

for homicide found in the Hebrew Scriptures, an approach that collides with the Greek evidence and has been refuted in detail by M. Dreher ('Hikesie, Asyle und das Tötungsgesetz Drakons', in: L. Gagliardi and L. Pepe [edd.], *Dike. Essays on Greek Law in honor of Alberto Maffi* [2019], pp. 87–104) and A. Maffi ('Rassegna critica', *Dike* 21 [2019], 186–8). Third, S. (pp. 128–32) attempts to downplay the importance of pollution in homicide law despite the evidence of passages such as Aeschines 2.148, Antiphon 5.11, 82–3; 6.6, and Demosthenes 20.158; 37.59 (see E.M. Harris, 'The Family, the Community and Murder: the Role of Pollution in Athenian Homicide Law', in: C. Ando and J. Rüpke [edd.], *Public and Private in Ancient Mediterranean Law and Religion* [2015], pp. 11–35).

S. (pp. 570–80) follows Aeschines (3.175–6) in attributing the public action for cowardice (*graphe deilias*) to Solon, but this is implausible because the word *taxis* in the law implies a style of warfare that did not develop until the late sixth century BCE (see H. Van Wees, *Greek Warfare* [2004], pp. 166–83). The analysis of laws about *hybris* (pp. 581–94) relies heavily on another forged document at Dem. 21.47 (see now M. Canevaro and E. M. Harris, 'The Authenticity of the Document at Dem. 21.47', *RDE* 9 [2019], 91–108) and the discussion of F117a on a questionable passage from the *Digest* (see I. Arnaoutoglou, 'The Greek Text of D. 47.22.4 (Gai *ad legem duodecim tabularum*) Reconsidered', *Legal Roots* 5 [2016], 87–117). In F116e (= Plutarch, *Solon* 21.1) and F97d (= Plutarch, *Solon* 23.1) S. does not see that the mention of drachms calls the authenticity of several laws into question (see G. Davis, 'Dating the Drachmas in Solon's Laws', *Historia* 61 [2012], 127–58).

What is also lacking in these two volumes is an overview or attempt to situate all the laws into the general framework of the principles expressed by Solon in his poetry. As a result, the picture of Solon's achievement remains fragmentary. And there is no attempt to place Solon's aims and statutes within the larger context of the development of the *polis* in the Archaic period with the gradual transition from personalised forms of power to formal institutional structures (see e.g. E.M. Harris, *Democracy and the Rule of Law in Classical Athens* [2006], pp. 3–28; M. Canevaro, 'Social Mobility vs. Societal Stability: Once Again on the Aims and Meaning of Solon's Reforms', in: J.C. Bernhardt and M. Canevaro [edd.], *From Homer to Solon: Continuity and Change in Archaic Greece* [2022], pp. 363–413).

Durham University

EDWARD HARRIS  
[edward.harris@durham.ac.uk](mailto:edward.harris@durham.ac.uk)

## ECONOMICS IN ANCIENT GREECE AND BEYOND

DÄRMANN (I.), WINTERLING (A.) (edd.) *Oikonomia und Ökonomie im klassischen Griechenland. Theorie – Praxis – Transformation*. Pp. 226. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2022. Cased, €54. ISBN: 978-3-515-12745-5.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X23001750

The study of ancient, especially Greek, economics has reached a turning point. After New Institutional Economics (NIE) in its neoliberal interpretation dominated the theoretical aspects of performance, transaction costs and market orientation in recent years, a more

cultural approach has recently prevailed, which enables a cross-epochal and global comparison of the Greek economy. The edited collection under review also stands for this cultural turn in ancient economic history.

The volume is based on the concept of the interdisciplinary research group 'Economy/Oikonomia' of the former Excellence Cluster 'TOPOI' in Berlin: the fundamental question was the influence of ancient thought on the conceptualisation of modern economics. Starting from the meaning of the word *oikonomia*, the *oikos* as the basic socio-economic unit of society inevitably plays a key role. Based on the value-loaded distinction made by Aristotle, the volume takes up this normative discourse and makes a distinction between *oikonomia*, understood as household management aimed at satisfying needs, and *chremastike*, as the unnatural and limitless pursuit of profit for its own sake. The volume is logically structured and, in addition to an introduction, comprises four thematic sections: 'Zur Forschungslage', 'Antike Theorie', 'Antike Praxis' and 'Aspekte der Transformation'. Of the eight thematic contributions, all but two are in German.

First, the two editors each give a very brief introduction. In 3.5 pages Därmann outlines the problem: the dominance of modern economics could not be explained by itself, i.e. by modern economic developments such as the money and credit economy or markets, but is the result of an ancient heritage: through ancient reception, not least in the Old and New Testament and the translation of ancient *oikonomia* literature in the Middle Ages, ancient ideas were adapted and reinterpreted culturally, politically, religiously and literarily. Therefore, the transformation of *oikonomia* and *chremastike* can also be traced in non-economic spheres. This sets the basic tenor of the volume: it is not only about economic issues, but also about literary reception and transformation in modern economic thinking.

The second editor, Winterling, sets out in 1.5 pages the questions and aims of the volume: it is about the knowledge and structures of the economy in antiquity and the history of its reception and transformation in the late Middle Ages and early modern period. According to Winterling, two basic distinctions are relevant: first, how economics was perceived by ancient, medieval or early modern contemporaries and how these perceptions shape our understanding of economics today; second, a discrepancy between ancient *oikonomia* and modern economics exists. The post-ancient reception and reinterpretation of the ancient concept provides information about how the economy was seen in the respective time periods. These reinterpretations and appropriations of the concept of economy have a decisive influence on our understanding of the economy today, which in turn affects our perception of the ancient economy.

After these brief problematisations N. Morley gives an overview of current questions, theories and conceptions of economic research. This chapter certainly suffers most from its late publication, as Morley notes in an afterword: the chapter was completed in March 2015; so crucial theoretical and methodological interpretations and approaches to ancient economics could not be considered (without writing a completely new contribution). Morley's critique turns against New Institutional Economics that until recently dominated research on ancient economics. Since the publication of *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World*, edited by W. Scheidel, I. Morris and R. Saller in 2007, a number of works have appeared, especially in the field of Roman economic history, which have dealt primarily with the performance of ancient economies using a quantitative approach. In contrast, Morley identifies three possible research approaches that are being pursued more intensively today: comparative studies, the incorporation of social scientific approaches and greater consideration of environmental and climate factors. In this context one could add a cultural approach, as it is also applied in the volume under review with its strong discursive perspective.

These remarks on the state of research on the ancient economy are followed by the section 'Antike Theorie'. First, P. Spahn compares Hesiod's economic advice in the *Erga* with Xenophon's *Oikonomikos* in order to work out continuities and changes in economic thought in archaic and classical times. It is striking to see how both authors give economic considerations a moral underpinning. The differences are that Hesiod deals with the self-employed peasant, whereas Xenophon focuses on the urban landowner. The role of women also differs: while Hesiod's portrayal is marked by misogyny, Xenophon concedes women an important role in the preservation of the *oikos* in economic terms.

Second, D.T. Engen examines the relationship of philosophical considerations to economic practice. Plato, Aristotle and Xenophon present their ideas in conformity with traditional values and norms, as expressed in their high regard for agriculture. In contrast, the economy of Athens had diversified: trade, crafts, banking and investment offered income opportunities especially for the non-elite population. These economic changes were perceived by the three authors, but judged negatively and evaluated as the decline of an idealised past.

The next two articles turn to economic practices. A. Eich begins with a clear rejection of NIE, in agreement with Morley. He is concerned with how an economic-social system was constituted through monetary exchange. War, which was increasingly monetised, played a decisive role in this. On the one hand, this meant that the sums of money spent on it (e.g. for the construction of triremes or for military service) ended up in the hands of non-elite consumers. On the other hand, the war-financing elite had to make profits to enable the *polis* to wage war, which in turn meant that the *polis* built triremes or paid wages for military services and so on. The basis for this cycle was a scarcity of money, i.e., the amounts distributed to non-elite consumers (e.g. in the form of *misthoi*) were so small that they supported subsistence but did not remove the compulsion to work.

This is followed by a contribution by M. Hirsch, who summarises his dissertation in about 40 pages. His subject is the *oikos* and its economic strategies in classical times. He points out that the *oikos* did not aim for self-sufficiency or subsistence. Its gender- and age-specific structure made it flexible enough to adapt to and successfully participate in the monetised economy. The goal was to secure or even increase the continuity of the household. In doing so, the (elite) household was caught between two conflicting demands: on the one hand, the householder had to protect the *oikos* from financial ruin, but on the other hand, he had to behave generously and to support the community through liturgies. Hirsch's assumption that the *oikos*-based economy, in contrast to the Middle Ages, prevented the development of non-domestic forms of economic organisation such as guilds is not entirely convincing. In doing so, he underestimates the corresponding organisations at Athens and overlooks the fact that the household is still the primary economic unit today – without usually being integrated into companies.

The last section unites three contributions under the heading 'Aspekte der Transformation'. W.R. Keller deals with Geoffrey Chaucer's *House of Fame*. In the medieval poem in the form of a dream vision the poet uses economic vocabulary to describe the commercialisation of poetry. H. Pfeiffer analyses Leon Battista Alberti's *Della famiglia*, a work that was strongly influenced by Xenophon's *Oikonomikos*, which had become known in Italy shortly before this work's composition. In the last contribution B.P. Priddat expands his thoughts on the reception and transformation of the *oikos* model. He understands the *oikos*-economy according to Aristotle as a relationship in which the head of the household ruled over the family and slaves, while the *polis*-model according to him is characterised as a relationship of equal citizens. Here, the (early) modern economy functioning via the free market is associated with the *polis*-model, as the market

as a virtual *polis* is associated with self-rule of the citizens involved, whereas the *oikos*-model stands for companies in which capital owners exercise power over the people involved in the production of goods.

These three case studies are undoubtedly interesting in their own right, but they lack introductory or concluding remarks that demonstrate the relevance of these analyses. For an ancient historian it is not clear why, for example, the economic *imaginaire* of Chaucer is relevant to the question of the transformation of the ancient economy. Here and throughout, explanations would have been helpful as to how far the case studies are representative and which continuities and disruptions are discernible in the reception of ancient thought. The same applies to the case studies from antiquity: if transformations are the focus of interest, why is the Roman field completely excluded? After all, one might assume, Columella was no less important for the reception of Xenophon and thus of Greek *oikos*-literature than Geoffrey Chaucer.

The quality of the contributions, as far as it can be judged by an ancient historian, is not questionable. For them have an impact on the study of antiquity – or on the scholarship included in the volume – it would have been desirable for the individual contributions to have been more strongly linked and contextualised. This observation does not make the individual contributions any less valuable, but the current structure of the volume does make the reception of the edited collection as a coherent book more difficult.

Bielefeld University

DOROTHEA ROHDE   
[dorothea.rohde@uni-bielefeld.de](mailto:dorothea.rohde@uni-bielefeld.de)

## AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SPARTANS

BAYLISS (A. J.) *The Spartans. A Very Short Introduction*. Pp. xxiv + 145, ills, maps. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022. Paper, £8.99, US \$11.95. ISBN: 978-0-19-878760-0.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X23002615

This book, in the *Very Short Introductions* series published by Oxford University Press, offers ‘a stimulating and accessible way into a new subject’ (as printed in the series advert inside the book). B.’s contribution on the Spartans certainly achieves this aim. From the first chapter, ‘Go Tell the Spartans’, it is clear that B. aims to focus on introducing the uninitiated to the problematic nature of our source material and the uncertainties that this creates for the study of Spartan history and society. Indeed, in this opening chapter B. deconstructs that most famous incident – the battle of Thermopylae – as a way of grappling with the different sorts of evidence and the problems that they bring about.

The book then moves on to Spartan civic life, particularly social structures, citizenship (including different groups such as *mothakes*), the Spartan constitution and the mythical figure of Lycurgus. Here, it must be pointed out, for this reviewer B. leaves the reader wanting a little more on the dyarchy, which B. points out was unusual (p. 34). There is a chance missed here to give readers some impression of the chaos that having two kings could cause – a rather unique element of Spartan political life.

The next four chapters (on lifestyle, education, women and helots) all interrogate the particulars of what made Sparta tick. In each of these, B. is careful to highlight not only