K.'s outrage echoes through this passionate (and detailed) work. And if just occasionally he may strain too hard for his argument, that strain highlights a dilemma for any historian of ancient slavery. In the absence of slave evidence, and in a world where much of the routine life of a slave would have gone unreported, is it legitimate to leave the argument at 'not proven', and thereby gloss over (probably massive) human misery? In addition, crucially, whatever difficulties one might pose with individual pieces of evidence, his overall case is extremely strong. It is very difficult to argue with his conclusions: that slavery was an institution based on force, that the Greeks had a pretty cold-blooded and superior attitude towards their slaves, and that slavery would have been harsh for most of those who suffered it (Chapter 10). This book is indispensable both to students of slavery and to anyone interested in the way historians argue.

University of Birmingham NIALL MCKEOWN

MERCHANT CITIES

A. BRESSON: *La cité marchande*. Pp. 343, ills. Bordeaux: Editions Ausonius, 2000. Paper, frs. 248. ISBN: 2-910023-16-8.

This volume consists of twelve essays, six published previously and six new, that take aim at the primitivist interpretation of the Greek economy proposed by the late Sir Moses Finley. B. argues that the public/private, state/economy distinctions of the primitivists are false dichotomies. Individually, the essays are densely argued; taken together, they make a strong case for modifying many of Finley's positions.

The volume opens with two chapters on Naukratis. B. argues that Herodotus (2.178–9) is right to distinguish between residents and traders. The former constituted a community under the authority of the Pharaoh and not an independent Greek *polis*. Furthermore, the Hellenion did not arise to serve an informal mélange of Aegean traders, but was a formally constituted body regulated by representatives of member states. We end up with a minimalist view of Naukratis as a city—it is always under Egyptian authority—and a maximalist view of the Hellenion—it was more than a random grouping of traders.

Supporting evidence, however, is inconclusive and contradictory. For example, B. identifies the honorand of *IG* 12.1.760 as an Egyptian resident in Naucratis, not an Aiginetan (as in Austin's restoration). But, as a subject of Pharaoh, the honorand had no citizenship, the basis (according to B.) of proxenia. Similarly, in the Damoxenos proxeny decree, the honorand is described as dwelling in Egypt. This should make him a resident and not a member of the trading community, yet the Naucratite copy of the inscription is destined for display at the Hellenion, the sanctuary of the trading community. Rather than demonstrating the clear separation of the two groups, the inscriptions therefore support Austin's contention that the separation between town and traders was unclear.

The question of Naukratis' status has also been taken up by Mogens Hansen. B. rejects Hansen's conclusion that Naukratis was a polis by the mid-fifth century on the grounds that the coinage and inscriptions used by Hansen are all late (post-Alexander), and that the specificity claimed by the so-called *lex Hafniensis* is specious: Herodotus refers to many Egyptian towns as *poleis* and he certainly does not mean city-states. One cannot conclude that Naukratis was a *polis* in the formal sense simply because Herodotus calls it that.

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

B. then turns to a series of discrete studies, each designed to undermine the primitivist model. The Cup of Arcesilas is shown to reflect seventh- and sixth-century interest in measurement and commerce (in this case, of silphium). A prosopography of Rhodian wheat dealers puts them within the élite of Rhodian society, while a study of the territory of the cities of Lesbos challenges the assumption that the size of a city's land is a reliable indicator of its power. Instead, B. sees Mytilene and Methymna as most advantageously located in relation to trade routes running up the eastern coast of Lesbos. In a chapter discussing the phenomenon of recorded weights of dedications often falling short of round figures, B. challenges the (primitivist) view that these discrepancies were due to the weights of various piles of actual coins and argues in favour of a silver standard. In each of these studies, trade and commerce are shown to have had a more pervasive influence than previously suspected, and to have been handled by the Greeks with greater sophistication than is usually recognized.

It is, however, in the study of markets that B. provides the most complete attack on the primitivist model. B. argues that Arist. *Pol.* 1.9.6–7 articulates a full theory of state interest in trade: a *polis* cannot do without foreign exchange because no city can provide itself with all that it needs. But how far does this take us from the minimalist position? Ancient thinkers conceptualized economics in terms of reciprocity and autarky. Familiar goals, familiar means, whether for the *oikos* or the individual.

B.'s arguments are bolder when he turns to specific practices. He takes Arist. *Rhet.* 1.4.1359b as reflecting a growing interest in controlling trade through the awarding of import and export licenses, a phenomenon also demonstrated, in B.'s view, by the Grain Inscription from Cyrene. But in both instances B.'s argument requires reading a great deal into the Greek. All Aristotle claims is that city leaders ought to know whom they need for markets and whom they require as suppliers, so that they can arrange agreements and accords with them. The emphasis is not on trade or regulation except in so far as they guarantee steady supplies. Similarly the Cyrenian inscription records amounts of grain supplied to certain beneficiaries. Whether these amount to something as technical as export licenses is far from a necessary interpretation of the Greek.

B. is more persuasive in showing a gradual tendency towards official intervention in daily markets. This is reflected both in a second-century agoranomic inscription from Piraeus and in references in fourth-century speeches to the *kathestēkuia timē*. B. convincingly demonstrates that the *kathestēkuia timē* is a wholesale price set by Athenian magistrates for grain sold to the public. Price control is a significant step away from a completely unfettered market. The question remains, however, and this is true of B.'s entire argument, just how significant are such developments? For B., the regulation of imports and exports, international accords, and international institutions such as the *emporion* of Naukratis call into question the primitivist model. Taken together, they do suggest that Finley's primitivism is too extreme, yet there is a contradiction at the heart of B.'s own argument. On the one hand, he shows that trade (and especially the market) was more significant and more complex than we have allowed, but he also argues that an examination of public and private *prosodoi* shows no distinction between public and private spheres. If the distinction between the state and the economy is a false dichotomy, as B. argues in the final chapters, then the two become inextricably interwoven. One might well ask, how different is this from an embedded economy?

University of Pennsylvania JEREMY MCINERNEY

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.312 Published online by Cambridge University Press