

Giuseppe Salvioli's *Capitalism in the Ancient World*

Jairus Banaji

SOAS, University of London

Paolo Tedesco

University of Tübingen

Giuseppe Salvioli's *Le capitalisme dans le monde antique* was first published in French in 1906.¹ The Italian edition, a shorter, revised text, only came out two decades later, in 1929, a year after Salvioli's death.² Gino Bandelli has pointed out that this later edition contains far fewer references to Marx and even exhibits a distinctly Catholic strain. He raises the interesting question of why Salvioli (1857-1928) found no Italian publishers earlier in the century, when Marxists like Ettore Ciccotti and Corrado Barbagallo seemed to find no difficulty being published in their home country, and puts this down partly to the (hostile?) influence of the Catholic historian Gaetano De Sanctis.³ As to Salvioli's intellectual relationship with Max Weber, the original French edition of Salvioli's book does cite Weber's earliest work of 1891 (his *Römische Agrargeschichte*, which is still close to Theodor Mommsen in its general perspective) but

¹ G. Salvioli, *Le capitalisme dans le monde antique*, Paris, 1906, transl. Alfred Bonnet. The German edition was translated from the French by Karl Kautsky, *Der Kapitalismus im Altertum. Studien über die römische Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Stuttgart, 1912; 2nd ed. 1922. (An earlier version of this paper appears as an interview given to the French website *Période*.)

² G. Salvioli, *Il capitalismo antico: storia dell'economia romana*, Bari, 1929, new edition with an introduction by Andrea Giardina, Bari, 1985.

³ G. Bandelli, "Il capitalismo antico di Giuseppe Salvioli. Note sulla fortuna (e sfortuna) di un libro", in *Quaderni di Storia*, XII, 23, 1986, pp. 257-272. A. Giardina, "Introduzione", pp. xxxix-lix, has suggested that by the time Salvioli revised his text for the Italian edition his focus had shifted from the issue of "primitive accumulation" to the economic backwardness of the *Mezzogiorno*, especially to the legacy of the *latifundium* in Sicily.

makes no reference either to Weber's famous lecture of 1896 (his most primitivist work!) or to the first edition of *Agrarverhältnisse im Altertum*.⁴ And Weber, for his part, seems to have ignored Salvioli completely, just as the Italian version of Salvioli's book ignores *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* (1922). We shall come back to Weber later.

Situating Salvioli

A superficial reading of Salvioli might suggest that his work lies beyond the opposition between modernists and primitivists, but this is not the case. Salvioli's *Capitalisme* is an anti-modernist work, and this becomes fairly obvious once one gets beyond Chapter 2. The more interesting point is that it was clearly conceived by Salvioli as such. Its whole thrust is against the view that the ancient economy contained any "real" elements of capitalism. The target is Mommsen (in Roman history) and Eduard Meyer (1855-1930) in ancient history more generally.⁵ On the other hand, Salvioli wants to distinguish himself from both Johannes Karl Rodbertus (1805-1875) and Karl Bücher (1847-1930),⁶ finding their denial of "industry", "commerce" and "capital" too extreme.⁷

Salvioli's basic argument is that capital existed in the ancient economy but not capitalism. By "capitalism" he means of course industrial capitalism as the world had known it since the 19th century. He argues that: there was limited investment in Roman agriculture

⁴ T. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, 4th ed., Berlin, 1866, vol. III, p. 516; M. Weber, *Die römische Agrargeschichte in ihrer Bedeutung für das Staats- und Privatrecht*, Stuttgart, 1891; Id., "Die sozialen Gründe des Untergangs der antiken Kultur", 1896, in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Tübingen, 1924, pp. 291-309; Id., "Agrarverhältnisse im Altertum", in *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, Supplement, II, 1897, pp. 1-18.

⁵ E. Meier, *Die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung des Altertum*, 1895, and *Die Sklaverei in Altertum*, 1899, in Id., *Kleine Schriften*, Halle, 1910, pp. 79-168 and pp. 171-212.

⁶ K. Bücher, *Die Entstehung der Volkswirtschaft*, Tübingen, 1893.

⁷ M. Mazza, *Economia antica e storiografia moderna. Interpreti e problemi (1893-1938)*, Rome, 2013, pp. 53-90; A. Giardina, "Introduzione", pp. liv-lv.

and industry; no true mass market could emerge; economic life was dominated by an ideal of self-sufficiency, which characterised the economy of the larger households as much as anyone else; and monetary wealth was scarcely ever accumulated because it was either immobilised or dissipated. One consequence of all this is that Salvioli drastically underestimates the scale and vitality of Roman commerce. For example, André Tchernia has calculated that exports of wine from Italy to Gaul in the latter decades of the Republic averaged between 120,000 and 150,000 hectolitres a year,⁸ a very substantial volume even compared, say, with wine exports from Bordeaux to England at the start of the 14th century. Salvioli claims that “wine was not widely consumed” (p. 194), but in fact the market for cheap wine was huge. He works with an extremely simplified model of the Roman social structure, one essentially polarised between a handful of plutocrats (some of whom he calls “capitalists”) and a mass of free artisans and slaves, with no room for a middle class of any sort. His central thesis of restricted consumption flows from this, and of course it is this that makes large-scale production of any kind unviable in his view.

Capitalisme was written at a time when archaeology had made scarcely any impact on the writing of history, which relied mainly on documentary sources from the field of law. Salvioli's own training was in law, and it is striking that after expressing scepticism about writing an economic history of Rome based purely on literary sources, he goes on to do precisely that. Moreover, and this ambiguity permeates his whole book, he claims to be writing about the ‘Roman economy’ but his radar is restricted to the Italian peninsula! Nothing at all is said about the provinces, except for passing references here and there, such as the fascinating allusion to Alexandria as a productive urban centre, which completely contradicts his more orthodox view of the ancient city as essentially parasitic and consumer-oriented.

⁸ A. Tchernia, *Le vin de l'Italie romaine: Essai d'Histoire économique d'après le amphores*, Rome, 1986.

Salvioli and the Roman Economy

Salvioli's extreme minimalism about Roman agriculture contrasts sharply both with the Weber of 1891 (*Römische Agrargeschichte*, let us recall, is a largely modernist work) and with what became the orthodox position among leftist historians in Italy and Britain by the 1980s when Carandini was excavating at Settefinestre.⁹ Salvioli describes the famous introductory portion of Appian's history as a remarkable résumé of Rome's economic history and is willing to admit that "rich capitalists" seized the greater part of the *ager publicus*, but – and this is a decisive clue to how he *understands* "Roman capitalism" – he only seems to allow for the influence of capital in terms of the violent and illegal seizure of land, not in terms of more stable investments geared to external markets on the *villa Catoniana* model which became popular with post-war archaeologists and historians and which was already present in some form in the work of Gummerus.¹⁰ This is accumulation by dispossession, if you like, but not any more conventional idea that Roman capitalists were always faced by investment decisions and always out to make money. It doesn't occur to Salvioli that if capital shuns this or that sector (either in agriculture or outside it), it does so on strictly commercial grounds, as André Aymard suggested when he tried to explain why Roman capitalists may have found viticulture too fraught with risk or unprofitable at certain times.¹¹ For Salvioli, there are intrinsic reasons why no type of production will attract capital on a large scale. The markets are too restricted, the technologies are not there, and, besides, even the biggest landed households prefer to produce for own consumption, selling only "surpluses" left over after domestic consumption. Each of these assumptions is vulnerable both to theo-

⁹ A. Carandini, *Settefinestre. Una villa schiavistica nell'Etruria Romana*, Modena, 1985, I-III; *Società romana e impero tardoantico*, ed. A. Giardina, Rome, 1986, I-III.

¹⁰ H. Gummerus, *Der römische Gutsbetrieb als wirtschaftlicher Organismus nach den Werken des Cato, Varro und Columella*, Leipzig, 1906.

¹¹ A. Aymard, "Les capitalistes romains et la viticulture italienne", in *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, 2, 3, 1947, pp. 257-265.

retical counter-argument and to the substantial body of historical work that has been done in more recent decades. Aristocratic households in the late empire accumulated vast reserves of money capital *from their estates*, as the historian Olympiodorus tell us.¹² The economic behaviour of the aristocracy would have been no different in earlier centuries, and Dominic Rathbone's study of one large estate (*ousia*) in the third-century Fayyum, in Middle Egypt, shows how estates on this scale structured both their production and their management.¹³ But Salvioli's model is an essentially autarchic estate geared to use-value. He asserts that while industrial activities around what the Romans called *opus doliare* were widespread on rural estates, this type of industry was primarily for "own" consumption or household needs.¹⁴ In fact, nothing could be further from the truth. The work of Jean-Paul Morel and a host of other ceramicists has pointed to markedly capitalist features in the organisation of the Roman fine ware industries. The organisation of labour was no longer purely at the craft stage (contrary to Salvioli's opinion), but structured on strictly industrial lines with job simplification, deskilling and the standardisation of manufacturing processes; scales of production were huge; distribution networks vast; and so on. The type of glazed ware known technically as "Campanian A" embodied a low-cost, high-quality product that was widely marketed throughout the western Mediterranean.¹⁵ The same is true of

¹² Olympiodorus, fr. 44, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. iv, p. 67.

¹³ D. Rathbone, *Economic Rationalism and Rural Society in Third-century AD Egypt: The Heroninos Archive and the Appianus Estate*, Cambridge, 2008.

¹⁴ Salvioli's autarchic model has recently been reprised for the Apion estates by Todd Hickey, *Wine, Wealth and the State in Late Antique Egypt: The House of Apion at Oxrhynchus*, Ann Arbor, 2012. Against this picture, let us observe that Byzantine estates show a marked preference for gold; this was already obvious to E. Hardy, *The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt*, New York, 1931, p. 100. See J. Banaji, *Exploring the Economy of Late Antiquity: Selected Essays*, Cambridge, 2016, pp. 22 and 55 for further references to this; and, more extensively, Id., *Theory as History: Essays on Modes of Production and Exploitation*, Leiden-New York, 2010, pp. 155-179.

¹⁵ J.-P. Morel, "La produzione della ceramica campana: aspetti economici e sociali", in *Società romana e produzione schiavistica*, II, *Merci, mercati e scambi nel Mediterraneo*, eds. Andrea Giardina and Aldo Schiavone, Rome-Bari, 1981, pp. 81-97.

commodities like wine and olive oil. Salvioli contends that there was no industrial-scale production even on large estates, but this claim has been shown to be unfounded. Spanish and North African olive oil was produced on an industrial scale for distribution across the Mediterranean, not least to the huge metropolitan consumer market in Rome. Salvioli consistently downgrades the scale of Roman economic enterprise out of his prejudice that almost no capital was employed in industrial production and that capital shunned all production, whether industrial or agricultural. This is where Rostovtzeff's work made Salvioli's study obsolete and where even writers like Heinrich Sieveking, otherwise broadly sympathetic with the view that the Roman economy failed to develop the "necessary basis for a capitalist economy", were willing to concede that large establishments (*Großbetriebe*) may well have been common in such sectors as pottery, glass, bricks, metal products, and so on.¹⁶

It is worth asking what kept Salvioli from seeing that Roman capitalists who were so active in sectors like finance, real estate speculation and public contracts might actually put money into productive enterprises such as fish-salting factories, ceramic workshops, olive estates, commercial shipping, and so on. Why did he take the peculiar position that no capital ever went into production? The answer has to do with his view that as long as slavery remained the basis of the "household economy" of the upper classes, investment and accumulation of capital were automatically ruled out. In other words, whereas for Weber, and for Gummerus especially, ancient capitalism was *quintessentially bound up with slavery*, for Salvioli it was, conversely, ruled out by slavery. Mommsen himself realised that slavery was *not* an impediment to capitalism because he had before him the living example of the cotton plantations in the US South and saw the southern states as being ruled by a "capitalist regime". Marx himself agreed that those plantations were run by *capitalists*.¹⁷ Salvioli, perhaps in a religious tradition that valorised

¹⁶ H. Sieveking, *Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Berlin, 1935.

¹⁷ K. Marx, *Capital: Volume III*, transl. D. Fernbach, Harmondsworth, 1981, p. 940.

“productive” capital and saw accumulation as the labour of the capitalist, must have found the idea of a slave-based capitalism utterly improbable and even repugnant. Slavery, for him, was part of natural economy more than of monetary economy, as it was for Rodbertus as well, even though he himself had observed earlier in the book that capitalists made money from buying and selling slave labour-power.

Salvioli shows no awareness of an important paper by Sombart in which the slave-based estates of the ancient world were, like early-modern slavery and modern capitalism, integrated into a unified set of economies dominated by what Sombart called the *Erwerbsprinzip*, that is, the profit motive, the antithesis, Sombart argued, of the *Bedarfsdeckungsprinzip*, the principle of need-satisfaction as the primary objective. Sombart suggested that capitalism was indifferent to the form of labour it exploited; what mattered to it was the drive to exact and accumulate a profit.¹⁸ Between the first version of his *Agrarverhältnisse* (1897) and the final version published in 1909, Weber grew less hesitant about claiming that “whole epochs of antiquity displayed a markedly ‘capitalist’ character” precisely because, following Sombart’s argument in the above-mentioned paper, he was convinced that capitalism should be defined primarily in terms of its “economic content” and not by the fact that capitalists typically used free labour.¹⁹ Elio Lo Cascio has persuasively demonstrated this particular influence of Sombart.²⁰

Finally, Salvioli was quite wrong to think of late antiquity in such deeply catastrophist terms and to identify its economic life with expanding natural economy. But this was the conventional picture of everything from the third to the eighth century at that time; it was pure orthodoxy, and it would have been surprising if Salvioli had

¹⁸ W. Sombart, “Die gewerbliche Arbeit und ihre Organisation”, in *Archiv für soziale Gesetzgebung und Statistik*, XIV, 1899, pp. 1-52, 310-405.

¹⁹ M. Weber, “Agrarverhältnisse im Altertum”, in *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, I, Jena, 1909, pp. 52-188.

²⁰ E. Lo Cascio, *Crescita e declino. Studi di storia sull’economia romana*, Rome, 2009, pp. 305-315.

argued differently. Even Weber, in his 1896 lecture, assigns great importance to the re-emergence of natural economy following the end of Rome's expansion and the collapse of an earlier "slave capitalism" (Hintze's term for what Weber was talking about).²¹ Indeed, only after Gunnar Mickwitz demolished the orthodoxy about the third-century crisis leading *irreversibly* to the universal triumph of "natural economy" did this deeply rooted strand of the historiography begin to weaken.²² The reversal of the orthodox position was extremely slow and can hardly be described as widespread even by the 1970s, when "late antiquity" barely existed for Moses Finley.²³ Salvioli seemed to think that a famous passage in Symmachus where the money changers complain about the solidus (the main gold currency of the period) rising in value against the base-metal coinage meant that gold was disappearing! Nothing of the sort, but the argument shows that he had a very poor grasp of the monetary history of the fourth century, unlike Arthur Rosenberg, for example, who knew that Constantine had restructured the monetary system of the empire and given it a sounder foundation.²⁴ One gets the distinct impression that Salvioli had read Weber's 1896 essay and was simply replicating parts of its general thesis.

Moving Forward

To conclude with some general remarks that have a direct bearing on the current state of the debate about the Roman economy, the basic argument of Salvioli's book is found on p. 241 of the French

²¹ O. Hintze, *Feudalismus - Kapitalismus*, herausgegeben von Gerhard Oestreich, Göttingen, 1970, p. 174.

²² G. Mickwitz, *Geld und Wirtschaft im römischen Reich des vierten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.*, Helsingfors, 1932; J. Banaji, *Exploring the Economy of Late Antiquity*, pp. 37-51.

²³ M.I. Finley, *The Ancient Economy*, London, 1973.

²⁴ A. Rosenberg, *Einleitung und Quellenkunde zur römischen Geschichte*, Berlin, 1921, pp. 53-54; see also J. Banaji, *Exploring the Economy of Late Antiquity*, p. 27 and f. 138, and L. Canfora, *Il comunista senza partito*, Palermo, 1984, pp. 9-79, a rich introduction to Arthur Rosenberg's life and works.

version, where he says: "The activity of Roman capitalists is extraneous to the creation of values. Most of them simply seek to augment the value of an existing product through trade. ... Such trade has nothing to do with the capitalist production of commodities in which the capitalist buys labour on the market, uses it in production and sells the final product." In other words, like the early Rostovtzeff, Salvioli saw Roman capitalism as essentially parasitic, that is, unproductive of value because not actively engaged in *producing* values. Yet throughout the book Salvioli refers to "capitalists", and in Chapter 2, the book's best chapter, he concentrates on describing the forms which he thought capitalism typically took in the Roman Republic. Towards the end of *Capitalisme* he introduces the category "commercial capitalism", referring to it as a "phase" of capitalism peculiar to antiquity and (along with usurer capitalism) as the "ancient form" of capitalism. Indeed, Salvioli is even willing to admit that in the immediate surroundings of Rome itself "agriculture took on a capitalist character" (p. 217), a rare reference to capitalism in a productive sector. But he ends by describing all of this as "superficial", a varnish that shone brilliantly on the surface of the Roman economy, something purely "artificial".

So, capital and capitalists but not capitalism. Salvioli, in other words, worked with an epistemology of "true" capitalism, the economic system based on the accumulation of industrial capital as described by Marx in the first two volumes of *Capital*. For Salvioli, there was no middle ground between the ancient economy, with its "superficial' capitalism, and modern capitalism as described by Marx. But as Martin Frederiksen observed in a devastating review of Finley, "Somewhere between the theoretical extremes, between the static traditional economy and the perfectly fluid market economy, all periods of history lie; and the problem about ancient societies is to measure and plot the economic relations and behaviour they contained as well as we can, and then locate them in the scale."²⁵

²⁵ M.W. Frederiksen, "Theory, Evidence and the Ancient Economy", in *Journal of Roman Studies*, 65, 1975, pp. 164-171.

We would like to suggest that our problematic can be more sensibly framed and debated today if we draw a distinction between three sorts of questions that tend to be hopelessly conflated in the discussion. We can ask, *first*, how advanced an economy is (how advanced or specialised the division of labour? how extensive trade and the circulation of money? how sophisticated the financial instruments used? and so on); *second*, whether it contains elements of capitalism within it; and *third*, whether it represents a more full-blown capitalism comparable with modern capitalist economies. In ancient history, nowadays no one any longer argues for an affirmative answer to the third question. Today, a modernist historiography works entirely at the first two levels, just as minimalism is full of assertions about how “backward” ancient economies were (Question 1) and is eager to deny the existence of any form of capitalism (Question 2). Once the claims of modernism are scaled down in this way and the questions themselves become more manageable, it is possible to see that, despite Finley and the strong influence of Cambridge-style minimalism, Roman history at least has tended to move decisively towards modernist perspectives. In Italy, Andrea Carandini and Andrea Di Porto are leading examples of this, from very different fields (archaeology, legal history);²⁶ in France, Jean-Paul Morel, Maurice Picon, Robert Étienne, Françoise Mayet, all ceramic specialists;²⁷ in the UK, Dominic Rathbone, Kevin Greene, Ken Dark, and Andrew Wilson (one papyrologist, three archaeologists);²⁸ in Germany, Karl

²⁶ A. Carandini, *Schiavi in Italia*, Rome, 1988; A. Di Porto, *Impresa collettiva and schiavo “manager” (II sec. a.C.-II sec. d.C.)*, Milan, 1984.

²⁷ J.-P. Morel, *Céramique campanienne: Les formes*, Rome, 1981; M. Picon, “Metodo di determinazione della provenienza delle ceramiche antiche”, in *La Ceramica*, 5, 1976, pp. 21-26; R. Etienne et al., *Un grand complexe industriel à Tróia (Portugal)*, Paris, 1994; F. Mayet, *Les céramiques sigillées hispaniques*, Paris, 1984, p. 216.

²⁸ D. Rathbone, *Economic Rationalism and Rural Society*; K. Green, “Technological Innovation and Economic Progress in the Ancient World: M.I. Finley reconsidered”, in *The Economic History Review*, 53, 1, 2000, pp. 29-59; K. Dark, “Proto-Industrialization and the End of the Roman Economy”, in *External Contacts and Economy of Late Roman and Post-Roman Britain*, ed. K. Dark, Woodbridge, 1996, pp. 1-21; Id., “Proto-Industrialization and the Economy of the Roman Empire”, in *L’artisanat romain: Évolutions, continuités and ruptures (Italie and provinces occidentales)*, ed. M. Polfer, Montagnac, 2001, pp. 19-29;

Strobel;²⁹ among expat Greeks, Nicolas Oikonomidès and Angeliki Laiou in Byzantine studies.³⁰ And we could cite many other scholars (of diverse nationalities) who have contributed decisively to undermining primitivist positions through their specialised studies of this or that aspect of the Roman/Byzantine economy.

For historical materialism, this doesn't solve the problem, it defines it. Salvioli is willing to allow that capital existed in various forms in antiquity, but because he sees modern industrial capitalism, the "capitalist mode of production" in Marx's sense, as the only true capitalism, he's not sure how to accommodate those types of capital theoretically. In any case, his book is not a work of theory but a polemic against exaggerated versions of modernism. So Salvioli's work is riddled with an unresolved tension, and the best way around his dilemma is to reframe the question. When Weber asked, "Did a capitalist economy exist in Antiquity?", his response, typically, was convoluted but interesting. On the one hand, inspired by Sombart, he suggested that the concept of capitalist economy (Weber's language!) was best disentangled from the exploitation of free labour as its sole basis (Weber, correctly, put "free" in quotes). This is the passage in which he writes that whole periods of antiquity displayed such a "far-reaching capitalist character" (*ein recht weitgehend "kapitalistisches" Gepräge*). On the other hand, with that preliminary qualification he went on to map out what he called the "classic areas (*Richtungen*) of capital investment in Antiquity", citing sectors like government contracts, mining, and maritime trade. This, broadly, is the perspective that we have described above under Question 2: Does an economy contain elements of capitalism? Signs that we are cer-

A. Wilson, "Large Scale Manufacturing, Standardization and Trade", in *Engineering and Technology in the Classical World*, ed. J.P. Oleson, Oxford, 2008, pp. 393-417.

²⁹ K. Strobel, *Zwischen Primitivismus und Modernismus: Die römische Keramikindustrie: Produktions-, Rechts- und Distributionsstrukturen*, ed. K. Strobel, Mainz, 2000, pp. 1-8.

³⁰ N. Oikonomidès, "Byzantium between East and West (XIII-XV Cent.)", in *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 13, 1988, pp. 319-332, esp. pp. 327-329; A. Laiou, "The Byzantine City: Parasitic or Productive?", in *Economic Thought and Economic Life in Byzantium*, Collected Essays, ed. C. Morrisson, R. Dorin, Aldershot, 2013; A. Laiou, C. Morrisson, *The Byzantine Economy*, Cambridge, 2007, p. 24 ff.

tainly dealing with an economy that contains “elements of capitalism” would be: widespread use of paid labour (which was certainly true of the Roman Mediterranean, but also of the Islamic world and China); the existence of productive sectors where commercial operations were conducted in relatively large units of production (samian pottery or terra sigillata at La Graufesenque in southern France; the “huge factory sites” at which olive oil was processed in North Africa and elsewhere; the volume production of glass in the primary centres that exported large chunks for further processing elsewhere; the bigger “brick factories” that were usually subcontracted to private entrepreneurs called *officinatores*; etc.).

We think this approach helps us to situate the repeated references by scholars to specific groups or classes as “capitalists”. André Aymard asked in a famous paper in *Annales* why Roman capitalists seemed to shun viticulture in Italy at least down to the reign of Nero.³¹ Mazzarino described late Roman landowners as “capitalists”.³² This doesn’t mean that all of them were, but that there were *capitalist elements within the late Roman aristocracy*: those individuals or *domus* that were more deeply involved in speculation (*avara venditio*), the owning and financing of ships, large-scale commercial agriculture, business transactions of various types, and so on. Again, Oikonomidès describes members of the Byzantine aristocracy that engaged in the silk trade on a vertically integrated basis as “capitalists”. They were large-scale silk merchants who had successfully bid for contracts from the state and had to ensure that substantial supplies of raw silk could be secured at low cost for processing in establishments that they didn’t necessarily own. For them, the chief interest lay more in the trade in silk than in its manufacture.³³ In any case, we have said enough to indicate the broad directions along which a new generation of Marxist scholars and historians can pursue some of these questions and reshape the debate around them.

³¹ A. Aymard, “Les capitalistes romains et le viticulture italienne”, p. 263.

³² S. Mazzarino, *Aspetti sociali del quarto secolo. Ricerche di storia romana*, Rome, 1951, p. 63.

³³ N. Oikonomidès, *Social and Economic Life in Byzantium*, Collected Essays, ed. E. Zachariadou, Aldershot, 2004.