

Zimnicea-Plovdiv-Cherkovna și Coslogeni. Deși se constată o uniformizare la nivelul formelor și tehnicii decorative în ceramică (poate un început de standardizare), aceasta nu poate fi explicată încă la nivel satisfăcător (mișcări de populație, schimbări climatice, rețele de schimb?). Lipsa unor cercetări interdisciplinare la scară mai largă îngreunează foarte mult acest demers.

În lumina celor expuse mai sus, considerăm contribuția colegului Neculai Bolohan o reușită deplină. Bibliografia variată și bogată (632 de titluri), planșele color care ilustrează artefactele, hărțile de distribuție și graficele completează în mod fericit textul, întotdeauna bine argumentat. Este demn de remarcat că autorul se ferește de târâmul speculațiilor și apelează la acestea

numai atunci când evidența faptică este foarte săracă sau inexistentă. În opinia noastră, cheia volumului este efortul de *conceptualizare* a epocii bronzului târziu la Dunărea de Jos, demers foarte rar în arheologia românească și care i-a reușit, în cea mai mare parte, autorului. Volumul de față se constituie într-un reper important în cercetarea epocii bronzului din sud-estul Europei, nu numai prin solida bază de date pe care autorul o supune criticii, dar și prin direcțiile viitoare de cercetare pe care le propune.

Cristian Eduard Ștefan,
Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan”,
București;
e-mail: cristarh_1978@yahoo.com.

David M. Lewis, *Greek slave systems in their Eastern Mediterranean context, c. 800–146 BC*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2018, xii + 372 p., ISBN 978-0-19-876994-1

Well documented books that question long-entrenched orthodoxies and stereotypes through return to a thorough enquiry of sources are always most useful for research and very pleasant to read. It is the case of this book written by David Lewis, who admirably makes recourse to a wide range of sources and carefully undertakes a comparative approach between the societies in the Greek *poleis* and those of the ancient Near East in order to overhaul the authoritative views on the economic dimension of Greek, Roman and Eastern slavery exposed by Moses Finley (and a few other researchers) almost half a century ago, which still inform the way most scholars reconstruct ancient slavery in the Mediterranean.

The author explicitly assumes this objective in the first pages of his Introduction (p. 1–5), where he states that he advocates “against the standard view in Classical scholarship ... that Greece (by which Athens is usually meant) and Rome were the only genuine ‘slave societies’ of the ancient world” and for a new perspective on “the role and evolution of slave labour within the societies of the Greek world”. In the same Introduction, Lewis clearly and usefully announces the reasons for his choices regarding the temporal and thematic framework of

the book (p. 4–5), the plan of his work (p. 5–7), his commitment to regional studies as the best method for correctly grasping evolutions and phenomena of economic history (p. 7–8) and his avoidance of well enrooted terms such as ‘chattel slavery’, ‘debt enslavement’, ‘unfree’ or ‘serfdom’, which mostly obscure or alter facts when they are applied to ancient societies (p. 8–11). He also reviews the historiography on the subject, from Wallon and Eduard Meyer to Westermann and Finley, and from Marx and Soviet historians to the research groups on slavery of Mainz, Besançon and Nottingham (p. 11–21).

However, only advancing through the theoretical and the conceptualizing Part I (Chapters I–IV), the reader really starts to understand the aim and the scope of the book. Rejecting opinions that emphasize secondary characteristics of slavery, Lewis assumes in Chapter I (p. 25–56) that slavery is above all a legal status for individuals, who represented a particular type of labour force. According to Lewis’s definition, “the slave is an article of property (the object of the relationship) that is subject to the ownership (the relationship itself) of his or her master (the subject of the relationship)” (p. 25) and therefore the relationship

between slave and slave master should meet all the ten criteria defining ownership delineated by A.M. Honoré in a seminal study of 1961, no matter how different societies are in terms of using formal laws: the right to possess, the right to use, the right to manage, the right to income, the right to capital, the right to security, transmissibility of term, absence of term, prohibition of harmful use, liability of execution (p. 33–39). Such definition and criteria are crucial for the comparative approach intended to be undertaken by the author because it further allows him to accurately differentiate between slaves and other workers and to notice that the basic legal elements of slavery were one and the same both in Greece and the Near East (p. 39–53). In the subsequent two chapters (II, p. 57–79; III, p. 81–91), Lewis aptly demonstrates that former views based mainly on superficial, de-contextualized, terminological studies, which held that distinctions between free people and slaves were blurred in the Near East and that in Greece there was a full spectrum of legal conditions between free people and slaves, are simply wrong: in ancient societies, people were able to easily distinguish between free people and slaves on the basic principle that the latter were legally owned by the first.

Only after setting these legal prerequisites, whose previous absence determined serious confusions and mistaken assumptions on the role of slavery both in Greece and in the Near East, Lewis proceeds in Chapter IV (p. 93–105) to investigate how we may assess the economic significance of slavery in ancient societies and how they might be artificially, but still usefully, classified in ‘slave societies’ and ‘slaveholding societies’. Rejecting quantitative methods that set up demographic proportional thresholds for slave populations among societies, he warily embraces Finley’s qualitative approach that emphasizes the distribution of slaves in society and the proportion of wealth created through exploitation of slave labour as criteria for assigning to slavery its right place in a regional economy. Lewis agrees that, despite a certain unavoidable vagueness of the definition, societies where “elites derived a significant proportion of their wealth from slave labour” might be considered ‘slave societies’ (p. 95–96), while societies where slaves are not

widely distributed and do not account as a main means to produce wealth might be classified as ‘slaveholding societies’ or ‘societies with slaves’. He further maintains that in history there were much more ‘slave societies’ than the few customarily accepted (Greece, Rome, the Caribbean, the US South, Brazil) and he notices that the proper methodology for assessing the significance of slavery in ancient societies requires “identifying the standard range of slave ownership among the elite, the elite’s sources of wealth, the uses they put that wealth to in maintaining their dominance, and gauging (roughly) whether or not slave labour was a key ingredient in producing this wealth.” (p. 96)

Thus, the basic outline of the following nine chapters dealing with nine regional economies, grouped in two parts – Part II (Chapters V–VIII) for Greece, and Part III (Chapters IX–XIII) for the rest of the Mediterranean, mainly the Near East – is sketched. In each chapter, Lewis firstly investigates the regional particularities of the legal status of slaves: he tries to demonstrate the existence of a clear cut emic legal status for slaves, distinct from that of freemen, to check if all the etic conceptual requirements to define slavery as ownership over an individual, delineated in Chapter I, are met and to explain the main regional peculiarities of slave status. Secondly, starting from brief descriptions of the main traits of the regional economies under scrutiny, he searches for adequate documentary means to assess the importance of slavery in the given economies, mainly in the case of elites, in order to affirm or infirm the label of slave societies.

The first Greek study, focused on archaic Greek society and economy (Chapter V, p. 107–124), contradicts the long held historiographical view originating in Finley’s works, that before Solon’s reforms, Greek elites relied more on dependent forms of workforce other than slaves. Through a thorough study of Homeric and Hesiodic information inspired by previous works of Hans van Wees and William Thalmann and an apt inquiry of other archaic sources, too, Lewis is able to show that: 1. *dmōes* and *dmōai* are typical slaves, whose legal status was not essentially different than that of slaves in classical Greece; 2. big and medium archaic Greek landowners relied mostly on a core group of slave workforce,

only temporarily complemented by hired labourers; 3. the late archaic changes in Greek society and economy affected only the main sources of slaves (Greek piracy and enslavement of indebted countrymen were gradually replaced by trade as the main means of procuring slave workforce), not the institution of slavery itself and its embeddedness in economy.

The second Greek study is the first one truly regional: it deals with Spartan 'helotic slavery' (Chapter VI, p. 125–146). Lewis dismisses previous approaches based on late sources like the famous claim of Pollux 3.83 that helots and other similar labourers in Thessaly, Crete, Heraklea, Argos and Sikyon (*penestai*, *klarōtai*/*mnōitai*, *Mariandynōn dōrophoroi*, *gymnētes*, *korynēphoroi*) had a legal status between freemen and slaves. Working only with classical sources (e.g. Ephoros *FGrHist* 70 fr. 117), Lewis demonstrates that helots were privately owned by the Spartiates and that they were pictured as nothing else but slaves by contemporary Greek authors. The essential outline of their legal status was not different than the legal status of slaves in any other Greek *polis*, although some rights of their owners were partially restricted due both to the communal ethos of Sparta and to the pragmatic necessity of a small privileged group of freemen to hold sway, through 'state terror', over a much larger mass of resentful slaves living far from their masters in uniform ethnic communities. With regard to the economic significance of helotic slavery for the income and status of Lakedaimonian citizen elites, required to monthly contribute from the produce of their estates the ratios for communal mess, Lewis shows that the latter quasi-totally depended on helots, given the isolated economy of Sparta. Consequently, he concludes that "Sparta ... represents the most extreme example of slave society anywhere in the ancient world, perhaps even world history. The only reason why this has not been fully realized is the mistaken belief of many scholars that the helots were something other than slaves." (p. 143).

In the last section of the chapter dedicated to Sparta ('What is helotic slavery?', p. 143–146, as well as in the last section of the next chapter, p. 165), Lewis departs from the strictly regional approach in order to give valuable insights on the particular kind of slavery only typically

represented by the Lakonian and Messenian helots, but found also in many other Greek *poleis* from Syracuse to Heraklea Pontika. Following Plato and Aristotle, the author shows that ancient Greeks clearly distinguished between 'helotic slavery' and the more familiar to us slavery in Athens, Chios, Korinthos or Aigina. While ancient authors used as main defining criterion the unity of language displayed by the 'helotic slaves', Lewis maintains that this should be added to the more important fact that the slave owners in 'helotic slave systems' relied exclusively on natural reproduction of their slave population rather than on raids or trade, like in the other classical Greek slave systems.

In the next chapter (VII, p. 147–166), dealing with the slave systems of Cretan *poleis*, mainly based on the epigraphic evidence of Gortyn, Lewis explores another economy where the importance of another instance of 'helotic slavery' is tantamount to that of Sparta. The Cretan slave study is particularly important because it enables the author to explain why and how differences between the otherwise similar epichoric slave systems of Greek *poleis* appeared.

The last Greek study, encompassed in Chapter VIII (p. 167–195) deals with Athenian slavery, long held to be the most representative case for the whole Hellenic world. Lewis interestingly notes that slaves were cheap in Athens, amounting to the medium wage paid for 150–200 work days, due to the strong commercial connections Attika had with the major supply zones of Thrace and Anatolia. This fact determined a widespread social distribution of slavery, even some of the most impoverished Athenian landowners being able to purchase slaves. On the other hand, the complexity and diversity of Athenian economy enabled local elites to draw on much more income generating activities (land leasing and house renting, tax farming, money lending etc.) than only exploiting the massive slave workforce at hand, which was intensively used in agriculture, sweatshops (*ergasteria*), mining, quarrying and household activities.

The conclusion of the Greek regional studies is natural: "An expansive range of *poleis*, scattered across a number of regions, fostered a diverse range of bespoke, local institutional responses to the problems posed by slavery. Some of these

responses arose from issues common to all *poleis*; others reflected specific regional imperatives. This produced a vast patchwork of regional variants, a world of epichoric slave systems” (p. 195).

Part III, dealing with slave systems of the wider Mediterranean world, features generally shorter, but equally pervasive studies dealing with slavery in Iron Age II Israel (Chapter IX, p. 199–222), Assyria in the 8th–7th centuries BC (Chapter X, p. 223–234), Babylonia in the 7th–5th century BC (Chapter XI, p. 235–245), Anatolia, Egypt and Fars as clearly delineated regional economies within the Persian empire (Chapter XII, p. 247–258), and Carthage (Chapter XIII, p. 259–266). The basic conclusion of this tour in the Mediterranean and the Near East is that the common slave legal status in the Greek world was neither unique, nor new, being extensively paralleled, sometimes even in minor details, in other societies. However, slave labour was used on widely varying scales in the societies used as comparative terms and its economic importance for the elites and these societies in general greatly fluctuated depending on a mix of economic, geographical, political and cultural factors: whereas landowning elites in Carthage and Anatolia depended on slave labour similarly to the elites of Athens, densely populated Assyria and Babylonia never attained reliance on slave workforce on the same level given the steady availability of tenants and deportees.

Such insights derived from the comparative approach undertaken by Lewis are given a systematic conclusion in the very rich in ideas Part IV (Chapter XIV, p. 269–294), devoted to understanding regional variations in the usage and significance of slave labour. Combining neoclassical economics focused on supply and demand, New Institutional Economics and varied anthropological observations, Lewis lists and explains the diverse factors that contribute to the appearance of regional patterns of slave systems: the monetary costs of slaves compared to other types of workforce, envisaged as “the most fundamental underlying cause of regional variation in the exploitation of slaves across the ancient Mediterranean world” (p. 271–272), the institutional advantages of slavery in some long-term activities or in activities like mining, which were not deemed proper by the free wage-earning

workforce (p. 272–273), cultural variables, such as the ideological rejection of waged labour in classical Athens, which was nevertheless widely embraced in Babylonia (p. 273), dynamics of labour use, triggered by facts like the unity or fragmentation of elite estates (p. 273–274).

Some of these factors depended on political and economic geography, mainly on the proximity and connectivity between ‘slaving’ and ‘no-slaving zones’ (e.g. Attika, which became after Solon’s reform a ‘no-slaving zone’ for Athenians, was tightly connected through trade to the nearby ‘slaving zones’ of Thrace and Anatolia). Networks of slave trade determined by geographical features, with ports as the main hubs of human trafficking are also taken into account in their diachronic evolution, particularly for the Aegean. The impact of slavery on both supplying and demanding zones is assessed: whereas demanding zones flourish given the inflow of additional workforce, the supplier zones enter a vicious circle of instability and impoverishment determined by the enslaving raids of local elites driven by the wish to acquire wealth through continually supplying slaves to the developed trade networks. In the particular case of the Greek world, slavery and slave trade are conceived as “major institutional forces driving economic growth”, which “undergirded the economic prosperity of citizens of the Greek *poleis*, and enabled a growing commitment on behalf of average citizens to civic life and civic responsibilities”, while in that of the slaving zones that traded with the Greeks (Thrace, inner Anatolia, the Black Sea region) they had “an entropic effect”, so that it is safe to conclude that “these regions, and the slaves exported from them, paid a hefty price for Greece’s material and cultural efflorescence.” (p. 286).

Lewis is finally able to distil the discussion into ‘a matrix of variables’ that can be used to explain the different degrees of reliance on slavery in distinct societies. He concludes that the ideal environment for slavery to proliferate should display certain features that, when they are not retained, determine lesser forms of ‘slave societies’ and ‘slaveholding societies’ (as in the case of Assyria, Babylonia and Fars): “(i) strong state institutions guaranteeing citizen rights, law and order, and market infrastructure; (ii) capital

formation, especially if it is distributed relatively equitably across the citizen body; (iii) high levels of commitment to civic activities and a strong disinclination among citizens to work for one another; (iv) markets for slave-produced goods; (v) geographical proximity to a slaving zone; (vi) commercial networks linking buyers and sellers, ideally by sea; (vii) high demographic density within the slaving zone (i.e. strong potential supply)” (p. 287).

The book ends with ten main conclusions that are awkwardly appended to the last chapter of Part IV instead of being separated in a particular section (p. 290–294), and an appendix, where Lewis makes a compelling case that the term *oiketēs* should be understood as denoting in classical Greek only ‘slave’, not ‘servant’, ‘household slave’, or ‘family member’, as it is usually assumed (p. 295–305). A very rich bibliography (however, lacking, understandably, but still regrettably, some important contributions on the Greek slave trade in the Black Sea region, e.g. Alexandru Avram, “Some thoughts about the Black Sea and the Slave trade before the Roman domination (6th–1st Centuries BC)”, in V. Gabrielsen & J. Lund (eds.), *The Black Sea in Antiquity. Regional and Interregional Economic Exchanges*, Black Sea Studies 6, Aarhus, 2007, p. 239–251) and comprehensive indices of sources, names and terms are also added (p. 307–350, respectively p. 351–372).

Lewis’s book is part of a wider series of recent works that question with more or less success perennial interpretative assumptions on social and economic traits of ancient Greece and Rome, like Kyle Harper’s *Slavery in the Late Roman World, AD 275–425* (2011) and Brian Rose’s *Class in Archaic Greece* (2012). I think that Lewis’s courageous case for superseding Finley’s mid-20th century theories on slavery in ancient Mediterranean is strong and that his findings will be at least hotly debated, if not generally adopted as an important step forward in this research field.

This is mainly the merit of his two carefully undertaken methodological approaches – the regional focus on ancient economies that

successfully overhauls the obsolete ‘modes of production’ approach, and the comparative analysis of Aegean and wider Mediterranean societies, understood as well connected entities, whose history is better intelligible only through such broader enquiries, an approach that the reviewer has also applied in his work on archaic Greek mercenaries. It is self-evident that the comparative approach is conditioned by a huge effort to get familiar to other sources than those used in Classical research, but it should be stressed that Lewis masters well the issues regarding Assyrian slave sales contracts, Babylonian dowry and division of inheritance agreements, or Egyptian demotic documents. In fact, he should be praised for the emphasis he places on presenting the advantages and shortcomings of each type of sources he uses in his reconstructions and his rigorous criteria for selecting trustworthy and useful documents.

A second reason that determines the compelling character of Lewis’s case is his well pondered recourse to concepts and ideas developed by other disciplines, like economics and anthropology, either for heuristic reasons, or in order to better explain his choices. Furthermore, references to works written by Wittgenstein, Eco, McMahon, Patterson, Lakoff, Mark Johnson or Malinowski clearly enriches the academic discourse in the book. On the other hand, Lewis is well acquainted to the long-lasting historiographical disputes pertinent to crucial or marginal aspects of his inquiry, like the controversies on the meanings of *dolos* and *woikeus* in Gortyn law codes (p. 150–153), and on the subsistence or profit-driven character of small scale agriculture in classical Attika (p. 181–185), which he briefly and masterfully reviews before cautiously taking sides or expressing his own new opinions.

There are many valuable contributions in this book that are clearly worth emphasizing, from the insistence on the fact that slavery is above all a legally-sanctioned ownership relationship between a slave and a master, characterized by all the rights that an owner has over his property, to the ‘matrix of variables’ that explains the different extensions and intensities of slavery in different societies, from the demonstration that slavery is conspicuously existent and economically relevant

in archaic Greece to the delineation of two main patterns of slave systems in the classical Greek classical, with many epichoric variations: 'the helotic slavery' typical to Sparta, Crete, Syracuse, Thessaly, or Heraklea Pontika, and 'the chattel slavery' (no better term was found), typical to Athens, Chios, Korinthos, or Aigina, and so on. They clearly overwhelm the few shortcomings of the book, like the lack of even a brief discussion on the relationship between public and private slavery (assumed by Lewis in his Introduction, p. 4–5, but still regrettable) or the vagueness that engenders the possible conclusion that both 'helotic' and 'chattel slavery' evolved from a single type of Homeric slavery (p. 120–122), although it seems more probable that epichoric differences of slave systems had existed well before classical times.

Somehow frustrating, but otherwise a rather common feature of Western monographs dealing with ancient Greek social and economic phenomena, the references to the Pontic area are

meager (p. 276, p. 278, with a short commentary on *SEG* 23:381, the epitaph mentioning, among others, two slaves bought at Istros; more references to Thrace, Thracians and the Mariandynoi of Heraklea Pontika, p. 9, 100–101, 167, 170, 276, 279–280, respectively p. 138, 143–146, 165), although it was one of the major slaving zones connected to the Aegean through networks of intensive trade whose nodes were ports as that of Istros, near the mouths of the Danube, or the factories on the shores of the Maiōtis lake. Nevertheless, the numerous conceptual, methodological and historical novelties introduced by Lewis's book are clearly useful for the future research on Pontic slavery and slave trade, which should not remain stuck to the old Finleyan perspectives on ancient slavery.

Liviu Mihail Iancu,
University of Bucharest;
e-mail: liviu.iancu@drd.unibuc.ro.

Lupescu Makó Maria (főszerkesztő), Ionuț Costea, Ovidiu Ghitta, Sipos Gábor, Rüss-Fogarasi Enikő (szerkesztő), *Cluj – Kolozsvár – Klausenburg 700: várostörténeti tanulmányok = studii de istorie urbană*, Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, Cluj-Napoca, 2018, 548 p., ISBN 978-606-739-102-2

Volumul *Cluj – Kolozsvár – Klausenburg 700: várostörténeti tanulmányok / studii de istorie urbană*, publicat de Muzeul Ardealului, adună între copertile sale 51 de studii a 54 de autori. Încă din introducere, editorii subliniază că tomul se dorește a fi un pas în plus în direcția rezolvării problemei istorice a faptului că, precum „și în alte domenii ale științei istorice, și în cercetarea urbană, în istoriografia maghiară, română și săsească se «discută» în paralel”. Mária Lupescu Makó, Ionuț Costea, Ovidiu Ghitta, Gábor Sipos și Enikő Rüss-Fogarasi fac o întreprindere admirabilă în privința depășirii acestui impas, prin acest volum bilingv, care însumează 25 de studii în limba maghiară și 26 de studii în limba română, toate însoțite de rezumate cuprinzătoare, redactate în limba engleză. Istoriografia săsească rămâne singura mai puțin reprezentată. O situație regretabilă, având în vedere că numeroase comunicări se referă la orașele săsești.

Volumul constituie varianta, în formă revizuită și extinsă, a comunicărilor reunite în cadrul conferinței științifice internaționale *Cluj – Kolozsvár – Klausenburg 700*, organizată la Cluj-Napoca între 10 și 13 noiembrie 2016, cu ocazia celebrării a 700 de ani de la obținerea statutului de oraș regal liber.

Putem menționa din programul sesiunii, în legătură cu istoriografia germană, comunicarea lui Konrad Gündisch (Institutul pentru Cultură Germană și Istorie a Sud-Estului Europei din München) despre antecedentele privilegiului din 1316 și despre așezarea sașilor la Cluj și în împrejurimile orașului, comunicare care nu a ajuns însă să fie cuprinsă în volum. Nu este singura în această situație. Astfel, locul comunicării lui Ciprian Firea, despre *Preoți parohi ai Clujului ca patroni ai artelor și liturghiei în Evul Mediu și Renaștere*, a fost luat de un studiu despre posibilitatea existenței unei bresle a pictorilor în