

Evidence, Theories and the Ancient Economy : A Critical Survey of Recent Work*

Sadao Ito

I

There is no doubt that M. I. Finley's *The Ancient Economy* (1973) caused the well-known controversies on the ancient economy that continued unceasingly since the end of the nineteenth century to take a remarkable turn. Finley contributed greatly to the lively discussion, producing fertile work by Euro-American specialists in this field. The intention to overcome the Finleyan theory encouraged studies of Greek and Roman economy in various ways. I want to take a critical overview of this trend as a Japanese student of ancient Greek history, who has been concerned with Finley's work since the publication of *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500-200B.C.* (1952), very nearly the first and technically the best achievement in his academic career.

I think the cornerstone of Finley's view of ancient economic history is his seminal opinion on slavery. What is the distinguishing feature of this opinion? How does it match the evidence, literary and epigraphical, in particular, of ancient Greece? How is it related to, and to what extent does it have significance in, his economic history? Making mention of these points briefly, I examine the vigorous investigations by Euro-American scholars into the Finleyan view of ancient economic history, and suggest that it is still alive as an undercurrent among studies of Greek and Roman economy.

II

Slavery is one of the most important problems in ancient history, concerning which an accumulated knowledge has been shared among common intellectuals as well as specialists on the ancient economy. Finley's theory on this matter in particular attracts my attention because it has a final goal of identifying the historical position of Greek and Roman society in the ancient world.¹

* This paper is a revised and abbreviated version of an article by the same author published in *The Transactions of the Japan Academy* 64, 2010, pp.109-140 (pp.109-136 in Japanese). I am much

Finley certainly holds the common view about Spartan helotage and pre-Solonian serfdom. He also takes note of some evidence of debt-bondage in various areas including Crete.² Bondmen as well as typical slaves come within the range of his study. It is, moreover, remarkable that he constructs the socio-economic framework of the Greek and Roman world on the basis of slavery in a way of his own. ‘True slaves’, bought and sold, were extensively forced to work in almost all fields of daily life in classical antiquity. Slavery was the basis of Greek and Roman society. That is a generally accepted view of classical antiquity, and the historical materialist concept of ‘slave society’ was based on such an idea. Finley emphasizes, however, that mass employment of typical slaves was limited to the expressly developed economies, for example, those of classical Athens, Italy and Sicily from the late republican to the early imperial periods. He states that taking a general view of classical antiquity, serfdom was the main current of workforce geographically and historically. His opinion depends on two presuppositions. The first is ‘the spectrum of statuses’ which implies both clear differentiation and subtle proximity of social position among inhabitants, for example, from a landed citizen through a foreign merchant to a slave employed in a bank, in classical Athens. In the whole of ancient Greece, there are helots and debt-bondmen. The second is his interest in relevant materials of the ancient Near East. This invites him to compare servile circumstances in classical antiquity with those in Oriental states. On these methodological premises, Finley attempts relatively to allocate some socio-economically developed areas and periods in the whole span of Greek and Roman history and the classical antiquity in the ancient world inclusive of the Near East.

Although it is undeniable that Finley’s comparative method is intrinsically static, it hides the possibility of relating the historical dynamics of classical antiquity and

obliged to Professor Y. Hashiba and Professor M. Ikeguchi for their helpful comments and suggestions on my draft. All errors and shortcomings in this paper are mine alone. I am also grateful to Mr. Y. Uchida for his laborious help in computerizing the manuscript draft.

¹ M. I. Finley, *The Ancient Economy*. London, 1973, esp. pp.62-94; id., *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*. London, 1980, esp. pp.67-92, 123-149. Finley’s theory of ancient slavery in these books is based on his previous articles republished in id., *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece* (ed. by B. D. Shaw-R. P. Saller). London, 1981, pp.97-166: Was Greek Civilization based on Slave Labour? (1959); The Servile Statuses of Ancient Greece (1960); Between Slavery and Freedom (1964); Debt-bondage and the Problem of Slavery (1965).

² Two types of intermediate servile status, the serfdom originating from conquest (*woikeus*) and another from debt-bondage (*nenikamenos*, *katakeimenos*), are corroborated in Fifth-Century BC Gortyn (*IC IV 72*). In classical Greece outside Athens, the custom of debt-bondage remained extensive. The fact is indicated by the geographical diffusion of relevant inscriptions (Halicarnassus: *Buck 2* ll.32-41; Crete: *IC IV 72*, I 56-II 2, VI 46-55, IX 40-43; Heraclea: *Buck 79* ll.154-156) as well as the description of *Lysias XII 98*.

the position of its own in world history. Making Greek history a reference point of his story, Finley states that in pre-Solonian Athens even a citizen, when he could not repay a debt and was reduced to a bondman with his family, must have paid to creditors one-sixths of his harvests every year in the grip of fear of being sold abroad (*hektemoroi*). This sort of risk was related to the custom of debt-bondage. The great significance of Solon's social reform is found, Finley discusses, in the emancipation of *hektemoroi* and the prohibition of debt-bondage thenceforth (*seisachtheia*). Although he follows the common interpretation of relevant descriptions of Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia*³, Finley argues that in Athens, when wealthy citizens could no longer compel poor fellows to work as debt-bondmen through the institutional change based on Solonian reform, there arose a need to import non-Greek slaves from surrounding regions. He finds the structural root of developed slavery in the constitutional change of the citizen body. The economic development requiring mass employment of typical slaves and the existence of fitting areas to supply these slaves might be naturally supposed as other motives. But Finley's opinion is to be highly assessed as a hypothesis attempting logically to interpret the relationship between the freedom of citizens and the development of slavery.

Moreover, taking a general view of Roman history, where slaves have been deemed to have performed massive work throughout the empire, Finley cherishes his own opinion, which seems to be partially influenced by P. Garnsey's legal and social studies of the Roman empire.⁴ He insists that historical materials show the mass employment of slaves just in prosperous Italy and Sicily, and that in the early republic *clientes* and debt-bondmen worked for wealthy elites. In the later empire, he further asserts, lower 'Roman citizens' could latently supply servile manpower for large-scale farming of elites. If it is permissible to reiterate, according to Finley,

³ Aristot. *Ath.Pol.* II 2-3, IV 5, V 1-3, VI 1-2, IX 1, XII 4. P. J. Rhodes and E. M. Harris most distinctly criticize the common interpretation. P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford, 1981, pp.90-97, 126; E.M. Harris, Did Solon abolish Debt-Bondage? *CQ* 52, 2002, pp.415-430 (=id., *Democracy and the Rule of Law in Classical Athens. Essays on Law, Society, and Politics*. Cambridge, 2006, pp.249-269). Both suggest the existence of debt-bondage in classical Athens. Harris' speculation that the aim of Solonian reform was to emancipate the victims of factional struggles is, however, no more well-grounded than A. Andrewes' theory (essentially followed by Rhodes) that *hektemoroi* were originally hereditary serfs. If some sources appear to tell us that debt-bondage survived in classical Athens, they do not prove authorized survival as a system. I suggest that it would be possible for a debtor to offer himself as a servile laborer under the circumstances that he no longer has any prospect of repaying. Two rather convincing instances of debt-bondage (Menandros, *Heros* 20-38; Terentius, *Heautontimorumenos* 600-606, 790-796) might be related to non-citizens.

⁴ P. Garnsey, *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire*. Oxford, 1970.

serfdom was the main current of labor force in the Roman world as well as in the Hellenic world.

Finley's opinion of ancient slavery is closely related to his historical theory of the ancient world from a socio-economic point of view. He explores the origin of 'true slaves' in the social and economic development of sixth century BC Athens and describes the declining phases of slavery in the social transformation of the later Roman empire. The crux of Finleyan theory is found in the relationship between the socio-political freedom of citizens and the mass employment of typical slaves.

The point of the argument is clear and the idea is far-reaching. Therefore, Finley's theory has been a conspicuous subject of reference and criticism both methodologically and empirically. While specialists of Greek history attempt to criticize Finley's opinion of ancient slavery through their studies of Solonian reform⁵, those of Roman history are rather inclined to be concerned with the Finleyan theory of ancient economy based on that controversy dating from the end of the nineteenth century, explaining in particular the economic development of the early Roman empire richly endowed by historical materials.⁶

Finley's socio-economic view of the ancient world, described in *The Ancient Economy*⁷, gave impetus to studies of the Greek and Roman economies and has

⁵ P. Cartledge, The Political Economy of Greek Slavery. In: Cartledge et al. (eds.), *Money, Labour and Land*. (vid. n.11), pp.156-166, esp. pp.158-163; I. Morris, Hard Surfaces. *ibid.*, pp.8-43, esp. pp.27-42. While both are revisionist articles, the following are more critical of Finley's opinion. Harris, *CQ* 52 (vid. n.3), p.415 with n.2; H. van Wees, Conquerors and Serfs: Wars of Conquest and Forced Labour in Archaic Greece. In: N. Luraghi-S. E. Alcock (eds.), *Helots and Their Masters in Laconia and Messenia: Histories, Ideologies, Structures*. Cambridge (Mass.), 2003, p.33 n.2, pp.73-74. van Wees' criticism is based on the helotage.

⁶ K. Hopkins' work is representative of this trend. K. Hopkins, Taxes and Trade in the Roman Empire (200 B.C. — A.D. 400). *JRS* 70, 1980, pp.101-125; id., Introduction. In: P. Garnsey-K. Hopkins-C. R. Whittaker (eds.), *Trade in the Ancient Economy*. London, 1983, pp.ix-xxv; id., Rome, Taxes, Rents and Trade. *KODAI Journal of Ancient History* 6/7, 1995/96, pp.41-75 (=W. Scheidel-S. von Reden (eds.), *The Ancient Economy*. Edinburgh, 2002, pp.190-230). His revisionist theory has a great influence on the studies of ancient economies, as discussed below.

⁷ This book was republished in 1985 with an addendum by the author (Chap. VII Further Thoughts (1984)) and in 1999 with a foreword by I. Morris. In the added chapter, Finley does not *prima facie* agree with Hopkins (pp.182-183). But referring to W. Sombart's theory, he says that chief contributors to the foundation of cities were not merchants and craftsmen but wealthy landowners extracting wealth from the countryside through taxes and rents (pp.192-195). This might signify his acceptance of Hopkins' revision in view of the trends of Roman economic history. It is remarkable in the foreword to the updated edition that Morris proposes as a starting point for the studies of ancient socio-economic history the relationship between the freedom of citizens and the development of slavery. His article published in 2002 (cited above in note 5) may be an attempt of his own. But in general, slavery is not fully discussed in terms of the Finleyan theory, with the exception of R. Zelnick-Abramowitz, *Not Wholly Free. The Concept of Manumission and the Status of Manumitted Slaves in the Ancient Greek World*. Leiden, 2005. The author, affirmatively referring

subsequently been an axis of economic and social research on ancient history. Finleyan theory owes much to M. Weber's historical view comparing Greek and Roman economies with those of early modern Europe and is influenced by K. Polanyi's concept of the social 'embeddedness' of the ancient economy. Many scholars in the field of Greek history as well as Roman studies have made attacks against such a view as negatively evaluating the ancient economy.⁸ Notwithstanding being roundly criticized, the Finleyan theory has still a far-reaching influence on studies of the ancient economy. I survey the situation and evaluate the significance of Finley's opinion of ancient slavery in socio-economic studies of the Greek and Roman world in the future.

III

Recent work on the ancient economies generally refers to Finley's theory, if it keeps a broad awareness of the issues. Among many articles and books, the following three groups, in particular, attracted my attention: (1) work on Solonian reform by many scholars⁹; (2) M. H. Hansen's work based upon *Copenhagen Polis*

to Finley's model of the spectrum of statuses, describes exhaustively the problem of Greek manumission.

⁸ R. Osborne, *Pride and Prejudice, Sense and Subsistence: Exchange and Society in the Greek City*. In: J. Rich-A. Wallace-Hadrill (eds.), *City and Country in the Ancient World*. London, 1991, pp.119-145; J. Davies, *Hellenistic Economies in the Post-Finley Era*. In: Archibald et al. (eds.), *Hellenistic Economies*. (vid. n.11), pp.11-62; E. M. Harris, *Workshop, Marketplace and Household: The Nature of Technical Specialization in Classical Athens and its Influence on Economy and Society*. In: Cartledge et al. (eds.), *Money, Labour and Land* (vid. n.11), pp.67-99; P. Christesen, *Economic Rationalism in Fourth-Century BCE Athens*. *G&R* 50, 2003, pp.31-56; D. T. Engen, "Ancient Greenbacks": Athenian Owls, the Law of Nikophon, and the Greek Economy. *Historia* 54, 2005, pp.359-381; K. Vlassopoulos, *Free Spaces: Identity, Experience and Democracy in Classical Athens*. *CQ* 57, 2007, pp.33-52. Osborne's far-reaching argument appears to show intimacy with Hopkins' in attributing the formation of markets to wealthy citizens' desire for money as a result of their financial burdens. In the endnote of this article, republished in id., *Athens and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge, 2010, p.126, Osborne more clearly criticizes Finley's theory.

⁹ Solonian reform, in particular the emancipation of *hektemoroi*, has been actively discussed as referred to in note 3. In the Cambridge collection (vid. n.11), R. Osborne, *Archaic Greece*. p.300 and J. K. Davies, *Classical Greece: Production*. p.353 n.108 explain the emancipation of debt-bondmen and the prohibition of debt-bondage (*seisachtheia*) as the crux of Solonian reform, whereas three articles recently published in learned journals respectively interpret *hektemoroi* and *seisachtheia* in their own ways. K.-W. Welwei, *Ursachen und Ausmass der Verschuldung attischen Bauern um 600 v. Chr.* *Hermes* 133, 2005, pp.29-43; G. Németh, *On Solon's Land Reform*. *Acta Antiqua* 45, 2005, pp.321-328; Tadashi Ito, *What is the seisachtheia?* *Journal of Classical Studies* (Kyoto) 55, 2007, pp. 101-113, 201-203 (in Japanese with English summary). Two books mentioned below, particularly the latter, will contribute to the study of Solonian reform at large. E. Irwin, *Solon and Early Greek Poetry. The Politics of Exhortation*. Cambridge, 2005; J. H. Blok-A.

Centre's exhaustive studies of Greek city-states¹⁰; (3) several collections of relevant articles that are the result of organic collaborations concerning ancient economies¹¹. My review will be focused on Hansen's opinion and the collection of articles published by the Stanford group¹², because both criticize Finleyan theory squarely. While the former is concerned with Finley's theoretical position in relation to Weber's, the latter makes an attempt to overcome Finleyan theory and explore new methodologies.

Hansen, one of the most eminent scholars of Greek institutional history, organized the Copenhagen Polis Centre on the occasion of the 250th Anniversary of the Royal Danish Academy in 1992, which sought to conduct exhaustive case studies of ancient Greek states, both *poleis* and *ethne*. The result of research has been published in fourteen collections of relevant articles¹³ and was richly realized in a tome published in 2004¹⁴. Having published many articles in the collections mentioned above, Hansen finally summed up the result in the huge opening essay of *An Inventory*¹⁵ and another handy book published two years later¹⁶.

P. M. H. Lardinois (eds.), *Solon of Athens. New Historical and Philological Approaches*. Leiden, 2006.

¹⁰ M. H. Hansen, The Hellenic Polis. In: id. (ed.), *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures*. Copenhagen, 2000, pp.141-187, esp. pp.156-165 (The Polis and Max Weber's Account of the Ancient City); id., The Concept of the Consumption City applied to the Greek Polis. In: T. H. Nielsen (ed.), *Once Again: Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Stuttgart, 2004, pp.9-47; id., *Polis. An Introduction to the Ancient Greek City-State* (vid. n.16), pp.85-97 (Chap. 14: The Economy of the Cities: Max Weber's 'Ideal Type').

¹¹ The following list includes only collections published since the beginning of this century. Their abbreviated titles are given in parentheses. D. J. Mattingly-J. Salmon (eds.), *Economies beyond Agriculture in the Classical World*. London, 2001 (Leister-Nottingham AE); Z. H. Archibald-J. Davies-V. Gabrielsen-G. J. Oliver (eds.), *Hellenistic Economies*. London, 2001 (Liverpool AE 1); P. Cartledge-E. E. Cohen-L. Foxhall (eds.), *Money, Labour and Land. Approaches to the Economies of Ancient Greece*. London, 2002 (Delphi-Cambridge AE); J. Manning-I. Morris (eds.), *The Ancient Economy. Evidence and Models*. Stanford, 2005 (Stanford AE); Z. H. Archibald-J. K. Davies-V. Gabrielsen (eds.), *Making, Moving and Managing. The New World of Ancient Economies, 323-31 BC*. Oxford, 2005 (Liverpool AE 2); P. F. Bang-M. Ikeguchi-H. G. Ziche (eds.), *Ancient Economies. Modern Methodologies*. Bari, 2006 (Cambridge-Bari AE, more briefly for convenience, Bari AE); W. Scheidel-I. Morris-R. Saller (eds.), *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World*. Cambridge, 2007 (Cambridge AE); A. Bowman-A. Wilson (eds.), *Quantifying the Roman Economy. Methods and Problems*. Oxford, 2009 (Oxford AE).

¹² Manning-Morris (eds.), *Stanford AE* (vid. n.11).

¹³ These collections are classified respectively into seven *Acts* (Copenhagen, 1993-2005) and *Papers* (Stuttgart, 1994-2004) of the *Copenhagen Polis Centre*. The result of the research is summarized in M. H. Hansen, 95 Theses about the Greek *Polis* in the Archaic and Classical Periods. *Historia* 52, 2003, pp.257-282.

¹⁴ M. H. Hansen-T. H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. Oxford, 2004.

¹⁵ M. H. Hansen, Part I Introduction. In: *An Inventory* (vid. n.14), pp.3-153.

¹⁶ M. H. Hansen, *Polis. An Introduction to the Ancient Greek City-State*. Oxford, 2006.

As studies of *poleis* by the Copenhagen group led by Hansen attach importance to the institutions of *poleis*, they are short of references to slavery. But Hansen's articles show that he is not a little concerned with the economic basis of the Greek city-state. He pays attention to the aforementioned controversy, and examining literary and archaeological materials in detail, emphasizes the importance of commerce in Greek economies naturally including those of classical Athens and other prosperous cities. Appraising highly Weber's concept of the 'consumer city', Hansen criticizes Finley's theory which interprets negatively the role of Greek and Roman trade.¹⁷ I do not agree with Hansen. Although Weber refers to the importance of trading activities, his studies of ancient economic history are focused on agriculture. Weber's position in the controversy is rather close to K. Bücher's. Moreover, Finley is deeply influenced by Weber's theory that the consciousness of Greek and Roman citizens as political and social elites restricted their economic activities. Hansen's criticism of Finleyan theory is off the mark.

Hansen's opinion of the so-called primitivism is also simplistic, because he does not refer to the fact that various revisionary theories have been published since Hopkins' epoch-making article.¹⁸ Having analyzed and synthesized the results of some recent archaeological and numismatic studies, Hopkins devised his own views on the economy of the Roman empire. He admits that 'modest, though significant, economic growth' occurred in the Roman world from the late republican to the early imperial periods, revising Finley's rather static view. As a methodological contribution, his appreciation of institutional or developmental economics should be mentioned. It offers the prospect of comparing the Roman economy with those of early modern Europe and pre-modern Asia. The best result of using Hopkins' methodology is P. F. Bang's work. Bang compared the Roman empire with, in particular, the Mughal in India and found similarities in the economic structures of their tributary systems with trading networks operated on the stable domination of both empires. He makes much of agriculture as a common economic foundation of these empires. Bang's theory is considered to originate from those of Hopkins, Finley and Weber.¹⁹

¹⁷ Hansen, *The Hellenic Polis*. pp.159-160; id., *The Concept of the Consumption City*. pp. 25&32; id., *Polis. An Introduction*. pp. 94&96. vid. n.10&16.

¹⁸ Hopkins, *JRS* 70, pp. 101-125. vid. n.6.

¹⁹ P. F. Bang, *Imperial Bazaar: Towards a Comparative Understanding of the Markets in the Roman Empire*. In: *Bari AE* (vid. n.11), pp.51-88; id., *Trade and Empire—In Search of Organizing Concepts for the Roman Economy*. *P&P* 195, 2007, pp.3-54; id., *The Roman Bazaar. A Comparative Study of Trade and Markets in a Tributary Empire*. Cambridge, 2008. The lastly mentioned work is the present result of his laborious research on the Roman economy. Bang

While the collection of the Cambridge-Bari group aims at synthesizing ‘primitivism’ and ‘modernism’ under the influence of Hopkins’ theory²⁰ and the Cambridge collection often shows intimacy with Finley’s theory, particularly in terms of the social transformation in late antiquity²¹, the common purpose of the Stanford collaborators is, though a revisionist article such as Saller’s is contained in the collection²², to get the better of Finley’s theory. This group considers not just

enumerates the following as characteristics of trading activities in the bazaar, namely, diversified investment, mixed quality of commodities, speculative enterprise exploiting price differences between regions, practical use of social and religious connections, all of which are fit for underdeveloped information and transport technologies. He also discusses the conflict between imperial powers and local landed interests, in particular, in the Roman Empire. Bang’s interest in Weber’s theory is shown in *P&P* 195, pp.9, 33, 45; *The Roman Bazaar*, pp.3-4, 7, 20-21, 23, 27, 32-33, 63-65, 67, 122. Bang is mainly concerned with the Weberian concepts of comparative history and ‘political capitalism’. As another interesting example of Hopkins’ influence on an article published in a learned journal, should be mentioned P. P. M. Erdkamp, Beyond the Limits of the ‘Consumer City’: A Model of the Urban and Rural Economy in the Roman World. *Historia* 50, 2001, pp.332-356, which, referring to modern Spanish cities, attempts to adjust the Weber-Finley’s model of the ancient ‘consumer city’ to the Hopkins’ model of ‘economic growth’ of the Roman empire. J.F. Drinkwater is sceptical of following Hopkins’ revisionary theory too far. His argument in Leister-Nottingham *AE* (vid. n.11) seems to be a recurrence to Weber-Finley’s theory of ‘political capitalism’. J.F. Drinkwater, The Gallo-Roman Wollen Industry and the Great Debate. The Igel Column Revisited. *ibid.*, pp.297-308, esp. pp.302-304. Osborne also supposes the relationship between the political engagement of the local elite and the economic growth in late antiquity. R. Osborne, Economic Growth and the Politics of Entitlement. *The Cambridge Classical Journal* 55, 2009, pp.119-121.

²⁰ Though contributors of Bari *AE* (vid. n.11) respectively consider their own subjects, the following appear to constitute remarkable features of their collection. (1) They generally evaluate the recent results of archaeology, but often have doubts about giving them absolute priority. (2) Accepting the theory of institutional economics, they emphasize the significance of Roman imperial government, in particular, the relationship between tax and trade. (3) Recognizing the economic growth of Roman world, they use the yearly products *per capita* as a criterion for judging. (4) They assert the difference between the ancient world and Europe after the Industrial Revolution and are concerned with the comparison between Roman world and pre-modern China, India and other non-European countries. (5) References to slavery, though found here and there, are regrettably scanty. N. Morley’s criticism that the Finleyan theory is static (vid. n.52) seems to be linked to this sort of leaning.

²¹ While Stanford *AE* (vid. n.11) leans toward the methodological researching and presentation of a tentative vision, Cambridge *AE* (vid. n.11) is a comprehensive description of ancient economic history that includes in part the Near East. This massive work is composed of 28 chapters, among which five chapters in Part I discuss broadly ecology, demography, family, institutions and technology in the Greco-Roman world as the ‘determinants of economic performance’. Each chapter summarizing the result of recent research is useful for the general readership concerned with ancient history as well as for relevant specialists.

²² R. Saller, Framing the Debate over Growth in the Ancient Economy. Stanford *AE* (vid. n.11), pp.223-238 (=Scheidel- von Reden (eds.), *The Ancient Economy* (vid. n.6). pp.251-269). Relying on theories of Hopkins and the developmental economics, Saller estimates the growth *per capita* of the Roman economy during the 300 years from 200 BC to AD 100 at 25% in total, from which is concluded an annualized rate of 0.1% or less. He compares this result with the average growth rate

Greek and Roman world, but also the ancient Near East, and declares an idea of unified ancient Mediterranean world. Whether the result of this collaboration is sufficiently valuable or not, it might indicate an advisable way of future research at least.

The Stanford collection is composed of a methodological introduction by coeditors²³, eight articles by ancient historians, and three comments by social scientists. Articles are classified into four parts, the Near East²⁴, the Aegean²⁵, Egypt²⁶ and the Roman Mediterranean²⁷. Specialists of sociology and economics are invited as participants to intensify the discussion exclusive of Egypt.²⁸ The trend of collaboration leans against Finley.²⁹ They regard Finleyan theory as dichotomizing the ancient world between Greco-Roman city-states and Oriental monarchies and explore a way to describe the ancient Mediterranean world by uniting the Occident and the Orient from an economic view, based upon recent results of archaeology, papyrology and numismatics. Articles in this collection are, on the whole, inclined to recognize economic growth in the ancient world.

Each article narrates theories and materials in its own field, which is useful for specialists of different fields. It is interesting that Saller compares Finley's text with M. Rostovtzeff's and criticizes such a view as asserting the fundamental difference between their opinions of ancient economic history.³⁰ The participation of social

of English economy in the nineteenth century, namely, 1.2%, and agrees with Hopkins' interpreting the Roman case as one of 'modest, though significant, economic growth'. Saller considers the controversy between primitivism and modernism to be insignificant and explains the bases of Roman economic growth from four points of view. As for the gross national product of the Roman empire, refer to Bang, *The Roman Bazaar* (vid. n.19), pp.86-93. This argument also originates from Hopkins.

²³ I. Morris-J. G. Manning, Introduction. In: Stanford *AE* (vid. n.11), pp.1-44.

²⁴ M. Liverani, The Near East: The Bronze Age. In: Stanford *AE*, pp.47-57; P. R. Bedford, The Economy of the Near East in the First Millennium BC. *ibid.*, pp. 58-83.

²⁵ I. Morris, Archaeology, Standards of Living, and Greek Economic History. In: Stanford *AE*, pp.91-126; J. K. Davies, Linear and Nonlinear Flow Models for Ancient Economies. *ibid.*, pp.127-156.

²⁶ J. G. Manning, The Relationship of Evidence to Models in the Ptolemaic Economy (332 BC-30 BC). In: Stanford *AE*, pp. 163-186; R. S. Bagnall, Evidence and Models for the Economy of Roman Egypt. *ibid.*, pp.187-204.

²⁷ R. B. Hitchner, "The Advantages of Wealth and Luxury": The Case for Economic Growth in the Roman Empire. In: Stanford *AE*, pp.207-222; R. Saller, Framing the Debate over Growth in the Ancient Economy. *ibid.*, pp.223-238.

²⁸ M. Granovetter, Comment on Liverani and Bedford. In: Stanford *AE*, pp.84-88; T. Amemiya, Comment on Davies. *ibid.*, pp.157-160; A. Greif, Comment on Hitchner and Saller. *ibid.*, pp.239-242.

²⁹ Three contributors, Liverani, Granovetter and Saller, however, appear basically to agree with the Finleyan theory. As for Saller's revisionist opinion originating from Hopkins', refer to n.22.

³⁰ Saller, op.cit. (vid. n.22), pp.223-228. In the argumentation, Saller calls Bang by name as a young Danish scholar showing a warm interest in the comparison with pre-modern Asia (p.228).

scientists reflects the increasing attention paid by historians to methods and results of neighboring sciences. So-called modernism, a theory typically critical of Finley's, seems to be methodologically related to the mainstream of economics, which supposes a trend toward rationality in all economic actions by individuals. According to this theory, the market should be the frame of reference.³¹

In the collaboration by the Stanford group, orientalists including specialists of Hellenistic and Roman Egypt play an important role. They are, on the whole, positive in constructing a Mediterranean world that unifies classical antiquity and ancient Near East. It is in marked contrast to the fact that specialists of classical antiquity, who are mainly concerned with Greece around the Aegean, Italy and western provinces of the Roman empire, discuss the problem more cautiously.³² Whereas orientalists are constrained to cope with massive materials on clay tablets and papyri, classicists are fully equipped with a system of publication of texts, literary and epigraphical. Though classicists share a long-held tradition of revision and interpretation for each text and enjoy favorable conditions deeply to consider individual problems on the basis of such a tradition, they are prevented from conceiving unrestrained ideas. Orientalists seem to be placed in different circumstances from those of classicists.³³

However, Greek and Roman history has also been transfigured, particularly by the accelerating increase of archaeological materials. In economic history, it is appropriate to quantify excavated sites and artifacts and to make the result a basis of arguments. The best example in the Stanford collection is Morris' investigation of standards of living in archaic and classical Greece by classifying the archaeological data on house sizes from 800 to 300 BC.³⁴ Research on Greek and Roman amphoras

³¹ Besides the articles of ancient Greek history cited in note 8, let me here add only P. Temin's work of the Roman economy criticizing definitely Finleyan theory. P. Temin, *A Market Economy in the Early Roman Empire*. *JRS* 91, 2001, pp.169-181; D. Kessler-P. Temin, *The Organization of the Grain Trade in the Early Roman Empire*. *EcHR* 60, 2007, pp.313-332. Though influenced by Hopkins' theory, Temin appreciates the trading activities of merchants around the Mediterranean rather than Roman imperial systems.

³² Davies' article (vid. n.25) is a prominent exception, which has a wide field of vision and makes free use of abundant data. Amemiya's comment on Davies (vid. n.28), agreeing with Davies' criticism of Finleyan theory, is sceptical about his excessively mathematical method. T. Amemiya, *Economy and Economics of Ancient Greece*. London, 2007 is an attempt to quantify, if at all possible, economic activities, public and private. The author, while also feeling empathy with primitivism, accepts the recent trend of the controversy and recognizes the existence of the market in classical Athens. In spite of being a laborious work, there are regrettably more than a few misprints and other errors in this book.

³³ Liverani, op.cit. (vid. n.24), p.47.

³⁴ Morris, op.cit. (vid. n.25). Morris concludes that notwithstanding an increase in population, a durable improvement in living standards at all social levels is recognized in ancient Greece from

is representative of these investigations, because this sort of relic, used for storing wine and olive oil for the most part, is largely useful to find traces of production and distribution of the daily living necessities around the Mediterranean and Black Seas through the quantitative data based on their massive volumes.³⁵ They play an important role in showing, for example, the chronological changes in trade between Hellenistic Egypt and Rhodes.³⁶ Quantification of excavated amphoras is also helpful in indicating the remarkable growth of olive production in Roman North Africa and vicissitudes of wine production in prosperous Italy.³⁷

800 BC to 300 BC. He aims at coordinating the primitivism with the economic growth in archaic and classical Greece from an archaeological viewpoint, taking production and consumption *per capita* into account. The best example in the field of Roman history is Hopkins' article published in *JRS* 70 (vid. n.6), in which the author suggests the economic prosperity of the Roman world from 200 BC to AD 200 on the basis of A. J. Parker's underwater archaeological research of shipwreck sites in the western Mediterranean. Hopkins, op.cit. pp.105-106. This archaeological result is referred to in some articles of Cambridge *AE* (vid. n.11) too. W. V. Harris, The Late Republic. *ibid.*, pp.533-535; N. Morley, The Early Roman Empire: Distribution. *ibid.*, p.572; W. M. Jongman, The Early Roman Empire: Consumption. *ibid.*, p.612. A. Wilson, Approaches to Quantifying Roman Trade. In: Oxford *AE* (vid. n.11), pp.219-229, however, acutely discusses the points at issue of shipwrecks as historical materials.

³⁵ Y. Garlan, Greek Amphorae and Trade. In: Garnsey et al. (eds.), *Trade in the Ancient Economy* (vid. n.6), pp.27-35 is useful because of indicating amphoras' value as historical materials and the points at issue. While Garlan's argument is based on the case of classical Thasos, Lawall's study focuses on amphoras produced in Chios from the end of the sixth century to the end of the fifth century BC. M. Lawall, Ceramics and Positivism revisited: Greek Transport Amphoras and History. In: H. Parkins-C. Smith (eds.), *Trade, Traders and the Ancient City*. London, 1998, pp.75-101. Referring to the relationship between the modal transition of amphoras and the political fluctuation of contemporary Chios, Lawall puts confidence in the contribution of archaeology to the political and economic history. Whereas Garlan leans toward primitivism, Lawall shows intimacy with modernism. However, it is interesting that both of them pay attention to the relationship between elite landowners and the production of amphoras as well as their distribution. As for Hellenistic amphoras, refer to the elaborate work of M. Lawall, Amphoras and Hellenistic Economies: Addressing the (Over)emphasis on Stamped Amphora Handles. In: Liverpool *AE* 2 (vid. n.11), pp.188-232. Regarding Roman amphoras, refer to the following articles in Cambridge *AE* for the nonce. Harris, The Late Republic. *ibid.*, pp.532&535; D. P. Kehoe, The Early Empire: Production. *ibid.*, pp.546, 554-556, 560, 562; Morley, The Early Roman Empire: Distribution. *ibid.*, pp.573, 580-581, 590; E. Lo Cascio, The Early Roman Empire: The State and the Economy. *ibid.*, pp.638&641. As for the Roman amphoras as historical materials, A. Wislon's critical opinion is naturally to be referred to. Wilson, op.cit. (vid. n.34), pp.229-237.

³⁶ Y. Suto, *Greek Civilization in the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Kyoto, 2006 (in Japanese), pp.348-365, 371-377. Suto's opinion is based upon the Japanese excavation at Akoris in the Nile valley as well as a survey of previous research. The results of the excavation were published in H. Kawanishi-Y. Suto, *Akoris I Amphora Stamps 1997-2001*. Tsukuba, 2005 (in English). The greater part of this report, namely Part III Stamped Amphora Handles with the presentation of 353 examples and Part IV Historical Perspectives with three relevant articles are both written by Suto himself. *ibid.* pp.23-185, 187-206.

³⁷ R. B. Hitchner, Olive Production and the Roman Economy: The Case for Intensive Growth in the Roman Empire. In: Scheidel-von Reden (eds.), *The Ancient Economy* (vid. n.6), pp.71-83; C.

Although these investigations based on amphoras offer evidence against Finley's rather static view of economic history³⁸, there are some drawbacks to the quantification of archaeological materials, not to speak of the contingency of discoveries. Texts, literary and epigraphical, also have their own flaws. Classics survive the selection in Roman and Byzantine times, and inscriptions have accumulated more rigorous experiences than the classics, for example, utilization as architectural stones, weathering with lapse of time, missing transcribed texts, as well as the contingency of discoveries.³⁹ However, there has recently been growing interest in archaeological materials, and they should be handled with greater circumspection. It would not do to make an exception in the case of amphoras alone, even though they were representative goods for daily living in the Greek and Roman world and have been so extensively discovered that the quantification seems to be meaningful.⁴⁰ Most of archaeological materials happen to be discovered unexpectedly under specific conditions. Though they often prove fruitful in interpreting individual problems, therefore, in the cases of major problems such as the growth and decline of the Roman economy, it is not only necessary to conduct an exact quantification of the data, but they must be integrated with the results of investigating related sources, literary or epigraphical.⁴¹

Nonetheless, there is every reason to expect that archaeology will greatly contribute to the discussion on economic growth, because it is helpful in confirming, for example, standards of living⁴² and the level of technology⁴³. Archaeologists as

Panella-A. Tchernia, Agricultural Products transported in Amphorae: Oil and Wine. *ibid.*, pp.173-189. Giving attention to amphoras excavated at Rome and Ostia as well as remains in producing areas, both articles infer the growth of Roman economy. Their attitude implies modernism.

³⁸ From this viewpoint, Hitchner and Suto criticize Finleyan theory. Hitchner, *op.cit.* (vid. n.37), pp.71-72, 76, 80-81; Suto, *Greek Civilization* (vid. n.36), pp.340-342.

³⁹ Combining extant fragments into an epigraphical text also occasionally shakes the reliability as historical material. R. S. Stroud illustrates the fact by two examples regarding the Delian League, *IG I³ 259-272, 273-280* (the tribute lists) and *IG I³ 1453* (the coinage decree). R. S. Stroud, *The Athenian Empire on Stone. David M. Lewis Memorial Lecture Oxford 2006*. Athens, 2006. The vulnerability of both texts originates in the discovery of new fragments kept idle respectively in the Acropolis Museum and the Archaeological Museum of Thessalonika. *ibid.*, p.15n.7&p.22. It suggests that the history of the Delian League as well as the texts themselves might be revised in the future.

⁴⁰ Garlan, *op.cit.* (vid. n.35), pp.28-32. In terms of Greek amphoras, Garlan suggests their limits as historical material in detail.

⁴¹ The following articles in Bari *AE* (vid. n.11) take a sceptical view of the recent trend giving archaeology absolute priority. Bang et al., Introduction. *ibid.*, pp.14-15; K. Greene, Archaeological Data and Economic Interpretation. *ibid.*, pp.109-136, esp. pp.112, 117, 130-131; H. G. Ziche, Integrating Late Roman Cities, Countryside and Trade. *ibid.*, p.272.

⁴² Morris, *op.cit.* (vid. n.25&34).

well as historians are expected to evaluate the quantification of excavated artifacts and sites, integrating with such sources as the classics, documentary papyri, inscriptions and coins. That is one of the most important problems for research on the ancient economy.⁴⁴

⁴³ K. Greene, Technological Innovation and Economic Progress in the Ancient World: M. I. Finley Re-considered. *EcHR* 53, 2000, pp.29-59. Greene criticized seriatim Finley's arguments developed in the same journal thirty five years earlier (M. I. Finley, Technical Innovation and Economic Progress in the Ancient World. In: id., *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece*. London, 1981, pp.176-195) on the basis of recent archaeological research. Greene insists that slavery was not the decisive factor of the technological stagnation, and that the development of ancient technology is to be discussed on the model of the Roman economy. He emphasizes the imperial government as a firm foundation of such economically effective constructions as aqueducts, roads and various sorts of public edifices. One of A. Wilson's articles, which is concerned with mining and agricultural devices, also thinks much of the role of Ptolemaic dynasty or Roman empire. A. Wilson, Machines, Power and the Ancient Economy. *JRS* 92, 2002, pp.1-32. In Part I of Cambridge *AE* (vid. n.11&21), H. Schneider, Technology. *ibid.*, pp.144-171 gives a useful overview of technological improvements in Hellenistic and Roman times. Remarking on agriculture as well as production *per capita*, Schneider leans toward primitivism. Contributors in Parts V, VI and VIII appear to be intimate with primitivism (Harris, op.cit. (vid. n.34), p.538; Kehoe, op.cit. (vid. n.35), pp.547-549, 551-553, 559; Morley, op.cit. (vid. n. 34), p.589; A. Giardina, The Transition to Late Antiquity. *ibid.*, pp.764-765) or quasi-modernism (Lo Cascio, op.cit. (vid. n.35), pp.625&647) from their respective points of view on ancient technology.

⁴⁴ Besides Morris' article in Stanford *AE* (vid. n.25&34) paying attention to the neighboring disciplines too, work of Copenhagen Polis Centre should be mentioned as an imposing example. Hansen-Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (vid. n.14); M. H. Hansen, *The Shotgun Method. The Demography of the Ancient Greek City-State Culture*. Columbia (Missouri), 2006; Hansen, *Polis. An Introduction* (vid. n.16), esp. Chap. 11-13 (pp.67-84). Integrating the results of surface surveys of about one thousand *poleis* with other evidence, Hansen concludes that in Fourth-Century BC Greece half of the total population lived within the town walls. Hansen's demographic study is naturally related to modernism. In Cambridge *AE* (vid. n.11) the following articles exemplify the significance of surface survey. Osborne, op.cit. (vid. n.9), p.287; Davies, op.cit. (vid. n.9), pp.334&349; Harris, op.cit. (vid. n.34), p.525. As an individual study of a surface survey in Bari *AE* (vid. n.11), taking note of integrating the result with other materials, I would like to mention M. Ikeguchi, A Method for Interpreting and Comparing Field Survey Data. *ibid.*, pp.137-158, which discusses the structure and chronological fluctuations of agriculture at six areas of central Italy through quantifying the result of previous field surveys. The author refers to the so-called agricultural crisis in the first century Italy. His archaeological investigations of Roman Italy were later developed in a dissertation submitted to the University of Cambridge. vid. n.52.

Hopkins demonstrates a numismatic view concerned with the growth and decline of the Roman economy. Hopkins, *JRS* 70 (vid. n.6), pp.106-116. As recent numismatic articles criticizing Finleyan theory, should be cited S. von Reden, Money in the Ancient Economy: A Survey of Recent Research. *Klio* 84, 2002, pp.141-174; W. V. Harris, A Revisionist View of Roman Money. *JRS* 96, 2006, pp.1-24. In Cambridge *AE* (vid. n.11) the following refer to the economic and institutional significance of Greek and Roman coinage. Osborne, op.cit. (vid. n.9), pp.292-294; Davies, op.cit. (vid. n.9), pp.355-360; A. Möller, Classical Greece: Distribution. *ibid.*, pp. 370-380; Harris, op.cit. (vid. n.34), pp.521-523, 529; Morley, op.cit. (vid. n.34), pp.587-589; Lo Cascio, op.cit. (vid. n.35), pp.627-630.

As a recent example collating archaeological materials with documentary papyri, A. Bowman-A. Wilson, Quantifying the Roman Economy: Integration, Growth, Decline? In: Oxford *AE* (vid. n.11),

IV

Studies of Hellenistic and Roman economies particularly stress the result of archaeological research, because in both fields relevant materials have been increasing recently. Historiography is always based on extant materials. For Finley, a historian of archaic and classical Greece, primary sources were the classics, and inscriptions. What is more, he was under the influence of M. Weber. Taking part in the aforesaid controversy, Weber analyzes two *ergasteria* of Demosthenes' father described in *Demosthenes XXVII*. They are both devoid of their own workshops. These factories are virtually composed of fifty two or three slaves producing knives and beds. Being unorganized as a cooperative system depending on specialization, they are arbitrarily divided and sold by their owner. Moreover, an Athenian manufactory is usually just a part of the property, when the owner is a wealthy citizen or metic.⁴⁵ According to Weber, ancient Greek states were communities of warriors, whose lives were based on the ownership of lands and slaves. *Politai*, full members of *poleis*, therefore, fundamentally had no consciousness as producers or entrepreneurs but rather depended on returns their slaves brought in. They were, Weber concludes, intrinsically consumers relying on the income from interests ('*Rentner*'). On the methodology of the 'ideal type', Weber formulates early republican Rome as well as archaic and classical Greece as a world of city-states, based on a rigorous status system dividing inhabitants between landed citizens and non-citizens including slaves as the lowest social stratum. He contrasts Greek and

pp.3-84 should be mentioned. While criticizing Hopkins-Saller's theory, the coeditors make an objection to the description in Cambridge *AE* (vid. n.11) because of the latter's being short of a unified view of the ancient economy. Relying on archaeological materials and documentary papyri, they evaluate economic growth more positively than Hopkins and Saller. They refer to the archaeological research of precious metal mining in the Balkans (pp.66-68) and the study of documentary papyri in terms of Egyptian population and settlement (pp.40-41, 56-60) respectively in detail and emphasize the need to pay attention to special circumstances in individual regions. The Oxford group seems to be rather interested in reliable research of materials than the methodology. However, it does not imply that the collaboration of this group is indifferent to the controversy concerning the Finleyan theory. Indicating the empirical vulnerability, Bowman-Wilson recognize a certain validity of various models inclusive of Hopkins' 'taxes and trade' model (pp.14-15, 62). Their final aim is to describe a new economic history of the Roman empire from 100 BC to AD 350, and if possible, to propose materials for consideration to the far-reaching economic history extended after AD 1000 (p.69).

⁴⁵ M. Weber, *Agrarverhältnisse im Altertum* (1909). In: id., *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*. Tübingen, 1924, pp.9, 117 n.1, 142-143. Sadao Ito, *Polis Society in Classical Greece*. Tokyo, 1981 (in Japanese), Part I Chap. 1-2 (pp.3-67) describes some aspects of Athenian manufacturing, being stimulated by Weber's theory and based upon forensic speeches including the Demosthenic, other classics, inscriptions and archaeological materials.

Roman cities with European medieval cities where merchants and craftsmen took the initiative in civic activities, both political and economic.⁴⁶

Finley describes the socio-economic framework of classical antiquity composed of city-states under the influence of Weber's theory, using classics and inscriptions as the main sources. It was more significant for him to show the features of Greek and Roman societies by a methodological concept of the spectrum of statuses than quantifying production and distribution in the ancient world and comparing its 'growth' with that of early modern Europe. His view of the ancient economy is naturally related to the study of slavery.

On reflection, it is also natural that the Stanford collaborators are generally not interested in slavery, because they pay attention to the synchronical features of the economy and stress the significance of quantification. Throughout the collection only two contributors mention the significance of slavery. While Bedford, an orientalist, refers to bondmen caused by debt or conquest with a mind to Finley's theory⁴⁷, Bagnall, a specialist on Roman Egypt, discusses the decline of slavery in late antiquity. The latter, however, is not concerned with Finley's dynamic interpretation of late antiquity that polarization of Roman citizens into *honestiores* and *humiliores* made the mass employment of slaves unhelpful.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ M. Weber, *Die Stadt* (1921). In: id., *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*. 3rd ed., Tübingen, 1947, pp.514-601, esp. pp.583-601 (§5. Antike und mittelalterliche Demokratie).

⁴⁷ Bedford, op.cit. (vid. n.24), pp.65-67, 77-79.

⁴⁸ Bagnall, op.cit. (vid. n.26), pp.195-196. Considering servile statuses in Roman Egypt with both *coloni* and slaves in mind, Bagnall rather focuses on the latter and indicates the following facts. First, though Egyptian slaves were usually employed in urban households, there was a custom in countryside that peasants fostered deserted infants and sold them to urban families as workers. As for the relationship between deserted children and slavery, R. Motomura, *The Exposure of Infants and Slavery in the Roman World*. Tokyo, 1993 (in Japanese) has previously discussed in detail, depending on relevant materials inclusive of documentary papyri. Second, in terms of the decline of Egyptian slavery in late antiquity, Bagnall refrains from expressing his opinion, because of unknowability of economic fluctuations resulting in inefficiency of slave employment.

Manning's article as a counterpart of Bagnall's (vid. n.26) refers to recent theories giving peasants in Ptolemaic Egypt a status between freemen and slaves. But Manning is rather concerned with a new interpretation of documentary papyri unifying governmental and local evidence. Manning, op.cit., pp.180-182. He evaluates Rowlandson's theory of *basilikoi georgoi* as epoch-making. J. Rowlandson, *Freedom and Subordination in Ancient Agriculture: The Case of the Basilikoi Georgoi of Ptolemaic Egypt*. In: P. A. Cartledge-F. D. Harvey (eds.), *Crux. Essays presented to G. E. M. de Ste. Croix on his 75th Birthday*. Exeter, 1985, pp.327-347. In Bari *AE* (vid. n.11), von Reden leans rather toward Rowlandson's theory considering *basilikoi georgoi* as a privileged status than toward theories equating them with helots or *coloni*. S. von Reden, *The Ancient Economy and Ptolemaic Egypt*. *ibid.*, pp.164-165. Referring to Finley's opinion, Rathbone also appreciates Rowlandson's theory and remarks on the adoption of Greco-Roman institutions resulting in a special economic growth in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt. D. Rathbone, *The Ancient Economy and Greco-Roman Egypt* (1989). In: Scheidel-v. Reden (eds.), *The Ancient Economy* (vid. n.6), pp.155-169, esp. 158-

It should be further mentioned that there is a radical difference between Finley's attitude toward the ancient world and that of the Stanford group. While the Stanford group is inclined to attempt quantifying distributions of resources and artifacts and considering both the Orient and classical antiquity as a unified world, Finley overlooks them from his own viewpoint based upon comparative research on serfdom. Finley's theory of ancient economy is not a dichotomy. It comprises both Greco-Roman and Oriental worlds under his methodological concept of the 'spectrum of servile statuses'. Reconsidering the position of prosperous regions in classical antiquity from the viewpoint of labor force, he concludes that the Orient and the underdeveloped regions of Greco-Roman world were the mainstream of ancient economic history.

It is noteworthy that Euro-American specialists of ancient history have recently been interested in the history of pre-modern Asia, particularly China. The Stanford collection gives us a glimpse of this trend. Its introduction by I. Morris-J. Manning suggests the influence of globalization on historians.⁴⁹ The coeditors highly value P. Horden-N. Purcell's ambitious work⁵⁰, which describes a universal history of the Mediterranean Sea as developing with the mutual exchange between small areas around the sea, and explain the significance of comparing the economy of classical antiquity with that of England before the Industrial Revolution or that of pre-modern China, in particular, the Song dynasty. They assume a positive attitude toward exo-eurocentrism. Exo-eurocentrism *per se* is persuasive and the end of Cold War as well as the drastic development of information technology have certainly promoted the recent prosperity of 'Global History'.⁵¹ But I do not agree with Morris-Manning

159, 161-162. The aim shared in common by four articles cited above is to give the economy of Greco-Roman Egypt an appropriate position in the ancient history, going into details based on the recent result of papyrology. Manning's comprehensive description in Cambridge *AE* (vid. n.11), stimulated by Finleyan theory, shows the influence of Hopkins' model. J. G. Manning, *Hellenistic Egypt. ibid.*, pp.434-459. As for *basilikoi georgoi*, vid. pp.451-453.

⁴⁹ Morris-Manning, *op.cit.* (vid. n.23), pp.19-25.

⁵⁰ P. Horden-N. Purcell, *The Corrupting Sea. A Study of Mediterranean History*. Oxford, 2000.

⁵¹ In Japan two books have been published (both in Japanese) on comparative studies of the East and West. T. Mizushima (ed.), *Challenges of Global History*. Tokyo, 2008; O. Saito, *A Comparative Study of Economic Growth in the East and the West. A Historical Approach*. Tokyo, 2008. While the former is a compact collection of articles surveying recent trends of global history with various viewpoints and methods, the latter aims at going deep into the comparative study of economic growth in Japan and England, keeping in mind the circumstances of other European and Asian countries too. The former includes K. L. Pomeranz's essay, and the author of the latter, Saito, has published many articles in English hitherto. As for the research of Chinese economic history, K. G. Deng discusses in detail, asking the question why pre-modern China, despite having constructed a firm system of imperial government with the highest level of technology, was outdone by European countries in modern times. K. G. Deng, *A Critical Survey of Recent Research in Chinese Economic*

on their denying the Weberian and Finleyan theories as Eurocentric. The final aim of historiographers is to interpret the true nature of their own society. It is therefore a matter of course that Weber and Finley turn their attention to the origin of modern Europe, in which they have the foundation of existence. Weber's sociology of religion should be recognized as a kind of global history notwithstanding being a torso, and Finley's economic history also has the seeds of worldwide history for reasons to be given later.

Though the Stanford collection is remarkable as a cooperative attempt to engage in a constructive criticism on the Finleyan theory, the collaborators still remain at the threshold of research. It is most impressive in comparison with Finley that they do not succeed in proposing a useful framework to describe the historical dynamics of the ancient world. The Finleyan theory has incessantly been criticized by specialists of Greek and Roman economies. The ancient economy can no longer be narrated without referring to this trend. It seems rather to imply that a coherent opinion offered by a prominent historian has still the potential to make sure of the way to take for research on the ancient economy.⁵²

History. *EcHR* 53, 2000, pp.1-28. Inclination to grasp the Mediterranean World or Eurasia as a whole seems recently to be noticeable among Euro-American scholars. Besides Stanford *AE* (n.11), the following collections can be mentioned in the order published. R. Osborne-B. Cunliffe (eds.), *Mediterranean Urbanization 800-600 BC*. Oxford, 2005; I. Malkin (ed.), *Mediterranean Paradigms and Classical Antiquity*. London, 2005; V. H. Mair (ed.), *Contact and Exchange in the Ancient World*. Honolulu, 2006; F. -H. Mutschler-A. Mittag (eds.), *Conceiving the Empire. China and Rome Compared*. Oxford, 2008; W. Scheidel (ed.), *Rome and China. Comparative Perspectives on Ancient World Empires*. Oxford, 2009.

⁵² In a methodological essay, Morley criticizes Finleyan theory because of its lack of the viewpoint of historical development. N. Morley, *Narrative Economy*. In: Bari *AE* (vid. n.11), pp.41-42. But as aforesaid, Finley discusses not only the decline of slavery in late antiquity but its formation with reference to Solonian reform. In view of the position of slavery in Finleyan theory, he is considered to pay attention to the historical dynamics of the ancient economy in a non-narrative framework of his own. Two recent articles, long and short, seem to show paradoxically the continual influence of Finley's theory. M. Ikeguchi, *The Dynamics of Agricultural Locations in Roman Italy*. Diss. Cambridge, 2008, pp.4-5; J. Osgood, a book review on Cambridge *AE* (vid. n.11). *CJ* 105, 2010, pp.370-374. They refer both to the Finleyan theory, of course critically, at the outset of their arguments.

Moreover, his theory appears to permeate into recent descriptions of ancient economic history, particularly those of late antiquity. In Bari *AE* (vid. n.11) Jongman emphasizes the poverty of lower citizens and the fall of their legal position, in particular, as a result of the Antonine edict. W. Jongman, *The Rise and Fall of the Roman Economy: Population, Rents and Entitlement*. *ibid.*, pp.247, 252 n.42. In the same collection Ziche also discusses the affluence of central and local elites in connection with their dependence on the colonate. Ziche, *op.cit.* (vid. n.41), pp.260-261, 267-268.

This fact is more obvious in Cambridge *AE* (vid. n.11). Jongman argues under the shadow of Finley that in late antiquity the extreme concentration of wealth in imperial elites overwhelmed Roman citizens and so notwithstanding the decrease of population the former could get hold of the latter's manpower at a reduced cost. Jongman, *op.cit.* (vid. n.34), pp.602, 616-618. Giardina's

The Finleyan theory has the advantage of centering on his own opinion about slavery in a broad sense, within which various types of serfs are included as well as chattel slaves. It should be emphasized that the methodological concept of ‘spectrum of servile statuses’, giving the people ranked between freemen and slaves a definite position in each society, is able to propose a socio-economic framework for worldwide history. Servile people, chattel slaves or various kinds of serfs, are universally corroborated in all times and regions before the modernization. Their names, origins, forms of employment and legal positions respectively have great variety. The conditions, in which these people were situated, are related to fundamentals of pre-modern world. The relationship between servile people and freemen, in particular the lowest stratum of the latter, for example, the ratio among the total population, the social mobility, the roles in production and distribution, are all indispensable matters for historians to understand the feature of each society concerned. If they further reflect upon the comparison with other societies, it will be a helpful means to make sure of the historical position of that society. Slavery in a broad sense is a subject related to almost all fields of world history. The comparative history of slavery is therefore significant and the result is anticipated because of the abundance of relevant studies in respective countries.⁵³

opinion gets closer to Finley’s theory of slavery. Emphasizing the significance of colonate and referring to the stratified structure of labor force with slaves at the bottom, Giardina explains that the criminal systems with differentiation based on social strata, originating from the Hadrian age, were the legal and ethical background of oppression over lower citizens. Giardina, *op.cit.* (vid. n.43), pp. 748-753, 761-762. Bang also touches on the fact that since the second century the differentiation between *honestiores* and *humiliores* began to replace the distinction between Roman citizens and free foreigners. Bang, *The Roman Bazaar* (vid. n.19), p.124. This sort of social differentiation is more recently remarked by R. Osborne referring to P. Garnsey’s study (vid. n.4). Osborne, *op.cit.* (vid. n.19), p.119. In Leister-Nottingham *AE* (vid. n.11), two archaeological researches on North African sites minutely criticize Finleyan theory, but the Introduction by the coeditors seems fundamentally to agree with Finley. D.J. Mattingly-D.Stone-L.Stirling-N.B. Lazreg, Leptiminus (Tunisia). A ‘Producer’ City?; A. Wilson, Timgad and Textile Production; D.J. Mattingly-J. Salmon, The Productive Past. Economies beyond Agriculture. *ibid.*, pp. 3-14, 66-89, 271-296.

⁵³ In Japan after the Second World War, particularly during the third quarter of the twentieth century, ancient slavery was one of the most important subjects for historians. Their research yielded rich harvests both methodologically and empirically. I would like to propose again to review the work Japanese historians provided for comparison. The Finleyan concept of spectrum of servile statuses will find useful witnesses in pre-modern Japan and China. S. Ito, The Greek Slavery in Ancient History: Finley’s Theories Revisited. *Legal History Review* (Tokyo) 55, 2006, pp.121-154 (in Japanese with English summary pp.10-11). In addition to the standard works cited in my review article above (p.151n.70), an exciting article may be suitable to be mentioned here: B. Tsunoda, Servile People of a Temple in Ancient Japan: A Case of Manumission. In: id., *Development of*

If it is permissible to add a remark, the first to be ready for use in worldwide comparative history is to select the most suitable periods and regions from the East and West under specific criteria and to clarify the scope of the problems. Bang's work⁵⁴ and a book written and edited by W. Scheidel⁵⁵ are both persuasive methodologically and suggestive for empirical research in the future. The comparison of economic growth between the Roman empire and modern Europe⁵⁶ is also meaningful in spite of criticism by A. Bowman-A. Wilson⁵⁷. Hopkins-Saller's theory is a hypothesis for the revision of Finleyan theory. It has been playing an active part in intensifying studies of the ancient economy. The collection edited by Bowman and Wilson is itself proof of this.

While appreciating the revisionists' work originating from Hopkins, I suggest the following as a student of ancient Greece. First, recent trends in ancient economic history lean toward trade and finance rather than the production of artifacts. Within this current, it is relevant that economic historians seem not to be very interested in slavery. I think that slavery should be more ardently discussed among economic historians, not least because the Finleyan model's 'spectrum of servile statuses' is effective for examining comparative history even from a worldwide viewpoint.⁵⁸

Japanese Ancient State in Ritsuryo Period. Tokyo, 1965, pp.170-215 (in Japanese). The up-to-date report of Greek and Roman studies in Japan is found in T. Minamikawa, *The Power of Identity. A Japanese Historical Perspective on the Study of Ancient History*. In: A. Chaniotis-A. Kuhn-C. Kuhn (eds.), *Applied Classics. Comparisons, Constructs, Controversies*. Stuttgart, 2009, pp.231-243. The author says that recently young scholars seldom study ancient slavery and economic history in general. This comment is substantially correct. But the academic tradition of Greek and Roman history in Japan, which I have described in my article (above-mentioned *Legal History Review* 55, pp.125-126, p.138 n.23-31, p.139 n.32-33), appears to be exhibited, for example, in M. Ikeguchi's monograph (vid. n.52).

⁵⁴ Bang, *The Roman Bazaar* (vid. n.19).

⁵⁵ Scheidel (ed.), *Rome and China* (vid. n.51).

⁵⁶ Saller, op.cit. (vid. n.22), pp.228-231.

⁵⁷ Bowman-Wilson, op.cit. (vid. n.44), pp.28-30, 36-41, 44-46.

⁵⁸ Nevertheless extensive studies in Greek and Roman slavery by the Mainz group is worthy of attention. Ito, op.cit. (vid. n.53), pp.123&136 n.8-11; p.150 n.69 (I. Weiler's work). My question raised in note 69 about slavery in late antiquity is now solved by some articles cited above (vid. n.52). The Mainz group has been publishing a colossal corpus of Roman legal materials concerning slavery. e.g. G. Klíngenberg, *Juristisch speziell definierte Sklavengruppen 6: Servus Fugitivus. Corpus der römischen Rechtsquellen zur antiken Sklaverei* Teil X. Stuttgart, 2005. A research project centered at Trier University about the servile labor force from the viewpoint of world history was also launched. *Sklaverei • Knechtschaft • Zwangsarbeit. Untersuchungen zur Sozial-, Rechts- und Kulturgeschichte*. Band 1: E. Herrmann-Otto (ed.), *Unfreie Arbeits- und Lebensverhältnisse von der Antike bis in die Gegenwart. Eine Einführung*; Band 2: S. Knoch, *Sklavenfürsorge im römischen Reich*. Hildesheim, 2005. In Band 1 are included two review articles. W. Nippel, Marx, Weber und die Sklaverei; H. Heinen, Das Mainzer Akademieprojekt „Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei“: Geschichte und Bilanz, Perspektiven und Desiderate. *ibid.*, pp.317-356, 371-387. I

Second, in terms of Athenian manufacturing and banking, the stability of prosperous shops may have been restricted by, for example, the public burden imposed on wealthy citizens and metics (*leiturgia*), as well as by the legal system which mandated partible inheritance.⁵⁹ Although the ancient economy was certainly

expect K. Bradley-P. Cartledge (eds.), *The Cambridge World History of Slavery I The Ancient Mediterranean World*. Cambridge (forthcoming) to attempt a comprehensive description accompanied with prospects for the future research.

As for work in Japan, refer to n.53. Two representative historians of pre-modern Japan and China have proposed to give Greco-Roman slavery a relative position from a worldwide viewpoint respectively in a brief explanation. S. Ishimoda, A Consideration of Ancient Slavery (originally published in 1942 and revised in 1957). In: id., *A Collection of Sho Ishimoda's Works*. vol. 2, Tokyo, 1988 (in Japanese), p.96; N. Niida, *A Study of Chinese Legal History: Law of Slave and Serf, and Law of Family and Village* (1962). revised edition, Tokyo, 1981 (in Japanese with Chinese and English summaries, respectively pp.1-5, pp.1-9), p.14. They did not recognize that ancient Greece should be the starting point for observing the complicated circumstances of servile people. Nor is Tsunoda concerned with Greek slavery. Tsunoda, op.cit. (vid. n.53), pp.195, 200, 203-205, 210-212. But H. Ota, one of the most active specialists of Greco-Roman history, establishing his own concept of the ancient Mediterranean world under the theoretical influence of K. Marx as well as appreciating the recent results of studies in ancient history mainly realized by European scholars including Finley, has considered in detail the complicated circumstances of servile statuses with the case of ancient Greece as the central figure. H. Ota, *Ancient History of the East Mediterranean World*. Tokyo, 1977 (in Japanese); id., *Slaves and Servile Peasants: A Historical Theory of Ancient Society*. Tokyo, 1978 (in Japanese). Ota criticizes the concept of 'slave society'.

⁵⁹ I have investigated individual cases of Athenian manufacturing, mining and trading enterprises on the basis of forensic speeches and inscriptions, though sporadically, in detail. Ito, *Polis Society in Classical Greece* (vid. n.45), Part I Chap. 1-7 (pp.3-248). Despite the rule of partible inheritance, a sort of concentricity is often perceived among wealthy households concerning the main source of earnings. Polemarchos and Lysias, wealthy metics, were joint owners of the largest shield factory composed of over one hundred slaves, which they had inherited from their father Kephalos, though later seized by the Thirty Tyrants (*Lysias* XII). Athenian wealthy citizens had the desire to keep their households as intact as possible particularly in terms of hereditary immovables. *ibid.*, pp.303-350 in comparison with Hellenistic Tenos.

In Cambridge *AE* (vid. n.11&21), refer to W. Scheidel, Demography. *ibid.*, pp.70-73; Davies, op.cit. (vid. n. 9), pp.347, 349-350. While Scheidel considers the Greco-Roman household to be inclined often to form such an extended family as one of Eastern or Southern Europe, Davies seems to suppose the nuclear family to be a typical type in ancient Greece. I agree with both Scheidel and Davies in emphasizing the significance of household as the basic unit of economic activities. Bang also describes the function of extended household in the Roman commerce and finance comparing with the case of the Mughal empire. Bang, *The Roman Bazaar* (vid. n.19), pp.268-286. Saller's view is much the same as Davies'. Saller says that though Greco-Roman households were often extended through their life cycle by including widowed mothers or unmarried relatives, they never adopted the extended household as a normative form. R.P. Saller, Household and Gender. Cambridge *AE* (vid. n.11), pp.90-92. Hansen seems to be of the same opinion as Saller's. Hansen, *The Shotgun Method* (vid. n.44), pp.52-60. But I think that the significance of extended households should be approved even in classical Athens, because in addition to the evidence Saller and Hansen give, there are such cases as Pericles' household with two adult sons (at least one of whom, Xanthippos, was married. Ito, op.cit. (vid. n.45) p.267 n.14. vid. Plut. Pericles 16&36) as well as not a few examples in the eastern provinces of the Roman empire or in the early modern Southern and Eastern Europe, which are recognized by the scholars of ancient Roman history or of historical

protected by the public authority, the activities of individual entrepreneurs were often controlled by legal and customary regulations.

The University of Tokyo, The Japan Academy

demography. S. Ito, An Introduction to Comparative Study of Ancient Greek Family. In: S. Ito-K. Kabayama (eds.), *A History of the Mediterranean World*. Tokyo, 2002 (in Japanese), pp.56-70. The Athenian families with their surrounding social groups from *anchisteis*, the close relatives, to *polis*, the citizen body, which respectively had ambiguous influences upon entrepreneurs in various ways, will continue to be interesting subjects for students of ancient social and economic history.