



ORIENT - OCCIDENT

Volume 20/2
2015



*Ouvrage publié avec le concours
de la Société des Amis de la Bibliothèque Salomon Reinach*

Comité d'honneur (au 01.01.2016) :

Jean ANDREAU, Alexandre FARNOUX, Ian MORRIS, Georges ROUGEMONT, Catherine VIRLOUVET

Comité de Rédaction (au 01.01.2016) :

Marie-Françoise BOUSSAC, Roland ÉTIENNE, Jean-François SALLES, Laurianne MARTINEZ-SÈVE, Jean-Baptiste YON

Responsable de la Rédaction : Marie-Françoise BOUSSAC

Adjoint : Jean-Baptiste YON

Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée — Jean Pouilloux
7 rue Raulin, F-69365 LYON

Marie-Francoise.Boussac@mom.fr

www.topoi.mom.fr

www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/revue/topoi

Diffusion : De Boccard Édition-Diffusion, 11 rue de Médicis, 75006 PARIS

Topoi. Orient-Occident 20, Lyon (2015)

ISSN : 1161-9473

Illustration de couverture : Masque de théâtre en terre cuite ornant une lampe à huile, Égypte romaine. Dessin O.Callot, d'après *Pierre Bergé, Catalogue Archéologie* (vente 1^{er} décembre 2011), p.104, n° 171.

Illustration du dos : Lutteurs, bronze du Walters Art Museum 54.1050. Dessin O.Callot.

SOMMAIRE

Fascicule 1

Sommaire	5-8
Index des auteurs	9-10
Dossiers	
<i>Rencontres, convivialité, mixité, confrontations.</i>	
<i>Les espaces sociaux de l'Égypte tardive</i>	
B. REDON et G. TALLET, « Introduction »	11-23
M. YOYOTTE, « Le “harem”, les femmes de l'entourage royal et leurs lieux de résidence aux époques tardives : espace social ou espace clos ? »	25-45
M.C.D. PAGANINI, « The gymnasium as ‘lieu de sociabilité’ in Ptolemaic Egypt: the role of private associations »	47-58
B. REDON, « Rencontres, violence et sociabilité aux bains. La clientèle des édifices balnéaires ptolémaïques »	59-87
Fr. DUNAND, « Espace public, espace privé. la convivialité des fêtes égyptiennes »	89-107
Chr. VENDRIES, « Regard sur les spectacles à Alexandrie. Le comportement du public à travers le discours de Dion de Pruse (<i>Or.</i> 32) »	109-142
S. DHENNIN, « La nécropole à l'époque hellénistique et romaine en Égypte. Espace funéraire, espace social ? »	143-164
<i>Le thème du déclin dans l'historiographie de l'Égypte et l'Orient ancien</i>	
D. AGUT, M.-P. CHAUFFRAY et A.-E. VEISSE, « Introduction »	165-166
J. MONERIE, « De Šamaš-šum-ukin à Sardanapale : Histoire d'un mythe de la décadence »	167-185
E. JAMBON, « “Fin de siècle” ou “Belle époque” ? Réflexions sur la représentation de l'Égypte tardive chez Gaston Maspero et Ernest A. Wallis Budge »	187-208
Chr. FISCHER-BOVET, « A challenge to the concept of decline for understanding Hellenistic Egypt. From Polybius to the twenty-first century »	209-237
L. MEDINI, « Chronique d'une mort annoncée ? Le crépuscule des temples et des païens d'Égypte »	239-280
Études	
M. CASEVITZ, « Grec Παράνοια, français Paranoïa »	281-291
G. ROUGEMONT, « Épigraphie delphique »	293-321
Fr. IMBERT, « L'épigraphie des traces. L'inscription monumentale peinte de Hammâm as-Sarâh en Jordanie »	323-332

SOMMAIRE

Fascicule 2

Sommaire	337-338
À propos des <i>Finances des cités grecques</i> de L. Migeotte	
V. CHANKOWSKI et D. ROUSSET, « Introduction »	339-344
J. DAVIES, « Migeotte's Finances...: <i>Altertumswissenschaft</i> and the economic historian »	345-357
O. PICARD, « Monnaies et finances publiques dans la cité grecque »	359-368
D. ROUSSET, « Les fonds sacrés dans les cités grecques »	369-393
P.J. RHODES, « Léopold Migeotte on Athenian Finance »	395-409
A.V. WALSER, « The Finances of the Cities of Asia Minor »	411-433
V. CHANKOWSKI, « L'apport des sources d'époque impériale à la connaissance des finances des cités grecques »	435-461
D. MENJOT, « Regard sur les finances des villes de l'Occident médiéval (XIII ^e -XV ^e siècles) »	463-476
L. MIGEOTTE, « Les finances de cités grecques un an plus tard »	477-494
Variétés	
A. AL-HUSAN, J. ALIQUOT, « Retour au pays natal. L'épithète d'un bénéficiaire du gouverneur du Diospont en Arabie »	495-502
Comptes rendus	
<i>Monde méditerranéen</i>	
R. ÉTIENNE, G. CHASTAGNARET, P. HORDEN et S. KIONSHITA, <i>A Companion to Mediterranean History</i> (2014)	503-506
<i>Orient ancien, Iran, Inde</i>	
R. BOUCHARLAT, E.R.M. DUSINBERRE, <i>Empire, Authority, and Autonomy in Achaemenid Anatolia</i> (2013)	507-510
R. BOUCHARLAT, E.W. SAUER <i>et al.</i> , <i>The Great Wall of Gorgan</i> (2013)	511-515
P. CALLIERI, M. SHENKAR, <i>Intangible Spirits and Graven Images</i> (2014)	517-522
P. SCHNEIDER, R.A. CARTER, <i>Sea of Pearls</i> (2012)	523-528
V. LEFÈVRE, C. FERRIER, <i>L'Inde des Gupta (IV^e-VI^e siècles)</i> (2015)	529-535
C. FERRIER, D. SCHLINGLOFF, <i>Fortified Cities of Ancient India</i> (2013)	537-542

Monde hellénistique

- P. BRIANT, *East and West in the World Empire of Alexander. Essays in honour of Brian Bosworth* (2015) 543-550
- P.-O. LEROY, V. Bucciantini, *Studio su Nearco di Creta* (2015) 551-556
- L. CAPDETREY, P.J. Kosmin, *The Land of the Elephant Kings* (2014) 557-565
- J. LERNER, S. Plischke, *Die Seleukiden und Iran* (2014) 567-572
- J.-Fr. SALLES, G. Lecuyot, *Fouilles d'Aï Khanoum. IX. L'habitat* (2013) 573-578
- L. SÈVE-MARTINEZ, R. Mairs, *The Hellenistic Far East* (2014) 579-588
- L. SÈVE-MARTINEZ, F. Muccioli, *Gli epiteti ufficiali dei re ellenistici* (2013) 589-597
- Ch. LEROUGE-COHEN, R. Strootman, *Courts and Elites in the Hellenistic Empires* (2014) 599-603
- L. GRASLIN-THOMÉ, S. Honigman, *Tales of High Priests and Taxes* (2014) 605-614
- Fr. PROST, J. Ma, *Statues and Cities* (2013) 615-618

Égypte et Orient de l'époque hellénistique à l'islam

- J.G. MANNING, K. Burselis et al. (éds), *The Ptolemies, the Sea and the Nile* (2013) 619-622
- J.G. MANNING, K. Blouin, *Triangular Landscapes* (2014) 623-626
- Th. FAUCHER, H.-Chr. Noeske et al., *A catalogue of the Roman provincial coins from the Alexandrian mint in Alexandria* (2014) 627-629
- G. RUFFINI, Y. Broux, *Double Names and Elite Strategy in Roman Egypt* (2015) 631-636
- S. SCHEUBLE-REITER, A.-E. Veïsse, St. Wackenier, *L'armée en Égypte* (2014) 637-644
- J.-B. YON, G.Fr. Grassi, *Semitic Onomastics from Dura Europos* (2012) 645-656
- M. SARTRE, M. Restle et J. Koder (éds), *Azra'a (Zora)* (2012) 657-659
- C. SALIOU, Chr. Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places. Late Antique Antioch* (2014) 661-666

Grèce depuis l'époque archaïque

- M. DANA, R. Garland, *Wandering Greeks* (2014) 667-673
- J. ZURBACH, Th. Tartaron, *Maritime Networks in the Mycenaean World* (2013) 675-678
- J. WHITLEY, S. Verdan, *Le Sanctuaire d'Apollon Daphnéphoros* (2013) 679-682
- M. PERRON, M. Bessios et al., *Μεθώνη Περίαις I* (2012) 683-696
- W. TIETZ, I. Pernin, *Les baux ruraux en Grèce ancienne* (2014) 697-699
- T. LUCAS, A. Blaineau, *Le Cheval de guerre en Grèce ancienne* (2015) 701-706
- R. ÉTIENNE, B. Helly, *Géographie et histoire des Magnètes de Thessalie I* (2013) 707-709
- A.-C. PANISSIÉ, N. Papazarkadas (éd.), *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia* (2014) 711-718
- M.-Th. LE DINAHET, Gr. Bonnin, E. Le Quéré (éds), *Pouvoirs, îles et mer* (2014) 719-723
- B. HOLTZMANN, A. ZAMBON, *Aux origines de l'archéologie en Grèce* (2014) 725-732

Rome et Occident

- H. BRUHNS, Ph. Kay, *Rome's Economic Revolution* (2014) 733-738
- Fr. DE CALLATAÏ, C. Apicella et al. (éds), *Les affaires de Monsieur Andreau* (2014) 739-744
- J.-Cl. DECOURT, M. P. de Hoz, *Inscripciones Griegas de España y Portugal* (2014) 745-750

MIGEOTTE'S *FINANCES*... : Altertumswissenschaft and the economic historian

It is both an honour and a pleasure to be able to contribute to this collective salutation to LÉOPOLD MIGEOTTE and to have participated in the Lyon colloque that was held in his honour.¹ I am sure that all colleagues and students of ancient Greek history world-wide will wish to join the participants on that occasion in saluting and congratulating M. MIGEOTTE on the publication of *Les finances des cités grecques*, for it must be regarded not just as his *magnum* but surely as his *maximum opus*. It builds on, and distils, his lifetime's work on identifying and exhaustively documenting the various categories of the economic activities of the Greek states, but even with that corpus of work at his instant disposal² it will have been an immense creative labour to construct an adequate overarching framework, to illustrate each component of the structure succinctly and systematically, and to summarise each section lucidly. Not, of course, that the value of the book ends there, for time and time again his footnotes are a thesaurus of information, bibliographical references, and brief but incisive judgments on the merits or demerits of this or that published study.³ I also welcome his decision to treat Athens and Delos on their own as *sui generis*, alike for the size of their documentation and for their untypical position within the spectrum of Greek polities. That decision has both allowed him to paint a collective portrait of the more 'normal' Greek polities

-
1. Since, apart from its honorand, I was (alas) its *doyen*, it is appropriate on behalf of all participants to thank Véronique Chankowski, Denis Rousset, and their colleagues for identifying the theme of this Colloque as appropriate and timely and for taking the initiative of hosting our meeting. As always with thematic colloquia, personal and scholarly components converged, on this occasion yielding the utmost amicability and constructive discourse: all participants owe the organisers a debt of gratitude.
 2. And now at ours, with the appearance of MIGEOTTE 2015 to complement MIGEOTTE 2010.
 3. I note that I have not been immune to the treatment (*Les finances* p.48 n.42; p.504 n.349).

which will have lasting value, and to provide us with full-scale descriptions of the public finances of Athens and Delos. All in all, therefore, what we have before us is a landmark publication, which will stand as a memorial in two particular respects. Its quality is a reflexion not just of M. MIGEOTTE'S careful scholarship and authoritative judgment but also of the long and distinguished tradition of Francophone achievement in this area of scholarship – a tradition which he has both used and adorned.

My own comments should therefore be understood within the framework of that general admiration and appreciation. In part they are intended to draw attention to aspects of the subject where more might usefully be said by way of contextualisation or comparison. They should also be understood in terms of my own role in this initial discourse – or rather roles, for I found myself reading this book with two divergent eyes. One of them is that of the straightforward historian of Greek antiquity, familiar with the genres of primary documentation and modern scholarship and also with the frameworks of understanding and exposition which we have inherited from our predecessors – not least (and very relevantly) from August BÖCKH himself. (If my title uses the word 'Altertumswissenschaft', that is not of course to suggest that that inheritance is specifically German.) However my second, much more amateur, eye is that of the economic historian, even of the economic sociologist⁴ and of the economic anthropologist.⁵ Such beings have a different descriptive and analytical vocabulary, a different agenda, and a different perspective in time and space. That perspective is not confined to Greece, nor to 'Classical antiquity' as conventionally understood, nor even to the Mediterranean, for it has a bias towards comparison, it can embrace 'pre-industrial societies' as a world-wide phenomenon, and it can even debate whether the caesura between 'pre-industrial' and 'industrial' is real. Yet that second eye is relevant today, not just because M. MENJOT'S presentation illustrates one highly relevant dimension of comparison but also because the challenge of learning to use the analytical vocabulary of the social sciences and of applying it within classical scholarship is inescapably with us. To decline that challenge, especially on so central a topic as *Les finances des cités grecques*, would be to accelerate a process of marginalisation and to create a vacuum which sociologists and economists may try to fill without always possessing the intimate knowledge of ancient societies and texts (especially of the more recondite epigraphy and papyrology) that historians aspire to possess:

4. Since the latter discipline is likely to be less familiar, it is appropriate to report that SMELSER & SWEDBORG 2005 provides a comprehensive introduction.

5. For which HANN & HART 2011 and CARRIER 2012 likewise provide preliminary guidance, in very different styles.

there are already examples in print, not to mention the fashion for embracing the New Institutional Economics.⁶

How then to accommodate this bifocal vision of *Les finances*? As illustration, let me plunge at once *in medias res*, for what M. MIGEOTTE has given us in Chapters II to IV is more than a 'collective portrait'. Any political scientist would immediately recognise it as a professionally constructed model⁷, built up by aggregating the characteristics which were visibly common to a large number of specimens. As such it is tempting, and in some way legitimate, to reify it, but also to recognise, as a model, its provisional status and to ask of it: Does it function? Where are its limitations? Is it a model that can be recognised elsewhere in time and space for comparative purposes? Does other evidence suggest that it needs modification? How, why, and when did it crystallise, and how, why, and when did it disintegrate? Plainly, the evaluation that follows in these pages cannot do more than touch on these questions, but it serves to remind us that what is constructed in standard antiquarian mode within one specific discipline can also serve broader agendas of research.

One aspect of such an agenda immediately presents itself to the reader, namely the general theme of **power: its concentration, diffusion, and exercise**. That that is a central theme of political theory and practice goes without saying, but the question needs to be made specific: within M. MIGEOTTE'S model of ancient Greek civic financial administration, where does power lie, and why? It is remarkable how uniform and emphatic (p.119) the answer is: in formal terms with Council and the Assembly of many or all adult male citizens, in administrative terms with a multiplicity of committees and commissions, and in participatory terms with a heavy emphasis on collegiality, on limited tenure, on audit of accounts, and on personal accountability via *euthuna*: all in all a picture of an extreme diffusion of power and of financial atmospheres wherein, as my and Peter RHODES'S Doktorvater David LEWIS once put it in an Athenian context, 'absolutely nobody was to be trusted'. That picture is remarkable, all the more because it contrasts strongly with the alternative models that were visible in the monarchies and also in the fourth-century Athenian development of (in effect) a finance minister with wide powers and long tenure: are we looking at a deliberate choice by individual *póleis*, or are we looking at organisms outside Athens whose fiscal needs and potentials were not complex enough to require expertise?

I do not try to answer such questions, but rather call attention to the nature of the **evidence base** for M. MIGEOTTE'S model. Throughout the book his primary evidence is drawn very largely from a single region, the Aegean islands and the cities of the Aegean seaboard. That is indeed the inevitable consequence of

6. Brief sketch of NIE in GROENEWEGEN *et al.* 2010, ch. 2, with bibliography, and in dictionaries of economics: brief critique in CHANG 2014, p. 151-156.

7. One may take as an example the discussion of loans made to and by cities (*Les finances*, p.204-229).

proceeding positivistically, by the accumulation of pertinent evidence, since apart from Delphi it was that region which adopted the epigraphic habit far more readily than the other regions of Greek speech and culture. Yet the consequence is that those other regions play only minor parts in the drama.⁸ Nor does that imbalance stand alone, for even without access as yet to the final volume of the late and lamented Getzel COHEN's *Hellenistic Settlements*, we have a clear enough picture of a massive post-Alexander expansion of the *Raum* within which Greek-style *poleis* came to shape and define the landscape, above all that of inland Asia Minor. It is understandable that they generated too little relevant surviving documentation for them to figure in *Les Finances*,⁹ but the effect is that a huge area of Greek settlement and culture is invisible. We have therefore a serious imbalance of coverage, driven by a variation in the geographical distribution of relevant surviving epigraphic and literary documentation which remains extreme.

Of course, our author is well aware of the arbitrariness of survival: repeatedly, after summaries of the available evidence for this or that administrative practice, we have inferential comments to the effect that it 'devait être assez répandu, lui aussi'.¹⁰ Such comments help to paint the picture of a more or less uniform system across the board, but they leave residual doubt: is that reassuring inference really safe? Can one, for example, explain the growing but still pitifully meagre epigraphic record from Sicily and Magna Graecia purely in terms of the low survival rate of documents of bronze as compared with stone? Might that comparative absence not be due at least in part to a significant difference in administrative practices (most obviously between more and less democratic regimes), or even to a residual cultural difference between Doric speakers and the rest? Or again, given what little we do know of the governance of the cities of the post-Alexander diaspora, with their multi-ethnic populations and their *politeumata*, can we really posit a uniformity with Old Greece? If not, alternative models may need to be sketched, albeit on a far more precarious evidence base.

If we return to the theme of **power**, that possibility takes firmer shape. Like Alain BRESSON's two-volume study of *L'économie de la Grèce des cités*, to which our book is in some sense a complement, M. MIGOTTE's focus is firmly and explicitly on the cities, indeed especially on 'les cités petites et moyennes' (p. 15). That focus runs the risk of marginalising other types of *pólis*, ranging from hegemonic or would-be hegemonic cities (Athens, Surakousai, Sparta, and the rest), through cities which see themselves mainly as ancillary bodies of a major

8. Kerkyra, for example, merits five index entries for three items, Korinthos scores six, Surakousai a mere five (apart, to be fair, from the *lex Hieronica*), Kurene a mere three.

9. The only Alexandria cited in the Index is Alexandria Troas.

10. *Les finances*, p. 256: similar phaseology at p. 259 n. 577, p. 279 top, p. 315, p. 346.

temple (Delphi, Elis, Ephesos, Samothrake, etc¹¹), to those entities whose political and social geography was structured *katà kômas* and whose more formal links with the outside world were mainly or sometimes indirect, via collectivities such as amphiktyonies or *koiná*.

Even more firmly, that focus marginalises **the monarchies**. In saying that, I am not lamenting their absence, for their financial practices were so different that any systematic description of them would nowadays require a treatise of almost the same scale as *Les finances* itself. It is rather to insist that at least from the early years of the fifth century those practices impinged spasmodically (or even, as in Western Asia Minor, almost continuously) on the majority of the Greek cities, whether in predatory, fiscal, political, military, or euergetic mode. I fully acknowledge that the monarchs make repeated appearances in the pages of *Les finances*, but they mostly do so as individuals on single occasions, and even when viewed collectively as 'les maîtres' the prime emphasis is laid on the fact that their demands hardly affected the traditional functioning of financial institutions (p.25). That may be true, but they were also components of an overall milieu that shaped actions and expectations through time.

I offer two illustrations of that milieu, the first being Hellenistic Ephesos. A few years ago, when I was analysing the city's rise to its Augustan and subsequent pre-eminence,¹² it was clear that its institutions and magistracies were indeed stable, but that its decisions – financial and other – were a response to the pressures and opportunities that that milieu presented. What mattered was not procedure but policy – in the case of Ephesos, one which kept its distance from all potential partners or predators for the sake of survival and 'whitewashed both sides of the wall'.¹³ That paper may appropriately provide a 'worked example' of the application by one city of the institutional tools and fiscal choices that M. MIGEOTTE has catalogued so comprehensively, on occasion even by hinting at a 'politique commerciale' (p.118). But in fact it does more, for it provides a clear example of **game theory**, that branch of economics which analyses contexts where one actor's behaviour 'induces a material reaction' from other individual actors and where the objective is to minimise conflict and instead to strike the best bargain, financial and otherwise, that they could achieve and live with. This is not the moment to do more than allude to the theory and to its main component, the concept of the 'Nash equilibrium', or to cite in detail the book which has become the model for

11. Johannes NOLLÉ has recently added the Pamphylian city of Perge (HANSEN & NIELSEN 2004, p.1216 no.1003) to such a list (NOLLÉ 2014, p.294-295, who attributes to it 'mehr oder weniger den Charakter einer Tempelstadt..., d.h. einer Polis, die um einen Tempel entstanden war und in der das Heiligtum den Mittelpunkt des städtischen Lebens einschließlich der Ökonomie bildete').

12. DAVIES 2011, especially p.190-194.

13. PAUS. vi. 3. 15 (of the Samians).

its application to a historical context, Avner GREIF's study of the trading activities of mediaeval Genova (GREIF 2006). It is sufficient to report that, just as GREIF could see 'Institutions as systems in equilibria' and 'Institutional dynamics as a historical process',¹⁴ so what we have before us in the form of M. MIGEOTTE's book provides the raw material for reading the financial histories of the Greek states in ways which respect, but go beyond, the antiquarian mode.

My second illustration, unfortunately far too complex to be a second 'worked example', is another temple state, namely that which after Athens and Delos is the third well-documented Greek polis. Though Delphi does indeed command extensive attention in *Les finances*, I could have wished for the many scattered references to the financial activities and experiences that centre on Delphi to have been drawn together in the way that the book does for Delos. I make that plea for one specific reason. The default mode of *Les finances* is to present the unitary *pólis* as the principal actor. The various Amphiktyonies and *koiná* of the Greek world do of course feature in the text as examples,¹⁵ but they are allotted minor roles: of the 13 *confédérations* listed in the Index, only two (Akarnania and Troas) are cited as such more than three times. One concludes that for the author of *Les finances*, as traditionally for classical scholarship from Aristotle to Hans BECK, the *koiná* comprised a different species of polity with rather different structures of government, both financial and otherwise.

It is therefore slightly too easy for the inexpert reader to see Greece through this book as *monocolore*, a landscape of single cities. Yet that is surely too simple, even if the monarchies are left aside. As I know all too well from using Delphi as the theme of a third-year seminar topic for many years, in resource-management, as in everything else to do with the exercise of power, Delphi – though indeed a *pólis* in the normal understanding of the term – was a many-layered place, in a way that Delos was not. Its layers ran from the phratry (on the assumption that the Labuadai were indeed a phratry¹⁶) through the *pólis* to the Amphiktyony (itself layered and bifocal), within which lay both another two-level polity (Phokis) and a Thessaly that was itself both a polity of at least two levels and a geographical term of multiple ambiguity:¹⁷ and to that *mélange* one must add for Delphi at

-
14. The headings of his Chapters II and III. But note also the recognition of 'multiple equilibria' as outcomes of different historical, cultural, or environmental influences (GROENEWEGEN *et al.* 2010, p.144-145).
 15. Early in the book we are given brief sketches of the systems in place in two of them, Boiotia and the Pylian Amphiktyony (p.46-50). Later on we are told how contributions were levied for four of them from their constituent cities (p.395-396), and later still of how they were levied in the two Athenian alliances (p.438-444).
 16. Brief discussion in RHODES & OSBORNE 2003, p.8.
 17. Cf. the citations from Georges DAUX and Bruno HELLY in HANSEN & NIELSEN 2004, p.676 n.1.

various pre-Roman times the influence, domination, or euergetism of Korinthos, the Makedonian monarchy, the Aitolian *koinón*, the Attalid monarchy, and many others. It may justly be granted both that the complexities of governance at Delphi were extreme and that the flow of recent publications on Delphi and the Amphiktyony has clarified them very considerably, but precisely for that reason it might have been timely for *Les finances* to use it as a worked example of the limits – geographical as well as conceptual – of the utility of any simple model of the unitary city as the one primordial type of political building-block in ancient Greece.

From the particular I move to the general. One of the richest and most valuable aspects of *Les Finances* comprises the space and level of detail which is devoted to the management of resources that are described as being the property of gods or heroes. We have the principle asserted that cities tried to ensure that sanctuaries financed themselves (p.372), together with assemblages of evidence for 'the cities' (p.300-315), for Athens (p.469-475) and some of her demes (p.495-504), and for Delos (p.596-605), but much of this evidence has to do with income-streams of various kinds (rents of property, fees for sacrifices, purchase of sanctuary-reared livestock for sacrifice, interest from loans, etc), i.e. with revenue 'above the line', to use accountancy parlance. Questions of the origins of the lands, rights, or bullion which generated those income-streams are less fully explored, though occasionally we do have evidence cited for the origin of a component of a property portfolio that lay 'below the line',¹⁸ as testimony that the tendency was towards *kathierōsis*, not laicisation.

As one who has worked intermittently for some decades on such material, I am personally most grateful to have so broad a picture laid out before the reader. And yet that picture presents me with a dilemma. It presents – again – a remarkably uniform aspect, wherein cults, sanctuaries and temples are autonomous, yes, and to a considerable degree self-financing, but are firmly encapsulated within the curtilage and authority of an individual city and to a large extent are administered by the officers appointed by that city. Moreover, as throughout the book, the synchronic nature of the exposition – by structure and institution – emphasises stability and continuity rather than instability and change. In one sense that picture of stability is correct, and is valuable precisely because it stimulates the question 'Why was it so?' – a question to which I return below. However, in another sense that picture overlays, and therefore obscures, a historical background wherein some cults were (or had been) properties beneficially owned by lineages and where in any one landscape the sanctuaries were one among many other sources

18. Thus, much use is made (p.25 n.18; p.40 n.5; p.41 n.6; p.185 n.266; p.191-192; p.214 n.809) of the 21,000 drachmai gifted to Delphi by Attalos II for educational purposes in 159/8 and at once declared by the city to be Apollo's sacred funds (*SIG³* 672; BRINGMANN & VON STEUBEN 1995, no. 94; JACQUEMIN *et al.* 2012, no. 168, with MIGEOTTE 2009/2010). Nikias's donation of land to Apollo (Plut. *Nikias* iii.3) is also cited (p.598 n.30).

and categories of power. This is to venture back into DE POLIGNAC country here,¹⁹ as modified by Jonathan HALL and many others,²⁰ where even the briefest visit is enough to make the point that in city after city for which we have any usable information the relationship between the formal polity and the ensemble of cults – ‘polis religion’, in Christiane SOURVINOU’s now standard short-hand term²¹ – was a hard-won compromise of opposing interests. Moreover, even within the Classical and post-Classical landscape that our book describes there was significant innovation: one has only to point to what Phanodemos was creating at Oropos after its reallocation to Athens by Alexander in 335,²² or to Magnesia’s ruthlessly persistent marketing of their festival of Artemis Leukophruene after 221/0,²³ or to what must be a late-Hellenistic introduction or re-branding, the festival of the Sarapieia at Tanagra²⁴. All this (and much more) is not a wholly static tableau: it is a slowly moving picture.

And yet, insofar as the tableau *was* near-static, one asks Why? If, without belittling their importance, one leaves aside explanations in terms of the imputed power of the gods and the need to honour them in order to avert anger and vengeance, then (as became clear to me during my work on Ephesos) aspects of security and of resource-management become fundamental, not least that of redistribution. Two examples among many must suffice. The first, M. MIGEOTTE’S fundamental analysis of what lay behind the transactions recorded in the tablets of Herakleia of Lucania (p.165-167), both makes comprehensible sense of extraordinarily difficult texts and illuminates the importance attributed to the desirability of keeping substantial areas of land under public control. For the second, it is sufficient to open the pages which set out the costs of the two major Athenian festivals, the City Dionusia and the Panathenaia (p.550-552), in order to appreciate the size of the monies which went from the city and the *choregoi* and *gumnasiarchoi* to performers, competitors, and cult personnel, for remuneration, production costs, and feasting: a scale of redistribution, largely from the wealthy to the indigent, which was at least as much the ‘glue of the democracy’ as the *theorikón*. And yet, though I write this paragraph in purely antiquarian terms, its argument can equally well be generalised in terms of game theory and the

19. DE POLIGNAC 1984; revised English-language edition, DE POLIGNAC 1995.

20. HALL 1997; HALL 2002; HALL *et al.* 1998.

21. SOURVINOU-INWOOD 1988; SOURVINOU-INWOOD 1990.

22. Detailed exposition in DAVIES in press.

23. *I. Magnesia* 16-87, with WELLES 1934, nos. 31-34, and especially RIGSBY 1996, p.179-279.

24. *Les finances*, p.201-204; p.363.

dynamics of institutions, in such a way that the particular can be seen to form part of the general.

That theme may usefully be taken further. I have already called attention to the relative uniformity of administrative practice which emerges from the pages of *Les finances*. Even if, like M. MIGEOTTE, we confine our gaze largely to the Aegean and do not insist on embracing all 1035 of the polities listed in the *Inventory* (HANSEN & NIELSEN 2004), we shall have a population of several hundred units in view. It is reasonable to ask how and why that uniformity developed and was sustained. Some possible answers fall within the scope of the general concept of Peer Polity Interaction as formulated by Colin RENFREW a generation ago,²⁵ such as the fact of institutions and terminology being shared by polities that had been founded by the same colonising founder,²⁶ or the influence of contact at periodic gatherings at the sanctuary centres of *koiná* and amphiktyonies, or the influence of treaty-making and the formulation of *sýmbola*-style agreements. That is to frame an answer in traditional antiquarian terms, but even that answer implicitly acknowledges the absence of any formulated rules, let alone enforceable rules. The drive and the self-discipline to conform to an imagined blueprint therefore has to be seen as located within each organism itself – at which point we are looking at such comparanda as the behaviour of herds of wild animals or flocks of birds and at branches of evolutionary theory such as epigenetics.²⁷ Even for those who see that as a step too far, the comparative dimension has now been brought far more forcibly to our notice by the collaborative work that lies behind Mogens HANSEN'S massive compilations.²⁸ Again, while the Greek particular can be seen by itself in its own terms, it can also be seen as an example of the general, and I suspect both that we shall see more work in such directions and that we should equip ourselves to collaborate with it.

One other theme also carries an implicit comparative dimension. If, in the pages of *Les finances*, cults and festivals and their resources rightly take a prominent role in the catalogue of components of the asset-base and the spending patterns of the cities, that is less true for one particular – very elusive – component which nonetheless contributed substantially to the *éclat* of the festivals that I have just mentioned. This is *aphanès ousía*, 'invisible property', i.e. movable wealth in the form of coin, Hacksilber, plate, or precious stones. It presented the fiscal systems of the *póleis* with the problem of accessing it and exploiting it fiscally in any systematic way, and presents us with the problem of estimating its extent and

25. RENFREW & CHERRY 1986.

26. A theme explored in detail by JONES 1987 and (within a very different framework of reference) by MALKIN 2011.

27. I owe awareness of this avenue of thought to DAWKINS 2009, p.216-220.

28. HANSEN 2000 : 2002. Major review of both by HÖLKESKAMP 2004.

importance. To begin with the second problem, there can be no doubt whatever that for Classical Athens *aphanès ousía* was a resource of very substantial extent. My own early essay²⁹ assembled some of the evidence and concluded that by the fourth century BCE it formed part of the property portfolio of most wealthy citizens, for some of them even the principal part, though no reasoned estimate for its order of magnitude at any one time can be offered. What can be said is that some of it will have been owned by non-Athenians who could not invest it in real property, that some of it will have been ‘new money’ in the most literal sense, i.e. coined bullion from the Laureion mines, and that three of its main deployments were (a) in the form of bottomry loans advanced to finance the importation of grain, with a return in the form of interest, (b) in the form of working capital for tax-farming groups, with a return in the form of whatever surplus could be extracted, and (c) in the form of expenditure on military and festival liturgies, with a return primarily in the form of social capital.

M. MIGEOTTE’s text says all that needs to be said about type (c), but rather less, at least not explicitly, about types (a) and (b). Yet in scrutinising his text, both for Greece in general and for Athens, I was struck by the prominent role that he accorded to tax-farming as the normal mechanism for raising revenue from non-cultic activities: so prominent, indeed, that unanswerable questions pose themselves about how tax-farming could raise capital for deposits and sureties in cities that had limited access to bullion supplies. Since tax-farmers have been for far too long the little-known and less-loved actors on the stage of public finance, I for one am profoundly grateful to M. MIGEOTTE for having assembled the evidence from across the Greek world³⁰ and having set it all out so lucidly and succinctly. Given that evidence, and given the sums that this or that *pentekosté* might yield, even outside the major entrepôts of Peiraeus or Rhodos, large capital sums must have been available. Indeed, in discussing the hoards of silver coins that have been found in houses on the North Hill of Olynthos, Nicholas CAHILL has noted ‘the association between monetary wealth and trade and industry rather than with traditional pursuits’ and has quoted Edward COHEN with approval for arguing that the importance of *aphanès ousía* ‘has been greatly underestimated by many historians, precisely because it was practiced outside the usual realms of philosophical and legal discourse’ – a point which others have taken further.³¹ Even more to the immediate point, and indeed as we know ourselves from the current discourse about tax-rates and the super-rich, it was impossible for a polity to quantify any one man’s holdings, so that it could only be tapped for public benefit (through office-holding, liturgies, subscriptions, and other benefactions)

29. DAVIES 1981.

30. *Les finances*, p. 89-101 ; p. 113 ; p. 453-458.

31. CAHILL 2002, p. 273, citing COHEN 1992, p. 191-194 ; also GABRIELSEN 1986 ; FERRUCCI 2005.

by offering substantial social capital in return, and perhaps also material benefit via grants of proxeny or *atéleia*. As set out in M. MIGEOTTE'S pages, the latter expedients are therefore a structural component of a public economy.³² It is not difficult to identify economies of other cultures of which the same can be said, with all that such comparisons imply for the workings of conspicuous consumption and social dependency.

For all these reasons I have found *Les finances* a paradoxical book, very hard to assess. On the surface it is exhaustive, but it is so within a strictly limited compass, in that it only reviews one, the *politiké*, of the four kinds of *oikonomía* which the author of the Aristotelian *Oikonomika* identifies³³ – and even that list ignores those that characterise *koiná* or temple states, not to mention the various versions of collective *khrematistiké* that can be detected (one thinks of Thasos). Yet, contained but implicit within the book, I find material that (as I have tried to sketch) points in several far more expansive and diverse directions. That is profoundly welcome, for I have noted elsewhere 'a deep dissatisfaction with the terms of the current discourse about the Greek polis'.³⁴ I share that dissatisfaction strongly, and have to say with regret that this book sharpens it. Economic history is about human needs, commodities and transactions: institutions are essential but secondary. As an institution the *pólis* has exerted a stranglehold on Classical Scholarship for a century and more,³⁵ but its fiscal history is not the same as the economic history of a region or a culture. Fortunately, M. MIGEOTTE'S book is also a window through which that economic history can be perceived, indirectly indeed but with clarity and goodwill.

John DAVIES
U. of Liverpool

Bibliography

- BRESSON A. 2007-2008, *L'économie de la Grèce des cités*, I-II, Paris.
BRINGMANN KI. & H. VON STEUBEN 1995 (eds.), *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechischer Städte und Heiligtümer*, I, Berlin.

-
32. Cf. especially *Les finances* p.69-74, with much citation of FRÖLICH 2004.
33. Royal, satrapal, civic, and household ([ARIST.] *Oik.* ii. 1. 1, a list castigated by FINLEY (1985, p.20-21) for its 'crashing banality': wrongly, for to separate zones in that way is usefully to permit individual or collective actors in different categories to be seen to be acting differentially according to agenda and context. The list is not so much 'banal' as seriously incomplete.
34. DAVIES 2015, p.239; extended exposition in VLASSOPOULOS 2007.
35. It is sufficient to cite GAWANKA 1985.

- BUXTON R. 2002 (ed.), *Oxford readings in Greek religion*, Oxford.
- CAHILL N. 2002, *Household and city organization at Olynthus*, New Haven CT-London.
- CARRIER J.G. 2012 (ed.), *A handbook of economic anthropology, Second edition* (12005), Cheltenham -Northampton MA.
- CHANG H.-J. 2014, *Economics: The user's guide*, London.
- COHEN E.E. 1992, *Athenian economy and society: A banking perspective*, Princeton NJ.
- DAVIES J.K. 1981, *Wealth and the power of wealth in classical Athens*, New York.
- DAVIES J.K. 2011, 'The well-balanced *Polis*: Ephesos', in Z.H. ARCHIBALD, J.K. DAVIES, & V. GABRIELSEN (eds.), *The economies of Hellenistic societies, Third to first centuries BC*, Oxford, p. 177-206.
- DAVIES J.K. 2015, 'Retrospect and prospect', in TAYLOR & VLASSOPOULOS 2015, p. 239-256.
- DAVIES J.K. in press, 'Was "polis religion" "economically rational"? The case of Oropos', in A. KAVOULAKI (ed.), *Anagnoseis: readings in Greek myth, history and culture in memory of Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood*, Rethimno.
- DAWKINS R. 2009, *The greatest show on earth. The evidence for evolution*, London.
- DE POLIGNAC FR. 1984, *La naissance de la cité grecque*, Paris.
- DE POLIGNAC FR. 1995, *Cults, territory, and the origins of the Greek city-state: with a foreword by Claude MOSSÉ*, Chicago (tr. J. LLOYD).
- FERRUCCI S. 2005, 'La ricchezza nascosta. Osservazioni su ἀφανής ε φανερά οὐσία', *MedAnt* 8,1. p. 145-170.
- FINLEY M.I. 1985, *The ancient economy*, 2nd ed., London.
- FRÖLICH P. 2004, *Les cités grecques et le contrôle des magistrats (IV^e-I^{er} siècle avant J.-C.)*, Genève.
- GABRIELSEN V. 1986, 'Phanera and aphanes ousia in Classical Athens', *C&M* 37, p. 99-114.
- GAWANTKA W. 1985, *Die sogenannte Polis. Entstehung, Geschichte und Kritik der modernen althistorischen Grundbegriffe der griechische Staat, die griechische Staatsidee, die Polis*, Wiesbaden.
- GREIF A. 2006, *Institutions and the path to the modern economy. Lessons from medieval trade*, New York.
- GROENEWEGEN J., A. SPITHOVEN, & A. VAN DEN BERG 2010, *Institutional economics*, Basingstoke-New York.
- HALL J.M. 1997, *Ethnic identity in Greek history*, Cambridge.
- HALL J.M. 2002, *Hellenicity. Between ethnicity and culture*, Chicago.
- HALL J.M., I. MORRIS, S. JONES, S. MORRIS, C. RENFREW, R. JUST 1998, 'J.M. Hall, *Ethnic identity in Greek history* (Review article)', *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 8: 2, p. 265-283.
- HANN C. & K. HART 2011, *Economic anthropology. History, ethnology, critique*, Cambridge-Malden MA.
- HANSEN M.H. 2000 (ed.), *A comparative study of thirty city-state cultures. An investigation conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre*, Copenhagen.
- HANSEN M.H. 2002 (ed.), *A comparative study of six city-state cultures. An investigation conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre*, Copenhagen.

- HANSEN M.H. & T.H. NIELSEN 2004 (eds), *An inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford.
- HÖLKESKAMP K.J. 2004, Review of HANSEN 2000 and HANSEN 2002, *BMCRA* 2004.04.03.
- JACQUEMIN A., D. MULLIEZ, & G. ROUGEMONT 2012, *Choix d'inscriptions de Delphes, traduites et commentées* (Études épigraphiques, 5), Paris.
- JONES N.F. 1987, *Public organization in ancient Greece : A documentary study*, Philadelphia PA.
- MALKIN I. 2011, *A small Greek world. Networks in the ancient Mediterranean*, Oxford-New York.
- MIGEOTTE L. 2009-2010, 'La fondation d'Attale II à Delphes : Dispositions administratives et financières', *Dike* 12/13, p.203-217. Reprinted in MIGEOTTE 2015, p.315-326.
- MIGEOTTE L. 2010, *Économie et finances publiques des cités grecques I : Choix d'articles publiés de 1976 à 2001*, CMO 44, Lyon.
- MIGEOTTE L. 2015, *Économie et finances publiques des cités grecques II : Choix d'articles publiés de 2002 à 2014*, CMO 54, Lyon.
- NOLLÉ J. 2014, "'Panegyris Coinages'" – eine moderne Geisterprägung', *Chiron* 44, p.285-323.
- RENFREW C. & J.F. CHERRY 1986 (ed.), *Peer polity interaction and socio-political change*, Cambridge.
- RHODES P.J. & R.J. OSBORNE 2003 (eds.), *Greek historical inscriptions 404-323 BC*, Oxford.
- RIGSBY K.J. 1996, *Asyilia. Territorial inviolability in the Hellenistic world*, Berkeley, Los Angeles-London.
- SMELSER N.J. & R. SWEDBERG 2005 (eds.), *The handbook of economic sociology*, 2nd ed. (1994), Princeton-Oxford-New York.
- SOURVINOU-INWOOD CHR. (1988), 'Further aspects of polis religion', *A.J.O.N.* (archaeol.) 10, p.259-274, reprinted in BUXTON (ed.) 2000, p.38-55.
- SOURVINOU-INWOOD CHR. (1988), 'What is Polis religion?', in O. MURRAY & S. PRICE (eds.) 1990, *The Greek city, from Homer to Alexander*, Oxford, p.295-322, reprinted in BUXTON (ed.) 2000, p.13-37.
- TAYLOR C. & K. VLASSOPOULOS 2015 (eds), *Communities and networks in the ancient Greek world*, Oxford.
- VLASSOPOULOS K. 2007, *Unthinking the Greek Polis. Ancient Greek history beyond Eurocentrism*, Cambridge.
- WELLES C.B. 1934, *Royal correspondence in the Hellenistic period. A study in Greek epigraphy*, New Haven CT.