The economy (economies) of ancient Greece

PAUL CARTLEDGE

In memoriam M.I.F.[1]

Old and new history

In 1975 John Davies issued a forceful and timely plea for a new kind of ancient history course in universities. As Peter Brunt (then Camden Professor of Ancient History at Oxford) correctly observed, in an equally forceful rejoinder, 'it is obvious in Davies's choice of sixteen major interpretative themes that for him the social structure and economy are all-important'.[2] Perhaps predictably, the new edition of the *Cambridge Ancient History* has failed to take the full measure of Davies's plea.[3] Yet even in the genuinely new historical enterprises of the 1980s and 1990s the outlook for economic history, or the study of the economic in history, has not proved to be obviously brighter.

As Theodore K. Rabb observed in 1982, with a note of palpable surprise, or shock, 'it is almost as if there were a shrinking from the physical world'.[4] Historians, that is, or at any rate 'new' historians, seemed to Rabb to be in headlong 'flight from materialism', driven by an 'uneasiness with the material conditions of life that until recently seemed so compelling', an uneasiness itself inspired by 'doubts . . . about the explanatory power of economic developments, and . . . the defensiveness of the economic historians themselves'. Since 1982, that tendency has if anything accelerated, with the widespread, if premature, discrediting of materialist historiography of any kind and an avoidance of pure (or mere) economic history.

We ancient historians of course tend to be congenitally suspicious, or positively contemptuous, of novelty, on the quasi-Aristotelian principle that what is new is not true, and what is true is not new. But by a coincidental paradox, during the past couple of decades we have found ourselves walking or running in parallel with our more progressive colleagues in other historical fields regarding the economic in history. It is not that the flight from economics in ancient Greek

DIALOGOS | Hellenic Studies Review | Number 5 (1998)
Paul Cartledge | The economy (economies) of ancient Greece | pp. 4-24

history has been by any means total. But here too there has long been discernible a distinct turn from 'how it might actually have been' empiricist historiography to 'how it seems to have been thought or represented' intellectual-cultural studies.

Economy (economies): what's in a name?

All the main words of my title require prior definition, delimitation and specification. Spatio-temporally, 'ancient Greece' will be taken to mean pretty much Plato's metaphorical 'pond',[5] that is the Mediterranean and Black Sea Hellenic world, between about 500 and 300 BCE. 'Economy' or 'economies', let alone 'the ancient Greek economy', are more complex issues. Perhaps one might approach them first by asking *whose* 'economy' or 'economies'?

Objectively, students of ancient Greek economic life are faced with the problem of generalizing usefully about a world of more than a thousand separate political units, which were on the whole radically self-differentiated. Perhaps there is a useful sense in which we might say that by 500 BCE the Greek world was unified by intersecting lines of economic exchange via the long-distance trade in staple goods (human as well as vegetable and mineral). But there is surely no useful sense in which we might speak of the Greek world of 500 as one economic system. When Herodotus attempted to define Hellenism (*to Hellênikon*), in terms of what all Greeks uniquely and distinctively had in common, economic life was conspicuously not among his chosen ingredients, let alone economic 'system'.[6] Indeed, what strikes us perhaps most forcibly about ancient Greece is rather its heterogeneous pluralism, in economic life as in other fundamental aspects of both individual and communal activity.[7] The economy of Sparta, for instance, however precisely it is to be classified and analysed, is surely a different animal from the economy of Athens – not to mention such further complications as whether Athens and Sparta themselves can be said to have had a single economy or, rather, to have comprehended a plurality of micro-economies.[8]

Subjectively, the issue turns in part on what one wishes to understand by economy or economics: is it need-satisfying production, distribution and exchange of the goods required for the purpose of securing life? or is it want-satisfying behaviour of those kinds with a view to achieving the good life? or something of each, or something in between? Failure to make the *explananda* clear from the outset is one reason for the long-running and now rather exhausted debate between the so-called 'primitivists' and 'modernizers': those who argue that the Greeks' economy (or economies) differed wholesale from any modern

(Western, capitalist) economy, and those who discern in ancient Greece smaller-scale or inchoate versions of modern economic life and thought. Another reason for its persistence is that the primitivists tend to be trying to explain how the 98% of Greeks 'economized', that is, secured a bare livelihood within the framework of the ideally (yet rarely) self-sufficient *oikos* or household; whereas the modernizers focus instead on the 2% of exceptions for whom macro-economic activity at a regional or international level was the sole or prime source of their wealth. (My percentages are of course purely notional and rhetorical.)[9]

The other pivotal subjective factor in understanding 'economy' or 'economies' is the modern interpreter's choice of models or theory. One of the targets of Moses Finley's attack on the importation of anachronistic theory and assumptions into ancient Greek economic history was John Hicks's 'model for the "First Phase of the Mercantile Economy", in the city-state, which presupposes that "the trade (oil for corn) is *unlikely to get started* unless, to begin with, it is a handsome profit"'.[10] Hicks at least was using an explicit model, but it was Finley's persuasive view that he (like many other, if usually less distinguished, scholars) had got hold of the wrong one. For Finley's reading of Weber and his follower Johannes Hasebroek had honed his appreciation of cross-cultural comparison by way of economic and cultural anthropology (especially that of Karl Polanyi out of Richard Thurnwald) and had led him to embrace what came to be known as the 'substantivist' position as opposed to that of the 'formalists' on the location, mental as well as material, of the economic in ancient Greece.[11]

For the formalists, the ancient economy was a functionally segregated and independently instituted sphere of activity with its own profit-maximizing, want-satisfying logic and rationality, less 'developed' no doubt than any modern economy but nevertheless recognizably similar in kind. Substantivists, on the other hand, hold that the ancient economy was not merely less developed but socially embedded and politically overdetermined and so – by the standards of neoclassical economics – conspicuously conventional, irrational and status-ridden. It is crucially important that this much more interesting and important substantivist-formalist debate should not be confused, as it often is, with the primitivist-modernizer debate. Not even the most ardent primitivist would deny that quite a bit of extra-household economy was practised in ancient Greece. Not even the most fervent modernizer would deny that some quite basic aspects of ancient Greek economy were really rather primitive. The most serious misunderstandings can arise when the debate about the level and quantity of Greek

economic life becomes confused with the argument over its politico-social location.[12]

Finley, however, made things too easy for himself. From his almost tautological demonstration that the categories of neoclassical economic analysis had no useful application to 'the ancient economy' he proceeded to the illegitimate inference that the ancients did not employ economic analysis because there was no economy for them to analyse.[13] Granted that there is no question of 'economics' having been conceptualized by ancient Greeks in the terms of an Adam Smith or an Alfred Marshall, yet one might still prefer to use the non-applicability of neoclassical theory as merely a preliminary heuristic. It might then be allowed that the ancient Greeks both had an economy and practised economic analysis, perhaps of an incommensurably different nature from anything familiar to or recognizable by us as such.[14] It is in these broader terms that both Plato and Aristotle have been claimed on independent grounds as 'discoverers' of 'the economy'.[15] However, it should go without saying that neither would have dreamed of – nor could reasonably be imagined as – writing either *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* or *The Principles of Economics*.

Sources: evidence and/or models?

How then should we set about formulating usable and useful models? According to Geoffrey de Ste. Croix, we should 'formulate the necessary categories, from the ground up' on the basis of 'a very large body of evidence about the economic life of the Greek city ... the great bulk [of which] comes from the late fifth and (more especially) the fourth century'.[16] This is right in principle, but right for the wrong reasons. Actually, there did not exist a single, homogeneous, normative 'Greek city', nor can we, as Ste. Croix claims, 'steadfastly clear our minds of all preconceptions derived from other periods of history'; and, finally, his phrase 'a very large body of data' may be seriously misleading.

Notoriously, there are few good, let alone statistically significant, quantitative data available, and so no possibilities of *histoire sérielle* on the *Annales* model. We cannot even test anachronism-free qualitative hypotheses numerically. Documents generally are in very short supply.[17] In theory, inscriptions and coins might be thought our best prospects, but they are both flawed in practice. Inscriptions disappoint chiefly by their incompleteness or limited scope.[18] Coins do so, rather, because it is often unclear what exactly it is that they represent.[19] Archaeology more broadly, including wrecks and amphora-stamps as well as intensive field-

survey and limited site-excavation, can, again, take us only so far.[20] Modern so-called 'proxy-data', drawn from *ex hypothesi* relevantly similar contemporary societies are quantitative, to be sure, even serial, and have a solidly empirical base in accurate records. But they also have their own, rather different, problems in retrospective application, above all the difficulty of ensuring that like is being compared with, or substituted for, like.[21]

It is sooner rather than later, therefore, that we find ourselves driven back on 'literary' sources of one sort or another. Empirically, their limitations are obvious. Suppose, then, that we take them not as a *pis aller* but rather as primary in the significatory sense, that is, as evidence of ancient Greek mentality, the whole nexus of ideas in Greek culture;[22] and suppose we assume, further, that mentality does not merely reflect but also up to a point determines economic (as other) reality. Yet this move too involves further, interconnected problems, namely how to evaluate both the representativeness and the ideology of the extant writings. Arguably, Aristophanes, Plato, Xenophon, Demosthenes and Aristotle shared an identical or closely similar economic mentality, but were their views representative of a wider 'Greek' mentality, and, even supposing they were, how justified would we be in assuming a snug fit between them and the economic realities on the ground (in the agora and port, as well as within the private *oikos*)? Secondly, since a crucial part of the evidence these writings provide is ideological – both explicitly formulated theoretical reflections and pragmatic expressions of inexplicit ideological assumptions – should that disqualify such evidence entirely as a basis for our notionally non-ideological analyses?

In a sense, ideology is where Finley started – and ended. His 'ancient economy' was a unitary construct because in his view the ruling élites of Greco-Roman antiquity shared, morally and operationally, a single economic outlook. Finley, however, failed to allow sufficiently for ideology in the guise of false consciousness, the deliberate resistance to and distortion of reality in defence of a precarious or challenged *status quo*. On the other hand, he was surely right about the nature and function of dominant ideology: ruling ideas do tend to be the ideas of a society's rulers, and the writers mentioned above, like almost all our literary sources, belonged in some sense to the ruling class. Certainly, there were those outside the ruling classes or élites of ancient Greece who adhered to alternative ideologies, but as long as politics dominated economics and traditional landed property-owners dominated politics, 'commercial' or 'market' mentalities or ideologies were not actually going to prevail. However reactionary one takes

Aristotle to be, in his economic as in his political and social theory more broadly, nevertheless his outlook ought still to have reflected with some fidelity the norms governing the vast bulk of economic activity throughout the classical Greek world – excepting perhaps only that which went on at Athens and, more particularly, in the Piraeus.[23]

Politics

Aristotle wrote on practically everything under the sun, but what he conspicuously did not write was economics.[24] Nor can it be shown that in works devoted in significant part to what might plausibly be labelled 'political economy' Aristotle engaged in economic analysis properly so called.[25] *A fortiori*, on the imaginary spectrum that runs from practical politicians, at one pole, through economic political theorists, political economists, and economic actors to economists, at the other pole, the ancient Greeks in general can barely be said to have transcended the stage or status of 'economic political theorists'.

On the other hand, almost everything that Aristotle wrote on interpersonal social transactions can comfortably be placed under the general rubric of 'politics'. It is simply not possible to overstate the degree to which ancient Greek life – communal and private, individual and collective – was politicized.[26] It is this politicization which explains, for instance, the necessity (rather than the mere desirability) of alienating market-exchange as far as possible beyond the tight bonds of the civic community, displacing it for preference onto sub-citizen classes excluded from full civic participation by reason of their legal status as women, aliens or unfree.[27]

Politics, however, is one thing, 'the state' quite another. That Latin-derived term is harmless enough if it is used to denote the *polis*, a citizen-state or civic community in a strong sense, united by constitutional and other laws defining who was and who was not a 'share-holder', and especially (but not always, most notably not in the case of democratic Athens) on the basis of the ownership of landed property.[28] Its use can, however, be quite gravely harmful if it conjures up an entity in any significant way resembling the modern State: that is, a strongly institutionalized and differentiated, centralized and bureaucratized public sphere of professional government, in contradistinction from and opposition to the non-political, private sphere of 'civil society'. That modern State (capital 'S') is an invention of the early modern and modern periods, and is simply not to be found in ancient Greece, in which, as Aristotle succinctly put it, 'the same ideals

[literally 'things'] are best in both public and private life, and it is the lawgiver's task to implant them in the souls of mankind'. [29]

Agriculture, ecology and ethnoarchaeology

This absence will have a particular bearing on our discussion of trade and commerce. But I begin my substantive discussion of ancient Greek economics with the normal and the normative rather than the exceptional and possibly antinomian.[30] The ancient Greek world was massively and unalterably rural. The overwhelming majority of its inhabitants lived in and off the country, as farmers. That much is not in dispute, though precise percentages and the nature of farming activity undoubtedly are. Within the modern historiography of ancient Greece, agriculture has been comparatively neglected, for two main reasons. First, the ancients themselves whose writings have come down to us tended to despise or affected to ignore its sordid realities.[31] The ancient literary sources, therefore, are not only relatively poor in reference to matters agricultural, but are also skewed by the perceptions and perspectives of the rich and leisured élite. Secondly, many modern students of the ancient world have shared their contempt for the base material factors of history, the economic infrastructure of civilized living.[32]

Yet although, or rather because, the available literary sources are inadequate, especially for purposes of quantification, the study of ancient Greek agriculture has in the last dozen years or so been refertilized and fructified by both the development of new, and the more productive application of old, theories and methodologies. These include: techniques of intensive field survey inspired by the 'New Archaeology' that pay minute attention to how it actually was – and is – on the ground, as opposed to how it is represented in either the elite texts of ancient armchair agronomists or the digbooks of modern excavators;[33] ethnoarchaeology, that is the participant observation and recording of contemporary Greek or other Mediterranean peasant agrarian communities that farm in *ex hypothesi* relevantly similar environments;[34] experimental history and archaeology, that is the modelling by computer-simulation of the domestic household life-cycle, or the attempted replication of ancient farming procedures; palaeoethnobotany; and then the renewed scrutiny, in the light of some or all of these novelties, of the available literary and epigraphical documents.[35] Many problems remain, however, and many fundamental issues are still open. Particularly furious debate rages over the legitimacy of using modern 'proxy data' to substitute for the original evidence we shall never have.[36] But some incontrovertible gains

can surely be registered.

Few intensive field-surveys in Greek lands are as yet either completed or fully published; this is still new and largely uncharted territory.[37] But even the most inchoate have already transformed our picture of the settled countryside. We now have such a huge increase of raw information about human rural settlement in Greek lands from the Neolithic age to the modern era that debates have inevitably become more sophisticated or have shifted to different levels of analysis. For example, what is it that the visible artefactual remains represent? If a 'farm', was it the farmer's sole or principal residence, all year round or seasonally? Was it part of a nucleated or dispersed pattern of agrarian settlement? Did farmers deliberately disperse their holdings to spread and thereby minimize risks and/or to maximize efficient exploitation of different micro-environments?

Behind such questions, which are often unanswerable finally or globally, lurks the will-o'-the-wisp of economic rationality. Were ancient Greek farmers as rational in their choice, and as efficient in their pursuit, of economic goals as (some) Greek philosophers and mathematicians famously were in their respective fields of activity? Rationality? – *whose* rationality, it might well be asked, especially since the collocation of 'the Greeks' and 'the irrational' is not quite as paradoxical and outrageous as it appeared in 1951.[38] However, the general consensus would seem to be that ancient Greek farming practices were on the whole well adapted to terrain, climate, labour-supply and other environmental and social variables, given of course the universally and distinctly 'low' technological base and absence of what is understood today by infrastructure.

Some scholars indeed would go further. Sallares, for instance, has innovatively, if speculatively, drawn attention to the palaeoethnobotanical possibilities of seed-evolution by both natural and human selection. Gallant has reconstructed theoretically, with the aid of 'proxy data', a 'working-model of the average Greek peasant household life-cycle' comprising a nicely calibrated scale of responses to risk and crisis; this is certainly not intrinsically implausible (if as yet insufficiently fine-grained). Exponents of the so-called 'Alternative' or 'New Model' of Greek agriculture have even argued for not just the possibility, but the necessity, of regular deviations from a regime of strict biennial fallowing and the evolution of genuinely mixed farming, which would have involved systematic crop rotation and much manuring (human as well as animal), and thus what has been dubbed 'agro-pastoralism'.[39] Probably the principal common factor behind these radically positive constructions is the concern to account for seeming population

explosion(s) in many parts of the Greek world between about 500 and 250 BCE, which have even prompted talk of a 'great transformation', a sort of ancient Greek agricultural revolution.[40] That is doubtless premature, but defenders of the traditional model of biennial-fallow dry-farming without benefit of animal manure are finding themselves having to fight a rearguard action.[41]

Industry, technology, and labour

To label the classical Greek world 'pre-industrial' is too vague; to call it 'third-world' too precise.[42] But if 'primitive' in its culturally loaded sense does have any application to ancient Greece, surely it is in the domain of industrialization, technology and labour. Whether or not the Greeks knew the wheelbarrow (a perennial and partly humorous debate), this was unarguably a world still very largely of human energy and man-power, and deficient in artificially generated energy or power.[43] The major exception in ancient pre-Roman Greece was wind-power, used, however, not to turn mill-sails, but to fill the sails of the specialist merchantmen that had been developed already by 600 BCE.[44] The contrast between the ingenuity, time and material resources expended by the Greeks on sacred constructions, on the one hand, and on industrial or agricultural ergonomics, on the other, remains very striking indeed.[45]

Three quarters of a century ago, a valuable account was published of the major written sources on ancient agriculture, Roman as well as Greek, 'from the point of view of labour'.[46] Since then, there have been studies of the Greek ideology of labour in general: the pagan Greeks were mostly agreed that working for one's living was not an intrinsic good, and their term for hard physical toil, *ponos*, is generally pejorative; to be without *ponos* was, according to Hesiod, to live like the blessed immortal gods.[47] Labour, moreover, as an abstract theoretical category (as in 'labour power', or a 'labour theory of value') was unknown to the ancient Greeks, by whom it was understood in the most concrete, physical sense.[48]

Three major problems might be worth further consideration. First, was ancient Greece in broad terms a 'peasant' economy (or society)? First find – or define – your peasant. For some modern interpreters, the word is inherently negative, because peasant status necessarily involves multi-directional subjection to powerful outsiders and so is inappropriate at least for free Greek citizen farmers.[49] For others, there is no shame in peasant status – on the contrary: the Athenian democracy was a 'peasant' republic. [50] Still others find the term unhelpful for various reasons: because there was no ancient Greek equivalent term, because

ancient Greek farmers differed crucially from medieval and modern peasantries, and because use of the term has given rise to contradictory interpretations.[51] There is, I suggest, a *via media*. Provided 'peasant' is allowed to retain its etymological sense of country(wo)man and does not necessarily connote political subordination or subjection, it may be helpful in picking out a category of farmer below that of the rich landed estate-owner and also in pointing unambiguously to the rural and agrarian economic base of all ancient Greek culture and societies.

In the eyes of Burford, however, true peasants were to be found only 'in all the various tied populations . . . of the Greek world, men genuinely under obligation and rendering labor services in return'.[52] That includes populations such as the Helots of Lakonia and Messenia, whose status, functions and social organization constitute the second of my three major problems. It was on their backs that there rested the peculiar economy and society of Sparta, one of the two great powers of classical Greece before the rise of Macedon. Of that there is no question. On the other hand, to use 'peasants' or 'sharecropping tenants' to categorize their status seems seriously misleading and inappropriate.[53] Although the Helots were ethnically Greek, chiefly agriculturalists, and certainly a dependent population, in official Spartan parlance they were also *douloi* ('slaves' or 'unfree'), and they were not merely 'tied' to the land and its citizen owners, but also laboured constantly under pain of summary death. In the nature of the evidence we shall never attain anything like certainty or even consensus over the precise nature and efficiency of Helot agricultural production, but perhaps we may at least avoid terminological inexactitude in classifying their status.[54]

Fortunately – or sadly – no such doubt surrounds the proper classification of all *douloi* in Athens: in our parlance, they were chattel slaves, wholly owned, natally alienated, socially, culturally and of course politically deracinated, and legally construed as quasi- or un-persons. Scholarly doubt concerns rather the nature, extent and effect of slaves' enforced participation in agriculture. In 1992 Michael Jameson restated the case he had made some fifteen years earlier that 'in classical Attica the prevailing pattern was that of independent farmers who worked their own land intensively and were commonly assisted by slaves belonging to their household'.[55] Behind that deceptively bland statement lies a massive controversy about the political economy of Athens. Against Jameson are ranged both those who wish to minimize the role of slavery in agriculture[56] and those who wish to maximize the role of slaves (and others) in the non-agricultural sector of 'the Athenian economy'.[57]

That controversy may never be finally resolved; the role of slavery in manufacture presents a further seeming paradox. Wherever anything like industrial craft-production existed in ancient Greece (shield-making, silver-mining, temple-building, pottery-manufacture, textiles for non-domestic consumption, wine for export), slaves constituted an important or major part of the workforce.[58] Yet for Aristotle, keen to defend the necessity of slavery for 'politics' as he understood them, slavery was an essential component, not of *poiêsis* ('production'), but of *praxis* ('behaviour', 'action', in the sense of living the good life of the citizen). The explanation is political, in the sense of that word discussed above: shields (etc.) could have been and sometimes were produced by free labour, but without slaves no free Greek could in Aristotle's view live the only truly good, civic life of moral-political activity in the *polis*. That depended upon the leisure that slaves provided, and were themselves by definition denied, that is, precisely, freedom from the *ponos* of *poiêsis*.[59]

Aristotle's privileging of *praxis* above *poiêsis* is therefore in large part ideological, and yet it did also have a basis in material actuality. The observation passed by David Hume on the non-association of the growth of any ancient city with the establishment of a manufacture is still generally valid.[60] To the extent that manufacture of goods for exchange on the domestic or external market always played second fiddle to primary domestic production for autarkic home consumption, the ideal-typical Greek city was always a 'consumer' not a 'producer' city.[61] Defence of the territory and the securing of an external supply of basic foodstuffs in case of domestic shortfall (a constant preoccupation at Athens from, at the latest, 450 BCE) were regularly on the civic agenda figuratively speaking, and literally so in democratic Athens.[62] Yet there was no overall city 'budget' nor any global concern with a 'balance of payments', nor indeed with 'the' (or an) economy as such, partly because of the nature of the political in Greece, and partly for reasons that the next section should make clear.[63]

Trade, commerce, and plunder

It is probably in the context of trade and commerce that the question of the nature of 'the' ancient economy has been most hotly disputed. There is, to be sure, still plenty of room for legitimate disagreement over just how rational, profit-maximizing and disembedded ancient Greek economy or economics could become, at any rate in fourth-century Athens, and even more specifically in the fourth-century world of the Piraeus *emporion*, with its *sumbola*, *dikai emporikai*,

bankers, maritime loans, and *nauklêroi*.[64]

As a vehicle for the distribution of goods, trade may have to take its place in the queue behind plunder and gift.[65] Trade may also have to be distinguished from commerce (i.e. 'big business'): the transfer and exchange of goods over long distances can be accomplished without developed market mechanisms, let alone state regulation, and do not necessarily have major economic implications.[66] Finley, it is true, was over-impressed by Marcel Mauss's *Essai sur le don* (1925)[67] and so exaggerated the narrowly economic, as opposed to the social-political and ideological, importance of gift-exchange in his 'world of Odysseus'.[68] Homer was after all epic poetry, composed mainly about and for the elite, which largely screened out lower-class trade in a manner that a conservative eighteenth-century English aristocrat might have found congenial.[69]

But Finley was not wrong to draw attention to the large amount of non-market transfer of goods and to the non-commodification of exchange in the world of the early Greek states.[70] Serious changes, both structural and functional, are not in fact clearly visible before about 600 BCE in round figures; and for some considerable time after that the Greeks remained backward by comparison with Phoenicians and Etruscans, filling the role of pupils rather than teachers. Indeed, it was not until the creation of the fifth-century Athenian empire and, in consequence, the development of the Piraeus as both a commercial and a naval harbour that anything resembling the State regulation of trade long familiar from, say, Egyptian Naukratis came into being in the world of the Greek city.[71]

Even then, it is striking that there was no preferential treatment legally prescribed for Athenian citizen traders; and, partly for that reason, most regular, long-distance traders frequenting the Piraeus were aliens, not resident aliens (*metoikoi*) but transient foreigners (*xenoi*), both Greek and non-Greek. The Athenian community, moreover, pursued always and only an import interest rather than an export interest. The city as such was not interested in economic growth, in 'developing the economy'. The wall between citizens and profit-motivated investment was not perhaps as thick and impermeable as Finley imagined.[72] But it was there all the same, most obviously in regard to the ownership of real property. In so far as the Piraeus economy (or economic activity focused on the Piraeus) developed its own values, both material and moral, this was perhaps something like the ancient equivalent of our black economy. It was at any rate no accident that Hermes, 'the god of good luck and whatever is shadowy and chancy', was patron god of thieves as well as of merchants.[73]

However – contrast present-day Colombia or Russia – the ancient Greeks' black economy had no State, however weak, to contest, collude with – or evade.

Moreover, it was the loss rather than the acquisition of empire which prompted the most innovative and far-reaching civic measures of intervention and control. It cannot be emphasized too firmly that the extensive development by Athens of a legal apparatus of would-be regulation was but a second-best option. Force, military force, remained the ideal economic specific, in the fourth as it had been in the fifth century.[74] Hence in Aristotle's *Politics* war was automatically conceptualized as a 'natural' means of production – not only for arms-manufacturers and shipbuilders, but for the community as a whole, in the shape of the acquisition of new resources, especially new cultivable land. Note also Xenophon's choice of *episitismos* – a process of restocking, especially in grain or food more generally (*sitos* could mean either) – to describe a massive Spartan-led invasion of the rich territory of Elis in the immediate aftermath of the economically exhausting Peloponnesian War. On the high seas, too, piracy was not merely a relic of some pre-political mode of acquisition, but even more prevalent in the fourth century than earlier.[75] War-damage to agriculture or rather arboriculture (especially olives) can be exaggerated,[76] but it is difficult to overstate the Greeks' engrained booty-raiding mentality.

Most foreign wars pitted Greek against Greek over some disputed frontier territory.[77] Civil war (*stasis*) also had profound economic effects, by no means all negative. Redistribution of land and cancellation of debts were the slogans of oppressed peasantries, and *staseis* could result in shifts in the balance of power and wealth of which modern political parties of Right or Left can only dream.[78]

Symbolic capital

When Augustine spoke of the Passion in terms of a commercial transaction – 'he bought us when he was crucified. There he poured out his blood, the price for us'[79] – he was using metaphorical language that we can instantly recognize; for us too, 'redemption' has a secular economic as well as a transcendental spiritual meaning. The classical Greeks likewise would have found nothing odd in the assimilation or melding of the material and the spiritual, the political and the economic. What better example than *timê*? This good Homeric word for non-material value, such as the honour due to the gods, in Classical Greece came to mean also 'census group', 'political office', and yet more concretely 'price' (material cost, reward, recompense, valuation), without sacrificing one whit of its

original moral sense.[80]

Such interference between culture and economy, or manipulation of 'symbolic capital', is well attested both visually and verbally in the archaic period.[81] But it can be explored most tangibly in classical texts, from Aeschylus to Aristotle.[82] One might perhaps note especially the telling chapter-titles of Leslie Kurke's exploration of 'the poetics of social economy' in Pindar: 'The economics of *nostos*', 'The ideology of aristocratic exchange', 'Guest-friends and guest-gifts', and the title of Part III, 'Pindar's political economy'.[83] Her more recent interpretation of 'the economy of *kudos*' as 'a circulation of powers and honors whose goal is to achieve a harmonious sharing of this special commodity within the city' neatly captures the undoubtedly increasing commodification of goods in classical Greece.[84]

This approach consciously reflects the turn of the so-called 'new cultural history' towards what have been described as 'agent-centered issues of meaning, treating "the economic" as a category of representation, a field of negotiations for knowledgeable actors in pursuit of their own goals'.[85] A further illustration, recalling the '*whose* economy or economies?' debate with which I began, is von Reden's skilful development, and application to classical Greece, of the distinction between a positive, 'long-term' social model and a more morally questionable, 'short-term' economic model of material exchange.[86]

Such an approach seems to me far more easily conformable to a model of balanced reciprocity among Athenian citizen peers and negative reciprocity between social and political unequals than to any modernizing market-centred, profit-maximizing model of disembedded economy, and far more fruitfully so.[87] This preference may be due simply to a blinkered 'Cambridge School' vision, but I submit that it is objectively based on the sorts of evidence discussed above, and plausibly informed by the 'substantivist' mode of interpretation.

Presentism

No doubt, as Max Weber once put it, 'the interest in a story is always keener when the audience has the feeling, *de te fabula narratur*, and when the story-teller can conclude his yarn with a *discite moniti*!' But what Weber went on to say, with regard to the world of late antiquity, applies no less to our present topic: 'Unfortunately, the discussion which follows does not fall into this enviable category. We can learn little or nothing for our contemporary problems... [which] are of a completely different character.'[88] To which, however, I would want to add

that in other than directly practical ways difference, even polar otherness, of socio-economic and cultural formation can be as instructive as close similarity.[89] I close therefore with a concrete historical example that wears its revelatory difference on its sleeve. It is taken from Thucydides' famous account of the Kerkyra *stasis* of 427 BCE:

> The civil war at Kerkyra began when the [250 or so] prisoners taken in the battles for Epidamnos were released by the Corinthians and returned home. In theory they had been released on a payment of 80 talents as security by the Kerkyraians' diplomatic representatives among the citizens of Corinth, but in fact they had undertaken to bring over Kerkyra to Corinth. They set to work, approaching each of the citizens in the attempt to detach the city from Athens . . .
>
> A man called Peithias, who had volunteered to serve as diplomatic representative of the Athenians and was the leader of the common people, was brought to trial by these men on a charge of enslaving Kerkyra to Athens. He was acquitted, and in turn prosecuted the five richest men on a charge of repeatedly cutting vine-props from the sanctuary of Zeus and Alkinöos: a fine of one *statêr* was prescribed for each prop. These men were found guilty, and because of the size of the fine they went as suppliants to the shrines, hoping to come to an arrangement over the payment. But Peithias, who was also a member of the Council, persuaded it to enforce the law . . . They [the condemned] therefore banded together and, armed with daggers, suddenly burst into the Council chamber, killing Peithias and about sixty other Councillors and ordinary citizens.[90]

The monetization and size of the ransom-payments and fines are of course independently interesting and informative, and the evidence Thucydides provides is all the more valuable for coming from outside the directly Athenian sphere. Yet what strikes one most strongly here is the quintessentially classical Greek mixture. Combined in this one episode are what *we* might want to call 'economics', together with war, civil war, politics (including both a highly politicized attempt to exercise legal justice and a flagrant illegality), and – centrally, not accidentally – religion. That peculiar cocktail surely exudes a strong aroma of the substantive alterity of classical Greek *oikonomia* and *oikonomika*.

NOTES

The original version of this essay was delivered as the Keynote Address at a conference held in 1994 at the European Cultural Centre, Delphi. Warm thanks are owed to Dr A. Courakis (as Trustee of the John Hicks Foundation) for inviting me, and to my many helpful critics. Likewise to the editors of Dialogos *for encouraging me to reshape that text for its present, very different context and audience. Yet this essay, like the original address, is a consciously selective survey intended to stimulate productive debate and research. For further references to and discussion of recent literature, see my articles and review-essays cited in notes 10, 30, 37, 74, below.*

1 This essay appears exactly a quarter of a century after the first edition of the groundbreaking *The Ancient Economy* (Berkeley 1973; 2nd edn., 1985) by Moses Finley, to whose memory in affectionate gratitude it is dedicated. Compare also Finley, *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece*, ed. B.D. Shaw and R.P. Saller (London 1981); H. Schneider, 'Der moderne Markt und die antike Gesellschaft. Über Moses Finley', *Freibeuter* (1986) 143-6; I. Morris, 'The Athenian economy twenty years after *The Ancient Economy*', *Classical Philology* 89 (1994) 351-66.

2 The debate between Davies and Brunt occurred in the now defunct *Didaskalos* (a journal aimed mainly at teachers of ancient history in UK secondary schools) 5.1 (1975) and 5.2 (1976); the quotation from Brunt is at 5.2: 239.

3 In *CAH*^{2} III.3 (1983), V (1992), VI (1995), and VII.1 (1984) 'economy' is still confined, alongside 'culture' and 'society', to its carefully segregated reservation.

4 T.K. Rabb in Rabb and R.I. Rotberg (eds.), *The New History: the 1980s and beyond.* I. *Studies in Interdisciplinary History* (Princeton 1982) 321.

5 Plato, *Phaedo* 109b.

6 Hdt. 8.144.2. It is at least more plausible to speak of the Greco-Roman world of (say) CE 1 as constituting such a system, and therefore of 'the ancient economy' in the singular. However, R. Duncan-Jones, 'Trade, taxes and money' in his *Structure and Scale in the Ancient Economy* (Cambridge 1990) 30-47 has taken cogently strong issue with the unitarian view of M.K. Hopkins, 'Taxes and trade in the Roman empire, 200 BC – AD 400', *Journal of Roman Studies* 70 (1980) 101-25; and id. in P. Garnsey, K. Hopkins and C.R. Whittaker (eds.), *Trade in the Ancient Economy* (London 1983) esp. x-xiv.

7 E. Ruschenbusch, 'Zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialstruktur der *Normalpolis*', *Annuario della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, 13 (1983) 171-94, has sought to define a sort of model or ideal-typical Greek city; this construct's chief value is to demonstrate unequivocally the abnormality of classical Athens, from which most of our fine-grained evidence comes, and on which most of the debate concerning the nature of the ancient Greek economy is explicitly or implicitly focused.

8 On the objective question of the nature of classical Greek economy in comparative perspective see further Finley (ed.), *The Bücher-Meyer Controversy* (New York 1979).

9 The debate is neatly summarized by E. Will, 'Trois quarts de siècle de recherches sur l'économie grecque antique', *Annales (ESC)* 9 (1954) 7-22; cf. M.M. Austin and P. Vidal-Naquet, *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece: an Introduction* (London 1977); E.M. Burke, 'The economy of Athens in the classical era: some adjustments to the primitivist model', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 122 (1992) 199-226.

10 Finley, *Ancient Economy*, 26 (Finley's italics), citing J. Hicks, *A Theory of Economic History* (Oxford 1969) 42-3. Note also Hicks, *A Market Theory of Money* (Oxford 1989); but for some of the problems with contemporary market theory, see F. Hahn, 'Incomplete market economics', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 80 (1993) 201-19, esp. 211. See further my review of E.E. Cohen, *Athenian Economy and Society: a Banking Perspective* (Princeton 1992), *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 17 April 1993, where I draw attention to the dangers of interpretative polarization (*either*

primitive, non-market, embedded economy *or* full-blown, disembedded market economy). A more favourable response to Cohen's important book may be found in the review by T. Figueira, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 5 (1994) 109-13.

11 On Hasebroek see briefly Cartledge, '"Trade and Politics" revisited: archaic Greece', in Garnsey, Hopkins, Whittaker (eds.), *Trade in the Ancient Economy*, 1-15. Polanyi's views are best read in K. Polanyi, *Primitive, Archaic and Modern Economies*, ed. G. Dalton (New York 1968), with the useful critiques of: S.C. Humphreys, 'History, economics and anthropology: the work of Karl Polanyi', in *Anthropology and the Greeks* (London 1978) 31-75; F. Block and M. Somers, 'Beyond the economistic fallacy: the holistic social science of Karl Polanyi', in T. Skocpol (ed.), *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology* (Cambridge 1984) 47-84; W. Nippel, 'Ökonomische Anthropologie und griechische Wirtschaftsgeschichte', in *Griechen, Barbaren und "Wilde". Alte Geschichte und Sozialanthropologie* (Frankfurt 1990) 124-51; D.W. Tandy and W.C. Neale, 'Karl Polanyi's distinctive approach to social analysis and the case of ancient Greece: ideas, criticisms, consequence', in C.M. Duncan and D.W. Tandy (eds.), *From Political Economy to Anthropology: Situating Economic Life in Past Societies* (Montreal 1994) 9-33.

12 See further Morris, 'Athenian economy', 354: 'reducing substantivism to primitivism misses its political program, and with it everything that made Polanyi's and Finley's work – and ancient Greece – interesting to a wider audience.'

13 See S. Meikle, 'Aristotle and exchange value', in D. Keyt and F.D. Miller (eds.), *A Companion to Aristotle's Politics* (Cambridge, Mass. 1991) 156-81; 'Modernism, economics and the ancient economy', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 41 (1995) 174-91.

14 H. Kloft, *Die Wirtschaft der griechisch-römischen Welt: eine Einführung* (Darmstadt 1992), seems to be saying something like that, even if his work is otherwise theoretically flawed; see S. von Reden, *Classical Review* 43 (1993) 321-3. It is not irrelevant that, although our words are Greek in etymology, the semantic fields of 'economy' and 'economics' overlap only marginally with those of ancient Greek *oikonomia* and *oikonomika*: C. Ampolo, '*Oikonomia*: tre osservazioni sui rapporto tra la finanza e l'economia greca', *Archeologia e storia antica* 1 (1979) 119-30; cf. F. Roscalla (ed.), *Senofonte. Economico* (Milan 1991) (with an important introduction by D. Lanza); G. Audring (ed.), *Xenophon. Ökonomische Schriften* (Berlin 1992).

15 M.S. Schofield, 'Plato on the economy', in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *The Ancient Greek City-State* (Copenhagen 1993) 183-96; Polanyi, 'Aristotle discovers the economy', in Polanyi, C.M. Arensberg and H.W. Pearson (eds.), *Trade and Market in the Early Empires* (Chicago 1957) 64-94. Xenophon too has been hailed as the 'earliest Greek economist' in S.B. Pomeroy, *Xenophon's 'Oeconomicus'. A Social and Historical Commentary* (Oxford 1994) 42; but for a critique of her modernizing and economistic reading of Xenophon see V.J. Hunter, *Classical Philology* 91 (1996) 184-9.

16 Ste. Croix, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 87 (1967) 180, reviewing M.I. Finley (ed.), *Trade and Politics in the Ancient World* (Aix-en-Provence 1965).

17 Finley, 'Le document et l'histoire économique de l'antiquité', *Annales (ESC)* 37 (1982) 697-713.

18 H.W. Pleket (ed.), *Epigraphica* I. *Texts on the Economic History of the Greek World* (Leiden 1964).

19 Kloft, *Wirtschaft*, 55ff.; cf. M.H. Crawford, 'Numismatics', in Crawford (ed.), *Sources for Ancient History* (Cambridge 1983) 185-233, esp. 205-7, who remarks, with reference to P. Grierson, 'Commerce in the Dark Ages: a critique of the evidence', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 9 (1959) 123-40, that 'as far as the distribution of goods, including coins, is concerned, plunder and gift and such things as indemnities may be much more important than trade as a vehicle' (207). See also now C. Howgego, *Ancient History from Coins* (London 1995).

20 A.M. Snodgrass, 'Archaeology', in Crawford (ed.), *Sources*, 168-72; cf. Morris, 'Athenian economy', 361 ('excavated materials are no more of a transparent window on the past than are written sources'). Note also esp. the determined attack on the 'positivist fallacy' (the correlation of the

economic significance of an artefact or class of artefacts with its propensity to survive in archaeologically recoverable form) in D. Gill, 'Positivism, pots and long-distance trade', in I.M. Morris (ed.), *Classical Greece. Ancient Histories and Modern Archaeologies* (Cambridge 1994) 99-107. Field-survey: below, nn. 33, 37.

21 See below n. 36.

22 C. Gill, *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy, and Philosophy. The Self in Dialogue* (Oxford 1996) 4 n.11, 30, 468.

23 On class in antiquity see G.E.M. de Ste. Croix, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World. From the Archaic age to the Arab conquests* (London 1981, corr. impr. 1983). On the Piraeus economy, see further pp. 14-16 above, with n.64.

24 The Aristotelian work known under the Latin title *Oeconomica* was not written by Aristotle himself, nor does it comprise much that could be dignified with the label 'political economy', let alone economic analysis.

25 Finley, 'Aristotle and economic analysis' (1970), repr. in Finley (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Society* (London 1974) 26-52; S. Meikle, *Aristotle's Economic Thought* (Oxford 1996).

26 On politics and 'the political' in ancient Greece, see e.g. C. Meier, *The Greek Discovery of Politics* (Cambridge, Mass. 1990); further references and discussion in Cartledge, 'La Politica', in S. Settis (ed.), *I Greci*, I. *Noi e I Greci* (Turin 1996) 39-72.

27 Morris, 'The community against the market in Classical Athens', in Duncan and Tandy (eds.), *From Political Economy*, 52-79, at 68; a point not sufficiently appreciated by Cohen, *Athenian Economy*.

28 'Share-holder': P.B. Manville, *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens* (Princeton 1990). 'Citizen-state': W.G. Runciman, 'Doomed to extinction: the *polis* as an evolutionary dead-end', in O. Murray and S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City from Homer to Aristotle* (Oxford 1990) 347-67.

29 Arist. *Pol.* 1333b36-8. I am esp. indebted here to the unpublished Cambridge PhD thesis of M. Berent, 'The Stateless Polis. Towards a Re-evaluation of the Classical Greek Political Community' (1994).

30 In this section I resume Cartledge, 'Classical Greek agriculture: recent work and alternative views', *Journal of Peasant Studies* 21 (1993) 127-36, a review-article of A. Burford, *Land and Labor in the Greek World* (Baltimore 1993) and S. Isager and J.E. Skydsgaard, *Ancient Greek Agriculture: An Introduction* (London 1992), in which I pay due tribute to the inspirational pioneering work of the prehistorian Paul Halstead.

31 R. Osborne, *Classical Landscape with Figures: the Ancient Greek City and its Countryside* (London 1987) makes what he can of what sources there are.

32 Even a scholar like Alison Burford, who has written with sympathy on ancient craftsmen (typically humble people, often slaves), in her *Craftsmen in Greek and Roman Society* (London 1972), can claim that 'the Greeks rose to greater heights above the furrowed field in more spheres of intellectual and artistic activity than other people': *Land and Labor*, 2.

33 S.E. Alcock, J. Cherry and J.L. Davis, 'Intensive survey, agricultural practice and the classical landscape of Greece', in Morris (ed.), *Classical Greece*, 137-70. See also n. 37 below.

34 H.A. Forbes, 'The ethnoarchaeological approach to ancient Greek agriculture', in B. Wells (ed.), *Agriculture in Ancient Greece* (Stockholm 1992) 87-101.

35 Household cycle: T.W. Gallant, *Risk and Survival in Ancient Greece: Reconstructing the Domestic Rural Economy* (Oxford 1991). Palaeoethnobotany: R. Sallares, *The Ecology of the Ancient Greek World* (London 1991).

36 P. Garnsey, *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis* (Cambridge 1988) and Gallant, *Risk and Survival*, are broadly – and to me persuasively – positive on this issue; Isager and Skydsgaard, *Ancient Greek Agriculture*, rather vehemently negative.

37 This was a considerable handicap to S. Alcock, *Graecia Capta. The Landscapes of Roman*

Greece (Cambridge 1993). But see now M.H. Jameson, C.N. Runnels and T. Van Andel, *A Greek Countryside* (Stanford 1994), with Cartledge, 'Classical Greek agriculture II', *Journal of Peasant Studies* 23 (1995) 131-9, a review-article of Jameson et al., and of V.D. Hanson, *The Other Greeks. The Family Farm and the Agrarian Roots of Western Civilization* (New York 1995); and L. Foxhall, H.A. Forbes and C. Mee, 'Six hundred years of settlement history on the peninsula of Methana: an interdisciplinary approach', *Dialogos* 3 (1996) 72-94.

38 E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley 1951).

39 S. Hodkinson, 'Animal husbandry in the Greek polis', in C.R. Whittaker (ed.), *Pastoral Economies in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge 1988) 35-74.

40 Morris, 'Athenian economy', 364.

41 See esp. Isager and Skydsgaard, *Ancient Greek Agriculture.*

42 As Ste. Croix remarks, *loc. cit.* (n. 16), '"underdeveloped countries" [are] powerfully affected by the advanced industrial societies towards whose condition they aspire'.

43 J-P. Vernant, 'Some remarks on the forms and limitations of technological thought among the Greeks' [1957], in *Myth and Thought in Ancient Greece* (London 1983) 279-301; Finley, 'Technical innovation and economic progress in the ancient world' [1965], repr., with bibliographical addendum, in *Economy and Society*, 176-95, 273-5; H.W. Pleket, 'Technology and society in the Graeco-roman world', *Acta Historiae Neerlandica* 2 (1967) 1-25; id., 'Technology in the Greco-Roman world: a general report', *Talanta* 5 (1973) 6-47. For a specific instance see L. Foxhall, 'Oil extraction and processing equipment in Classical Greece', in M-C. Amouretti and J-P. Brun (eds.), *La production du vin et de l'huile en Méditerranée* (Paris 1993) 183-200.

44 L. Casson, *The Ancient Mariners. Seafarers and Sea Fighters of the Mediterranean in Ancient Times* (2nd edn., Princeton 1991).

45 See Osborne, *Classical Landscape*, esp. 81-92.

46 W.E. Heitland, *Agricola: a Study of Agricultural Life in the Graeco-Roman World from the Point of View of Labour* (Cambridge 1921).

47 Vernant, 'Work and nature in ancient Greece' (1955), and 'Some psychological aspects of work in ancient Greece' (1956), in *Myth and Thought*, 248-70, 271-8; N. Loraux, '*Ponos*: some difficulties regarding the term for "labor"' [1982], in *The Experiences of Tiresias. The Feminine and the Greek Man* (Princeton 1995) 44-58.

48 Esp. S. von Reden, 'Arbeit und Zivilisation: Kriterien der Selbstdefinition im antiken Athen', *Münstersche Beiträge zur antiken Handelsgeschichte* 11 (1992) 1-31, at 31 (English summary): 'in antiquity labour was conceptualized in terms of toil and achievement, rather than in terms of production'.

49 Esp. Burford, *Land and Labor*, 85-6 and n.92.

50 Esp. E.M. Wood, *Peasant-Citizen and Slave: the Foundations of the Athenian Democracy* (London 1988), and 'Labour and democracy, ancient and modern', in *Democracy Against Capitalism. Renewing Historical Materialism* (Cambridge 1995) 181-204.

51 E.g. M.H. Jameson, 'Agricultural labor in ancient Greece', in Wells (ed.), *Agriculture*, 135-46.

52 Burford, *Land and Labor*, 201.

53 I have in mind here Hodkinson, 'Sharecropping and Sparta's economic exploitation of the Helots', in J.M. Sanders (ed.), *ΦΙΛΟΛΑΚΩΝ. Fest. H.W. Catling* (Athens 1992) 123-34, though I must add that Hodkinson seems to me to be currently the leading exponent of Spartan social and economic history.

54 J. Ducat, *Les hilotes* (Paris 1990), is comprehensive and acute, but by no means entirely satisfactory: see my review in *Classical Philology* 87 (1992) 260-3.

55 Jameson, 'Agricultural labor', 135. But note his explicit qualification in 'Class in the ancient Greek countryside', in P.N. Doukellis and L.G. Mendoni (eds.), *Structures rurales et sociétés antiques* (Paris 1994) 55-63, at 60 n.29: 'I would not claim that [agricultural slave-owning]

characterized the Athenian lower classes or deny that most slave-owners were of middling or higher status'.

56 Esp. Wood, *Peasant-Citizen and Slave.*

57 Esp. Cohen, *Athenian Economy*; id., 'The Athenian economy', in R. Rosen and J. Farrell (eds.), *NOMODEIKTES. Fest. M. Ostwald* (Ann Arbor 1993) 197-206.

58 Y. Garlan, *Slavery in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca 1988), confirms the conclusion of Finley, 'Was Greek civilisation based on slave labour?' (1959), repr. in *Economy and Society*, 97-116.

59 Cartledge, '"Like a worm i' the bud"? A heterology of Greek slavery', *Greece & Rome* 40 (1993) 163-80; id., *The Greeks: a Portrait of Self and Others* (rev. edn., Oxford 1997) ch. 6.

60 Hume is quoted by Finley, *Ancient Economy*, 137; but see now also L. Neesen, 'Zur Rolle und Bedeutung der produzierenden Gewerbe in antiken Städte', *Ancient Society* 22 (1991) 25-40, at 27-33.

61 Finley, 'The ancient city: from Fustel de Coulanges to Max Weber and beyond' [1977], repr. in *Economy and Society*, 3-23, has been besieged but not stormed by D. Engels, *Roman Corinth. An Alternative Model for the Classical City* (Chicago 1990): see the review by R. Saller, *Classical Philology* 86 (1991) 351-7.

62 Garnsey, *Famine and Food Supply*, Part III.

63 L. Migeotte, *Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grecques* (Quebec 1992), shows that the phenomenon of the public subscription was an index of neither political nor financial crisis, and that it had little to do with the budget gaps, deficit reductions, and belt-tightenings familiar to us.

64 E.E. Cohen, *Ancient Athenian Maritime Courts* (Princeton 1973); R. Garland, *The Piraeus from the Fifth to the First Century B.C.* (London 1987); P. Millett, 'Maritime loans and the structure of credit in fourth-century Athens', in Garnsey, Hopkins and Whittaker (eds.), *Trade in the Ancient Economy*, 36-52; J. Vélissaropoulou, *Les nauclères grecs* (Geneva 1980); Cohen, *Athenian Economy.*

65 See quotation in n.19 above.

66 Cartledge, '"Trade and politics" revisited'.

67 This is available in two, revealingly different English translations (1954, 1990): Morris, 'Athenian economy', 357 n.32. Mauss himself actually said virtually nothing about ancient Greece.

68 Finley, *The World of Odysseus*[2] (London 1978).

69 Morris, 'The use and abuse of Homer', *Classical Antiquity* 5 (1986) 81-138.

70 S. von Reden, *Exchange in Ancient Greece* (London 1995).

71 U. Wartenberg, *After Marathon: War, Society and Money in Fifth-Century Athens* (London 1995).

72 Finley, 'Land, debt and the man of property in classical Athens' [1953], repr. in *Economy and Society*, 62-76; id., *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens 500-200 B.C.* (New Brunswick 1952, repr. with intro. by P. Millett, 1984); *contra*: Cohen, *Athenian Economy.*

73 The quotation is from the late Canadian novelist Robertson Davies *ap.* D. Buitron Oliver (ed.), *The Greek Miracle. Classical Sculpture from the Dawn of Democracy* (Washington, DC 1992) 75.

74 Finley, 'War and Empire', in *Ancient History: Evidence and Models* (London 1985) ch. 5; Osborne, *Classical Landscape*, ch. 7; Millett, 'Warfare, economy and democracy in Classical Athens', in J. Rich and G. Shipley (eds.), *War and Society in the Greek World* (London 1993) ch. 9. Tabulation of booty reported in Greek historians: W.K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War*, V (Berkeley 1991) 505-41, with Cartledge, 'Ancient warfare', *International History Review* 15 (1993) 323-8, at 326-7.

75 Arist. *Pol.* 1255b37, 1256b23-7, 1333b35ff.; Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.26. Piracy: Garlan, *Guerre et économie en Grèce ancienne* (Paris 1989), ch. 8; C.R. Whittaker, 'I popoli del mare', in V. Castronovo (ed.), *Storia dell' economia mondiale* I. *Permanenze e mutamenti dall'antichità al medioevo* (Turin 1996) 153-76, esp. 159-75.

76 V.D. Hanson, *Warfare and Agriculture in Ancient Greece* (Pisa 1983) is an admirable corrective.

77 M. Sartre, 'Aspects économiques et aspects religieux de la frontière dans les cités grecques', *Ktema* 4 (1979) 213-24.
78 D. Asheri, *Distribuzioni di terre nell' antica Grecia* (Turin 1966); id., *Leggi greche sul problema dei debiti* (Pisa 1969).
79 *Sermon* *54 Mainz, ch. 17. I am grateful to Peter Garnsey for drawing this new text to my attention.
80 Compare Latin *honores*, as in the Roman *cursus honorum* (ladder of political offices).
81 'Symbolic capital': P. Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge 1977) 179. L. Gernet, '"Value" in Greek myth' [1948], in R. Gordon (ed.), *Myth, Religion and Society. Structuralist Essays* (Cambridge 1981) 111-46, was early to explicate this interpenetration of the moral and the material in Greece; cf. R. Di Donato, *Per una antropologia storica del mondo antico* (Pisa 1990). Also, L. Kurke, 'The politics of *habrosunê* in Archaic Greece', *Classical Antiquity* 11 (1992) 91-120, and 'The economy of *kudos*', in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (eds.), *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece* (Cambridge 1993) 131-63.
82 G. Crane, 'Politics of consumption and generosity in the carpet scene of the *Agamemnon*', *Classical Philology* 88 (1993) 185-233; and esp. von Reden, *Exchange in Ancient Greece*.
83 Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise. Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (Ithaca 1991).
84 Kurke, 'Economy', 141. Likewise, Carol Dougherty, with reference to Thucydides 1.22.4 (*ktêma es aiei*), has percipiently noted the historian's 'success in packaging the past as a metaphorical commodity': leaflet accompanying a 1994 exhibition at Wellesley College entitled 'The Object of History and the History of Objects'. Cf. L. Kallet-Marx, *Money, Expense, and Naval Power in Thucydides' History 1-5.24* (Berkeley 1993) 1-20.
85 Morris, 'Athenian economy', 351.
86 von Reden, *Exchange,* following the anthropologists M. Bloch and J. Parry (eds.), *Money and the Morality of Exchange* (Cambridge 1989); cf. A. Appadurai (ed.), *The Social Life of Things* (Cambridge 1986).
87 P. Millett, *Lending and Borrowing in Ancient Athens* (Cambridge 1991), e.g. 110-11. *Contra*: Cohen, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 3 (1992) 282-9.
88 Weber, 'Die sozialen Gründe des Untergangs der antiken Kultur' [1896], repr. in trans. [1950] in *Max Weber*, ed. J.T. Eldridge (London 1971) 254-75 (quotation at 256).
89 This is the governing idea of Cartledge, *The Greeks*; cf. id., 'The Greeks and anthropology', *Anthropology Today* 10 (1994) 3-5.
90 Thuc. 3.70, tr. P.J. Rhodes (modified); note that '80' is read instead of the '800' of the MSS.