

BOOK REVIEW

Marathon Fighters and Men of Maple: Ancient Acharnai. By DANIELLE L. KELLOGG. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. xiv + 348. Hardcover, £75.00. ISBN 978-0-19-964579-4.

Danielle Kellogg's *Marathon Fighters and Men of Maple* is a study of a single Attic deme, Acharnai. Acharnai deserves its own study, Kellogg states, because it was the largest deme outside the urban center of Athens, because the increase in archaeological and epigraphic evidence makes a more thorough study possible, and because rural Attica was not a uniform landscape as it is often implied in opposition to the city, but had its own institutions and a tone to its life that should be explored. The majority of the book's chapters are descriptive and Kellogg does not necessarily succeed at illuminating the way of life and the uniqueness of the institutions of the deme, but the evidence she has drawn together concerning the largest of Attica's demes is interesting and provides a basis for further studies.

The first three chapters are descriptive and rely heavily on archeological evidence. Chapter 1 addresses the location of the deme center. Unlike traditional studies, which claim that each deme had a single center serving its political and social needs, Acharnai, according to Kellogg, had a decentered arrangement. Instead of one deme center, it had as many as three, positioned in different areas of the deme and interspersed with agricultural settlements. Kellogg argues further that the multi-centered demes with scattered settlements would enable residents to more fully exploit the natural resources of the deme given its topography and size. A single center of such a large deme—its bouletic quota was 22—would likely have left an archeological record, but this multi-centered arrangement could be nearly invisible in the archeological record.

Chapter 2 turns to demography and population. As with the first chapter, this is similarly descriptive (not that this is a bad thing in this case). Starting from Hansen's estimates of total Attic population, Kellogg estimates the Acharnian population to be between 5000–9000, with preference for the higher number. The Acharnian population did not consist only of full-time deme residents. Instead, Kellogg posits a more transient and fluid population throughout the Attic

countryside. She may, however, be too sweeping in her conclusions of such a large population based on what a few inscriptions can tell us about the demographics and residency patterns. The evidence skews towards a few elite, wealthy members of the population who could own property in the deme, city, and Piraeus (Pasion and Apollodorus are representative); the evidence reveals little about the slave and metic populations or the tenant farmers, charcoal makers, and other laborers who would have made such a large agricultural deme function. Kellogg is right to draw our attention to population movement throughout the Attic countryside, but more work needs to be done to correlate that movement to status.

Chapter 3 describes the deme's political and economic organization, focusing on deme magistracies. Although it is valuable to know more about the functioning of deme offices, Kellogg misses an opportunity to speculate about the day-to-day operations of the deme and the interaction of deme and city. Such a discussion would have nicely transitioned to the final more interpretative and analytical chapters.

Chapter 4 tackles the prominent literary descriptions of the Acharnians. The primary stereotype of the Acharnian comes from Aristophanes, of course, who represents them as bellicose, stubborn, and obsessed with their vines. They are also, it seems, willing to put their revenge above the interests of the city as a whole. Kellogg suggests that this willingness to put deme before *polis* is a product of strong local loyalties that had not been entirely erased by the Kleisthenic reforms and absorption into the Athens/Attica super-*polis*. Local loyalties are important for chapter 5 as well where Kellogg discusses religion in the deme. Acharnai was one of only a handful of demes that had both a pan-Attic cult and that celebrated a rural Dionysia. The cult of Ares and Athena Areai was the only known cult to Ares in the classical period and was associated with the *ephebeia* in the fourth century. Kellogg links the stereotypes of the Acharnians to their association with the cult of Ares. She also suggests that evidence for a cult center to the eponymous Oineus in Acharnai that predates the Kleisthenic reforms could also signal (following Anderson 2003) that Oineus was selected as an eponymous in order to bind a potential local rival for authority on the Attic peninsula to Athens in the Archaic period.

The chapters are followed by a series of appendices that include a gazetteer of archaeological sites in Acharnai, an extensive prosopography of the deme, and an (incomplete) index of inscriptions.

Are studies of a single deme possible or necessary? In the case of large and religiously important demes like Eleusis and Rhamnous,¹ the answer is yes. Kellogg makes a strong case for placing Acharnai into that category. And yet I am not completely convinced. The last two chapters, with their balance of analysis and interpretation, shows how much can be ascertained when evidence of different types is brought together. But the first three chapters were rather too descriptive for my tastes and we learn very little about the function of the deme in contrast to the *astu*. It does provide a better foundation to consider the relationship between city and deme in Attica. It is not clear that it is best treated in isolation. In fact, so long as evidence for individual demes remains limited, many important questions may best be addressed by considering numerous demes together.

REBECCA FUTO KENNEDY

Denison University, kennedyr@denison.edu

¹ Or the unofficial deme Salamis or the site of Brauron.