direct democracy like Athens. The reason offered for Perikles' citizenship law, apparently in all seriousness, is "a felt apprehension of a rising population, requiring administration, over against a decline in the administrative pool" (p. 170). It is difficult to see what sort of state Mrs. Broadbent conceives Athens to have been, in which the demos must be 'administered' in some way, creating problems which she must think could be alleviated by reducing citizens to metics.

The final chapter, taking off from the genealogy of the Kephali-dai at Athens, ranges through 99 pages of speculation to produce a stemma covering almost all the literary and mythological genealogies of the pre-Trojan War period.

As far as I can see, the book is of little value to classicists. I cannot speak for the anthropologists, but anyone who wishes to use Mrs. Broadbent's conclusions should be warned to plow through the text to see upon what speculative grounds they are based. As prolegomena to a new round of anthropological analysis of the Greek world, it points up the uselessness, rather than the promise, of such an exercise.
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The economy of the Greek city-states is a difficult subject. Its monetary aspects are among the most elusive. To what extent were the ancient economies 'money-economies'? What was the function of money in ancient economic life? Was exchange in natura a normal phenomenon throughout antiquity? (cf. Bogaert, 225). Whatever the answers will be, it is beyond doubt that an assessment of the place and function of banking in the ancient economy is fundamental to any solution of the above problems. B. has provided a very full and comprehensive study of ancient Greek banks from their first occurrence in Greece in the archaic world up to the later Roman period, when there is "pratiquement une éclipse de la banque" (31). He has an impressive command of the ancient source-material (literary, epigraphical), which enables him to avoid one of the worst sins, namely the making of general statements, based upon an interpretation of only part of the relevant evidence.

The first part of the book is devoted to a welcome study of the terminology of banking (37-60; with important discussions of terms like διαγράφειν (50 ff.) and διαγραφή, which have been inter-
interpreted in different ways by students of the subject) and (61-278) to a critical discussion of all the available evidence for ancient banks and bankers throughout the Greek-speaking world (except Egypt, which will have a volume of its own, thanks to the great mass of evidence and to the strongly centralising tendencies of its economy).

In the second part B. classifies the numerous data which resulted from the interpretation of the available evidence, under several headings: temple-banks, private banks and public banks are discussed separately and for each of them B. investigates the nature of their activities (e.g. deposits, loans, change, interest-rates; function of loans in economic life); in the process problems like the internal organization of banks, the social standing of bankers, the relations between state- and private banks and the rise and character of the public banks receive due attention. We do not have here a purely antiquarian and descriptive treatment of what ancient banks did and looked like; on the contrary, for B. description and interpretation are means to an end and the end is to assess the function of banks in ancient economic life. Throughout his book B. emphasizes that most loans were to buy consumer-goods: "Le crédit qu'elles accordaient était avant tout du crédit réal à la consommation" (411; cf. also 294). B.'s conclusion is in line with what M. I. Finley has written about the loans which are on record in the horos-inscriptions and which were made mainly for non-productive ends.

In this field the inferences, of course, are not as solid as one would wish. B.'s thorough and accurate analysis of temple-loans (cf. e.g. Rhamnous (93 f.), Delos (129, 141)) shows that on the whole the amounts of money borrowed by private people were small (e.g. 200, 300, 150 dr.). From the very smallness it is inferred that the money will have been used for purposes of personal consumption. This inference is unsafe. I certainly subscribe to the view of those who argue that the money probably was not used to finance the introduction of better agricultural methods and the purchase of better and e.g. labour-saving implements. In leases of cult-associations the tenant is not required to improve the cultivation of the land but merely to maintain the status-quo and from the Delian temple-accounts it appears that the sacred land has been cultivated with the same unchanging methods and results for long years. But it remains possible that a peasant near Rhamnous borrowed 200 or 300 drachmae to finance the purchase of admittedly traditional but nevertheless new tools. Thereby he does not boost the yield of his fields but at least he prevents the yield from going down! This is another way of saying that the ancients may well have had a production mentality, provided one gives the word 'productive' a less modern and anachronistic twist.