cent pages d’Addenda d’une importance particulière (pp. 635-738) : l’auteur a ajouté quatre nouveaux indices (Écriture sainte, passages de Tertullien, auteurs anciens, auteurs modernes), puis une série de compléments, bibliographiques et autres. Or ces compléments sont d’une grande valeur et méritent d’être étudiées par tous ceux qui s’intéressent à la patristique, et en tout cas par le nombre croissant de Tertullianistes. Je ne mentionne ici que les notes approfondies sur ‘Théorie de Θεὸς-Deus comme nomen proprium’ (pp. 692/3), sur Deus inaestimabilis (695/6), unitas (701) et persona (704/5), mais il y en a des douzaines. On trouvera là beaucoup de vraies recherches nouvelles, présentées dans la forme la plus succincte possible. En outre, les notes bibliographiques et la bibliographie spéciale de la période 1965-1975 aideront le lecteur à compléter et à renouveler ses connaissances des études Tertulliennes.
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On the basis of the numerous inscriptions pertaining to prytaneis and bouleutai this study tries to elucidate the Cleisthenic reform as described by Ath. Pol. 21. What do these texts tell us about the representation of the various demes and trittyes in the tribal contingents in the Council in the various periods of Athenian History (510-307; 307-224; 224-201/00; 200-126 A.D.; 126 A.D. and later)?

Pp. 1-35 contain introductions and notes to plus commentaries on the 15 tables of representation which cover all the stages of the evolution of the Council from Cleisthenic up to Roman Imperial times. Pp. 35-55 provide an introduction to the splendid maps in this volume, which visualize in colour the location of the trittyes of the tribes and both the location of the various demes within the trittyes and the number of representatives the demes sent annually to the Council. This introduction is followed by a conspectus of the deme locations with a succinct indication of the evidence for these locations.

An enormous amount of hard work and critical effort must have gone into this work. It cannot be emphasized too much how well and how easily we now can derive a clear picture of Cleisthenes’

Mnemosyne, Vol. XXXII, Fasc. 1-2
'constitutional map' of Attica from Tr.'s maps 1 and 2. For didactic purposes these maps seem indispensable from now on. Copies of these colour maps are available at D. 1.50. Less useful didactic material has often been offered for more money!

Traill's work enables us to add an important qualification to the comminis opinio according to which the Cleisthenic system of representative government "continued to function for some three hundred years on a broad general basis of representation according to population" (56). The qualification is that, in spite of the fact that the population of a number of demes was not a constant, nevertheless from ca 500 till ca 200 B.C. the original Cleisthenic system of fixed quotas of deme representatives in the tribes remained basically unchanged; this testifies to a conservative approach towards the idea of representative government (Traill, 57) or, rather, in my view, to the weakness of this very idea in the minds of the Athenians altogether. Even in 307/6 and 224/3, when general reapportionments were made within the larger context of a tribal reorganization, no attempt seems to have been made to adapt the quotas to changed demographic circumstances.

For the historian it is interesting to see (70-72) that on the whole the city trittyes contributed less councillors than either of the other two regions (coast, inland). Since the size of the trittys-contingent depends on the size of the demes within the trittys, the above means that Athen's population in majority lived outside Athens and that the composition of the boulē off-set the probable over-representation of urban voters among visitors of the assembly.

In a final chapter Tr. discusses various problems concerning the Athenian demes. There is an important linguistic point here. Attica contained a great number of villages, hamlets, small townships; all these conglomerations can be subsumed under the word dēmos. However, all dēmoi are not necessarily identical with the Cleisthenic demes. Undoubtedly, the latter in many cases were natural, geographic units, but they did not always coincide with what in the literary sources is called a dēmos. Brauron and Kynosarges, called dēmoi by Stephanos of Byzantium, are not known to have been Cleisthenic demes (73). In short, though Tr. does not say this explicitly, may one say that the Cleisthenic demes nearly always had a dēmos (village, township) as an administrative centre, but that not all dēmoi, mentioned in the literary sources, invariably were identical with Cleisthenic demes?

The latter, aptly styled 'constitutional' demes by Traill (73, with note 1), are on record in the demotics mentioned in the literary and epigraphic evidence and put together in Kirchner's Prosopographia Attica. I had never realised that the number of 141 demes which