



## Beyond and Below the Polis: Networks, Associations, and the Writing of Greek History

Kostas Vlassopoulos

To cite this article: Kostas Vlassopoulos (2007) Beyond and Below the Polis: Networks, Associations, and the Writing of Greek History, *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 22:1, 11-22, DOI: [10.1080/09518960701538507](https://doi.org/10.1080/09518960701538507)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518960701538507>



Published online: 19 Dec 2007.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 692



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)

# Beyond and Below the Polis: Networks, Associations, and the Writing of Greek History

Kostas Vlassopoulos

*This article looks at the ways we can use networks in the study of the history of Greece. At the level below the polis, networks take the form of associations (koinoniai) that bring together people of various statuses and backgrounds. Studying these koinoniai allows us to move beyond structuralist approaches into the study of real social interactions. When looking at the level below the polis, we have to adopt a world-system perspective, and study the networks that move people, goods and ideas/technologies, and the world centres that organize these networks. This approach allows us to move beyond Hellenocentric and Athenocentric approaches, and insert the Greek world into the wider Mediterranean and Near Eastern world-system.*

*Keywords:* Koinonia; Association; World-system; Metics; Aristotle

The study of Greek history in the last few decades has been dominated by the concept of the polis. This trend has taken two separate, but closely connected, forms. On the micro-level, the view of the polis as an adult male citizen club tends to emphasize a number of insuperable polarities as fundamental features of Greek social, economic, political, and cultural history: citizen vs. foreigner, male vs. female, free vs. slave, Greek vs. barbarian.<sup>1</sup> On the macro-level, the concept itself of the Greek polis came ultimately to play the role of the subject of Greek history. The polis was and is still seen as *the* Greek form of state, *the* Greek form of society, *the* Greek form of economy; and as such was what separated the Greeks from the other peoples of the Mediterranean and the Near East, thereby allowing modern scholars to focus on specifically Greek economic, social, cultural, and political history. The many different Greek communities, scattered all over the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, could be seen

---

Correspondence to: Kostas Vlassopoulos, Department of Classics, University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD, UK. Email: Konstantinos.Vlassopoulos@nottingham.ac.uk

as so many different replicas of the common denominator. And instead of the bewildering variety between the developments of different Greek communities, modern scholars could substitute a unified history based on the rise, acme, and decline of the polis.

Two main problems arise with this standard approach. The first is that, in an age of disillusionment with structuralism, the static polarities seem particularly problematic.<sup>2</sup> But the more important problem is the inability of the polis concept to explain both the wide diversity and the fascinating unity of the Greek world.<sup>3</sup> We have no analytical standpoint apart from the level of the polis to understand the Greek world as a whole.<sup>4</sup> Instead, we accept the wider Greek world as a matter of fact; in this framework, everybody who spoke Greek is considered somehow part of Greek culture and civilization. The assumption behind this approach is that culture and society are closed, homogeneous, bounded entities. Greek culture is understood as a closed, bounded entity juxtaposed to other closed, bounded entities. This has also created problematic reifications: Greek history is written as a national history, and is separated from other national histories in the Mediterranean (e.g., Egyptian or Persian). Even when scholars take into account the interactions between Greeks and other peoples, they tend to understand this as an interaction between two closed, bounded entities.<sup>5</sup>

What I wish to propose in this paper is that the concept of *network* can allow us to move beyond this orthodox model of writing Greek history.<sup>6</sup> The concept of network enables us to explore two levels apart from the polis; the level of social, economic, political, and cultural interaction *below* the polis, and the level *beyond*. I will propose that in order to study the networks below the polis, we need to employ the concept of *koinônia* (association); and that in order to study networks beyond the polis, we need to employ the concept of the world-system.

### **Below the Polis: The *Koinôniai***

Networks are processes that connect people and places in order to move goods, people and ideas/technologies. But how do they actually work at a micro-level? Networks function by bringing people into association with each other, in order to buy and sell, to work, to drink and eat, to participate in worship, to discuss, to fight, to travel, etc. This concept of association plays a fundamental role in the work of Aristotle, who sees the polis as a *koinônia* encompassing other *koinôniai*:<sup>7</sup>

But all *koinôniai* are parts, as it were, of the *koinônia* of the polis. Travellers for instance associate together for some advantage, namely to procure some of their necessary supplies. But the *politikê koinônia* too, it is believed, was originally formed, and continues to be maintained, for the advantage of its members. . . . Thus the other *koinôniai* aim at some particular advantage; for example, sailors combine to seek the profits of seafaring in the way of trade or the like; comrades in arms the gains of warfare, their aim being either plunder or victory over the enemy, or the capture of a city. . . . All these *koinôniai* then appear to be parts of the *koinônia* of the polis.<sup>8</sup>

Of course an association can take an institutional form, like a *deme* (township), or a tribe; but there are many other *koinônai*, ranging from the temporary and the informal, to the highly institutionalized. It is regrettable that modern historians have not paid enough attention to this Aristotelian concept, as it offers a number of great advantages.<sup>9</sup> The first advantage of the concept of *koinônia* is its ability to overcome static polarities and divisions, such as those between masters and slaves, citizens and metics (alien residents), men and women, Greeks and barbarians. Of course, these distinctions did exist and they did play an important role; but the problem is that we have made of them unsurpassable states of being, when in reality these concepts are images and identities that are defined by constant challenge and renegotiation, depending on the context.<sup>10</sup> The advantage of Aristotle's concept, then, is that it allows us to focus on the concrete experience of people in the various forms of *koinônai* in which they associate. In the case of the Greek and barbarian identities, what is the actual form of such a polarity when they both participate in a *koinônia* aboard a ship? And what happens when a free man and a slave both participate in a *koinônia* for work (in the shipyards, for instance), under the same conditions? What occurs when a citizen and a metic drink together and converse in a tavern or a barber's shop? And last but not least, what takes place when men and women participate together in a *koinônia* of religious practice?

A further advantage of Aristotle's *koinônia* is its conceptual flexibility. In contrast with the modern conception of isomorphism between society, economy, and the state, the concept of *koinônai* recognizes that the boundaries of different *koinônai* are different, and not necessarily overlapping. The boundaries identifying a household, for instance, are very different from those of guest-friendship, or for a trading agreement, a religious or scholarly community, or a group of *systratiôtai* (military comrades). All these relationships, which are described as *koinônai* by Aristotle, are part of the *politikê koinônia*, but each one has its own boundaries, directions, and rhythms of change.

Let us look at a number of examples that show the value of the concept of *koinônia*. I will restrict my examples to cases of *koinônai* between Greeks and foreigners. Much has been written about the Greeks' perceptions of the Other, their racism, and their contempt for Barbarians.<sup>11</sup> While of course there is a lot of truth in these accounts, it seems to me that these issues are rarely discussed with real people in mind, nor are they subjected to the sort of analysis that historians with better evidence are accustomed to applying.

Let us imagine a Greek and a Phoenician drinking a cup of wine after work in Piraeus, and that the former is Athenian: how would he formulate his discussion on the superiority of Athenian democracy over Oriental despotism, and what would the Phoenician reply? Would the Greek speak to the Phoenician in the same way as he would with other Greeks? How would his personal, daily contact with the Phoenician influence his own perceptions? Given that in Piraeus, Greek citizens and Phoenician aliens lived in the same neighbourhoods, worked in the same streets, buried their dead in the same graveyards, and their children played together—how

did this day-to-day experience influence and formulate people's perceptions in general?<sup>12</sup>

Although we do not have the direct evidence to answer these questions, nor do we have records of actual encounters and discussions, certain bits and pieces of evidence have survived that offer some clues. For example, an official Athenian inscription honouring the king of Phoenician Sidon also stipulates the following: 'Those Sidonians that while residing in Sidon and having political rights there (*politeuomenoi*) come to Athens for trade should be exempt from the *metoikion* tax, from acting as *choregoi* and from being registered for an *eisphora*.'<sup>13</sup> The Athenians in this inscription recognize that, while a Near Eastern community might be governed by a king, its citizens were not without some political rights.<sup>14</sup> So our Phoenician might argue that the Athenians themselves recognized that the commonly held idea of Oriental despotism was far from the actual reality. How did the Athenians know that some Sidonians had political rights in Sidon? Surely, the Greek discourses on Oriental despotism that we find in Greek texts did not provide them with the material to raise such a possibility. Is not this inscription a result of these actual encounters that I am postulating?

Further evidence is found in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, in which Ischomachus describes the following encounter:

Once I had an opportunity of looking over the great Phoenician merchantman, Socrates, and I thought I had never seen tackle so excellently and accurately arranged. For I never saw so many bits of stuff packed away separately in so small a receptacle. . . . I found that the steersman's servant, who is called the mate, knows each particular section so exactly that he can tell, even when away, where everything is kept and how much there is of it, just as well as a man who knows how to spell can tell how many letters there are in Socrates and in what order they come. Now, I saw this man in his spare time inspecting all the stores that are wanted, as a matter of course, in the ship. I was surprised to see him looking over them, and asked what he was doing. 'Sir,' he answered, 'I am looking to see how the ship's tackle is stored, in case of accident, or whether anything is missing, or mixed up with other stuff. For when God sends a storm at sea, there's no time to search about for what you want, or to serve it out if it's in a muddle. For God threatens and punishes careless fellows, and you're lucky if he merely refrains from destroying the innocent; and if he saves you when you do your work well, you have much cause to thank heaven for.'<sup>15</sup>

Ischomachus (or Xenophon) was clearly impressed by the huge Phoenician vessel; from the detailed way it is described one can easily assume that the event was well remembered. So intrigued was Ischomachus that he went deliberately to make inquiries with the mate of the Phoenician ship, and one wonders in which language Xenophon believed them to have conversed: did Ischomachus speak Phoenician, or did the Phoenician sailor speak Greek? Were there also Greek sailors aboard the Phoenician ship? And what else can the two men have talked about? Clearly, after such a detailed conversation, no Greek would continue to sustain the view of Barbarian inferiority or incapacity.

Another fascinating example occurs in the account of Athenogenes, an Egyptian metic involved in selling perfumes in late fourth-century Athens.<sup>16</sup> The cunning

Athenogenes conspires with Antigone, a prostitute, to sell to a wealthy young Athenian citizen two male slaves along with their heavily indebted perfume workshop. In this case, the presumed superiority of the dominant Greek citizen is completely subverted. Although the details of the story are not of direct concern here, what happens later on is quite revealing (§29–31):

During the war against Philip, he left the city just before the battle and did not serve with you at Chaeroneia. Instead, he moved to Troezen, disregarding the law, which says that a man who moves in wartime shall be indicted and summarily arrested if he returns. The reason for the move, it seems, was this: he thought that the city of Troezen would survive, whereas he had passed a sentence of death on ours. . . . He is so degraded and so true to type wherever he is, that even after his arrival at Troezen, when they had made him a citizen, he became the tool of Mnesias the Argive and, after being made a magistrate by him, expelled the citizens from the city.<sup>17</sup>

Here we have an Egyptian perfume-seller with the obligation to fight for Athens, along with thousands of other foreigners living in Athens, and who instead escapes to a tiny, obscure place like Troezen, where he is enrolled as a citizen and even becomes a magistrate.<sup>18</sup> How common was such an event? To judge from the tone of the passage, it does not seem very extraordinary—indeed, the outrage is for his having disenfranchised other citizens, not for his having managed to become one himself. What did Athenogenes bring with him from his Egyptian cultural baggage when he became a citizen and a magistrate? We need a larger horizon.<sup>19</sup>

Elsewhere we find an Athenian grave inscription dating from the third quarter of the fifth century, bearing an epigram in Homeric hexameters, which reads thus: ‘This is the beautiful tomb of Manes, the son of Orymaios, the best of Phrygians there ever were in wide Athens. And by Zeus, I never saw any woodcutter better than me. He died in war.’<sup>20</sup> We have here the epigram of a foreigner, a Phrygian, who is a manual worker and clearly proud of his craft and his manual skills. Furthermore, it is reasonable to suppose that he died fighting for Athens during the Peloponnesian War, or equally possible in some other previous military engagement. Thousands of metics fought alongside Athenians every time Athens was at war.<sup>21</sup> How would our Phrygian converse with his Athenian comrades-in-arms while serving in the Athenian regiment? How would he converse with his Athenian fellow-workers? What would a low-class Athenian think when reading this epigram on his way to his workshop?

To conclude, the concept of the network takes the form of *koinônia* (association) in the micro-level below the polis. This concept can allow us to move beyond the static polarities that we employ when writing Greek history, and move towards more nuanced accounts.

### **Beyond the Polis: Networks and the World-System**

How can the concept of network help us with levels beyond the polis? Many modern historians believe that the polis is the key to the underlying unity of the Greek world and of all Greek culture, and that it is somehow possible thereby to make a clear

distinction between the Greek world and all the other cultures of the Mediterranean and the Near East. These same historians have also been reluctant to create proper methodological and analytical tools for studying the variety of Greek cultures, their links, and forms of interaction. We still lack the analytical tools for studying all those intermediate levels, the complex links between them, and the ways in which the variety of communities and levels scattered all over the Mediterranean came to form a single, overarching system with its own rules.

Athenian monumental funerary art of the Classical period provides a good example of the problem and my proposed solution.<sup>22</sup> One of the most impressive monuments of fourth-century Athenian art is the funerary monument of Nikeratos—a metic from the city of ancient Istria on the Black Sea; the monument is clearly inspired and imitates the famous Mausoleum of Halicarnassus. But the creation of this new form of funerary art, which fuses Greek temple architecture and sculpture with Near Eastern decorative themes and funerary monuments, is neither simply an imitation, nor another illustration of Athenian creativity; it was based on the long experimentation between Greek and non-Greek artistic practices that took place in the wider Mediterranean Greek world.

Working for both Greek and non-Greek customers, Greek artists in Sinope (the Black Sea), Cyrene (North Africa), and the Greek cities of Asia Minor experimented for a long period, fusing the tradition of Greek public art with the various non-Greek traditions of monumental tombs, which were to be seen in their adjacent areas. In the fourth century this experimentation found its way to Athens, giving rise to one of the most impressive artistic achievements of the Greek world, clearly demonstrating the interaction between various components of Greek and other Mediterranean cultures, the role of the wider Greek world as a laboratory of experimentation and interaction, the introduction of the new practices to Athens, and not least the role of metics in Athenian culture.

The above example should lead us to a number of conclusions. First, to talk of the art of an individual polis (Athens) is misleading, as the artistic monuments created in Athens are the product of complex processes taking place over time within the wider Mediterranean world, without belonging to or emanating from a particular centre. Second, the unity of Greek culture cannot be attributed solely to the emergence and development of the polis. Composed of a multitude of different, fragmented polities scattered all over the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, the Greek 'world' was created and fostered by the vast numbers of people in movement, namely, sailors, traders, soldiers, artists, physicians, poets, and intellectuals. As Filippo Cassola has put it: 'The activities [of these thousands of mobile people] were enough to create a connective network which embraced the whole Greek world and caused an exchange of experiences that guaranteed not the homogeneity of the culture, but the reciprocal comprehension and the reciprocal interest among the inhabited centres.'<sup>23</sup> But if we accept that this is the case, we need to reach a further conclusion: the networks of mobilizing and moving these people, the networks which create the unity of the Greek world, were not controlled only by Greeks, nor did they involve only Greeks.

These three observations can best be answered by adopting the concept of the world-system, which allows us to study how the various networks function beyond the level of the individual polity.

What is a world-system? It is important to clear up some significant misconceptions that gather round this notion.<sup>24</sup> The first is that a world-system implies by necessity a distinction between a dominant core and an exploited periphery (and semi-periphery). Therefore, if it is impossible to find a clear distinction between a centre and an exploited periphery, then there exists no world-system. A dominant centre and an exploited periphery is only one possible form of a world-system. While the modern world-system is undoubtedly structured on a centre/periphery basis, this does not mean that all world-systems in the past have had the same characteristics, or that there were no world-systems before the emergence of the modern one. Indeed, a variety of different forms are feasible: Janet Abu-Lughod has convincingly argued that the medieval world-system of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries CE had a form of concentric circles, instead of a single centre and periphery.<sup>25</sup>

The second misconception is that direct links are required for a world-system to qualify as such. A sceptic might ask: what exactly do we gain in comprehension if we say that Paestum (Italy), Thebes (Greece), and Olbia (Black Sea) belong to the same world-system.<sup>26</sup> But although direct contacts might as well develop within a world-system, they are by no means mandatory. What makes Croton, Aegina, Athens, Samos, and Persia all components of the same world-system is not their direct contacts; it is rather the networks that already existed in the sixth century—and which prompted the famous doctor Democedes to traverse the whole Mediterranean from his native Croton to Persia—that link these places together into a ‘system’.<sup>27</sup>

If we accept Wallerstein’s minimum definition that ‘[a system] is a world-system, not because it encompasses the whole world, but because it is larger than any juridically defined political unit’<sup>28</sup> then the crucial issue is that a single community or polity (a Greek polis) cannot be a self-sufficient unit of analysis.<sup>29</sup> The term ‘world-system’ is used here to define and analyse a larger frame of historical reference. There are various forms of interactions and processes that one could call world-systems; they range from low- to high-intensity systems; and from anarchic to centrally organised. There need then be two primary qualifications: a world-system does not necessarily encompass the whole world; there can be several coexisting world-systems; and the extent of each of them can change from period to period and so can only be historically reconstructed. Moreover, a world-system is a system, but not necessarily a highly structured and coherent one; again, its intensity can be described only in concrete historical analysis, and not in a priori theory. So, a world-system can indeed be a (highly structured) system of the (whole) world, as it is nowadays; but it can also take historically contingent forms varying in extent, structure, and intensity.

The components of such a world-system comprise three main aspects: *processes* (the movement of goods, people, and ideas and/or technologies); the various *centres* that organize and control these processes; and the *forms of change* of this system. The first

two aspects are dealt with in detail in a forthcoming article,<sup>30</sup> so my analysis here will focus on the forms of change.

A world-system can be said to exist when there is a manifest presence of processes, exchanges, and interactions linking many individual groups, communities, and polities; and when these processes, exchanges and interactions, moving people, goods, and ideas, range beyond the boundaries of a single group, community, or polity. Within this framework, three different world processes can be identified: processes moving people; processes moving goods; and processes moving ideas/technologies.<sup>31</sup> Any study of these processes would have to take several issues into account, such as the scale and extent of these networks through time and space. Another issue is the form of the networks that underlie these processes (e.g., is the network based on diaspora communities? How much power do the network agents have? Are they supported by state agencies or not?). A final issue would be how these different processes are interlinked: does the movement of people follow the same path as the movement of ideas, or are the different networks separate and with different routes and directions?

A world-system has a number of different centres, one being its religious centres, which bring together communities, forge links of common identity, disseminate types of worship and ideologies; in this respect, the importance of Delphi and Olympia is well documented.<sup>32</sup> Second come the *emporion*: those commercial nodes that organize, attract, and channel the movement of goods, people, ideas, and technical know-how.<sup>33</sup> Then there are the centres of cultural, scientific, and academic practices, such as the courts of the Sicilian tyrants<sup>34</sup> or of some Anatolian dynast,<sup>35</sup> or the philosophical schools of fourth-century Athens,<sup>36</sup> or the Cnidian and Coan centres of medicine.<sup>37</sup> Added to these of course were political centres, like Athens or Syracuse.

Any analysis of the various centres of such a world-system would have to take into account three main issues. The first is the *relationship* between different types of centre, that is, to discern how religious centres relate to political centres (e.g., Delphi and Athens); or how a commercial centre managed to transform itself into a political and cultural centre (e.g., Rhodes in the Hellenistic period).<sup>38</sup> The second issue concerns *scale*; the size, catchment area, and extent of influence of a given centre never remained static. For example, Naucratis and Alexandria are good illustrations of the increase in population, power, and extent of network links that took place from the Archaic to the Hellenistic period.<sup>39</sup> A third issue concerns influence and competition. A centre can attempt not only to attract the activities and processes on which it is based, but to control them too; moreover, a centre might try to transform its influence in one field into covering other fields; or, alternatively, its role as a centre in one particular field might necessitate the creation of centres in other fields too.

Finally, we need to take into account the forms of change that take place within a world-system. Failure to differentiate between them has often resulted in misleading conclusions. Following Robert Gilpin,<sup>40</sup> we can define three forms of change. The first concerns 'the nature of the actors or diverse entities that compose an international system', and could be called *actor change* (e.g., the change from the archaic political system composed of Greek polities, to the classical one composed of Greek polities and

a large empire (Persia), to the Hellenistic one with the emergence and domination of the large Hellenistic kingdoms); the second type of change is ‘a change in the form of control or governance of an international system; this type of change will be called *control change*’ (e.g., the change from the tri-polar balance between Athens, Sparta and Persia in the fifth century, to the anarchic balance of the evolving fourth century); and, third, ‘a change may take place in the form of regular interactions or processes among the entities in an ongoing international system; this type of change will be labelled simply *interaction change*’ (e.g., the change from mainly cultural and scattered political and military exchanges between Greek polities in the Archaic period, to a new form of relationships, where a border conflict in one region might lead to a general war among all the Greek polities).<sup>41</sup>

The failure to differentiate between the different forms of change in the political world-system creates acute problems. Instead of positing all-encompassing (and misleading) forms of change, like the emergence or the decline of the polis, it is better to look at the different underlying forms of change that might be taking place at the same time. The so-called fourth-century crisis and the decline of the polis is a good example.<sup>42</sup> After the defeat of the Greek cities by Philip in 338 BCE, we see a control change for the large Greek *poleis*, like Athens and Sparta, who lose their ability to control the system; but there is no control change for the vast majority of Greek *poleis*, who were already under the control of various powers by the early fifth century. If anything, the actor change, with the emergence of the new Hellenistic monarchies, meant for many medium and small Hellenistic *poleis* a control change in the opposite direction: many *poleis* in the Hellenistic world did benefit from being controlled by a monarchy, instead of being controlled by other *poleis*, as in the Classical period.<sup>43</sup>

In conclusion: the concept of network can help us to write a new kind of Greek history, both below and beyond the polis. We live in a globalized world, with fragmented identities, extensive networks, high mobility, and a world-system that seems out of any single power’s control. The ancient Greek world provides a fascinating arena for studying many of the most troubling issues of our own times. Whether we will be able to benefit from this reciprocal *problematique* remains to be seen.

## Notes

- [1] For the role of these polarities in Greek historians, see Cartledge, *The Greeks*.
- [2] See the critical attitudes to structuralism in Hunter, *Policing Athens*; Loraux, *Experiences of Tiresias*; Cohen, *Athenian Nation*.
- [3] See Whitley, *Style and Society*, 194.
- [4] The concept of ‘city-state culture’, adopted by Hansen in the more recent publications of the Copenhagen Polis Centre, is though a positive step forward; see Hansen, ‘Introduction’.
- [5] Among recent protests for such attitudes, see Dougherty and Kurke, *Cultures within Greek Culture*.
- [6] For a similar plea, see Malkin, ‘Networks’.
- [7] See Sakellariou, *Polis-State*, 214–82.
- [8] *Nicomachean Ethics* 1160a.4–6.

- [9] For exceptions, see Murray, 'Polis and Politeia'; Ober, 'Polis as Society'.
- [10] Aristotle's great discovery was indeed diversity and multiplicity, where other Greek thinkers were trying to see the underlying unity behind the apparent diversity; at the same time he used the concept of hierarchy to subordinate diversity to his normative ideas; see Saxonhouse, *Fear of Diversity*, 189–95. We can keep his explorations of diversity, without therefore accepting his concept of hierarchy.
- [11] See for example Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian*; Hartog, *The Mirror of Herodotus*. Cartledge, *The Greeks*, 51–77, offers a well-articulated presentation of such arguments.
- [12] For the fundamental importance of actual experience for any historical account and supposition, see the classic Thompson, *Poverty of Theory*.
- [13] *IG*, II<sup>2</sup>, 141.2.30–6.
- [14] See the interpretation of Culasso Gastaldi, *Le prossenie ateniesi*, 113–14.
- [15] *Oeconomicus* 8.11–6.
- [16] Hypereides, *Against Athenogenes*.
- [17] For the law mentioned by Hypereides, see Adak, *Metöken als Wohltäter Athens*, 67–72, whose interpretation I accept.
- [18] See Whitehead, *Hypereides*, 287–88, 339–41.
- [19] Our colleagues studying the Bronze Age Aegean have been more open-minded in this respect: see Knapp, 'Thalassocracies'; Cline, 'Tinker, Tailor, Soldier, Sailor'.
- [20] *IG*, I<sup>3</sup> 1361. Of course, predictably the interest of the few ancient historians who have dealt with this inscription has focused on dating, topography, and the language and oral features of the epigram. No wonder the political and social implications of this document have never been seriously addressed. But see now the commentary in Bäbler, *Fleissige Thrakerinnen*, 159–63.
- [21] Adak, *Metöken als Wohltäter Athens*, 67–72.
- [22] For the following, see Hagemajer Allen, 'Becoming the Other'
- [23] Cassola, 'Chi erano i Greci', 10.
- [24] Cf. Shipley, 'Distance, Development, Decline'.
- [25] Abu-Lughod, *Before European Hegemony*.
- [26] An example of this attitude can be seen in Finley, *Ancient Economy*, 177–78.
- [27] Herodotus 3.125–38.
- [28] Wallerstein, *Modern World-system*, 15.
- [29] Wallerstein, *Unthinking Social Science*.
- [30] See Vlassopoulos, 'Between East and West'.
- [31] See Charpin and Joannès, *La circulation des biens*, for a similar perspective on the Near East.
- [32] On their emergence, see Morgan, *Athletes and Oracles*; see also Rougemont, 'Delphes et les cités grecques'; Sanchez, *L'Amphictionie des Pyles*.
- [33] Bresson and Rouillard, *L'emporion*.
- [34] Dunbabin, *Western Greeks*, 298–99.
- [35] Hornblower, *Mausolus*.
- [36] Ostwald and Lynch, 'Growth of Schools'.
- [37] Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos*, 256–89.
- [38] Gabrielsen, *Naval Aristocracy*.
- [39] See the articles in Nicolet, *Mégapoles méditerranéennes*.
- [40] Gilpin, *War and Change*, 39–40; in my essay I have changed his terms to make them more comprehensible.
- [41] See the case of Lokrians and Phokians in the 390s and the eruption of the Corinthian War; *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* 13.3–4.
- [42] A classic treatment is Mossé, *La fin*. See the critique of Davies, 'The Fourth Century Crisis'.
- [43] See Gauthier, 'Grandes et petites cités'.

## References

- Abu-Lughod, Janet L. *Before European Hegemony. The World-system AD 1250–1350*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Adak, Mustafa. *Metöken als Wohltäter Athens: Untersuchungen zum sozialen Austausch zwischen ortsansässigen Fremden und der Bürgergemeinde in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit (ca. 500–150 v. Chr.)*. Munich: Tuduv, 2003.
- Bäbler, Balbina. *Fleißige Thrakerinnen und wehrhafte Skythen: Nichtgriechen im klassischen Athen und ihre archäologische Hinterlassenschaft*. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1998.
- Bresson, Alain and Pierre Rouillard, eds. *L'Emporion*. Paris: Publications du Centre Pierre Paris, 1993.
- Cartledge, Paul. *The Greeks. A Portrait of Self and Others*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Cassola, Filippo. 'Chi erano i Greci?'. In *I Greci. Storia, cultura, arte, società. Vol. II: Una storia greca. I. Formazione*, edited by S. Settis. Turin: Einaudi, 1996.
- Charpin, D., and F. Joannès, eds. *La circulation des biens, des personnes et des idées dans le proche orient ancien: actes de la XXXVIIIe rencontre Assyriologique internationale*. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1992.
- Cline, Eric H. 'Tinker, Tailor, Soldier, Sailor: Minoans and Mycenaeans Abroad'. In *Politeia: Society and State in the Aegean Bronze Age*, edited by R. Laffineur and W. D. Niemeier. Liege and Austin, TX: Program in Aegean Scripts and Prehistory, 1995.
- Cohen, Edward. *The Athenian Nation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Culasso Gastaldi, Enrica. *Le prossenie ateniesi del IV secolo a.C.* Alessandria, 2004.
- Davies, John K. 'The Fourth Century Crisis: What Crisis?'. In *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Vollendung oder Verfall einer Verfassungsform?*, edited by W. Eder. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1995.
- Dougherty, Carol, and Leslie Kurke, eds. *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Dunbabin, Thomas J. *The Western Greeks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1948.
- Finley, Moses I. *The Ancient Economy*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985.
- Gabrielsen, Vincent. *The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1997.
- Gauthier, Phillipe. 'Grandes et petites cités: hégémonie et autarcie'. *Opus* 6–8 (1987/89): 187–202.
- Gilpin, Robert. *War and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Hagemajer, Allen, K. 'Becoming the "Other": Attitudes and Practices at the Attic Cemeteries'. In *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*, edited by C. Dougherty and L. Kurke. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Hall, Edith. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-definition through Tragedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Hansen, Mogens H. 'Introduction. The Concepts of City-state and City-state Culture'. In *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-state Cultures*, edited by M. H. Hansen. Copenhagen: Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, 2000.
- Hartog, François. *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*. Translated by Janet Lloyd. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Hornblower, Simon. *Mausolus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Hunter, Virginia J. *Policing Athens: Social Control in the Attic Lawsuits, 420–320 B.C.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Knapp, Bernard A. 'Thalassocracies in Bronze Age Eastern Mediterranean Trade: Making and Breaking a Myth'. *World Archaeology* 24 (1993): 332–47.
- Loroux, Nicole. *The Experiences of Tiresias: The Feminine and the Greek Man*. Translated by Paula Wissing. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Malkin, Irad. 'Networks and the Emergence of Greek Identity'. *Mediterranean Historical Review* 18. (2003): 56–74.

- Morgan, Catherine. *Athletes and Oracles: The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Mossé, Claude. *La fin de la démocratie athénienne: Aspects sociaux et politiques du déclin de la cité grecque au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.C.* Paris: Presses Universitaires Françaises, 1962.
- Murray, Oswyn. 'Polis and *Politeia* in Aristotle'. In *The Ancient Greek City-state*, edited by M. H. Hansen. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1993.
- Nicolet, Claude, ed. *Mégapoles méditerranéennes. Géographie urbaine retrospective*. Paris: Maisonneuve, 2000.
- Ober, Josiah. 'The Polis as a Society: Aristotle, John Rawls, and the Athenian Social Contract'. In *The Ancient Greek City-state*, edited by M. H. Hansen. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1993.
- Ostwald, M., and J. P. Lynch. 'The Growth of Schools and the Advance of Knowledge'. In *Cambridge Ancient History, VI: The Fourth Century BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Rougemont, Georges. 'Delphes et les cités grecques d'Italie du sud et de Sicile'. In *La Magna Grecia e i grandi santuari della madre patria: atti del trentunesimo Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia*. Taranto: Istituto per la storia e l'archeologia della Magna Grecia, 1992.
- Sakellariou, Michail B. *The Polis-State: Definition and Origin*. Athens: De Boccard, 1989.
- Sanchez, Pierre. *L'Amphictionie des Pyles et de Delphes: recherches sur son rôle historique, des origines au II<sup>e</sup> siècle de notre ère*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2001.
- Saxonhouse, Arlene. *Fear of Diversity. The Birth of Political Science in Ancient Greek Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Sherwin-White, Susan M. *Ancient Cos. An Historical Study from the Dorian Settlement to the Imperial Period*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1978.
- Shiple, Graham. 'Distance, Development, Decline? World-systems Analysis and the "Hellenistic" Word'. In *Centre and Periphery in the Hellenistic World*, edited by P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad, J. Zahle, and K. Randsborg. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1993.
- Thompson, Edward Palmer. *The Poverty of Theory: Or an Orrery of Errors*. London: Merlin Press, 1978.
- Vlassopoulos, Kostas. 'Between East and West: The Greek Poleis as Part of a World-System'. *Ancient West and East* 6 (2007): 91–111.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Modern World-system. I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press, 1974.
- . *Unthinking Social Science: The Limits of Nineteenth-century Paradigms*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
- Whitehead, David. *Hypereides: The Forensic Speeches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Whitley, James. *Style and Society in Dark Age Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.