

finality the mystery of whether the relationship was platonic or sexual before or even after their marriage” (pp. xxxi–xxxii). She refers to a variety of recent opinions (including those of Michael St. John Packe, Michael Jacobs, Nicholas Capaldi, and Richard Reeves) and Hayek’s own view in a footnote (p. xxxiin). The footnote refers to an unpublished essay by Hayek (“J.S. Mill, Mrs. Taylor, and Socialism,” pp. 298–312) found in the study of his son Laurence after the latter’s death, and contains the remark by Hayek that he was “convinced the relationship was purely platonic” (p. 305), perhaps echoing a comment of Thomas Carlyle in a letter to his brother, John (p. 85n) that “I do believe that the whole thing is strictly Platonic still!” (March 1839). In another letter to John Sterling, written in 1837, Carlyle refers to “His *Platonica* [Harriet Taylor] and he [Mill] are constant as ever: innocent I do believe as sucking doves, and yet suffering the clack of tongues, worst penalty of guilt” (p. 80). I recall asking John Robson, when the edition was nearly completed, if he thought that the marriage was ever consummated, and he replied that he did not believe that it was, because, among other reasons, both Mill and Taylor were in constant ill-health. I agree with Hayek, Peart, and Robson, but would like to discover some direct evidence as to what Mill and Taylor thought of these issues of sexuality.

Frederick Rosen
University College London

Aristotle’s *Οικονομικά*, Modern Greek Translation, Introduction, and Commentaries by Basileios Kyrkos and Christos Baloglou (Athens: Herodotos, 2013), pp. 328, €30. ISBN 978-960-485-031-0.

doi: 10.1017/S1053837216000900

This work is part of the Aristotelian tradition and it is attributed to Aristotle, although it is definitely not his own, but was written much later, circa the second century BC. It is commonplace in the Aristotelian school to discuss ‘economy’: that is, household-management issues and their relation to ethics and politics. Diogenes Laertius refers to such a lost oeuvre attributed to Theophrastus (V.49). The fake Aristotelean *Οικονομικά* contains three books; the third exists only in the Latin translation made by William of Moerbeke in 1267. The first book focuses on *oikos*, and the second focuses on aspects related to *polis*. The third elaborates on elements from both areas from a doxographic point of view without adding anything substantial on the matter; this might be the reason why it was not preserved in Greek.

The editors completely follow the conventional way of thought in downplaying the importance of those anonymous and probably fake Aristotelian works. This is evident in the emphasis they place on the influence of Xenophon’s *Economics* (p. 29) or in their mere assertion that it is the work of an ‘imitator’ (p. 26). It has to be noted that ancient schools created a tradition of books attributed to Aristotle without thereby being a mere imitation of Aristotelian works. It is quite often a case of evolution of ideas within the frame of this tradition. Therefore, the interest shown in ‘economy’ during the II–I centuries BC with the publication of similar works, such as the Epicurean Philodemus’s *Peri Oikonomias*, is due to an ongoing competition between schools.

The latter dimension often goes unnoticed in this edition. Moreover, the split of the second book into a theoretical and an empirical/historical part reflects an overall methodological concern, clearly a trademark of the Aristotelian tradition, proper to economic matters. It is therefore more than an internal, structural division of this specific work as the editors suggest (pp. 125–126), but rather a commonplace encountered in the moral and political philosophy of the abovementioned Philodemus or in the Stoics of the same period.

The translation fills an important gap in the scholarship on the history of economic thought in modern Greek. There are a few controversial elements in the choice of modern Greek terms, essentially regarding ancient and modern Greek terms derivative of *oikos*: it is not always clear whether the “household management,” in the modern Greek term νοικοκυριό, for instance, includes private and public property issues, as is the case with *oikos*. Having said that, it is quite hard to go beyond connotations around the private/public dichotomy in contemporary Greek terminology containing *oiko*—as a component or root. Overall, this is a systematic and rich edition that, it is hoped, will open up the path for a renewal in the editions of ancient and early modern classic texts in the history of economic thought.

Spiros Tegos
University of Crete

Abdul Azim Islahi, *History of Islamic Economic Thought: Contributions of Muslim Scholars to Economic Thought and Analysis* (Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2014), pp. 136, £65. ISBN 978-1-78471-138-2.

doi: 10.1017/S1053837216000870

To understand this book—the focus of which is accurately portrayed by its title, and in particular its subtitle—readers should be aware of two current trends.

The first, which is specific to economics, is that in the modern teaching and practice of the discipline, the history of economic thought plays a relatively limited role. Students and practitioners certainly acknowledge their intellectual predecessors, but there is a tendency to focus on the more recent iterations of an idea—a sort of tacit deployment of the concept of a sufficient statistic. This is partially the result of the fact that some older intellectual contributions tend to be nested in newer ones, as happens when an economist writes down a mathematical model that depends upon an assumption, and a subsequent economist relaxes that assumption to make a more general model. A good example is the work of Kenneth Arrow and Gerard Debreu, which constitutes a more sophisticated version of the contributions of Léon Walras. Regardless, the fact remains that mainstream economics does not typically involve tracing a modern idea back to its progenitors, especially if they existed prior to the Classical school of Adam Smith and his successors. How often does an economics student come across a reference to a Greek philosopher in a textbook or syllabus?

The second trend is the feeling among many people in the Muslim community that there is widespread, global animosity toward Muslims, and that one manifestation of that animosity is a desire to downplay the contribution of Islamic scholars to modern