

M. J. OSBORNE, *Naturalization in Athens* (Verhandelingen Kon. Acad. voor Wetenschappen van België, Klasse der Letteren vol. 43, 1981 no. 98). Paleis der Academiën, Brussel, 1981. 241 p. with 15 plates. Pr. B.F. 800.

Prestigious societies, like the Greek and Roman, were fond of honors and privileges. Most cities developed in the course of time a rather complicated scheme of honorific grants. In the Hellenistic period cult honors completed that scheme. As the title of the book under review indicates, Osborne, who has distinguished himself in the past by an impressive series of preparatory studies (cf. p. 7, note 11), focuses on one specific privilege, the grant of citizenship (*politeia*), "a signal mark of honour" (p. 5), which for the Athenians essentially was an *offer* of citizenship, since the granting did not necessarily imply the actual implementation of *politeia*. Many "naturalized" Athenians preferred to stay in their home-cities. Until late in the 2nd century B.C. it was only by decree of the assembly that *politeia* could be granted. Thereafter "naturalization ... was transformed into an automatic right for duly qualified candidates" (p. 6).

Osborne now presents the first of four planned volumes on naturalization in Athens. Since most of the evidence is epigraphic and since the increasing finds of the last 50 years underline the importance of that evidence, half of the project will be devoted to epigraphy. The present volume presents the texts of all decrees up to the late 2nd century B.C. (121 items), with brief technical-epigraphical commentary. A second volume will provide "the substantive commentary on the individual decrees". Vol. III will be devoted to *testimonia* concerning grants and in vol. IV a synthesis will be given of the nature and development of the procedure for naturalization and the frequency and significance of *politeia*-grants, the question of implementation included. The latter is especially important since we know from various non-Athenian inscriptions that special rules were designed for those who *really* were to settle down in the city which awards them *politeia*.

All in all this may be called both an ambitious and eminently useful project. The present volume is a corpus of *politeia*-decrees, all independently examined by O. As a result quite a few new readings, restorations and dates are scattered throughout the book and will undoubtedly be a ready prey for R. S. Stroud in his part of SEG XXXI. It is to be hoped that in his synthesis O. will take into

account the results of studies on citizenship-decrees from cities other than Athens, for example that of I. Savalli in *Annali Sc. Norm. Pisa* 1982. There is no a priori reason to consider Athens as a unique, fully atypical case.

In an introduction to the corpus O. points out that study of the formulation furnishes a crucial dividing point. Prior to ca. 229 B.C. an individual was made an Athenian; thereafter he was granted citizenship. It remains to be seen to what extent this change in formulation represents a *meaningful* change in the significance of *politeia* itself. The danger of playing formal, formulaic games, admittedly always useful for dating purposes, lurks under the epigraphic dust!! Up to ca. 229 O. manages to distinguish *fourteen* different phases, until 321/0 reflecting procedural changes but thereafter changes of political regime. It will be interesting to see in volume IV which formulaic changes are politically 'neutral' and which are not and in the former case what the significance of politically 'neutral' procedural changes is.

As a result of all this the decrees are presented in two large segments (229 B.C. being *the* dividing point) which in turn are split up in a large number of sub-segments based on further changes in formulation and procedure. O. very conveniently gives a checklist of the fourteen "types" of naturalization-decrees, preceded by a brief survey of the basic formulae denoting the naturalization procedure. Since, as pointed out above, changes in the *formulae* used after 321 B.C. are said to reflect changes in regime, the reader may be somewhat puzzled to find that the same elements are used in the periods 334-321 and 321-319 B.C. Admittedly, the latter period witnessed a change in political regime (oligarchy) but I fail to see any reflection in a change in the use of formulaic elements. Decrees of other periods, in which the same combination of procedural elements occurs as in 321-319 (oligarchy) and which consequently should also be regarded as products of an oligarchy, unfortunately seem to stem from democratic periods (307-302: cf. C. Habicht, *Unters. z. pol. Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrh. v. Chr.* 1979, 23; 300-295: idem, 26). On the other hand, if a specific combination of such elements points to a democratic set-up (in 318 B.C.), the year 295-294, which has decrees with the same combination, should also be described as democratic. However, Lachares' regime which belonged to that year, surely was *not* a democracy (cf. Habicht, *op. cit.*, 8 and 21). So with due impatience we await O.'s analysis in volumes II and IV on these matters. In this connection it should be