Dies mag vielleicht für Statius zutreffen, aber bestimmt nicht für Ovidius, der durch alle Jahrhunderte hindurch fast gleich beliebt war. Und aus diesem Ovidius wußte man auch im 4. Jh. genau, wie es mit der Quantität der Silben dieses Wortes bestellt war: Clarius (vgl. z.B. A. A. 2, 80; Met. 11, 413; F. 1, 20). Wir sind denn auch der Meinung, daß in 664, 2 die Lesart Clarii weitaus den Vorzug hat vor Clari.
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In this book the author endeavours to demonstrate that the historical conception of K. Marx may be instrumental to explain the historical events and processes and the prevailing ideas and institutions in the Greek world from about 700 B.C. to about 650 A.D. He concentrates largely on what in his eyes is the most important tool supplied by Marx, and the most fruitful in explaining history, namely the concept of class and of class struggle (pp. IX; 3). The first part of the book is largely concerned with methodological questions and with the outlining of concepts; in the second part the author (S. henceforward) seeks to illustrate the usefulness of the accepted methodology and concepts in explaining historical developments and prevailing ideas in "his" Greek world. As this Greek world was for a long time under Roman sway and had become part and parcel of the Roman empire, S. also devotes much attention to Rome.

The contents of this book are very rich and variegated, covering a large period and various aspects of Ancient History, founded upon an impressive knowledge of the ancient evidence and of the

pertaining modern literature. Moreover, S.' learning and interest are not confined to ancient (including early Byzantine) history. He is also well informed about many later historical developments and a great number of well-documented expatiations on various topics testify to his wide range of interest. His style of writing is lively, with a very personal accent, and his book characterized by sharp reasoning. S., who acknowledges his indebtedness to his former master A. H. M. Jones, is not chary with appraisal and reproach; his book abounds with often sharp and sometimes witty critical comments, e.g. upon the opinion of such authorities as Rostovtzeff and M. I. Finley. This book is a monument of learning and henceforward scholars who are occupied with the social and economic history of the ancient world—and not only these—will be obliged to take full account of the ideas put forward by S. in this book.

S. is an admirer of K. Marx and a staunch supporter of his ideas. As such, he has devoted many pages to Marx' historical conceptions. I am not in a position to go into questions of Marxian orthodoxy, however interesting and important they may be. But as a historian I am concerned with the question whether our evidence admits the conceptions used by S. and whether his Marxist presuppositions and historical explanations concur with the facts.

1. Class, according to S., is "essentially a relationship, the social embodiment of the fact of exploitation" (p. 3), "exploitation by the proprertied class of the non-propertied" (p. 68); "the essence of class struggle is exploitation or the resistance to it" (p. 3; cp. p. 44). This meaning "represents the fundamental thought of Marx himself" (p. 3). Class struggle does not necessarily imply "any class consciousness or any political element" (p. 3) nor "involve collective action by a class as such" (p. 44). Therefore the often alleged argument that we cannot speak of class struggle in Antiquity because there was in the ancient world "no explicit common awareness of class on either side, no specifically political struggle at all, and perhaps even little consciousness of struggle of any kind" (p. 57) is not applicable here. In this book class struggle is, contrary to current modern usage, toned down to the contrast, not even the struggle, between rich and poor. Thus S. can contend "that a Marxist analysis in terms of class, far from being the imposition upon the ancient Greek world of inappropriate and anachronistic categories suited only to the study of the modern capitalist world, is actually in some essentials much the same type of analysis as that employed by Aristotle" (p. 4; cp. p. 69 ff.), whose *Politics* Marx