the Megaris and declares them to be a general phenomenon. G. Steinhauer<sup>4</sup> reporting the absence of towered farms among the rural buildings which were excavated in the Mesogeia, has recently noted that in Attica such towers seem particularly a phenomenon of coastal, or perhaps better border, areas, and none of the towers to which L. refers here seems to disprove that observation. Similarly, the pattern of scattered burials which L. reveals in Atene seems best paralleled by the archaic pattern of burial in the

<sup>4</sup> Παρατηρήσεις στην οικιστική μορφή των αττικών δήμων in: W. Coulson, O. Palagia et al. ed., *The archaeology of Athens and Attica under Democracy*, Oxford 1994, 175–89 at 177–8.

Anavyssos area and the northern Mesogeia; such a pattern seems no longer visible in those areas in the fifth and early fourth centuries and it is far from clear that it can be considered generally true.<sup>5</sup>

Because L. thinks that Atene is typical of Athenian demes he does not explore the factors that influenced its settlement pattern and settlement history. Although there is much valuable discussion of aspects of silver, lead, and iron mining L. never assesses the size of the workforce employed there or the demands which so large a body of people imposed. Although he makes clear his view that those who lived nearer Athens were more active in public life, L. fails to consider the effects which separation from Athens might have on local society. He dismisses the existence of craftsmen in a deme which he considers agricultural, but then makes no attempt to understand how subsistence worked in a community which he believes grew olives and cereals but no vines and kept few animals. Despite the evidence he produces to enable the size and agricultural potential of at least two farms to be computed L., who generally likes playing with numbers, produces annual production figures for olives alone. It is unfortunate in this regard that the recent works of Gallant and Sallares appeared too late to stimulate him.<sup>6</sup> Rather it is Osborne's work which L. is obsessed with refuting, and it is difficult not to feel that this would have been a much better book had Osborne never published chapter 2 of *Demos*.<sup>7</sup>

The major importance of L.'s work lies in the exceptional features of Atene. For archaeologists Atene provides a striking case of a survey area where one period is very well represented and another totally absent. The development of survey archaeology in Greece in the last 20 years has made two massive contributions to our understanding of the ancient Greek world: it has shown the density of classical occupation of the whole landscape, and it has shown how, by contrast, other periods, amongst which the later hellenistic and early Roman are notable, leave little material trace in the countryside. How should such archaeological 'silences' be interpreted? Debate has turned on whether population actually dropped or whether residential preferences change, and on isolating causal factors in either case.

Recently Susan Alcock has argued that the late hellenistic and early Roman 'silence' should be seen as a product of changing landholding patterns, with the rise of larger landholdings leading to a more nucleated settlement pattern.<sup>8</sup> Atene makes an important contribution to this debate, both because its classical buildings and landholdings seem rather large (L. thinks he can securely define one estate of 20 ha. and another of 5–6 ha.<sup>9</sup>) and

<sup>5</sup> L. himself stresses that grave terraces seem generally to be a later-fourth-century phenomenon; this, and the appearance of rupestral horoi in the later fourth century, suggests that there may be more change within the classical period than has been recognised in the past.

<sup>6</sup> R. Sallares, *The ecology of the ancient Greek world*, London 1991; T. W. Gallant, *Risk and survival in ancient Greece*, Cambridge and Stanford 1991.

<sup>7</sup> Readers of that chapter will know that Osborne's thesis is not nearly as extreme as L. makes it out to be. O. is happy to admit to the misidentification of remains at Vouliagmeni, for which he is thrice castigated (138, 187), but would note that it is unfortunate that when L. travels to Thasos specially to prove O. wrong yet again (138, 193) he translates Ἀκηράτο εἶμι μνήμα τῷ φρασσιερῖδο as «Ich bin das unversehrte Grabmal des Phrasieridos». Given that not all graves on Thasos took the form of towers, identifying this as a grave is the beginning not the end of the story.

<sup>8</sup> S. E. Alcock, *Graecia Capta. The landscapes of Roman Greece*, Cambridge 1993.

<sup>9</sup> Comparing the 25 ha. landholding attached to the Cliff Top Tower in the Agrilesea

because the silence from the mid-third century on seems absolute and not just a matter of fewer sites. Atene seems to provide convincing evidence that agricultural, and even pastoral, activity actually ceased here in the 3rd century B. C. and suggests marked discontinuity rather than the continuation of old practices under a new settlement organisation. And if that is firmly the case here then the challenge is out to survey archaeologists to show that the evidence compels a different view elsewhere.

For historians it is the appearance of Atene rather than its disappearance which is most challenging. L. believes that evidence for sixth-century settlement in Atene is so exiguous that «kann Atene zum Zeitpunkt der kleisthenischen Reform noch keinen selbständigen Demos gebildet haben» (57, repeated 122, 270, 292). The earliest member of Atene attested is Eureka, ταμίαις of Athena in 432/1, and so the deme of Atene must have been created before that time. But if Atene was created as a new deme that can hardly have been an isolated occurrence – other demes would have had their bouleutic quotas altered by the need to allow three councillors to Atene. L. is inclined to believe that Herodotos may be right to record just 100 demes at the time of Kleisthenes, and one might further speculate that it may, in part at least, be later additions which cause some ‘geographical’ trittyes to be so far from being arithmetical thirds of tribes; certainly Atene contributes to the largest grouping of councillors from one tribe in a single district – the 27 councillors of Antiokhis from southwest Attica. Whatever the case, if L. is right about Atene then we have to reckon with a major reorganisation of the deme system during the fifth century not recorded by any literary source, and we have to acknowledge that demes known from, and the bouleutic quotas recorded by, fourth-century inscriptions do not reflect the distribution of the Athenian population in c.507. There must even be doubt about whether the isolation of certain demes so that they belong to a different tribe from any neighbouring deme can be any longer safely attributed to Kleisthenes. The rise of Atene and the adjustment of the deme system to cope with it imply considerable settlement mobility still in the early fifth century, a mobility which is not at all the movement from country to town which the Athenaion Politeia alleges to have occurred after the Persian wars. Reform of the deme system must have involved some citizens who had been registered in one deme coming to be registered in another, and this implies that deme, and indeed tribe, loyalty may have been slow to develop. It is perhaps not surprising that demotics did not replace patronymics in Athenian usage, despite what Ath. Pol. 21.4 seems to claim.<sup>10</sup> L. never explores the historical ramifications of his claims, but it is important that they should not go unnoticed.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

*Robin Osborne*

---

valley, L. stresses that «Zahlreiche Athener besaßen sogar Land in verschiedenen Demen» (227), but the Cliff Top Tower is precisely the site that has yielded evidence that it was run by an ἐπίτροπος, suggesting that size of holding is no guarantee of residence by the owner.

<sup>10</sup> See T. F. Winters, Kleisthenes and Athenian nomenclature, *JHS* 113, 1993, 162–5.