

consideration is the form in which propertied classes appropriated their surpluses, when in fact I not only stress his views on that point but discuss his argument on slavery *precisely* in order to explore the degree to which large proprietors derived their wealth from the labour of slaves. What more can I say?

*York University, Ontario*

Dr Scott Meikle writes:

Professor Wood misses the point of the criticism, and perhaps I am partly to blame. Her object had been to show that slavery was not 'widespread' in agriculture (79). This is a thesis about numbers, and even if it were true (which she fails to prove) it would not necessarily be incompatible, as she seems to think even in her reply, with Ste. Croix's thesis which is about the origin of the surplus derived by the propertied class, a minority.

There is a limited number of ways in which surplus can be pumped out of the direct producers; if there are no markets in capital and wage-labour it will have to be done through some form of unfree labour; if debt-bondage and serfdom are unavailable, chattel slavery will be used. This is the gist of Ste. Croix's main argument, not, as she represents it, that chattel slavery is 'inherently more profitable' than other methods of surplus extraction (64, 65, 72).

If Professor Wood were right that the surplus was not largely produced by slaves then how was it produced? For one of her possible alternatives, leasing by landowners, she could produce only one 'notable' piece of evidence, *Lysias* 7.4–11, on which she laid great stress (73, 182–3). I showed in my review that this passage tells directly against her. Another obvious alternative, hired labour that was regular and not merely casual or seasonal, she admits was 'relatively rare in Athens' (71). Her argument fails and her position becomes incoherent. She would have done better to stick more closely to what I suspect was her original intention: to debunk what her first chapter calls 'The Myth of the Idle Mob'.

*University of Glasgow*