kernel of historical "reality" ' (p. 36); rather, it is the 'representation' that it offers that counts. But this argumentative move is disingenuous, because it seeks to reinstate the straightforward evidentiary status of the story even as it adverts to the problems of using literary sources as windows onto practice. The story could instead be interpreted as a variation upon the Christian *topos* whereby the divine visitation cuts across the conventional circuits of power and plugs straight into the meek and lowly. In other words, the story might depend for its rhetorical surprise upon the reader's presumption that texts are usually copied formally and 'professionally'. I offer this interpretation *exempli causa*, the broader point being that literary sources need interpretation according to their own idiosyncratic ruses and generic play.

In a short book on an enormous topic, the question of which material to privilege is inevitably a nice (and, to an extent, arbitrary) judgement. This is particularly pronounced in Chapter V, on textual harmonizations and deviations in early papyri: clearly a vast topic, but the examples are chosen (to a neophyte's eye) judiciously. Chapter II, on female scribes, on the other hand, seemed to me to get the balance wrong. The story of Thecla the scribe is intriguing (pp. 50–2), but given that it is unattested before the seventeenth century (!), little weight can be placed upon the observation that 'nowhere is the plausibility of a female scribe questioned' (p. 51). More surprising than the admission of possibly superfluous material (the ancient sources are, after all, exiguous) is the underinterpretation of the material that does survive. H.-E. is rightly contemptuous of masculinist assumptions in modern scholarship about the gender of scribes, but she fails to explore gender dynamics in the period under review. It is striking, for example, that women are repeatedly associated with calligraphy in the sources she cites (*καλλιγραφεῖν*, p. 42; *καλλογραφοῦσα*, p. 48; *pulchre scriptitent*, p. 49): what might this association tell us about ideologies of gender in early Christianity? Is this a way of attempting to focus women's scriptorial abilities upon form rather than content, that is to say, away from the real interpretative power?

Overall, however, this book is vigorous and engaging. It deploys effectively the widespread current interest in the intersection between literary history and cultural materialism, whilst retaining an enviable grasp upon the several methodologies appropriate to the ancient evidence. For this alone it offers a shot in the arm to studies in the field, even if one suspects that the brevity of the book will mean that it will not persuade everyone. There are a couple of scribal errors in the text (*ῥήματα* for *ῥήματι*, p. 110; *ἔιτε* for *εἴτε*, P. 111; also 'was' for 'were', p. 124). Traces of the embattled politics of OUP typesetters?

University of Exeter TIM WHITMARSH

ATHENIAN ENTREPRENEURS

P. V. STANLEY: *The Economic Reforms of Solon.* (Pharos: Studien zur griechisch-römischen Antike 11.) St Katharinen: Scripta Mercaturae Verlag, 1999. Pp. iii + 329. Paper, DM 58. ISBN: 3-89590-067-2.

If Solon had not offered a bounty for every dead wolf handed over to the authorities, Athenian animal husbandry would not have developed, there would have been no leather industry and no rich tanners, and we would never have heard of Cleon. Much has been written since antiquity about the unforeseen consequences of Solon's reforms, but Phillip Stanley is the first, I think, to suggest this set of surprising ramifications (pp. 251–2, 295–6).

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.88 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It takes S. eleven dense pages to outline his reconstruction of economic and political developments from the Dark Age to Peisistratus (pp. 288–99), but with some simplification it can be reduced to two main strands. The first strand concerns the attempts of the 'aristocracy' and the curiously labelled 'wealthy class of well-off peasant farmers' (p. 290) to enrich themselves by exporting ever greater agricultural surpluses. By the end of the eighth century, their efforts led to the internal colonization of Attica and the conquest of Salamis (pp. 145, 153, 157–8, 202, 204, 292). Fields newly brought under cultivation were leased out to entrepreneurial tenants on the lookout for opportunities to increase their own surpluses. Some borrowed heavily in order to invest (pp. 186–92, 197–201, 293–4). A century later, Solon thus faced successful non-aristocratic entrepreneurs who resented their exclusion from power, and unsuccessful entrepreneurs struggling to pay their rents and pay off their loans. He revised the distribution of power by means of the property class system and alleviated the difficulties of 'overextending' farmers (p. 218) by means of the *seisachtheia.*

There is much to be said in principle for placing energetic self-enrichment by élite landowners and wealthy farmers at the centre of developments in archaic Greece, and S. may be right to suggest that the activity of these two classes was responsible for the spread of market-exchange in the Greek world—under Phoenician influence (pp. 103–7). The evidence and arguments mustered in support, however, are often unconvincing. For example, the main archaeological evidence for an almost marketless, redistributive Dark Age economy is supposed to be the presence of storage areas in excavated houses. This 'demonstrates that one of the functions of the royal *oikos* was as a collection-distribution center for goods produced by the villagers and given to the king as a gift', says S. (p. 66). Surely this demonstrates only that supplies were stored, as they would also be on a self-sufficient farm. The main evidence cited for an 'almost complete' transition to market-exchange by about 700 B.C. (p. 69) is that 'sale-terms' occur only twice in the *Iliad* but eight times in the *Odyssey* (pp. 62–5). This is a naive use of sources, and in any case the *Iliad* upsets all such would-be statistics with a single scene of a whole army bartering booty (7.467–75).

There is similarly much to be said both for and against S.'s interpretation of problems specific to Athens. He makes a good case that *hektemoroi* were not serf-like dependents and that their status was not formally abolished (pp. 174–97). On the other hand, his assumption that the only problem caused by élite self-enrichment was the failure of some of their enterprises is fundamentally flawed. Did no one ever get rich at the expense of small peasants or farm workers? All S. has to say about the rôle of the lower classes is to quote four times, in full, Alison Burford's remark that the impoverished rich were likely to complain 'more vociferously' than those who had always been poor (pp. 88 n. 92, 173, 201 n. 158, 217). Why the failure of a few over-extended businessmen caused a violent crisis and was blamed on the oppressiveness of an oligarchic regime remains unclear.

The second main strand of S.'s argument concerns developments in Athenian manufacture. He argues that the export of painted pots and silver had been a major element of the Athenian economy until its decline in the late eighth century. The situation became worse after an Athenian defeat by Aegina in the early seventh century led to an 'embargo on Athenian painted pottery' (pp. 162–7, 292). Athenian export production thus no longer matched import needs, until Solon redressed the imbalance by stimulating olive cultivation, animal husbandry, and craft production for the export of oil, leather, wool, and pottery. Athenian manufacture became so successful that craftsmen began to stake a claim to political power, forcing an overhaul of the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.88 Published online by Cambridge University Press

property class system in 580 B.C. (pp. 280, 286, 296–7). They continued to be a major political force as supporters of Peisistratus' tyranny (pp. 281–2, 287).

Interesting and original as this line of argument is, it again suffers from a casual use of evidence: most blatant is perhaps the twisting of Herodotus' reference to Athenian pots being banned from a single sanctuary on Aegina into a widespread trade boycott (pp. 163–6). More importantly, despite S.'s attempts to distance himself from the primitivist–modernist debate (pp. 4–11), his interpretation is as modernizing as they come, yet makes virtually no effort to anticipate predictable primitivist protest about the economic (in)significance of a few dozen Athenian potters and the (un)likelihood that Solon consciously and systematically set out to transform his city's economic infrastructure.

The intertwining of the two strands with one another and with other developments, less central to the argument, such as the rise of the *polis* and the hoplite phalanx, adds further dimensions to S.'s ambitious historical scheme. It would be petty to dwell on minor errors and omissions, since this book gives every impression of having been single-handedly produced by the author down to the production of camera-ready copy: it carries no acknowledgements of any kind to anyone. As such, it is quite an achievement, and the range of S.'s intriguing ideas is impressive. But few readers will be convinced by his main arguments unless they share the sort of hard-line modernizing outlook which makes you think that well-dressed figures on Attic vases must have subliminally advertised the Athenian clothing industry, simply because you find it 'hard to imagine' anything else (p. 252).

University College London HANS VAN WEES

RELIGION AT ATHENS

A. RUBEL: *Stadt in Angst. Religion und Politik in Athen während des Peloponnesischen Krieges*. Pp. 413. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2000. Paper, DM 64. ISBN: 3-534-15206-9.

Scholars sometimes assume that Greek religion was in many ways immune to political developments. Greek history can be divided up into specific periods (archaic, classical, and Hellenistic), and religious developments (such as ruler cult) could occur in response to political developments, but on the whole the apparatus of religion and people's beliefs went on. There was a clear connection between politics and religion, but religion's influence over politics was much more important and apparent than politics' influence over religion at Athens during the Peloponnesian War.

Rubel in some senses covers well-travelled ground in this book, and when one thinks of religion in the Peloponnesian War some themes and events are immediately recalled: the mutilation of the Hermai, the profanation of the mysteries, the Delphic oracle, and the Athenian desecration through profane use of the sanctuary at Delion. But Rubel casts his net wider, and in nine chapters, each divided into various subsections, covers a great swathe of material.

Chapter I (pp. 11–48) serves as a useful introduction to the topic; Chapter II concerns the impiety charges against philosophers and sophists (pp. 49–119); Chapter III deals with the plague and Perikles (pp. 120–56); Chapter IV, the impiety prosecutions of Protagoras and Diagoras (pp. 157–77); Chapter V is on the religious and political significance of the mutilation of the Hermai and profanation of the Mysteries (pp. 178–232); Chapter VI covers tradition, innovation, and new gods

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.88 Published online by Cambridge University Press