REVIEW—ARTICLE

# CLASSICS AND ANTHROPOLOGY

VIRGINIA HUNTER

A COMMENTATOR, DESCRIBING THE IMMENSE KNOWLEDGE and varied skills of Marc Bloch, the historian of medieval France, has listed the studies Bloch pursued in his attempt to develop a methodology. They include archaeology, agronomy, cartography, economics, geography, social anthropology, and sociology.[1] The list is not inclusive, but does serve to illustrate the kinds of techniques Bloch thought he required for his research. More recently, Peter Burke has described the achievement of both Bloch and Lucien Febvre. Having found historical writing in France predominantly political—a narrative of events—they left it predominantly social, concerned with structures, "a discipline in which students were encouraged to see history as one of the social sciences ("*sciences humaines*") and to learn from the others."[2] That Bloch and Febvre discovered the social sciences through geography can be explained in part by the close link between history and geography in French education. Their English and American sympathizers, Burke points out, usually start with sociology or anthropology.

Sally Humphreys may not explicitly acknowledge herself to be a sympathizer of Bloch and Febvre, but her book, *Anthropology and the Greeks*,[3] is, at least in the approach it sets forth, very much a part of the illustrious tradition of research inspired by the two historians. For what Humphreys proposes is the use of the methods of the social sciences in Classics.[4] This means more comparative studies aimed at re-examining reconstructions in the light of data derived from better known societies; it means a new kind of conceptual clarity and rigour, the result of using explicit assumptions which can be tested; it means the construction of models or the use of ideal types in order to control the insights gleaned by more traditional methods of interpretation. In addition, Humphreys is

[1]From Bryce Lyon's Forward to Bloch's *French Rural History. An Essay on its Basic Characteristics*, English translation (London 1966) xi-xii.

[2]*A New Kind of History: from the writings of Febvre*, edited by P. Burke (London 1973) xv.

[3]London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1978. Pp. xi, 357.

[4]The connection between anthropology and sociology remains close; thus Humphreys' proposals about method include the use of concepts and theories from both disciplines. For a more explicitly sociological approach to the ancient world, see K. Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves. Sociological Studies in Roman History*, 1 (Cambridge 1978). See too P. Burke, *Sociology and History* (London 1980).

concerned with social structures, and structural differentiation. Merely to characterize specific institutions and values is insufficient: they must be related to the underlying structure of the economy as a whole. The word "relate" is important, for, as comparison in anthropology is concerned with forms of relationship, so an anthropological approach in Classics means a search for the connections between various apsects of social life and culture, between structures and institutions and values. Humphreys calls this a "more holistic approach."[5]

Humphrey's approach is not, of course, entirely new. In recent years, archaeology, or more precisely "the new archaeology," has begun to draw on the techniques and methods of other disciplines in order to arrive at more systematic reconstructions of prehistoric societies and to offer more valid explanations of culture change. Claims to sharper insights and greater validity rest on the fact that new archaeologists make their assumptions explicit in a number of ways, among them a conscious use of ethnographic parallels. On the other hand, one-to-one comparisons, the kind of parallels sought by archaeologists a generation ago, are now rejected as leading only to superficial resemblances. Instead, many archaeologists employ sophisticated models, derived from a whole range of living societies. To summarize this shift in perspective, it is "from talk of artifacts to talk of societies, and from objects to relationships among different classes of data."[6]

Probably the most fruitful studies of this kind to date are those that consider a specific regional environment in its entirety—ecology, topography, land use, settlement patterns, etc. The Minnesota Messenia Expedition nicely illustrates the manner in which such studies bring

[5]30. The meaning of the term "structure" is problematic. Humphreys herself refers to the "concept of social structure as an articulated set of roles and corporations" (247). For an anthropologist's view, see A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, *Structure and Function in Primitive Society* (London 1952). Radcliffe-Brown states (192): "In the study of social structure the concrete reality with which we are concerned is the set of actually existing relations, at a given moment of time, which link together certain human beings." Social structure, he believes, has a "dynamic continuity." Cf. the historian F. Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World of Philip II*, 1, English translation (New York 1972) Preface to the Second Edition, 16. Structure denotes long-term realities. Though the duration of structures may vary, they are essentially "horizontal relationships and connections."

[6]C. Renfrew, *Before Civilization: The Radiocarbon Revolution and Prehistoric Europe* (London 1976) 277. Renfrew has drawn on the techniques and methods of an impressive array of disciplines, including anthropology, in *The Emergence of Civilisation. The Cyclades and the Aegean in the Third Millenium B.C.* (London 1972). See too *The Explanation of Culture Change: Models in Prehistory*, edited by C. Renfrew (London 1973). For a discussion and elaboration of the model of the chiefdom, see C. Renfrew, "Beyond a Subsistence Economy: The Evolution of Social Organization in Prehistoric Europe" in *Reconstructing Complex Societies*, edited by C. B. Moore, Supplement to *BASOR* 20 (1974) 69–95, esp. 73.

together specialists and encourage collaboration.[7] In addition, work in Messenia has led to a new appreciation of the possibilities inherent in ethnography and ethnographic parallels for reconstructing life in classical antiquity. Here the object of study is the modern Greek community. As part of the Argolid Exploration Project, for example, M. H. Jameson and a group of collaborators have studied *inter alia*, in a modern setting, traditional techniques of land cultivation, patterns of transhumance, sources of water, and the extraction of olive oil. Ethnography, they have discovered, helps "to bring otherwise dead and enigmatic ruins to life again."[8] As a result of such regional studies, two important uses of ethnographic data emerge. They have a heuristic value, offering clues to ancient practice. Moreover, they not only discourage "arbitrary conjectures"[9] and assumptions based on common sense, but they can suggest the way in which systemic relationships between land use, for example, and settlement size and distribution might have existed in the ancient agricultural economy. This brings one back to Humphrey's plea for a combination of history and social anthropology: its value is heuristic; it acts as a stimulus to the historical imagination; and it affords the historian comparative control and systemic relationships which link data.[10]

So much for the book's proposals in respect of methodology. What are the substantive issues it addresses? And how much does it add to our understanding of the Greeks?

*Anthropology and the Greeks* is a collection of essays originally published in the decade 1967–1977 and reprinted here virtually without alteration. Arranged in rough chronological order, the essays reflect both the intellectual development of their author and the dual function anthropology has for her, as a heuristic and as a theoretical framework (1). In Part One, "Classical Studies and Anthropology," Humphreys presents a kind of "history of the relation between classics and anthropology" (2). In fact, she concentrates on the Comparative Sociology of

[7] *The Minnesota Messenia Expedition. Reconstructing a Bronze Age Environment*, edited by W. A. McDonald and G. R. Rapp (Minneapolis 1972). This kind of study is discussed by Humphreys 122–127.

[8] The work of Jameson *et al.* is described in a number of articles in M. Dimon and E. Friedl (eds.), *Regional Variation in Modern Greece and Cyprus: Toward a Perspective on the Ethnography of Greece*, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 268 (1976). (Cited by Humphreys 316.) The quotation about ethnography is from two of Jameson's collaborators, H. A. Forbes and L. Foxhall, " 'The Queen of all Trees': Preliminary Notes on the Archaeology of the Olive," *Expedition* 21 (1978) 47. See too Forbes' "The 'Thrice-Ploughed Field': Cultivation Techniques in Ancient and Modern Greece," *Expedition* 19 [1976) 5–11.

[9] "Arbitrary conjectures" is Humphreys' wording, to be distinguished from "rational methods of interpretation" (22).

[10] 13 and 29.

Max Weber and Emile Durkheim, a tradition reflected in the writings of Karl Polanyi (Weber) and Louis Gernet (Durkheim). In turn, the impact of Polanyi's interpretations can be seen in the work of M. I. Finley, while Gernet's ideas constitute some of the intellectual roots of his pupil, J.-P. Vernant and other "heirs of the Gernet tradition," such as M. Detienne (82). In short, we are dealing with a continuous tradition of scholarship, the results of which no one could term negligible.

In Part Two, "Economy and Society," Humphreys attempts to construct "a picture of the practical details of economic life in ancient Greece" (2). The problem she first addresses, the primitiveness or modernity of the Athenian economy, has a long history. What especially concerns Humphreys are points of tension and instability, contradictions, and obstacles to innovation and development. Her initial formulation of the problem in "Economy and Society in Classical Athens," using ethnographic comparative material derived from modern peasant societies and developing economies, stresses "the obstacles in mental attitudes and institutions" (150). In "Homo Politicus and Homo Economicus," however, she criticizes this approach for its "over-emphasis on the study of 'values' in abstraction from social structure" (159). What follows is a structural study of the effects of war, slavery, and trade on Greek economy and society from the eighth to the fourth centuries.

Part Three, "Structure, Context and Communication," continues to explore structures and more particularly structural differentiation. "The Social Structure of the Ancient City,"[11] which is concerned with kinship and kin groups, notes that, in addition to the development of centralized political institutions with their attendant decrease in the functions of groups of kindred, such as tribes and phratries (identically based segmentary groups), there is a multiplication of specialized roles and specialized areas of interaction. Here is an evolutionary perspective, in which the Greek city is seen as an intermediate level between tribal society, with its identical segments, and a stage of full structural differentiation. The remainder of the book traces shifts in the status of intellectuals, the differentiation of intellectual roles, and changes in the context of communication (among them, the effects of writing) from Homer to the philosophic schools of the fourth century. Other processes of structural differentiation, including the development of occupational specialization, are dealt with in the last essay, "Evolution and History," where Humphreys considers recent attempts to develop a new evolutionary approach. She expresses some reservations, but accepts such approaches as necessary to the ultimate elaboration of an "adequate theory of social change" (244).

[11]Written in collaboration with A. Momigliano. Part 2, Humphreys' contribution, is entitled "Kinship in Greek Society, c. 800–300 B.C."

In what follows I will discuss a number of essays from *Anthropology and the Greeks* with the aim of indicating the book's major value for classicists. I will also attempt to show how different formulations or alternative lines of approach may in some instances supplement the ones offered by Humphreys.

Polanyi's basic thesis, as stated by Humphreys in "History, Economics and Anthropology: the Work of Karl Polanyi," was that "economic theory applies only to the modern market economy and cannot serve the needs of the economic anthropologists or the historian of pre-market civilizations" (32). In proposing a substantive as opposed to a formal definition of economy, Polanyi evolved four forms of integration or operational patterns whereby to classify economies: reciprocity, redistribution, householding, and market exchange.[12] Moreover, he attempted to transcend the fruitless debate between primitivists and modernists by formulating new questions. Rather than "'What type of economy?'" he asked "'What kind of institutions, and how did they work?'" (42). Polany's approach and his categories have in fact inspired a whole tradition in classical scholarship.[13] Humphreys' examples of this tradition are brief but significant: redistribution or "'movements towards an allocative center and out of it again'" (32) are characteristic of the economy of Mycenaean Greece, as revealed in the Linear B tablets; both redistribution and reciprocity, the latter including gift exchange, hospitality, and other kinds of generosity among equals, are linked in Homer's early society; in the context of market exchange and an encroaching market mentality, classical Athens supplemented taxation by a system of depersonalized redistribution which involved public displays of munificence and the presentation of gifts to the entire citizen body.

Here is the very opposite of "arbitrary conjecture," for the above examples are based on categories of thought and a method which can be traced back, on the one hand, to the ethnography of Malinowski (reciprocity and primitive trade) and, on the other, to the comparative studies of Weber and Mauss. Humphreys performs the valuable service of synthesizing an overwhelming mass of interdisciplinary material. In fact, it is precisely here, in the synthesis of ideas and the presentation of bibliography, that Humphreys is at her best. On the other hand, classicists may well experience difficulty with an essay which presupposes in its readers more than a passing acquaintance with sociology and anthropology. How many, for example, have read Parsons, Meillassoux, or

[12]For a full exposition of these terms, see, in addition to the works cited by Humphreys, Polanyi's posthumous book, *The Livelihood of Man*, edited by H. W. Pearson (New York 1977). Part 2, "Trade, Markets, and Money in Ancient Greece," which is published here for the first time, should be of especial interest to classicists.

[13]The tradition is generally associated with the name of M. I. Finley.

Eisenstadt? Persistence here can be rewarding, for the issues faced today by these various disciplines are remarkably similar. As Polanyi's example demonstrates, an understanding of the concepts and methods evolved in one discipline may result in a new way of perceiving, and so ultimately a way of solving, problems in another.

Humphreys also notes some of the limitations of Polanyi's views. His typology, she believes, is "too formalistic," for patterns of allocation "formally classed as 'redistributive' can play very different roles in different social units and systems" (73). One need only consider the three examples of redistribution presented above: the function and relative significance of each, within its particular social system, are very different. Mycenaean Pylos is an elaborately organized palace economy, which has a census, fixes quotas of agricultural produce and livestock, and allocates rations. All of this, and more, scribes record at the centre.[14] In the society depicted in the *Iliad*, where both centre and bureaucracy are lacking and relations of reciprocity prevail, distributions of prizes, booty, and even food are made on the basis of rank, prowess, or sometimes age, while the common soldiers enjoy their share of food and drink. Finally, in the democratic city-state of Athens wealth is redistributed through the liturgy system. This form of redistribution is all but marginal and increasingly incompatible with the economic integration afforded by market exchange.

In order to avoid "formalism" one could also ask the following questions: who collects? how much is collected, and for what purpose? who receives? how do those who fix, collect, and allocate legitimize their role and any privileges that accrue from it? Our concern has shifted to questions of leadership, status, rank, and finally power. In fact, we are talking about politics, and looking at the political side of economic institutions. The role of redistribution is not only different in different social systems but within those systems implies distinct political institutions—palace (king), aristocracy (chief), and democratic city-state (citizen). This is not to suggest that Humphreys is unaware of the close connection between political and economic institutions and structures. Her essay, however, tends to reflect the discussions of economic anthropologists of the 1960's with their concern for primitive and peasant markets, scarcity, surplus, and economic rationality. Since then much has been done in the area of political anthropology. Initially, study centred on chiefdomship, the political side of reciprocity and redistribution. Elman R. Service, for

[14]I accept M. I. Finley's view of the nature of Mycenaean society in "The Mycenaean Tablets and Economic History," *EHR* 10 (1957) 128–141. One of my students, Ms. Jan Fishback, has made a creditable beginning to a study of the redistributive economy of Pylos, following Finley's suggestion (*ibid.* 141). Cf. Renfrew, *Emergence of Civilisation* 296–297, on redistribution.

example, describes chiefdoms thus: "Chiefdoms have centralized direction, hereditary hierarchical status arrangements with an aristocratic ethos, but no formal, legal apparatus of forceful repression."[15]

Using modern parallels, one can construct a model of the chiefdom and employ it fruitfully in the study of Homeric society. Agamemnon, the *wanax*, or highest ranking chief, organizes the expedition to Troy, binding equals to himself by oaths and promises of appropriate booty and prizes. In order to ensure that reciprocal obligations are carried out, he must see that wealth is brought to the centre of the host and duly distributed. (It is his interference with this process—and hence his break with tradition—that sets the *Iliad* in motion.) In addition, Agememnon (and his peers) can command the skill of craftsmen and the toil of soldiers in return for maintenance by a supply of food and drink. He performs ceremonies and rituals. In a word, Agamemnon and the other main protagonists in the *Iliad* are members of an hereditary hierarchy with an aristocratic ethos. *Vis-à-vis* the commoners they are a nobility with a whole array of privileges based on rank, and sometimes divine birth.[16] The model derived from ethnography thus proves useful in a number of ways. While it does not do violence to traditional interpretations of the *Iliad*, it affords the control of a theoretical framework. By establishing new relationships, it reveals in Homeric society the same kind of coherence demonstrated by M. I. Finley, using the concept of reciprocity. Homeric society proves to be no less coherent on its political than on its economic side. By adding this new dimension, one can "escape altogether from the opposition of 'political' and 'economic'."[17]

It may be fruitful to consider the rest of the book as well from the perspective of new dimensions. In retrospect, Humphreys criticizes "Economy and Society," because there she overemphasized values in attempting to determine why the Athenian economy was resistant to change. Other might criticize the essay for being somewhat diffuse and impressionistic. Like Polanyi, Humphreys underestimates, indeed, virtually ignores, environment and technology, and production in general, especially agriculture.[18] What influenced the organization of labour on the land and even the produce grown, much of it for consumption in

[15]*Origins of the State and Civilization. The Process of Cultural Evolution* (New York 1975) 16. Ethnographic examples of chiefdomship are manifold. See, in addition to Service's work, M. D. Sahlins, *Tribesmen* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1968) and *Stone Age Economics* (Chicago 1972).

[16]For the division of booty and prizes see *Iliad* 1. 125, 166, and 368. Whenever a *dasmos* takes place, Agamemnon's "prize" is always far greater. At *Iliad* 9.330–334 Achilles describes how he brings captured treasure to Agamemnon, who in turn shares it out, or redistributes it.

[17]Humphreys 74.

[18]See 44, 60, and 62 for Humphreys' own criticisms of Polanyi.

kind? The following are some "determining factors," derived from A. V. Chayanov's *The Theory of Peasant Economy*:[19] the permanent features of the Mediterranean ecosystem (the possibilities afforded by natural history), the level of technology, and the existence of other economic outlets, such as the market or the demand for specialized crafts and trades. Some of these "determining factors" are the very object of the Argolid Project. Work patterns are being reconstructed, based on modern parallels, and a new picture is emerging, in which the labour of both women and slaves is seen as essential to agricultural production. Jameson now challenges the received notion that a slave was uneconomical, given the seasonal nature of the work on an Attic farm.[90] Rather, he stresses the possibilities of diversification and intensification, noting that the pattern of farming he describes falls somewhere between Chayanov's peasant and his slave farm system.[21]

One might follow Chayanov further in considering the structure of the family dynamically, as well as statically. What are the developmental aspects of the family unit and what is the basis of its size and composition at each stage? This means a study of the family over several generations, the results of which must be very different from Chayanov's analysis of the Russian peasant family. Where partible inheritance prevails, the potential for, or perhaps the advisability of, very large families is naturally reduced. On the other hand, the extended family will require far more consideration than it has hitherto received. How is the household sustained when a newlywed son brings a wife home and young children are in time added to the unit? Jameson recognizes the indispensability of women's labour and the capabilities of children. This is one answer. Conversely, what is the effect on the organization of the farm and its production when an adult son leaves to train as an ephebe? A thorough study of agriculture along these lines might also consider labour and the allocation of labour time in preindustrial agrarian societies. A recent cross-cultural study has confirmed many of Jameson's conclusions about the labour of women and children, indicating that the contribution of both is substantial.[22] In the peasant households of Java and Nepal, for example, boys of 15 to 19 spend up to 7.9 hours per day in work activities, and girls of the same age, 10.2 hours per day, the latter figure

[19]Edited by D. Thorner, B. Kerblay, and R. E. F. Smith, English translation (Homewood, Ill. 1966) 71.

[20]"Agriculture and Slavery in Classical Athens." *CJ* 73 (1977–78) 122–145.

[21]*Ibid.* 140, n. 90.

[22]W. Minge-Klevana, "Does Labor Time Decrease with Industrialization? A Survey of Time-Allocation Studies," *Current Anthropology* 21 (1980) 279–287. As far as labour time in general goes, one might also follow Jameson, *ibid.*, in studying Roman agricultural writers. He cites Columella for the man-days required per *iugerum* for wheat and vines (130, n. 45). Further, see K. D. White, *Roman Farming* (London 1970) 370–374.

exceeding the number of hours worked by adult males. Even girls of 12 to 14 work almost as many hours as males 15 years and older. The activities studied here include both work outside the home (productive labour), pertaining to agriculture, and work inside the home (reproductive labour), pertaining to care of the family and household. Apart from demonstrating the amount of productive work done by women and children, studies of this kind afford a basis for estimating how much labour is required in the operation of a peasant household, and so at what points in the developmental cycle of the family slave labour would be more or less essential. They make it clear that one must take account of many factors in addition to the seasonal nature of work on an Attic farm in assessing whether slave labour was economical.

A study of the structure of the peasant family would be valuable in yet another respect. In "The Social Structure of the Ancient City" Humphreys discusses different contexts of interaction in Athenian society. She points out:

> Phratry, *genos*, kindred and household each have their own rules, structure and patterns of behaviour. There is in each case a central cluster of coherent structural principles defined and upheld by law or strong religious and moral beliefs (206).

The essay as a whole is particularly valuable for calling attention to the Greek kinship system and the strains to which it was subject. On the other hand, Humphreys' brief discussion of the household is disappointing. She notes the removal of political interaction from the context of the household to the centre of the city, and some of its effects. This is scarcely sufficient. The household remained the *locus* of nurture and socialization, and of work. Of the four "contexts of interaction" discussed, this is surely the one for which the best documentation is extant in Attic private orations. Here again ethnography can be of value. The classical Greek household, viewed as a structural system, together with the attitudes, code of behaviour, and ideology which sustained and perpetuated it, finds a parallel in peasant communities of agriculturalists in Bulgaria, Greece, and Yugoslavia.[23] On the basis of these studies, one can bring a kind of system to material which is anecdotal and fragmented and give a new coherence to the structure of authority in the household and the relationships and attitudes which prevailed within it.[24]

[23]See especially B. Denich, "Sex and Power in the Balkans," in *Woman, Culture, and Society*, edited by M. Z. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere (Stanford 1974) 243–262. In general *Anthropology and the Greeks* does not concern itself with the family and male/female relationships, or with those works which discuss values of honour and shame in contemporary Mediterranean societies. See, for example, J. G. Peristiany (ed.) *Honour and Shame. The Values of Mediterranean Society* (Chicago 1966).

[24]See Jack Goody, *Production and Reproduction. A Comparative Study of the Domestic Domain* (Cambridge 1976) for another kind of study, which takes as its starting-point

Finally, the notion of structural differentiation, for all that it permits a certain kind of precision, is perhaps more descriptive than it is explanatory. The question is, when one is attempting to elaborate "an adequate theory of social change" (244), what brings about structural differentiation? I suspect that a thorough study of the role of the state as "the supreme integrative apparatus above the level of kinship institutions"[25] would add an important dimension to the understanding of the "separation of public and private life"[26] and with it the development of institutional contexts beyond the household.

One reviewer of *Anthropology and the Greeks* has noted: "The collection as a whole is stronger on defining problems than offering solutions to them. . . ." Its real strength, he continues, lies in the way it grapples with "fundamental and too often neglected—or too often unasked—questions."[27] Questions, of course, must precede answers, just as an adequate methodology must precede the solution of new problems, as the example of Marc Bloch illustrates. And that is what *Anthropology and the Greeks* is all about, for it represents the search for "a firm conceptual basis and accepted categories of analysis."[28] The book is more than moderately successful: it is required reading. Perhaps Humphreys will now attempt to employ these methods in a detailed study of the economy and society of ancient Athens. Someone surely will. If contemporary French historiography is any example, we can expect some very good history.

---

the difference in systems of inheritance in Africa and Eurasia. Goody shows the connection between modes of transmitting property and other social institutions such as serial monogamy, marriage of cousins, adoption, and the epiclerate. These and other "strategies of heirship" (Chapter 7) are characteristic of Athenian society.

[25]From E. R. Service, "Classical and Modern Theories of the Origins of Government" in *Origins of the State. The Anthropology of Political Evolution*, edited by R. Cohen and E. R. Service (Philadelphia 1978) 28. Cf. Service's *Origins of the State and Civilization* 97: ". . . a true state administers a codified set of laws with formal procedures and backed by force . . . ."

[26]Humphreys 257. W. K. Lacey, *The Family in Classical Athens* (London 1968) 88, believes that the principal effect of Solon's laws was "to liberate the conjugal family (the *oikos* of husband, wife, children and dependants) to some extent from the wider kinship-groups in the matter of property-ownership." Whether it is correct to attribute to Solon major laws pertaining to the family remains a problem. Essentially, however, Lacey is correct. With the formation of the state at the time, as I believe, of Peisistratus and Cleisthenes, laws emerged protecting the family and family property and ensuring the perpetuation of the individual *oikos*. Such laws established securely the position of the household in society as the *locus* of reproduction and as the private world of women and children, quite separate from the institutional settings of the male citizen, the public sphere of assembly, council, courts, etc.

[27]G. E. R. Lloyd, *TLS*, Oct. 27, 1978, "Classicists and their Kin."

[28]The words are Humphreys's (111). I believe they are applicable to her own work.

ADDENDUM

Since the completion of this essay, several reviews of Humphreys' work have appeared. While generally they welcome the attempt to develop a new methodology, the kind of criticism made by Lloyd does recur. For example, N. R. E. Fisher, *CR* 30 (1980) 58–61, notes that "documentation and argument tend to be exemplificatory and suggestive rather than exhaustive and conclusive" (59). He looks forward to further, more detailed work from Humphreys. (Humphreys has, in fact, recently published a detailed study entitled "Family Tombs and Tomb Cult in Ancient Athens: Tradition or Traditionalism?" in *JHS* 100 [1980] 96–126.) Another review, that of V. Valeri, *CP* 76 (1981) 63-66, discusses, critically, Humphreys' structural functionalism, touching briefly on some problems of general anthropological theory. Anthropological theory is also the focus of Marylin Arthur's review-essay in *History and Theory* 19 (1980) 338–353. Arthur's work moves into quite a different realm from that of the present essay. For, in concerning myself with the concepts and techniques which, in my own experience, have major value for classicists, I have made no attempt to distinguish the theory or theories which underlie a particular methodology. Arthur, on the other hand, begins by locating "Humphreys' approach within the wider framework of contemporary anthropological theory" (340). While primarily structural functionalist, the approach is eclectic enough to incorporate other viewpoints. Arthur then compares Humphreys' theoretical model with that of M. Godelier, *Perspectives in Marxist Anthropology*, English translation (Cambridge 1977) and M. Bloch, "The Past and the Present in the Present," *Man* 12 (1977) 278–292. (I myself have found the work of Godelier especially useful. See his "Infrastructures, Societies and History," *New Left Review* 112 [1978] 84–96.) In a word, Arthur's review will interest those who wish to go beyond methodology to theory. Finally, for a fascinating, not to say vituperative, corrective to the direction and concerns of the new social history, see Elizabeth Fox and Eugene Genovese, "The Political Crisis of Social History: A Marxian Perspective," *Journal of Social History* 10 (1976) 205–220.

YORK UNIVERSITY May 1981