

nine

24 FEBRUARY 1971

The institution of money. Money or different kinds of money? ~
The three functions of Greek currency: metathesis of power, simu-
lacrum, social regulation. ~ Money as establishment of diakaion
kai alēthēs.*

1—THE INSTITUTION OF MONEY

In Hesiod we saw the vague search for a measure: a measure the sense and function of which are still hardly specified since it is a matter of the measure of time, of the calendar of agricultural rituals, of the quantitative and qualitative appraisal of products, and, furthermore, of determining not only the when and the how much, but also the “neither too much nor too little.”¹ Measure as calculation and measure as norm.

Now these measures are established in the seventh and sixth centuries, in the epoch of tyranny; and often by the tyrants themselves.

Herodotus (VI, 127) recounts that Pheidon, tyrant of Argos, invented a system of measurement for the Peloponnesians.² In any case, it was under his reign that Aegina was joined to Argos and Aeginetan money appeared.³

Cypselus introduced the use of money at Corinth;⁴ and it was at this time that the Euboea drachma was defined (65 grains of silver).

* Manuscript lecture title.

This major activity of measurement is least unknown with regard to Solon:

- redefinition of individual properties;
- assessment of the incomes of each;
- allocation of a part of political power to each in proportion to their wealth;
- circulation of monetary standard.⁵

Tyrant or legislator,⁶ the person holding power is the city quantity surveyor: the measurer of lands, things, wealth, rights, powers, and men.⁷

Let us just recall, at the same time or very shortly after:

- the work of town planning accomplished (or projected) by Hippodamus of Miletus⁸ and the introduction of the grid plan;
- the work of cartography undertaken at this time (and the map of the world constructed by Anaximander);⁹
- Pythagorean research on geometrical and musical proportions.¹⁰

We should not forget that before being inscribed in Western consciousness as the principle of quantification, harmony, and classical non-excess, Greek measurement was an immense social and polymorphous practice of assessment, quantification, establishing equivalences, and the search for appropriate proportions and distributions.¹¹

We can see how introducing measure is linked to a whole problem of peasant indebtedness, the transfer of agricultural properties, the settlement of debts, equivalence between foodstuff or manufactured objects, urbanization, and the establishment of a State form.

The institution of money appears at the heart of this practice of measurement.

A—Interpretations

The traditional interpretation attributes the birth of the use of money to the development of a market economy:

- groups of peasants established around the Mediterranean gradually took off from the subsistence economy;

—the appearance and growth of terrestrial and especially maritime commerce (with what this entails in the way of distances, delays, and the unforeseen) made the use of a recognized monetary standard necessary: a metal fragment weighed and authenticated by a stamp—private to start with and then State controlled.

Commercial, international, market origin of money. Mercantilist interpretation of money restricting it from the start to functions of representation and exposing it to that “fetishism” which consists in taking the sign for the thing itself, through a sort of primary and radical philosophical error.¹²

In fact, this interpretation may account for some early uses of money, in Lydia or Phoenicia.¹³ But money was not adopted and used in Greece on the basis of this model. This is indicated by certain facts:

a—If we see money institutionalized in most of the big trading cities, some cities, where trade was not non-existent, did not adopt it; and it seems that for a long time many important transactions between individuals took place in the form of barter.

b—On the other hand, the first assessments of equivalence that we see in Homer are not made so much in terms of objects of exchange, but of sacrificial objects. They are tripods, oxen.¹⁴

More precisely, these objects do not appear in any number whatever (as would be the case if their function was simply calculation); they figure in quantities (9, 12, 100) which are ritual numbers brought into play in sacrifices.

So we may suspect that the calculations of equivalence, even when their purpose is a market type of exchange, no longer took as their model and foundation the assessment of an identical value, but the recognition of religious substitutability. The form of money does not emerge in the abstract sky of the commodity and its representation, but in the game of the sacrifice and its simulacra.

c—To this should be added that the first major uses of money appear to be internal to the city: taxation no doubt, the distribution of money by tyrants, the assessment of wealth, the classification of citizens and the hierarchy of their political rights according to their wealth.

It seems therefore that the use of money was, in an essential respect, other than commercial. But what then is this monetary practice, some dimensions of which refer to religious rituals and others to social regulations?

B—An example

The institution of money is better known at Corinth than elsewhere.¹⁵ A legend recounts that Cypselus, the son of an artisan and of a descendant of the Bacchiadae, made the following vow to Zeus: If I take power in Corinth, I will give you its territory. Once in power, he taxed the landowners at the rate of a tenth of their wealth, and at the end of ten years the equivalent of the whole Corinthian wealth would have been accumulated in the temple of Zeus.

In fact, it seems that the schema was more or less the following: Cypselus, having been polemarch and having carried off victories thanks to the hoplite army of peasants, drove out the old aristocracy of the Bacchiadae. And he proceeded to redistribute, not all the land, by any means, but some of it. (No text says so exactly, but Solon, a bit later than Cypselus, alludes to a demagogic tyrant who shared out the soil.)

Now this partial redistribution of land did not resolve the problem of existing debts, and especially of those which were going to arise anew. Hence the levy of ten percent, not on properties, but on the highest incomes, a levy which then makes possible direct distributions to the poor, the financing of major works, advances to artisans—and thus the settlement of debts to the rich.

But this complex system (redistribution of the land, taxation of incomes, distribution to the poor, repayment of creditors) would not have been possible in kind. What was needed was the circulation of a constant substitute in the distributions and returns. And it is very likely that Lydian (and Argive, or rather Aeginetan) money served as a model at this time.

But the important thing is that if the material and form of this substitute do have this oriental origin, the system's general arrangement has a religious origin. In fact the system of collective contribution, levy of a tenth, and redistribution to the participants, is the schema of the sacrificial rite (one provides the victim; the god, the temple, the priests levy a tenth, then redistribution takes place: redistribution that imparts

a new strength and power to those who benefit from it, deriving from the sacrifice itself).

The game—sacrifice, division, levy, redistribution—is a religious form of individual and group invigoration which has been transposed into a social practice involving the resolution of a class conflict.

We should still add this: Corinth had no silver mines. Will supposes¹⁶ that the first injection of metal into this system was made by the melting down of precious objects belonging to dispossessed rich families; objects which were both taxed wealth and liturgical objects. The transfer of these objects to the community could only take place with the support and intervention of an external religious authority more powerful than family religious practice. This explains the intervention of Zeus demanding possession of Corinthian wealth in his own name. Sacrifice of liturgical objects to the State worship of Zeus. And it is afterwards that this use of metal is linked up with the quest for mining resources: colonization of the Adriatic coast and Southern Italy where silver ore was found. And, by using this currency, commercial development coinciding with the reign of the descendants of Cypselus and above all of Periander.

The policy of Cypselus can therefore be read as a system with several levels:

—Economic reading: the at least partial redistribution of land, the maintenance of debts, the introduction of a monetary circulation strictly controlled by a heavy taxation, the shift of the main economic activity from agriculture to commerce and from the land to the sea, the development of colonization in the search for metallic raw materials.

—Religious reading: a ritual sacrifice in which the participants give up to the god the share that falls to him; the invigoration of the social body through the redistribution of the wealth sacrificed and sacralized in this way; the reduplication and displacement which supplies and sacrifices to the city's god, Zeus, the objects already supplied and sacrificed to the divinities of the *genos* and already made sacred by them.

As we can see: the conjunction, intertwining, and superimposition of the two operations form a single grid. And that is where money starts to

exist, to circulate, to function in a common space of interplay defined by these two transformations. There is money when the same object is both sacrifice and tax, income of the poorest and ritual redistribution, the temple's or fire's share and constraint or plunder by power, magical invigoration of the social body and daily activity of potters at their wheel.

I am aware in choosing this example that it is an example.

Maybe there was not a single birth of money in general. Maybe what appeared on the edges of the Mediterranean from the eighth to the sixth century were different kinds of money:

- a Lydian money linked to the State apparatus;
- a Phoenician money linked to commercial practices;
- a Greek money linked to class conflict and class alliances characterized by peasant debt, the appearance of craft industry, the formation of a semi-popular army, a split in the interests in the wealthy class (agricultural commerce *versus* craft commerce).

So maybe it is not money, in its abstract generality, which marks its appearance at Corinth in the reforms of the tyrant Cypselus. Monetary generality is no doubt only the result of a later homogenization, linked to a new historical process (the development of a large scale market economy).

In any case, this historical analysis shows us that the mercantile essence of money is by no means its historical root. The beginning of money is not a solemn origin already inscribed in market and meta-physical nature.

Money was not instituted "in the exchange of products," the most we can say is that it "developed" in it (Marx, *Capital*, [I, 2, iv]).¹⁷

C—Three functions of Greek money¹⁸

Power preserved and displaced: the *metathesis of power*.

a—Money is linked to the exercise of power, but not in a simple way ([it is not] because one possesses money that one acquires and exercises power). Rather, it is because some took power that money was institutionalized.¹⁹

b—But it is not a matter of the wealthy property owners seizing power (they already have it) or new property owners, but rather of the

seizure of power by an alliance between a certain type of property owner and the majority of poor peasants and artisans.

The appearance of money is linked to the constitution of a new type of power whose *raison d'être* is to intervene in the regime of property, in the interplay of debts and settlements. Hence the fact that it always appears at the same time as an "extraordinary" form of political power: tyrant, legislator.

c—What function does money have in this seizure or redistribution of power?

If the tyrant Cypselus introduces the monetary institution, this is because:

- he refused to practice the systematic and entire division of land;
- he did not cancel debts but maintained the interplay of debts and cycles of indebtedness;
- he attracted impoverished peasants to craft industry or wage labor.

Money will have a somewhat analogous role later when Solon undertakes his great reform at Athens. Despite the different particulars: Solon cancels debts, but preserves property. To reduce tensions he develops craft industry (calling on foreign manpower) and exports (banning the uprooting of olive trees).

In both cases, money has a well-defined political role:

- to limit social demands, which have grown continually since Hesiod and which the formation of hoplite armies make more dangerous;
- to preserve, thereby, both the property regime and possession of power by the wealthy property owning class;
- to shift [possession of power*] from an agricultural aristocracy to a more commercial and manufacturing aristocracy;
- to strengthen it, finally, by putting in the governors' hands the double instrument of taxation and wage-earners, accompanied by the power to strike coins.

* Manuscript: to shift it.

What is inscribed in the monetary stamp—in those figures of the horse at Corinth, the tortoise at Aegina, and soon the owl at Athens—is not, in its general semiological nature, the sign; it is a struggle for and around political power; it is a shift, preservation, and reinforcement of power.

Certainly, we should not neglect the appearance of this stamp, in its function, but rather than compare the monetary stamp to the linguistic sign, as has been done traditionally since Turgot,²⁰ it would be better to compare it with the symbols and rites of power.

2—MONEY-SIMULACRUM

Let's say, very schematically:

a—The symbol of power in archaic Greece was the scepter, the staff of command,²¹ which circulated in the Assembly when anyone had to speak, put forward his views, take part in a decision, or swear an oath and expose himself to the risk of punishment as a perjurer.

Now this power, manifested in this way (power both divided up and circulating between group chiefs), was the power conferred on them by their lands, their goods, the extent of their crops, the size of their household, and the accumulation of tripods and rich fabrics at the heart of their home. The scepter demonstrated power symbolically in a society in which politics and economics were interdependent.

b—In a market society like that studied by the classical economists, money is the sign for an absent commodity; and the visible circulation of money, while showing commercial circuits and market equivalences, hides the true political relations. Through the monetary sign, wealth looks like it circulates, is distributed, and shared according to both nature and skill, necessity and chance; but in fact power is held on to.

The economic and the political are linked, but out of synch with each other; their dependence is hidden and the monetary sign is the instrument of, at the same time, their dependence, their dislocation, and the occultation of this dislocated dependence.

In seventh and sixth century Greek society money is no longer entirely a magical-political symbol like the scepter, but it is far from being already the occulting representation of classical economics. It is the instrument of a power which is being shifted (while preserving itself),

and which, through an interplay of new regulations, ensures the preservation of class domination.

At this point, money is no longer a symbol which effectuates and is not yet a representative sign. It should be understood as a fixed series of superimposed substitutions [...*]:

- it effectuates a religious substitution: it makes possible a levy and a redistribution;
- it effectuates an economic substitution: fortune, investment;
- it effectuates a political substitution: from one social group to another;
- it effectuates another substitution: it substitutes a slight shift of power for the social upheaval sought after.

From the myth recounted to the political operation, there is a whole series of substitutions. These substitutions are superimposed on and replace each other. This is the simulacrum: real operations, indefinite series—creating fixation (not representation).

Whereas the sign “represents,” the simulacrum replaces one substitution for another. It is its reality as simulacrum that has enabled money to remain for a long time not only an economic instrument but a thing issuing from and returning to power, by a sort of inner intensity or force: a religiously protected object it would be impious, sacrilegious to adulterate.

It has been possible to pick out a number of pieces of evidence for this surcharged character of the monetary object:²²

- counterfeiting money treated as sacrilege in Greece; major religious centers [functioned] as banks for deposits and loans;
- sharing out revenue from the Laurion mines between citizens at Athens (Themistocles was opposed to it);
- redistribution to the *dēmos* of the tributes paid by the allies of Athens in recognition of its sovereignty, a redistribution which took place by means of indemnities paid to citizens when they exercised their political or judicial functions;

* The manuscript adds: which replace each other.

- or distribution of money by Roman emperors to demonstrate and maintain their sovereignty;
- or, in the Christian epoch, gifts of money to sovereigns and redistributions of money;
- the interplay of income and charity in Christian ethics.

The functioning of money is not accounted for by a theory of the signifier, but rather by analysis of the simulacrum. Money was simulacrum before becoming sign.

And maybe we can go further. It is as simulacrum that it is sign: getting it to function as sign in a market economy is an avatar of its real history as simulacrum. Simulacrum of a nature of things, of a value exclusive to it, of a real equivalence. What Marx called “fetishism.” To summarize all this, let’s say that money is linked to power as simulacrum.²³

3—MONEY-MEASURE

Money appears therefore in a figure whose [outline (*dessin*)*] has the form of the religious ritual and whose essential points are:

- the gift and the gathering,
- sacrifice and dividing up,
- redistribution,
- strength restored to the participants.

In its Greek origin, money is closer to ritual and restorative consumption than to the exchange of two commodities.

a—Money is therefore above all an instrument of regulation between the different elements making up the city:²⁴ through the distribution of money [in the] form of presents or gifts, one avoids the poor becoming too poor; through the tax levied on the rich, one avoids them being too rich.

Money is indeed *metron*—an instrument of measure—but in the sense that it prevents excess, *pleonexia*, having too much.

But it also prevents excessive poverty, unlimited indebtedness; it enables the poorest to redeem their debts and escape the slavery threatening them. If it is *metron*, it is not because it proposes a yardstick for measuring

* Manuscript: *dessin* (intention, purpose, plan....)

the respective value of different things; it is because it lays down a limit to wealth and poverty. It is not measure as definition of a common quantity, but as exclusion of opposed excesses (wealth/poverty).

The formula “not too much or too little”²⁵ is absolutely in line with the monetary institution.

b—It is *metron* also in the sense that it enables the double political violence accompanying excessive wealth and excessive poverty to be avoided. The institution of money enables the poor to pay their debts; it enables them to be offered work by giving them a wage (or to buy provisions distributed to them).

But by the same token, it enables the rich to avoid major political and social upheavals: at the end of the day, and thanks to the sacrifice demanded, it guarantees that they will keep the greater part of their lands and wealth.

The person who institutes money is he who regulates social conflicts; someone like Solon,²⁶ who stands like a barrier between the parties, and does not give way to either of them; who holds the shield between them which prevents them fighting.

*c—Thus money

—maintains order, justice;

—allows one to establish the truth of what one owes, of what it is worth. It institutes *dikaion kai alethes*. But at the same time it plays a fundamental role in the game of power;

—it involves the State institution: tax, levy, accumulation, fixing value, distribution;

—it made possible the preservation of class power.

It leaves to each the possibility of assessing truthfully, of measuring; it makes justice possible (measure[†] as non excess).

Non-excess and the truth: profound Greek affiliation. The relation of money to the truth is therefore:

—by avoiding excess,

—by establishing the equilibrium (and non-violence),²⁷

* Synthesis on unnumbered page, which, judging by the paper used, was drafted in Montreal at the time of a presentation at McGill University.

[†] [*la mesure*, which can mean moderation, limit; G.B.]

—by making the order of the city work,
it allows things to be revealed in their truth.

So it is not because it measures things quantitatively that it states a truth, it is because it excludes excess that it allows them their value and to display themselves in their truth. Money measurement: things are true in the element of the measure (*la mesure*) (of the non excess). Practicing measure (*la mesure*) (that is to say, making use of quantifiable signs) will be to avoid excess, to establish the equilibrium.

[We may note that even later in Greek thought, the State will be thought to be composed of rich and poor:²⁸

Republic, IV, 422e: Every city contains at least two cities, each the enemy of the other, that of the poor and that of the rich:²⁹

Aristotle, *Politics*, IV, 1291b: In the city the two most distinct classes are the rich and the poor.³⁰

For a long time, excess wealth and poverty will be seen as one of the sources of the city's destruction:

Republic, VIII, 550e: Wealth excludes virtue.³¹

Republic, IV, 421d: When the craftsman is too poor, he can no longer even work because he no longer has any tools.³²]

d—Finally, as we see, the monetary institution is not linked to the value of things in their truth, but to *dikaion*, to the justice that must reign in the city and prevent it from perishing.

Or rather, if money is related to truth it is because it is an instrument of social regulation, correction, and rectification. It is what enabled both tyrants like Cypselus and legislators like Solon to make the city live in accordance with an order which is specific to it. Money is the harmony and real strength of the city. For a long time the Athenian tetradrachma,³³ bearing the owl, will be the visible strength of the city circulating throughout the Ionian world.

The truth of money is inseparable from the order and vigor of the State; it is like the other face of the *dikē* reigning within it.

Before we can ask different questions about money (no longer about what it can do in the city, but about what it represents in the exchange of commodities), before it can appear as (natural or conventional) sign, before we can ask whether it truly or deceptively represents the value of things, a whole series of changes will be needed:

- obviously it will require the development of a monetary economy on a Mediterranean scale, with problems of equivalence;
- there will also have to be some monetary experiments like the Hippias devaluation;³¹
- the accumulation of individual fortunes (thanks to the monetary economy) will have to bring about a new imbalance.

Then money will leave definitively the double region of *dikaion* and the simulacrum, the region of sacrifice and just distribution, of religious ritual and social pacification, to appear and be handled as sign—as natural or arbitrary sign—which enables one really to measure or which allows only the exchange of what one desires. A problematic of the monetary signifier will become possible (and to tell the truth, necessary) and its truth function will then have to be questioned.

Right in the middle of the fourth century, a passage in Aristotle's *Politics*³² is still very revealing. It distinguishes:

- a natural chrematistics, which falls in the domain of domestic economy (which consists in acquiring wealth through cultivation); wealth which is necessarily circumscribed. The use of money is not excluded from this economy, but it is useful for something other than itself: it is useful for acquiring what one needs.³³ Money therefore has the double character of being subordinate to something other than itself, of being acquired only in limited quantities;
- a chrematistics in the strict sense, which seeks only the acquisition of money itself and consequently in unlimited quantities. This rests on exchange. It is subject to the criticism that it is not natural. In a sense it is not true, and yet it is nevertheless regarding this chrematistics that the question arises: is not money true wealth, since it enables one to acquire every kind of wealth, since it

allows one to make every kind of exchange? Things then are worth their cash equivalent.

Is money not rather “pure foolishness”?³⁷ Something entirely conventional, with “nothing natural,” since one can devalue it by decree, demonetize the metal, and since, like Midas, one may die of hunger in front of a pile of gold.

The double problematic of money (arbitrary/natural, truth/illusion) is linked to its late function as sign. Previously, its truth was linked, but in a non-apophantic way, to *dike* and *nomos*—*nomos* which is not yet convention.³⁸

1. The formula is attributed to Solon, a policy favorable to the middle classes in contrast with the aristocratic formula "nothing too much" which fixed an upper but not a lower limit, in G. Thomson, "La Philosophie d'Eschyle" (Paris: CERM [no date]).
2. P.N. Ure, *The Origins of Tyranny*, p. 154 and p. 183: "First third of the seventh century, the reign of Pheidon opened the age of tyranny... it is Plato and Aristotle who later reinterpreted tyranny as the effect of military victories because they had before their eyes the late example of Dionysius of Syracuse." (Foucault's notes kept on a card relating to the development of a servile labor force in Greece. The tyrants encouraged manual work, but the stage of artisanal work began to be overtaken by enterprises under tyranny. According to this card, slavery spreads only with the Median Wars.) In fact, Aristotle, *Politicus*, V, 10, 1310b, 25-35, relates that Pheidon transformed his kingship into tyranny.
3. A.P. Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants*, pp. 78-83.
4. E. Will, "Réflexions et hypothèses sur les origines du monnayage," *Revue numismatique*, 5th series, 17, 1955.
5. E. Will, "La Grèce archaïque," pp. 74-94; C. Hignett, *History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952).
6. M.J. Finley, *The Ancient Greeks*, p. 42: "...the Greek lawgiver laid down the rules by which the community should govern itself." (Foucault's card on the legislator and the tyrant.)
7. Plutarque, *Œuvres morales. Propos de table*, Book VIII, 719a-b: "It is said that Lycurgus banned the study of arithmetic in Sparta for being democratic and popular in its effects, and that he introduced geometry as better adapted to a strict oligarchy and institutional monarchy. In using numbers, arithmetic distributes things equally; in using proportion, geometry distributes things according to merit. Geometry is not a source of confusion of the State therefore, it includes a principle of distribution between the good and the bad, who do not receive their share according to chance or weight but by the difference between vice and virtue" (quotation copied out by M.F. in his preparatory notes); English translation by Edwin L. Minar, Plutarch, *Moralia* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, Loeb Classical Library, 1961), Volume IX, Book Eight, pp. 123-125: "You know, of course, that Lycurgus expelled arithmetical proportion from Lacedaemon, because of its democratic and rabble-raising character. He introduced the geometric proportion, which is appropriate to a moderate oligarchy or a lawful monarchy. The arithmetical distributes an equal amount to each, measuring by number, whereas the geometric distributes to each an amount corresponding to his worth, measuring by proportion. It does not mix everything together, but has within it a clear principle of the distinction of good and bad: people receive their due not as the balance or the lot directs, but always by the distinction of good and bad in them."
8. According to E. Will, *Le Monde grec et l'Orient*, Hippodamus of Miletus (second half of the fifth century) worked on the reorganization of Piraeus, and, according to B. Gille, *Les Mécaniciens grecs* (Paris: Seuil, 1980) pp. 50-51, also on the construction of Thurii and Rhodes.
9. C.H. Kahn, *Anaximander and the Origins of Greek Cosmology*; J. P. Vernant, "Geometry and Spherical Astronomy in the First Greek Cosmology," Nietzsche and Rohde have commented upon Anaximander, which is recalled by some quotations copied by Foucault in his preparatory notes, taken from W. Jaeger, *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers*.
10. See C. Mugler, *Platon et la recherche mathématique de son époque* (Strasbourg-Zurich: Heitz, 1948).
11. See G. Vlastos, "Equality and justice in early Greek cosmology" pp. 164-168.
12. Althusser and his students undertook a fresh scrutiny of the genesis of the money form in Marx and criticized "fetishism" as an anthropological process of the reification of social relations (money): "a category ['thing'] more foreign to Marx cannot be imagined." L. Althusser, *For Marx*, trans. B. Brewster (London and New York: Verso, 2005) p. 197n.
13. H. Michell, *The Economics of Ancient Greece*, pp. 311-314.
14. The first to have developed this thesis was probably B. Laum, in *Heiliges Geld. Eine historische Untersuchung über den sakralen Ursprung des Geldes* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1924), and *Über das Wesen des Münzgeldes* (Staat. Akad. Braunsberg, 1929). E. Will refers to Laum, notably in "De l'aspect éthique des origines grecques de la monnaie," *Revue historique*, CCXII (2), 1954, pp. 211-213:

(1) the ox is object, not means of exchange.

- (2) in sacrifices and evaluations we find the same unit (ox) and the same multiples (9, 12, 100).
15. From here, in the main, Foucault follows the studies of Edouard Will, whose *Korinthiaka* is still today a comprehensive survey of references.
 16. E. Will, "Réflexions et hypothèses sur les origines du monnayage."
 17. Reference to the transformation of the movements C-M-C into M-C-M, the subject of considerable commentary at the time by Althusserians. Foucault recalled elsewhere the diplomatic function of a quotation from Marx.
 18. Is it completely unnecessary to recall the three functions of universal money for Marx: those of means of payment, means of purchase, and social material of wealth in general? See K. Marx, *Capital*, Volume 1 (London: Penguin Books/New Left Review, 1976) Book I, Part One, chapter 3, §3.
 19. P.N. Ure, *The Origins of Tyranny*: "The tyrannies in Greece were founded on the monetary economy." (Note by M.F.)
 20. See Turgot's article "Étymologie" in the *Encyclopédie*, which, according to Foucault, established the first systematic parallel between money and words. See *Les Mots et les Choses*, p. 90; *The Order of Things*, p. 109.
 21. Homer, *The Iliad*, Book One, 234-239, 245-246; Book Two, 100 et seq.; Book Sixteen, 501-506.
 22. B. Laum, *Heiliges Geld*; E. Will, "De l'aspect éthique des origines grecques de la monnaie," pp. 211-213.
 23. From the 1960s, a growing conceptualization of the simulacrum—*versus* sign and symbol—circulates between Klossowski, who links it to the "eternal return," Deleuze, who associates it with "difference and repetition," and Foucault. See P. Klossowski, *Un si funeste désir*; G. Deleuze, *Différence et Répétition*; *Différence and Repetition*; and M. Foucault, "La prose d'Actéon" (1964) in *Dis et Écrits*, vol. I, no. 21, pp. 326-337/"Quarto," ed., vol. I, pp. 354-365; English translation by Robert Hurley, "The Prose of Acteon" in M. Foucault, *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*, pp. 123-136.
 24. E. Will, in "Réflexions et hypothèses sur les origines du monnayage," proposes for "regulation" the Greek term *nomisma*, "instrument of assessment of value," from the root NEM, *nomésō*, *nomos*, *nomisma*, *nomizein*. From this Deleuze also derives the theme of the "Nomad" in *Différence et Répétition*, p. 54; *Différence and Repetition*, p. 36 and p. 309 note 6.
 25. See above, note 1.
 26. Allusion to a poem by Solon, in G. Vlastos, "Solonian justice," *Classical Philology*, 41, 1946, pp. 65-69.
 27. Demosthenes will say that every particle of violence creates injustice; see G. Vlastos, *ibid.*
 28. C. Mossé, *La Fin de la démocratie athénienne*, pp. 234-239.
 29. See above, p. 127, and p. 132 note 21.
 30. See *ibid.* and note 22.
 31. Plato, *Republic*, p. 779: "May not the opposition of wealth and virtue be conceived as if each lay in the scale of a balance inclining opposite ways?"
 32. *Ibid.*, p. 663: "...if from poverty he is unable to provide himself with tools and other requirements of his art..."
 33. According to the *Robert* dictionary, "the Academy made this word from the feminine. But archeologists always use it in the masculine." [Foucault writes: "*le* tétradrachme," whereas drachma (*la* drachme) is feminine; G.B.]
 34. H. Michell, *The Economics of Ancient Greece*, pp. 331-332.
 35. Aristotle, *Politics*, I, 3, 1253b and I, 9, 1257a-b.
 36. That is to say, the happy life: *alathen zōen*; *ibid.*, I, 8, 1256b32.
 37. *Ibid.*, I, 9, 1257b; English translation, p. 1995: "mere sham."
 38. M. Ostwald, *Nomos and the Beginnings of Athenian Democracy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969).