

See also
review
A-116

THE JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC HISTORY

Published for
THE ECONOMIC HISTORY ASSOCIATION

VOL. XXII

MARCH 1962

No. 1

SCHMOOKLER	<i>Economic Sources of Inventive Activity</i>	1
WILLIAMSON	<i>The Long Swing: Comparisons and Interactions Between British and American Balance of Payments, 1820-1913.</i>	21
MILLER	<i>Components of Labor Force Growth . .</i>	47
LAMBI	<i>The Protectionist Interests of the German Iron and Steel Industry, 1873-1879</i>	59
	<i>Review Article</i>	
FISHLOW	<i>Trends in the American Economy in the Nineteenth Century</i>	71

Reviews of Books

are listed on the inside front and back covers

Books Received



PUBLISHED BY THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
OF NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

voting a separate chapter to each company founded by Langrand results in some repetition and at the same time obscures the interrelations of the various promotions. Moreover, the author's excessive concern with the promotions leads to a neglect of the normal, routine administration of the companies and to superficial generalizations concerning their economic significance. Jacquemyns, although exaggerating at times the importance of his subject, retains throughout an admirably objective attitude toward the merits and defects in Langrand's character. Finally, I am tempted to characterize as a malallocation the effort and resources expended on a relatively minor figure (in addition to its length and detail, the volume is lavishly produced, with many illustrations and portraits); but, in view of the scarcity of detailed, objective treatments of nineteenth-century businessmen and their methods, one must admit that this is a welcome addition to the literature and harbinger of the more interesting and important volumes to follow.

RONDO E. CAMERON, *University of Wisconsin*

Foreign Trade in the Old Babylonian Period as Revealed by Texts from Southern Mesopotamia. By W. F. Leemans. (Studia et Documenta ad Iura Orientis Antiqui Pertinentia, Vol. VI.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960. Pp. vii, 196.

How deserved is Babylonia's reputation as a lively center of trade in the ancient world? The economic historian curious to check finds in English few specialist interpretations, or even source materials in translation. The present book redresses this situation. The period dealt with is ca. 2000-1600 (more summarily, by way of introduction, from ca. 2400 B.C.). Documents, not artifacts, are the sources utilized, although archaeological evidence is adduced in the few cases where it is available and relevant. The general conclusions are clearly stated, particularly in Chapter five. One of the more interesting is that the most distant regions with which these cities, south of Baghdad, are known to have had commercial contacts in this period are within the limits of the Mesopotamian plains (except Bahrein), within what was clearly a cultural unit and, briefly under Hammurabi, even a political unit. "Long-distance trade" might have been a better designation than foreign trade. But by ca. 2400 B.C. boats from Meluhha (here plausibly placed in western India) tied up at Akkad. So more distant direct trading existed earlier! The number of documents alluding to foreign trade is surprisingly small—Leemans gives fifty-five from about seventy-five hundred published texts. Were contracts drawn up in foreign trade only when credit was given (Leemans)? Their contents are disappointing: "the evidence extant does not permit us to form a clear-cut idea of Old Babylonian foreign trade" (p. 132). The quantities of goods referred to are surprisingly small; the individual trading expedition was evidently a modest affair. Goods imported and exported are usefully listed in Chapter five—but was silver *sui generis*? The title of an earlier study by Leemans, *The Old Babylonian Merchant* (Vol. III in the same series), would lead one to expect that the person of the *tamkârum*—the subject of the earlier study—would have loomed large in a study of foreign trade. In fact, not once is this term here found applied to the persons involved in such trade. Well does the preface note:

"Less is known about the activity of the *tamkārūm* than is generally supposed." As a book which will upset many a long-cherished notion as to what we may affirm about long-distance trade from the heart of Babylonia, it deserves a wide circle of readers. R. F. G. S.

W. F. Leemans' book on Babylonian foreign trade incidentally throws a new light on the role of markets and prices in trade. Touching on the difficulties of translation, he says in footnote one on page 1: "For example, if the word 'market' is used, we must realize that there is no evidence that a market in our sense of the word was held in the ancient cities of southern Mesopotamia or that there was a 'market square.' There is not even a word for it, in fact (cf. K. Polanyi and A. L. Oppenheim in Chapters II and III of *Trade and Market in the Early Empires*, 1957)." This latter remarkable statement has, to our knowledge, been here made for the first time by an Assyriologist. The author was conscious of the import of these facts for the economic historian of antiquity; several years ago he guarded against the inference that serious doubt about the presence of a word for market in the Akkadian language be taken in any way to indicate that no market-type institutions were in evidence. He was skeptical of any non-marketing approach to forms of trade in Mesopotamia, such as underlay Chapter II on "Marketless Trading in Hammurabi's Time" in *Trade and Market in the Early Empires* (cf. W. F. Leemans in *Jaarbericht* No. 15, 1957-1958, *Ét. Orient. Lux.*, p. 203 ff.). He expressed the belief that the place corresponding to our traditional markets was the so-called *kārūm*. This is a common Akkadian designation for a quay on the riverbank known as the landing-site of boats and ships, and on which much business was transacted in this country of waterways. The *kārūm*, then, he asserted, "functioned as market together with all its appurtenances" (*ibid.*). This conjecture still stands in need of proof. Much would, for instance, depend on the evidence of the nature of the business transacted in the *kar*, that is, on the whole organization of trade. Unless that business comprised the retailing of the necessities of life, such as food; unless gain in trade—provided there was such—can be demonstrated to have derived from some kind of "price function" obtaining there, it might be very doubtful, whether the *kārūm* should be regarded as the missing market. Leo Oppenheim, in Chapter III of *Trade and Market*, "A Bird's-eye View of Mesopotamian Economic History" tends to link the absence of a marketplace in the cities to the presence of a "special extramural district called the port (translated *kar* by Oppenheim) for intercity economic relations. Here enters the third and most decisive factor . . . This factor clearly represents a redistributive system of varied complexity and magnitude." The reference is, of course, to the sanctuary or palace. Under these circumstances he regards as imperative "the necessity of a re-evaluation and re-examination of the entire evidence bearing on matters economic in Mesopotamia" (p. 29). Leemans himself notes that at Uruk, for instance, government trade and private commercial activities were "intermingled in a way which is almost incomprehensible to people of the western world" (*ibid.*). Important new subjects of controversy may be here coming into view. K. P.

KARL POLANYI, *Columbia University*
R. F. G. SWEET, *University of Toronto*

Leemans's

Foreign Trade in the Old Babylonian Period as revealed by Texts from Southern Mesopotamia. By W.F. Leemans. (Studia et Documenta ad Iura Orientis Antiqui Pertinentia, vol. VI) Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1960. Pp. VII, 196.

How deserved is Babylonia's reputation as a lively center of trade in the ancient world? The economic historian curious to check its desert finds in English few specialist interpretations, or even source materials in translation. The present book redresses this situation. The period dealt with is ca. 2000-1600 (more summarily, by way of introduction, from ca. 2400 B.C.). Documents, not artifacts, are the sources utilized, although archaeological evidence is adduced in the few cases where it is available and relevant. The general conclusions are clearly stated, particularly in Chapter 5. One of the more interesting is that the most distant regions with which these cities, south of Baghdad, are known to have had commercial contacts in this period are within the limits of the Mesopotamian plains (except Bahrein), within what was clearly a cultural unit and, briefly under Hammurabi, even a political unit. "Long-distance trade" might have been a better designation than foreign trade. But already ca. 2400 B.C. boats from Meluhha (here plausibly placed in western India) tied up at Akkad. So more distant direct trading existed earlier! The number of documents alluding to foreign trade is surprisingly small -- Leemans gives 55 from about 7500 published texts. Were contracts drawn up in foreign trade only when credit was given (Leemans)? Their contents are disappointing: "the evidence extant does not permit us to form a clear-cut idea of Old Babylonian foreign ~~handmade~~ trade" (p. 132). The quantities of goods referred to are surprisingly small; the individual trading expedition was evidently a modest affair. Goods imported and exported

are usefully listed in Chapter 5 -- but was silver sui generis? The title of an earlier study by Leemans, The Old Babylonian merchant (vol. III in the same series), would lead one to expect that the person of the tankārum - the subject of the earlier study - would have loomed large in a study of foreign trade. In fact, not once is this term here found applied to the persons involved in such trade. Well does the Preface note: "Less is known about the activity of the tankārum than is generally supposed." As a book which will upset many a long cherished notion as to what we may affirm about long distance trade from the heart of Babylonia, it deserves a wide circle of readers. - R.F.G.S.

*

W.F. Leemans' book on Babylonian foreign trade incidentally throws a new light on the role of markets and prices in trade. Touching on the difficulties of translation, he says in footnote 1 on page 1: "For example, if the word 'market' is used, we must realize that there is no evidence that a market in our sense of the word^R was held in the ancient cities of southern Mesopotamia or that there was a 'market square'. There is not even a word for it, in fact (cf. K. Polanyi and A.L. Oppenheim in chapters II and III of Trade and Market in the Early Empires, 1957)." This latter remarkable statement has, to our knowledge, been here made for the first time by an Assyriologist. The author was conscious of the import of these facts for the economic historian of antiquity; several years ago he guarded against the inference that serious doubt about the presence of a word for market in the Akkadian language be taken in any way to indicate that no market-type institutions

were in evidence. He was sceptical of any non-marketing approach to forms of trade in Mesopotamia, such as underlay Chapter II on "Marketless trading in Hammurabi's time" in Trade and Market in the Early Empires (cf. W.F. Leemans in Jaarbericht No. 15, 1957-8, Ex Oriente Lux, p. 203ff). He expressed the belief that the place corresponding to our traditional markets was the so-called kārum. This is a common Akkadian designation for a quay on the riverbank known as the landing-site of boats and ships, and on which much business was transacted in this country of waterways. The kārum, then, he asserted, "functioned as market together with all its appurtenances" (ibid.). This conjecture still stands in need of proof. Much would, for instance, depend on the evidence of the nature of the business transacted in the kar, i.e., on the whole organization of trade. Unless that business comprised the retailing of the necessaries of life, such as food; unless gain in trade - provided there was such - can be demonstrated to have derived from some kind of "price function" obtaining there, it might be very doubtful, whether the kārum should be regarded as the missing market. Leo Oppenheim, in Chapter III of T. & M., "A bird's-eye view of Mesopotamian economic history" tends to link the absence of a market-place in the cities to the presence of a "special extramural district called the port (translated kar by A.L.O.) for intercity economic relations. Here enters the third and most decisive factor ... This factor clearly represents a redistributive system of varied complexity and magnitude." The reference is, of course, to the sanctuary or palace. Under these circumstances he regards as imperative "the necessity of a re-evaluation and re-examination of the entire evidence bearing on matters economic

in Mesopotamia" (p. 29). Leemans himself notes that, for instance, a Ur government trade and private commercial activities were "intermingled in a way which is almost incomprehensible to people of the western world" (ibid). Important new subjects of controversy may be here coming into view. - K.P.

Karl Polanyi (Columbia University) and
R.F.G. Sweet (University of Toronto)

omitted copy

W. F. Leemans' book contains a significant remark on some semantic difficulties encountered. He says (p. 1, footnote 1):

For example, if the word 'market' is used, one must realize that there is no evidence that a market in our sense of the word was held in the ancient cities of southern Mesopotamia or that there was a 'market square'. There is not even a word for it, in fact.

100 }
100 }
100 } 500
100 } 33
100 } 533

(cf. K. Polanyi and A.L. Oppenheim in chapters II and III of Trade and Market in the Early Empires, 1957).⁴ The author is ^{obviously} justly fully conscious of the import of such a statement for the economic historian of antiquity, since no exchange economy has been ever conceived of in the absence of markets of some shape or other. ~~But~~ ^{for} the author

320
213

expressly rejects the inference that the absence of a word for a market in the Akkadian language should be taken ^{in any way to indicate} to imply that no ^{institutions} markets were in evidence; according to Leemans the ~~well known~~ ^{known} Akkadian term ~~designating~~ ^{for} KARUM (designating a quay on the river bank) known

as the landing place of boats and ships, and on which ~~undoubtedly~~ ^{in this country of waterways, the karum then} much business was transacted, "functioned as market, together with all its appurtenances." ("Jaarbericht" Nr. 15 (1957-58), Ex Oriente Lux, p. 203) ~~the karum, then,~~ ^{locus of the} should be regarded as the ^{known} Babylonian

~~"institution of market and market trade, together with~~ the formation of market prices" (ibid.) On the face of it, this conjecture may seem at first plausible. However, it stands in need of proof. Much would, for instance, depend on the evidence of the nature of the business transacted ^{that is, on the organization of trade.} in the kar. ^{Besides} Unless ~~it~~ ^{it} comprised

the daily necessities of life, such as food; ^{sufficiently} unless the kar's place was topographically ^{stable}, in contrast to that of the landing-sites on the Mesopotamian rivers which were themselves notorious for shifting their location, ^{in trade} unless gain ^{was} provided there was such

that business comprised the relaying of
ad next page by

they did shift - but not so frequently as to affect an economic institution, surely? Once the river had shifted to a new bed, it might well keep it for a century or more - even many centuries. Major shifts probably came at times when the irrigation and flood control systems had been allowed to silt up at periods of

PTO

"The same watercourses persisted for more than three millennia with little change, even through periods of abandonment..." p.1754.

weak central authority.

"In all essentials the same network of watercourses was in use throughout this long time span" (ca. 4000 - 500 BC) — Jacobsen & Adams, "Salt & Silt in Ancient Mesopotamian Agriculture," *Science* vol. 128, no. 3334 (Nov. 21, 1958) p. 1254. They speak of "periodically shifting side branches" — but the main settlements were on the major watercourses. The fluctuating pattern of occupation "proceeded from sociopolitical, rather than natural, causes."

can be demonstrated to have derived from some kind of price formation
obtaining there. It might be very doubtful, whether the kārum should
* be regarded as the missing market. ^{P like} Leo Oppenheim tends to link
"the absence of market places" (p. 31) to the presence of the re-
distributive system and even to that of the kar, as included in his
(p. 31) intercity
"special extra-mural district" ^{for international} / economic relations.
Under ^{the} such circumstances he regards ^{as imperative} "the necessity of a re-evaluation
and re-examination of the entire evidence, bearing on matters econo-
mic" ^{in Mesopotamia} ~~as imperative~~ (p. 29). ~~Leemans himself, in his "Jaarbericht"~~
~~pointed out that according to the Egyptian market~~
~~were not known (though, ...)~~
~~Leemans adds~~ ^{it is a} An important subject of controversy may be
here coming into view.

Karl Polanyi (Columbia University) and R.F.G. Sweet
(Univ. of Toronto.)

6 in his Chapter III of Trade and Markets, "A bird's-eye view of Mesopotamian
economic history,"

Babylonia commonly enjoys a vague reputation for having been a lively centre of trade and traffic in the ancient world. But how deserved is the reputation? An economic historian curious to verify its justice soon finds himself frustrated by a dearth, particularly in English, of either interpretations, or even source materials in translation, which he might expect Assyriologists to have made available.

W. F. Leemans deserves praise for having provided both source materials and interpretation relating to the subject delimited in his title in a book which will be of value to both general economic historian and Assyriologist. ^{the present work ~~concerns~~ ^{addresses} this situation.}

The period principally dealt with is ca. 2000-1600 B.C. But materials relating to foreign trade even before this period are discussed, albeit in more summary fashion, and the book therefore provides a history of Mesopotamian foreign trade ~~from approximately to the middle of the second millennium B.C.~~ ^{from ca. 2500 B.C.}

The method is, ^{primarily} philological, not archaeological; documents, not artifacts, are the sources utilized, although archaeological evidence is adduced in the few cases where it is available and relevant (the Old Babylonian period, however, is none too well known archaeologically and even what might appear at first glance to be archaeological evidence of striking relevance can, as Leemans points out, be inconclusive (pp. 138f.)).

Although this strict (and thoroughly commendable) philological approach means that much in the book will be of direct interest only to the Assyriologist, ^{however, it should not be allowed to deter the general economic historian, who will find the general conclusions clearly stated, particularly in chapter 5.}

The sites from which the majority of the texts treated come are all in the south, below modern Baghdad, (texts from ~~Kanesh, near modern Kayseri in Turkey, relating to trade with ancient Assur, on the Tigris in the latitude of modern Kirkuk, and others from Mari, on the middle Euphrates just west of the Iraqi border, figure largely among texts from the north introduced for comparative or historical purposes.~~) One of the more interesting general conclusions to emerge ~~from this study~~ is that the most distant regions with which these southern cities are known to have had commercial contacts in the Old Babylonian period are all within the limits of the Mesopotamian plains (except Tilmun, ~~most probably to be identified with modern Bahrain in the Persian Gulf~~) and are all within the Akkadian-speaking area (except presumably Tilmun and perhaps Susa). Although this area was ~~divided up in the period in question into competing city-states,~~ ^{with what} it was nevertheless clearly a cultural unit and, ^{for a brief period at least} was, indeed, even a political unit for at least a brief period under Hammurabi. The trade attested by these documents was therefore not so exotic as the book's title might at

63
62
38
46

209

The

69
43
74
41
122
82
78

507
209

716

719

first suggest; "long-distance trade" might have been a better designation. More ambitious trading ventures, distance-wise, are known from an earlier period, however. Already around 2400 B.C. boats from Meluhha (plausibly placed by Leemans in western India, and so an outpost of the Indus valley civilization) tied up at the quay of Akkad. In other words, the most distant direct trading came first!

The number of documents alluding to foreign trade are far fewer than Babylonia's reputation as a trading centre would lead one to expect. Leemans, employing rather liberal criteria as to what establishes such an allusion (e.g., mention of the payment of tithe by a Tilmunite), has collected 55 Old Babylonian documents as evidence. How meagre a catch this is becomes apparent when one remembers that they have been culled from about 7,500 published texts! It leads Leemans to suggest that contracts were drawn up in foreign trade only when credit was given.

Even these 55 documents are disappointing in what they yield; "the evidence extant does not permit us to form a clear-cut idea of Old Babylonian foreign trade" (p. 132). (Although many kinds of goods were imported into Babylonia from distant regions (as absolutely necessitated by natural conditions), it is surprisingly to find that the quantities referred to in these texts are quite small.) Even if we wish to believe--largely by faith--that the volume of trade was large in the aggregate, we cannot, on the showing of this book, believe that the quantity of goods handled by the individual trading expedition was large.

The goods shown to have been imported and exported are usefully listed in chapter 5. But was it necessary to treat silver differently from other commodities? Admittedly, it was used as the regular yardstick of value and it could be used--but was not invariably--as a means of payment. But do these uses render it sui generis as an article of trade?

The title of an earlier study by Leemans, The Old Babylonian Merchant (vol. III in the same series as the book reviewed) would lead one to expect that the person of the tamk̄arum--the subject of the earlier study--would have loomed large in a study of foreign trade. In fact, not once is this term found applied to the persons involved in such trade. Leemans does not consider the fact too significant. A wiser judgment, ~~while it seems to be~~ ^{surely seems to be} his remark in the preface that "less is known about the activity of the tamk̄arum than is generally supposed".

As a book which will upset many a long cherished notion as to what we really know about long distance trade from the heart of Babylonia, this is a book deserving of a wide circle of readers. ~~Are~~ May others besides specialist Assyriologists be among those readers!

~~should be taken in any way to suggest that~~
~~that the market is evidence for~~
~~of the least the least~~ "price formation"
and its function in trade ~~is~~
raise problems of a searching kind
characteristic for the economic historian
concerning the organization of Trade.

II ~~is~~ ^{is} sharply sceptical of any non-
marketing approach to ~~the~~ forms of
trade in Babylonia, such as underlay
the ^{of Trade and Markets} ~~the~~ "Marketers trading in Hammur-
rabi's Time." Instead ~~of the~~ ^{he} ~~affirms~~ ^{believes}

^{actually} that these are ^{staying} ~~the~~ ^{retained} ~~the~~ ⁱⁿ ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~place~~ ^{of} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~rest of~~ ^{the} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~world~~ ^{has} ~~were~~ ^{been} ~~have~~ ^{found}
in the so-called Karnun. This is a
common Akkadian term for designating
a quay on the riverbank ---

~~At the least questions~~

^(in the ancient Near East)
which implies that trade did not
necessarily depend upon markets ~~it~~ (ibid)
(Jaarsveld)

"However strong indications that the
Karnun functioned as market
together with all its appurtenances."

Dr Sweet is was ^{as} member of the ~~the~~
Interdisciplinary Project at Columbia
University which was responsible for the
~~editing~~ of "Trade and Markets in the
Early Empires," 1957. He submitted
a ~~#~~ Ph.D. thesis on 'Monies and
Money Uses ~~and~~ in the Old Babylonia
period ~~1957~~ 1958 which was ~~not~~
eventually sponsored by Prof H.
Oppenheimer of the Oriental Institute,
Chicago, Info. Jacobsen.